UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 101—PART 4

APRIL 4, 1955, TO MAY 4, 1955
(PAGES 4293 TO 5710)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1955

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1955

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Under the order of Friday last, and in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 103, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1955

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 12 seconds p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order of Friday, April 1, 1955, to Wednesday, April 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. ALBERT, Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 31, 1955.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, April 4, 1955.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all love and goodness, we have entered upon Holy Week commemorating days in the life of our blessed Lord, whose sacred significance we are contemplating with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May our thoughts continue to go out toward Thee in praise and in gratitude for the King of Kings who, on Palm Sunday, proclaimed His divine sovereignty over the spirit of man.

Grant that we may bow in penitence as we seek to comprehend the love of the great High Priest who, on Good Friday, laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the salvation of the world.

Help us on Easter Sunday to rejoice and appropriate by faith that glorious redemption whereof Thou hast given us assurance by raising Him from the dead and daily may we rise with Him into newness of life.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 31, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Nevada, Mr. BIBLE, and the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to fill existing vacancies thereon.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, to fill an existing vacancy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 1, 1955.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk today received from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4436) entitled "An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Speaker, pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, March 31, 1955, did on April 1, 1955, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter I wrote to one of my colleagues in answer to many inquiries I have received from my colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

APRIL 4, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PETE: You spoke to me about statements regarding my attitude toward Italy, the Italian people, and Americans of Italian descent, attributed to me in a story printed in the Washington Sunday Star, on March 26, 1955. I told you that the author of the story, one Mary McGrory, falsified my statements and misquoted me and took some of what I said entirely out of context. However, I do not want to leave my public record in the state in which this perverted account of a casual conversation which took place in the presence of two witnesses, and I therefore want to give you a few points in explanation.

I have been brought up and educated in an atmosphere of admiration for the Mediterranean cultures and civilization, and all my life I have been an admirer of Italy and a true friend of the Italian people. These are not statements made to suit a politician. The record speaks for itself:

1. In 1947, as a member of the House Select Committee on European Aid (Herter committee), I insisted on bringing Italy into the purview of the Marshall plan. I do not have to tell you what the Marshall plan did for Italy and its people.

2. In 1949, after an investigation in Italy and upon my return I sponsored legislation which has restored United States citizenship to thousands of Americans of Italian origin who voted in political elections in Italy. I believe that by this legislation I have helped to reunite more than 5,000 families.

3. In 1950, I sponsored amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which included Italian refugees from Venezia Giulia. That amendment helped to provide American homes for 2,000 Italian refugees hopelessly stranded in Trieste.

4. In 1951, I conceived and sponsored the creation of the organization now functioning under the name of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. This 24-nation Committee has so far been helpful primarily to the people of Italy, providing overseas homes for upward of 80,000 Italians.

5. In 1953, I sponsored on the floor of the House an amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, providing for the admission of Italians who have relatives in the United States. I believe that I have so far—through that amendment—helped more than 20,000 Italians to join their kin in this country.

6. In 1954, I worked out another amendment to the 1953 act, under which all of the 60,000 additional quota numbers for people born in Italy have been made available to

Italian relatives of American citizens, or to Italian refugees.

I have never stressed this record before, as I do not believe in that type of self-promotion. But, since I am now accused not only of being unfair to Italy and to Italians but of using vile language while referring to Americans of Italian origin, I feel compelled to protest against this vicious campaign and answer it with facts, and to ask my critics what they have done to compare with this record.

You also wanted to know why I questioned the wisdom of appointing Mr. Edward Corsi to the post of the Secretary of State's advisor on refugee and migration matters; I am glad to give you my position in this matter.

1. I believe that Mr. Corsi's association for a long period of time with highly objectionable groups and organizations continued long after it became obvious that these organizations were dominated by Communists, and that they, in fact, became Communist-front organizations. Mr. Corsi denies this, as you know, but my files are replete with documentary evidence testifying to the fact that he was an active member of those questionable groups, which he attempted to disassociate himself with by pointing to his military record, consisting of a few months service in a college student training program which was not a part of the armed services. If one wants to be very generous, Mr. Corsi's membership in the Communist-front organizations might be attributed not to his political tendencies nor to his naivete but to his lack of judgment.

2. I further believe that Mr. Corsi should not be entrusted with the administration of laws for which he has expressed contumacious disdain and contempt.

As you well know, entries of immigrants under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, are subject to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (sec. 15 of Public Law 203, 83d Cong.). In that connection, Mr. Corsi's testimony of October 1, 1952, before a commission appointed by President Truman, is pertinent. Mr. Corsi, testifying not as a private citizen, but as the then Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York, referred to a Federal statute (which he is now charged with administering) in the following words:

"The Immigration and Nationality Act * * * based on archaic concepts cannot be patched up * * * it must be junked entirely. * * *

"The world is in too precarious a state for this Nation to indulge itself in the luxury of conduct based on the same type of pathological mentality that brought the German people to destruction.

"To base national policy on a type of reasoning which, if displayed by an individual would place him in jeopardy of commitment to an asylum, etc."

Subsequent to his statement before the President's Commission, Mr. Corsi published under the auspices of the B'nai Brith, in 1953, a propaganda pamphlet under the title "Paths to the New World: American Immigration—Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." A perusal of pages 27 to 44 of that pamphlet will provide you with ample evidence that Mr. Corsi has not only neglected to acquaint himself with the law he is dealing with, but also appears to prefer to avoid telling the truth where a lie serves his purpose better. The vicious untruths therein contained render a great disservice to the unity of our beloved republic.

Mr. Corsi's "job specification" in the State Department has been written so as to circumvent the necessity of submitting to the United States Senate an obviously obnoxious name. I am quite certain that if for no other reason than for calling legislators—in effect—nazis and candidates for an insane asylum, Mr. Corsi would never have been confirmed by the Senate should his appointment have called for the Senate's advice and consent.

I hope you will agree with me that to continue Mr. Corsi's services in the Department of State and to entrust him with the administration of the law, which he has pledged himself to destroy—to use his own words, to "junk"—is not compatible with American ideas of good government and does not serve the interests of this country.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file reports on sundry private bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last fall I visited with a banker friend of mine who asked me if I could explain a phase of Federal financing which was troubling him. The bank he operated had made a profit in handling Commodity Credit paper. He, like any of us, was pleased with the profitable business. However, as a taxpayer he was concerned about this manner of handling the Government's business.

During the recent hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, discussed this transaction with Department officials. On page 1383 of part III of the printed hearings, the following explanation appears:

It is estimated that the additional interests costs incurred by CCC through the use of private lending agencies in lieu of Treasury financing are $4,385,000 for the fiscal year 1954 and $12,750,000 for the fiscal year 1955. Partially offsetting increased interest costs incident to certificates of interest held by private lending agencies, the Treasury Department refinanced certain borrowings of CCC, thereby reducing its interests costs by an estimated $1,868,000 during the fiscal year 1954 and by an estimated $4,644,000 during the fiscal year 1955.

On January 27, 1954, I called the attention of the House to the favorable interest rates on CCC paper. At that time I said:

This CCC paper is issued in the form of certificates of interest. The interest rates have been attractive, as evidenced by the fact of oversubscription for each issue. The first offer was on October 28, 1953, in the amount of $360 million at an interest rate of 2½ percent. The banks offered to buy over $2 billion worth of this paper because of the attractive interest rate. The second offer was on December 7, 1953, in the amount of $450 million at an interest rate of 2¼ percent. The banks offered to buy $1.2 billion worth of this issue. The last two offers were an January 15 of this year in the amount of $350 million at an interest rate of 2⅛ percent. The banks wanted over $1.8 billion of this paper.

During this period the Treasury could have borrowed the money on 91-day bills for approximately 1½ percent interest or less. Commercial call money in New York was only about 2 percent at the time of the issue last fall.

No wonder that my banker friend was concerned. Is the American taxpayer being forgotten entirely? I sincerely hope that this is not an example of the business know-how of the Eisenhower administration.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Joseph Pulitzer last week removed one of the truly distinguished publishers of this generation. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was a nationally recognized newspaper when he inherited control from his father, one of the last giants of the era of personal journalism. It is a measure of the man that he left the Post-Dispatch, after more than four decades, stronger than he found it, proud in its tradition, and respected everywhere in the world where honest opinions and courageous independence are sought.

All through Joseph Pulitzer's career as publisher, the Post-Dispatch carried as part of its masthead the remarkable words of his father upon retirement:

THE POST-DISPATCH PLATFORM

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, alway remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

APRIL 10, 1907.

A creed such as this is not self-executing. The nobility of the sentiments is no guaranty that the ideal will be fulfilled. Only a vital and understanding personality could have transformed the words into deeds, could have made the Post-Dispatch through all the days of the years a living expression of the finest traditions of the free American journalism.

This was Joseph Pulitzer's achievement. The Post-Dispatch has had many able editors in both the news and editorial departments, but the best editors cannot function effectively unless they are given encouragement and creative support from those who also control the business office. It has been no accident

that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch today conducts great crusades that match the most distinguished efforts of its past, that its news columns have continuously been used to explain as well as recount the news of the day, that its editorial page is genuinely distinguished for independence of thought, its fire and passion, its earnest search for the truth beneath controversy.

It may safely be said that only 1 to 2 American newspapers are read so eagerly and faithfully in governmental and journalistic offices elsewhere as the Post-Dispatch. This St. Louis publication is sometimes called the Manchester Guardian of America, and that is a high compliment, because the Guardian is recognized all over the world as a spokesman for the best in independent English thought. But something may be added—that the greatness of the Post-Dispatch is peculiarly American. It is respected because it expresses in our modern day the long American passion for the full flowering of our democracy.

Newspapers like the Post-Dispatch, with the boldness to make their own assessments of events, with a dedicated devotion to the truth, have a great part reserved in our times, when human society is riven by anxieties, when even in our own land there are many voices counseling fear, when winds of suspicion are set in motion among us.

Joseph Pulitzer maintained his Post-Dispatch as a fighter for freedom, for democracy, for the rights of man. His inner spirit lighted by his father's concept of what a great newspaper should be, he made that concept a living reality. He thought of himself, always, as a newspaperman and he was proudest of the thought that his personal contribution to the Post-Dispatch was the leadership he could give as a newspaperman. What finer thing could be said of any man than that he took something given into his hands and by his stewardship passed it on to others the better for his life?

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. While my city is saddened by the death of Joseph Pulitzer, his passing is mourned throughout the world. He was one of the greatest newspapermen of our time.

For over 43 years Joseph Pulitzer headed the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Succeeding his father, the founder of the paper, in 1912, he adopted the Post-Dispatch platform as his journalistic and editorial guide. It literally became his Bible and in every issue of the Post-Dispatch there is printed a copy of this platform:

THE POST-DISPATCH PLATFORM

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

APRIL 10, 1907.

His steadfast adherence to these principles and high ideals has made the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a distinguished symbol of journalism at its best. While he personally supervised the various operations of the newspaper, his true love was his work as an active newspaperman. The news and editorial pages were closest to his heart. With his deep sense of public responsibility and public service, he personally led many of the campaigns which have been a distinguishing feature of the Post-Dispatch.

He kept his newspaper abreast of all scientific and technological developments. He took an active interest in the development of radio as well as television. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch station, KSD, which went on the air in 1922, was the first radio station to be operated by a newspaper. The same was true of the television station, KSD–TV, which began telecasts in 1947.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was Mr. Pulitzer's life. Although he is gone, his great newspaper lives on, and I am confident it will keep alive the high standards and ideas which have earned for him an honored place in the world of journalism.

To his son and other members of the family, I extend my deepest sympathy. It is my prayer that the good Lord will sustain them in their sorrow.

THE AMERICAN CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Waco Times-Herald recently carried an editorial which I think is worthy of serious consideration by all of us. It is true that this editorial indicts our school system, but it indicts American businessmen and American politicians as well. Undoubtedly, unless those of us in this generation pay a little more attention to the education of the next generation, this country may never survive to be conquered by the Communists. Instead it may well be found instructing the Russians. What else can we expect when 55 percent of high school seniors answer that the basic tenet of Marxism "from each according to ability, to each according to need" is a valid basis for an economic system.

Those are the very words of Karl Marx. It is probably more of an apology than an explanation to say that the high school seniors questioned did not recognize the words or their source. I think this editorial is worth reading and studying. It is as follows:

THEY FLUNKED

Here are six basic questions about the American capitalistic system:

1. Is there competition in business?
2. Do owners receive too large a share of business profits?
3. Do owners or workers profit more from benefits of improved machinery?
4. Is the theory, "from each according to ability, to each according to need," a valid basis for an economic system?
5. Is the profit motive necessary to survival of the capitalistic system?
6. Should a worker produce as much as he is capable of producing?

Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N. J., asked those questions of high school seniors in 86 communities picked across the Nation.

Here are the results:

1. Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business.
2. Sixty percent said owners get too much of the profits.
3. Seventy-six percent believed that owners get most of the gains from new machinery.
4. Fifty-five percent said "Yes" to the fundamental theory of communism.
5. Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system.
6. Sixty percent said a worker should not produce all he can.

The opinion survey produced no conclusions on the question of whether the majority of these youngsters had been taught their wrong answers or whether they were guessing out of ignorance. The point of the findings, however, is plain. These young people for whatever cause hold false conceptions of the facts of life. They don't understand the simplest things about the system that is feeding them, sheltering them, schooling them. As high school seniors, they are on the threshold of citizenship, apparently without the foggiest notion of what American economics is all about.

The schools and the business system that supports the schools obviously have flunked the test, too.

INVESTIGATING THE FEASIBILITY OF USING WATERS OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN IN TEXAS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill entitled "A bill providing an appropriation for investigating the feasibility of transporting the surplus waters from the area of the Missouri River Basin for utilization in Texas."

The bill will, no doubt, be referred to the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, has constituted for the first time, insofar as I know, a Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. I am hopeful that this subcommittee will have an opportunity to take a good look at the overall water requirements of the United States. A

water program of the first magnitude is of the greatest urgency. It is imperative, in my judgment, that we harness the surplus waters wherever we find them in the United States and direct those surplus waters wherever possible to areas where they can be successfully utilized.

The proposal which I am making to harness surplus waters in the Missouri River Basin and apply them to areas of the Southwest where there is a great deficiency of waters may seem like a pipedream. Nevertheless, I think the time must come when things of this kind are done in the overall interest of the United States. This is only one possibility. We need to explore all possibilities for a better utilization of this great natural resource.

I hope to have the opportunity of presenting this matter in some detail at a later date to the Subcommittee on Public Works. I have placed these remarks in the RECORD today in order to call attention to the necessity for a more ambitious and adequate water program. The following is a list of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations: Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman; Mr. LOUIS RABAUT; Mr. MICHAEL KIRWAN; Mr. JOHN FOGARTY; Mr. FRED MARSHALL; Mr. JOHN RILEY; Mr. JOE EVINS; Mr. EDWARD BOLAND; Mr. JAMES MURRAY; Mr. GLENN DAVIS; Mr. BEN JENSEN; Mr. JOHN PHILLIPS; Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN; Mr. T. MILLET HAND; Mr. JOHN TABER.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes on the first legislative day following the Easter recess, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 31, 1955:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances;

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

On April 2, 1955:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN) in two instances.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. GEORGE).

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 103, the House adjourned to Wednesday, April 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

624. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the completion of the Inter-American Highway which extends from the United States to the Canal Zone via the Central American countries; to the Committee on Public Works.

625. A letter from the National Executive Director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, pursuant to Public Law 272 of August 14, 1953 (H. Doc. 124); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

626. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on transportation, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. 125); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

627. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the first annual report of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, covering the activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee and its regional subcommittees from August 2, 1954, the date of its authorization in title VI of the Housing Act of 1954, to March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

628. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia,' approved February 1, 1907"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

629. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422) so as to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

630. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

631. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a message dated February 4, 1955, addressed to the Congress of the United States by the Municipal Assembly of the City of Taipei, Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

632. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

633. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed concession permit with Gaylen C. Lamon, which, when executed by the Superintendent of Olympic National Park, Wash., will authorize Mr. Lamon to provide a pack and saddle horse and guide service for the public within Olympic National Park during a period of 1 year and 7 months from June 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

634. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard' for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

635. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

636. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1835. A bill to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes; with amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2194. A bill for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3878. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3879. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4052. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4426. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 50. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 202. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 2699, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; with amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of David R. Click; with amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of John Jordan; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1255. A bill for the relief of Ferenc Babothy; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1281. A bill for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1287. A bill for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger; with amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). (Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein; with amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Maria Nizzia Constantino; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Eleanore Hauser; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1028. A bill for the relief of Melina Bonton; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Ebolya Wolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia; with amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh; without amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Ramos; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson); without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas; with amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta); with amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Max Kozlowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg; with amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Wing Chong Chan; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez; with amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5462. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5463. A bill to increase the annual compensation of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5464. A bill to provide for studies by the United States Information Agency in

order to increase the effectiveness of United States postage stamps in promoting understanding in other countries of America and its objectives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 5465. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 5466. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5467. A bill to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5468. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 5469. A bill to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5470. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5471. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5472. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5473. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5474. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 5475. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5476. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis Reservoir, the San Luis-West Side Canal, the Avenal Gap Reservoir, and the Antelope Plain Canal, West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5477. A bill to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5478. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 5479. A bill to retrocede to the State of Maryland exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within boundaries of the United States Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Charles County, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5480. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 5481. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 5482. A bill making an appropriation to finance the cost of an investigation of the feasibility of developing surplus water in the Missouri River Basin for use in Texas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5483. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 5484. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 5485. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, approved April 25, 1951, to limit payment of indemnity to brothers and sisters of the insured who are dependent at the time of the insured's death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair (including painting and papering) of his home to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5487. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. UDALL: Memorial of the 22d Arizona Legislature, 1st session, requesting Congress to enact legislation and make an appropriation for the construction of Buttes Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 22d Arizona Legislature, 1st session, requesting Congress to enact legislation providing that the State of Arizona and the United States share equally any income inuring to the United States Government from federally owned lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of H. R. 3204, which provides for a floating ocean weather station in the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to withdraw land in Saline Valley in Inyo County from the public domain for use as an aerial gunnery range; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal taxes on the transportation of persons and property as each affects interisland transportation in Hawaii and transportation between Hawaii and the mainland United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that hearings be held within the Territory of Alaska on complaint filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief from high rates on freight moving to the Northwest ports for shipment to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that all Federal and Territorial agencies within Alaska be directed to order all employees of such agencies to cease and desist the unfair practice of infringing upon and competing with the legitimate private carriers whose license fees and taxes comprise a valuable contribution to the appropriations upon which such Federal and Territorial agencies survive; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that appropriate action be taken to provide for the sale of the Eklutna project to the people of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that the act of March 4, 1915 (48 U. S. C. 353), be amended as provided for in H. R. 1570, 83d Congress, 2d session, to give the Territory authority for leasing lands as it may deem proper for a maximum of 55 years at any one time; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5488. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5489. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Athanasios Deligiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5490. A bill for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5491. A bill for the relief of Jan Mruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5492. A bill for the relief of Hebbani Krishnamurthi Jairaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5493. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5494. A bill for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:
H. R. 5495. A bill for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 5496. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 5497. A bill for the relief of Patricia Stone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:
H. R. 5498. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey Charles Medworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:
H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Fidel A. Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Herta Friedrichs Rockwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 5501. A bill for the relief of George Ellenikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:
H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex., and such county to convey a portion thereof to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

184. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the manager, Texas Production Credit Association, San Angelo, Tex., relative to the District Farm Credit Board of Houston going on record as opposing title II of Senate bill 1286; to the Committee on Agriculture.

185. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, County Judges' and Commissioners' Association, New Braunfels, Tex., relative to requesting the enactment of clarifying and remedial legislation providing that the Natural Gas Act does not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas, and the local sale of gas by producers or gatherers, and the price received by the producer or gatherer from such sale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

186. Also, petition of the president, Defenders of the Constitution, Inc., Forest Hills, N. Y., relative to stating that the Defenders of the Constitution, Inc., are in complete support of the principles and objectives of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

187. Also, petition of the grand knight, Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to the Federal Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

188. Also, petition of Antonio Chacon, Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, relative to a pattent in question on an elevator for luminous advertising signs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Limit of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker the greatest single issue confronting the American people today is the foreign policy of the United States. Unless it is successful all other issues become inconsequential.

Our foreign policy has expanded to all parts of the world, involving us in tremendous economic and political problems, until the very existence of our Nation depends upon their correct solution.

If we should become involved in the holocaust of a worldwide war with its H-bomb, jet planes, and the mechanized weapons of modern warfare, not only the future of our Nation but even the world would be at stake.

It will not help us, however, to have any illusions about our foreign policy. No one need have any obligation or inclination to look through rose-colored glasses to see what has been done or to minimize the difficulties of the future.

In a constantly changing world we cannot pull a master switch and shunt independent sovereign nations around to do our bidding as if they were boxcars in a switchyard, or outline a new master plan for the future.

The difficulties of master planning are well illustrated by archy, the cockroach, spelled with a lower case a, appearing in the Don Marquis stories. Archy, in discussing with his brethren the sad life of cockroaches in general, their struggle for food and their danger of being oppressed by human feet, discovered a wonderful solution to their problems by simply deciding to change all roaches into grasshoppers so life would be merry and food plentiful.

But when archy was confronted by one of the more practical of his brethren as to just how this could be accomplished, his only reply was, "Oh, just leave the mere details of the transformation to the administrators of the plan."

Just because of the difficulties of master planning, this does not mean we must adopt the views of those who apparently adhere to a doctrine that the United States is better off to pretend the world beyond our shores does not exist.

We need not wash our hands of the whole business and concentrate on building shelters that will be proof against the H-bomb. In our foreign operations we have not reached the place where we ought to close up shop and liquidate our assets or liabilities for whatever they may bring.

While we are not prophets, we can plan for the future by analyzing successes of the past, avoiding our mistakes as far as possible, and constantly keeping in mind the objectives of our foreign policy and strive for their success.

But before we do so, we must have the firm realization that there are certain definite limitations in dealing with foreign policy.

One of our best diplomats frequently makes the statement, "If you can give the other fellow orders, it isn't foreign policy." His point is that you can't give orders to independent sovereign nations. If the nation has a status which makes it possible for it to be ordered around, in the way Russia orders its satellites, it is no longer foreign policy but domestic policy which is involved. All this means that the methods which we can use to get a foreign country to do what we want it to do are limited. We should not base our foreign policy on an assumption that other countries are going to behave differently than they really are.

We cannot by edict or fiat in Washington control the action of our allies, to say nothing of our adversaries. We know that each nation has interests different from those of every other nation and that its reactions are not likely to be identical to ours.

We cannot halt the actions of Russia or Communist China—all we can do is try to deter them from aggressive action by creating conditions that will be in their own self-interest to do so.

This will become abundantly clear as we analyze what has happened in the past and consider the possibilities of our future course of action.

But before we do this let us state the primary objectives of our foreign policy. Fully realizing the danger of oversimplification we must constantly keep in mind our goal or we will lose sight of the forest because of the trees.

We must promote and obtain security and peace for the United States. We must maintain our independent sovereignty. For our own self-interest our foreign policy must be inherently selfish.

At the same time, if by cooperating with our allies and freedom-loving peoples we can accomplish these goals we should likewise strive for permanent peace everywhere in the world.

We cannot be the sole gladiator to save the world. We need all the help we can get. But if by overtaxing our own strength we destroy ourselves, we destroy the world.

The time has come, however, to call in some engineers who are not "yes men" for the old management to make sure that our future foreign operations get on the right track.

No matter on which side of the world we look the most vigorous defender of United States foreign aid has to admit our program has not worked as well as was expected. This is true whether one sympathizes with what has been done or sees in recent events their past predictions of failure.

There are few people who still believe we have not been generous enough in dealing with other countries. If we could have bought friendship there would be little doubt as to the success of our efforts.

The policy of "give them the aid and assume they will do the right thing"

might make sense if you can assume that the recipients of our help are seeking the same things we are, that they agree with us on major issues, and that they are ready to accept our leadership in the step-by-step action necessary to attain our major goals. I am afraid that many of our internationalists have allowed themselves to be fooled on this point. It is natural for everyone who regards himself as intelligent, high-minded, and a keen analyst to think that others who possess these same characteristics will see issues in the same way that he does and will react in specific emergencies in a similar manner.

It is easy to see how, at the beginning of the Marshall plan, our officials and many of our people believed that an aid-without-detailed-commitments policy was sound. The United States at the end of World War II was undoubtedly preeminent among the nations of the world. We had the best Army, Navy, and Air Force. We had the atomic bomb. We had the highest standard of living, the most food, and the most money. It was, and it is, easy for us to visualize ourselves as having reached the most advanced stage of civilization known to mankind as the result of a process of natural development. It was, and it is, easy for us to visualize the rest of the world as struggling forward in a sort of evolutionary process, striving to be as much like the United States as possible. Under such circumstances, if by giving aid we could hasten this evolution a little bit, it would be sound policy to do so.

But France, after dragging its feet for years with regard to the European Defense Community, has finally rejected it. Our hopes now must be based on a substitute plan which is now in the process of acceptance. The United Kingdom advocates a policy toward Red China which is opposed to ours. India does not believe in a regional defense effort in Southeast Asia. Denmark has recently announced that its membership in NATO is now on an inactive basis.

We have only secured an uneasy peace in Korea and Indochina, and face a most critical situation in Formosa and the Pacific area.

It would seem, therefore, we have been wrong in some of our fundamental assumptions. We have gone wrong in assuming other countries want the same things we do and will react the same way we react in specific events. We must recognize these new developments for which we have not made adequate adjustments in our policy. In the future we must assume our allies will not always carry out our dictates as we wish they would, even if we place certain conditions on our aid. We have reached the place where we must assume many countries will demonstrate their freedom from United States domination by doing just the opposite.

I think that, therefore, we are going to have to work out with nations what each of us is to do about certain specific matters in the current year and the next year and the next. If we can agree as to a course of action, each party should contribute on a fair basis to carrying out the agreement. If we cannot agree, let us not go ahead assuming that things will work themselves out in the long run.

This does not mean that every nation which is unwilling to join us in a military alliance against Russia is immediately classified as an enemy and denied future United States aid or cooperation. Whether we like it or not there are many countries, particularly those which have only recently emerged from a colonial status, that sincerely believe they can remain neutral. There is no advantage to us in driving them into the enemy camp. On the other hand, we should limit our aid and our expectations to those things that can be undertaken by mutual agreement and mutual self-interest.

For example we must recognize that the problem of unification of Europe not only is of the utmost importance to us, but that it is also a European problem whose solution must be worked out by the Europeans themselves.

It seems to me that the United States should state its policy unequivocally favoring European unification, and we should stand ready to assist in specific matters when asked by the Europeans to help. The United States should not, however, take the initiative in the matter. We should not have our Ambassadors in London, Paris, and Bonn calling on Ministers with various proposals and counter-proposals to advance the cause of unification. We should not have the United States Information Agency putting out propaganda in favor of unification. There is no use trying to go faster than the Europeans are able and willing to go themselves.

They must realize once and for all that they must help themselves and that their own fate is involved; and that their only chance of survival is to cooperate to the fullest extent with other liberty-loving nations of the free world.

I believe our future policy should be to continue to strengthen regional arrangements such as NATO and SEATO if they are willing to cooperate on a basis of self-help and mutual aid. This is necessary because assistance should only be given to a country if it advances the foreign policy of the United States.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was ratified by the United States Senate. It is the law of the land. Aggression against one of the member nations is considered aggression against all. Under this treaty we have entered into mutual security arrangements to protect ourselves as well as other liberty-loving nations.

We have furnished NATO with military end items amounting to billions of dollars, and are maintaining thousands of our young men in the military service in that area. For us to withdraw at this time our aid and leave a vacuum for the Soviet to take over is unthinkable. We have but a Hobson's choice—no choice at all.

The situation reminds me of the Texas jackrabbit which, under hot pursuit by the hounds, climbed a tree remarking. "This is contrary to my natural predisposition but necessity leaves no choice."

Our aim should be liberation rather than containment. We should continue to encourage and implement the military arrangements entered into by Greece, Turkey, and Pakistan. We should use our good offices as well as the United Nations to settle the disputes in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab States.

I believe the recent implementing of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is a step in the right direction. Taken together with our arrangements with Japan, South Korea, and Formosa, these agreements greatly strengthen the security of the United States and our allies in the Pacific area, and in my judgment are a great deterrent to the further aggression of the Communists. Without such arrangements the chances of becoming involved in war would be much greater and without them our defenses would have to be, for all practical purposes, withdrawn to the continental United States.

The resolution which was passed almost unanimously by the Congress expressing our determination to defend Formosa and the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, strengthens our security in that part of the world. In unfriendly hands these islands would seriously dislocate our military strategy in the Pacific. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific which constitutes for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that area.

We should not trade any part of this area for a cease fire or recognition of the Red Communists in the United Nations.

Another policy which I feel should be continued and implemented is the point 4 program for the rehabilitation of so-called backward countries. I do not know of any program from which we receive more benefit for as few dollars. However, we must be careful in its implementation that we confine it to its original purpose, namely, to help those countries to help themselves by giving them scientific knowledge and the know-how in the fields of education, agriculture, health, and sanitation. We should not permit these programs to grow into a worldwide WPA.

In my judgment we should not engage in a preventative war. While it might be a temptation to precipitate a general war while we are still ahead in the armament race, in the field of nuclear and mechanized weapons, the ruin, exhaustion and devastating effects which would follow would make it preposterous to follow such a course.

To fight a preventive war to avoid such a worldwide conflict is equally foolhardy. It would be as absurd as a man committing suicide because he is afraid to die.

There are those who believe that the Soviet, ourselves, and our allies can settle our differences by peaceful coexistence. Such an argument is fallacious. It would allow the Soviet to retain all the territory that they have won by aggression, and we would have to write off to Communist domination without a contest all the territory which they now control. It would permit the Soviets unimpeded exploitation of these tremendous areas with their high industrial potential and natural resources, including the vast area of China. By such a pol-

icy we would strengthen the hand of the Kremlin for further world conquest.

One of the doctrines espoused by President Wilson in his fight for the League of Nations was that we should have open covenants openly arrived at. While I do not decry the use of international organizations as not being helpful in the cause of peace, I do feel that sometimes this public or "microphone diplomacy" is fraught with danger. While the United Nations gives us an open forum and a sounding board to answer the illogical charges and propaganda of the Soviet and her satellites, it seems to me the very publicity attending such open forums places limitations upon what we may accomplish. For example, a somewhat minor issue may be publicly debated, each party taking opposite sides, until an issue is blown up to so much importance that neither side can retract from the position it has publicly taken. Each side may find itself in the position of the small boy who has put a chip on his shoulder and dared his opponent to knock it off. Both sides are afraid to give in.

While it may be a slow and tedious process, I believe we should continue our discussions of the issues that come up in the foreign fields with the countries concerned, working together to find mutual and reciprocal solutions. It may be a tedious and difficult process to reach such an understanding and mutual consent that will be for the benefit of all concerned, but I believe such negotiations will be on a more firm basis by such methods, and will help to bring about the permanent peace and security all the free world is so devotedly striving to accomplish.

Anniversary of Russian Occupation of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, April 4, is an anniversary of a day which must be forever circled in blood in the annals of Hungarian history. It was on this date in 1945 that the armies of Soviet Russia completed their brutal occupation of Hungary. Earlier the siege of Budapest from December 1944 until February 1945 had resulted in the virtually complete destruction of that historic city.

It has now been 10 years that the Hungarian people have been kept in subjection under the hirelings of the Soviet Union and the Red army. These years have held untold hardships and deprivations, both psysical and of the spirit. There has been a systematic attempt by the Communists to destroy all vestiges of racial and national autonomy. In order to further convert the individual Hungarian into the soulless, subservient robot, which is the ideal Communist citizen, the government under the aegis of the Red army has through mass deportations, terrorization, and religious persecution attempted to instill in him a feeling of individual helplessness. He has been made to feel that no aspect of his daily existence is safe from the mad caprices and controls of the government.

And yet, the Hungarian people have resisted the alien ideologies which the Communists have attempted to force upon them. Time and again the Communists have retreated from a manifestly unpopular course in an effort to obtain popular support. The very variety of their tactics and their reversals of policy attest to the fact that they have been unable to carry out their plan for Hungary.

On this sorrowful anniversary for Hungarians the world over, we join in praying that the liberation they so earnestly desire will soon reward the steadfastness of the Hungarian people.

Federal Contributions to the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I observe from current press reports that the District of Columbia is also having its revenue problems. According to these reports, it is anticipated that the District's revenue will fall short of meeting the budget requirements for the next fiscal year considerably in excess of $20 million. It is further stated that for the first time in its history, the District government is faced with deficit spending.

Furthermore, the current press reports indicate that the annual cry for additional Federal contributions is going up by those responsible for the fiscal affairs of the District. In fact, it seems that the city commissioners are prepared, if they have not already acted, to call upon Uncle Sam to again increase the annual Federal contribution to the District of Columbia. There are even suggestions that this contribution should be increased to meet half of the city's budget of approximately $175 million.

That the Federal Government should make some reasonable and equitable contribution to the maintenance of the District government is recognized. This, of course, is based upon the fact that the Federal Government occupies a considerable portion of the District territory. But what seems to be overlooked by the advocates of ever-increasing Federal financial contributions to the operation of the District Government is the economic contribution made to the city of Washington, D. C., by the Federal Government. We are constrained to believe that most any city in the United States would be willing to contribute to the Federal Government in return for the Federal payroll and other advantages enjoyed by the economy of the District. In fact, the city of Washington is one of the most prosperous cities in the world as a result of this Federal situation.

Mr. Speaker, other cities, States, and subdivisions of government have their financial problems also, but they cannot look to the Federal Government to bail them out. It so happens that the legislature of my State of Mississippi is now and has been in session for the past 3 months for the sole purpose of raising enough taxes to meet the increased demands on the treasury of that State. But the State of Mississippi and all other States as well as cities must look to their own resources rather than Uncle Sam for the needed revenues to operate their governments. As a Representative in the Congress of that State, I cannot idly sit by and permit my people to be taxed further for such increases by the Federal Government to the city of Washington, D. C., while the legislature of my State is verily scraping the bottom of the barrel to get further taxes with which to operate our State government.

The following table shows how the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has been steadily increasing for the past 10 years:

Federal annual contributions to the District of Columbia, fiscal years 1946–55

Year:	*Amount*
1946	$6,000,000
1947	8,000,000
1948	12,000,000
1949	12,000,000
1950	12,000,000
1951	10,800,000
1952	11,400,000
1953	11,000,000
1954	12,000,000
1955	21,890,000

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will not grant this increase and that the District government, like the other governments of the country, will relie on its own resources.

Relief for Farm Losses From Natural Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the recent freeze during the last days of March imposed another economic loss on the Nation's farmers. The result of the record low temperatures on March 26 and 27 across the greater southern farm belt will be added economic loss to our farmers, who have already suffered by drastic cutbacks in all controlled crops.

The fruit and vegetable farmers will be especially hurt. In Arkansas the fruit and vegetable farmers, in many cases, have suffered the entire loss of their crops. From North Carolina down

to Florida and across the South to Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, the peach crops are considered a near total loss. It is reported, that with few exceptions, it will not pay the fruit farmers to set up packing sheds for what crops remain. The same is true of the apple crops.

For this reason, it was pleasing to see the dispatch of interested Members of the other House of the Congress through the introduction of S. 1628. This would appear to be a method of relieving to some degree the great burden to the farmers, and it is my hope that the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture will study this matter along the principles of S. 1628 immediately upon the resumption of sessions following the Easter holidays.

This action, together with the disaster loan assistance from the Farmers' Home Administration will be of great assistance to these farmers. I am pleased to be notified by the officials of the Farmers' Home Administration that they are rushing their surveys and county eligibility designations throughout this disaster area.

The economy of our Nation is dependent on the solvency of our farmers, and we must not delay in striving to relieve this latest blow to our Nation's agricultural economy.

I include the following copy of S. 1628:

S. 1628

A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment, thus causing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economies of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed or damaged,

the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, shall cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever he determines that the normal production from the acreage allotment for the principal crop produced on any farm, together with the normal production of other crops grown on such farm, is insufficient to provide a livelihood for the operator of such farm and his family, to increase such acreage allotment to the extent necessary to enable such operator to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to provide such livelihood.

(c) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

Col. Robert R. McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret and a deep sense of loss that we learn of the death of Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Daily Tribune.

It is not often in the course of a generation that a name or a personality rolls across the horizon in such a manner as to attract almost worldwide attention to itself, but Colonel McCormick had such a personality.

No matter where one travels in the civilized world, the name and accomplishments of Colonel McCormick are readily recognized. Certainly he was one of the controversial figures of our century, but controversial only in the sense that he was a man of strong convictions who was willing and able to state those convictions and defend them. Many times in the course of Colonel McCormick's life he adopted stands and espoused principles which were unpopular at the time of his dedication to them. Yet, in the majority of cases, history has proven the correctness of those convictions and the brilliance of his foresight.

For instance, when the Nuremberg trials were under way, Colonel McCormick and his paper, the Chicago Daily Tribune, stood virtually alone in their denouncement of them and in warning the American public of the dangers inherent in these trials. Today, a decade later, most thinking Americans question the wisdom in the holding of these trials.

Similarly with the Yalta proceedings. Colonel McCormick immediately attacked, through the medium of his paper, the decisions made at Yalta. The publication of the Yalta documents last week—which, incidentally, resulted in the accomplishment of a feat rare in the annals of newspaper history when the Chicago Daily Tribune published 32 full newspaper pages of the Yalta proceedings in a matter of hours—gave proof positive to the correctness of Colonel McCormick's stand on the Yalta agreements.

His long, unrelenting fight against the prohibition amendment, his continuing fight against Communist infiltration, and the inroads socialism was making in our own Government, were stands that could be taken only by a man who was firm in his conviction and dedicated in principle.

Colonel McCormick took great pride—and justly so—in the designation of his Chicago Daily Tribune as "the world's greatest newspaper." He also took great pride in carrying the American flag on the paper's masthead, with the caption underneath reading "The Voice of the Middle West." However, Colonel McCormick's greatest pride was in his country, and his fierce spirit of nationalism was always in evidence in the policies of his newspaper.

May America always be blessed with men of such stature as Colonel McCormick, who are willing to fight for the freedom of expressing their philosophy and principles which they will not compromise.

Colonel McCormick took a very vital interest in the affairs of his native city of Chicago, having served as an alderman in the Chicago City Council from 1904 to 1906, and as president of the Chicago Sanitary District from 1905 to 1910.

He always fought against crime, corruption, and against political privileges for the few at the expense of the general public. Through his newspaper he continually brought to the attention of the citizens of Chicago civic conditions which were inimical to their well-being and the general welfare.

Colonel McCormick may have left us bodily, but his courageous spirit and his tenacious adherence to the principles he believed in will be remembered for a great many years to come.

Robert Rutherford McCormick, lawyer, editor, and publisher, was born in Chicago, Ill., July 30, 1880, the son of Robert Sanderson and Katharine Van Etta (Medill) McCormick. Education: Yale University, bachelor of arts 1903, and Northwestern University Law School.

Political record: Member, Chicago City Council, 1904–06; president, Chicago Sanitary District, 1905–10; member of Chicago Charter Convention, 1907; member of Chicago Plan Commission. Business record: Editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune; admitted to Illinois bar 1907. Military service: Major, 1st Illinois Cavalry on duty on Mexican border, 1916; attached to General Pershing's staff in France, American Expeditionary Forces, 1917; assigned as major, 5th Field Artillery, adjutant, 57th Artillery Brigade; lieutenant colonel, 122d Field Artillery, United States National Guard; colonel, 61st Field Artillery, United States Army; served as commandant, Fort Sheridan, Ill.; awarded Distinguished Service Medal; author of With the Russian Army—1915; Army of 1918–20; Ulysses S. Grant, the Great Soldier of America—1934; Freedom of the Press—1936; How We Acquired Our National Territory—1942; American Revolution and Its Effect on World Civilization—1945. Numerous shorter works on historical, military, scientific, legal, and political subjects. Member, Racquet and Tennis Club, Chicago Club. Presbyterian. Home: DuPage County, Ill. Office, Tribune Square, Chicago, Ill.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Stuyvesant High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, crowded in between stores, hospitals, and apartment houses in the lower East Side of New York City is an educational institution which has an amazing 50-year record. Since it was founded, in 1904, Stuyvesant High School has made a reality of the American ideal, "each according to his ability," for thousands of talented boys who later made their marks in the world.

Among its nationally known alumni are Actors James Cagney, George Raft, and Sam Levene; Judge Irving Saypol, former United States attorney for the southern district of New York; and New York Supreme Court Judges Samuel DiFalco and Saul Streit; Motion-Picture Director Joseph Mankiewicz; former New York Health Commissioner Dr. Marcus Kogel; Radio Announcer Ted Husing; former West Point coach and war hero Maj. Gen. Gar Davidson; Queens College President John Theobold; world-famous Photographer Victor Keppler; Philip Sporn, president of American Gas & Electric Co., one of the Nation's largest utilities; Dr. Irving Fischer, world-famous obstetrician; Dr. William Hitzig, one of the world's greatest diagnosticians and heart specialists; Federal Judge Sidney Sugarman; Architect William Hohauser; Commissioner of Taxation and Finance of the State of New York George Bragalini; and Olympic champion Frank Hussey.

What makes Stuyvesant so unique? It has an excellent educational record. It has many famous alumni. It has a great athletic record.

All of these things are part of the Stuyvesant story. However, there is much more to it. In many areas of the world, education of any type is difficult to obtain at best. Special education for leadership is even more difficult. Stuyvesant was created to provide such education at no cost to all New York boys who could meet its high entrance requirements.

Although the school prides itself on scholastic achievement—61 percent of the students have I. Q.'s of 120 or over—its record in other fields is equally impressive. Last fall its football team was coholder of the city championship. Recently Stuyvesant's undefeated fencing team won the school's ninth city crown in the sport. Its track teams have garnered 16 city championships.

Dr. Irving Fischer, president of the alumni association, reports that Stuyvesant boys have set a national record by earning more than $2 million in scholarships during the last 10 years. To supplement this achievement, alumni are setting up a scholarship fund to help the school's many other talented youngsters to obtain a higher education. Dr. Fischer says, "It is an investment that will pay off in tomorrow's leaders."

Stuyvesant teachers also help make the school unique. Many have successful careers outside the field of education. For example, swimming coach and physics instructor Dr. Siegfried Meyers has made notable contributions to radar, medical, and guided missile research. Art instructor and sculptor, Nat Werner, has had two of his works accepted in the new Whitney Museum for permanent exhibition.

Because the need to develop leaders in a democracy was never greater, New York City has started a multi-million-dollar renovation of the school.

With this kind of support Stuyvesant hopes to continue its great record of service to students, community, and Nation.

A. Boyd Campbell, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Mississippi has been honored by the election of one of its favorite sons to the presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The new president of this great organization, Mr. A. Boyd Campbell, of Jackson, Miss., has long been active in Mississippi affairs, and has contributed greatly to the growth and expansion of Mississippi industry and agriculture.

We who know Mr. Campbell congratulate the United States chamber on its selection. We know that he is a proven leader, and that the chamber will never have cause to regret its choice of Mr. Campbell as its president for this year.

Since his election, many deserved tributes have been paid to Mr. Campbell in the press throughout the Nation. Practically every newspaper in Mississippi has taken notice of the great honor he has brought to our State, and the Mississippi Legislature has passed a concurrent resolution commemorating Mr. Campbell's election.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me particular pleasure to add my congratulations to Mr. Campbell, along with my personal appreciation for having brought such distinctive recognition to my congressional district. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Mississippi State Legislature, and editorials from several Mississippi newspapers, dealing with Mr. Campbell's election as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Senate concurrent resolution commemorating the election of A. Boyd Campbell, Jackson, Miss., to the most important office, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States

Whereas Mr. A. Boyd Campbell, a native of Attala County, Miss., who completed his collegiate education at Millsaps College with honors, has made his home in Jackson, Miss., since the beginning of his business career; and

Whereas Mr. Campbell has been the organizer and owner of several splendid businesses in the capital city of Jackson, Miss.; and

Whereas the city of Jackson has been fortunate to have the services and guidance of Mr. Campbell through civic, church, and economic fields of endeavor; and

Whereas Mr. Campbell has served in the city of Jackson, Miss., as president of the chamber of commerce and thence through numerous appointments in various fields of endeavor in the United States Chamber of Commerce; and

Whereas Mr. A. Boyd Campbell was recently elected to the most important position, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), Through this resolution bespeak the innumerable fine qualities of our fellow Mississippian, A. Boyd Campbell, and wish for his tenure of office the fullest in accomplishment and the brightest in administration in the history of the chamber; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. A. Boyd Campbell, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, to the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Jackson, Miss., and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Mississippi in Washington.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of March 23, 1955]

A big welcome will await Boyd Campbell, one of Jackson's best-beloved businessmen and industrial leader, when he makes his appearance at the regular meeting of the Rotary Club next Monday. Brother Rotarians are deeply appreciative of the honor paid Mr. Campbell in his election to the presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce, highest honor within the gift of the business people of the Nation. Moreover, Boyd Campbell fully rates the honor. He has for several years shown a keen, intelligent, and constructive interest in the work of the organization and is fully acquainted with its wide

ramifications and the work it is carrying on in all parts of the country. It is well that Rotarians should flood Boyd Campbell with honors, because he is a living exemplification of its motto, "Service above self." Always he has been alert to all opportunities to unselfishly serve the community to which he is so ardently devoted.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily Clarion-Ledger of March 23, 1955]

With his sane observations on segregation and other issues, our Jacksonian who has become president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, A. Boyd Campbell, has already started his valuable and distinctive service in his new office. He is already at work on the job to which he has been so recently elected.

The national organization did well by itself and the leadership which it represents in choosing our own Mr. Campbell as its new president. This vital national organization, representing over 1,600,000 business leaders, who are chamber of commerce members, now has a president who will not only uphold but will also enhance the high standards of his great office.

The Nation admires his modesty in describing himself as "unquestionably the smallest man in commercial stature ever to hold this office." We also like his candid admission that he has no pat formula for solving the country's economic and social ills.

Friends of free enterprise are heartened at Mr. Campbell's firm declaration as an adherent and supporter of the time-tested way of life which has made this the world's greatest power. This declaration, made in his simple statement that "I believe in free enterprise," will go far to reassure all who have viewed with distress an inexplicable tendency of some to drift toward the welfare state and centralized bureaucracy.

Having had valuable experience as an educator and school administrator, Mr. Campbell believes that education and business are inseparable partners. He considers education as a State and local responsibility. He does not believe there can be Federal aid to education without Federal control. His views in this respect coincide with those of many fellow Mississippians who are proud of this latest honor accorded to one of foremost leaders.

A firm advocate of education, Mr. Campbell believes that raising educational levels of our people also raises economic standards of white and colored alike. He says: "We cannot compete with enemies who seek to destroy our idealogies on a numerical basis. We must do it by raising our educational levels."

Such sound judgment and keen insight in local, State, and National problems will stand Mr. Campbell in good stead during his tenure of service as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. His wisdom and vast knowledge has been of inestimable value in the past to his city and State. It will prove of even greater value when applied on a national level, for the benefit of the organization and economic system which he so ably represents.

We congratulate our own Boyd Campbell on his election to this high office. We also congratulate the United States Chamber of Commerce on their most fortunate selection of leadership. They will soon learn what folks in Jackson and Mississippi have known for years—that he is a sterling citizen and outstanding executive who measures up to every standard of responsibility. We could use more men like him locally and nationally.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times of March 19, 1955]

Selection of A. Boyd Campbell as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce comes as no surprise to those who know this business, civic and education leader. His activities have been so wide in scope, his influence so certain in the right direction and his enthusiasm for good causes so boundless that such honors almost inevitably come his way.

Mr. Campbell is not a native of Jackson, as most of us are likely to believe. However, he has been so long and so intimately associated with the growth and development of the city that Jackson has a prior claim on him. He has headed one of Jackson's major business establishments for more than 30 years; he is a director of several of its financial and commercial institutions; he has served his community in ways too numerous to mention, through its civic organizations, its churches and its schools.

Education has always been one of his primary interests, and as head of a United States Chamber committee, he did yeoman work in stimulating national interest in the public schools and their needs.

Jackson and Mississippi are proud of him and his high attainment. It is a deserved tribute to him personally and reflects honor upon his State and community.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Post-Herald of March 20, 1955]

It was indeed pleasing to receive the news of the election of A. Boyd Campbell, of Jackson, to the office of president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. A distinguished Mississippian and a personal friend of many years, Boyd Campbell now adds lustre to his own outstanding career of public service and he brings added glory to Mississippi, in heading the national chamber.

There is very little that can be added to any story of Boyd Campbell. In every avenue of public service, he has been in the forefront. In his own community, in the State of Mississippi, he has distinguished himself through his unselfish service and his contructive work. He will bring to his new office a wealth of experience in all types of civic and community work, and he will have an eminently successful administration.

We extend hearty congratulations to Boyd Campbell on the signal honor which has come to him.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippi is proud of A. Boyd Campbell, but Mr. Campbell is also proud of Mississippi. He has exercised leadership in bringing progress to Mississippi, and his leadership of the United States Chamber of Commerce will give the Nation the benefit of his abilities. Mississippi offers its congratulations to the United States Chamber of Commerce. A better selection could not have been made. We know because we know Boyd Campbell.

The Meaning of Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday night, April 6, 1955, Jewish people all over the world will usher in the festival of freedom, Passover. Passover commemorates the exodus of the Jewish people from their slavery in Egypt, under the divinely inspired leadership of their great leader, Moses.

The season of Passover can serve to teach all Americans to be grateful for the manifold blessings of freedom which our beloved country confers upon all its citizens. Jewish people, especially, who have been among the most oppressed in history give due recognition to their blessings in this "land of the free and home of the brave."

Passover is the holiday which unites the family at one festive board at its main festive meal, the Seder. The entire family, young and old, are present. The table is set with special dishes, and the candles, lit and blessed by the mother, shed their soft light. A goblet stands at each plate to receive four fillings of wine, the amount that should be taken on this night of historic celebration. There is an additional great silver goblet, reserved to be filled later for Elijah the prophet, who will come one day to announce the Messiah and the final redemption.

The ceremonial ritual of the Seder service is conducted from special booklets, called Haggadahs. In Biblical narrative style and through bold, colorful pictures, the Haggadah tells the wondrous story of the deliverance from the ancient Pharaoh, the cruel king of Egypt. Before the master of the house is a special ornamental plate, containing pieces of food symbolic of this festival. On it is a bitter herb, representing the bitterness of the Egyptian slavery—the charoses, the fruit, nut, and wine mixture, designed to appear like the mortar out of which the Hebrew bondsmen were forced to make bricks for their masters—the roast bone, suggestive of the sacrifices offered in the Temple of Jerusalem on Passover in olden days—the egg, symbolizing the new life and hope of the free—the salt water, the tears shed by the enslaved.

Matzoh is the most important food at this meal. It is an unleavened cracker, suggested by the sunbaked dough eaten by the freed Hebrews as they marched without stopping on their way to liberty. There are thousands of years of history in every morsel. Much painstaking labor has gone into the preparation of this family ritual meal, for no detail may be omitted or performed incorrectly.

Children are especially joyful on this evening of evenings, for they have a special part to perform. They will recite the four questions, taken from the ancient Talmud and thoroughly memorized for this occasion. The story of Passover deliverance is chanted from the Haggadah, a full meal is served, and then the company reclines to sing the traditional songs of praise and hope. The songs go on into the night to end with Chad Gadyo, a delightfully simple ditty which details the fate of the beast who would destroy the kid, which is Israel.

The Seder, the Passover observances, and the prayer book, all keep alive the memory of the event known as the going out from Egypt. This has become one of the greatest Jewish doctrines. It declares that God is on the side of the slave and the oppressed. Tyranny may flourish for a while, and may even appear all powerful. But God detests the oppressor and sooner or later overthrows

him. Egypt seemed unconquerable but it fell before God's just punishment. So shall all tyrannies ultimately vanish and be destroyed.

The Jew is told not only not to despair of freedom, but also to take care never to fall into the temptation of becoming an oppressor himself. The Bible commands him, "Thou shalt treat the stranger who lives among you as the native, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." The story of Jewish slavery in Egypt always reminds all people never to lose the quality of sympathy and never to treat fellowmen without mercy.

Our world today should heed both these lessons of Passover—first, that through the perspective of history, freedom is invincible, and second, that each man must remember that his fellow is equally entitled to freedom in the eyes of God.

Ready for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress approves H. R. 4393, which would authorize the building of a fifth supercarrier for the United States Navy, my colleagues should read a recent comment from an authoritative source in Great Britain on the new British supercarrier, the *Ark Royal*. I would like to point out in passing that the new British supercarrier perpetuates the name of one of the proudest vessels of the age that gave Great Britain control of the seas. It was a stroke of propaganda genius to propose that the new United States supercarrier carry the name of the legislative body that is asked to authorize and appropriate funds for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands an editorial from the February 27, 1955, issue of the London Sunday Express, which is owned and published by the distinguished and influential Lord Beaverbrook. It is called, "Waste, Waste, Waste" and the waste it refers to is the carrier. The London Express states without qualification that the 25 million pounds—almost $75 million—that has been spent on the *Ark Royal*, which was 12 years abuilding, is a "prodigious and totally unjustified waste of money." This carrier would be useless in any of the narrow seas, including the Mediterranean, in which British interests chiefly lie; an atom bomb dropped a mile away would wreck it beyond control, and a near miss would melt it away.

Great Britain has long been a Navy power, dependent upon the control of the seas not only for security but for the supplies necessary to her economy and to the welfare of her people. But a realistic appraisal of the lessons of World War II has convinced the British that airpower is decisive in modern war, and their great military leader, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Alamein, has spoken for the British people in emphatically and repeatedly declaring that.

The British have not evolved a program of supercarrier construction, however, and it is doubtful if the British would have started construction of the new *Ark Royal* today. It was begun 12 years ago, before the development of nuclear weapons and planes that fly supersonic speeds. Britain today depends realistically for her security on long-range, land-based bombers carrying nuclear weapons at speeds of 600 miles an hour, rather than on carriers all but static at 40 miles an hour in the open sea.

The London Express sums it up bluntly:

Aircraft carriers are finished. In mid-20th century war strategy there is no place for them. They are futile. They are as obsolete as the London trams. They are no good at all.

These are startling words to hear at a time when the United States is just getting well started on its program of supercarriers. We must be ready, we are told, for sudden, devastating attack. We must be ready to launch an annihilating counterattack. But the readiness of the supercarrier can disappear as quickly as the Navy's fleet was knocked out at Pearl Harbor. We must be ready, yes, but ready for what intelligence tells us to expect, and with something adequate to answer the attack.

If the United States is directly attacked, it will be by intercontinental land-based heavy bombers, of which we know the Russians have an advanced model. If we are to use massive retaliation, it can only be with land-based bombers. If carrier-based aircraft are involved in another war their use will be peripheral. The danger is that under the American program we are building enormously expensive weapons of probable secondary importance while diverting funds from the construction of those weapons on which our security primarily depends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the London Sunday Express, as follows:

WASTE, WASTE, WASTE

The new aircraft-carrier *Ark Royal* joins the fleet. She slides massively out to sea on her first shakedown cruise.

For nearly 12 years men have toiled to build her. Now she is ready at last.

But here is the question.

Ready for what?

The Sunday Express believes in the Royal Navy. It is a service with a splendid tradition. It is a magnificent fighting instrument. It is superbly manned.

But the Sunday Express has no belief whatever in the aircraft carrier. It considers that the £25 million spent on the *Ark Royal* has been a prodigious and totally unjustified waste of money.

What are the arguments for this carrier?

Certainly her speed cannot be one of them. At full stretch she will go at something over 30 knots. That is only half as fast as the family saloon car.

But, of course, her champions say she will be able to hide in the oceans.

Which oceans?

She will not be able to sail the North Sea or the White Sea, the Baltic or the channel, Biscay, or the Mediterranean. Not a chance of concealing herself in any of those confined spaces. Enemy radar will seek and swiftly find her. And then the bombers, traveling at 20 times her speed, will come like lightning in pursuit.

Next, the *Ark Royal's* apologists say: "But look how marvelously equipped she is for emergencies. If necessary, her engines could be operated by remote control."

What sort of fatuous nonsense is that?

An atom bomb dropped a mile away would wreck the *Ark Royal* beyond control of any kind. And a near miss would melt her.

Then there is the argument that her own aircraft would be capable of defending her. But under what conditions? They could not do the job at night. They could not even do it in bad weather against radar-directed bombers carrying nuclear weapons.

So that argument falls too.

And always the *Ark Royal* would be vulnerable to submarines unless a large protective surface force were sent out to ring her around. How fantastic to spend so much effort and waste such resources on defending her when her function is intended to be offensive.

Aircraft carriers are finished. In mid-20th century war strategy there is no place for them. They are futile. They are as obsolete as the London trams. They are no good at all.

What offensive weapon should Britain concentrate on instead?

There is no doubt about the proper answer.

The land-based bomber.

The striking power of the lumbering carrier is utterly negligible by comparison.

Soon the land-based bomber will be able to fly nonstop round the world.

That is where more money should be going. That is the weapon to which our military planners, scientists, and manufacturers should be devoting their skill and drive.

The mass production of long-range bombers must henceforward lie at the heart of our whole strategy.

For the future of Britain's defense depends not on a 35-miles-an-hour service but on these devastating, nuclear-equipped aircraft, sweeping across the earth faster than sound, which alone would give us security from attack.

The United States Foreign Policy Toward India, 1947–52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, India is a new member of the sisterhood of nations, having achieved her independence in August 1947, a very short time ago indeed. Already she is taking her place as a leader of world opinion. We need her love for freedom, and she needs ours. We need her patience and understanding, and she needs ours. All these, I think, our two countries have for each other to a very great degree. The peace of the world depends upon further growth of these attributes in our own country and hers. We are neighbors.

Recently I have become acquainted with a young man from India, Shiwaram

K. Kshirsagar, who is a student at American University here in Washington, where he is a candidate for his doctorate of philosophy degree in international relations. I am impressed with the love and respect which he holds for our country, and his deep devotion for his own beloved country. Recently as an assignment for one of his classes at American University, he wrote an article touching upon our relations with his own country. I thought it rich in historic detail and am inserting it as a part of my remarks so that my colleagues may read it also:

THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD INDIA, 1947–52

(By Shiwaram K. Kshirsagar)

I. INTRODUCTION

After President Franklin D. Roosevelt had influenced Prime Minister Winston Churchill's views toward India's efforts to achieve her independence, only one significant incident in the last 10 years in United States-Indian foreign policy preceded the proclamation of Indian independence by Great Britain in June 1947. This was Col. Louis Johnson's mission to India in April 1942. As the personal representative of the President, Colonel Johnson went to India at the time when Sir Stafford Cripps was there on his mission to solve the Indian political deadlock of 1942. The Indian National Congress was appreciative of this friendly action by President Roosevelt.

II. PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN ON INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

On August 15, 1947, India achieved her independence. On this memorable occasion, in Indian history, United States President Harry S. Truman telegraphed the best wishes of his Government and the American people to Lord Louis Mountbatten, the Governor General of the Dominion of India, and to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and to the Indian people. President Truman expressed his hope that Indo-American friendship would continue and that these two great nations would cooperate in the international struggle to fashion a world society founded on mutual trust and respect. He continued, that to achieve this objective a mutual understanding and cooperation were essential. Both the Government and the people of India greatly appreciated these best wishes of the President, of his Government and of the American people. India extended reciprocal good wishes to President Truman, to his Government, and to the American people. She assured the President and the American people that such mutual cooperation would be forthcoming from India. Such action on the part of United States carried great influence in India. It has strengthened the hope and given encouragement to the people in their own efforts to raise the standard of living and to educate the Indian masses, for the success of a democracy is largely dependent on the spread of education. After President Truman's recognition of Indian independence, diplomatic relations were established between the United States and India.

III. PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 1949

Recognizing the world's new problems, President Truman, in the fourth point of his inaugural address in 1949, suggested a "bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas." President Truman's proposal was hailed as an instrument toward fashioning world peace not only by India but by all the freedom-loving countries. The free citizens of these countries have always hoped that once they made a start toward self-help to solving their own problems, some help might be forthcoming from the world's greatest democracy. There is no question that India shared such a hope. In a democracy dissemination of foreign aid has always resulted in strengthening ties of mutual understanding and cooperation among nations. When such nations are willing to help themselves, then there is no fear whatsoever that foreign aid might make the receiving country a parasite. But if no such foreign aid is forthcoming there is a possibility of the danger that the weaker nations may fall a prey to Communist imperialism.

IV. PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INVITATION TO PRIME MINISTER JAWAHARLAL NEHRU TO VISIT THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In order to strengthen the ties of friendship between the United States and India Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit was appointed Indian Ambassador to United States in May 1949. President Truman still further strengthened these ties of mutual friendship by inviting Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to visit the United States in 1949. Prime Minister Nehru accepted this invitation and arrived in the United States in October 1949 for a month's stay. This was Mr. Nehru's first and only visit to the United States. However, for many years he manifested a keen interest in the United States and its democratic ideals. Mr. Nehru, in his first speech to the House of Representatives on October 13, 1949, said:

"I deem it a high honor and privilege to be given this opportunity of addressing this honorable House, and I must express to you, sir, my gratitude for it. For this House represents in large measure this great Republic which is playing such a vital part in the destinies of mankind today. I have come to this country to learn something of your great achievements. I have come also to convey the greetings of my people and in the hope that my visit may help to create a greater understanding between our respective people and those strong, sometimes invisible links, stronger even than physical links, that bind countries together. * * * It may interest you to know that in drafting the constitution of the Republic of India we have been greatly influenced by your own Constitution which lays down as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * * The great democracy of the United States of America will, I feel sure, understand and appreciate our approach to life's problems because it could not have any other aim or a different ideal. Friendship and cooperation between our two countries are, therefore, natural. I stand here to offer both in the pursuit of justice, liberty, and peace."

Mr. Nehru was warmly appreciative of the hearty welcome that he received from both President Truman and the American people.

V. UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO STRENGTHEN THE TIES OF FRIENDSHIP WITH INDIA

The Truman administration took keen interest in establishing good Indo-American relations. In 1949 the State Department started the educational exchange program between the United States and India under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts. Under these acts Indian exchange students, teachers, and professors came to study and teach at different universities in the United States. Likewise, United States exchange students and professors went to India. There has been a great change in India since August 15, 1947. After her independence many students began coming to the United States for their education. It is hoped that such young Indian people will contribute to the success of democracy in India.

In June 1950 the Korean war broke out. India supported the United Nations action in Korea. Prime Minister Nehru received full cooperation of his Government in this matter. He was in favor of halting the United Nations forces at the 38th parallel in Korea. This was the point where the United Nations authorities and Mr. Nehru differed. In order to effect a token participation, however, he sent a medical corps to Korea.

In December 1950 the Indian Ambassador, Madame Pandit, presented to President Truman an official request for a wheat loan to India since famine was rampant in India. That year the crops failed due to the paucity of rain. It always takes some time in democracies to take action on such international requests for long-term loans. Finally on June 15, 1951, President Truman signed the Indian emergency food aid bill. The President expressed particular satisfaction with two provisions of the act. One permits the use of $5 million from the interest of the loan for exchange of students and technicians between the two countries, and the other authorizes ocean transportation for relief supplies given to India by individuals and private organizations. Mr. Nehru expressed his deep gratitude at the adoption by the United States Congress of the Indian Emergency Assistance Act of 1951. This act made available $190 million to purchase 2 million tons of food grains in America. Both Mr. Nehru's government and the people of India expressed their gratitude to the United States.

In the fall of 1951 the President appointed Mr. Chester Bowles as United States Ambassador to India. The credit for strengthening the mutual ties of friendship and better understanding goes to Ambassador Bowles. In his short tour of duty in India he represented the United States in the best possible way. He truly deserves the title "The Ambassador of Good Will." He has recently published his book, Ambassador's Report, in which he presents the facts in an objective manner. It is a good picture of what is going on in India. His efforts should certainly achieve deserved success. He became interested in India's technical development and on January 5, 1952, signed the second joint Indo-American cooperative program, which extends technical assistance to India under the point 4 program. This assistance was proven to be of great help to the success of the Indian first 5-year plan.

Soon after Ambassador Bowles' arrival in 1951, in New Delhi, he was invited, along with other Ambassadors, to attend a party at the Soviet Embassy. Every year the Soviet Embassy celebrates the October Revolution of 1917 in honor of Lenin. At this party Ambassador Bowles observed that more than 3,000 people were invited from different walks of life. He immediately sensed that this was not the usual diplomatic party, but a covert maneuver to reach the Indian masses. In February 1952 Ambassador Bowles sent out 7,000 invitations to celebrate George Washington's Birthday. Some 5,000 people attended the function. This was perhaps a Machiavellian stroke on the part of the Ambassador toward informing the Indian people concerning this great man and his search for American independence.

VI. FUTURE TRENDS OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD INDIA

When we review the foreign policy of the Truman administration toward India, we find that President Truman has laid down a solid foundation for friendship between the United States and India. In the political picture of the world today both these countries need each other in combating world communism. Both countries have the same objectives, that is, to help the enslaved nations to achieve their independence and to maintain international peace and security. In reaching these objectives each nation follows an independent foreign policy. On these and similar lines the future foreign policies will shape themselves.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, Thou has ordained that not in cushioned seats of safety and ease, but in danger and stern conflict and in contending for the things which are more precious to us than life itself, shall we find our strength and our triumph in these days when all mankind stands in the Valley of Decision. For a part and a place on the side of human dignity and truth and decency in the raging struggle against the powers of darkness and the principalities of evil, God of freedom and of justice, we give Thee thanks.

Make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world. Arm us with the sword which is the might of Thy love, and with the shield which is Thine invincible truth, against which all the spears of hate cannot ultimately prevail. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 1, and Monday, April 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 5, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 465) for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford.

PUBLIC UTILITY RELOCATION INCIDENT TO HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 127)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Secretary of Commerce was directed by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 to make a study of problems posed by the relocation of utility facilities resulting from improvements under Federal highway programs, and to submit a report to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

I am transmitting herewith a report entitled "Public Utility Relocation Incident to Highway Improvement," which has been submitted to me by the Secretary of Commerce.

Respectfully yours,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to order of the Senate of April 1, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on April 2, 1955, he had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4436) relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 1, 1955,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 12, 1955, reported favorably with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 136) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make before I suggest the absence of a quorum. I plan to ask unanimous consent for the consideration today of the bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States. If that unanimous consent is granted, and if action is concluded on that bill, it is planned to take up Calendar No. 125, a bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; Calendar No. 126, a bill (S. 460) to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; Calendar No. 132, a bill (S. 800) to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; Calendar No. 133, a bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; Calendar No. 134, a bill (S. 1137) to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; Calendar No. 135, a bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; and Calendar No. 136, a bill (S. 1600) to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit.

It is also possible that if word is received from the Senator who objected when the bill was reached on the calendar, and if it is agreeable with him, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 121, a bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I ask unanimous consent that after the Senate completes its morning business it proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 137, a bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is, of course, rather unusual to bring up such a bill at this time and take immediate action, but the Treasury-Post Office bill is so general that the Senator from New Hampshire, as the ranking minority member of the committee, would have no objection to having it taken up for consideration today. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], spoke to me earlier about the matter. I see no reason why the bill should not be taken up today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 10 years ago this week the greatest man of our generation was laid to rest at Hyde Park, and the whole Nation went into mourning.

A pall of gloom spread over the country and crossed the seas to far distant lands where American soldiers, sailors, and airmen were fighting for freedom. The whole free world felt a sense of shock. Only dictators and tyrants rejoiced.

A decade later, this is still one of the most melancholy of our anniversaries. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was fashioned from the stuff of greatness, and his passing left an empty, lonesome space against the sky.

The problems with which he struggled were mighty, and he met them as only a great leader can. Sometimes he made mistakes—great mistakes—but only a man who avoids great problems altogether can avoid great errors altogether.

It is difficult in this mid-decade of the 20th century to recall the feeling of hopelessness and helplessness that held our country in bondage at the time he first assumed the Presidential office.

Our people could see no hope; no confidence; no future. Around us there was nothing but foreclosures; idle factories; food and fiber rotting in the fields while children went hungry and unclad. Poverty had ceased to be a spur to achievement, and had become merely an incentive to lethargy.

Into this welter of gloom strode a man with confidence in America—a man who could speak the true voice of courage and hope. In his inaugural address, he told the country that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

It was a trumpet call to action. A nation prostrate rose to its feet and began to march. The wheels of industry turned once again—sometimes grinding and clashing, but still turning. Our soil became a blessing which could produce food and fiber instead of mortgages and foreclosures.

The years that followed were hectic and sometimes feverish. The great social reforms of the New Deal burst upon the Nation at an unprecedented rate. A new principle was written into the country's philosophy, a principle best stated by the President himself.

> We have always known that needless self-interest was bad morals—

He said—

> We know now that it is bad economics.

He also said that:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The spirit that bested the depression also conquered the Axis Powers, even though the architect of victory himself passed away before the victory was consummated. But in a real sense, the spirit never died, because it was compounded of the courage and the determination of the American people.

Ten years later, Franklin Delano Roosevelt is still a controversial figure. He is still a man about whom much is argued and little is settled. But it is a real test of his greatness that even now there are those who feel compelled to descend into his grave to debate endlessly the questions of his times.

As one who was close to him, I myself do not believe that he would carry on such debates. He always met the problems of the present with the zest and enthusiasm of a true leader. The problems of the past he left to those whose sole concern is kicking over the ashes of long-dead fires.

Although I frequently disagreed with Franklin D. Roosevelt—in fact, I cast one of my first votes as a Member of Congress against him—I always recognized in him the greatness of his leadership. His role in history we cannot determine now. But we know it will loom large.

It is fitting and proper that we commemorate the anniversary of his passing. In so doing, we will be in tune with the millions of Americans who never swerved in their allegiance to him despite the detractors and the muck rakers of history.

But the greatest tribute we could pay would be to dedicate ourselves to the problems of the present. The greatest honor we could bestow would be to resolve that we shall face the enemies of America in 1955 in the same spirit he displayed in facing depression and the Axis powers. As united Americans, we could once again demonstrate to the world that we have banished fear from our hearts and resumed our role as the confident leaders of the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the April 12 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER 10 YEARS

It is 10 years today since Franklin D. Roosevelt died. His memorials are not in bronze alone, nor in stone. They are in international policies which grew out of those he followed. They are in the United Nations, to which he gave the name and to whose principles, forecast in the Atlantic Charter and outlined at Dumbarton Oaks and in what was good in the Yalta agreements, he subscribed. They are ironically outstanding in the very fact that after 10 years he is still a center of controversy and that some of the things he did and said at Yalta are as hotly debated as though he were likely to be again a candidate for the Presidency.

It would be futile, at this time, to compare Franklin D. Roosevelt with other Presidents. But the truth is, because of the very nature of this generation's historical trends, that he remains in the current of events. He is alive as few men, however influential, have ever been 10 years after they passed from this earth.

He is alive because his principles and his hopes are still at stake. He did not invent the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan and its successors, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, point four, technical assistance, or the policy which now attempts to turn Germany and Japan from beaten enemies into allies in defense. Yet the union of the free world was his dream and his conception of necessity.

He had his moments of error. He was sometimes overconfident. Circumstances compelled him to look at the future out of the confusion of an armed struggle. He did not live to see the final victory. He did not live to see the Communist betrayal of that victory. He never had to face the full implications of the atomic age. Today's schoolboy could tell Mr. Roosevelt things he did not know.

Nevertheless the influence of this man persists. Let anyone who finds himself within sight of mid-Manhattan's East River skyline lift up his eyes: there, against the light, are buildings constructed out of the faith for which Mr. Roosevelt in his high moments eloquently spoke. There stands the visible United Nations: imperfect, echoing discords as well as harmonies, providing a forum for the world's disputes, carrying on almost in silence a great struggle against hunger and disease. There it stands, and he helped build it. This is his monument, quite as much as that humble slab at Hyde Park where many pilgrims pause, day in and day out, to do him honor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. Few men of history have made such an impact on the people, the Nation, and the world as did Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He was chosen by the people to lead at a time when they faced despair, hunger, and frustration. He warned against fear, and through forcefulness and action he turned away fear and brought hope to the people.

He led them out of the morass of depression, and spoke for them as they faced the tyranny of fascism.

As stated by the majority leader, there are some who would try to detract from Franklin Delano Roosevelt's deeds and his memory. But he will live on in posterity.

It was a great Kentuckian who said:

> If I were to read, must less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out all wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right, would make no difference.

Historians will continue to record the greatness of our 32d President long after his critics fade from this life and even as they, themselves, fade from the pages of history.

As we pay honor to this great American here today, we rejoice in the announcement of the Salk vaccine, which may well conquer another of the dreaded diseases—a disease which Roosevelt fought and conquered and which he worked so hard to see conquered in all others. This is fitting, for he would have it this way. We have conquered fear again, and in his memory we look forward to a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion, there has never

been a greater American than Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He came upon the scene in the United States at a time when we were not only on the verge of sinking out of existence, but in danger in every field of activity. Senators may think that today we are in danger of communism. On March 4, 1933, we were in much greater danger than we are in today. President Roosevelt faced that situation in the right way.

Let us consider some of the things he did. All the banks in the United States were closed. Today there are upon the statute books laws which protect every depositor. I give Franklin Delano Roosevelt credit for that. I also remind Senators that he was the one who had placed upon the statute books of the United States our social-security laws. At that time there was a great deal of opposition to placing upon the books laws for the protection of the common people.

In the field of labor, the wage and hour law was enacted at the insistence of President Roosevelt. Until he came into office the farmers of the United States had practically no protection. Today we talk about floors and supports under the prices of various commodities. Until Roosevelt came upon the scene and did something for the farmers of our Nation, there were no supports.

Turning to another field, unemployment compensation is a great backlog to protect us in the event of large-scale unemployment. If it had not been for unemployment compensation, social-security legislation, and increased retirement allowances, in my opinion, we would have suffered a depression long before this.

Mr. President, I believe that Franklin Delano Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the greatest men who ever lived in the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we are returning to a session of Congress which bids fair to be heavily controversial. We are returning from an Easter recess which should have impressed upon every one of us the value of peace, quietude, restraint, consideration of others, and cooperative endeavor, and the value of mutual respect, each of us for the others. At this moment it is peculiarly fitting and timely that we make brief mention of the anniversary of the passing of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was an exceedingly controversial figure, and always will be such, in the annals of our history. However, the fact remains that when he assumed the Presidency, he had courage to lead us through unknown fields and in untried directions, in the effort to solve problems which bore down tragically upon the Nation.

We have such problems now, Mr. President. I am hoping that there may come a challenge and an inspiration to us, as we resume this session, to attack these problems in somewhat the same way that Franklin Delano Roosevelt attacked the problems of his day, upon a nonpartisan basis. Many Members of Congress acted upon such a basis at that time.

I recall that one of the distinguished Senators from Florida at that time, Senator Duncan U. Fletcher, was known as a lifelong conservative. At the express invitation of the President he abandoned the chairmanship of a committee which would have been his own preference, to become Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because so many of the reforms which were apparently needed lay in the field of the jurisdiction of that committee. I recall that he stated to some of us who were his dearest friends in Florida that he felt that it was a time for conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, and indeed all Americans to get together and try to solve the problems which then bore so heavily upon the hearts and consciences of the people of this Nation.

From that committee came some measures which have not survived the test of time. Many more came from that committee which are now a permanent part of our economy and of our American way of doing things. I refer to such measures as the Securities and Exchange Commission legislation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act; and such measures as those which very largely reorganized our entire banking system. I refer to such measures as the Home Owners Loan Corporation Act, which afforded to many millions of our citizens of all creeds and all varieties of political persuasion an opportunity to save their homes. I refer to such measures as the Federal Housing Administration Act, which later succeeded the Home Owners Loan Corporation, which was more or less of an emergency agency designed to meet the terrible problems of debt which weighed upon home owners as an incident of the depression.

As we survey the number of measures which have become a part of our American system and our American way of life, measures which came from a committee headed by a life-long conservative who gave up his own earnest desire of a lifetime to serve as chairman of another committee in order to furnish the kind of leadership which was needed, we should all take renewed inspiration at this time in striving to meet the challenge of our day.

In addition to furnishing leadership in the economic fields which I have mentioned, and in other fields which have been mentioned by my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and by the distinguished majority leader from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], this Nation should never forget the great hope which President Roosevelt inspired in those who were afflicted, those who had been visited with grave disease or infirmity. He came back from the devastating blow which was dealt to him by polio, to become a great Governor of New York and then a great President, at a time of unparalleled crisis in the history of our Nation.

I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who was not called upon in those early days, either as Governor of his State, or in some other capacity, to take some part in the leadership of the March of Dimes campaign, or the campaign to establish and maintain the Warm Springs Foundation. I know that every other Member of the Senate must have felt deeply, as did the Senator from Florida, the exaltation of spirit resulting from the announcement made yesterday of the discovery of what appears to be a cure or a preventive of polio, which gives renewed hope to millions of our children and young people in American homes which have been endangered each year by that devastating disease.

In this time of rejoicing because of that discovery and its tremendous impact on the lives of our people, we should not forget for a moment that that great development has come out of the shadows which beset the life of Franklin Roosevelt, and that in a very real way he was the leader from whose inspiration and from whose example our people, working together, without thought of politics or any other differences of any sort, have made it possible for this tremendous discovery to be made, which discovery is of such great import to all of us, as it will be of equally great import to all the peoples of the earth. Therefore, at this time of apparent victory over polio, I do not believe that we should forget the part that Franklin Roosevelt played in that unceasing battle against disease and death.

Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, and other Senators, in commemorating this 10th anniversary of President Roosevelt's death.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the majority leader and with the other Senators who have spoken with kindness and with truth of the life of that great man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I recall very vividly the night before President Truman recognized Israel as an independent nation. At that time I made some remarks at a meeting held in Madison Square Garden, in New York, before an assembly of approximately 25,000 or 30,000 people. They realized that the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt still lived.

The impact of his life on those who knew him best and those who had worked with him was well known.

Because of Franklin D. Roosevelt the American people are happier and in better condition. Because of him the farmer is better off, the home owner is in better condition, and the laborer is in better shape. More social and economic progress was made under his administration than in the 100 years prior to his taking office.

Let us not forget that his spirit is still with us. We cannot say too much about him. We can entertain the hope that the way of progress he pointed out, the American way of life he brought to millions of people, and what he did to improve the American standard of living, will continue.

I am proud of the fact that I participated in a small way in bringing about all the legislation that has been referred to today—legislation providing for rural electrification, hospitalization, home security, good wages.

I know what I am talking about. I have seen human beings work for $1.25 for 12 hours. I have seen the conditions under which miners worked. We think about the miners when there is an explosion in a mine in West Virginia or Kentucky or Illinois. Unless there is

some emergency we do not think about them or about the wages they used to receive.

I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last evening, as I watched the Edward R. Murrow television program, which featured the announcement of the discovery of the highly effective serum which will be used in the battle against polio, I was very vividly reminded of the striking example of human courage which was afforded in American history by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was stricken at the height of his physical powers and thereafter subjected to extreme physical limitations for the remainder of his life. In spite of that he became President of the United States not only once but several times, during some of the most critical days of our country's entire history. To carry on with fortitude and courage of soul and heart and mind as Franklin D. Roosevelt did is a striking example to all of our people, particularly our youth. He is a splendid illustration of a courageous man with a steadfast purpose, the type that has always been necessary in our Nation, and which is even more necessary today than ever before.

While thinking along that line I thought, too, as the Senator from Florida did, of those days in March and April and May of 1933, when I lived in a small town in Mississippi. My office was in the county courthouse, and daily I saw people with their problems. I saw on the faces of those people, not only in my county but in other counties as well, their expressions of despair and almost hopelessness. I had active connection with a small bank, which brought me into contact with their financial problems. I saw the establishment of the FDIC, largely brought about in those dark days through the efforts of President Roosevelt. It immediately affected the people and their problems. They felt like trying again.

It resulted in helping to stabilize our economy and restore confidence. It helped small banks as well as large banks to take a new start. This program has been of the most far-reaching consequences, and continues right on to this day.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to join in the expressions of appreciation of some of the contributions which our late President made in those difficult times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the American people cherish today the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt and are grateful for his life. I venture to predict that they will continue to be grateful for many decades to come.

HIS COMPASSION THE RESULT OF GRAVE ILLNESS

As we look back upon the career of Franklin D. Roosevelt, after a decade, it now seems that the crippling effect of polio which he suffered in 1921 was the turning point in his life. Facing death and permanent paralysis, he was transformed from the charming young man of fortune into a courageous battler who could fight death and a crippling disability with a smile. It made him unafraid. Having looked death in the face and what might be worse than death, and having conquered both by efforts stimulated by courage, it gave him also a fellow feeling for all those who were in trouble, for the sick, the needy, and those who were bowed under life's heavy load. That fellow feeling is sometimes difficult for a Hudson River squire to appreciate.

THE NATION'S PERIL WHEN ROOSEVELT BECAME PRESIDENT

When he came to the Presidency he found the Nation in greater trouble than ever before in our history, with the possible exception of the period of the Civil War. There were nearly 16 million persons unemployed. Industry, agriculture, and commerce had broken down. Starvation threatened our land, despite all of our great productive power. The leaders of industry, and the bankers had lost confidence in themselves, and the tinder of discontent was heaped high and could have turned into a blaze which would have destroyed our democratic institutions. Almost like a bolt of apocalyptic lightning and thunder most banks were closed on the eve of his taking office.

ROOSEVELT'S MEASURES FOR RECOVERY AND REFORM

Roosevelt largely reversed all of this. The Government stepped in to protect the people from starvation, offering work wherever possible. The Public Works Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Progress Administration, and the National Youth Administration, so bitterly criticized at the time, not only gave work and life, but also resulted in the construction of a myriad of useful public buildings and works which have enabled Federal, State, and local governments to be of much greater service to the people. If we could know all the works which were constructed during that decade, if there were appropriate plaques placed upon them, we would vividly realize that they have more than paid for themselves. A major degree of recovery was effected, and the people and the country were saved.

At the same time a series of far-reaching and long-delayed reforms were started. The banks were reopened. Small depositors were protected in their deposits. Those whose farms and homes were about to be foreclosed were given new hope. Issue houses were compelled to tell the truth about the securities they floated, despite the statements of certain Wall Street men that this would ruin the investment banking business. Some of the worst abuses in connection with the manipulation of the stock market were prevented. The hold of the private banks upon the Federal Reserve System was reduced. Investment in housing for the middle-income groups was encouraged by the creation of Federal Housing Administration.

Farmers were protected from the disastrous fall in farm prices and were helped to their feet. For the first time a modern program of soil conservation was placed in operation. Electricity was brought to farms. The Tennessee Valley Authority was started.

In the field of labor the wage earners of the country were largely protected against the difficulties of old age and unemployment by the Social Security Act. In the same year, 1935, workingmen were given the effective right to join unions without fear of being discharged, and the right to bargain collectively if a majority of the workers in a given factory or unit so decided.

In 1938 the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed fixing the minimum wage at 25 cents an hour. Even this was bitterly opposed.

I may say, Mr. President, that the crucial battles which were the prelude to the passage of that act were largely won by the victory of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the primaries of that State in 1938, and on the same day there was a similar victory in the State of Florida. These were great achievements, and they admitted the wage earners of the country to first-class citizenship.

So, Mr. President, a great program of both reform and recovery was carried out in the period from 1933 to 1938.

ROOSEVELT LEADS AMERICA FROM ISOLATION TO THE PROTECTION OF LIBERTY

In the same period the war clouds in Europe were gathering. The totalitarian party came to power in Italy in 1922. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria and, despite the efforts of a great American who was then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, the hands of the United States Government were tied so far as active prevention was concerned.

In 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany, and the dictators soon launched a program of aggression. Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini in 1935. The Rhineland was reoccupied by Hitler in the winter of 1936. Civil war broke out in Spain in the same year. Austria was taken by Hitler in February and March of 1938. The first partition of Czechoslovakia occurred in the fall of 1938; the second partition took place in the spring of 1939.

What was America to do under those circumstances? Was she to hold herself aloof and wrap herself in isolation? To have done that would have meant that a sea of tyranny would have engulfed Europe and the world. America would have been isolated. Ultimately it would have been necessary for the United States to engage in a war in which we would have fought alone, with our backs to the wall, and with the future of the Nation and the people at stake and with the odds against us.

Two great statesmen saw this danger: Winston Churchill, in Great Britain, who never ceased to criticize the appeasement policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain from the floor of the House of Commons; and Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the United States.

I remember standing in Chicago in October 1937, when President Roosevelt dedicated the outer bridge and said that in the future aggressors should be quarantined. That was a profound, statesmanlike declaration, but it was greeted with opposition from most of the people and the press of the country, and also from the opposing political party. It was

clear that America had not yet recognized the danger.

But as surrender followed surrender, and finally when Great Britain and France, at the very last minute, recognized the danger which was close upon them, the United States began to be more concerned.

Then came the fall of France and the seizure of Western Europe in May and June of 1940. Russia, we all remember, was at the time leagued with Nazi Germany. Hitler was supreme over the European world, with only the English Channel barring him from Great Britain.

In the summer of 1940, with a presidential election impending, Roosevelt took a courageous step. He gave to Great Britain 50 over-age destroyers in return for bases in the Caribbean and in other parts of the new world. He sent to Great Britain large quantities of obsolete small arms adapted to British use, which gave Great Britain the physical means of resistance.

Then came the election of President Roosevelt to a third term. In 1941 he proposed lend-lease, and the United States began to furnish arms and equipment to our allies on a large scale.

ROOSEVELT A GREAT WAR PRESIDENT

On December 7, 1941, came Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt threw the full resources of the Nation into a struggle for liberty. He drew no party lines. He had already brought into the Government two of the most eminent men in the Republican Party to head the Department of War and the Department of the Navy. My friend and fellow Illinoisan, Frank Knox, headed the Department of the Navy, while the noble Henry Stimson became Secretary of War.

Roosevelt was a great war President. With tremendous energy, he secured the 50,000 planes a year which he had said would be needed and which some people had said it would be impossible to get. He brought us victory. He had the discernment to appoint George Marshall, who was 33d on the list, to be Commanding General of the Armies; and he picked out an obscure lieutenant colonel and made him commander of the forces in the field in Europe, thus starting Dwight D. Eisenhower on the road to fame. He made a multitude of military decisions, most of them have proved right. He gave precedence to the struggle for Europe. He decided Russia would not give in. He insisted on an offensive. He developed the atom bomb. In a multitude of other cases he was also right.

A man who has been President of the United States for more than 12 years, who has had tens of thousands of important decisions thrust upon him, inevitably makes mistakes. It should not be pretended that Franklin Roosevelt did not make mistakes. I think the NRA was a mistake, and I believe President Roosevelt himself thought so in later years.

I think the manner in which he tried to change the face of the Supreme Court probably was a mistake; although it should never be forgotten that closely following upon that attempt came the famous switch of Mr. Justice Roberts which transformed what everyone thought would be unfavorable decisions in the minimum wage, social security, and Wagner Act cases into favorable decisions; so, to use baseball parlance, Franklin Roosevelt may have made a sacrifice hit and bunted in three runs.

It is true that Roosevelt probably overestimated the desire of Russia for peace and that he made certain concessions which perhaps should not have been made. I do not intend to discuss the Yalta papers at great length today, because to do so would take too much time. I can only say that, in the main, the steps which were taken in Europe and Asia probably would have been about the same no matter what was agreed upon at Yalta, because Russia already was in military possession of Eastern Europe and was ready to move into Manchuria and Korea.

We do not say that Roosevelt was a perfect man. Of course, he was not. He was handicapped, as all of us are handicapped, by certain elements in background and training. But, taking all in all, he was a noble American, and I think one of the handful of truly great American Presidents.

While there may be elements in society who would dance upon his grave and traduce his memory, as even now some are carrying on a campaign against him, I wish to say, that, with the passage of time, his name will stand out.

Mr. President, a grateful people pay tribute to Franklin Roosevelt today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the basic characteristic of Franklin D. Roosevelt was confidence in his country and its people.

Mr. Roosevelt believed in forward-looking policies and a dynamic America, economically as well as politically. He believed such policies were essential for our future, and were essential to the prosperity and security of both the United States and the rest of the free world.

Of even more importance, Mr. Roosevelt was able to implant his brilliant optimism into the minds and hearts of the people he represented. There was no faltering, no retreat.

Under his leadership America fought and won the war forced upon us at Pearl Harbor. At the same time, his leadership gave to the people the highest standard of living ever known in any land.

Franklin Roosevelt worked against ignorance, by striving for ever more education for all the people. He worked against tyranny by striving for individual and national freedom—economic freedom as well as political freedom.

He worked against poverty, in all countries, because he knew that poverty is the breeding ground of the greatest of all dangers to those who would be free—ideologies which turn man into but a servant of his state.

In the abiding optimism of Franklin Roosevelt lies the future of our country. If we falter, if we let events form policies, instead of creating policies which form events, there is little chance of maintaining the American way of life. But if we follow the star of his abiding confidence in America, we will pass on to our children an even greater heritage than the one bequeathed to us at the time of his death.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader upon the very eloquent, timely, and deserving tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt which he has delivered.

One could say so many things, one could characterize in so many different ways, the elements of greatness of the late President that is impossible to undertake a comprehensive treatment of his character, work, and record in a brief time.

By his vision, courage, and leadership, Franklin Roosevelt brought hope to millions of despairing, depressed, and despondent souls. Because of his boldness, America today is ahead in atomic development. Having had some small connection with that program, I know something of the decisions which President Roosevelt made, the chances he took, the courage he displayed, and the boldness of his vision that led to the atomic weapons which saved so many hundreds of thousands of lives of Americans.

Mr. President, there is a little story I wish to tell. In 1945 I had dinner with General Stilwell on Okinawa. The war in the Pacific was then in its crescendo. General Stilwell told us in general terms about where the landing was expected to be made in Japan. He gave us an indication of the date when the assault would be undertaken. It was imminent. Across the Pacific we had witnessed the gathering of the fleets and the marshaling of men and armaments. While in the quonset hut the air-raid signal screamed, and General Stilwell told us that it would be a very costly assault, but he thought it would be successful. I shall never forget the shudder I felt when he said that we could expect 500,000 American casualties from an assault upon the Japanese islands.

Mr. President, on the return trip of the congressional committee of which I was a member, when we landeed in Hawaii only 5 days after General Stilwell had given us that estimate, the headlines all told about the dropping of the atom bomb. Two days later, when we landed in California, the headlines in the papers proclaimed the efforts of Japan to bring about her surrender.

I think of those 500,000 American boys who were not casualties. That weapon which ended the war with Japan was a product, in a very realistic sense, of the boldness of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was one of the great leaders of America, one of the great Presidents of our country, and one of the men in all of world history who has indelibly imprinted himself upon the minds, the hearts, the consciences, and the memories of all his contemporaries and upon the history of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his very generous remarks.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for his very beautiful and timely tribute to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have this morning been

engaged in a meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during which we talked of the recent epochal development in the prevention and cure of poliomyelitis, the marvelous vaccine given to us through the inspired genius and devoted efforts of Dr. Jonas E. Salk.

We know the story of Franklin Roosevelt, stricken down with polio, of his long and determined struggle to win against that dread malady, and of the victory which he won, but we were impressed this morning by the thought that he was not satisfied to win just for himself. He was not satisfied that he might be restored to health and strength; that it might be made possible for him to go forward and lead a useful and great life. Franklin Roosevelt continued the struggle that all the sons of men—that all our children—might some day be protected from this dread disease, and that those who were so unfortunate as to contract the disease might be able to defeat it, save their lives, keep whole their bodies, and not have to go down the road of death or down life's highway with crippled and broken bodies.

It was the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, founded by Franklin Roosevelt — an association which came into being as a result of his vision, faith, resolution, and leadership—which provided the funds and the resources which made it possible for Dr. Salk to carry on his great work and searching experiments and to develop the marvelous vaccine which has just been tested and proven true. The founding of this organization illustrated the heart and the character of Franklin Roosevelt, the humanity of the man, how his great heart and strong arms reached out wherever there was suffering, wherever people were in distress, and how again and again and again he sought to bring them relief and the help which they so desperately needed. He was seeking always to serve his fellow man.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs during the late World War, and in that position I had an opportunity to see the magnificent and inspired leadership of Franklin Roosevelt. It would not be possible to enumerate all his contributions to the winning of that war for the United States and for all people who cherish liberty and love freedom. In fact, he was our great leader in the winning of two wars. The first, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so eloquently described, was the war against economic distress, economic suffering, and economic collapse here at home.

The distinguished majority leader spoke of the day when Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated, when he proclaimed to the Nation that we had nothing to fear except fear itself. At that time our American system—yes, the capitalistic system of our America—stood on the brink of disaster. Confidence was shattered. Hope had left the hearts of men. When Franklin Roosevelt, the brave, the bold, the dauntless leader, sounded the battle cry to go forth to win this war for America, a new light came into the faces of the American people. They were inspired, they responded, and they rallied, and under his gallant leadership and the great programs that he gave us we restored America's strength, her power, and her dynamic spirit.

Mr. President, at the end of World War II I happened to be 1 of 4 Senators—along with Senator Ball, of Minnesota; Senator Burton, of Ohio; and Senator Hatch, of New Mexico—who joined in the submission of the first resolution calling for the United States to take the lead in the formation of an international organization for law and peace. The encouragement, support, and faith of Franklin D. Roosevelt moved us to press for the adoption of that resolution, and resulted in having this body take action leading to the creation of the United Nations.

Mr. President, today I pay my tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt as a friend and as a mighty leader—a man of faith, of vision, of courage, of resolution, of wisdom in great affairs.

As the distinguished majority leader has said, today it is not possible for us to determine the exact place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in history; but we do know that he will stand as one of the foremost men in all the history of the world.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in complimenting our distinguished majority leader upon his timely and eloquent tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt knew well the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Early in the career of our distinguished majority leader, President Roosevelt recognized in LYNDON JOHNSON the qualities of leadership, of statesmanship, and of high political morality and purpose which have so markedly characterized his public career since that time, and which now bring into fulfillment his gift to our party and to the country, as majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. President, LYNDON JOHNSON knew well Franklin Roosevelt. Although LYNDON JOHNSON was then a very young man, between the two there existed a very deep and warm friendship and a mutually shared affection. So it is, Mr. President, that some of us who in those days served in the House of Representatives know that when the distinguished senior Senator from Texas speaks of Franklin Roosevelt, he speaks with a full heart.

I also wish to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in his impressive and eloquent tribute to Franklin Roosevelt, speaks with great knowledge and as a result of close association. As I recall, he had the honor of being selected by the then President Roosevelt to nominate him at the convention of the Democratic Party in 1940, in the city of the distinguished Senator from Illinois—Chicago.

Of course, Mr. President, in the limited time available today, it is utterly impossible to begin to portray or properly eulogize or describe the life, works, and qualities of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. President, the triumphant announcement yesterday of the tremendous success of Dr. Salk's antipolio vaccine experiments came most appropriately and fittingly on the 10th anniversary of the death of our beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt—the one man who, more than any other American, was responsible for our acute consciousness in recent years of the ghastly ravages and devastating waste in human resources of the fearful disease from which he suffered. This newest scientific conquest is but one more laurel, Mr. President, to be added to the memory of that great American whose historic role it is still too early, perhaps, to evaluate completely.

But, Mr. President, regardless of political differences, I believe that no American, of whatever political faith or persuasion, can fail to recognize, nor can he refuse to acknowledge, the indomitable courage of Franklin Roosevelt and his imagination, translated into action, in freeing the Nation from the paralyzing stranglehold of one of the worst depressions the world has known and in successfully insulating us against the inevitability of recurring depressions by inaugurating far-reaching measures and securing the enactment of more social legislation than has any other President, either before or since. Nor is it too early to recognize and acknowledge his great leadership in bringing us through the worst war of all time, or his vision in creating the United Nations as our most effective weapon against another world war and our most hopeful instrument for securing international peace.

Today we are grateful, and we pause to give thanks to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt for his part in promoting our victory over polio, and for the hope and inspiration he provided, not only to the victims, but to the research scientists in their efforts to conquer that disease. I am confident that the ensuing years will continue to augment the glorious laurels to his credit, and our eternal indebtedness and everlasting gratitude to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the majority leader for the very excellent statement he has made and for giving the first of the tributes today paid to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and I desire to join all my colleagues who have paid their tribute to the memory of that great President, one of America's greatest men—in fact, one of the world's greatest men.

Mr. President, most of the things we usually think of in connection with President Roosevelt have already been said today by Members of the Senate, and I do not care to burden the Senate by taking the time to repeat them. But if there is one outstanding characteristic of President Roosevelt, I believe it is that he, perhaps more than any other person, succeeded in banishing fear and developing hope in the hearts of men.

The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], spoke a few minutes ago about all the work which President Roosevelt did to change the thinking of a world which had more or less drifted into a defeatist attitude. His work was effective not only in the economic field, but in the political situation of practically the entire world. He was never one to be a defeatist. Instead, he worked and

spoke and did everything he could to drive away fear and build up hope.

I shall never forget his first inaugural address. I remember very well where I was. I was a practicing lawyer in my hometown of Huntsville. I remember stopping in the street outside a business place on my way from the courthouse to listen to the inaugural address. It greatly impressed me. If I correctly remember, it lasted 12 minutes. I believe it was the shortest inaugural address which had been delivered up to that time, and perhaps was even shorter than any since delivered. The thing in that address which impressed me was the challenge to people not to be afraid, to work to abolish fear and build up hope. Somehow or other we could sense the spirit of those who heard that address. They walked away with a new feeling of hope, a feeling that there was someone who could give them hope and lead them out of their difficulties. We know the magnificent work which President Roosevelt did in that connection.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from South Carlina [Mr. JOHNSTON], spoke of some of the programs of President Roosevelt. The Senator from Florida mentioned one particular program to which I think sometimes we do not pay enough attention. Perhaps we are prone to forget it. I refer to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a daring program, one which I dare say few people would ever have been willing to conceive or put into effect. That program did a great deal to support our crashing economy and to hold it until a positive plan could be devised to underpin it.

In a small way I had a connection with the Home Owners Loan Corporation, at the county level. I was one of the two men in our county who administered the program. I used to visit the homes of the people who were making application for loans. I was a field appraiser. I would check the property to ascertain the conditions, not only from a physical standpoint, but with reference to the arrearages in payments on mortgages. In many of those homes I saw little besides despair. Yet we were administering a program which was coming to their relief, a program to give them hope once more, and to help raise them up.

I could detail many other programs which Franklin Delano Roosevelt dared to put into effect. I might mention the many things which he did in connection with the war, but I do not wish unduly to extend these remarks. Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought hope to the people in time of great economic distress. It has been stressed here today many times that he brought hope not only to polio victims, but to physically handicapped persons everywhere, who saw the tremendous physical handicap which he had mastered. He gave hope to a world that was on fire. Even after the time came when it was apparent that the fire would be put out, he offered hope against a recurrence.

The greatest monument that could be erected to any man stands today to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, not only in one spot, but all over the world where freedom-loving people live.

I was in Alabama when President Roosevelt died. I went there to make a Jefferson Day speech. I remember coming into the hotel the afternoon when he passed away, and hearing the announcement on the radio. That was the first indication I had received of his death. I remember the feeling of sadness and sorrow in the hearts of the people.

We all remember the story of the journey of his funeral train as it came back from Warm Springs. People gathered silently along the tracks, not merely at the railroad stations, but everywhere. The people were weeping because they knew that the greatest friend the ordinary man had had in a long time had died.

Franklin D. Roosevelt lives today in the hearts of the people everywhere. That is the tribute which the people paid to him—the greatest tribute that can be paid to anyone.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to speak of Franklin D. Roosevelt at the very time when one of his great hopes and aims has been fulfilled, namely, victory over the dread disease which struck him down in the day of his greatest strength. I know that the winning of the fight against poliomyelitis was nearer his heart than almost anything else save the security, prosperity, and welfare of his country.

I shall not try to write a biography of Franklin D. Roosevelt today on the floor of the Senate. I wish to make my remarks in a personal vein, because I believe I knew Franklin Roosevelt better than did anyone else who is a Member of this body today.

Franklin Roosevelt was, above all things, my friend. As I recall, I first met him during the First World War, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and I was, for a time, associated with the Navy Department.

The friendship that began then deepened and grew stronger through the years as the broad stream of public service brought us closer and closer together.

My first political mentor in New York was Al Smith, whose follower and supporter I was for many years, dating back to the first decade of the century. But in 1928, when I ran for the first time as a candidate for public office—for Lieutenant Governor of New York—my running mate, the head of the ticket, was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I saw in Franklin Roosevelt, during those years, the great inspirational qualities of leadership, the vibrant courage, the endless ingenuity, and the bold and adventurous spirit which came to characterize his historic administration as President of the United States.

He was a man who could—because he had to—shed some of the heavy cares of office once he had made a decision in regard to those cares. Someone once asked him, while he was Governor, how he managed not to show the tensions of some of the problems which confronted us in those days. He said, as well as I can recall, "Well, I have made the decisions and I let Herbert do the worrying for me." I was the Herbert in this case. I was privileged to share his problems with him, but I did not share his capacity for throwing off the worry that followed the responsibility.

Actually, this characteristic of Franklin Roosevelt was more apparent than real. His great heart was frequently heavy with the cares of office. He had one of the most remarkable physiques, in spite of his physical handicap, that I have ever seen. But the burden of 12 years of the Presidency, added to 4 years as Governor of New York, during the most difficult period in all history, proved, in the end, too great even for him.

He was a man who could be fervently loved, as he could be violently hated. Millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world loved him deeply and passionately, and mourned him as one of their own when he died.

There is no way of precisely describing the hold he had upon people—and upon his friends. He had his faults. There is no human being without them. But he was a leader of the people of a greatness which only history can precisely measure. Of course he was the most controversial President of our time. I believe, with all my heart, that he will be recorded as one of the greatest of our entire history.

I served 4 years as F. D. R.'s lieutenant governor. It was one of the great experiences of my life. It was my great privilege, in 1936, and again in 1940, to second his nomination for the presidency. I am proud of that distinction.

I was privileged to be selected by the people of New York State to succeed Franklin D. Roosevelt as Governor of New York. During all the years I was Governor of the great Empire State, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States. We worked closely during those years—almost as closely as we had while he was Governor and I was lieutenant governor. It is an interesting circumstance that once he had become President, he showed little or no partiality for the State of New York as against other States. He had, of course, a very deep concern for New York State, which was his native State. All his memories and all his family associations were identified with New York. Yet it was frequently not an easy task to gain from him the support we had to seek for projects and undertakings of special concern to New York State until he was convinced that they were fair to all the other States of the Union.

I had my differences with him in those days—differences we always resolved for the best interests, I am sure, of my State and of the Nation. That was one of his great talents—his ability to improvise and compromise, not on principle, but among contending forces so as to bring out of him a result which was acceptable, if not entirely satisfactory, to all.

In speaking of differences, I recall vividly the only time I had a great public break with him. I could not go along with his Supreme Court packing plan. I opposed him publicly. I thought he was in the wrong. I am sure he did not cherish my opposition to him, but his was such a warm, all-embracing nature, comprehending objects far beyond the present moment, that our differences

were soon all forgotten in the broader medley of common beliefs and common principles that we shared.

Above all, Franklin Roosevelt was an apostle of freedom. He believed in freedom as a goal and as a way of life. He believed in the practice, as well as in the preaching, of freedom. He held up freedom as a shining goal for all mankind. He helped lead the world to that goal. He helped forge the coalition of freedom-loving nations which saved the world from the forces of evil which threatened to overcome us at that time.

There is little that I can say to add to his stature. There is nothing that was said at the time, or that can be said now, to detract in the least degree from that stature.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I desire to commend our distinguished and able majority leader for his beautiful tribute to that great American leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The tributes by my other colleagues have been most appropriate. I should like to add a few words to the comments being made here today about the late President.

History has recorded the stories of but few men who accomplished so much on behalf of their fellow men in so short a time as did President Roosevelt. History has recorded virtually no story of accomplishment against such odds. The odds which Franklin D. Roosevelt had to overcome were fantastic in every respect.

He had the tremendous problem of his personal health. As the real fighter he was, he fought valiantly for his country in spite of his braces and wheelchair. Until his death many Americans were not aware of the great physical handicap under which Mr. Roosevelt had worked throughout his years as President.

No other Chief Executive had ever faced a more serious domestic situation in our country than he did when he took the oath of the Presidency. Millions were jobless, homeless, and hungry. There was little prospect of better times.

Although we did not know it at that time, we were soon to realize the seriousness of the world situation—the danger of the dictators. Gradually that shadow of responsibility was to envelope President Roosevelt and place upon him even greater burdens than those of physical handicap and domestic crisis.

But Franklin D. Roosevelt was a man of decision and a man of action. He sought and obtained measures appropriate to those days of domestic crisis to relieve the common man and to provide him an opportunity for the future. The President drafted the experts of Government and business to work out with him the multitudinous problems of the early thirties. His programs took Americans off their backs and put them back on their feet. He designed programs to meet the need of a particular time.

Although President Roosevelt had hoped the nations of the world would be able to quarantine aggressors, he was decisive in his actions to protect our Nation and our allies when he realized we had to fight for peace or lose it.

It is true that President Roosevelt was a controversial figure even before his death. Even his closest adherents did not agree with all his policies, which were conceived in the heat of economic battles at home and military action abroad.

Only history can make the final estimate of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his contribution to his fellow men, but none can doubt that the age of Roosevelt will always be recorded as one of the most important periods in the growth of our Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the career of that illustrious President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As one of the newest Members of the Senate, I cannot say that I have had the honor, as the majority leader and many of my colleagues have had, of having had my career commingled with the career of this distinguished American.

However, I do know what his career and his great work have meant to my region of the country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was not born in the Pacific Northwest, and he was not brought up in the Pacific Northwest, but I doubt that few natives of the Pacific Northwest ever did more than was done for our region by Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was born and brought up 3,000 miles away on the far side of the continent, in New York State.

I dare say that Senators who are far more experienced in politics than I, and whose careers are much longer than mine, remember the campaign of 1932, when Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke in Portland, a city where I was born and raised. He said that the next great Federal hydroelectric development to be undertaken by the United States Government would be on the Columbia River.

He kept that promise. As a result of that promise, the people living on the farms in our area received the blessings of electricity. Mrs. Neuberger's family are northwestern dairy farmers. They never had electric lights on their farm until Franklin D. Roosevelt brought about the construction of Bonneville Dam and the Rural Electrification Administration was established.

Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity of participating in the Pacific Northwest in a hearing concerning issues relating to that subject. My distinguished senior colleague also participated in those hearings, as did the distinguished senior Senator from Montana. We heard people, particularly women from the farms, testify concerning the rural electrification program and the power program, which were both started by President Roosevelt.

Regardless of any criticisms made of him, I think the tangible things Franklin D. Roosevelt did will live long after him and long after any criticisms of him. I believe that what he did will linger in the hearts of the people of the Pacific Northwest because he brought them a better life, a fuller life, and a higher standard of living.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, because I had the opportunity of serving in a minor role during the first year of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I feel that I should add a word to the tributes which have been paid to him today, so truthfully and so deservedly, by other Members of the Senate. Everyone recognizes his courage, his insight, his service, his leadership, and his devotion to American principles.

I had the opportunity of sitting at the Cabinet table during the discussions which took place in the formulation of policies during the year 1933. I marveled over and over again at the intimate and detailed grasp he had of the problems which came up from every department and from the new agencies of Government. He was the leader, he was the formulator of policy, and his were the decisions.

As I look back upon those days, Mr. President, I think of Franklin D. Roosevelt in terms of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, and I feel that the session today would be incomplete if, as a part of this tribute, there were not read into the RECORD the noble words with which the framers of the Constitution laid that instrument before the people of the Colonies. They constitute the keynote of our Government.

I read, though I have known this preamble by heart for years:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

President Roosevelt made that preamble an instrument of his policy. In the Nation and throughout the world he sought to make this Government an agency of service to the people. He sought not only to provide tranquillity and to establish justice; he sought not only to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, but he also threw all the weight of his great personality, of his genius, to make our Government an effective world leader in the effort to secure the blessings of liberty to people here and all around the globe. He was thinking of people not only in the United States but throughout the world. Every single step of the way all this man's service as President of the United States was dedicated to the people; it was dedicated to the purpose of so directing public policy as to give new life everywhere to all these great fundamental humanitarian objectives for which this Government was established.

The tasks still remains to be finished, Mr. President, here and throughout the world. The objectives of this preamble, the objectives for which President Roosevelt fought, are now facing another great crisis, because there is a government in this world which has no thought for the humanitarian objectives of a government of, for, and by the people, but which would use force to end human freedom and make people the pawns of dictatorship.

Mr. President, in paying my tribute today to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I feel that I should lay particular emphasis on this spiritual and patriotic factor in his career. I remember so well the first statement he made

in launching the campaign of 1932, in his reference to the forgotten man. It was service to the forgotten man that was his purpose. Service to the forgotten man here in the United States and throughout the world should be the objective of the people of the United States, just as it was when the framers of the Constitution established our Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that pressing duties in connection with the Committee on Appropriations this morning prevented my being present to hear what I know were eloquent tributes paid to that great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I wish to associate myself with all that has been said in praise of him as a man, as a public servant, and as a great leader of men.

We cannot add to the stature of Franklin D. Roosevelt by the words we utter here. There are able men in the Senate, but I doubt that any of them will occupy a place in history that would enable them to add to the stature of Franklin D. Roosevelt as it will loom across the pages of the history of the period in which he lived and made his great contribution to the welfare of mankind.

I would, however, Mr. President, be remiss to my duty and to the people of my own beloved State of Georgia, which he chose to call his second home, and where he was visiting when the final summons came, did I not add my poor flower to the beautiful tributes which have been offered here. I should likewise be remiss to a personal association which is one of the prized possessions of my life.

It so happened that I was Governor of the State of Georgia at the time Mr. Roosevelt was Governor of the State of New York. I was privileged to entertain him in the executive mansion as he would go to Warm Springs, Ga., seeking treatment to help to relieve him from the agony and the handicap of the dread paralysis which afflicted him. I was with him at the Governors Conference at Richmond, Va., and at the sesquicentennial ceremonies at Yorktown. President Hoover entertained the Governors at the White House.

As the chairman of the Georgia delegation, I was privileged to second his nomination for President at the 1932 Democratic convention. I traveled with him for several days on his campaign tour that fall.

At that time I was the youngest Governor in the land and I still thrill as I think of those days and my associations.

I came to the Senate, filling an unexpired term, and took my seat here some 6 weeks before Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, March 4, 1933. He was the last man to be inaugurated in March, before the amendment to the Constitution sponsored by the late Senator Norris became effective changing the date to January.

I was privileged to be the youngest Member of this body during the thrilling 100 days of the extraordinary session of the Congress which President Roosevelt assembled to attempt to deal with the grievous economic problems which confronted this Nation.

I doubt very much whether the political and economic order of the United States was in any greater danger of dissolution in the darkest days of the War Between the States than it was in the early spring of 1933. Privation and suffering were so great that chaos impended.

I well remember being in yonder cloakroom when one of the best known Members, Senator Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, of "share the wealth" fame, and father of the illustrious junior Senator from Louisiana, walked back and addressed Senator Ed Smith, Senator Pat Harrison, and others who were there, saying, "Men, it will not be long until there will be a mob assembling here to hang Senators from the rafters of the Senate. I have to determine whether I will stay and be hung with you, or go out and lead the mob." That statement evoked very little laughter, because the situation was exceedingly grave.

If Franklin Delano Roosevelt had made no other contribution to civilization as we know it today than when he pulled the Nation back from the verge of dissolution in 1933, he would have assured himself of a place among the immortals of history.

His courage, his high purpose, his faculty for speech, yes, his voice, which seemed to intrude itself in to every living room in the country, and into the homes of those who did not have living rooms, told the American people they had nothing to fear but fear itself. He caused them to attack their problems with renewed courage. He inspired confidence.

Of course, Franklin Roosevelt, being human, made mistakes, as do all other human beings. But he was truly a great man. Our country was passing through a dark hour when, in March 1933, he assumed the office of Chief Executive of the United States. It is a singular fact that providence has blessed America by always giving us great leadership in our darkest and most trying days.

Jefferson was a controversial figure. George Washington was a highly controversial figure when he was President of the United States. If we examine the records of the past we can find some of the old cartoons lampooning those Presidents during their terms of service. They were denounced for practically everything they did. Lincoln was a highly controversial figure, as we all remember.

But, Mr. President, how many of us could sit down today and give the names of the outstanding critics of Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln? Indeed, even among the closest students of history, who could name three of the sharpest critics of any of those great men out of hand.

In my opinion, history will place Franklin Roosevelt among the great leaders of America. I believe firmly that in the years to come he will stand alongside the other three whom I have mentioned in the making and the preservation of the United States we all love. In the years to come he will loom above his critics, just as mountain peaks rise above the plains. His good works will continue to bless mankind after the last of them is forgotten.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to have the opportunity to join with the distinguished majority leader and my other colleagues in commemorating the passing of the late great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Roosevelt was not infallible. He had his weaknesses, as all men do. But he had great strength and great courage. While there are many who will disagree with him, even at this date, none will deny that when he faced an issue, he was able at the time to render a decision.

As the eloquent Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, men like Roosevelt, and other great Presidents, as well, are always the objects of criticism. But that is only because of their courage. If they arouse enmity, it is only because of what they did, which, in some respects, may have made some people afraid of them.

But I go back to the Montana of the 1930's. At the time President Roosevelt came into office in 1933, I know what had been happening to the farmers, the ranchers, the miners, and the businessmen of that State. What happened in Montana also happened in every other State of the Union. President Roosevelt did a great amount of good to benefit the workingman and to help him to organize and to prosper. He did a tremendous amount of good for the farmer, because he introduced new concepts which gave security to the farmer and, by the same token, to the Nation, as well.

Furthermore, Mr. Roosevelt did much to stabilize big business in our capitalistic economy. I think the Nation owes him a great debt for the many contributions which he has made, and the Nation also will have as a remembrance the many monuments which he has left behind in the form of pieces of fine legislation which will be beneficial to all classes of our population.

I know the free people of this country and of the world will always have a warm spot in their hearts for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who practiced what he preached, a man who was not afraid of fear, a man who did what he could, in the best way he could, for the benefit of all the people.

It is uniquely coincidental that on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin Roosevelt there has occurred the retirement of another great statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, a man who worked with the late President.

Likewise, the anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's death is coincidental with the announcement that the Salk polio vaccine is almost an assured success. This is a tribute to the attitude of the late President in his fight to overcome polio and to his efforts to encourage the people of the United States to contribute money so that research could be conducted toward the elimination of this scourge, which affects, almost always, children or persons in their teens.

We meet today to honor a great man, one whose memory will live so long as

there is a United States of America; and that will be for many, many centuries to come.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am very happy to have an opportunity to speak in connection with the observance today of the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I recall that I had been State chairman of my party in the 1928 campaign in my State. By the time the 1932 campaign was rolling around, we were looking for a leader who might bring victory to our party.

During the period of 1930–31, I wrote many times to Mr. Roosevelt, who was then Governor of New York, urging that he read a book written by T. E. Lawrence, entitled "Revolt in the Desert," and that he realize that Lawrence had solved his problem by setting Arab against Arab, finally working out a solution which enabled him to emerge victorious.

Out of that correspondence there developed a friendship that was and still remains very precious to me.

I have been steadily collecting books dealing with the Roosevelt period. I came to Congress in 1941, at the time the present distinguished majority leader was a Member of the House. He and I were among the first to serve as National Youth Administrators, trying to bring young people to realize that there were still opportunities in this country.

I remember very well the convention of 1932, which I attended. I recall the dramatic flight which Franklin Roosevelt made to that convention, and the great appeal which he made.

I recall my activities in the early days of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Works Progress Administration.

I can say truthfully that I have come to regard Franklin Roosevelt as one of the great figures in the life of America. I am very happy and proud that a portion of my life was dedicated to service in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with deep humility that I rise to join with the distinguished majority leader and other Senate colleagues in paying honor to the memory of a great American—Franklin Roosevelt. I wish to commend the majority leader for his leadership in writing this chapter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of Franklin Roosevelt. I think when we all have become dust, and students of American history, in research, study the chapter of history which is being written on the floor of the Senate today, they will reach the unanimous conclusion that truly it was a great man who, 10 years after his passing, could elicit on the floor of the United States Senate the comments which have been made today about his life, his work, and his service to the people of our country.

Mr. President, any words that I could speak, as one American, are inadequate to portray the feeling I have for the record of Franklin Roosevelt. As I have studied his life's work, I find in it much evidence of his putting into action the challenge which I think confronts all public servants in executive or legislative posts. It is the challenge of constitutional liberalism. Franklin Roosevelt's record is a record of constitutional liberalism. By that, Mr. President, I mean that he sought to put into practice the most cardinal principle of the Constitution of the United States, namely, the general welfare clause. It was referred to so eloquently a few moments ago by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] when he spoke of that great keystone of the Constitution, the promotion of the general welfare.

As a constitutional liberal, Franklin Roosevelt had caught a great vision that needs to be seen by all the American people these days, and by all our leaders of government of all parties; namely, that the wealth of America is to be found in a great spiritual wealth. That spiritual wealth takes the form of human beings, created by a Divine Being in His image, and, I am satisfied, designed for and dedicated to good causes and good things.

In a democracy such as ours, a government by the people should seek to promote human values; and I think that is the epitome of the political philosophy and of the record of action of Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. President, it is true, as has been said on the floor of the Senate, and as the record itself discloses, that Franklin Roosevelt made mistakes. He, being human, made his fair share of mistakes; but they were human mistakes, they were honest mistakes, and they were honorable mistakes.

In 1944 I opposed the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt. I campaigned in opposition to his reelection. I stand on the record I made at that time; but in no way did that diminish my high respect and regard for Franklin Roosevelt. One of the many reasons which caused me to oppose him was that I thought it was a great mistake for him to be a candidate for reelection for a fourth term. To me it was perfectly clear that in a democracy it was important that new leadership periodically be brought into the White House, and that presidential leadership not be vested for too long a time in one man, no matter how great a man he might be.

Then, too, it was obvious, I thought, that the physical strain of the White House could not be borne by any human being for a great length of time. I have always felt, and feel now, that the campaign of 1944 hastened Franklin Roosevelt's death, and that he became a casualty in the service of the people of the country years before it would have been true had he not been a candidate in 1944. His counsel, wisdom, and advice were needed by the American people, and are still needed by our country. Would that we had him as a living ex-President today to advise with our Government and with our people on the critical issues of our time.

Mr. President, I think one of the most beautiful eulogies I have read in recent days about Franklin Roosevelt appeared on last Tuesday morning in Drew Pearson's column.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

F. D. R. PRAISED 10 YEARS AFTER DEATH

A lot of things have happened since that day 10 years ago when F. D. R. passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach. And then his body came home—came back on a flag-draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue, up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President. The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, F. D. R. hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again—then back to Washington to lie in the east room of the White House—silent and alone. But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers, seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he was working for them and they knew they had lost a friend.

The little man who took his place, a humble man, was in SAM RAYBURN'S office late in the afternoon when he got a phone call to come to the White House immediately. White faced and grim, he left. He knew what the call meant. At the White House later Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States. The Cabinet stood by, shocked and shaken. Miss Perkins, who had known F. D. R. since their early reform days in Albany, broke down and wept. Henry L. Stimson, a Republican who had served in three Cabinets and who once had battled against young F. D. R. in New York State, also wept—unabashed.

Times change

The funeral train that carried F. D. R. to Hyde Park was crowded with Cabinet members and old friends. They stayed awake most of the night. Outside as the train passed were bonfires, people standing, waiting to pay homage to the last visible remains of their dead leader. All night through Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, New York, people stood along the tracks. At Hyde Park the Cabinet and the Supreme Court stood on one side of the rose garden, opposite the grave. The new President stood on the other side. With him were Mike Riley, of the Secret Service, Mrs. Truman—and Jimmie Byrnes. Jimmie, who had left Washington, supposedly for good, just 2 weeks before, had hastily flown back to board the funeral train. Taps were blown. A West Point cadet handed Mrs. Roosevelt the flag which had been draped over her husband's bier. She bore up well. The dead President was lowered into his grave.

That night as the special train rolled back to Washington, Harry Truman spent most of his time with three men—Jimmie Byrnes, Ed Pauley, George Allen. Of these, only Pauley, the California oil man, continues close to him. Byrnes, whom Truman appointed to the highest Cabinet post, has fought him bitterly, tried to carry South Carolina for Eisenhower. George Allen, who was given high honor by Truman and a lush job in RFC, is now Eisenhower's partner in the farm at Gettysburg and in a Howard Johnson restaurant.

Churchill erred at Yalta

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office; the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name. In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more, to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory.

F. D. R. did not promote me to high office, did me no favors. He fired my father, a Republican-appointed Governor of the Virgin Islands by Hoover, and once in the heat of battle he called me a liar. However, I rise to defend some of his great qualities. When he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. He knew war was inevitable and began preparing for it. When people were hungry, he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. Sometimes he made mistakes. The NRA he recognized as one of his mistakes. Sometimes he did things that were illegal. When Hitler threatened England in 1940, after France fell, and the British lost most of their arms at Dunkirk, F. D. R. emptied our arsenals. In one bold stroke he sent all our arms to England. He knew what the political consequences would be if his gesture failed. For he acted without an O. K. from Congress. But he also knew the consequences to the free world if England fell. He acted illegally. But he acted. And England was saved. I remember in 1933 how poverty-stricken veterans came straggling into Washington, a few at a time. Herbert Hoover let them pile up—until an army of 20,000 was driven out of Washington by tanks and cavalry. F. D. R. collected them as they came to Washington, a dozen at a time, took them to Fort Hunt, fed them, sent them back home to WPA officials to get jobs. Veterans continued to straggle in during the early days of his administration, but he never let a bonus army pile up in the Nation's Capital. That was one great difference between F. D. R. and some other Presidents who occupy or have occupied the White House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to read two excerpts from that column, because they express, with greater verbal beauty and greater eloquence than my lips are capable of uttering, the feelings in my heart today. Pearson wrote:

A lot of things have happened since that day 10 years ago when F. D. R. passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach. And then his body came home—came back on a flag-draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue, up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President. The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, F. D. R. hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again—then back to Washington to lie in the East Room of the White House—silent and alone. But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he was working for them and they knew they had lost a friend.

Then later in his beautiful eulogy, Pearson wrote:

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office, the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name. In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory.

F. D. R. did not promote me to high office, did me no favors. He fired my father, a Republican-appointed governor of the Virgin Islands by Hoover, and once in the heat of battle he called me a liar. However, I rise to defend some of his great qualities. When he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. He knew war was inevitable and began preparing for it. When people were hungry he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. Sometimes he made mistakes.

Mr. President, sometimes President Roosevelt made mistakes. But he never made a mistake based upon a bad motive. He never made a mistake which was not motivated by what he considered, as a constitutional liberal, to be sound judgment in promoting the general welfare of his people. In the disturbing hours in which we in the United States are living, with partisan conflict and controversy bombarding the minds of the American people, when there are some who still would seek to besmirch the name and memory of the great Franklin Roosevelt, I wish to say today that I do not think history will record that he made a mistake at Yalta. But, Mr. President, as we read the record of the world situation that existed at the time of Yalta, President Roosevelt had before him the great problem—as was pointed out earlier today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—of determining what course of action American military policy should follow in respect to the expected invasion of Japan. He knew that such an invasion would have cost American mothers and fathers the lives of tens of thousands of American boys. It is said now, by way of hindsight, that we were then on the verge of the dropping of the atomic bomb, and that the President had been advised that the atomic bomb would be completed and ready in a short time for dropping. However, Mr. President, there was no certainty that the bomb would work as hoped. There is no evidence submitted by his critics that any scientific report was submitted to President Roosevelt, or could have been submitted to him at the time, giving assurance of the success of the dropping of the atomic bomb. He was in a great international conference with the foreign ministers of other nations. He was confronted with the justification of trying to get Russia to open up an Asiatic front against Japan in an endeavor to save American lives that he feared would be lost if we invaded Japan alone. So I think it is perfectly clear that, as our Commander in Chief, he was impelled by a sense of moral obligation to the American people to bring into that war common enemies, at the time, of imperial Japan; and one of those common enemies of Japan happened to be the Russian Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as one who listened to President Roosevelt's report to the American people at the joint session of Congress following the Yalta Conference and as one who on that occasion watched the great war President, obviously broken in health, I am convinced that he demonstrated clearly that to the very end he kept the faith with his moral obligations to the American people. It is my opinion that the judgment of history will be that at Yalta he did what he could in an honorable way to bring into the war the common enemies of Japan, in the interest of first destroying that tyranny. Also I think it is clear that he held to the hope that when the end of the war came, in some way, somehow, the peaceful nations of the world would succeed in persuading the leaders of Russia to understand that they had everything to gain by joining in setting up peaceful procedures for settling international disputes. Franklin Roosevelt stood for such a goal based upon a system of international justice through law as the great Arthur Vandenberg so frequently stated it. The great ideal of such a goal became monumentalized in the San Francisco Charter.

Mr. President, I close by saying that in my judgment the greatest monument to Franklin Roosevelt is one which was erected shortly after his death; and it was erected, insofar as our Nation is concerned, under the leadership of another great President—Harry Truman. That monument is the San Francisco Charter. I think historians will cite it as the befitting last lines of the last chapter of the great life-book of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I congratulate our great leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, upon his eloquent words of tribute to President Roosevelt. I have enjoyed all that has been said here today in tribute to that great man, and in memory of him.

I am reminded that 2,000 years ago the most flaming personality of all times gave utterance to one of the most inspiring sentences I have ever read:

I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

Those words have been echoed and reechoed through the centuries, giving hope, inspiration, and courage to all people. Those words come to us from One who, divine in origin, frequently was human in achievement. When we reflect upon that noble statement of His purpose, Mr. President, I wish to state that in my judgment no man of our generation has done more to make it a living reality in this day and time than has Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As has been said here this afternoon, Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt made mistakes; but they were the mistakes of a big man and a brave man. He never permitted himself to shrink from taking the responsibility of making decisions.

He had a great faith—a great faith in God, a great faith in his country, and a great faith in his fellow man. Of that faith was born a courage which enabled him to strip the mask from the specter of fear, and to expose it to public scorn.

Mr. President, if people had a need, Franklin Roosevelt knew that he, as President, had a responsibility. Human welfare was more important to him than temporary fiscal balance. When a choice had to be made between the welfare of the people and the saving of a dollar, his decision was in favor of serving the welfare of the people. Thank God he was not afraid to spend money to relieve human suffering. He kept faith with the common people. If he made a promise, he kept it in letter and in spirit. He brought economic improvement and progress to the worker. He helped make it possible for the common laborer to lift his head in pride in a home that was his own, and by a fireside where his family found the greatest economic welfare it had ever known. He brought prosperity to the farmer. He brought American farm families out of economic bondage just as effectively as Lincoln had freed the slaves from physical bondage. Franklin D. Roosevelt helped reinforce the foundation of American business, by building greater purchasing power for all the people. He knew that if the farmer and the worker prospered, there was no way for business to suffer.

Yet he never forgot that if workers and farmers suffer there is no way for business to prosper. He fought, above all, for the American people, for their prosperity, their security, and their happiness. Then he fought and died to help build a better world for all people everywhere, as he himself so eloquently said, in order that all men in all lands might live out their lives in freedom from fear and freedom from want. We honor ourselves and our country today when we pay tribute to one of America's greatest sons.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in thanking our outstanding majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, for taking this occasion, on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to observe some of the great contributions he made to his times and to the world.

I think it is fitting and proper to gain strength now, as dark clouds seem to hide the sun, by looking back on the disasters, the tumult, the squalls, and the hurricanes through which we passed under the steady guiding hand of one of America's greatest Presidents.

We have heard his record spoken of today, running the gamut from caring for crippled children and the establishment of a polio foundation which, fittingly, on the anniversary of his death, seems to have found a vaccine to prevent this disease from ravaging the children of the future, to the grand conception of earmarking funds to search for atomic energy for the benefit of civilization, a conception to which his magnificent daring and ability led. We have already witnessed the power of atomic energy. Someday we may see its glory.

It is difficult to think of President Roosevelt as a President of a single type because of the many situations through which this country has passed. The administrations of other Presidents have been marked by war or characterized by other particular situations. It is difficult to realize the four great stages through which President Roosevelt guided us.

He was President during an economic crisis which led to deepest despair. Through his indomitable courage and faith in America he taught us to have faith in America and brought us out of the worst economic crisis any nation had ever seen.

He was a President of recovery. In the strong drive for recovery he respected our capitalistic and free enterprise system, and first made secure those bastions of capitalism. But he did not stop there. He knew that only a broad base of prosperity, shared by all the people—by the farmers, the workers, and the little people of America—could finally insure the prosperity of the great temples of our capitalistic system. So he placed the accent on human values as he guided the Nation to recovery.

Again his spirit captivated all America when he gave us the leadership and the courage to supply the free world with armaments and munitions, but, above all, the moral leadership of the world, through which President Roosevelt, with his great personality and great ideals, was able somehow to impart courage to free peoples around the seven seas.

We saw him through those three eras, down to the winning of the great war. I think more than anyone else, he contributed to that victory. The leadership of President Roosevelt was perhaps a greater factor than any other.

Then we saw him live long enough to launch what, in the future, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, will be his greatest monument, namely, peace through collective security and justice.

We have witnessed the fulfillment and realization of the goals of the first three periods in which he provided leadership. We must have faith to believe that through the cooperation of the free nations of the world in striving for a just and lasting peace, we shall see the dawn of a new age in which we can vanquish the threat and fear of war.

So it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues, and particularly our illustrious leader, in observing this day. We should face the difficult times of the future with confidence in ourselves, because of our successful passage through other great difficulties through which President Roosevelt led us.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I was on the floor of the Senate today and heard the beautiful encomiums which were paid to a former President of the United States, F. D. R. I do not think anyone could listen to what was said without seeing a page of history unravel before him. I remember very well those years, 1933–45. Although I never was intimate with President Franklin Roosevelt I did have a slight acquaintance with him. I remember his smile, his voice, and his gracious manner on meeting him. I remember his attendance in this Chamber, in the services for a departed Senator. I can see him at the inaugural from the porch at the White House in 1945. He was a very sick man then, but he carried on.

I remember the appeal he made in 1933 when he said that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. I remember the impression which that statement made on the country at large. I would classify him, first, as a master salesman of ideas whether when speaking to a joint session of the Congress or over the radio. Second, I think, in spite of his great physical handicap, he demonstrated the ability to do the almost impossible. I did not agree with much of his philosophy. I find, however, as the years go on and as I look back that much that he stood for has influenced our times tremendously. What has been said so eloquently today by many of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle, regarding his fearlessness, his hope and his willingness to adventure in new fields to meet the problems, is correct.

This willingness to take a risk is exemplified in his setting aside several billion dollars to seek to get the atomic bomb.

If we had not got it first one might well ask what would have been the course of history.

If he made a mistake, he never dwelt on it, but diverted attention by another move.

He utilized the talents of men of both parties in the interest of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, I express my personal appreciation for the life that has been lived among us, the life that has spread inspiration and courage to countless persons, the life which was much misunderstood, the life which stood for many new adventures in politics and economics, but, nevertheless, a life that saw the Nation through many a crisis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in tribute to the late great President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT, APRIL 13, 1955

Whenever the name Franklin D. Roosevelt is mentioned anywhere in this troubled world, it carries a single meaning—democratic leadership in its finest sense.

The effective, courageous leadership which President Roosevelt gave this country was not by accident. It sprouted and thrived in his unfaltering conviction that people must govern themselves if they are to remain free. This Nation learned under the guiding hand of President Roosevelt that empty words and colored optimism is no substitute for courage and conviction when man's freedom is at stake.

The contributions President Roosevelt made toward the cause of the free world will live forever in the minds of man and the annals of time. It is fitting that we take time out today to look back upon his work. All of us would do well to ponder the

Roosevelt thesis in seeking out the solutions of today's perilous problems.

Each of us could spend many hours discussing the work and life of President Roosevelt, but we could never find words that would justly describe the indebtedness the free world owes to this man of the ages, this leader of the generations. In his work, we all can find courage to carry on, even in the darkest hours. In his spirit we must never waver in our unending fight for the American way.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader and others of our colleagues who have spoken on this occasion in memory of Franklin Roosevelt, whose great courage gave hope to the American people in their darkest economic hours.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are Senators who wish to transact routine business, I ask unanimous consent that such routine business may be transacted at this time, with the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND THE TREASURY (S. Doc. No. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1955, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1955, for the General Services Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. Doc. No. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions relating to appropriations of the Department of Defense—military functions, for the fiscal year 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF PROPOSED PROVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955, for the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation allotment under administrative regulations and procedures promulgated by that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national industrial reserve, dated April 1, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 13th semiannual report on the International Educational Exchange Program, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY FIREARMS BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States to carry firearms (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONVEYANCE OF SITE IN COLON, PANAMA, TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CEASE-FIRE IN STRAIT OF FORMOSA—LETTER OF MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY, TAIPEH, TAIWAN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a message addressed to the Congress of the United States, by the Municipal Assembly of the City of Taipei, Taiwan, relating to a proposed cease-fire in the Strait of Formosa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics and R. and D.), Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property disposal, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government of American Samoa, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (pt. II) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "TRANSPORTATION" BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on "Transportation," dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "LEGAL SERVICES AND PROCEDURE," COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission entitled "Legal Services and Procedure," dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, CANYON DE CHELLY NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession contract in Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Ariz. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMITS IN CERTAIN NATIONAL PARKS

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed concession permits in Glacier National Park, Mont., Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., and Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASED PUBLIC BENEFITS FROM NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to increase the public benefits from the National Park System by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on negotiations for settlement contracts with the Indians of the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Reservations, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIBERALIZATION OF PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIGHTS REQUIRED TO BE CARRIED BY MOTORBOATS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission as of February 28, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS, CERTIFYING OFFICERS, AND PAYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees with respect to certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIE C. PICKETT, GEORGE WILLIAMS, AND HERMAN L. LOONEY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WINSTON BROS. COMPANY ET AL. *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 343, 82d Congress, 2d session, a copy of that court's opinion in the case of *Winston Bros. Company and the Utah Construction Company; Roy L. Blair & Company and James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc., and T. E. Connolly, Inc.,* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT, COMPENSATION, AND POWERS OF BAILIFFS IN DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Legislative Resolution 21

"Resolution re acquisition of land around shores of Gavins Point Reservoir

"Whereas the Gavins Point Reservoir, which lies between Nebraska and South Dakota, and the shores thereof is ideal for public use and public access and for wildlife; and

"Whereas in order to have the full benefit and use thereof for such purpose acquisition of public land for such use should be obtained; and

"Whereas the Gavins Point Development Association and the Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission have requested the Army Corps of Engineers to purchase certain lands adjoining the reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

"1. That the Representatives in Congress from Nebraska be urged to expedite the acquisition of adequate public land for public use and public access and for wildlife around the shores of Gavins Point Reservoir, which lies between Nebraska and South Dakota.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution memorializes the President of the United States, the Nevada congressional delegation, and others to do their utmost to effectuate the construction of a four-lane highway over the Sierra Nevada mountain ranges as a matter of public defense and necessity

"Whereas the severe winter of 1952 has revealed to the Nation what many have long suspected, that the Sierra Nevada mountain passes on the main traffic and trucklines of the central transcontinental routes across this country are woefully inadequate and can be blocked for long periods of time by forces of nature as effectually as they could be blocked by an atomic bomb, enemy military action, or sabotage; and

"Whereas the military commitments of this Nation in the past two decades have expanded greatly in the Pacific Ocean areas and the lands adjacent thereto, and much of the military personnel and material is shipped from the San Francisco Bay area as the principal Pacific coast port; and

"Whereas this great and strategic port cannot function unless the materials are brought over the Sierra Nevada Ranges and, as a primary target for enemy attack or sabotage, in case of an emergency it would require supplies and reinforcements over the central transcontinental route; and

"Whereas weather conditions or unforeseen difficulties on the narrow and obsolete central routes, functioning with the same limited capacity of 20 years ago, could jeopardize and impair the safety and fighting ability of the entire United States; and

"Whereas more than 20 major Department of Defense supply depots, tactical establishlishments, and experimental installations are located in the intermountain areas and served only by the transcontinental routes; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada and all other Western States have continually clamored for the improvement of these routes and have beseeched governmental officials to rectify the intolerable condition of these Sierra Nevada highways in order to facilitate normal travel for business and pleasure as well as the mandatory need for civil and military defense measures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby memorializes and requests that the Nevada congressional delegation in Congress take every action available to them, collectively and individually, to bring about and effectuate the immediate modernization of a major Sierra Nevada highway by promoting, proposing, instigating, and insisting that it be widened to four lanes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to include this project as one of the main objectives of his highly commendable and necessary highway program; and be it further

"Resolved, That if the necessary funds are not made available immediately for this essential project of making a transcontinental highway over the Sierra Nevada Mountains four lanes, that the Nevada congressional delegation and those from other Western States be memorialized to request the utilization of defense funds in order that the security of the vital San Francisco Bay area can be assured at the earliest possible moment to insure the availability of supplies and reinforcements in the event of enemy action or sabotage; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, directed to promptly transmit certified copies of this highly important resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Governors of Nevada, California, Utah, and Idaho, and the esteemed Senators and Representative in the House of Representatives from Nevada."

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning the Congress to amend present laws so as to enable a highway to be constructed as part of the interstate highway system between Utah and Colorado without regard to present mileage limitations

"Whereas at the present time no proper link exists between Utah and Colorado in the interstate highway system; and

"Whereas in case of an enemy attack the present highway system is not adequate to evacuate urban areas and to transport the military forces to defend this vital area rich with natural resources; and

"Whereas one of the main impediments to the desired route is the statutory limitation on mileage in the interstate highway system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializes and requests the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning Congress to amend the present law by extension of the mileage limitation in an amount sufficient to permit a highway to be constructed between Utah and Colorado as part of the interstate highway system; or, as an alternative, to recommend that the law be amended to permit the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Commerce, by joint agreement, to decide where inequality and need exists and thus enable them to add any route that they consider as being necessary without regard to the present mileage limitations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, directed to promptly transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Nevada congressional delegation, and the Governors of the States of Utah and Colorado."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to facilitate national centennial celebrations in commemoration of the 1857 act of Congress allowing the creation of the Pacific overland mail route; urging local agencies and groups to cooperate therein; commending the American Association for State and Local History; and other matters properly relating thereto

"Whereas by act of Congress of the United States, dated March 3, 1857, the Postmaster General of the United States was, for the first time, authorized to contract for the conveyance overland from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, Calif., of all letter mails; and

"Whereas prior to the passage of this act, letter mail was carried to the Pacific coast by the long, slow, and arduous ocean route fraught with danger from storm and sea and totally dependent upon the vagaries of the wind and weather; and

"Whereas the opening of this overland mail service route was the culminating event of a series of events of prime importance, not only to the development of the West and the State of Nevada, but also to the development of the entire United States, and it enabled the word to be spread of the richness of this region and hailed the outstanding discovery of the Comstock Lode in Nevada during the year 1859; and

"Whereas centennial celebrations of these events should be fittingly observed throughout the length and breadth of this Nation in order to memorialize this historical event and to show the developments from the 'four horse coaches, or spring wagons suitable for the conveyance of passengers, as well as the safety and security of the mails,' as specified in the orilgnal 1857 act, to 1957; and

"Whereas the modern development of mail transportation and our systems of communication have greatly aided the binding together of the East and the West into one great Nation; and

"Whereas the American Association for State and Local History has undertaken the national sponsorship of centennials and has established regional committees to plan centennial celebrations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the Senate of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the celebration of the centennials commemorating the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully urges that all State and local governmental units, public schools, civic, patriotic and historical societies, and all agencies of communication in this State participate wholeheartedly in the observance of the celebration of the various centennials along the route of the Pacific overland mail by cooperation with the committees now organizing the Pacific overland mail centennials in 1957–58 in commemoration of the accomplishment, efforts, and achievements of those sturdy pioneers who engineered the beginnings of the overland communication; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada does hereby congratulate and pledge its support to the American Association for State and Local History for its action in undertaking on a national scale the sponsorship for the centennial observances of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the governor of this State, the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, the Nevada Historical Society and the board of directors of the Nevada State Museum, to the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States and to the governing head of the American Association for State and Local History."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 45

"Whereas some large industrial areas in this State are presently suffering from excessive unemployment because of curtailed production; and

"Whereas many large contracts for defense materials, such as M–48 tanks, which could have been manufactured with existing facilities in such areas of surplus labor in this State, have been awarded to large companies in other States; and

"Whereas it is the declared policy of the Office of Defense Mobilization to encourage full utilization of existing production facilities and workers in preference to creating new plants or moving workers and also to award negotiated procurement contracts to industries in labor surplus areas provided no price differential is paid therefor; and

"Whereas the requirement that no price differential be paid in order to award such contracts to firms in labor surplus areas has, to a great extent, defeated the purposes of the before-mentioned policy which was designed to relieve unemployment in distressed areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature hereby urgently requests the Federal Government to bring about an immediate amendment to Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 so that labor surplus areas may be given consideration for Government contracts, even where some price differential is involved, provided that in the opinion of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization the requirements of the distressed area justify the additional cost involved; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature also requests the Federal Government to revise its present policy of concentrating the production of certain defense items, such as tanks, in the hands of a single large producer and provide instead that such items shall be manufactured at a number of different facilities throughout the country with special consideration being given to facilities located in areas suffering from critical unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to take all necessary steps to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary.

"In assembly, April 2, 1955, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 38, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes

"Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Wisconsin industry, and provide a market for the agricultural and manufactured products of the State; and

"Whereas lack of package freight shipping has adversely affected Wisconsin agriculture and industry, and has caused substantial unemployment in the martime industries of the Great Lakes area; and

"Whereas package freight shipping will contribute to the reduction of such unemployment; and

"Whereas package freight service will provide a stepping stone to the maximum use of the facilities of the Great Lakes ports of Wisconsin for international trade when the

St. Lawrence Seaway has been completed; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States Maritime Commission, to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"W. P. KNOWLES,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"CLARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Resolution 20

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1938, authorized the construction of a dam on the Kaskaskia River at Carlyle, Ill., with auxiliary structures above and below such dam, in accordance with a report of the Corps of Engineers, for the purpose of flood control, with other incidental benefits; and

"Whereas the 2d session of the 83d Congress of the United States appropriated a sum of $50,000 to commence detailed planning of said dam, which planning is now being performed by the Corps of Engineers, and there is now a request before the Congress of the United States for additional funds to continue such planning; and

"Whereas subsequent to the aforementioned authorization the Corps of Engineers, at the behest of the Congress of the United States, made a comprehensive study and survey of the entire Kaskaskia River Basin, with a view to submitting a report outlining an economically feasible flood-control plan for the entire basin, and now have that report in its final stages before submission to Congress; and

"Whereas said report is expected to recommend the expansion of the original authorization to include the construction of a dam and auxiliary structures at and below Shelbyville, Ill., on the Kaskaskia River; and

"Whereas the Kaskaskia River services and drains 22 counties, representing approximately one-fourth of the State of Illinois; and

"Whereas water is now universally recognized as our most valuable and limited natural resource, and the need for water conservation and control is both a local and national problem; and

"Whereas the Kaskaskia River is noted, not only for its disastrous and costly floods, but also for its extremely low levels during the dry seasons, thereby causing the Kaskaskia Valley Basin to be annually threatened with the prospect of disastrous floods, followed by prolonged and dangerously low water supplies which now endanger the welfare of the people and acutely increase the economic necessities of the area; and

"Whereas completion of the comprehensive plan of flood controls on the Kaskaskia River in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers will control floodwaters, eliminate flood damages, and will hold and conserve floodwaters for use during seasons when the area normally suffers acute water shortages, and will, thereby, encourage and increase the economic and social development of southern and central Illinois, and, in addition, will operate to alleviate flooding and improve essential navigation downstream on the Mississippi River; and

"Whereas the benefits to be expected from completion of the Kaskaskia Valley project will exceed the estimated cost thereof and the State of Illinois is ready and willing to assist in this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to:

"(a) Give immediate and favorable consideration to the recommendations in the survey report of the Kaskaskia Valley project, as soon as such report is submitted to Congress by the Corps of Engineers; and

"(b) Appropriate sufficient funds in the current session of Congress to continue and complete the detailed planning of the Carlyle Dam; and

"(c) Appropriate funds to commence detailed planning of the Shelbyville Dam as soon as the Corps of Engineers indicates it is ready to commence such planning; and

"(d) Appropriate construction funds for both dams at such times as they can be economically used by the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution and its preamble be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman and minority leader of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the chairman and minority leader of the House Appropriations Committee, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house March 16, 1955.
"WARREN F. WOOD,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FRED RUEGG,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Concurred in by the senate, March 22, 1955.
"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"House Resolution 82

"Resolution relative to the establishment of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif.

"Whereas a dependable and adequate supply of uranium is vitally necessary for the defense of the Nation; and

"Whereas many valuable deposits of uranium ore have been discovered in those portions of California and Nevada in the vicinity of Doyle in Lassen County, Calif.; and

"Whereas the establishment by the United States of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif., would provide centrally located facilities, thereby expediting the processing of the uranium ore from the surrounding area and at the same time providing a relatively safe and dispersed location for such facilities in case of war; and

"Whereas the location of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif., would be in convenient proximity to the Sierra Ordnance Depot: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the assembly respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States that provision be made for the establishment of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Commerce; the Congress of the United States; the Governor of Alaska; the Auditor of Alaska; to All Territorial Department Heads; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas it is the avowed policy and firm purpose of Federal and Territorial agencies to promote and sustain the development of Alaska through the encouragement of private investment and enterprise; and

"Whereas the 22d session of the Legislature of Alaska, by virtue of its passage of Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, opposing Government competition with private enterprise, has forthrightly declared its intention to inspire and protect private ventures; and

"Whereas owners, operators, and lessees of taxicabs, rental vehicles, drive-yourself cars, drayage, transfer, parcel delivery, contract hauling, and similar types of vehicles pay all prevailing fees imposed by all taxing agencies for registration, licensing, and operation of such vehicles in addition to all other taxes applicable to private business enterprises; and

"Whereas Federal and Territorial agencies are in direct competition with such privately financed and taxpaying enterprises by transporting passengers and cargo between air, rail, and steamship terminals in Alaska, and particularly in transporting Government officials and other employees who are authorized to patronize private carriers and be reimbursed for proper charges incurred.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully urges that all Federal and Territorial agencies within Alaska be directed to order all employees of such agencies to cease and desist the unfair practice of infringing upon and competing with the legitimate private carriers whose license fees and taxes comprise a valuable contribution to the appropriations upon which such Federal and Territorial agencies survive.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 13, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Memorial 19

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the provision of section 27 of the Jones Act, excluding Alaska from the enjoyment of the benefits of through routing over Canadian lines, the same as is bestowed upon every other part of American territory,

is a vicious discrimination against and a great injustice and injury to our people; and

"Whereas we believe that said discrimination is in violation of the spirit of section 9, article 1, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another;' and

"Whereas the Alaska Steamship Co. has in the past challenged Alaska by threatening to discontinue operation of ships from Seattle if the Territory opposed any rate increase proposals; and

"Whereas previous stoppages of service have resulted in groundwork having been laid for establishing other means of transportation at lower costs primarily by making Canadian service available.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully urges that section 27 of the Jones Act be amended to permanently remove the discrimination against Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 23, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Joint Memorial 23

"To the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the economic development of the Territory of Alaska has been severely handicapped by the high costs of transporting virtually all of its materials and supplies into the Territory and of its own products out of the Territory; and

"Whereas the costs of railroad transportation within the continental United States represent a substantial part of the total transportation bill; and

"Whereas the American railroads penalize the Territory of Alaska by charging higher rates on freight moving to the Northwest ports for shipment by vessel to Alaska than they do if the shipment is going to the Territory of Hawaii or foreign countries in the Pacific. This penalty is as much as 100 percent in some cases. The same penalties exist on shipments of Alaskan products into the continental United States; and

"Whereas the Administrator of General Services has filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which requests that Commission to require the railroads to discontinue this grievous practice; and

"Whereas the relief sought by the Administrator of General Services on behalf of the Federal Government as a shipper would greatly assist commercial and other interests in Alaska and thereby benefit its whole economy.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that the attention of the Congress of the United States be directed through the Delegate from Alaska, E. L. BARTLETT, to support the efforts of the Administrator of General Services so as to assure the vigorous prosecution of this complaint to a successful conclusion, and to this end to request holding of hearings within the Territory of Alaska so as to permit the Alaskan community and commercial interests of the Territory an opportunity to be heard.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 20, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the transfer of 11.223 acres of land located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has had a revocable permit from the Government of the United States since September 23, 1946, for the use of 11.223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, title to which property is vested in the United States of America; and

"Whereas a civilian subcommittee of the Land Use Committee operating under provisions of Presidential directive dated October 1, 1946, to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments for the purpose of examining all land acquired by the Departments of War and Navy for military purposes in Hawaii with the object of promptly releasing to the civilian economy that which was not necessary for the national security, recommended in its report to the Interior Department return to the civilian economy of the above area under revocable permit (Folder XIX, Tax Map Key 9–17–19–35, area 11.209 acres, acquired by Civil 724 et al.); and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has used the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit to provide domiciliary care for tuberculosis patients from 1946 to 1949; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has, since October 12, 1949, utilized the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit as a hospital for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has, by Public Law 411, undertaken full responsibility for the costs of care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Hansen's disease program in the Territory of Hawaii is outstanding in its modern medical and sociological approach to the problems involved and has made definite progress toward the eventual eradication of this disease from Hawaii, and has been commended by various authorities, including officials of the United States Public Health Service, the Leonard Wood Memorial Foundation, and health authorities of both private and public health agencies in foreign countries, as being sound and effective; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has improved and renovated the grounds and buildings covered by the revocable permit referred to above for its special use in the care and treatment of patients with Hansen's disease; and

"Whereas the stability and effectiveness of the Hansen's disease control program in the Territory of Hawaii would be enhanced by the transfer of the title of the land and buildings from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii, and the 27th legislature of the Territory in 1953 requested such transfer by the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress of the United States, but the Congress has not yet taken the requested action: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will transfer title to 11.223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, to the Territory of Hawaii, title to which property is now vested in the United States of America.

"SEC. 2. Upon its approval, authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the Commissioner of Public Lands, and to the President of the Board of Health.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the continuation of appropriations for the Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the retention at its present location of the Naval Supply Base at San Pedro, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Minutemen of America, New York, N. Y., signed by Francis A. Adams, director general, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year with the assessment of duties determined on American valuation of comparable articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Russell Smith and sundry other members of the Paton Methodist Church, Paton, Iowa, relating to disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners 34th annual convention at Chicago, Ill., opposing world government, Atlantic union, or any form of supergovernment, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Gabriel Valley Retail Petroleum Distributors' Association at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to competition and practices in the sale and distribution of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Holy Name Society, Immaculate Conception Parish, Astoria, N. Y., signed by Anthony G. Paretti, president, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Defenders of the Constitution, Forest Hills, N. Y., signed by Thomas J. Quinn, president, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Our Lady of Fatima Council, No. 3263, Knights of Columbus, Bellerose, N. Y., praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Morris Park Council, No. 566, Knights of Columbus, Richmond Hill, N. Y., signed by Walter Kowalcyk, recording secretary, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Loyola Council, No. 477, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Maris Stella Council, No. 378, Knights of Columbus, Far Rockaway, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Baron DeKalb Council, No. 1073, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Bayview Republican Women's Club, San Diego, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Veterans of Military Intelligence Service, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the appointment of Ben M. Tashiro to be judge of the Circuit Court of the Fifth Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Elizabeth Kiernan, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to reject passage of the reciprocal trade bill which would lower tariffs on textiles to the detriment of the people of the United States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration H. R. 1, commonly known as the reciprocal trade bill; and

"Whereas under the terms of the reciprocal trade bill the President would be authorized to further reduce tariffs on textiles for an additional 15 percent over the next 3 years; and

"Whereas such reduction in tariffs would permit this country to be flooded with textiles produced in foreign countries, chiefly Japan and India where the average wages are one-tenth or one-twelfth of the prevailing American rate; and

"Whereas the textile industry of the United States could not possibly dispose of its products in competition with such foreign textiles and would be forced to liquidate and throw hundreds of thousands of textile employees out of work; and

"Whereas such reduction in tariffs would not only be disastrous to the textile industries of the United States but also to the carpet industry, the ceramics industry, crabmeat producers, and other industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That Congress is memorialized to reject passage of the reciprocal trade bill which would be disastrous to the textile and other major industries in the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and each Member of the House of Representatives to Congress from South Carolina."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Department of Agriculture to retain the classing office at Charleston, S. C.

"Whereas the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture is considering closing the cotton classing office at Charleston, S. C.; and

"Whereas Charleston is the only South Atlantic port with approved warehouses for delivery of cotton on contract, and local cotton classing service is vital to both Charleston firms and mills in South Carolina; and

"Whereas every farmer in South Carolina is affected by the classing office in Charleston because mills will pay farmers better than delivery price as long as they can deliver cotton on contract; and

"Whereas the State ports authority states that if the classing office is closed, Charleston could lose the importing of Egyptian cotton; and

"Whereas the total annual appropriation is only $16,000, which is a relatively small amount for any Government agency and certainly a minor consideration as to the needed service at the port: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That the United States Department of Agriculture be memorialized to retain the classing office at Charleston, S. C., to insure orderly and efficient marketing of cotton handled at the port of Charleston; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, the South Carolina commissioner of agriculture, and to each of the Members of Congress from South Carolina."

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, to allocate and permit the planting of 1 acre of cotton for each acre of peaches destroyed by the recent unseasonable weather

"Whereas the recent unseasonable weather has destroyed the peach crops in the State of South Carolina; and

"Whereas such destruction will be a disastrous financial blow to the peach growers of the State; and

"Whereas there is still time to permit such growers to plant cotton as a substitute for the destroyed peach crop: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, is requested to allocate and permit the planting of 1 acre of cotton by any peach grower for each acre of peaches destroyed by the recent unseasonable weather, regardless of the fact that such grower may have had no prior allocation for cotton; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, and to each of the United States Senators and Members of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid the farmers, peach growers, and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and other counties in the State who have suffered so disastrously from the recent unseasonable cold weather

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina:

"The House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, now in regular session at Columbia, S. C., wishes to call to the attention of the Congress of the United States that from the 26th through the 28th of March of this year, the State was visited by a cold wave unprecedented in the past 50 years. According to the records in the office of the United States Weather Bureau, a temperature as low as that which prevailed during the dates above mentioned was recorded only in the year 1894. Preceding this unusual cold wave the State had about 2 weeks of unusually warm weather. Peach and other fruit trees budded out profusely. As a result of the cold wave it is estimated that the 1955 peach crop will be a total loss to the farmers and fruit growers of Spartanburg and other counties in South Carolina. Expressed in money, this loss will range from $12 to $14 million in Spartanburg County alone. The peach and fruit growers are in dire need and the area so disastrously affected should be designated by the Federal Government as a disaster area.

"This body therefore respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide the peach and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and of other counties in this State with substantial aid so as to enable them to bear without complete ruin the unprecedented loss which they have sustained, and also to increase the cotton acreage of the farmers of this State so that they will have some means of offsetting the tremendous losses that they have sustained from the recent freeze: Be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to take action relative to the increased rents in the housing projects in the city of Boston

"Whereas the Old Colony housing project in the south Boston district of the city of Boston was established by Federal funds for the assistance to veterans and other needy persons; and

"Whereas the purpose of such a project was to keep low rental units; and

"Whereas notices have now been issued effective May 1, 1955, increasing the rents in 873 units from $3.50 to $16.50 per month; and

"Whereas such action at this time is unfair, unjust, and inequitable; and

"Whereas the housing authorities are contemplating raising the rents in other projects in the Boston area which will affect 13,000 other families: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memoralizes the Congress of the United States to cause an investigation to be made of the action taken by the housing authorities in the Boston district and to enact appropriate legislation to prevent such increases of rents: And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Federal Housing Authority in the District of Columbia and the city of Boston."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing,

which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill for a public law, H. R. 1, which, if enacted, would give the executive branch of the Federal Government extended and broad new authority to reduce United States import duties and regulations without further congressional action and possibly contrary to express findings and recommendations of the expert United States Tariff Commission; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is sympathetic to the declared purposes of the present Federal trade agreements legislation and the continuance of such legislation as will further the interests of the domestic economy of the United States through expansion of reciprocal world trade, with fair and adequate means of protecting domestic workers, producers, and industries against excessive tariff reductions, but this legislative assembly opposes so changing the existing legislation as to make the tariff policy and rates of the United States primarily instruments of international politics; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is gravely concerned by the adverse effects which substantial tariff reductions already made are having upon important industries of this State, such as the cranberry, cherry, crab, dairy, filbert, fish, grass seeds, hops, lumber, mint, mushroom, walnut, and wool industries, and by the failure of the trade-agreements program to obtain effective reciprocal concessions for United States products, such as Oregon apples and pears which continue to be virtually barred from their former normal world markets by various arbitrary foreign import restrictions; and

"Whereas provisions of H. R. 1 go far beyond the present trade agreements legislation, and offer less, rather than more, promise of recovery and expansion of export markets for domestic products, and if enacted would threaten the possible destruction or substantial curtailment of agricultural and other industries which are vital to the economy of the State of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in regular session assembled, hereby does memorialize the Congress of the United States not to pass H. R. 1, or any legislation which would similarly add to and change the existing trade agreements legislation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to United States Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Representatives WALTER NORBLAD, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, SAM COON, and EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate February 18, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house March 11, 1955.

"E. R. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the United States, by and through its Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, has constructed more than 40 dams in the Columbia River watershed since 1902; and

"Whereas the fishery resource of the Columbia River has already received severe damage as a result of such dams; and

"Whereas it is evident that the river development projects referred to herein are prime factors in the depletion of the said fishery resource and that the river development projects should pay from their earnings the continuing operation and maintenance costs of the fishery rehabilitation program presently in progress for the Columbia River watershed; and

"Whereas the United States, acting by and through the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in June 1948 entered into a signed agreement with the fish and game departments of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho for a program of conservation and rehabilitation of the salmon fishery of the Columbia River by authority of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345), as amended August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932); and

"Whereas the agreement of June 1948 provided for construction of fishways, salmon hatcheries, and other improvements by the signatory States with Federal funds released through the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas many of these structures and improvements have now been completed; and

"Whereas the agreement providing for the creation of these structures and facilities does not provide for their permanent operation and maintenance with Federal funds; and

"Whereas it is evident that the depletion of the fishery resource of the Columbia River watershed caused by Federal irrigation, power, and navigation projects in the said watershed will be to some degree a continuous depletion which will necessitate a permanent operation and maintenance of these facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists earnestly petition that the President and the Congress of the United States do recognize that the permanent maintenance and operation of these facilities are a Federal responsibility and that moneys for their operation and maintenance should become a continuing part of Federal appropriations, to be allocated to the State agencies responsible for such operation and maintenance through the Fish and Wildlife Service; be it further

"Resolved, That your memorialists earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to establish a permanent means of financing the maintenance and operation of these facilities by appropriate legislation, making the costs of such operation and maintenance a charge against funds received by the United States and its agencies in payment for electrical energy generated at Federal hydroelectric powerplants in the Columbia River Basin; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Oregon, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of the Army, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

"Adopted by senate March 3, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"ELMO C. SMITH,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by house March 10, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

"House Joint Memorial 11

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Federal funds are appropriated annually to the United States Geological Survey for a program of cooperative investigation of water resources, wherein the Federal allotment matches the State allotment in amount; and

"Whereas cooperative agreements for water resource studies are in effect between the United States Geological Survey and the Oregon State engineer, the Oregon State Highway Commission, and the water departments of Coos Bay-North Bend, Eugene, McMinville and Portland, and negotiations are proceding to effectuate a similar agreement with the county court of Douglas County; and

"Whereas in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Federal appropriation was not adequate to match all cooperative offerings with the result that each agreement was in the ratio of $97.50 Federal to $100 State; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the agreements must be further reduced to the ratio of $95 Federal to $100 State; and

"Whereas still further reductions are in prospect, with a probable ratio of $85 Federal to $100 State for fiscal year 1955–56 unless the Congress appropriates an adequate amount, and these deficiencies will result in discontinuance of some stream-flow measuring stations and inadequate rehabilitation and maintenance of existing stations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States hereby is requested to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to carry out the traditional practice of 100 percent matching of all State offerings for the purpose of continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house March 9, 1955.

"EDITH EYNON LAW,
"Chief Clerk.
"ED GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate March 14, 1955.

"ELMO C. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 12

"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Senators and Representatives from Oregon in Congress of the United States of America; and to the Board on Geographic Names:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in

legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas in 1954 the President of the United States of America threw the governing switch which sent thousands of kilowatts of electrical energy from a mighty dam that had just been constructed spanning the Columbia River, an historical day for the Nation marking another milestone in the progress of the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas it was proper and fitting that the dam should be named McNary in order to perpetuate the name of this illustrious pioneer statesman, Charles Linza McNary, who, cooperating with his friends and neighbors, had within the span of one lifetime built from an unexplored wilderness and sagebrush country a progressive and stable part of our United States, homes and industries of the Northwest consuming hundreds of thousands of kilowatts provided by McNary Dam and other dams promoted by Senator McNary and his neighbors; and

"Whereas Oregon and Washington owe so much to pioneer ctitizens whose hard work and fortitude made the Northwest great; and

"Whereas the dam being named McNary after a pioneer statesman, it would be proper and fitting that the waters creating a lake back of McNary Dam be named Aldrich Lake as a memento to that tireless newspaper editor, Edwin Burton Aldrich, who spent his entire life using his pen to achieve greater things for the Pacific Northwest through the development of its water resources; and

"Whereas E. B. Aldrich, editor of the East Oregonian in Pendleton, Oreg., was the leader at the first meeting ever called for the development of the resources of the Columbia River; and

"Whereas E. B. Aldrich was one of the Northwest's representatives sent to alert the Congress of our Nation and Corps of Engineers of the power potentialities of the Columbia River; and

"Whereas it was E. B. Aldrich and his associates who secured the first money ever appropriated for the study of the Columbia River; and from that meager appropriation of $50,000 from the Congress of the United States and $10,000 from the State of Oregon an embryo was created from which has emerged multipurpose dams on the Columbia River; and

"Whereas although E. B. Aldrich's pen was forever stilled by his death in 1950, a record of his achievements should be marked for all time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to name this lake Aldrich Lake; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Wayne Morse, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Richard Neuberger, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Walter Norblad, Reresesntative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Sam Coon, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Edith Green, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Harris Ellsworth, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Board on Geographic Names.

"Adopted by house March 23, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of the House.
"EDITH BYRON LAW,
"Chief Clerk.

"Adopted by senate March 30, 1955.

"ELMO C. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk two joint resolutions enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing to the Congress to take action in two important fields.

The first relates to restoration of package freight shipping on the Great Lakes, an issue which I personally have recommended for many years and toward which I have in the past introduced legislation.

The second relates to the appropriate issue of a commemorative memorial stamp in honor of the first kindergarten in the United States, established in Watertown, Wis., by Mrs. Carl Schurz in 1856.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 38, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes

"Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Wisconsin industry, and provide a market for the agricultural and manufactured products of the State; and

"Whereas lack of package freight shipping has adversely affected Wisconsin agriculture and industry, and has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries of the Great Lakes area; and

"Whereas package freight shipping will contribute to the reduction of such unemployment; and

"Whereas package freight service will provide a steppingstone to the maximum use of the facilities of the Great Lakes ports of Wisconsin for international trade when the St. Lawrence Seaway has been completed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes at the earliest practicable date; and, be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States Maritime Commission, to each House of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"W. P. KNOWLES,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Joint Resolution 20, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Post Office Department to issue a postage stamp commemorating the establishment of the first kindergarten in the United States in Watertown in 1856

"Whereas the concept of the kindergarten was developed in Germany during the 2d and 3d decades of the 19th century by Fredrick Froebel; and

"Whereas in 1856 the first kindergarten in the United States was established in Watertown, Wis., by Mrs. Carl Schurz, a student of Froebel; and

"Whereas it was not until 1873 that a public-school kindergarten was established anywhere in the United States; and

"Whereas the establishment of the Watertown kindergarten represents a milestone in the development of education in this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General, be requested to give consideration to the issuance, during 1956, of a postage stamp commemorating the centennial celebration of the founding of the first kindergarten in the United States in Watertown, Wis.; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield and to each Member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

"MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"W. P. KNOWLES,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

CONTINUANCE OF AMERICAN MARINE HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOR SEAMEN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I did not wish to interrupt the eulogies in honor of the great Franklin D. Roosevelt. My heart is as tender in respect and high regard for the memory of that great man as are any of those who have made their expressions on the other side of the aisle. But there is an Appropriations Committee session beginning at 2:30 o'clock today, and for that reason I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the legislative body of the State of Minnesota. I think it is a very timely resolution, since it memorializes Congress to continue the operation of the great merchant marine hospital.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, the United States Maritime Commission, and the Congress of the United States to support measures to insure the continued operation of the American Marine Hospital system for seamen

Whereas, the nature and type of work performed by the seamen on the American merchant marine operating on the high seas as well as on the Great Lakes is such that it is imperative that adequate hospital facilities be provided for them;

Whereas large numbers of residents of the State of Minnesota are beneficially employed as seamen on the Great Lakes and on the high seas;

Whereas steps have been taken which if carried out would lead to the destruction of the hospital system built up over many years for seamen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to insure the continued operation of the hospital system for the American seamen; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

ALFRED F. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
KARL T. ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives, the 10th day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate, the 30th day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1955.

H. G. SORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved April 5, 1955.

ORVILLE J. FURMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY FOR FARM COMMODITIES — RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Isanti County Cooperative Association, at Zimmerman, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide 90 percent of parity on all farm commodities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since net farm income has fallen off about 30 percent since 1948, while nonfarm income has increased about 43 percent since 1948, no amount of scrambling of figures can convince us we are better off now under flexible-price supports than we were before. In view of these facts, we submit the following resolution:

Calling upon the President and the Congress to work out a long-range permanent farm program on all commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity—produced by the family-sized farm—(a family farm can be described as one of which the family lives on the land, makes all the major decisions, and supplies the major part of the labor).

We further resolve that the Government stop giving aid to the rich hobby farmers and the large cooperation farms—who really produce the surpluses if there are any—and that the Government provide enough money through low-interest credit for the farm program, CCC, crop insurance, REA, SCS, etc.

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
RAYMOND STOECKEL, *Secretary.*
ZIMMERMAN, MINN.

INCREASED SUGAR QUOTA—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Blue Earth, the Commercial Club of Frost, and the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, all of the State of Minnesota, relating to increased sugar quotas.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of Minnesota; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of Minnesota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic sugar industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this organization is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by Chamber of Commerce, Blue Earth, Minn., March 28, 1955.

A. KOLKJEN,
President.
M. A. GATZKE,
Secretary.

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of this community; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of this community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of Commercial Club is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by Commercial Club, Frost, Minn., March 28, 1955.

SELMAR MATHESON, *President.*
LESTER SCOTT, Secretary.

The Director of the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce meeting in a special session on March 28, 1955, at Moorhead, Minn., approved the following resolution:

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1951 expires December 31, 1956; and

"Whereas the sugar industry of the United States is today operating at a minimum of capacity; and

"Whereas the annual consumption increase since 1947 has been 1 million tons; and

"Whereas the sugar industry is a vital portion of the economy of the Red River Valley of the North; and

"Whereas we do have at the present time capacities to produce and process more than double the amount of beet sugar being produced and marketed from this area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, Minn., go on record requesting that any increase in the consumption of sugar within the United States be given to the beet and cane producers within the territorial boundaries of this country commensurate with their ability to produce and market this additional consumption economically and in the best interests of the sugar industry of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to all other interested parties."

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE SENATE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Legislature, which has just concluded its biennial session, adopted a resolution petitioning the Congress to take appropriate action which would insure the continuance of programs for the impounding and control of water runoff in the State of Kansas.

This resolution calls attention to the severe hardships and the great financial loss from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

This action on the part of the Kansas Legislature is one of the most progressive and forward-looking steps taken in many years regarding future development of our State.

I believe that everyone must agree that our State's growth, economically, agriculturally, and industrially, will be determined by the amount of water that we can conserve and use.

Kansas is a State that has suffered seriously from intermittent floods and droughts. In 1951 we suffered one of the most disastrous floods in our State's history, causing hundreds of millions of dollars of damage. During the last 3 years, we have suffered a serious drought.

It is, of course, impossible to estimate the terrific loss suffered by our citizens from the lack of water. Our State, through the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, has completed a number of projects in our State that are proving to be of great value.

The programs under the direction and sponsorship of these agencies must not only be continued, but must be expanded.

Every Member of Congress will receive a copy of this resolution, and I sincerely hope they will keep in mind the problems that have been mentioned in the resolution approved by the legislature.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas, and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation pollution control, and soil conservation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MERCHANT MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Pacific Coast Zone Marine Conference of the International Association of Machinists, at Portland, Oreg., favoring the establishment of a merchant marine and shipbuilding program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the experience of two world wars has amply demonstrated the need for the shipbuilding industry standing on a firm base; and

Whereas in the event of a future conflict the added tempo of atomic and guided missile warfare will not allow leeway to build our deteriorated shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities and more particularly will not allow the time necessary to train personnel in skills required to man these yards, said skills including designers, engineers, supervision, and craftsmen of all trades; and

Whereas we are rapidly losing the trained personnel to carry on this industry due to the lack of a stabilized shipbuilding program and the present policy of offshore procurement in the building and repair of American vessels in foreign ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the Pacific Coast Zone Marine Conference of the International Association of Machinists, assembled in Portland, Oreg., this 5th day of April 1955, strongly urges the shipbuilding industry of the United States and our Congress now in session to put forth every effort to establish a merchant marine and shipbuilding program in order to stabilize our present shipyard facilities;

2. That the Pacific coast zone should receive an equitable share of all construction and repair of vessels in order that employment in the shipyards on the west coast be increased and maintained at a level necessary to assist in the protection of the United States in case of emergency;

3. Our membership in the United States and Canada engaged in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry must continue to use every effort to impress upon their representatives in Government and industry the urgent necessity for immediate action in the building and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine fleet for the defense and protection of the North American Continent and the free world.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY ON BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—LETTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have received from the Morrow County Farm Bureau, of Ione, Oreg., signed by Mrs. Markham Baker, secretary, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide 90-percent parity for basic agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IONE, OREG., *April 6, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: At the regular meeting of the Morrow County Farm Bureau held on March 22, a resolution was passed unanimously, advocating Government support of at least 90-percent parity on basic commodities used at home. One of the reasons for this action is the fact that industries and other groups are so supported thus keeping the prices of machinery and other things that the farmer has to buy at such a level that if the farmer is forced to take lower prices it may prove disastrous as well as being unfair.

Sincerely yours,

MORROW COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
MRS. MARKHAM BAKER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF A HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Oregon Grangers, electric cooperative associations, labor unions, the State Farmers Union, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and other groups, in support of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE GRANGERS RESOLUTION

Grangers, representing 34 of the State's 36 counties, meeting at State grange headquarters in Portland, Oreg., on January 17, 1955, to discuss the hydroelectric power situation in the Northwest hereby go on record urging immediate action by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to authorize the construction of the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

We feel that such action must be taken at once in order to assure that this great resource will be fully integrated into the Pacific Northwest grid system before an actual power shortage develops that will be a detriment to all the people of the United States.

We feel that to permit the Idaho Power Co. to despoil Hells Canyon with its partial and piecemeal scheme would be a dangerous and needless loss to this Nation and to this region. We therefore urge all granges and other organizations to join together in a united effort to attain authorization of the high Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

Signed by:

RAY W. GILL,
ALBERT ULLMAN,
EARL A. MOORE.

Resolved, That we reaffirm our former resolution that we favor the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government in accord with the survey and recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in Congress.

Adopted at annual State convention of the Oregon State Farmers Union in Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1955.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE OREGON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 14, 1954

Be it resolved, That the legislative program of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association be supplemented by the following policy statement:

Resolution No. 4: That we urge early enactment of legislation to authorize construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

Resolution adopted.

B. R. LITTLE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

CENTRAL LINCOLN
PEOPLES' UTILITY DISTRICT,
Newport, Oreg., February 10, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the interest of securing a continued supply of low-cost power necessary for the further development

and progress of the Pacific Northwest, the members of the board of directors of the Central Lincoln Peoples' Utility District solicit your support of the Hells Canyon Dam bill as recently approved by the board of directors of the National Hells Canyon Association.

It is our belief that only through Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project can the full maximum development and utilization of the hydroelectric potential be realized. Benefits of low-cost power for the Pacific Northwest would be realized through the proposed interconnection with the Federal Columbia River Power System and marketing of electric energy under provisions of the 1937 Bonneville Project Act.

Very truly yours,

MILLARD MARTIN,
President.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress, and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill, for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest Power Pool to insure needed power for this area, and for national defense, and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means, and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people, these added industries, this added payroll, added homes and all other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments, and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it, and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation, and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America, had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials, all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low cost power in the Northwest, and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure, and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure, so; therefore be it

Resolved, that Sixes Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon bill, and that we forward copies of this resolution to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, requesting their undivided support of this bill.

ALBERT BRITTON,
Master Sixes Grange.

DENMARK, OREG.

FRANK MORRIS, Jr.,
Secretary Sixes Grange.

SIXES, OREG.

BAKER DISTRICT POMONA GRANGE, NO. 24,
March 5, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Baker District Pomona Grange assembled in regular session at Missouri Flat Grange, No. 612, on March 5, 1955.

Go on record as favoring adoption of the Hells Canyon bill as presented to the present Congress and Senate of the United States.

We further resolve that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, Representative SAM COON, and the Oregon State Legislative Committee.

EDGAR STORIE,
Master.
EDITH MORIN,
Secretary.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY
CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
Oregon City, Oreg., March 18, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This council is appreciative of your efforts in behalf of congressional approval of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. PERRIN,
Secretary.

PUYALLUP, WASH., *March 19, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our regular session, Fruitland Grange, No. 999, instructed me to inform you that we favor the early passage of S. 1333, authorizing the construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon.

We are familiar with your position but are simply offering written evidence which may be used by you in proving what the public sentiment is in regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

NEVA MILNE,
Secretary,
Fruitland Grange, No. 999.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, and many other Senators from many different States of the Union for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas to get the fullest benefits of the water resources of the Northwest for power, irrigation, navigation for all of the people for more industries and a fuller opportunity for work for an ever increasing army of working people. It is absolutely necessary to build the Hells Canyon Dam as soon as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226 of Portland, Oreg., do earnestly and sincerely endorse Senate bill 1333 as now introduced in the United States Senate and pledge its full support of said bill; be it further

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226 of Portland, Oreg., do hereby sincerely commend and appreciate all those Senators.

A. E. Larson, C. J. La Salle, James W. Johnson, C. B. Fairley, H. W. Goodding, T. E. Johnson, A. T. Williams, Sr., Geo. Hany, Andrew F. Sears, Carpenters, No. 226.

RESOLUTION FROM KITTITAS COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, NO. 58, HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas we the Grangers of Kittitas County Pomona Grange No. 58 feel that the Hells Canyon Dam should be built to assure our downstream dams an ample supply of water when the river and its tributaries are low; and

Whereas engineers have assured that the dam will produce a capacity of 686,000 kilowatts, as well as serving as flood control, and other benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kittitas County Pomona Grange go on record favoring the construction of Hells Canyon Dam and that Senate bill No. 1333; providing for the construction of the high dam by the Bureau of Reclamation, be passed and that construction be started as soon as practical; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution go to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator WAYNE MORSE, who introduced the bill, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator HENRY JACKSON, Representative HAL HOLMES, and Representative DON MAGNUSON. Copies should be sent to our Washington State Grange Master Lars A. Nelson, and to the Hells Canyon Dam Association.

The above resolution was adopted by the Kittitas County Pomona No. 58 meeting at Ellensburg on March 26.

ORVILLE E. BURGETT,
Master.
ELNA EMERSON,
Secretary.

OSWEGO GRANGE, NO. 175,
Lake Grove, Oreg., March 24, 1955.

Re Hells Canyon bill No. 1333.

It is hereby resolved that the Oswego Grange No. 175 wishes to go on record in support of the Hells Canyon Dam, bill No. 1333.

DURWARD E. FRY,
Master.
SABRA F. OLDHAM,
Secretary.
STANLEY OLDHAM,
J. F. HALLMEYER,
JOE DECORT,
Executive Committee.

PENDLETON, OREG.

Cold Spring Grange, No. 801, urges the Federal Power Commission and the Congress of the United States to support the proposed multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam project and to oppose the alternate proposal for smaller dams.

Authorize the construction in the near future.

MERVIN R. MEINERS,
Master.
Mrs. BERT BLOOM,
Secretary.

JUNCTION CITY.

RESOLUTION

Whereas economic future of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest depends on an adequate supply of hydroelectric power,

Whereas Army engineers' reports show that the construction of a high multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River Basin: Therefore be it

Resolved by South Benton Grange, No. 756 (in session assembled March 25), to go on record as urging the adoption of Senate bill 1333, which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River; be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to State Grange, National Hells Canyon Dam Association, and Senators and Representatives of Oregon congressional delegation.

MILES PETERS,
Master.
EVA PETERS,
Secretary.

ROSEBURG, OREG., *March 31, 1955.*

Whereas Lookingglass Grange No. 927, of Lookingglass, Oreg., went on record January 12, 1954, in favor of and supporting the Hells Canyon donation fund: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of Lookingglass Grange No. 927 at a recent meeting went on record favoring S. 1333, the Federal high Hells Canyon measure.

CHARLES E. SCHULZE, *Master.*
SUSIE OAR, *Secretary.*

KEATING GRANGE,
Keating, Oreg.

Whereas this grange is, and always has been, in favor of a Federal Hells Canyon Dam: Therefore be it

Resolved by Keating Grange No. 823 (met in regular session this 25th day of March), Go on record as favoring Senate bill 1333; also be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen and to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho.

Resolution examined and approved by Keating Grange No. 823, Keating, Oreg.

BOB COWARD, *Master.*
ARLAINE CORNETT, *Secretary.*

BANDON, OREG., *April 1, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We of Westmost Grange No. 884 would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in order to obtain construction of the vital Hells Canyon Dam.

This Graige has unanimously passed a resolution favoring Federal construction of the high dam in Hells Canyon. We want you to know that public support for this project is not lacking.

Sincerely,

WESTMOST GRANGE NO. 894.
ED. B. GOULD,
J. J. MORRIS,
L. M. KRANICK, *Committee.*

RIVERSDALE GRANGE, No. 731
Roseburg, Oreg.

Whereas Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been highly successful, contributing greatly to the winning of World War II, and have been the direct origin of the industrial expansion of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas additional facilities of this type are needed in order to continue this expansion, to provide for Oregon's rapidly increasing population, and further to minimize flood levels on the Columbia River and other streams; and

Whereas the Army engineers' 308 report has already shown that construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River System, providing the most practical upstream storage and maximum firm power at downstream dams; and

Whereas the State granges of Oregon, Washington, and California are in favor of the United States Government erecting a high dam in Hells Canyon: Therefore, be it

Resolved (1) That we again affirm our previous decisions regarding construction of Hells Canyon Dam. (2) That we strongly denounce the present administration for its failure to oppose the granting of a license by the Federal Power Commission to build three low dams and to promote the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government. (3) That a copy of this resolution be sent to: Kay Meriwether, executive secretary, National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 Southeast Salmon Street, Portland, Oreg.; Senator Wayne L. Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Walter Norblad, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Sam Coon, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Edith Green, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Harris Ellsworth, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Gracie Pfost, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Submitted by Riversdale Grange, No. 731, Douglas County, Oreg.

NELDA NORRIS, *Master.*
ANNA TROZELLE, *Secretary.*

POULSBO, WASH., *March 29, 1955.*

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: We appreciate the fine work you are doing for the high dam on the Snake River. We realize what this means to the economy of the Pacific Northwest. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

R. KVELATED,
Secretary, North Kitan Farmers Union, Local 488.

BEAVERTON, OREG., *March 28, 1955.*

Whereas in the electrical development of the Pacific Northwest, the Snake River will ultimately be harnessed; and

Whereas it is our considered belief that this will be accomplished most efficiently by the construction of a single high dam by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Beaverton Grange in regular session assembled this 28th day of March 1955 go on record favoring the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Adopted.

BERT WILSON,
Master.
E. G. PERKINS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

McKINLEY GRANGE, No. 582,
Myrtle Point, Oreg.

Whereas the need for electrical power is increasing rapidly in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas we do not believe in the administration's partnership-power program of the Government building dams and the private power interests collecting the lion's share of the revenue; and

Whereas we believe a high dam in Hells Canyon will utilize in the fullest the potential of this great site: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the McKinley Grange No. 582 in regular session on the 26th day of March 1955 unanimously went on record as favoring the enactment of S. 1333 at this session of Congress so that this great power site may begin contributing prime kilowatts to the Northwest power pool at the earliest possible moment.

ELMER STRODE,
Master.
PRISCILLA MAST,
Secretary.

FRIENDLY GRANGE No. 897,
Portland, Oreg.

Whereas the supply of hydroelectric energy in the Pacific Northwest has presently forced the curtailment of production of aluminum and other goods essential to defense and national prosperity; and

Whereas reliable surveys indicate that by 1960, unless adequate steps are taken now, this region will face even more critical shortages; and

Whereas advance planning for the integrated development of the water resources of the region, as represented by the findings and recommendations of the Army's 308 report, calls for the construction by the Federal Government of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River; and

Whereas such a dam, operated as an integral part of the Bonneville system, will bring untold benefits to downstream areas in the form of increased power production and flood control: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Friendly Grange No. 897 go on record requesting immediate enactment of S. 1333, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon; Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, the chairman of the Senate Insular Affairs and Interior Committee; Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; the National Hells Canyon Association; and to the Oregon State Grange.

MILDRED NORMAN, *Master.*
CLAIRE ELLIOTT, *Secretary.*

Approved March 24, 1954.

UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE.

Whereas all the electricity that can be developed in the Northwest will soon be needed; and

Whereas aid to navigation and flood control that this dam will provide is a necessity for the full potential use of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and

Whereas the building of Hells Canyon Dam would result in an outstanding recreational lake amid a locality already famous for its scenery and place to spend vacations—such addition would become part of a growing asset as a tourist resort; and

Whereas the electricity generated at Hells Canyon and the buildup at the lower dams will be much more than any other proposed plan; and

Whereas cheap electricity is needed to develop the great phosphate deposits in Idaho for fertilizer that is used, more and more, in the growing of farm crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Union County Pomona Grange this 26th day of March 1955 in regular session, That we ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to support and pass S. 1333 as soon as possible and to appropriate funds to start the same.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON, *Master.*
LAURA E. BATES, *Secretary.*

NORTH RIVER GRANGE, No. 946,
Brooklyn, Wash., April 1, 1955.

Whereas we of the North River Grange No. 946 believe that a high, multipurpose dam should be built at Hells Canyon: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this Grange go on record as approving the construction of a high multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our representatives and to our Senators and to the National Hells Canyon Association.

Dated this 1st day of April 1955.

HAROLD E. WOOD,
Master.
JAMES M. CRICK,
Secretary.

ONTARIO HEIGHTS GRANGE, No. 917,
Ontario, Oreg.

Ontario Heights Grange, No. 917, at a special meeting on March 25, 1955, held for consideration of the high Government dam as an integrated part of the Columbia and Snake Rivers resource development versus the low head dams as proposed by Idaho Power Co., voted unanimously to have the high dam built by the Government as an integrated unit in the Columbia Basin development.

It is emphasized that—

A. The high dam is a necessity for full development of this section of the basin to promote and insure continued expansion of our agricultural resources to provide power at rates that will attract industries with the resultant employment and taxable properties that the area does not now have in sufficient quantity, especially in the area adjacent to Hells Canyon.

B. The aid in equalization and firm-up of power at downstream powerhouses is imperative; without this storage for firm-up a loss of potential power and its benefits will occur at downstream points as long as they exist.

C. The development of the phosphate beds of southern Idaho are necessary if our farms of the area are to maintain their fertility and ability to produce the maximums. Existing transportation cost alone deny many of the farms of the great Northwest the benefits of phosphate application. The extension of the Bonneville grid system into this upstream area will insure phosphate development as well as attract payrolls and industrial development needed to stabilize many parts of our local economy.

D. Flood control, benefits of power revenues to help equalize high cost irrigation development, recreation with its vast potential for sportsmen, vacationists, etc., alone justify building of the high dam.

A God-given resource; a great river, its tremendous horsepower flowing incessantly, a canyon, one of the deepest in the world, a combination unequaled and unsurpassed; surely it is our duty and trust to preserve this for our sons and daughters and their future generations.

We urge immediate action favoring the Federal high Hells Canyon measure, S. 1333.

GEO. L. WHITE,
Master.
WYOMA ROGERS,
Secretary.

CENTRAL GRANGE, No. 360,
Veneta, Oreg.

Be it resolved by Central Grange, No. 360, Lane County, Oregon, That we go on record favoring the Hells Canyon High Dam on the Snake River as originally outlined in the 308 report of the Army engineers in the overall development of the Columbia River power system.

H. A. PETZOLD, *Master.*
FLORENCE INMAN,
Secretary.

FERNHILL GRANGE, No. 592,
Rainier, Oreg.

Whereas the Federal high Hells Canyon Dam will provide more power than the three low head dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co.; and

Whereas there is a vast need for more power in the Pacific Northwest to promote more industries which will help solve the unemployment situation in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas low cost power is needed to develop the phosphate beds of Idaho to furnish fertilizer which is badly needed by the farmers in this area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Fernhill Grange, No. 592, Rainer, Oreg., go on record to petition the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to favor the Federal Hells Canyon Dam; be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the United States Senators and Representatives of Oregon and to the Oregon State Grange.

Resolution read and adopted by Fernhill Grange, No. 592, at a regular meeting, March 26, 1955.

W. W. KIMBLE, *Master.*
LUCILLE KIMBLE,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM

IRON WORKERS NORTHWEST DISTRICT COUNCIL,
Spokane, Wash., April 4, 1955.

Whereas there is now before Congress of the United States, both in the Senate and House, a bill known as Senate bill 1333, introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and 29 other Senators representing 20 States; and

Whereas this bill provides for the construction of a multiple-purpose dam rather than the construction of the smaller dams as proposed by the Idaho Power Co.; and

Whereas the construction of Hells Canyon Dam will not only provide employment during its construction but will be an asset to the economic future of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and essential to the defense strength and economic expansion and stability of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the second quarterly meeting of Iron Workers Northwest District Council go on record supporting construction of Hells Canyon Dam, and passage of Senate bill 1333.

Submitted by Iron Workers Local 29, John O'Neill, Carl Johnson, Henry Sinner, and local unions affiliated with the district council: Local 505, Tom E. Day; Local 86, Claude Jackson; Local 506, Earl L. Lawrence; Local 14, Howard A. Turner; Local 511, Mickey H. Melaas; Local 114, Einar Nelson; Local 581, Arthur J. Ruebenson; Local 516, Homer I. Park; Local 598, Kenneth Frazier.

VALE GRANGE, No. 696,
Vale, Oreg., April 2, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the regular meeting of Vale Grange, No. 696, at Vale, Oreg., on April 1, 1955, a resolution was unanimously passed by the members to support the authorization of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Yours truly,
D. E. CARTER, *Master.*
CARRIE M. BERRY, *Secretary.*

OPHIR GRANGE, No. 767,
Ophir, Oreg., March 25, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Ophir Grange, No. 767, went on record endorsing Senate bill 1333 at their regular meeting on the above date.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND H. STEVENS, *Master.*
RUTH M. MOORE, *Secretary.*

LINN COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
Albany, Oreg., March 17, 1955.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area and for national defense; and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people—these added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and all other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments; and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation; and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials—all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Linn County Pomona Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon bill, and that we forward copies of this resolution to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, requesting their undivided support of this bill; also, that a copy of this resolution be sent to every Pomona Grange in the State of Oregon requesting their support.

G. R. TRUAX, *Master.*
WENONAH WILEY, *Secretary.*

In order to acquaint our Congressmen of the stand of our Grange regarding a high dam or three low head dams on the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area, we, the East Side Grange, No. 583, located at New Pine Creek, Oreg., propose the following resolution:

"HELLS CANYON DAM VERSUS THREE LOW-HEAD DAMS

"Whereas the three proposed low-head dams are to be located in the area which would be the reservoir site of the Hells Canyon Dam, as located by the Army engineers and the Federal irrigation group; and

"Whereas the sites for the three low-head dams are requested by private utility companies; and

"Whereas the granting of these sites to the private companies would shut off construction of Hells Canyon Dam without bargaining with the private companies for the return of the sites; and

"Whereas low-head dams make no provision for flood control, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide an exceptionally large reservoir in an ideal primitive area for water storage; and

"Whereas low-head dams require water rights to assure sufficient river flow for maximum development of power, while Hells Canyon dam would store great quantities of surplus water during the spring run-off, thus holding it from flooding the lower area and also providing power development even during the long dry periods, not only at the dam site, but to riverflow dams below, only becoming a low-head dam when the stored water is used down to the river flow; and

"Whereas low-head dams are of no value for wild life, scenic, or recreational uses, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide all these benefits: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this grange stands definitely for the construction of the Hell's Canyon dam and opposed to giving away the three sites in the Snake River which would obstruct the construction of the Hells Canyon dam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we want the Hell's Canyon dam constructed and owned by the Federal Government, provided however, that in power development the Federal Government share with the States concerned such costs and benefits as may be for the best interests of the people of those States and of the Nation, and provided further that the Federal Government enter into such contracts with private companies, including cooperative companies, for the development, distribution, and sale of electric power as will be to the advantage and for the benefit of the whole population; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen and to our State secretary of the grange."

JOHN RICHARDSON,
Master.
MURIEL SMITH,
Secretary.

POWELL BUTTE GRANGE, No. 629,
Powell Butte, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Powell Butte Grange assembled in regular session April 1, 1955.

It was discussed and voted on in favor of S. 1333 and urge immediate action on this legislation.

Very truly yours,
NICK RACHOR,
Master.
HELEN SIMMONS,
Secretary.

MARYSVILLE, WASH.

Whereas after a careful study of both sides of the question of 1 high dam at Hells Canyon, or 3 low dams, on the Snake River, as

the arguments appeared in the daily press; and

Whereas we have in mind the most benefit to the most people, and after due consideration of both sides of the question we are convinced that it would not be to the best interest of the majority of the people living in the States of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington to build three low dams on the Snake River: Therefore be it

Resolved by Kellogg Marsh Grange, No. 136, in session the 19th day of March 1955, That we instruct and urge our Senators and Congressmen to work for a high dam on the Snake River at Hells Canyon.

GERTRUDE BRITSCH,
Master.
A. G. ZIEBEL,
Secretary.
C. A. BRITSCH,
R. C. FRANKIE,
Resolution Committee.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
MOUNT HOOD LODGE, NO. 1005,
Portland, Oreg., April 8, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is the wish of the membership of Mount Hood Lodge, No. 1005, International Association of Machinists, to be placed on record as endorsing and supporting Senate bill 1333.

It is our belief, and history has proven, that Federal contract and operation of such projects in the Columbia River Basin are most desirable.

With sincere approval of your past efforts on behalf of this bill and best wishes for future success, I remain,

Very truly yours,
RALPH F. KAUFMAN,
Financial Secretary.

HOQUIAM, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of Humptulips Valley National Farmers Union, Local 441, wish to offer you our thanks for leading out in the fight supporting a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon. We are in hearty accord with any effort to prevent this "giveaway" of public resources.

Yours for more job opportunities and a better America through Federal power.

Sincerely yours,
HUMPTULIPS VALLEY NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 441,
ELSIE TUFFREE.

COQUILLE, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bandon Grange, No. 702, Bandon, Oreg., voted 100 percent in favor of Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

LEANDER PANTER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION AT 13TH ANNUAL MEETING, FEBRUARY 17, 1955

Whereas long-established Federal power policy, embraced in the basic resource laws of the land for over 50 years calls for the full development of the peoples resources; and

Whereas the full development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin requires the construction of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the rural electric systems strongly endorse the Morse-Neuberger-Pfost bill authorizing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the authorization of Hells Canyon Dam at this session of the Congress and the appropriation of adequate funds to get construction underway immediately; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the campaign of the Idaho Power Co. to seize control of the middle Snake River in order that it may construct 3 small dams which would result in the waste of approximately half the power potential of that area.

FORT THOMAS VETERANS HOSPITAL, KENTUCKY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, resolutions adopted by the Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion Department of Kentucky, Covington; the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion Department of Kentucky, Newport; the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, Newport, Ky.; and the South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, Newport, Ky.; relative to the status of Fort Thomas Veterans' Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our membership is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., to be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory an inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veteran Administration hospitals, and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the organization, and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by the South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, Newport, Ky.

CHARLES J. GOETZ,
President.

Attest:

WILBUR SCHOO,
Secretary.

Whereas the American Legion is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veteran Administration Hospitals, and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the American Legion; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the central office of the Veterans' Administration be requested to concur with the recommendations as made by Mr. W. G. Stephens, manager of the Veterans Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., as stated in his letter of March 7, 1955, file 5178–M, which is made part of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, March 22, 1955, Covington, Ky.

STANLEY KANIENBERG,
Commander.

Attest:

FOSTER RAUCH,
Adjutant.

Whereas Jas. Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., to be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the Jas. Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans' Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Le-

gion, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas "giveaway" program.

Passed unanimously by the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, in regular session assembled on Thursday, March 31, 1955, at Newport, Ky.

GEO. A. MASON,
Commander.

Attest:

LOUIS L. HOLLOWELL,
Adjutant.

Whereas our membership is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., to be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the organization; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Clifton Third Alarm Associates do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, 203 Main Avenue, Newport, Ky.

EARL ANDERSON,
Commander.

Attest:

EUGENE GIANCOLA,
Adjutant.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE FROM 21 TO 18 YEARS—RESOLUTION OF MARINETTE COUNTY (WIS.) YOUTH COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear from the Marinette County Youth Council in my State on the issue of granting the vote for 18-year-olds.

I personally have long felt that these young men and women should be given the opportunity to cast their ballot; obviously, maturity is not simply a matter of chronological age. And certainly, since young people are considered old enough to fight, they should be regarded as old enough to vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and thereafter be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

MARINETTE COUNTY YOUTH COUNCIL,
Marinette, Wis.

(NOTE.—This is a copy of a resolution passed by the delegates to the Marinette-Oconto County Youth Conference, Saturday, March 12, 1955.)

Whereas as a result of a poll taken throughout the State, by the Wisconsin Youth Organization, it has been shown that the youth of Wisconsin are overwhelmingly in favor of legislation designed to lower the legal age required to vote from 21 to 18; and

Whereas it has been noted that President Eisenhower is in favor of legislation which would allow 18-year-olds to vote; and

Whereas it has been pointed out that there are about 5 million citizens, between the ages of 18 and 21, paying either direct or indirect taxes; and

Whereas we feel that this is an example of taxation without representation, an issue which the American Revolution was fought over; and

Whereas there are about 1,500,000 people between the ages of 18 and 21 that are married and have set up housekeeping; and

Whereas most of the young men between the ages of 18 and 21 are expected to enter military service to fight for their country, but still can't help in electing its leaders; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States clearly states that no person who is a citizen shall be denied the right to vote because of race, color, creed, sex, or previous condition of servitude; and

Whereas we feel that, since the majority of those between the ages of 18 and 21 must bear the responsibilities of a citizen, that they should not be kept from the rights of a citizen, as defined in the Constitution; and

Whereas bills, designed to lower the voting age, have been introduced in both the State legislature and the Congress;

Resolved, That the Conference of Marinette and Oconto County Youth urges the leaders of State and National Government to get behind the legislation which would lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 33. A resolution for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission; with amendments (Rept. No. 137).

NELLE FUHR BECKLEY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Nelle Fuhr Beckley. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 88) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nelle Fuhr Beckley, widow of Harold R. Beckley, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF 57TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution to print the 57th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1954, as a Senate document. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 89) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the 57th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1954, be printed as a Senate document.

NELLE C. KOEN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Nelle C. Koen. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 90) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nelle C. Koen, widow of Frank L. Koen, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 9 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 13, 84TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our

Capitol." I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), submitted by Mr. CLEMENTS on April 1, 1955, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol," of which 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 200,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by communistic-controlled authorities; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa;

S. 1655. A bill for the relief of Nicola Shawki Salameh; and

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Ana DeMoura Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1657. A bill to authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities; to provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to certain other Federal property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1658. A bill to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory bird hunting stamps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1660. A bill for the relief of Fidel A. Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1661. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure payment of the full face value of national service life insurance policies on which payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 1662. A bill for the relief of Herminio DePalma Inacio;

S. 1663. A bill for the relief of Antonio dos Santos Casqueira; and

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1665. A bill for the relief of Ronny Toochinsky Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1666. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1667. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 1668. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Dr. Milan Gavrilovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1670. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tanash H. Atoynatan and his wife, Eleni Atoynatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Father Evencio Moreno Villar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Bruno Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (by request):

S. 1673. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Akers; and

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of Lawrence A. Woolhether; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of Dwight S. Sharer; and

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Antonio Domenico Narciso Biancho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WITH RESPECT TO PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, to be printed and lie on the table, a bill to which I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion, the bill requires very prompt action by the Senate. At the present time a number of Americans are held as prisoners of war by the Chinese Communists. For the first time they will be required to pay income taxes if this measure is not enacted. I shall not ask for its immediate consideration, because this matter was called to my attention only yesterday afternoon, by the wife of one of the prisoners of war. I have had this measure prepared, and I should like very much to discuss it with the majority leader and with the chairman of the Finance Committee, as I have already done with representatives of the executive departments, including the Treasury Department and the Defense Department. The bill is very short, and I wish it have it read, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the bill read; and I shall be delighted to discuss it or any other bill the Senator from California may care to discuss with me at any time at his convenience.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and will lie on the table.

The bill (S. 1653) for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by communistic controlled authorities, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 1653 which I have introduced may be read for the information of the Senate. It is my hope that the House, where a companion measure is being introduced by Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, will be in a position promptly to act on the matter, because of the time element involved. I wish to have the proposed legislation printed and to lie upon the table. It is my intention, at the earliest opportunity, if there is some other revenue bill which the Senate Finance Committee should report to the Senate, to add my measure as an amendment, in the event that there is no legislation dealing with the subject at an earlier date, because I feel that it is extremely important.

Mr. President, may the bill be read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the Senate has given its consent to having the bill lie on the table?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the bill being read at this time and to having it lie on the table. I think the statement the Senator has made will permit early action in the event the House acts. I wish to assure the Senator that I shall cooperate in seeing that the matter is brought to the attention of the appropriate committee and of the Senate.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's understanding of our situation today. There is certainly no desire to prevent the bill from being read to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that. The Senator has always extended every courtesy. I have many times had an opportunity to remark to Members on this side of the aisle and to persons outside the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Texas has always been most courteous regarding any of the requests we have made, and we have tried not to make unreasonable requests.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding after subsections (a) and (b) a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) Gross income does not include compensation for active service received by any member of the Armed Forces of the United States for any period during which he was held against his will in an area controlled by a Communist government authority even though such area does not constitute a combat zone within the meaning of this section."

Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is further amended by renumbering subsection (c) to read subsection (d).

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that there might be a brief explanation of the situation, section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 reads, in part, as follows:

(a) Enlisted personnel: Gross income does not include compensation received for active service as a member below the grade of commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such member—

(1) served in a combat zone during an induction period.

Subsection (b) reads, in part, as follows:

(b) Commissioned officers: Gross income does not include so much of the compensation as does not exceed $200 received for active service as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such officer—

(1) served in a combat zone during an induction period.

Subsection (c) reads, in part, as follows:

(c) Definitions: For purposes of this section—

* * * * *

(2) the term "combat zone" means any area which the President of the United States by Executive order designates, for purposes of this section or corresponding provisions of prior income-tax laws, as an area in which Armed Forces of the United States are or have (after June 24, 1950) engaged in combat.

(3) service is performed in a combat zone only if performed on or after the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the commencing of combatant activities in such zone, and on or before the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of the combatant activities in such zone; except that June 25, 1950, shall be considered the date of the commencing of combatant activities in the combat zone designated in Executive Order 10195.

Under the Executive order of January 1, 1955, the combat operations in Korea were terminated as of January 31, 1955; and there is no desire to recreate the previous situation through the proposed legislation. But had the prisoners of war been released under the terms of the armistice agreement, this situation would not have arisen. Nevertheless, the fact is that I received word yesterday from the wife of one of the prisoners who are being held by the Chinese Communists that because of the provision in the statute, the prisoners of war are being compelled, for the first time, to pay an income tax. Of course, they are being held against their will.

It appears to me that there is no way in which the executive branch of the Government can, by Executive order, modify the law. In other words, it would be necessary for the executive branch to recreate a combat zone to enable everyone concerned, including those serving in Korea today, to receive an exemption, or a change will have to be made in the law.

I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is chairman of the Committee on Finance; with the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; and also with some of the Members of the House; and I am very hopeful that, because of the imminence of the income-tax deadline of April 15, some way may be found in the House to expedite consideration of the proposed legislation. Then, when it comes to the Senate, we might promptly take up the matter. I intend to be in touch with the distinguished majority leader, to expedite action on the bill, as I have indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it appears that the bill is meritorious. However, the Senate has no authority to originate tax legislation, even with a deadline confronting us. I think the proper course is being followed, namely, to have the bill introduced in the House. While it is somewhat unusual to give consent to have a bill lie on the table, perhaps, with the agreement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and also the ranking minority member, the bill might be considered by the Senate without following the usual formalities, in view of the merits of the measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

PROPOSED FEDERAL PROPERTY TAX AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to strengthen the independence and integrity of local governments by restoring to them a part of the revenues they have lost because of Federal acquisition of real estate and other property. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared describing the bill be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1657) to authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities; to provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to certain other Federal property; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Property Tax Authorization Act of 1955."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States hereafter to make such tax payments and contributions in lieu of taxes on account of such property as may be fair and equitable to compensate the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities for tax revenue of which they are deprived by reason of the ownership or control by the Federal Government of such property within the States.

(b) In enacting this act it is the purpose of the Congress to remove, so far as practicable, inequities existing between taxpayers of State and local governments, on the one hand, and taxpayers of the Federal Government, on the other hand, in the distribution of governmental costs incident to property owned or used by the Federal Government.

(c) In consideration for the payments authorized by this act, the Congress expects that the several State governments, and all political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, when so requested, will make all public services normally provided by them available to and with respect to the Federal Government, its property, and its officers and employees, upon the same terms and conditions as such services are made available to or with respect to other property and individuals.

(d) The Congress reserves the right to amend, modify, or repeal the provisions of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, office, or independent establishment in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and any corporation now or hereafter subject to the provisions of title I of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 846);

(b) The term "Federal property" means any property the legal title to which is held by the United States or any Federal agency;

(c) The term "controlling agency," when used in relation to any Federal property, means the Federal agency which is charged with the duty of administering such property;

(d) The term "Board" means the Federal Tax Payments Board established by this act;

(e) The term "State" means any State of the United States;

(f) The term "State tax authority" means any State, and any county, city, municipality, tax district, or other political subdivision or public entity thereof having authority under the law of such State to levy and collect within its territorial jurisdiction any tax or special assessment;

(g) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, association composed of individuals, or private corporation;

(h) The term "tax" means any tax of general application levied according to value by any State tax authority upon property situated within its territorial jurisdiction, but does not include (1) any tax levied upon the manufacture, purchase, sale, transfer, or use of any property, or (2) any tax levied or fee imposed for the procurement of any license, permit, or other authorization to engage in any form of activity;

(i) The term "tax year," when used in relation to any tax, means a period of 1 year, beginning with (1) the first date on which liability for the payment thereof is established under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax, or (2) if no such date is ascertainable under such law, the first day of the assessment period prescribed under such law for such tax;

(j) The term "taxable person," when used in relation to the payment of any tax, means any person who is the owner of any property and who is not, by reason of his status or the use made of such property, exempt from obligation to pay such tax;

(k) The term "special assessment" means any levy, other than a tax, imposed by any State tax authority directly upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction to defray the cost of any public improvement, and equitably apportioned according to the benefit conferred by such improvement upon such property;

(l) The term "property" means any real property or tangible personal property;

(m) The term "real property," when used in relation to any tax or special assessment,

means any interest in land, and any improvement thereon if such improvement constitutes real property under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax or special assessment;

(n) The term "tangible personal property," when used in relation to any tax, means any physical object, other than real property, defined as tangible personal property by law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax, but does not include any coin, bullion, currency, credit, security, or chose in action;

(o) The term "industrial or commercial use," when used in relation to any Federal property, includes any use made of such property for (1) the mining, manufacturing, fabrication, or repair of any article or commodity, (2) the generation of electrical energy, (3) the transportation of individuals or property, (4) the storage of property, and (5) the sale or leasing of commodities or services;

(p) The term "governmental use," when used in relation to any Federal property, means any use made of such property other than (1) an industrial or commercial use, or (2) use for the housing of individuals for which rent is received; and

(q) The term "local governmental use," when used in relation to any Federal property, means any governmental use made of such property for the purpose of rendering public service to or for persons residing within the vicinity of such property.

CONSENT TO TAXATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this act, all Federal property of the following classes situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority shall be subject to the assessment and collection of any tax imposed by such authority to the same extent and under the same conditions as other property of like class situated within such jurisdiction—

(1) any property legal title to which is held by a Federal agency to secure any Federal agency against loss in connection with any loan, contract of insurance, or guaranty; and

(2) any property legal title to which is held by any Federal agency but which has been leased, or sold under a conditional sale contract, to any taxable person.

(b) Tax payments authorized by subsection (a) with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the beginning of the tax year for which such tax is imposed. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made to each State tax authority for each fiscal year with respect to all Federal property (other than property subject to tax under sec. 2) of the following classes situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority:

(1) Any property devoted to commercial or industrial use by any Federal agency or by any other person acting, directly or indirectly, for or on behalf of any Federal agency;

(2) Any property devoted to the housing of individuals for which rent is received; and

(3) Any property devoted primarily to any other use except a local governmental use.

(b) Subject to limitations contained in this act, the aggregate amount of the payments authorized by subsection (a) to be made to each State tax authority for each fiscal year shall be a sum equal to—

(1) the nominal Federal tax liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the taxes which would be payable to such authority during such year with respect to all property of the classes specified in subsection (a) if legal title to such property were held by a taxable person for that portion of the applicable tax year during which such title was held by one or more Federal agencies; reduced by

(2) the Federal credit against tax liability, which shall be the aggregate value of governmental services of kinds normally furnished by State tax authorities which, during such fiscal year, were furnished within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority by Federal agencies, computed upon the basis of the unit cost incurred by such authority in providing like services, or (in the absence of such data) the unit cost therefor incurred by comparable State tax authorities in the same vicinity; and increased by

(3) the Federal specific liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the expenditures incurred by such authority during such fiscal year in furnishing to or on behalf of all such Federal property services of kinds not customarily furnished by such authority to or on behalf of other properties of like class.

(c) No payment shall be made under this section to any State tax authority for any fiscal year with respect to any Federal property unless such authority—

(1) files with the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property a claim, in such form and containing such information as the Board shall prescribe, for payment under this section with respect to all Federal property subject to such payment which is controlled by such agency within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority;

(2) files with such claim an itemized statement of (A) the property with respect to which such claim is made; (B) the assessed valuation placed by such authority upon such property; (C) the nominal Federal tax liability claimed with respect to such property; (D) the tax rate or rates applied in computing the amount of the nominal Federal tax liability of such agency; (E) the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability accorded to such agency in computing the amount claimed from such agency under this section; and (F) the amount of any Federal specific liability included in such claim for payment;

(3) files with such claim a detailed statement of the procedural action which may be taken by such agency to obtain administrative review, or judicial review, or both, with respect to the nominal Federal tax liability of such agency with respect to any such property;

(4) for the purpose of determining the amount of the nominal Federal tax liability of such Federal agency under subsection (b), makes available to such agency all substantive and procedural rights, administrative and judicial, which would be available under law in effect within such authority in determining the valuation of such property, the rate of tax applicable thereto, and the amount of the tax which would be payable with respect thereto if such property were owned by a taxable person; and

(5) for such purpose treats such property in all respects in a manner at least as favorable as the treatment accorded to property of like owned by taxable persons.

(d) Each payment authorized by this section with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the beginning of the fiscal year for which such payment is due. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(e) Whenever any Federal agency and any State tax authority fail to agree with respect to any question concerning the identity of Federal property claimed to be subject to payments under this section, the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability or the amount of the Federal specific tax liability to be included in computing the amount of any payment to be made by such agency under this section to such authority with respect to any Federal property, application may be made by such agency or by such authority to the Board for the determination of such question.

(f) Whenever properties subject to payments under this section which are situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority are controlled by more than one Federal agency, and determination of the amount so payable by any such agency involves any question concerning the allocation among two or more such agencies of the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability or the amount of the Federal specific tax liability which shall be included in computing the aggregate amount of the payments to be made to such authority with respect to all such properties, such authority shall apply to the Board for the determination of such question.

EXCLUDED PROPERTIES

SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made under section 4 or section 5 to any State tax authority with respect to any Federal property—

(1) acquired by any Federal agency before September 8, 1939; or

(2) subject to taxation by such authority, or with respect to which any payment in lieu of taxes is authorized to be made to such authority, under any other provision of law.

(b) No such payment shall be made with respect to any Federal property which—

(1) if privately owned or controlled, would be exempt from tax because of the use to which it is devoted;

(2) is the subject of any revenue sharing arrangement, entered into under authority of Federal law, under which any portion of the revenue derived from its use or sale, or from any product of such property, is paid to such authority; or

(3) is devoted primarily to any local governmental use, including (without limitation) any courthouse; post office; property used for any purpose incidental to local postal operations; weather station or observation post; assay office; local irrigation or sanitation project; airport maintained and operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; or any plant, farm, station, laboratory, or other property devoted to any experimental, testing or research purpose rendered primarily to the local public.

(c) No such payment shall be made with respect to any—

(1) office building which is not devoted to any industrial or commercial use and is not included within any class of properties listed in section 4 (a);

(2) customs house;

(3) facility for coining money or printing currency;

(4) bullion depository;

(5) river or harbor improvement;

(6) prison, reformatory, detention farm, or disciplinary barracks;

(7) hospital, dispensary, clinic, or other medical facility;

(8) sanatorium, home for the aged, or facility providing domiciliary care;

(9) cemetery;

(10) aid to navigation administered by the United States Coast Guard;

(11) beacon or other aid to air navigation administered by the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(12) facility used in the performance by any Federal agency of any police, investigative, or regulatory function, except any such function performed incidental to the administration of property of any class listed in section 4 (a) or section 5 (a); or

(13) post, camp, station, fort, armory, airfield, proving ground, or other installation administered by any of the Armed Forces of the United States, except to the extent that any such installation may be devoted to any industrial or commercial use.

(d) No such payment shall be made with respect to any—

(1) stock of strategic or critical material or any agricultural commodity in the custody of any Federal agency; or

(2) other personal property unless such property is devoted to an industrial or commercial use.

LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the aggregate amount of the payments authorized by section 5 to be made for any fiscal year to any State tax authority by one or more Federal agencies with respect to all property of the classes described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 5 (a) exceeds the aggregate amount of the taxes levied by such authority upon all taxable property situated within its territorial jurisdiction which is not Federal property, any such Federal agency may apply to the Board for an order requiring a reduction in the amount so payable by such Federal agency. Upon the filing of such application, the Board shall give notice thereof to such authority and to each Federal agency subject to any such payment, and after hearing shall determine whether the payment of the aggregate amount payable by such agencies under section 5 would confer upon such authority unwarranted benefit contrary to the interest of taxpayers of the United States. If the Board determines that the payment of such aggregate amount would confer such unwarranted benefit, it shall prescribe (1) such lower aggregate amount as it shall determine to be fair and equitable, and (2) the portion thereof to be paid by each such Federal agency. The aggregate amount so prescribed shall be a sum not less than the aggregate amount of the taxes levied by such authority for the applicable tax year upon all taxable property situated within its territorial jurisdiction which is not Federal property. The portion thereof to be paid by each such Federal agency shall be a sum which has the same relationship to such aggregate amount as the assessed valuation of all property administered by such agency with respect to which such payment is made has to the total assessed valuation of all property administered by all Federal agencies with respect to which all such payments are made.

(b) Whenever any State tax authority fails to furnish to property administered by any Federal agency, or to any officer or employee thereof, or to the family of any such officer or employee, any service furnished by such authority to any other property or resident upon the same terms upon which such service is furnished to such other property or resident, and such agency has not expressly waived the furnishing of such service as unnecessary or undesirable, no payment shall be made under section 5 to such authority by any Federal agency for any tax year during which such failure occurs.

TRANSITIONAL PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 8. (a) In addition to the payments authorized by section 5, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made to each State tax authority, for each of the first 10 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this act, with respect to all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority which—

(1) is of any class listed in section 6 (c), but is not included within any class described in section 6 (b);

(2) was acquired by the United States or any Federal agency on or after the date which is 10 years before the date of enactment of this act; and

(3) is not subject to tax under section 2.

(b) The aggregate amount of the payments authorized by subsection (a) to be made with respect to such property to each State tax authority for each such fiscal year shall be a sum equal to the difference between the following two sums:

(1) The aggregate amount which would be payable with respect to such property for such year if such property were subject to payments in lieu of taxes under section 5; and

(2) A sum equal to the percentage of such aggregate amount which is specified for such fiscal year in the following tabulation:

1	0
2	10
3	20
4	30
5	40
6	50
7	60
8	70
9	80
10	90

(c) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 5 shall apply to payments made under this section to the same extent and with the same effect as if such payments were authorized to be made under section 5. The prohibition contained in section 7 (b) shall apply to payments made under this section.

CONSENT TO LEVY OF SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this act, all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority shall be subject to the levy and collection of any special assessment upon real property to the same extent and under the same conditions as other property of like class situated within such jurisdiction whenever such assessment is levied upon non-Federal as well as Federal property. No payment shall be made under this subsection unless such authority treats all Federal property subject to such payment in all respects in a manner at least as favorable as the treatment accorded to property of like kind owned by taxable persons.

(b) Payment of any portion of any special assessment authorized by subsection (a) with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the time such portion becomes due and payable under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such special assessment. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

FEDERAL TAX PAYMENTS BOARD

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Tax Payments Board, which shall be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Of the original members, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, 1 for a term of 2 years, and 1 for a term of 3 years. Succeeding members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, after notice and hearing, for malfeasance in office, neglect of duty, or incompetence, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members shall at all times constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $14,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(d) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a chief clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(e) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 11. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board—

(1) to prescribe such uniform rules, regulations, and forms as may be required for the submission by State tax authorities of claims for payments authorized by this act;

(2) to promulgate such uniform rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the making by Federal agencies of the payments authorized by this act and for the determination of the amounts thereof;

(3) to consult, at least once in each calendar year, with the advisory committee established under section 12 of this act with respect to problems arising in the administration of this act;

(4) upon application by any State tax authority or any Federal agency, to hear and determine any question of fact or law concerning (A) the liability of any Federal agency to make payment under this act, (B) the identity of Federal property subject to any payment under this act, or (C) the amount of any such liability, except that no such question shall be heard or determined by the Board until the parties to such controversy have exhausted administrative and judicial remedies available to them under law in effect within the jurisdiction of the State tax authority concerned for the determination of any question concerning the nominal Federal tax liability with respect to any property as to which such application is made; and

(5) to transmit to the President and to the Congress, as soon as may be practicable after the end of each calendar year, a written report containing a full and complete statement of its activities during such year including—

(A) the names, salaries, and duties of employees of the Board;

(B) an account of the moneys disbursed by the Board;

(C) a description of each proceeding heard or determined by, or pending before, the Board; and

(D) such recommendations for legislation as the Board may consider advisable with respect to the administration of this act.

(b) Upon the filing of any application for any determination under this act, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may summon and join as a party to such proceeding any Federal agency or State tax authority found to be a necessary party to the determination sought; hold hearings; administer oaths and affirmations; examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States; and require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of

documentary evidence deemed to be relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of any Federal agency or State tax authority which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena, the Board may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process issued to any individual or person may be served in any judicial district in which such individual or person is an inhabitant or is found.

(c) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel; to offer oral or documentary evidence; to submit rebuttal evidence; and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

(d) Each determination made by the Board under this section shall be final and conclusive upon all State tax authorities and Federal agencies who were parties to the proceeding in which such determination is made, and shall not be questioned by any court or by any accounting officer of the Government.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 12. (a) The President shall establish an advisory committee on Federal tax payments composed of 12 members appointed by the President, of whom six shall be officers or employees of Federal agencies, three shall be officers or employees of State governments, and three shall be officers or employees of other State tax authorities. One member shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to—

(1) study the administration of this act and problems arising in connection therewith;

(2) consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems; and

(3) transmit to the President from time to time a report containing a summary of the results of its studies, together with its recommendations for administrative or legislative changes which it may consider necessary or desirable for the efficient, economical, and equitable administration of this act.

(c) Members of the committee who are officers or employees of any Federal agency shall receive no additional compensation for service rendered under this act. Other members may receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day of service, as the President shall prescribe. All members shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties under this section. All funds disbursed under this section shall be disbursed by the chief clerk of the Board from funds appropriated to the Board.

MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Each Federal agency which is the controlling agency for any Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority which is claimed by such authority to be subject to any payment under this act shall furnish to such authority, upon request made in writing by the appropriate officer thereof, such information concerning such property as may be lawfully required with regard to property of like kind owned by taxable persons within such jurisdiction.

(b) The failure of any Federal agency to make, or to make timely payment of, any payment authorized by this act shall not subject—

(1) any Federal agency, or any person who is a purchaser of any property from any Federal agency, to the payment of any penalty or penalty interest, or to any payment in lieu of any penalty or penalty interest; or

(2) any Federal property to any lien, attachment, foreclosure, or other legal proceeding not specifically authorized by this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each Federal agency such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under this Act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any Federal agency or any State tax authority, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this act, and the application of such provision to other Federal agencies and State tax authorities, shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. Sections 4, 5, 8, and 9 of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1955. All other provisions of this act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am introducing in the Senate today a bill intended to strengthen the independence and integrity of local governments by restoring to them a part of the revenues they have lost because of Federal acquisition of real estate and other property. The bill would authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities and provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to other Federal property.

In recent years, the States and local communities have become increasingly concerned because their revenues are being undermined by the Federal Government. The increasing acquisition of various types of property by Federal agencies has removed billions of dollars of property from the tax rolls of the States and towns and cities throughout the country. This trend has threatened the integrity and independence of local governments, and should be halted at once.

Many communities throughout the Nation, a number of them in my own State, have been adversely affected. But perhaps the most glaring example of the impact upon a community when the Federal Government acquires an industrial plant and removes it from the tax rolls is in Stratford, Conn. In Stratford is located Air Force Plant No. 43, operated for the Government by the Avco Manufacturing Co. The current value of the installation, as estimated by town officials, is more than half the amount of the entire grand list of taxable property now totaling $126 million. Until a recent revaluation, the appraised value of the plant exceeded that of all other properties in the town combined, $83 million as against $67 million. The influx of workingmen needed to man the machines, and their families, resulted in a sharp increase in population. Stratford was forced to build more schools, and provide more police and fire protection and other services. Local taxpayers had to dig into their pockets to pay the bills while Uncle Sam took what amounts substantially to a "free ride."

Federal ownership of land and buildings is by no means the only problem involved. Many procurement contracts negotiated by the various armed services with private contractors contain provisions under which the Government, upon making any partial payment, takes title to parts, materials, inventories, work in progress and tools, acquired or produced by the contractor for the performance of the contract. Both the Government and the contractors claim that this legal technicality makes such property tax free.

Connecticut industrial centers, together with others throughout the Nation which are contributing to the defense effort, have lost tax revenues as a result of this bit of legal legerdemain. Congress should authorize payments in lieu of taxes on such property, and the bill would so provide.

The plight of Stratford and the hardship suffered by other Connecticut communities to a lesser degree as a result of the tax-exempt status of federally owned defense production plants and other facilities was called to my attention during the 83d Congress. Because I felt strongly that an injustice was being done to the municipalities in my State and throughout the Nation, I became deeply interested in legislative attempts for remedial action. Upon consulting the late Senator Robert A. Taft, I found that he was greatly concerned with this problem. As a result of his initiative and the interest of a number of other Senators, legislation was drafted which was intended to provide substantial relief to communities which had lost tax revenues as the result of the Federal acquisition of defense-production facilities following the outbreak of the war in Korea. S. 2473, based on the draft prepared for Senator Taft, was introduced in the 83d Congress by the then majority leader, Senator Knowland, with Senators Taft, Ferguson, Potter, and myself as cosponsors. An identical bill, now numbered S. 826, has been introduced in the present session by Senator BENDER.

Although hearings were held in both sessions of the 83d Congress on S. 2473, no legislative action was taken because the creation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations brought under review the whole broad problem of reaching a fair distribution of tax revenues among all levels of Government. S. 2473, together with related bills, was referred to that Commission for consideration in its study. Mr. Arthur E. B. Tanner, former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Connecticut General Assembly, was a member of the Commission, and headed a task force assigned to consider the question of Federal consent to taxation or grants in lieu of taxes. It is my understanding that the full Commission is now reviewing the problem, and that its recommendations to the Congress are scheduled to be made by June 1.

Although the Commission's recommendations undoubtedly will be of great value to the Congress, I am strongly convinced that we should begin focusing our attention upon this problem at once, recognize its seriousness, and consider all possible solutions. For that reason, I am introducing this bill, which, while similar in some respects to S. 2473, recognizes that equitable treatment of the States and local governments re-

quires Federal payment of taxes or grants in lieu of taxes on other property in addition to that acquired as a result of the Korean war.

Many difficult problems are involved in drafting legislation which will result in fair treatment of the States and municipalities while safeguarding legitimate Federal interests and avoiding the imposition of too great a burden on the Federal Treasury. I do not offer this bill as the final answer, but believe it will provide a sound basis from which to start. It is my hope that the bill will be in harmony with the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. While the Commission's report is being awaited, a savings in time would be accomplished if this bill and related measures were given intensive study by the staffs of the Committee on Government Operations and the appropriate governmental agencies. I hope that such studies will be started at once.

DESIGNATION OF MAY 11, 1955, AS COLONEL-COMMANDANT MICHAEL KOVATS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating May 11, 1955, as Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day.

Colonel Kovats was a distinguished officer of Hungarian birth who served as Colonel-Commandant of the Pulaski Legion, the cavalry of George Washington's army in the War of the Revolution. He was mortally wounded on May 11, 1779, in a heroic charge against the British.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from Emil Lengyel's book, "Americans from Hungary," which describes Colonel Kovats' career and his services to America be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The excerpt presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

George Washington did not sleep in every bed, but every nation likes to boast of a general attached to George Washington's staff. Few had the luck to produce a Marquis de Lafayette, or a Count Pulaski. But there was a Hungarian officer who played a distinguished part in Washington's army. His elusive fame had fascinated workers in the field of Hungarian Americana, and one of them, a judge in the Budapest Patent Office, Aladár Póka-Pivny, spent years in tracking down incidents in his hero's life.

The name of this officer was Michael Kovats, or de Kovats, or Kowatch, Kovach, Kowacz, Cowatch. He, himself, preferred to sign his name as "Kovats." The common spelling in today's Hungary is Kovács, meaning Smith.

Michael Kovats was born at Karczag-Ujszálás, now Karczag, on the Hungarian plains, of Calvinist stock. The year was 1724. Military tradition was strong in the region peopled largely by descendants of Cuman warriors who had terrorized eastern Europe centuries before. Young Kovats joined the huszárs, mounted troops, and had an adventurous life in Europe. One luckless day, however, he found himself in the Hapsburg capital, Vienna, an unemployed hero. A disloyal servant had stolen his mounts and Kovats set out to catch him. Hot on the servant's trail, he reached Bohemia's Prague, and thence proceeded northward.

Frederick the Great was then Prussia's ruler, warring against a large part of the world. In great need of soldiers, he was not very scrupulous as to how he got them. No sooner was Kovats inside Prussia than he was impressed into the Prussian Army by the King's men, in spite of the fact that he was a foreign subject. This type of service was, evidently, to the liking of our Hungarian, however; he fought for Frederick for 16 years, won his promotion as a captain, and had command of a body of men known as Kovats'sches Corps. He was wounded several times. One of Frederick's enemies was Queen Maria Theresa of Hungary, Kovats' own sovereign. During an engagement the Hungarian huszár was captured by the troops of the Queen. Fighting one's own country today would be high treason, but in those days the dividing lines were not so sharp, and Captain Kovats talked himself out of trouble. Again unemployed, and finding nothing better to do, he returned to his native Hungary. But word had reached him about the fight of the American colonists for independence and he decided to try his luck overseas. By way of Venice and Genoa, he reached Bordeaux and there he offered his services to America in a letter to Benjamin Franklin in Paris.

Franklin was one of the three commissioners the Continental Congress had dispatched to France to negotiate a treaty of alliance, amity and commerce with the French Government, and to obtain supplies, military and naval assistance. His fellow commissioner, Silas Deane, had concluded a contract with the far-famed champion of Polish liberty, Count Casimir Pulaski, to fight for the freedom of America. Kovats, therefore, approached the right people. However, we have no record of any answer from any of the commissioners.

If America did not want him, that did not mean that he did not want America. He set out for himself, arrived in America, sought and obtained an interview with Pulaski, who must have found him to his liking. The Count wrote to Washington on behalf of Kovats on January 9, 1778, that the new cavalry formations which it was contemplated to set up "must be exercised and taught the service from colonel to private. Colonel Kovats is a man of great merit and deserves the charge of master of exercises; he is an officer worthy of research and exclusive of a thorough knowledge of his abilities I request his being employed by your Excellency. I can recommend him and assure your Excellency will never have reason to repent your confidence in him, if this proposal should be agreeable to your Excellency. The sooner I am informed the better, as he will be of infinite service to the cavalry this winter in quarters."

No reply was forthcoming from Washington's headquarters. A few weeks later the Count wrote again, this time from Trenton, "about the commission for Colonel Kovats with authority to command a detachment as a colonel." Still no reply, and he dispatched another letter to George Washington in mid-March: "I would propose for my subaltern, an experienced officer, by name Kovats, formerly partisan in Prussian service."

A few days later the authorization did come for the formation of the Pulaski Legion, 68-horse and 200-foot, and in mid-April Colonel Kovats was appointed Colonel-Commandant of the Pulaski Legion. By that time word had got around about the Hungarian ex-huszár and we hear him described as "that famous Colonel Kovatz," and "the well-known Kovats, Prussian officer in the last war."

Pulaski's Legion was ordered to Sussex Court House, then to Cale's Fort, where it wintered, defending New Jersey against the Indians. In February 1779 it received orders to join Gen. Benjamin Lincoln in South Carolina, and reached Charlestown (now Charleston) in May. The town was defended by Gen. William Moultrie. His plight was so hopeless that civilian authorities urged him to surrender. At that strategic moment the Pulaski Legion arrived. While not a large force, the commander knew how to make it appear impressive. The British forces were commanded by Gen. Augustine Prevost.

On May 11, Pulaski and Kovats attacked General Prevost with 120 men, and met an overwhelming force. In the very first onslaught, Kovats was mortally wounded. "The British buried him where he fell," Dr. Joseph Johnson, Charleston physician, recorded in his Traditions and Reminiscences "on the west side of the road, in the land now owned and enclosed by John Margart, at the corner of Huger Street. He was an officer of great merit," the physician added, "a Hungarian by birth."

The Pulaski Legion was the "best cavalry the rebels ever had," wrote Maj. F. Skelly, brigade major of the English forces at Charleston.

The commander of the Legion, Count Pulaski, met his death at the siege of Savannah, on October 9 of the same year. These losses so weakened the Legion that it was disbanded. Its colors were preserved in the Maryland Historical Society at Baltimore.

"The news of Kovats' death seems to have reached Hungary very quickly, for a report dated September 28, 1779, from the Buda Fortress Command to the Hungarian General Headquarters speaks of his wife as a widow. She herself, unable to visit her gallant husband's grave, erected a small memorial chapel to his memory near the church of Szinne. There it stands to this day, surrounded by century-old lime trees, recalling the memory of the Hungarian officer of hussars who died in action for the liberty of the United States of America."

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY CERTAIN EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in the summer of 1945—with the explosion of the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima, Japan—the world entered the atomic age.

Man's conquest of the atom was a momentous development, opening doors to long-dreamed-of opportunities in the industrial and medical fields.

But the development of the atom, like the lifting of the lid on Pandora's box, brought with it a number of terrible fears. Man was faced with the fact that he had developed the means to destroy in a day the civilization it had taken centuries of effort to build.

That fear was intensified by the development of atomic weapons by the Soviet Union. That development made it necessary for us to concentrate most of

our efforts on the building of bigger and better nuclear weapons of destruction.

Nearly 10 years have passed since the race for atomic superiority between the Western and Communist worlds began. Perhaps hundreds of thermonuclear devices have been exploded in that time by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. With each passing year the explosions become larger and the number of tests more frequent. Soon more nations will be joining in the race for atomic and hydrogen weapons.

It is not pleasant to think of the possible consequences which the development of nuclear weapons might have on our civilization. In the case of war, we know their use would be suicidal, both for us and for the Soviet Union.

But what about peacetime? What about the continued effects of testing, testing, and more testing all around the globe?

In recent weeks many reputable scientists have sounded a note of alarm, a warning that continued testing of nuclear weapons might have lasting genetic effects on all living things on this earth, including man. Scientific associations are taking a keen interest in this problem, fully aware of the dreadful possibilities in which further delay could result. Not long ago the highly respected National Academy of Sciences said it was undertaking a study of the question.

It is scientific fact that radioactive particles—some more dangerous than others—are released by thermonuclear explosions. Carried by the winds into the atmosphere, these particles could infect thousands of square miles of earth near the explosion. Others are carried off all around the globe in a matter of days. They could infect plants and animals—the things we eat—as well as man himself.

Radioactive particles have no respect for boundaries or national sovereignty. They could infect the American as well as the Russian, the Japanese, the South Sea Islander, and even the peoples living above the Arctic Circle.

It is not enough that a scientific association in this or some other country directs its attention to this problem. This is a matter of the greatest importance to peoples all over the world. It is a matter which the United Nations alone is capable of studying in such a way as to insure the greatest possible participation and interest. For any action which is taken to insure that injury is not done must be taken by all the nations of the world, particularly those with the capability of producing nuclear devices.

In raising this question today I do not mean to be an alarmist. There is still no known evidence that harm has been done by the nuclear explosions which have been set off to date. But the possibility that harm could be done is a very real one. We must not delay until it is too late. For once the damage has been done, it will be difficult indeed to correct it.

It is my hope that the United Nations may come up with some sound determinations on this problem. I hope that it will be possible for the Soviet Union to offer genuine cooperation in working toward an answer to this question which is bigger by far than any issue presently before the world. Before we can do anything about controlling the atom, we must all be aware of the full consequences of not controlling it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which would put the Congress on record as favoring United States participation in a scientific commission to look into this grave problem under the auspices of the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may lie on the table until April 20 to afford other Senators, who may so desire, an opportunity to cosponsor it.

I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution and a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955, entitled "How Bad Is Radiation?" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Maine; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) submitted by Mr. PAYNE, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas various nations are setting off an increasing number of nuclear explosions; and

Whereas the number of such explosions is more likely to increase than decrease in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas it has been established that the redioactivity released as a result of such explosions can have serious deleterious effects, from an immediate and long-range standpoint, on human beings and other living organisms, and

Whereas existing knowledge of the effects of such explosions on living organisms is very incomplete: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress requests the President to instruct our chief delegate to the United Nations to take whatever steps may be necessary to propose and urge the formation of an international scientific commission within the United Nations to study and determine the effects on living organisms of radioactivity released by nuclear explosions.

The editorial presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

HOW BAD IS RADIATION?

The National Academy of Sciences has undertaken a highly important task in studying the effects of atomic radiation on living organisms. If the mounting concern about radioactivity is justified, the public ought to know it; and if the apprehensions are unwarranted, the best way to dispel them is with facts. The field for exploration is a vast one and the extent of present-day knowledge about the effects of radioactivity is appallingly small. No other group, unless possibly an international scientific commission, assembled by the United Nations, could speak with the standing and authority of the National Academy of Sciences.

Perhaps there can be no clearcut conclusions. The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, generally has been inclined to pooh-pooh fears about present radioactivity from nuclear weapons tests on the basis of its own extensive studies. But the Commission's pronouncements have been carefully qualified, and they serve to emphasize that there is much that is not known about the byproducts of nuclear explosions—whether in tests or in actual warfare. A number of reputable scientists here and abroad are seriously disturbed about the possible long-range genetic effects even of further tests. Few adjustments are so delicate, of course, as those that determine human inheritance. Whether or not the study can answer all questions, it should throw new light on the areas of danger.

Another benefit from the study may be the evolution of new criteria for civil defense planning. The known facts about the radioactive fallout from new-type hydrogen-uranium weapons are alarming enough, but the Atomic Energy Commission has seemed to indicate that persons in bombed areas can minimize the effects by taking proper shelter and decontamination precautions. Is there a possibility, however, that some of the fine radioactive particles would remain in the air so that they would be inhaled in breathing? If so, then perhaps the plans for shelters that protect against blast and direct radioactivity will need revising.

There is no area of public policy in which so little firm information is available. Recent Gallup polls have shown a surprisingly uncritical public resignation to the use of hydrogen bombs—an example of the danger in making policy decisions on the basis of expressions of opinion about questions upon which the public has little information. The crying need is for facts, and since so few seem to be emanating from the Government it is the more important to have an authoritative study.

INVENTORY REPORT ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 32)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations on Tuesday, April 12, it was recommended that a committee print of a newly compiled inventory of Federal Real Property, prepared by the General Services Administration at the request of the committee, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations. I present the committee print for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I also ask that the correspondence relating to the report, together with a press release and fact sheet on the inventory, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence, press release, and fact sheet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: We are pleased to submit the attached report covering the inventory of Federal real property in the continental United States as of December 31, 1953.

This report has been prepared pursuant to the committee's request in report No. 237, dated May 12, 1953 covering the first independent offices appropriations bill, 1954.

This has been no small task. The report consolidates 11,493 reports on individual Federal installations with a total cost of $30.2 billion, with no value on land in the public domain.

We believe the effort well worthwhile. It gives the Government an inventory which

can be maintained on a current basis. It will be useful in many ways, and, will help the Government attain the objectives set forth on page 2 of the report—not the least of which is to facilitate disposal of surplus property and thereby increase revenues and decrease expenditures.

Every effort has been made to achieve maximum accuracy. However, it would be improper to assume that a report of this magnitude—particularly the first one—contains no discrepancies. Additional work is needed to refine the data and the records of the holding agencies from which the data is obtained.

Pursuant to the committee's request, GSA, in cooperation with the General Accounting Office, is working on the development of a reporting system which will maintain the inventory on a current basis.

The report could not have been prepared without the splendid cooperation of all participating agencies. Submission of the report at this time would not have been possible without the helpful cooperation of the Bureau of the Census.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Earl Cooper, of the committee's staff, whose counsel and assistance has been invaluable.

Cordially yours,

E. F. MANSURE,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 25, 1955.

Hon. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator of General Services,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: The committee is in receipt of the Report on Federal Real Property in the United States as of December 31, 1953, prepared by your Administration pursuant to the committee's request.

Examination of the report reveals much information of value in all phases of the operation of this huge business we call the Federal Government. The extent of the usefulness of the inventory is indicated in the major objectives listed to—

(a) Facilitate disposal of surplus property and thereby increasing revenue to the Government, as well as decreasing maintenance and realty costs;

(b) Restore property to private ownership and thus increase the opportunity for its productive use, especially as a source of employment;

(c) Return such properties to the tax rolls of State and local governments;

(d) Effect economies in acquisitions by purchase or lease and in construction and operation;

(e) Facilitate the preparation of budgets by individual agencies;

(f) Assist in the intelligent evaluation and appraisal of budgetary requests, and

(g) Achieve maximum control over and utilization of real property.

Now that the inventory has been compiled to this point, the committee requests that a second report be compiled as of June 30, 1955, to be issued as a Senate document in January 1956, and that the reporting procedures and compilations be continued as of the end of each fiscal year thereafter.

The summary report, with supporting charts and tables, is being issued as a Senate document and made available to all Federal agencies as well as to the public generally. We recommend that a set of the electric accounting machine detail data sheets be furnished to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and to the reporting agency, and that file and working copies of these sheets will be available also in your Administration for reference.

The committee also strongly urges that you, as Administrator of General Services, in conjunction with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, see to it that the inventory information is made available to each agency, as well as each part of an agency that may be concerned, with specific instructions as to the method of obtaining and the use to be made of the inventory information.

The committee believes that each agency of the Government should make good use of this inventory, in order to consider well if suitable space or facilities may be already available to the Government, before requesting to spend money in making further acquisitions. It would seem that resulting economies must certainly reward such vigilance.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN,
STYLES BRIDGES.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, announced today that General Services Administration has compiled an inventory of federally owned real property in the continental United States.

The inventory, prepared at the request of the committee, lists in detail all land, buildings, and other structures and facilities owned by the United States or Government-owned corporations on December 31, 1953.

The announcement was accompanied by publication of an inventory report on "Federal Real Property in the United States," summarizing inventory findings submitted to the committee by Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of General Services.

In announcing completion of the inventory, Senator HAYDEN commented in behalf of the committee:

"This inventory report is a fine tribute to the memory of Senator Maybank, as well as a mark of achievement for Senator SALTONSTALL. These capable leaders of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations recognized the need for the inventory, when it was brought out during hearings on the 1954 appropriation bill, that no attempt had been made since 1937 to compile one. They caused a request for this compilation to be placed in the Senate committee report on the independent offices bill, and there now is established what the Government owns in real estate in the United States.

"We now have thousands of facts reported and compiled in orderly form. The report reveals what the Government owns, what it cost, what it is used for, and what agency uses it. This array of information replaces previous inadequate, piecemeal glimpses of the huge Federal holdings.

"The inventory will prove invaluable. Both the executive and legislative branches will find the information indispensable in managing Federal property in the best interest of the Nation.

"With the inventory in hand, we are in position to achieve greater economy in the Government and make greater savings for taxpayers. These inventory facts and figures will help assure maximum control and utilization of property now in Federal ownership and avoid unnecessary new acquisitions and new construction. Specific property information will encourage economical budgets by helping executive agencies prepare requests to fit their needs and by assisting Congress in evaluating those requests.

"In addition to these benefits, the inventory provides a tool which will be useful in locating Federal holdings no longer needed to serve the public interest. As an aid in identifying additional surplus, the inventory will help eliminate unnecessary maintenance costs, bring additional revenue to the Treasury from sales, and restore property to real estate tax rolls to the benefit of State and local governments. Returning property to private ownership, moreover, will enhance the opportunity for its productive use as a source of employment.

"This body of information, uniformly brought together in one place, is a genuine contribution to knowing and understanding the Government of the United States. It supplies a heretofore unavailable source of facts necessary in considering many issues of modern-day government. The benefits of this work will be valuable to Federal, State, and local governments, taxpayers of all kinds, industry and labor, and, lastly, research. The inventory represents a major achievement in the operation of the Federal Government.

"The committee acknowledges with appreciation the service performed by General Services Administration in compiling the inventory in cooperation with the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Census, and the Federal agencies which supplied the basic facts.

"The committee has requested that continuing reports be issued for each fiscal year hereafter."

FACT SHEET ON INVENTORY AND REPORT

NOTE.—The information below highlights the chief findings in the GSA summary of the Federal real property inventory and sets forth rules used in collecting the data. The inventory covers all holdings of the Federal Government and its wholly owned corporations in continental United States, including the District of Columbia, but does not embrace real property owned by the District government.

Federal real property in the United States represents a total acquisition cost of $30.2 billion. This is the sum total of the cost of all property acquired since 1789 and still in Federal ownership on the inventory day, December 31, 1953, with one major exclusion from the cost total.

The principal excluded items consist of the land in the public domain, lands withdrawn for national parks, national forests, and other conservation uses, and historical sites acquired other than by purchase. Properties held in trust by the United States, mainly Indian tribal lands, are likewise excluded.

Acquisition cost represents the actual cost, plus later improvements at their cost, or the estimated cost at the time of acquisition.

The holdings are presented and summarized under three major types of realty:

Land: The United States owns 405.1 million acres, about 21 percent of the Nation's continental land area. Public domain, including national forests and parks, represents the bulk of the holdings—346.6 million acres in all. The balance, 58.5 million acres with an acquisition cost of $2.2 billion, consists of lands acquired by purchase or other methods. Trust properties amounting to 56 million acres are excluded from the acreage as well as the cost total.

Buildings: The United States owns 428,786 buildings with a total floor area of 2.2 billion square feet and an acquisition cost of $14.4 billion. The buildings include those for industrial, housing, storage, service, office, and institutional uses. The total acquisition cost for each of those uses ranges downward in the same order from $3.6 billion for industrial property.

Structures and facilities: These properties represent an acquisition cost of $13.6 billion. These installations include property used for power development, utility systems (heating, sewage, water, and communication), roads and bridges, flood control and navigation, reclamation and irrigation, electrical distribution systems, harbor installations, and railroads.

The acquisition costs for each type ranges downward from $2.7 billion for power development facilities. These include hydroelectric projects consisting mainly of dams, powerhouses, and integrated transmission lines. Electrical distribution systems, as facilities of a separate type, distribute energy from sources in non-Federal ownership or operation, usually to Federal installations.

Inventory data has been analyzed by use, by agency, and by State, and the summary facts are to be presented in a Senate document. The 3-way breakdown, moreover, has been applied to the inventory totals for each of the 3 major types of realty.

Detailed reports for 11,493 Federal installations in the United States were compiled to complete the inventory. An installation is defined as a reporting unit and may represent a military reservation, industrial plant, office building, or the like. For units with area in more than one State, such as national forests, a separate report was prepared for the section in each State.

Projects under construction on inventory day are reported only if they were available for use at that time.

The inventory is the first to be completed since 1937 and is more comprehensive in coverage and treatment than the earlier listing of Federal buildings and real estate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

Excerpts from an address by Vice President NIXON before American Association of School Administrators at Cleveland, Ohio, on April 3, 1955.

Report by Senator SMITH of Maine on trip to the Far East.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him over station WGN, Chicago, entitled "Easter, the Atom, and Automation."

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement relating to plans of the Bald Knob Christian Foundation, Inc., for the erection in Union County, Ill., of a 500-foot cross dedicated to greater unity of religious thought and effort.

Statement prepared by himself, and letter from Miss Josephine Taylor, director of social service at Cook County Hospital, Illinois, dated March 4, 1955, regarding the training of hospital and clinic personnel, etc.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article from the Oregonian of April 8, 1955, regarding Representative EDITH S. GREEN, of Oregon.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Tabulation of votes received from the State of Iowa in response to annual questionnaire.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senate received today from the White House, the following nominations: C. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the State of Vietnam; Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

For the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

QUEMOY AND THE MATSUS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of editorials dealing with American policy in Asia. Many of the editorials have special reference to Quemoy and the Matsus, and other of the editorials point out the growing perplexity among the American people concerning the question of what our foreign policy in Asia is. The editorials show an interesting shift in editorial opinion in the United States.

There is much talk about keeping the Asians in doubt. I happen to be one who believes there is no justification for keeping the American people in doubt as to what our Asian policy is. But at the present time the administration has not made clear to the American people what our policy is in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus. It is about time for the President of the United States to tell the people of the Nation what our policy there is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 6, 1955]

ONE BRITON APPROVES OUR FORMOSA POSITION

(By John S. Knight)

With the British public opinion openly hostile to United State Asiatic policy, the observations of Arthur Bryant, writing in the Illustrated London News, are worth noting.

Bryant calls President Eisenhower's Formost stand "brave and sensible"; deplores British criticism, and adds:

"If the Americans, who won the island back from Japan, regard Formosa as essential to the preservation of themselves and others from the fanatical and murderous tyranny of those who invaded South Korea and who, like the Japanese, slew and tortured helpless American and British prisoners, we should allow them the right to be judges of what is their own affair."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer reports that a number of boomlets are under way in behalf of Ohio's Governor, Frank J. Lausche, as the Democratic candidate for President. * * * As usual, Lausche is keeping his own counsel, but plans to run for the Senate against Senator GEORGE BENDER, Republican, in 1956.

The Defense Department is concerned over local and political resistance to location of guided missile (Nike) defense sites. * * * Many of our cities yowl about the lack of "adequate" defense but want no inconvenience in getting it.

In diplomatic circles, the biggest guessing game is what the United States intends to do if the Chinese Reds attack the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. * * * We are pledged to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. * * * Secretary Dulles says "the United States will not abandon Quemoy and the Matsus—unless that abandonment would bring a guaranteed peace to Asia, and unless Nationalist China agrees."

Dulles has warned the Communists they risk United States attack if they invade the small coastal islands.

The Dulles doctrine has the unrealistic ring of his proclamations last summer concerning the defense of Indochina. * * * Even if Nationalist China should agree, a "guaranteed peace" understanding with the Communists would be utterly worthless.

The people will back Eisenhower in defending Formosa but they want no part of a shooting war over Chiang's Nationalist-held islands a few miles off the China coast.

[From the Des Moines Register of March 5, 1955]

RUSSIANS TRYING TO SPLIT ALLIES ON FORMOSAN ISSUE, BINDER WARNS

(By Allan Hoschar)

Loss of Formosa to the Chinese Communists would be far less of a setback than a split among Western allies over United States action there, Carroll Binder, editorial page editor of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, said here Friday.

"Russian leadership would like nothing better than to see us involved in the Formosan Straits, tying up our Navy and Strategic Air Force," he told the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce luncheon meeting at Hotel Savery.

"That would give a freer hand for Russia in Europe," he continued.

REDS HOPE TO SPLIT ALLIES

"Russian policy is to split the Western allies from the United States," Binder continued, as he told of the rift and suspicion in the minds of our allies on United States policy in Formosa.

"As long as we have alliances (in the free world) we can withstand communism," said Binder.

Binder said the United States is committed to the defense of Formosa but most of our allies believe it suicidal for the United States to make an attempt to hold (the offshore islands of) Quemoy and Matsu.

The Labor Party in England has made an issue of the United States policy in Formosa, Binder said, adding that there is a division in Conservative ranks in England. Canada, he said, opposes involvement in the islands.

DISTURBING TENDENCIES

Binder, for many years a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, cited what he called a disturbing tendency in the United States to underestimate the hold the Communists have in China and that country's tie to Russia and to entertain a theory that "if we drop a few bombs, the people would panic."

Instead, said Binder, the Communists have succeded in imposing their will "to an extent that no central government has done for centuries in China."

The Chinese Communists have developed a great hatred for the United States and regard Chiang Kai-shek as a traitor, he said.

The trouble is that both the United States and the Chinese Communists have a "serious underestimation of what the other is out to get," said Binder.

REPORT FROM INDIA

Binder indicated belief that the Chinese Communist leadership will "not really commit the tremendous folly to take Formosa" but said he had been perturbed by recent news reports from New Delhi, India, and Burma, by different writers, "that the Reds mean to have Formosa this year."

He said he had contacted a friend in India and that a reply received Thursday said "Nehru has no knowledge (of such a plan). * * * Nehru believes that if the Chinese Communists keep up pressure, then Formosa will just fall in their lap."

"I don't think anyone knows if there will be shooting, but I think we should be careful of our relations with the Nationalists and our allies that can create a situation * * * which would involve the United States in a total war," said Binder.

President Eisenhower has stated that "our policy is not to participate in any aggression," Binder recalled, and termed it a "wise decision" for the President to reserve the power himself to decide what to do should the Communists take the first step."

TENSION FOR DECADES

Binder, who recently visited Tokyo, Hong Kong, and other Asiatic cities, looked for the present tensions to continue for decades. He said the United States must maintain alliances with the free world.

"We never understood the nature of the struggle between Nationalists and Communists in China," said Binder.

He pointed out that it became fashionable in some circles to say "the United States lost China," an expression he flatly declared not true. Because China was lost, "we thought we should regain China," said Binder.

"In retrospect it would have been better in 1949 to recognize the regime (Communists) that had established de facto control of China, such as did Great Britain and some other of our allies," he said.

AID TO CHIANG

Binder said the United States has spent $1½ billion to aid Chiang on Formosa since 1949 on the promise this group will be established on the mainland, which he saw as fine, if realized, but extremely unlikely.

There is a tendency in the United States, he said, to overestimate the strength of Chiang's troops.

He said they were elite troops when taken to Formosa, but time has crept up on them. He said there were only about 100,000 Formosans in the army.

HOPES REDS VISIT IOWA

Binder commented briefly in his talk on the recent editorial in the Register inviting Russians to come to Iowa to study corn production, an idea that has found favor in the Russian-controlled press.

"Russians have made an incredible mess of their agriculture," said Binder. "I hope they come (to Iowa), and I hope they learn."

Binder recalled that he was in Russia 26 years ago as a foreign correspondent, when the Soviets started farm collectivism, the breaking up of small farms.

"Three to five million persons perished that winter in the liquidation," said Binder.

"Their agriculture has never recovered from that, because the peasant owners killed their animals and chopped down their fruit trees, knowing they were probably going to lose their own life, anyway."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 14, 1955]

STILL NO. 1 ENEMY

We hope you have read William Philip Simms' thought-provoking memo published on page 3 today.

Because Phil Simms has been an avid student of United States foreign policy for 40 years, and a penetrating writer-analyst for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Because there is acknowledged grave risk in our China policy. There is no intention of going all-out in a war against Red China, yet we have drawn a line around Formosa and will fight if we have to, with air and sea forces. But can we hold it to that?

Four years ago Mr. Simms wrote that in no circumstances should we be suckered into an all-out war with Red China.

He said then that Russia instigated the Korean war, which brought massive intervention by the Red Chinese, with the idea of wearing us down while Russia sat on the sidelines awaiting the hour for striking at us with increased assurance of success.

That is his warning today. The scene has shifted, but his reasoning, in our opinion, is just as valid today.

Let's stop pretending we don't know what Russia is up to in the current crisis. Her unchanging policy is to find and utilize every means to bleed the United States white.

Red China may or may not be Moscow's instrument. But by drawing us into an all-out war, certainly she will be subscribing to Russia's pattern. And it would be "a very nasty, costly war," as Phil says, with no assurance we would win.

For one thing, we would be going against a nation of 600 million, an enemy notoriously callous about human life, and an ideology that millions of their own people would be expendable if it led to world communism and, of course, a more powerful Red China in the end.

That is not to say we must let the Chinese Communists have Formosa. But neither should we fall into the Moscow-Peiping trap and shove ourselves into a war on the Asian mainland.

That, we think, is the larger picture in true outline, as framed by Phil Simms with his usual perspicacity. We agree with him that we should be wary of any talk of a "quick and easy" victory in case of war. Especially that we should "not let China tie our hands, at Moscow's behest and with Moscow's aid, bleed us white," while Russia waits to move in for the kill.

The answer is not here. Except, "to keep ourselves as strong as we can, militarily and economically, ready and willing to go along with any allies who are ready and willing to go along with us—but never forgetting that Soviet Russia is the main foe—not Red China."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 29, 1955]

A CLEAR LINE IN THE FAR EAST

The military estimate of a Red Chinese attack on the offshore islands by mid-April may or may not be accepted as final; but there is no doubt that the situation is critical. It could deteriorate rapidly, at any time, from the uneasy stalemate of today to limited or even total war.

The citizens of the United States will want to face up candidly to this danger and to discuss it openly. Partisanship can have no place in such discussion. The country's long-range interests, and the interests of a world that recognizes increasingly the fatal nature of modern war, must be controlling.

The fact is that a large degree of imprecision has grown up around our intentions in regard to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. The essence of American policy had been to avoid imprecision and ambiguity—to make plain, as was not made plain before the outset of hostilities in Korea—the nature and extent of the American commitment. Unfortunately, this kind of explicitness is the very thing that is lacking where the offshore islands are concerned. Vagueness in matters of such importance increases the danger.

The basic policy is entirely clear. It is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. This newspaper believes the country must reassert this policy, must rest on it, must make it strictly determine every other action in the area.

Mr. Dulles has stated that this country will not defend the offshore islands "as such." That is, it seems to us, the right position. It means that we would defend them only if in the President's judgment an attack upon them were a direct part of an attack on Formosa; only if, again in the President's judgment, the threat to them were of such a nature as to make the holding of Formosa militarily impossible.

In a word, the possible defense of Matsu and Quemoy is related specifically to the problem of maintaining the territorial integrity of the islands where we have a clear moral and juridical responsibility. To make Quemoy's defense a matter of the free world's prestige, or a matter of upholding the morale of Chiang Kai-shek, would be an extension of the original policy which thus far has received no formal expression of support from the American people.

As things stand at present there rests upon President Eisenhower the whole weight of deciding whether Chinese action against the offshore islands is or is not part of a movement against Formosa, so direct and menacing as to call for immediate resistance by our forces. It is a fearful choice, in effect, determining the issue of peace or war.

To decide to withhold support after the attack has begun, moreover, would inevitably be exploited by the enemy as a defeat. For that reason, it might be impossible to effect such a move even if there were no overriding military necessities for taking up the battle.

Suppose, on the other hand, the President should decide to announce now a decision not to intervene in support of the offshore islands? This would not alter in any way the commitment to defend Formosa. No one contends that Formosa and the Pescadores are incapable of being defended without Matsu and Quemoy. The 7th Fleet operating in the Formosa Strait, plus air support from Formosa and the Pacific bases, would be a strong guard, behind which the Nationalist forces would be deployed. There is every reason to believe that this country would have the support of powerful allies—a support which will almost certainly be lacking in an undertaking to hold the offshore islands.

To decide against intervening is admittedly not easy. There are many areas in Asia where such a move would be construed adversely. The impact on the Nationalist Chinese could, in particular, be very great. But the gains should not be underestimated. This country would once more be in a situation where its military line and its juridical responsibilities coincide; it could be confident that it could do the job and secure in the knowledge that it was a job which enlisted the assent and support of allies across the world.

In making such a decision, the President would be following the policy of disengagement which he has pursued consistently. Truce in Korea, partition of Indochina, an enforcible cease-fire in the Formosa Straits—these would all be part of the same picture. It is not an ideal picture by any means, but one which conforms to the realities of a harsh and bitter situation. Given the resolve to stand fast and the statesmanship which looks toward some ultimate settlement, it may yet be converted into the foundations of a true peace.

The country is united on the fundamentals of foreign policy in the Far East. What is important now is that the fundamentals not be obscured by secondary considerations. Clear lines, definite commitments, unwavering determination—these can be reaffirmed now—and their reaffirmation can be the means to keep the peace.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 10, 1955]

DULLES LAID IT ON THE LINE, BUT WHAT LINE?

The reaction of Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, to Secretary of State Dulles' latest report on the Formosa crisis was probably fairly representative. The Senator thought that Secretary Dulles has laid it on the line. For our part, however, we still wish he had found it possible to take this firm stand on a line that more nearly coincides with the military and political realities in the Formosa Strait.

The judgment that the Dulles speech represented some hardening of American policy on Formosa derives from its tone rather than from its content. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State revealed no real change at all in the United States position: We remain as firmly committed as ever to defense of Formosa and the Pescadores; we still will not say whether or not we intend to fight if necessary to hold the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu; the requirements of flexible defense make it necessary that this question be left up to the President to decide in light of his judgment as to the overall value of certain coastal positions

to the defense of Formosa, and the cost of holding these positions.

The impression Mr. Dulles conveyed of expecting a showdown came from his frank estimate that "the Chinese Communists seem to be determined * * * to challenge" United States power in Asia, and his assurance that "we are prepared to * * * meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess." The necessity for such firmness he attributed bluntly to "Chinese Communist propaganda (that) portrays the United States as being merely a paper tiger. It suggests to the small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force. * * * We must always remember that the free nations of the western Pacific and southeast Asia will quickly lose their freedom if they think that our love of peace means peace at any price."

After such a statement, it is difficult to see how we can again "fall back," perhaps even from Quemoy and Matsu, if the Chinese Communist challenge materializes there. It is Mr. Dulles' open anticipation of such a challenge, and of disastrous political consequences if we fail to meet it, that seems to make the United States attitude in the Formosa crisis more uncompromising than ever, even though our policy itself remains unchanged.

To whatever extent the possibility of our fighting for Quemoy and Matsu may have been thus increased, to that extent the administration's position seems to us to be growing more risky and more questionable. The necessity of our going to war if necessary to defend Formosa and the Pescadores is now almost beyond dispute by responsible Americans. But it does seem that such a war could be fought to much better advantage, militarily and politically, on and over the 100 miles of open water separating Formosa from Communist China than in the scant 7 miles between Quemoy and the mainland.

Moreover, as Foreign Secretary Eden, of Britain, suggested almost simultaneously with the Dulles speech, if the United States could get Chiang Kai-shek to yield the remaining coastal islands, there seems an outside chance that they might yet be used in diplomatic negotiations to avoid altogether an immediate war over Formosa. If Quemoy and Matsu could be exchanged for a cease-fire, enforced by those 100 miles of open water between the Communist and Nationalits forces, Eden said "consideration could then be given internationally at an appropriate stage to the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations and to the future status of Formosa."

This sounds to us like the best hope for peace. If peace should prove impossible, withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would still leave us in a position to fight for Formosa and the Pescadores on the best available terms. The worst possible position we could occupy—the most politically isolated, the most militarily dubious—would be to let ourselves be boxed into going to war to keep Chiang Kai-shek on a few tiny islands that are geographically a part of mainland China.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 10, 1955]

WAR DECISION LEFT IN HANDS OF REDS

Secretary of State Dulles reported to the American people Tuesday night on his trip to the Far East. He outlined an Asiatic policy based on realities of the situation—much of it a long-range program dependent for its success upon the military power and economic resources of the United States.

While not specific about our military commitments, the Secretary made statements from which it will be difficult to retreat. In fact, as he pointed out, further retreats will result in complete loss of confidence in this country and the threatened neighbors of Communist China would fall like ripe apples into the Red basket.

He reiterated that the United States will defend Formosa. But once again he was not specific about the time or place. His remarks did, however, contain a warning to the people of this country that the Communists seem determined to attack Formosa. If this be true and if he has made our intentions clear, war is perilously close.

Mr. Dulles made one statement that is a departure from all past concepts of the use of atomic weapons. Our sea and air forces, he pointed out, are equipped with new and powerful precision weapons "which can utterly destroy military targets without endangering unrelated civilian centers."

As the speech clearly shows, the United States is on the defensive in Asia. In fact, our entire foreign policy is and has been negative and defensive. It has been conducted in an atmosphere of crisis.

There have been some successes with these defensive tactics, but we definitely have not seized the initiative about which Mr. Dulles so bravely talked when he took over the job. We have met a ruthless, aggressive, and completely understandable Communist foreign policy with retreats and apologies.

Mr. Dulles detailed some of the positive steps now being taken in Asia. They sound constructive. Backed by United States power, these countries may indeed want to preserve their freedom and be willing to exert the effort necessary. If Communist China is bent on aggression—and it is perfectly obvious that the vast resources of Southeast Asia are the objective—there is great danger.

Meanwhile, reports from the Far East to Washington are not in the least encouraging. While we can be hopeful that Dulles' speech will ease the situation, a move by the Reds on Formosa will mean a general war with Communist China.

[From the Boston Post of March 10, 1955]

DULLES AND HIS PAPER TIGER

Apart from the announcement that we now have a new precision bombing weapon, presumably atomic, there was nothing significant in the speech of John Foster Dulles except the admission that his soft Asian policy is not only a failure but has become a deadly boomerang. Plenty of people have been trying to warn Mr. Dulles of this fact for some time, but until now he hasn't heard—or hasn't listened.

By his own admission the Red Chinese have long since decided that our failure to act swiftly and with strength in the various crises in Asia proves that we haven't the courage or the will to fight anywhere.

More important, they have sold many of the millions of Asiatics on this idea. To them United States power is—in Mr. Dulles' own words—a "paper tiger," without teeth or claws; an international joke, or laughing stock.

Listen to Mr. Dulles' own words about the Red Chinese claims: "They boast that in 1950, in Korea, they drove United States forces back from beyond the Yalu and gained a great victory. They boast of their victory over the French Union forces in Indochina. * * * When we recently helped the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate the Tachens * * * the Chinese Communists claimed that this represented great victories for them. * * *

"In such ways Chinese Communist propaganda * * * suggests to the small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force and that Communist China is sure to win."

The paper tiger has claws now, the Secretary warned the world in his speech. There is available, he said, a new secret weapon which can destroy Red forces without damaging civilian populations.

This is, of course, heartening news. We don't know what the secret weapon may be, but as a matter of speculation it may well be a guided missile. It is a matter of public record that the Navy is using such weapons on some of our ships and, by the same token, it is the Navy which will share the burden of defending Formosa with the Air Force.

We heartily hope that whatever the weapon is it is available to our forces in large quantities, ready for instant use. We also hope Mr. Dulles doesn't believe that the Reds are likely to be unable to strike with similar force.

The Russians have guided missiles, too, and may be ahead of us in their development because they have working for them the German experts they captured after the last war. According to James A. Michener's dispatch from the Matsu Islands, the Communists are at work on the Chinese mainland right now digging what look to be big gun emplacements. It could be that these are actually launching platforms for guided missiles with atomic warheads.

The Chinese can't produce such weapons. But the Russians can and have, and what would give the Russians more pleasure than to try them out under the Chinese flag with the American Seventh Fleet as a prime target?

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1955]

"BURNING DAYLIGHT" IN ASIA

Readers of this newspaper may well have been startled by a Washington dispatch from Anthony Leviero, published yesterday. Their minds will not be relieved by James Reston's article on the Far Eastern situation, on this page today. Mr. Reston quotes Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. GEORGE was facing the problem of what to do if the Chinese Communists invaded the Quemoy and Matsu islands lying off their coast. He knew, as the Pentagon knows, and as the White House knows, that there is grave danger that the islands will be invaded some time during the months of April and May. Senator GEORGE said: "We are burning daylight. The darkness is coming on in the Far East."

Senator GEORGE at 77, in the twilight of his own career and in his 33d year in the Senate, has the courage and is in a position to speak out. Mr. Reston gives this interpretation of the opinions of some other Senators who have not spoken out: "We are drifting into a war over Matsu and Quemoy. The administration is reconciling itself to the idea that this issue now rests not with Washington but with Peiping." So we have, as today's news describes it, a situation in which a certain kind of logic—the logic, perhaps, of death and widespread destruction—goes from the defense of Quemoy and Matsu to an all-out atomic attack on the industrial potential of Communist China. What this logic means in cost of human life and perhaps in a vast destruction of cities far outside China, the citizen may ponder.

It is clear that the resolution authorizing the President to take whatever steps are necessary to defend Formosa gave a choice only between rejecting the administration's foreign policy in the Far East, or accepting with it an ambiguous phrase that might justify an all-out defense of the Quemoy and Matsu islands. Everyone in this country, certainly including the President, would be happier if the Quemoy and Matsu islands did not exist or if our national prestige and honor had not somehow seemed to be involved in their defense. If we had been able to persuade our Nationalist Chinese friends to pull out of them when they abandoned the Tachen islands, we would all be easier in our minds.

There is the further argument, which we find reiterated in today's dispatches from Taipei on Formosa, that the morale of Chiang Kai-shek's troops and people would collapse if the islands were abandoned or lost. There is a curious paradox in the fact that while Senator GEORGE and many others in this country fear involvement over the islands, some persons on Formosa suspect that we are making a quiet deal with the mainland Chinese to abandon them.

Here is a dilemma that can easily be understood. Whether a greater wisdom on the part of the State Department and the administration would have avoided it we do not know. The fact is we face it.

There may, however, be one way out that has not been fully explored and exploited. From Japan to Canada and all around the circle of our allies and potential allies there is strong opposition to joining us in any hostilities brought on by attempts to hold the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. There is not the same opposition toward the defense of Formosa, which is a keystone in guarding the frontiers of all the free nations of southeast Asia, including the Philippines.

This newspaper believes that the time is ripe for a new Formosa Strait declaration. We believe that that declaration should make it plain that we will put all we have into a defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, which are essential to such a defense. The Seventh Fleet is already a formidable obstacle to an attack on Formosa. It might be possible to throw at least a token force of American ground troops into the island to assist in repelling attack.

What this situation calls out for above everything else is precision. The enemy ought to know just what he can do and just what he cannot do without meeting resistance from us. If he learns that he can take the Quemoy and Matsu Islands without provoking a major war, that fact may be tragic. Nevertheless there are small tragedies and vast tragedies. A vast tragedy would be stumbling into war against the intention and the wishes of the majority of our people and our allies. A still vaster tragedy would be a loss of freedom through repeated retreats.

It is time that the fire eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon or elsewhere, went into silence. We need calmness and wisdom. This newspaper hopes and believes that President Eisenhower, hating war as we know he does, and realizing, as he said he did, that one cannot see where a war will take us, will exercise his leadership during this coming critical week to save this country and the world from irretrievable disaster.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 1, 1955]

THE MOVING FINGER WRITES

(By Ralph McGill)

Two United States Senators made speeches Sunday night.

In Cleveland, Ohio, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S, Democrat, text before a Democratic Party dinner was that the United States should quit talking about defending the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. We also, he said, should cease pretending that Chiang Kai-shek is the key to blocking the spread of communism in Asia; the future and strength of India and Japan hold the key to the future of southeast Asia.

In Baltimore, Senator BUTLER, Republican, spoke to the Knights of Columbus. His text was that British leaders should quit "demanding that we turn Formosa, Quemoy, and Matsu over to the Reds." "Instead," he said, "we should stand up and be counted in opposition to further Communist aggression in Asia."

Most of Senator BUTLER'S talk was criticism of British policy, especially the left-wing labor leaders who "found it pleasant to break bread with Red leaders and, in effect, give away part of the British Empire."

TOO LATE?

KEFAUVER, the tall Tennessean, shelled down the corn. He was positive, direct.

"A Far Eastern policy tied to Chiang is almost certainly doomed to fail, and by the time the failure is recognized it may be too late to disengage ourselves without grave loss of prestige," he declared.

"While this country is under obligation to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we should not," he said, "kid the world or ourselves by keeping up the fiction that Chiang is a great, dynamic force in Asia."

He urged a policy which recognizes that the future and strength of Japan and India hold the key to the future of Asia.

"If they remain free, there is every reason to believe that the bulk of Asia will remain free," he said. "If they go under, the Communists are likely to take over from Tokyo to Cairo."

The Senator put a pragmatic finger on a sentive point without mentioning the Manila Pact.

"We must continue to defend and support the smaller nations now friendly to us, but we should not assume that they constitute a decisive, effective anti-Communist force," he said.

KEFAUVER denied that Quemoy and the Matsu Islands are necessary to Formosa's defense, saying this "is about like saying that the defense of Staten Island, in front of the harbor of New York, is necessary to the defense of Bermuda.

"They may be important to the morale of Chiang Kai-shek but one cannot really expect the Chinese Communists to lie down and play dead with his forces that close to their harbors.

TRUTH

What KEFAUVER said may not be contradicted.

There is tragedy in it.

Chiang's supporters charge we failed him in his hour of need. He controlled about three-fourths of China. Yet, the steady deterioration of his own armies, which never had the heart to fight, quickly became a disaster. It was like dykes breaking.

If we accept all his most extreme admirers charge, the sad facts of today are not thereby changed. Senator KEFAUVER is not in error. The islands in question are not essential to the defense of Formosa. It is only domestic politics which attempts to make them so.

The moving finger writes and what it has written may not be erased with blood or tears. Whatever the past, whatever our failures, the facts of today are that Chiang is no longer an asset. Formosa, if there is a battle for it, will be held by American troops, aircraft and Navy, not by Chiang.

And, as for the Matsu and Quemoy, the American people do not want to fight for them. The moving finger may write this was our moment of failure, a prelude to disaster. But the fact remains. It is not only Britain. The people of this country do not want a war over Matsu and Quemoy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 15, 1955]

STATE OF THE NATIONS: PAPER TIGER?

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It becomes desirable, it seems to me, to examine most carefully why Secretary of State John Foster Dulles feels that it may become necessary to prove to Communist China that the United States is "prepared to stand firm and, if necessary, meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess."

According to Mr. Dulles, the Chinese "are persistently trying to belittle our power and to throw doubt on our resolution." He says that Chinese Communist propaganda "portrays the United States as being merely a 'paper tiger'." This, he says, "suggests to small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back."

Mr. Dulles cites three events in recent history as being used by the Chinese propaganda to support their claims that the United States is a "paper tiger"—the retreat from the Yalu in 1950, nonparticipation in Indochina in 1954, and the evacuation of the Tachens in 1955.

The real question at issue is whether these three events actually make a reason why Communist China, or anyone else, could believe that the United States will always find a reason to "fall back"; whether they do add up to evidence of irresolution in Washington.

The answer is unavoidable, no matter how painful, that in each of these episodes in history there was evidence of irresolution, and even of vacillation, in Washington. In each case there was a moment when Washington talked as though it would do more than it actually was prepared to do when the test came.

In 1950 Washington changed the definition of its purposes in midstream. The original statement of purpose at the time of the intervention in Korea was "to repel the aggression and punish the aggressor." When a chance seemed to present itself to "drive to the Yalu," the purpose was enlarged to encompass the reunification of Korea. This larger purpose was not achieved.

In 1954 the act of nonintervention in Indochina was preceded by an assertion that Vietnam was of "paramount importance" to the security of southeast Asia. And Vietnam was likened to the cork in the neck of the bottle of the Malayan Peninsula. Those characterizations of the importance of Vietnam indicated an intention to intervene to save it from a Communist victory. The purpose implied in the characterizations was not achieved.

In 1955 the withdrawal from the Tachens was accompanied and surrounded by words and interpretations which appeared to imply a forward movement, when actually they covered a regressive movement.

If we consider these three cases carefully we can, I submit, see why actions which need not have implied irresolution did come to seem irresolute. There would have been no irresolution in Korea had Washington and its allies adhered rigidly to their first definition of purpose in the Korean intervention. When the 38th parallel was crossed the aggression had been repelled, and in the process the aggressor had been severely punished. It was when the original purpose was expanded that an unachieved goal was created.

There would have been no evidence of irresolution in Indochina had words been avoided which implied an intention to do something which subsequently was not done.

There would have been no evidence of irresolution in the Tachens withdrawal had it been labeled publicly precisely what it was, a military withdrawal.

In each case there was no need of causing an impression of irresolution. Had Washington estimated accurately what it would do and limited its declared or implied purposes to its actual intentions, there would have been no basis for a belief anywhere in the world that Washington was irresolute. The damage arose out of appearing to be ready to do more than was actually done.

In the same speech in which Mr. Dulles faces up to the dangers which arise out of the appearance of irresolution in Washington, he presents a theory that if the Chinese Communists aggress on any one of their fronts they would be confronted "with tasks at the south, center, and north." This is his theory of the three-front war. It implies that a Chinese advance on any one front would automatically release war on all three

fronts. He doesn't forecast it or say that it will necessarily happen. He does imply that it would happen.

But if the treaty commitments which cover these three fronts are examined, grave doubt emerges that they would or could be joined. To reopen the Korean front would require an act of the United Nations. To reopen the Formosa front would require, according to Mr. Dulles' own previous assertions, the constitutional process in Washington. American intervention on the southern front, in the event of aggression, would also require the constitutional process. As Mr. Dulles has pointed out himself, none of the United States commitments in Asia involves the automatic feature of the NATO alliance.

It would seem to me that Washington once more has laid itself open unnecessarily to an appearance of irresolution by using words which sound stronger than they really are. The man who understates his intentions is never open to the charge of irresolution, is never mistaken for a paper tiger.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 29, 1955]

ATOMIC WAR OVER MATSU?

This capital is in the midst of a war of nerves about the Matsu and Quemoy islands. The deadline for a Chinese Communist attack on the Matsus may be approaching, some sources believe, and the assault may come by April 15 unless the Chinese are deterred by the certainty of American retaliation. If an attack should come, the same argument runs, the question would be whether the counterattack should consist of an effort to blot out Communist airfields with tactical atomic weapons or whether it should also aim at China's industrial potential. Thus is the deadly prospect of nuclear war raised over a couple of tiny and in themselves insignificant island groups on the doorstep of Communist China.

This possibility of involvement over the Quemoys and Matsus has caused increasing concern among our allies. The British have made known their intention not to join in a war over the coastal islands; and last week the Canadian Foreign Minister said much the same thing. These protests evidently are aimed at dissuading the administration from what other governments consider a rash course; our allies know that if a major war should develop from a clash over the Matsus the question of cause would become academic and they would inevitably be drawn in. The fact remains that despite a large measure of support for the American pledge to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, most of the free world simply does not believe that the Matsus and Quemoys are worth a war.

How, then, did we get into this paradoxical situation in which the administration is being urged to fight for some remote islands which under peaceful circumstances it probably would relinquish? It is instructive to recall that the Matsus and Quemoys were very lightly held by the Chinese Nationalists until 1953. Then, as part of the policy of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, we abbetted him in garrisoning the coastal islands until he now reportedly has between a fifth and a fourth of his entire army on them.

An opportunity to get off this hook existed last fall when the administration began its praiseworthy effort to revise its China policy in a more realistic direction. A withdrawal from the Quemoys and Matsus would have been a logical corollary of the evacuation of the Tachens and the releashing of Chiang in an attempt to bring about a cease-fire. But the coastal islands were left in an anomalous status, apparently in part for bargaining reasons, in part as a concession to Chiang and his spokesmen in Congress. It may be suspected that there now is an element of blackmail in Chiang's refusal to give them up, for a war over the coastal islands represents his one remaining hope of restoration on the mainland.

If it is easy to see how the predicament might have been avoided, it is not so easy to see a way out at this stage. Against the argument that we should abandon the Quemoys and Matsus and force Chiang to withdraw, there is the countervailing argument that this might undermine the defense of southeast Asia and paralyze the will to resist Communist subversion. Furthermore, the argument goes, it would be extremely difficult to sustain the morale of Chiang's army if another withdrawal were to follow the evacuation of the Tachens. Such action might leave Chiang's ranks wide open to subversion.

Also, it is said, the amazing new developments in tactical atomic weapons make it possible to regard them virtually as weapons of precision. That is, small atomic weapons could be used against military targets without necessarily endangering unrelated centers. If an American counterattack were confined to the use of such weapons against military targets, Russia might not feel bound to enter the conflict.

While there undeniably is some truth to these contentions, there also are powerful arguments on the other side. Military men have acknowledged the usefulness of the Matsus and Quemoys in a defense of Formosa, but no responsible military leader has said that they are essential. That is the point that stands out: a war over the Quemoys and Matsus would be a war over islands that are not militarily essential. Moreover, no one can be sure that a war over these islands would not lead to general war. In such a situation Senator BRIDGES' crass comment that no "American white soldier" would be forced to fight in Asia would become even more ridiculous. There is no safe warrant for the easy assurance that air and naval action would suffice or for the blithe assumption that, as Elmer Davis puts it, only ground troops have mothers.

Finally, we must consider the responsibility for initiating atomic war. From a strictly military viewpoint it would be logical to use atomic weapons wherever they could be employed profitably—especially if reliance on them has narrowed our capabilities in conventional weapons. In a large war, even a war concerned directly with the defense of Formosa, their use would be inevitable. But in a war over the Matsus and Quemoys—in which a large part of the world would be critical of the American position—to initiate the use of atomic weapons would be to cross a vast psychological bridge. Even if such weapons could be restricted to purely military targets, Asians have not forgotten that the only atomic bombs ever used in war were employed against an Asian nation; and Chinese propaganda would be sure to stress the point.

This newspaper is not so presumptuous as to think that there is an infallible prescription for protecting the American interest in this dilemma. President Eisenhower has exhibited great statesmanship on the avoidance of nuclear war; and there is every reason to think that he will not be stampeded by zealots who would welcome a holy crusade against communism. Conscientious men in Government are aware of the risks. There is something to the point that at this stage the prestige of the free world might suffer a serious blow in an abandonment of the Quemoys and Matsus, and that the most disastrous course of all would be for this country to undertake to defend them and then back down.

But Congress and the public ought to understand just how close war may be, and to have no illusions about its nature or about the solitary situation of this country once it started. The hope lies in the sagacity of President Eisenhower in a decision that Congress has left in his hands, and in the earnest efforts of free world diplomacy to enlist the help of Moscow in averting a Chinese attack. Meanwhile, the administration would do well to put a muzzle on the tough talk that, far from dispelling any idea that we are a "paper tiger," may contribute to the notion that we are one.

[From the Hartford Courant of March 4, 1955]

CONFUSION CONTINUES OVER QUEMOY AND MATSU

So experienced a Secretary of State as Mr. Dulles must feel sure he is doing the right thing. But some aspects of our policy over Formosa have left, and continue to leave, much of the public vaguely uneasy. Yesterday again, after having visited Chiang Kai-shek, Mr. Dulles made some statements that confirmed the original doubt as to whether we would, or would not, make war over those close-to-shore islands, Quemoy and the Matsus. Mr. Dulles obviously wanted, once more, to keep the Red Chinese guessing. But he kept the American people, and their worried allies, guessing too.

Even that would be entirely satisfactory, obviously, if it achieved the national objective: To avoid a retreat from Formosa without ourselves starting a war. The whole purpose of President Eisenhower's approach to Congress, for confirmation of his authority to fight in Formosa if need be, was precisely to warn the Red Chinese in advance. The idea was to keep them from repeating the tragedies of 1914 and 1939, when the aggressors started two world wars by miscalculation. In 1914 it was the inability of Sir Edward Grey to say in advance that Britain would fight, if Germany invaded Belgium, that tempted the Kaiser to invade and so let loose the war. And again in 1939 it was the neutrality of America, and what Hitler took to be our decadence, that fooled him into thinking he could fight a war without our getting into it. The whole purpose of such an advance warning, if it is to do any good at all, must be to make what we will fight for clear and precise beyond all question.

In Formosa yesterday, however, Mr. Dulles warned the Chinese Communists once more that they risk possible United States attack if they invade the Matsus and Quemoy. He also echoed his all-but-forgotten threat of massive retaliation. For he said that the Chinese Reds must not assume that defense would be static and confined to Formosa itself, or that the aggressor would enjoy immunity with respect to the areas from which he stages his offensive.

All this, instead of removing doubt, adds to it. This at a time when Sir Winston Churchill, and our own authorities from the President down, assure us in all but so many words that the possibility of mutual annihilation in H-bomb warfare has made war obsolete. Mr. Dulles himself, behind closed doors in Manila only the day before yesterday, told our Far Eastern Ambassadors that war has become so abominable, and dangerous to civilization, that we must deter aggression by unswerving firmness. One could wish that he would be not only firm but utterly clear.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of March 4, 1955]

NOW CHIANG IS TELLING US

The United States now appears to have been maneuvered into a position where its defense of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands is a matter for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to decide, instead of the designated authority in Washington.

This is the surprising purport of the statement by Secretary of State Dulles as he took off from Taipei on his flight to the homeland.

Whereas it was once believed that the United States would be willing to trade the offshore islands for a ceasefire agreement in the Formosan area, it is now reported from Taipei that the kind of truce entertained would allow the Nationalists to hold the islands in present circumstances but does not insist on their permanent retention as an irrevocable American policy.

The most important concession obtained by the unyielding Chiang is revealed by Mr. Dulles with these words:

"I have * * * made it clear the United States will not enter into any negotiations dealing with territories and rights of the Republic of China except in cooperation with the Republic of China."

And when he further says that there will be no trade of the islands, which certainly are not the republic's territories, "behind the Nationalists' back," there is the strongest kind of intimation that Chiang at last has won the right to call the shots.

The Secretary gave no indication of Chiang's attitude on the American position, according to news reports. But at the same time it was revealed that sources close to the generalissimo told their distinguished visitor that Nationalist China has staged its last retreat and cannot possibly accept any plan which would mean evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsus.

Faced by such a dilemma, Mr. Dulles can only express the "ardent hope * * * that the Chinese Communists will not insist on war as an instrument of policy." That hope should also be extended to the Nationalists.

Although at no time in the past have we made definite commitments to go along with Chiang's plan of dealing with the offshore islands—at least not publicly—the very vagueness of our keep-'em-guessing program has created an impression that we would do so. We can understand how another evacuation would mean unbearable loss of "face" for Chiang, but it is strange to find the United States being influenced by the same consideration.

Regardless of what we at home might think, it has come to pass that American refusal to defend the disputed islands in company with their Nationalist allies, would be hailed as another great Communist victory. American prestige would be immediately hurt, and the effect on the scheduled April meeting of Asiatics in Indonesia could be damaging indeed.

One significant fact about Mr. Dulles' farewell airport statement was his reminder that President Eisenhower holds the power to decide how and when to use American forces in the defense of the islands while he did not mention the "if." If this omission was an oversight, it was an unfortunate one. If it was premeditated, it has somber implications.

On the face of things, Senator KNOWLAND and the China lobby have reason to rejoice that the American policy has veered so closely to that of Chiang, whose only hope of survival as a world figure is to involve the United States in war with the Communists.

And by the same token, those who have warned against involving ourselves too closely with the man whose rule over China was destroyed by his own inefficiency and the corruption of his government and armies, will be sorely disappointed.

Whenever the United States cannot make decisions regarding war or peace without Chiang's consent; whenever the veto power in a danger spot of the Far East is placed in the hands of one not worthy to wield it, it is an ominous development."

In the extension of Mr. Dulles' remarks, which is sure to come when he reaches Washington, an effort to clarify our current relationship with the Nationalist leader of the Chinese Republic may be expected. On this occasion, it is to be hoped, he will attain his long-sought objective of clarity and transparency on a question of high importance to the waiting people. The guessing game has lasted overlong.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 13, 1955]

PEOPLE UNIMPRESSED BY DULLES' WARNING

(By Russell Reeves)

Considering that the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, virtually told the Nation that it is on the brink of war, the people remained amazingly calm.

Perhaps "calm" is not the word. "Smug and imperturbable" might be a better description. Aside from the remarks of a few editorial writers and commentators, there was no reaction.

It is no exaggeration to report that there was more expressed concern in these parts over the problem of using the Cleveland Indians' pitching strength than there was over the danger of war with Communist China.

NO SIGN OF WAR JITTERS APPARENT

Yet Secretary Dulles was not delivering a silent soliloquy in a soundproof room when he spoke last Tuesday after returning from a 2-week trip to the Orient. His words were caught up by microphones and catapulted electronically through a vast network of radio and television stations. Thousands of newspapers reported the address at length and in prominent positions.

And there was scarcely any mistaking of what he was saying. He asserted that the Chinese Communists "seem to be determined to try to conquer Formosa." He repeated the fact that we are committed by treaty and authorized by law to defend Formosa and the Pescadores with the Armed Forces of the United States.

So if the Secretary is right in believing the Chinese Reds are determined to try to conquer Formosa, then we are in for war. Why he believes such war would be wider than the Formosa area he explained in these words:

"For military purposes, the Chinese Communist front should be regarded as an entirety because if the Chinese Communists engage in open armed aggression this would probably mean that they have decided on general war in Asia. They would then have to take into account the mutual defense treaties of the United States with the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, and the forces maintained under them. Thus, general war would confront the Chinese Communists with tasks at the south, center and north, tasks which would strain their inadequate means of transportation."

Secretary Dulles also gave the impression that we would use atomic and other new weapons if we got into such a war.

All in all, it was a dismal picture he painted. But there was a minimum of public response to it. How can that be explained?

Do people believe Secretary Dulles has exaggerated the situation? Are they confident that Red China will be restrained by our threats? Are they incapable of visualizing what a war in the Orient would mean in terms of human grief, alienation of other nations, material cost, and inconclusiveness? Or are they completely fatalistic about whatever happens?

Anyone may have a theory, but no one just now has an authoritative answer.

The known facts suggest that the war which Secretary Dulles foresaw is not likely to break out in the months immediately ahead. There are no indications of a military buildup on the Chinese coast large enough to support an assault on Formosa.

Furthermore, it would be impolitic for Red China to take any aggressive action before or during the Afro-Asiatic Conference scheduled for next month.

AGREEMENT WITH CHINA WILL COME

Whether the unsettled condition of the Moscow Government would be a deterrent is debatable. The Kremlin might be happy to have the upstart Chinese Reds get involved in a war which inevitably would weaken us and would take the spotlight away from their troubles.

Secretary Dulles said nothing to clarify our position regarding the Chinese coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu, now in the hands of Chiang's Nationalists.

Many Americans consider it was a serious mistake to intimate that we might try to repulse an attack on them if it were considered a prelude to an attack on Formosa. It would be impossible to defend such action before the bar of world justice and it would alienate nations which might otherwise be friendly.

Nevertheless, President Eisenhower is under pressure to include those islands along with Formosa and the Pescadores in our guaranty.

It is unlikely that he will yield to that pressure, for he must recognize the danger in so doing. It is of vital importance that when and if we have to act in Asia, or in any other trouble spot, we act in concert with the other non-Communist powers, and not play a singlehanded game.

Likewise, it is important that we keep all possible doors open for reaching an agreement with the Chinese Reds. As difficult and disagreeable as they seem to us at the moment, the fact remains that someday, with or without a war, we will reach an agreement with them.

History is full of irony. It just could happen that someday the Chinese Reds might be our ally in a future war with the Kremlin.

PROPOSED RELEASE OF GERMAN ASSETS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have in my possession a copy of a statement made by Dr. Herman Abs requesting our Government to release German assets seized during the last war. Dr. Abs was Chancellor Adenauer's special representative sent here to negotiate this question with this Government.

I ask permission to have Dr. Abs' statement printed in the RECORD. I understand this statement was made by Dr. Abs at the beginning of the negotiations with the executive branch of the Government. It is an able argument of the German case for the return of the property seized from German nationals during the last war.

A press release dated March 3 this year indicates that the State Department favors only a partial return of such assets, a return limited to $10,000 for each natural person. This would exclude corporate claimants, and thus all individuals who hold shares in such corporations. The proposed solution offered to Chancellor Adenauer is offensive for many reasons and has the effect of recommitting our Government to a policy of confiscation of private property—something we talk about as happening only in Russia.

The New York Times in one of its leading editorials of March 9, 1955, rejects the proposed partial solution by our State Department. The editorial concludes:

The sooner that problem is finally solved with full vindication for the principles for which we stand, the better we will be able to meet the Communist challenge to the free world.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have the full text of this New York Times editorial printed in the RECORD.

According to a news release published in the New York Times, Dr. Abs is quoted with respect to General Aniline and Film Corp., one of the companies seized as German property. Dr. Abs stated that the Germans have no interest whatever in that company. He said it was Swiss property.

Mr. President, in view of Chancellor Adenauer's strong plea for the return of German property, coupled with Dr. Abs' statement that the Germans have no interest in General Aniline and Film Corp., I think it is time that the appropriate committee handling this problem should look into this matter very closely. If the statement by Dr. Abs is correct, then this Government had no right to seize the Swiss property at all. The Swiss claimants already have testified to this effect before the Judiciary Committee. I think the appropriate committee chairman should have this question looked into on the spot in Germany and Switzerland.

If these suggestions are followed, I believe we can dispose of this entire matter on the basis of principle and in accordance with our traditional respect for the sanctity of private property.

There being no objection, the statement by Dr. Abs and the editorial from the New York Times of March 9, 1955, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. HERMANN J. ABS ON FEBRUARY 10, 1955

It is indeed a privilege for me to be meeting with representatives of the Government of the United States for discussions on a subject which our people and my country have very much at heart, namely, the release of the property of German citizens. The Chancellor of the Federal Republic has entrusted me, as his special plenipotentiary, with the task of conducting here in Washington the discussions which were agreed upon between President Eisenhower and the Chancellor on the occasion of the Chancellor's recent visit to this country. In connection with this question, as you know, the Chancellor addressed a letter to the President on July 17, 1954, which in fact forms the starting point for the subsequent development that was to lead up to the present discussions. In that letter, the Chancellor drew attention to two principal categories of claimants whose property was taken in pursuance of wartime measures, and who are anxious to see their property released or adequate compensation granted in cases where assets have been liquidated; one category comprises a large number of Germans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in a very distressed economic position, and the other, those German individuals and corporations who by investing their capital in the United States have in the past contributed toward friendly relations between our two countries and their peoples.

We all know, of course, how difficult it is under the present circumstances for a country to change its policy—economic or political—once it has been adopted, all the more so if that policy has been embodied in international agreements or domestic legislation. It would be even more difficult for a country to shift its adopted policy over to an entirely new basis if that policy is the consequence of a belligerent dispute with another country. The Federal Government is, therefore, all the more grateful—and I am pleased to be privileged to convey its gratitude to you—for the willingness of the Government of the United States, as indicated in the President's declaration, to discuss the question of German property with German representatives. I would like to add to this my own personal expression of gratitude.

We think that this willingness to discuss with German representatives a question of this nature, which, after all, is not altogether free from emotional and political factors and business interests, offers striking evidence not only of the particular openmindedness with which the United States faces all problems as they arise, however difficult of solution they may be, as is the case with the set of questions to which we are now about to address ourselves; in our view, this attitude also shows that the awareness of the individual's private sphere which harbors his person and his rights is today as alive in this freedom-loving country as it has always been.

In Europe, the rights of the individual have during the past 50 years in many cases undergone a greater measure of restriction than, for instance, in this country. This was due to a number of factors inherent in our general development, such as extremely rapid industrialization which caused large masses of people to be crowded into small and even very small areas, and—most important of all—the disintegration and depreciation of property and the sundering of economically coherent reasons after each of the two world wars. It was not until they were threatened with imminent danger from the East, aggravated by the advance of the Communist ideology on the West European continent and elsewhere, that the peoples of Europe, their political parties and governments really became definitely alive to the fatal and inevitable consequences of a policy which carries with it an evergrowing measure of disregard for individual freedom and private rights. The nations of Europe, and especially those living closest to the Iron Curtain, have now fully grasped the magnitude of the fate which threatens the Western World, and they not only have become much more determined in resisting Communist methods and ideas but have also grown more conscious of the importance of personal freedom and private property rights. Their position has been substantially strengthened by the generous economic and moral aid which the United States accorded Western Europe during the postwar period.

This development is certainly encouraging but there are strong opposing forces at work, and they are constantly drawing support from behind the Iron Curtain. They are still too strong to be checked by Europe, or by individual European nations, without assistance from outside. Problems of international policy and the necessity of joint military defense make it imperative to us, and to the Western World as a whole, to stand together as free nations, firm and unequivocal, in words and deeds, on those questions which primarily affect the individual, namely, personal freedom and the inviolability of lawfully acquired rights. Only if the individual sees that in this sphere he enjoys the full protection of his own government and of those connected with it, will he consciously identify himself with Western policy. This, in the last analysis, is the crucial test; for unless the individual believes in the rightness of the policy to which he is asked to subscribe, the weapons he may one day have to wield in defending his country, however ingeniously devised, will remain ineffective.

That openmindedness, that liberal concept and the aliveness to the rights of the individual with which your country has grown and become great, and which are among the foundations of democracy and the Christian way of life, encouraged me to address myself to, and discuss with you, the problem of private property, despite all the existing legal and political obstacles. At the same time, this attitude inspires me with confidence in the successful outcome of my mission.

I would like to invite you to forget for a moment that I am addressing you as a German citizen. I would like to remove the property problem, for the time being, from its particular context of German-American relations and to consider it within the general framework of the political and ethical fundaments of the free Christian world, my motive being, that, as an individual person, I, like your great Nation and like each of you here, am deeply concerned regarding the fate of the Western World in its conflict with Eastern ideology, and feel that I have my share in the responsibility for our future destiny. We are each of us aware that this period marks a decisive phase in Western history, and a crucial point in the controversy with the Eastern block.

We have come to a crossroad, and there are but two courses open: Either the free individual will disappear and with him the things he stands for—progress, security, trust, and humanity among nations; or the inner values upon which we have built up our life through the centuries, will be restored in all their strength and fullness.

In the history of the United States, from the Declaration of Independence to this very day, two things have played a paramount part: The pioneer spirit of its citizens and respect for the human person and the private sphere surrounding it. With all its immense wealth in soil and mineral and other resources, this country could never have accomplished its astounding evolution from an undeveloped land dependent on capital to its present position of primary power and principal creditor of the globe, but for the scrupulous difference which its foremost representatives have at all times shown to this fundamental principle. I trust you will not take it amiss if I quote some of these men in this context, my sole motive being one of responsibility for our common destiny.

In 1794, Alexander Hamilton, defending article X of the Jay Treaty, solemnly declared:

"No power of language at my command can express the abhorrence I feel at the idea of violating the property of individuals, which in an authorized intercourse in time of peace has been confided to the faith of our Government and laws, on account of controversy between nation and nation. In my view, every moral and every political sense unite to consign it to execration."

After World War I, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, said in an address, in Philadelphia, on November 23, 1923:

"Confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interests of particular individuals, but at the foundation of international intercourse * * * rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state. It is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles."

In 1938, Mr. Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, said:

"It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory, whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or those of friendly powers. The departure from that policy and the taking over of such property except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results."

Again, after World War II, many distinguished persons, among them the elder statesman Mr. Bernard Baruch, faithfully upheld American tradition and pronounced

themselves against the seizure of private property belonging to former enemies. Mr. Baruch did so in these words:

"Back in the days of the Versailles Treaty, when Britain and France urged that the private property sequestered of aliens should be seized, I took a definite decision and said: 'No.' I took the stand in Paris that under all law, all morality, and all tradition, all private property of former enemies—and that included ships seized at sea—was inviolate. I would not permit it."

And also Mr. John Foster Dulles, the present Secretary of State, who had opposed the seizure of private property owned by nationals of former enemies under the Treaty of Versailles, recently reaffirmed this position during the hearings on the Dirksen bill. In his words,

"The policy adopted after World War II of completely eliminating ownership of enemy private property was a departure from historic American policy after other wars. I myself have had some experience in this field, I worked at this very problem at Paris in connection with the Treaty of Versailles at the end of the First World War.

"I can say frankly, that I would like to see a return to our historic position, the position of the sanctity of private property in time of war, to return to that historic position to the extent that may be practical, although I recognize that there are considerable difficulties in dealing with the matter on that basis after so long a period of time."

The sanctity of private property which these eminent statesmen strove to uphold is of paramount significance in this present time and will be even more so for the future, because with the ever growing number and density of populations everywhere, the increase in functions taken over by governments and the development in all fields of technology and communications, the burden resting on the individual will increase while his rights and freedoms will of necessity become more and more restricted. As this process goes on, there will gradually melt away that sphere in which free enterprise—be it that of corporation owners or managers, or that of the man in the street—can be freely deployed. And it is the first and foremost task of the policy conducted by the countries of the Western World to arrest that process and to reverse it, wherever possible, lest we drift slowly, but with inexorable steadiness toward the state of affairs in which the countries of the Eastern bloc, through revolution or outside force, now find themselves. How many people are there in the Western World even now, who have succumbed to resignation or are prepared to submit to communism, because, as they see it, there is in practice but little to choose between the two ideologies. Many are those who think that free Western thought is not worth fighting for if it should remain dead and sterile as a mere embellishment of the phraseology of treaties and propaganda, while it has no resonance in their own everyday life.

I would like to take only one example out of many which demonstrates with particular clarity the fatal consequences of departing from the path of law and morality: as everybody with some knowledge of economics knows, our economic and political future stands or falls with the development of world production and world trade. This great task can only be mastered if we can find new markets with such purchasing power as will ensure work for our industries and a better standard of living for all our peoples. Countries with surplus capital, such as the United States and Great Britain, have therefore at an early date established plans for financing new investment projects in underdeveloped areas and have already achieved remarkable results. Financing these projects will require an ever increasing participation of private capital now that the first phase of government financing, necessitated by post-war conditions, is coming to an end. Drawing on private capital sources is necessary both in order to reduce step by step the excessive taxes and duties and to revive private initiative which was largely lost during the period of dirigism which, as we all hope, will forever remain a thing of the past. But we can expect private investors to be able or willing to assume the risk involved in investments abroad only if they are assured that their investments will be secure from confiscation or expropriation. But this security cannot be said to exist now, no matter how many clauses in private contracts and international agreements purport to give it; for if it did exist, there would be no need to have recourse to the rather doubtful device of offering prospective investors guaranties on the part of their own governments against risks of this nature.

There is, I think, no need for me to dwell on the many instances of confiscation of alien capital and property during the recent past. They are all well known to you. I would submit that the majority of these cases would not have occurred at all, or would not have assumed the same dimensions, had it not been for the far-reaching extent to which the concept of private property had suffered from confusion and been watered down even in our Western World, for reasons not always directly resulting from the war.

An illustration of this is offered by the well-known case in which a confiscating government tried to justify its action on the ground that the investor's country had nationalized some of its own industries. Other instances of this nature result from a tendency to couple private property rights with claims which are in no way connected with them.

We—and I am not exempting my own country—have for some time now been dangerously close to getting entangled into an inextricable maze of legal confusion and moral disintegration in which all those principles will be fatally destroyed on which are founded our human and international relations and our mutual confidence and loyalty. This will be the inevitable outcome if we fail in the timely restoration of the principle of the sanctity of private rights such as has been so vigorously defended by distinguished statesmen such as Alexander Hamilton, Mr. Cordell Hull, or Mr. John Foster Dulles, and by many others both in the United States and in Europe.

The United States, a country which has devoted itself with particular energy to the welfare of all nations, today has financial interests throughout the world, running to many billions of dollars. It is the policy of the United States further to increase its investments abroad for the benefit both of its own economy and of the standard of living especially in less developed countries. Taxation benefits and other measures have been or are being introduced in order to induce private capital to take a greater interest in financing such investments. Europe, too, has been invited to take a greater part in these projects than she has done until now. Our continent has by now sufficiently recovered for us to be able to undertake such a task; but the risks to be run, especially on the political and moral side, are so great that neither private individuals, nor business enterprises, nor even the European governments feel encouraged to invest any further substantial financial interests abroad. Can we, for example, expect those countries which are using capital invested by our citizens and our national economy to develop their own economies, to respect and protect without restraint our interests if we ourselves by our own deeds defy the established principle of the sanctity of another person's property? I do not think we can, and there are many who share my opinion. Not the least among them is Mr. Dulles himself, who last year, during the hearings of the Dirksen bill, said:

"I recognize that there is force in what you say, to the effect that our own position to protect American interests abroad is strengthened, if we protect foreign interests that are here.

"I would think that in an era when we expect the American interests abroad, American capital investments abroad, it is wise for us to adhere ourselves strenuously to the highest standards of conduct in relation to those matters. That puts us in a better position to call upon others to apply the same standards."

As a banker whose profession calls for the assessment of credit and goodwill, I certainly would strongly advise my clients against investing their money in countries where, over and above the natural economic risk connected with any investment, there would be the added hazard of losing one's investments through expropriation or seizure. Only recently I witnessed a particularly striking example of the utter hesitation prevailing in German business circles as regards new foreign commitments, which is motivated by that very political hazard.

On the other hand, if we indulge in an ambiguous attitude regarding private property rights, we shall discourage and alienate people and groups of people of good will who, throughout the world, still have faith in the ethical and legal tenets of the Western way of life.

We need them; only with their help can America and Europe hope to safeguard their own rights and those of their citizens so that they will put their hearts into stemming back nationalism and communism. As a citizen of the Western World whose views are guided above all by the supremacy of confidence among nations, I believe that we can ensure this inner preparedness of our citizens if your great country, acting in a given concrete case, demonstrates to the world at large that she is resolved to stand firmly by her consistent tradition of maintaining inviolate the private property rights even of nationals and companies of one of her former enemies.

In the long run, our struggle to check the powers of the Eastern block and to stem the infiltration of socialist ideologies will be doomed to failure if we rely on financial and physical means alone. Our physical strength must be backed by the conviction among our peoples that the Western World unflinchingly stands for the ethical values of the Occident, and that we are all devoting our efforts to living by them. The highest rank among those spiritual values belongs to personal freedom and the sanctity of private rights.

I could well imagine that if your great country were to give this practical demonstration with regard to former enemy private property, this would leave a deep impression both on our friends and our opponents, and would stand out in this period of ethical confusion and political instability in which the nations of the world are anxiously awaiting a visible sign of the rebirth of Christian ethics. For is it not true that the principle of the sanctity of private property, like that of personal freedom, has its ultimate roots in the philosophy of protecting one's weaker neighbor as it was first conceived in Christian teaching—the philosophy of protecting individuals against injury by their own state and protecting citizens of little states against measures threatening their person and property on the part of bigger ones.

If a mighty country such as the United States took the lead in the field of private interests, as she has so admirably done in international politics since the end of the Second World War against so many difficulties and setbacks, I believe that she would thereby also conquer the hearts of those

multitudes of people on whom we must rely to attain our common goal.

This, however, would only be a first, although decisive step, toward our common task of protecting individual rights and legitimate interests against restrictions or against encumbrances which belong exclusively to the field of relations between states and have no possible connection with the sphere of private rights. If this first step were accompanied by an appeal launched by the United States for the conclusion of an international convention, a Magna Carta to be drawn up for the protection of lawfully acquired property and providing for joint sanctions to be taken especially in the economic field against any future cases of deprivation of rights and infringements upon the inviolability of personal freedoms of foreign citizens and corporations, she would thereby make an essential contribution toward the final aspiration of all freedom-loving men and women, that respect for the individual and unconditional protection of his interests may once more become the unwritten law of nations. At the same time, this would insure the implementation of the vast development programs which have been established by the United States and other major powers to advance world economy and to improve the living conditions of all peoples.

The efforts made by distinguished Members of Congress on both sides of the House until this very day, and the statements regarding the property question which have been made by representative Americans—and this brings me back to the specific question of German-American relations—have convinced me that the principle of the sanctity of private property and its application with regard to former enemies is regaining increased acceptance in American public opinion. This being so, there would have been no need for a German initiative in raising the problem of German private property with the Government of the United States, had it not been for the necessity before which the federal republic finds herself of solving an impending problem of extremely great difficulty, both internal and external, namely, the final step of integrating the Federal Republic of Germany into the Western defense system and her accession as an equal partner to the concert of Western nations. The Federal Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, ardently wishes—and of this I may give you full assurance—to see the Federal Republic of Germany fully integrated with the Western community, and to make such sacrifices as are necessary to attain this end, to the fullest possible extent. This policy, however, cannot lead to complete and lasting success unless it is supported by a decisive majority among the German people. And this is where an early release of private German property confiscated in the United States, with adequate compensation for such assets as have been disposed of, would constitute a substantial contribution toward convincing those in Western Germany who are still in hesitation or opposition, that the Chancellor is right in his policy. It is a policy geared to the defense by all of those values which determine the strength and growth of free nations and their countries and which, in the last analysis, are the foundation of their very existence.

While it is true that only a relatively small section of the German public have assets and interests to defend in the United States, we should not underrate the strains and stresses which the confiscation and liquidation of German private assets have caused in the relations between our peoples. Nor should it be overlooked that these measures affect not only the actual owners but also, in an indirect way, the large number of small stockholders and workers who depend on them. They all feel—and I think rightly—that the seizure and disposal of their property would be something they have not deserved. Moreover, they feel that there is a marked contrast between the general policy to which they as citizens of the Western nations are asked to subscribe—a policy which is, after all, directed against Communist methods—and the practical measures which the same Western nations are maintaining despite the changes which the political configuration of this world has undergone in the meantime.

It is clear from this, I think, that this is not a question which involves the interests of only some few owners or managers of large enterprises, but a profound question of principle, which has deeply stirred public opinion in Western Germany. If that question has only recently found its way into public opinion, it was because the German public as well as the Federal Government and Parliament had felt that Germany should settle her most urgent external obligations first.

I do not think that I am saying too much when I state that the Federal Republic of Germany has given proof of her willingness to make every sacrifice that it is within her power to make for our common cause, and I would not be here today if I were not convinced that my country, divided and crowded with millions of refugees as she is, has done everything possible to atone for the wrongs perpetrated by the rulers of the Third Reich against the nationals of former enemy countries. I may mention, with all modesty, first the settlement of German external debts under the London Agreement of 1953, and the measures of restitution to victims of persecution by the Third Reich. The Federal Republic of Germany will make every effort in continuing this policy.

This fact is to me an added encouragment in hoping that the step taken by the Federal Republic of Germany and Chancellor Adenauer in raising the question of German property and seeking discussions with your Government will not give cause for resentment or surprise in the United States.

In taking this step, the Chancellor is well aware of the political, legal and also technical problems which render a solution of this question difficult. However, once the principle of the sanctity of private rights has been recognized as henceforth extending also to Western Germany, and its full application effected, as I have not the slightest doubt it will, I am sure that these difficulties will yield to our concerted endeavor.

In conclusion, I may be permitted to say a few words on the friendly relations existing between the German and American peoples, which it is the particular concern of the federal government and the Chancellor to strengthen even further. In the last analysis, these relations between peoples themselves are the basis of any joint policy—for what would be the good of treaties of friendship and alliances if they were not carried by mutual trust among peoples?

I am most gratified to be able to state that this mutual trust in our relations exists not only between our statesmen, Government representatives, and businessmen. We also agree that the same trust has gained strength from year to year between simple German and American citizens, despite the element of tension which any occupation is bound to introduce in international relations. In former eras of diplomatic practice, ambassadors and ministers of one country, when speaking of friendly relations with the host country, could refer only to a select circle of private persons and official governmental representatives of the countries in question who were in contact with each other through professional intercourse. Today, however, one can truly say that between Western Germany and the United States the peoples themselves are in close day-to-day contact with each other. Many thousands of American tourists, soldiers, officials, and businessmen are coming to Germany for extended visits where they live together practically as members of our community. And conversely, the United States has offered an immense number of Germans an opportunity to become acquainted with your country, its people, and its institutions. The result of this process is as positive as it could possibly be in international relations, and I am very happy to confirm this fact. The German people have discovered that they have many features in common with the American people, which makes it much easier to maintain friendly relations. In addition, they admire the outstanding achievements of the American people in practically every field of human activity, their openmindedness and love for freedom, qualities which are today more than ever apt to make a particularly favorable impression on the German people. It is the particular wish of the Federal Chancellor and the Federal Government to see a situation in which a troubled chapter of the past has been closed and the road made free toward genuine and sincere friendship and cooperation.

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1955]

GERMAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States and Germany have reached a preliminary understanding on an American plan calling for a partial return of German property in this country seized during the war. According to this plan, which must still be approved by Congress, the United States proposes to return such property to individual owners in West Germany up to a maximum of $10,000 per person, and to restore all German copyrights, trade-marks and cultural property. The same formula will be applied to residents of East Germany when Germany is reunited.

Germany welcomes this plan as a constructive step, but it is not a final solution in either principle or substance. The property is to be returned "as a matter of grace," not as a matter of respect for private property—a principle to which the United States has frequently pledged itself and which it observed in large measure after the First World War. Furthermore, the plan does not cover corporate property, which constitutes the bulk of the $450 million worth of German assets seized. This is left to future settlement.

The problem has been complicated, first, by the ruthless Nazi treatment of private property, which prompted European nations to look askance at any return of German property, and second, by counterclaims of American nationals against Germany for war damages. The latter claims are now to be settled up to a maximum of $10,000 in each case, from a fund of $100 million to be set aside out of payments made by Germany for American economic aid after the war. But taking into consideration the scandals attending the Alien Property Administration after the first World War, the use of such property for political rewards after the last war and the long delays in and exhorbitant cost of any settlement, it cannot be said that the treatment of private property constitutes the most glorious chapter in the history of Western democracy. The sooner that problem is finally solved with full vindication for the principles for which we stand the better will we be able to meet the Communist challenge to the free world.

NECESSITY FOR A STRONG AND VIRILE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there was a meeting held in Washington by the independent bankers of the country. At that time a resolu-

tion was adopted with reference to the Senate Small Business Committee, particularly with reference to Senate Resolution 16 which is pending before the Senate, and which has, I believe, the sponsorship of 70 Senators, or at least more than a majority. The resolution asks for a change in the rules relating to that committee. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Independent Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS RESOLUTION

Whereas there was created in the 82d Congress, February 20, 1950, a Senate small business continuing committee; and

Whereas because of the effective work carried on by that committee in behalf of small business these past 5 years; and

Whereas the committee members believing the time has arrived to give standing-committee status to the present Small Business Committee, a resolution was introduced in the 83d Congress providing standing-committee status, the resolution being sponsored by the full Committee on Small Business of the Senate, together with other Members of the Senate, totaling 50 in all; and

Whereas the Senate Rules Committee failed to act on the resolution in the 83d Congress; and

Whereas on January 6, 1955, a similar resolution was introduced in bipartisan action in the 84th Congress, Senate Resolution 16, cosponsored by 53 Members of the Senate; and

Whereas the number of Senators supporting the resolution has now reached a total of 70 Members of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., this 26th day of March 1955, That the Independent Bankers Association endorse the resolution as now introduced in the 84th Congress to give the Committee on Small Business the status of a regular standing committee of the United States Senate; be it further

Resolved, That the Independent Bankers Association furnish a copy of this resolution to the present chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, and the ranking minority member, the Honorable EDWARD THYE; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be forwarded to each member of the Senate Rules Committee, with an accompanying letter urging the Rules Committee to take immediate action in reporting Senate Resolution 16 to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I share a common interest with other Senators in this august body who have devoted much time and considerable effort in promoting the welfare of small business. It has long been my feeling, and I have urged it on many occasions, that a strong and virile small business community is an essential element in the economic bloodstream of America.

Some of the requisites for nurturing small business include proper financing, and a fair share of both Government and military contract work. Obviously, this calls for a substantial measure of cooperation from the large firms. It is vital that the base of our economy be as broad as possible; and every step which results in the acquisition of new business by a small company is a step toward the enlargement of that foundation.

Those who saw the full-page advertisement by the Radio Corporation of America in the newspapers of April 11, in which RCA recited its program for the development of small business, were—as I was—doubtless impressed by the facts stated therein. It is possible that no large company, including RCA, has yet gone far enough in the direction we advocate. It may well be that even this corporation, which has taken a long stride in the right direction, can increase the scope of its relationship with small business. However, I feel that the efforts made by General David Sarnoff, the chairman of the board, and Mr. Frank M. Folsom, the president of RCA, constitute notable progress in this sphere. It is to their credit that 80 percent of their 7,500 suppliers are small businesses from 43 States; that this 80 percent receives from 45 to 50 percent of the dollar volume expended by RCA with its suppliers; and that all this has been accomplished without the use of Government-owned or Government-leased plants, facilities, or equipment.

I am sure that many other companies are taking the same forward steps; but I was gratified to read of the implementation of the policies of General Sarnoff and Mr. Folsom in the full-page advertisement to which I adverted earlier.

This is indeed a heartening and encouraging sign of progress.

PREVAILING MINIMUM WAGE DETERMINATIONS UNDER THE WALSH-HEALEY PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT OF 1936

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the statement I am about to make is made on behalf of both the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself. On April 4, Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, handed down an opinion in the case of Covington Mills against Mitchell which, if it is allowed to stand, will destroy the effectiveness of prevailing minimum wage determinations under the Walsh-Healy Public Contracts Act of 1936. The Secretary of Labor was given authority in the Walsh-Healey Act to ascertain already existing prevailing minimum wages and to require that employees of a manufacturer who enters into a contract with the Federal Government be paid such prevailing minimum wages. The purpose of this provision in the Walsh-Healey Act is to make sure that pressure to get Government contracts on a low-bid basis does not depress industrial wages and to insure that Government contracts do not go only to those areas of the country which pay the lowest wages.

Generally speaking, the Secretary of Labor has made most of his prevailing minimum-wage determinations on an industrywide or nationwide basis. In the Covington Mills case Judge Holtzoff ruled that industrywide determinations were "invalid as in contravention of the statute."

For some time it has been realized that the language of section 1 (b) of the Walsh-Healey Act is ambiguous. To correct this ambiguity I introduced S. 1703 in the 83d Congress on April 21, 1953. This bill was designed to clarify the present language by authorizing the Secretary to make his Walsh-Healey minimum-wage determinations within such a geographic area as he found appropriate. On behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself I introduced an identical bill (S. 738) in the 84th Congress on January 26, 1955.

It is a function of the Congress and not of the courts to correct ambiguities in statutes. This was clearly pointed out in the Covington Mills case when Judge Holtzoff stated:

> The court is impressed with arguments made by counsel as to the administrative difficulty that would be created if the Secretary of Labor were not to be permitted to make nationwide determinations under the Walsh-Healey Act. The court is further impressed with the argument that it is desirable from a social and economic standpoint in some instances to fix the rate of prevailing wages on a nationwide basis. The court expresses no opinion on these points because they are not for the judiciary to determine. These arguments should be addressed to the Congress, because they relate to policy and expediency and not to the interpretation and the meaning of what the Congress has already enacted.

It is hoped that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will schedule hearings on S. 738 and other bills to amend the Walsh-Healey Act at the earliest opportunity. This matter is of such importance in our basic national labor policies that it should be resolved without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the opinion in the Covington Mills case, a copy of S. 738, and three editorials on this matter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion, bill, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COVINGTON MILLS, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, VERSUS JAMES P. MITCHELL, SECRETARY OF LABOR, DEFENDANT

Llewellyn Thomas, Esq., of Washington, D. C., and Whiteford Blakeney, Esq., of Charlotte, N. C., for the plaintiffs.

Edward H. Hickey, Esq., of the Department of Justice, and Stuart Rothman, Esq., Solicitor of the Department of Labor, both of Washington, D. C., for defendant Secretary of Labor.

David E. Feller, Esq., of Washington, D. C., for defendant Textile Workers of America.

Warren F. Farr, Esq., of Boston, Mass., for defendant National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.

This case comes before the court on cross motions for summary judgment. The action is brought for a declaratory judgment to adjudicate an order by the Secretary of Labor to be invalid as in contravention of the statute pursuant to which it was promulgated.

The order in question fixed a minimum wage for persons employed in certain branches of the textile industry in connection with Government contracts. This was done pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. The prevailing wage as determined by the order in question, promulgated on December 5, 1952, was to be the same throughout the United States.

The Walsh-Healey Act, pursuant to which this order was promulgated (41 U. S. Code, sec. 35), relates to Government contracts for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000. One of the provisions of the act is that there shall be

included in each contract a representation and stipulation that all persons employed by the contractor in its performance will be paid not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work or in the particular or similar industries or groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract.

It is contended by the plaintiffs that under this provision the Secretary of Labor is without power to fix a single prevailing minimum wage for a particular industry on a nationwide basis. To determine whether this objection is sound it is necessary to analyze the pertinent phraseology of the act. The Secretary of Labor is directed to determine the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work, or, persons employed in the particular or similar industries, or, persons employed in groups of industries. In other words, he may act under any one of these three provisions. These provisions are followed by the clause, "currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract."

It is contended by the defendants that the words "currently operating in the locality" are limited only to the last of the three alternatives, namely, persons employed in similar groups of industries. On the other hand, the plaintiffs claim, contrary to the contention of the Secretary, that those words relate back to all of the three clauses. There is some ambiguity in the statute. It is difficult to construe it according to strict grammatical requirements. The words "currently operating" seem inapplicable to the noun "work" or to the noun "industries." It is, perhaps, an unfortunate choice of words, but it seems to the court that the phrase "currently operating" may not be construed as being limited solely to the last of the alternatives but relates back to each of them, namely, persons employed on similar work currently operating in the locality, or, persons employed in the particular or similar industries currently operating in the locality, or persons employed in similar groups of industries operating in the locality. This is the interpretation, in the opinion of this court, which should be accorded to those words.

In this connection, the court wishes to call attention to the fact that when the construction of this provision was first raised in litigation in *Lukens Steel Co. et al.* v. *Perkins, et al.* (107 F. (2d) 627), the point now made by counsel for the Secretary of Labor was not advanced, but it seemed to be assumed that the words "currently operating in the locality" were applicable to and limited each of the three alternatives. Apparently the present construction sought to be applied by counsel for the Secretary of Labor is more or less of an afterthought.

Since the phrase "currently operating in the locality" applies to each of the three alternatives, the next question to be determined is whether the entire United States of America can be considered as a single locality in the discretion of the Secretary. To be sure, the word "locality" is an indefinite term. It may mean a single community. It may mean a county. It may mean a region. A considerable degree of discretion is vested in the Secretary to determine what shall constitute a locality for any particular purpose. So long as the construction placed by the Secretary is reasonable, the court may not set it aside. May it be said, within reason, that the entire United States of America may be regarded as a single locality? It seems to the court that to attach this interpretation to this term would be to place a tortured interpretation and attach a distorted meaning to a simple English word.

Such a type of interpretation and construction of words was satirized by a great English satirist in the well-known book Through the Looking Glass. This book records a dialog between Alice and Humpty Dumpty, and says:

" 'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

" 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

" 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master—that's all'."

The court is not going to place its seal of approval upon that type of construction of plain English words. The court is of the opinion that under no circumstances is it reasonable to construe the word "locality" as applicable to the entire United States of America and calling the entire country a single locality.

The court is especially impelled to this conclusion by the opinion of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Lukens Steel Co., et al.* v. *Perkins et al.* (107 F. (2d) 627). That case involved the validity of an order under this statute, which fixed wages in the steel industry at a single figure for an area of about 14 States and the District of Columbia and referred to them as a locality. In an opinion written by Mr. Justice Justin Miller, in which Mr. Justice Vinson, then a member of that court, concurred, it was very cogently and persuasively held that the word "locality" may not be used to describe a broad area consisting of 14 States and the District of Columbia. On this point the court made the following observations (pp. 630, 631):

"It is true that the word "locality" is one of somewhat indefinite meaning. Still, its indefiniteness has certain well-recognized limits in common meaning and usage, which exclude and forbid the interpretation placed upon the word by the appellees in their determination."

And again the court stated:

"In ordinary and common usage locality is synonymous in meaning with such words as place, vicinity, neighborhood, and community. These words, also, are too indefinite to be used for purposes of exact measurement in terms of acres or square miles. But neither they nor locality itself, in any case, connote large geographical areas, with widely diverse interests, such as the 14 States and the District of Columbia, grouped in the protested determination."

A fortiori, if 14 States is too large an area to be deemed a single locality, it necessarily follows that the United States of America is much too large an area to be so considered.

In that case Mr. Justice Edgerton dissented. He did not disagree with the interpretation by the majority of the word "locality," but reached the conclusion that the plaintiffs had no standing to sue and for that reason and that reason alone felt that the bill of complaint should be dismissed. The Supreme Court reversed the determination of the court of appeals (310 U. S. 113). The Supreme Court, however, did not discuss the views of the majority of the court of appeals as to what is meant by "locality," but merely held that the complaint should be dismissed on the ground that the plaintiffs had no standing to sue. This procedural obstacle was later overcome by the so-called Fulbright amendment, which permits judicial review of the determinations of the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. (41 U. S. C. A. 43 (a), added June 30, 1952, 66 Stat. 308.)

The court is impressed with arguments made by counsel as to the administrative difficulty that would be created if the Secretary of Labor were not to be permitted to make nationwide determinations under the Walsh-Healey Act. The court is further impressed with the argument that it is desirable from a social and economic standpoint in some instances to fix the rate of prevailing wages on a nationwide basis. The court expresses no opinion on these points because they are not for the judiciary to determine. These arguments should be addressed to the Congress, because they relate to policy and expediency and not to the interpretation and the meaning of what the Congress has already enacted.

Accordingly, the court will hold that for the reasons stated the order of the Secretary of Labor here involved is invalid as in contravention of the statute, and will deny defendants' motion for summary judgment and grant the plaintiffs' cross motion for the same relief.

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF,
United States District Judge.

APRIL 4, 1955.

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1 of the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended (the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) That all persons employed by the contractor in the manufacture or furnishing of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment used in the performance of the contract will be paid, without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account, not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages (1) for persons employed on work similar to that to be performed under said contract; or (2) for persons employed in the particular industry in which work under said contract is to be performed or in industries similar thereto. In making determinations of prevailing minimum wages, the Secretary of Labor may determine such wages within such geographic area or areas as he finds to be appropriate, giving due consideration to locations of establishments, areas of marketing competition, or other competitive factors."

[From the Boston Herald of April 6, 1955]

WALSH-HEALEY SETBACK

The decision of United States District Judge Holtzoff, enjoining the Secretary of Labor from setting an industry-wide minimum wage for cotton textile workers employed on Government contracts, is a blow not only to New England, which has strongly supported such a minimum, but to the country as a whole.

Under the Walsh-Healey Act, which became law in 1936, Government contractors are required to pay the prevailing minimum wage as determined by the Secretary of Labor. The obvious intent of the legislation is to prevent marginal producers from undercutting their competitors by paying substandard wages.

The Government thinks this should apply to groups of producers as well as individuals, and to regions as well as groups. It has therefore determined prevailing minimums on a country-wide basis. But this hasn't set well with areas whose chief competitive advantage has been cheap labor. And when the minimum for cotton textiles went up to $1 an hour recently, 140 southern mills went to the courts for relief.

What is the legal issue? The original act refers to prevailing wages "in the locality in which the materials are to be manufactured," and the southerners charge that the Government is interpreting locality to mean the whole United States. Judge Holtzoff agreed with them that this interpretation was tortured and he threw it out.

But the Government contends that the wages of the "locality" are only 1 of 3 standards which the law permits it to use. The others are wages "for persons employed

on similar work," and wages "for persons employed * * * in the particular or similar industries." It is all a question of how you read the law.

Surely it would have been better for the judge to resolve the doubt in favor of the Government. The Labor Secretary is presumably acting in good faith, and he has given the law the meaning which he thinks will be most beneficial to the country as a whole. Is Judge Holtzoff's guess any better than his?

New England has a special interest in retaining a strong Walsh-Healey Act. Because of the wage differential between northern and southern textile plants it has had to compete at a tremendous disadvantage and it naturally welcomes any move which will tend to narrow the wage gap.

But the Federal law can only narrow the gap. It cannot close it. An industrywide minimum wage would still be well below the New England average, and would leave the South with a considerable wage advantage. New England industry is prepared to fight its own battles. It asks only that the rules be kept reasonably fair.

The Government will, of course, ask a review of Judge Holtzoff's restrictive ruling. And we have no doubt that the higher courts will restore to the Labor Secretary the right to interpret the Walsh-Healey Act as it was intended. But it is frustrating, to say the least, to see the opposition's delaying tactics officially abetted.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun of April 6, 1955]

COTTON TEXTILE WAGE MINIMUMS

It may be some time before we have final judicial determination of the issue, but the northern textile mills, cotton as well as woolen, have lost an important round in the dispute over how to interpret the Walsh-Healey Act.

The Walsh-Healey law, passed back in the early days of the New Deal, was a device intended to boost wages and thereby incomes. It stipulated that the Federal Government could set wage minimums in industries making goods on Government contract, taking into account the wage-floor prevailing for "similar work" in "similar industries" and in "groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials * * * are to be manufactured or furnished."

For many years "locality" was interpreted to mean the entire United States, and by throwing into the scales the wage rates prevailing in northern textile mills, the Government was able to set textile-pay floors well above those then prevailing in the South alone.

But when the late Labor Secretary Maurice Tobin boosted the cotton textile minimum from 87 cents an hour to $1, just before the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, the South rebelled. Its cotton mills sued to prevent application of the Tobin order, on the premise that Congress never intended to have Walsh-Healey wage minimums fixed on a nationwide instead of a local basis.

Now a Federal judge has agreed with them, and we are inclined to feel that eventually the judge will be proven correct. If Congress had not meant to use the word "locality" in the sense of "regional," it would not have placed that language in the law.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Evening Journal of April 5, 1955]

SOUTHERN MILLS WIN

Cotton textile mills in Dixie won the first round in a legal battle over the minimum wage.

A Federal judge granted a motion by some 140 southern mills for a permanent injunction barring the Secretary of Labor from determining such wages on an industry-wide basis.

The decision was a setback for textile unions and for New England mills which have contended they were at a disadvantage, because of generally higher wages in New England, in competing with southern mills for Government contracts for textile goods.

Holtzoff's ruling was an interpretation of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Law. This law requires contractors for Government work to pay wages at least as high as the prevailing wage of the locality for that type of work.

The northern mills haven't given up the fight. They will take the decision to a higher court.

AMERICAN TRAVELERS ABROAD—AMBASSADORS OF GOOD WILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared relative to the increasing numbers of Americans who are traveling abroad.

I regard this great increase in international tourist travel as an extremely significant phenomenon. Tourist travel abroad widens the personal horizons both of Americans and of the various foreign peoples. It brings them into closer contact with one another so that they can see for themselves and truly get better acquainted.

International tourist travel also largely increases the availability of dollar exchange in foreign countries.

I am always pleased to note that many fine private American groups are encouraging this tourist travel. The National Association of Travel Organizations has been a leader in this field. In my statement, which follows, I also refer to the constructive activity of the Illinois Commercial Men's Association. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. I hope that worldwide tourist travel will increase. Contrary to many reports, the behavior of our private citizens and of our servicemen already has, on the whole, been splendid. We look forward to further increases in civilian travel this year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Last year, a new high of 452,000 passports were issued to the American people. This is 34,000 more than in 1953, and almost 60,000 more than in 1952.

The principal means of overseas transportation was steamship—253,000—followed by aircraft: 194,000.

This tremendous upsurge in travel reflects the increased amount of leisure time available to the American people.

It reflects their increased curiosity to find out for themselves more about the world. It also reflects the activity of many fine American organizations which are encouraging travel for professional, business, fraternal, religious, civic, veterans, and other interests.

I cite one particular instance: That of the Illinois Commercial Men's Association. It sponsored a nation-wide membership contest resulting in 15 awards to members—awards wisely taking the form of travel and, in particular, travel to foreign lands.

These award winners, two of whom are from my own State, from Milwaukee and Ashland, respectively, will shortly set out for abroad. They will walk the streets and tour the rural areas of foreign lands—to wonder and compare, from their own American viewpoints. But they will also be, to those who meet with them, symbols of American friendliness and good will.

Carrying within themselves the basic American qualities of simple dignity, generosity and quiet humor, they will personify the best among us.

The Illinois Commercial Men's Association, formed for mutual aid by self-reliant men, is to be congratulated for this thoughtful private contribution to the nurturing of the best form of foreign relations our country can achieve. May I also at this point congratulate these 15 men who, with their wives, we are pleased to have as our unofficial ambassadors:

Michael E. Adameak, Milwaukee, Wis.; Scott A. McLean, Ashland, Wis.; Lee S. Vincent, Chicago, Ill.; Charles E. Cole, Portland, Oreg.; John E. Lunsford, Birmingham, Ala.; A. E. Sharpe, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Adelbert A. Young, Oakland, Calif.; George W. Harlan, Sacramento, Calif.; A. O. Wendelburg, Miles City, Mont.; W. S. Corneille, Ambler, Pa.; Kendall Daskey, Peoria, Ill.; Lloyd Dean Estes, Memphis, Tenn.; Theodore I. Glou, Syracuse, N. Y.; Bert B. Rosen, University City, Mo.; Raymond H. Young, Houston, Tex.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia will not make a point of order, but he would like to remind his colleagues that the Senate is prepared to take up an appropriation bill involving the appropriation of $4 billion. Therefore he hopes that Senators who wish to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business will confine themselves to 2 minutes, under the rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say as a matter of courtesy to the distinguished majority leader that he permitted a departure from the rules of the Senate which not only took most of the time of the morning hour to which the Senator has referred—and I have no complaints about it—but a second rule was changed so that the majority leader was permitted to yield time during the entire period, and no one on this side of the aisle had an opportunity. There were several Senators who remained and who had an opportunity to transact some of their business, without any remarks which they normally would have an opportunity to make during a morning hour. I think that would be a more correct way of putting it. But I raise no complaint, and I hope the Senator will not call attention to the expiration of the 2-hour period and thus foreclose those Senators on this side who under a normal 2-minute provision would have an opportunity to make some remarks.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I said that I would not make that point, but I wished to remind my colleagues that the morning hour had expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that unanimous consent was granted, and the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

(At this point Mr. WILEY addressed the Senate in tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

DISMISSAL OF EDWARD CORSI BY SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 9, on hearing of the dismissal of Edward Corsi by Secretary Dulles, I made the following statement:

The ouster of Mr. Edward Corsi from his position as special assistant to the Secretary of State on immigration problems represents another milestone on the path of administration retreat from principles it professes to hold.

It is a shameless surrender to the opponents of immigration and citizenship law reform, a capitulation to the apologists for the racial and national discrimination built into the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. Corsi was, for many years, a high-ranking member of the Republican administration of my State under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. But he has been considered by Republicans and Democrats alike as a reputable, loyal, and outstanding American citizen, who, in such questions as immigration policy, considered the reform of present law as the concern of all Americans, regardless of party. He was determined also to make the Refugee Relief Act work, despite its tragic shortcomings and built-in booby traps.

Now he has been mercilessly sacrificed because of his identification with immigration reform.

I do not have the benefit of knowing Mr. Corsi on a personal basis, but I do know of his works, and speaking even as a Democrat, I would say that most of them have been good.

His removal from his present position is an assault upon the cause of immigration reform, but it is also an insult to the people of New York State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks 3 editorials, 1 from the New York Times of April 12, 1955, entitled "The Corsi Affair"; 1 from the Washington Post-Times Herald of April 12, 1955, entitled "Knuckling Under"; and 1 from the New York Post of April 11, 1955, entitled "The Aftermath to a Clear Case of Political Murder."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1955]

THE CORSI AFFAIR

If President Eisenhower has ever wondered why it is sometimes difficult to get first-class citizens to serve in important jobs in his administration let him look at the treatment meted out to Edward Corsi, former Industrial Commissioner of New York.

Mr. Corsi has been a distinguished public servant for more than two decades. His first public office of note was Federal Commissioner of Immigration here, a post to which he was appointed by Herbert Hoover in 1931. A liberal Republican, he has been his party's nominee for United States Senate and also for mayor of this city. Because of his expert knowledge of and sympathetic interest in immigration problems, Secretary Dulles named him last December as special assistant for refugee and migration problems, presumably on the theory that if anybody could make sense out of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 Mr. Corsi could. In appointing his "old friend," as he called him, Mr. Dulles noted that for this job Mr. Corsi was the "best qualified man in the United States."

But when Mr. Corsi came to Washington he had two strikes against him. He had been a vigorous and effective opponent of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. Furthermore, he was serious about trying to make the 1953 law work—and he actually started to do something about it. There are people in Washington who do not want the Refugee Relief Act to work. And Representative Walter, a Pennsylvania Democrat, has apparently not forgiven Mr. Corsi for what he said about the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. WALTER suddenly accused Mr. Corsi of having had Communist associations. Mr. Corsi denied the charges. Preliminary security investigations give Mr. Corsi a clean bill of health, as expected. Yet Mr. WALTER persisted, and Mr. WALTER is an important figure in Congress. We are left to conclude that rather than fight Mr. WALTER and stand up for his personal appointee Secretary of State Dulles capitulated. It is not the first time.

Even in capitulating the State Department says that security is not the issue. Of course it isn't. The issue is a refusal to defend an appointee who was especially called to Washington to do a certain job but who has the administration rug jerked from under him the minute he becomes the target of political attack. Mr. Corsi has been offered some kind of alternate job as a consolation prize. Whether he accepts or refuses it we hope the administration will learn that this is not the way to win the respect of the American people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

KNUCKLING UNDER

Edward Corsi's refusal of a State Department sinecure in place of the important post of immigration consultant from which he was ousted last week by Secretary Dulles heightens the general respect in which he is held. He would have forfeited that respect had he acquiesced in the Secretary's shabby appeasement of Representative FRANCIS WALTER. To treat Mr. Corsi, who has served as Commissioner of Immigration under President Hoover, as director of New York City's Emergency Home Relief Bureau under Mayor LaGuardia, as New York State Industrial Commissioner under Governor Dewey, as though he were some hungry, hat-in-hand jobseeker is as absurd and offensive as to treat him as though he were a security risk.

Mr. Corsi came to Washington at the request of Mr. Dulles to straighten out the emergency refugee program which has been shamefully mishandled by the State Department's Chief Security pooh-bah, Scott McLeod: His experience and accomplishments justified Mr. Dulles in characterizing him as "the best man for the job." Mr. Corsi had long been on record as favoring a much more liberal administration of the emergency relief program and a drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. These views naturally enough won him the hostility of Mr. McLeod and Representative WALTER. The latter, in accordance with a pattern he has followed respecting all critics of his immigration law, recklessly charged Mr. Corsi with being a Communist fronter.

In ousting Mr. Corsi and knuckling under to Mr. WALTER, Secretary Dulles has done something more than sacrifice one of his subordinates—as he has done on so many occasions in the past—to congressional pressure and intemperance; he has also indicated that he means to soft pedal efforts to repair the bigotry of our immigration procedures. Mr. Corsi could not have allowed himself to be a party to this without prostituting all that he has stood for throughout his public life. Mr. Corsi's reputation remains untarnished. But the administration has contributed to another victory for xenophobia.

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1955]

THE AFTERMATH TO A CLEAR CASE OF POLITICAL MURDER

Secretary Dulles' spineless surrender to the political mobsters who went out to "get" Edward J. Corsi has created a storm that will not quickly subside.

For one thing, Corsi's ouster has unforgettably dramatized the administration's betrayal of its pledge to liberalize the United States immigration program. Corsi was the man who took that pledge seriously; he lasted less than 90 days.

No doubt President Eisenhower will assure his next press conference that he still favors revisions of the oppressive McCarran-Walter law; that, indeed, no cause is closer to his heart than that of abetting the rescue of the dispossessed everywhere. The men who dominate his administration always grant Ike the luxury of voicing noble sentiments after the dirty business is done.

But the exiling of Corsi has pointed up the scandalous injustice and inhumanity of our refugee policy more vividly than any speech or editorial ever composed on the subject. In those terms the humiliation to which this decent public servant has been subjected may yet have a salutary aftermath.

In another sense, the Corsi episode underlines the steady moral disintegration of what used to be called The Crusade.

Nothing in the whole story is quite as revealing as Corsi's melancholy picture of the way in which ranking Republicans turned their backs on him the moment that Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and embryo McCarthy of the Democratic Party, opened fire. As Corsi told the Post Saturday:

"Herb Brownell, Sinclair Weeks, Secretary Dulles—I've known them in the party all my years as a Republican. But after WALTER made his unfounded charges nobody spoke out, nobody was around. I've never felt so much a stranger; I've never been so lonesome in this town."

Corsi is only the latest of a long list of worthy men whom the administration has deemed expendable in its cowardly record of capitulation to the know-nothings. What renders his case somewhat unique is his long history of Republican association. He was first appointed to a Government post by Herbert Hoover. He served this State long and well under Tom Dewey. He was his party's candidate for the Senate and the mayoralty.

Yet, in the end, the pillars of republicanism acted as if they had never been formally introduced to him. He had offended both Scott McLeod, Joe McCarthy's ambassador to the State Department, and Representative Walter, a congressional big shot. How could Herbert Brownell or John Foster Dulles dare be caught defending him against such adversaries?

There is little glory for the Democrats in the episode. It was a Democrat—WALTER—who started this infamous attack.

House Leader RAYBURN has silently condoned WALTER's gutter tactics with the benign cynicism that the Republican leadership used to display toward MCCARTHY. Only Herbert Lehman, Senator Sparkman, Representative Celler, and a handful of other Democrats have risen to Corsi's defense, just as Jack Javits and Representative Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey, have been almost alone among Republican dignitaries in challenging the Corsi ouster. But great multitudes of Americans who care about the refugee program may make themselves heard before this argument is over.

Let no one pretend that this is a minor skirmish or that Dulles has so many weightier matters on his mind that he cannot be severely called to account for his craven crawl. Our intolerant, small-minded immigration policy is a worldwide issue. Throughout Europe and Asia the Communists have shrewdly exploited the McCarran-Walter law and the restrictive McLeod operation as proof of America's inhumanity to man. The Corsi dismissal will magnify the damage tenfold.

Republican essayists will offer all manner of explanations for the President's role in the seamy affair. They will assert that he didn't know what was happening; that he grieved when it happened; that he wishes it hadn't happened. What none of them can explain is why he continually permits honorable men to be shot down for trying to carry out what he professes to regard as his own program.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S NEW CHINA POLICY SPEECH

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President on the evening of April 11, 1955, former Gov. Adlai Stevenson made a highly important and thoughtful speech on Far Eastern affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADLAI STEVENSON'S NEW CHINA POLICY SPEECH

I have not spoken to my fellow countrymen for more than 4 months. And I do so tonight only because I have been deeply disturbed by the recent course of events in the Far East and because many of you have asked for my views. I have waited until the first excitement about the islands, Quemoy and Matsu, has subsided and we can more calmly examine our situation in the straits of Formosa and in Asia. Emotion in matters of national security is no substitute for intelligence, nor rigidity for prudence. To act coolly, intelligently, and prudently in perilous circumstances is the test of a man—and also a nation.

Our common determination, Republicans and Democrats alike, is to avoid atomic war and achieve a just and lasting peace. We all agree on that, I think, but not on the ways and means to that end. And that's what I want to talk about—war, and ways and means to a peaceful solution in the present crisis.

When war lashed at us out of the skies over Pearl Harbor in 1941 we accepted that grim challenge with the conviction that we could at the end help forge a new world of peace and freedom. And tonight on this April evening, I remember that it was in April just 10 years ago that the largest conference in all diplomatic history met at San Francisco to write the charter of the United Nations—a charter of liberation for the peoples of the earth from the scourge of war and want.

The spirit of San Francisco was one of optimism and boundless hope. The long night was lifting; Hitler's armies were on the eve of collapse; the war lords of Japan were tottering. Our hearts were high in that bright blue dawn of a new day—just 10 years ago.

But tonight, despite the uneasy truces in Korea and Indochina, our country once again confronts the iron face of war—war that may be unlike anything that man has seen since the creation of the world, for the weapons man has created can destroy not only his present but his future as well. With the invention of the hydrogen bomb the human race has crossed one of the great watersheds of history, and mankind stands in new territory, in uncharted lands.

The tragedy is that the possibility of war just now seems to hinge upon Quemoy and Matsu, small islands that lie almost as close to the coast of China as Staten Island does to New York. Why are we in this bleak situation? Why is all the world anxious?

Well, the implications of our country's recent Formosa policy cannot be overstated. But I shall not enlarge now on the injury it has done us and the confusion it has wrought, not only among the uncommitted nations of Asia, but among our allies in Europe.

DIFFICULT DECISION

In brief, having first unleashed Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, presumably for attacks on the mainland, it appears that after some sober second thoughts President Eisenhower is now trying to releash him and return to the previous policy. Just a couple of months ago when the Chinese Communists made menacing gestures at other coastal islands occupied by the Nationalists, our Government had the disagreeable task of forcing General Chiang to evacuate the Tachen Islands which he had reinforced as a by-product of our own policy of encouraging the threat of invasion.

And today we find ourselves facing another difficult decision over the defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, also presumably fortified by the Chinese Nationalists with our approval and assistance. Having hinted at American intervention in Indochina, and then done nothing; having forced Chiang Kai-shek to evacuate the Tachen Islands; we now face the bitter consequences of our Government's Formosa policy once again; either another damaging and humiliating retreat, or else the hazard of war, modern war, unleashed not by necessity, not by strategic judgment, not by the honor of allies or for the defense of frontiers, but by a policy based more on political difficulties here at home than the realities of our situation in Asia. If we should withdraw under fire from the defense of these islands we again act the "paper tiger"; if we join in their defense we are at war, perhaps world war, without major allies and with most of public opinion in Asia and Europe against us.

Given these unhappy choices it appears that President Eisenhower will decide what to do if and when the attack comes, depending on whether in his judgment it is just an attack on these islands or a prelude to an assault on Formosa.

While our President has great military experience, perhaps it is not improper to ask whether any man can read the mind of an enemy within a few hours of such an attack and determine whether, at some later date, the enemy plans to go further and invade Formosa. Is it wise to allow the dread question of modern war to hinge upon such a guess? Moreover, it would seem to me difficult for any leader to make a rational, calculated decision under fire. In the explosion of emotion it is easy to be swept into war.

Now the President, as usual, is getting a lot of advice these days, and I hope I'm not making his hard task harder. Many of his most influential associates—including the Republican leader in the Senate and the chairman of the Republican policy committee—have been insisting that the President pledge us to the defense of these islands. They say that another bluff and backdown, another retreat in Asia, would add substance to what the Chinese Communists say about the United States being a "paper tiger."

Those who demand a pledge to go to war say that having gone this far with Chiang Kai-shek to let him down now when he is reinforcing these islands and preparing an all-out stand would deal a heavy blow to the morale of his forces and endanger the defenses of Formosa itself.

COUNTERARGUMENTS

Now there is undeniable merit to these and other arguments, but I must say in all candor that they seem to me overborne by the counterarguments, and I have the greatest misgivings about risking a third world war in defense of these little islands in which we would have neither the same legal justification nor the same support as in the defense of Formosa. They are different from Formosa. They have always belonged to China. But Formosa belonged to Japan and was ceded by the Japanese peace treaty. We have as much right to be there as anybody, except perhaps the real Formosans.

But, of course, the President's judgment must be final. He asked for and got from Congress the sole responsibility for making this decision. As Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Democratic majority leader, has said: "We are not going to take the responsibility out of the hands of the constitutional leader and try to arrogate it to ourselves." So the ultimate decision must rest with the constitutional leader, the President, our Commander in Chief. Yet in a democratic community he is entitled not only to the support, but also the informed judgment of his fellow countrymen.

The President will have my prayers for his wisdom and fortitude in making this critical decision, if he must and when he must. I only hope that inflammatory advice in his party and his administration does not unbalance his consideration of these critical questions:

Are the offshore islands essential to the security of the United States?

Are they, indeed, even essential to the defense of Formosa, which all Americans have been agreed upon since President Truman sent the Seventh Fleet there 5 years ago?

Or is it, as the Secretary of Defense says, that the loss of Quemoy and Matsu would make no significant military difference?

Can they be defended without resort to nuclear weapons?

If not, while I know we now have the means to incinerate, to burn up, much of living China, and quickly, are we prepared to use such weapons to defend islands so tenuously related to American security?

Finally, are we prepared to shock and alienate not alone our traditional allies, but most of the major non-Communist powers of Asia by going to war over Quemoy and Matsu, to which the United States has no color of claim and which are of questionable value to the defense of Formosa?

Are we, in short, prepared to face the prospects of war in the morass of China, possibly global war, standing almost alone in a sullen or hostile world?

These are the questions that must be answered, this time I hope with more concern for realities in Asia and for unity with our allies than for fantasies in Formosa and for placating implacable extremists in America.

At this late date there may be no wholly satisfactory way of resolving the dilemma we have stumbled into over the onshore islands. But if we learn something from this experience, if we realize at last that we have been pursuing a dead-end policy in Asia, then perhaps we can turn our present difficulties to good account and devise an approach more in keeping with the realities of Asia and of the hydrogen age.

And that causes me to say that the division of our coalition over these offshore islands, the weakening of the grand alliance of free nations pledged to stand together to defend themselves, is in my judgment a greater peril to enduring peace than the islands themselves.

I know some politicians who tell us that we don't need allies. Life would certainly be much simpler if that were so, for our friends can be highly irritating. But it is not so. We need allies because we have only 6 percent of the world's population. We need them because the overseas air bases essential to our own security are on their territory. We need allies because they are the source of indispensable strategic materials. We need, above all, the moral strength that support of the world community alone can bring to our cause. Let us never underestimate the weight of moral opinion. It can be more penetrating than bullets, more durable than steel. It was a great general,

Napoleon, who wrote: "In war, moral considerations are three-quarters of the battle."

Should we be plunged into another great war, the maintenance of our alliances and the respect and good will of the uncommitted nations of Asia will be far more important to us than the possession of these offshore islands ever could be. Moreover, the maintenance of a united front is of vital importance to the defense of Formosa itself, since, in addition to the material and military support our friends might contribute toward the defense of Formosa, their moral support and the knowledge by the Communist leaders that they would be facing a united free world, would be a much more effective deterrent to an assault on Formosa than is our present lonely and irresolute position on the offshore islands.

So it seems to me that to repair the broad breach in our ranks should be our first priority, for the supreme aim of the Peiping-Moscow axis is to drive a wedge between America and her friends and allies. To divide and conquer is not yet obsolete strategy.

How shall we mend the walls of our coalition? And is there any hope of a peaceful solution of the offshore island question?

I think so. Senator GEORGE, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has recently pointed the way: "We nations of the free world must understand each other and reach a measure of unity before any hopeful approach can be made to a reexamination of * * * our far eastern problems."

And Governor Harriman, of New York, long familiar with the problems of maintaining a coalition, warned us the other day that in Asia: "The whole world is a party at interest, and that it has been not only illogical but deadly dangerous to arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for decisions which involve the future of many peoples."

So I would urge our Government to promptly consult our friends; yes, and the uncommitted states, too, and ask them all to join with us in an open declaration condemning the use of force in the Formosa Strait, and agreeing to stand with us in the defense of Formosa against any aggression, pending some final settlement of its status—by independence, neutralization, trusteeship, plebiscite, or whatever is wisest.

Nor do I see any reason why we should not invite Soviet Russia, which is united by treaty with Red China, to declare its position, to indicate whether it prefers the possibility of ultimate settlement by agreement to an unpredictable, perhaps limitless conflict, started by an arrogant, foolhardy Communist China, either by miscalculation or by design.

With the assurance provided by such a common position concurred in by the nations whose weight and prestige are essential to the ultimate success of any Formosan policy, neither we nor General Chiang Kai-shek should any longer need to rely upon a militarily precarious position in these little offshore islands to resist the aggressive ambitions of the Chinese Communists toward Formosa.

With such an international declaration denouncing the use of force; with such collective support for the defense of Formosa; with the addition thereby of moral solidarity to military strength in Formosa, I should think Quemoy and Matsu would have little further importance to the Nationalists, let alone to us.

Diplomacy prescribes no rigid formula for accomplishing our objectives, and another major avenue in the quest for a peaceful solution in the Far East remains unexplored; the United Nations. I should think that the United States, together with friends and allies in Europe and Asia, could submit a resolution to the United Nations General Assembly, calling upon the Assembly likewise to condemn any effort to alter the present status of Formosa by force. And I think we could afford to go further and call upon the United Nations Assembly to seek a formula for the permanent future of Formosa, consistent with the wishes of its people, with international law, and with world security.

One of the weaknesses of our position is that we have been making Formosa policy as we thought best regardless of others. But we can't expect other nations to always support policies they disagree with. We can persuade but we can't coerce. And one of the advantages of joint action would be to put Formosa policy on a much broader basis. In the eyes of Asian nations we would thereby achieve a consistent and morally unquestionable position in providing for the protection of the Formosans according to the principles and ideals of international law.

In the eyes of our European friends and allies we would once more have asserted our full belief in the value, indeed in the indispensability, of maintaining the alliance of the free world against the slave world. And in the eyes of our Nationalist friends on Formosa, surely the understanding and support of the bulk of the non-Communist world is a much stronger defense of Formosa than these islands can possibly be.

But if the Chinese Communists refuse, if they insist on force and reject any peaceful solution, then at least it would be clear to everyone who the aggressors were. And, clearly, if the Chinese are so bent on violence, so intoxicated by their successes, so indifferent to the grisly realities of modern war, then we have no alternative but to meet force with force. But let us at least meet it with our allies beside us and the blame placed squarely where it belongs—not on America's fantasies and inflexibility, but on the unteachable and unquenchable ambition and the indifference to human life of China's Communist regime.

So to repairing the cracks in our walls and recapturing lost confidence, I would attach the first priority. And to profit from this unhappy experience we might ask ourselves how we ever got in this position, how the prestige and honor of the great United States, not to mention the peace of the world, could be staked on some little islands within the shadow of the China coast in which we have no claim or interest.

The answer, of course, is that we have been making Formosa policy lately not only on a unilateral basis but more on considerations of domestic political expediency than foreign realities. Domestic politics should not enter our foreign affairs, least of all factional conflict between the two wings of the President's party, but they have, and too often our hot and cold vacillating behavior abroad has reflected efforts to please both the views that divide our Government and the Republican Party, especially on far-eastern policy.

While I do not belittle some recent achievements in the foreign field, too much of our foreign policy of late has disclosed a yawning gap between what we say and what we do—between our words and deeds.

For example, you remember that as the Communist pressure rose in Indochina, just a year ago, so did our warlike, menacing words. The Vice President of the United States even talked of sending American soldiers to fight on the mainland of Asia. But what happened? Nothing.

Likewise all the bold, brave talk about liberation of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain has long since evaporated, with the loss of half of Vietnam and of our prestige and influence.

So also we hear no more of last year's dire threats of instantaneous and massive atomic retaliation. Instead, the President has spoken lately of pinpoint retaliation with tactical weapons. I fear, however, that the psychological effect of the use of atomic weapons, large or small, will be unfortunate.

But there has been plenty of massive verbal retaliation, and the administration's policy of extravagant words has alarmed our friends a good deal more than it has deterred the aggressors. For our allies assumed that the great United States meant what it said, and it seems to me that when you compare what we have said with what we have done during the past 2 years it is little wonder that Secretary of State Dulles is fearful lest the Chinese Communists really do think that the United States is a "paper tiger."

Now let me be clear. I am not criticizing the administration for abandoning these extravagant positions; I am criticizing it for taking such positions, for making threats which it is not prepared to back up, for bluffing and undermining faith in the United States.

Another example of these winged words, as we have seen, was President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement 2 years ago that he was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, taking the wraps off him, presumably for an attack on the mainland to reconquer China. We need not speculate on the President's reasons for thus serving notice on Communist China and the whole world that Formosa was now free to resume the civil war. However, it was apparent to everyone else, if not to us, that such an invasion across 100 miles of water by a small, overage, underequipped army against perhaps the largest army and the largest nation on earth could not possibly succeed without all-out support from the United States.

Since it seemed incredible to sober, thoughtful people that the Government of the United States could be bluffing on such a matter, the President's unleashing policy has caused widespread anxiety that we planned to support a major war with China which might involve the Soviet Union. Hence we find ourselves where we are today—on Quemoy and Matsu—alone.

What, then, are the lessons to be drawn from the past 2 years?

In the first place, I think we should abandon, once and for all, the policy of wishful thinking and wishful talking, the policy of big words and little deeds.

We must renounce go-it-aloneism.

We shall have to face the fact that General Chiang's army cannot invade the mainland unless we are prepared to accept enormous burdens and risk—alone.

The world will respect us for recognizing mistakes and correcting them. But if our present posture in the offshore islands, for example, is a wrong one, who will respect us for stubbornly persisting in it? Our friends have made it clear that so long as fantasy, rigidity and domestic politics seem to stand in the way of peaceful Formosa settlement, they will not support us if, in spite of our endeavors, a conflict should break out. If we cease to deceive ourselves over the hard realities of power in the Formosa situation we shall have taken the first step toward our first essential—the restoration of unity of purpose and action between ourselves and our allies in the free world.

So, finally, let us face the fact that keeping friends these days calls for more statesmanship than challenging enemies, and the cause of world peace transcends any domestic political considerations.

But, preoccupied as we all are with the immediate problems of these islands, we must try to keep things in perspective somehow and not lose sight of our main objectives. For beyond Quemoy and Matsu, and even Formosa, lie the urgent and larger problems of Asia—the growing attraction of enormous, reawakened China, the struggle of the underdeveloped countries to improve their condition and keep their independence and the grave misgivings about America.

If for today the best hope for the world is a kind of atomic balance, the decisive battle in the struggle against aggression may be fought not on battlefields but in the minds of men, and the area of decision may well be out there among the uncommitted peo-

ples of Asia and Africa who look and listen and who must, in the main, judge us by what we say and do.

It is not only over the offshore islands crisis that we need a new sense of direction and to mend our fences. Too often of late we have turned to the world a face of obdurate military power. Too often the sound they hear from Washington is the call to arms, the rattling of the saber. Too often our constructive, helpful economic programs have been obscured, our good done by stealth. Thus have we Americans, the most peaceful and generous people on earth, been made to appear hard, belligerent and careless of those very qualities of humanity, which, in fact, we value most. The picture of America—the kindly, generous, deeply pacific people who are really America—has been clouded in the world, to the comfort of the aggressors and the dismay of our friends.

As best we can, let us correct this distorted impression, for we will win no hearts and minds in the new Asia by uttering louder threats and brandishing bigger swords. The fact is that we have not created excess military strength. The fact is that compared to freedom's enemies we have created if anything too little; the trouble is that we have tried to cover our deficiencies with bold words and have thus obscured our peaceful purposes and our ultimate reliance on quiet firmness rather than bluster and vacillation, on wisdom rather than warnings, on forbearance rather than dictation.

We will be welcome to the sensitive people of Asia, not as soldiers, but as engineers and doctors and agricultural experts, coming to build, to help, to heal. Point four was an idea far more stirring, far more powerful, than all the slogans about "liberation" and "retaliation" and "unleashing" rolled together. Let us present once more the true face of America—warm and modest and friendly, dedicated to the welfare of all mankind, and demanding nothing except a chance for all to live and let live, to grow and govern as they wish free from interference, free from intimidation, free from fear.

Let this be the American mission in the hydrogen age. Let us stop slandering ourselves and appear before the world once again—as we really are—as friends, not as masters; as apostles of principle, not of power; in humility, not arrogance; as champions of peace, not as harbingers of war. For our strength lies, not alone in our proving grounds and our stockpiles, but in our ideals, our goals, and their universal appeal to men of all faiths struggling to breathe free.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has already submitted for the RECORD the text of Adlai Stevenson's great statesmanship speech of the other evening. Therefore, I shall now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a press release I issued regarding that speech; and I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the same point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, commenting on Mr. Stevenson's speech.

There being no objection, the release and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1955.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, issued the following statement today on Adlai Stevenson's speech on the administration's foreign policy in Asia.

"Adlai Stevenson's speech was a great speech by a great statesman. It was true to the historic ideals of American foreign policy. In essence it urged the Eisenhower administration to return to a foreign policy within the framework of international law by pointing out that the United States has no legal right to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, and by recommending that we call upon the United Nations to intercede in the interest of maintaining peace in the Pacific and averting, if possible, a third world war.

"Stevenson reinforced the case which Senator LEHMAN and I have made against the administration's foreign policy in respect to the coastal islands from the day that we opposed and voted against the resolution authorizing the President to act outside the framework of international law.

"Stevenson's recommendation that we try to get together with our allies at once for joint action in defense of Formosa, and that we substitute moral principles and economic assistance in Asia for threats of military action points the way to the high road toward peace in contrast with the administration's low road toward war."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 13, 1955]

MR. STEVENSON'S SPEECH

Mr. Stevenson made a very fine speech on Monday on the great issues at stake in the Formosa Straits. But he ought to have made it 2 months ago. At that time the President submitted to Congress a joint resolution on the straits (following the mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek) which complicated the situation that Mr. Stevenson now seeks to clarify and resolve. But in February, along with most of the Democrats in Congress, the titular head of the party stayed silent. It was left to half a dozen Senators, led by Senator MORSE, to raise the questions about both the resolution and the treaty which are now agitating the entire country.

Last February these questions were also agitating our allies in the Western World. It is plain that, as Mr. Stevenson says, we should be left to fight alone if we sought to keep Quemoy and Matsu from falling into Chinese Communist hands. For this among other reasons the Democratic leader implies that he thinks we should not support Chiang Kai-shek there. Whether the President agrees with him is still a debatable question. That was one purpose of the joint resolution—to keep our purposes vague in the hope that the ambiguity would facilitate a cease-fire in the straits. More and more observers feel, however, that the Pekingites will not be so intimidated. If they should attack the islands and fail because of our intervention, they would probably succeed in isolating the United States, in Asia and possibly in Europe.

The case of Formosa is altogether a different propositon. Mr. Stevenson would invite the world to cooperate in the defense of Formosa pending a final determination of its status. Here is a very attractive suggestion. Whether or not it is practicable, however, is a large question. The United States will not let Formosa slip out of its control so long as an aggressive Communist regime in China is threatening free peoples on the continent of Asia and in Japan. If an agreement for international defense of Formosa could be worked out on the basis of this understanding, it would be a great contribution to the cause of peace.

In part, the present situation has resulted from the efforts of the administration to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. The White House clearly wants a peaceful solution. It thought it was working toward it—toward a way out of what Mr. Stevenson calls the dead-end policy on Asia—when it appealed to Congress last February. But far more action is needed on the positive side. It may be that nothing will divert Red China from following her announced course of trying to take Formosa as well as the offshore islands. However, Mr. Stevenson's statesmanlike speech has the merit of making clear that there is time to try again through diplomatic means to avoid a military showdown.

REPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION ON MILITARY TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have read with interest the stories in the newspapers concerning the Hoover Commission report on the subject of military transportation costs. I have noticed with particular interest that the Commission states that military transportation facilities are competing extensively with private shipping and the airlines.

Among other things the news stories report that the Commission singles out for attention the so-called waste involved in the hauling of "hitchhikers" in aircraft of the Armed Services. The news story quoted the Commission as stating that more than 4,800,000 passengers were carried as "hitchhikers, or on a leave status."

Mr. President, I yield to no one in desiring to eliminate waste, and to improve efficiency within the military services, and also to bring about a corresponding improvement in our economic structure. However, I am equally opposed to broad and sweeping generalizations which, if effective, would reduce the fringe benefits available to our military personnel. One of the most important factors in the maintenance of morale within the military service is the privilege of taking leave by its personnel. Due to the far flung locations of our military forces, such leave, if to be enjoyed frequently, requires transportation beyond the financial ability of most military personnel.

I personally feel that the question of permitting "hitchhiking," as referred to, if analyzed would be found to involve little or no cost to the Government. Such transportation is normally provided on a basis of space available on flights scheduled for other purposes.

It may be true that in some cases the individuals would have flown commercially if free military transportation were not available. It is much more likely they would not be able to get home in many more instances if military transportation were not available, because of the cost involved.

I sincerely trust that in implementing the generally excellent work of the Hoover Commission, the point of the continuing need to encourage our military personnel to remain as our active and reserve forces will be considered. I believe much good is accomplished at a small comparative cost by permitting service personnel to ride military planes when extra space is available.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the comments made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] regarding the taking away of so-called fringe benefits from military personnel, in respect to making available to them accommodations when they wish to go home and when facilities are

available on air transports to take them home.

When I was a member of the Armed Services Committee I served on a subcommittee dealing with the problems of military personnel. In my judgment, one of the greatest losses of military morale in recent years has come as a result of a very picayunish and parsimonious tightening up on the so-called fringe benefits available to military personnel. Great savings can be made in the military, but I believe it is false economy to make such savings by denying to military personnel an opportunity to have a free plane ride home, shall I say, when a plane is going to the vicinity of their home, anyway. There is nothing more disheartening. We subsidize the commercial airlines sufficiently, without insisting upon an indirect form of subsidy by means of requiring that when military personnel wish to go home for a visit—and all of us know they have little free money in their pockets—they must purchase commercial airline tickets, even though a military plane is going to the same vicinity at the same time.

There are other fringe benefits we are also taking away from military personnel that are very costly to military personnel morale. I refer, for instance, to the cutting down on commissary privileges. In my opinion, that has been very costly to morale, and I hope those commissary privileges will be restored at an early date.

THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, 8 years have been written into the history of the Army Medical Service since the Women's Medical Specialist Corps was established by Public Law 36, 80th Congress, on April 16, 1947.

As the eighth anniversary of the corps is at hand, the dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists making up its personnel find themselves integrated completely into the ranks of those responsible for the Army's health.

While achieving this integration, the three sections of the corps have functioned as a single unit, although each remained highly individual within its own specialty. They have unified their educational approach for the procurement of needed personnel, and they have consolidated their long-range functional objectives into a harmonious working pattern.

The Women's Medical Specialist Corps, an all-officer organization, currently has on active duty 210 dietitians, 200 physical therapists, and 135 occupational therapists. There is an immediate need for entrance on active duty of graduate dietitians and occupational therapists who have had 1 or more years of experience in their professional specialties.

It is a matter of deep pride to the corps that 13 percent of its total strength is on duty overseas, caring for hospitalized American soldiers in Europe, the Far East, the Caribbean, and Pacific areas.

Assigned principally to Army hospitals, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps officers perform the duties of their individual professions. The dietitians, in charge of food service in Army hospitals, direct the activities of their division. This includes planning diets for patients' individual needs, whether on a regular or therapeutic diet; instruction of patients in correct dietary habits; and performing the administrative duties in personnel and budgetary management which are inherent to a food service operation.

Physical therapists and occupational therapists apply the skills and techniques of their professions, under medical prescription, to the treatment of all types of patients.

The physical therapist uses exercise and massage and the physical agents such as electricity, heat, light, and water in a program of treatment designed to restore maximum usefulness of nerves and muscles.

Through varied creative and manual arts, the occupational therapist teaches and directs the patient in activities prescribed for his physical or mental illness. Both physical and occupational therapists work to hasten the patient's return to normal living through the use of their own specific media.

The corps is also participating in research, procurement of personnel, full-time teaching in professional specialties, and other special duty details. Dietitians are engaged in Army Medical Service research, connected with the nutritional content of the troop ration and the use of irradiated foods, the metabolic response to burns, and a study of human dietary needs in metabolic disorders.

Physical therapists have worked in Korea with the medical-assistance program, instructing ROK personnel in the principles and application of physical therapy. Occupational therapists have contributed to the designs of new equipment adapted to the needs of disabled persons.

Procurement activities for WMSC officers stationed in the Army area headquarters reflect the highest type of liaison efforts. In their contacts with the colleges and universities graduating the young women eligible to enter the corps, they have widened the horizons of career opportunities afforded these graduates. In their many appearances before civic organizations, women's groups, and vocational guidance conferences, they have interpreted the medical specialties of the corps from the level of actual experience.

Each section of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps has its own educational program. The courses are open to selected college graduates who wish to qualify in one of the corps' three specialties. Young women accepted for these courses of instruction are commissioned in the WMSC with a service requirement of 2 years, which includes the training period. Professionally accredited courses in hospital dietetics, physical therapy, and occupational therapy clinical affiliation are offered annually.

Despite the comparative youth of the WMSC as a component of the Army Medical Service, the corps retired 8 officers during the past 12-month period after 20 years service. These officers served with the Army as civilians in the earlier part of their careers and were recipients of AUS commissions early in World War II. The founding of the corps in 1947 was the culmination of many years of pioneering effort on the part of dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists working with the Army. Their record of service dates back to the Spanish-American War, and is a shining example of dedication to the best interests of humanity and the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the senior Senator from Maine is on the floor, I should like to have her attention for just a moment to say that I am very pleased that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] inserted in the RECORD today a report by the senior Senator from Maine with respect to the trip she recently took to a good many parts of the world. I happen to be one who believes that the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] performed a great public service in making that trip. I think it was one of the finest examples of good American public relations in the last several years; and I am sure that all Members of the Senate will read with great interest the observations contained in the report. I wish that my friend, the Senator from Maine, would go beyond the report, however, and some day would call together a group of us for a briefing on her observations, because I believe that all Members of the Senate would be delighted to sit down with her and have her give them the benefit of her observations and findings, as a result of that trip.

Having made this comment, I also wish to say that in my judgment she is not deserving of a single one of the irresponsible criticisms regarding her trip that we have heard from some prejudiced minds.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I very much enjoyed and appreciated what he has said about the remarks made by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon is aware that only the great modesty of the Senator from Maine prevented her from mentioning the fact that, as a Member of the House of Representatives, she introduced a measure which resulted in the formation of the Women's Specialist Corps. We should give credit not only to the corps itself, but also to the senior Senator from Maine, who was responsible for initiating that great work.

Mr. MORSE. I was not aware of that fact; but I am not at all surprised to receive the information, because I would expect her to do such a thing.

Mr. AIKEN. I was sure that if the Senator from Oregon had been aware of it, he would have given the Senator from Maine full credit for the contribution she made.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly would, and I thank the Senator from Vermont for supplementing my remarks.

THE STATUS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, genuinely alarmed as I am as to the improvident status of civil defense in this country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I addressed to President Eisenhower on March 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: "Civil Defense is dying." This is the report that I have received for the past several months from persons vitally concerned with the problem of civil defense. With great anxiety, I must state that my individual studies clearly reaffirms this conclusion and that unless some decisive action is taken at once, the alternative may be a fate for many millions of Americans far too horrible to contemplate.

"There is no absolute defense against the hydrogen bomb * * * [before its consequences] imagination stands appalled." So said Sir Winston Churchill recently in the British House of Commons. It is undeniably true that men's minds have not yet learned to assimilate the ultimate effect such weapons could have upon civilization. Civil defense need not remain a great engima. Adequate precautions which could greatly minimize casualties in case of an attack, atomic or otherwise, are firmly within our capabilities if sought with great endeavor and realistic dispatch.

The American people deserve and expect such a program—the most effective, efficient civil-defense program possible of attainment and they are entitled to such safeguards today. Unfortunately, not only is a comprehensive civil-defense program nonexistent, but what is more alarming, the Federal Civil Defense Administration as it is presently situated is manifestly incapable of effectual operation. Last July when plans to move the headquarters of this vital agency to Battle Creek, Mich., were first announced, I wrote you, outlining in detail what I regarded as persuasive reasons as to why this transfer should not take place. Subsequently, the Senate of the United States by a large majority voted against the move to Battle Creek.

My efforts and the vote of the Senate were unavailing and ostensibly, for reasons of economy, the Federal Civil Defense Administration proceeded with plans for moving to the Midwest—an act which unquestionably robbed this agency of the ability to perform the functions assigned to it.

Removed from the operations of this complex agency, as we in Washington are, any evaluation of its work would be extremely difficult and a task I would not attempt to undertake. However, there are collateral means available with which to judge these operations at Battle Creek. As one most convincing example, consider the fact that the work of the Civil Defense Administration is essentially liaison in nature. Twenty-six agencies and departments of the Government, all located in Washington, actually perform the investigations, studies, and other basic responsibilities on instructions from Battle Creek.

Yet, connecting Battle Creek with Washington are only seven telephone lines. As incredible as it might seem, these seven lines must afford adequate communications for several hundred civil-defense employees with associated Government personnel in Washington. Can there be any question as to the inadequacy of these telephone communications?

When civil defense was located in the District of Columbia, it used 25 telephone lines. Comparable telephone communications between Washington and Battle Creek would cost approximately $500,000 per year. This one cost factor would appear to make retention of the headquarters at Battle Creek economically impossible. What is more, even if these additional telephone facilities were obtained at such an immense cost for the performance of routine, unclassified liaison, proper administration could still not be maintained from Battle Creek because a large segment of the work performed by civil defense is classified and cannot be discussed over the telephone.

Gov. Val Peterson, FCDA Administrator, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 4th virtually admitted that at the present time the Battle Creek experiment was not satisfactory and that another year would be needed to appraise properly the ultimate merit of moving the headquarters to that midwestern location. Does our Nation have a year to waste? Can we afford a lingering 12-month's period in which to determine that this experiment is unfeasible?

Immediate steps, in my considered judgment, must be taken to locate these headquarters somewhere in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital so that the mandate of the Congress and the American people will be capably fulfilled. The administrative machinery essential to an adequate civil defense program must be reoriented and regenerated. The Civil Defense Administration must be returned from exile and given a chance to live and to perform its prescribed functions.

Civil defense is infinitely important to the future of our Nation. The Government agency entrusted with the primary responsibility of providing our Nation with a civil defense program should not be permitted to die a premature death. I believe that the conclusions stated in my letter of July 22, 1954 are now self-evident and that a new, more practical location for this vital agency should be selected immediately—Maryland, as before, is prepared to provide that location. Meanwhile, priceless time is being lost.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Also, Mr. President, in connection with the same critical situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Bring It Back Home," which appeared in the March 27, 1955, issue of the Washington Sunday Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRING IT BACK HOME

Because the original move was illogical, there is a lot of merit in Senator BUTLER'S request to President Eisenhower that the Civil Defense Administration be brought back to the Washington area from Battle Creek, Mich. It was illogical to single out Civil Defense for such a drastic dispersal move, while leaving in this target area such sensitive agencies as the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Even more illogical is the splitting up of CDA, with the Administrator and his staff of about 25 assistants staying in Washington and the remainder of the personnel working at Battle Creek. The extra time and expense involved in operating such a divided organization must be enormous. And the quarters at Battle Creep are apt to be needed by the Army in an atomic or other emergency, for they are former military hospital facilities still owned by the Government.

The return of CDA to Washington or its suburbs would contribute to the agency's efficiency. Certainly if the CIA feels that it is safe to remain in Washington metropolitan area, as is indicated by its plans for a new building near Langley, Va., the CDA ought to feel equally secure here.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, to further illustrate the confused reaction to this situation, particularly at the community level, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the April 8, 1955, edition of the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE: STILL A MUDDLE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

The General Assembly had before it, in its recent session, two bills dealing with civil defense. One would have empowered the civil-defense authorities to purchase or otherwise "lawfully acquire" such supplies and properties as might be needed in the event of an acute emergency, which means an atomic attack. The second bill was much more modest, It would have blanketed into the industrial accident system the volunteer workers for civil defense. The cost might have been as much as $20,000 a year. Anyway, both bills were turned down.

Maybe that is not important in itself. But it does show that, despite efforts at the Federal, State and even municipal level, civil defense has not yet come to be regarded as a matter of urgency. In this State, the organization has probably gone as far as in any. Some thousands of Marylanders devote time every week to spotting planes, manning emergency stations of all sorts, learning rescue and fire-fighting techniques and so on. Public services, utilities and similar corporate organizations have their own plans for the emergency; there are stockpiles of supplies, chiefly medical; everyone knows about the siren and other warning systems here in the city; large buildings have their approved shelters. In short, on the organizational level, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Sherley Ewing, State director, and Col. Frank Milani, who heads the Baltimore organization, much has been accomplished.

But interest lags, so far as most of us are concerned. Maybe the biggest factor is the feeling of hopelessness in the face of the terrific power of the bomb, a feeling greatly intensified by the recent stories of the subsequent dangers arising from "fall-out." But there has been confusion, too, at the highest levels. Told that cities must be evacuated in the event of attack, or even before it if possible, the local authorities duly marked "Civil Defense Highways." Were they to be used or avoided if attack came? That was never made clear. Then the word was given that if the population were to abandon the scene of attack, it should be on foot, so as to avoid highway congestion. The question of "on foot to where?" was never precisely answered. But still later we were told that evacuation was impossible and the thing to do was to prepare shelters in the house, stock them with food and water in advance and stay there until ordered out.

Confronted with such shifting and even impossible suggestions, is it any wonder most of us have done little or nothing? Is it any wonder that in Washington some Senators are now saying the whole Federal civil-defense system is useless and that the problem ought to be turned over to the military? Is it any wonder, indeed, that representative citizens, such as those who make up the General Assembly of Maryland, become bored with the whole subject and refuse to take action on even the simple proposals laid before them?

RESIGNATION OF FEDERAL JUDGE JOHN CLARK KNOX

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday, on the 37th anniversary of his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge John Clark Knox submitted to President Eisenhower his resignation as senior judge of the southern district of New York.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because Judge Knox began his long and honorable career in Greene County, Pa., where he was born.

Judge Knox was a member of a fine old pioneer family of western Pennsylvania. We in the Keystone State are proud of his distinguished attainments and his outstanding record of service to the Nation.

Judge Knox graduated from Waynesburg College, my alma mater, and attended the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania. He was admitted to the bar of Greene County, Pa., in 1906. As a young man he served as a justice of the peace, and from the very beginning he displayed the fine qualities and great ability which won for him the highest respect of the legal profession and his fellow citizens.

He was a careful and painstaking student of the law, kindly and considerate, with a keen desire to work for the best interest of all concerned.

He became an assistant United States attorney in New York in 1913. During the First World War, as a special assistant to the Attorney General, he successfully prosecuted many sabotage and espionage cases.

President Wilson appointed him to the Federal district court in 1918. During his career on the bench he presided over many trials of outstanding national importance, including that of Harry M. Daugherty, former Attorney General of the United States, and the cases growing out of the collapse of the Samuel Insull utility empire.

In these and many other cases, which attracted wide attention, he earned high praise for this ability, courage, and great understanding of the law.

Judge Knox is a man of deep learning and the highest integrity.

He has made a great contribution to the welfare of the United States.

DEVELOPMENT OF HELLS CANYON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just returned from hearings held last week in the Pacific Northwest by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the development of the finest undeveloped power site in North America, Hells Canyon on the Snake River, bordered by the States of Oregon and Idaho.

The issues involved in the full development of Hells Canyon as proposed by Senate bill 1333 are of crucial importance to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an informative debate between the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and myself, sponsored by the North American Newspaper Alliance, which was published in the Portland Oregonian April 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the debate and an article entitled "The Great Debate," written by Keith Hansen and published in the Portland Oregonian of April 3, 1955, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT DEBATE—HELLS CANYON HEARINGS NEAR

(By Keith Hansen)

Additional argument in the case of Hells Canyon Dam, a subject responsible for millions upon millions of written and spoken words in the past few years, is scheduled this week in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The new action is occasioned by a series of field hearings by the United States Senate Interior and Insular Committee scheduled in Boise, Idaho, Monday morning; Lewiston, Idaho, Monday afternoon; Pasco, Wash., Tuesday, and Portland, Wednesday.

The hearings will be the first on Senate bill 1333, which would authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River.

FPC RULE AWAITED

Idaho Power currently is awaiting a decision by a Federal Power Commission examiner on its application to build 3 dams in Hells Canyon. The examiner's decision is expected this month or next, and is expected to be favorable to the private utility, since the FPC's legal staff last November recommended licensing of the 3 dams. Any decision by the examiner, however, probably will be appealed to the Commission by one side or the other.

The issue of the Hells Canyon Dam is a critical one in present-day politics, because it represents a clear-cut battlefield for private power versus public power.

There is no "partnership" side road here. Private power and its friends want Idaho Power to build the 3 dams—at Hells Canyon, upstream at Ox Bow and further upstream at Brownlee.

BIG DAM PUSHED

Public power advocates, with strong Democratic Party backing, want Idaho Power Co.'s bid denied and are pushing for Federal construction of a single high dam at a site located very close to the site of Idaho Power's proposed Hells Canyon Dam.

The power company says it can build for $133 million 3 dams which will generate about 780,000 kilowatts of firm power. Height of the dams—meaning the head of water from the pool behind the dams to the tailrace below—would be 117 feet at Ox Bow, 208 feet at Hells Canyon, and 277 feet at Brownlee.

The new Senate bill would authorize Federal construction of a single high dam at a cost of $473 million, including $357 million for the dam, $68 million for power transmission facilities, and $48 million for 2 smaller dams and powerhouses on the north fork of the Payette River in Idaho.

Such a Federal dam would be 602 feet high. By comparison, McNary Dam's head is 92 feet.

BILL FAILS TO WIN

Federal Hells Canyon legislation was introduced in both the 82d and 83d Congresses, but never was authorized. In 1950 the dam was included in a reclamation package which President Truman asked Congress to authorize. Congress, however, approved only the public works part of the package, after a floor debate was won by those who contended reclamation and public works projects should be considered separately.

Chief among the Senate's warriors for a Federal dam are the Senators from Oregon and Washington, MORSE, NEUBERGER, WARREN MAGNUSON, and HENRY JACKSON. Senator HERMAN WELKER, of Idaho, is bluntly opposed, and Senator HENRY DWORSHAK questions whether the dam would be economic without taking needed Idaho irrigation waters. The Idaho Senators are Republicans.

United States Representatives of the three States are about equally divided.

While the Truman administration plumped for Federal construction of a Hells Canyon Dam and entered the Interior Department as an intervenor against Idaho Power Co., the Eisenhower administration took a different tack. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay ordered the Interior Department withdrawn as intervenor. He is quoted as saying personally he hopes Idaho Power Co. gets its applications. He has stated categorically that he is taking no official stand but he doubts that Congress will appropriate money for the project.

ANDERSON TO PRESIDE

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and ex-Secretary of Agriculture, will preside at this week's hearings as chairman of the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation.

He has said it is not the intent of the committee to take technical testimony, but rather to get grassroots opinions from individuals and organizations in the areas to be affected by Snake River dams.

THE HIGH DAM—OREGON SENATOR INVEIGHS AGAINST POWER MONOPOLY

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Hearings will be held in the Pacific Northwest this week by the Senate Interior Committee to decide the fate of one of the most valuable properties belonging to the American people. This property is a vast river canyon, a mile in depth—Hells Canyon of the Snake River, on the Oregon-Idaho border. It contains the finest hydroelectric power site in the United States. Along with 29 other Members of the Senate, I am sponsor of a bill to authorize development of the power resources of Hells Canyon with a high dam owned and operated by the Federal Government, a dam like Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

The national administration prefers that the great river gorge be turned over to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation, which favors 3 pygmy low-level dams instead of 1 lofty structure that will create a 93-mile long lake. Technical data developed at hearings before the Federal Power Commission shows the high dam will produce about 1,100,000 kilowatts of power, compared with only 680,000 kilowatts by the company dams, a difference of about 420,000 kilowatts in favor of the Government project.

FIVE QUESTIONS CRUCIAL

Five crucial questions are at stake in this controversy:

1. Will the power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries—the mightiest hydroelectric stream in North America—be tapped for the public or for a favored few?

2. Will power sites in the Columbia Basin be used to full capacity or to merely a fragment of their possibilities?

3. Will the 308 report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the master plan for Columbia Basin development, be followed or will it be abandoned?

4. Will Columbia Basin kilowatts be available to farmers, manufacturers, and homeowners at low cost or at high monopolistic rates?

5. Will the generation of hydroelectric power be accompanied by such additional multipurpose benefits as flood control, irrigation, downstream power firming and the protection of wildlife?

The stakes at Hells Canyon are great. Because of its location in a remote, rock-walled chasm, Hells Canyon provides an unparalleled location for a water-storage reservoir. The huge lake formed by Hells Canyon Dam could store 4 million acre-feet of surplus

Snake River water. Aside from its value for flood control, storage of such a tremendous volume of water would have important economic effects in the Pacific Northwest because it could be released in winter months when normal river flow is down, thereby increasing the power production at all generators located between Hells Canyon and the sea.

The impact of this stored water has special significance at this time. On March 21, the Bonneville Power Administration ordered a drastic reduction in the power it supplies to 14 major aluminum and other industrial users in Oregon, Washington, and Montana. Reason for the order was that the flow of the Columbia was below normal and production from generators had declined accordingly.

FUTURE WELFARE AT STAKE

The stored water at Hells Canyon is its greatest potential asset. Its beneficial effects would be especially important during critical flow periods such as the present one, when the region's important industrial units are threatened by curtailment of operations, workers and their families faced with layoffs, and the entire region suffering the resulting economic loss because of the lack of stored water. The small Idaho power dams provide less than one-fourth the storage capacity of the proposed Federal dam.

Surrendering the Snake River to the partial development proposed by Idaho Power Co. would be especially unfair to future generations.

We live in an age when energy for industrial fuel is a dominant factor in social and economic growth. The Columbia River Basin contains about 42 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric energy. We have developed approximately one-sixth of the possible capacity. Here is a challenge to American ingenuity and farsightedness. Have we the wisdom to carry on the program that will realize the full possibilities of this resource?

Federal development of Hells Canyon is especially important to the people of Idaho, which has lagged behind the other Northwest States. One-eighth of America's hydroelectric power potential runs unharnessed in the canyons of the Snake and its Idaho tributaries. If the much-less-than-full-use proposed by Idaho Power Co. is accepted as the yardstick for the remaining sites, only a fraction of the potential will be utilized.

Cream skimming by the power company would be a barrier to the industrial future of Idaho, which has 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate deposits. With cheap power from Hells Canyon, this ore can be turned into fertilizer badly needed by American farmers.

PER CAPITA INCOME CITED

The high rate structure of Idaho's private utilities has dominated the State's economic life. It is noteworthy that, among the 11 Western States, Idaho ranks 10th in per capita income. Only New Mexico has a lower income figure.

Much of the present opposition to Hells Canyon revolves around the slogan "subsidized power." Interior Secretary Douglas McKay used this phrase in a radio broadcast a year and a half ago to describe Columbia River power projects. But he failed to add that of all the works financed by public funds, only Columbia River power facilities have the attractive feature of paying all costs of construction, all operation and maintenance costs, and interest to the Treasury at 2½ percent.

In fact, McKay's Bonneville Power Administration reports the Federal Columbia power system is $65 million ahead of schedule in repaying the Federal investment.

The decision on Hells Canyon is one from which there is no turning back. Once established at Hells Canyon, the policy circumscribes our national attitude toward every rivulet that runs to the sea. Shall we impose a doctrine of inadequacy or shall we look to the future, endorsing a physical structure which symbolizes the meaning of full and comprehensive conservation of natural resources?

THE LOW DAMS—IDAHOAN STRESSES NEED FOR WATER-STORAGE SITES

(By Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho)

WASHINGTON.—Although the average American has heard of the biggest and deepest canyon in North America—Hells Canyon in Idaho—few understand the current controversy concerning the proposed high dam at the site and the views of those most concerned—Idahoans. Much misinformation concerning what a high dam at Hells Canyon would mean is abroad.

I have consistently supported maximum resource development in the Columbia River basin, with emphasis particularly upon upper watershed development. I do not believe the way to insure comprehensive development of the Columbia River basin is to contend that Hells Canyon is the only dam which will provide maximum results. We have available other dam sites such as Pleasant Valley, Mountain Sheep, Nez Perce, Bruces Eddy, and Penny Cliffs in the upper watersheds. Any of these dams would do as much as Hells Canyon, if not more, because these dams would not only impound Snake River water but have the additional advantage of storing water from the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers.

STATUTES INVOLVE RIGHTS

Idaho has four large watersheds—namely, Snake, Salmon, Clearwater, and Kootenai. Only Snake River water is used for irrigation. This means that any proposal to build a downstream high dam dependent entirely upon Snake River water will antagonize irrigation farmers throughout southern Idaho. It is well to reiterate that the menacing flood waters do not originate on the Snake, but on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. Therefore, it is apparent that if a multiple purpose dam is to be constructed to impound flood waters which subsequently can be used to firm downstream power generation, the dam should be built further downstream where the flood waters originate.

Both Federal and State statutes safeguard prior rights of the use of Snake River water for consumption purposes. This means that there will be constant expansion and more reclamation in the Snake River valley in Idaho. If a high Hells Canyon dam is built at a cost of almost $500 million, it may be necessary at some future time to require the preferential discharge of water to operate the generating facilities at the dam site. Such action would result in a conflict with prior rights in the upper watershed.

Representatives of water districts and canal companies throughout southern Idaho have repeatedly gone on record as being opposed to any downstream development which would jeopardize these upstream prior rights.

1948 FLOOD IDEAS MISLEADING

Those who, by implication in talking of flood control, indicate that in 1948—when there was a loss of life in the Portland, Oreg., area and a property loss involving many millions of dollars—that the Snake River and failure to build a high dam at Hells Canyon were largely responsible for that tragic flood, are misleading the public.

The record shows that most of the flood waters which had such devastating effect in the lower Columbia River basin did not originate in the Snake River. They originated in the Salmon River and in the Clearwater River. In fact, five-sixths of the flood waters which course down the Snake River originate in the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. For this reason, the argument that a high dam must be built at Hells Canyon to avert in the future floods such as that which occurred in 1948 is a spurious one.

Summarizing various arguments against this proposed legislation which should be developed during the field hearings but which surely will be emphasized at the committee hearings in Washington later in this session:

1. The water resources of Idaho should not be disposed of by other States without regard to the wishes of the State of Idaho.

2. There has been no evidence adduced to demonstrate that the project is either economically feasible or desirable from an engineering viewpoint.

DAM SUPPORT QUESTIONED

3. The administration has not recommended this project and, in fact, the previous administration never did anything effective to institute the project during the preceding 20 years.

4. This project is so patently political that so-called public hearings at the "grass roots" are not even going to take into account any technical data, all of which will later be presented at regular hearings in the Capital.

5. The proponents of this legislation are seeking to demonstrate a show of strength by a great number of cosponsors, many of whom have little or no interest in the project.

6. Actually, the proposal is primarily designed to create a seductive campaign issue for 1956.

I believe a serious blunder will be made if the advocates of a comprehensive river development in the Northwest are misled into making an all-out fight for Hells Canyon merely because it has been propagandized as the symbol of public power. We must recognize that before any dams can be built in the upper regions of the Columbia River Basin, funds must be appropriated by Congress. These funds will not be forthcoming unless there is conclusive evidence that water will be available to operate the dam after it is built.

TURMOIL, DISSENSION DECRIED

I shall be glad to join forces with my colleagues from the Northwest in promoting maximum comprehensive resource development in the Columbia River Basin. If we want to build dams which are economically feasible, why do we not build them where they will be most effective, instead of creating turmoil and dissension among those who have as a common objective the maximum use of these natural resources?

For 20 years the Democrats controlled the executive department and with the exception of the 80th Congress also the legislative branch. They did not build Hells Canyon Dam during that period. Now they are obviously proposing this project as a symbol of the political aspects of public versus private power.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, under the order previously entered the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4876, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had

been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in presenting the committee report on H. R. 4876, it gives me great pleasure to say that the subcommittee and the full committee were unanimous with respect to every detail of the bill. One reason why we had no difficulty in reaching agreement on the bill was that we did not undertake to increase any item provided in the House bill which we did not believe was necessary to be increased in the public interest. Of course, it is traditional that we have less differences of opinion in providing funds for the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department than for any other department, because all of us recognize the essential work of these two agencies of Government.

The total of the Treasury, Post Office, and Tax Court appropriation bill for 1956 is $3,358,622,000 which is an increase of $76,069,000 over the amount of $3,282,553,000, allowed by the House. This is a reduction from the estimates of $1,763,000 and $12,789,300 over the 1955 appropriation.

The subcommittee added $7,530,000 for the Treasury Department to the total of $595,818,000 allowed by the House, making a total of $603,348,000, an amount $1,050,000 under the estimate.

The subcommittee added $68,404,000 to the $2,685,700,000 allowed by the House for the Post Office Department, making a total of $2,754,104,000, an amount $713,000 under the estimates.

The subcommittee also added $135,000 for the Tax Court, which was contained in a budget estimate not considered by the House, bringing the total to $1,170,000, the budget estimate.

The bill contains 9 amendments, 4 of which are for the Treasury Department. Two of these restore the position of Assistant Secretary, the first adding $30,000 to the Office of the Secretary for the Assistant Secretary and 2 assistants, the second deleting Section 104, inserted by the House, which would not permit the continuation of the position of the third Assistant Secretary. The Assistant Secretary handles almost all the programs formerly handled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, including the synthetic rubber and tin programs in the Federal Facilities Corporation, the defense production loan program, and the liquidation of the RFC. There is still $246 million in the RFC portfolio, and $227 million outstanding in defense production loans and commitments. The Department testified that it would be seriously crippled if the office were abolished at this time, and the committee recommends its continuation because it believes the emergency situation for which the office was created is not yet over, but has expressed in the committee report the hope that the position will be abolished at the earliest possible date.

The committee also recommends two amendments for the Internal Revenue Service. The first of these permits the Service to purchase the budgeted number of 200 new passenger automobiles, rather than the 150 provided by the House, of which 100 are for replacement. Testimony revealed that these new autos are needed to enable 175 new alcohol tax fraud agents, taken out of supervisory work in distilleries and assigned to criminal field work, to do their jobs effectively.

The other Internal Revenue Service amendment restores $7,500,000 to the House allowance of $278,500,000, making a total of $286 million, the budget estimate. This will permit the hiring of the scheduled addition of 1,000 new revenue agents during the year. The Department states that the additional agents will add $10 for every dollar spent the first year and $20 for every dollar spent by the third year. The committee believes that an ultimate return of $150 million for $7,500,000 is sound economy and consonant with the attitude of all fair-minded taxpayers who are willing to pay their share of running the Government but who do not wish to pay the share of tax dodgers. Expansion of the force in the present year has yielded $144 million in additional revenue in 7 months and similar results are expected of next year's expansion program.

For the Post Office Department, the committee has added language which will allow the Department to credit postal revenues from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent specific legislation has provided certain items to be carried through the mail free of charge or for amounts less than cost. The item was omitted by the House. It does not increase the total of the bill, as reflected in the 5 appropriation items. It will, however, affect the books of the Department to the extent of decreasing the deficit by $10,362,000. The Department testified that it will aid in placing the Post Office on a businesslike basis.

The other three amendments for the Post Office Department restore to the budget estimates the appropriations recommended for Post Office "Operations," "Transportation," and "Facilities."

The House report indicates that reductions were made, in large measure, because it was believed that mail volume was overestimated for 1956. The Department, on the other hand, is afraid that their estimate may be too low. Here is the story in brief.

In fiscal 1954 mail volume was estimated at 53.7 billion pieces. The actual volume turned out to be 52.2 billion pieces. The Department took this decrease into consideration in preparing its 1956 estimates. The original 1955 estimate was 55.8 billion pieces. This was revised downward in June of 1954, because of the 1954 reduction, to 53.6 billion pieces. However, present estimates based on 8 months of 1955 operation indicate a possible increase to 55.6 billion pieces, or 6.7 percent over 1954. The Department had budgeted for a smaller increase—5.8 percent in transportation—which it reflected in expenditure estimates increases of only 2.1 percent.

The need for these funds affects the various accounts in a variety of ways.

In "Operations," the reduction of $36,363,000 by the House from $1,886,363,000 to $1,850,000,000 is more than $14 million under the 1955 appropriation, although mail volume is increasing. Unless the requested funds are made available, the Department states that extensions and expansions of service in city and rural deliveries cannot be accomplished.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the appropriation bill carry funds for the $100 uniform allowance which was granted last year to the men in the Post Office Department?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It does. That is one of the items I shall mention in a moment. It is one which the House cut out. We believe it should be restored. The men were promised the uniform allowance, and we believe they should have it. It is contained in the bill as it is reported to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Virginia understand that the supplemental appropriation bill, on which the Senate has not yet acted, will carry a uniform allowance for the present fiscal year, ending June 30, 1955?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator understands that item is carried in the supplemental appropriation bill which is being marked up by the full Appropriations Committee this afternoon. The item in the bill now before the Senate is for the fiscal year commencing July 1 next.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, Congress will keep its commitment for both years. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Virginia are concerned, Congress will do it.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In "Transportation," the reduction of $27,241,000 by the House from the estimate of $675,241,000 to $648 million, is $14 million and $15 million under the actual and estimated obligations for 1954 and 1955, respectively. Expansion of service to meet the demands of shifts in population and new and growing communities can only be made if adequate funds are available.

In "Facilities," the reduction of $4,800,000 from the estimate of $159,800,000 has been restored. The Department states that were this not allowed, the modernization of the Department would be seriously affected, and that in the face of increased mail volume it could only be met by a reduction in the capital expenditures for the light, color, and ventilation program and for new mechanized equipment.

Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate consider the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 6, after the word "operators", to strike out $2,650,000" and insert "$2,680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Internal Revenue Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "two hundred"; and on page 4, line 4, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$278,500,000" and insert "$286,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—Treasury Department," on page 11, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 104. The number of Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury provided by section 234 of the Revised Statutes as amended is hereby reduced from three to two.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, generally speaking, the minority of the committee, including myself, are in accord with this bill, and I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the excellency of the job he has done. I should like to ask him what section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Section 104, because that contains the language of the House which abolished the position of special assistant to wind up the RFC.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 11, after line 23, to strike out section 104.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department," on page 12, after line 3, to insert:

PAYMENTS FOR SPECIAL SERVICES

For expenses incurred by the Post Office Department in transporting United States mail by foreign carriers at a Universal Postal Union rate in excess of the rate prescribed for United States carriers; and for an amount equivalent to (a) postage for matter sent in the mails free of postage, and (b) the difference between the regular rates of postage and the reduced rates for matter permitted to be sent at reduced rates, under authority of the following laws, to the extent they are not covered by section 1 of the act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), (1) subsection (a) (3) of section 5 of the act of June 23, 1874, as amended (39 U. S. C. 283 (a) (3)), relating to reduced rate of postage on newspapers or periodicals of certain nonprofit organizations; (2) sections 5 and 6 of the act of March 3, 1877, as amended (39 U. S. C. 321), relative to certain matter sent free through the mails; (3) section 25 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 286), and subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (b)), relating to free-in-county mailing privileges; (4) the act of April 27, 1904, as amended (39 U. S. C. 331), relating to free postage and reduced postage rates on reading matter and other articles for the blind; (5) the act of March 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 1359), granting franking privileges to Edith Bolling Wilson; (6) the act of February 14, 1929 (39 U. S. C. 336), granting free mailing privileges to the Diplomatic Corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union; (7) the act of June 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 1395), granting franking privileges to Grace G. Coolidge; (8) the act of April 15, 1937 (39 U. S. C. 293c), granting reduced rates to publications for use of the blind; (9) the act of June 29, 1940 (39 U. S. C. 321–1), granting free mailing privileges to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau; (10) section 212 of title II of the act of July 1, 1944 (42 U. S. C. 213), relating to free mailing privileges of certain officers of the Public Health Service; (11) the act of May 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 707), granting franking privileges to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt; (12) subsection (e) of section 204 of the act of July 3, 1948, as amended (39 U. S. C. 292a (e)), granting reduced fourth-class postage rates to libraries and other organizations or associations, and to films and related material for educational use; (13) the act of July 12, 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. app. 891 and 892), relating to free mailing privileges of members of the Armed Forces in certain areas; (14) the second and third provisos of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (a)), granting reduced second-class postage rates to certain organizations; and (15) the fifth proviso of section 3 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 290a–1), granting reduced third-class postage rates to certain organizations; $10,362,000, to be paid to postal revenues on the basis of billings by the Postmaster General at quarterly or other intervals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Current Authorizations Out of Postal Fund—Operations," on page 16, line 2, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,850,000,000" and insert "$1,886,363,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] who, as chairman of the subcommittee, has done such splendid service. I wish to commend him and the full Appropriations Committee for bringing in a report which restores some of the amounts cut from the bill in the other body.

Personally, I think the Post Office Department not only justified the restorations, but I think it would be most damaging to the postal service if they had been eliminated.

Mr. President, I think I should also pay tribute to the personnel of the Post Office Department. In the hearings there is a statement which I requested to have placed in the record. We hear much about the inefficiency of the operation of the Post Office Department. After all, the test of a business is the efficiency of its management and employees. There has been a great increase in the efficiency of the Post Office Department in the matter of handling of mail by individuals; for instance, the number of pieces of mail handled per man in 1950 as compared with 1955. In 1950 the number of pieces handled was 215,443. In 1954 the number was 246,537. Each individual handled 31,094 more pieces, an increase of 14.43 percent.

I think it will be found that that is more than the average increase in efficiency in industry, which I think runs from 7 to 9 percent.

The same efficiency prevails in the collection and delivery service. It has increased 5.03 percent in a 5-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table found on page 18 of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of pieces of mail handled per man-year in 1950 and 1954

	1950	1954	Increase	
			Pieces	Percent
Mail handling and window service	215,443	246,537	31,094	14.43
Collection and delivery service	357,882	376,634	18,752	5.23
Total	573,325	623,171	49,846	8.69

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement commending the Postmaster General and those in charge of his department. Splendid progress has been made in the operation and efficiency of the Post Office Department, as attested by the shrinking deficits.

In 1954 the deficit was $399,146,000, or approximately $400 million.

The estimated deficit on June 30, 1955, will be $313,400,000.

The estimated deficit for the fiscal year 1956 will be $284,638,000.

I think that is a record that is outstanding in the Post Office Department, and the officers and employees are entitled to credit and commendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table appearing on page 46 of the hearings be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Postal Deficit, Workload, and Employment, 1954–56

SUMMARY

Item	1954 (unaudited)	Percent increase	1955 (estimate)	Percent increase	1956 (estimate)	Percent increase
Revenue	$2,268,516,717	8.45	$2,389,000,000	5.31	$2,470,362,000	3.41
Obligations [1]	2,667,663,483	−3.16	2,702,460,000	1.30	2,755,000,000	1.94
Deficit	399,146,766	−39.80	313,460,000	−21.47	284,638,000	−9.20
Volume of mail (in thousands)	52,220,053	2.50	53,630,000	2.70	55,240,000	3.00
Special services (in thousands)	833,828	−2.87	801,205	−3.91	789,432	−1.47
Paid employment (man-years)	507,809.7	−.52	510,566.2	.54	513,007.0	.48
Productive employment (hours)	937,463,555	−.79	941,607,588	.44	944,815,915	.34

[1] Includes "Judgments, United States courts and court of claims, $383,832 in 1954 and $116,350 in 1955, also "Adjusted losses and contingencies" in 1954 of $97,678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation," on page 16, line 22, after the word "mail", to strike out "$648,000,000" and insert "$675,241,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee explain the transportation cost figures? I note in the report the following statement:

> The committee recommends that the full amount of the budget estimate of $675,241,000 be appropriated for "Transportation" in the Post Office Department. This is an increase of $27,241,000 over the amount allowed by the House. The Department indicated that these funds would be necessary in order to continue to improve transportation services, and thereby speed up delivery of mails, and to expand services essential to prompt mail delivery to new and extended communities.

I wonder if the Senator will explain whether that means particularly changing any of the forms of transportation of the mails, whether it means any fundamental change, and just what the increased cost will be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the subcommittee went quite fully into the requested restoration. We accepted the estimates of the Post Office officials that there would be an increase in volume. But the chairman of the subcommittee, to make assurance double sure, had the Budget Bureau send some of its top experts on this particular budget before our subcommittee so that we could get a competent appraisal or estimate. We accepted the figures—we could not challenge them—that in 1955 the volume of mail would be 2.7 percent over 1954, and in 1956 3 percent over 1955. Reports from the 300 largest post offices which handle 75 percent of the total mail indicate that in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year the mail volume has increased 6.7 percent over the first 8 months of the fiscal year 1954.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the committee was not too sure that we were providing sufficient funds, but, of course, we did not attempt to go beyond the budget estimate. As the name implies, transportation means the hauling of the mail, and this item covers every way in which mail is hauled, by railroad, by truck, by traveling post offices. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] might give us the official record in connection with the system which was inaugurated about 15 years ago, where mail is assorted in trucks which stop at the post office and deliver the mail.

I happen to know that much of the mail from New York which comes into my little hometown of Lexington, Va., which has very poor railroad connections, was brought in by truck a day earlier than it had been coming. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina can tell us the official name of the vehicles which are now being used.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Virginia refers to the highway post offices.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The highway post offices. In any event, the bill provides some funds for the use of trucks on short hauls, where such movement is quicker and cheaper than by railroad. I would not be frank if I did not admit there are some funds provided in the bill for that purpose. However, no major change in the method of the transportation of mail is contemplated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what assurance has the Senator received that there will be no major change? Has the Post Office Department been notified to report any contemplated change to the full committee or the subcommittee? Just what is the Senator's assurance in that respect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The only assurance I can give is that of the $675 million, an item of $3,286,700—a relatively small part of the total—will go for improvements and expansion of services on star routes and highway post offices.

I find I had the name correct. The highway post offices are the big trucks which have traveling post offices installed in them for the purpose of sorting mail on short-haul truck routes.

This sum is also for increased contract transportation rates and for the increased cost of group life insurance. These items are all included in the amount of $3 million-plus, which is a relatively small amount.

It is a natural deduction that if that is to be the amount to cover all these items, certainly it could not include funds for any major shift from railroads to trucks for the delivery of mail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Regardless of whether it be trucks, railroads, planes, or whatnot, do I correctly understand that it is the statement or the contention of the Senator from Virginia that no changes will be involved in connection with the rest of the money; it merely concerns the item of $3 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I regret that the witnesses were not pinpointed or tied down to a statement that if they could effect some economies, while facing a possible deficit of very close to $500 million, depending upon how large a pay increase Congress finally agrees upon, they might not do so.

My general impression from the testimony of the witnesses, in connection with the small amount which is provided for short hauls by trucks, was that no major shift from railroads to trucks was contemplated. However, I cannot predict what will happen.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not opposed to any methods of economy by which money can be saved; but by reason of inquiries which have been made of me, as they have been made of other Senators, I should like to determine where we stand on this question and to ascertain, if changes are to be made, as they may very well be made in the interest of economy or efficiency, whether the full committee or the subcommittee will be duly advised, and will have sufficient notice of the proposed changes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As chairman of the subcommittee, I shall be glad to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the suggestion made by my distinguished colleague, so that if any major shift in the means of transportation is planned, the committee will have an opportunity to consult with the Postmaster General about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator has put it correctly when he says the Postmaster General should consult with the committee about such a proposal. I did not mean to intimate that I was opposed to the Senator's suggestion; I merely desired to have the committee advised as the steps were taken.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That assurance can be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Facilities," on page 17, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "$155,000,000" and insert "$159,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—The Tax Court of the United States," on page 19, line 14, after the word "services," to strike out "$1,035,000" and insert "$1,170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the bill, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for the fine cooperation I received, as chairman, from the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

I join with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in saying publicly that the Committee on Appropriations could not have dealt with a finer group of persons than the representatives of the Treasury and the Post Office who came before our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish heartily to commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for the excellent work they have done on the bill which is now before the Senate. No other committee of the Senate has more difficult problems, requiring painstaking care, prudence, and thoroughness, than has the Committee on Appropriations.

A few minutes ago I was examining the chronological history of appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1955. I observed that last year the bill providing appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office was passed by the House on February 18, but was not acted upon by the Senate until May 13. I believe the first appropriation bill acted upon by the Senate last year was the Treasury-Post Office bill, which was pased on May 13, 1954. If I am not incorrect, today is April 13.

So the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], with the help of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, has brought to the Senate, as a result of thorough committee work, painstaking care, and the exercise of excellent judgment, a bill in which controversy has been cleared away and the Senate is prepared to act.

I am very proud of what has happened, although I am not surprised, because I served in another body for many years with the distinguished junior Senator

from Virginia, and I know how conscientious he is. He always does a good job on any work he undertakes.

I simply wished to pay tribute to him, to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and to other members of the subcommittee, for the promptness and thoroughness with which they have acted, and the concern they have shown for the public interest.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I acknowledge with grateful appreciation the very kind and commendatory words of the distinguished majority leader. Naturally, the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations feel some pride in the fact that the Senate is taking final action on a major appropriation bill at an unprecedentedly early date in a legislative session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I, too, am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, has reported this bill, which is about to be passed by the Senate. Likewise, I concur in what the able majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, has said.

However, I wish to point out also that last year all the appropriation bills were passed in record time. I hope the other subcommittees will so perform their duties that the able majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, forthright individual that he is, will be able to rise in the Senate, commend and congratulate the subcommittees, and send us on our way to our respective States upon the conclusion, at any early date, of this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Presiden, I concur in the expression of hope by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Before the adjournment of the Senate last year, I paid public tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for the efficiency with which he had conducted the deliberations of what I have already said is probably the committee in the Senate confronting the most difficult problems. I am happy to say that, with its usual spirit of cooperation in whatever questions have arisen, the members of the committee have worked out the problems which have confronted them and have reported to the Senate a bill which has not provoked much controversy on the floor, where matters cannot be handled as efficiently as they can be in the committee room.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I notice the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is still present on the floor. I should like to clarify one matter in the appropriation bill, which has just passed, relating to the Post Office. Can the Senator from Virginia inform me as to how the allowance for postal employees of $100 for carriers' uniforms is to be made? How is that amount of money to be conveyed to the postal employees? Who is to decide when the employees should get it? Is it an automatic proposition? Could it be delayed until the end of the year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it was explained to the subcommittee that the promise for a uniform allowance was made to carriers in certain cities. All the carriers are not to get the allowance.

Mr. AIKEN. Just the employees who normally wear uniforms would get the allowance. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is our understanding. It was not explained to the subcommittee whether the local postmaster would have anything to do with granting the allowance. It was just assumed that the allowance was going to be an automatic one to all those employees who were entitled to uniforms.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the employee specifically have to prove he wears a uniform, or will he automatically get the $100 which will be made available for uniforms?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The employee will get the allowance automatically. He will not have to prove anything. As he accumulates a certain amount of seniority, he will be entitled to a uniform allowance.

Mr. AIKEN. At what time of the year does the Senator from Virginia understand the employee will get the uniform allowance?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe I can answer the question.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the answer should be made clear for the record, because questions are already being asked about the allowance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Last year Congress passed a bill which allowed every postal worker who was required to wear a uniform an allowance of $100. That is what that item in the appropriation bill is for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina understood as I did, that there was no specific detail as to when the postal employee would get the uniform allowance or who had the authority to determine the question. We merely provided for a uniform allowance of $100 a year. Naturally, the paying of it would be an administrative function, and the allowance would be made to the employee as soon as the money became available.

Mr. AIKEN. Will discretion be left to each postmaster as to when the allowance will be made available to the post office employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is an administrative function.

Mr. AIKEN. Was it intended by the committee that the $100 should be made available to each post office employee who is required to wear a uniform?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It was so intended by the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I understand that the supplemental appropriation bill, which is yet to be reported to the Senate, will very likely carry a similar allowance for the current fiscal year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator very much for the information. I think the Senate bill has been made as clear as it is possible to make it.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955, ON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event the Committee on Appropriations reports the second supplemental appropriation bill today, it will be in order to consider it in the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to say that the Committee on Appropriations is now meeting. It is hoped the supplemental appropriation bill will be reported this afternoon. If copies of the bill and the report are made available, it is our plan to consider the bill tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. Then, before I move that the Senate take a recess, if any other Senators have any statements to make, I shall withhold making the motion for the taking of a recess.

Let me say that we had hoped to take up tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill. I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he does not believe the committee report can be drafted this evening, but that he does believe that the bill and report can be ready for action on Friday.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered, for the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill tomorrow, be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 125, Senate bill 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 37) to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 37) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 878), is amended by deleting the following: *"And provided further,* That the increases provided herein shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1955."

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say there have been 4 or 5 minor bills reported by committees which I have cleared, not only through the staffs and the distinguished minority leader, but with the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 121, a bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has an amendment to be offered, which woud place a limitation on the authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated each year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission of Fine Arts to carry out its functions under this act."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and substitute in lieu thereof this language:

SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding $35,000 a year is hereby authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared in connection with the amendment I offered, as well as a communication from Mr. Wilson, secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, and three enclosures in the letter.

There being no objection, the statement, communication, and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GREEN IN EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 1413

When S. 1413 was called up on the Senate Calendar, March 28, 1955, Senator PURTELL questioned the lack of provision in the bill for a top limit on authorization for expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts. He suggested an amendment which would limit the authorization in S. 1413 to $25,000. The amendment was not accepted at the time in the absence of advice from the Commission of Fine Arts as to the financial limit under which it could operate. The bill was thereafter passed over on objection of Senator MCCARTHY.

I have since communicated with Mr. L. R. Wilson, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, for supplemental information. I offer Mr. Wilson's reply, dated March 29, 1955, and its three enclosures, which together list the members and staff of the Commission, describe the Commission's activities, and indicate the desirability of amending the 1910 act establishing the Commission of Fine Arts so as to provide a limitation on expenditures not exceeding $35,000 a year, rather than the present limitation of $10,000.

There appears to have been a considerable increase in the duties of the Commission without any comparable increase in the money available for such items as members' travel expenses, salary increases for the Commission's three paid employees, and an additional urgently needed professional employee.

Section 2 of the act entitled "An Act Establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371, 40 U. S. C. 106), reads as follows: "To meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding $10,000 a year is authorized."

I propose that section 2 of the act be changed to read "$35,000" instead of "$10,000." To that end, I now offer an amendment to the pending bill, S. 1413, as follows: Strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 and substitute in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding $35,000 a year is hereby authorized."

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, March 29, 1955.

HON. THEODORE F. GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In answer to your inquiry regarding Senate bill No. 1413, which amends section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., sections 104–106), it would be appreciated if the limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated each year could be increased from $10,000 to at least $35,000.

During the past 4 years an appropriation of $21,200 has been provided and the estimate for the fiscal year 1956 is the same. This appropriation provides for only three regular positions, consisting of the secretary, a clerk-typist, and a clerk-stenographer; and approximately $8,000 for travel expenses, communications, printing, and other expenses. The members of the Commission do not receive any salary but they are reimbursed for their travel expenses to attend the meetings of the Commission, of which approximately 10 are held each year.

Since the act was passed in 1910 there has been a considerable increase in the duties of the Commission caused by the Shipstead-Luce Act (Public Law 231, 71st Cong., approved May 16, 1930) and the Old Georgetown Act (Public Law 808, 81st Cong., approved September 22, 1950), but there has been no increase in the professional assistance in that time. There also have been several increases in salaries and other costs. At present the Secretary is unable to perform his duties adequately and also serve the Commission as he should, even with many hours of overtime. An additional professional employee is urgently needed to assist the Secretary in research and preparation of material for the Commission. This, together with the current proposed increase in salaries and possibly some other small adjustment will require approximately $30,000, leaving only a small margin of $5,000 for possible future expansions in workload. It was because of the difficulty of determining what changes may occur in the services required of the Commission during the immediate future that no limitation was placed in the proposed bill. It will be agreeable to the Commission, however, to place a limitation in the bill, but it is felt that it should be at least $35,000 for the reasons stated above.

Your kind consideration and assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated. If we can be of any further assistance, we will be happy to have you call us.

Respectfully,

L. R. WILSON,
Secretary and Administrative Officer.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

MEMBERS

Hon. David E. Finley,[1] Chairman, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Felix W. de Weldon,[2] sculptor, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Wallace K. Harrison,[2] architect, New York, N. Y.

Hon. Emily L. Muir,[2] artist, Stonington, Maine.

Hon. Douglas W. Orr,[2] architect, New Haven, Conn.

Hon. Elbert Peets,[2] landscape architect, Washington, D. C.

Hon. William G. Perry, architect, Boston, Mass.

STAFF

Mr. Linton R. Wilson, Secretary, GS–12, and administrative officer, Washington, D. C.

Two assistants, GS–3 and GS–5.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1955.

Memorandum for: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Subject: Fiscal year 1957 estimates.

The Interior Department has requested us to begin to assemble data as soon as practicable to cover the estimate of appropriations that the Commission will require in fiscal year 1957.

During the 45 years of the Commission's existence 2 public laws and 4 Executive orders have broadened the scope of the duties of the Commission with no corresponding increase in funds and personnel to accomplish the work. As a result the small staff of the Secretary's office has been able to accomplish the necessary work at a very much reduced speed and at the sacrifice of some desirable services the Commission might render. The advent of a new Secretary last June highlighted the shortcomings of the existing administrative procedures and indicated the importance of initiating a modest expansion. A study of the situation has revealed that:

(a) The grades of the 4 civil-service positions now allotted to the Commission are

[1] Appointed June 4, 1951.
[2] Appointed February 18, 1955.

comparatively lower than the grades of corresponding responsibility in other agencies of the Government.

(b) The present funds allotted the Commission will not permit having an incumbent for the fourth position authorized.

(c) The Secretary is overburdened with too many time-consuming administrative functions that have to be accomplished in working hours, so that all work on reports, legislation, policy, or research must be relegated to off-duty hours.

(d) The capacities of the clerical staff are overtaxed and the traditional minutes of the Commission, for example, can only be produced with undesirable delay. It is difficult to keep an incumbent in the GS-3 clerk-typist job because of the low salary.

(e) The ability of the Commission to supply information is greatly handicapped by inability to maintain an adequate processing and filing system for fine arts material.

Congressional response to increasing agitation in the art world for a broader participation in the Government has swamped the Commission with an inordinate amount of research and reports on proposed legislation not only during the period when Congress is in session, but also during the recess period. The personal attention of the Secretary to this work is required and is very time-consuming at the expense of other duties.

The Commission has operated for so long on a very limited budget that any attempt to expand and increase the amount will probably be looked on with opposition in view of the Administration's desire to reduce spending. A reasonable increase in the Commission's expenditures would not push the overall budget figure above $35,000 for fiscal year 1957.

The views of the members of the Commission are desired.

DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

Approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting on March 15, 1955.

OUTLINE OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

MARCH 29, 1955.

The Commission of Fine Arts was created by Public Law 181—61st Congress, approved May 17, 1910. During the 44 years of its existence it has steadily grown in importance as one of the advisory bodies of the Government. The Commission renders expert technical and professional advice to the Government in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, sculpture and painting, in connection with official fine arts projects. The scope of its activity covers not only the city of Washington but also extends to projects outside the District of Columbia, such as the World War I and World War II memorials and cemeteries, the designs for which come before the Commission by authority of Public Law 534—67th Congress as amended.

The functions of the Commission comprise the following: The Commission of Fine Arts advises generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President, or by any committee of either House of Congress.

The Commission advises on all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments of the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the city of Washington.

The Commission carries out the provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act—Public Law 231—71st Congress, approved May 16, 1930—an act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital.

The Commission also carries out the provisions of the Old Georgetown Act—Public Law 808—81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950—an act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital.

The Commission of Fine Arts advises upon location and design of statues, fountains and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains, and monuments, erected under the authority of the United States and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same; also the Commission advises upon the merit of designs of medals, insignia, and coins produced by the executive departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 126, Senate bill 460.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 460) to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a similar bill was passed last year by the Senate. The present bill is the result of a request by the Treasury Department for legislation which would further improve safety on river steamers.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in summary of Senate bill 460 be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

SUMMARY OF SENATE BILL 460

S. 460, introduced at the request of the Treasury Department, is identical with S. 1763, as passed by the Senate in the 83d Congress, second session. The bill failed to receive consideration in the House.

It would require that any steam vessel navigating rivers only be provided with an approved life preserver for each and every person allowed to be carried on said vessel by the certificate of inspection, including the crew. Such life preservers, it would provide, must be kept in convenient and accessible places on such vessels, so as to be readily available for use in case of accident.

In order to prevent serious economic loss to operators during the changeover period, discretion is permitted the Coast Guard Department Commandant to allow the use of such proportion of approved floats to the total number of persons carried or authorized to be carried as he may determine.

The present statute governing such vessels has been interpreted for years as permitting carriage of either a life preserver or a life float for each person aboard, other than cabin passengers, for each of whom a life preserver was mandatory. According to Coast Guard testimony presented at the 1954 Senate hearing, the modern life preserver offers far more assurance of security to passengers in emergencies than do floats, in that the life preserver is designed to hold the wearer in an upright position, with head and face out of water, while passengers would have to cling to the handholds on either side of the float, which might be most difficult in case of injury, or where small children are concerned.

No objection has been raised to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered to the bill, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 460) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4482. Every steam vessel navigating rivers only shall also be provided with an approved life preserver for each and every person allowed to be carried on said vessel by the certificate of inspection, including each member of the crew, which life preservers shall be kept in convenient and accessible places on such vessel in readiness for immediate use in case of accident. In lieu of an approved life preserver for each such person, the head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may permit the use of such proportion of approved floats to the total number of persons carried or authorized to be carried as he may determine."

LIMITATION OF DATE OF FILING CLAIMS FOR RETAINER PAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 132, Senate bill 800.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 800) to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill, for the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the committee from which the bill was reported, is not on the floor. He is attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations considering the supplemental appropriation bill. It is my understanding, however, that the bill merely extends to the marines the same privilege which is now available to members of the other armed services with regard to the limitation date, and equalizes the privileges for the members of all the armed services. The bill was reported unanimously from the committee.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. If the distinguished minority leader insists on an explanation, I can give him one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the explanation made by the majority leader is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 800) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), is hereby repealed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1137, Calendar No. 134, extending the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1137) to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question regarding this measure. I know of a particular case in which a Chilean boy wishes to join the United States Marine Corps. He speaks English perfectly. Does the bill provide that a foreigner of any origin will be able to join the Marine Corps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], is present, and can explain the bill. My understanding is that the bill simply would extend the present law. But the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts is more familiar with the bill than I am, and I shall be glad to have him explain it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I would answer in the negative the question asked by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. The bill applies to the Army alone, and extends for 2 years the present law.

Under this measure, an alien cannot enlist in the Marine Corps, but can enlist only in the Army, after obtaining certain clearance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It happens that the young man to whom I have reference 's a great grandson of Artemas Ward, of New England. The great grandson is, however, a Chilean, even though his direct ancestors are the New England Wards. He has applied to the State Department and to the Marine Corps, for permission to join the United States Marines. However, as I understand the explanation given by the Senator from Massachusetts, under the bill, that young man will not have an opportunity to join our Marine Corps. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed by one of the committee experts that such a case will not come under the present law to which we are now referring, but that there is no objection to having such a person apply for enlistment in the Marine Corps, and enlisting in the Marine Corps if he can qualify, even though he is not a United States citizen. However, his case would not come under the law to which the pending bill applies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1137) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of June 30, 1950 (ch. 443, 64 Stat. 316), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "June 30, 1955," and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "June 30, 1957."

LOAN OF SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1139, calendar No. 135, extending the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I desire to make a brief statement regarding the bill.

The act of August 5, 1953, authorized the loan to the Government of France of a small aircraft carrier. This loan was for a period defined in the act as follows:

Until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, as determined by the President, or 5 years after the date of this act, whichever is earlier.

Although no definite proclamation has been made relative to the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, it is quite apparent that, at least from a practical point of view, those hostilities are no longer in progress. As a result, the authority for the continued retention of this carrier by the French Government requires clarification. The bill proposes to provide such clarification by fixing a definite cutoff date of June 30, 1958. This action will permit the French to complete the building and commissioning of a carrier of their own, and to train the necessary antisubmarine crew.

The Committee on Armed Services received testimony in complete justification for the proposed legislation, the enactment of which is strongly desired by the Department of the Navy, and seems to be quite obviously in the interest of our own national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1139) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), is hereby amended by striking out the remainder of the sentence after the word "until" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

ACCUMULATION OF LEAVE ACCRUED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHILE PRISONERS OF WAR IN KOREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1600, Calendar No. 136, relating to leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war in Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1600) to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, in section 2, on page 2, line 17, after the words "Armed Forces," to strike out "who, on or before January 22, 1954," and insert "who," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That leave accumulated or accrued by a member of the Armed Forces of the United States while held as a prisoner of war by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States engaged in armed conflict at any time during the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending July 27, 1953, shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which he is permitted to accumulate or have to his credit. Cash settlements may be made for such accumulated or accrued leave without regard to the limitations imposed by subsection (b) of section 3 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, and irrespective of whether the person entitled to such settlement has been discharged or released to inactive duty or is on active duty. In the case of any person on active duty on the date of enactment of this act, such settlement shall be made on the basis of the basic pay and allowances applicable to him as of the date of enactment of this act. Leave taken by any member of the Armed Forces entitled to the benefits of this act shall not be charged to the leave accumulated or accrued while he was so held as a prisoner of war, unless he has no other accrued or accumulated leave which may be charged.

SEC. 2. The benefits of this act shall not accrue to any member of the Armed Forces who (1) was interned in a foreign country, (2) had an opportunity to be repatriated, and (3) did not accept repatriation.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect as of June 27, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1600) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

During the 83d Congress, I joined with my colleague from Maine in introducing S. 3270. Our objective was to preserve leave credits earned by our service personnel while in a prisoner-of-war status subsequent to the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea. We felt very strongly that the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 was causing a hardship on these unfortunate members of our Armed Forces and that this hardship was entirely unintended.

S. 3270 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services almost a year ago and unanimously passed the Senate. In view of the fact that no action on the bill was taken in the House, my colleague from Maine and I reintroduced the bill with some technical improvements in the language. The new version of the bill—S. 1600—was considered by the Committee on Armed Services on March 31, 1955, and unanimously reported by the committee with a slight amendment.

In explaining the bill, I would point out that the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 overhauled and codified the procedures governing furloughs and leaves of absence for men and women in our military services.

Among other provisions is the limitation of 60 days that was fixed on the amount of leave which could be accrued by any one individual.

This provision while suitable and necessary as a matter of normal routine has operated to the clear disadvantage of men who were captured as prisoners of war during the Korean conflict.

These men obviously could not avail themselves of any leave credits which might accrue to them while in a prisoner-of-war status. As a consequence, they were required to forfeit all such credits in excess of 60 days.

It was most assuredly not the intent of the Armed Forces Leave Act to exact this added penalty from men who were already bearing the hardships of Communist prisoner camps. The bill seeks to remedy this unintended situation by specifically providing that leave accumulated or accrued by a prisoner of war in the hands of any hostile force with which we were engaged in armed conflict at any time during the period June 27, 1950—the beginning of the Korean hostilities—and ending July 27, 1953—the cease-fire date—shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which the individual is permitted to accumulate.

The bill makes it clear that the proposed benefits will not accrue to any person who, having been offered an opportunity for repatriation, had failed to accept such opportunity. As originally introduced, the latter provision of the bill was limited to persons who became prisoners of war on or before January 22, 1954 and had refused repatriation. January 22, 1954, being the end of Operation Big Switch, seemed to provide a definite date upon which to peg the operation of this limiting provision of the bill, but the committee felt that the elimination of the specific date would obviate possible unforeseen administrative difficulties which might occur in the future.

A full hearing was held on the bill during the 83d Congress, and the bill was discussed in detail by the Armed Services Committee at its regular meeting on Thursday, March 31, 1955. The testimony indicates that the bill will affect approximately 3,500 persons and will cost not to exceed $1 million.

I am hopeful that the Senate will see fit to give this bill the prompt approval which it received last year and which we feel is still strongly merited.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT AND CONSIDERATION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second supplemental appropriation bill, if reported by the Committee on Appropriations, be in order on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have authority to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may have neglected to announce it, but it is not planned to have a session of the Senate tomorrow. It is planned that the Senate shall adjourn until Friday.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield, I wish to express my appreciation to Members on both sides of the aisle, and particularly to the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], for their indulgence while I have cleaned up the calendar. I am sorry I have had to ask the Senator from Missouri to postpone his remarks until that has been done. However, as usual, he has been most considerate and helpful.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his expression concerning what he characterizes as my consideration. Quite to the contrary, I think I should thank him again, as I have undertaken to do many times, for his unfailing and invariable consideration of the membership of this body.

I have indicated that I desired recognition at this time because I am in the midst of a hearing which I have been asked to conduct, and which is now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. For that reason I ask the indulgence of my colleagues, and suggest that, much as I should like to yield for insertions and other matters, time is pressing upon me, and I must return to the hearing.

Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration yesterday began hearings on S. 636, a bill proposing a revision of the Federal election laws and the enactment of a new Federal election law regulating financial practices and reporting in connection with elections to Federal office. I should like to extend, once again, an invitation to all Members of the Senate to take part in these hearings, either by personally testifying or by submitting a statement concerning the bill.

The bill which the subcommittee is considering would, if enacted into law, affect the campaigns of all candidates for Federal office. All Members of the Senate who have had personal experience in campaigning can materially assist the subcommittee if they care to do so. Their assistance will be appreciated by all members of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in order to assist the Senate in understanding the nature and purpose of these hearings, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD a copy of the opening statement which I, as chairman, made on behalf of the subcommittee. I also ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD several editorials and news stories dealing with the purpose of the hearings, as well as with the first day's proceedings.

There being no objection, the statement, editorials, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, ON S. 636, THE FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1955, ON TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1955

Today the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration begins hearings on S. 636, the proposed "Federal Elections Act of 1955," which is intended to revise the Federal election laws to prevent corrupt practices in elections, and for other purposes. As chairman of the subcommittee and as the sponsor of this measure, I would like to make a brief statement explaining the background of the bill, its principal provisions, the objectives which the bill is intended to attain, and, in particular, the nature and purpose of these hearings. I might say parenthetically that I have some familiarity with these matters since I am now in my fifth year of service on this committee. I have participated in the most extensive investigations of election practices, including the contested elections in Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and others. Out of these hearings and investigations, I have had ample opportunity to see the pressing need for substantial revisions in our Federal election laws.

At the present time, financial matters in connection with elections to Federal office in the United States are regulated primarily by two laws—the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939, as amended. The bill which is the principal subject of these hearings, S. 636, expressly repeals the Corrupt Practices Act, and amends certain portions of the Hatch Act.

The legislative history of the existing laws reveals clearly that the Congress in enacting them, had two principal objectives in mind. First, the Congress intended to limit the amount of money which is spent in Federal election campaigns. Second, the Congress desired to make certain that the full facts

concerning campaign finances were made public so that the people might know the cost of election campaigns, and so that no attempt to "buy" an election could be successful. Neither of these objectives has been realized to any appreciable degree. We know that tremendous amounts of money are spent in election campaigns and these amounts are far in excess of what the law intends. Reporting and publicity are so hopelessly inadequate that we can do little more than guess at the actual moneys spent in any campaign. This is a lamentable state of affairs. And yet, such facts do not imply that there is any widespread violation of the provisions of the laws. Actually, these laws are so inadequate, so antiquated, and so riddled with loopholes that they invite evasion. Indeed, they are so unrealistic that they demand evasion, in many instances. The limits placed on campaign spending by these laws are so low that few candidates can campaign on what the law allows, in this day of widespread and costly television and radio communication. Any legal system which makes law evaders of honest men, which forces individuals willing to serve their country to resort to practices which are contrary at least to the spirit of the law, cannot and should not be tolerated in a country such as ours.

Present laws are defective in four major respects: (1) They do not apply to primary elections, caucuses, or conventions; (2) they do not apply to political committees other than those which are national in character, and thus are not applicable in the case of the vast majority of political committees which are active in national elections; (3) although presumably intended to be effective they contain no provisions to ensure enforcement; (the Justice Department in the past has said that they are virtually unenforceable); and (4) the limits which they impose on campaign contributions and expenditures are hopelessly unrealistic.

In view of these defects, it is not surprising that suggestions for the repeal or reform of these laws have been advanced regularly. S. 636 is the latest such proposal. It has been drafted after careful study, and after serious consideration of the many well-written congressional reports and scholarly articles recommending change. It is designed to correct all the defects which I have just mentioned, as well as all others which have come to my attention.

I might point out that when Congress enacted the Corrupt Practices Act in 1925, it specifically provided that the provisions of the act should not apply to primary elections, and conventions and caucuses. This was quite understandable since the law was drafted only a short time after the Supreme Court had ruled in the well-known Newberry case that congressional control over elections did not extend to such primaries and conventions. However, 16 years after the enactment of this law, the Supreme Court, with an understanding of the essential connection between nomination and election, reversed the Newberry decision and specifically affirmed, in *United States* v. *Classic*, that Congress did have authority to regulate primary elections. Nevertheless, in the 14 years which have elapsed since the *Classic* decision, Congress has not accepted the mandate given it by the Court. Primary elections are, therefore, still unregulated by law.

Thus, the proposed bill applies specifically to primary as well as final elections and to caucuses and political conventions. It applies to all political committees which support candidates for Federal office. It establishes a system of supervision and enforcement, and it raises the ceilings on political contributions and expenditures to levels which are realistic and adequate. In many other respects, S. 636 would revise the present methods of reporting and controlling the use of money in elections.

The bill which we are considering in these hearings does not propose any revolutionary change in campaign practices. It has the same two objectives which all such legislation encompasses. It is designed to make certain that the amounts of money which are spent in connection with campaigns for Federal office are not unduly excessive, and to assure adequate publicity for all such expenditures, as well as for the sources of campaign funds. It has thus been framed with a full realization of the fact that the use of money in elections can be dangerous if excessive or secret. It has also taken into consideration another equally important fact—that election campaigns do have many necessary and admirable results, in that they inform the American people on the vital and important issues of the day, and that they therefore increase the level of understanding of and participation in politics and the affairs of government. S. 636 is thus based on a realization of the fact that campaigns are expensive, and that satisfactory campaigns require the expenditure of large amounts of money. As long as such expenditures are in conformity with both the spirit and the letter of the law, and are used for the purposes which a campaign should really accomplish, they are advantageous and healthy. Therefore, the bill before the committee would raise the limits, so as to provide effective, but reasonable, controls and limits on such spending.

I have long been disturbed by a considerable weight of public opinion which holds that campaigns are suspect, and in some way unclean. A great many people seem to feel—and understandably so—that election campaigns are necessarily corrupt, and that little can be done about such conditions. For my own part, I cannot accept such a defeatist conclusion. I am exceedingly anxious to see the level of political morality raised, and to see the field of politics returned to the position of prestige and respect that it formerly occupied in our society. Better laws can do much to assist in such a return, I am certain.

These hearings are designed to explore fully the problems which arise in connection with campaigns for Federal office, as well as to examine thoroughly the possible means of controlling such problems through corrective legislation. And in view of the widespread attitude of suspicion and disillusionment, we must make certain that the law which we recommend to the Rules Committee and to the Senate is sound, reasonable and workable, and is really designed to bring about a positive and constructive revision in national election practices. Under no circumstances must we be content with a law which will continue to permit evasion, and which will thus further disillusion the American people.

We have extended invitations to testify to persons from many fields who can contribute to the successful accomplishment of the task which faces this committee. We have asked the leaders of the two major political parties to appear, and they have graciously accepted. We have extended an invitation to the Attorney General, and we hope that he will appear and give us the benefit of his views and his experience. We have requested the testimony of newspaper publishers, representatives of the radio and television industry, working journalists, lawyers, political scientists, and political leaders from all levels of political activity, local, State, and national. We have extended invitations to all Members of Congress, and in particular to the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives Republican and Democratic Campaign Committees. Any other interested persons and organizations are invited to communicate with the subcommittee if they wish to appear, and we will certainly give serious consideration to all such requests. We intend to develop fully all of the facts, so that we may undertake the revision of the laws with a real chance of success.

S. 636 is the principal subject of these hearings, but we do not intend to limit these hearings only to the provisions of this bill. It is our intention, and our aim, to uncover all of the important facts which relate to the matter of campaigning, so that we can thoroughly understand the problems which candidates and political committees face, and so that we eventually can recommend to the Rules Committee and to the Senate a bill which will accomplish the objectives we all seek, and which will, at the same time, allow the parties and the candidates to carry on vigorous and complete campaigns.

We do not intend to draft a law which will further complicate the tasks which our parties face. We are not inclined to penalize the political calling. I feel that politics is one of the highest human endeavors, and I believe that we should assist the parties and candidates for elective Federal office in their efforts to inform the people on the state of this Nation, subject only to reasonable requirements which will prevent the abuses which have occurred in the past.

S. 636 is, in a way, a point of departure for these hearings. I hope that the witnesses who will appear before this committee will state frankly their opinions of the provisions of this bill. I am not wedded to any of the detailed specifications of the bill, but I am thoroughly committed to its objectives. I believe that the hearings will reveal the defects in the bill, where such exist, and will disclose alternatives which may be more satisfactory in solving the problems in the field which we are studying.

I believe that the matter which is before the committee, is, and should be, a bipartisan and a nonpartisan problem. I sincerely hope that no partisan loyalties will arise which will complicate the task of the committee. I realize full well that the problem which we are studying is one which can be utilized for partisan purposes, and I hope that this will not occur. The members of the subcommittee are united in their approach to the problem at hand, and I am sure that these hearings will proceed in a nonpartisan fashion.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 7, 1955]

HEARINGS WILL OPEN TUESDAY ON ELECTION LAW OVERHAUL

(By Robert C. Albright)

The first substantial move to overhaul the Federal election laws since adoption of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act of 1939 is getting under way at the Capitol.

A bill by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, supported by all five Democratic members of the Senate Rules Committee, provides the basis for proposed reforms, ranging all the way from more realistic limits on campaign spending to tightened accountability for amounts contributed and spent.

The proposed modernized election law for the first time would cover primaries, conventions, and caucuses as well as already scrutinized Federal elections, and would attempt to lift supervision of elections out of the horse-and-buggy era.

HEARINGS OPEN TUESDAY

Public hearings on the proposed changes will open next Tuesday before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which HENNINGS is chairman. Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler and Republican National Chairman Leonard Hall will be the lead-off witnesses. A long list of political scientists, lawyers, business and labor leaders, and representatives of the newspaper, radio and television industries, also have been invited to testify.

HENNINGS and other interested legislators have proposed election law revisions in each of the past several Congresses but seldom has the Senate outlook been more favorable than now.

That is due partly to the fact that no national elections are on the immediate horizon and partly to a growing realization on both sides of the aisle that existing statutes are outmoded.

The Hennings bill, with certain modifications, is virtually assured in advance of a favorable committee report and a place on the Senate calendar. A majority of the Rules Committee has indorsed it in advance of the hearings.

THREE ARE COSPONSORS

Three Democratic members of the group are cosponsors of the bill with HENNINGS. They are Senate Rules Committee Chairman THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, and Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, and ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee. The fifth Democratic member of the Rules group, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, sponsored similar legislation while a Member of the House.

"I'm all for it," said MANSFIELD. "I believe it will be passed out of the committee and approved by the Senate, with Republicans coming along."

The lone Republican member of Henning's three-man subcommittee, Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, told the Washington Post and Times Herald he agrees with HENNINGS that present campaign spending limits are unrealistic, and should be modernized in line with modern costs and campaign media. But he said he would like to study further certain other provisions of the bill, notably the proposal to bring primaries within the scope of the act.

"Our election laws must, of course, prevent fraud and corruption," said CURTIS, "but they should not be so written as to prevent either candidates or political committees from taking their arguments openly to the public through the most appropriate media."

The third member of the subcommittee is Senator GORE.

Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, coauthor of the 1946 law modernizing congressional procedures, termed the Hennings bill a "marvelous approach to modernizing our election law." MONRONEY said the committee should be careful to harmonize Federal and State laws on the subject, however.

The proposed revision lifts the present $3 million spending limit for national political committees to approximately $12 million, using an elastic formula keyed to the voting turnout in the last previous election.

Following a similar expanding formula, House Members' limits would be from a maximum of $5,000 to a top of $25,000 under certain conditions. A Senators' ceiling would step up from the present peak of $25,000 to as high as $250,000.

But while granting more leeway on expenses, the bill would sharply tighten accountability by requiring detailed reports at specific intervals. These would be given direct legislative review under a stipulation that summaries of the reports be channeled to appropriate committees of each House.

Sponsors believe the revised reporting machinery would also insure greater publicity on amounts spent—a factor they believe will do more to assure compliance than penalties provided in the bill.

As a double check on the multiple committees that have sprung up in recent campaigns, the bill provides that a candidate must indorse in writing any political committee supporting his candidacy before it can accept contributions or make any expenditures in his behalf.

Like the periodic financial reports required, this authorization must be filed with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. Copies of all statements must also be filed with the clerk of the United States District Court, in the district where a political committee maintains its principal office.

Penalties up to $1,000 or 1 year in jail are provided for violation of the proposed act, with this stepping up to $10,000 or 2 years if the violation was willful.

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1955]

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

IT CAN'T ALL BE BLAMED ON TELEVISION

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Next Tuesday Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, will open hearings before his Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in an effort to get fuller disclosure of the amounts spent in the process of choosing the holders of elective Federal office. He calls the present accounting laws "unrealistic, inadequate and antediluvian." To these terms he could add "grossly deceptive," because only an indeterminate part of the money raised and spent is ever acknowledged to Congress.

Congressional Quarterly has just completed the task of compiling partial spending statistics of the 1954 Federal elections from the more than 1,000 reports the laws require. These show that on the record about $13.7 million was spent to elect the 84th Congress. But there is no doubt that spending illegally concealed, and that which need be reported only to State authorities, amounted to many millions more. When it is noted that the cost of primary campaigns is not accounted for (in some parts of the country these are the conclusive contests) a fair speculation is that the $13.7 million represents but part of the spending, perhaps the lesser portion.

The high cost of television, to which most candidates now resort, provides one of the reasons why the midterm spending reported to Congress in the 1950 Federal election was $10.9 million as contrasted with $13.7 million in 1954. But that is only a contributory clause of the excessive electoral splurges which Senator HENNINGS apparently hopes may be checked by the public shock of fuller revelation.

The compilation by Congressional Quarterly

The statistics compiled by Congressional Quarterly are the more startling because of the inadequacy of the reporting laws. So in considering the following figures it should be borne in mind that much more was spent in each instance:

In 1952 the electioneering costs reported were $17.5 million in the presidential race, $5.6 million in the contests for Congress.

Republican groups accounted for $7,251,590, and Democrats for $3,798,413, in the 1954 congressional elections. Democratic candidates were most of those assisted by the $2,057,613 disbursed by 41 union labor committees, and primary contests are not included.

In 5 Senate races in 1954, $50,000 was the minimum sum reported. The unsuccessful Republican in Rhode Island and 2 assisting committees spent $105,255.59 to $13,638.30 in Senator GREEN's behalf. Senator Guy Cordon, defeated by RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in Oregon, was the beneficiary of $141,264.01 paid out by 30 committees and 4 individuals, and for NEUBERGER a spending of $87,652.64 was reported. In Illinois the total was $66,626.75; in New Jersey, $64,151.99; in Michigan, $58,523.97. And of these three States, only in New Jersey was more spent for the Republican than for the Democratic candidate.

Senators RUSSELL, of Georgia; ELLENDER, of Louisiana; EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and JOHNSON of Texas reported no expenditures in getting reelected. SPARKMAN, of Alabama; ERVIN, of North Carolina; SCOTT, of North Carolina; and MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas reported spending, respectively, $100, $100, $50, and $37.50. But ELLENDER, SPARKMAN, and MCCLELLAN had to overcome strong primary opposition, the cost not required for accounting to Federal authorities.

Ohio Led New York

New York carried off the doubtful honor of housing the district—the Sixth, Queens—in which the second largest outlay in the Nation was recorded for the choice of a Representative. This amount was $38,596.24, with the defeated Republican candidate the beneficial object of almost $34,000 of it. First place was won by the spenders in the Ninth District of Ohio, who reported to Congress the total of $42,639.42.

Of the 96 political committees which made the required reports to Congress, 27 listed contributions of $1,000 or more from individuals. The Republican grist from 738 high contributors was $1,434,084.30, the Democratic was $418,900 from 244. But these totals are especially misleading because the Hatch Act limit of $5,000 is merely on what may be given to 1 candidate or 1 committee by 1 individual.

Senator HENNINGS proposes several reforms. He would include primary costs; require Congressional accounting from all committees active in campaigns for Federal office (only those operating in 2 or more States are now covered by the law); and require written authority from a candidate for a committee to operate in his behalf. He wants to raise the widely disregarded spending limits imposed on candidates for Congress and the $3 million limit now fixed for the official national political committees. Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana, has advocated another set of increases to the same purpose.

Both would uncover the local political committees which currently need not report their spending to Congress. Hence, in HENNINGS' words, the Federal law merely lends "false respectability" to a social abuse.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1955]

CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO GET SCRUTINY—SENATE UNIT TO OPEN INQUIRY TUESDAY IN DRIVE TO PUT MORE HONESTY INTO REPORTS

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The chairmen of the two major political parties were scheduled tonight to be the first witnesses in a new drive in Congress to force more honesty into official reports on what campaigns really cost.

Leonard W. Hall and Paul M. Butler, Republican and Democratic chairmen, respectively, were asked to appear next Tuesday.

An important objective of the new drive is to curb expenditures at least to the levels reported to Congress. Suspicion that actual contributions and expenditures habitually soar far beyond set limits sparked the reform effort. It has been tried before in Congress.

However, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, is eager to try again. He heads the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. He has scheduled hearings for Tuesday and for April 13, 19, 20, 26, and 27. He will call in political leaders, lawyers, political scientists, and others having contributions to make to the proposed changes.

LEGAL LOOPHOLES NOTED

Present law, Mr. HENNINGS and fellow reformers argue, seems to hold political contributions and expenditures only to limits stated in official reports to the Senate and House of Representatives. These reports come in by the hundreds and appear to stay within the legal boundaries.

But, it is asserted, they concern only the $5,000 limit on an individual contribution to one candidate or committee and a top of $3 million by everyone to each national committee.

Not included, it is held, are:

Accountings of contributions made in primary election contests, though the primaries usually provide the final election results throughout the South.

Contributions made and expended by local committees fostering the future of a single candidate for Federal office, from President down to the lowest of Federal office seekers.

Contributions to campaign committees whose efforts do not cross State lines.

AIMS OF NEW LAW LISTED

The impending Senate hearings would seek support for a new law that would:

Require the reporting of primary election contributions and expenditures. This proposal appears to be prompted by reports that some southern Senators, after bitter and apparently expensive primary campaigns last year, were able to report to Congress that they spent not a penny to become reelectd in November.

Require an official accounting to Congress of all contributions and expenditures made by all committees working locally or within State boundaries.

Demand written authority from a candidate for Federal office to any committee, local, statewide, or national, that raised and expended funds on his behalf.

Increase the present legal limits on contributions and expenditures to a point that might do away with the present cheating on statutory rules.

NEED OF REFORM CITED

Such reforms, Senator HENNINGS declared, might halt a false respectability that attends the present system. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, he said, was "admittedly inadequate at the time it was framed."

"The years which have passed since the adoption of that law," he added, "have further demonstrated its lack of real meaning, Today, the situation is truly intolerable.

"It is our belief that the hearings will convincingly demonstrate the need for better laws.

"The American public is well aware of the fact that the present laws are meaningless. This is too apparent to be argued. The people are disillusioned with the entire matter of political campaigning.

"They have looked with suspicion on past attempts to revise the laws, because of a general attitude that regardless of what is done, unscrupulous politicians will find a way to evade the law. We must be certain that we * * * eventually report * * * a bill which really will reform campaign practices."

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

PARTIES SEEK RISE IN VOTE FUND CURB—HALL, BUTLER TESTIFY LIMIT OF $3 MILLION A TICKET IS OUTMODED TODAY

(By Allen Drury)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The chairmen of the two major political parties agreed today that the ceiling on campaign spending should be raised.

Paul H. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said the limit should be lifted to at least $6 million from the $3 million authorized by present election statutes.

Leonard W. Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee, refused to specify an exact figure, but he denounced the present ceiling as outmoded and unrealistic in an age of television and airplane campaigning.

The two party leaders testified before a Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee that is considering a bill by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri.

In addition to allowing the two national committees approximately $12 million apiece for spending in Presidential elections, the Hennings bill would extend Federal law to primary elections for President, Senator, and Representative. Present law applies only to general elections.

COVERAGE WOULD BE WIDER

The Hennings bill also would place a limit on spending by all subsidiary committees supporting candidates for Federal office, and would require them to file statements of expenditures with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. At present only nationwide committees must do this.

Aside from a dig by Mr. Hall at the Democrats' Democratic Digest magazine, and a slap by Mr. Butler for what he called the Republicans' seeming to spend more money than the Democrats, today's hearing was filled with the nonpartisan cooperation requested by Senator HENNINGS.

The Senator set the mood in an opening statement in which he said present laws were "so inadequate, so antiquated, and so riddled with loopholes that they invite evasion."

"Indeed," he said, "they are so unrealistic that they demand evasion, in many instances."

The Senator said present laws were "hopelessly unrealistic" because they did not apply to the myriad of State and local committees that organize to support candidates for Federal office. He also said they did not cover primaries in which some candidates, particularly in the South, were assured of victory long before the general elections in the fall.

Also, he said, reporting of expenditures is so inadequate that "we can do little more than guess at the actual moneys spent in any campaign."

HALL VOICES RESERVATIONS

Mr. Hall said he agreed with the objectives sought by Senator HENNINGS in his bill, but questioned whether making all committees register would not create more "violations of spirit" than under present law.

He said he thought the Republicans would probably spend increased amounts for television in the presidential campaign next year, but thought this would be balanced by expenditures reduced by a shortened campaign. The GOP will meet in San Francisco on August 20, 1956, to nominate its candidates.

Mr. Butler said he thought the spending ceiling should be "at least $6 million a year, merely to take account of the growth of our country and the increased cost of reaching the voter, especially through the highly expensive medium of television."

He said the present unrealistic ceiling had subverted the original purpose of laws to control politics.

"The necessity of spending more than $3 million to reach the voting public," he said, "has encouraged the formation of temporary committees which we all know have tended to diffuse and blur responsibility for the tone and content of a campaign away from the head of the ticket and the responsible leadership of the party."

The two chairmen differed over provisions of the Hennings bill requiring a presidential candidate to authorize expenditures by all committees, National, State, and local, supporting him.

Mr. Hall said it would be impossible for a candidate to keep track of all groups backing him, but Mr. Butler said the idea was meritorious.

A similar difference developed on requiring all the committees to file expenditures reports with Congress. Mr. Hall estimated this might mean "a million or more reports each election year," and create an impossible storage problem for the records. Mr. Butler said he didn't think any amount of "inconvenience" could offset the value of having the information available to the public.

He said he thought the law should apply to committees "at least down to the county level."

Mr. Hall's allusion to the Democratic Digest came in the form of a comment that the Republican National Committee had studied the election laws and had come to the conclusion that they prohibited the committee from sponsoring any publication for profit.

Mr. Butler countered that he thought Mr. Hall had left the implication that the Democratic National Committee had been guilty of "loose interpretation" of the law.

Actually, he explained, the Digest, a monthly magazine, is published by the "Democratic Digest Corp."

"It is just coincidence," he said with a smile, "that I happen to be president of the corporation."

He said the Digest had no direct connection with the national committee and did not accept advertising.

Mr. Butler said he hoped the Hennings bill would do something to correct the "financial imbalance" between the two parties. As an example of this, he cited figures for committees other than the two national committees in the 1952 presidential campaign. The figures were prepared by Congressional Quarterly and the New York Times.

The Quarterly showed 22 Democratic committees spending a total of $5,018,215 and 42 Republican committees spending $9,740,106. The Times estimates showed 22 Democratic committees spending $6,847,725 and the 42 Republican committees spending $18,769,848.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955]

HORSE AND BUGGY LAWS UNDER STUDY—CONGRESS STARTS TO DIG INTO CAMPAIGN COSTS

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—A congressional committee is launching what promises to be a determined, documented, and opinion-rousing scrutiny of Federal laws governing political campaign spending.

By admission of almost everybody, these laws are straight from the "horse and buggy era." With the advent of costly television campaigns, with the thousand loopholes in the laws, there is, as ex-Senator Guy Gillette succinctly declares, "No control at all" on election spending.

Nobody really knows how astronomically high campaign expenditures rise in the elections for Senate, House and the President.

FIRST WITNESSES

So the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections is holding hearings, beginning April 12, at which Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul Butler and Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard Hall will be the leadoff witnesses. An impressive roster of political scientists, lawyers, labor leaders, businessmen, and representatives of the newspaper, radio, and TV media will testify.

Able, energetic Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, who chairmans this subcommittee, terms present election laws—including major portions of the Hatch Act of 1939 and the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—"unrealistic, inadequate, and antediluvian." Senator HENNINGS has his own bill for overhauling the rules.

What is the matter with the election laws?

Well, they set a limit of $3 million on the campaign expenditures of any "political committee." And they declare that individuals may contribute no more than $5,000 apiece. This means that the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee cannot list expenditures above $3 million apiece in any election.

Obviously, when it is estimated that television costs in the 1952 election alone cost over $5 million, the money had to come from somewhere else. The difference was covered by voluntary organizations—there is no limitation on the number of "committees." That is one of the "loopholes" in the law.

COMMITTEES GALORE

So there have been "Lawyers for Dewey" committees and "Red-Headed Men for Roosevelt" committees—each claiming the right to spend $3 million.

Similar loophopes lift the lid on individual contributions. A rich contributor himself can send only $5,000 to the national committee, but he can also send $5,000 to each State committee, and his wife, son, brother, and great uncle can also contribute $5,000 apiece.

Moreover, the laws do not attempt to cover primaries, which in some southern States are the determinative elections.

HIGHER LIMIT

Senator HENNINGS proposes a number of reforms. He would include primary costs in the totals. He would require congressional accounting from all committees active in campaigns for Federal office, not merely from those (as the law now reads) which operate in two or more States. He would require, before anybody could contribute to anybody's campaign, that the candidate give written authority for the contribution.

Most important, the present totally unrealistic spending limitation of $3 million would be revised upward for national political committees—to approximately $12 million, using an elastic formula keyed to the voting turnout in the last previous election.

By a similar formula, the amount a Congressman might spend would be upped from $5,000 to $25,000 under certain conditions, and a Senator's ceiling would rise from the present peak of $25,000 to as high as $250,000.

This is not the first time Congress has turned the spotlight on election spending. In 1952 a House committee headed by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana called witnesses and heard testimony. At that time Mr. BOGGS was saying:

"The recent campaign added jet stops to the whistle stops and expensive TV rhetoric to the fireside chats. The enactors of laws which were passed in 1925 and 1939 could not possible have foreseen these drastic changes in campaign techniques and the alarming costs of these techniques."

Mr. BOGGS set the cost of the 1952 national campaign at somewhere between $50 million and $100 million. A 48-State survey undertaken by the New York Times found the 1952 expenditures to be at least $32 million—this total gleaned from official reports and known contributions.

Yet, by comparison, the electioneering costs which were required to be reported under the election laws amounted to only $17,500,000 for the presidential race and $5,600,000 for the congressional contests, according to the Congresional Quarterly. The discrepancy is obviously vast.

The Hennings bill is virtually assured a favorable committee report. Whether spending reform will win out depends on the pressures generated. The Democrats, who see their richer Republican rivals going into future campaign armed with larger campaign funds than they are able to muster, have an obvious special incentive. But members of both parties agree present laws are obsolete.

The reformers want to equalize campaign expenditures, put the spotlight of publicity on splurges, and reduce spending sufficiently so that a man does not have to be wealthy, or even well connected with a labor union, to run for Congress.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

EXPENSE OF CAMPAIGNS

Senator HENNINGS' attempt to tighten up the Federal election laws merits the most thoughtful support from his colleagues and the public. The existing laws are so unrealistic that they have become dead letters. For example, a candidate for the Senate is permitted to spend from $10,000 to $25,000 to get himself elected. Some candidates for the House are limited to $2,500. As Senator HENNINGS has pointed out, these are truly ridiculous provisions. In these days of television, radio, and air travel, any candidate who insists on getting his case before the people must violate the law.

The Hennings bill would allow a candidate for the Senate or for Representative-at-large to spend $50,000 and other candidates for the House to spend $12,500. These amounts could be increased, however, up to a sum equal to 10 cents per vote cast in the last election, with cutoffs at $250,000 for senatorial candidates and $25,000 for House candidates. The spending limitation on national committees would be lifted from $3 million to approximately $12 million under a formula allowing 20 cents per vote cast for all presidential candidates in any one of the last three previous elections. The real question is whether these limits are realistic for the years ahead.

Campaigns today without television are unthinkable, and television has proved to be very costly. Even in 1950 the Ohio senatorial campaign cost more than a million dollars. With increasing use of mass communications media, campaign expenses are certain to rise in the next decade, and Congress would certainly not want to say that candidates for the highest offices in the land should not use the most effective means of presenting their views.

Expensive campaigns have been generally deplored because of the danger that money would be used improperly to influence voters. Bribery and buying of votes will always be evils whether they come high or low. But the same cannot be said of expenditures to acquaint the people with the personalities, the views and the records of the candidates. Expenditures of this sort are an asset to representative government so long as the funds used do not place the elected officials under obligation to special interests.

While liberalizing cost ceilings, the Hennings bill would also tighten up reporting and accounting procedures so as to minimize the danger of special interest contributions and corrupt use of political funds. The bill would apply to primaries as well as final elections. Every political committee working for a candidate for Federal office would have to report receipts and expenditures. Even individuals spending more than $100 for the benefit of a candidate would have to report their contributions. In an effort to compel a central accounting by the groups working for each candidate, committees would be forbidden to accept contributions or to spend for political purposes without authorization from the candidate.

It is by no means certain that these provisions would close all the loopholes in the present law or that all of them would pass the test of constitutionality. But the Hennings bill appears to be the best approach yet made to this very important problem. Certainly the hearings on it should be extensive and thorough. Congress should then pass a bill that will throw a maximum of light upon where political funds come from and where they go, while keeping the door open to adequate financing of means to keep the people informed on political issues.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, with a heavy heart I rise in tribute to the memory of Joseph Pulitzer—the editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a distinguished leader of our press. To say farewell to Joseph Pulitzer—the man and the citizen—is a heavy and sorrowful task.

For long decades Joseph Pulitzer was an expression of our political conscience, a teacher of political morals, a fighter for progress and welfare.

The death of such a man is an event of many implications. It is a tragic national loss but it is also a reminder and a call for the continuation of his life's work—the fight for a responsible press and for honest, conscientious, unselfish public service.

Our cultural heritage rests on the idea of work and service. We all fulfill our allotted task in life. But there are only a few among us who feel that they are called and who are inspired by their calling. Joseph Pulitzer was one of these inspired. Unassuming and modest, he was a man of unreserved belief in his ideals and of untiring drive to see them live. His inspiration was the source of the serenity of his character. "The words of the wise are serene words" suggests an old saying. Joseph Pulitzer was an outstanding example of its truth.

In his life's work Joseph Pulitzer was the spiritual successor of his great father. They shared the same philosophy of life and the same views on the function of the press in our society. But the son was more than a follower of his father. He was in his own right and by his own work and his own courage, the executor of their common ideas. The greatness of his personal effort becomes clear if we consider the changes of our life since the turn of the century. Only a sovereign mastery of ideas could have permitted Joseph Pulitzer to steer his course without losing touch with reality and without becoming dogmatic.

Our Constitution abolished orthodoxy as a test of worthiness—culturally, politically, and economically. It protects our freedom of thought and belief. It gave birth to a democracy that is conceived as a unity in diversity.

As a legal document, as a charter of our institutions, the Constitution is equally important in all its provisions. But when we look at them from within, in their reciprocal relationships, we discover that the provisions of our Constitution possess different constitutional depth. Thus, in my view, the first amendment is not only an important element of the Bill of Rights, but, I would say, the soul of our Constitution, the spiritual rationale for its existence.

For us Americans the Constitution of the United States is not a passing document. It is the embodiment of our life and existence. Like any other embodiment it is inseparable from the things it embodies. Our adherence to its provisions is not a half-hearted acceptance. It is a belief—an unshakable belief—in its wisdom. Once it was a prophecy and our history has shown that it was a true prophecy. The Founding Fathers succeeded where men in other

countries failed. What is the reason for the greatest of our ancestors' work? I have often thought of this and I have come to the conclusion that it depends on the nature of our Constitution which happily united practical considerations with deep philosophical insights and matters of principle.

The sociologist and the legal scholar realize how closely it materialized the theoretical formulations of Montesquieu and the philosophy of its age. At the same time, the student of our past is impressed by its closeness to the events of political and social reality of American life.

The first amendment, with its all-embracing, unequivocal language is no exception. As an expression of the trust in the free spiritual activity of man, and of the belief in the great ideal that only free thought and free persuasion leads to progress and happiness, it reflected also American practices. We observe this when we study even our colonial past.

Here I have specifically in mind the activity of Benjamin Franklin and of his circle. In 1727, Franklin organized a club first called Leather Apron and later, officially, Junto. It united people interested in literature, science, ethics, politics, and religion. To become a member, one had to declare that he "loved mankind in general, of what profession or religion soever," and that no person should be "harmed in his body, name, or goods, for mere speculative opinions, or his external way of worship." The language of the first amendment is obviously nothing but a reformulation of these ideas and practices.

Also, let me quote some excerpts from Franklin's set of "Rules for the Club Established for Mutual Improvement." Here are some of the questions suggested for discussion:

> Do you think of anything at present in which the Junto may be serviceable to mankind, to the country, to their friends, or to themselves?
>
> Have you lately observed any defect in the laws of your country, of which it would be proper to move the legislature for an amendment? Or do you know of any law that is wanting?
>
> Have you lately observed any encroachment on the just liberties of the people? Hath anybody attacked your reputation lately? And what can the Junto do toward securing it?

These questions, do they not, strike us as if they were formulated today? Are they not eternal and fundamental questions of our democracy? Is it not clear that to these questions the Founding Fathers tried to give an answer?

Our history has shown that out of such clubs as Franklin's Junto our democracy has actually developed. We also know that there was a direct road from the activities of Junto to Franklin's paper the Pennsylvania Gazette, and this, I think, was a logical development. The free press of our country is an equal necessity for the existence of our democracy as those institutions which were explicitly established by our Constitution.

A society of free thought lives by the dissemination of diversified information and free honest comment. Free spiritual activity and free government dies when the exchange of information and comment stop. In our midst the press therefore acquires a singularly important position and it is the duty of every generation of Americans to see to it that the freedom of the press is protected and continues unabridged.

Under freedom of the press, I also understand its independence from interests that are extraneous to its primary purpose. Let me explain this.

The growth of the Nation's wealth tends to increase the size of business undertakings and newspaper business is no exception. In fact, the publishing of a metropolitan newspaper has become big business. We often hear, and we know it to be true, that economic considerations sometimes influence editorial policy and persuade some newspapers to yield too readily to the expedient of satisfying tastes and mores which sometimes are incompatible with integrity and the general welfare. It is often forgotten that regardless of the need of every business venture to be financially sound, where the business is peculiarly vested with a public trust as in the case of a newspaper, the primary function should not be sacrificed. It is the primary purpose of the press to report the significant news of the community and in this respect to act as its political conscience. It is the duty of the press to inform and to educate the people of our country, without prejudice or favor, interpreting the important facts of day-to-day life in the light of the total framework of our cultural heritage and possible future.

Our cultural heritage institutionalized in our Constitution presupposes the unique position in our society of a free press. It is not an exaggeration to say that the principles of our Constitution derive in great part from the position of the press which is a structural, and I think I can say, a constitutional part of our society. And the right to be free necessarily imposes on our press strict professional standards.

In this connection, I should like to mention one specific point that in no small degree affects the value of the press to our people. There are reports that in a number of instances publishers and editors try to impose their own opinions on the members of their staff. Insofar as that is true, this practice, in my view, violates the basic principle of free comment and, considering the consolidation of newspaper publishing in our time, is fraught with dangers of regimentation and restraint of spiritual "trade."

Joseph Pulitzer was aware of this danger, and the freedom of thought of his collaborators was as sacred to him as the freedom of the press itself.

The life of society is subject to constant change. There is always a tension between established ideas and new strivings which force their way into life. The soul of democracy is freedom. And democratic freedom presupposes and incorporates change. Every generation rejuvenates our Constitution, and our history is a sequence of new interpretations of its provisions. The possibility to do so is the proof of its depth and greatness. To grow within our democratic framework without impairing freedom is the paramount goal of a free people. Our people have a right to expect the press to adhere unalterably to these principles and to keep them constantly before us. These were the ideas that guided Joseph Pulitzer in his work as a newspaperman, and he brought us the much-needed proof that a gifted man of business can manage a financially successful paper without sacrificing its ideals.

The ideals of Joseph Pulitzer go back not only to his great father. We are aware that they were present at the dawn of our life as a nation. More than that, they ushered our people into freedom, statehood, and greatness.

In his personal characteristics, Joseph Pulitzer was particularly akin to Benjamin Franklin. They both knew how to intertwine ideals with things practical and possible, and when we contemplate the activity of Joseph Pulitzer we have the reassurance that up to now the spirit of our country was alive. I am convinced that so it will be in the future and that, through the conscious and conscientious activity of our own generation, the spirit of our democracy will continue to be as vigorous as in the past.

In conclusion I congratulate Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.—the third by that name—on his election to the editorship of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a natural and proper successor to his distinguished predecessors.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks his signed editorial which appeared in the issue of April 4, 1955, under the title "The Tides of Time" in which he so fully covenants that the great tradition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch will continue undiminished.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial tribute to Joseph Pulitzer from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat expressing the mutual respect and friendship of the publishers of these two great competing newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 4, 1955]

THE TIDES OF TIME

A flame of integrity was extinguished at the death of my father, Joseph Pulitzer, but its light will always radiate to newspapermen of conscience everywhere.

Joseph Pulitzer was devoted to the journalistic commandments written in 1907 by my grandfather, the first Joseph Pulitzer, and carried daily as the platform of the Post-Dispatch. These words are a monument of granite which the tides of time will never efface.

Guided by the platform, my father exerted all the skill, conviction, imagination, force and courage with which he was unusually endowed to make the Post-Dispatch responsive to the needs of mankind. He never made a mean decision; on the contrary, his generosity of mind and heart made him a shining guardian of my grandfather's ideals.

Inspiration alone cannot move stones; so my father achieved his distinction by inspiration conveyed to loyal men and women. The Post-Dispatch is fortunate to be brought out day after day by people who are devoted to the ideals which gave this newspaper its

character, acclaimed in recent days from near and far.

Today the platform continues to proclaim its proud, timeless message. We of the Post-Dispatch shall abide by the standards we have inherited.

With all the moral strength, the intellectual strength, the professional strength at our command, we will continue to labor as public servants. Not only will we report the day's news but we will illuminate dark places, and, with a deep sense of responsibility, interpret these troubled times.

Opinion will be strong for what we believe to be right, and equally strong against what we construe to be wrong. We also know that laughter is a joy and we hope we will entertain.

For public service our reward will be what each of the men and women of this newspaper and the broadcasting stations will carry within himself. Each will know his voice has merged in a mighty chorus which will resound as heretofore in our city, our State, our Nation and the world.

That chorus, I am confident, will be recognized and I hope it will be found to have added more splendor to the noble profession of journalism.

JOSEPH PULITZER, Jr.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

JOSEPH PULITZER

The sudden death of Joseph Pulitzer comes as a personal loss to the publisher of the Globe-Democrat and to those on this newspaper who enjoyed the acquaintance of the 70-year-old publisher of the Post-Dispatch. Only the night before he died, he was the guest of the Globe-Democrat at its traditional reception prior to the gridiron dinner of the Advertising Club of St. Louis. At that time he appeared to be in better health than usual.

Newspaper competition sometimes destroys friendships, in the relentless task of turning out a commodity which will please the public. There is such keen competition in the area of business between the Post-Dispatch and the Globe-Democrat, but the personal relationship between the latter's publisher and Mr. Pulitzer was never disturbed in the slightest. When only a few days ago Mr. Ray disposed of his holdings in the Globe-Democrat and turned over the ownership of the newspaper to another, he received many kind letters. One much cherished by him was from Mr. Pulitzer.

The name of Pulitzer is famous in the field of journalism. The first Joseph Pulitzer was the founder of the Post-Dispatch and of the New York World. Before he died in 1911 he had provided in his will that his sons should carry on, and in 1905 the second Joseph came to St. Louis to learn the business from the ground up. In February, 1912, he became the publisher and editor of the Post-Dispatch and was active in its direction until only a few hours before his death.

He was proud to be called a working newspaperman, who certainly knew his way around the business office but whose chief interest, as he said many times, was in the editorial page and the news. Liberal in his views, he transferred those sentiments to his own newspaper, which has long been identified with crusades and campaigns which Mr. Pulitzer believed were due the public.

Mr. Pulitzer was not a man known by large numbers of St. Louisans. He made few public appearances, due no doubt to the fact that he was approaching blindness, an affliction similar to that of his father. But although he needed a secretary to read to him, he insisted on detailed information on every topic of the day. His zest for living remained with him until he closed his desk at 6:30 on Wednesday night and went home, where he was stricken 2 hours later.

In his departure, St. Louis has lost one of its good citizens. He contributed much to making it a better city. He will be missed. And as personal friend, his going is sincerely regretted by the publisher of the Globe-Democrat.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Missouri on his remarks concerning Joseph Pulitzer and the elder Pulitzer. As a youngster in the early 1900's my "Bible" was the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World, both being Pultizer newspapers. I think everything the Senator from Missouri has said carries out the idea Pulitzer had in mind in connection with a free press.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague will yield for an observation, I not only wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico for his generous comment and his observation upon my attempt to characterize the late great Joseph Pulitzer, but I also wish to say that it is very reassuring, and, indeed, we of Missouri take pride in the acknowledgment of the Senator from New Mexico of the inspiration given him by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I think the life, the work, the attainments, and the stature of the great senior Senator from New Mexico certainly are an exemplification of many inspirations, and we are very glad indeed to know that a newspaper in the State of my birth had some part in making a contribution to the Senator's tolerance, his deep philosophy, and his understanding of the world in which we live.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the grandfather, the son, and the man who is now editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch contributed to and carried on the American way of life as we would have it. They had the philosophy of Jefferson, the activity of Jackson, and the kindness of Lincoln, and they wanted everyone in the United States to have those qualities.

Mr. President, I now desire to speak briefly on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

OUR RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this hemisphere begins at Hudson Bay and extends clear to Patagonia. South of the Mexican border there are 140 million people. They are people of dignity, who desire to get along with us. They are the ones on whom we shall have to depend in the future. We may talk about Europe and Asia. The people there have been fighting about real estate for 2,000 years. But where are we going to develop our resources unless it is south of the border?

The production and exportation of natural resources have hardly been touched. There are many minerals—gas, oil, copper—and much lumber and other products south of the Mexican border. Is it not to our interest, then, to try to do something with reference to developing those countries so that even we might receive some benefit?

Mr. President, I wish to give credit to the Vice President of the United States for his recent trip into the Central American countries, including Mexico, Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, and several Caribbean Islands in the area. He did a tremendous job in the way of building good will.

I say this, Mr. President, as a hard-boiled Democrat. He did a fine job. To my way of thinking, I believe the Vice President actually carried the American spirit of good will to Latin America in the best manner and with the best of propriety. Personally, I was thrilled with the reception given the Vice President and his good partner in all the Central American and Caribbean countries. Knowing the cultural background of those who compose the population in those areas, I was not surprised at the reception they gave the Vice President. They are fine, courteous, decent people, and they receive one with open arms. They were only reaffirming what Spanish culture has been doing for thousands of years. By the Vice President's kind words, his mannerisms, and the way he would meet children or men of state, he disclosed something which should bring pride to those who believe in our free institutions and the benefits we expect from Government in matters affecting freedom of mind, freedom of conscience, and of politics. I think the Vice President and his good lady did a fine piece of work in hemispheric relations for the United States of America.

While I appreciate what he did, and without reservations on his public expressions, I still think Uncle Sam should go beyond that and actually prove to Latin America that he wants to be their friend, and that in bringing about good will for free people, we will respect the dignity of the smallest of Latin American countries; yes, even the potential future power of those same countries.

Niceties at embassies and in the halls of parliaments of Latin America are certainly proper, but how best can we prove to those good neighbor countries that we actually mean it? In my opinion there are many ways by which we can tell those good people that it is not economic selfishness on our part, but that we want to cooperate so that economically, politically, and spiritually all the countries to the south and north of us in this hemisphere shall be beneficiaries.

I hate to say this, but I say it advisedly. As you know, Mr. President, there are in Washington representatives of foreign governments from all over the world. I do not know of one that I would not trust. But of necessity, they are bound by diplomatic protocol in their every-day affairs of life. It so happens that I am of the same national, religious, and philosophical origin as the peoples who compose the populations of Latin America. I believe that I know their national reactions, their political reactions, yes, their religious reactions, to what is going on, and which of necessity, can be expressed in public by their diplomatic representatives.

The closest one of the Latin American countries to us is the Republic of Mexico. Mexico, in my opinion, can be the axis of all of our good-will efforts with Latin America. We are next-door neighbors, thanks to highway contacts from eastern Canada, central Canada and

western Canada to the boundary of Guatemala and Mexico. Thousands of American automobiles ride those highways yearly. American businessmen, American mechanics, and American schoolteachers can get into an automobile in Detroit or New England, go on American highways to the Mexican border. First they know the philosophy and the people of their own country. Then they get on a foreign highway that is just as good as the American one and has the same type of motels, the same gasoline, and all of the necessities that are required in our standards of living. They go into Mexico, anywhere in the Republic, and they find that those good people also have a culture. They have universities, museums, and fine musical centers. After they have been through Mexico and have found out these things, they return to their home States—New Jersey, Michigan, Mississippi, Arkansas—and preach the gospel of good will. Thus they do more for better understanding as between the two countries and its peoples than could be accomplished by a hundred years of political discussion by the diplomats and foreign services of either country.

I will pin my faith upon the American people, who do their visiting on good roads. They will know the United States, and they will know the foreign countries.

The same thing can be said as one travels over the old highways of the Spaniard from Mexico City to old Antigua or what was Santiago de Guatemala; in the memorable days of Alvarado and Bernal Dias del Castillo who went from Mexico into this area after following Cortez into Old Mexico. Yes, one will find the ruins of a civilization that Spain brought there in the 16th century. What is left are wonderful convents that were intended not only to lift the spiritual life of the local Indians, but also to help them on the material side. The traveler can proceed on to Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama.

How are we to do these things and carry out the idea of Vice President NIXON that it is our purpose to be good neighbors? One way is to finish the Inter-American Highway from the Mexican border to Panama City. I believe that I have a good conception of the American. I know he likes to travel. I think he wants to know how other people live; but he will not learn how the people of Central America live until the highway is finished to Panama City. American tourists would then go there by the thousands. They would buy, in general, things that are manufactured in the United States—the oil and grease for their automobiles, which possibly were manufactured in the United States, and many other articles. Naturally, the local folks would make money out of the tourist trade, but in turn they would use that same money to bring in American goods for sale to local folks and a mutually satisfactory relationship would result.

I want to give, briefly, some of the mileages—and I am sorry the majority leader is not in the Chamber at the moment. From Laredo in Texas to Mexico City, there are now 765 miles of paved roads. From Mexico City to San Cristobal on the Guatemala border, there are 727 more miles of paved road, making a grand total of 1,492 miles from the American border to the Guatemalan border, all paved. In Guatemala there are 67 miles of paved roads, 242 miles of all-weather roads, and 25 miles of impassable roads. One could not get through them if he wanted to. This 25-mile stretch on the border of Mexico and Guatemala should be one of the "musts" in our efforts of cooperating in the construction of roads in Central America.

I am happy to note that the President, after speaking with the Vice President, has recommended that something be done about the condition. Congress also can do its share in the effort to cooperate in the construction of roads in Central America.

In El Salvador there are 174 miles of paved roads, and 21 miles of all-weather roads. In Nicaragua there are 132 miles of paved roads, and 106 miles of all-weather roads. In Costa Rica there are 60 miles of paved roads, and 206 miles of all-weather roads. East of Cartago and San Isidro to the Panama border there are 134 miles of impassable roads at the moment. From the Costa Rican border to the city of David there are 14 miles of impassable roads, but there are, between David and Panama City, 88 miles of paved roads and 214 miles of all-weather roads; and, of course, there are 14 miles of impassable roads between David and the Costa Rican border.

One must visualize the geography of the region. He must be in the country in order to understand what improved roads would mean to the United States and how they would affect our good neighbor policy. The automobiles which would travel this road would be built in Detroit, Cleveland, Dayton, and other cities of America.

David is the headquarters of the Province of Chiriqui in Panama. This is the richest province in the isthmus and could provide sufficient food and produce to feed Panama City if the province had an opportunity of getting the farm products into Panama City. What they need is a road.

How would such a road affect the security of the United States? Would we not like to have a road in case, for example, an enemy had a fleet of submarines operating in the Caribbean? Would it not be to our interest to have a road into Panama City, aside from the economic need for such a road?

Let us forget about good will for a moment. Let us think that we shall be taking care of our national defense interests. Would it be good for the United States national defense to have an all-paved road from the Mexican border to Panama City or not? The question answers itself. With modern weapons, including new types of submarines, what would we do in an emergency if there were submarines in the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean, as there were during the late war, and we did not have transportation facilities from the United States to Panama City? That question answers itself.

The help of the United States in finishing this highway would prove advantageous, first, from a national and a hemispheric defense standpoint. It would prove advantageous from an economic standpoint, not only for ourselves but for all the countries through which the road would pass. It would prove advantageous from the standpoint of getting people acquainted with one another, and thereby bring about the neighborliness and the good will about which we love to brag but do so little. The Vice President was representing the United States on that trip, whether he meant to do so or not. He went with Presidential approval, and what he said and did was official in the eyes of the people whom he visited. I trust the President and the administration will back up every action. If the action which follows is effective, the Vice President will have made a great contribution. If it fails to come, he might as well have stayed home. I look forward to the result.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate. I have just been informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that a report on the supplemental appropriation bill can be filed by midnight tonight. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee be authorized to file a report up to midnight tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the supplemental appropriation bill on tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I heartily approve of the expedition of this matter by the distinguished majority leader, I should like to have it understood that the bill will be considered on the assumption that the report will be available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the assumption, Mr. President. If the unanimous-consent request is granted, I shall then propose to ask that the previous order to meet on Friday next be rescinded, and that the Senate meet tomorrow, Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MODIFICATION OF ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered, that when the Senate concluded its business today it stand in adjournment until Friday next, be modified to read that the Senate will stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there be no further business to be transacted, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, April 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the state of Viet-Nam.

UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960, vice Nelson Lee Smith, term expiring June 22, 1955.

COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert E. McLaughlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Renah F. Camalier, term expiring May 26, 1955.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George E. C. Hayes, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955, vice Robert E. McLaughlin, resigning.

George E. C. Hayes, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, expiring June 30, 1958. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 4 years, vice Philip L. Rice, elevated.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard Newton Abrahams
Kenneth Donald Albritton
Gordon George Allen
Donald David Anderson
Joseph Nicholas Andrassy
William John Bickford
Charles Anthony Biondo
Carmen Joseph Blondin
Alan Dorr Breed
Richard Lee Brown
Theodore Gregg Brown, Jr.
Edward Hegeler Carus, Jr.
Arthur Ernest Champagne, Jr.
Daniel Buell Charter, Jr.
Joseph Leo Coburn, Jr.
Robert Lee Cook
Donald Clair Cunningham
Leon Thomas Dankiewicz
Stephen John Dasovich
Kenneth Roy Depperman
John Joseph Dirschel, Jr.
John Martindale Duke, Jr.
James Joseph Dunlop
Gary Benbow Erekson
Ralph Walston Eustis
Joseph Francis Fallon
Charles William Fead
James Edward Ferguson
David Brockman Flanagan
Francis Duane Forbes
Kenneth Wahlin Forslund
Carlos Anthony Garcia
Ronald Nicholas Gaspard
Arthur Edwin Gerken
Charles Bertram Glass
Donald Leroy Gordon
David Lorance Green
Henry Haugen
Frederick Ferdinand Herzberg, Jr.
Bobby Flynn Hollingsworth
Robert Louis Johanson
John Bennett Jones-Bateman, Jr.
Leo Jordan
Martin Jay Kaiser
Robert Allan Knight
Herbert Herman Henry Kothe
Ira Leslie Krams
Alban Landry
Robert Earl Larson
Thomas Stanyer Latham
Charles Leddy
Edward Francis Lewis
Irvin Wayne Lindemuth
Thomas Channing Lutton
Charles Franklin McFadden
Thomas Joseph McKey III
Charles Anthony Millradt
Edward William Murphy
Richard Nielsen, Jr.
Daniel Carl Olson, Jr.
Robert Henry Overton III
Richard Rounsevelle
John William Sheedy
Ralph Elmer Slater
William Neil Spence
Edmund Joseph Spillane, Jr.
Henry Suski
Joel Richard Swanson
Ira Edward Thompson
Howard Benton Thorsen
Howard Michael Veillette
George Edward Walton
Robert Ireton Welsh, Jr.
Norman Randolph West
Jimmie Dale Woods

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

×Abbott, Richard S., O66648.
×Absher, Richard L., O66649.
×Ackerson, Robert L., O66297.
×Adams, Adran DeT., O66651.
×Adams, Floyd C., Jr., O66652.
×Agnew, James B., O66653.
×Ahearn, David C., O66374.
×Aker, John R., O66265.
×Alderman, Craig, Jr., O66347.
×Allen, Frank A., 3d, O66547.
×Allen, James L., O66654.
×Allen, Loma O., Jr., O66655.
×Allen, Terry de La M., O66606.
×Amundson, Donald M., O71435.
×Anderson, James L., O66656.
×Anderson, Norman R., O66657.
×Anderson, Olaf C., Jr., O66658.
×Anderson, Robert W., O66659.
×Anderson, Ronald W., O68805.
×Anderson, Thomas E., O66660.
×Anderson, Thomas E., O66661.
×Angel, Jack F., O68806.
×Anson, Richard W., O66662.
×Applegate, Walter V., O66663.
×Arkley, Robert J., O66665.
×Armstrong, James E., O66521.
×Arnold, Harvey L., Jr., O66214.
Aron, Fred W., Jr., O66667.
×Asensio, Manuel J., Jr., O66574.
×Ashkenaze, Bernard M., O66570.
×Ashton, Thomas W., O66402.
×Atkinson, Dean M., O66668.
×Atkinson, Frank W., Jr., O66669.
×Atkinson, Norman F., O66670.
×Atkinson, Robert V., O66671.
×Auld, Stuart D., O66672.
×Austermann, William D., O66673.
Ayers, Thomas D., O66329.
×Bacci, John J., O66674.
×Badger, Robert L., O66675.
×Badgley, John H., O66676.
×Baer, Martin D., O66677.
Bahr, Henry J., O66678.
×Bailey, Vincent P., O66452.
×Baird, Harry H., Jr., O66562.
×Bal, Roscius I. D., O68807.
Ball, Ray E., O66680.
×Bardis, Michael J., O66681.
Barkley, George F., O66516.
×Barrell, Edgar A., 3d, O66683.
×Barrick, Richard O., O66684.
×Bart, John F., O66529.
×Bartel, George B., O66397.
×Bartlett, Fred O., Jr., O66686.
×Barton, Harold B., O66687.
×Baughman, Larry J., O71442.
×Beardsley, Stephen G., Jr., O66688.
×Beasley, Horace B., O66689.
×Beasley, James M., O66485.
×Beasley, Lewis E., O66377.
×Beaulieu, Richard E., O67985.
×Becker, Ronald E., O66691.
Beckett, Eugene F., O66692.
×Beelman, Dale C., O66694.
Beiser, George R., O66217.
×Bell, James D., O67986.
×Bell, Kermit W., O66567.
Belt, Charles M., O67987.
×Benedict, Frank C., O66419.
×Bennett, Arthur M., Jr., O67988.
×Bergeson, Raymond O., O66494.
×Bergman, Edward, Jr., O66699.
×Berke, Henry H., Jr., O66700.
Berrier, Jerry A., O66701.
×Berry, Billy E., O66702.
×Bethea, John D., O66375.
×Betts, George A., O66703.
×Biddle, Albert G. W., Jr., O66561.
×Bieber, Werner F., O66704.
×Billman, Ervin L., O66705.

×Blakely, William R., Jr., O67891.
×Bland, Ivan C., O66706.
×Bliss, Hugo S., O66708.
×Block, Ted S., O66709.
×Bochniak, Thomas R., O66710.
×Bond, David C., O66410.
×Bond, Gene T., O67896.
×Bookman, Edmund B., Jr., O66711.
×Boos, Michael A., O66573.
×Bouffard, Robert L., O66714.
×Bovard, John O., O66385.
Bowen, John W., O66715.
×Bowers, Richard K., O66717.
×Boyer, Frank A., O66442.
Boyland, William G., Jr., O66719.
×Boyles, William B., O66491.
×Bracy, Alfred McR., O66508.
Bradford, Charles R., O66721.
×Bradley, Don McL., O66365.
×Brake, John W., O66722.
Branch, Ben E., O66723.
×Brant, Charles E., O66724.
×Bremer, James H., O66518.
×Brennan, William F., O66725.
×Brest, Clarence A., Jr., O67792.
×Brewer, John F., Jr., O66259.
×Brewington, Charlie W., O66727.
×Brewster, Vann A., O66572.
×Bridges, Bennie R., O66729.
×Bridgman, Earl N., Jr., O67793.
×Bridwell, Arthur W., Jr., O66730.
×Briggs, Philip D., O66731.
×Brisman, Jerome I., O66519.
×Britten, Gerald H., O68328.
×Broadbent, Carl DeL., O66366.
×Broadhurst, Hugh H., Jr., O66466.
×Brock, Oliver D., O66732.
×Brodigan, Peter A., O66733.
×Brodin, Thomas T., O66530.
×Brooks, Howard J., O66734.
×Broome, George C., Jr., O67794.
×Brown, Bernard F., O66735.
×Brown, Brisbane H., Jr., O66737.
×Brown, Bruce L., O66738.
×Brown, Edward A., O66292.
×Brown, Horace W., O66559.
×Brown, Paul J., O66307.
×Brown, Sam P., O66739.
×Brown, William W., O66740.
Bryan, Lawrence E., O67795.
Bryan, Louis C., Jr., O66524.
×Bryant, Arthur R., Jr., O66742.
×Buck, Horatio S., Jr., O69872.
×Buck, Kent L., O68329.
×Buckley, Blair, Jr., O66421.
×Bullock, Richard S., O66242.
×Burke, Martin J., O66745.
×Burke, Robert J., O67993.
×Burke, Robert L., O66597.
×Burkhalter, Thomas H., O66746.
×Burkhard, Alfred E. S., O66541.
×Burkheimer, Jack W., O66436.
×Burnett, George H., Jr., O67901.
×Burnett, George W., O66747.
×Burns, Gilbert L., O66309.
×Butler, Albert C., O66749.
×Butler, Chestine H., O66750.
×Butler, Everett A., Jr., O66751.
×Butler, John D., O66229.
×Byron, Joseph P., O66752.
×Cade, Alfred J., O66753.
×Cain, James W., O66594.
×Calahan, James E., O66754.
×Campbell, James E., Jr., O66517.
×Campbell, James P., O66755.
×Campbell, Paul G., O66756.
×Cannon, John L., O66239.
×Carley, George A., O66759.
Carlin, Robert S., O67902.
×Carlson, John E., O66256.
×Carmichael, Robert B., O66760.
×Carnie, Sidney K., O66761.
×Carpenter, Gordon D., O66353.
×Carroll, Kelso A., Jr., O66596.
×Carter, John B., O67994.
×Carter, Robert H., O66764.
Carter, Ulysses B., O66765.
×Carter, William D., O66766.
×Cartland, Harry E., O67998.
×Casey, John P., Jr., O70079.
×Catterson, James M., Jr., O67798.
×Catts, Elmer P., Jr., O66768.
×Caughron, Walter E., Jr., O71457.
Cerri, Theodore A., O66770.
Chamberlain, William C., O70173.
Chaney, Donald G., O66771.
×Chasteen, Paul C., O66773.
Chatman, David L., O66774.
×Chavez, Joseph D., O71460.
×Cheaney, Frank H., Jr., O66775.
×Child, Paul W., Jr., O66303.
×Chung, Donald Y. B., O66778.
×Ciccolo, William N., O66779.
×Claggett, William, O67906.
×Clardy, Lawrence L., Jr., O68181.
×Clark, Chapin DeW., O66780.
×Clark, James M., Jr., O66781.
×Clark, Joseph H., O66782.
×Clawson, James W., O67799.
×Claybrook, John H., O66593.
×Clement, Joseph T., 2d O66579.
×Clendenin, Paul E., O66784.
×Cline, Ralph M., Jr., O66373.
×Clyne, Norman G., Jr., O66785.
×Coffman, King J., O66295.
×Cole, Thomas F., O66249.
×Coleman, Philip D., O66482.
×Coleman, Richard C., O66484.
×Collier, Thomas W., O66225.
×Collins, Robert O., O66786.
Colombo, James L., O66787.
×Compton, James McV., O68336.
×Comstock, Keith L., O66488.
×Condina, Ernest F., O66496.
×Condit, Richard B., O66788.
×Conner, Coffee R., O66790.
×Conner, Donald H., O66791.
×Conner, MacPherson, O66549.
×Cook, Robert S., O66793.
Cooke, Herbert J., O67803.
×Cooke, John W., Jr., O66540.
×Copthorne, William A., Jr., O66539.
×Corbridge, Leith J., Jr., O66526.
×Cordell, Glenn A., O66391.
×Costin, Richard W., O66795.
×Cotten, Francis W., O67806.
×Cottey, Robert J., O66379.
×Courant, Thomas E., O66236.
×Covington, Edward B., 3d, O66796.
×Cowan, Joseph C., Jr., O66798.
×Cox, Cloyd W., Jr., O66799.
×Cox, Rodney E., O66800.
×Craig, Malcolm B., Jr., O66316.
×Crair, Morton L., O66801.
×Crannell, William G., O66802.
×Crawford, Elder T., Jr., O67997.
×Cross, John S., O70134.
×Crow, James E., O66331.
×Crowell, Chester D., Jr., O66805.
×Croxford, Ernest R., O66806.
×Cuevas, Ramon N., Jr., O66807.
×Culbertson, Sam R., O66808.
×Cully, Frederick R., O66809.
×Custis, Arthur B., Jr., O66551.
×Cutter, William S., O66811.
×Dadmun, Edward T., O66813.
×Dalston, Jeptha W., O66814.
×Daly, John B., O66815.
×Danford, Howard H., O66438.
×Daniell, Sidney C., O66817.
×Danielson, John N., O66818.
×Dannemiller, Leo M., O68338.
×Davey, Robert A., O66819.
×Davidson, William W., Jr., O68182.
×Davies, Billy T., O66821.
×Davis, Clifford A., O67999.
×Davis, Dale T., O66822.
Davis, Fred J., O65821.
×Davis, George R., O66823.
×Davis, Graham C., O66824.
×Davis, Louis McA., O66489.
×Day, James O., O66602.
×Day, Robert E., O66291.
×Day, Robert L., O66829.
×Dean, Fred E., O66830.
×DeAngelis, Joseph A., O66364.
×DeBoalt, Richard F., O66407.
×Deiss, Herbert, O66258.
×DeLapp, William C., 3d, O66832.
×Delaune, Elton J., Jr., O67808.
×Demmons, Jack L., O68000.
×Derbes, Daniel W., O66287.
×DeShazo, Thomas E., Jr., O70086.
×Dethlefs, Henry J., O66835.
×Deverill, Arthur P., Jr., O66369.
×Devine, Donald W., O66837.
×Devins, Joseph H., Jr., O66558.
×DeWald, Arthur B., O66515.
×Dietz, DuWayne E., O66838.
×Dietz, George R., O66357.
×Dietz, James J., O66306.
×Dingle, Peter, O66839.
×DiSerafino, Giulio L., O66840.
Dixon, Marshall E., O66841.
×Dombrowski, Edwin H., O66842.
×Dombrowski, Albert J., Jr., O66400.
×Donovan, Paul, O66843.
×Doody, Richard F., O66571.
Dorman, James, O66844.
×Dowler, Thomas W., O66232.
×Dowling, John H., O66845.
×Driskill, John G., O66231.
×Dubie, Richard H., O66847.
×Duerr, Michael G., O66279.
×Duffy, James J., Jr., O66848.
×Dughi, Charles H., O66849.
×Duncan, Dorman L., Jr., O67565.
×Duncan, William H., O66550.
×Dunmire, Thomas S., O66532.
Dunn, Robert H., O66449.
×Dupke, Carl F., Jr., O66305.
×Durant, Oswald D., 2d, O66851.
Durie, Robert E., O66535.
×Dutchyshyn, Harry V., O66300.
×Dyer, Edward R., Jr., O67812.
×Dyer, Freddie A., O68183.
×Dyson, William E., O66852.
Eachus, David A., O66459.
×Earle, Marsden P., Jr., O66600.
×Earnest, Clyde T., Jr., O66285.
×Easton, Harr McC., 3d, O66853.
×Ebel, William E., O66854.
×Eckert, Edward N., O66460.
×Edgerton, John D., O66855.
×Edwards, Charles A., Jr., O66439.
×Edwards, David F., O68340.
×Edwards, Robert A., O66857.
Edwards, William H., O66858.
×Ehlert, Richard A., O68184.
×Eichhorn, Ralph F., Jr., O66859.
×Eiken, Marcus A., O66860.
×Eisele, Robert P., O66861.
×Eisenhart, Warren H., O66429.
×Eley, Claud E., Jr., O66862.
×Elliott, Wayne H., O66560.
×Elliott, Wilburt L., O66863.
Ellis, Thomas N., O66468.
Ellison, Thomas B., O66864.
×Elmore, Arthur C., O66431.
×Englesby, Howard E., O66865.
Erickson, Arne B., O66867.
×Erickson, Arthur LeR., O66368.
Espey, John R., O66386.
×Espy, Carl L., Jr., O66868.
×Evans, John C., O66870.
×Evans, Thomas J., O66871.
×Evans, Timothy L., O66872.
×Evans, Winston K., O66873.
×Everhart, Tommy L., O66874.
×Everingham, Neil G., O66875.
×Evrard, James A., O68341.
×Falconer, Walter J., O66878.
×Faught, William F., O68003.
×Fawcett, John A., O66879.
×Feaster, Jacob L., Jr., O66880.
×Ferguson, Jerry, O66882.
×Ferguson, William H., Jr., O66883.
×Fiala, Thomas F., O66261.
×Finch, Richard B., O66884.
×Finn, William G., O66575.
×Fischel, Frank J., O66887.
×Fischer, William H., O66888.
×Fitzpatrick, Thomas E., O66544.
×Flanagan, Eugene P., O66601.
×Fleming, John A., O66890.
×Fleming, Mills L., Jr., O66891.
×Flemming, Daniel B., O66892.
Floro, Lawrence A., Jr., O66893.
×Foley, John V., O66237.
Fonshell, William R., Jr., O66897.
×Ford, Allan T., O68186.
×Frankeberger, John R., O66903.
×Franklin, Chester A., O66904.
×Frederick, Austin, O66905.
×Friend, Donald F., O66907.
×Fulwyler, Niles J., O66908.

×Gambaccini, Louis J., O66910.
×Garcia, Efraim S., O68005.
×Garibay, Raul A., O66913.
×Garland, Donald E., O66914.
×Garrison, Robert M., O67818.
Gartman, Frank T., O67921.
×Garver, John B., Jr. O66408.
×Garver, Ralph T., O66284.
×Garwood, Kenneth J., O66916.
×Gaskill, Robert C., O67819.
×Gaskins, Leonard L., O66917.
×Gearey, Thomas P., O66918.
×Geatches, William H., O66268.
×Geiler, William A., O66920.
×Gelke, Donald E., O66921.
×Gerhardt, James M., O66223.
×Germond, George F., O67923.
×Gibbs, Gerald G., Jr., O66420.
×Gibler, John K., O66923.
×Gibney, John V., O66514.
Gilbert, Edgar A., 3d, O66216.
×Gile, Rexford R., O66926.
×Gilkey, Clarence D., O66262.
×Gillespie, Marc S., O66927.
×Girdner, Ralph W., O66359.
×Glad, Amos D., O67574.
×Glahe, Robert W., O66928.
×Gleason, William P., O66580.
×Glover, Frederick J., O66929.
×Glynn, William P., 3d, O66930.
×Goebel, Werner W., O66932.
×Goff, Richard W., O66933.
×Golden, Harold R., O66935.
×Goldman, Fred, O66936.
×Goliash, Joseph F., O66938.
×Gooch, Kaye W., O66939.
Good, Kenneth N., O66384.
×Goodall, Arthur L., O66940.
×Gorby, Alvin R., O66409.
Gotschall, Wellington J., O66942.
×Gottsche, John S., O66943.
×Gould, David C., O66944.
×Grafton, Benjamin McL., Jr., O66440.
×Gray, Donald J., O66503.
×Gray, George B., Jr., O69661.
×Gray, Paul A., O66472.
×Grayeb, George A., Jr., O66605.
×Green, Moses R., O66947.
×Green, Roy G., O66948.
×Greene, Merle R., O67820.
×Greer, George D., O66949.
×Gregory, Theodore O., O66425.
×Griffin, Alfred C., O66456.
×Griggs, Grady E., O66953.
×Grissom, Charles C., O66954.
×Groninger, Dwight L., O66955.
×Gross, Francis P., 3d, O68350.
×Gruver, Mead S., O66956.
Guertin, J. A. Richard, O66958.
×Guess, Carl B., Jr., O66599.
×Guinn, William D., Jr., O66959.
×Gulley, Willard C., O66960.
×Gustafson, William G., O66961.
×Hackbarth, Richard O., O66962.
×Haeussler, Rodolfo, O68351.
×Hahn, Gordon M., O66396.
×Hahn, James R., O66963.
×Hains, Peter C., O66401.
×Hairston, Charles, O66964.
×Haley, George R., O66965.
×Hall, Henry R., Jr., O68011.
×Halley, Frank H., O69664.
×Hamilton, Philip W., Jr., O66534.
×Hamilton, Wilson S., O66967.
×Hampton, Norman A., O66969.
×Hand, Robert P., O66458.
×Hannan, Joseph A., O66276.
×Hansard, David G., O66378.
×Hanson, Harvey LeR., O66971.
×Haras, Robert J., O66250.
×Harbuck, Robert L., O70095.
×Hare, John F., O66972.
×Harrick, Joseph W., O66973.
×Harriman, William C., O66974.
Harris, Bobby J., O68188.
×Harris, Clyde E., Jr., O66975.
×Harris, Daniel D., Jr., O66976.
Harris, John R., O67927.
×Harris, Nat, 3d, O66977.
Harrison, William J., O66330.
×Harrison, Williams L., Jr., O66465.
×Hartin, Edward W., Jr., O66978.
×Hartzell, Edwin Y., Jr., O66979.
×Haskell, Richard B., O66552.
×Hastings, Wallace H., Jr., O66581.
×Hatch, William T., O66981.
×Hatton, Robert E., O66507.
×Hauser, Ernest W., O66983.
Hausknecht, Richard H., O66985.
×Hawkins, Jeremiah B., O67821.
×Hayford, Warren J., 4th, O66230.
×Hays, James D., O66987.
×Hazen, Carl M., Jr., O66988.
×Heathcock, James T., O66989.
Heflin, Henry G., Jr., O66990.
×Hegberg, Donald E., O66238.
×Heilman, Robert L., O66991.
×Heineke, Hilton E., Jr., O68820.
×Heiss, Clarence LeR., O66992.
×Helms, Jay F., O66993.
×Henderson, Lewis J., O66584.
×Henderson, William J., Jr., O66994.
×Hendrickson, Joe D., O66555.
×Hennigan, John R., O67825.
×Hensley, Rayburn K., O68821.
Hermann, John R., Jr., O66553.
×Herrgesell, Oscar, O66996.
×Herron, Dan P., O66997.
×Herstrom, Frederick W., O66998.
Hess, Robert G., O66999.
×Hettinger, John A., Jr., O66435.
Hewell, Robert E., O68014.
×Hicks, Edson C., O67000.
×Higgs, Irwin L., O67001.
×Hildebrand, Graham, O66326.
×Hiley, Thomas E. Sr., O67002.
Hill, Don K., O67004.
×Hill, John G., O66538.
×Hill, Lloyd H., O71514.
×Hill, Roy W., Jr., O68015.
×Hill, Thomas R., O66255.
×Hodgskin, Howell L., Jr., O66234.
×Hoenstine, Charles A., Jr., O66351.
Hoffmann, Joseph A., O67006.
×Hogan, Henry W., O67007.
×Hoge, Daniel H., Jr., O66563.
×Holden, William B., O66565.
×Hollander, Herbert C., O66299.
×Holle, Bradford, O67009.
×Holle, Kendrick, O67010.
×Holleran, Owen C., Jr., O66537.
×Holley, William T., O67011.
×Holmes, Ashley W., Jr., O67012.
×Holmes, Robert S., O66302.
×Holt, Winfield A., O66533.
×Holtz, Edward S., O67013.
×Hooker, John D., O67014.
Hope, Leon MacK., O67015.
×Hopkins, David A., O67016.
×Horan, Edwin P., Jr., O66512.
×Horlick, Robert C., O67017.
×Horn, William L., O66267.
×Horne, Jasper, C., Jr., O67018.
×Howard, Max L., O66247.
Hubbard, Samuel J., O66411.
×Huch, Charles G., O67022.
×Hudson, William R., O68189.
×Hukkala, Tenho R., O67023.
×Hulley, Robert N., O66525.
×Humble, Graham L., O66585.
×Hunt, Frizell, O67024.
Hurley, Robert D., O67025.
×Huskerson, Guy M., Jr., O67026.
×Hutchins, John A., Jr., O67027.
×Hyde, Orion J., O67028.
Hylton, Irvin L., O67029.
×Ireland, Orville F., Jr., O66497.
×Irwin, Thomas G., O68253.
×Jackson, Arthur G., O66564.
×Jackson, Carroll V., O66470.
×Jacobson, Reginald C., O67032.
×Jaggers, Joseph N., Jr., O66493.
×Jameson, John G., Jr., O67033.
×Jarvis, James W., Jr., O67035.
×Jelen, Edward J., 2d, O66527.
Jelinek, Howard C., O66566.
×Jenkins, Wallace E., O67037.
×Jenkins, William E., O67833.
×Jess, Raymond C., O66501.
×Johnson, Frank F., Jr., O68254.
×Johnson, Howard D., O67039.
×Johnson, Hunter C., Jr., O68017.
×Johnson, John G., O67040.
×Johnson, Oscar A., Jr., O67041.
×Johnson, Raymond E., O67042.
×Johnston, Douglas E., O67045.
×Jones, Charles P., O67834.
×Jones, Lynn W., 2d, O67047.
×Jones, Wesley G., O66557.
×Jordan, Joseph L., O66346.
×Jorgensen, LeRoy, O67048.
×Joyner, Floyd, O67049.
×Juvenal, Michael P., O66477.
×Kaltenthaler, John H., O67051.
×Karlson, Ernest E., O67052.
×Kaser, William T., O67053.
×Katz, Jason H., O67054.
Keating, Kenneth J., O66441.
×Keeler, Phillip R., O67055.
×Keeler, Robert B., O67056.
×Keeley, John B., O66340.
×Keenan, John A., O67057.
×Kelley, William D., O67058.
×Kelly, Keith S., O67059.
×Keltz, Richard E., O67060.
×Kennedy, Edmund J., 3d, O67062.
×Kennedy, John L., Jr., O67936.
×Kenney, John F. C., Jr., O66275.
×Kenz, Herbert W., O67064.
×Kersey, Walter G., O67065.
×Kidwell, Birtrun S., Jr., O66323.
×Kiefer, Homer W., Jr., O66327.
×Kiernan, Thomas A., O66304.
Kilgour, Jordan McI., O67066.
×Kimmel, Robert G., O66464.
×King, Ivan W., O66543.
×King, Peter C., O66455.
×Kirklighter, Gerald W., O67067.
×Kitts, James R., Jr., O71536.
×Kitts, Richard A., O67068.
×Kleberg, Jack C., O66338.
×Klinner, Enzo F., Jr., O68193.
×Klussendorf, John R., O67070.
×Knight, Daniel B., Jr., O66528.
×Knight, O'ferrall, Jr., O66447.
×Knipe, William A., Jr., O67071.
×Knipp, Fred M., O67072.
Knutson, Karl, O67074.
×Knutson, Kent G., O66318.
×Kochanek, Louis J. O67075.
×Koerner, Star C., Jr., O67076.
Korchek, Robert L., O66520.
×Kraft, Donald E., O67077.
×Kraska, Richard J., O68824.
Kreitler, Clark F., O67078.
×Kuick, Stanley J., O66422.
×Kurz, Ralph E., O67079.
LaBarbera, Albert, O67081.
×LaFrance, Raymond J., O71542.
×Lahr, John A., Jr., O67083.
×Lamb, Richard F., O66542.
×Lamp, Harold R., O66349.
×Lane, Edward E., O66335.
×Lane, John W., O67087.
×Lang, Richard N., O66424.
×Lang, Vaughn O., O67088.
×Lange, Karl F., O67089.
×Lank, Joseph M., O67090.
×Larkin, Richard J., O67091.
×Larkin, Richard X., O66417.
×LaRosa, Reginald A., O67092.
×Lash, Raymond E., O66582.
×Lasher, Donald R., O66430.
×Lavernoich, Valerian J., O67094.
×Lawrence, Alfred F., Jr., O66235.
×Lawrence, Paul S., O71545.
×Lawson, Harold F., O67095.
×Lax, William M., O67096.
Layman, George G., O67097.
×Leach, Jack H., O68371.
×Leach, Robert W., O66380.
×Leary, Arthur J., Jr., O67099.
×LeDoux, Ramon M., O67101.
×Lee, James B., O66227.
×Lee, James M., O67102.
×Lee, Williams S., Jr., O67103.
×Leggett, William T., Jr., O66361.
×LeGrand, Kenneth L., O67104.
×Lehan, James F., Jr., O66345.
×Lehman, Albert C., O66312.
Lennon, Leo H., O66444.
×Lentz, John J., O66395.
×Leroux, Francis, O67105.
×Lespasio, Neal A., O66583.
Letourneau, Joseph A., 3d, O67106.
×Levin, Kenneth C., O67107.

×Lewellen, William H., O67108.
Lewis, John H., O67838.
Lewis, John H., 3d, O66498.
×Lichtenwalter, Leon E., Jr., O66322.
Liebl, Arthur F. W., O67109.
Liliker, Thomas W., O68024.
×Lillis, William J., O67839.
×Littlejohn, James N., O67111.
×Livsey, William J., Jr., O68025.
×Loewy, Arthur F., O67112.
×Logan, Andrew H., O67113.
Lombard, Charles F., O67114.
×Longmore, Myron J., O67116.
×Lopkoff, Alexander, Jr., O68374.
Lorenzen, Albert I., Jr., O66554.
×Love, John D., O67117.
×Lovis, Richard S., O67118.
×Lowder, Henry I., O66381.
×Lunsford, Lee R., O67119.
×Lupton, Edward R., O67120.
×Lush, Rolla S., O67121.
×Luther, Jay E., O66301.
×Lycan, Daniel L., O67122.
×Lynch, Francis J., O68379.
×Lynch, James McG., O66603.
×Lyon, David K., O66243.
×MacDonald, Kenneth W., O67124.
×MacDonald, John C., Jr., O67123.
×MacGarrigle, George L., Jr., O66545.
×Madison, Jack V., O67126.
×Magoni, John C., O67127.
×Mahan, Gary C., O68196.
×Mailler, James R., O67129.
×Malmgren, Alfred C., O67840.
×Malone, Paul B., 3d, O66324.
Malone, William E., O67937.
×Maloney, James W., O66228.
×Mangum, David C., O67938.
×Manifold, Rodney M., O67130.
×Manning, Thomas J., O68197.
×Mansfield, Eldon L., Jr., O68026.
×Marden, Richard H., O67133.
Margraf, John A., O67134.
×Markley, Richard E., O67135.
×Marks, Robert P., O67136.
×Martin, David H., Jr., O66434.
×Martin, George L., O67138.
×Martin, James J., O68381.
×Matteucci, Albert, O67140.
×Matthews, Mack O., 3d, O67141.
×Matthews, Richard F., O67142.
×Mauer, John C., O66469.
×Maxham, Robert L., O67145.
McAndie, James L., O66260.
×McBride, Frank A., O67147.
×McBride, James S., 2d, O67148.
×McCaffrey, Charles T., Jr., O67149.
×McCarley, Fred S., Jr., O67150.
×McCauley, Paul J., O67151.
McClung, Edgar B., O66388.
McCluskey, Thomas C., O67153.
×McCormack, Harold J., O70211.
×McCrindle, Robert, O66314.
McDonnell, James E., O66487.
McElroy, Robert I., O68030.
×McGarry, Robert S., O66257.
×McGowan, Robert S., O66360.
×McGregor, Frank A., 3d, O68200.
×McGuire, Raymond F., Jr., O67845.
×McKinley, Hall F., Jr., O67157.
×McKnight, Clarence E., Jr., O66367.
×McKnight, Robert D., O67158.
×McLain, Charles I., O67159.
×McMahon, Daniel P., O66476.
×McManus, Richard J., O67847.
×McMenemy, Alexander E., O67160.
×McMurray, James H., Jr., O70111.
×McNeil, Frank H., O71558.
×McNickle, Robert J., O67164.
×McSpadden, William A., O67942.
×Meagher, Clyde R., Jr., O67165.
×Mechtly, Ivan R., Jr., O66241.
×Medaris, Oliver J., O68384.
×Meek, Ben F., Jr., O67167.
×Meikle, Charles E., O66352.
×Mellinger, Dale E., O67943.
×Merian, John A., O67170.
×Mersch, Robert J., O67171.
×Mess, John A., O67172.
×Messner, Warren A., O67173.
Meyer, Alvin J., O67174.
×Meyer, Henry R., O66270.
×Michel, James A., O66333.
×Mickel, Larry S., O66387.
×Middleton, Wilbur A., O70141.
×Milan, Jerome C., O68272.
×Miles, Charles D., O67175.
Miles, Edgar G., O67176.
×Miller, Bruce McK., O67178.
×Miller, Duane H., O67182.
×Miller, Edwin N., O67183.
×Miller George W., O66354.
×Miller, John J., O69989.
×Miller, Pat C., O68829.
×Miller, Richard J., O66288.
×Miller, Wayne B., Jr., O67184.
×Miller, William W., 067185.
×Mills, Darrell H., O67186.
×Milne, Robert S., O67187.
×Mintz, Arthur L., O67189.
×Misch, John M., O66272.
×Mitchell, Corwin A., O66320.
×Mitchell, William L., Jr., O66414.
×Mittelstadt, Russell J., O67851.
Moffatt, Edwin G., O68830.
×Mohler, Robert L., O67192.
×Moore, James E., O68032.
×Moore, Richard D., O66220.
×Moore, William C., O66382.
×Moorer, John D., Jr., O67193.
×Moran, Otis A., Jr., O66398.
×Morano, Frank T., O67196.
×Morgan, James R., O67197.
×Morgan, Robert L., O66233.
×Morin, Louis F., O66461.
×Morris, Hubert, O71567.
Morrison, George E., 3d, O67199.
×Morrissey, Robert L., O67200.
×Morton, Richard E, O68831.
×Moseley, Bernard R., O68388.
Moseley, Henry G., O66423.
×Moser, Alexander J., O67202.
×Motta, Paul R., O68033.
×Mueller, James W., O66412
×Mullane, Denis F., O66315.
×Mullen, Raymond C., Jr., O67205.
Mullins, Billy P., O67206.
×Munsel, Harold M., O71574.
×Murnighan, Richard L., O67207.
×Murphy, Paul A., 067208.
×Muslin, Melvin G., O67209.
×Myers, William A., O67210.
×Myers, William A., O66511.
×Nabors, Alphonso W., Jr., O67211.
×Naughton, Dennis E., O67212.
×Neal, Albert, O67213.
×Neal, Robert W., O67214.
×Neander, Herbert A., O67215.
×Nelson, Thomas W., O66226.
×Nelson, William D., O67217.
Nestlerode, George H., O68035.
Neumann, Bernhardt E., Jr., O67220.
×Neuvar, Erwin W., O67221.
×Neville, James C., O67222.
×Nichols, Stephen E., O66358.
Nikkel, Roy G., O68036.
Nims, Richard H., O70146.
×Nixon, Donald A., O66509.
Noakley, Don H., O67225.
×Noble, Edwin L., Jr., O67226.
×Noel, James S., 067227.
×Nolan, William L., Jr., O67228.
×Nolde, William B., O68037.
×Nord, Alan A., O67229.
Nunn, David H., O67231.
×Nys, Robert E., O67232.
×Obach, Ronald M., O66453.
×O'Brien, Donald J., O67233.
×O'Brien, Thomas E., O67234.
×O'Connor, Theodore E., O67235.
×Oglesby, Lenox W., O67236.
×Olson, George C., O67237.
×Oltman, Richard M., O67238.
×O'Mary, Paul R., O67239.
×Opel, Donald M., O67242.
×Orr, Carson D., O67243.
×Orr, Jerry C., O68835.
Osborne, Paul R., O67244.
×O'Sullivan, Warren S., O66264.
×Ousley, Thomas J., Jr., O67246.
×Overby, Charlie K., O67247.
×Overdahl, Norman L., O67248.
×Overholt, Eugene F., O67948.
×Owre, Peter T., O70147.
×Ozaki, John, O68393.
×Pace, Thomas D., O66500.
×Pack, Ishmael, O67249.
Pafford, Donald V., O66454.
×Palmer, Glenn H., Jr., O66290.
×Palmer, Leslie A., O67250.
×Paluh, Joseph R., O66350.
×Panton, William E., O70218.
×Paparone, Cono R., O67251.
×Paquette, Dean R., O71583.
×Park, Alan H., O67252.
×Parks, Walter G., O66343.
Parmentier, Stanley J., O67253.
×Paterson, Stewart, Jr., O66371.
×Patrick, George H., 3d, O67255.
×Patrick, William L., O67256.
×Patterson, James H., O67257.
×Patton, Robert S., O67258.
×Payne, Charles R., O67261.
×Peat, Douglas W., O67262.
×Peel, Marvin M., O68039.
×Pehrson, Alan R., O67263.
×Pelton, John DeW., O66588.
×Pendleton, Freeman L., O66463.
Perko, John A., O67266.
Perrin, William S., O68040.
×Perritt, Harvey H., Jr., O66450.
×Peters, Harold K., O66506.
×Petersen, Donald F., O67267.
×Peterson, James M., O66372.
×Petrenko, Glenn, O67853.
×Petro, Peter P., O67268.
Pettit, James S., 2d, O66480.
×Petty, Thomas B., O67269.
×Pfanzelter, Max R., O71586.
×Pfeil, Robert P., O66446.
Phillips, James W., O68041.
Pickering, Phillip B., O66334.
×Pickett, Dayton S., O66317.
×Pierce, Robert W., O67270.
×Pierce, Samuel M., O67271.
×Pilk, Jack R., O66308.
Piotrzkowski, Joseph L., O71589.
×Piske, David F., O66244.
×Plackner, William V., O67273.
×Plotkin, Nathan, O67274.
×Plunkett, John J., O70017.
×Pollard, Arnold R., O67276.
×Ponton, John W., Jr., O67277.
×Poor, William T., O68042.
×Potts, William L., O67279.
×Powell, Bill C., O67280.
×Prather, William R., O67281.
×Price, Douglas E., O67282.
Price, James E., O67283.
×Price, John E., Jr., O67604.
×Price, Robert W., O70148.
×Prince, Ivan R., Jr., O67284.
Pritchett, Charles C., O68043.
×Prohaska, Andrew M., Jr., O67285.
Puckett, Robert B., O67286.
×Purple, Robert A., O67950.
×Purvis, Gerald W., O70479.
×Putnam, Lawrence H., O66383.
×Quinn, John T., O66591.
×Rafferty, Robert R., O67290.
×Raiford, William R., O66328.
×Rainbolt, Harry E., O67291.
×Rainey, Charles N., O66504.
×Rajchel, Louis J., Jr., O66568.
×Rallens, Larry D., O67292.
×Rametta, Thomas P., O68045.
×Ramirez, Raul P., O67293.
×Ramsey, William S., O67294.
×Rathbun, Rex H., O67297.
×Ray, Richard B., O66556.
×Reaves, James B., O66289.
×Red, Dale S., O67299.
×Reece, Carroll K., O67300.
Reece, Laurence H., Jr., O67859.
×Reece, Wendell D., O67301.
×Reeder, Franklin L., O66499.
×Reese, Grady G., O68286.
×Reeve, John H., O67303.
×Rehm, Thomas A., O66426.
×Reid, James A., O67305.
×Reilly, William F., O66219.
×Reinhalter, Edmund J., O66445.
×Reinstein, Vincent P., O67306.
×Relyea, George R., O66245.
×Rende, Richard M., O67307.
Renz, Ray H., O67308.

Repko, John J., Jr., O67860.
×Reynolds, James M., O67309.
×Rhiddlehoover, Loyd P., Jr., O66522.
×Richards, Everett D., O66332.
Richardson, William F., 3d, O67310.
×Ricketson, Wayne E., O67312.
×Rickman, James H., O67313.
×Riddick, Mills A., O67314.
×Ridgeway, William M., O67315.
×Riese, Paul E., O67316.
×Riker, James J., O67317.
Riley, Robert S., O66598.
×Rink, James H., O66392.
×Rippel, George W., O67319.
×Risch, Theodore D., O67320.
×Ritter, William H., O66548.
×Rizzo, Paul J., O67321.
×Robbins, Albert W., O67952.
×Roberts, Lee W., O68398.
×Roberts, Ovid E., 3d, O67324.
×Robertson, Daniel B., O67325.
Robertson, Robert E., O67326.
×Robertson, Victor M., Jr., O67862.
×Robinson, Eugene E., O67328.
×Robinson, Frank E., O66413.
×Rochester, Earle F., O67331.
Rodney, Richard M., O67332.
×Rodolph, John E., O67333.
×Rodrigues, James A., O66467.
×Rogers, Fred C., O67334.
×Rogers, Richard J., O66433.
×Rogers, Roy D., O67336.
×Rollins, Robert L., O67337.
×Romero, Louis J., O67338.
×Roper, Harry McK., Jr., O66246.
×Ross, Donald H., O66348.
×Ross, Eugene, O67339.
×Ross, Wilbur A., O66546.
×Rousse, William C., O68205.
×Rowe, James R., O68206.
Rowland, Louis N., O67341.
×Rowland, Richard O., O67342.
×Royals, Gerald E., O67343.
×Ruff, Clarence G., O66263.
×Runion, Roger C., O67344.
×Runquist, Joseph J., O67345.
×Rushing, Robert K., O67346.
×Russell, Lawrence, 3d, O66282.
×Russell, Robert L., O66403.
×Russomano, Richard J., O66254.
×Ryan, Thomas A., O67349.
×Sadler, John W., O66271.
×Sagul, John C., O67350.
×Salley, Donald B., O67351.
×Samisch, Hillel, Jr., O67352.
×Sammons, Anthony J., Jr., O68207.
×Sandhaas, John J., Jr., O67864.
×Santilli, Joseph F., Jr., O66505.
×Sarber, William R., Jr., O67354.
×Sauers, Robert L., O67355.
×Saunders, Norman C., O67356.
×Sawtelle, Thomas K., O67357.
Sayre, John R., O67358.
Schandler, Herbert Y., O66296.
×Schexnayder, Edmond P., O67865.
×Schlim, Albert W., O67360.
×Schloss, Charles M., Jr., O67361.
×Schmalhorst, Joseph H., O68401.
×Schmidt, Richard H., O67362.
×Schoebel, James G., O70229.
×Scholz, Rudolph J., Jr., O67363.
×Schrack, Neil W., O70230.
×Schroeder, William S., O66589.
×Scott, Gilbert T., O66337.
×Scott, Julien A., Jr., O67955.
×Seamands, George A., O67364.
×Sears, Robert L., O66475.
×Sell, Charles E., Jr., O66293.
×Selleck, Clyde A., Jr., O66218.
×Sells, Donald E., O66248.
×Senna, Jozef F., O67366.
×Shackleton, Ronald A., O67367.
Shannon, John F., O67368.
×Shattuck, William M., O67369.
×Shea, John J., Jr., O67370.
×Sherman, Anthony, Jr., O67371.
×Shores, Richard L., O67372.
×Shull, Wesley B., O67373.
Shultz, Robert H., Jr., O67374.
×Shy, John W., O66215.
×Sigwalt, Paul H., O67376.
×Simmons, Thomas R., Jr., O67377.
×Simons, Gerald S., O67379.
×Simpson, John A., O67380.
×Simpson, Richard R., O67381.
×Singletary, R. M., O67382.
×Slingerland, Douglas A., O66473.
×Sluga, Leonard A., O66298.
×Smallwood, Eugene F., O67960.
×Smallwood, Grady L., O67383.
Smallwood, Paul L., O67384.
×Smith, Billy R., O67961.
×Smith, Frank B., O66399.
×Smith, John D., O66310.
×Smith, Millard H., O67387.
×Smith, Ralph H., O68049.
×Smith, Robert W., O67389.
×Smith, Vincent K., O67390.
×Snyder, Oscar P., Jr., O67391.
×Snyder, William P., O66274.
×Sobel, Joseph I., O67392.
×Solley, Bill, O67393.
×Spannuth, Steven H., O67394.
×Sparks, Jackson M., O67395.
×Spaulding, Warren A., O66252.
×Speir, Ashley C., Jr., O66294.
×Spell, James M., Jr., O66325.
×Spencer, William H., Jr., O66586.
×Spero, Paul G., O67397.
×Spirito, Leonard A., O68208.
×Spitzer, Robert N., O67398.
×Sprague, John T., Jr., O67399.
Spurlock, William W., Jr., O67400.
Stanaland, William A., O67401.
×Stanford, Daly H., O67402.
×Stanier, Richard E., O66432.
×Stebbins, Arthur R., O66356.
×Steen, Charles S., Jr., O66513.
×Steinport, George L., O67404.
×Stephens, George R., Jr., O67406.
×Stephens, Jack V., O67407.
×Stephens, James H., Jr., O68053.
×Stephens, Louis M., O67408.
×Sterling, Norris P., Jr., O67409.
×Stevens, Charles LaF., O67410.
×Stevens, Frederick A., Jr., O66479.
×Stevens, Richard S., O67411.
×Stevenson, Joseph M., O67871.
×Stockman, Bonny R., O67413.
×Stokes, Eugene J., Jr., O66278.
×Stoll, Joe D., O67415.
×Stone, Lawrence J., O67416.
×Stone, Walter D., Jr., O67418.
×Story, Richard E., O67419.
×Stovall, Johnnie N., O67420.
×Strauss, Stephan N., O70151.
×Strickfaden, Wellington J., O70153.
Strickland, George E., O67421.
×Stromfors, Robert E., O67422.
×Strong, William R., O67423.
×Stubblebine, Albert N., 3d, O66363.
×Sullivan, Albert W., O67424.
×Sullivan, John J., O66462.
×Sullivan, Milton D., O66394.
×Suilivan, Robert A., O67425.
×Sundt, Thoralf M., Jr., O66283.
×Sutherland, Fred G., O67426.
×Swank, Sheldon E., O67428.
×Swanson, Kermit D., O66344.
×Swygert, Donald R., O66280.
×Sykes, Cecil R., O66355.
×Szalwinski, Ambrose A., O67429.
×Szymczyk, Norbert J., O66576.
×Takasumi, Tetsuo N., O67430.
×Tanner, Eugene P., O67431.
×Tasset, Warren J., O67433.
Tausch, William H., Jr., O67434.
×Taylor, Arthur E., Jr., O66437.
×Taylor, George E., O67436.
×Taylor, Robert A., O67437.
Tellifero, George J., O67438.
×Tensfeldt, Raymond J., O66471.
×Tervin, Wallace, O70124.
×Thieme, Alfred L., O66457.
×Thomas, Otto J., O67441.
×Thomas, Raymond G., O67442.
×Thomas, Reynold, Jr., O66451.
Thomas, William E., O71610.
×Thompson, Dwight S., O67443.
×Thompson, Edmund A., O66376.
×Thompson, Edmund R., O66277.
×Thompson, Egbert H., O67444.
×Thompson, Luther C., O67445.
×Thuston, William O., O67448.
×Tice, Norman R., O67449.
×Tickle, Robert S., O66313.
×Tierney, Robert R., O67450.
×Tignor, Forrest D., Jr., O68803.
×Tilley, Derald A., O67452.
×Tipton, John H., Jr., O66370.
×Todd, John A., Jr., O67453.
Toepel, Adalbert E., Jr., O66486.
Tomasetti, Louis V., O66253.
×Tow, James L., O66495.
×Towne, Richard S., O67456.
×Trepagnier, Jules C., Jr., O68057.
×Trimble, Rae C., O67457.
×Tripp, Perry D., Jr., O67458.
×Tronsrue, George M., Jr., O66240.
×Trotti, Robert S., Jr., O67969.
×Truax, Robert H., O66478.
×Turner, Frank D., Jr., O67877.
×Turner, James J., O66523.
×Turner, Robert C., O66587.
×Tuttle, Roger L., O67461.
×Tyree, John B., O67462.
×Tyson, Wallace S., O67463.
×Ulmer, Walter F., Jr., O66389.
×Underhill, George R., O66362.
×Underwood, Bibb A., O68209.
×Upton, Edwin J., O66393.
×Urruela, Mario L., O68408.
×Uzee, Richard J., O67465.
×Vagins, Milton, O67466.
×Vance, Larkin B., O70055.
×Van Meter, Maurice R., O67467.
×Van Ness, Richard E., Jr., O67468.
×Van Trees, Harry L., Jr., O66213.
×Vanwinkle, Herbert N., O67470.
×Verlautz, Sidney J., O67472.
×Vermillion, Russell G., O67473.
×Vitetta, Eugene J., O67474.
×Vogel, Herbert D., Jr., O66502.
×Vuley, Ernest A., Jr., O67476.
×Waara, Ralph C., O67477.
×Waggoner, Roger C., O67478.
×Wagner, Harry D., O66592.
×Wagner, Julian F., O67479.
Wagnon, William M., Jr., O67480.
×Wakefield, Hobson M., O67481.
Walker, Donald A., O67482.
×Walker, William A., Jr., O66321.
×Wallace, Raymond E., O66342.
×Waller, Bogue M., O67483.
×Wallis, Charles R., O66221.
×Wallwork, James H., Jr., O66224.
×Walter, James N., O66404.
×Walters, Thomas E., O67485.
×Walton, Fred H., Jr., O67879.
×Ward, Charles R., O67486.
×Ward, Leon T., O67487.
×Warner, Nelson M., O67489.
×Warren, William R., O67491.
×Wasiak, Joseph E., O66481.
×Watkins, Charles E., O66339.
×Watts, David E., O67493.
Webb, Harold T., O67880.
×Weber, Edmund G., O67495.
×Weed, Mahlon G., O66510.
×Weeks, Asa J., O67496.
×Wehmeyer, Rubin R., O67498.
×Wehr, Arthur J., Jr., O67499.
×Weikert, Jerry L., O68410.
×Weindorf, Donald W., O67500.
×Weinert, Donald G., O66281.
×Weiser, George T., O67501.
×Welch, Deane E., O66311.
×Welch, Robert L., O67502.
×Wellford, Armistead L., 3d, O67503.
×Wells, Edward C., O67504.
×Wells, Parker H., O67505.
×Wells, Robert N., Jr., O66416.
×Wendell, Charles R., O67507.
×Wensyel, James W., O66336.
×Werner, Donald R., O67508.
×West, Wilfred W., O67510.
×Wetzel, Robert L., O66448.
×Weyhrich, Richard J., O66415.
×Whalen, Thomas R., O67511.
×Wheeler, Robert J., O66483.
×Wheeler, Robert J., O67513.
×Whipple, Deryle T., O66341.
×White, Horace R., O67514.
×White, Joseph D., O67515.
×White, Wayne N., O66490.
×Whitener, Hubert J., O68411.

×Whiting, Frederick D., 3d, O67516.
×Whittemore, Olin S., O67517.
×Wiard, Robert C., Jr., O67519.
×Wigman, John M., O67521.
×Wilcox, Nelson I., O67523.
×Wiles, Richard I., O66531.
×Wilkinson, Paul F., O67524.
×Williams, Albert F., O67526.
×Williams, Bruce F., O67527.
×Williams, Charles E., O67528.
×Williams, Donald L., O67529.
×Williams, Fred A., O67530.
×Williams, Green B., Jr., O67531.
×Williams, Joel J., O67532.
×Williams, John R., O67533.
×Williams, Lewis A., O66273.
×Williams, Royce C., O68061.
×Willis, Maurice L., O67534.
×Wills, Robert V., O68849.
×Wilson, Drake, O66286.
×Wilson, Harry S., Jr., O66266.
Winemiller, Paul L., Jr., O67535.
×Wirth, Gustav A., Jr., O67536.
×Wirth, Paul R., O67537.
×Witherell, John R., O66251.
Withers, Peter C., O66492.
Wohlfarth, Howard K., O68063.
×Woltersdorf, Karl A., Jr., O66406.
Wood, Raymond D., Jr., O67538.
Woodill, William R., O67540.
×Woodruff, William R., O67541.
Wooley, Wilson C., O67542.
×Wooten, James P., O71631.
×Wright, Robert E., O66269.
×Wuthrich, Edward E., O66222.
×Yaden, Jesse L., Jr., O68064.
×Yantis, William J., O68316.
Yarbrough, Charles Van Der V., O66604.
×Yocum, Charles W., O66319.
York, Thomas R., O67887.
×Young, Melvin A., O66578.
×Yuille, Ryan S., O67543.
×Zaice, Joseph E., O67888.
×Zellem, Steven, O66569.
×Zielonka, Alfred W., O67890.
×Zimmer, Charles E., O67977.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

×Barron, John W., O66635.
×Borg, Lavern G., O66713.
×Burke, James C., O70291.
×Gilley, William F., O68347.
×Grigas, Alfons A., O66952.
×Hawkins, Lewis L., O66986.
Jenkins, Russell I., O67036.
×Leach, Bertram G., O67098.
×Marble, David W., O68027.
×McClure, Warner D., O68199.
×McGlade, Joseph G., O67843.
×Miller, Norman G., O67945.
×Mulrenin, Bernard K., O68800.
×Ramthun, Gerald A., O67857.
Rutkowski, Roman B., O67348.
×Wilbarger, Edward S., Jr., O67522.
×Zollman, William M., Jr., O67545.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

×Broyles, Emma L., L450.
×Hooker, Betty J., L459.
×Lippman, Renee E., L457.
×Patterson, Betty A., L451.
×Payne, Ruth W., L447.
×Rees, Eleanor V., L452.
×Thome, Alice C., L456.
×Thompson, Martha J., L454.
×Williams, Thelma M., L449.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

×Brown, Barbara R., N2589.
Casey, Marguerite C., N2569.
Doyle, Mary E., N2579.
×Farland, Vivian, N2574.
Fuller, Catherine E., N2582.
×Gieldseth, Betty M., N2583.
×Ginsberg, Miriam K., N2590.
×Hill, Louise, N2584.
×Holtz, Dorothy M., N2575.
×Kuehn, Dorothy M., N2571.
McLean, Mary F., N2572.
×Polidori, Joan M., N2580.
×Schairer, Margaret L., N2586.
×Smith, Nancy V., N2578.
×Starkey, Elizabeth J., N2587.
×Suess, Helen V., N2591.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×Adams, Rachel H., M10148.
Anderson, Marylyn J., M10133.
×Foegen, Dorothy, McC., M10146.
Lambertson, Elizabeth L., M10139.
×McKinley, Harriet J., M10147.
Reynolds, Cora D., M10141.
×Sherburne, Jeanne, R10157.
×Wakefield, Patricia, M10143.
Westhoven, Mary F., M10144.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be major

Phillips, Richard J., MC, O1775268.

To be first lieutenant

Rutledge, Elizabeth J., WAC, L1010536.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

To be captain

Schug, Willis E., Jr., O28039.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Bouzard, Walter C., O4029294.
Brown, William C.
Deubler, Keith F., O4030392.
Goldsmith, Ralph S., O2273768.
Hatch, Robert P., O4038150.
Joy, Robert J. T., O4038152.
Kristeller, Adrian R., O2201121.
Levin, Herbert J.
Myers, John E., Jr., O2273733.
Parsons, Robert W.
Rodriguez, Ariel, O4030408.
Sadler, Dean L.
Sanders, Lester W., Jr., O2273711.
Sorenson, Roger W.
Tweedy, Franklin V., O4033384.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Shiveley, Charles B., O2014603.

To be second lieutenants

Callis, Bennie E., O4006025.
Chipps, James H., O4020931.
Moore, Robert L., O1892107.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Bragalone, Raymond A.
King, Olin B., O4023822.
McDowell, Thomas E.
Wallace, Malcolm B.
Watson, Henry G., O4033155.

IN THE NAVY

Robert D. Harrop (Naval Reserve aviator), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the line in the Navy (special-duty officers), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Aikens	Edward R. Fink
Robert P. Best	Gardiner M. Haight
Donald R. Bradshaw	Walter B. Harris
James W. Buchanan	George S. Lundin
Gordon A. Evans	Charles T. Pearson, Jr.

Dock T. Hatcher, Jr. (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Giles D. Morrill (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named civilian college graduates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John K. Bontrager
George E. Haroldsen

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Paul S. Fauks
James H. Morris
Philip Steinberg

ENSIGN

Bruce R. Banks	Roger M. Sudduth
Jerome L. O'Brien	Charles Z. Webb

Joseph A. Puleo (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William A. Bourne (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William C. Fuller (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Jane C. Hessel (Naval Reserve officer), to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named women officers to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Joyce B. Parker
Cecily J. Smith
Nancy L. Warner

Eugene LeR. Walter, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Gerald Fink for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named Reserve and temporary officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Maurice H. Alexander	Harlan C. Chase
Louis J. Bacher	Jerry P. Chene
Freddie J. Baker	William C. McClelland
Roger H. Barnard	Doyle H. Cole
Elena D. Brigotti	Charles F. Cresswell
Richard N. Buethe	William M. Cryan
William O. Butler	George D. Cumming
Guy R. Campo	George A. Dimsdale
Frank S. Cannon	Roy L. Doering
John C. Cawthron, Jr.	Joseph R. Donaldson

Mark P. Fennessy
Charles R. Figard
David D. Finne, Jr.
John J. Finnegan
John E. Forde, Jr.
George E. Fuller
Orvis O. Gaugh, Jr.
David G. Geddes
Edward Z. Grabowski
Edward M. Guell
Frederick M. Haden
John R. Hansford
Richard E. Hemmingway
Donald H. Hildebrand
Max J. Hochenauer
Page H. Holmes
George Hubbard
Paul G. Janssen
Mary G. Johancen
Joseph S. Jordahl
Robert J. Keller
Alan B. Kimball
Walter E. Kiracofe
Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
Howard A. Koritz
Dudley N. Kyle
George G. Long
James F. Mahoney
Frederick F. Mallard
Joseph V. Manis, Jr.
Clarence E. May, Jr.
Thomas E. McNally
Max McQuown
Edward J. Megarr
Robert E. Miller
Thomas G. Mooney
Rowland M. Murphy
Donald E. Newton
Bruce C. Ogilvie
Wilford E. Overgard
Charles R Puckett
Ernest R. Reid, Jr.
Charles M. Reitz
Charles C. Renshaw II
Robert C. Rice
William L. Robbins
Richard L. Robinson
Walter F. Rogers
Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
Leonard Schoenberger
Richard C. Schulze
William F. Sheehan
Wilson E. Shepherd
Vernon C. Shortsleeves
William G. Siegfried
William J. Spiesel
Broman C. Stinemetz
Wylie W. Taylor, Jr.
Speros D. Thomaidis
George W. Troxler
Gerald W. Vaughan
Timothy S. Vogt
Carroll R. Vorgang
Douglas E. Wade
Anthony G. Waite
Vonda Weaver
James J. Weiry
Morgan W. West
Norman C. Willcox
Estas L. Williams
Rondell K. Wood
Jack G. Woolery

The following-named reserve and temporary officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. Alber
James O. Allison
Eugene W. Andersen
William C. Ashby, Jr.
James P. Austin
Carl J. Beaver
Kent M. Beckman
Joseph P. Beno
Wyman U. Blakeman
Charles F. Bogg
William O. Bonsall
Charles L. Booth
John R. Braddon
Jack A. Brandon
Virgil B. Brandon
Margaret A. Brewer
Carroll E. Brown
Dickinson Buell
James D. Calder
Laurence A. Campbell III
Gary L. Carlson
Francis M. Casey
Logan Cassedy
Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr.
William H. Chisholm
Eual R. Christian
Merideth M. Clark
Holly Clayson
John E. Clewes
William F. Coffey
Francis E. Coit
Marcus H. Cook
Donald E. Coombe
John F. Cornish, Jr.
Richard G. Courtney
Jack O. Curtis
Samuel E. Dangelo
David L. Day
Carl W. DeLaughter, Jr.
William L. Diebels
Walter R. Dillow
John V. Dinan, Jr.
Winfield S. Ditch III
Thomas A. Doyle
Lawrence T. Drennan, Jr.
Billy R. Duncan
Hollis T. Dunn
Russell M. Dunn, Jr.
Robert J. Eitel
Vincent M. Ernst, Jr.
Paul G. Fahlstrom
Bob W. Farley
William E. Farris
Michael J. Fibich
Wallace E. Fogo
Chester A. Folck
David T. Forbes, Jr.
James F. Forhan
Paul H. Fraser
Richard A. Freeman
John R. Fridell
George W. Fritschi
Donald G. Gascoigne
Clarence U. Gebsen
Herbert H. Geister
Robert A. Gillon
John J. Giubilato
George E. Goodall, Jr.
Richard J. Gowdy
Wallace H. Graham
Arthur L. Graves
Edward F. Grayson, Jr.
Robert P. Green
James C. Greene, Jr.
Michael W. Gubany
Robert J. Hafey
Roger C. Hagerty
William P. Haight
Richard E. Haislip
Robert D. Hanson
Jerry M. Harrison
Donald L. Harvey
Webster C. Heath
Robert W. Heesch
Donald C. Heim
Robert G. Hendricks, Jr.
John A. Herber
John C. Hergert, Jr.
Edward C. Hertberg
Herbert M. Herther
Wesley F. Hixon
Walter G. Horais
Ivan F. Horne
John Hubner
Rayburn A. Hudman
Ralph L. Hughes
Earl R. Hunter
Thomas K. Jefferson
Joe L. Johnson
Victor J. Johnson, Jr.
Therin H. Jones
Harold E. Juedeman
Martin D. Julian
Louis K. Keck
Albert W. Keller
Samuel G. Kelley, Jr.
John F. J. Kelly
Harold L. Kendrick
Hunt S. Kerrigan
Robert W. Kirby
Paul E. Kisner
John R. Kline
John K. Knope
Donald E. Koelper
Carol A. Kramer
Albert C. Krause
Herbert W. Kress
Donald W. Kron
Eddis R. Larson
Raymond F. Latall, Jr.
John B. Lavelle
John J. Lawendowski
Richard J. Lee, Jr.
Richard P. Lee
Robert D. Leipold
Donald L. Lindemuth
Thomas G. Logan
Aubrey L. Lumpkin
Dan J. C. Lyttle
Arthur D. Malovich
Richard S. Mariasy
Leonard R. Markwitz
Joseph F. Mayfield, Jr.
James P. McBride
John J. McCarthy
Charles A. McCluskey
James G. McCormick
Gerald E. McDonnell
Frederick J. McEwan
George X. McKenna
Thomas J. Medina
Franklyn E. Meyer, Jr.
John H. Miller
Richard L. Moeller
Ralph F. Moody
Neil E. Moore
James M. Moriarty
Ellen B. Moroney
John R. Mounie, Jr.
Wilbur L. Mundell
Michael J. Needham
Lawrence F. Nelson
William T. O'Rourke, Jr.
James D. Page
Lowell W. Parish
Frederick D. Patterson, Jr.
Norman E. Payne, Jr.
Matthew B. Peck, Jr.
Ernest F. Piskorski
James W. Pitsenbarger
James E. Prather, Jr.
Richard L. Prather
Ralph D. Proctor
Joseph T. Quinn
Richard E. Rainbolt
Clifford E. Reese
Edmund J. Regan, J.
John P. Reichert
Donald N. Rexroad
Wesley E. Rhine
Fred C. Rilling, Jr.
Duane J. Ring
Charles S. Ritter
Otto W. Ritter
Robert P. Rose
William H. Ross, Jr.
William W. Rubrecht
Wesley M. Rush
James N. Ryder
Dale W. Sanford
Melvin H. Sautter
William K. Schlef
Beverly Schofield
Charles E. Schwob
John E. Seissiger
Leon R. Sellers
Walter C. Service III
John C. Shaffer
Robert P. Sherman
Marvin S. Shinbaum
Jack A. Simmons
William E. Smilanich, Jr.
Jack P. Smith
Louis G. Snyder
Ralph B. Spencer
Richard L. Spreitzer
John K. Springer
Cameron Standish
Alfred J. Stashis
Merlin V. Statzer
Raymond B. Steele
Walter R. Stendahl, Jr.
Arthur C. Stephens, Jr.
Ray N. Stewart
Donald C. Stgermain
John C. Streed
Richard A. Sulik
Bennie W. Summers
Theodore D. Svoboda
Rudolf S. Sutter
Robert W. Swayne
Harry E. Taylor
John L. Thatcher
Joseph H. Thompson
Lester H. Thompson, Jr.
Roy L. Thompson, Jr.
Dale Thornton
Larrance M. Todd
Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
David S. Twining
James R. VanDenelzen
Edwin J. VanZandt
John L. Vibberts
Henry R. Vitali
David H. Wagner
Raymond D. Walters
George W. Ward
James W. Warner
George J. Waters
James A. Wells, Jr.
Albert Whalley
Robert E. White
James A. Whitmer
George A. Wickman
Richard A. Wieland
Kenneth H. Wilcox
Donald G. Williams
Charles W. Wilson
George M. Wilson
Jenny Wrenn
Dennis W. Wright
Frank H. Wright
William J. Wright, Jr.
Willard J. Wyatt
Martin V. Young, Jr.
Eugene H. Zimmerman

Gerald Fink for temporary appointment to the grade of major in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Maurice H. Alexander
Louis J. Bacher
Freddie Baker
Roger H. Barnard
Elena D. Brigotti
Richard N. Buethe
William O. Butler
Frank S. Cannon
John C. Cawthron, Jr.
Jerry P. Chene
William M. Clelland
Doyle H. Cole
George D. Cumming
George A. Dimsdale
Joseph R. Donaldson
Mark P. Fennessy
Charles R. Figard
David D. Finne, Jr.
John J. Finnegan
John E. Forde, Jr.
George E. Fuller
David D. Geddes
Edward Z. Grabowski
Edward M. Guell
Frederick M. Haden
John R. Hansford
Richard E. Hemmingway
Donald H. Hildebrand
Page H. Holmes
George Hubbard
Mary G. Johancen
Walter E. Kiracofe
Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
Dudley N. Kyle
George G. Long
James F. Mahoney
Frederick F. Mallard
Joseph V. Manis, Jr.
Clarence E. May, Jr.
Thomas E. McNally
Max McQuown
Edward J. Megarr
Robert E. Miller
Thomas G. Mooney
Rowland M. Murphy
Donald E. Newton
Bruce C. Ogilvie
Wilford E. Overgard
Charles R. Puckett
Ernest R. Reid, Jr.
Charles M. Reitz
Charles C. Renshaw II
Richard L. Robinson
Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
Leonard Schoenberger
Richard C. Schulze
Wilson E. Shepherd
Vernon C. Shortsleeves
William G. Siegfried
William J. Spiesel
Broman C. Stinemetz
Speros D. Thomaidis
George W. Troxler
Timothy S. Vogt
Carroll R. Vorgang
Douglas E. Wade
James J. Weiry
Norman C. Willcox
Estas L. Williams
Jack G. Woolery

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. Alber
James O. Allison
Eugene W. Andersen
William C. Ashby, Jr.
James P. Austin
Joseph P. Beno
Charles F. Bogg
William O. Bonsall
Charles L. Booth
John R. Braddon
Margaret A. Brewer
Carroll E. Brown
James D. Calder
Laurence A. Campbell III
Francis M. Casey
Logan Cassedy
Ernest C. Cheatham
Eual R. Christian
Merideth M. Clark
William F. Coffey
Marcus H. Cook
Richard G. Courtney
Winfield S. Ditch III
Thomas A. Doyle
Lawrence T. Drennan, Jr.
Billy R. Duncan
Hollis T. Dunn
Robert J. Eitel
Paul G. Fahlstrom
William E. Farris
Michael J. Fibich
Chester A. Folck
Paul H. Fraser
Richard A. Freeman
John R. Fridell
George W. Fritschi
Herbert H. Geister
Wallace H. Graham
Edward F. Grayson, Jr.
Michael W. Gubany
Robert J. Hafey
William P. Haight
Donald L. Harvey
Webster C. Heath
Robert W. Heesch
John C. Hergert, Jr.
Wesley F. Hixon
Walter G. Horais
Ivan F. Horne
Rayburn A. Hudman
Earl R. Hunter
Joe L. Johnson
Therin H. Jones
Martin D. Julian
Samuel G. Kelley, Jr.
John F. J. Kelly
Harold L. Kendrick
Hunt S. Kerrigan
Donald E. Koelper
Carol A. Kramer
Albert C. Krause
John J. Lawendowski
Richard J. Lee, Jr.
Donald L. Lindemuth
Thomas G. Logan
Aubrey L. Lumpkin
Arthur D. Malovich
James G. McCormick
Frederick J. McEwan
John H. Miller
Richard L. Moeller
Ralph F. Moody
Ellen B. Monroney
John R. Mounie, Jr.
Michael J. Needham
Lawrence F. Nelson
William T. O'Rourke, Jr.
James D. Page
Lowell W. Parish
Norman E. Payne, Jr.
Ernest F. Piskorski
James W. Pitsenbarger
Joseph T. Quinn
Richard E. Rainbolt
Edmund J. Regan, Jr.
Donald N. Rexroad
Wesley E. Rhine
Fred C. Rilling, Jr.
Otto W. Ritter
Dale W. Sanford
Melvin H. Sautter
William K. Schlef
Beverly Schofield
Charles E. Schwob
John E. Seissiger
John C. Shaffer
Robert P. Sherman
Marvin S. Shinbaum
Jack A. Simmons
William E. Smilanich, Jr.

Louis G. Snyder	John L. Vibberts
Ralph B. Spencer	Henry R. Vitali
Cameron Standish	David H. Wagner
Merlin V. Statzer	Raymond D. Walters
Raymond B. Steele	George W. Ward
Donald C. Stgermain	Charles J. Werger
Richard A. Sulik	Albert Whalley
Rudolf S. Sutter	Robert E. White
Robert W. Swayne	James A. Whitmer
Harry E. Taylor	George M. Wilson
John L. Thatcher	Jenny Wrenn
Joseph H. Thompson	Dennis W. Wright
Dale Thornton	Willard J. Wyatt
Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.	Eugene H. Zimmerman
James R. VanDenelzen	

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond C. Baker, Jr.	Arthur T. Mixon
Richard M. Camper	Herbert W. Moore
Warren L. Comstock	Reginald H. Ridgely III
John S. Gary, III	Sidney W. Rossuck, Jr.
Joseph M. H. Irby	Travis M. Russell
William T. Kerlin	George H. Scherer
Thomas L. LeCleir	Robert A. Sisk
Charles R. Martin	Harry C. Valentine, Jr.
Richard C. Martin	John R. Wright
Thomas G. McFarland, Jr.	
James L. McManaway	

The following-named officers of the United States Marine Corps and United States Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John C. Archbold	Willard L. Mattmiller
David B. Ballash	Donald A. Mayo
Don G. Bangs	James R. McQuillan
Aloysius J. Bannigan III	Paul F. Melcher
Arnold L. Belgum	Bruce B. Miller
Francis N. Berdanier	James R. Miller
Ralph A. Berninzoni	Jacob W. Moore
Patsy J. Boglioli	Marion C. Morgan
Stephen Bosbonis	George S. Morita
Robert A. Bowman	Thomas D. Murphy
Richard A. Burns	Thomas E. Nessmith
Donald N. Caliendo	Donald J. Norris
John R. Carr, Jr.	Eddie C. Paige, Jr.
Joseph A. Cole	Jimmie L. Pappas
Richard O. Compton	Alfred R. Parent
Jack W. Crayne	Robert J. Patrick
Basil F. Dally	Marvin E. Peacock
Dave Dichter	James W. Persons
Robert C. Dinsmore	Robert L. Ray
James L. Doody	Thomas A. Reeves
Kenneth R. Erickson	Charles D. Riordan
James E. Frazier	Harold W. Robbins
Lawrence Furstenburg	John H. Roberts
Ronald D. Green	John G. Rudel
Patrick D. Guifoile	Warren G. Sanborn
James C. Hitz	Robert G. Sedan
Joseph P. Jester, Jr.	John W. Sewell, Jr.
Orville B. Johnson	Gerald D. Shaw
John F. Kahoun	Spencer W. Smith
Richard M. Kaleta	Howard L. Snider
Gerald E. Kepler	Calvin B. Steiner
Leonard E. Korenek	James B. Talley
Louis C. Kressin	Ronald M. Thompson
Arthur B. Kulla	Alvin G. Thorson, Jr.
Jerrel W. Lear	Frederick G. Towle
Hugh N. Leuin	Henry A. Wheat III
Bobby F. Long	Bobby W. White
John R. Loose	Kenneth R. Williams
Warren C. Mahan	Richard A. Wilson
Gordon M. Martin	Milton A. Wolfgang
	John M. Wood

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are coming unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer with hearts full of praise and gratitude, for Thou hast been our ever-present help and everlasting hope in all our yesterdays.

We are facing new days challenging us with many needs, but we are confident that those needs will be far outnumbered by the abundance of Thy grace and mercies.

May we daily yield our life humbly and gladly to the inspiration and counsel of Thy divine spirit, to be touched to nobler issues and to be used in the service of Thy holy will.

Grant that our minds may be filled with eager and earnest desires to do good unto all mankind in its longings and struggles to find the way of blessedness and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 4, 1955, was read and approved.

PUTTING "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON OUR CURRENCY

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced H. R. 619, to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God we trust." This matter was first brought to my attention by the Honorable Donald K. Carroll, president of the Florida bar. He told me that the matter had been brought to his attention shortly after a speech that he had made in Gainesville, Fla. I promptly brought this suggestion to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, and received a letter in January of this year from the Honorable E. F. Bartelt, Fiscal Assistant Secretary, speaking on behalf of Secretary Humphrey. In Mr. Bartelt's letter he said:

> Provision was made by law in 1865 for placing this motto on coins. Another act providing for the inscription became law in 1908. During debate on the 1908 measure, the suggestion was made that the motto be placed on currency, but no action was taken on this point.
>
> From the record of this legislation, which has received careful study recently, the conclusion has been reached that a clear precedent was set for congressional action and that in the absence of action by Congress, no change of that nature should be taken in regard to currency.

I have just received some encouraging news from the Honorable W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs. He advises me that the President has been interested in this matter and "the principle of having this inscription on our currency is one with which we would all be in agreement, and we have been reviewing with great care the practical problems." Mr. Burgess has further advised me today that a good opportunity for making this change at a negligible cost is now afforded because new processes for the printing of currency are underway and they find that "the inscription 'In God we trust' can be included in the design with very little additional cost, if it is timed along with these technological changes."

In view of this I sincerely hope that Congress will take speedy action in enacting House Joint Resolution 619 so that our printed currency will henceforth bear the inspirational phrase, "In God we trust."

In these days when imperialistic and materialistic communism seeks to attack and to destroy freedom, it is proper for us to seek continuously for ways to strengthen the foundations of our freedom. At the base of our freedom is our faith in God and the desire of Americans to live by His will and by His guidance. As long as this country trusts in God, it will prevail. To remind all of us of this self-evident truth, it is proper that our currency should carry these inspiring words, coming down to us through our history: "In God we trust."

THE LATE ROBERT B. ARMSTRONG, JR.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am certain every Member of the House learned with regret of the death of Robert B. Armstrong during the recess of the Congress. Bob Armstrong was one of the best-known reporters of our times and passes on at the untimely age of 52.

Mr. Speaker, there is no provision in the Constitution for the participation of the fourth estate in our form of government. But under unwritten law, more irrevocable than any recorded statutes, the newspapermen who serve with us here in Washington carry a responsibility as important and as effective as that of any who serves in the other three branches of Government. And Bob Armstrong discharged the duties of that responsibility with singular fidelity.

We have an abiding faith that when he handed in his last copy the Great Editor wrote below the finish mark "Duty well performed."

PROPOSED MEDAL OF HONOR TO DR. SALK

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a suitable medal of honor to be awarded Dr. Jonas Salk for his great contribution to mankind in the discovery of poliomyelitis vaccine. I have

talked to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Hon. BRENT SPENCE, to which committee my resolution will probably be referred. He is very sympathetic and feels that Dr. Salk richly deserves this honor. I am very hopeful that the parliamentary situation will be such as to permit this joint resolution to come to the floor of the House soon, and that it will be passed unanimously.

THE CORSI REMOVAL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is from the first page of the Washington Star. Listen:

With Washington and much of the Nation engulfed in argument over the Corsi removal Secretary Dulles does not—

And so forth. I wonder where these newspapers get the idea that everything they print is of interest to all the rest of the people.

I was out home when this fuss was going on and I asked, I think, 14 people about it and only 1 of them had ever heard of or remembered this fellow Corsi, and he wanted to know what he had been doing. I did not know either, so I could not help him out.

When I got back, I got a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4, page 4293, and read what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said. He said that this gentleman is against the law that he was supposed to administer. So if that is to be the rule I will write the mayors of the cities in the fourth district to put some policemen on the force who have no objection to reckless driving or drunkenness or other offenses. Fine administrations they would get, wouldn't they? Could anything be more absurd than to leave the interpretation and the enforcement of the laws to those who did not believe those laws had merit?

We would not need any Congress if we would just let the editors of these newspapers in Washington run the business of the country; I wonder if they would all be satisfied with their own acts. Why some of them do not move into a congressional district and be elected is difficult to understand.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, events of the past 10 days and recent revelations of the continued maladministration and bumbling of our immigration laws impel me to speak out on behalf of action by this Congress to cure a situation which is getting worse instead of better and which to me is a clear flouting and disregard of the intent of Congress in the laws governing admission of foreign-born to this country.

The weakly explained summary firing of Edward J. Corsi is symbolic of the confusion existing in the administration of the immigration laws. It also seems apparent that the real reason for the discharge of Mr. Corsi was that he was attempting to do something to cut red tape and carry out the intent of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which it appears is not in keeping with the views of the administration or some Members of this Congress.

This is not a partisan matter. It is a conflict between a group in Government which wants to follow a policy of rigid exclusion, building a wall around this country to deny admittance to potential citizens, and what I believe to be the great majority of Americans who favor a policy of admitting qualified foreign-born persons under proper regulation to add fine new blood to our racial stock in the best tradition of our country and to the benefit of America. I believe the arbitrary actions of a little group of exclusionists is wrecking our immigration program and thwarting the will of Congress.

I am not in sympathy with the philosophy of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I feel that a great many of the Members who passed it over a Presidential veto must have been aware of its harshness and unreasonable nature, for they later voted to relieve it by admitting 214,000 additional persons under provisions of the refugee relief measure.

Even the worst law may have redeeming features and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 has such a feature, for it provided a continuing committee of the House and Senate to be known as the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy which was to make a continuous study of this act and its effect on the national security, the economy, and social welfare of the United States.

Now, we might expect that such a committee would be in a position to watch the administration of our immigration laws, make recommendations as need for amendments or revisions appeared and expose administrative procedures which defeat an orderly immigration system, but the fact is that this committee specifically charged with responsibility never has functioned and is not now functioning, though our whole program appears in a mess.

I understand the committee held a meeting in January 1953 and another in January 1954 with no reported results. It has no staff.

I want to serve notice now that it is my intention to introduce a resolution in this House requesting immediate action by the committee inquiring into the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, reporting back to the Congress its findings and recommendations for legislation to clear up our immigration laws.

It must be as disheartening to other Members as it is to me to learn that in the entire year 1954 only 821 persons were admitted to this country under the relief act which was designed to provide a refuge here for 214,000 persons. It must be as disheartening to other Members as it is to me to find that many countries of Europe have mortgaged their quotas for up to 320 years in the future to send a mere trickle of immigrants here. In my office, every day, as in that of other Members, we have cases in which qualified persons who will make fine American citizens, are facing delays estimated at 5, 10, or 15 years into the future before they can join their families here.

I am aware of the fine speeches of the President advocating changes and stating that the law contains injustices and discriminations, but it appears to me that the record of his administration indicates no disposition toward action.

Our entire immigration situation today, the unsurmountable barriers we are erecting, the unmerciful crucifixion of those who disagree with a policy of exclusion, is to me un-American and contrary to all the principles upon which our country has grown to world leadership. It makes mockery of the inscription on the Statue of Liberty and undermines the foundation of our future. This Congress must act to bring us back to the American road.

STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that we are about to embark here this afternoon on a most unusual procedure. The State and Justice Department Appropriation Bill, involving some 325 millions of dollars, is coming before the House. To my knowledge no copy of the bill and no copy of the report has been available until this morning.

I am sure the Committee on Appropriations is a fine committee, Mr. Speaker, but I question whether we should accept as final the word of any particular committee of Congress on a matter of this kind involving the amount of money it does.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this procedure and I will try to make my opposition known. It is unthinkable that Members should be called on to pass judgment on legislation, which they have had absolutely no opportunity to study, for this bill and accompanying report was voted out of the Appropriations Committee only this morning.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 212th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. In honor of this occasion, the superintendent of Monticello, Mr. Curtis Thacker, has sent two gavels which have been made from a copper beech tree which Thomas Jefferson himself planted on the grounds of Monticello at Charlottesville, and which tree was destroyed by a storm in 1953. One of these gavels was used today by the Speaker to open this session of Congress.

You will see in the House Democratic cloakroom a beautiful frame made out of wood from this same tree, which will be used as an information board.

As Thomas Jefferson's home in Monticello is located in the district which I represent in the Congress, I take great pleasure in calling the attention of the House to the anniversary of this great personage's birth.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday, May 4, for 1 hour, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Abbitt	Ashmore	Beamer
Adair	Avery	Becker
Addonizio	Barden	Belcher
Allen, Calif.	Barrett	Betts
Allen, Ill.	Bass, N. H.	Blatnik
Anfuso	Baumhart	Blitch
Bolling	Frazier	Mason
Bolton, Frances P.	Fulton	Matthews
	Gamble	Metcalf
Bolton, Oliver P.	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
	Gathings	Miller, N. Y.
Bosch	Gordon	Mollohan
Bowler	Granahan	Morano
Boykin	Grant	Morrison
Boyle	Gray	Mumma
Bray	Green, Oreg.	Murray, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	Green, Pa.	Nelson
Broyhill	Gregory	Norblad
Buchanan	Gwinn	O'Brien, Ill.
Buckley	Halleck	O'Konski
Budge	Hand	Osmers
Byrne, Pa.	Harden	Passman
Canfield	Hardy	Patman
Carlyle	Hays, Ohio	Patterson
Carnahan	Hayworth	Perkins
Carrigg	Henderson	Philbin
Chase	Heselton	Pilcher
Chatham	Hiestand	Polk
Chelf	Hill	Powell
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Christopher	Hoeven	Radwan
Chudoff	Holifield	Rains
Clark	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Cooley	Holtzman	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Huddleston	Reed, N. Y.
Cramer	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Cretella	Jackson	Richards
Crumpacker	James	Riehlman
Davidson	Jennings	Riley
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Jonas	Robeson, Va.
Deane	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Dempsey	Judd	Roosevelt
Denton	Kean	Scott
Devereux	Kearney	Sheehan
Diggs	Kee	Short
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Dodd	Kelly, N. Y.	Sullivan
Dollinger	Keogh	Taylor
Donohue	Kilday	Thompson, N. J.
Donovan	King, Calif.	Tuck
Dorn, N. Y.	King, Pa.	Van Zandt
Doyle	Klein	Vorys
Durham	Laird	Wainwright
Eberharter	Lane	Watts
Elliott	Lanham	Westland
Ellsworth	Latham	Wharton
Evins	Lesinski	Widnall
Fallon	Lovre	Williams, N. J.
Fascell	McCarthy	Wilson, Ind.
Fernandez	McConnell	Withrow
Fine	McDonough	Wolcott
Fino	McIntire	Yates
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Zablocki
Fogarty	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 243 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 417), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 94, noes 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the promise I made to the House, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

THE ROLLCALL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa was properly within his rights when he made the point of order that a quorum was not present. That was not included in any promise I made prior to the recess. However, I think in justice to our colleagues who are away I, as majority leader, should make the observation that they knew there were not going to be any rollcall votes until tomorrow, and that the reason they are away is the announcement I had made to that effect, with the statement that they could govern themselves accordingly.

I make this observation in justice to my colleagues who were not here to respond to their names when the roll was called for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE THOMAS D. NASH

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I call to the attention of the House of Representatives and the country, of the passing of Thomas D. Nash, a very close personal friend, an outstanding leader of the Democratic Party, and a revered lawyer and civic leader of the city of Chicago, Ill., who died on Monday, April 11, 1955, after an extended illness.

Thomas D. Nash was born on February 2, 1886, near 41st and Wabash Avenue in Chicago, Ill. He was the son of Michael Nash, an employee of the city of Chicago. He attended parochial schools in Chicago and secured his law education at St. Ignatius College, attending night classes.

Mr. Nash entered public life in 1911 as alderman of the old third ward in the city of Chicago. For 45 years he wielded a tremendous influence in the Democratic Party for the good of his city and country. At the time of his death he was a respected elder statesman of the Democratic Party. He served as treasurer for the county of Cook and also as public administrator of Cook County. He was committeeman of the Democratic Party for the 19th ward for many, many years.

In addition to serving his city and his party, he was a most successful lawyer. He was founder of one of the noted legal firms in the State of Illinois, namely, Nash, Ahern & McNally. Many of the outstanding judges in the city of Chicago obtained their early knowledge of the law as members or associates of his firm.

The passing of Thomas D. Nash leaves a void in the hearts of all who knew him.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Loretta Nash, and to their son, Thomas D. Nash, Jr., and to his sisters, Mrs. Anna N. English and Mary A. Nash.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I take this opportunity to express to the House the regret of this side of the aisle at the passing of Mr. Nash, who had become almost an institution in Illinois politics. I wish to extend to his family the warm sympathy of all who know the great depth of their personal loss, and give our sympathy, also, to the Democratic Party on the loss of their leader.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman. I am certain that his family and all of Mr. Nash's friends appreciate the sentiments expressed by the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Illinois in expression of deepest sympathy to the widow, the son and namesake, and the sisters of the Honorable Thomas D. Nash, whose passing from the activities of life on earth has brought grief to all the Members of the Chicago delegation in the Congress.

He was a great American. None in the profession of the law excelled him in the brilliance of his legal mind. His leadership in the Democratic Party was marked by devotion to principles and to causes in which he believed. His rare attributes of mind and of heart early brought him into a position of leadership which he retained in ever-increasing measure until the end. He contributed so very, very much to making the community in which he lived a better community, the city of his nativity and of his affection a better city, and the world into which he came a better world than it had been before.

Chicago indeed has lost one of her greatest sons. Mine is the sense of a personal loss in the passing of an old and dear friend. In these moments of shock and of grief, memory takes me back to a campaign in the Second District of Illinois in the spring of 1923, attending a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable James R. Mann.

The Republican nominee was the Honorable Morton D. Hull, who later served five terms in this body and died in 1937. On the suggestion of Tom Nash, then committeeman of the old third ward, I was designated as the Democratic nominee. The district then was a blue-ribbon Republican stronghold, despite which the herculean efforts of Tom Nash reduced the majority to a fairly close figure.

Twenty-five years later I was elected from the Second District to the 81st Congress. Tom Nash in the meanwhile had moved into the district now represented by Mr. MURRAY and was committeeman of a ward in that district. The morning after my election I met him. He was all smiles, threw his arms about me, and said: "Congratulations, Barratt, finally we have won the battle of 1923. It took us 25 years, but I always told you we couldn't lose."

It always was that way with Tom Nash. He never got into a fight unless he thought he was right, and, once he was in, there could be no end except victory. The world can ill afford his passing.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

MR. EDWARD J. CORSI

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go on record as opposing the shabby treatment of Mr. Corsi by the Secretary of State. It seems to me the people of this country are entitled to an explanation. Mr. Corsi was brought to Washington as one of the most qualified men to handle a particular problem, and then without any rhyme or reason he was cast aside by those who had boasted about his abilities and humiliated before the entire Nation without any justification. It seems to me that the people of the United States are entitled to know what is going on in the State Department. I think the Secretary of State owes an explanation to the American people for the shabby way in which he has treated a distinguished American.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore granted and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TUMULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

OVERSEAS INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in speaking of the need for an overseas information service, President Eisenhower once said:

> It is not enough for us—
>
> The United States—
>
> to have sound policies, dedicated to goals of universal peace, freedom, and progress. These policies must be made known to and understood by all peoples throughout the world. That is the responsibility of the United States Information Agency.

"All peoples throughout the world" is a large order. But in these days of improved communication techniques, the job can be done. It is being done. The United States Information Agency is carrying out its responsibilities.

In doing the job, the Agency employs all techniques of communication. This means radio, television, motion pictures, books, and other publications, the press, person-to-person contacts. Each has a special part in the program. Each has an important part. But in reaching the masses of people the printed word is the Agency's most effective operation.

Take India for example. The Voice of America, the Agency's international broadcasting service, goes into India, but that country has, all told, only about 1 million receiving sets. In a population of 400 or more million, this reduces the effectiveness of radio even when the Voice is expanded, as it is, by programs where the people listen over loud speakers in the village square, cafes, or other places of public gathering.

Motion pictures have great appeal in India. But here again, their range of appeal is limited by the lack of necessary equipment. The same, of course, can be said for television. The person-to-person technique, to reach each Indian

village, would require an army of workers.

For India, the printed word is the answer. Illiteracy, to be sure, is high, but what one man reads he tells another. The word spreads.

This is true of other countries besides India.

To spread the American message by the printed word is the responsibility, in the United States Information Agency, assigned to the Press and Publication Service. In light of the job assigned to it, it is not surprising that this is the Agency's most massive operation. I have heard it roughly compared to the total of the Macmillan Co. and Bantam Books; Reader's Digest, Time, Life, and Fortune; the Associated Press, including AP features and AP photos; Earl Newsom and J. Walter Thompson.

And yet, believe it or not, this worldwide publishing operation is carried on in Washington with a staff of only 217. To use another rough comparison, that staff can be compared to that of one of the great metropolitan dailies or a percentage of one of the commercial wire services. The Associated Press, for example, has approximately 90 people assigned to covering the Senate and House of Representatives alone.

One operation of the Press and Publication Service is known as the wireless file. This is 8,000 words of news and background sent out to the world by wireless 6 days a week. Overseas, it services some 10,000 foreign publications and radio stations, supplying them with United States news in specific support of foreign policy.

This service does not duplicate the commercial press service. In some places, to be sure, it supplements those services. In others, it is the only United States news service received. India, to use that country again by way of illustration, has a great number of newspapers. Two or three, indeed, have been listed among the best 20 in the world. Of these papers, however, the Times of India alone takes a United States commercial wire service, the United Press, but only on a limited basis.

For that reason, in the past Indian newspapers carried very little United States news. What they did carry was frequently supplied by Tass, the Communist press service, and you can imagine what kind of news that was.

Other countries not served by American news services, according to latest reports, include in the Near East and South Asia, Afghanistan, Belgian Congo, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Nigeria, Syria, the Gold Coast, Kenya, and Tunisia. Countries receiving a limited service, like India, include Ceylon, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Pakistan, and Turkey. In the Far East, only Japan receives regular news files from United States commercial agencies. In many of these countries, Tass, again, in the past was the chief purveyor of United States news.

Glancing over that list, I think many of us will recognize names where a need for straight and accurate United States news is important.

The wireless file, for example, transmitted the full text of President Eisenhower's United Nations speech proposing international cooperation in the development of the peaceful use of atomic energy. The text was moving over the wires before the President had finished speaking. It appeared next morning on the front pages of newspapers throughout these countries I have just mentioned. Subsequent developments of the proposal have been given equally thorough coverage with equally generous response.

In covering this story, the Press and Publications Service was equally active with its other operations. A background kit, containing an assortment of material on the subject, was supplied to each of the United States Information Agency's overseas posts. Reprints of articles appearing in United States publications have flowed in a steady stream. There were three pilot-model pamphlets sent overseas for adaptation by the various posts. All posts have been provided with glossy prints of news pictures, plastic plates, cartoons.

Not quite so elaborate but completely thorough coverage was given the Supreme Court's decision outlawing racial discrimination in United States public schools. Every Indian newspaper carried that story and, in color-conscious India, it was a great victory for the free world. Thanks to the Press and Publications Service, in many countries of the world the President's State of the Union Message this year was carried in full.

The Agency's Press Service covers events in the United States of special interest to particular countries. The recent visit of the Shah of Iran was such an event. Stories about the visit of Emperor Haile Selassie were read by Ethiopians in their newspapers and magazines. There are other important incidents too numerous to mention.

The Press Division also services the newspapers and magazines published at overseas posts of the United States Information Agency. It prepares and sends to the posts for distribution leaflets and pamphlets on a wide variety of subjects. There is also a regular cartoon strip.

MILITARY JETS AT WILLOW RUN AIRPORT, THE NATION'S SIXTH BUSIEST

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Thursday, I called the attention of the House to the projected, expanded Air Reservist jet training program which the Air Force contemplates for the next fiscal year. That program is of particular interest to the congressional district I represent, since Willow Run Airport in my district, is among some 30 airports in the country where the Air Force proposes to establish Reserve jet squadrons for weekend flight training of Reserve pilots. Willow Run is the sixth busiest commercial airport in the Nation. The operation of a Reserve jet squadron will seriously threaten its continued use as a commercial terminal. My discussion of this subject appears on pages 4131–4137 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, from the fact that there are about 30 commercial airports facing this problem, it is safe to assume that many other congressional districts are affected. Thus, it is a national, not a local, problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is in the vicinity of Detroit an airport maintained by the Wayne County Road Commission, known as the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. That airport, only 5 air miles distant from Willow Run, is perfectly adequate for military jet operations. In fact, the Michigan Air National Guard currently operates from Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, using facilities erected for it at a cost of $2½ million.

Mr. Speaker, to be blunt about the matter, the controversy is solely ascribable to the long-standing efforts of one Leroy C. Smith, to force the commercial airlines to use Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. This past week I received a letter from an authority on this subject, Mr. Cass Hough, executive vice president of the Daisy Manufacturing Co., of Plymouth, Mich. Mr. Hough served as chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission for a period of 5 years following January 1947. Michigan's present Democratic Governor, G. Mennen Williams, disregarded the wishes of aviation groups in the State of Michigan, and some prominent Democrats, and instead played politics with the post, replacing Mr. Hough.

In his position as chairman of the commission, Mr. Hough was fully familiar with the efforts of Mr. Smith and others of the Wayne County Road Commission to lure the commercial airlines away from Williow Run Airport. He set forth these efforts in plain terms in a letter to me dated April 6, 1955, which, under leave, I insert in the RECORD at this point:

DAISY MANUFACTURING CO.,
Plymouth, Mich., April 6, 1955.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Willow Run Airport versus Wayne County Airport.

DEAR MR. MEADER: First of all, let me introduce myself by saying that, while I spend the better part of the day here in Plymouth, I live at 2220 Washtenaw Avenue in Ann Arbor.

The late Kim Sigler, shortly after becoming Governor of Michigan in January of 1947, appointed me chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission, which post I held for approximately 5 years. Despite the fact that all the aviation groups in the State, and even such prominent Democrats as Hicks Griffiths and his wife, Martha, all tried to get the bow-tied boy wonder to reappoint me, he refused to do so. I point this out only to tell you that what I am about to say on the merits of the Willow Run-Wayne County controversy is not just an offhand opinion, but is based on watching this whole thing at an official level for a great many years.

You probably know Leroy Smith as well as I do. My first contacts with him came shortly after I was made chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission. At that time the Detroit Metropolitan Aviation Au-

thority was formed to do a job of planning major airports and satellite airports for the metropolitan area of Detroit, which, of course, included going as far west as Ann Arbor and as far north as Pontiac. This authority worked long and hard to bring about, and almost brought into being, an international airport located just west of Windsor, the better to serve downtown Detroit. It also recommended at that time that Wayne County and Willow Run be kept as major airports, satellites if you will, to the proposed international airport, to take care of the extra traffic which was bound to develop over a period of years. In other words, Willow Run would have borne the same relationship to the proposed international airport that Idlewild does to La Guardia and that Newark does to La Guardia. While professing great interest in the project, and a desire to help, Leroy Smith subtly and quietly undermined the project so completely that it fell flat on its face after several years of work. He did this only because he has one idea in mind, and that is to get the airlines away from Willow Run and into Wayne County Airport.

The question, of course, comes up always why Leroy is so bullheaded about this, and the question is easily answered. Years ago he persuaded the board of supervisors to sink a lot of money into Wayne County Airport. It has never been even close to a paying proposition. His cantankerous nature, and the equally cantankerous nature of a man who, up until a year ago, was the airport manager, Henry E. Baker, antagonized everyone who came in contact with either of them. This was particularly true of the airlines, who were smart enough to realize that Wayne County Airport had, for years, been a political football, and that their occupation of Wayne County Airport would not be a happy thing. As more and more money was poured into the airport, Leroy Smith became more and more obsessed with the idea that he was going to get the airlines there, by hook or by crook. He has given interviews time and time again, stating that the airlines were about to move, that he had tentative contracts from them in his hip pocket, etc., etc.—all of which was designed to undermine the confidence of the public in Willow Run, and to keep the issue so confused and clouded as to give him an opportunity to get in his dirty work. It's the old business of using the same tactics the Communists use—confuse and cloud the issue, and while people are arguing about the little things involved, those with an ax to grind can get in their dirty work.

I have been in the flying business for 30 years, and I know most of the top personnel in all the major airlines serving Detroit. These people are not interested in the type of shenanigans that Leroy Smith is apt to hand them at any time, but are caught squarely in the middle of this running fight. Obviously, if Willow Run can be made undesirable (by the type of press that Leroy Smith gets, and the constant reference to the great distance Willow Run is from Detroit), the better the chance he has to get the airlines to move to Wayne County airport. It is obvious, too, that if the public really gets down on Willow Run, the airlines eventually can be forced to move to Wayne County. What I am trying to say is, they don't want to move, any of them, and it is my considered opinion that they will not move, if a decent job of getting good press for Willow Run is maintained year round. Incidentally, it is beside the point but interesting to note that 5 years ago I appeared before the board of regents of the University of Michigan to urge them to do a decent job of publicity and public relations for Willow Run—a continuing job—if they were to keep the airlines there and make people accept Willow Run graciously. I was told by the board of regents at that time that they had the best airport in the area; that it didn't need goodwill, so to speak—in other words, my suggestion didn't amount to too much. Had they heeded it at that time, it is my opinion that the situation between the two airports would not be as critical as it is today.

You and I and anybody who stops to think about it knows that the few miles difference between Willow Run and Wayne County amounts to nothing. It isn't miles that count, but the time involved, and the extra 7 or 8 minutes it takes to get from Wayne County to Willow Run is not sufficient reason for the public to feel that they were getting a better deal by moving to Wayne County. However, unless a good job of telling them about this is done, they are going to think that the miles involved are the determining factor.

One thing that has been left unsaid in this whole controversy is this: The movement of the city of Detroit is westward. When I started flying out of Wayne County back in 1932 there were a few scattered farmhouses, but that's all, within a radius of about 5 miles of the airport. Now there is one housing project after another, practically backing up on the airport. As Detroit moves farther west the area around Wayne County Airport will become more and more congested, to a point where one of these days, and before too long, mark my words, you would have the same irate public as now exists around Newark Airport and around La Guardia, hemmed in as they are by homes, schools, etc. This is not true of Willow Run, unless perhaps one is looking a hundred years into the future.

Leroy Smith wants somebody to take him and the Wayne County Road Commission off the hook, for spending so much money on an airport that has comparatively little use—and the maintenance of which is costing the taxpayers a fortune every year. He doesn't care who takes him off the hook, just so he is taken off the hook. He can be stopped—at least the airlines can be stopped from moving, by an intelligent job of advising the public what is going on, and not doing it with gloves on. If he gets away with it, it will be one of the greatest steals since Manhattan was purchased from the Indians, will serve no useful purpose to the taxpayers, and will wind up costing the airlines considerably more money.

I feel very strongly about this, and I would like to help you in any way that I can. For your information, I have in my office probably the biggest and most complete file on this controversy that there is, inasmuch as I have probably all of the newspaper clippings, but in addition I have all of the official minutes of the various meetings of both the aeronautics commission and the Detroit Metropolitan Aviation Authority, all the side notes, etc. You are welcome to any or all of this, if it will help you in your efforts to expose the unfair tactics being used by Leroy Smith and his henchmen on the Wayne County Road Commission.

Sincerely yours,

DAISY MANUFACTURING CO.,
CASS S. HOUGH,
Executive Vice President.

P. S.—You probably know also that to succeed me on the aeronautics commission, Leroy Smith and the Wayne County Road Commission were able to get Mr. John McElroy, director of public relations and personnel at Wayne County, appointed. This was done purely and simply to be able to better steer actions of the aeronautics commission favorable to Wayne County Airport. Down through the years I was on the commission there was constant pressure by Wayne County for a larger share of airport funds—Federal matching funds, that is, as well as State matching funds—and in some instances the Wayne County lobby effectively blocked certain pieces of aeronautics commission legislation because of the unwillingness of the commission to go along on certain Wayne County proposals in the matter of expenditures. These things are a matter of record.

P. P. S.—On page 2 of my letter, two-thirds of the way through the second paragraph, I refer to the interviews given by Leroy Smith and his henchmen, quoting that the airlines were about to move, etc. Witness this paragraph from a so-called news item in the April 3 issue of the Detroit Sunday Times: "A $10-million program to streamline Wayne Major is now in the offing, if the top airlines can be convinced they should make the move in the public interest, Richards said." This was undoubtedly a press release from the Wayne County Road Commission, and please note the insidious use of the phrase "they should make the move in the public interest."

C. S. H.

Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of Ypsilanti Township, in which a part of the Willow Run Airport is located, and representatives of the University of Michigan, which holds the title to Willow Run Airport, called upon Federal officials concerned with this problem. Although they were courteously received, they were given little assurance that the projected jet operation at Willow Run Airport would receive serious reconsideration.

Mr. Speaker, I think the whole matter is one that should be very carefully reviewed by the Appropriations Committee of the House. I have requested my colleague from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Air Force Panel of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, to set a convenient date at which I might appear and present the financial aspects of this problem. I believe the subject should be thoroughly explored by the Appropriations Committee before a program is initiated which on its surface might seem to save a little money, but which in its consequences would be extremely costly and wasteful.

I intend to suggest at this time only a few of those costly consequences; to make a prima facie case, as it were, for a complete investigation by the appropriate congressional committee.

If the proposed Reserve jet operation at Willow Run results in driving the commercial airlines from that terminal, the University of Michigan would be unable to stand the cost of maintenance of the airport; it would be forced to default in some of the conditions of its deed from the Federal Government, giving rise to a reversion to the Federal Government, at its option. The burden of the annual maintenance of the air field would thus fall upon the Federal Government. That cost is estimated to range from $350,000 to $500,000 per year.

Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is not equipped to accommodate commercial airlines. It does not have a terminal. Additional runways and access roads would have to be built. Estimates have been made that it would cost from $20 to $30 million to put Detroit-Wayne Major Airport in suitable condition to accommodate commercial airline traffic. Detroit-Wayne Major Airport has secured from the Michigan Legislature enabling legislation to permit the issuance of a

$10 million bond issue, without the approval of the Wayne County taxpayers.

Several years ago Wayne County taxpayers rejected a bond issue proposal by Smith for this purpose. Now Wayne County taxpayers can be bound without having anything to say about it.

That, however, is only the beginning of the cost of improving Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. Substantial additional sums would be required for which Detroit-Wayne Major on its past record, would expect huge contributions from the Federal Government. In that connection, it should be recalled that Detroit-Wayne Major has already had the lion's share of Federal airport aid to Michigan, $4,035,858 out of a total of $7,761,064, or 52 percent since the end of World War II.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Appropriations Committee in approving a program of basing Reserve military jets at a busy commercial airport, should look beyond its nose and anticipate increased expenditures in other fields, such as the Federal Airport Aid Program.

Just one other item of cost—the University of Michigan is currently conducting research and experimental work in temporary buildings located at the eastern end of Willow Run Airport. These buildings will not last much longer and are located adjacent to the so-called Packard property—a permanent building which the Air Force plans to occupy for its jet squadron. I mentioned in my earlier discussion that the university had requested this Packard property for its research work. Although the request was dated July 19, 1954, it was acknowledged indirectly under date of April 6, 1955, after this controversy had arisen.

Should the university be forced to give up Willow Run Airport, where would the research facilities to accommodate some 400 persons, mostly scientists, be found? Here is another expensive construction project, flowing as an inevitable result of the decision to locate a jet squadron at this busy commercial airport. I have no estimate of the possible cost of such research facilities. However, being acquainted with Federal construction costs generally, it would be a safe guess to say that additional millions would be involved.

Mr. Speaker, the peculiar thing about this dilemma is that it is so unnecessary. Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, recipient of over $4 million of Federal bounty, is admirably suited to military jet operations. As I have pointed out previously, the Michigan Air National Guard for many years has been operating a jet squadron at that airport. In further support of this statement I offer for the RECORD a copy of a letter to me dated April 11, 1955, from Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department, indicating the desire of the Navy to move their jet operations from Grosse Ile, which has become inadequate, to Wayne Major Airport. Thus far the Wayne County Road Commission has denied this request. I include at this point in my remarks the letter I received from Admiral Russell:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS,
Washingon, D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MEADER: I wish to thank you for your letter of April 1, 1955, and the accompanying tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1955.

For some time, the Navy Department has been negotiating with the Board of County Road Commissioners of Wayne County, with a view to relocating the Naval Air Station from Grosse Ile, Mich., to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. That airport is ideally suited to Naval Air Reserve use, and it is hoped that it can be made available for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES S. RUSSELL,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

For the information of the House, I also incorporate at this point in my remarks a memorandum prepared by Floyd G. Wakefield, University of Michigan Airport manager, enumerating the advantages of maintaining Willow Run Airport as a commercial airline terminal for the use of Detroit and southeastern Michigan:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN POINTS OUT CONTINUED ADVANTAGES IN USE OF WILLOW RUN AIRPORT BY THE AIRLINES FOR DETROIT AND SOUTHEASTERN MICHIGAN

1. The University of Michigan ownership of Willow Run Airport has provided Detroit and southeastern Michigan with a free airport for 8 years. Continued use of Willow Run by the airlines provided Detroit and southeastern Michigan with one of the best equipped airports in the United States which is self-supporting in its operation as well as in its improvements.

2. The University of Michigan returns all rental money received from the airlines into improvements of Willow Run which keeps this airport one of the top best in the Nation. The terminal ramp has been expanded, engineering has been completed for an extension of the center taxiway, the airport is reaching the culmination of a zoning program, and a dual program for strengthening the taxiway and ramp, coupled with testing the materials for resurfacing, in progress for this year.

3. The fact that Willow Run is one of the finest and best equipped airfields in the country is due to the original planning of Willow Run Airport which was directly approved and supervised by Gen. James H. Doolittle. It was purposely located here because of the excellent drainage and soil conditions, and because of its proximity to the industrial communities of southeastern Michigan, and the interchange of highway systems from these communities.

4. University of Michigan's acquisition of Willow Run Airport turned a $10 million wartime expenditure into a $50 million saving for Detroit and southeastern Michigan. Duplication of Willow Run's terminal and hangar facilities and airfield would cost at least this amount considering present-day land acquisition and building costs.

5. Foresight by the University of Michigan in acquiring Willow Run Airport saved Detroit from being bypassed by airlines with four-motor planes' schedules from other major cities. Willow Run's location is ideal for continued expansion of large aircraft use by the airlines. The distance from Detroit is less than many major airports used by other cities in the Nation. Detroit is relieved of increasing air traffic over heavily populated areas. The driving time from Detroit to Willow Run has been shortened by the express highways which serve the Detroit area.

6. Use of Willow Run by the airlines has made possible a pavement study which has made this airport one of the finest pavement laboratories in the United States. Its benefit to the Nation and the State of Michigan during a time of unprecedented highway expansion is invaluable. Further research has been planned for Willow Run, which will not only improve the airfield, but will provide highway engineers and airport engineers with test results never before possible, and which will mean the savings of millions of dollars to the public.

7. The lease arrangement between the airlines and the University of Michigan has made available laboratory space for the national defense research in radar, aircraft electronics, aircraft fuels, and innumerable defense projects which could not have been accomplished in Michigan without the expenditure of many millions of dollars to duplicate these laboratory facilities. Nondefense research directly beneficial to Michigan for research in highway construction, harbor installation, and the prevention of Great Lakes shoreline erosion have been possible only because of the availability of space at Willow Run.

8. A change of operations by the airlines will result in a costly relocation of navigational aids which have been installed by the CAA at Willow Run for commercial airline use at Willow Run.

9. Movement of the airlines from Willow Run will entail costly personal housing changes for the 1,800 employees who are employed by the airlines and the terminal employees.

10. The University of Michigan regards its ownership of Willow Run as providing an ideal public service to Michigan and Detroit which is self-supporting in its present operation. It is also providing the airline industry with an airport which the airlines can directly operate according to airlines' policies without outside interference. Public acceptance and use of Willow Run is evident in the higher than national average increase in passenger volume. Willow Run's yearly passenger volume has risen from three-quarters of a million passengers in 1947 to over 2½ million passengers in 1954. The University of Michigan, in view of the advantages offered by Willow Run to the airlines and the communities as a whole, wished to continue its service to the airlines and the public through its cooperative arrangement with the airlines at Willow Run Airport.

Mr. Speaker, there has recently been published a letter purporting to come from the Honorable Albert E. Cobo, mayor of Detroit, to Secretary of Defense Wilson urging the Defense Department to concentrate all military reserve jet operations at Willow Run Airport. I incorporate this letter in full in my remarks at this point:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF WAYNE,
March 29, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Defense Secretary,
United States Government,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On January 1, 1947, because the Detroit City Airport was no longer adequate to handle large commercial airplanes, it was found necessary to move the airline operations. The Willow Run Airport, 32 miles from downtown Detroit, while admittedly an undesirable permanent location, was picked to be used until such a time as a better facility could be provided. Government officials, faced with the responsibility

of providing adequate facilities, agreed that the Wayne County Airport site, at the corner of Middlebelt Road and the Edsel Ford Expressway, would provide Detroit with a first-class commercial airport. The city of Detroit officials, the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, the metropolitan airport authority, the State board of aeronautics, and the civil aeronautics authority all agreed that this airport, 18 miles from downtown Detroit, should be expanded and improved as a major commercial airport.

Money was provided jointly by the county, State, and Federal Government to expand this airport to nearly 4 square miles, making it the second largest commercial airport in the United States. Considerable money has been spent in providing long runways, all-weather landing facilities, taxiways, drainage, and other needed facilities. The Pan American Airlines, using the largest planes in commercial use, has been using this airport during the past year. Nonscheduled and air-freight lines have been using the airport commercially for years.

Money is being provided to build a first-class air-terminal building and to provide other facilities in the immediate future. The mayor of the city of Detroit, the Detroit Common Council, the board of supervisors, and the road commission of Wayne County, who were authorized by the supervisors to operate and manage the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, have recently joined together in a determined effort to provide first-class airport facilities at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and to negotiate with the airlines for a transfer of their operations as soon as possible. May 24 has been set as the date for a meeting with the airlines at which time a plan for the use of the Wayne County Airport by all the airlines will be discussed. We are convinced that by this move the Detroit metropolitan area can best be served.

During the past 2 years the Wayne County officials, responsible for operating the Detroit-Wayne Airport, have made several attempts to work out an arrangement with the airlines for the use of the Detroit-Wayne Airport and for providing a new terminal building, hangars, and extra facilities required for this operation. It is difficult to compete with the financial arrangement the airlines have at the Willow Run Airport, which was turned over to the University of Michigan without cost. Actually, the airlines at the Willow Run Airport are receiving what amounts to a subsidy, and at no other airport in the United States do they enjoy such a financial arrangement.

The United States Government cooperated with this area in making the Willow Run Airport available to the airlines as a temporary facility at a time that it was not needed for military use. Expansion of the military Air Force has brought requests for additional airport facilities in this area. At the present time one military service, the 30th Air Division (Defense), is stationed at the Willow Run Airport using jet aircraft. United States Navy officials have made an effort to move into the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, as their Grosse Ile Airport is no longer adequate for jet aircraft.

The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport management has had to tell these Navy officials that it is impossible to make such a move due to the fact that the county airport was primarily built to serve the commercial air activity of that area, and that in our opinion it is the only airport that can adequately and conveniently serve the public in this area at this time.

An airport study made by competent engineers some time ago indicated that the Willow Run Airport should be developed as a military airport. It is quite apparent now that this recommendation was logical and should be carried out at an early date. The Willow Run Airport is much more centrally located than Selfridge Field and would provide a much better location for the large number of Reserve Air Force pilots living in this part of Michigan. In addition, there is sufficient room and accommodations for the Michigan Air National Guard, which are now required to pay for facilities at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. It appears to us that having military services at one airport would tend toward efficiency and economy.

We sincerely hope you concur with us in these matters and see fit to indicate at this time that such a move is desirable on the part of the military services, especially to solve the present dire need of the Navy and Marine Corps. If this military situation could be cleared up by using the Willow Run Airport, we are sure that we could soon reach an agreeable contract with the airlines to move to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport which is recognized by all as one of the finest locations for commercial airline services in the country.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT E. COBO,
Mayor, City of Detroit.
ED. CONNOR,
Chairman, Board of Wayne County Supervisors.
MICHAEL J. O'BRIEN,
Chairman, Board of Wayne County Road Commissioners.

Mr. Speaker, although the letter is signed by Mayor Cobo and two Wayne County officials, it is interesting to note that the initials of the dictator of the letter are LCS. These happen to be the initials of Leroy C. Smith, the manager of Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

Mr. Speaker, it might strike some as odd that the mayor of Detroit would concern himself with an airport which is not located in Wayne County.

It is perfectly obvious that this request to Secretary Wilson is to make the airlines so uncomfortable at Willow Run that they will be forced to move to Detroit-Wayne Major. This strips of all pretense the nature of the past efforts of the Wayne County road commission and baldly bids for the powerful assistance of our Military Establishment in a local airport fight.

Having known Mayor Cobo and his excellent reputation as an efficient administrator of a big metropolitan center, I am disturbed that he permitted himself to be used in this fashion, and I sincerely hope that Secretary Wilson and Secretary Talbott of the Air Force will not fall into a similar trap.

Mr. Speaker, the Cobo letter contains many inaccuracies, one of which deserves comment. The statement is made that the 30th Air Division, stationed near Willow Run, uses jet aircraft. The 30th Air Division operations near Willow Run are not flying operations and the jet aircraft it uses are two T–33 jet trainers based at Selfridge Field and assigned to the 30th Air Division only for courier duty. They average about five flights a week. This is substantially different from the impression the letter would create that there are substantial jet operations already at Willow Run.

Also, reference is made in the letter to a study by competent engineers indicating that Willow Run Airport should be developed as a military airport. It is impossible from such a general description to know what study is being referred to. It might well be a study by engineers of the Wayne County Road Commission and nothing more.

Another statement receives my hearty approval. That statement is:

> It appears to us that having military services at one airport would tend toward efficiency and economy.

The Michigan Air National Guard, utilizing facilities costing in excess of $2½ million, is already based at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. It would be logical for Navy jet operations and 10th Air Force Reserve jet training operations to move to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, where the Michigan Air National Guard is already operating. This would achieve the desirable economy and efficiency of locating all military operations at one airport.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other overriding consideration which has not been considered in this controversy, namely, that Willow Run Airport was built originally to accommodate the B–24 bombers manufactured at the Willow Run bomber plant. In this unit—the plant and the airfield—the Federal Government has a substantial investment. The acquisition cost of the plant was $43,519,646, and the acquisition cost of the airfield was $21,197,000. When the plant was sold to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. as of December 1, 1948, a national security clause was incorporated in the deed giving the Federal Government the right to repossess the plant in the event of a national emergency. This national security option in the Federal Government runs for 20 years. When the Kaiser-Fraser Corp. sold this plant to General Motors recently, the national security rights of the Government remained intact.

Similarly, the Government's rights to repossess the Willow Run Airport in the event of a national emergency were expressly reserved in the deed to the airport from the Government to the University of Michigan. The philosophy and policy behind these provisions was a significant phase of our national defense policy. We wanted, in the event of a sudden emergency, to have available at a moment's notice the productive capacity of the Willow Run bomber plant for the construction of aircraft. The availability of the airprot built in conjunction with the plant for flying away the bombers constructed there would be imperative. This policy is revealed in the following two paragraphs quoted from the national security clause of the deed to Kaiser-Fraser:

> (3) Reservation of dormant estate: The Government shall reserve in the premises to be conveyed a dormant estate for a period of 20 years from the effective date of transfer, which dormant estate may be activated in accordance with procedures specified herein as to the whole or any part of the premises for one or more periods, each of which shall not exceed 5 years in duration. At the expiration of the 20th year the rights reserved to the Government with respect to the premises shall cease and terminate, notwithstanding any prior activation of the dormant estate.
>
> (6) Alterations, removal, and maintenance of property: (a) During the 20-year period of the dormant estate, the grantee will not,

without the written consent of the Government make any alteration to the premises which will materially impair or diminish the capacity of the premises as existing at the effective date of transfer, to produce the items for which the premises were designed, unless other facilities of the grantee which are determined by the Government to have equivalent productive capacity, are made subject to all of the terms and conditions set forth in this national security clause.

This long-standing policy, in my judgment, is one of the wise things we did with surplus property at the end of World War II. We made the facilities available for civilian use which would assure their maintenance in good condition at no expense to the Federal Government, but wisely reserved the power to repossess these facilities quickly in the event an emergency required rapid expansion in productive facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this wise policy is working effectively in connection with this $65 million wartime Government investment. Both the plant and the airfield are being maintained in tiptop condition without any expense to the Federal Government and can readily be converted to defense purposes without exorbitant construction expense and without the much more costly delay which would be involved should similar facilities have to be built. This salutary arrangement should not be lightly disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Appropriations Committee and the House will give a good, long, hard look at this latest development in the scheming of Leroy Smith to drive the commercial airlines out of Willow Run to bail him out of his improvident expenditures at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of this week and during the next 2 weeks the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit at such times when there is no legislation being considered under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MR. EDWARD J. CORSI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman who just left the well of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY], a few moments ago when he said that the State Department owes an apology to the American people because of the appointment or the discharge of Mr. Corsi.

Sure, the Department of State should apologize for bringing him down here. His record was pretty well known, and I am not referring to the controversy between that gentleman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

I am not saying anything about the organizations to which Mr. Corsi belongs or about his line of thought in connection with communism—not a thing about that because I do not know anything about it. But here is the point: According to the published reports of statements made by Mr. Corsi, he testified he has no use for the law which Congress enacted—the McCarran-Walter Act—referred to it as junk.

That being true, why put in the Department of State to interpret and administer the law any man who does not have any use for or faith in or respect for the law and says it is junk and who does not believe in it? How far would the Government get with that kind of an administrator?

It is just absurd and silly to hire a man to tell what the law means and to enforce it when he has already said it is no good.

What a man thinks of a law is his own concern while he is a private citizen. But when charged with administering a law, he must accept it as written—not attempt to repeal it by misinterpretation or maladministration.

I know what is the matter with some of the folks in New York, if what the reports say is true; that is, that they are afraid of the Italian vote.

I cannot understand why the nationality of any individual would have anything to do with his ability to hold office, to interpret or administer a law. Suppose even an Irishman, or a German, or a man of some other nationality were appointed. What has that to do with his official acts?

Have we gotten into a situation in America where just because a man belongs to a certain racial group or religious group, or some other group, anything and everything he does or says has to be excused or approved. If a Republican is a crook, he is a crook.

I just cannot get over this idea that certain individuals have a right—a right, if you please—to Government jobs. Then there was a great hullabaloo over this man Oppenheimer. It still works on occasion. You remember him. Oh, it was just a crime to discharge that fellow, so we were told, but unless I am completely wrong, unless I did not read his testimony correctly on the stand, he admitted that he, for a number of years, had a mistress and that she was a Communist.

I know, and I am sure you know, that I am not intolerant, but I cannot understand why in a high Government position an official should be retained in office after he admits that he has a Communist mistress or a mistress of any kind.

There was an old saying, "If you have got to suck eggs, for heaven's sake hide the shells." "Do not go around boasting about your sins, petty or otherwise."

I cannot bring myself to believe that the American people are so low in their sense of common decency that their sympathy flows out to some fellow who lacks ordinary decency in spite of the fact that the papers here in Washington—here in Washington—seem to condone all sorts of rottenness.

Of course they do not believe in it, but if you read their defense of first one man and then another, day after day, and week after week, and year after year, you get the idea that this town is a little worse than Sodom or Gomorrah. That I do not believe.

Just to get a slant at what one Peter Edson says, read the following from today's News:

BULL IN A CHINA SHOP

The story on Edward J. Corsi—ousted by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles as his special assistant on migration and refugee problems—is that he turned out to be a bull released in the State Department's china shop.

A lot of people have been bleeding over Mr. Corsi's sudden demise as a bureaucrat—including Mr. Corsi. Well-intentioned, warm-hearted, generous, and likable Mr. Corsi thought everybody in the world was his friend, and wasn't far wrong.

But Mr. Corsi also was impulsive and unpredictable. He couldn't be bothered with redtape or regulations. And every once in a while State Department officers administering the refugee-relief program would wake up with a start to discover that Mr. Corsi had gone way out on the end of a limb to commit them to some fantastic scheme that just couldn't be done under the law.

There was, for instance, Mr. Corsi's idea to bring over 1,000 Italian cooks and bakers. He was going to bring them over on one boat. He would have the boat arrive in New York on the Fourth of July. He would have the boat sail up the Hudson River, to some nice park he had in mind where they would all debark and have a picnic. Mr. Corsi would be on hand to welcome them and make a speech.

He always was making speeches. In Philadelphia recently he made a speech about some poor refugee he had seen on his inspection trip in Europe. He painted a marvelous word picture of this unfortunate man. A number of people in the audience came forward and wanted to sponsor his admission to the United States as a refugee immigrant.

The trouble was, Mr. Corsi couldn't remember the man's name or what camp he had seen him in. The State Department tried to find him, but after a lot of time wasting in diligent search, they gave up. By that time all the Philadelphians who had wanted to sponsor this unfortunate man gave up in disgust.

Early in March the State Department gave Mr. Corsi a written directive that he was to make no speeches and issue no statements that had not been given prior clearance. That helped some. But by that time Mr. Corsi had upset the State Department's protocol polished apple cart so often they decided they'd better let him go.

What really got Mr. Corsi in the end was his admission to a high State Department officer that he wanted to run for the United States Senate from New York in 1956. He had apparently thought he could use the refugee job to build up a big foreign-born vote following.

Mr. Corsi was in hot water almost from the first day he hit town. He had been getting $20,000 a year as New York's Commissioner of Labor and Immigration under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. He wanted that much here,

But the most he could get under civil service was $13,000 a year. They finally stretched a point and made it $13,700, but it still wasn't enough.

He didn't like the office space assigned him. He worked for a time in the back office of Scott McLeod, Security Administrator, who by law is given responsibility for the refugee program. That was the job Mr. Corsi wanted; that and a free hand. He wanted to open an office for himself in New York, but they stopped him on that one.

His correspondence was voluminous. But more than half of it was personal and social. In one exchange of letters he got all involved in a big surplus butter deal, from which he had to be extricated, because that was the business of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson.

The State Department was going to reveal all this and a lot more. Then they decided to forget it. But as a lifelong Republican, Mr. Corsi still can't understand why he's getting the gate. He thinks he got a raw deal.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, of course I feel that the honest position is that the Secretary of State owes an apology to the American people for the way he has mistreated America. I was not merely defending Edward J. Corsi. I had not attempted nor does anyone intend to bring in any racial issue to this matter, except that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] who preceded me seems, somehow or other, to be conjuring up a ghost about which he is very much worried. I am an American of Irish descent—a blow against one American is a blow against all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The only reason I brought that up is because I have heard talk around here from one side and the other that the action of the Secretary of State in connection with this matter was going to cost either one party or the other a lot of Italian votes. That seemed to me to be an insult to the Italian people.

Mr. TUMULTY. I cannot understand what you folks talk about in the Republican cloakroom. I did not bring up that charge. Your Secretary of State brought this man down here and he said he was the best qualified man for the job. When an attack was made on him he shifted his footwork and dismissed him. I cannot help the blundering which your party makes. There is no sense in your getting up here and trying to raise a false issue. The proposition is, Was this man treated fairly? I say, "No." If you get up and talk about some people having a lot of mistresses and trying to injure that man who has done nothing else, you are attempting to injure this man or infer that he has done something wrong.

Let me call your attention to an article which appeared in the Newark Evening News, which is a distinguished pro-Eisenhower paper. This editorial says:

Edward J. Corsi has refused a consolation post in the State Department, and in view of the treatment he has received, who can blame him?

A respected man in his State and community, Mr. Corsi went to the Department last January to accelerate administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. He was welcomed by Secretary Dulles as "the best qualified man in the United States" for the work.

Today the "best qualified man in the United States" is out of his job, under retirement, under attack by the other side—yes, by the Republican side.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. In the gentleman's statement that Mr. Corsi is under attack by the Republican side—and I do not concede that——

Mr. TUMULTY. Well, he is out of his job, is he not?

Mr. HILLINGS. Under the gentleman's statement is he repudiating the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, who leveled the original charge at Mr. Corsi? I do not know why the gentleman should say that Mr. Corsi is under attack by Secretary Dulles, who has not charged him with any wrongdoing and who has offered him another job.

Mr. TUMULTY. Dulles fired the man, threw him out of his position, did he not?

Mr. HILLINGS. But do you repudiate the statement about Mr. Corsi made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

Mr. TUMULTY. I know nothing about the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. All I say, as far as I am concerned is that Mr. Corsi was entitled to better treatment. He is a man who was brought here by your Secretary of State, not by Mr. WALTER. What Mr. WALTER had to say can be cleared with Mr. WALTER. I address myself to the action by your Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, what he has done.

Mr. HILLINGS. But I ask that the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point or order. I cannot hear what these gentleman are saying. Both talking at the same time.

Mr. TUMULTY. We are having no trouble in hearing each other.

The SPEAKER. Both gentleman will proceed in order and not try to talk at the same time.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I think I have already yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. HILLINGS. May I ask the gentleman a question: Do you recognize that the attack on Mr. Corsi was made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]? As far as I know the Secretary of State has made no attack on Mr. Corsi.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am talking about the Secretary of State. It is my position and implication that the attack made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] was entertained by the Secretary of State, by the Republican Secretary of State; and the excuse he gave was that it was due to friction in the Department. However that may be, the "best-qualified man for the job," according to Dulles, in 90 days has ceased to be the best-qualified man for the job under Dulles.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] did not hire Mr. Corsi, it was the Secretary of State of the Republican administration. Now, the question of repudiating anything that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said, or growing out of a disagreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], is beside this point, for the fact remains that he was hired by the Republican administration; he is a Republican himself, and he was fired by a Republican administration, and it is the action of the Republican administration. The fact remains, furthermore, that Mr. Corsi was one of the men closest to Governor Dewey when he was the Republican nominee not so many years ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no time to yield; his time has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. Let me conclude my remarks and then I will yield. I want to read the last sentence of the editorial:

There is no use arguing the Corsi blunder was a minor miscalculation in a department dealing daily with war or peace; or to say that it was all the fault of that Democratic liability * * * and a couple of other fellows.

A principle has been breached and responsibility rests with Secretary Dulles. That is where it belongs.

That is distinctly a Republican action.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now will the gentleman yield to me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You see, there is a difference between what Dulles did and what Acheson did. When Dulles found that he had made a mistake in appointing Corsi, and when he learned that, he acknowledged it and corrected it. When Acheson found he had made a mistake with Alger Hiss he did not do anything about it. That shows the difference. One learned of his errors, corrected them—the other did not.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does the gentleman concede that Dulles made a mistake?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I think he did when he took Corsi on.

Mr. TUMULTY. I agree with the gentleman only in that Dulles blundered in mistreating Corsi by firing him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He should not have had him down here at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER.

Mr. SIKES and to include an editorial.

Mrs. KNUTSON in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a statement made by him on the anniversary of Bataan Day which took place on April 10.

Mr. KEATING and to include a resolution.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. YOUNG.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ZELENKO), until May 4, 1955, on account of official business.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Florida), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

637. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $70,060,000 for several agencies in the executive branch and $221,300 for the District of Columbia, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

638. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Public Utility Relocation Incident to Highway Improvement," pursuant to section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

639. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on legal services and procedure, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

640. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting part II of a report on the audit of Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

641. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

642. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 28, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted September 10, 1946, and December 14, 1950, respectively (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

643. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 14, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore of Grand Isle, La., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

644. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 22, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Big Sioux River and its tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 20, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 133); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

645. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 22, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Fair Haven Beach State Park, N. Y., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 134); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

646. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 30, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of the Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts, authorized by the River and Harbor Acts, approved on August 26, 1937, and March 2, 1945. This report covers damages to levee and drainage districts affected by pools 14 to 26 only (H. Doc. No. 135); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

647. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 12, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River relative to the section between the Missouri River and Minneapolis with a view to providing improved harbor facilities at Alton, Ill. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 136); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

648. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 16, 1954, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Tanana River Basin, Alaska. This report is submitted under the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of harbors and rivers in Alaska, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and related water uses, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 30, 1948. It is also submitted in final response to a preliminary examination and survey of Chena Slough, Alaska, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

649. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 13, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with five illustrations.

650. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1955, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

651. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

652. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

653. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, relative to reporting an overobligation of $821.05 that occurred in an allotment account on December 19, 1954, pursuant to section 1211, Public Law 759, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

654. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting

a report of an obligation incurred in excess of amount allotted under administrative regulations and procedures, relating to regional director, region No. 6, GSA, Kansas City, Mo., pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

655. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

656. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes'," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

657. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 13th Semiannual Report of the International Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

658. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the government of American Samoa, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

659. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics and Research and Development) transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Army relative to foreign excess personal-property disposal for the period January 1 to December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

660. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 28, 1955, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

661. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of negotiations for settlement contracts with the Indians of the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Reservations, S. Dak., pursuant to Public Law 478, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

662. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

663. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to A. B. Nelson, John R. Nelson, and Ida Mae Borum, operating as a partnership, which will, when finally executed on behalf of the Government, authorize them to provide accommodations, facilities and services at the Thunderbird Ranch and Trading Post in Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Ariz., for a 20-year period from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

664. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Murl Emery which, when executed by the superintendent, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada, will authorize Mr. Emery to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within the Eldorado Canyon site of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

665. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with B. Ross Luding, which, when executed by Superintendent J. W. Emmert, Glacier National Park, Mont., will authorize Mr. Luding to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Sperry and Granite Park Chalets within Glacier National Park, during a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

666. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Robert Eslinger, which, when executed by the Superintendent of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., will authorize Mr. Eslinger to sell firewood to the general public at the Chimneys public campground, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, during a period of 6 months beginning April 15, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

667. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with E. G. Wellman, which, when executed by Superintendent J. W. Emmert, Glacier National Park, Mont., will authorize Mr. Wellman to operate a saddle-horse concession within Glacier National Park for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

668. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees with respect to certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

669. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

671. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

672. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

673. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting two certified copies of the court's opinion rendered on April 5, 1955, *In re P. Diacon Zadeh* v. *The United States* (No. 5–52, congressional), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 635, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

674. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of plaintiffs' motion to dismiss with prejudice, filed April 5, 1955, and consented to by counsel for the Government *In re Walter W. Flora and Mildred L. Flora (Doing Business as Flora Engineering Company)* v. *The United States* (No. 13–54, congressional), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and H. R. 9334, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

675. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

676. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

677. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter,' approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

678. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the year ended June 30, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

679. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list giving the names of the aliens covered by the enclosed copies or orders, such names being arranged according to the dates upon which the orders authorizing admission were issued, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and section 212 (d) (3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

681. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

683. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

684. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to

section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

685. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of the aliens listed who have been found admissible into the United States under the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5502. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3123. A bill to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3990. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5502. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5503. A bill to promote further respect for and observance of civil rights within the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5504. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5505. A bill to change the name of the reservoir above Garrison Dam and known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, to Lake Sakakawea; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 5506. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5507. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5508. A bill to make permanent authority for the surrender and reapportionment of wheat-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 5509. A bill to appropriate $38,000 for the expenses of a survey to be conducted by the Secretary of the Army at and in the vicinity of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y. (Black River Bay Harbor); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5510. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5511. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army and Air Force all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 5512. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5513. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 5514. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 5515. A bill to provide special disaster cotton allotments in areas affected by drought or other uncontrollable natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 5516. A bill to amend section 306 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5517. A bill to remove the income limitations which prohibit payment of pension to certain veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to the widows and children of widows of certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 5518. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Rio Grande and its tributaries in Texas at Fort Hancock, Hudspeth County, Tex., and vicinity in the interest of flood control, drainage and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5519. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5520. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5521. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of the Florida State Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5523. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5524. A bill to provide for the establishment of a uranium ore-buying station and a uranium mill in Nevada; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5525. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to increase the annuities of principal and survivor annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to provide the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to take action relative to the increased rents in the housing projects in the city of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to take action relative to the increased rents in the housing projects in the city of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action relative to the increased rents in the housing projects in the city of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of Senate bill 205, introduced by Senator LISTER HILL; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that provision be made for the establishment of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to expedite the acquisition of adequate public land for public use and public access and for wildlife around the shores of Gavins Point Reservoir which lies between Nebraska and South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to forbear any action leading to the termination of the Federal trusteeship over American Indian wards and properties held in trust for American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the transfer of 11,223 acres of land located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn M. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Antoine Dahdah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5528. A bill for the relief of Yousef Said Dahdah and his wife, Charlotte Dahdah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5529. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 5530. A bill for the relief of Rita (Keskula) Vigla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5531. A bill for the relief of John F. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5532. A bill for the relief of James H. Wheatley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5533. A bill for the relief of John C. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (by request):

H. R. 5534. A bill for the relief of Clementine Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 5535. A bill for the relief of S. H. Prather; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 5536. A bill for the relief of Robert Cyril Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 5537. A bill for the relief of James Earl Parrott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5538. A bill for the relief of David Piementel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5539. A bill for the relief of Bror Henrik Johansson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5540. A bill for the relief of Enrique Miramontes-Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5541. A bill for the relief of Armando Lomas-Ayala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 5542. A bill for the relief of Stephen Parnetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 5543. A bill for the relief of De Soto Lead & Zinc Co., Fort Scott, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie B. Prescott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 5545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Bertha Yarnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Francisca Alemany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5547. A bill for the relief of Joseph Nicholas Olivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5548. A bill for the relief of Paul Max Julius Schweitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5549. A bill for the relief of Norbert Scheiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

189. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the Council of the city of Delaware, Ohio, opposing legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act by excluding from Federal regulation the well-head prices of the field producers of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

190. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to influencing the United Nations to secure the adoption of the world calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

191. Also, petition of the chairman, 134th Independence Day of Greece Celebration, Chicago, Ill., relative to expressing the will and fervent desire of our citizens pertaining to the Cypriotic question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

192. Also, petition of the president, Holy Name Society, Immaculate Conception Parish, Astoria, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

193. Also, petition of the grand knight, Brooklyn Council No. 60, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

194. Also, petition of the grand knight, Maris Stella Council No. 378, Knights of Columbus, Far Rockway, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

195. Also, petition of the grand knight, Gate of Heaven Council No. 468, Knights of Columbus, Huntington, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

196. Also, petition of the grand knight, Loyola Council No. 477, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. Also, petition of the recording secretary, Morris Park Council No. 566, Knights of Columbus, Richmond Hill, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. Also, petition of the State corresponding secretary, Daughters of the American Revolution, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the rules of the House of Representatives be amended, relating to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Seasoned to Taste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received two publications relating to race relationships. One is a Wilson Library bulletin entitled "Seasoned to Taste" by the director of libraries, University of Washington, Harry C. Bauer. This article takes six from a list of Negro librarians with distinguished records and cites their work as a significant example of professional attainment in spite of the struggle a Negro must make to gain recognition.

The other bulletin received is the 1954 annual report of the Seattle Urban League which seeks to help Negroes overcome discrimination through vocational guidance and opening the door wider for them in employment opportunity. Obviously these two publications are related in that one is a study of successful careers of Negroes in a professional field while the other is a report of community activity to make such careers possible.

It is of more than passing interest therefore to briefly describe the activities of the Seattle Urban League during 1954.

(a) The Urban League continued to remind Seattle that a policy of discrimination in employment against Negroes and other nonwhites is unsound economically as well as morally.

(b) In its program of vocational guidance, the league sought to enlighten young people as to work opportunities and how to prepare for them.

(c) The league helped establish during the year three commercial club type of organizations for district community service and mutual cooperation.

(d) The league worked with child-placing agencies toward getting more foster parents and adoptive families for nonwhite families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Urban League report shows clearly its many activities, all related to each other, have a central objective: "To help the Negroes of Seattle live better, fuller, happier lives, and so to serve the Negroes and the whole community." I am proud of the Urban League's record in my district and shall certainly try and do what I can on the Federal level to supplement their efforts and objectives.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed to Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of the votes I have received from the State of Iowa in response to my annual questionnaire.

On March 1, I mailed 42,561 questionnaires to the people of Iowa. I have distributed similar questionnaires in the First Congressional District of Iowa during the past 5 years but this is my first statewide distribution.

The only statement accompanying the questionnaire was a letter printed thereon as follows:

MARCH 1, 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: The following questions are based primarily on the budget report, economic report, President Eisenhower's message to the first session of the 84th Congress on the state of the Union, and his special messages to Congress. I am sending this questionnaire to every 20th householder of Iowa—both town and country. (I have used rural directories for each county, and all city directories. For towns without householder directories, I have used every telephone directory obtainable.)

In order to help us tabulate the returns, please check your answers but do not add any comments on this side. Use the back of this sheet for your comments if you wish. Your individual opinions will be kept strictly confidential.

I am also distributing yellow sample copies to other persons for their information regarding the poll we are taking. These yellow copies will not be tabulated but replies to them will be highly valued by me.

This questionnaire gives Iowa householders the opportunity to join together without regard to party affiliation in stating their views on the issues covered in the questionnaire. I plan to summarize and present to Congress the returns received during the next 4 weeks. Undoubtedly Congress will consider this summary as the prevailing view of Iowa on these issues. Later on I will send a copy of my report to each person to whom questionnaires and sample copies have been mailed. I hope my report will be of interest.

We have received a total of 6,599 replies which are included in the tabulation. This return of 15.5 percent is unusually high for this type of poll, and I am deeply grateful to the people of Iowa for their generous response.

The occupations listed by those replying were as follows:

Farmer	2,373
Labor	1,223
Business	745
Professional	691
White collar	885
Miscellaneous	682

Yellow sample copies were distributed freely and we received 6,119 sample-copy replies which are not included in our tabulation.

Both yellow and white ballots brought us hundreds of good discussions on many of the issues of special interest. These special discussions are of utmost value to us.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Questionnaire—Tabulation of total vote

	Total vote	Yes	No	Percentage Yes	Percentage No
1. Do you favor drafting men for 2 years' active military service, subject to call in time of war or emergency for another 6 years?	6,103	4,046	2,057	66.30	33.70
2. Do you favor military training for 6 months, subject to call in time of war or emergency for 9½ years thereafter in lieu of 2 years' active duty and 6 years availability?	5,884	2,272	3,612	38.61	61.39
3. Do you approve President Eisenhower's foreign policy?	5,725	4,580	1,145	80.00	20.00
4. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making treaties of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	5,734	3,622	2,112	63.17	36.83
5. Do you favor ending foreign military aid?	6,180	2,303	3,877	37.27	62.73
6. Do you favor ending foreign economic aid?	6,163	2,448	3,715	39.72	60.28
7. Do you approve exchange of atom secrets between the United States and our allies?	6,246	2,376	3,870	38.04	61.96
8. Do you favor authorizing the development and use of atomic energy by private enterprise within our own country?	6,359	5,476	883	86.11	13.89
9. Do you favor trading American butter for Russian manganese?	6,239	3,739	2,500	59.93	40.07
10. Do you favor removing price supports from some types of wheat not fit for milling in order to improve price-support situation on wheat suitable for human consumption?	6,156	5,202	954	84.50	15.50
11. Do you approve stricter controls on what farmers can plant on land diverted from maior crops?	6,270	2,097	4,173	33.44	66.56
12. Do you favor support levels for agriculture at 90 percent of parity if such support requires the imposition of stricter marketing allocations, acreage allotments, and price controls of agricultural products so supported?	6,102	2,564	3,538	42.02	57.98
13. Do you favor immediate balancing of Federal budget by increasing Federal taxes?	6,258	1,233	5,025	19.70	80.30
14. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	6,265	1,590	4,675	25.38	74.62
15. Do you favor immediate balancing of Federal budget by reduction of Federal spending?	6,191	4,882	1,309	78.86	21.14
16. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit, except in time of war, any Congress from appropriating more than the Federal Government expects to collect from taxes?	6,295	4,686	1,609	74.44	25.56
17. Do you approve President Eisenhower's 10-year construction program to modernize our primary roads (urban and farm-to-market), secondary roads (entirely farm-to-market), other roads and streets (both urban and farm-to-market), and interstate roads, requiring the expenditure of $101 billion by all levels of government?	6,153	3,955	2,198	64.28	35.72
18. Do you approve Federal appropriations totaling $31 billion over 10-year period to help pay for the construction program described in question 17?	6,086	3,922	2,164	64.44	35.56
19. Do you favor Federal Government purchase of school-construction bonds when school districts cannot sell the bonds at a reasonable price on the private bond market?	6,265	3,703	2,562	59.11	40.89
20. Do you approve matching Federal and State funds to launch statewide "building agencies" which would finance construction of schools and pay for them by renting them to the school districts?	6,093	2,418	3,675	39.68	60.32
21. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools?	6,128	3,198	2,930	52.19	47.81
22. Do you approve an increase in the minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents an hour?	6,231	3,551	2,680	56.99	43.01
23. Do you think management of money in welfare funds of labor unions should be regulated by law as insurance funds are regulated?	6,269	5,766	503	91.98	8.02
24. Atomic Energy Commission has first call on Tennessee Valley Authority power. The present capacity of TVA will not meet total demand for power by 1957 in that area.] Do you favor purchase of private power by Atomic Energy Commission from private utilities operating in the area where the power is needed?	5,925	4,699	1,226	79.31	20.69
25. Where the number of prospective private suppliers of power is limited, do you approve the Atomic Energy Commission negotiating privately the contracts for needed power?	5,742	4,028	1,714	70.15	29.85
26. Do you favor reduction of Federal Government's competition with privately owned business and industry?	6,176	4,770	1,406	77.23	22.77
27. Where national security is not involved in our reciprocal trade program, do you favor making the Tariff Commission's findings of injury to any industry binding upon the President and to require him to grant tariff relief?	5,475	2,794	2,681	51.03	48.97
28. Do you approve extending social-security old-age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social-security insurance or some equivalent plan?	6,295	4,958	1,337	78.76	21.24
29. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance plans?	5,984	2,102	3,882	35.13	64.87
30. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public-housing program?	6,114	4,132	1,982	67.58	32.42
31. Do you favor free Government treatment of a veteran for non-service-connected disability when there is doubt of his ability to pay for needed treatment?	6,288	3,603	2,685	57.30	42.70
32. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Postal Department deficit?	6,337	4,358	1,979	68.77	31.23
33. Do you approve reducing the voting age to 18 years?	6,381	2,902	3,479	45.48	54.52
34. Do you approve statehood for Hawaii?	6,142	5,016	1,126	81.67	18.33
35. Do you approve statehood for Alaska?	6,092	4,985	1,107	81.83	18.17
36. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today:					
(a) Government spending		(1) 5,002			
(b) Debt of Federal Government		(6) 3,281			
(c) Taxation		(2) 4,430			
(d) Farm price-support policy		3,179			
(e) United States foreign-trade policies		2,498			
(f) Control of communism in America		(4) 3,921			
(g) Labor policies		2,168			
(h) Defense and war preparedness		(3) 4,047			
(i) American foreign policy		3,141			
(j) Atomic-energy policies		2,460			
(k) Limitation of President's treaty-making power		938			
(l) Corruption in government		(5) 3,582			

The total tabulation of the white ballots appears on this page and the tabulation by occupations follows on the next page.

Total vote of the questionnaire by occupations

	Farmer		Labor		Business		Professional		White collar		Miscellaneous	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor drafting men for 2 years' active military service, subject to call in time of war or emergency for another 6 years?	1,290	892	854	310	479	224	416	225	602	223	405	183
2. Do you favor military training for 6 months, subject to call in time of war or emergency for 9½ years thereafter in lieu of 2 years' active duty and 6 years availability?	823	1,301	404	712	263	394	248	386	310	487	224	332
3. Do you approve President Eisenhower's foreign policy?	1,604	431	753	307	557	102	549	74	687	105	430	126
4. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making treaties of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	1,215	800	671	427	427	220	414	209	527	252	368	204
5. Do you favor ending foreign military aid?	898	1,314	436	733	237	464	202	446	255	584	275	336
6. Do you favor ending foreign economic aid?	839	1,368	509	665	281	413	215	431	325	507	279	331
7. Do you approve exchange of atom secrets between the United States and our allies?	777	1,483	411	771	271	433	355	308	350	487	212	388
8. Do you favor authorizing the development and use of atomic energy by private enterprise within our own country?	1,911	365	1,007	183	649	81	618	54	769	102	522	98
9. Do you favor trading American butter for Russian manganese?	1,444	803	586	586	444	271	426	222	505	341	334	277
10. Do you favor removing price supports from some types of wheat not fit for milling in order to improve price-support situation on wheat suitable for human consumption?	1,859	412	562	187	604	90	551	68	725	100	501	97
11. Do you approve stricter controls on what farmers can plant on land diverted from major crops?	900	1,389	350	816	259	448	177	477	249	590	162	459
12. Do you favor support levels for agriculture at 90 percent of parity if such support requires the imposition of stricter marketing allocations, acreage allotments, and price controls of agricultural products so supported?	1,196	1,077	461	659	247	436	181	454	274	544	205	368
13. Do you favor immediate balancing of Federal budget by increasing Federal taxes?	464	1,789	173	1,001	143	564	165	502	160	688	128	481
14. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	567	1,689	362	807	169	544	131	532	200	650	161	453
15. Fo you favor immediate balancing of Federal budget by reduction of Federal spending?	1,781	448	897	260	565	138	498	153	661	179	480	131
16. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit, except in time of war, any Congress from appropriating more than the Federal Government expects to collect from taxes?	1,781	491	883	295	541	168	426	237	610	239	445	179
17. Do you approve President Eisenhower's 10-year construction program to modernize our primary roads (urban and farm-to-market), secondary roads (entirely farm-to-market), other roads and streets (both urban and farm-to-market), and interstate roads, requiring the expenditure of $101 billion by all levels of government?	1,280	936	743	416	498	205	461	188	605	225	368	228
18. Do you approve Federal appropriations totaling $31 billion over 10-year period to help pay for the construction program described in question 17?	1,292	893	745	409	483	206	449	195	586	238	367	223
19. Do you favor Federal Government purchase of school-construction bonds when school districts cannot sell the bonds at a reasonable price on the private bond market?	1,308	965	806	373	378	331	364	293	509	334	338	266
20. Do you approve matching Federal and State funds to launch statewide "building agencies" which would finance construction of schools and pay for them by renting them to school districts?	772	1,431	514	647	273	431	275	364	355	465	229	337
21. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools?	1,143	1,048	736	432	293	412	294	354	423	411	309	273
22. Do you approve an increase in the minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents an hour?	822	1,429	1,014	162	341	365	405	248	630	221	339	255
23. Do you think management of money in welfare funds of labor unions should be regulated by law as insurance funds are regulated?	2,046	177	1,032	148	688	40	636	34	804	55	560	49
24. [Atomic Energy Commission has first call on Tennessee Valley Authority power. The present capacity of TVA will not meet total demand for power by 1957 in that area]. Do you favor purchase of private power by Atomic Energy Commission from private utilities operating in the area where the power is needed?	1,647	462	864	266	572	117	521	118	665	146	430	117
25. Where the number of prospective private suppliers of power is limited, do you approve the Atomic Energy Commission negotiating privately the contracts for needed power?	1,400	633	713	393	506	169	454	155	583	216	372	148
26. Do you favor reduction of Federal Government's competition with privately owned business and industry?	1,577	663	858	296	613	93	550	109	727	123	445	122
27. Where national security is not involved in our reciprocal trade program, do you favor making the Tariff Commission's findings of injury to any industry binding upon the President and to require him to grant tariff relief?	1,016	914	577	472	338	300	248	340	385	376	230	279
28. Do you approve extending social-security old-age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social-security insurance or some equivalent plan?	1,703	561	988	191	578	138	496	171	704	148	489	128
29. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance plans?	730	1,419	482	642	215	479	204	436	259	556	212	350
30. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public-housing program?	1,559	635	822	325	397	311	414	229	541	291	399	191
31. Do you favor free Government treatment of a veteran for non-service-connected disability when there is doubt of his ability to pay for needed treatment?	1,287	977	791	390	364	346	306	354	477	378	278	240
32. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Postal Department deficit?	1,469	815	908	278	500	222	490	182	615	240	376	242
33. Do you approve reducing the voting age to 18 years?	1,045	1,246	586	609	314	412	291	380	380	484	286	348
34. Do you approve statehood for Hawaii?	1,699	452	987	186	552	149	576	91	703	146	499	102
35. Do you approve statehood for Alaska?	1,709	426	992	177	559	139	552	108	692	148	481	109
36. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today												
(a) Government spending	(1)	1,797	(1)	903	(1)	583	(1)	507	(1)	677	(1)	535
(b) Debt of Federal Government		1,148	(6)	563	(6)	385	(5)	337	(6)	456	(6)	392
(c) Taxation	(3)	1,552	(2)	834	(2)	520	(4)	435	(2)	625	(2)	464
(d) Farm price support policy	(2)	1,636		409		301		277		294		262
(e) United States foreign trade policies		930		368		268	(6)	331		341		260
(f) Control of communism in America	(4)	1,443	(4)	772	(4)	411		329	(5)	505	(3)	461
(g) Labor policies		623		479		285		239		298		244
(h) Defense and war preparedness	(6)	1,255	(3)	831	(3)	469	(3)	448	(3)	613	(4)	431
(i) American foreign policy		929		537		373	(2)	471	(4)	513		318
(j) Atomic energy policies		741		493		304		328		360		234
(k) Limitation of President's treatymaking power		376		174		98		90		83		117
(l) Corruption in government	(5)	1,388	(5)	713	(5)	391		259		408	(5)	423

MY DUTY AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, each year I have received several inquiries regarding the purpose and use made of my questionnaire. The source and substance of the questionnaire grew out of my analysis of the President's reports and messages to Congress, and I developed my method of distribution of it after consultation with Dr. George Gallup. The purpose of the questionnaire is best described in the words of Edmund Burke, 18th-century British statesman, as follows:

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

But a representative's unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure—no,

nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Excerpts From Address by Vice President Nixon Before American Association of School Administrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from the address of the Vice President of the United States before the American Association of School Administrators at Cleveland, Ohio, on April 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aggressive international communism presents the only threat to world peace. There will be no major war unless the Communist nations begin one.

How can we best deal with this threat?

The guiding principle of our policy is peace without surrender. History shows that in dealing with dictators, a policy of weakness and concessions may bring a temporary truce in the short run. But in the long run such a policy leads to war.

We believe this is the policy which has the best chance to bring peace without surrender:

Militarily and economically: Keep the United States and the free world stronger than any potential aggressors.

Diplomatically: On the one hand, firmness in which our will and determination to use our strength against aggression when it occurs is made clear to the world. On the other hand, fairness and friendship in which we emphasize:

Our readiness to join with other nations in converting the power of the atom to peaceful uses.

Our willingness to participate in big power conferences when conditions are such that there would be a chance to reduce world tensions.

Our desire to explore every means of reducing the level of armaments, a determination which was made dramatically clear by the unprecedented appointment of Harold Stassen to Cabinet rank as assistant to the President for disarmament.

Some who question the wisdom of this policy have suggested that the United States should announce to the world at this time that certain named areas would not be defended by us if attacked. Apparently they believe such action would avoid war.

But a study of history casts grave doubt on this contention.

In January 1950 Secretary Acheson announced that Korea was outside the defense zone of the United States. Some may have breathed a sigh of relief at that time in the belief that there would be no war in Korea. But in June the Communists attacked and we had to go in unprepared.

It was just 17 years ago that we heard the cry, "Why die for Danzig?" No one died for Danzig then—millions died later.

History shows that surrender of territory in itself never satisfies an aggressor; it only increases his appetite.

The possibility that surrender of territory demanded by an aggressor might remove the chance for war over that territory—now, must be weighed against the effect such action would have in increasing the chance for a bigger war—later. This is the difficult decision which confronts the President, a decision which he correctly insists can and should be made only when we see the nature of the attack.

Of this much we can be sure. Where a dictatorial aggressor is involved the only way to eliminate all chance for war is to surrender completely. We believe that, if we are not to do that, the least chance for war and the best chance for peace will be created through following a policy of strength and firmness with the door always open to negotiation but never to appeasement.

There should always be open discussion and criticism of our policies because the decisions we eventually make must represent the very best thinking of the Nation. But this we should get straight at the outset—there is no war party in America.

I know of no one in the House or Senate, Democrat or Republican, no one in the administration, no one of our top military leaders, who wants war.

Anyone who charges that there is a war party in the United States is unfortunately feeding the Communist propaganda mill which has been grinding out this big lie and trying to peddle it around the world for years.

Let us advocate vigorously the policies we think are best designed to avoid war and obtain peace. But let us do so without questioning the motives of those who disagree with us. We may disagree on the means but we all agree on the end.

I have sat in the councils of the administration over 2 years. No two men could be better qualified and more dedicated for the task of finding peaceful solutions to world conflicts than President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles.

They bring a wealth of diplomatic and military experience to their positions.

They have the judgment and temperament which comes from long participation in the making of great decisions.

The Nation can be sure that there will be no trigger-happy decisions as they lead the Nation during this period of world tension.

Plans of Bald Knob Christian Foundation, Inc. for Erection of Giant Cross on Bald Knob Mountain, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement relating to the plans of the Bald Knob Christian Foundation, Inc., for the erection of a cross in southern Illinois.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a result of the tireless efforts of the men and women of the Bald Knob Christian Foundation, Inc., there is to be erected in Union County, Ill., a mammoth 500-foot cross, the world's largest, and dedicated to a greater unity of religious thought and effort. The location is near the population heart of the United States and the great cross is to be built atop Bald Knob Mountain, to be known as Mount Calvary, in southern Illinois. Illuminated at night, the great cross will be visible over an area of 7,500 miles spreading its important lesson of the importance of religion to each and all.

This huge cross with its connected building will be a shrine for all denominations of all religious beliefs. This is a magnificent undertaking embracing the greatness of all the concepts of the American way of life.

This undertaking is due to the unselfish work of C. Lester Biggs and Wayman Presley of Union County, Ill., joined by the General Federation of Women's Clubs headed by Mrs. Theodore Chapman, Jerseyville, Ill., and Mrs. R. I. C. Prout. The General Federation of Women's Clubs with 5 million members throughout the United States is conducting a fund drive for funds aimed at raising $3 million for the construction of the cross.

In proper recognition of this splendid monument dedicated to embrace and signify our freedom for religious belief and as a further recognition of the efforts of the American people to make this great shrine a reality, it is fitting and proper that we reflect upon the significance of this worthy effort and that as individuals we do everything that is proper to further it.

Representative Edith Green, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Representative EDITH GREEN, from Oregon's Third Congressional District, is perhaps one of the busiest Oregonians in our Nation's Capital.

Representative EDITH GREEN represents the finest tradition of women occupying high public office.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an informative article about Mrs. GREEN by Ann Sullivan, from the columns of the Oregonian for April 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE GREEN FINDS CAPITAL JOB GRILLING, ANTICIPATES SUMMER

(By Ann Sullivan)

One of the busiest Oregonians in Washington is Congressman EDITH GREEN, the bright-eyed Portland Democrat who swept into office last November.

Home for the first time this week to participate in the Hells Canyon Senate hearings and to do a little congressional snooping for her own, she's easily 15 pounds lighter than when she left for Washington. Blame the rigors of 16-hour days, the opening of a new Congress and Edith's own conscientiousness.

She hasn't had time for any Washington sightseeing, though son Dick, 13, and his father, Arthur, have done a lot of it. She spends her traveling hours pretty much in

the 10-minute subway walk between the old congressional office building and the House of Representatives.

The Greens live at the new 4200 Cathedral (named for its address) apartment house, where they have a good-sized living room, dining room, kitchen, and two bedrooms. They found that so far they do considerable eating out because of the social and work demands. A cleaning person comes in three times a week to help with housework.

DICK MISSES FRIENDS

Dick is in the seventh grade at Alice Deal Junior High School, a public school. He misses his Portland friends but is looking forward to being here for the 3 months of the summer vacation. He will return then with his father, who will tend to some business. Mrs. GREEN will join them when Congress adjourns, probably about August 1. They expect to stay with Mrs. GREEN's mother, Mrs. Julia Starrett, 5615 Southeast 60th Avenue.

Wistfully, Mrs. GREEN remembers that Oregon summers are so delightful and Washington is so hot. But, between then and now comes a lot of work to keep the brown-eyed, graying solon right busy. Thus goes a typical day:

She gets up at 6:30 a. m., and unless she had one of many breakfast meetings scheduled, will breakfast with her family before dressing. That's usually orange juice and several cups of black coffee coupled with a variation of eggs or meat. She skims two papers, the Washington Post and Times Herald and the New York Times.

BLUE, BLACK FAVORED

Usually she wears conservative suits to her office, most frequently blue or black. She takes the family car, a 1955 green De Soto sedan, from the apartment house garage, and drives it to the office, often getting to her office at 8 or 8:30 and at least by 9.

The driving takes 10 minutes, unless during rush hours, and she has no trouble parking, for there are spaces reserved for congressional Members.

Her office is room 312 on the third floor of the old congressional office building, looks over a courtyard. It has two high-ceilinged, spacious rooms, one of which is occupied by a staff of three and the other by Mrs. GREEN.

The inner office has a green carpet, black leather overstuffed furniture, including chairs and a davenport, a desk, bookcases, and other chairs.

OREGON AREA RETAINED

Prominent on the walls are pictures of Oregon scenery, which she had sent out from Photo Art studios, about a dozen in all. Some of them hang on the walls of her apartment and some in the office. From her desk she can see one of Mount Hood, another of the city of Portland with Mount Hood in the background and a third of the St. Johns Bridge.

First order of business is looking over the mail, which sometimes runs to 100 letters or more a day. All are answered.

Soon after 9, people started dropping in, including frequent visitors from Oregon.

She dictates from 9 to 10 a. m., then marches off to a daily 10 a. m. committee meeting. She is on two, the Interior and Insular Committee and the Education and Labor Committee. The latter usually meets in her building, and other in the new congressional office building.

GAVEL FALLS AT NOON

At noon the House convenes, and it takes her 10 minutes to walk there through the subway. During lull in activities she usually lunches either in the congressional Members' dining room a floor below or another Members' dining room where they can take guests.

There are also several snack bars and a cafeteria available.

From all these congressional Members can be called, 1 bell for teller vote, 2 for aye-and-nay vote; 3 for a quorum call, and 4 for adjournment.

MORE STUDY FOLLOWS

After adjournment, Mrs. GREEN goes back to her office, studies, and reads bills and background material, sees people, and works on legislation.

What time she goes home depends on the amount of work. Sometimes her family will join her for dinner at the Congressional Hotel, and she will go back to the office afterward. Some of her work she'll take home.

"I don't think I've ever yet gone home without work to take with me."

Even on Sundays on the way home from Westmoreland Congregational Church, she usually stops at the office to look at her mail. Saturdays she's always there.

"I've never spent so many hours on a job in my life," she explains seriously.

SOCIAL DUTIES CONTINUE

Social obligations, particularly heavy the first few weeks, are still demanding, but she remembers most vividly the pleasant congressional reception and luncheon at the White House. She even recalls what they ate, which was pheasant, wild rice, broccoli, consomme, a tossed salad, and peach ice.

She's most proud of a real honor given her, election to the presidency of the Democratic 84th Club, which is composed of all the new Democratic Members of the House. They meet once a week for breakfast.

"I spend lots of time sitting in chairs, you see."

Report by Senator Smith, of Maine, on Trip to the Far East and Mediterranean Areas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, during the congressional lull in late February and early March, my distinguished and able colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] went on a trip entirely at her own expense through the Far East, and Mediterranean areas.

Upon her return she wrote a report on her observations for the Trunk, which is an excellent little newspaper published by the Maine Council of Young Republicans.

Senator SMITH visited some 13 countries on her trip. She conferred with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa; President Magsaysay in the Philippines; Prime Ministers U Nu in Burma, Nehru in India, Mohammed Ali in Pakistan, Nasser in Egypt, Menderes in Turkey, Scelba in Italy, and Chief of State Franco in Spain. But in her traditionally thorough way, Senator SMITH did not merely talk with the leaders in the countries she visited; she also talked with average citizens in the villages and countryside.

In order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read Senator SMITH's interesting and enlightening summary report on her trip which appeared in the April 7, 1955, issue of the Trunk, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trunk of April 7, 1955]

REPORT ON RECENT TRIP ABROAD

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

Recently I returned from an extensive trip overseas for which Communist Russia attacked me calling me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose. The length of it in miles was approximately 30,000 miles. The length of it in time was 4 weeks. It was not at taxpayers' expense as the Government did not pay for a penny of it but rather I paid for it out of my own personal funds. During a goodly portion of the time that I was gone the Senate was in an undeclared recess with the understanding that no important business would be taken up so that Republicans could speak at Lincoln dinners and Democrats could speak at Jefferson-Jackson dinners.

VISITS CHIANG, HORACE HILDRETH

It was a person-seeing trip and not a sightseeing trip since there wasn't enough time to do leisurely sightseeing. The places that I went to were Japan, Formosa, Philippines, Viet-Nam, Hong Kong, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, Italy, and Spain. Some of the national leaders I had conferences with were Chief Justice Tanaka of Japan; Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, where I also inspected the Chinese Nationalist troops; President Magsaysay in the Philippines, where I also addressed the Philippine Senate; Prime Minister Diem in Saigon, Indochina, where I also went to refugee camps out in the country and where I also conferred with Gen. Lawton Collins; the Acting British Governor General in Hong Kong; Foreign Minister Prince Wan in Thailand, where I also visited schools in the country; Prime Minister U Nu in Burma; Prime Minister Nehru and Vice President Radhakrishnan in India, where I also visited in small country communities with Indian natives; Prime Minister Mohammed Ali in Pakistan, where I visited Horace and Katherine Hildreth and where Horace is doing a magnificent job; Prime Minister Nasser in Egypt; Prime Minister Menderes in Turkey, where I also visited small Turkish country villages and schools; Prime Minister Scelba in Italy; and Chief of State Franco in Spain.

TRIP PARTIALLY TELEVISED

Because I felt that I could share some of the experiences of interviews on my trip with millions of Americans, I agreed to give permission to have some of the conferences recorded for later showing on television. While none of these were shown in Maine, I have been informed that the kinescopes have been made available free of charge to all Maine TV stations desiring them.

TALKED WITH LITTLE PEOPLE

But I didn't talk only to the leaders, I went into the villages and talked with the little people as well. I talked with them to learn their feelings and their problems. I told them of the desire of America and Americans to be their friends—of how we wanted them to be free and remain free from Communist slavery. I told them how we lived. I told them about our wonderful State of Maine. It is a great source of satisfaction to me that all the embassies of the countries I visited have reported that I served the

interest of our country well and that my visits produced desired results.

UNITED STATES PRESTIGE GOING UP

I am glad to report that the prestige of the United States abroad is not on the wane. It may have been a year or two ago but not now. To the contrary, the prestige of the United States abroad is going up very much. I think that this is largely because President Eisenhower in the last few months has begun to exercise real leadership.

SEES CHANGES

I saw a difference in reaction on this trip abroad between the time of my trip last October when repeatedly people said to me that they wished President Eisenhower would give the world more vigorous leadership and that they were almost hungry for him to do so and that they would quickly follow.

In my trip last month, I found that this attitude had changed. People in the various countries are inspired by the manner in which President Eisenhower has been asserting world leadership. It has done much to build up their courage against resisting the threat of communism.

COMMUNIST FALLACY SEEN

There is growing realization in Asian countries that communism is nothing less than Russian colonialism or Russian imperialism—something far different from the past colonialism they seek to throw off. For example, many of the people of northern Viet-Nam who took the side of the Communists now say with bitter disappointment and disillusionment, "The Communists promised to give us the land and they did—but it hasn't done us any good because they take everything we produce from the land away from us."

ANTI-AMERICANISM IN JAPAN

There has been some talk and some reports about anti-Americanism in Japan and that it is growing. But let's be realistic about that. It is a natural feeling on the part of a nation that is in the transition stage between coming out of being occupied by a foreign conqueror to returning to national independence.

Our Army commander, General Hull, in that area, explained it to me this way. He said that it was really a pro-Japanese feeling that sometimes evidenced itself in political criticism against our occupation troops and that it was not really anti-Americanism. He pointed out that the Japanese admire and respect us—because they found we could do things better—we defeated them and while they may resent the defeat they nevertheless respect us for our victory.

He further pointed out that Japan has a traditional hate for and fear of Russia—that history shows repeated warfare between Japan and Russia—and that as between the United States and Russia, we can depend upon Japan to fight very strongly on our side.

MEDITERRANEAN STRENGTH

At the present our position in the Mediterranean is very strong—particularly on the ends of the Mediterranean with Spain on the west and Turkey on the east being our most loyal allies. And it is getting better in the middle now that France and Italy have at long last joined the Western European Pact. Of course, we have strength in our good ally Greece.

WEAK SPOTS

Our weak spots are Yugoslavia and north Africa. Yugoslavia has a strange form of communism supposedly independent from Russia. One weakness in north Africa stems from the continuing conflict between Israel and Egypt. Egypt has considerable distrust of us. Another weakness in north Africa is the rebellion against French colonialism. It is similar to the problem in Indochina.

All in all I came back from the trip very encouraged. I was surprised by the warm feeling and friendship shown me by the little people as well as the leaders in every country that I visited. In spite of the gloomy reports I had read and heard, I found that America and Americans are far better liked and respected in these foreign countries than I think we realize.

WE ARE GAINING

There is no question but that we are gaining ground against communism. We may be gaining ground slowly but we must remember that Asia is going through a most critical period of readjustment as people shift from past colonialism to future independence and self-reliance. In going through such a transition, the nations of Asia are suffering from growing pains.

One of the overall impressions I gained from the trip is that we should act more from confidence in our country and less from fear of Russia. I believe we must start charting our course on the basis that we are not going to let Russia scare us any more—that we are plenty capable of taking care of ourselves—and that we must strive for positive construction instead of fear-minded, negative defensiveness.

TRIP BENEFICIAL

Perhaps the most beneficial result of the trip to me and the good people of Maine whom I represent is that it gave me first hand, personal information which will make me better able to pass on important legislation involving foreign relations and national security—to pass on the many billions of dollars of appropriations for military and economic aid programs in my capacity as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Medical Social Work Offers Expanding Career for Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, every American concerned with the Nation's health and rehabilitation needs knows that a growing population requires more hospitals, clinics, and rehabilitation services. We have the habit of thinking first of buildings, beds, and laboratory equipment to meet these needs. Of equal or greater importance, however, is the tremendous shortage of highly trained persons we must have to man the hospitals, clinics, and other health services.

In a very real sense it is the present and future generations of college and high-school students who hold the key to what kind of health and welfare services we will be able to have in this country. We of the older generations can help to provide the buildings, the beds, and the budgets but these will be of limited value without more and more young men and women stepping into the ranks of the health and welfare professions and allied occupations.

Not everyone who is interested in a health career can or should be a doctor or a nurse. Most of us know little or nothing about the other health professions which play an important part in caring for sick persons. Parents, as well as students, should inform themselves about the educational requirements and career opportunities of these professions also.

Medical social work is one of the health professions which offers expanding career opportunities for young men and women with a sound liberal arts college educational background and specialized university training. Like all worthy professions, the standards of preparation are high. A parent can feel proud to have a son or daughter choose this unique profession which combines knowledge of medical and health problems with the skills of social work.

I am especially pleased to have a letter from Miss Josephine Taylor, director of social service at Cook County Hospital, calling attention to the unusual opportunities for medical social work professional education in the city of Chicago. Miss Taylor is one of the distinguished members of her profession as well as an outstanding leader in health and welfare activities in Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Taylor's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1955.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Knowing your great interest in the rehabilitation of citizens who have had severe injuries or disabling illnesses, I am venturing to write you about the opportunities for young people in medical social work—one of the professional groups working in the fields of medical care and rehabilitation.

Medical social work is an especially appealing profession for those who are interested in the medical setting and who want to help sick people return to health or gain the maximal recovery from disability. Medical social workers have since 1905 been valued members of the medical team working in clinics, hospitals, and medical-care programs. It is our job to help patients and their families solve some of the social and emotional problems which interfere with their recovery or their adjustment to disability. Through 2 years of specialized graduate work in a school of social work (after graduation from college), medical social workers are trained to work with doctors, nurses, and other medical specialists.

Persons with this training are in great demand for important positions in the expanding programs of medical care and public health. The sad fact is that there are not nearly enough trained medical social workers to fill all of the positions in which they are badly needed. During World War II, it was found that there were only half enough trained medical social workers to fill he jobs then existing, and since then the needs of the armed services, the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the increase in civilian hospitals establishing social-service departments, and, most recently, the expansion of rehabilitation programs, have made the shortage more severe. It is estimated that 3,500 newly trained medical social workers must be recruited by 1957.

We in Illinois are fortunate in having a long established and excellent teaching center for medical social workers in the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration, with the University of Illinois School of Social Work ready to start such a curriculum by the fall of 1955 if prospective students present themselves. The University of Chicago is able to train a far larger number of students in the next few years, and I hope that we may have your

help in bringing to the attention of young people seeking careers the opportunities in this growing profession which so badly needs more recruits to keep pace with the important health needs of the country. Young people who wish to have their training in our great State of Illinois should write to Miss Marietta Stevenson, dean, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., or Miss Helen R. Wright, dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. The American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1700 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., will also give information to any interested college students or their parents.

As director of social service in this large public hospital in our State, I know at first hand the needs and opportunities for trained staff in this field. As a medical social worker with many years of experience in the field, I also know the rewards of satisfaction and interest which medical social work through service to ill and handicapped persons offers to those who enter the profession.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPHINE G. TAYLOR, *Director.*

Easter, the Atom, and Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, prior to the Easter weekend, it was my privilege to deliver an address over station WGN, Chicago, regarding the message of Easter in our time.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTER, THE ATOM, AND AUTOMATION

Eight days from now, we will celebrate Easter Sunday.

I would like to talk to you on this occasion, my friends, on a pre-Easter theme.

I would like to talk to you about faith in the future, as against fear of the future.

The Easter season is, of course, a season of birth and rebirth.

The great spiritual message of this springtime is the conquest by life over death; we realize through every budding flower and every bird singing in the trees, the significance of immortality. We relearn the triumph of the things of the spirit over the things of the flesh, the triumph of beauty and good over evil.

And so, during these next 15 minutes, I would like to see how you and I can approach the problems of our country with the same spirit of faith.

Let's put to practical use the inspiring message of the Way-Shower, which you and I will be hearing from the pulpits of our churches during this Easter season.

I am going to answer now a series of questions on this subject of the fears of our time, and faith for our time.

Question. Senator WILEY, what would you regard as some of the principal fears which are expressed widely today?

Answer. Well, there are a great many fears. I am just going to list a few, because I don't believe that we should dwell too long on them, as such. I don't believe in giving power to fear or evil.

But first, of course, we all know there is the fear of war.

Then there is the fear of depression and unemployment.

There is the fear of inflation.

There is the fear of Communist conquest of the world. There is the fear of trouble at home—of a long series of strikes in our country, resulting in harm to labor, to management, and to the public.

Question. Do you think that there is substance to any of these fears?

Answer. No. I don't believe so. None of these feared conditions need actually come about. If we use our God-given intelligence and judgment, we are not going to have war.

We are going to enjoy continued peace. If we use our God-inspired wisdom we are going to enter into a golden new age of prosperity and expansion.

You know, by 1975, there are going to be—not 165 millions of us, but 220 million Americans in this country. They are going to enjoy comforts and conveniences such as we have not enjoyed today.

If we use our heads, our God-directed intelligence, then the miracle of atomic energy and the miracle of automatic factories—of the new science, called automation—are going to produce a higher standard of living for our people than we have ever before enjoyed.

And, too, we can have industrial peace in our country, with higher pay envelopes for labor, and more real purchasing power.

We can assure higher income to American farmers, and can halt the serious drift away from our farms. All of these things are possible, provided we use our God-given intelligence and initiative.

VIGILANCE AGAINST RED MENACE

Question. Then, in your judgment, Senator, there is no real reason to give way to the fears which we mentioned earlier in the broadcast.

Answer. Very definitely not.

That doesn't mean that we should ignore serious problems which do definitely exist.

The fact of the matter is that world conditions are very troubled. International communism is constantly on the march, constantly agitating new trouble for us—in the western Pacific Ocean, in Europe, in South America, in Africa. We have got to be vigilant against the Communist menace everywhere.

DANGER IN PACIFIC

Question. What about that Pacific problem, Senator, the problem of Matsu and Quemoy? Is there going to be war over it?

Answer. I hope not. I pray not. And I don't believe there will be war. America wants peace—peace with honor. What I do want to emphasize is that we've got to keep our faith in the President of the United States. He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He has available the latest, most confidential, top secret information as regards Red China's ambitions and capabilities. The President is the spearhead of United States foreign policy. He doesn't want war, but neither does he want appeasement.

Let's not usurp his functions. It is not for the Congress to try to act as Secretary of State or as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I say there is much too much of a tendency these days for people to forget the constitutional division of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Question. How do you mean that?

Answer. Well, I want the Congress very definitely to do its job, but I don't want the Congress to try to take over the Chief Executive's job also. And remember, no one is going to force the President of the United States to do anything that the President doesn't want to do and doesn't feel should be done, if the President, as Commander in Chief, determines it is not in the best interest of our country. On the other hand, whatever the President does decide, the Congress and the American people will definitely back up. There may be honest differences of opinion. But we are Americans first and can support our American President. Partisan politics come last. America comes first. Unity behind our President is essential. So, I say, give him your faith. His burdens are many and they are heavy. He merits our respect and admiration. He is going to see the crises through successfully.

Question. Now, what about another problem—right here at home? What about this much-talked-about problem of automatic factories, Senator WILEY? Are they going to take the place of manpower completely? Are we going to have mass unemployment?

Answer. I believe the answers to those questions are clear, and they are encouraging, not discouraging.

We are definitely going to see more and more automatic operations in private industry. We are going to witness what has been called a second industrial revolution—so-called push-button factories. We are going to see fabulous new electronic control machines. They can store up a bewildering variety of complex information and can actually supervise and run entire assembly lines. These control machines are going to completely alter the pattern in more and more of our industries.

MANY EFFECTS

Question. What will be some of the effects of this automatic technology?

Answer. Well, the effects will be many. I can list them as follows:

1. First, there is going to be a great demand for skilled workers, for more and more brain, and less and less brawn. That means, we need better-educated Americans. This in turn means more schools, and better-paid teachers. It means we need many times more engineers, physicists, chemists, executives. Adequate education is no longer a luxury, it is an absolute job and national necessity.

2. Second, there will be more opportunities for women to perform tasks which might formerly have only been handled by men, who required some degree of physical strength.

Women already number more than 28 percent of our labor force, and by 1975, 1 out of every 3 American workers will be women.

3. We can and will have more elderly Americans working. Here, too, as is the case of women, the skills of years of experience will be more important than merely the physical strength of male youth, as such.

4. More mechanization will mean lower prices and expanding markets. That means for you, my listeners, more refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners, automobiles, radios, and television sets.

Question. What other effects will occur?

Answer. Well, here is a fifth effect. There is going to be a tremendously increased outlay for new capital goods. Vast new equipment must be built. In 1953, production of capital goods and services amounted to $54 billion, or around one-seventh of our gross national product. It provided 8 million jobs. But this will be small compared to the increased capital-goods jobs in the future. And, too, we are going to have to replace machinery faster because it will become obsolete faster, and that will mean more jobs.

6. Sixth, most important of all we are going to have more leisure for the American people, more opportunity for personal growth and development and enjoyment of the good things of life.

AVOIDING UNEMPLOYMENT

Question. But now, Senator WILEY, what about the big fear that automatic factories are going to mean mass unemployment, throwing vast numbers of workers out of jobs?

Answer. I think the answer to that question is this: What automation is going to mean is indeed a readjustment in many American industries and jobs.

There is going to be some job dislocation. But for that matter, every time a new industry has burst on the American scene, there has been some dislocation.

The automobile industry literally revolutionized the Amercian scene. It eliminated the horse-and-buggy business and a great many other obsolete, affiliated businesses.

But now, with sound cooperation between labor, management, and the public, there is no reason whatsoever why dislocation should not be relatively mild and temporary.

Now, I want to make it perfectly clear that unemployment—because of automation or any other reason—is no light matter. When a breadwinner is out of work, whether it is for a day or a week or a month, that can be serious, serious for himself and for his loved ones, serious for his morale, serious in terms of the community.

Fortunately, unemployment in recent times, has been comparatively mild. But that does not mean that we should not use every ounce of our energy so as to keep it to an irreducible minimum.

Many communities of my own State and of Illinois and its neighbors have often been hard hit by unemployment. We are determined to have no unemployment, but full employment and full purchasing power for our people.

But to achieve it, you cannot resist change. You cannot hold back the wheels of progress, you cannot try to freeze the status quo. You have got to accept change and to work with change.

CONCLUSION

Question. Well, Senator WILEY, you have discussed quite a few phases of current problems. You have discussed the problem of applying faith in our time. You have mentioned the necessity for truly applying the Easter message in our daily lives. You have mentioned the need for faith in the President of the United States and for vigilance against the Communist menace. You have stressed that there is no real ground for fear of the future, fear about misuse of atomic energy, or fear about any harmful effects of the new science of automation.

Answer. Yes; that about sums it up.

I want to say to my listeners that it has been a real pleasure to speak to you through the kind courtesy of station WGN, especially in this beautiful pre-Easter season. I look forward to the pleasure of talking with you again in the future.

I hope that in the intervening period you and I will know the full beauty, the full joy of Eastertide. I hope we will always have that faith which, as Paul said, is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen."

Thank you very much.

Our Defense Setup on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of emphasizing to the Members of Congress and particularly to those Members who are on the Committee on Armed Services that we have an Achilles' heel in our defense setup on the Pacific coast.

One look at a map and it becomes apparent that some combat units of the Pacific Fleet should be based, for operational purposes, in the Pacific Northwest. Since existing naval facilities already are established in Puget Sound, no major change or expense is involved. Many so-called hard-core naval officers for years have admitted privately that the concentration of our fleet in southern waters and at Pearl Harbor should be augmented by the location of at least one killer unit in the Pacific Northwest; and I am hopeful, in the light of the Soviet's growing naval strength, that Puget Sound will be designated as an operational base for certain of our Pacific Fleet combat ships.

Under permission to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I offer an excerpt from a talk I made to the Lions Club in Bremerton, Wash., on April 6, 1955, which gives some explanation and background to this defense vacuum in northern Pacific Ocean waters:

When the Navy Department was first established in 1798 there were six shipyards on the east coast which were given contracts for building vessels. These six yards were Portsmouth (New Hampshire), Charlestown (Boston), Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Gosport (Norfolk).

You will recall from your American history the purpose of providing these so-called men-of-war was to protect American shipping from the Barbary Coast pirates. The Mediterranean had just been opened to us by treaty with Spain. Other nations were paying tribute and our Congress considered a substantial appropriation for this purpose, which brought the cry of millions for defense but not a cent for tribute.

Since those early days of our Republic, in spite of much political pressure, no doubt, on our east coast the location of naval bases has been developed and maintained on a well-dispersed and logical basis in order to protect the entire Atlantic coastline and our established supply lines.

At approximately a midway point between Maine and Florida the Navy Department has its largest operating base to which all types of combat vessels are attached. This is Norfolk, Va. However, strategically dispersed to the north and south of Norfolk are other naval establishments where various types of vessels are based: Portsmouth has submarines; Boston has cruisers and destroyers; Newport, R. I., has destroyers; Quonset Point, R. I., has carriers; the New London, Conn., naval station has submarines; Charleston, S. C., is a mine craft center, and at Key West, Fla., are submarines and destroyer-type vessels.

Now, let us turn to the west coast. The Navy's first base in the Pacific was established in 1854. This was Mare Island.

Incidentally, I read once that a report on a possible location for a naval base on Puget Sound was filed in Congress in 1850. This was before the first settlers founded Seattle. The proposal was that by cutting a canal Lake Union would provide a fine deep-water anchorage secure from enemy attack. If the suggestion had been adopted I doubt if Lake Union would be a carrier yard today.

In any event, our Puget Sound Yard was next to be established in 1890, while San Diego came much later. The term "base" to the Navy is a facility which overnight can support a fleet of nominal size and is capable of provisioning, fueling and manning ships.

The distinction we of Bremerton are so conscious of is that of being a home base to ships of the fleet, which brings us to San Diego which began as a radio station in 1912. In 1917 it became a Naval Air Station and in 1919 a hospital and training station. Then in 1920 it became a destroyer base which was the beginning of its development as an operation type of base, or similar in point of importance to Norfolk on the Atlantic.

As you know, since then there has been a standing joke in the Pacific Northwest to the effect that the basing of combat units of the Pacific Fleet was arrived at, as to location, through careful analysis of morale factors including the availability of smooth waters, more sunshine and strategic dispersal of naval families near golf facilities. Certainly prior to World War II Pacific Fleet operations limited possible discomfort to the naval personnel manning our warships as far as northern waters were concerned to a summer cruise and colorful but brief visits to ports in Puget Sound during Navy Week. In July or August this provided a pleasant change and relief from the seasonal heat further south. Also the admirals were said to have found this arrangement with its change of golf courses stimulating.

Whether it was preference and wishful thinking on the part of the Navy or whether politics entered into the situation, the fact remains that no units of the fleet are based north of San Francisco. Meanwhile, unlike the period prior to World War II, the theater of Navy responsibility includes the vast coast of Alaska—for in an air age Alaska has a very strategic importance for both offense and defense.

From a defense standpoint, not because it would help Bremerton, some units of the Pacific Fleet should be based in Puget Sound.

The Need for Moral Principles in the Conduct of Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 11, I had the pleasure to attend the fifth annual all-Jesuit alumni dinner, which was held in the ballroom of the Hotel Statler here in Washington. Attending this dinner were the presidents of over 20 great American colleges and universities, graduates of those institutions and their friends. I was privileged to be one of the Members of Congress present.

The speaker of the evening was Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. His refreshing address was titled "Principle in Foreign Policy." He wisely cautioned against the crafty scheming of the Kremlin to create a world demand for peace at any price—a plan calculated to put all the nations and people of the world into Russian slave chains. Our attention was directed to the new closeness of all things in this world because man had harnessed air for both communication and transportation—the complexity of factors which of necessity enter into the taking of decisions bearing on our security and the conflict which often arises between spiritual and material considerations, especially when efforts are made to exclude morality from the arena of judgment. Secretary Dulles made it clear that our enlightened self-interest requires us to follow a consistent and dependable national course guided

by those moral principles which are rooted in the basic faith of the American people. This comes as a pleasant and sound rebuttal to the un-American beliefs which hold that there can be no morality or legality in the conduct of affairs between nations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE FIFTH ANNUAL ALL-JESUIT ALUMNI DINNER, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1955

PRINCIPLES IN FOREIGN POLICY

I

This is a gathering of learned persons. It is an occasion when it may be permissible to talk in terms of general principles. That, I can assure you, is not a purely academic exercise. National action should always reflect principles. Therefore, those who have responsibility for action have also a responsibility to assure that what they do represents something more than immediate political expediency.

However, the guides to conduct are not always clear and simple. Often, indeed, they seem to conflict. Perhaps it will be of interest if I indicate some of the problems which confront those who try to find, in morality and in reason, a compass to direct their course.

Let me mention, as a first problem, that of peace versus liberty.

Peace is a goal which men have always sought. It is a goal which we particularly think of at this Easter season when we commemorate the resurrection of the Prince of Peace.

It is difficult to exaggerate the horrors of war or the longing of humanity for peace. Wars used to be limited in their scope and they were regulated so as to spare civilians from most of its dire consequences. I, myself, can think back to the days when private property was immune from seizure in time of war; when interruption of trade was limited to particular ports which were closely blockaded, or to contraband of war, by which was meant the actual tools of war.

As a youth, I attended the Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907 which drew up protocols designed to prevent the use in war of the new scientific developments of that time. It was, for example, sought to forbid the dropping of explosives from balloons."

The First and Second World Wars showed that modern war is "total" war, and that it is whole peoples, rather than the military, who suffer its cruel effects.

Furthermore, we know that war more than ever involves compulsory enmity, outrages against the human personality, cruelty, vengefulness and wanton distortions of the truth.

Today, throughout the world there is a rising demand for protection against the misery, the agony of body and of spirit, the massive destruction of life and or property, which modern war wreaks upon man.

There is, however, another aspect of the matter. Peace can be a cover whereby evil men can perpetrate diabolical wrongs.

During recent years the Communist rulers, through their propaganda, have sought to capitalize on love of peace and horror of war as a means of extending their rule over all the human race. Through such propaganda efforts as the Stockholm "peace" appeal, they have tried to divert the peoples of the free world from necessary measures of defense and create throughout the free world a popular demand for peace at any price.

Craft scheming underlies that planning. The Communist leaders know that if pacifism becomes a prevalent mood among the free peoples, the Communists can easily conquer the world. Then they can confront the free peoples with successive choices between peace and surrender; and if peace is the absolute goal, then surrenders become inevitable.

In this connection, we should remember that while modern developments have made war more terrible, they have also made the consequences of retreat and surrender more terrible. Modern war could now destroy much of the life on this planet. But also it may be possible that craven purchase of peace at the expense of principle can result in destroying much of the human spirit on this planet. Peace, under certain conditions, could lead to a degradation of the human race and to subjecting human beings to a form of mental decay which obliterates the capacity for moral and intellectual judgment.

We know, in individual cases, the effects of brainwashing. It leads men to repudiate their cherished beliefs and to accept as fact what, if they were sane, they would know to be false. Not infrequently those who have been brainwashed come sincerely to believe that they committed acts elsewhere than where they physically were at the time.

There are now techniques which make it possible to alter profoundly the human spirit. Furthermore, this can be done on a mass scale. Certain falsehoods are incessantly pounded, without respite, into the consciousness of those whose minds are terrorized, whose spirits are disheartened, and whose bodies are weakened from malnutrition. In the end the peoples become abnormal.

One cannot but shrink from buying peace at the price of extending over human beings the rule of those who believe that men are in fact nothing more than animated bits of matter, and that, to insure harmony and conformity, they should be deprived of the capacity for moral and intellectual judgment. Man, we read in the Holy Scriptures, was made a little lower than the angels. Should man now be made little, if any, higher than domesticated animals which serve the purposes of their human masters?

So men face the great dilemma of when and whether to use force to resist aggression which imposes conditions which violate the moral law and the concept that man has his origin and his destiny in God.

II

Another dilemma which we face is that which I might call the dilemma of maps versus people.

Maps have an extraordinary fascination and a profound influence. They provide a temptation to seize, as solutions, what are not real solutions.

Up until a few years ago the American people were educated in terms of maps of Mercator's projection. They showed the North American Continent isolated from the rest of the world by the expanse of great oceans. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, spoke of "our detached and distant situation." That concept, originally valid, has dominated the greater part of our national life.

Now we face a world in which air is the means of communication. But air cannot be portrayed by maps alone. It is an invisible envelope that enfolds the earth without a break. So maps now need the supplement of an intelligent imagination. Some help can be got from polar maps. They help to teach that under modern conditions of communication areas which used to seem remote are in fact near.

Under present circumstances, divisions of land and water, of desert and mountain range, of river, and of plain, have lost much of their significance. More than ever before, the human family has become one.

Nevertheless, it is still necessary to draw lines. There are national lines, which have a meaning. But even national lines do not have an unchanging meaning. That is well illustrated by Europe. A map of Europe today looks as it did a few weeks ago. But, in fact, in Western Europe, an immense change is in process. It means that while nationalities will still exist, there will be cooperation so that the boundary lines will have lost much of their former forbidding significance. A new Western Europe is being born and maps cannot reflect the ending of age-old rivalries.

In Korea, the 38th parallel became famous as a line between the free and Communist-dominated parts of Korea. But the line did not demarcate the hopes and aspirations of the people. I recall being in Korea in June 1950 and addressing at Seoul a religious gathering of thousands of refugees. They had fled from the north, and crossed the parallel to the south, in the hope of finding the freedom of religion which they cherished.

In Vietnam, a line was drawn at the 17th parallel. But hundreds of thousands of refugees have crossed it, fleeing to the south. Again the driving force was a longing for religious freedom.

And there is this to be remembered: For each person who succeeds in becoming a refugee from communism, there are many more who do not want to be contained by the lines which statesmen have drawn in the hope that that would solve their problems.

In the world today, with air the means of communication, with time and space almost annihilated, geography still remains a fact. But geographical solutions rarely coincide with human solutions. That is why we do not accept the finality of a divided world.

III

Another dilemma that we face might be described as that of the part versus the entire story.

It is almost always easy to find a solution if only part of a problem is known. It is my experience that those who are most positive about political problems are able to be positive only because they do not know all the relevant facts. Those who are most harsh in their judgments are able to be harsh for that same reason. When the whole of a problem is known, solutions become excessively difficult and judgments are not easily made. Tolerance has become a vital need.

There is hardly any international problem which lends itself to easy or sure solution. Those who principally know Europe readily judge that the problems of Asia are unimportant and that almost any solution will serve so long as it does not trouble Europe. Those who are principally concerned with Asia are sometimes annoyed if it is suggested that Asian problems cannot be solved without regard for Europe.

The fact is that today any problem in any part of the world ramifies into almost every part of the world. There are no longer any simple problems, nor any easy solutions. A course of action for Indochina may have to be judged in the light of its repercussions in Europe, the Middle East, or Moscow; and vice versa.

I have the impression that in the days before the world became so unified, it was easier to take decisions. The issues were, or seemed to be, simple. Also, they could readily be explained. Today, almost every problem has many complications, so that it is difficult adequately to explain the reasons for a decision and the multiple factors which go to make up that decision.

There is a habit of mind which is sometimes called "localitis." Those who are close to a problem, or those who only see part of a problem, quickly find a solution that seems obvious. Those who know more may find that the "obvious" solution is no solution at all. Balancing scales may, from one angle, seem clearly weighted on one side. But when seen in proper perspective, they may seem to be equally balanced, or weighted on the other side.

This need for balancing many factors has some undesirable consequences. I have already alluded to the fact that it makes adequate explanation difficult. Also, it often tends to deprive decisions of the dynamic quality which is needed to make them effective. Often the mainspring of action is a sense of certainty. Unhappily, those who are best informed are often deprived of that satisfaction.

The great deeds of history were wrought primarily by men with deep conviction and dynamic faith. They were sure that they were right.

It seems today that sureness can be dependably found only in the spiritual realm but that, when moral principles are sought to be practically applied, confidence tends to vanish. Certainty is not readily found in the mundane realm, at least where there is full knowledge of the facts. The yearning for more certainty and precision than is compatible with the complexity of affairs encourages only doctrinaire or fanatical attitudes and ultimate disillusionment. Perhaps it is good if fanaticism, in worldly terms, is on the way out.

IV

Then we have the dilemna which might be called that of the spiritual versus the material.

There are some who believe that moral considerations ought not to influence the foreign policy of a nation; that moral considerations are all right for the individual but not for the collective unity. Corporate bodies, it is argued, should be directed only by material considerations.

It is, I suppose, always true that those who act in a representative and trustee capacity do not have the same freedom as is had by individuals in dealing with their own lives and the property they own. Thus, directors of a corporation are, in general, not free to use corporate assets for charitable purposes unconnected with the welfare of the corporation. To a degree, I suppose, the same principles apply to those who are trustees for a nation.

It is, indeed, generally the case that those who represent a government operate only for the immediate and direct self-interest of the nation they represent. That is why suspicion generally attaches to governmental grants. It is assumed that governments do not give away their taxpayers' money unless they see some specific quid pro quo.

The Government of the United States has, I like to believe, a rather unique tradition in this respect. Our Nation was founded as an experiment in human liberty. Our institutions reflect the belief of our founders that all men were endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights and had duties prescribed by moral law. They believed that human institutions ought primarily to help men develop their God-given possibilities, and that our Nation, by its conduct and example, could help men everywhere to find the way to a better and more abundant life.

Our Nation realized that vision. There developed here an area of spiritual and economic vigor the like of which the world had never seen. It was no exclusive preserve; indeed, world mission was a central theme. Millions were welcomed from other lands, to share equally the opportunities of the founders and their heirs. We put our experiment on public exhibition so that all might see and follow if they would. Through the establishment of schools and hospitals, often under religious auspices, American ideals were carried throughout the world. We gave aid and comfort to those elsewhere who sought to follow in our way and to develop for themselves societies of greater human freedom.

These conditions prevailed for 100 years and more. Then, as our material power waxed, our spiritual power seemed to wane. We appeared to be less concerned with conducting a great experiment for the benefit of mankind and to be more concerned with piling up for ourselves material advantages. Our vision seemed to contract, and our sense of mission to lessen.

We had to meet the severest test that can come to a people, the test of prosperity.

It was said by Jesus that material things will be added unto those who seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. But when that happens, then comes the great trial. For, as Jesus warned, those material things can readily become the rust that corrodes men's souls.

Thus there is a familiar pattern. Men who feel a sense of duty to some higher being strive here to do His will. Because of their faith, they have power and virtue and simple wisdom. They build not only for the day, but for the morrow; not merely for themselves, but for mankind. A society so founded will, when nature favors, produce wealth and luxury for many. When those byproducts come, they seem so good that they become promoted to be the all-sufficient end.

So there came a time when our people were drawn away from long-range creative effort and when they struggled to get and to hold material things. Practices, originally designed to reflect a faith, may not have been adequately vitalized by continuing faith. I believe, however, that it can fairly be said that, since the end of World War II, our Nation has recaptured the faith in which it was founded and has resumed works such as those which in the past were called the great American experiment.

With 60 other nations we have actively participated in the United Nations in its quest for peace. We have lent our moral, military, and material support to many free people. With more than 40 nations we have special mutual-security arrangements. These measures are our contribution to the creation of a world which is safer and more secure for human freedom. This basic interest is the common bond between us and the other free nations.

We exert in every part of the world an influence—an influence which we try, as far as is humanly possible, to make an influence for justice and not an influence for self-aggrandizement.

No doubt we have made mistakes. But broadly speaking, our Nation has played a role which I believe history will judge to have been honorable. It is a role which we could not have played unless those who exercised the power of government had believed that they were justified in putting moral considerations above material considerations.

V

I have outlined some of the problems and perplexities which confront those who have political responsibility. I have deliberately tried to avoid being dogmatic. Rather I have sought to stimulate your own thinking. I will, however, close with this general observation:

It seems to me that a nation situated as is ours needs to follow a consistent and predictable course. We represent great power in the world—morally, intellectually, and materially. Other peoples and nations who are free and want to stay free usually want to coordinate their policies with our own. I do not speak now of coordination in detail. As to details, there are almost always differences. That is inevitable, because differences are the attribute of freedom. It is only despotism that produces conformity. I do, however, speak of such basic harmony as freely emerges from those who feel a sense of common destiny, and who want to help, and be helped by, each other.

A measure of harmony exists today throughout much of the free world. It binds together, in a spirit of partnership, many of different races, creeds, and nationalities in many parts of the world. But the harmony for which many thus grope will never be perfected and preserved unless the United States pursues a dependable, consistent course.

There are many who, in particular cases, would like it if the United States would deviate from our basic principles to help them meet their particular problems. We rarely do so. That accounts for much of the superficial criticism we encounter abroad. But underlying these surface dissatisfactions lies, I feel, a deep, worldwide sense of respect for the United States because even though we sometimes fall short, we do in general stand like a rock for certain principles and follow a course which, in its broad nature, is consistent and predictable. Without that, there can never be harmony, and a sense of security, as among the free peoples.

Obviously, a consistent and dependable national course must have a base broader than the particular beliefs of those who from time to time hold office. Our policies must, on the one hand, be dependably embraced by our own people, and, on the other hand, reflect a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. It would seem that only principles which conform to moral law meet that specification. So not only the basic faith of our people, who are essentially religious, but also enlightened self-interest, combine to urge that moral principle be a guide, not merely to individual conduct, but also to the conduct of the nations.

Southern Nevada Home-Siters—Nevada's Modern Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, one of our valued rights as American citizens is the privilege to petition our Government for redress of grievances. Unfortunately, as our Government has increased in size and complexity, the influence of the individual in presenting his problems has diminished in proportion. And when you add to the growth in the magnitude and scope of Federal activities the fact that some of our States, such as the one I have the honor to represent, are located several thousand miles from the seat of Government, it makes even more difficult the task of an individual citizen who seeks a sympathetic and thorough consideration of his problems, important though they may be.

With nearly 87 percent of the State of Nevada under Federal ownership, it is to be expected there should develop occasional objections to the manner in which this area is administered. However, when objections are more than occasional, it is time for Congress to seek ways of improving the rules of administration.

In my State, concern over the present public land system is particularly acute. Recently with an unprecedented influx of population in the State, and an unforeseen increase in public land activity the land disposal program of the Department of Interior has been unable to keep pace with the demand for service.

In an effort to improve this service, there was recently organized in the

southern part of Nevada a group which in many respects recalls to mind the attempts of early settlers of Nevada and California to work out solutions to their public-land problems—efforts which eventually resulted in Congressional action of the kind that is needed today.

When gold and silver were first discovered in California and Nevada there were no Federal laws to govern the recovery of these minerals from the public domain. Local districts were formed by these hardy pioneers. These districts established rules and regulations to govern day-to-day operations and activities of those who had discovered and developed valuable claims. When Congress later enacted legislation, it adopted to a large extent the rules that had been worked out by these locally formed mining districts.

The pioneering organization to which I am referring is the Southern Nevada Home-Siters, Inc., a grassroots organization composed largely of those who have made application for sites on the public domain under the Small Tract Act of 1938.

The backlog of cases jamming the office of the Bureau of Land Management and the lack of clear information on the disposal program gave birth to this group. Widespread confusion was present in that area as result of inadequate efforts made by the Federal Government to handle the many problems involved. The actions of this organization concurred with the best principles of democracy and admirably carried on the vigorous spirit of self-help and initiative which were rooted in the mining districts organized over 100 years ago.

In a short period of time the Southern Nevada Home-Siters organization has accomplished the following:

It has organized applicants who are interested in securing small tracts so they would have a more effective voice in, first, improving the administration of existing laws; and, second, changing regulations and laws where it seemed advisable. It has served as a vehicle for better government for many people who perhaps as individuals would not have been heard or heeded. In short, it has breathed new life into their petition for redress against bureaucratic delay and legislative neglect.

It has served to secure and disseminate accurate information in an area where confusion was rampant. The Government was not discharging its obligation to furnish adequate service and self-appointed non-Government experts were profiteering as result of speculation, misinformation, and lack of knowledge.

It has been the source of constructive force to improve the services of the Bureau of Land Management office in the State of Nevada.

It has been in the forefront of moves to work out plans with the FHA, other Government organizations, and the communities of southern Nevada to develop the land resources in an orderly, intelligent way with an eye toward the future.

It has come to my attention that the 2,000th member recently joined this organization. This itself is a fine tribute to the excellent work they are doing at a local level. I wish to take this opportunity of pointing out the organization's splendid efforts and commending the officers and members on their fine contribution to better government, as well as the excellent example they are setting of grassroots democracy in action. No small measure of the credit for improvements already noted is due to their untiring efforts. If future achievements are made in modernizing our public land laws and the administration thereof, these Nevada citizens will have contributed substantially to such progress.

American history is replete with examples of the general public being ahead of its elected servants in recognizing needs and working for solutions. I am sure we have another such occasion in the present public land law tangle and that this body could well profit by following the lead of Nevada's modern-day pioneers.

Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, there are indications that our antitrust laws are either inadequate or not properly policed. The press is continually announcing new mergers. These mergers are common to all segments of business and quite pronounced in banking circles. Whoever thought that the First National Bank of New York would lose its identity? Why did the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan merge? Both were colossal banking institutions. One merger brings about other mergers—a race between Chase National Bank and the National City Bank to be the biggest in New York and second in size in the world. As the great banks of the country grow fewer in number, competition presumably would lessen and competition is a necessary spur to good service. Those that would monopolize usually give good service in perfecting its plans for a monopoly but once the monopoly is formed, it is the dead hand on progress. Monopoly is a stab in the back to a capitalistic system, as capitalism is not truly capitalistic unless competitive. Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, said that European businessmen must bear the lion's share of the blame for socialism's sweep over Europe; capitalism did not fail, businessmen failed capitalism.

H. R. 2674, among other things, would check the merger expansion through the holding company device. It would be a block to a nationwide system of multiple banking. It is a part answer to the merger epidemic. The passage of this bill would help preserve in a definite way the future of the small banks of this country, permit them to continue as community enterprises. This bill would put bank holding companies under the same rules and regulations as those pertaining to banks. While a bank holding company is not a bank, it is "Mr. Banker". These holding companies own practically all the stock of their subsidiary banks and as an owner, of course, run them by distant control. The holding companies attempt to fool the public into believing that their subsidiary is a community bank by having a local board of directors front for them but the board serves at the will of the corporation without a complete and full ownership of stock in the local bank. The holding company is a device that has been used for the purpose of evasion. Evasion should not be countenanced.

There should be a continuous place in our economy for the community bank—the local institution, the institution that is the heart of the business of our villages and small cities. These local bankers naturally know their communities well. Responsive to the needs of the people of the community, these small banks provide a personal service that is hard to match. The banker is helpful in numerous ways and beyond the natural scope of banking. Small business has a hard row ahead; it needs the help of another small business—the local bank. The two tie together and their interests are common. It is hard to believe that a branch of a gigantic corporation, with its headquarters many miles away, will have the sympathetic understanding of the needs of a community as does the local bank which is so definitely a part of the community life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H. R. 2674. It is legislation that is urgently needed and it is legislation that, in my opinion, is of great importance. We cannot afford to have a few large financial organizations dominate the credit machinery of this country. I believe in community-owned banks; I deplore the trend toward system banking regardless of the form it takes because multiple banking, that is, a bank with many offices, is a concentration of economic power greatly to be feared.

Anniversary of Bataan Day, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago Americans and Filipinos fought side by side with a heroic determination to prevent the fall of the Philippines. Outnumbered—with their supplies dwindling—ravaged by sickness and fatigue, and finally surrounded on the Bataan Peninsula, the defenders fought on to the bitter end. The Battle of Bataan stands today as a symbol of the will of freemen to remain free.

History has erased the defeat at Bataan. From that defeat the Philippine people, through the same tenacity and determination which they demonstrated

at Bataan, have risen to create a republic which today is a beacon of freedom in Asia.

At Bataan we shared with the Philippine people both defeat and the will to avenge that defeat. We shared the victory which followed. In a spirit of mutual understanding we subsequently shared in the many complex responsibilities of the transition to complete Philippine independence. We have watched with unstinted pride as the Republic of the Philippines in its own right has assumed its place among the democracies of the world. On this anniversary of Bataan Day, we continue to share with the people of the Philippines that devotion to freedom which could not be quenched by a military defeat on the Bataan Peninsula.

Expert Paints Grim Picture of Red Horror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the March 30, 1955, issue of the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., and containing the statements of the Honorable Charles J. Kersten regarding communism:

EXPERT PAINTS GRIM PICTURE OF RED HORROR

An expert on life behind the Iron Curtain in Russia and the countries it has made captive last night told members of the Harrisburg public forum that "if we don't find a way to checkmate the Communist conspiracy in this generation, our children will spit upon our graves."

Former United States Congressman Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, head of the House Committee on Communist Aggression which spent nearly 2 years studying Soviet techniques of conquest, drew a horrifying picture of how the youth of Russia is being trained by Communist leaders.

"Never in the history of the world has any government so assaulted the spiritual nature of its people," he asserted. "The young people are systematically bereft of all moral principles, of all belief in a Creator. Their young doctors and commissars are being taught how to inflict the most unspeakable tortures, their young psychiatrists shown ways to drive people insane."

INHUMAN DEVILS

"The nightmare of destruction by atomic warfare is a terrible one. But even worse, to me, is the thought of our American boys being opposed and made prisoner by millions of such inhuman devils—say 5 or 10 years from now."

Congressman Kersten reviewed the work of his committee in examining 335 witnesses and more than 1,500 documents, all concerned with the methods used by the Soviets in taking over other nations, keeping them subservient, and maintaining their own power within Russia.

He pointed out that the people of no nation, including Russia, ever willingly accepted communistic rule. In the 37 years of their existence, the Kremlin lords have imposed their will upon peoples by force, and kept control by slaughter, deportation, and the slave labor camp.

LISTS PREPARED

The speaker described how Soviet agents prepared detailed lists of entire populations of countries they intended to take over, with every citizen placed in a category, so that no time was lost after the occupation in eliminating any elements they knew would prove dangerous.

Such lists of Americans already are in their possession and they are kept up to date. Remember that the symbol of Russian occupation is a cadaver with a bullet through the skull and hands tied behind the back.

Congressman Kersten said his committee had drawn various conclusions from their exhaustive studies of Red tenets and techniques, and had made certain recommendations to Congress.

VILE CONSPIRACY

Chief among them was to withdraw diplomatic recognition of "this thing" which is not a government at all but a vile conspiracy against the world. The recommendation also would include Red regimes in captive countries.

"At the same time," he declared, "the United States must reaffirm our friendship for these enslaved peoples, including those in Russia. They are not our enemies—their kidnappers are.

"We should encourage the defection of military personnel from Communist armies wherever they are. Such men ought to be urged to join the defense of Western Europe, but allowed to keep their own national identities. Also, we should stop trading with Red governments, increase our information program, and never enter into any agreement around the conference table with Soviet leaders.

"Our country's policy must be founded consistently on the principles of liberty and belief in God—the direct antithesis of those in the Kremlin."

United States Information Agency Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times magazine published an article on the library at the United States Information Service Center in Rangoon, Burma. Some of you may have seen the article. It describes the library as "a striking instance of how democracy can win friends and influence people."

Today this seems to be the consensus of opinion on the United States Information Service libraries. Recently, Vice President NIXON remarked that he had visited United States Information Service libraries in 22 countries and he had come to the conclusion that the library program is one of our most effective overseas information operations.

The writer of the New York Times magazine article, Mrs. Peggy Durdin, was writing from Rangoon. She had inspected the library layout, browsed through the book shelves, noted the variety of library visitors, checked on its influence. She gave a most striking example of that influence. The father of a Communist university student—the Communists in Rangoon, as in many other countries, make a special effort to win university students—had borrowed a standard United States economic textbook. He read it and passed it on to his son. They studied it together. Returning the book to the library, the father said simply:

This book gave my son the true facts. He is no longer a Communist.

Mrs. Durdin wrote of the help the Rangoon library had given officials of the Burmese Government. But, she added, the library's influence extended beyond officials. It reached private citizens such as the former young Communist and his father. It had books for children. The shelves were open. Men, women, children of all ages pored over the racks, took notes, looked at pictures, read, or took books home.

She continued:

The library's books travel by river boat, by plane, and on the backs of human porters * * * across thousands of miles of jungle and mountains. Burmese read them eagerly in an umbrella cooperative in Bassein, a school in Mandalay, a prisoner's reading room in Myitkyina, an army officers' club in Akyab, a youth league in Moulmein. A doctor who has to perform a complicated new operation, a merchant who wants to make sparklers, and a landowner who plans to set up a model village on his property turn for help to the American library.

There are 157 of these United States Information Service libraries today in 67 countries. The story told by Mrs. Durdin could be repeated, with slight adaptations to suit the particular country, for each one of them. They are all over the world, ranging in size from the 2,200-book library in Curacao, Dutch West Indies, to Vienna, which boasts a collection of 175,323 books.

These libraries have special shelves devoted to particular subjects. The agency's support of President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace proposal, for example, inspired the setting up in most of our libraries of special shelves on that subject. All libraries have made a special feature of books dealing with the economy of the United States. They stress technical subjects heavily, although fiction is not ignored.

All books have been chosen to present to the peoples of other lands a balanced picture of American life, culture, and thinking. In my opinion, they are making a vitally important contribution in today's fight to keep free the minds of men.

The influence of these libraries, as Mrs. Durdin wrote, is extended into remote areas. Most of them support bookmobiles that tour the smaller cities, villages, and rural areas. People write in for them. There are "book trunks" that go to towns where libraries are unknown.

In light of the attacks once leveled at the United States Information Service libraries, it gives me great pleasure to pay them this tribute. I agreed with Vice President NIXON when he said recently:

The library service, unfortunately, received criticism which it did not deserve a couple of years ago.

In all new projects, mistakes are apt to be made. If the United States Information Service libraries slipped on a few occasions in the past, I think today they have profited by experience. The New York Times writer felt the American taxpayers could be proud of the Rangoon library. Let me enlarge that and say that all of us can be proud of the United States Information Service libraries, wherever they may be.

Discrimination Has No Moral Justification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to promote further respect for, and observance of, civil rights in the United States.

We have made considerable progress in recent years in the direction of eliminating discrimination and racialism in this country, but we still have a long road to travel before we can attain true understanding, equality of opportunity, and human brotherhood. Among the most important basic principles that have been handed down to us by the founders of our great Republic is the heritage of freedom, the concept of equality of opportunity, the belief that the individual should be judged strictly on the basis of ability and achievement. The flames of intolerance would have consumed this Nation long ago if these principles had not been made the core of the American creed.

One of the greatest struggles within the conscience of the American people today is to justify our practices of racial and religious discrimination in the light of our moral and democratic principles. The fact remains that there is no moral justification for racial or religious discrimination. It undermines the foundations of our way of life and it destroys the economic opportunities for all. Discrimination based upon a person's religious beliefs, or his national origin, or the color of his skin, cannot be reconciled with the American concepts of justice and the brotherhood of man. In order to build and maintain a great Nation such as ours we must make use of all the human resources of the country, but if we deny certain groups among our citizens the opportunity to develop their skills, then it is not only a contradiction of our own principles but we are actually hurting our country and its interests.

Whenever conscientious efforts instead of timid experiments have been attempted in the field of race relations the results always have been encouraging. There is no simple solution for wiping out prejudice, but undoubtedly the first direct step is to remove the legal sanctions of discrimination. So long as old racial laws remain or new legal barriers are imposed racial tensions will continue. So long as stereotyped ideas about minority groups are not modified bigotry and intolerance will flourish.

Law is an effective instrument for changing social conditions and law acts as a powerful factor in preventing discrimination. It fosters the conviction that discrimination is wrong by fixing standards which are respected by the majority of the people. Because people as a rule are law abiding, their behavior tends to create customs which are in harmony with the law.

For some time now Communist propaganda has been exploiting every manifestation of prejudice in the United States in order to spread hatred against us among the peoples of Asia and Africa. They tell many untruths and half-truths about our treatment of minorities, while the true facts are distorted to give a false impression of the extent of discrimination in our country. This forces us to be on the defensive and apologetic, and it affects American prestige and moral leadership among the peoples of the world.

Consequently, I believe the time is long overdue for us to seek to eliminate all remnants of discrimination in this country through the means of effective legislation. For this reason, I have drawn up a civil rights bill which is comprised of four titles, dealing with specific civil rights problems. These four major sections of my bill are as follows:

First. Civil Rights Commission: I propose to authorize the President to establish a Civil Rights Commission composed of three members, for a period of 3 years each. The purpose of this Commission shall be to conduct a continuing study of the policies, practices, and the enforcement program of the Federal Government with respect to civil rights, and of the progress made throughout the Nation in promoting respect for and the observance of civil rights. The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations each year to the President and to Congress.

Second. Prohibition against poll tax: This section of my bill recommends that the requirement for payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote in a primary or other election for President, Vice President, and Members of both Houses of Congress, shall be abolished. It shall be declared unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to levy a poll tax on the right to vote or registering to vote.

Third. Protection from mob violence and lynching: Groups of two or more persons who commit or attempt to commit violence upon an individual or a group because of their race, color, national origin, or religion, shall be recognized as a lynch mob and violence committed by them shall constitute lynching. Members of such lynch mobs who willfully incite or commit a lynching shall be guilty of a felony and punishable by a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment up to 20 years, or both.

Fourth. Equality of opportunity in employment: The last and most important section of my bill deals with discrimination in employment. It declares such discrimination based on race, color, national origin, or religion as contrary to American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, deprives our country of its full productive capacity, and foments industrial strife and unrest. Discrimination in employment is made unlawful.

The bill creates a commission to be known as the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, composed of seven members to be appointed by the President. The purpose of this Commission shall be to seek to prevent or discontinue discriminatory practices in employment through investigation, conciliation, and persuasion. Where necessary, the aid of regional, State, and local agencies should be obtained. Where voluntary methods fail, the Commission is to be empowered to issue complaints, conduct formal hearings, and issue cease-and-desist orders enforceable in the courts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time when the people of this country must be on the alert to defend our civil rights through the adoption of legislation along the lines indicated in my bill. To abuse our civil liberties and to permit the practice of discrimination against some of our fellow citizens is proving very injurious to the American way of life and all that America stands for.

Equality of opportunity for every citizen of this country is essential to the welfare and progress of our Nation and our civilization. Liberty-loving people throughout the world look to the United States as the leader in the cause of freedom and human rights; hence, it is our sacred duty to afford all American citizens the opprtunity to participate in every phase of our national life and to serve this country with pride and dignity. When we speak of the belief of the American people in freedom and human rights, we are not resorting to idle words; to the American people these words represent a wonderful idea and a cherished goal, they reflect the fundamental attitude of the people of this country who appreciate the meaning of true democracy.

This country is comprised of people who come from all races, religious beliefs, and national origin. All of them have made important contributions toward the development of the United States as a great nation and toward shaping its destiny. I am strongly opposed to setting up second-class citizenship for any group in this country, because I do not believe in the superiority of one race or one nationality group over another. As soon as we encourage second-class citizenship, we open the door for discrimination and bigotry.

Somewhere recently I came across the following lines:

Give us wide walls to build our temple of liberty, O God.
The North shall be built of love, to stand against the winds of fate;
The South of tolerance, that we may building, outreach hate;
The East our faith, that rises clear and new each day;
The West our hope, that even dies a glorious way.
The threshold 'neath our feet will be humility;

The roof—the very sky itself—infinity.
God, give us wide walls to build this great temple of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to build with love and tolerance; we must continue to have faith in our country and its future, and we must continue to hope for human brotherhood, for freedom, and for true understanding among the nations and the peoples of the world.

Greater Relief for Distressed Industrial Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, attention is called to a resolution of the New York State Senate, concurred in on April 2 last by the Assembly of the State of New York, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate and which appears on page 4321 of the RECORD of April 13.

This resolution directs attention to a problem which is of utmost concern to responsible people in certain industrial areas in my State, and which affects similarly a number of areas elsewhere in the country where the same conditions prevail.

This resolution points out one of those unhappy situations where a highly salutary and commendable policy of our Federal Government collides headlong with emasculating consequences, into another perfectly good and sound policy. In connection with procurement and manufacturing contracts to support our national defense effort, it has been established—and very wisely—that areas will be favored where there are idle plant capacity and unemployed labor resources. This was a basic determination, reflecting the commonsense conclusion that we should not cause new plants to be built or new industries started so as to require shifts in the labor population when there are idle capacity and unemployed workers to do the work elsewhere.

What has developed as a conflict with that policy, severely penalizing areas in my State which would otherwise be eligible under it, is another policy—equally understandable and good on its face—that the Office of Defense Mobilization will not give work to areas having unemployed and idle plant capacity if by doing so it must incur a price differential. In other words, the first policy applies only if the area to be given the work is able to underbid all its competition. Now that saves the Government money, but, in many cases, it defeats the other objective.

It is not suggested that either of these policies be scrapped. It would be ridiculous to insist upon this special dispensation at no matter what cost to the Government. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the present outcome is too harsh. Therefore, what the resolution proposes is that the Director of Mobilization shall be given greater discretion to adjust the conflict between the two in order that neither may be truly vitiated by the other.

The other question raised by the resolution—as to the wisdom of concentrating certain types of production entirely in the hands of a single large producer—also has my full concurrence.

I hope this problem will receive prompt and serious consideration.

Wheat Certificate Plan Provisions of H. R. 12 Offer Best Way To Solve Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of one of the finest commercial wheat producing areas in the world, and as a legislator who is interested in the welfare of all the people in the United States, I am concerned about the misunderstanding and the misinterpretation which has been given to the certificate-plan provisions of H. R. 12.

On March 12, 1955, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, eloquently denounced the certificate plan as unsound. From his remarks, it is apparent to me that he does not understand the full significance of this plan. He repeatedly assumes the plan would dump huge quantities of wheat on the feed market to the detriment of the corn producer. It is his assumption that additional huge quantities would be dumped on the shaky world wheat market. And, blackest of all predictions, while all this dumping was underway, the American housewife would be gouged by higher bread prices.

These assumptions are exaggerations of events that could happen under any program, particularly, the flexible price-support program as it affects wheat. The same safeguards which prevent them from happening now under our present program would prevent them from happening under the certificate plan.

On February 14, 1955, the Secretary of Agriculture announced at his press conference that the National Agricultural Advisory Commission would be requested to review the wheat surplus situation and consider anew, ways to solve the problem. He indicated an open mind on all programs including the certificate or what is erroneously called a two-price plan. Obviously, he was not convinced the flexible price program was the answer for wheat.

Under the legislation which was passed by the 83d Congress, wheat is the only basic commodity that is flexed downward to any great extent. The price support on wheat for 1955 will be 82½ percent, while other crops are near the 90-percent support level. It has been announced that corn will be supported at not less than 87 percent of parity. There is a chance it might even be back up to 90 percent by the time the final decision is made.

The theory of this legislation, the Agricultural Act of 1954, is that lower price support levels would encourage consumption and discourage production. While this may be true for some commodities, supply and demand for wheat foods are inelastic and show little response to price. Even though wheat is flexed downward more than any other basic commodity, it is doubtful if the program will increase consumption or decrease production.

Statistics show that as wheat prices declined drastically in the early thirties, the acres planted to wheat did not decline. Also, that production control programs have had more to do with acreage planted than has price. The principle of flexibility in a price support program may be sound as related to areas where producers have an opportunity to diversify. In those areas, farmers might be influenced through lower price supports to switch from surplus commodities to those in greater demand.

However, a great part of the Nation's wheat production which is on a commercial basis is in areas where there is not a great deal of diversification possible. The flexible support program will flex downward the price on all wheat produced, not just the surplus portion, even though the major part of the Nation's wheat production is used for domestic consumption as food and is entitled to a price comparable to the domestic prices of the things purchased for producing that wheat.

While the price of wheat will be reduced under the flexible support program, there is no possibility that retail prices of food products made from wheat will follow the downward trend. As this margin between the price paid the wheat producer and the price paid by the consumer widens, who is going to benefit? Most Members of Congress have, in the past, expressed concern regarding this spread. The effect of the present flexible support program on wheat should, and no doubt will, cause us to be more concerned than ever.

The certificate plan is described as a device for dumping surplus wheat in other people's markets. As far as the export market is concerned, no one supporting this plan would favor a dumping program. We all desire to maintain a world market for our wheat. No one interested in solving the wheat problem would want to see the international wheat market demoralized. Any threat of dumping would be avoided as now by the wise use of export quotas. May I point out that while the United States is curtailing wheat production, other countries are increasing their wheat plantings. Also, our share of the world market has shrunk faster than the market

itself. While we are selling less in the world market, competitive exporters are selling more.

In order to sell wheat at any time and in any place, the price has to be competitive. A difference of a fraction of a cent per bushel will determine a sale. Under this plan, it is probable there would be more aggressive merchandizing than at present when our competitive position depends entirely upon the amount of subsidy our Government is willing to pay. This subsidy is publicly announced from time to time which invites other exporting countries to come into the market under our price umbrella and sell their wheat for a little less.

Considerable effort and money have been spent in market development work. Unless our surplus wheat can be available at competitive prices, we are merely developing markets for wheat and wheat products from other exporting countries. This market development program does not contemplate trying to take markets from other exporting countries. Millions of people in other lands are underfed. Certainly, there are enough hungry people in the world to use our surpluses, if we can remove some of the obstacles that stand in the way. Price is a primary obstacle.

It should be noted there are 10 countries that guarantee their wheat farmers prices higher than the support price for wheat in the United States, as shown in the following table:

Turkey	3.21
France	3.04
Tunisia	3.03
Germany	2.83
Spain	2.81
Greece	2.40
Belgium	2.29
Sweden	2.10
Argentina	2.80
Japan	2.61

For years our domestic wheat program has stabilized the price for producers in other countries as well as our own. The unnecessarily high prices guaranteed producers in the importing countries listed above are encouraging uneconomic wheat production. A realistic pricing system on export wheat from the United States would result in many importing countries reducing their wheat production and growing more economic crops adapted to an intensified agriculture.

The certificate provisions of H. R. 12 could not result in dumping wheat on the domestic feed market. The provision for a floor under surplus-wheat prices would protect the feed grain producer from undue competition. I have been told by corn producers and feeders that if wheat were available in their area at prices comparable to corn, corn would be used in preference to wheat. Transportation costs would keep surplus wheat from moving in volume into corn producing areas. Wheat moving into feed uses under this plan would only equal from 3 to 5 percent of the total feed grain supply.

The charge that the certificate plan is subsidized competition is not a just one. Wheat would be made available at lower price levels, rather than being subsidized for export to the extent it is at the present time, at a cost of millions of dollars annually.

The opponents of this plan seem to think of the certificate as a means of increasing the returns to the wheat producer. Actually, it would merely bridge the gap between the lower price he would receive on all his wheat and the price that he has been receiving under farm programs up to the present time. The average price including the certificate would probably be no higher than under the flexible program, but more wheat could move into uses. Expanding our markets is the quickest way to solve the surplus wheat problems. Even though the blended return to the wheat farmer under this plan would be quite low, the increased use of wheat in the long run would more than compensate for this fact.

The gentleman from Indiana makes reference to a high and very profitable price that would accrue to the wheat farmer under a protected domestic price program. Actually, under this plan the top price received for domestically consumed wheat would be no higher than the price-support level that has been in effect on wheat for some years. This is true because the modernized parity formula will take effect in 1956 and 100 percent of parity will be no higher than 90 percent under the old formula.

The gentleman from Indiana refers to the Canadian situation and points out that the Canadian wheat farmer makes his living by selling wheat at the world price. Is he saying the American wheat farmer should sell all of his production at the world-market level even though the cream of the crop is purchased by the millers in our country and processed into food commanding prices that could well return parity to the farmer? From 1942–51, an average of 62.2 percent of the wheat produced in the United States was used for milling and seed. This was our best quality wheat and should command a price commensurate with retail prices of wheat products.

Machinery, labor, petroleum products and other items used in producing wheat are not priced at world-market levels. Is it fair to expect the wheat producer to sell all of his production in competition with world markets while other segments of our economy have various types of protection from the influence of world prices? Does my colleague from Indiana choose to support a wheat program that would place the American wheat producers in a situation similar to that of our friends to the north?

Wheat farmers in Canada have entirely different conditions from those in the United States. Land values, taxes, and labor costs are much lower. In spite of this, the Canadian wheat farmer does not fare too well as evidenced by his generally lower standard of living. While the Canadian farmer has been receiving less for his wheat, the Canadian consumer pays less for bread. Today a pound loaf sells for about 18 cents in the United States compared to 12.5 cents in Canada.

We look forward to the time when production controls will be unnecessary. With present supplies, however, they will be necessary regardless of what type of program is in effect.

The movement of wheat into feed and export under the domestic parity plan would be on a gradual basis. With the support level on wheat comparable to that on corn, wheat would not move into feed except in areas where corn was priced considerably due to transportation costs. Qualified officials have estimated that not more than 250 million bushels of wheat would be fed under the program. This is only about 5 percent of the normal feed-grain supply.

It is difficult for the wheat farmer to see what difference it makes to the corn farmer whether wheat is competing with corn on a basis under which the wheat farmer can stay in business, or on a basis under which the wheat farmer would go broke. Either way eventually the corn farmer is going to have some competition because most growers raising wheat in commercial wheat-producing areas have to continue to raise wheat. There are no other alternatives of any importance.

In resolving this difference of opinion, I believe it is necessary to look upon wheat as a dual commodity. Historically it has been used for both food and feed in rather large quantities. Wheat as food justifies a higher price than wheat as feed. If the wheat farmers of this country were to be limited to producing wheat only for food in order to maintain a fair price, they would of necessity produce feed grains on the acres taken out of wheat.

An article by Dr. J. T. Sanders in a recent issue of the Quarterly Review, put out by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, shows that feed grains produced on surplus acres would give more competition to the corn man than would wheat on these same acres. About 80 percent of the corn produced is fed in the locality where it is grown. The livestock fattened on this feed are sold in the domestic market at prices that do not have to compete with world prices on livestock products.

Still it is suggested that the wheat farmer sell all of his production at these lower world prices, ignoring the fact that only a portion of the production moves into world use. Even if the wheat producer received 100 percent of parity on a portion of his production, his blended return would be considerably lower than the 87 percent of parity guaranteed the corn producer.

The referendum provided for in this bill is criticized. It should be pointed out that the results of the farmers voting down marketing quotas in the referendum would be much more disruptive to the feed grain producers than it would be if the farmers would vote in favor of the certificate plan for wheat. Noncommercial producers of wheat do not depend entirely upon wheat for their living. Consequently the outcome of the referendum either on marketing quotas or the domestic parity plan would not be of as great importance to them.

From the statement made, it appears the corn producer would like to reserve the feed market for himself. Yet, on the other hand, he criticizes a program that

would discourage indiscriminate increase in wheat plantings. It is doubtful if the average corn farmer would be interested in establishing a base for food wheat production on his farm, in view of the fact that he has not chosen to do so under the 90-percent support program.

Even though wheat prices under this plan might be above world wheat prices a part of the time, certainly the amount of subsidy required to move the wheat in export would be considerably less than at present, thereby resulting in a saving to the taxpayer. Just how much exports will be increased over a period of time is problematical. Work being done presently under Public Law 480 as well as other efforts to increase consumption of wheat in foreign markets offers great promise.

Imports of wheat and flour in the Far East countries increased from a prewar average of less than 54 million bushels to nearly 290 million in the marketing season of 1951–52. While this high demand has not continued, annual import requirements of this area could well stabilize at around 150 million bushels. With a competitive export program, we can share in this expanded market.

The population in Asia alone is expected to increase by 215 million people in the next 10 years—an increase the size of the whole population of North America. Until such countries as lie in this area can raise their standard of living they must, of necessity, subsist largely on cereal diets. Wheat is needed to supplement rice because it is less expensive and more healthful for the people.

In looking ahead one can see the opportunities for expanding sales of our wheat products in Asia. Similar opportunities are available in Europe, South America, and Africa. Members of Congress indicated confidence in our ability to increase the sales of United States farm products when they appropriated $700 million last year under Public Law 480. By January 1, 1955, some $453 million had been obligated under this act, 43 percent of which would be spent on grains, mostly wheat and flour. This program is proving that markets can be expanded. All of the major farm organizations have joined in requesting the authority for export sales under Public Law 480 be expanded from $700 million to $1,500 million for the 3-year period.

We will never know how much more wheat and flour can be exported from the United States unless we give it an honest try. Only experience will answer that. As long as our domestic price-support program prices our wheat out of the market, we will never know what could be done. There is no surplus of wheat in the world today. There are local surpluses due to poor distribution and inadequate purchasing power. It is apparent our domestic-price policy has encouraged uneconomic production in other countries.

It is almost impossible to effectively control wheat production because weather is the governing factor. In the past 15 years, our growers in the United States have been blessed with twins from every acre. There is no assurance the rains will continue to come. Two years of drought in our Great Plains wheat area, and the surplus would be gone.

Under the rigid 90-percent support program there was little incentive to produce quality wheat. The certificate plan would once again provide an incentive for growing the best wheat possible, because all wheat would be sold on the open market. The farmer would become a salesman once again, getting all he could for his product at the current price. The market would operate freely with differentials for grade and quality and not a multiple-price system as indicated in my colleague's remarks.

The matter of distribution of certificates on an equal basis among producers often comes up for criticism. We know that a greater percentage of some classes of wheat are used in domestic consumption than others. Just what story is told by available figures depends upon the figures used. My colleague's figures show that on an average for the years 1949–53, 77.4 percent of hard red spring production is used domestically. However, if you take the average for the years 1948–53, the figure is 60 percent instead of 77.4.

On first consideration, this plan might appear unfair to the producer of Hard Red Spring wheat. However, it should be remembered that under programs of the past, the acreage reduction has been shared by producers of that area as in other areas. Also, under this plan if the demand for Hard Red Spring is greater than for other classes of wheat, this would be reflected in prices paid producers of this more desirable wheat. The producer of this wheat would receive certificates the same value as producers of less desirable classes of wheat; consequently his return per bushel would be considerably higher. In this way, he would be rewarded for producing high-quality milling wheat. This premium would be to his advantage and should offset this objection to the certificate plan, frequently referred to as the domestic-parity plan.

It should be pointed out that under this plan for wheat the situation in the export market would be no different than it is at present. Foreign consumers have for years received wheat products at a lower price through our subsidy program. In some cases, the American housewife pays more for her wheat products than the consumer of American wheat abroad. Without a lower price, foreign housewives with their lower standards of living could never buy wheat foods. In India, for example, the average wage is $54 per year.

Some opponents of this plan have called it a bread tax and warned that bakers might oppose it. This possibility has been discussed with some of the bakers and they say they have taken no official position regarding this plan. However, it would be natural for them to resist any program that would raise the cost of flour to them.

In discussing this possibility with several millers, I find they are having to pay a considerable premium at the present time in order to get the quality of wheat they need in their milling business. At times they are paying above parity for quality wheat. Under these conditions, this plan would not raise the cost of wheat for milling into flour. In fact, it probably would have an influence in the opposite direction. This plan would encourage the production of quality wheat types desired by millers and a free open market price with quality differentials again in the picture would discourage the production of undesirable wheat. The resultant increase in the supply of quality wheat would enable a miller to buy at a lower price.

The administrative procedure in connection with this plan would be very similar to that which is currently carried on in connection with wheat acreage allotments, and would not require a great deal of additional administrative activity on the part of the Government.

The gentleman from Indiana has said that this plan would increase the cost of bread and encourage the use of substitute foods. Wheat prices would have to vary approximately 75 cents per bushel to make a difference of one cent in the price of a loaf of bread; consequently, it is difficult to believe that this plan would provide a real incentive for research to develop ways of producing food products that would use less wheat, as inferred by my colleague.

I believe the certificate plan would encourage farmers to take marginal land out of wheat production. The low return on wheat produced in excess of the domestic food quota would discourage production on excess acres, particularly in areas where the wheat producer has some chance to diversify. Conservation practices would compete with low returns from poor lands if the grower received a high enough return for his share of the crop used domestically for food. This should encourage conservation farming.

Many misleading statements have been made on the cost of producing wheat. Certainly, individual cases can be shown where cost of production is way below average. These individual cases should not be used as a basis for lowering price supports to a level where many growers will go broke.

I know the 90-percent support program is not the answer to the wheat situation. Neither will the flexible-support program solve our wheat problem. The wheat certificate provisions of H. R. 12 are a middle-of-the-road approach. It combines the most desirable features of these other two plans. The grower would receive parity only on the wheat which is used in the world's biggest high-priced market—the domestic food market. The rest of the crop would move into other uses on a flexible basis. The plan would be fair to the wheat producer even though it would reduce his percentage of parity returns compared to what they have been under the 90-percent program. It is unfair to suggest that all of the wheat produced in the United States with high-cost machinery, tractor fuel, and labor should go at world prices when less than 20 percent of the crop has traditionally been sold to foreign consumers with their lower income. I realize it will take some time to make the necessary adjustments but they will

occur much faster with the domestic parity plan. We need to recognize wheat quality, take marginal land out of wheat production, sell wheat for foreign currency, and work with other countries to expand the total world demand for wheat. We are pleased that the gentleman from Indiana admits that as a part of solving the problem, we also will have to feed some of our surplus wheat. I think we all can agree that the above things should be done. The adoption of the wheat certificate provisions of H. R. 12 would assist in doing this job.

It should be emphasized again that under this plan, the certificate would not increase the price of wheat foods. The miller or processor would buy his wheat in the open market at a lower price level and the cost of the certificate to him would result in his paying approximately the same price for wheat that he has been paying under previous programs.

In developing a program for wheat, we have no choice except to start from where we are, not from where we would like to be. We cannot ignore the present situation in which tremendous amounts of wheat are stored at Government expense. It is absolutely necessary that we have a program that will permit wheat to move into all its possible uses. Most of the debate on what type of a wheat program we should have has been whether we should have a high-loan program or a low-loan program. The certificate plan provisions of this bill offer a compromise and should have the support of both groups. It would provide full parity for a portion of the production and permit the flexible features to apply to the surplus. The certificate plan for wheat should be approved by the House of Representatives as a long step in the direction of providing a practical long-range program for wheat.

Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an immigration and naturalization bill which would completely revise and replace the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which was passed over the President's veto in 1952. This immigration and naturalization bill, entitled the "Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955," is a codification of all existing immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws, clarifying and simplifying the present act, but above all, remolding American immigration and naturalization policy into its traditional directions of justice and equity. Moreover, this proposed act would establish an immigration and naturalization policy that will give faithful and positive expression to the basic human values to which American political institutions are dedicated.

Before discussing the principal features of my bill permit me to state that the need for a complete reevaluation of our immigration policy is made even more clear by the unwarranted ousting last week of Edward J. Corsi, the State Department's expediter of immigration. The treatment afforded Mr. Corsi, who has served as Commissioner of Immigration under President Hoover, and as New York State Industrial Commissioner under Governor Dewey, is as absurd and offensive as the present immigration policy itself. Last January Mr. Corsi was urged by Secfetary of State Dulles to come to Washington to accept the task of speeding up the flow of refugees into this country under the stringent provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. At that time Mr. Dulles called him the "best-qualified man in the United States" on immigration matters. After the highest praise from Mr. Dulles only 3 months ago he discharged this man who was trying to interpret the repressive immigration laws in the most humane way possible. This seems to me to be as unjust as the McCarran-Walter Act itself. We all know that Mr. Corsi has long been on record as favoring a much more liberal administration of the emergency refugee program, and a complete revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Both these objectives will be accomplished under the provisions of the bill I introduced in the House.

At this point, let me remind the spokesmen of both major political parties that they are on record as having assured the American people of a revision of the un-American McCarran-Walter Act and a new refugee law. I appeal to the leadership of both parties to redeem the pledges made by giving prompt consideration to my bill. It seems to me that the basic principle is whether or not we are to have a sensible, humane immigration policy—and that is obviously the concern of both political parties.

The bill I have introduced is a code of permanent immigration and naturalization law designed to enable the United States to meet its continuing obligations in the immigration field without periodic emergency measures, and to meet American needs and requirements at the same time. The proposed bill if enacted into law eliminates the national-origins-quota system with its built-in discriminations based on place of birth; eliminates statutory discriminations and distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens; eliminates the present insubstantial grounds for revocation and denial of citizenship, and eliminates fractions and arbitrary grounds for denial of admission to the United States.

Moreover, the proposed act would make clear distinction in requirements for entry between (a) aliens seeking permanent residence here, and (b) alien visitors coming here for scholarly or scientific purposes, for pleasure, or for business. In addition, this bill would eliminate special immigration barriers against Orientals and Negroes; establish an annual immigration ceiling of approximately 250,000 a year, but permit immigration up to that limit. It would also require all ordinary immigration from the Western Hemisphere to be included within the annual immigration limits. Another very important feature of the bill would establish a unified quota system, based on national need, individual aptitude, and the requirements of our foreign policy, and last but not least the bill would establish statutory review and appeals procedures in all cases of deportation and exclusion, and for denials of visas.

I wish to point out and make very clear that this bill would promote entry of desirable immigrants on a basis responsive to national need and international responsibility and at the same time protect this country from infiltration by those who would destroy or impair its political institutions. Let us not forget that the present struggle with Soviet communism is political and moral, as well as military, and therefore if we are to win this fight, we cannot allow legislation to remain on the statute books which enable others to accuse us of establishing our own "Redtape Curtain." Beyond any question or doubt, the United States is the leading democratic nation in the world. This fact imposes a grave responsibility on us which we are failing to live up to as long as the McCarran-Walter Act is the law of our land.

By adopting this bill you will eliminate all racial and national bias, establish a uniform right of review and appeal from administrative decisions, and remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens. The national origins quota system would be replaced by a new unified quota system. Likewise, all immigration and naturalization functions, now divided between the Consular Service of the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department would be consolidated in a separate single agency to be known as the Immigration and Naturalization Commission.

We in the United States know that our population stems from many races, groups, and tongues. It is also clear beyond dispute that our country has developed and prospered because we have made it a practice to offer a welcoming hand to substantial numbers of immigrants who were seeking freedom and equal opportunity. There is no question that our moral and material advancement has been due principally to the fact that we have had a liberal and progressive immigration policy. That liberal immigration policy, which allowed my ancestors to come to this country must be renewed if this country is not to lose an essential source of its great invigorating strength. In my opinion, the proposed legislation will achieve this purpose and at the same time guard the security, health, and welfare of the United States. It is extremely important that the Congress consider, with open and sympathetic mind, these grave problems of immigration and naturalization. We must remember that any injustice in our immigration and naturalization law is a wedge which will

weaken our political system and our long established, constitutionally guaranteed, doctrine that all men are created equal.

In conclusion I want to say that the bill I have introduced is a comprehensive revision of the present law designed and intended to reflect the genuine American tradition of equal justice and impartiality under the law for both the alien and the citizen, and to provide a friendly welcome for immigrants, without discrimination or prejudice, but within a fortified limitation as to total numbers. The bill also provides full security against the admission of criminal, subversive, and other undesirable aliens and it provides for the deportation of those inadvertently admitted or already present in this country. In my opinion the two most important reforms advocated are the abolition of the national origins quota system and consolidation of the overlapping immigration functions of the State Department and the Department of Justice. I firmly believe that if this proposed legislation is enacted into law it will represent an essential return to our basic American tradition and concepts of immigration and will remove the inequities and discrimination from our basic immigration and naturalization laws which are presently a sore on our American way of life.

Housing for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith my address before the Armstrong Association of Philadelphia in that city on January 13, 1955, on the subject Housing for Everybody:

Dr. Butterweck, Mrs. Montgomery, Mrs. Hill, members and friends of Armstrong Association of Philadelphia, coming from one of your neighboring cities, I welcome the opportunity to visit with you here. This City of Brotherly Love is an appropriate place to discuss your conference theme, Good Housing for Everybody.

Some of us have been striving for this objective for many years. For 10 years I served as a member of the Reading Housing Authority. Long before, I was one of those who helped fight the battle against those elements which see public housing and every other social advance as a threat to our way of life and our basic freedoms.

I am concerned, and I know you are, too, about decent homes for the people of our respective communities. But we are also interested, as you propose in "good housing for everybody," in Reading, in Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania and for all American citizens wherever they may live, and whoever they may be. To strive for decent homes for all of our people is a way to strengthen our way of life and our basic freedoms. It is where homes are dark, damp, and dreary, where there is poverty and injustice, that the seeds of communism take root. The fight against communism and all brands of totalitarian tyranny can be won by striking at the root of these evils. Communism breeds on the lack of education and employment opportunities, on discrimination, and in slum areas. Some of the most vocal opponents against communism unconsciously promote the Communist cause when they seek to block public housing programs and other social welfare measures.

Opponents of public housing often profess an interest in other housing programs. Most anything but what we should have. Their interest is primarily in how much they can exploit home building. They are looking at the dollar sign rather than at the social problem. I am sure you have some good examples here of windfall housing profits and discrimination that is both racial and political.

You are fortunate in the city of Philadelphia to have a mayor who is sincerely interested in housing for everybody. I have a high regard for your mayor, Joseph Clark. He is a great humanitarian, a practical idealist and a man of strong character and integrity. He is a true friend of public housing and a foe of discrimination, corruption and injustice. As a Pennsylvania Democrat I am proud of him. Having a good mayor does not mean that your problem of good housing for everybody will be readily solved. Indeed there are powerful forces here and throughout the Nation who have, from the start, bitterly opposed the public housing program which did so much to lift this Nation from the distress it suffered in the early 1930's. I can remember in my own community, the shantytowns on the dumps on the banks of the Schuykill River. I can also remember the opponents of public housing at that time who tried to block public housing. They saw the end of freedom and the beginning of regimented slavery with the development of public housing projects which were proposed. But despite such opposition, progress has been made throughout the Nation. Over 8 million new homes have been constructed in the United States since the end of World War II. It is far from adequate, but is a great step forward. All the while the foes of public housing never quit in their blind opposition. Today that opposition presents their own program which in many respects is phony or which is designed to benefit only the real estate and financial interests and speculators.

The problem of homes for everybody naturally involves such questions as finances, the selection of good sites for new homes, and the matter of how to take care of the uprooted families when slum areas are cleared Always associated with the housing problem in a big city is the question of discrimination against Negroes and minority groups. So your task to win good housing for everybody is no easy one and you are to be commended for your noble efforts. To achieve the goal for which you strive it is necessary to have good organization. With aggressive leadership, inspired by humanitarian ideals and possessing vision and good sense, you may effectively push your program to a successful conclusion. You will naturally find many good citizens who will support your efforts, and other organizations who are equally concerned about the housing problem.

The total supply of housing in our country has been increased, not as much as some would desire, but certainly more than the number which would have been built if the Federal Government under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman had not established a vigorous Federal housing program. We have made long strides therefore, toward the goal established by the Congress that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage.

And, the Supreme Court by its decisions in the covenant cases made possible a more equitable distribution of the increased supply of good housing which exists in this Nation.

The opening of the 84th Congress last week gives us an opportunity once again to review the existing supply of tools in the housing field to see if it may not be possible to make this sharing of good housing more general, or as your conference theme puts it, for everybody.

You who believe in good housing for everybody are well represented in the House of Representatives in the Congress. I speak particularly of the five Democratic colleagues. You never need worry. My good friend, Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, claims that he has more public housing in his district than any other in Pennsylvania. He has frequently boasted of the Raymond Rosen Apartments and a few others of which he rightfully feels very proud.

Those of you who have made a study of the tools which are available now in housing must realize how complex this field of housing is. We in Congress must keep in mind the wide variety of programs which have been written into the statute books. Recently we heard of the successful termination of one of these efforts when the Home Owners Loan Corporation was finally liquidated.

Another organization, the FHA, has been much in the news this past year. Those of you who are interested in slum clearance are aware of the existence of the Urban Renewal Administration. Last year 400,000 homes were built in this country through loans partially guaranteed by the Home Loan Guaranty Division of the Veterans' Administration. One million homeowners secured mortgages through the activities of savings and loan associations which operate under the auspices of the home loan bank.

I shall not take time to mention all of the activities of the Federal Government in this field because I am sure that you have here in the State of Pennsylvania similar group of agencies from the State Housing Board, coming down through your local housing coordinator and the activities of many citizens groups including Mrs. Montgomery's Philadelphia Housing Association.

The 1950 census of housing showed the Congress the size of the housing job lies ahead and it became clear to everyone in the housing field that it would require an increase in total housing production if we were to make a realistic impact on the problem. Those associated with the conservative judgments in the real estate industry had annually predicted the volume of housing to be constructed based exclusively on family formation. As a result the predictions of construction were wide off the actual number produced and sold each year in the housing market. The difference between the rate of construction and the prediction was so great that recently leading industry economists have been forced into public admission that the formation of additional families cannot be the sole basis for judging requirements of the market in this vital field.

If the real estate industry's approach had been accurate it would have meant that those who lived in the slums, those who were doubled up, were condemned to such continued existence. But happily the market does not respond alone to such narrow considerations as family formation and production in 1950 approximated 1,400,000 and has averaged 1,100,000 since. This coming year the industry predicts 1,200,000, the same as 1954, even though competent students urge a higher level of construction not only to house the expanding population and replace the overaged buildings in our national supply but the level of adequate housing necessary to achieve "the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," as established by the Declaration of National Housing Policy by Public Law 171 of the 81st Congress.

I believe that to achieve this objective we must set an annual goal of at least 2 million new homes a year. Even the National Association of Home Builders set their goal recently at 2 million homes a year for the next decade. Their goal, unfortunately, was based on rebuilding old as well as new homes.

The National Housing Conference, estimating replacement of the existing supply of substandard homes over a 20-year period, set the goal of just a little over 2 million homes a year—a figure advocated by the CIO in 1952. The CIO urged a minimum annual rate of production of (a) 850,000 for family and population growth; (b) 750,000 for slum elimination; and (c) 400,000 to replace outworn homes in the existing market.

The administration's proposal of 35,000 homes annually is disgracefully inadequate, and some of the administration leaders even rebel at the inadequate program.

The diehard opponents to public housing in the Congress have a philosophy which becomes apparent every time any important social and economic issues come before the Congress. They see red when any sort of improvement is suggested in the fields of housing, education, social security, and other welfare measures.

Since 1952 the organizations who represent conservative influence in the homebuilding industry, particularly the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, headed by William A. Clarke, of Philadelphia, have advocated emphasis on the old housing, that is, rehabilitation of the old housing, rather than construction of new housing.

Mr. Clarke described his performance in an appearance before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. In testifying on "Middle Income Housing," he said: "We worked out an arrangement with the Redevelopment Authority of the city of Philadelphia in which they are condemning one block in that area." Later he said: "They will turn that over to us and what they turn over to us is a block of houses that were built about the time of the Civil War. These are semidetached, still in good fundamental condition, but now in very bad shape otherwise."

The New York Times reported: "The Quakers have no permanent financial stake in their housing project. But they have spent some $60,000 which they plan to absorb as the cost of pioneering."

Even if this project was working out financially, and there is no public evidence to that effect, after 5 years it is far from completed and don't forget this was only a block. During this long period another project was started and is well on its way to completion in Bucks County.

Here great strides have been made in increasing the total supply of housing while making backward strides in the distribution. In December 1950, 10 months after Mr. Clarke revealed his plans which had been several years under formulation, the United States Steel Corp. announced construction of a $400 million plant on the Delaware River. Then other enterprising organizations announced similar developments. Then, in the spring of 1951 Mr. William Levitt turned the full resources of his organization to work to secure passage of the Defense Housing Act. In June he issued a booklet entitled "Defense Housing" with a change in the old slogan from "There ought to be a law" to "There must be a law," the defense housing law, which he helped ballyhoo through the Congress to make it possible for him to build Levittown. On July 28 he announced the purchase of 2,000 acres of land for Bucks County.

In the face of every effort Mr. Levitt and his colleagues have succeeded in establishing a new kind of segregated community as a neighbor to this City of Brotherly Love.

Recently the Congress investigated the operations of the FHA. During the course of this investigation it became clear that the success of Mr. Levitt's operation was due to the existence of a Government insured mortgage system known as the FHA. In a similar project on Long Island, Mr. Levitt secured FHA insurance for 4,028 houses, of approximately $29 million. In the Bucks County project he announced his intention to build 16,000 units.

After the houses were built and the bank loan had been repaid, and all debts had been paid, Mr. Levitt's company retained over $5 million cash in the bank. This kind of windfall profit would not have been possible without the FHA.

In the normal course of the construction business Mr. Levitt would have had no windfall; he would have even had to make some slight investment in the construction of 4,028 houses. If Mr. Levitt is such a substantial beneficiary of this Federal housing program enacted by the Congress to secure "good housing for everybody" it seems to me that the FHA should be so administered that its benefits should flow to everybody.

When the FHA appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, Congressman YATES sought to find out whether or not the FHA was so administered. He asked, "How many units of nonwhite housing has FHA approved for mortgages this year?"

It is no wonder that there is increasing request for the Government to refuse to use its powers as insurer of mortgages for lenders or builders who refuse to make sales or to rent to any group in our population. The solution lies not alone in increasing the production of housing. While I join with those organizations who call for an increasing supply, I shall urge my colleagues in the Congress to give the most careful attention to proposals to secure a more equitable administration of the FHA, the Veterans' Administration home loan guaranties and other segments of the Federal housing program. It may well be that the time has come in the review of the administration of the National Housing Act under which FHA operates, that the Congress declare that "no FHA insurance be granted where occupancy is denied to persons because of race, creed, or national origin."

Here in the Philadelphia area, as well as in many other communities throughout the United States, can be found those examples which prove the necessity of early action by the Congress in this vital matter which may determine whether our standing in the eyes of the world will be based upon performance as well as promise.

Your help and the help of all friends of housing for everybody is needed if we can hope for a forward looking program from this Congress.

Your work is more than a great contribution to the Negro people. It is a service to your entire city. It is a service to your entire city, to the cause of human decency and democracy, and to a better America and a more peaceful world.

Are the Islands the Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, is the issue aggression, or is it Quemoy and Matsu?

One used to read—and not too long ago—about the penalties of aggression, as well as the rewards of negotiation.

Have we changed?

Tax Refund Bill Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Panama City News, of Panama City, Fla., Friday, March 18, 1955, which gives an analysis of a bill introduced by me, H. R. 2879, to amend section 6415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to provide that fishing-boat owners who have been required to pay a transportation tax may now obtain a refund since the courts have held that the statute did not apply to fishing boats in the first place.

The enactment of H. R. 2879, or of some similar measure, appears desirable because of the following facts and circumstances:

The statute (sec. 4261, I. R. C.), while enacted and effective in 1941, was not applied to fishing boats, at least in my district, until about 1946, or later. The decision in *Smith* v. *U. S.* (110 F. Supp. 892), in part, reads:

> Section 3469 was enacted by Congress and became a law September 20, 1941. This section imposed a tax for the transportation of persons by rail, motor vehicle, water or air within, and, under certain conditions without, the United States. The record in this case is not clear as to when the Internal Revenue Bureau attempted to apply the section to charter party operations by fishermen, but so far as this case is concerned, the record shows that no tax was ever imposed on plaintiff until 1951 and the complaint in this case alleges that in 1951 the tax was imposed at some places and not others where charter boats operated. The complaint alleges also that the tax imposed at different places varied materially. From the record in the case it may be safely stated that no serious effort was made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to impose and collect the tax on charter parties prior to 1950.

The law imposed a tax on "transportation" and on nothing else. Obviously a man riding a plane, train, or bus from Miami to New York would be subject to the tax because "transportation" is clearly and unmistakably performed. "Transportation" is the clearly designated article, here activity, on which the tax was imposed or levied. The law made no mention about any tax on "fishing," the principal and primary activity here involved.

About the year 1946, or subsequently, it seems that someone in the Internal Revenue Service, precisely whom appears to be unknown, concluded that "fishing" was "transportation" and therefore taxable. In a more or less irregular manner, assessments were made accordingly and when not paid as demanded warrants for distraint were executed and liens were filed in the public records of the boatowner's county, all of which resulted in financial embarrassment to the taxpayers, adversely affected their standing in the community, socially, professionally and

otherwise and finally led to a reduction of his bank account or cash on hand in a substantial sum since some assessments were in excess of $1,000. This procedure appears to have reached a climax in 1951 after the fishing industry had employed an attorney in 1950 who immediately protested the tax, pointed out that if the statute, as a matter of law, imposed any tax, the rate of the tax on a $5.60 fishing fare was, or should be, only about 6 cents rather than the sum of 60 cents as demanded by the Internal Revenue Service at Panama City, Florida.

With the employment of counsel in 1950, the boatowners were informed and advised that the law did not impose any tax on fishing. A rather extensive investigation followed extending over an area of several States from Louisiana to Florida. This inquiry readily disclosed the lack of uniformity in assessing and collecting the tax on fishing boats. In some areas no taxes were being imposed while in other places, as in Panama City, the tax rate was fixed by the Internal Revenue agents at 60 cents for each $5.60 fishing trip. It is not clear how, or why, the tax agents presumed to fix the tax rate at sixty cents in Panama City unless it was because the boatowners denied any tax liability and refused to pay any tax.

In any event, when counsel was retained by the boatowners the first order of business was to establish a fishing fare at Panama City at $5.60 per person which sum did not include any tax. With the determination of the $5.60 rate, exclusive of any tax, the boatowners then proceeded to determine their tax liability, acting on the assumption that the law did, in fact, impose a tax on fishing. Their findings and conclusions, after an analysis of their operating costs, the approved method of ascertaining a tax liability in such cases, was that the tax varied on different occasions and on different boats depending on a number of facts such as boat value, size, type, load capacity, season of year, winds, tides, etc. The average tax, however, was found to be approximately six cents per person or one-tenth of the sum demanded, and in some instances collected, by the Internal Revenue Service. A few boatowners who employed counsel and established the fishing fare at Panama City in 1950 at $5.60 per person, exclusive of any tax, paid the tax, under protest, at the 6-cent rate, filed a claim for its refund and in a few cases have received a refund in full of all taxes paid, as well as penalties and interest resulting from late filing of returns or delayed payment of the tax illegally assessed. This group has been fairly and equitably treated insofar as refunds will accomplish fair and equitable treatment. There is another group, however, who did not have the benefit and advice of counsel, who, when liens were filed against them, in order to save their boats and other property from seizure and forfeiture, paid the tax, including penalties and interest as demanded by the tax agents. It is this group which my bill H. R. 2879 is designed to help. They were directed, by the tax agents, in no uncertain terms, to "collect" the tax. They were misinformed as to the law, that is, if we may assume that the Court in *Smith* v. *United States* (110 F. Supp. 892) has correctly determined the law. In that case the Court said:

> Clearly an operation of this character is not transportation upon which a tax may be imposed under the provisions of section 3469.

Parenthetically, I may say that section 3469 of title 26, United States Code, is now section 4261. This group was told that their fishing operation was subject to the tax and that they must collect it. They assumed they were correctly informed by the tax agents and concluded that the tax was included in their fishing fare of $5.60 but their charge for a fishing trip of $5.60 was the same identical sum as other boat owners who, on the advice of counsel, were not collecting any tax but paying at the 6-cent rate under protest, which sum has since been refunded. The group without counsel's advice, who were misinformed by the Internal Revenue Service, paid the tax at the 60-cent rate and have been denied a refund. This group will not be unjustly enriched, if and when a refund is made to them, since there was a more or less fixed fee of $5.60, exclusive of tax, on all boats. It is the group that was compelled by the Revenue Service to pay a 60-cent tax that my bill is designed to help. To deny a refund to them it seems would result in discrimination prohibited by the fundamental law of the land.

The news article reads as follows:

PANAMA CITY MAN ELECTED BY BOATMEN

Florida Boatmen's Association, Inc., yesterday elected J. E. Brunson, of Destin, president of the organization and at the same time named S. Walter Anderson to the post of vice president.

The officer election was held at a meeting of the Boatmen's Association at Destin which saw unanimous adoption of a tax-refund bill introduced in Congress by Congressman BOB SIKES.

The boatmen also adopted a three-point legislative program which will ask the legislature to (1) place fishing, a food-producing industry, in the same class with farming for the purpose of taxation; (2) exclude fish bait from the sales and use tax; and (3) exclude the cost of construction, sale, and repair of boats from the sales and use taxes.

The Sikes bill will require the United States Treasury to refund taxes which the courts have held illegally collected from some members of the Boatmen's Association, a tax that other members were not required to pay. When Congress imposed a tax on transportation the law was applied to party fishing boats—but a Federal court has since ruled that fishing boats are not transportation within the meaning of the law.

In fighting the illegally imposed tax, attorney for the association pointed out that no collection effort was made for several years after the law was adopted and even then was not collected from all boatmen at the same rate.

Total collections amount to approximately $100,000, since 1941, the year the transportation tax law was passed, David W. Palmer, association attorney, pointed out last night.

In introducing the refund bill, Congressman SIKES declared:

"The law was enacted in 1941 but no effort was made to apply it to fishing until 1950, according to a court decision. As the law was not uniformly imposed in all areas and in view of the fact that refunds have been made in some cases but denied in others, the bill is designed to provide equal and uniform treatment taxwise to all citizens."

The Boatmen's Association is represented in Panama City by Attorney W. G. Cornett.

A Conservation Acreage Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to transfer farmland not needed for commercial production each year into a "conservation acreage reserve" to store soil fertility until time of need. Designed to apply to all farmers, rent would be paid for such acreage to maintain "take-home pay" for the farm family while reducing the cost of the support program.

This legislation would protect the purchasing power of our rural families and prevent shifting from one crop to overproduction in another. The plan, horizontal in direction, would cover all farmers with special incentive to use wisely our soil resources. It would be made consistent with approved watershed development to improve fertility and to keep our farms ready to meet any demands imposed upon them in time of need. National interest demands that we, as a Nation, take care of our soil. One generation from now, the demands of our people must meet a sore test. We will need a reserve production of food to meet "head-on" the needs of a growing population. Seven thousand babies are born every day. When the growth cycle of present day children completes itself, will that generation have an adequate supply of food? Tragic as answers to this question can be, we have the power to prepare now to prevent food hardships. Farmers need adequate income if they are to build soil and not only mine their fertility. Under this bill, the farmer would be paid the landlord's share.

The bill makes provision for farmers to place acreage under this program if another farmer does not wish to use his quota. Where soil tests show fertility on a farm severely depleted, provision is made if the farmer wishes for this whole farm to come under this program. National policy dictates the necessity of such a conservation program. The act states, "It is the policy of Congress that farmers shall be encouraged to make the fullest and best economic use and conservation of the Nation's soil and water resources through coordinated watershed development." I feel it extremely necessary that we continually expand our outlook to bring the maximum number of farm families under programs such as this for our economic welfare and for the benefit of our country.

New Thinking on Our Asia Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, world attention is focused this week on the Nations of Africa and Asia who are meeting in Bandung to discuss their mutual problems. Of the free countries represented there, India is potentially the strongest ally of the democracies.

With good reason, we in this country are exasperated at times by the statements and actions of Prime Minister Nehru and his associates. At other times it is likely that we have misunderstood his motives and objectives, so perhaps it is well that we make a fresh attempt now to understand India and its leaders.

This effort may prove eminently worthwhile. Former Ambassador Chester Bowles, just back from India, reports spectacular progress in its economic program. Too, he notes that the Indian Communist Party was dealt staggering blows in recent elections. These developments are favorable to the cause of freedom, and, whether we like it or not, India seems destined to be the keystone nation for the democracies in the so-called Asian arc. This is reason enough why we should practice self-restraint and renew our efforts to understand Nehru and the people of Asia.

With these thoughts in mind, I present herewith two recent articles which discuss different aspects of the Asian problem. The first is a challenging report entitled "Memo on Our Policy in Asia" by Chester Bowles which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 10. The second is a vivid piece on Nehru which appeared in the April 8 issue of Commonweal magazine and was written by Father Jerome D'Souza, S. J., who formerly represented India at the United Nations. Few better attempts have been made than Father D'Souza's to explain the Indian Prime Minister to the American people.

Here is the first article:

MEMO ON OUR POLICY IN ASIA

(By Chester Bowles)

I returned from a recent trip to Asia profoundly impressed with the progress being made in India and Burma, and in certain respects, in Pakistan. The picture in India is particularly heartening. The Indian economy is growing stronger and more productive year by year, the Nehru government is as stable as any in Asia, the Communist Party has suffered serious reverses, and everywhere there is a sense of sober confidence about the future.

But I also found much in south Asia that was worrisome. No thoughtful person could fail to be disturbed by the low state into which our position has fallen, by the steadily growing power and prestige of China, and by the gap which exists between the views commonly expressed in America and those held by other non-Communist peoples.

I do not want to overstate my pessimism, much less to sound irresponsibly alarmist. I write only after sober reflection on the manifold, mixed impressions I have had in recent weeks, and after considering carefully the qualifications which must always be placed against such general judgments.

Reluctantly, I have concluded that our position in Asia will continue to deteriorate unless we modify sharply many of the concepts that we now seem to hold most firmly. Otherwise the day may not be far distant when we shall find the balance of power in Asia, and eventually the world, shifting inexorably against us.

I do not think it is too much to say that the danger to American objectives and interests is as great today in Asia as it was in Europe in 1947. Moreover, many of the fundamental advantages which we held then in Europe are not now available to us in Asia.

What follows is a 10-point memorandum setting forth the basic factors in the present crisis as I see them—and some suggestions as to what I believe can and must be done about our relations with non-Communist Asia. The weakness of our position in regard to Matsu, Quemoy, and Formosa, dangerous as it is, simply reflects these broader problems which must soon be faced.

1. The halting of communism in Asia is essential to the stability not only of that part of the world but also of the Middle East and Europe. Once the free world starts to crumble, it could go fast. In our present situation Lenin's observation that "for world communism the road to Paris lies through Pekin and Calcutta" has a dreadful validity.

2. Communist China's prestige and influence are steadily increasing throughout Asia, even among those who are ideologically opposed to communism. Asians are impressed by Red China's growing economic and military strength and by the fact that she is achieving a strong sense of political unity, ideological discipline, and patriotic morale.

3. We have dangerously minimized the influence of Red China because we have failed to understand the nature of Peiping's appeal to non-Communist Asians. From bitter experience we Americans have developed a justified, but stereotyped picture of the Peiping Government. We see a country allied with the Soviet Union, and bitterly opposed to our interests, a country whose doctrines and practices, steeped in cruelty and dishonesty, we deeply dislike.

Most non-Communist Asians are also aware of these facets of the new China and in varying degrees are repulsed by them. But this impression is often obscured by other aspects of modern China which have a fundamental appeal in Asia. These peoples see China as a nation which has participated in the common struggle against Western domination and which shares with other Asian nations such basic problems as poverty, illiteracy, and lack of industrial development. Throughout Asia there is widespread admiration for the vigor with which Red China is attacking these problems.

Moreover, there is a steadily growing, anti-white racial consciousness, particularly in south Asia, which finds a powerful rallying point in the Chinese slogan, "Asia for the Asians," and which will be vigorously exploited at the forthcoming Asia-African conference in Bandung, Indonesia. Thus a majority of non-Communist Asians have arrived at a picture of Communist China which, although still not fully crystallized, is dangerously different from our own.

4. Communist China's dynamic rate of development, her strong appeal to many Asians, and her bitter antagonism to the United States make her at least as great a potential threat to the stability of Asia as the Soviet Union itself. China's huge population in a limited land area would produce important geopolitical pressures regardless of communism. Her dwindling margin of potential increase in food production makes it likely that within the next 10 years she may be sorely tempted to expand into the rich and relatively empty lands of Burma, Thailand, Indochina, Malaya, and Sumatra.

5. American military power supported by Formosa and South Korea plus an alliance which includes only such Asian nations as Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippines, is unlikely to contain Chinese ambitions during the next 20 years. On the military maps these five nations appear as a formidable ring, but they include only 12 percent of Asia's people, and their power does not appear decisive.

The Chinese seem to have no idea of the destructiveness of atomic power. Mao's success has conditioned him to place his reliance on ideology, propaganda, central organization, and mass armies. He is probably correct in assuming that atomic slaughter of Chinese civilians would turn the world against us.

6. For the long haul, an effective counterbalance to China can only be provided by Asian nations strong enough and dedicated enough to defend their independence. The heart of such a counterbalance must eventually lie in India and Japan. Thus these two nations are the primary key to the peace and stability of Asia in the next generation.

As the French discovered in Indochina, the decisive power lies not in bombs, but in people. Between them India and Japan have one-fifth of the world's population. They also hold the strategic geographical positions on the periphery of the great Asian land mass. They have 75 percent of Asia's total industrial output, millions of skilled and potentially skilled workers, and India has vast natural resources. With her long religious and cultural heritage, India offers by far the most significant counterforce to communism in Asia. If she and Japan should slip under Communist domination, the rest of Asia would go, too.

7. India, like most other non-Communist Asian countries, is developing emotional ties with China. This is happening in spite of India's rapid economic progress, the lessening of the internal threat from communism, and the confidence of her leaders that they can meet the economic demands of their people through democratic means. And it is happening in spite of India's opposition to communism as an ideology.

At the same time India and America are drifting steadily apart. Three weeks of intimate discussions with Indian political, business, and religious leaders have convinced me that in a psychological and philosophical sense the gap between our two countries is already perilously great. Reports from Japan indicate the same unhappy development there. The Hatoyama Government was elected on a platform which promised the best from both worlds. If that government eventually fails, the drift of Japanese foreign policy is not likely to be more favorable to us.

8. The fact that the Soviet Union is now willing to provide economic aid for non-Communist Asian nations provides a further complicating element. Competent Soviet technicians are beginning to move into India, in some cases, I was told, following the refusal of the United Kingdom and the United States to meet urgent Indian requests for assistance.

Recently India turned to Russia for help on a steel mill after unsuccessfully seeking loan capital in the United States. Plans for a large mill are now well advanced, with Soviet capital assured. Within a few months, I was told, 200 Indians will be receiving advanced training in industrial management and technical planning in Moscow in connection with this one project. Since we have refused to offer the massive, long-term loans which India requires to meet the bold industrial goals of her Second Five Year Plan,

India may feel forced by the heavy political pressure for rapid progress to turn increasingly to Moscow.

9. The ominous deterioration of America's position in Asia stems from many complicated factors among them the things we say as well as the things we do. Here are some of the major forces working against us:

(a) Many non-Communist Asians, tragically, have come to consider us a militaristic people because most of the things they hear about us are of a military nature. A recent survey of the newspapers in the Indian state of Hyderabad revealed that 82 percent of all mentions of America in a single month involved military subjects, many of which were reports of belligerent-sounding speeches by American military, governmental, and congressional leaders.

Most south Asians place their principal faith in the strength of people and ideas, and tend to discredit the power of weapons. They contrast the success of the militarily weak government of free Burma in suppressing a formidable Communist rebellion, with the failure of massive French military power in colonial Indochina backed by $3 billion of American military aid.

Asians feel that their future will be largely determined by their ability to create inner political and social stability through economic reform and development. Most of them admit that communism is a military danger, but they believe that a more immediate danger lies in Communist subversion feeding on lack of economic progress.

(b) Most Asians are convinced that we are violating, in our conduct of foreign affairs, those principles on which our Nation was based, and from which many new Asian nations borrowed freely in establishing their own constitutions. Asians are particularly critical of what they believe to be our continued compromise on the issue of colonialism. Many of them charge us with tying our Asian policies to Asian leaders whose economic, social, and political views are part of the discredited feudal past. Their Hindu and Buddhist religious beliefs lead them to believe that evil cannot be conquered by evil, and that we have lost sight of this fact.

(c) The Indians in particular believe that their judgment on Asian affairs has been proved by experience to be at least as good as our own. They cite these examples:

In September 1950 they warned us that Red China would enter the Korean war if the United Nations Army crossed the 38th parallel; in July 1953, after heavy casualties, we settled for a truce at approximately the point where they had urged a cease-fire nearly 3 years earlier.

They prophesied that French military power could not hold Indochina even with unlimited American equipment. Their proposal for an Indochina cease-fire in January 1954, was abruptly rejected on the grounds it would aid the Communists. Three months later came the fall of Dienbienphu and the total collapse of the French armies.

They insisted that Chiang could not invade China without involving American forces in a major conflict.

Against this background most Indian leaders are greatly irritated by what they believe to be our failure to consult them or even to treat their views with respect. They are also annoyed by our assurance that the major objective of our Asian policy is to "save them from communism." They consider this approach to be patronizing and tactless, and to ignore the success of their own vigorous efforts to curb internal communism by creating the conditions under which a free society can survive.

(d) These formidable obstacles to understanding are compounded by the fact that most Asians, particularly the south Asians, are ignorant of the events which led up to the cold war impasse. While we were being conditioned by the harsh realities of the Stalin-Hitler pact, by the repudiation of the Yalta agreements, by the rejection of the Baruch atomic plan, by the coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, and by Soviet armament in the face of our disarmament, most non-Communist Asians were caught in the turmoil of their own independence struggle. They were largely oblivious to world events.

(e) Most Asians resent our efforts to force them to choose sides in the cold war. They point out that for 150 years we held ourselves aloof from the struggles of Europe and entered World War II only when we were attacked.

(f) Our energies and fears are concentrated on communism as the primary menace. But many of the present south Asian leaders, because of their own independence struggle, which often involved long jail sentences for them, are more deeply concerned with white colonialism than with Communist imperialism.

10. And yet there is solid ground for hope. Despite the tense attitude of South Asians, their sharp criticism, their frank disillusionment with our country, I am convinced that a deep underlying bond of respect and potential friendship continues to exist. With skill and sensitivity there is still time in which to build on that foundation.

On my recent trip I was struck by the concern with which Indian and Burmese officials discussed American-Asian relations, by the admiration which they continue to express for our democratic heritage, and by the friendly response I received to a blunt speech before the Council of World Affairs in New Delhi on "What is Right With American Foreign Policy." Although most of the audience may have disagreed with my thesis, they vigorously applauded my willingness to speak out frankly.

This reservoir of goodwill, however, is not bottomless. We will run grave risks unless we can soon bring our views into closer harmony, not only with those of most Asians but with those of our Western allies. If free Asia slips away, the support of the majority of Europeans will be difficult if not impossible to hold. The rush for the Communist bandwagon will be heavy.

If this long-range analysis of our position in Asia is even partially valid the question arises, "What can we do about it?" It is impossible in limited space to suggest more than the general direction which our policies might take.

In my opinion, we should start by frankly facing the fact that our ability to influence future events in Asia is strictly limited. India, Japan, and all of Asia may eventually end up under Communist domination, even though we do all the right things. They may remain independent and a growing source of democratic strength and stability, even though we do all the wrong things. Our role is at best marginal.

That margin, however, may be decisive and we cannot afford to throw it away. What we are now losing is our ability even to affect the final result, plus an opportunity to create a partnership with India, Japan, and the South Asian nations—a partnership which might conceivably determine the balance of power for several generations.

As I see it, we must continue to base our Asian policy on the assumption that the Atlantic Pact is the foundation stone of our national security. This means that we must give careful consideration to the views of our Western allies on Asian problems. The situation is complicated by the fact that their views are more radical than our own in dealing with Communist China and more conservative than our own in dealing with colonial problems.

Our present policy is correct in its insistence that a line be drawn against Communist aggression in Asia as in Europe and that this line be defended at whatever cost. However, it is essential for the line, wherever drawn, to be morally as well as physically defensible, and to have the clear support of our European allies and at least the unspoken approval of the great majority of non-Communist Asians.

If, as I believe, our present difficulties are as much the result of our words as our actions, we must find some effective means of reducing our public emphasis on the military aspects of foreign policy. For practical purposes this means a moratorium on warlike speeches and statements by military leaders. American military power must at any cost be kept at peak efficiency. But if we are to convince the world that we are genuine seekers after peace, our foreign policy statements must be less militaristic and less thundering.

Our diplomacy faces a particularly difficult challenge. Its objectives would seem to be, first, to achieve whatever degree of stability and coexistence the Communist powers will allow us; and second, to place on them the onus for whatever cold war differences and tensions continue to exist—and it would be folly to assume that they will not continue. The achievement of this double objective is by no means impossible. It will, however, require a quite different approach in our speeches, public statements, and diplomatic discussions.

In dealing with Asia and indeed with our allies in Europe we must start, not with our interpretations of the world situation, correct though they may be, but whenever possible with the interpretation of those non-Communist nations which may eventually determine the balance of power. Any manufacturer who failed to adopt this basic tactic in selling his products would not long remain solvent. Through diplomatic channels we should frequently discuss the tactics of peaceful solution with such Asian leaders as U Nu, Nehru, and Hatoyama, as well as with Churchill, Eden, and Adenauer.

In order to bring ourselves into a closer relationship with the non-Communist nations of Asia, it is important for us to develop a tenable colonial policy which faces the realities of the present world situation, and yet which remains responsible and practical. Africa requires a fresh, imaginative new look. We must approach Africa as Africa and not simply as a projection of Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal. Our consideration of Indochina as a projection of France, rather than as an Asian question in its own right, has already cost us dearly.

In our information work we should, I believe, place greater emphasis on a positive affirmation of democratic faith and less emphasis on negative, fear-ridden anti-communism. Our information program should respect the first rule of experienced advertisers and start, not egotistically with what we want to sell, but tactfully with what others want to buy.

We must work earnestly and patiently to find a common ground with India and Japan. While living up fully to our other commitments we must develop a priority approach toward these two key nations; without them a free, stable Asia is impossible.

Economic holding actions may be necessary to keep some of the weaker countries from falling apart, but a major share of our aid should go to those nations which have demonstrated growing strength in their own right and which have the potential strength to determine the future. Again, may I emphasize, that this means India and Japan, and, to a growing extent, Pakistan. There is pressing need for a comprehensive aid program which will enable us to work as partners with such nations in their own economic development.

In the present deteriorating situation an adequate loan-grant-technical assistance program is at least as important as the

equivalent effort devoted in Asia to military defense. Those who thoughtlessly or in the name of economy seek to block this effort may carry a heavy responsibility when the history of the present period is written.

It will be particularly tragic if we fail to find a means of harnessing America's industrial genius to the clamoring needs of fast developing, modern India. If we allow the Russians to beat us at our own game—industrial development overseas—it will be the ultimate folly.

I am aware that these proposals which I have made amount to a heavy shift in the present emphasis of our Asian policies. I am also aware of the contrary pressures which clamor for the attention of our policy makers.

The putting out of immediate fires in Asia is indeed a necessary objective of American foreign policy. But what we urgently require is a long-range policy geared to the basic realities of present Asian power and potential Asian power, which eventually will write the history of our generation.

The Crop Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, crop insurance has been stopped in 9 severely hit drought counties in the high plains area.

Colorado counties are Baca, Prowers, and Kiowa.

New Mexico counties are Quay and Curry.

Texas counties are Ochiltree, Deaf Smith, Hansford, and Childress.

Seven more counties will probably lose crop insurance in the near future.

Crop-insurance officials will not extend withdrawal date unless they have additional funds to cover expected losses.

For those farmers using crop insurance, it affords the best, most practical way to handle the land during this extreme drought emergency because it permits the farmers to obtain adequate financing from local sources to carry on proper and good farming practices.

The crop-insurance program is a good boost for the entire economy in the area and an excellent program for leveling off years of high production with low or no production. The soundness of the program should not be judged by losses taken during extreme drought years.

The program has been withdrawn from some of the historically best wheat-producing counties in the Nation.

Immediate reinstatement is necessary because many families cannot operate or obtain financing to get their land farmed this year.

Before the program can be reinstated, crop-insurance officials want assurance that losses, if taken, will not be charged to capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and have suggested either special funds come from legislation—this is time-consuming—or that the President authorize use of emergency funds and allot funds from the President's emergency fund for such purposes.

The withdrawal of the crop-insurance program had the effect of withdrawing on a 24-hour notice since many farmers had pledged this year's crop insurance to plant winter wheat last fall.

Israel Made the Desert Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate next week the seventh anniversary of the founding of Israel, our hearts go out to the millions of Jewish people who have made the desert bloom and established a sturdy democracy in the Middle East.

We recall the agony of the Jewish people as they suffered under the lash of the Nazi storm troopers throughout Europe. We recall a brave people huddled in the streets of the Warsaw ghetto as political gangsters sought to decimate the Jews.

Today the disease of anti-Semitism is carried by a new totalitarian power—world communism. Throughout Eastern Europe, in Russia itself, and now in China, the claims of the cynical Communists to be the benefactors of mankind have been unmasked as the deceitful Reds employ wholesale bigotry to whip disgruntled people in line.

History tells us that a healthy government can profit from the talent and devotion to morality of the Jewish people. A sick and decayed government—Nazi or Communist—traditionally turns on the Jews to cover up the failures and shortcomings of their boastful ambitions.

The American people can be proud of their contribution to the growth of Israel and for our part in relieving the pressures of world anti-Semitism as Israel welcomed Jewish refugees to its shores.

The best way I know of paying tribute to Israel's seventh birthday is to dedicate ourselves to working vigorously against all forms of racial and religious discrimination in this country. We must be on guard to see that anti-Semitism, which has destroyed and weakened other nations, does not gnaw at our foundations.

While we devote ourselves to keeping our own house in order, we must not overlook the perilous political and economic condition Israel finds itself in today.

The tension between Israel and the Arab States continues. In shipping arms to Israel's neighbors to build a bastion of military strength against communism, we have contributed to the tension and hostility lurking along Israel's frontier. We must return to our earlier policy of making peace between Israel and the Arab States our foremost aim in the Middle East.

Israel has passed through its infancy. It can walk now, and we must see that Israel is able to grow up with healthy muscles.

Housing Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspapers carried the story that the Veterans' Administration is about to take steps to tighten credit on housing mortgages. In my opinion this action is unwarranted, unnecessary, and undesirable. The prime issues which are raised in this whole matter are stated most briefly in an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 30, 1955. The text of the editorial is as follows:

TOO MUCH HOUSING CREDIT?

A group of leading life insurance executives has called on the administration to tighten up on both Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration mortgage loans. This is not the first warning that 30-year, no-down-payment mortgages may result in damage to the economy. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, raised his voice some weeks ago against poor quality credit arrangements in this field. The life insurance executives, obviously concerned because of the heavy real estate investments which their companies have, said the long-term loans with no down payment or almost none are "an open invitation to a boom-bust situation in home building." They also are costly to borrowers.

Because it is difficult for most of us to realize that what is good for the economy one month may not be good the next, there has been a natural reluctance to do anything to check the housing boom. After all, housing has been one of the major sustaining forces of the postwar prosperity. Moreover, the need for housing, especially low-cost housing, still is substantial. But an all-time record in housing construction was set last year, and in January and February this year housing starts were up 25 percent.

Now that the economy is operating at a very high level a slight tug on the reins ought not to have an adverse effect on construction activity. But it might put the industry in a stronger position over the long pull. The insurance executives did not suggest a specific governmental program, but it was indicated that some of them thought the addition of a 5-percent downpayment on both veteran and FHA mortgages would have a stabilizing effect. Such a mild check ought to be seriously considered in the interest of stability in the construction industry.

Though the Republican Party most of all fears a depression in 1956, for whatever political repercussions it might bring, they seemed prepared nevertheless to yield to the bankers' pressure to reduce housing construction below present levels. The way the Washington Post and Times Herald editorial put it, there should be a slight tug on the reins of mortgage credit.

Those who do not have solely the bankers' interest at heart sharply disagree.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert statements taking issue with this whole pressure campaign against the American people:

First is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald written by Leo Goodman, and dated April 5, 1955. It answers the editorial which I have previously mentioned. The letter is as follows:

HOUSING CREDIT

Deeply disappointed in the editorial position taken March 30 under the title "Too Much Housing Credit?" This question of credit goes to the heart of the availability of housing for the American people. Millions of families need more adequate housing. Only those who oppose the development of an adequate supply to meet the demand are advocating curtailment of housing construction. The Washington Post and Times Herald suggests "a slight tug on the reins," and then suggests that such "a mild check ought to be seriously considered in the interest of stability in the construction industry."

After careful study Senator Taft in 1945 advocated immediate expansion of the housing construction industry to 1,250,000 a year for a minimum of 10 years. Later, during the debate in the Senate on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and the subsequently enacted Housing Act of 1949, he raised his estimate to 1,500,000.

Competent students of housing have recently revised their figure upward and suggested the need of 2 million units a year for at least 10 years. Witnesses before the Congress, ranging from Walter Reuther to Prof. William L. C. Wheaton of the University of Pennsylvania, have urged 2 million units a year. Recently Public Housing Commissioner Slusser has pointed to the 8 million substandard homes in existence in the United States today.

The National Association of Home Builders in their monthly magazine Correlator, for February 1954, advocated, old and new, 2 million homes a year for the next decade.

All these competent sources reject, as now the building industry itself finally does, the thesis that family formation is the sole basis for calculating new housing construction. Economist Miles Colean, one who formerly used family formation primarily for first predictions, has now shifted. In last September's Architectural Forum he said: "Other influences are offsetting this bearish (decline in the rate of family formation) factor." He listed:

1. Increased security in old age.
2. The increasing propensity to spend.
3. The upward shift in average income.
4. Continued growth in personal income.
5. The continued high birth rate.

Millions now condemned to living in the slums would disagree that we need a mild check on building. Only when 10-year average of construction for a sufficient period exceeds the 10-year average of family formation do we need to consider credit restriction.

LEO GOODMAN.

WASHINGTON.

Next is a press release issued by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, dated April 14, 1955. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD SUSTAIN RATE OF HOME PRODUCTION, CONSIDER INCREASING IT, NAREB TELLS SENATE

The United States should sustain the current rate of home production and of purchase and consider increasing it—not cutting it down—Henry G. Waltemade, New York, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, yesterday informed the Senate Subcommittee on Housing.

This rate rests upon the healthy expansion taking place in the economy as a whole, he wrote to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee, who had invited his views on the question of "whether there is excessive credit and overbuilding in the industry."

Mr. Waltemade warned that if the market for homes "should be curtailed through restrictive action, its decline would reverberate throughout our sensitively balanced economy.

"Last year's sustained healthy home market is credited by economists with turning general trends from decline in the early part of the year to a productive upward movement in the second half of the year. A similar cause-and-effect relationship in the other direction can follow any deliberately planned restriction on home production and home buying.

"The home market has none of the characteristics of an erratic or inflationary surge, or of a building boom running out of gear with general economic movements," Mr. Waltemade added, listing the following points to demonstrate its stability:

"1. Today's home-mortage debt is sound and manageable.

"2. Current production is emphasizing home ownership in response to demand.

"3. Current home production is concentrating its output in the low and moderate price ranges.

"4. Goal of the private home production industry is to keep new production high and thus permit removal of unfit housing."

"Indications are," Mr. Waltemade said, "that we should expect to stabilize at the present rate of production while, in addition, increasing our supply of low-cost and low-rent adequate housing by stepping up the volume of rehabilitation and modernization of that part of our housing inventory that is susceptible to such treatment."

"This latter method of adding to our supply of good housing can be soundly stimulated by the new section 220 mortgage insurance provided in the Housing Act of 1954," he added.

Describing the soundness of today's mortgage debt, Mr. Waltemade said, "There is no parallel with the situation that prevailed 25 years ago. In 1954 mortgage debt represented only 37 percent of national income," he explained, "whereas it had equalled 62 percent of national income in 1930.

"Mortgage debt in the late twenties was expanded in financing hotels, apartment buildings, and office buildings. Today it is accounted for principally by purchase by families of homes of their own."

Mr. Waltemade contrasted the short-term loans accompanied by high interest rates and frequent second and third mortgages in the late twenties with the modern long-term amortized first mortgage geared to a monthly payment which the home buyer is qualified to meet.

"Whether home production may soundly be increased is a question worthy of study," he said. "Our population is increasing at the rate of 3 million per year. A larger proportion of our adult population is now in a married status compared to 1950. Last year there was a record total of more than 4 million births. Owing to a trend in marriages and births that began in the 1940's, a new high in housing demand is generally anticipated in the early 1960's. Our generally rising standards in housing and the ability to pay for them, largely account for today's housing demand."

Next there follows a press release issued by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, dated April 24, 1955, which contains quotations from a letter by CIO President Walter P. Reuther to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN:

CIO PRESIDENT REUTHER TAKES SHARP ISSUE WITH CRITICS OF RESIDENTIAL HOUSING BOOM—CALLS FOR A CONTINUED HIGH CONSTRUCTION RATE

CIO President Walter P. Reuther today took sharp issue with critics of the present residential housing construction boom and called for a continued high construction rate.

In a letter to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, responding to the Senator's inquiry as to whether CIO viewed present housing construction as excessive, Mr. Reuther said:

"It is our view that the well-organized and widely disseminated propaganda which depicts our present rate of residential construction as excessive because it exceeds the current rate of new-family formation either is based on ignorance or reflects a deliberate effort to deceive the American people."

The CIO president said that while present residential construction was at an all-time high "it still falls far short of meeting the housing needs of the American people."

He cited authoritative studies indicating the country needs an annual new home construction of 2 million units for the next 10 years. The reasons, he said, were to provide housing for new families, to meet normal replacement requirements, to rebuild units lost because of slum clearance and other public improvements, to accommodate families still overcrowded and to make it possible to vacate substandard dwellings which are not suitable for rehabilitation.

Mr. Reuther said the "rate of new-family formation could be conceived of as a major determinant of the need for new-home construction only if there were no need to replace existing substandard structures, no public or industrial programs, or acts of God, which destroy thousands of existing structures each year that must be replaced, and no preexisting shortages or overcrowding."

"If those who charge that the present building rate is excessive were forthright, they would admit that they are not concerned with housing needs at all but rather with housing prices. Actually, they fear that the value of existing properties will fall if the present rate of new-home construction is maintained. Their views are based on the false assumption that the Nation's economic well-being is preserved by scarcity, not by abundance," he continued.

Mr. Reuther said that "the American people fear a decline in economic activity, not an expansion of it. Only a handful of short-sighted individuals who cannot be persuaded that a constantly expanding and prospering America is possible fear rising production and look upon a decline in various segments of our economy as healthy."

The CIO president observed that America's concern "should be with a continuing program to aid and encourage home construction for sale and for rent and with the overall economic growth which these programs can so substantially stimulate. Submission to the fears of the prophets of scarcity will not avoid economic disaster; it will assure it."

The final insertion is a release from the New York State division of housing, by Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray, who was formerly chief of the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, March 17.—Recent predictions of a lessening of the housing need were attacked last night by State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray as poor and short-sighted statistical forecasting.

Examination of all the factors involved point instead to a tremendous increase in

need, he declared, in an address before the Real Estate and Mortgage Forum of the Savings Bank Women of New York, held at the Park Sheraton Hotel.

Commissioner McMurray cited as factors contributing to the need the huge increase to be expected in the early 1960's in the number of new families to be formed by the post-World War II babies, the great backlog of unfulfilled need which increases each year, the increased incomes of families which will continue, the formation of larger sized families, earlier marriages among our population, undoubling, the additional units required as a result of slum clearance and housing demolition for roads and other purposes, and the formation of households other than families.

Commissioner McMurray pointed out that the Federal Reserve Board's annual report published last week on consumers' buying plans shows more people, 9.6 percent, expect to buy homes this year than in any year since 1948. In 1950 it was 8.4 percent, in 1954 it was 6.6 percent. If the volume of construction in 1955 conforms to the volume of these previous years as compared to people's plans, 1955 construction would be at an all-time high of over 1,500,000 dwellings.

In New York State, Commissioner McMurray reported, the rate of construction is lagging behind that of the Nation. In 1950, when there was a national construction level of almost 1,400,000, the rate of construction in New York State was 124,000 units, or 8.85 percent of the national total. The year just completed, 1954, saw a rate of 1,220,000 nationally, while there were only 94,000 starts in New York State, or 7.70 percent of the national total.

In terms of the need in New York State, housing starts certainly should be in the same proportion, or greater than that of 1950. Certainly, as a goal, we should not count on less.

Aside from the FHA insured rental and cooperative-type housing and a relatively few projects financed by some of the large financial institutions, there has been practically no other rental-type housing built in New York State in the past 20 years.

Between 1950 and 1953, in New York City, the amount of money loaned by savings banks for mortgages of $50,000 and over (in which class new apartment house mortgages are found) declined by 29 percent on the average. By way of contrast, during the same general period, from 1949 to 1954, the mortgage portfolio of New York City savings banks increased by 87.5 percent from $4 billion to $7.6 billion.

The fact that New York City has so many urban renewal problems offers even greater opportunities for sound investment, he indicated to the savings bank women.

Commissioner McMurray described his philosophy of Government action to improve the welfare of the people as based on a reliance upon reason, knowledge, and truth. He indicated the many approaches he is making toward evolving a program of cooperation and coordination with the building industry, financial institutions, Federal and municipal agencies so that the State division of housing can better meet the needs of all the people.

Much of his attention, he said, is being devoted toward helping develop measures to stimulate the production of a large supply of good housing for the average wage earner and salaried person, the large group who are, for the most part, still in the no-man's-land of housing, ineligible for subsidized public housing because of incomes a little too high, yet earning too little to buy their own homes or rent available FHA housing at current high costs. He predicted the development of a number of such aids within a short time.

Commissioner McMurray also pointed out various ways in which deteriorating areas of the city could be redeveloped through a combined use of Federal urban renewal aids and those available under the State's slum clearance program. He indicted the role savings banks could play in this process and urged their assumption of their full share of responsibility in rebuilding the city.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the evidence which points to a growing need for home construction, we must all realize the attempt to cut back the volume of construction is obviously inspired by those who profit most on scarcity and who fear a housing program to meet the real needs of the American people.

I am sure that the members of the House Armed Services Committee will want to study carefully the long-range implications of the announced intention of the Veterans' Administration to bar GI home mortgages which require no down payment or closing fees from the veteran-purchaser. If this is done, many veterans will be denied the opportunity to buy homes which they urgently need for their growing families.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1955

Rev. Lawrence D. Folkemer, of the Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant us the knowledge of Thy holy will and then the grace and courage to accept it. Deliver us from any pious and superficial praying of the petition "Thy will be done" when we have no thought of pursuing any but our own selfish will. May Thy will be done in us first and then through us in the world.

Help us to put our trust in Thee, O God, and not in ourselves only, lest we lose the ability to trust ourselves and others. Teach us to look unto the hills, daily, from whence cometh our help.

May we never become too big or too important to pray, nor too proud to confess our sins, either as individuals or as a people. Convince us by Thy holy spirit that prayer is power and repentance is not weakness but moral strength. Whatever may be done here today that is good and true, uphold by Thy gracious power; whatever may be shortsighted and weak, bring to noneffect; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 13, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 13, 1955,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 13, 1955, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 138) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MCCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any statements made during the morning hour be limited to the usual 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN ILLEGAL PRACTICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of the appropriation for operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission, for travel to be performed by the Division of Organization and Personnel in the current fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOMINATION OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL AS CADETS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND (S. DOC. NO. 39)

A letter from the Managing Trustee and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 15th Annual Report on that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, ADJACENT TO GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit on lands adjacent to Great Smoky Mountains National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOHN L. BOYER, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REIMBURSEMENT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSMISSION OF OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT-MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON PROGRESS AND FEASIBILITY OF TOLL ROADS AND THEIR RELATION TO FEDERAL-AID PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the progress and feasibility of toll roads, and their relation to the Federal-aid program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Resolution 25

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 205, which would provide funds to the several States for the development of public library services in rural areas without such services or without adequate services; and

"Whereas the passage of the library services bill would provide direct cultural and educational benefits of incalculable value to more than two-thirds of the people of this State; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Alabama is justly proud that the library services bill was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator LISTER HILL of this State, and that a companion measure was introduced in the United States House of Representatives by the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, also of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama hereby commends Senator LISTER HILL for his action in introducing said Senate bill 205, and urges the immediate passage of the bill by the Congress of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house transmit a copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Alabama.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama, March 29, 1955.

"Concurred in and adopted by the senate March 29, 1955.

"Approved by the Governor April 8, 1955."

Resolutions adopted by the Gate of Heaven Council, No. 468, Knights of Columbus, Huntington, and Brooklyn Council, No. 60, Brooklyn, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Society of American Military Engineers, Washington, D. C., relating to the training and utilization of specialized scientific and engineering personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotments for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

"Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas the allotment of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers can not operate their farm successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

"Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to provide a premium on milling grades of hard spring wheat and to allocate as a minimum to any operator who has raised 100 acres or more of hard wheat during the past 5 years, an acreage equal to the maximum acreage of such operator, but in no event should such allocation if under 100 acres ever be reduced; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans, the same as death pensions granted to surviving World War I widows and orphans

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World War I who had 90 days or more of active military service in the Armed Forces of the United States or who were discharged for disability incurred in active military service in less than 90 days, we believe the same legislation should be passed giving the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to surviving widows and orphans of World War I due to the fact that the surviving widows of World War II and the Korean conflict deceased veterans have young children and are very much in need of assistance in caring for their families: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact necessary legislation granting to the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to the surviving widows and orphans of World War I deceased veterans; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution properly authenticated to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress of the United States, and

to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution Z–1

"Concurrent resolution urging that import restrictions upon Selkirk wheat be eased

"Whereas the farmers of the State of North Dakota suffered heavy damage during the 1954 crop season resulting from a heavy infestation of 15B rust upon hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas a hard spring wheat named Selkirk has been developed in Canada which is highly rust-resistant; and

"Whereas such Selkirk wheat is available for sale in Canada but cannot be exported to the United States because of an embargo by the Canadian Government; and

"Whereas if a sufficient supply of rust-resistant varieties of hard spring wheat is not obtained by the farmers of the State of North Dakota, extreme hardship may result during the 1955 crop season: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That this legislative assembly hereby urges and requests that all responsible officials of the United States Government take all possible action to obtain the termination of the embargo imposed by the Canadian Government on the export of Selkirk wheat, so that a reasonable amount of Selkirk wheat, of a purity test not less than 95 percent, can be made available to the farmers of the State of North Dakota for planting in the spring of 1955; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States; the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; and to all Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation; Be it further

"Resolved, That the control and purchase of such Selkirk wheat as may be obtained be handled by the North Dakota Experiment Station at the Agricultural College at Fargo, and distributed throughout the State by the county extension agents on a fair and equitable basis.

"F. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution J–1

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to authorize North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming to enter into a compact for an equitable division among the States of the water supply of the Little Missouri River

"Whereas there is an urgent need for a compact among North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming for equitable apportionment of the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries among those States to assure owners of lands lying near or adjacent to this river or its tributaries their equitable share of the waters thereof for stock watering, irrigation, and domestic use: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming to negotiate a compact or agreement, upon such terms and conditions as Congress may deem fit, and require, not later than January 1, 1959, for a division and equitable apportionment among the States for the water supply of the Little Missouri River and streams tributary thereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be, and is hereby, directed to mail copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota in Congress, and to the Governors of the States of South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a study and investigation into the feasibility of establishing additional manufacturing enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations in this State

"Whereas the establishment of a jewel-bearing plant adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation has provided much-needed job opportunities for Indians residing in the area and has brought into productivity a formerly unutilized labor force and has thereby been an aid to the general economy of the area and to the wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas the employment records of the jewel-bearing plant located adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation show that absenteeism and turnover among Indian employees are lower than the national average for similar industries; and

"Whereas the locating of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations is a positive act of providing social and economic opportunities for rehabilitation of and self-help for Indians; and

"Whereas the establishment of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations has proved to be beneficial to the Indians residing on and near such reservations, to the State of North Dakota, and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact proper legislation to provide for a thorough investigation and affirmative encouragement for such self-rehabilitating projects which will result in the elimination of dependency and the establishment of a substantial self-supporting status for Indian people; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Director of Defense Mobilization, and to each of the Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution X

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would create an agricultural rating for pilots engaged in the aerial application of agricultural chemicals

"Whereas the need for pilots and airplanes for aerial application of agricultural chemicals in the State of North Dakota and many other Midwest farm States is increasing more rapidly than the available commercially licensed pilots; and

"Whereas in North Dakota during the year of 1954 over 200 airplanes and pilots were licensed by the State aeronautics commission to engage in aerial crop spraying and dusting, and as newer chemicals are developed for the control of insects and plant diseases, the needs of the farmers of this State may require as many as three or four hundred agricultural planes and pilots; and

"Whereas in the State of North Dakota and other agricultural States there is a large reserve of privately licensed pilots and flying farmers, some of whom could qualify for a Federal agricultural rating, if the rating were based on flying ability, flight hours, and knowledge of agricultural chemicals, which would greatly relieve the present and future shortage of pilots qualified to engage in agricultural flying: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact such legislation as may be necessary to create an agricultural pilot rating for aerial crop spraying and dusting activities in the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.; to the chairmen of the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the Congress of the United States; and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution opposing repeal of long and short haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long and short haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the charging of a higher rate for a short haul than for a longer haul, the shorter being included within the longer, is now forbidden on North Dakota intrastate traffic in section 49–0409 of the North Dakota Revised Code of 1943; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from North Dakota, particularly on grain, lignite, and other commodities, to the detriment of producers, shippers, and consumers of the State of North Dakota; that it would encourage discriminations in

rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committe on Armed Services:

"Resolution 45

"Whereas some large industrial areas in this State are presently suffering from excessive unemployment because of curtailed production; and

"Whereas many large contracts for defense materials, such as M-48 tanks, which could have been manufactured with existing facilities in such areas of surplus labor in this State, have been awarded to large companies in other States; and

"Whereas it is the declared policy of the Office of Defense Mobilization to encourage full utilization of existing production facilities and workers in preference to creating new plants or moving workers and also to award negotiated procurement contracts to industries in labor surplus areas provided no price differential is paid therefor; and

"Whereas the requirement that no price differential be paid in order to award such contracts to firms in labor surplus areas has, to a great extent, defeated the purposes of the before-mentioned policy which was designed to relieve unemployment in distressed areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature hereby urgently requests the Federal Government to bring about an immediate amendment to Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 so that labor surplus areas may be given consideration for Government contracts, even where some price differential is involved, provided that in the opinion of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization the requirements of the distressed area justify the additional cost involved; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature also requests the Federal Government to revise its present policy of concentrating the production of certain defense items, such as tanks, in the hands of a single large producer and provide instead that such items shall be manufactured at a number of different facilities throughout the country with special consideration being given to facilities located in areas suffering from critical unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to take all necessary steps to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the senate,
"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary.

"In assembly April 2, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the assembly.
"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk."

DESIGNATION OF LAKE BEHIND McNARY DAM AS ALDRICH LAKE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Oregon State Legislature asking that the lake behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River be named Aldrich Lake, in tribute to the late E. B. Aldrich, publisher of the Pendleton East Oregonian, and a pioneer in the crusade to develop waterpower and navigation on this great waterway of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Aldrich is remembered throughout Oregon as a man of integrity and vision, who defied carping critics in his persistent advocacy of multipurpose development of the Columbia River. Some of these critics predicted that Columbia River projects never would fulfill their purpose. The success of these projects is the most enduring monument which Mr. Aldrich could have erected to his memory.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, under the rule, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 12

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Senators and Representatives from Oregon in Congress of the United States of America, and to the Board on Geographic Names:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas in 1954 the President of the United States of America threw the governing switch which sent thousands of kilowatts of electrical energy, from a mighty dam that had just been constructed spanning the Columbia River, an historical day for the Nation marking another milestone in the progress of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas it was proper and fitting that the dam should be named McNary in order to perpetuate the name of this illustrious pioneer statesman, Charles Linza McNary, who, cooperating with his friends and neighbors, had within the span of one lifetime built from an unexplored wilderness and sagebrush country a progressive and stable part of our United States, homes and industries of the Northwest consuming hundreds of thousands of kilowatts provided by McNary Dam and other dams promoted by Senator McNary and his neighbors; and

Whereas Oregon and Washington owe so much to pioneer citizens whose hard work and fortitude made the Northwest great; and

Whereas the dam being named McNary after a pioneer statesman, it would be proper and fitting that the waters creating a lake back of McNary Dam be named Aldrich Lake as a memento to that tireless newspaper editor, Edwin Burton Aldrich, who spent his entire life using his pen to achieve greater things for the Pacific Northwest through the development of its water resources; and

Whereas E. B. Aldrich, editor of the East Oregonian in Pendleton, Oreg., was the leader at the first meeting ever called for the development of the resources of the Columbia River; and

Whereas E. B. Aldrich was one of the Northwest's representatives sent to alert the Congress of our Nation and Corps of Engineers of the power potentialities of the Columbia River; and

Whereas it was E. B. Aldrich and his associates who secured the first money ever appropriated for the study of the Columbia River; and from that meager appropriation of $50,000 from the Congress of the United States and $10,000 from the State of Oregon an embryo was created from which has emerged multipurpose dams on the Columbia River; and

Whereas although E. B. Aldrich's pen was forever stilled by his death in 1950, a record of his achievements should be marked for all time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to name this lake Aldrich Lake; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Wayne Morse, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Richard Neuberger, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Walter Norblad, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Sam Coon, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Edith Green, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Harris Ellsworth, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Board of Geographic Names.

Adopted by house March 23, 1955.
EDITH BYRON LOW,
Chief Clerk.
E. B. GEARY,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate March 30, 1955.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

REMOVAL OF BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO INLAND WATER CARRIERS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a very important letter from John P. Madgett, general manager of the Dairyland Power Cooperative, which serves 87,000 farmers and rural businesses in the 4-State area of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois. Mr. Madgett writes concerning the adverse effect of legislation to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to inland water carriers by amending part 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE,
La Crosse, Wis., March 25, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On February 4, 1955, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce introduced by request Senate bill 951. The purpose of the bill is to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to inland water carriers by amending part III of the Interstate Commerce Act. Passage of the bill would have the effect of extending the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inland water transportation of dry bulk commodities.

A close perusal of this bill leads us to the conclusion that we oppose passage of the legislation for the following reasons:

1. The time schedule, geographic rights, and commodity rights provisions of the bill are needlessly restrictive. They are unrealistic, unfair, and in our opinion totally unconscionable.

2. It will discriminate against the Mississippi waterway while still exempting traffic in the Great Lakes and in the off-shore trades.

3. We believe it is a needless extension of Federal authority.

4. It will throttle and kill present healthy competition.

5. It will promote monopoly and a cartel type of economy.

6. It will unduly benefit few carriers to the detriment of the many.

7. Because of the operation of the price structure for water transportation when under Interstate Commerce Commission regulation as exemplified by 15 years past experience, we are convinced that the enactment of S. 951 will have the effect of substantially increasing the rates for shipment of bulk commodities and will signal the end of low-cost inland water transportation.

8. Dairyland Power Cooperative and the 87,000 farmers and rural businesses which it serves will be adversely affected for various reasons. The price of coal will rise and, hence, the cost of electrical energy will go up. Farmers will be paying more for fertilizer, and profits on grain sales when shipped by barge will go down. A wide variety of prices to consumers will increase.

In contrast we believe that under existing law:

1. We have open, free and fair competition among all carriers. Even certificated common carriers are free to and do compete with the unregulated carriers for liquid and dry bulk cargoes.

2. There has been a healthy and continuing expansion of the transporation industry without regulation. The bulk commodity field is one in which "small business" has had a chance and where there is presently a minimum of monopoly.

3. Competition has held the price structure in line to the mutual benefit of shipper, carrier, consumer, and the general public. None has been hurt, everyone has benefited.

4. Long-term "tailor-made" service contracts between carrier and shipper or buyer characterizes much of the current contract carrier business. Dairyland Power Cooperative, one of the many large buyers of coal, sees no valid reason why this system should not continue.

As you know, Dairyland is now supplying electrical energy to 87,000 farmers and rural businesses in the 4-State area of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, of which 60,000 are located in the State of Wisconsin. Of Dairyland's 9 generating stations, with a total capacity of 165,000 kilowatts, the 3 largest are steam power stations located on the Mississippi River at Alma, Genoa and Cassville. An additional 50,000-kilowatt unit is now being installed at Alma and will be on the line in late 1956. Coal represents the largest single item in the cost of production of electrical energy in steam stations, representing approximately 50 to 55 percent of the total final cost. These 3 plants annually consume 300,000 tons of coal which is brought by barge up the Mississippi River during the navigation season. Years of competition have established a differential between rail and water transportation in this region so that at the present time Dairyland can get coal by barge at an average of $1.75 per ton cheaper than by rail. Should the price of coal substantially increase for any reason you can well appreciate the increased costs involved inasmuch as we anticipate that increased demands for electricity will require us to use a minimum of 500,000 tons of coal annually by 1960.

We appreciate the heavy duties which you are carrying and that this is just one of many bills which you must consider. However, we, the directors, management, and farmer members of the Dairyland Power Cooperative, would sincerely appreciate any effort that you can make before either the Senate or House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order to get the foregoing viewpoints before the committee. Should you desire further information from us as to our operations and as to our opposition to this bill, kindly feel free to write.

Yours very truly,

JOHN P. MADGETT,
General Manager.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Richard Jack Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration; and

S. 1679. A bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1680. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Washington Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1682. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Intriago Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1683. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1684. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Luxembourg, also known as Henry Luxemburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1685. A bill for the relief of Christa Linek Toth; and

S. 1686. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Akbar Ashraf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1687. A bill for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1688. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1689. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Julia van Reigersberg Versluys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1691. A bill to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt transportation by air taxi from the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1694. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1695. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special 10-cent piece in recognition of the recent discovery of a vaccine by Dr. Jonas E. Salk for the prevention of poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1696. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration: Ivan N. Burlingame, John Marlin, Thomas C. McDougald, and Irene K. Shinn, which has been submitted by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany this bill the letter forwarded with this proposal by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1678) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NIXON: Enclosed is a bill for the relief of the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration: Ivan N. Burlingame, John Marlin, Thomas C. McDougald, and Irene K. Shinn.

The purpose of the bill is to reimburse the employees in amounts totaling $84.84, representing payments made from their personal funds to cover deficiencies incurred in their accounts without any fault or negligence on their part. The accounts were the accounts maintained in connection with ownership and operation of a war-housing project. The Public Housing Administration operated these projects and the employees involved were accountable for the funds. The relevant facts in each case are set out below:

Ivan N. Burlingame was general housing manager of the war-housing projects in Badger, Wis. He paid $10 from his personal funds to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to cover the deposit of a counterfeit Federal Reserve note. The counterfeit currency was included in a deposit made by the project office and received in the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago on July 6, 1954. The bank notified Mr. Burlingame on July 7 that in verifying the currency and coin included in the deposit it found a $10 counterfeit note, which it turned over to the United States Secret Service on that date, at its request. The bank transmitted the joint counterfeit receipt to Mr. Burlingame and asked him to remit $10 to the bank to cover the counterfeit note. Thereafter, on July 14, 1954, Mr. Burlingame sent his personal check in the amount of $10, payable to the Treasurer of the United States, to the bank. Mr. Burlingame stated that the counterfeit note was accepted by one of two project employees from a project tenant in payment of rent due and that it is quite impossible to determine who accepted the note or from what tenant it might have been received. He is of the opinion that in all probability the tenant who had the note in his possession and used it for paying his rent was unaware of the fact that it was counterfeit. Mr. Burlingame asked the Secret Service to return the counterfeit note to his office so that it could be studied by the employees who accept rent. The employees, as well as Mr. Burlingame, experienced extreme difficulty in detecting any difference between it and a valid note. The Federal Reserve bank advised Mr. Burlingame that the note would not be classified as particularly difficult for its trained sorters to detect, but that to a nontrained person it would be most difficult to detect.

John Marlin was general housing manager of the war housing projects in Tullahoma, Tenn. He paid $29.84 from his personal funds to replace stolen project funds. On July 26, 1948, in checking up cash at the close of the day, a shortage of $160 was discovered. The local police and FBI were called in to investigate the matter. A meeting of maintenance and office employees developed the fact that three individuals had been in the office while the clerk-stenographer was momentarily absent getting tools from the shop and one of them could have robbed the cash drawer of the missing amount during her absence. The local police and the FBI investigated 2 of 3 suspects in the case, found 1 of them guilty of the theft, and obtained a confession from him. Mr. Marlin had in the meantime replaced the amount of the loss from his personal funds. The total amount of recovery from the thief was $130.16, leaving unrecovered personal funds advanced by Mr. Marlin in the amount of $29.84.

Thomas C. McDougald was the management aide of the Carver Court housing project in Coatesville, Pa. He paid $25 from his personal funds to replace change funds stolen from the Carver Court housing project office. The agent cashier serving at the time in Coatesville, Pa., had been advanced a fund of $100. A portion of this fund was used for making change at the Carver Court Housing Project, as well as at another project in the locality. The sum of $25 had been advanced from the fund to Mr. McDougald for the purpose of making change and was kept in a safe at the project. During the weekend of January 14, 1951, the project safe was broken open and robbed of the $25 change fund together with $45.50 in rent payments taken after banking hours. The $25 change fund was replaced by Mr. McDougald and was included in the final accounting to the Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, by the agent cashier. The $45.50 in stolen rent money was charged against August J. Fink, general housing manager, who has been granted relief in this amount by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1947, 67 Stat. 720.

Irene K. Shinn was accounting clerk in the project office at San Diego, Calif. She voluntarily paid $20 from her personal funds to cover a counterfeit Federal Reserve Bank note. On January 9, 1950, she unknowingly accepted the note during the course of collecting $5,937.10 in receipts for the day. The counterfeit note was included in a shipment of funds to the depository, the United States National Bank of San Diego, on January 9, but was not detected until after the depository had forwarded the same wrapper of "twenties" on January 12 to the Federal Reserve Bank of Los Angeles. The Federal Reserve Bank impounded the note and turned it over to the United States Secret Service. The note was made available to the depository and representatives of the project office for scrutiny. The depository and project representatives stated that the counterfeit was very difficult to detect. The depository requested replacement of the counterfeit note and the project office had no alternative but to recover from the employee, Mrs. Shinn, who had accepted the note.

The act of August 1, 1947, 61 Stat. 720, authorizes the General Accounting Office to relieve, in proper cases, accountable officers of responsibility on account of deficiencies of Government funds, vouchers, et cetera, if, while the officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part. The Comptroller General has held, however, 27 Comp. Gen. 404, and in several subsequent decisions involving the application of this act, that its provisions have no application where restitution has been made by the employee involved, since in such a case there is no deficiency in his accounts for the relief of which consideration might be given under that act. In each of the four cases outlined above, the persons were advised that under this interpretation by the Comptroller General it would not be possible to obtain reimbursement.

In the case of Ivan N. Burlingame we sent a letter to the General Accounting Office on September 22, 1954, requesting reconsideration of the ruling in 27 Comp. Gen. 404. In this request it was pointed out that an interpretation of the relief statute which renders it inapplicable solely because the accountable officer has made payment seems to defeat the purpose of the act and tends to penalize accountable officers who manifest good faith by putting their accounts in balance pending determination of the question of relief. In decision B-121557, dated November 5, 1954, in response to the letter of September 22, 1954, the General Accounting Office reaffirmed its earlier decision to the effect that the act of August 1, 1947, does not apply in such cases. Concerning the effect of this interpretation on accountable officers who acted in good faith, the General Accounting Office stated:

"This Office has recognized that inequities would arise as a result of such interpretation of the relief act involved and the matter has been thoroughly considered, not only at the time the decision referred to above was rendered but also in a number of subsequent decisions involving the application of that act. See particularly, B-101301, July 19, 1951 (copy enclosed), wherein the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was advised that relief could not be granted under the act to an accountable officer who had covered with personal funds a deficiency in her account resulting from her acceptance of a counterfeit $50 bill. For the reasons therein stated, it is the view of this Office that the act is open to no other construction and that any inequities which arise from such construction are for the consideration of the Congress. Consequently, this office has, in proper cases, favorably reported on several private relief measures and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was advised that this office would not object to his sponsorship of a relief bill on behalf of the employee involved in that decision and on behalf of other employees of his administration similarly situated."

In view of the denial of relief in such cases by the General Accounting Office and the fact that the officers and employees acted in good faith to enable the accounts to be placed in a state of balance, congressional relief in the form of the bill herewith enclosed appears to be the only solution to an otherwise inequitable result, and I therefore respectfully recommend favorable action on this bill by the Congress.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT OF JULY 1, 1898

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. The proposed legislation was forwarded from the National Bankruptcy Conference, and was submitted by Mr. Horsky, a member of a prominent law firm.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1679) to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SEED ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUM-

PHREY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act. The purpose of the bill is to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to "knowingly" violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1688) to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISTRIBUTION OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to introduce a bill and briefly discuss this thrilling subject. The world is so beset with problems and dilemmas that some of us occasionally feel downcast.

In recent days we have witnessed a triumph of the human spirit. The development by Dr. Jonas E. Salk of a successful vaccine to prevent infantile paralysis is an historic occasion that equals the invention of pasteurization, the defeat of yellow fever, and the stamping out of smallpox.

We have our troubles, and they are solved only to have new ones replace them. The perfection of the polio vaccine must make us all feel that human ingenuity and dedication can make a better world. It is thrilling to witness this landmark in the battle against a crippling disease.

Every parent must have felt a surge of relief when the official announcement came that the Salk vaccine has proven to be 60 percent to 80 percent effective as a preventative of infantile paralysis. That was the verdict on the mass innoculation experiment of last year.

Since that time the vaccine has been improved so that it is even more effective.

Millions of Americans have contributed their dimes and dollars for some 20 years to the March of Dimes, and this victory belongs in large measure to all of the people in the United States.

It belongs also to those dedicated men and women of science who have worked around the clock in laboratories to test and test. Even the experiments that failed contributed to the final success—as one alternative after another eliminated false starts and narrowed down the path.

And the final victory belongs to a brilliant young doctor, Jonas Salk, and his associates, who had the imagination and industry and faith to bring forth this new blessing to mankind.

He was asked who owns the patent on the vaccine, and replied that no one does. "Can you patent the sun?" he inquired. He said that it belongs to the American people, who contributed to the March of Dimes.

Here indeed is a dedicated and unselfish man, whose greatest compensation is contributing to the welfare of mankind.

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY TO BE CONGRATULATED

The private pharmaceutical industry of the country is deserving of our thanks and praise. It has invested millions of dollars in manufacturing vast quantities of the vaccine before it was known definitely that it was a success. The industry has performed a great public service.

PROBLEMS OF SHORTAGE

However, there has not been time to manufacture sufficient quantities of the vaccine to meet the total needs of our whole population before the polio season this summer.

Great stress has been placed upon this fact in the press and radio. However, there is no great cause for alarm—if we act wisely and unselfishly.

There is sufficient vaccine for some 39 million children. Dr. Salk has said that he believes the vaccine may be more effective and more widely available if only 2 inoculations are given instead of the 3 inoculations used in last year's test. By this method at least 50 million sets of vaccinations can be given this year.

WHO SHALL DECIDE PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

It is necessary that the available vaccine be used sensibly and most effectively. If the proper methods of distribution are used, even those who are not vaccinated will be protected, Dr. Salk has explained. If those most susceptible to infection are inoculated, the sources of infection to those who are not vaccinated are reduced.

Dr. Salk has explained that children in certain age groups are most susceptible to infantile paralysis. The very young and older children are less likely to get the disease than children of 5 to 12 years old. That is the most dangerous age bracket, as far as susceptibility to polio is concerned, so medical science tells us.

A system must be devised to make sure that the youngsters who are in the greatest danger get treatment first. Then the younger and older children should be inoculated, and finally adults.

By next year there is expected to be enough vaccine to go around.

The problem is immediate and short run.

Dr. Salk suggests that a Government agency should arrange distribution and allocation of the vaccine. He said:

> I think it is unfair, really, to let everyone decide for himself who gets what * * * It seems to me there ought to be some central intelligence that could indicate or at least suggest what should be done, if not to specify the way in which one would approach this problem.

A COMMITTEE TO COMBAT INFANTILE PARALYSIS

I am introducing a bill which I believe will accomplish what the inventor of the vaccine suggests.

My bill provides that a commission of five, headed by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, decide priorities of distribution and vaccination. The commission would consist of the Surgeon General, Dr. Salk, if he would be willing to serve, a representative of State public health officials, a representative of vaccine manufacturers, and a representative of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Mr. President, it can be seen that the personnel of such a commission would represent very well the American medical profession. We are greatly indebted to the medical profession for the years of researching it has been doing in connection with this dread disease.

This Commission would be representative of those who know most about polio and the vaccine and who could provide impartial judgment as to its best use.

VACCINE SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO NEED

It is to be expected that they would establish priorities by age group and physical condition such as pregnancy, according to the degree of susceptibility to infection. They also could meet local emergencies if any should develop.

I believe the American people want to act wisely and unselfishly in this matter. We can avert difficulties if there is an official umpire to insure absolute fairness. Under those circumstances everyone will abide by rules of uniform application and no one will seek preferential treatment.

What I propose is a group of scientific traffic policemen who will set up traffic lights to avoid speeding and collisions.

My bill provides for fines—substantial fines—for knowing violation of the rules laid down by the Commission to Control Infantile Paralysis.

The Commission would go out of existence when it determines that there is sufficient vaccine and knowledge about its proper use. That should be in about a year.

I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that I am not proposing a commission that is to be set up and to continue in perpetuity. I am proposing an emergency commission, to meet an emergency need, namely, to see to it that the control of the vaccine which is going to be available next year is used to the best effect in protecting the people against susceptibility to polio paralysis infection during the coming year, until a quantity of vaccine can be manufactured so that it can be dispensed in the ordinary commercial way, through the offices of our doctors, to all patients as they come.

We now have a vaccine that can reduce and almost eliminate the child killer and crippler, infantile paralysis. We must use it wisely. We can avert unfairness and misuse of this new blessing.

I have faith that we shall do it.

Mr. President, I am not wedded to the particular procedure I am proposing. I introduce this bill only in order to focus attention upon the need of the Federal Government's proceeding to do what it can, within its legislative powers, to protect the health of all the people of this country, and to make the most effective use of this short supply of vaccine until an adequate supply can be manufactured for all.

I am sure that today all Americans join in prayers of thanksgiving and also pray that we shall conduct ourselves in such a way that we shall be deserving of this great discovery, the Salk vaccine.

In closing, and prior to introducing the bill, Mr. President, I desire to pay a very sincere tribute to Dr. Salk and his associates for what will be recognized in medical history, I believe, as one of the great monuments in medical progress.

I now introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1691) to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the American people are profoundly grateful that a vaccine has been developed which is an effective preventive of infantile paralysis. That development was financed by the voluntary contributions of the people of the United States and prosecuted by devoted scientists who seek no profit.

It is the policy of the Congress to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of the Salk vaccine while supplies remain too limited to meet the total needs of the whole population.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in the first section of this act, there is established a Commission to be known as the Commission To Control Infantile Paralysis (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and four additional members to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. One such member shall be a State health official: 1 shall be a representative of the manufacturers of the Salk vaccine; and 1 shall be a representative of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall invite Doctor Jonas Salk to serve as the fifth member of the Commission. In the event that Doctor Salk is unable to serve, the Secretary shall appoint as a member in his stead a scientist who has specialized in the study and treatment of poliomyelitis.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed (1) to issue mandatory rules and regulations regulating the distribution and use of all Salk vaccine manufactured in, imported into, and exported from the United States (including but not limited to the establishment of priorities by age group, physical condition, and geographical location) with a view to insuring the most effective and equitable use of Salk vaccine, and (2) to make such reports to the Congress as it may deem necessary, including recommendations for further legislation deemed by it to be desirable to implement the policies of this act. Any such report may recommend the enactment of legislation by the Congress to maintain reasonable prices of Salk vaccine whenever it shall determine that the price of such vaccine or substantial amounts thereof has become unreasonably high.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia, but it may hold meetings at such other places in the United States as it may deem necessary.

(b) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall serve on the Commission without compensation in addition to that received for his service as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 5. The functions exercised under this act by the Commission shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the Commission shall provide for the greatest practicable distribution and publication of its rules and regulations.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to limit or supersede the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by any rule or regulation promulgated under the authority of this act shall, upon conviction, be fined $5,000.

SEC. 9. The Commission, and all authority conferred under this act, shall terminate at such time as the Commission shall report to the President and the Congress that there is sufficient Salk vaccine to make unnecessary further controls under this act.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to direct attention at this time to National Hospital Week, sponsored by American Hospital Association, which will be observed this year from May 8 through May 14.

It is particularly fitting that the Nation should set aside these 7 days to mark the importance to our people of the American hospital of today.

It is almost 300 years since the first hospital was established here in this land that was to become the United States. During those 300 years the change in the concept of the word "hospital" and its meaning to our people has indeed been remarkable.

First regarded as places to which one went only to die, 300 years of progress has made the hospital today a place where the sick and the suffering, the broken in body and in health, go to be comforted and restored to health and strength.

The hospital of today combines the skill of the physician, the tender care of the nurse, and the devotion, training, and experience of pathologists, radiologists, and other medical specialists, and laboratory technicians, therapists, and all those others who devote themselves to the service of saving the lives of their fellow men, and whose efforts are so skillfully coordinated by the modern hospital administrator.

Our hospitals have grown in number since 1658 from one to over seven thousand. This in itself is remarkable. Yet we do not overlook the fact that 1 modern hospital of today is, to the people it serves, worth 7,000 of the hospitals which might have existed 300 years ago.

Too few realize that these complex centers, dedicated to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering and to preventing needless death, symbolize the new role which high quality patient care plays in the life of America. As hospitals in thousands of communities across the length and breadth of this land have improved and expanded in facility and function, they have become the heart and center of health activities in those communities.

Not only has the hospital of our day earned and won our confidence; it has paved the way for voluntary prepayment health insurance systems like Blue Cross and Blue Shield to bring within the reach of more of our people the blessings and benefits of modern hospital and medical care.

It is fitting that the Nation grant recognition and express its gratitude to the institutions and to those men and women who devote themselves so faithfully and unselfishly to the health, the strength, and the happiness of the people of America. I am today submitting, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] a concurrent resolution whereby the Congress asks the people of the Nation to observe National Hospital Week by joining in proclaiming the importance of hospitals to the American community and in acclaiming their tradition of devoted service to our people.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest-quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas the American hospitals are the centers of our community's health services to its citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American community has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 8, 1955, and ending May 14, 1955, will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by him before the City Club of Porland, Oreg., on April 8, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from statements dealing in part with proposed revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, delivered by Governor Harriman, of New York; Senator Lehman; Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and Carmine G. De Sapio, national Democratic committeeeman from New York; at a dinner meeting of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, held in New York City, on March 8, 1955.

Opinion of the General Counsel, General Services Administration, regarding rights of municipalities in disposing of buildings or projects constructed under the WPA.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago marked the sixth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, and I had prepared a statement to have printed in the RECORD on that occasion, but since the Senate was not in session I was unable to have it placed in the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A few days ago, we marked the sixth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. This marked the beginning of something new and, we believe, constructive in international relations.

Twelve independent nations and later the others who signed pledged immediate continuance and collective action in the political, economic, social, and military fields. Our Government is of the opinion that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization makes for security in Western Europe against Communist expansion. The nations agreed that they would consult together whenever the security of any of them is threatened. When Premier Faure, of France, obtained the final approval of the Paris pacts concerning Germany just recently, he promised that his government would attempt to reinforce and improve NATO in political as well as military aspects. Likewise, Premier Scelba when he visited here advocated that NATO be developed not only along the lines of a military union but into one for economic, social, and political action.

With the agreement by all nations concerned of the Paris pact it will mean that eventually Germany will provide 12 divisions for the strengthening of NATO.

Since the inception of NATO, there is a Council in permanent session with effective power of decision meeting as much as three times a week at half-hour notice. It is served by an international staff and a large number of committee and working groups working day in and day out on a wide variety of NATO problems. There is a military organization established to defend all NATO territories against armed attack, including a network of commands covering the North Atlantc Ocean and the European Continent from the North Cape to north Africa and from the Channel to the Caucasus Mountains. There are impressive achievements in infrastructure. In all these activities there is a remarkable degree of unity. In the NATO Defense College there are officers from 8 or 10 different nations working in the same study groups learning to know each other, making enduring friendships. General Gruenther says of NATO Military Headquarters: "In my 35 years of service I have been in many headquarters, but I have never had a happier one than SHAPE." Men engaged in this work feel themselves members of an international team dedicated to the service of the alliance as a whole.

After the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in June 1945, after the collapse of Nazi Germany and a few weeks before Japan capitulated, we saw the United Nations Charter come into being in San Francisco. As everyone knows, the Charter was founded on two assumptions. First, that the five powers holding permanent seats in the Security Council—China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union—would be able to reach lasting agreement on major matters. Secondly, that apart from Russia's known claims on Japan, none of these powers sought any territorial aggrandizement. Both of these assumptions proved incorrect. A new peril came into being—Communist Russia.

The defeat of the two great military and industrial countries, Germany and Japan, left a vast vacuum of strength in the West and East, and the Kremlin took advantage of this vacuum to carry forward its expansionist program. The Kremlin drew down its Iron Curtain, refused to hold free elections in Poland, and besides that the West disarmed. We who had 3,100,000 men on the Continent, withdrew all but 391,000, within a year, and the British who had 1,321,000 within a like period withdrew 488,000. Canada within a year took all of its 299,000 men home. Then there followed a period where the Western powers sought to reach an accommodation with the Soviet Government. However, in the Moscow Conference in 1947 and in the conference which was held later the same year and in the Foreign Ministers' Conference which met in Paris in 1949, it became more and more evident that there was no hope of getting anywhere with the Kremlin.

In the meanwhile, the Soviet expansion had included Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and areas in Finland, Poland, Rumania, northeastern Germany and eastern Czechoslovakia—representing over 200,632 square miles and almost 25 million people. And the presence of the Red armies in the heart of Europe compelled Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Eastern Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia to fall under Soviet domination.

The situation was indeed becoming critical for the free nations of the West—those that remained. There seemed to be no possibility of reaching an agreement with the Soviets. Greece seemed to be sinking under the heel of the Communists. Then it was that Uncle Sam reacted promptly. The Truman Doctrine came into play and we appropriated $400 million for the aid of Greece and Turkey, and in June the Marshall program came into being. It was directed against hunger, poverty, chaos and slavery. We even offered economic assistance to countries behind the Iron Curtain, but Stalin refused America's aid and forced Czechoslovakia and Poland to refuse likewise.

This situation resulted in March 1948 in the representatives of Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom meeting in Brussels to discuss and sign the Treaty of Mutual Assistance. The ink was scarcely dry on the Brussels Treaty when the Soviets started the blockade of West Berlin, which lasted 323 days and was defeated by the prodigious feat of the air lift.

Out of all this tension and defiance the North Atlantic Treaty Organization began to take form; the idea being that the Brussels Treaty powers would be superseded by a larger group of countries.

On the 4th day of April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was signed in Washington by representatives of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States and within 5 months was ratified by the Parliaments of the member countries and later by Greece and Turkey.

The North Atlantic Treaty speaks plainly and briefly about the resolution and idealism of the nations which signed it. It was written within the framework of the United Nations Charter and was based on article 51 of chapter VII. Article 5 is the essential clause. It provides: "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that if an armed attack occurs each of them will assist the party or parties thereof attacked by taking forthwith such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

To back up these words the parties agreed, under article 3, to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity, to resist armed attack and so it came about that by 1950 the different states entrusted their forces to international commanders, assisted by international staffs. This was an advance which was not missed by the Soviets.

We must realize, however, that the treaty is not exclusively a military alliance. It was born of collective security and its purpose is to promote conditions of stability and well-being and the cooperation by governments not only in the military field, but in the economic, social, and cultural as well. Six years ago this treaty came into being. It was a new experiment in international relations. It provides for the common defense of over 380 million people (if Western Germany were included it would be better than 430 million people). It has stopped the advance of the Kremlin in Europe, and it is hoped that it will spare the carnage and waste of another war.

FORMOSA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the noted author and columnist, Walter Lippmann, has written a very thoughtful and interesting series of articles on the highly dangerous and flammable situation with which we are now confronted in the Formosa Straits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "The Offshore Entanglement," written by Walter Lippmann,

and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE OFFSHORE ENTANGLEMENT

In the 2 months that have passed since Congress voted the Formosa Resolution, the President has been bearing an increasingly heavy burden of responsibility. It has been a strange development especially for him, so sincerely convinced a believer that personal government is undesirable and that Congress should participate with the Executive in the great decisions of war and peace.

The Formosa Resolution has left it to him to decide whether to defend the offshore islands at the risk of a general war. This is an extreme delegation of authority. For President Eisenhower must determine not only whether war is justified because a known and established vital interest of the United States has been violated—every President has that power and that responsibility—he must determine whether or not, and in what degree, there is an American interest in these offshore islands. Congress has left the decision entirely to him. There is no treaty obligation, there is no principle of law, which establishes an American interest in these islands. The President and Congress have not agreed upon any clear and definite juridical, strategic, or political standard to guide the Chief Executive in making the gravest decision that he can be called upon to make.

Ever since the vote in Congress, the President has been under pressure from all quarters to make a decision one way or the other. This he has thus far refused to do. Lacking a definite principle and a policy to guide him, it has seemed better to wait and see whether Peiping does anything which, when it is already happening the President then judges in the heat of the crisis to be vitally related to the defense of Formosa. Amidst all the uncertainties and pressures which converge upon the White House, it has seemed better not to make a decision and not to risk the displeasure of those who would not like the decision.

Yet this is an unsound position for the Chief Executive: that without public criteria known in advance, he must decide for peace or war after the confusion of war has begun. Can it truly be argued that it is good policy to make the Chinese guess how President Eisenhower will guess if they attack the islands? And in any event, the policy of not choosing a policy until the adversary has precipitated a crisis is an invitation to Peiping to proceed in such ways as will cause the most division and confusion in this country, in Formosa, among our allies, and in the uncommitted Asian countries.

It is never safe to assume that your adversary is a fool. And therefore it is not safe to assume that the Red Chinese will take such obvious military actions that it will be easy for the President to make a decision that will unite the country and rally its allies. There are, as anyone who has been reading the papers knows, ways of attacking these offshore islands which would not be recognizable, to use the words of the President's message, "as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Our problem is how to extricate the President and the country from this predicament. When the President was persuaded in January, perhaps against his better judgment, to accept personal responsibility for the offshore islands, two things were hoped for. One was that an overwhelming vote by Congress would deter the Red Chinese from any serious military action in the Formosa Strait. The other hope was that a truce could be negotiated in which the offshore islands would be used as an important bargaining point.

As to the first hope, experience has shown, I believe, that even if the Red Chinese are deterred from an open full-scale assault, they have been given a strong incentive to proceed by the other means—just short of open conventional war—which are available to them. But it is on the second point, on the hope of negotiating a cease-fire, that our knowledge now is most definite. We know, I believe, that a cease-fire cannot be had by the negotiation of a public agreement signed by all the interested parties.

A cease-fire by negotiation cannot be had because neither the Chinese Government in Peiping nor the Chinese Government in Formosa can sign such a document. For they would be agreeing to end the civil war by a partition of Chinese territory. Chiang would be renouncing his claim to be the head of the rightful Government of China; Mao Tse-Tung would be renouncing his claim to be the head of the legitimate Government of China. Peiping cannot be expected to sign such a renunciation. And we would have the greatest difficulty in persuading Chiang to sign it.

Since a truce in the Formosa Strait cannot be had by agreement between the two Chinese Governments, the best chance of preventing a dangerous war is to cut the Gordian Knot: to establish the ceasefire by an action of our own. We have the power to do that. It is not often that one nation has power of that kind. But in the Formosa Strait we have it. For all practical purposes, and over a considerable period of time at least, a military cease-fire would exist if the Nationalist forces were brought back to Formosa, if their naval and air raids, which are mere pinpricks, were discontinued, and our position in the Formosa area were made to conform to the law as laid down in our treaty with Nationalist China. This treaty provides for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. It was ratified with explicit assurance to our people that it calls for no American participation in the Chinese civil war.

This would be solid ground for the United States to stand upon. We would then be within our certain military capacities. Our stand would be in accord with our national interests. It would be acceptable, or better than that, to our allies. And last but by no means least, the ground on which we stood would be lawful ground.

The only known objection to such a forthright policy is that a decision to evacuate the offshore islands will shake the morale, and perhaps the allegiance, of the Chinese forces and Chinese officials in Formosa. Though there are countermeasures which can be taken to reduce this risk we must assume that it is a genuine risk.

But let us ask ourselves whether there is any other policy which will eliminate this risk—the risk of internal subversion and of defection. Our present policy of keeping everyone guessing and in suspense is hardly likely to keep morale high anywhere, and least of all in Formosa. How must the Chinese from the mainland, threatened with attack on the islands where Chiang has committed so many of his troops, feel when they are told that after they are under attack, the President will decide whether to support them or to let them be overwhelmed? It is not a pleasant fix to leave them in.

But suppose, then, that the President comes down off the fence and declares that these islands will be defended. How long would morale be kept high in Formosa? The answer, I submit, is that it will be kept high a little longer, but only as long as it looks possible that in defending these islands the United States will become involved in a general war to overthrow the Red government in Peiping.

For the only reason these islands are so important to the morale of the Nationalists in Formosa is that they raise the hope that the United States will become involved in a general war—in a general war which will restore Chiang and his followers to power on the mainland. The islands are of no strategic importance to the defense of Formosa or to the personal security of the Chinese in Formosa. It is not their defense which makes these islands so important. It is that they are the last best chance of entangling the United States in the unfinished civil war. That is the bitter truth about what is called, quite unequivocally, the defense of the offshore islands.

It is the paramount interest of the United States that whenever we must fight a war we shall fight it for the legitimate and clearly defined interests of the United States, and not because we have become entangled and cannot muster the moral courage to disentangle ourselves.

CONDITIONS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a column written by Walter Lippmann under its usual title "Today and Tomorrow," and with the subheading "Unquiet Spirit." I commend the article to the careful reading of every Member of the Senate.

I suppose no one would claim that the situation in the Far East, in Southeast Asia, in Asia generally, or, in fact, in all that part of the world, is not one of great danger. It is not merely a political issue. The conditions are not merely something with which to play politics. The situation is fraught with danger, and is most difficult to handle and to work out. It requires most careful thinking on the part of our people. I must say that I have not read a more thoughtful article that has been written on the subject than the one written by Walter Lippmann and published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am certain the distinguished Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact that this very interesting and thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann is only one of a series of articles which he has written with regard to the terribly dangerous and flammable situation with which we are confronted in the Far East, and notably in the Strait of Formosa.

I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama in appealing to Members of Congress and to the public generally to study these articles very carefully and to ponder them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from New York. I know that he has, at times, placed some of Mr. Lippmann's long series of articles in the RECORD.

The article published today, however, deals with the subject a little more comprehensively than any of the preceding articles, because it deals with a part of the program which we may be neglecting.

We talk of strength and military power, and all those things which are absolutely essential—and Mr. Lippmann recognizes their essentiality—but sometimes I think we may talk and think of those factors to the exclusion of the other side

of the picture, in trying to do something for those people, who are not primarily interested in military matters, and who do not have inherent within their nations and nationalities strength from a military standpoint.

Walter Lippmann points this out very clearly in his article, and brings out the weaknesses in many of the areas upon which we may be leaning for support in the great trouble which faces us.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Mr. Lippmann, entitled "Unquiet Spirit," may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

UNQUIET SPIRIT

Since his return from East Asia Mr. Dulles has been talking much and in ominous language. His theme has been that we must be determined and decisive in refusing to retreat any further in Asia. But he has not said this with the cool precision of a statesman whose task it is to define and to declare policy; he has been exhorting the country with the heady generalities which—before and during wars—are employed to heat up the popular emotion.

The tone of his utterances has created an impression at home and abroad that he is converted to the view of those who regard a war with China as inevitable and that, therefore, it had better be fought now when we can destroy Red China's war potential rather than postponed to a time when Red China is much stronger. I do not share this opinion that Mr. Dulles has come to believe in a preventive war, though no one should be surprised that what he has been saying has given rise to that opinion. I do not now believe that, on the ultimate issue of preventive war versus preventing war, Mr. Dulles differs as much from the President as the tone of his speeches would suggest.

To my ear, at least, Mr. Dulles has not sounded like a man who has taken a great decision and is then resolute and confident. He has sounded anxious and filled with foreboding, as if he had had a nasty shock when he was in southeast Asia and in Formosa. He has not been talking like the leader of a people in a dangerous time who, out of the clarity of his own conviction, gives courage to his people. He has been talking like a man who is troubled because he is unsure in his own mind, like a man who is not remembering how infectious is fear in high places.

As reflected in his speeches, the emotional impact of his trip was big: Was this due to evidence which he found of an increasing danger of war in the Formosa Strait? That might, of course, be an explanation. There is ground for worrying that the President has been gotten into a horrid position where he is supposed to decide after an attack begins whether to abandon to captivity and perhaps to execution, or to try to save, an important part of the National Chinese army. But I do not think this worry explains the mood of foreboding in Mr. Dulles's utterances since he came back. Nobody needs to go to southeast Asia to learn about the predicament in the Formosa Strait. It is evident enough in Washington.

My guess is that his foreboding and his despondency, approaching at moments a sense of doom, spring from his having realized by seeing at firsthand what it is not so easy to appreciate at a distance. This is how frail are the Asian reeds upon which we are leaning.

In Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and Formosa Mr. Dulles conferred with potentates, officials, officers, and politicians on whom depends our policy in that part of the world. It can have been only too painfully obvious how much is at stake on how weak a foundation. The authority of these governments is frail. The allegiance of factions, sects and clandestine groups among them is uncertain. For the containment of Communist expansion, we are relying primarily not on strong allies but on a rampart of client states, extending from Japan through Formosa to southeast Asia. Several of the vital sectors of the rampart are vulnerable to subversion, to conspiracy, to corruption and to seduction.

What makes our situation so baffling is that this outer rampart of ours is threatened even if the Communists make no attempt to conquer it by military assault. Against military conquest, we have the military means to give a good account of ourselves. The insidious threat, however, is that the rampart will crumble, and against that the Seventh Fleet and our nuclear weapons provide no relevant and effective remedy. Nor do exhortations to the Amerians not to retreat. Our real problem is how to keep this outer rampart from falling apart.

The question which I venture to raise is whether the campaign which Mr. Dulles has been conducting is strengthening or is weakening our position in the rampart of client states from Japan through Formosa to Thailand. Apparently he believes that he is rallying the waverers in Asia who wish to be on the side of the winner. Is he sure that this is a sufficient view, that it is not an example of what in his address Monday evening at Georgetown University he described as "a habit of mind which is sometimes called 'localitis'" when "those who only see part of a problem quickly find a solution which seems obvious" * * * though "the obvious solution is no solution at all"?

Is it really true that warlike speeches about the conflict in the Formosa Strait, accented with the threat of atomic bombs, is now rallying or is likely to rally to our side the other weak and threatened states in the East Asian rampart? I do not see how it can be true. It seems much more likely that the nearer we seem to be coming to atomic war in the Formosa Strait, the more urgent and imperative will be the will of the other nations of the rampart to extricate themselves from their exposed positions in our military system. Can anyone suppose, for example, that Japan, which is defenseless against atomic attack, would not try to escape into neutrality if we became involved in the kind of war with China that Admiral Carney has described?

It should be, it seems to me, the paramount objective of American policy in this part of the world to create among these threatened peoples the conviction that in friendship with us they will find security—security for their countries and for their own lives. It is essential, indubitably, to guarantee them—as we have done—against external aggression. But this is not enough. It is no less essential to convince them that we shall not be entangled, and that they will not be involved, in wars fought elsewhere and for causes that are not their own.

For weak and virtually defenseless states must be concerned primarily and almost exclusively—as we were for more than a century when we were ourselves a weak power—in their own security. If we fail to understand that about the peoples of East Asia, we shall, as we have been doing, alienate them from their faith and confidence in the future we offer them.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there will soon be before the Senate House bill 4903, the second supplemental appropriation bill. I desire to take this opportunity to make a very brief statement.

This is the second appropriation bill the Senate will consider this week. In connection with this bill, the Senate owes a deep debt of gratitude to four staff members who labored very late last night, in order that the bill and the report on it could be printed and could be available to the Senate and ready for our consideration today. Without the devotion of these staff members to their duty, it would not have been possible for us to consider this measure today.

The four staff members—key officials of the Appropriations Committee—are Everard Smith, Thomas Scott, Kenneth Bousquet, and Francis Hewitt. They remained at the Capitol until nearly midnight, doing the hard, detailed work necessary to put the bill into shape.

If they have to make any explanations to their families for the late hours, I am personally willing to vouch for each and all of them, because I left the Capitol when they did shortly before midnight.

I do not believe there is any group of staff employees in Washington as able and as hard working as those who are attached to the Senate of the United States. They labor under great handicaps—frequently without what anyone else would consider sufficient time—and it seems to me that they really produce miracles.

Only yesterday afternoon the committee voted to report the bill; and by midnight these staff members had prepared the detailed report on the bill, including all the multitudinous figures which it was necessary to assemble; and the report and the bill were on their way to the printer.

Mr. President, we Members of the Senate can trace practically all our successes, in my opinion, to the splendid work done by the committee staff members. Today, I desire to pay tribute particularly to these four loyal, devoted public servants. Their families and their friends can be justly proud of them, and all of them deserve our gratitude, as well as the gratitude of the American people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished acting minority leader, my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the remarks the majority leader has just made are most timely. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee; and I was present yesterday afternoon when the supplemental appropriation bill was finally marked up, preparatory to printing. It was late in the afternoon before the marking up of the bill was accomplished. The work which had to be done in order that the bill could be before the Senate today—completely printed and in detail—was more than one could possibly imagine, unless one happens to be a member of the Appropriations Committee and sits throughout the detailed, lengthy, tedious hearings which are involved in connection with the appropriation bills.

For that reason, I think the majority leader has not only spoken proper words of commendation for the work done by the staff members, but he has also called to the attention of all Members of the Senate the fact that the staffs of both the Senate committees and the House committees work at virtually all hours on all the tasks we assign to them; and they are certainly to be highly commended for the efforts they always put forth in order to make it possible for the work of the various committees to be completed with thoroughness and in detail, so that the various measures may be brought expeditiously to the floor of the respective Houses, for consideration by the Members.

So, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for having spoken so highly of these staff members, who serve with us daily. I have just come from the room of the Appropriations Committee; and many of those staff members were present again this morning, even though they had worked most of last night to get the work on the bill completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his generous references.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN F. ENDERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received regarding Dr. John F. Enders, who won the Nobel prize in 1954, and who was one of the important scientists in connection with the development of polio vaccine and subsequent vaccines, the development of which has recently been announced.

I also request to have printed at this point in the RECORD, following the telegram, two articles in connection with the same matter, which were published in the New York Times on April 13. The articles describe the highly-effective work done by Dr. Enders in his participation in these developments.

There being no objection, the telegram and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *April 13, 1955.*

Senator PRESCOTT S. BUSH,
Senate Office Building:

Surely the first person to deserve a Medal of Honor for polio and other vaccines is the modest initiator namely, John Franklin Enders, doctor of philosophy and doctor of science, native of West Hartford who is a member of the class of 1919 Yale College, and won Nobel prize in December 1954. Polio and subsequent vaccines should be known as Enders and Salk vaccines, et cetera.

ROBERT P. SHELTON.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

SAFE POLIO VACCINE RESULTED FROM 1949 HARVARD RESEARCH IN GROWTH OF DISEASE VIRUS—STUDIES AVERTED DAMAGE TO BRAIN—SCIENTISTS FOUND TEST TUBE TECHNIQUE THAT OVERCOME OBSERVATION BOTTLENECKS—INVISIBLE DAMAGE SEEN—TISSUE DEGENERATION GUIDED IN DETERMINING WHETHER SERUM HAD ANTIBODIES

The first major scientific breakthrough on the poliomyelitis front came in 1949.

That was the discovery by Dr. John F. Enders and his associates at the Harvard Medical School that polio virus could be grown in test-tube culture on monkey tissues of nonnervous origin.

Until Dr. Enders' major discovery it had been universally believed that the polio virus would grow only in the nerve tissues of humans and a few species of monkeys.

On the other hand, it was known that vaccines prepared from virus grown on nerve tissue carried the risk of causing severe damage to the recipient's brain, thus producing a disease worse than polio.

The discovery by Dr. Enders and his associates made possible the unlimited growth in test tubes of polio virus that does not carry the risk of any brain damage. This opened the way at last to a safe polio vaccine.

INVISIBLE VIRUS SEEN

In the course of their studies, Dr. Enders and his Harvard colleagues came upon the highly important observation that the polio virus, as it grows on the monkey tissue in the test tube, causes degenerative changes in the cells upon which it grows.

This made it possible actually to see the invisible virus, and thus to tell, by the amount of degeneration produced, the actual rate of the growth of the virus. Absence of cell degeneration meant absence of growth.

Furthermore, the observation provided a quick and easy test to determine whether or not the serum of an exposed or a vaccinated individual contained antibodies against the virus.

Since polio antibodies (immunity factors) check the growth of the polio virus, the addition of the individual's serum to the test tube virus culture would stop the virus growth and hence the degeneration of the cells on which it grows, the serum contained the specific antipolio antibodies.

On the contrary, if the serum did not contain the specific antibodies, the growth of the virus, accompanied by the degeneration of the cells, would continue unabated.

The polio virus is about one millionth of an inch in diameter and cannot be seen even with the most powerful optical miscroscope. Though it has been photographed recently with the electron microscope, which can magnify objects up to 100,000 times, the viruses thus shown are no longer alive.

Hence, until Dr. Enders and his team made their dramatic observation the only way to determine whether a polio virus was growing was to inject the culture into a living monkey and then wait to see whether the animal became paralyzed. To test for the presence of antibodies also required tedious and costly animal experiments.

BOTTLENECKS ELIMINATED

All these bottlenecks, which would have made the production of an antipolio vaccine on a large scale a practical impossibility, were completely eliminated by the development of the method for growing the virus in test tubes together with the observation that the growth or nongrowth of the virus could be determined by the rate of degeneration of the tissue cells in the test tube.

The progressive destruction of the cells can be observed with the ordinary microscope and serves as a definite visual index of the rate of virus growth: The greater the destruction the more abundant the growth.

Dr. Harry M. Weaver, former director of research for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, commented that because of the work of Dr. Enders and his Harvard colleagues:

"Today there is no practical limit to the amount of virus that can be produced."

For their epoch-making achievement, which also promises to open the way for vaccines against other virus diseases, Dr. Enders and his colleagues—Drs. Thomas H. Weller and Frederick C. Robbins—received the Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology for 1954.

There were two other major discoveries in the field of polio, in the period between 1948 and 1952, of great importance to the development of an effective vaccine against the crippling effects of the disease.

THREE TYPES IDENTIFIED

One of these was the isolation and identification of three distinct types of polio virus. This mammoth project was carried out in four major universities from 1948 to 1951, under grants of $1,370,000 by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

"The solution of this problem," Dr. Weaver said, "necessitated the monotonous repetition of exactly the same technical procedures on virus after virus, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, for 3 solid years. The number of monkeys utilized in this effort was legion. The physical effort expended by the investigators to cope with the struggles, the dodges, and the antics of this horde of primates is almost beyond comprehension."

After 3 years it was learned that there were three different types of polio virus circulating throughout all parts of the world, each capable of causing paralytic polio in the human being.

It was also found that development of immunity against 1 of the 3 virus types—named Brunhilde, Lansing, and Leon—does not confer immunity against the other two types. This meant that an individual might contract polio more than once.

These findings also meant, of course, that any polio vaccine, to be fully protective, must produce immunity against all three types of the virus.

The Salk antipolio vaccine is therefore a triple vaccine, consisting of a mixture of killed viruses of types I, II, and III. While they no longer can produce the disease, they are still capable of stimulating the blood serum to produce antibodies against them.

THIRD DISCOVERY MADE

The third major discovery—which came in 1952—was that the virus circulates in the blood for brief periods before the onset of the disease. This removed the earlier misconception that the polio virus attacks the nerve cells without previously passing through the blood stream.

Since antibodies are formed in the blood stream as a defense against germs that circulate in the blood, it seemed unlikely that a vaccine would produce antibodies against a virus that bypassed the blood stream altogether.

All previous efforts to find polio virus in the blood stream of animals infected with it had failed. The 1952 discovery of its presence for a brief period in the blood before it passed into the central nervous system, together with the discovery that small amounts of antibodies introduced in the blood prevent the virus from circulating in the system and from paralyzing the animal, provided strong support to the belief that a triple vaccine would neutralize the virus and prevent paralysis.

All these scientific discoveries formed the basis of the vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas E. Salk, of the University of Pittsburgh Medical School, with the March of Dimes funds.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

HARD BATTLE WON BY PERSEVERANCE—DR. ENDERS AND ASSOCIATES TRIED NEW APPROACH AFTER OTHERS HAD QUIT

Dr. John F. Enders, speaking of scientific discoveries, once said:

"The one who places the last stone and steps across the terra firma of accomplished discovery gets all the credit. Only the initiated know and honor those whose patient integrity and devotion to exact observation have made the last step possible."

Dr. Enders was speaking specifically of those who had patiently done the preparatory work leading to the discovery of how to produce the polio virus in test tubes. The last step was accomplished by Dr. Enders and two colleagues, Dr. Thomas H. Weller of the

Harvard School of Public Health and Dr. Frederick Robbins of the Western Reserve Medical School, Cleveland.

For this the trio won the Nobel Prize for medicine and physiology. Now the roles are reversed in the production of a vaccine against polio. Dr. Enders and his collaborators are among those who made "the last step possible" for the discovery of the Salk vaccine.

GUESS WE WERE FOOLISH

Dr. Enders is 58 years old, a crinklyeyed man with a sparse amount of hair and a streak of genius or foolishness, depending on who is describing him, his friends or himself.

Asked what had made him persevere on his Nobel prize-winning quest when it appeared foredoomed to failure, Dr. Enders replied:

"I guess we were foolish."

On receiving the Passano award of $5,000 in 1953, Dr. Enders quoted his former master, Dr. Hans Zinsser, a famous Harvard bacteriologist, to explain how he had succeeded where others failed:

"It is an erroneous impression that scientific discovery is often made by inspiration—a sort of coup de foudre [thunder clap] from on high. This is rarely the case.

"As a rule the scientist takes off from the manifold observations of his predecessors and shows his intelligence, if any, by his ability to discriminate between the important and the negligible, by selecting here and there the significant stepping stones that will lead across the difficulties to new understanding."

Before he became involved in polio research, Dr. Enders had been working for many years on children's diseases, such as mumps, measles, and chickenpox.

SERVED AS FLIER IN WAR

The famous virologist—he holds no medical degree but a Ph. D. in bacteriology and immunology—was born at West Hartford, Conn., February 10, 1897. He received his A. B. from Yale in 1920, his M. A. from Harvard in 1922, and his doctorate from Harvard in 1930.

He was a marine flier in World War I. From 1942 to 1946 he was a civilian consultant on epidemic diseases to the Secretary of War. For several years he was also on a civilian commission studying virus diseases for the Army.

He first was associated with the Harvard Medical School in 1929 as an assistant in the department of bacteriology and immunology. He became an assistant professor, a position he still holds, in 1942. He also is director of the Research Division of Infectious Diseases at the Children's Medical Center, Boston.

He was president in 1952 of the American Association of Immunologists and he is editor of the Journal of Immunology. He is the author of many articles in the field of tissue culture and virus research and the coauthor of two books on immunity and on the multiplication and properties of the polio virus.

Dr. Enders married Sarah Francis Bennet on September 17, 1927. She later died. They had two children, John Ostrom 2d and Sarah. He married Mrs. Carolyn Keane on May 12, 1951.

IMPRISONMENT OF UNITED STATES AIRMEN BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article written by Constantine Brown, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS STILL HOLD FLIERS—THE 3 MONTHS GIVEN HAMMARSKJOLD TO WIN RELEASE OF OUR MEN IN CHINA HAVE PASSED

While American diplomacy is waiting patiently for the result of the intervention of United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold toward getting our uniformed prisoners out of the Chinese jails, the Internal Revenue Service is less patient. At least one of these unfortunate victims of the Communists has received at his residence in the United States a "reminder" to pay his 1954 taxes and make his 1955 income tax return. Internal Revenue is not to be blamed. The exemptions to the men fighting in Korea were terminated when hostilities in that area were declared officially ended. But there is a somewhat gruesome undertone in this "dunning" by the Treasury men in action.

The country was rightly indignant at the news last November that 14 prisoners in the Korean war, from colonel to private, had been sentenced to long prison terms as spies. There was a loud demand for immediate action to get these men out. It looked for a short time as if our Government would adopt a stern attitude in the face of this total disregard of international law. But some of the timid souls in the administration urged patience and care.

Since the Korean campaign was not a war but a police action undertaken by the United Nations with 95 percent American personnel, it was primarily that international body's responsibility to free our men. Indeed, its highest permanent official, Mr. Hammarskjold, hotfooted it to Peiping. There he was dined and wined for nearly 10 days by Prime Minister Chou En-lai, had long political talks with the high Communist hierarchy and returned to New York, personally optimistic that somehow or other, some day, our men might possibly be liberated before their prison terms expired.

When the first news of this breach of international law by the Chinese became known, the United States Congress was as angry as the Nation at large. Besides the physical sufferings of those men, it was a new slap in the face at this country. It was suggested in speeches from the floor of the Senate and the House that we demand the liberation of our jailed prisoners, and, if the Communists did not comply, a blockade of the China coast be immediately enforced. This would probably have been done in the days gone by, when we had not become entangled in a complexity of alliances which compel our Government to pay as much attention (sometimes more) to the voices of our allies as to national interests.

The more vociferous advocates of a policy of retaliation, such as Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES, were called to the White House where it was explained to them that it would be unwise to precipitate a crisis when the United Nations could achieve our purposes by much more delicate means. There was a tacit understanding that Mr. Hammarskjold be given at least 3 months to show some positive results.

That happened early last January. The 3 months are now over and, as far as this reporter has been able to ascertain, all that the Secretary General of the U. N. has been able to produce was a film showing our jailed prisoners of war in good spirits and healthy playing volleyball.

How accurate is the film taken especially for the benefit of Mr. Hammarskjold it is difficult to say. It is also impossible to ascertain whether the reports that the men are being fed great delicacies such as bird's nest soup and shark fin stew are true. It is more probable that our men are undergoing the typical Communist brainwashing. The men in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill who have seen this exclusive movie believe that it is nothing more than clumsy Communist propaganda. The Secretary General of the U. N. may have fallen for it, but not the few who have been shown the film.

In any event, after 3 months of negotiations for the liberation of the American soldiers, all that the intervention of the United Nations has been able to produce is a movie.

The administration is unwilling, however, to regard the U. N. efforts as a failure. It urges the advocates of direct and more drastic measures to be patient and tolerant with the tortuous ways of diplomacy. It points out to these advocates that it would be fatal to our interests in the Far East if on the eve of the Afro-Asian conference at Bandung this country were to take any precipitate steps. This, say the spokesmen of the executive branch would have disastrous consequences on our policies of convincing the people of Asia that we are neither imperialistic nor war minded. Let nature take its course, the advocates for American action are being urged. In this manner we shall be given a chance to enforce our peaceful policies of raising the standard of living of the Asiatics and at the same time we shall not run counter to the views of our western European allies who frown on any idea of using power in the Far East.

The fact that the 14 men in Chinese Communist jails—and many others who should have been returned in keeping with the armistice terms—are undergoing the usual Communist mental and physical tortures appears to those who direct our policies of secondary importance, compared to the big diplomatic issues now at stake in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish once again to point out to the Senate that these American airmen are still being held by the Chinese Communists. The Communists admit holding these 15 men. Eleven of the 15 men were sentenced to Communist prisons for terms ranging from 4 to 10 years.

Mr. President, these airmen were shot down over Korea 2 years ago, in January 1953. So far as the 11 airmen are concerned, there is no doubt whatever that their plane was over Korea at the time it was shot down. There was an absolute radar fix on the plane at the time.

The best information is that the prisoners were subsequently taken from North Korea to Communist China.

Mr. President, these men wear the uniform of the United States.

Recently I was privileged to see a moving picture depicting the existence of these men under confinement in a Communist prison. I received no satisfaction from seeing that moving picture.

It is true, apparently, that the prisoners are not hungry and that they are permitted to have some recreation. Apparently they are being given food, at least of sustaining quantity, if not of the best quality. Apparently they are being permitted to write some letters home. I believe it is rather significant that they were not permitted to write such letters until about the time of the Hammarskjold visit to Communist China. Whether the films were made for the purpose of disseminating propaganda by the Chinese Communists is something everyone must decide for himself.

In that connection, I can only say that about 20 years ago I was privileged to

serve in the Legislature of California. At that time I served as chairman of the State committee on hospitals and asylums, and also for a time acted as chairman of the State committee on prisons and reformatories.

In the prisons of California and in the Federal prisons of the United States which I have visited, I have seen better food and more recreation and more liberal letter-writing privileges than are enjoyed by our men who are under restraint in the Communist prisons.

Mr. President, our men are being held contrary to the terms of the Korean armistice. Under the armistice they were supposed to have been exchanged either under the big switch or under the little switch.

Last December the Communists announced that these men had been sentenced to prison terms. It was the decision of this Government to allow the United Nations a reasonable period of time in which to obtain the release of these men.

Mr. President, we furnished 90 percent of the United Nations forces in the Korean conflict. I believe the United Nations has an obligation to take some effective steps to get the men out of Red China. Apparently the Communists have not been impressed by the resolution adopted by the United Nations; neither have they been impressed by the visit of Mr. Hammarskjold. The men remain there, and they are still in the Communist prisons.

Although I shall discuss this subject more extensively next week, I rise today to ask: What does the United Nations propose to do about it? Has it washed its hands of the situation?

When will Mr. Hammarskjold make a report to the American people and to the people of the United Nations on the status of these prisoners of war?

When such a report is made, what does the Government of the United States intend to do about it? I do not believe we can continue to let the American airmen serve in Communist prisons in violation of the terms of the armistic without adversely affecting the morale of the men in our Armed Forces.

These airmen have been in prison for 2 years. Will the United Nations wait until these men have been individually brain washed, and, as each one is brain washed and permitted to depart, perhaps serve as an agent for Communist propaganda?

Mr. President, from time to time criticism has been made of men, both civilian and military personnel, for apparently carrying on Communist propaganda after having been brainwashed by the Communists. What can be expected to happen to men who are subjected to the kind of hardships that are visited upon them in Communist prisons? We know that some civilians finally broke down in prison after being kept in leg and arm chains for 4 or 5 years. Strong men of various faiths have broken down under Communist treatment. We do not know all the methods the Communists use on these prisoners.

Mr. President, I believe that we in Congress, who are called upon to pass selective-service legislation and to provide for the Military Establishment, have an obligation in the case of American service personnel who are sentenced to serve terms in Communist prisons in violation of an armistice agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from California that I completely share the point of view he has expressed with regard to the 11 airmen.

I should like to ask him 2 or 3 questions in regard to the matter, because I shall be surprised if we are not pretty much in agreement in regard to this question. The incarceration of these 11 airmen, in my judgment, is a complete violation of the international law rights of the United States. If we do not stand for government by law under international law, as well as government by law under domestic law, we shall soon lose our standing in the world of nations.

There are also civilian prisoners in China——

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are approximately 30 of them, from the last figures I saw.

Mr. MORSE. I am not too sure how many there are, but I think there are at least 30. I am inclined to think, from the last briefing I have had, that the number is probably more than 30, although the figure may have included the 11 airmen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did some very careful checking on the civilian prisoners, because, as the Senator may recall, in 1952 there was released for the first time a list of the names of the American civilians. The last checkup I had of the civilians was that while a certain number had been freed—I forget the exact number, but perhaps it was as many as 8 or 9—the Communists had also arrested and put in prison 8 or 9 more, so that the figure is still approximately 32.

Mr. MORSE. I will take the Senator's figures, although the figure I had in mind was 53. That figure may include some British nationals. I do not recall at this moment whether or not it does.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If we take the approximate figure of 32 civilians whom we know the Communists are holding, and add to them the 11 prisoners from the one plane about which I was speaking, and the 4 fighter pilots they have admitted holding, we reached a figure which is pretty close to that mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, the Senator and I agree that there are too many. We are dealing with a basic principle of sovereignty, and if we destroy this principle we might as well recognize that we are going to live not in a world of order and law, but in a world of chaos.

The questions I should like to ask are as follows:

Does the Senator agree with me that at a very early date, either in executive session or, so far as I am concerned, in public session—but I shall go along at this time on an executive session—the two committees of the Senate which I think have a vital interest and jurisdiction in this matter, so far as our legislative responsibilities are concerned, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, ought to be advised by the Secretary of State specifically and exactly what the Department of State is doing at the present time to try to get the United Nations to assume what I think is its clear obligation under the juridical processes of the United Nations itself in an attempt to get these men released from Communist prisons?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in what the Senator says. I should go one step further. I think the matter is of such importance that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee should, not later than next week, get together and receive testimony from both the State Department and the Defense Department on the whole question of American prisoners of war still being held by the Chinese Communists, for while they admit to the holding of only 15 airmen at the present time, there is strong reason to believe, from a considerable amount of evidence in the archives of the Pentagon building, that there may be many other American GI's who were supposed to have been released at the time of the big switch and the little switch, who have not been released.

I think it is important that the Senate and the country understand that during the period prior to the Korean armistice and the big switch and little switch there were various letters which the Communists permitted to be sent out of Communist China from prisoners of war, at least purporting to be from them, to their families.

They compiled a list of names. There were certain propaganda broadcasts from Communist China purporting to be in the voices of American prisoners of war directing messages to their families back home. These names were carefully compiled. There were other cases where men who had been released reported having seen certain prisoners at a war camp.

The Communists were supposed to have done one of three things: Either release the prisoners who were disabled or wounded or sick, under the little switch; release the able-bodied prisoners, under the big switch; or return the names and then the bodies of those who had died in Communist captivity.

The difference between the names compiled and those who were delivered back to us represents, roughly, 800. It is entirely possible that the Communists had actually misrepresented the situation, that some of the people had died, and they had other persons purporting to represent them. But it seems to me that Congress has an obligation to clear up this discrepancy, because information has been given to me recently that there is alleged to be a prisoner-of-war enclosure in Communist China which does contain Americans. These matters need to be clarified, and the American people are entitled to the information.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's last remark covers the second of the three questions I intended to ask him. My second question was whether the Senator agreed with me that the situation has

come to such an impasse that we as legislators and as the legislative representatives of the people of our States have a clear duty to find out the facts from our Government in regard to the situation, because we should no longer leave this matter in the secret jurisdiction of the State Department. I think it is now a matter of such concern to all our people that we have the duty of apprising ourselves of the facts about it and then deciding what course of action we should take.

That leads me to my third question——

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit an interruption at that point, as the Senator knows, it was the decision of the Government to proceed in the matter through the United Nations, because United Nations Command was involved. I had no particular objection to that point of view, although I had some doubts as to the procedure followed by Mr. Hammarskjold, but since he went on his journey and returned in January, we have now had the month of January go by, the month of February go by, the month of March go by, and we are now in the month of April. It seems to me Mr. Hammarskjold owes a duty to the United Nations as a whole, because there may be prisoners of war from other United Nations countries. We know the Canadians had 1 or 2 men released only recently, men who had been held obviously in violation of the terms of the armistice.

I think Mr. Hammarskjold should make a forthright report to the United Nations. Then he should either say, "In my judgment, we cannot get these men out by the negotiations I have conducted, and I am recommending a course of action which will put effective steps into motion to get them out." Or he should say, if it is his decision, "I do not believe the United Nations can do anything more effectively. I am not willing to recommend any steps which might be effective. I return the matter to the Government and the people of the United States." But we are entitled to have a specific report on the exact status of the question.

Mr. MORSE. I completely share that point of view. It seems to me it leads to the third question, or, at least, a third possible course of action we might follow, namely, that after we have had a briefing and the presentation of all the facts from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the CIA, then the Senate has the responsibility, it seems to me, of deciding what course of action, if any, we should take in relation to representations to the United Nations itself.

But I happen to be one who shares the point of view that the United Nations is not in this matter living up to its clear responsibilities under the San Francisco charter and the juridical procedures which were set up in that charter. I do not think the United Nations has any right to stand by, to delay, or to allow secret diplomacy to go to work in a situation which involves the lives and welfare of American citizens, and also the citizens of some of the other allied countries, because we know that Canadian and British subjects are confined in Chinese prison camps. At least, we have been briefed to that effect in times past.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Oregon at this point that I think he has put his finger on a very basic question. The United Nations, by remaining silent now in regard to this clear violation of the terms of the armistice, to which the United Nations itself is a party, will be putting its stamp of approval upon the treating of a solemn agreement as a scrap of paper, and will be tearing down international confidence in any future agreements which might be entered into.

Either these agreements mean something, or they mean nothing. Now is the time and this is the place to ascertain whether such an agreement has any validity whatsoever.

Mr. MORSE. I share that point of view, too. The Senator from California knows the position I have taken on this question. I am perfectly willing to let the record show that it has been my consistent position over the years that if we are really to have a world order based upon a system of international justice through law, then the Government of the United States must in every instance, make it perfectly clear that we will insist on the legal principles of international law being followed by the members of the United Nations, that we will insist that the United Nations bring to account any outlaw nation which refuses to abide by world order under international law. I think Red China is such a nation. I have said so many times in the Senate and elsewhere in this country.

I have just come from a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations considering an incident which occurred in Ecuadorian waters, where I think it is perfectly clear, again, that the international law rights of the United States have been violated. Before the afternoon is over, the subcommittee will release a statement regarding that problem. I merely cite it here because it illustrates again a principle for which I intend to continue to fight so long as I am in the Senate, that is, if we are to have a system of international law, then the body which has the obligation of carrying out the judicial process to enforce that law, namely, the United Nations, must live up to its responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I deeply appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon today. While it is true that on a number of issues we do not see quite as eye to eye as we do on this important subject, I certainly welcome his very fine, forthright statement. I hope that coming from his side of the aisle, although formerly he was a member of this side of the aisle, his statement will convey to Mr. Hammarskjold and to the entire United Nations that in a situation where Americans are being held illegally by the Chinese Communists or by any other group, the United Nations will have to answer to the American people; and that we do not intend, not merely as Democrats or Republicans, but, more broadly, as Americans, to remain silent while a single American is being illegally held.

Mr. MORSE. I say "Amen" to the Senator's conclusion. I appreciate his personal remarks; but to his conclusion I say "Amen."

I close by saying that I serve notice that after the investigation or collection of facts has been completed, and if the facts bear out a justification for such a resolution, as I think they will, I shall offer a resolution in the Senate, in the days immediately ahead, which will make perfectly clear, I feel certain, what the position of the United States Senate will be in relation to the United Nations, in respect to its clear duty to use all the jurisdiction it possesses to make certain that Red China shall live up to its clear international obligations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEN. PEYTON CONWAY MARCH

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce to the Senate the passing of a great American soldier and patriot—a distinguished son of Pennsylvania—Gen. Peyton Conway March.

General March died yesterday in the Walter Reed Hospital at the age of 90.

Pennsylvania and the Nation mourn the loss of this great military leader, whose brilliant service as Army Chief of Staff in World War I contributed so much to American victory.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was appointed to West Point from his native State. He was graduated from the Military Academy as an honor man. His first active combat service came in the Philippines when he took part in the capture of Manila as commander of the famed Astor Battery.

At the beginning of World War I he went to France as artillery commander of the American Expeditionary Force, and in the face of great difficulties he brought that branch of the service up to the highest degree of efficiency.

It was as Army Chief of Staff that his exceptional ability as an organizer enabled him to initiate and carry out a program which landed 2 million men in France.

General March was a dynamic leader as well as a man of great personal courage. Among his many decorations was the Distinguished Service Cross, awarded to him for leading a charge against a strong enemy position in France.

To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWARD A. HAYES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the other day a friend took his departure. He was a friend to many. I speak of the passing of Edward A. Hayes, formerly national commander of the American Legion.

I know it was written long ago that there is a time to be born and a time to die. Yet in the mystic design of life, the

passing of a noble character is so difficult to understand, at a moment when his dreams of achievement and service are still unfulfilled.

Ed Hayes made no little plans, contrived no small hopes, conjured up no petty dreams. His whole life was in big dimensions because his purposes, his objectives, his devotions were big. It was marked with the finest of moral and spiritual attributes.

In an age when courtesy and good manners have fallen into a state of disrepair, he was an exemplar of these qualities. Why is it important? Because they were a reflection of his kindliness and grace of spirit in all things.

He was a humble person. Although great preferment came to him, it was forever hidden in his devotion to great causes. When he was the national commander of the American Legion, his prime concern was the well-being of the disabled, the orphans, the widows, who were the real victims of conflict. When his tour of duty as national commander ended, his interest and devotion carried on without abatement. The time and effort which he gave to this cause, year after year, in a quiet, self-effacing way, was the true measure of his unselfish devotion.

High on the agenda of his concern were the security and well being of his country. In this respect he was a fundamentalist. He knew that a nation was secure only if it was strong, within and without. He knew the strength of tradition. He knew that respect for the Constitution and its preservation was like a never-failing anchor of free government.

For this same reason, he enlisted himself in the struggle against the menace of communism, and fought with unremitting fervor against this insidious evil.

As a student of government, as a lawyer with a keen insight into constitutional processes, as a patriot who knew that liberty was the greatest boon to mankind, he so correctly assessed communism as the arch enemy of freedom and the destroyer of those spiritual values by which men must live. So he became a lifelong crusader in the cause of liberty, knowing that the spirit of the Lord could prevail only where men were free.

Ed Hayes was an unselfish person in the truest sense of the word. When he sought something it was not for the sake of the thing he sought, but only because it was a vehicle for service. As an outstanding national commander of the American Legion, he sought this high post only to serve more effectively the victims of war who were the special solicitude of that great organization.

As an Assistant Secretary of the Navy during World War II, it was not the power and authority which went with that position, nor the lure of the uniform which guided his conduct, but rather the opportunity to serve the Nation whose freedom and benefits he as a citizen was privileged to enjoy.

So Ed Hayes found happiness and exaltation, not in having or in getting, but in giving.

Everywhere in this land there are humble people who will mourn the departure of Ed Hayes because they have been enriched by his living. In one great unuttered song which rings in the hearts of his countless friends, we salute him for the patriot, American, and servant that he was.

We shall recall a favored expression of his as he referred to himself as "Your humble servant," and then we shall realize he was, indeed, a servant of noble causes, clad in the armor of selflessness and humility. Richly has he served and richly deserved is his reward of eternal peace and glory.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor at this time, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate H. R. 4903.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4903, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 6, after the word "control", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the Senate Appropriations Committee, in connection with its handling of the second supplemental appropriation bill, for providing the funds with which to pay the bills, under the contract authority provisions contained in the Federal Highway Act of 1954, with respect to national forests, national parks, and public land divisions.

I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He will recall that a year ago at the time when we were conducting hearings on highway legislation, we developed considerable testimony to the effect that there was a great lag between the appropriations made for roads on federally-owned lands and the authorizations which had been made in the several highway acts over a period of years. For example, we found that although we were authorizing the appropriation of $10 million for roads in the national parks, there was actually being provided in cash, each year, only about $3,500,000; that although the visitors to the national parks had increased by 10 times from 1945 to 1953, the national parks were getting just about as much money for roads as they received in 1945—or an average of approximately $3,500,000 a year.

We also found that a similar lag occurred between the appropriations for forest highways and the authorizations of such appropriations, and that that lag was retarding the sale of the timber resources of the Nation.

Growing out of that situation, we decided that the Federal Government should treat its own lands, insofar as roads are concerned, just as well as it is treating the lands of the various States, in connection with road construction. So we proposed that we establish for the roads in national forests, national parks, and for Indian roads on public lands, contract authority which would be equivalent to the authority to proceed under the apportionments for the several categories of Federal aid for the Federal highways. We did that in the Federal Highway Act of 1954.

The first fruition of that is shown in the appropriations now being made. I note with interest the comments made by the several members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as shown on pages 262 and following; and I am glad to see that the Senate subcommittee handling this item has provided the necessary funds, so that these bills will be paid promptly, with the result that the roads on the federally owned lands may be constructed on a par with the road-construction progress in other portions of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 2, in line 6, to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program," on page 3, line 2, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That said funds may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), for such funds as have been allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture for payments for the specific purposes authorized herein.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I notice that the

bill calls for added appropriations in the amount of $938 million. Am I correct in recalling that the first supplemental appropriation bill provided for additional appropriations of $1,659,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, with the two supplemental appropriation bills, we are appropriating a total of $2,597,000,000 more than was appropriated or provided for when we passed the budget, last year; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. These appropriations are above and beyond the regular, annual appropriation bills which were passed prior to the adjournment of the last Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice this bill is termed "the second supplemental appropriation bill." Is it probable that there will be a third supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There customarily is, toward the end of the session of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let me ask this question: How much reliance can we place on the claims for economy, which are made after the regular budget is passed, if the figure then stated is increased by means of supplemental appropriation bills, subsequently passed?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are various factors which must be taken into consideration. For example, Congress has voted to increase the pay of the congressional, judicial, and military personnel. Under those circumstances—Congress having thus acted since the adjournment of the last session of Congress—it is now necessary to provide the funds with which to carry out the will of Congress. In other words, the Appropriations Committee can only report appropriations under the authorizations previously made by law. If no authorization is made under a previous law, any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives can make a point of order and thus can prevent the making of such an appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, that I have before me the tabular analysis which appears on page 2 of the report; and it does not give any figures for the Department of Defense, but gives such figures only for other departments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; the third item is blank.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is blank for the reason that we found the Department of Defense had unexpended balances which could be utilized for that purpose. In other words, we inquired diligently, "Did we give you more money than you could spend between now and the end of June?" The reply was, "Yes."

So we said, "Then you can use the unexpended balances to pay these increases."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I should like to point out that the $938 million being appropriated in conformity with the request of the administration does not include any allowance for the increased military pay voted by the Congress. The amounts apropriated in this bill are due either to the failure of the Budget to estimate properly the actual needs, or to the fact that after Congress cut the appropriations, the administration has requested additional appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the case of the military pay increase, the situation happens to be that the necessary funds could be transferred from other appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but that will be in addition to the $938 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it is true in this sense: If Congress had not voted to increase the pay, that appropriation would have lapsed, and the money would have been returned to the Treasury on the 30th of June.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But no part of the $938 million is for the purpose of providing for the increase in the military pay. Approximately $182 million is for increased pay for the Department of Commerce; approximately $408 million is for increased pay for the independent offices.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Approximately $320 million is for increased pay for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those are the large items.

My point is this: Is it not altogether a bad practice—although, unfortunately, a common one—for the administration to claim it has achieved economy by cutting the amounts in the main budget, and then—a few months or a year afterwards—to make requests for supplemental appropriations which increase very grossly the appropriations figure above the amount the administration estimated and stated to the public.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has occurred a good deal in the past; I do not think there is any doubt at all about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also occurring in the present?

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be said, also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore, are not such claims illusory, extravagant, and ill-founded?

Mr. HAYDEN. Those are very strong terms to use. Nevertheless, there is a certain amount of justification for them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the comment of the Senator from Arizona on this point. I hope he will impress upon the administration the need for thrift and economy.

The administration claims to be cutting the budget. It claims to be working for economy. But after it obtains its appropriations and goes before the country with an economy program, it submits requests for supplemental appropriations which already amount to $2,600,000,000; and the end is not yet. I think we ought to keep books at the end of a period and not merely at the beginning of a period.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, what the Senator from Illinois has to say can be said about any administration in any year. During the 19 years I have been a Member of this body there have always been supplemental appropriation bills. It is distasteful to me, as it is to the Senator from Illinois, to have supplemental appropriation bills. I think we should live within our income. But when the Senator from Illinois says that there has been no effort toward economy, he is not accurate. As the Senator well knows, there have been great reductions in appropriations. There have been reductions in expenditures. So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, it is not very pleasing to him to see some of the departments failing to live within their appropriations; but the situation is not something new. The precedent was established under previous administrations, and the same thing has been happening year in and year out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When this practice was carried on by the preceding administration of my party, I objected to it. But in 1952 we heard that we were to have a change. Sound fiscal principles were to be established. The budget was to mean something. We were not to have supplemental appropriation bills. Expenditures were to be reduced.

Now what do we find? We find the same old song, except that, if anything, the situation is a little worse. I say that it is time for a change.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The situation certainly is not worse. The situation is very much better. Appropriations have been reduced. Expenditures have been reduced. We are operating on a much better basis than has been the case for a long period of time, as the Senator knows. So far as providing funds to meet deficits is concerned, supplemental appropriations are just as objectionable to me now as they were under the previous administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May we have the cooperation of the distinguished senior member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee in turning the heat on the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments to see that in the future estimates are honest estimates, and that the program of supplemental appropriations is not continued?

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose we shall always have some supplemental appropriations. However, so far as turning the heat on is concerned, I shall certainly do my part, as I have done in the past.

I point out to the Senator, as he looks over the various items, that with respect to certain items, when reference is made to an increase by the Senate committee over the House——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not been attacking the increases by the Senate committee. I have been attacking the practices of the administrative departments in not accurately forecasting what their demands would be and thereby giving a false impression to the country. I have no criticism of the Senate committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think perhaps I interrupted the Senator from New

Hampshire. I was waiting to have him pledge his cooperation in getting the administration to follow sound business practices.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am always looking in that direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I am inclined to agree with his statement that perhaps the time has come when some heat ought to be turned on someone to reduce appropriations and expenditures. I fully agree with the Senator from Illinois that the practice of submitting requests for supplemental appropriations leaves a false impression with the American people to a certain extent. However, the way to correct that situation and the way to put the heat on, is not to request the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Arizona to put the heat on the administration. We have the votes in the Congress to do the job. All we have to do is to vote down the requests, and that does the job automatically. That will put this administration, or any other administration on proper notice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Delaware think also that the votes of Senators and the votes of the people of the country might have some effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that certain appropriations ought to be cut. However, I still say that there is no use criticizing the administration downtown and then voting for appropriations. I do not say the Senator has been doing so, but I do say that so long as Congress votes appropriations we cannot criticize the administration for spending them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand that the Senator intends to vote against the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I intend to vote against many of the items. Some of them can be justified. We must approach each item on its merits. However, I think the practice has gone too far. In the past perhaps both administrations to some extent have claimed many things which have not been delivered. However, I believe that the proper way to approach the problem of lower expenditures is by our votes here in the Senate.

Let us not overlook the fact that in many instances these supplemental appropriation requests represent funds required by bills we have recently passed. For instance, while I voted against the 10 percent salary-increase bill it passed, and we will now be required to appropriate next year nearly $1 billion extra to meet the added cost. That bill was passed by the Senate over the administration's recommendations.

Again, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the time to balance our Federal budget is long overdue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware for his characteristically honest statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do wish to raise a point with the Senator from Arizona regarding the advisability of discussing the bill at all today. The bill was not available to any Member of the Senate until 11 o'clock today. No Senator except the members of the committee had an opportunity to see it. I have great confidence in the Appropriations Committee, but I think it is a bad practice to consider appropriation bills such as this in the Senate without letting them lie over at least 1 day as required by our rules. I did not happen to be in the Chamber at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was made, or I should have objected to it. However, now that the agreement is in effect, we must be governed by it. It is provided in our rules that appropriation bills should be printed and allowed to lie over at least 48 hours so that Members of the Senate can take them home and examine the different items. I think it is only fair to Senators, who must vote on such bills, to give them that opportunity. I wonder if we can have some assurance from the chairman that this situation will not occur again.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe that our rules should be followed in the case of major appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill carries appropriations of $950 million. That is a major item where I come from. I think it is a major item everywhere.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yesterday the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill, calling for appropriations of over $3 billion, was passed. That bill was likewise taken up by unanimous consent without Senators having had an opportunity to study it in advance.

I serve notice now that I will not consent to such unanimous-consent agreements again in connection with appropriation bills. I would not have consented to the present agreement yesterday had I been in the Chamber.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator has made a proper recommendation with respect to the major appropriation bills. However, so far as the Treasury and Post Office bill is concerned, those departments must operate, and only rarely is there any controversy over the appropriation bill for their appropriations. The same situation applies with respect to supplemental appropriation bills. However, when it comes to large appropriation bills, covering a multitude of subjects, I think Senators should have the time to study the bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The appropriation bill passed yesterday carried appropriations of more than $3 billion. Today's bill carries appropriations of approximately $1 billion. Four billion dollars is a great deal of money. With all due respect to the committee and to the departments, Senators cannot vote intelligently on the various items unless they have an opportunity to study the bills in advance.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator from Delaware. I think he is entirely correct. I also agree with the Senator from Arizona, that in the future we should live up to our rules. I may say to the Senator from Delaware, as well as to the distinguished chairman of the committee, that, as the ranking minority member of the committee, I have received several complaints from other Senators who have made plans, and who would like to be present during the consideration of the bill, because they are particularly interested in certain items. I believe that if we allow the practice now being followed to become general, we shall get into an unfortunate situation, and create ill feeling. In addition, it is not good legislative procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rule specifically provides that bills must lie over for 3 days. That rule has a constructive purpose. The purpose is to allow Members of the Senate an opportunity at least to examine the bills. In this particular instance I was unable to obtain a copy of the bill or the report of the Appropriations Committee until after 11 o'clock today.

I hope the chairman of the committee will assure us that in the future we shall be given proper notice.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have already given such assurance to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act," to remain available until expended as follows: Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., not to exceed $110,854; to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of amounts heretofore appropriated for "Claims, Federal Airport Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board—Payments to Air Carriers," on page 4, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$15,200,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment? Why is this increase justified?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who handles the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, to explain the item.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Board is making an effort to bring to a more current basis its payments of the subsidies to air carriers provided under the law that Congress passed.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he commends the Civil Aeronautics Board for trying to put this matter on a more current basis. The other members of the Committee on Appropriations felt the same way about it. We feel that we should hold up the hands of CAA in its manifest effort to

bring its business practice to a sounder basis by paying audited and earned items which are due commercial air carriers at an earlier date than they have been paid formerly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment is not an increase in the overall expenditure. The subsidies being paid to the airlines have been decreased. The purpose of the amendment is to make the expenditures on a current basis. In other words, the bookkeeping of the Board will be on a more current basis than it is at the present time. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is, of course, exactly correct. The size of these items depends upon the law, and we passed the law. The items are not passed for payment until they have been audited. Each claim is audited. The Civil Aeronautics Board is seeking to bring its accounts with the carriers on a more current basis. It is the judgment of the Senator from Florida that it is sound business practice, and he believes that we should commend the Board and go along with it in its effort to bring its accounts on a more current basis.

The same situation will arise later in the bill when we reach the consideration of the Maritime Commission payments. In fact, this prompt payment would be a more honest practice. It prevents airlines from piling up interest on money borrowed until their claims are paid; this, in the final analysis, must be paid by the Federal Government. As a rule, the interest paid on loans made by carriers are made at a much higher interest rate than would be the cost if the Federal Government were borrowing the money.

The amendment would promote sound and honest business practice by bringing these payments to a more current basis than has been the case up to now. The Senator from Florida believes—and he believes every other member of the Appropriations Committee also believes—it is a good practice to have these accounts brought up to date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps these questions would have been answered in my mind if we had had time to read these explanations. However, we did not have that time granted to us. Are not all the claims audited by the Comptroller General and approved by him prior to their being paid?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are all audited and approved.

I should like the RECORD to show, too, what was stated by Mr. Gurney, who testified for the Civil Aeronautics Board. Senators will remember that Mr. Gurney was an able member of this body some years ago. I quote from his statement, which will be found at page 233 of the Senate hearings:

> Under the rates on which the current estimates are based the average ton-mile yield for service pay and subsidy combined for all carriers, both domestic and international, declines from $1.19 in 1954 to 97 cents in 1955.

We feel the Board is doing a good business job in not only reducing the rates, but also in insisting on bringing the accounts to a more current basis.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The airlines are doing an exceptionally able job. Their deficiencies are less, and they are operating almost within their earnings. The Federal Government's subsidies now and in the future promise to be less than they have been in the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 4, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maritime Activities—Operating-Differential Subsidies," on page 4, line 21, after the word "subsidies," to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that item?

Mr. HOLLAND. This item also comes from one of the agencies which on its regular budget request would be handled by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Florida is the chairman. These operating differential subsidies are paid under the authority of title VI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. They have been consistently determined on a basis designed to place American shipowners on a par with their foreign competitors insofar as certain direct vessel operating costs are concerned. This principle of parity acknowledges the fact that since cargo rates of American operators, the source of income, must be competitive with those of foreign operators which have much lower costs of operation, the American operators could not continue to maintain scheduled services without a means of offsetting the considerably higher costs.

Mr. President, that result flows from the law which we passed in an effort to keep our merchant marine alive. The reason for the increase for the current year is exactly the same as the one stated a while ago for the CAB.

It is an attempt by the agencies to bring their accounts to a more current basis. The accounts have been audited, and they are ready for payment. The Senator from Florida asked the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, if we made this allowance, whether we would find later that we had appropriated more than the Commission needed. I warned him, if that were the case, we would not be apt to look with much favor on a recommendation of this kind in the future.

He stated categorically that these amounts would be needed, every penny of them. He said he was trying to reduce the carrying time and the carrying over of these accounts. He specifically brought out the fact that when late payments of subsidy caused borrowing the interest paid was added to the operating costs, so that subsidy payments increase. He stated, further, that the operators' loan interest rates were not good, and that we would be building up heavier claims, which the Federal Government would have to pay, by allowing these obligations to run so long.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware—and I am glad that he is interested in this item—that every member of the Appropriations Committee felt with respect to this matter just as all of us did with respect to the other matter which was handled a few minutes ago when we dealt with the CAB, namely, that the effort to handle these items in a more businesslike way is to be commended. We should do all we can to help bring these accounts on a more current basis and eliminate the unsatisfactory interest charge, and the unsatisfactory added operating expenses, which are occasioned by carrying these accounts unpaid for as long as 2 or 3 years, as has been customary in recent years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand the Senator correctly, the reason why some of these accounts have been carried 2 or 3 years or even 5 years is that they have been pending in the courts. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true with respect to some of them, but it is not true with respect to many others.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask this question, then?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to page 5 of the committee report, where the following statement appears. This is the view of the full committee, as I understand, and I heard no dissent from this sentiment.

> It is the opinion of the committee that when there exists an obligation of the Government incurred in accordance with law with members of the public, Congress should not take any action to abridge the payments due by failure to provide the funds fully to satisfy debts as promptly as payments can prudently be made.

We think that is sound law, sound judgment and good business, and we stand on that. We expect to find the disinguished Senator from Delaware, who I believe is one of the soundest businessmen in this body, to approve that approach.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the committee on that approach. However, I wanted to make sure that this item had been examined. The reason we are forced to ask these questions from the floor is that the report from which the Senator from Florida has read, was not available to the other Members of the Senate until about 2 hours ago. It is impossible for us to read that report now. The only way in which we can get the information is by asking some of these questions.

I should like to ask whether any part of the $60 million requested is to be used in payment of any claim which is now pending before the court and whether all claims included in this item have been audited and approved.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that this item applies only to claims which have been audited and are ready

for settlement. I refer the Senator to two quotations which may be found on page 25 of the work slips.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course we do not have the work slips available. The other Members of the Senate do not have the work slips available. However, I should be very much interested in hearing the quotations read by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. What I am about to read is a quotation on pages 285 and 288 of the hearings, which have been printed and which I believe have been available to the Senator for quite a while.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they have been available.

Mr. HOLLAND. The item on page 25 of the work slips is the same item as will be found on page 288 of the printed hearings.

This is a quotation from Mr. Rothschild, recently appointed and now serving as Under Secretary of Commerce:

> We owe the money and will owe the money by the end of this year. We have stepped up our administrative program to the point where we now have only a 3-month voucher processing backlog, where we formerly had a 6-month backlog.
>
> As was indicated to your committee on previous occasions, we had hoped to do just that, and we did get it done, and we need every bit of the money.
>
> As we stand today, for example, we have vouchers on hand as of today for just over $35 million, so that if we would get only the $35 million which was authorized by the House committee, we would be out of money as of today.

The other statement was made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which I now read:

> Chairman HAYDEN. I might state that a representative of the General Accounting Office says they have examined the records, vouchers, and the basis for estimating the requirements for the second supplemental, 1955, for operating-differential subsidies, and have found that the estimate is well founded on the basis of the United States payments due to provide for prompt settlement of three-fourths of the amount earned for the third quarter of fiscal 1955. Provided the shipping lines submit vouchers in time for completion of examination by Maritime Administration, the payment should be expected to reach $125 million this year.

Mr. President, I should like to advise the Senate of this fact. The distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of the committee, the ranking minority member and some of the junior members of the committee, remained here during the Easter recess in order to have the bill ready to report to the Senate. There has been not only no unnecessary delay, but I have been particularly impressed, as a new member of the committee, with the care displayed by the distinguished chairman, the distinguished ranking minority member, and other members, in insisting that on any point of difficulty the opinion of the General Accounting Office should be had, and on any point where such action was necessary it should simply be put over and come up in the annual bill which is yet to be considered.

I wish to say that I have been impressed by the way these items have been worked out, and I am sure the committee as a whole—I believe it is unanimous—is on sound ground in commending those agencies, some of which I have mentioned, for putting their operations on a businesslike basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I certainly do not want my questions to be taken as any criticism of the committee, but we cannot get away from the fact that the committee does not have the power to legislate. That power is in the Congress. The committee does have a responsibility under the rules of the Senate to make the information available to us and give us ample time to examine it. I am not criticizing the committee, but we have a perfect right to have access to the reports and to have an opportunity to read them overnight before we are asked to legislate. I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator, and I appreciate his kind comment with reference to the committee, and particularly with reference to the chairman. When this bill was marked up and reported yesterday, it was understood that it would come up on Friday or later. I do not know what happened on the floor to hurry up its consideration; that was not the expectation of the Appropriations Committee. I assumed it was worked out between the leadership of the two parties on the floor and with the presence on the floor of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who is always in his seat. I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate who is more earnest than he in attendance on the sessions of the Senate. The plan was changed after the bill was reported.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was one time when I was caught off the floor. If I had been present and a unanimous-consent request had been made for the consideration of the bill, consent would not have been given.

Are we to understand that the General Accounting Office has already approved the allowance in the amount of $60 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the General Accounting Office has approved it. I understand there was more than enough already fully audited and ready for payment on the day of our hearing to have taken up the whole amount allowed by the House, and that the audits are moving ahead rapidly. It was realistic of us to increase the amount allowed by the House to permit the carrying out of the excellent planning of the Federal agency, which wishes to keep more current in its payments than has been the case heretofore.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I just wanted to make the point at this time that perhaps I should have objected to the consideration of the bill today. I did not do so. I point out to the Senate, however, that last year and in other years when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I was many times harassed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators as to whether or not we were acting within the rule. Sometimes I would have to look up at the clock and say, "This bill was reported at 1:05 on Tuesday," for instance. The Senator from Illinois was very particular, and I had to live up to the rule. Perhaps I was a little at fault in not registering an objection when the Senator from Delaware was not present and some other Senators were not present.

I should like to read the rule. It is section 139 (a), and it reads as follows:

> No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been made available for at least 3 calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

That is very plain and specific, and I think that in the future we should live up to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate that statement from the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not believe there is anything in this bill of an emergency nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I assume the bill could have gone over an extra day. But I am reminded by the clerk of the committee that at least four agencies are now completely out of funds, and they need the enactment of this measure in order that they may meet payments which are now due.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly the point I am making. These agencies came before the Congress last year and outlined their needs for a full year. Only 8 months have passed and now if any agency is at a point where it is out of money completely if the bill is not passed today, I think it would do it good to go without a pay check or two. Under the law each agency is supposed to budget its expenditures.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida——

Mr. HOLLAND. May I make this comment just before the Senator asks his question. Undoubtedly some of the Senator's comment is properly placed against some of the items, although I cannot name them. But there are many items in the bill against which his comments would not properly lie. There are three items in the bill relating to the construction of roads and highways for which we gave contractual authorization and on which the work has been done and on which payment is due. The work was done under our specific direction. Probably one of the largest single items has to do with the meeting of the costs of recent legislation passed by the Congress applicable to the Defense Department. The Senator will recall that the total amount, running up, as I recall, to more than $300 million—the record will speak for itself as to that—had to do with transfers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, particularly the Army and Air Force, to take care of both incentive pay and retirement pay made necessary by legislation which we voted this year and which could not have been included in the budget.

So although I am very certain that the remarks of the Senator from Delaware may be very properly directed to some of the items in the bill, I must say that

the larger items in the bill would not be subject to those remarks, because they represent either funds due for the carrying out of contractual authorizations or funds needed because of changed law, which has been enacted during this session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct; but, by the same token, neither of the two cases he mentioned—and perhaps others which I believe are in the bill—would have been affected in the least whether the bill were passed today, tomorrow, or Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably correct in that statement. By the time the actual transfer or payment of funds had been made, probably 24 hours would not have made much difference. But certainly if the members of the committee had not stayed in Washington during the Easter recess and prepared the bill for early action, there would have been delays which would have been hurtful.

I think the Senator from Delaware will recognize the fact that the committee—especially its distinguished chairman—has been diligent in the matter. Whatever the reasons were that animated the leadership on the floor to move up consideration of the bill from Friday to Thursday should not be chargeable to the committee, which reported the bill with the distinct understanding that it was to be acted upon on the floor tomorrow—Friday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I concur in the statement by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I wish to proceed with the question of the $60 million item. I notice in the report that the amount comes out as exactly $60 million. Certainly there must have been a breakdown somewhere, because, if I read correctly, the cash deficit as of January 30, 1955, was $19,530,533. The estimated amount of additional vouchers for the last quarter of 1954 and the first quarter of 1955 comes to $40,469,447. That includes the estimated $20 million for 1955. The figure comes out as an even $60 million for the three quarters.

There must have been some breakdown. I wonder if the committee had such an estimate furnished to it. I notice in the hearings that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] raised the same point, that a General Accounting Office report or breakdown was not available to the committee, and he suggested that one should be obtained. Did the committee obtain such a breakdown?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee obtained such a breakdown.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my point. I wanted to be sure it had been obtained. I did not see it printed in the hearings, and I wondered if the committee received such a breakdown from the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HAYDEN. We did.

Mr. HOLLAND. A later expenditure statement was furnished. I think the Senator from Delaware will find, by perusing the hearings, that the members of the committee had the same feeling as does the Senator from Delaware, that the matter should be substantiated by a breakdown which would be worthy of belief by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the committee took the same position at the time, but I did not find it in the report. Evidently, the report came after the hearings had been printed. I merely wanted to be certain that such a breakdown had been furnished.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am advised by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that such a report was furnished and was considered by the committee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his interest. I am glad he is concerned about these matters. He will find the Senator from Florida equally concerned. But in this instance I think the committee, which worked with such diligence to prepare the bill, is not to be charged with the fact that the bill is being considered today, on only 1 day's notice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With respect to payments to shipping companies of the amounts which are certified by the General Accounting Office as being due them, are the payments made to a company which might at the same time owe the Government money? Or would such payments be withheld in such a situation?

That is, if there should be an outstanding claim by the Government against a company, would the money due the company be withheld until the claim was settled?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am advised by the clerk of the committee that in contested matters of the type which the Senator from Delaware has mentioned, the agency is now withholding, and will continue to withhold, payments. At present $125 million is so withheld, which amount is not included in the amount provided in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wished to make certain that Congress would not be authorizing payments of claims to companies against which the Government had claims.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am able to advise the Senator that our information from the agency is that it withholds money to cover such matters, and does not approve such claims for payment, and that they are not included in the items covered by the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

REPAIR OF RESERVE FLEET FACILITIES

For expenses of repair and installation of mooring facilities and restoration of cathodic installations at reserve fleet locations, $970,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Repair of Reserve Fleet Vessels (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)," on page 5, line 11, to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $40,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for Reserve Fleet expenses is increased from "$6,460,000" to "$6,860,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads—Federal-Aid Highways," on page 5, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Highways," on page 6, line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Lands Highways (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)," on page 6, line 10, after "(68 Stat. 73)", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Civil Functions—Department of the Army—Canal Zone Government—Operating Expenses," on page 6, at the beginning of line 26, to strike out "$230,000" and insert "$338,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Defense," on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims," $4,320,000, to be derived by transfer from "Military personnel, Navy," fiscal year 1955.

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay," $8 million, to be derived by transfer from "Military personnel, Navy," fiscal year 1955.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the respective amount stated:

"Claims," Department of Defense, $4,320,000;

"Retired pay," Department of Defense, $22 million;

"Military personnel, Army," $150 million;

"Military personnel, Air Force," $110 million; the foregoing amounts under this head to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation only during the fiscal year 1955 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the senior Senator from Illinois mentioned some of the increases in the supplemental appropriation bill. Apparently, he did not fully realize that the Committee on Appropriations has no discretionary authority to ignore some of the legislative mandates of the legislative committees which are contained in bills approved by Congress.

At this point I wish to call attention to the fact that although funds in the

amendment currently before the Senate are authorized transfers within the Department of Defense and call for no additional funds, a large share of the increased operating expenses is the direct result of the so-called Career Incentive Act of 1955, which was approved by Congress in March of this year.

At that time probably little attention was paid by Members of the Senate to the various provisions of the Career Incentive Act. One of the provisions increased the retirement annuities resulting from that direct mandate. I wish to point out that for the last 3 months—the final 3 months—of this fiscal year, the estimated cost of the increased retirement annuities is in excess of $14 million; and that for the fiscal year 1956 the estimated cost is $56,308,000.

When the increased retirement costs are added to the amounts for the Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodedic Survey, the cost for the last 3 months of the present fiscal year will be $15,820,000, while the estimated cost for fiscal 1956 will be $63,487,000.

I emphasize the fact that the Committee on Appropriations had no discretionary authority to withhold funds which are necessary to implement the provisions of the Career Incentive Act.

I am calling attention particularly to the increased retirement annuities, because probably very few Members of the Senate knew in March, when the career incentive bill was before this body, that very extensive increased costs would result specifically from increasing retirement annuities, allegedly to stimulate interest on the part of enlisted men in making a career of the armed services.

It is difficult for me to rationalize the substantially increased retirement annuities for officers in the grades of colonel and general as having a direct effect in encouraging and in influencing privates to make a career in the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK subsequently said:

Mr. President, in connection with the remarks which I made earlier on the supplemental appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief summary dealing with increased retirement annuities resulting from career incentive legislation.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increased retirement annuities resulting from career incentive legislation

	Estimated cost, Apr. 1–June 30, 1955	Estimated cost, fiscal year 1956
Army	$7,570,000	$30,280,000
Navy	4,769,000	19,076,000
Marine Corps	395,000	1,580,000
Air Force	1,343,000	5,372,000
Total Defense	14,077,000	56,308,000
Coast Guard	1,700,000	7,000,000
Public Health	33,000	140,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey	10,000	39,000
Grand total	15,820,000	63,487,000

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Foreign Operations Funds Appropriated to the President—Mutual Security—Contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance," on page 9, line 2, after the numerals "1955," to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Export-Import Bank of Washington—Limitation on Expenses," on page 9, line 15, to strike out "$1,110,000" and insert "$1,140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Independent Offices," on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

SURVEYS, PLANS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 20, to strike out:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by such Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 14, to insert:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

For an additional amount for "Expenses, general supply fund", $258,000, to be derived by transfer from "Defense public works, community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

SOO LOCKS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Commission in preparing, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 620), a comprehensive plan for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, and transportation and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence for members serving without compensation, $21,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of Labor," at the top of page 14, to insert:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, $13 million, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," on page 15, after line 6, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO STATES, GENERAL

The limitation under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from "$2,400,000" to $2,418,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $125,000, to be derived by transfer from "Retired pay of commissioned officers," fiscal year 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," on page 16, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$79,400,000" and insert "$80,640,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 14, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services," $28,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IX—Department of State—Salaries and Expenses," on page 17, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 14, to insert:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1955 shall be available for additional contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, as authorized by the act of August 31, 1954 (Public Law 736), in an amount not to exceed $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Contingencies," on page 18, line 3, after the word "contingencies", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expense, United States At-

torneys and Marshals," on page 18, line 10, after the word "marshals", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Judiciary," at the top of page 20, to insert:

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $13,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries of Judges," on page 20, line 9, to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$914,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter X," on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 10, to insert:

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," $1,100,000 to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay," $584,000, to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 19, to insert:

RESERVE TRAINING

For an additional amount for "Reserve training," $46,000, to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 6, to insert:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $63,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—District of Columbia," on page 22, after line 12, to insert:

OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL

The limitation of $10,000 for the settlement of claims not in excess of $250 each in accordance with the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, is increased to $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

OPERATING EXPENSES

METROPOLITAN POLICE

The appropriation for "Metropolitan Police (additional municipal service, American Legion Convention)," contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for payment at basic salary rate for services performed from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, by members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department in excess of their regular tour of duty (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing service within such period).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 4, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Department of Public Health," $650,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 7, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Department of Public Welfare," $152,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500 65 Stat. 131), $23,008.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 20, to insert:

JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Congress), $10,587, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 3, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS

For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Congress), $155,095, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest on audited claims for refunds at not exceeding 4 percent per annum as provided by law (act of July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 546, sec. 14d).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XII—Legislative Branch," on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, AND SALARY AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF SENATORS

For an additional amount for "Compensation of Senators," as authorized by Public Law 9, 84th Congress, $320,001.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 11, to insert:

COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Compensation of the Vice President of the United States," as authorized by Public Law 9, 84th Congress, $1,667.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 16, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the office of the Secretary, $3,905, to be available, effective April 1, 1955, for the compensation of one director of photography, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $5,100 and one laboratory technician, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $4,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 26, to insert:

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $140: *Provided*, That effective April 1, 1955, the basic rate of compensation of the chief cabinetmaker shall be $3,540 in lieu of $3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 5, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $3,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 9, to insert:

Furniture: For an additional amount for materials for furniture and repairs of same and for the purchase of furniture, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 12, to insert:

Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items," exclusive of labor, $51,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 14, to insert.

Packing boxes: For an additional amount for "Packing boxes," $500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 16, to insert:

Postage stamps: For an additional amount for "Postage stamps," for office of Secretary, $115.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 18, to insert:

Notwithstanding any provision of law, service heretofore or hereafter performed as an employee of the Republican senatorial campaign committee or the Democratic senatorial campaign committee shall be considered for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to be service as an employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of such act by the act of July 13, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "House of Representatives," on page 27, after line 6, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Clerk: For the employment effective April 1, 1955, of an administrative assistant to the Coordinator of the Joint Recording Facility, at the basic salary rate of $4,800 per annum; a film librarian, at the basic salary rate of $2,500 per annum; and a secretary, at the basic salary rate of $2,220 per annum in lieu of $1,500 basic per annum, $3,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Capitol Police," on page 27, after line 21, to strike out:

Capitol Police Board: For an additional amount, $3,420.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Capitol Police Board: For additional amounts for "Capitol Police Board," as follows: fiscal year 1954, $21,139; fiscal year 1955, $38,972.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings," $16,000, of which $12,500 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Capitol Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination, including related architectural treatment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with respect to page 28, line 19, which provides for an additional amount for the Senate Office Building, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate and the chairman of the committee that the bill has a very broad authorization for the House of Representatives to build a new office building and to acquire land and property for the expansion of facilities for use of House Members. I think it is perfectly proper that should be done, and I am in favor of it. However, I wish to point out that finally, after some years, we have started on a new Senate Office Building. I think we made one great mistake about it, however. I do not think we have acquired the necessary property in the area, much of which is slum property, to provide for adequate parking facilities, for proper approaches, or for anything of the kind. I wonder if the chairman of the committee will express an opinion on that subject and give some consideration to it, so that we may approach the problem more on the basis on which the House is approaching their problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. The suggestion was made during the consideration of the pending bill that something of that kind ought to be done. Of course, there is great merit in the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire. We did not have time to go into the question in a proper way. I am quite sure the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations will look into the matter very carefully when it comes to report the regular bill. There is no question about the situation which is going to develop in that regard; which, as a matter of fact, has already developed. Parking space is at a tremendous premium, even if no other use could be found for the property. I think also it would be well to own such property for the protection of the building. I think it would be well to have the building some distance away from other buildings. There is merit in the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is suggesting that perhaps in the consideration of the regular legislative appropriation bill that matter could be considered At that time the problem might be approached as the House has approached it here. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, will give consideration to that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make another statement. I know I am looking quite a bit ahead when I say this and that some people will scoff at the idea, but 2 or 3 or 4 years ago we authorized about $65 million for the United Nations to build a modern building in New York and we provided a substantial sum of money for that purpose. Many Members of this body have visited the capitals of other countries of the world, some of which we have been helping for years and some which we have been helping more than others and many of them have magnificent parliamentary buildings. There is hardly a person who will not say that the Capitol of this country is a historic institution, but, in my judgment, it is becoming rapidly obsolete for the proper functioning of the Congress of a great country of 165 million people. That time may not come in the life of those presently in the Senate, but some thought should be given to the idea of acquiring property in this vicinity so that a new modern capitol of the United States may be constructed, in which the Congress could function efficiently and capably, at which time the present Capitol of the United States could become a great historical monument, such as Mount Vernon is today. It would be an historic shrine to which many people could come. I am very sincerely of the opinion that the time will come, but I do not know when.

My only point in raising the question at this time is that, if that time should come, such a new capitol should be constructed near the present Capitol of the United States, where we do have the Senate and House Office Buildings. Some thought should be given to acquiring the property necessary when that necessity arises. I realize that tomorrow someone may severely criticize me for mentioning this, but we must look ahead. I am sure that no one who has been in this building for any length of time will deny that it is difficult to function efficiently in our present building as should be the case in a government of a great country.

Mr. HAYDEN. I concur in what the Senator from New Hampshire has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to insert:

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," $43,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 20, under the item "Senate Office Building," it is proposed to strike out the amount "$43,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$53,000", and add thereafter a comma and the following new language, "of which $10,000 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Senate Office Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I might state that the lighting system in the Senate Office Building was designed for the use of direct current electricity. It is being changed to alternating current, and therefore a different kind of equipment will be required. Just what kind of equipment it will be, we do not know, but it will be necessary, in order to obtain efficient lighting in the offices of Senators, to make some study of what lighting system is needed for their use and the use of employees who work there. The object is that such a study should be made as promptly as possible, so that when the regular legislative appropriation bill shall be under consideration, there will be definite information which can be submitted with regard to working out the changeover from one kind of electrical current to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment on page 28, after line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 20, to strike out:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by such Commission.

SEC. 1202. (a) If the site upon which the building authorized to be constructed by section 12A (1) of this act is not within the United States Capitol Grounds as defined in the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regu-

late the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a, 193m), the Architect is authorized to acquire such site by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and upon acquisition of such site and completion of the building, such building, and the grounds, sidewalks, and facilities surrounding it, shall be subject to the provisions of (1) of the act of May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175) (relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building), and (2) the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., sec. 193a, 193m).

(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–614).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated $2 million, to remain available until expended; and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 1204. This subchapter may be cited as the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 14, to insert:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary equipment, such necessary connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such necessary access facilities over or under public streets, such other appurtenant or necessary facilities, such changes in the present House Office buildings and mechanical and other changes necessitated thereby, and such changes in or additions to the present subway systems, as may be approved by such Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on pa[illegible] after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 1202. (a) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purposes of section 1201 of this chapter or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any street, avenue, road, highway, alley, or part thereof, acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the House Office Building Commission. Square numbered 636 in the District of Columbia (which is now part of the new House of Representatives Office Building site) shall be available for the purposes of this chapter. Any real property owned by the United States and located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol without reimbursement or transfer of funds. At such time or times as may be fixed by order of the House Office Building Commission, (1) any real property acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter shall become part of the United States Capitol Grounds and subject to the act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a–193m, 212a, and 212b), and (2) the building and all facilities constructed pursuant to section 1201 of this chapter shall become subject to such act approved July 31, 1946, and to the provisions of law relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building contained in the act approved May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175).

(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–644).

(c) When any real property has been acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this chapter there is hereby appropriated $5,000,000, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by the House Office Building Commission to be required for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of such Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 1204. This chapter may be cited as the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XIII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments," on page 34, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 25 and"; and in line 11, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$6,269,842" and insert "$9,504,219."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "School-lunch program," $7,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, this amendment is being offered to meet the requirements in Oklahoma and several of the other States for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the State Board of Education in Oklahoma, describing the acute emergency which has arisen there.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 1955.

Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
Senator, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KERR: I have been notified by Harvey Allen, legislative chairman of the American School Food Service Association, that the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended a drastic cut in the Federal school-lunch appropriation and a $25 million increase in the special school-milk program. Since the School Lunch Division is responsible for administering both programs in Oklahoma, I would like to advise you of status of the two programs in this State.

The maximum allowable reimbursement under the National School Lunch Act is 9 cents per meal. The average payment in Oklahoma is 4½ cents. In spite of reducing the rate to that low figure, we will be unable to pay any reimbursement for the month of May this year and possibly only 75 percent of April.

On the other hand, the procedure set up to administer the special milk program is so unrealistic we will have a balance of unexpended funds, totaling $600,000, which will have to be returned to Commodity Credit Corporation. You can readily see that the programs are working conversely for the children of Oklahoma.

As you know, the extreme drought in this area has caused much unemployment—those on relief rolls approximate 200,000 and the need for schools supplying free meals in many cases reaches 40 percent of enrollment.

If the proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture are adopted, it will seriously impair the health of the schoolchild in Oklahoma.

We would appreciate anything you can do to aid us in this cause.

Very truly yours,
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
DREW V. LANGLEY,
Director, School-Lunch Division.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a telegram signed by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and myself, addressed to Mr.

Howard Davis, acting director of the Food Distribution Division, Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1955.

Mr. HOWARD DAVIS,
Acting Director, Food Distribution Division, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:

Please advise at earliest convenience status of school-lunch fund for reimbursement of States which are, like Oklahoma, running short of funds for months of April, May, and June. Also furnish rate of reimbursements each of these States and other information in line with telephone conversation your office today.

ROBERT S. KERR.
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, of the Department of Agriculture, dated April 13, 1955, setting forth the answers to our questions, and also a table showing a list of States expected either to reduce the level of reimbursement payments or to cease reimbursement payments to the participating schools for the latter part of the school year, and also reimbursement rates paid as of January 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KERR: This is in reply to your telegram of April 6 to Howard P. Davis of our Food Distribution Division, requesting information as to the status of school lunch funds in those States which may expend the balance of their funds at existing reimbursement rates prior to the end of the school year.

At the beginning of each fiscal year the funds appropriated for the operation of the national school lunch program are apportioned to the States in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act. The States are then advised of the amounts that will be available for cash reimbursement to participating schools during the fiscal year. These funds are advanced to the States on a quarterly basis and the State agencies are encouraged to budget these funds so as to maintain assistance to participating schools throughout the school year. The fourth quarterly payment in the amount of $10,360,397 was made to the States the first week of April.

Cash payments to the schools are made on the basis of a specified rate of reimbursement for each meal served. The rate of reimbursement for individual schools is determined at the beginning of the school year and is made a part of the agreement between the State agency and the school. In making this determination, States must estimate the number of meals that will be served during the year and establish the level of reimbursement in relation to the amount of funds available. This means that any increase in participation not anticipated by the State will result, if no adjustments in rates are made, in exhaustion of funds prior to the end of the year. (During the current year participation increases in many States have been higher than normal and the program nationally is reaching about 11 million children, as compared to 10.1 million last year.)

In most cases, the States review their funds situation after midyear and make necessary adjustments to bring the monthly rate of expenditure in line with the total funds available. In other instances, States prefer to maintain the rates without change, with the result that funds are exhausted before the close of the school year. The latter situation is likely to occur in a number of States this year. However, it should be recognized that commodities purchased with funds appropriated for the national school lunch program as well as surplus foods continue to be available to the individual lunch programs, and that most schools arrange to continue lunch program operations despite the curtailment of cash payments.

We are enclosing a list of States whose current rate of expenditure is likely to result in exhaustion of reimbursement funds prior to the end of the school year, or will mean that sharply reduced rates of reimbursement will be paid for the last 2 or 3 months of the year. This situation occurs for at least a few States each year, but has been more pronounced this year because of a greater than usual increase in program participation.

Sincerely yours,

ORVIS V. WELLS,
Administrator.

NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

List of States expected either to reduce level of reimbursement payments or to cease reimbursement payments to participating schools for the latter part of the school year and reimbursement rates paid as of January 1955:

State:	*Reimbursement rate* [1] *(cents)*
Arizona [2]	3–9
California	4
Delaware	5
Georgia [2]	3–6
Idaho	4½
Indiana	5
Iowa	4
Michigan [2]	4–6
Minnesota [2]	1–5
Mississippi	7
Missouri	5
Ohio	5
Oklahoma [2]	3–7
South Carolina	5
Tennessee [2]	3–8
Vermont	9
Washington	4
Wyoming [2]	4–6

[1] Prevailing rate as of January 1955.
[2] Variable rates paid in relation to need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to state, for the benefit of my colleagues, that this matter was not brought to the attention of the committee before it made up the bill. Therefore, all the knowledge we have regarding the necessity for additional funds to carry out the school-lunch program is embraced in the letter the Senator from Oklahoma has inserted in the RECORD, as the letter had come from the proper authorities. If the references contained in the letter are correct, certainly some additional funds should be made available.

Whether the exact amount the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to have made available is the proper amount under the circumstances, I have no way of knowing. All I can say is that, after consultation with the other members of the committee, we have agreed to accept the amendment, take it to conference, and then obtain such further information as may be necessary in order to adjust the matter satisfactorily and properly.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. I wish to say to him that we did not get word of this shortage and this crisis until after the committee had completed its hearings on the bill, or otherwise we most certainly would have presented the matter to the committee at the hearings.

On behalf of my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], myself, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who has joined us in submitting the amendment, we wish to express our sincere and keen appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee, to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and to the other members of the committee who have indicated their willingness to take the amendment to conference and there, to the extent that they feel it necessary, check on the amount which is being included in the bill at this time, and for this purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I desire to express my deep appreciation to the Senators who have agreed to take the amendment to conference. We regret that the emergency was not disclosed until after the hearings had closed.

When we consider that more than 1 million school children are now participating in the school-lunch program, and when we further consider the vast areas affected by drought or by freezing weather, which have most seriously affected various parts of the country, and in some cases have caused more than 40 percent of the school children to have to rely upon Federal participation in the school-lunch program, because of a lack of food in the families of those children, I believe it will be realized that the amendment is a most worthy and deserving one. So I greatly appreciate the willingness of the members of the committee to take the amendment to conference for further study.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish to throw any cold water on the amendment, but I think we should understand all the facts in connection with it.

To begin with, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has told us that the information came in too late to be presented to the committee. He is correct. Of course, the fact that it was not presented to the committee is bad practice, because all these items should be brought before the committee, and evidence should be submitted. However, the Senator was not informed in time to enable

him to present the proposal to the committee. We understand the situation.

The Congress was very generous last year in connection with the school-lunch program. I agree with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the school-lunch program is one of the best programs we have in this country. Perhaps the money spent in connection with it is put to as worthwhile use as would be possible in connection with any program. I have always been for it, as most of my colleagues have been.

However, there is an obligation on the part of the States, when funds are allocated to them for the school-lunch program, so to budget the funds they receive that they will cover the entire school year. Some States must have done so, and some States must not have done so. The States which must not have done so are today in the condition described.

While I feel sympathetic toward the States facing the situation which has been described, nevertheless, I point out that it is not exactly fair to the States which are properly budgeting the funds and are living within their estimates in connection with the school-lunch budget.

I am not raising a point of order, as I told the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I would not. I understand that what they are doing is trying to protect the schoolchildren of their State. It is not my purpose to oppose their proposal today. However, I think the facts should be known, so that we may avoid getting into such a situation again.

Earlier in the day I was taken to task, as was the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is against all supplemental appropriation bills. Apparently he has forgotten that we had supplemental appropriation bills over the years when the administration of his party was in power. Apparently he has forgotten that last year he compelled the Senator from New Hampshire to abide strictly by the rule in connection with appropriation bills.

Apparently the situation as to school lunches is the result of some unforeseen happening, on the one hand, or the failure properly to budget on the other hand. As the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out, there are more school children participating in the school lunch program this year than were included in it in the previous year. The total number of children participating and the number of schools taking part may have been unequally distributed among the various States. Perhaps that is one reason for the budgeting plan being thrown out of balance.

Nevertheless, in connection with a situation such as this, I think we ought to give warning. The Senator from Arizona has indicated his willingness to take the item to conference. We certainly should give warning, by this debate, and by the expressions not only of the Senator from New Hampshire, but the Senator from Arizona and the two Senators from Oklahoma, that next year the States should live within their budgets, and that the funds should be so budgeted as to cover the entire school year, unless some unforeseen emergency occurs. Otherwise, we shall be extending an invitation to other States to do the same thing next year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think there is great force in what the Senator has said. It is true that there have been excessive droughts in certain parts of the United States, and there have been freezing conditions in other parts of the United States, which have seriously interfered with the local economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In looking at the figures this morning I noted that in the 1955 budget there was $85 million plus for the school lunch program, but that the estimate for 1956 is only $68 million. As I remember the footnotes—and I am drawing on memory now—there will be an unexpended balance from the 1955 appropriation which will be available for 1956. While I have not examined the figures which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has presented, it occurs to me, from those figures, that a certain sum of money would be available. How much, I cannot say without going into the subject a little more thoroughly.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the House committee has increased the sum to $83 million, which was the appropriation last year. That is above the budget estimate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am only pointing out what the budget estimate for 1956 is, as compared with the actual appropriation for 1955.

Mr. HAYDEN. I accepted the amendment with the distinct understanding that we would look into it very thoroughly in conference. We realize that there have been droughts in certain parts of the country, and freezing conditions in other parts. There have been unusual circumstances affecting certain States. We will go into the subject very thoroughly. That is all the assurance I could give the sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4903) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS BY ECUADOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the consultative subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee met in executive session this morning with Mr. Sheldon Mills, United States Ambassador to Ecuador; Mr. Rollin S. Atwood, Director of the Office of South American Affairs of the Department of State; and Mr. Fred E. Taylor, of the Office of the Undersecretary of State.

Ambassador Mills and Messrs. Atwood and Taylor gave the subcommittee a detailed account of the seizure of the American fishing vessels *Arctic Maid* and *Santa Anna* by an Ecuadoran naval ship on the high seas off the coast of Ecuador March 27. An American citizen, a member of the crew of the *Arctic Maid*, was wounded during the incident. The vessels were taken to Guayaquil by the Ecuadoran Navy and subsequently fined on charges of violating fishing regulations which the Ecuadoran Government has promulgated to cover waters 200 miles from the coast. At the time they were seized, the fishing vessels were between 25 and 30 miles from the coast.

Ambassador Mills has been recalled to Washington for consultation with the Department of State, which takes a serious view of the incident.

The subcommittee shares the Department's view regarding the gravity of the case and expects to follow developments with deep interest.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make for the benefit of the Senate.

On Monday next it is planned to take up calendar No. 131, Senate bill 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and for other purposes.

In addition, I should like to inform the Senate that when we conclude the consideration of the upper Colorado River project bill, it is planned to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 651, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], commonly known as the feeder airline bill.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO JUDSON KING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the many friends of Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, and a grand old warrior for the people, are planning the annual celebration of his birthday on April 29, to wish him many more fighting years.

If more people knew all that Mr. King has done for them, his modest home near Washington would be snowed under with messages of congratulation. He, at least as much as any other man, pioneered the long battle against the private-power monopoly and brought to millions of city and farm folks the blessings of cheap and abundant electricity. In spite of many handicaps, he has continued his studies, his research, his generous cooperation and advice to many who come to him for guidance, and his stimulating and effective bulletins and magazine articles. He has also made headway with his history of the origin of the TVA—a definitive study so urgently needed for current guidance of Dixon-Yates activities and for historical purposes in future protection of the TVA and all it means to the American people.

Recently, in one of his bulletins, Mr. King turned his attention to the propaganda campaign directed against Nebraska's "Little TVA." With his usual skillful marshaling of facts, he has brought into sharp focus the relationship between the attacks on Nebraska's 100-percent public-power system and the Dixon-Yates contract, the proposed issuance of revenue bonds to expand TVA, and the tremendous costs of flood damage which could be eliminated by integrated development of all our great river systems.

Mr. President, as a birthday tribute to Judson King, and in order that it may be widely circulated, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the revised edition of his bulletin numbered 254.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT NEBRASKA'S "LITTLE TVA"—ITS RELATION TO THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT, NATIONAL POLICY, AND THE QUESTION OF REVENUE BONDS

The crux of it—electric power

1. In 1926 (sic) Ottawa, capital of Canada, served by Ontario Hydro, was the first city to achieve an average residential rate of exactly 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

2. In 1954 Chattanooga, Tenn., served by the TVA, was the first city in the United States to achieve exactly 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

3. The cities of Nebraska, the Pacific Coast, and elsewhere are on the way, and many are close to 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

4. The slogan of the REA Co-ops on the front cover of the NRECA's official magazine is "Electricity for every farm" at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

In 1954 private rates in different sections ranged from just above to 3 or 4 times as much. But you cannot float oceans of stock and make large profits on 1 cent current. That is what the conflict is over.

Flood control and the taxpayers

1. The Weather Bureau and the United States Geological Survey estimate that the total loss from major floods alone in the United States from 1902 to 1951 was 3,989 lives and $4,744,878,370 of property.

2. The Corps of Army Engineers estimates that from 1898 to 1954, inclusive, Congress has appropriated about $4 billion for flood control which has prevented damage of about $7 billion. Yet, annual flood damages still total around $600 million.

3. No one has yet produced a figure of the scores of millions spent in the last 25 years, say, by Congress for flood relief.

4. But the Red Cross estimates that from June 1947 to April 1952 it has spent for relief from major floods alone in the Columbia, Missouri, and upper Mississippi Rivers, and in New England, a total of $20,755,845.

The bitter test of 50 years proves that in addition to soil conservation, etc., great reservoir dams, like Hells Canyon, are necessary to forestall major disasters. Yet, the Platte, the Tennessee, and the Lower Colorado alone are harnessed, due to the political opposition of the power trust. The crux here is, shall the taxpayers foot the bill for flood protection and be cheated out of the low-cost incidental power?

I. THE ATTACK UPON THE NEBRASKA SYSTEM

Long before and during the hectic conflict over the sensational Dixon-Yates contract the American public, by pamphlets, press, and radio, has been deluged by a flood of falsified history as to the origin of TVA and gross misrepresentation as to its financing and concrete benefits to the South and to the Nation.

And now comes a renewed attack upon the genesis of Nebraska's "Little TVA," so-called by Senator Norris in his effort to aid businessmen and farmers to establish multipurpose river development and public power in his home State.

When the Tennessee Valley business and professional men attend national conventions, or the folks visit their folks in other States, they are frequently criticized and treated as charity patients or dupes of "Red" schemers and are told, "We are paying for your cheap power in our taxes." And recently came a volley of facts from Nebraska to dispel myths about that project. Two newspaper articles will illustrate my point.

"Nebraska consumers are the only losers"

The Tulsa World, largest newspaper in Oklahoma, on November 18 last carried an article by Ray Tucker, veteran Washington newsman whose syndicated column appears in many dailies over the country, which left readers with the impression that Nebraska's Public Power System was the illegitimate child of an unholy alliance between Wall Street stock gamblers and New Deal politicians in the 1930's with the result that "Nebraska consumers are the only losers."

"Thanks to the advent of public power"

But on December 26 the Omaha Sunday World-Herald featured a story by its staff writer Harold Cowan of a sharply different character. It was based on an extensive factual study made by Mr. George E. Johnson, Hastings, chief engineer of the Central Nebraska Power and Irrigation District of the benefits to the State of the public system's 20-year experience. It emphasizes the many millions of dollars saved to farmers and all other users of electricity "thanks to the advent of public power."

It is this sort of thing that is causing fair-minded people everywhere to exclaim in despair "Whom and what can we believe."

In his scintillating book "Why Not Survive?," just published in New York, by Simon and Schuster, Michael W. Straus, former militant United States Commissioner of Reclamation, charitably terms vendors of falsehood regarding efficient conservation of our water resources "Apostles of Reaction and Yearners for Yesterday." The bunkum circulated about the Nebraska project comes from the same sources.

Now, during the last generation it has been charged that the TVA was a super-State, forced upon the southern people by Washington bureaucrats, depriving them of their independence. Millions believe it, and the same tale has been vended as to Nebraska and Bonneville. The result is to disrupt and wreck or delay needed 20th century progress in river development. Hence, the truth about Nebraska becomes important, and the major part of this bulletin will be devoted to who created it, why, and how.

The first fact for the reader to hold in mind is this: The movement which resulted in this project was started by Nebraska businessmen during the Hoover administration—before the New Deal was born.

II. ORIGIN OF THE NEBRASKA PROJECT

According to the Tulsa World story, the mastermind back of President Roosevelt's multipurpose power policy was the late Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, who, in the Nebraska affair, worked hand-in-glove with a Wall Street stock salesman—a mysterious individual, unknown to the public, Guy E. Myers. With the aid of pressure brought by Ickes, as charged by Tucker, Myers was able to force the sale of the Nebraska Power Co. to the city of Omaha, netting for himself a nice commission of $530,000. Since it is well known that Myers negotiated the purchase of the remaining 14 private companies in the State, a like sellout is to be inferred. Inflated prices were paid by the public, and as a result of this political blackmail on the part of Ickes, Nebraska consumers are the only losers, as before noted.

The Boren investigation of 1945

As authority for his account of the origin of the Nebraska project and Mr. Myers' part in it, Tucker quotes from a House speech by Representative Lyle H. Boren, Democrat, of Oklahoma, on July 6, 1945, which requires our attention. At that time Myers was acting as agent for the citizens of Omaha in negotiating the purchase of the Nebraska Power Co., and the outcome was in doubt. In addition, the Murray bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority, and the Mitchell bill, to create a Columbia River Authority, had been introduced and were under discussion in Congress. Both involved the extension of TVA power policies which Wall Street was determined to block—as it still is in 1955.

In his speech, Boren asserted the existence of a plot to turn the entire private electrical industry of the United States—then pegged at $18 billion—over to public ownership. He charged that Wall Street bankers and manipulators had discovered a loophole in the Holding Company Act of 1935 by which they could purchase, with Government cooperation, the stocks of private companies and sell them at grossly inflated prices to public bodies and reap millions in profits.

Said he: "The Marxians care not how high the price so they attain their end. The bankers care not how they foul the nest of capitalism if they can turn an 'honest penny' * * * The stakes are high! This bonanza is bigger than the Credit Mobilier, the Whiskey Ring, and it dwarfs the swag of Teapot Dome." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 6, 1945, pp. 7329–7330). He should have added that all 14 private companies in the State outside Omaha had already been purchased.

An investigation by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce followed in which Myers and others were questioned by Boren. The charge of a gigantic conspiracy was not sustained and was promptly forgotten, but it served a temporary political purpose.

What actually happened

In briefest brief, the Nebraska system had its origin in the efforts of three separate groups, composed of prominent business and

professional men, stockmen, and farmers, to rescue the State from disastrous results of the depression which followed 7 years of drought. They were not public-ownership men. But they had faith in the teachings of the great conservationist Dr. G. E. Condra of the State University.

These men went into action right after the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was signed by President Hoover on January 22, 1932, in order to secure Government aid and money to start useful projects which would prime the business pump and relieve unemployment. A majority were stalwart Republicans. Some even thought Senator Norris was a radical dreamer. At the same time they urged the passage of a State law permitting them to form multipurpose districts. It was signed by Gov. Charles W. Bryan on April 18, 1933.

The account given of Secretary Ickes' part in this charge is a baseless canard. I had a part in this 12-year war over the Nebraska project and can state from personal knowledge as well as by the documents that Ickes was by no means the mastermind of the New Deal power policies. He was opposed to the Nebraska project, just as he was to Bonneville and Coulee, but was overruled by President Roosevelt. The idea that he was in "cahoots" with Guy C. Myers is absurd.

The first group at Columbus, located in the eastern one-quarter of the State where rainfall is normal, sought to build a power plant on the Loup River, a tributary of the Platte. Here the late Harold Kramer was the outstanding leader.

The western three-quarters of the State does not have normal rainfall, droughts are disastrous and irrigation with waters from the Platte River and elsewhere from deep driven pumps necessary. Hence, the second group, at Hastings 80 miles farther west, proposed to start a power and irrigation project to help out in that region. At this point the leader was Dr. D. W. Kingsley, son of the pioneer of the project.

The third group, at North Platte 150 miles still farther west, also desired power and irrigation. Their leader was Hon. Keith Neville, banker, stockman and ex-Governor.

By the time engineering plans had been prepared and applications for loans reached Washington all such matters had been transferred from the RFC to the Public Works Administration, of which Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes was Administrator. Presently the three separate groups came into collision, not with "bureaucracy" but with sound investment needs and modern engineering.

Birth of the unified system

It was doubtful if these individual projects would pay out. PWA could make a "grant" of 30 percent for relief, but the remainder would be a loan which the promoters thought they could pay by selling water and power to private companies.

A Power Board was created in PWA, consisting of Dr. Clark Foreman, K. Sewell Wingfield, engineer, and J. D. Ross, engineer of Seattle City Light. These men worked closely with George E. Johnson, above quoted, and other Nebraska engineers and came up with a new comprehensive plan which would serve Nebraska's needs as a whole and repay Uncle Sam.

In short, they recommended the building of a great reservoir dam on the Platte River near Keystone in west central Nebraska (now Kingsley Dam) which would hold the entire river flow plus floods in the spring, and generate power. Said they, in effect: Connect your three hydro projects with a transmission network and you will have flood control, irrigation water the year around and 500 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy to serve your farmers and municipalities. It is now called "The Hydros" for short.

Ickes heeded the wrong engineers

Senator Norris approved the plan, but Ickes, trusting the advice of his old style engineers that there would be no market for that amount of power, refused PWA money to finance it. He appointed another board, headed by Dr. Ellwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation (for whom Lake Mead at Hoover Dam is named), but this board also approved the plan, Roosevelt ordered it, and these are the alleged "Reds" responsible for the State's generating and transmission system.

It was not "put over" by Ickes. On July 1, 1939, this project and others were transferred to the newly created Federal Works Agency, with John M. Carmody, Administrator, and Alan Johnstone as Chief Counsel. They were friendly and assisted the three hydro districts in working out a joint agreement so they could operate as one unit, called the Nebraska Public Power System. Later Mr. Johnstone suggested and wrote the legislation by which Congress reduced the interest rate from 4 to 2.5 percent—because private companies were then themselves borrowing money at the lower rate.

Purchase of the private companies

The multipurpose plan decided upon, its managers faced the problem of marketing 500 million kilowatt-hours of power. Private companies declined to cooperate and J. D. Ross advised the hydros to purchase them and do it by negotiation instead of by the long, expensive, and uncertain method of legal condemnation, essentially as TVA bought the Tennessee Electric Power Co. in 1939. Senator Norris agreed.

Employment of Guy C. Myers

Ross recommended the employment of Guy C. Myers to negotiate the purchases. He had employed Myers to market $6 million of revenue bonds in Wall Street to build the powerplant at the Diablo Dam for Seattle City Light after Ickes had turned him down. Hence, he had confidence in Myers' ability and integrity.

Now note the terms: If Myers failed he would get nothing. If he succeeded he would get an average commission of around 2 percent, as against the customary 5 percent for private work. He would pay his own expenses. Valuation of the properties would be superintended by Ross, the actual work being done by R. W. Beck and Associates, Ross' former aid at Seattle; a firm of able analysts and engineers, still working for the Nebraskans.

Preliminary work started in June of 1937, but in 1939 Ickes still denied PWA funds, whereat the hydros made a bold move. On August 5, 1939, they organized, under State law, the "Consumers Public Power District" to buy out companies and market the power generated and transmitted by the hydros.

Actual purchase of scattered private companies began in 1940 and by October 13, 1943, all 14 companies outside Omaha were bought for a grand total of $40,750,000. The Nebraska Power Co. at Omaha was purchased on December 2, 1946, for $42 million and Nebraska became a 100 percent public power State—the first.

Fees. Testifying at the Boren hearings, Mr. Myers stated that for 10 years' work his fees totaled $1,328,000 in purchasing the 15 companies, which included the $430,000 for the Omaha deal, and his total expenses were $652,500.

So, the Nebraska districts paid Myers a fee of 1.6 percent for purchasing $82,500,000 worth of utility properties. But if he had done the job for a New York holding company, say, at the customary private fee of 5 percent it would have yielded him a gross of $4 million, probably at less expense and there would have been no hullabaloo about it.

Evidently resentful over false rumors which made boobs of responsible men, Mr. T. H. Maenner, a leading businessman who, with George Ashby, president of the Union Pacific Railroad, was a member of the Omaha citizens committee which made the purchase of the Nebraska Power Co., requested to be heard. He informed the Congressmen, emphatically, that without Myers' aid they could not have made the purchase as soon as they did, if at all; that they were satisfied with his fee and the price paid; that the whole deal had been on the up and up, and had saved the city $2 million the very first year. (See House committee hearings, 1945–46, vol. 1110, pp. 735–782. For Myers, p. 743; for Maenner, pp. 767–782.)

Benefits to the State and the Nation

I have no space for ample statistics, but there is overwhelming evidence of what the wholly owned and managed 100-percent public multi-purpose river system is doing for the State; the same as TVA is doing for Tennessee. Vast areas of arid lands have been and are being put into production through irrigation, just as worn out and eroded southern lands are redeemed by soil conservation. Hundreds of new industries have started in cities and towns, which means a balanced economy. The Platte River flood menace is gone.

The key to all this is low-cost power. Engineer Johnson reports 95.6 percent of farms electrified with an average cost of power of 3.1 cents per kilowatt-hour, as against 11 cents in 1935 with only 8.3 percent of farms electrified.

In 1935 Nebraska's total bill for power for all services cost 3.44 cents per kilowatt-hour. In 1953 it cost 1.8 cents with a 500-percent increase in usage.

Mr. Johnson further demonstrates that if Nebraska's power bill for 1953 had been paid for at 1935 private rates it would have cost $61,955,000 more. Of course he makes no claim of a like comparison as against present-day rates since they are lower, but the figure gives us something to think about, especially when we remember that about one-half of the State's power (all of Omaha) is generated by steam.

IV. TAXES AND FINANCIAL STABILITY

But "Do they pay taxes?" They do. Mr. Johnson assures us they do, exactly as the companies did. Making inquiry, State Tax Commissioner F. A. Harrington sent me the 1953 report. Pages 120–123 reveal that the system paid in lieu of taxes the total sum of $1,010,912.50, which went to the State, counties, cities, villages, townships, and schools, the schools getting nearly half of the total.

"But is it a financial success?" Well, John D. Dawson, of 25 Wall Street, N. Y., financial counsel for the enterprise since 1939, laid down the cold facts in an article in the Daily Bond Buyer of July 22, 1953, which recounted the history up to January 1 of that year, from which we glean such items as these: The system had spent $122 million on new plant to anticipate the rapidly growing demand, of which $44 million came from revenues; redeemed $23 million of its debt; paid $10 million in State and local taxes; and was a $202 million going concern which has saved consumers $24 million in reduced rates as against private rates charged when the companies were acquired from 1940 to 1946.

Regarding the tax scarecrow this cool, level headed Wall Streeter who knows his onions, tartly reminded the public that:

"It would seem that utility companies do not pay taxes in the same sense that you pay your taxes out of income which would otherwise be available to meet your bills. Utility companies are nothing more than tax collecting agencies, since their net income is unaffected by the amount of taxes they pay. The consumer actually pays the taxes instead of the owners of the company."

V. WHY NEBRASKA IS IMPORTANT

Having cleared the air of myth and smog let us now summarize the chief values of this unique experiment to national thinking on river development.

1. A clean-cut honest pilot plant: Although Tennessee is a close second, Nebraska is the only other State in which a public superpower system can demonstrate how low rates to consumers can ultimately go, provided it is freed from competition with, or dangerous partnership entanglements with, private power companies.

2. Revenue bonds: Its experience in financing its distribution system with revenue bonds should be of value since Congress is soon to consider revenue bonds as supplementary to the existing right of Congress to appropriate money, or the TVA to use earnings to finance new construction.

3. Integration: Nebraska is demonstrating what a unified system will do for a valley. It needs to be integrated with an entire Missouri River system, of which it is a part, as provided in the Murray bill. That great region can then anticipate the results following the TVA example, as set out in former Chairman Gordon R. Clapp's lectures last year, now available in book form from the University of Chicago Press. And James Dahir's book, Regional Building, just published by Harper's, pictures for us the dividends of health and happiness 6 million people are enjoying by utilizing the opportunities made possible to them by TVA.

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, this date is one of particular interest for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It marks the celebration of that providential day 65 years ago when the association which just became the Pan American Union, and later the Organization of American States, was established. The Western Hemisphere stands as a proud example of what mutual understanding, respect, and confidence may achieve in the creation of a system to preserve the peace. It is a system which does not depend for its effectiveness exclusively or even primarily upon the imposition of superior force, but whose greatest influence comes from those qualities of restraint, tolerance, patience, and solidarity, all combining to create a tremendous reservoir of public opinion that few governments can truly ignore.

Thank God that it is so. Thank God that the Inter-American system is not a yoke cast upon any of its members by any brutal or oppressive power, against the will of the member. Within the voluntary, free system, each republic is the equal of any other; each government is entitled to get and receives the same respect as any other government. Its paths are the paths of mutual self-interest, not the paths of fear and oppression.

The Organization, which was invigorated at Bogotá, goes about its duties so unspectacularly and unobtrusively that not many of our people are aware of what it does. It rarely gets the prominent headlines which have been enjoyed so often by the Security Council of the United Nations. Its deliberations have not been overcast with the presence of dignitaries whose utterances sometimes provoked uneasiness and concern in the chancelleries of the world.

Instead, quietly, without fanfare, but with patience, dignity, firmness and the tactful competence of the OAS representatives, it has been steadily laying the foundations of a more harmonious society in the Western Hemisphere. Thoughtful men recognize this. They remember earlier days, when the promise was not so bright. I recall, during the stormy, but short-lived history of the League of Nations, that the Pan American was rather disparagingly discussed by men who should have had greater vision, as a rather futile, ineffectual organization of little promise.

But the League has gone, and in the ensuing years, the Pan American Union and its Governing Board have evolved into a solid and respected force for the maintenance of peace in the Americas. And all this, without disproportionate voting rights in any member, no matter how powerful, and without the veto.

I doubt that such a development would have been possible without the many years of preparation and of discouragingly slow progress. It underscores something we are perhaps prone to forget. Instruments of this kind cannot be forged overnight. In the area of intergovernmental cooperation, the progress must be slow, sometimes aggravatingly slow; but no progress at all is possible without a common groundwork of mutual good will and a neighborly concern that views the needs and aspirations of one as a common problem of all.

On this great day, then, let us resolve to do all we can to strengthen this free association, to keep it alive, and as a part of this effort, to assist our fellow Americans in the Western Hemisphere to meet and overcome the economic and social obstacles to a rich and better life for their peoples.

I am sure that on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations I express the good will of the American people to all the peoples of the Latin-American republics when I say that we join them today in doing honor to this long period of mutual respect among the republics of both hemispheres.

TRANSPORTATION OF LIVE SCORPIONS IN THE MAILS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 35, Calendar No. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was unable to be present on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon because of my attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore, I was unable to ask for the consideration of the pending bill at that time.

The bill is identical with a bill I introduced in the 81st Congress and in subsequent Congresses. However, up to this time I have not been able to get the Post Office Department to make a favorable report on such a bill, because of the fear that the shipment of live scorpions through the mails might result in injury to postal employees.

Now that a satisfactory plastic bag has been devised, and the Post Office Department is convinced that live scorpions can be safely shipped through the mails, the Department has withdrawn its objection to the passage of such a bill.

The subject is of considerable importance. Senators are aware of the fact, of course, that serpent serum is used in the treatment of persons who have been bitten by serpents. In many cases the injection of such a serum saves the lives of persons who have been bitten.

Scorpion stings are also very serious and can prove fatal, particularly to children. Even adults have died from scorpion stings. The same antivenom practices which are used with respect to serpents can also be used with respect to scorpions.

One of the leaders in the development of this practice as applied to scorpions is Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, the head of the poisonous animals research laboratory of Arizona State College. An article describing his work, entitled "Arizona's Venom Man," was published in the February 1953 issue of Arizona Highways, and I ask unanimous consent that an extract from the article be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Extensive scientific research with venoms in Arizona has revolved, for nearly a quarter of a century, around the dreams, hopes and labors of Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, head of the department of biological sciences and director of the poisonous animals research laboratory at Arizona State College. Dr. Stahnke came west from Chicago in 1928 to make Arizona his home. He married shortly thereafter and by the time his first child was a few years old he had heard of a number of fatalities among children from scorpion sting. This caused him so much concern that he made an effort to find out all he could about scorpions and the best form of treatment that was available or recommended for victims of their sting. Information was scarce and even what he did read or hear was often contradicted by other sources of information. Most alarming of all, there seemed to be no sure treatment for the sting of the lethal species.

During the next few years, Dr. Stahnke collected specimens from all corners of the Southwest and through careful study and scientific observation and experimentation he became one of the best informed authorities on scorpions and other venomous animals of the Southwest. In recognition of his work he is listed in "Who's Who" and a host of other leading indexes covering noted persons. In his poisonous animals laboratory at Arizona State College he studied effects of various venoms on the bodily functions of laboratory rats. His findings in administering carefully measured nonlethal doses stirred his hopes and imagination to new and fascinating heights. Different venoms react in different ways.

Scorpion venom, for example, reacts as a particular type of nerve stimulant. In controlled doses the doctor feels that venom might hold out great therapeutic possibilities in the treatment of polio paralysis by gradually stimulating the dormant nerves and muscles, encouraging them to function again. The reaction of venom on cancer cells is being studied with laboratory rats and mice and as assistance in starting this effort the laboratory received a $5,000 grant from the Damon Runyon Foundation.

The field of venom therapy is comparatively unexplored, and one with a seeming vast array of possibilities in the treatment of various human disorders. However, as is usually the case when new fields are being pioneered, there was the ever-present discouraging lack of sufficient funds needed to obtain the necessary costly equipment and assistance. There were no college funds available for such research so it was necessary to inch along painfully slowly on the proverbial shoestring. First things must come first and a serum to combat the effects of lethal scorpion sting was number one on Dr. Stahnke's list.

Putting every spare moment to the challenge and with much makeshift laboratory equipment, most of it laboriously handmade, he pushed his No. 1 dream forward to the final stage. The result was a serum that worked near-miracles in saving lives of children who had been stung by the sculpturatus or gertschi and, because they had not received first aid in time, were in the last stages of convulsion preceding death. If becoming a world's leading authority on venomous animals was the first major milestone in his career, then practically wiping out the scorpion hazard of the Southwest was the second.

But then the problem was not completely whipped. All the years that went into study of venomous animals leading up to scorpion antitoxin were of little avail if the serum could not be produced in sufficient quantities to supply the entire area where it might sometime be needed. Distances in the Southwest are great and scorpion venom works fast. A child stung in Yuma would receive little relief from a vial of serum in Tempe, no matter how excellent the serum was. And then, lethal scorpions are the least common in the State and 10,000 live ones of this species would be required each year to provide serum for all the possible danger areas in Arizona. To obtain 10,000 scorpions was an insurmountable task without public cooperation. Then, even if the people of Arizona and neighboring States heard about this need, there was still no satisfactory means to send live scorpions to the laboratory. Though the mails were fast and efficient, postal regulations forbid using the mails for the transporting of live scorpions. Other methods of shipment proved either too costly or slow or the packages often were in the hot sun long enough so that as a general rule scorpions were in bad shape or dead upon arrival.

In an effort to overcome this major obstacle in conquering the scorpion, by obtaining sufficient quantities of them as a venom supply for serum manufacture, Dr. Stahnke has designed a simple lightweight cylindrical mailing tube container with a plastic inner bag which is completely airtight and escape-proof even if damaged or crushed. Since a scorpion could easily spend a week in such a sealed container and suffer no ill effects, it is the ideal answer for transportation to the laboratory from all parts of the State. In an effort to modify a postal regulation which all but blocks the serum program, Dr. Stahnke has the backing of many interested persons, including the Governor of Arizona and Arizona Senators in Washington, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Postmaster's Advisory Committee, the Postal Employees Union of Tucson, and many others. Senate bill 1886 has been introduced to "permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical-research purposes."

This bill is but awaiting approval of the Postmaster General, and with his understanding cooperation and endorsement will surely be acted upon, opening the way not only for adequate serum manufacture but for further advancement in the science of venom therapy.

Even after the required number of scorpions is collected, each one has to be "milked" of its venom and much elaborate and expensive specially designed laboratory equipment is required to manufacture the serum on a proper scale. The venom has to be frozen and then all moisture content removed. Then it must be weighed to the fraction of a milligram and rediluted with a known quantity of distilled water. In small non-lethal doses it is periodically injected into the blood stream of a laboratory animal until an immunity is built up. And then a small amount of blood is drawn from the immunized animal and through more intricate sterile processing the serum separated from the red corpuscles is again frozen, dehydrated, weighed, and bottled for distribution. The laboratory animals in this case are cats and few cats have a softer life. Not only do they enjoy temperature controlled sanitary quarters but their diet is balanced and ideal for their welfare. The gradual periodic venom doses cause them little or no discomfort, and the only contribution they are called on to make is an occasional blood donation, no more bothersome than giving a pint of blood to the Red Cross is for a human being.

In the spring of 1951 the Tucson Daily Citizen, hearing of the serum and the lack of funds to supply the State, got behind Dr. Stahnke and put on a compaign to acquaint the citizens of Arizona with the need for scorpions and funds through donations to put the serum program in process. At once a series of informative news items and editorials placed the problem before the public. Response was immediate and generous. Temporary scorpion centers were set up and, while donations rolled in to the Daily Citizen, quantities of scorpions arrived daily through these centers to the laboratory in Tempe. Though most of them were the more common non-lethal ground scorpions, which were useless in the manufacture of serum, they were valuable for the venom therapy program. And enough sculpturatus arrived to start full scale operation.

On June 26, 1951, the Tucson Daily Citizen invited Dr. Stahnke to Tucson to receive a check for $4,500 to apply on the procurement of equipment and start the serum manufacture ball rolling. Two days later the Arizona State Legislature passed a bill giving an appropriation of $1,500 to finance a year's manufacture of serum. Dr. Stahnke, in appreciataion of the splendid cooperation of this newspaper and the citizens of Arizona who contributed to the cause, took with him to Tucson the only two precious vials of serum he possessed and presented them to the Tucson Health Center.

Almost like a dramatic climax to a story, 3 days later little 4-year-old Rachel Barraza of Tucson got up from her nap and started to get dressed for a party. As she picked up her shoe a tiny straw-colored scorpion dropped out and stung her on the thumb. She was rushed to a hospital but in only a few minutes the child was experiencing the specific symptoms of a fatal dose of venom. Suddenly the doctor recalled having read in the paper of the serum presented to the Tucson Health Center a few days before by Dr. Stahnke. The police were notified and a motorcycle patrolman rushed the serum from the medical center to the hospital where it was administered to the patient. In a short time Rachel was relaxed and over the crisis.

Today in the refrigerator of Dr. Stahnke's laboratory, where only two tiny life-saving vials of antivenin once stood as guardians of life provided they could get to the patient in time, there are trays and trays of fresh serum available to any doctor or hospital throughout the State where they are needed, free for the requesting. In this dehydrated state the serum is good for 5 years and all that Dr. Stahnke asks in return is that a simple medical report form be filled out explaining when and how the serum was used and the results. When this form arrives in the laboratory a new supply of serum is automatically shipped to the sender.

These little vials of life-saving serum placed throughout the State are each a proud monument to a scientist who, facing a common fear, rolled up his sleeves and conquered it for the benefit of his fellow men. This accomplishment he takes in stride and never misses a step in his ceaseless effort to search for important scientific and humanitarian benefits in his field and to spread knowledge and useful information on this subject through all media available to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the report of the committee on the pending bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 131) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Poisonous Animals Research Laboratory at the Arizona State College in Tempe has been making antivenin and doing extensive research work for a number of years with live scorpions as subjects.

The number of scorpions required yearly both for the production of serum and for use in research work cannot be obtained locally. It is not practical to raise them since a 5-year growth is required before they are large enough to milk and it has been determined that the cost of providing a natural habitat and live insects for food for such a long period of time would make the price of the serum prohibitive and their use for research out of the question.

Scorpion antivenin manufactured in other parts of the world is not of value in the Southern United States, since the reaction is species-specific. That is, an antivenin from a species living in one area of the world is not therapeutically effective against the lethal sting of a different species living in another geographic area.

Scorpions are found in most of the Southern States but are most plentiful in the Southwest and particularly Arizona. However, collecting a quantity of live specimens is difficult. It is not feasible to employ collectors and their transportation by express is costly and frequently impossible because express agents are not located in many of the smaller communities where scorpions are most abundant.

SAFETY FACTOR

A sturdy tube containing a plastic bag has been developed and suggested for use in transporting the scorpions through the mail. It is asserted that this would provide as great a protection, or greater, than is now afforded from some other dangerous materials now permitted in the mails.

STATE SURVEY

The Arizona State College conducted a survey of medical doctors as follows:

1. Number of questionnaires	485
2. Number returned	377
3. Number of doctors whose practice included scorpion sting cases	237

4. Number of doctors desiring anti-scorpion serum 251
5. Number of scorpion sting cases treated in 10-month period 1,228
6. Number of therapeutic doses of serum requested 428

VIEWS OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Hearings were held by the committee on S. 1886, an identical bill introduced in the 81st Congress by Senator CARL HAYDEN. The bill was not reported at that time because of opposition voiced by the Post Office Department. Since the Department is now convinced that safe shipping containers have been developed and can be made available to shippers in remote areas in the State of Arizona, the Department has removed its objection as indicated in its letter of March 8, 1955, which follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for a report on S. 35, a bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

The purpose of this measure is to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to direct the Postmaster General to permit the transmission of live scorpions in the mails under such regulations as he may prescribe. The scorpions would be used for medical research.

This Department has made a careful study of this matter. Although scorpions are highly dangerous because of their poisonous sting, it has been concluded that packaging standards can be devised to minimize the possibility of postal employees being stung by the insects while they are in the mails.

In view of the worthy purpose for which it is proposed to permit the mailing of live scorpions, and the further fact that employee groups have indicated they favor enactment of this legislation, the Post Office Department will interpose no objections to the enactment of S. 35.

It is not believed that the enactment of this legislation will result in any additional cost to this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate, 134 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 25, 1955, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on S. 35, a bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

Live scorpions have been found valuable for use in medical research. For example, venom from scorpions is necessary for the manufacture of a serum used for the treatment of scorpion stings, which otherwise might prove fatal.

Enactment of this bill would permit the mailing of live scorpions by amending section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to direct the Postmaster General to permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions under such regulations as he may prescribe. The Post Office Department has advised that suitable packaging standards can be devised, which would minimize the possibility of danger to postal employees resulting from the insects while in the mails.

Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD PEARSON,
Assistant Director.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported, are shown as follows (existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman, new matter is printed in italics):

SECTION 1716, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 1716. Injurious articles as nonmailable.

All kinds of poison, and all articles and compositions containing poison, and all poisonous animals, insects, reptiles, and all explosives, inflammable materials, infernal machines, and mechanical, chemical, or other devices or compositions which may ignite or explode, and all disease germs or scabs, and all other natural or artificial articles, compositions, or material which may kill or injure another, or injure the mails or other property, whether or not sealed as first-class matter, are nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or station thereof, nor by any letter carrier.

The Postmaster General may permit the transmission in the mails, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe as to preparation and packing, of any such articles which are not outwardly or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property.

The Postmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker.

The transmission in the mails of poisonous drugs and medicines may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles from the manufacturer thereof or dealer therein to licensed physicians, surgeons, dentists, pharmacists, druggists, cosmetologists, barbers, and veterinarians, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

The transmission in the mails of poisons for scientific use, and which are not outwardly dangerous or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property, may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles between the manufacturers thereof, dealers therein, bona fide research or experimental scientific laboratories, and such other persons who are employees of the Federal, a State, or local government, whose official duties are comprised, in whole or in part, of the use of such poisons, and who are designated by the head of the agency in which they are employed to receive or send such articles, under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

All spirituous, vinous, malted, fermented, or other intoxicating liquors of any kind are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried through the mails.

Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail, according to the direction thereon, or at any place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared nonmailable by this section, unless in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail, according to the direction thereon or at any place to which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared nonmailable by this section, whether or not transmitted in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, with intent to kill or injure another, or injure the mails or other property, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 781; May 8, 1952, ch. 246, 66 Stat. 67.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second paragraph thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker."

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 131, S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on next Monday may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the designation of April 14 as Pan-American Day gives us an opportunity to pause a moment in our unrelenting endeavor to stave off war, to pay homage to an experiment in peace. The learned historian, Arthur Toynbee, has said that his-

tory will characterize our epoch, not for the immense technological strides that have been made, not as the atomic age, but rather as the period when man for the first time reached across boundaries of race, religion, and nationality to help his fellow men, for the good of all mankind. If Dr. Toynbee is right, then the organization whose development we commemorate today will occupy a place of honor in history. The growth of pan-Americanism, viewed in historical perspective, will surely be considered by posterity as one of the notable achievements of our era.

Pessimism, born of the failure of the League of Nations and nourished by the frustrations of the United Nations, has been corroding our faith in international organizations for maintaining peace. The Organization of American States stands alone, but firm, as proof of the effectiveness of international cooperation. It stands as a beacon light in the dark, inspiring optimism when doubts assail us. It is fitting that we pause each year to reexamine the evolution of that institution, and by so doing, to rekindle our hope that the noble principles motivating it will spread to other parts of the world.

The Organization of American States was not easily arrived at or built over night. A good many obstacles had to be surmounted; fears had to be assuaged, prejudices eradicated, and self-interests repressed before the 21 nations that make up the membership of the organization could work together in their collective interest. As far back as 1826 the great South American liberator, Bolivar, conceived of the idea of a union of the democracies of the Western Hemisphere. In those days the newly independent nations were menaced by the Holy Alliance; it was Bolivar's idea that by union, the young states could protect themselves against any threat. The rough draft prepared by Bolivar for the conference he called in Panama contains these prophetic words:

> This congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. * * * No one of [the nations] will be weak in respect to any other; no one will be stronger. A perfect equilibrium would be established in this truly new order of things. The strength of all would come to the aid of any one which might suffer from the aggression of a foreign enemy.

The Panama Conference, as you know, was a dismal failure. Owing to factional opposition in the United States Congress, there was much delay in appointing the American delegates to the gathering. One of two that were finally appointed died on the way to Panama, and the other arrived too late. The politicians in Buenos Aires, jealous of the leading part played by Colombia, declined the invitation. Paraguay, then a principal state, also remained aloof. When the conference met, only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru had delegates present. Under the circumstances, Bolivar's magnificent dream of a union of the American nations in the interest of peace, protection, and general advancement, went up in smoke. But it did establish a definite precedent for future inter-American meetings.

Later in the century other attempts were made to get joint action. One gathering in Peru in 1847, with delegates from New Granada, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile in attendance, was directed against the United States who was at war with Mexico. The avowed aim of the conference was confederation for the purpose of preserving independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. No permanent results came from the meeting, or from other conferences of small groups of Latin American states held later in the century.

In the meantime, some of the South American nations themselves fell into battle with each other. In the 1860's the population of Paraguay was decimated in a war against an alliance consisting of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In 1879, Chile went to war against Peru and Bolivia, and claimed the victor's spoils, which included Peru's nitrate-rich provinces of Tacna and Arica and Bolivia's seacoast. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia that began in 1932 killed about 60,000 Bolivians and a good many Paraguayans; continental animosities sharpened when Chile actively supported Bolivia and Argentina threw its aid to Paraguay.

In spite of the bitterness generated from these flare-ups, certain unifying forces were at work. The revolutionary struggles by the American states against Spain and England left in their wake powerful sentiments shared by all the people of the New World. They held themselves to be different from those in the Old World, a new race on a new continent. They believed that Europe was old, corrupt, torn by wars, governed by tyranny, pessimistic, and declining. On the other hand, they believed that America was the opposite, young and vigorous and destined to fulfill mankind's utopian dream.

From these basic convictions, a mass of related sentiments derived. It was held that democratic republican government is the best form of government, all others being inclined to tyranny; that states are equal, irrespective of size and power; that being equal, no state has a right to intervene in the affairs of another; that disputes between states could be settled peacefully by substituting the rule of law for that of force; that cooperation would replace competition. So deep-seated were these convictions, that they withstood the turbulent years of reorganization and intermittent warfare.

While sometimes lost in the clash of fraternal battle, Bolivar's vision of a family of American nations never completely died. In 1889, a first major step was taken to make the dream a reality. In that year, at an invitation from the United States to meet in Washington to discuss commercial matters, 18 of the then 19 American republics responded favorably. This was the first of the series of international conferences of American nations. The delegates to that first feeble effort at cooperation on a hemispheric basis did not realize the precedent they were establishing. One contemporary United States newspaper, reflecting the prevailing opinion, even declared that "the Pan American Conference is pronounced a failure by those most concerned." Today, with the advantage of hindsight, we commemorate the 65th anniversary of that conference as the modest beginning of the mighty union we have today.

But not all was clear sailing for the inter-American ship after the first Pan American conference. In the first decades of the 20th century the United States pursued a course that was bitterly unpopular in Latin America. This policy consisted of unilateral intervention of United States Armed Forces in other American nations to protect United States lives and property or to prevent real or imagined threats of European intervention; the practice of dollar diplomacy, whereby the United States sought to control the finances of certain of the Caribbean countries; and the decision on the part of the United States to apply the Monroe Doctrine without consulting the other American States. Under the circumstances, it was unlikely that progress toward unity could be achieved.

All of us know the happy consequences that resulted when the United States signed the treaty at Montevideo in 1933 pledging nonintervention. With the shift to the good neighbor policy, the whole concept of pan-Americanism had a rebirth. After that, in rapid succession, the sister republics laid the foundations for hemispheric solidarity. When war clouds began to darken the horizon in Europe, the nations of America gathered at Buenos Aires and agreed upon a procedure for consultation in emergencies. Actual outbreak of World War II put the machinery of consultation into effect. During the war, the American nations worked in close cooperation. After the war the 21 republics formalized their system of mutual defense and peaceful settlement of disputes by the Rio and Bogotá pacts. Today the Organization of American States is a far cry from the timid excursion into inter-American cooperation of 65 years ago. It comes very close to realizing Bolivar's dream of the New World united in defense of the noble principles of freedom and independence.

But today the threat to our institutions comes not only from physical attack, as Bolivar feared from the hands of the Holy Alliance. Instead, every country in the Western Hemisphere is under constant, insidious assault. The current enemy, international communism, has created a new dimension in international warfare. Communism attacks at the very moral fibers of a nation. It has developed a modern Trojan horse technique of boring from within, of first spreading dissatisfaction and fear and suspicion, and then presenting itself as the savior. In Latin America, this precise moment in history is auspicious for the Communist scheme. The people have awakened from their apathy and resignation. They are seething with discontent for their lot, and no longer accept gnawing hunger and disease as their portion. The Communist defection of Guatemala, however-short-lived,

should serve as a warning that it can happen here. The removal through revolution of Communists from influential posts in Guatemala has done nothing to relieve the conditions that fostered the rise of those Communists in the first place.

All the mutual defense pacts and pledges of solidarity will not halt the war of ideas the Communists are waging. I do not mean by this statement to belittle the effectiveness of the inter-American system. Its continuous and upward growth in the face of difficulties, culminating in the fine Organization of American States which exists today is an island in the turbulent sea of international relations. I do mean, however, that we must not stop working to make it even more effective. We must not be so satisfied with our handiwork to date that we will permit our thinking with regard to Latin America to ossify. We must keep it fluid so that we are prepared to meet every new challenge in this dynamic and changing world.

Since it is presently unlikely that the Soviet Union will launch physical warfare upon one or more of our sister republics, we must be prepared to combat a different type of assault. The Latin American delegates to the conference in Rio last November pointed the way. They need help to raise the living standards of their people quickly, before they turn in desperation to the false promises held out to them by the Communists. Our full-hearted cooperation with Latin America in the economic field is as essential to the preservation of American institutions as is our military and political cooperation. If we are to meet the threat posed by Communist infiltration, we must take bold, original measures. Fortunately, the inter-American system has not been rigid. It has proved again and again that it can, so to speak, roll with the punches.

It is my fervent hope and prayer on this 65th anniversary of the Pan American movement that the unity of purpose of the sister republics of the Western Hemisphere will be increased and strengthened, and that the nations of the New World, through sincere efforts at cooperation, will march steadily toward the fulfillment of Bolivar's vision of a properous and free continent, at peace with the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who believes in Pan American understanding and unity, I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has said about the history of the Pan American movement, and I wish to associate myself with him in his remarks.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the supplemental appropriation bill, which he has just joined in passing, there is an additional contribution to the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History, in furtherance of an act passed by Congress last year. I hope it will have some additional value by virtue of having been passed on the 65th anniversary of the Pan American Union.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks. I feel certain that the people of Massachusetts value highly the Senator's interest in conditions around the world as well as in the affairs of his own people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as has already been noted, today is the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and because of my interest in the subject as a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics, I wish to pay tribute to the great success which has attended the Organization of American States.

This organization was established in 1889, the first Pan American Conference having been held in Washington. From that early beginning the organization has developed into one of the most remarkable international structures the world has seen.

The Pan American Union and the Association of American States are a great tribute to the good will and consistency of purpose of the republics of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres in this part of the world; and to their ability to get together on their mutual problems, and increasingly to strengthen the effectiveness of the Organization of American States.

Pan-American Day as such was first proclaimed 25 years ago in commemoration of this organization and its activities before that time. As I mentioned a moment ago, it is a system of voluntary associations of independent republics, which has been a stimulus and in some ways has been a pattern, for other organizations in other parts of the world.

We have recently seen several examples of its success—the Guatemalan situation; the recent tension between Costa Rica and Nicaragua; the solution of problems in other nations in South America; border disputes and the commissions which have been voluntarily set up to solve those disputes peacefully and without resort to the force which before that time had been all too often used.

And so, Mr. President, I merely want to pay tribute today to the vigor and the unity with which the American republics have successfully solved, in the main, the problems which occur in this hemisphere, and the problems which constantly beset the nations so far as their associations with one another are concerned. I hail this day as an anniversary, and I am sure we can look forward in the future to increasing strength and increasing success of this great American institution.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of World Affairs, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the United States Congress.

Grant us, we beseech thee, the divine graces necessary for our salvation.

Enlighten our souls with generous principles of goodness, freedom, and progress.

Strengthen our wills that we may embrace the sacrifices required to make good neighborliness a golden reality rather than a form of words.

Guide us, dear Saviour, in the ways of righteousness, truth, fairness, and sincere affection for all the people of the American Republics and Canada.

These are the favors we seek in the name of our Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1955:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1955:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; and

H. R. 2576. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1957.

On March 30, 1955:

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

On March 31, 1955:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

On April 5, 1955:

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

On April 11, 1955:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the revised statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts;

S. 1600. An act to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE DAN A. SUTHERLAND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of a man who served 10 years in these halls. My predecessor, Dan A. Sutherland, died March 23 at Abbington Memorial Hospital, Pennsylvania, at the age of 85 years. He served as Delegate in Congress from the Territory of Alaska from the 67th through the 71st Congress, covering the years from 1921 to 1931. He was not a candidate for election to the 72d Congress. After leaving office in the spring of 1931 he and Mrs. Sutherland moved to Pennsylvania where the former Delegate became associated with a sister in the operation of the Ogontz School, at or near Rydal. Although he never again lived in the Territory, Mr. Sutherland visited there occasionally and maintained an interest in Alaska affairs.

Born at Pleasant Bay on Cape Breton Island, Canada, April 17, 1869, Mr. Sutherland moved with his parents to Essex, Mass., in 1876. There he attended the public schools and later was employed as a grocer's clerk. From Massachusetts he made the long trip to Circle City, Alaska, in 1898 and in 1900 went on to Nome, later living at Juneau and in the Fourth Judicial Division of Alaska. He mined in many sections of the country and also engaged in fishing. A Republican, Mr. Sutherland was appointed as United States marshal for the First Division of Alaska in 1908, serving in that capacity for 2 years. In 1910 he was married to Hilda Evanson at Nulato, Alaska, and was a resident of Ruby, also on the Yukon River, when he was elected as a member of the first Alaska Territorial Senate in 1912. Reelected, he also served as a member of the Territorial Board of Education under appointment from Gov. Thomas Riggs. He was Alaska's fourth Delegate. Frank Waskey had been elected as Alaska's first Delegate in Congress for the short term at the election of 1906; at the same election, Thomas Cale was elected to the long term. James Wickersham served as Delegate following the election of 1908 until Dan Sutherland was chosen to succeed him in the election of 1920 after Judge Wickersham had left office of his own volition.

Mr. Sutherland is survived by his widow and a son who is a member of a university faculty in Colorado.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on May 11, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have heard quite a bit of talk about the State Department and the Secretary of State relative to his attitude generally on various subjects.

Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD two letters from a very distinguished citizen and constituent of mine, Mr. Marcus A. Gallagher, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn. In his letters to the Secretary of State, Mr. Gallagher outlined a very serious condition that was resulting from the maltreatment of religious groups in Italy.

On March 4 he wrote the Secretary of State the first letter. The Secretary of State has not even extended the courtesy of making a routine reply to this constituent of mine.

On April 4 he directed another letter to the Secretary of State outlining the same situation, yet has received no reply.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that is the general attitude of the Department of State, not even acknowledging letters relating to situations involving religion, or is it just an attitude generally of our Secretary of State?

I certainly feel that this outstanding Republican constituent of mine should have a reply from the Secretary of State on this very vital subject which has disturbed Christian men and women throughout the world.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 65th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. All the peoples of the Americas have every reason today to express their gratitude that so great a group of nations as these 21 American Republics of ours—covering a vast area and including millions of human beings—have found a way of working together to achieve common purposes and a just and lasting peace.

The United States has the proud distinction of being first of the American Republics to become independent, and we can be proud of the fact that our sister Republics of this hemisphere, as they acquired their own independence, patterned their national constitutions on our own Constitution.

It is refreshing on Pan-American Day to recall the many interchanges with our sister Republics which uphold and develop further understanding and friendship through the official agencies of government. The progress so far made by the American Republics in seeking ways to establish their independence and liberty upon solid foundations is a bright chapter in world history. While there have been some few mistakes and some possible misunderstandings during this march toward achievement of perpetual security and peace, such mistakes and misunderstandings have been rectified by conferences in which the equality of each republic was taken into proper consideration. With a firm resolve and a spirit of unity, the Western Hemisphere Republics look forward to perfecting an understanding and trust upon which our country and our neighbors shall always meet.

I am glad to have the privilege of joining my colleagues in paying tribute to those who work with us to promote hemisphere solidarity, in the spirit of good will to help produce the true foundations for world peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that indefinite leave of absence be granted to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] on account of illness.

THE LATE WILLIAM SEBASTIAN JACOBSEN

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad assignment for me to report to the House of Representatives that a former Member—William Sebastian Jacobsen—passed away suddenly late Sunday afternoon. Interment occurred yesterday morning in Clinton, Iowa, where he was born on January 15, 1887. His mother preceded him in death by only 10 days.

Bill Jacobsen, as he was familiarly called, served during the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses as Representative of the old Second District of Iowa, and succeeded his father, the late Bernard M. Jacobsen, who represented the same district for three terms preceding his son's election. It was a father-son succession.

In 1941, the General Assembly of Iowa resolved that the State should be reapportioned, and as a result of that decision, Representative Jacobsen and I found ourselves seeking the same office in the campaign of 1942. It was a vigorous but friendly contest conducted on a high plane by two contestants who had served together in this Chamber for 4 years and who regarded one another with respect and esteem.

Representative Jacobsen will be remembered for diligent service on the then Naval Affairs Committee. He will also be remembered as a loyal and stanch member of his party. He will be remembered, too, as a successful businessman in several fields—merchandising, real estate, finance, and radio ownership and operation. His energy was directed also to civic affairs in which he took genuine interest.

It is not too much to say that Bill Jacobsen will be remembered by his friends for his warm personality and generous spirit. Deepfelt sympathy is extended to his widow, his 2 sons, his 3 sisters, and other surviving relatives.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and regret that I read in the paper of the passing of our dearly beloved former colleague and friend, Bill Jacobsen. Bill was a hail fellow well met. To know him was to love him. When I first came to Congress, he, as a member of the opposite party, greeted me warmly and extended the hand of fellowship. He was always ready to assist me when I needed help. I will always remember him for his kindness toward me in those days. Bill Jacobsen loved people; he loved his native State. He never ceased to work for the good of all the people, whether in Congress or out. His passing is a great loss to the State of Iowa and to the Nation. My sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. TALLE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the relatives of my very dear friend, the late William Jacobsen. His mother passed away only 10 days before the death of our former colleague. Together, he and his father represented the old second district of Iowa for 12 years. When I came to Congress in 1939, I was not acquainted with Bill Jacobsen, but we had scores of mutual friends, and he was awaiting me with open arms when I arrived in Washington. We became very close personal friends. He was strong in the essentials of good citizenship. Bill Jacobsen always viewed every important issue from one point of view: Is it good for our country? That was his attitude throughout his service. He represented the old area that sent to Congress the late Senator William B. Allison, who served a total of nearly 40 years in both the House and the Senate. He represented the old area that sent to Congress the late Speaker David B. Henderson, the only Speaker from Iowa, and the first Speaker of that great region west of the Mississippi River. Our friend, whom the older Members of the House will recall with a great deal of affection, served his country well on every occasion, and my heart goes out to his relatives, and particularly his charming wife, who many Members of Congress probably know. She served in the office of Senator Gillette for a good many years, and later served as secretary for our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to hear of the death of Bill Jacobsen, who served in this House in an honorable and trustworthy manner and with great distinction to his people, his State, and country. His widow and sons may derive great consolation in the knowledge that he gave to his country the best of his capacity, which was outstanding. I know that the knowledge of his fine service in this body will always be a source of consolation to them and to his sons in particular a source of inspiration in their journey through life.

I extend to Mrs. Jacobsen, to the sons, and to the sisters of our late colleague, my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and accomplishments of our late colleague William Jacobsen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew Mr. Jacobsen well and had great respect for him. He was a fine patriot. He was a splendid public servant.

My sympathy goes out to all his loved ones.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to observe the passage of another year of cooperation among the republics of the Western Hemisphere. This Pan-American Day marks the 65th anniversary of the unique union of free nations now officially called the Organization of American States.

In a turbulent world filled with misapprehensions and mistrusts, the success of the 21 member states in their cooperative endeavor is a buoyant note, filling our hearts with optimism in the future of similar undertakings. To those who doubt the possibilities of maintaining international peace through cooperation, we point proudly to the Organization of American States.

Its creation was a remarkable achievement. The countries of the New World speak Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, and a pot-pourri of Indian languages; they are populated with many races and peoples of varied culture and background; they have had bitter memories of intermittent warfare to overcome. Yet, instead of dwelling upon their differences, the young republics determined to uphold jointly those ideals of freedom and the dignity of the individual that all hold dear. Out of the patient efforts of far-sighted American statesmen, both north and south of the Rio Grande, has grown the inter-American system we honor today. It touches every aspect of international life: Peaceful settlement of disputes within the Hemisphere, moral and military union against aggression from outside, cultural and economic cooperation for the advancement and strengthening of all members. It is my ardent hope that the inter-American system will become even stronger, and will continue to set a pattern that all the nations of the world might follow.

I am so pleased that on this meeting of the House of Representatives that my valued friend, Father Thorning, again offered prayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks on Pan-American Day at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today, April 14, 1955, marks the 65th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, now the Secretariat of the Organization of American States. This day is traditionally observed by the 21 American Republics as Pan American Day.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it affords me great pleasure to convey my best wishes and deep feeling of friendship for our 20 sister Republics in Latin America. In March of this year, it was my privilege to have been selected by President Eisenhower to attend the inauguration of President Luis Batlle Berres as President of Uruguay. The trip to Uruguay afforded me an opportunity to visit other countries in Latin America and to renew the profound impressions which I had gained from earlier visits of the real feeling of friendship which exists in Latin America for the United States.

Pan American Day is not merely one day set aside for recognition of the ties which bind the Republics of the hemisphere but also serves as a symbol of the day-to-day relations between the United States and Latin America which are continuously cementing the good will which exists between us. Pan American Day also serves as a fitting reminder that in the Organization of American States we have an international agency that has done much to bring our countries closer together. Only recently we have seen how, through statesmanlike action, the Organization was able to avert a serious dispute which arose between two Central American Republics. The Organization does much in the field of economic and social progress and has been a strong force in building the solidarity of the hemisphere.

Each year on Pan-American Day we should be reminded that we must continue to work together for the welfare and security of the hemisphere and that these objectives require patience, understanding, cooperation, and a recognition of the mutual interests of our peoples.

CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS FOR AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS AT LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill which will be of considerable help to all of the agricultural experiment stations in connection with the land-grant colleges of the United States.

This bill is introduced at the request of the directors of these agricultural experiment stations and at the request of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Prior to becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my pleasure to serve as president of the Utah State Agricultural College. In that capacity I controlled the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station and also worked closely with the experiment stations of other States. All of these State experiment stations are under a very cumbersome accounting system which is the result of adding various funds and amendments to the original Hatch Act of 1887. They must account separately for the funds of the Hatch act of 1887, the Adams Act of 1906, the Purnell Act of 1905, and Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 and amendments of 1946. My bill purposes to consolidate these funds into one fund for accounting purposes. It not only has the backing of the Department of Agriculture, but the Bureau of the Budget and the directors of the experiment stations of the United States, which directors have worked for 4 years to bring about this legislation.

The 83d Congress passed a bill which consolidated the funds of the Extension Service. This bill streamlined the Extension Service in exactly the same way in which my bill would streamline the work of the agricultural experiment stations. The Extension Service has been greatly benefited by the simplification and consolidation of funds brought about by the act of the 83d Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG AS CHAIRMAN OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower announced yesterday that he had picked J. Sinclair Armstrong, a member of the Securites and Exchange Commission, to be the new Chairman to succeed Ralph H. Demmler, who is leaving the Commission.

Sinclair Armstrong is one of the younger, new generation of Americans that has brought the highest type of public service to Washington. He has had a distinguished career as a lawyer and civic leader in Chicago. He was for a number of years a member of the law firm of Isham, Lincoln & Beale, one of the great law firms of America.

The industry which he has displayed since becoming a member of the Commission is noteworthy. He has an enthusiasm about him which is contagious. He loves hard work and fortunately is endowed with much natural ability.

I doubt that the President could have, within the breadth of America, found a more capable, honest, and diligent public servant to head an administrative Commission. Irrespective of party, he is the kind of public servant who would be generally approved under any administration.

Mr. Armstrong, in addition to all that I have thus far related, is the father of five fine children and enjoys the kind of family life which the people like to associate with American life. I am sure all of the House will be glad to hear of this splendid appointment by President Eisenhower.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a news story from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald in which it is stated that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], making an address on yesterday commemorating the anniversay of the birth of the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, referred to another great Democratic leader, Gen. Andrew Jackson, as an inept politician.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what other references were made to General Jackson, derogatory or otherwise, because I was not there to listen to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia make the address commemorating the birth of the founder of the Democratic Party.

While I am quite certain that such a mild epithet has not disturbed the memory of one of America's greatest leaders, I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that it is indeed fortunate that he represents a northern Virginia constituency rather than one in my own State of Louisiana. There the General's politics never disturbed us too much. As a matter of fact, we approved him about a thousand percent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. As a Tennessean, I simply want to say that the name of Andrew Jackson occupies such an exalted position in the history of this country and he is held in such high esteem and genuine affection by the American people that no such derogatory remarks could make any impression on the people of this country.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would also like to say that we in Louisiana not only think of Andrew Jackson as a great Democrat but we remember his gallant and unbelievable defense of our city, his rout of the enemy, and his supreme qualities of leadership.

It could even be, I might suggest to the gentleman from the 10th Virginia district, that a few Louisianans who have migrated—and I might add some Tennesseans, or even just plain old Democrats who now reside in that district—might not necessarily appreciate derogatory references with respect to Gen. Andrew Jackson.

SALUTE TO DR. JONAS SALK

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday we saw the passage of a historic milestone in man's struggle against the mysterious forces of disease. The announcement in Ann Arbor, Mich., of the effectiveness of the poliomyelitis vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk is a truly remarkable and significant discovery which will undoubtedly rank high among the medical achievements of all time.

Grateful parents of children long threatened by the deadly crippling polio raise their voices in praise of the distinguished Pittsburgh doctor who has rendered such an outstanding and humane service to his fellow citizens and all mankind.

His name will be long remembered by our generation of healthy, polio-protected children and by generations yet unborn. Americans everywhere, as well as people throughout the world, salute Dr. Jonas Salk for his notable achievement and offer their personal thanks for a job well done.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include Senate Joint Memorial 7, passed by the Idaho State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Memorial 8, which was passed by the recent session of the Idaho State Legislature, petitions Congress to maintain at least one veterans' hospital in every State. I am sure I do not need to impress upon this body either the fairness nor the urgency of such a request.

The memorial was undoubtedly sparked by the recommendation of the Hoover Commission Task Force that a number of veterans' hospitals be closed, including the VA hospital in Boise—the only one in Idaho. Such a move would work an obvious and undeserved hardship on Idaho veterans.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that any move to close veterans' hospitals will meet with stubborn resistance in this body—especially in view of the waiting list of 3,200 GI psychiatric cases, and of the expanding need for more—not fewer hospitals as World War II veterans grow older and as medical research makes it manifest that more and more diseases stem from service injuries and experiences.

The memorial follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in this its 33d session, do respectfully petition and represent, that—

Whereas the welfare and rehabilitation of sick and disabled veterans of all wars of the United States, is of the utmost importance to the people of the several States; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has assumed the responsibility of providing hospitalization for all veterans with service-connected disability or disease or chronic illnesses; and

Whereas the national welfare will be promoted by maintaining a minimum of one veteran's hospital in every State of the Union, in recognition of the contribution of each State in the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1955, now in session (the senate and house of representatives, concurring), That we most earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to support and maintain not less than one veteran's hospital in each and every State of the United States, in order to more effectively carry out the Government's established policy toward veterans; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Director of the Veterans' Administration, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 1st day of March 1955.

J. BERKELEY LARSEN.
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 4th day of March 1955.

R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], I read with amused interest the alleged remarks, which I assume were correctly quoted, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. Of course, nothing that anyone could say could dim the stature and position of Andrew Jackson in the minds of the American people. As part of the great history of our country, the battle of New Orleans alone is enough to refresh the memory of anyone who might perhaps forget Andrew Jackson. The only one whose position is dimmed is he who undertakes to attack Andrew Jackson. But in that same address, as I remember, the gentleman from Virginia said that Thomas Jefferson was the patron saint of the Republican Party. I assume he meant political patron saint. You know, unconsciously, the gentleman never made a more correct statement because Abraham Lincoln was a great Progressive. When you study the life of Abraham Lincoln, you find that Lincoln was a follower of Thomas Jefferson and the great political truths enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], his guilty conscience probably operating, made that statement having in mind that if Lincoln were alive today, Lincoln would be a Democrat.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States continuously seeks to strengthen the spiritual, political, military, and economic bonds of the free nations. By cementing these ties, we help preserve our way of life, improve the living standards of free peoples, and make possible the higher levels of production required for the security of the free world. With this objective in view, I recommended to the Congress in my message of January 10, 1955, the enactment of legislation designed to promote a healthy trade expansion and an increased flow of private capital for economic development abroad.

Consistent with that broad purpose, the United States over the past 7 years has participated in the multilateral trade agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This key element in the Nation's foreign economic policy has been carried on under the authority vested in the President by the Congress in the trade agreements legislation. After several months of intensive review of the trade rules in the general agreement, the United States and 33 other participating countries last month agreed upon certain revisions of those rules. A new instrument was also drafted which would set up a simple international organization, to be known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation, whose purpose is the administration of the general agreement.

I should like to recall the circumstances that gave rise to the general agreement and this country's participation in it. I should also like to stress some of its benefits to us which justify the continued existence of the general agreement and United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The economic and political dislocations produced by World War II jeopardized, in the postwar years, the reestablishment of healthy, expanding international trade. Many countries had little to export and lacked the means to buy the products of other countries. Widespread resort to restrictions on imports and to discriminatory bilateral trade arrangements threatened a return to economic isolationism and narrow channels of Government-directed trade. There was a great need for cooperative efforts to reduce unjustifiable trade restrictions and to establish a set of principles, mu-

tually beneficial to the free nations of the world, for the reconstruction of world trade.

In this state of world affairs, the United States and a group of friendly nations negotiated a series of tariff agreements among themselves. They also negotiated a set of trade principles or rules to protect the tariff concessions. These tariff agreements and trade rules were incorporated in a multilateral trade agreement, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The trade rules consist basically of provisions which this Nation, since 1934, has incorporated in bilateral trade agreements to protect our interest in the tariff concessions granted to us in such agreements. They provide, for example, that tariff concessions should not be nullified by the imposition of other restrictions; that quantitative restrictions should not be imposed on imports; that trade restrictions, when used, should be nondiscriminatory as between countries; and that concessions granted to one country should be extended to like products of other countries in accordance with the unconditional most-favored-nation principle.

To provide the degree of flexibility required to meet the varying needs of participating countries, the general agreement provides for specific exceptions to the basic rules. Under certain circumstances waivers may be granted to countries to depart from these basic rules. The United States has obtained such a waiver to restrict imports of agricultural products on which we have Government programs.

The general agreement through the trade rules and the tariff negotiations sponsored under it has served well the purpose for which it was designed: the orderly expansion of international trade. Thirty-four countries, whose trade accounts for nearly four-fifths of the world's total trade, are now participating in this cooperative effort. World trade has expanded at a rapid rate, and for many countries foreign trade now represents a higher ratio to total output of goods than in the prewar years.

An important benefit to this country results from participation in multilateral trade negotiations under the general agreement. Doing so makes it possible for us to obtain more tariff concessions on our exports than would be forthcoming from bilateral negotiation. This country, as a party to the multilateral agreement, obtains benefits from concessions which other countries would be unwilling to negotiate except in a multilateral undertaking.

Some measure of the value of these multilateral trade agreement negotiations to the United States is indicated by the fact that we have been able to obtain concessions covering about 50 percent in value of our exports.

Another advantage to this country through our participation in the general agreement has been manifest during the past 2 years. Restrictions on the part of other countries against dollar imports are permitted under the trade rules for genuine balance of payments reasons, and as the balance of payments position of other countries has improved we have been able to persuade them to relax such restrictions. Between 1953 and the beginning of 1955, 10 Western European countries had removed quantitative restructions on dollar imports amounting to about 60 percent of such imports. Since the beginning of this year additional restrictions have been removed. In the absence of the general agreement it would be more difficult to persuade these countries to relax such controls. We are thus moving toward full realization of the tariff concessions that have been granted our exports since 1948. It is the policy of this Government to utilize the consultative procedures of the general agreement to press for the discharge of these commitments for the benefit of our foreign trade.

In addition to the general relaxation of restrictions on dollar imports that has been accomplished, we have been successful in persuading other countries to remove discriminatory restrictions against imports of particular dollar goods. This Government has protested the inconsistency between the discriminatory action in those cases and the principles of the general agreement. Certain discriminatory restrictions have thus been removed on imports from this country of such items as coal, apples, cigarettes, lumber, potatoes, textiles, automobiles, tobacco, petroleum, wool, and motion pictures.

A further important contribution of the general agreement to the extension of trade is the assurance against wholesale increases in tariff rates in export markets. Our exporters, therefore, can proceed with their plans for sales in markets abroad with a greater degree of certainty as to tariff rates. Participating countries may, of course, consistently with the trade rules, raise tariff rates in individual cases where serious injury to domestic industry is threatened.

The revised general agreement has been thoroughly reviewed within the executive branch of the Government. I believe it has been improved and strengthened. It protects the legitimate interests of this country and provides a firm basis for orderly trade expansion among the free nations of the world. The necessity for the United States to restrict imports of agricultural products with regard to which we have government programs is fully recognized. The right of this country to protect the legitimate inteersts of its industries and labor is clearly provided for. The rules of trade regarding the imposition of discriminatory import controls have been tightened and should assist in the efforts to remove and to prevent discriminatory restrictions against United States exports. The spirit with which the participating countries cooperated in the task of review and revision of the general agreement was heartening and augurs well for its future vitality.

The United States and the other participating countries concluded on the basis of seven years' experience that the organizational provisions of the general agreement should be changed to provide a continuous mechanism for the administration of the trade rules and the discussion of mutual trade problems. Under present arrangements these activities are confined largely to the annual sessions of the parties to the agreement. The participating countries therefore have proposed to set up an Organization for Trade Cooperation for more effective administration of the trade rules and related activities.

The Organization for Trade Cooperation would be established by a separate agreement among the participating countries. In addition to administering the general agreement, it would provide a mechanism through which arrangements for trade negotiations could be facilitated. It would also serve as a forum for the discussion of trade matters and for the amicable adjustment of problems involving the trade rules. The organization would have no supranational powers. It would conduct no trade negotiations; this would be done by the countries who choose to participate in the negotiations and to whatever extent they choose.

The United States delegation which took part in the revision of the general agreement was specifically instructed to reject all efforts to expand the functions of the new organization into fields other than trade. One measure of the success of the negotiations from the standpoint of the United States is the fact that the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation is thus limited in its functions. Its effectiveness, in my judgment, will be enhanced by the fact that it has such specific and limited responsibilities.

I believe the reasons for United States membership in the proposed organization are overwhelming. We would thus demonstrate to the free world our active interest in the promotion of trade among the free nations. We would demonstrate our desire to deal with matters of trade in the same cooperative way we do with military matters in such regional pacts as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and with financial matters in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We would thus cooperate further with the free world, in the struggle against Communist domination, to the greater security and the greater prosperity of all.

Such action would serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. As a member of this Organization we could work more effectively for the removal of discriminatory restrictions against our exports. We could help establish conditions favorable to convertibility of currencies. We could further the expansion of markets abroad for the products of our mines, our farms, and our factories. We could assist in the development of conditions conducive to the international flow of investment capital so urgently needed to expand production throughout the free world, especially in its underdeveloped areas.

Failure to assume membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would be interpreted throughout the free world as a lack of genuine interest on the part of this country in the efforts to expand trade. It would constitute a serious setback to the momentum which has been generated toward that objective. It would strike a severe blow at

the development of cooperative arrangements in defense of the free world. It could lead to the imposition of new trade restrictions on the part of other countries, which would result in a contraction of world trade and constitute a sharp setback to United States exports. It could result in regional realinements of nations. Such developments, needless to say, would play directly into the hands of the Communists.

I believe the national interest requires that we join with other countries of the free world in dealing with our trade problems on a cooperative basis.

I herewith transmit copies of the agreement providing for an Organization for Trade Cooperation, and I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing United States membership in that Organizaion.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1955*.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5502, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. I would like at this time to ascertain the program for next week, if the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to state the program for next week at this time. I have it quite generally made up, but there are one or two matters that I wanted to look into further. I am sure the gentleman wants me to state the agreement we have with reference to today.

If at the conclusion of the bill there are any rollcalls, the rollcalls will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the agreement, as I understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if the bill is passed without any rollcalls, that is entirely different. If it is passed, then I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations brings you for your consideration today after having held hearings in regard thereto since the second of February, the bill H. R. 5502, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

At the outset I should like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee. They labored long hours to bring forth this bill which is before the House today. I know of no finer group that could be assembled to handle this vitally important bill. They are all men of experience in this House. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]. I should also like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation for his fine work, his capable and honest diligence, to the executive secretary of this subcommittee, Mr. Jay B. Howe. Without his help we might not have produced such a good bill as we have here today.

I also want it understood at this time that this bill represents the thinking of every member of this subcommittee, from both sides of the aisle. Some of us on the subcommittee with regard to some of the items, thought they should have been higher; some of us thought they should be lower, but this bill represents an agreement patiently arrived at between all members of the subcommittee with regard to every item contained therein.

With regard to the Department of State there was requested the amount of $147,267,197, which would represent a substantial increase over the amount of the current year's appropriation, to wit: $129,585,000. In its judgment the committee cut the President's budget estimate to the extent of $20,497,220, allowing the amount contained in the bill, to wit: $126,769,977.

With regard to the Department of Justice the committee was requested to appropriate the sum of $201,485,000. The committee allowed $197,525,000. It should be remembered that included in this item for the Department of Justice are the appropriations for the coming fiscal year not only for the maintenance of the law office of the Government, the Office of the Attorney General, and the district attorneys throughout the country, but also the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal prison system, and the Office of Alien Property.

In connection with the $30,279,715 request of the judicial branch of the Government, there was allowed the amount of $29,603,250, a cut merely to the extent of $676,465.

The next item is that for the United States Information Agency, which includes the Voice of America, wherein there was requested the amount of $88,500,000. As the result of the understanding arrived at among all the members of the subcommittee this item was agreed upon in the amount of $80,500,000, a cut of $8 million in the amount of the Bureau of the Budget's request.

With regard to the request for funds appropriated to the President for the Refugee Relief item in the bill wherein the amount of $16 million was requested, although the committee felt that the results of this program have been practically negligible and very disappointing, they also felt that to deny this money at this time might place the Congress in the position of being subsequently held responsible in the event of the failure of the administration of this program to carry it out as was originally planned by the Congress of the United States.

We have read in this morning's newspapers about suggested investigations to be made by the Congress with regard to this particular refugee relief bungling.

If you will take the time to read the printed transcript of the hearings had before this subcommittee, some very amazing things will be found in reference to the inept administration of this program. You will find at page 529 that as of last January 14 only 500 refugees had been brought to the United States.

As to the item, "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," I should point out that we have allowed $1,860,000 over the comparable appropriation for the current fiscal year; but that the item for salaries and expenses of the Department of State is $5,790,000 below the amount of the budget estimate. Of the new money allowed, $1,500,000 is for the personnel improvement program set up following the Wriston report; $100,000 is staff strengthening, and $260,000 for new foreign posts which are required to be opened.

The committee has denied the amount of $1,600,000 requested for additional economic reporting and trade commissioners. The Department asked for $1 million for 159 new employees in connection with expanded economic reporting and $600,000 for 63 additional employees in connection with the trade commissioner program. As pointed out in the report, we already have in the budget for the State Department $6 million for reporting, of which $2,200,000 is now being used for personal services of commercial attachés.

With regard to the request of the Department of State for a 47-percent increase in the next item which we shall continue to insist be labeled representation allowances rather than operations allowances, the committee has decided

to maintain this appropriation at the current level, to wit, $475,000. We have denied the additional $225,000 requested, and I am sure this will satisfy some gentlemen at one of whom I now look.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think the $475,000, nearly a half million dollars, is a lot of money for the purpose for which it is being used?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that these allowances might be termed necessary evils. I have never had the great privilege of sitting down with the gentleman from Iowa in this regard, but may I say that some business can be successfully transacted only under certain circumstances. I am sure the gentleman would not want our lower-paid capable career employees in the Foreign Service to have to take their counterparts in the country at which they are stationed to dinner or lunch and then have to pay the bills out of their own pockets on the meager salaries they get.

Mr. GROSS. Throughout this bill there is provision made that counterpart funds or credits owed to or by the United States be used, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, that is true. The credits the gentleman has mentioned have been attained as the result of the disposition of surplus property overseas and lend-lease transactions.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask this further question?

Mr. ROONEY. I am waiting for the first question. I am trying to ascertain what the gentleman is getting at.

Mr. GROSS. As far as foreign liquor is concerned, why not buy it out of these counterpart funds?

Mr. ROONEY. A great deal of the whole amount is purchased as the result of the use of foreign currencies or credits.

Now, I want the distinguished gentleman to understand that in order to use these credits on currencies which are in the Treasury of the United States, we must appropriate dollars, and that is the reason this is a dollar appropriation item, in order to get the credits and currencies out of the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that we have to buy our own money back again?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, the gentleman has been here a number of years now, and while I address these remarks to him directly, they are principally for the information of those who have not been here so long so that they may understand what happens in regard to these funds, currencies, and credits. It is all a bookkeeping transaction. The Congress must appropriate the money by way of this appropriation bill in order to get these credits or currencies out of the Treasury for use by the State Department. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. No. I am not satisfied that we should appropriate 475,000 American dollars for entertainment purposes. I am not satisfied with that at all and will offer an amendment at the proper place to strike it out. I think it is a waste of the taxpayers' money and we ought to get rid of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, that may very well happen, but I feel that the committee, in unanimous agreement, did quite well when we continued this appropriation at the current level, and this is at a low level as compared with some previous years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you increase the appropriation for the construction of buildings abroad?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, that is the next item. We did not increase that appropriation dollarwise. I think the gentleman understands from reading these hearings that we have in their bill appropriated cash moneys only to the extent of $750,000, and that $6,250,000 is for use by way of those foreign currencies or credits which the gentleman referred to a while ago.

Mr. GROSS. I think we can very well use some of this seven-hundred-odd-million dollars in currencies owned and owed to the United States to buy farm surpluses and things of that kind. When you enlarge the building program overseas, you are going to have to send people over there to live in the buildings, and we are going to maintain this veritable army of people that we have in foreign countries.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman maintaining that the Eisenhower administration is reckless in its spending? Does he think it has gone haywire in regard to every financial policy and requested appropriation?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman maintains that it has gone on for a long time and is not being stopped fast enough.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall point out later on that there are many, many items contained in this bill which are higher today than they were in George Washington's time.

Mr. GROSS. I am not surprised at that, and the gentleman should not be surprised.

Mr. ROONEY. I will give the gentleman an example, to get on his side of the case for the moment. There has already been spent in connection with this refugee relief program of President Eisenhower's the sum of $5,849,330 to bring 500 refugees and about 13,500 relatives of citizens and legally admitted residents into the United States. That appears at page 529 of the testimony. I think this is the worst administrative outfit ever created in Government. There is no question about that. And that is the reason we today have the controversy which someone has told me about in regard to a couple of gentlemen, both of whom come from New York.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have read the gentleman's questioning of certain witnesses before the committee, and I think he did a very good job.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Under the circumstances, I cannot understand why you provide in this bill an appropriation of $80.5 million for the Information Service, when you disclosed in your hearings that there was rank duplication of all kinds in foreign countries; for instance, 87 American employees in Spain or employees paid by the Government in Spain.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not yielding here for a speech, I must say to the gentleman from Iowa, but I think we have adequately taken care of all these things. We went into the contents of a certain book which has been written within the past few months and which has been highly advertised and, as I understand, is a best seller today. We went through that book with its author, paragraph by paragraph, and found therein a great many misstatements. When one considers these things, one has to be fair, particularly if the writer of that book attacks everything meat ax fashion and makes untrue statements. For instance, he described a broadcast which he listened to on the liner *Queen Elizabeth* at sea on the 2d of April 1954, and he tore it apart. Among other things, he said that the principal news item carried on the BBC broadcast 15 minutes before the VOA broadcast was the battle raging at Dienbienphu in Indochina. He said that the Voice of America broadcast immediately following omitted all mention of that battle in its news program. He said that the diction of the announcer was poor, flat, and harsh; that he was like a verbose young fellow palming off his first essay before a public-speaking class at school. The committee had them produce the tape recording of that broadcast of April 2 and listened to the content and the diction of the announcers. The committee found that the first and important news of the day's broadcast by the Voice of America was that battle in Indochina. Now, when one finds a situation like this, one goes a little further. We wondered, since the gentleman had for 25 or more years been a considerable figure in the motion picture business and should have been an expert, whether or not he was qualified to attack the motion-picture program.

In his book he mentioned certain motion pictures by name. The committee looked at some 13 or 14 motion pictures, short and long, some of them of 2 hours' or more duration. The committee also looked at a long or feature-length Soviet propaganda film, The Doomed Village, and decided to question this author. The committee found that of the 13 or 14 motion pictures which were exhibited—we spent a day and a half doing that—he had seen only one short two-reeler. And I have a doubt as to whether or not he saw that two-reel picture because, when he was asked to point out what were the wrong slants in it, he seemed utterly unfamiliar with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I think I shall have to proceed, I regret to say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I know how interested the gentleman is in the Department of State and in such international organizations as UNESCO, but the gentleman will have his opportunity to speak later on.

I should like, before we use up all our time, to refer to the international educational exchange program. Is it conceivable that anyone in this House would stand for allowing $4,110,000 to administer a $22-million program of this kind?

Is it conceivable that anyone here would stand for this program getting off into an area where, instead of bringing foreign students to the United States, we take them from one country in Europe and send them to another country, to go to school? That was proposed in this budget submitted by the Department of State. They requested funds to send over 1,300 students from one part of Europe to another part of Europe to go to school. I do not think anyone here is going to stand for such. Furthermore, about 35,000 foreign students come to the United States every year. About 93 percent of them are brought under auspices other than the Department of State.

If the private institutions and private foundations are doing so well in bringing the bulk of these students here I think we may very well leave some of this program in a static condition appropriationwise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wanted to ask the distinguished chairman whether we are leaving it static. We are appropriating less money under this item for this year than for last year as I see the figures in the report.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the distinguished gentleman has read the testimony and found what was the situation with regard to the failure of so many aspects of this program. For instance, they have no way of knowing, after having brought these people to this country over the years, not only as students but as leaders, as professors, what they did after they went back to their native countries. They cannot tell you whether they are on our side or on the Communist side. With reference to the Parliament in Germany, we found that we taxpayers have brought 25 percent, or 1 out of every 4 members of the lower house and 17 percent of the members of the upper house here to the United States. And when the chips were down and there arose in the German Parliament the issue whether or not they were going to stand by the United States or going to sit down with Soviet Russia, every member of the Social-Democrat Party who had been brought here, voted against us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I suggest to the gentleman he has criticized the size of the appropriation used for administrative expenses. To follow these people and to see what they do with that education when they get back to their own countries would take administrative funds, would it not?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that under the terms of the pending bill they are pretty well taken care of with regard to administrative funds. I might also point out in passing that a similar situation prevails with regard to the parliament in Paris, that we have brought to the country certain members, at the taxpayers' expense, whom we cannot depend upon when the chips are down.

Another point I must make is with regard to the fact that they bring here under this program people who have already been in the United States once, twice, or three times. That never was my understanding of this program at its inception. I was here when it was conceived by an able and distinguished Member of the other body, who was at one time a Member of this House from the State of Arkansas. The legislation was passed on the theory that we had all these surplus property credits in connection with the property we were leaving all over the world after the war, and we were going to use those credits for this program, so that it was going to cost the taxpayers hardly a nickel. Well, we have certainly gone plenty far afield from that, and the hearings with regard to this program will show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the fact that the committee has reduced the appropriation under last year's amount reflect thinking on the part of the committee that this program is less important this year than it was last year?

Mr. ROONEY. No, I think the action of the committee would reflect the fact that we are highly critical of the administration of this program. We do not think they should get into this business of taking foreign students from one country in Europe and sending them at our expense to another country. We think they should not bring people to this country who have previously been here. These reactions are reflected in these figures, may I say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey.

As to the Department of Justice, as a former prosecutor I was amazed to find in connection with the case of a man named Val Lorwin that there was an assistant attorney general who had been down in the Department for a number of years, who was held over by Mr. Brownell for about 16 months, who about a year after he was with Mr. Brownell went before a grand jury here in the District of Columbia without Mr. Brownell's knowledge, without the knowledge of the head of the Criminal Division, without the knowledge of the assistant heads of the Criminal Division, in other words, without anyone's knowledge, and caused the indictment of this man Lorwin, after having told the grand jury two falsehoods, one that he had two FBI informants as additional witnesses who would be ready to testify on the trial.

There was only one Government witness before that grand jury; and this prosecutor said, "We have two others whom we will produce on the trial who will back up the facts as given by this one witness." Then when the grand jury said, "We would like to hear the defendant, we would like to hear what he has to say about this," this assistant attorney general of Mr. Brownell said, "There is no sense in my subpenaing the defendant before you because he will only raise the fifth amendment as all the Communists do." And this without any notice to the defendant.

The underlying fact in the case was that there never was a case against the defendant, and the Attorney General later had to go into the District court and dismiss the indictment.

I might also say, while I am talking about the Department of Justice, that they do not like competitive civil service. If you will refer to page 14 of the hearings on the Department of Justice you will find this colloquy. I was addressing Mr. Brownell.

Mr. ROONEY. Here is something I would like to bring to your attention. I ran across a "good government" letter put out by the National Civil Service League:

"More patronage plums. The jobs-for-marshals drive has created a strong atmosphere of patronage in Washington. It is not surprising that the recent removal of 900 deputy United States marshal jobs from competitive civil service is viewed with wide suspicion. Deputy marshals have been under civil service since 1940. Proposals to place them in a noncompetitive classification have been opposed in the past by the league, the Hoover Commission, and the Civil Service Commission itself. The Commission attempted to explain its change of attitude in a 4-page press release stating that placing them under schedule B would be the cheaper and more practical way to fill the jobs."

What about that?

Mr. BROWNELL. I think it would be more practical and cheaper, but I think the important thing to note there is the qualifications for deputy marshals have been raised so that we expect to get a better grade of applicants.

Mr. ROONEY. But you will take them out of civil service?

Mr. BROWNELL. Out of competitive civil service.

Now, as to some of the well-known cases in the Department of Justice. After this administration took over and after they had told the American public the Government was infested with Communists, what have they done with Judy Coplon? What have they done with Mr. Foster, the kingpin of the Communists in America? He has not been tried yet. They came before the committee and pointed out that there have been 82 successful prosecutions under the Smith Act, and it turns out that 72 of those cases were investigated and the defendants were indicted before the new administration came into office.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. About a year ago there was a bill before the House which would have created a situation with respect to wiretapping which would have permitted the conviction of Judy Coplon. How did the gentleman from New York vote on that bill?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say this to the gentleman from Kentucky: when the day comes that the Congress has to legislate ex post facto with regard to a particular defendant, and when the Department of Justice with its FBI cannot get enough evidence properly and legally, after this lady had been caught turning over secret documents to an acknowledged Russian spy, then we are in a sad day.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then it is your understanding that at the present time she can be successfully prosecuted under existing law and you do not need that wiretapping law which we tried to pass here last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I see no reason to think otherwise. I think all the facts should be brought out on the table with regard to Judy Coplon. They have never been brought out as yet. We never hear the subject brought up by Mr. Brownell.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Kentucky mean that Congress is asked to pass an ex post facto law for the specific purpose of dealing with this individual?

Mr. ROONEY. That was a bill which would have provided that many years after something happened, it would have made something admissible in evidence which was not admissible in evidence at the time of the happening.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Was that the sole purpose of bringing that bill before the Congress?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I think the gentleman from Mississippi should ask that question of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, so that other Members will have some time on our side, I am going to conclude after only briefly referring to the appropriation request with regard to the judiciary. Included, therein, is the money for the referees in bankruptcy and their expenses. It appears it is expertly prognosticated that in the coming fiscal year 1956 there will be as many as 75,000 bankruptcies, the highest number in the history of the United States of America. Someone might say, "Well that only applies to 10,000 or 20,000 business concerns because included therein are the farmers and the employees and professional people." But the fact remains that a highly capable career man has prognosticated that these bankruptcies will reach the highest point in the history of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. It is also true that the income of the American people is the highest that it has ever been, and there is more prosperity in the United States than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; with regard to the first part. But that all happened during a perid of time which, the gentleman will not admit, began after a thing called the Hoover depression, when we had Hoover cities and tents and people standing on breadlines.

Mr. MARTIN. Let us forget the past and get back to date. The gentleman was saying a short time ago that we were going to have a depression, and now he admits that the income of the American people is the highest it has ever been, and our prosperity is greater than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not say we were going to have a depression.

Mr. MARTIN. Your party leaders did.

Mr. ROONEY. I said we were going to have 75,000 bankruptcies in 1956 according to this testimony, the highest in the history of the country. That is what I said.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to ask a question and not make a statement.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure it will be a good question.

Mr. COUDERT. I seem to recall a headline or a head note in the Times this morning indicating that the testimony to which the gentleman is now referring with respect to the number of bankruptcies is misleading and incorrect. I am not criticizing the gentleman, but the witness himself apparently stated it in such a way as to be misleading.

Mr. ROONEY. If I understand correctly, the press consulted the firm of Dun & Bradstreet. Dun & Bradstreet came along and said, "Oh, no, there will be only ten or twenty thousand bankruptcies of commercial firms." You see they do not engage in getting statistics with regard to farmers and the employed. Incidentally, right in these hearings you will find the number of bankruptcies beginning in 1900—55 years ago.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Do I take it that this is a new line for the prophets of gloom; they have given up the idea of a recession and a depression and now it is bankruptcies?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman can take my remarks whichever way he cares to. We deal in facts. We do not make speeches in our hearings. We elicit answers by questions, and when we get the answers they stand in the record.

Mr. WILSON of California. But you say there are anticipated so many thousand bankruptcies. That is not a fact; that is conjecture.

Mr. ROONEY. Your colleagues on your side from the appropriations committee would take with some reliance the predictions of the gentleman who made these predictions. He is the Chief of the Bankruptcy Division. He is not someone like you and I who do not know much about bankruptcies.

In conclusion may I again say that I am grateful to all the members of the subcommittee for their hard work and their splendid efforts in bringing out this important bill. I trust it is acceptable to the House and will not be amended.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], chairman of the subcommittee, has reviewed in a general way the results of the deliberations of this committee, which constitute the substance of this bill.

I do not intend at this time to go over the ground that he has covered. All of the material is summarized in the report, and the record of several hundred pages of testimony is printed and available to Members of the House.

I do want to say, however, that I appreciate my colleague's kind words about his colleagues. For my part, I am sure the members of the minority reciprocate. I have the greatest admiration and respect for the hard-working and sometimes hard-hitting gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], our chairman and the other members of this subcommittee. I simply cannot let the occasion pass without expressing my very warm regard and respect for that other able gentleman, without whom we could scarcely function, the very able and hard-working executive secretary, Mr. Jay B. Howe.

The gentleman from New York took occasion to refer to a couple of cases handled by the Department of Justice. He took occasion to suggest some criticism at the Attorney General's Office under its present administration.

With respect to those two matters let me say to Members that if they want the full story, if they are sufficiently interested in the case of Miss Judy Coplon and Mr. Val R. Lorwin they should examine the printed record of testimony where the whole story is to be found and from which they can draw their own conclusions. For my part I have the highest respect and regard for the Attorney General. He is a first-class lawyer and able citizen. I was much impressed with the ability and knowledge of the other witnesses from the Department of Justice who appeared before this committee.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. I have a question relative to the United States Information Agency as it affects the report of the committee. As printed I notice there are several limitations written into the report. For instance, not to exceed $300,000 is provided for the "presentation" program; not to exceed $200,000 is provided for exhibits for which $334,000 was requested, and other limitations of that type.

I am wondering if the fact that these limitations appear in the report make them actual limitations in law. I notice they are not mentioned in the bill itself, and I wonder if the committee regards them as binding on the agency, because there are many serious limitations, particularly in regard to exhibits, for example. I would just like to hear the opinion of the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. I may say to the gentleman from California that it is expected that they will be the law; and that they are binding. The fact that they have not been inserted in the bill is not important. They represent the considered judgment of the committee and we expect the language of the report to be followed.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of California. Are limitations written in a committee report such as this, but not written into the wording of the legislation, binding?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter to be settled by the members of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILSON of California. I merely wanted it for my own understanding and information, for I am fairly new here.

It seems to me rather unusual to consider matter written into a report of the same binding effect on an administrator as though written into the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the prerogative of the Chair to pass upon the sufficiency or insufficiency of a committee report.

Mr. WILSON of California. I am not really asking whether the report itself is sufficient or insufficient; I am asking whether the legislation we are voting on here is sufficient or insufficient.

The committee report on the appropriation bill now before the House includes recommendations on maximum amounts to be available to the USIA for certain specified functions. The recommendations appear to be intended as limitations. No comparable limitations are contained in the bill appropriating funds to USIA.

I should like to point out that recommendations contained in a report of a committee of the House can have no legal force. Such recommendations do not reflect the will of the House. The Members of the House do not have an opportunity to accept or reject the limitations, or to otherwise amend them since there is no established procedure for the House to amend committee reports.

Legislation can be enacted only by the joint action of the House and Senate and the President. Legislation cannot be unilaterally enacted by a committee of the Congress. Naturally the committee recommendations are to be given due weight by the executive agencies in the administration of the programs concerned. These recommendations are the result of the arduous labors of conscientious legislators. They are not to be lightly ignored or disregarded by the executive arm of the Government. They are not, however, legislative mandates having the force of law.

I am firmly of the above view and understand that my view is shared by the General Counsel of the General Accounting Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman might address that inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say once again that the language in the report with regard to these limitations is a matter of custom which has been followed over many years, and it is expected that the USIA and the departments involved in this bill will strictly follow the language of the report unless the will of the House demonstrates otherwise by adopting amendments to the bill.

I cannot make it more clear.

Mr. COUDERT. I have now before me the column from the New York Times of this morning, April 14, with respect to the subject of the 75,000 bankruptcies referred to by the chairman of this subcommittee a few moments ago. The headline is "Failure Figures Just Fail To Jibe—Alarming Forecast in House Report Traced to Error in Comparing Data—No Rise in Bankruptcies—Furore Finally Liquidated—Misleading Estimate Aided Court Budget, Anyhow."

That is the headline and the subcaption. Then as you go down the column—there is an entire column of it—you read this:

> The Dun & Bradstreet's spokesman termed the 75,000 figure fantastic, saying that the witness could not possibly have been talking about business failures which totaled 11,000 last year and are expected to run about the same total this year. Dun & Bradstreet list among bankruptcies any enterprises that go out of business on account of lack of money.
>
> The spokesman compared the 1954 total of 11,086 failures with a total of 117,164 new enterprises that started up during the same period.

I read that into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, merely to clarify the situation so that there will not be any misunderstanding. I think my friend from New York did make that clear generally at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In order to further clarify the situation I would appreciate it if the gentleman would permit me to read into the RECORD the following brief paragraph from the testimony, appearing at page 115 of the committee hearings with regard to the Judiciary:

> The upward trend began in 1953 when 40,087 cases were filed, and it has continued through the fiscal year 1954 when new filings totaled 53,136. This represents a numerical increase of 13,049 over 1953, which is by far the largest numerical increase in any year since the salary system began. The percentage increase was 32.55 percent. There are strong indications that the upward trend will continue and that approximately 65,000 cases will be filed in 1955, and that the total increase to 75,000 in 1956 can be expected.

I may say that the salary system began in 1946 or thereabouts.

Mr. Covey has been the head of the bankruptcy division and connected with the administration of referees in bankruptcies since 1942. If he were not such a capable gentleman I do not suppose he would be there now. So I am willing to take the figures of this capable gentleman who testified before the committee rather than this story of Dun & Bradstreet's.

Mr. COUDERT. All I had in mind was to make sure there is no misunderstanding. I do not question the figures presented, they may be right, they may be wrong, and by referring to Dun & Bradstreet it merely puts the whole situation in proper perspective.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman will recall that the figures of Mr. Covey with regard to predicting the number of bankruptcies over the years has been uncanny, uncanny in the fact they have been accurate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that Mr. Hoover, Jr., the son of one of our great and illustrious Presidents, has added a great deal to the efficiency of the Department of State? I find him able, fine, and kindly, and very helpful to his country.

Mr. COUDERT. For my own part, I entirely subscribe to the gentlewoman's observations about Mr. Hoover, Jr. I am sure he has been a very great, powerful, and useful addition to the staff of the Department of State.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Former President Hoover must be extremely gratified that his son was confirmed by the Senate without a dissenting vote.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to the charming gentlewoman from Massachusetts that Undersecretary Hoover is a charming gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And very able.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to ask my good friend from New York some questions about an item on page 3 of the report under the heading "Contributions to International Organizations." I refer specifically to the amount of $1.6 million plus for the International Labor Organization. I understand that is an increase over the previous appropriation of about $106 million, and I wonder if the gentleman could tell the committee why it was necessary to make an increase in our contribution.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman has inadvertently quoted an incorrect figure. The amount appropriated for the current year was $1.5 million plus and the amount requested was $1.6 million plus, which represents a requested increase of $106,378.

Mr. BENTLEY. I accept the correction. But, I would still like to ask the gentleman about the increase of $106,000.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the increase, as related to the committee by Ambassador Lodge, is based on a general increase. It is the United States share, our part of the contributions to ILO.

Mr. BENTLEY. I believe the gentleman will confirm me when I say that our percentage of contribution to the total budget is about 25 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I think I should answer the gentleman this way, that the total assessment budget for the calendar year 1955, which compares with this bill, fiscal year 1956, approved by the 37th international labor conference, amounts to $6,990,913 or $434,026 more than the comparative figure for the calendar year 1954, fiscal 1955. The primary factors responsible for this increase are the salary increases, travel attributed to home leave, and increase in field work program. The United States share remains the same as it has been, to wit, 25 percent.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee looked into the very serious problem which I understand exists with respect to the ILO at the present time. I am specifically referring to the fact that among the Communist delegations to that conference, although their delegations, like ours, are

supposed to be divided into three groups, namely, an employer delegation, a worker delegation, and a government delegation, actually the delegates from the Communist countries are all government delegates. I wonder if the gentleman's committee considered that problem at all.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee does, as far as possible, try to stay away from policy matters and legislative matters which are properly within the confines of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. This budget was presented to the committee by Ambassador Lodge and his staff. The committee found no reason to complain with it. It might surprise the gentleman if we were to say that the majority members have some confidence in Ambassador Lodge, as do the minority members. He is a fine American, he makes a fine presentation, and he makes a forthright statement, but I regret to say that the committee did not probe into this matter the gentleman from Michigan mentions.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I personally consider it unwise that our worker delegates to that conference, appointed by the AFL and the CIO, and our employer delegates, appointed by the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, are forced to sit down with so-called worker and employer delegates who are nothing but mouthpieces of their Communist satellite governments. I might point out further that I understand on the part of our employer organization, because of the situation which is existing at the present time, there is some question as to whether in the future we should send employer delegates to ILO conferences.

Mr. ROONEY. I deplore the existence of this situation which the gentleman describes. But when we have our U. N. affairs in the hands of Ambassador Lodge, who is busy with this whole problem of the U. N. and international organizations, I wonder if it is something that one should decide here on the floor of the House in a few minutes rather than leave it to Ambassador Lodge, sitting before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and going over the subject in detail with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say that I have no intention of offering any amendments with respect to our contribution to the ILO, but I do hope that the gentleman, in spite of the respect that he and I both have for Ambassador Lodge, would consider the question of our contributions to the organization and perhaps the question of our membership in the organization as one for the Congress, both his committee and mine, a question to which we should give serious consideration in the future.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman does not propose that we should take the United States out of the International Labor Organization without very mature consideration. As a matter of fact, my first reaction would be one of opposition to such a proposal.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman, in the time remaining, would answer 1 or 2 questions about the appropriations for the USIA.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall try to.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether any breakdown was furnished with the request by that organization of $88.5 million, of the increases over the 1955 appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, there was.

Mr. BENTLEY. Am I correct in assuming that about two-thirds of the requested increase was for appropriations to carry on the work of overseas missions in certain geographic areas?

Mr. ROONEY. That would be correct.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with how much of that money went to the so-called Near East.

Mr. ROONEY. The amount of the increase to the Near East would come to approximately 50 percent of the requested increase. USIA overseas operations totaled $4,518,000, and $2,023,000 was proposed to be used for missions in the Near East.

Mr. BENTLEY. Does the gentleman have a country breakdown of the allocations in the Near East?

Mr. ROONEY. We do.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman could make a comparison between the amount allocated for India on one hand and the amount allocated for countries of the Middle East and Africa on the other hand. Those are all the questions I have at the present time.

Mr. ROONEY. Those are a couple of good questions, I must say to the gentleman. With regard to India, the 1956 estimated expenses for 8 posts, 65 Americans, and 472 locals, would be $2,171,700, whereas the figure with regard to—would the gentleman want the figure for Iran?

Mr. BENTLEY. Would the gentleman tell me if I am correct in this? Would it not be very unfortunate that there was more money requested for India alone—I believe nearly three times as much—as all of the requested increase for Israel, the Arab States, and the entire continent of Africa?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that is a fair statement; that is, that by far the largest amount requested was for India. I want the gentleman to understand that we are now talking only about the estimated or requested amounts, before the scalpel was used by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, in considering the committee recommendation of $28,079,977 for our contributions to international organizations, I wish to call attention to the amount of $1,633,855 for the International Labor Organization.

According to the Secretary of State, our estimated contribution for the current fiscal year to this organization is $1,527,477, representing 25 percent of the entire organization budget. Now we are asked to approve an increase of more than $106,000 to this organization about which I have very grave misgivings indeed. I might add that our contribution to the ILO has increased from $532,000 in fiscal 1946 to the figure which the committee is asking for today and which represents the largest contribution, if approved, which we have yet made to that organization in any one fiscal year.

One of the gravest reasons for my misgivings concerning this organization, Mr. Chairman, lies in the large number of worker and employer delegates to the international conferences of the ILO who are selected by governments rather than by private organizations. Now in this country the CIO and the A. F. of L. select our worker delegates and the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce select our employer delegates. But at these international meetings they are brought face to face with Communist delegates who are not representative of worker or employer organizations in their country, but instead, are mere mouthpieces of the various Communist governments which accredit them.

In the fall of 1953, I participated in a special study mission on international organizations and movements which, at the direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, spent a month in Western Europe studying these organizations and movements. We found, for example, that the credentials committee of the ILO and the conference itself had approved the seatings of a Czech Government official as an employer delegate in spite of the fact that the ILO constitution itself says that an employer representative must be nongovernmental. This appears to me to be a clear violation of the ILO constitution and is one of the reasons for my grave misgivings regarding our participation in an organization which operates thusly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the sixth annual report from the United States employers' delegation to the 1954 International Labor Conference. The report calls attention to the influx of Communist nations into the ILO, especially at the 1954 Conference. It further points out that this Communist invasion resulted in an impetus to greater solidarity among the employer representatives of the free world, brought about a sharp cleavage within the normally solid worker group to which the United States worker delegation was a happy exception, and left a general impression of unwillingness on the part of most governments to clash with the Communists in the ILO.

I understand that the admission of Communist nations to ILO membership and the decision of the Conference to accept and seat Russian-defined employer and worker representatives from Iron Curtain countries has raised the broad question as to whether or not United States employers should continue to participate in the Organization. I understand that this question is still under consideration by the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

At this time, I would like to say that the employers' last report did not contain the usual progress report and made no recommendations in view of the fact

that the entire question of future participation by United States employers is at stake. The report did, however, contain the following paragraph which may prove enlightening to the committee:

We cannot credit the ILO staff with any less bias than in the past. The attitude of the staff toward the Communist problem was strictly one of self-preservation. Naturally they would look with disfavor upon any move that might jeopardize their secure positions in an international agency. We cannot at all subscribe to the undue influence which the staff exerts on many occasions in many meetings at an ILO conference.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our Government has been quite strong in its support of the ILO for many years. Organized labor in the United States, as well as the major business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have, by their active participation in ILO activities, rendered strong moral support to the organization. There has, of course, been criticism based upon the fact that a number of proposals taken up by the ILO are not compatible with the free enterprise, free collective bargaining concepts which prevail in this country.

Also, the fact that ILO conventions are subject to ratification as treaty law has been a cause of concern in management circles and has been one of the primary sources of United States criticism of the ILO. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I am firmly opposed to the fact that proposals passed by the ILO take a form which is subject to ratification as a multilateral treaty. I have been informed by the Department of Commerce that they too are similarly opposed to the use of the convention as an ILO instrument on any subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that Assistant Secretary Wilkins, of the Department of Labor, has been doing a very good job in representing the United States in the ILO and, further, I think that the United States representation is now much improved and much stronger than it has been in the past. To some extent, the Soviet entry into the ILO has had a salutary effect in unifying the position of the free nations and in bringing employer and worker delegates of the free nations closer together on many issues where in the past they have been divided.

Nevertheless, I remind the Committee again that employer and worker delegates from the Soviet bloc nations have been seated even though these delegates are not true representatives of employers or workers but are, in fact, government representatives. There is no question but that since the Communist countries were given representation on industry committees by the ILO governing body, the activities of these committees have been hampered, to say nothing of the fact that it gives the Communists another platform for propaganda purposes.

I am not going to oppose the appropriation made for the ILO by the Appropriations Committee. But there is one more fact to which I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues. The total 1956 ILO budget is approximately $7.5 million, of which more than $3.7 million is for salaries and wages of the international secretariat. Just about half of the whole budget. I understand that the director general requested from the governing body a total of 85 new jobs and received approval for 51 of these. Now, this obviously means an expansion of this organization beyond anything in the past, and to the extent that we continue to furnish our proportionate share of the budget, it will require larger and larger contributions from this Government in the future. In this same connection, I understand that the total ILO budget for 1956 represents an increase of $450,000 over the 1955 budget, to which must be added an amount of $250,000, which is now in a capital fund. In other words, the organization figures to spend about $700,000 more in 1956 than they are spending in the current calendar year.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not intend to vote against this requested appropriation, but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that there are serious doubts among responsible quarters as to the value of our continued participation in this organization which seems to be embarked on a very real program of growth. I strongly urge that future contributions to this organization be made with the foregoing facts in mind.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

I understand that the budget estimate for this purpose totaled $88.5 million, representing an increase of $11,386,000 over the amount appropriated in the current fiscal year. I further understand that this increase is distributed as follows: $8.4 million for the agency's overseas missions to carry out stepped-up United States information programs in the American republics area; the Far East; and the Near East—there being no increase for Europe; $1.3 million for more effective backstopping of the overseas mission by domestic media services—motion picture, press, and information center services—these costs being nonallocable by area; $1.5 million for increased Voice of America activities, including funds for television development; $100,000 to promote increased cooperation in information activities by private enterprises and groups; $175,000 to strengthen the agency's research and intelligence functions; and a decrease of $75,000 in overhead administration costs. The committee has unanimously reduced this budget estimate to $80.5 million which is actually an increase of better than $4 million over the 1955 appropriations when certain nonrecurring costs are figured in.

The Information Agency advises as follows:

The fiscal year 1956 budget for the United States Information Agency anticipates a world situation in which it will be more necessary than ever for United States policies and actions to be understood overseas, and for the United States to have a strong program capable of counteracting hostile Communist propaganda throughout the world. The fiscal year 1956 budget request of $88.5 million is approximately the same as the $89 million request for fiscal year 1955 transmitted to Congress by the President last spring. Congress cut the 1955 request back to $77.1 million or to about the level of fiscal year 1954, excluding nonrecurring liquidation costs. This 1954 level represented a severe 37 percent cut from funds available to the information program in fiscal year 1953. At the time, it was understood that this reduction was made to give the new United States Information Agency an opportunity to reorganize, review its operations, and personnel, and sharpen its objectives. It was anticipated that the Agency would be given more adequate funds following the reorganization period. The Agency has had over 18 months' experience at the level of operation to which it was cut in fiscal year 1954. Numerous shifts have been made in country programs, so as to concentrate resources in countries and areas with highest priorities. Despite these shifts, which were designed to achieve greatest effectiveness with the funds at hand, the demands on the Agency in specific priority areas and countries cannot be adequately met without the increased budget requested for fiscal year 1956. This 1956 budget is a careful estimate of the increases the Agency requires to enable it to meet its responsibilities; it is based primarily on items prepared by public affairs officers in each country in which the Agency operates on the strength of carefully worked-out world, area, and country, objectives.

There, Mr. Chairman, you have the position of the Agency in requesting its 1956 fiscal budget estimate. Now I have always been in favor of a strong overseas information program. My thoughts in this direction are perhaps best expressed by the following statement which I made on the radio program America's Town Meeting of the Air on a program on July 21, 1953, and entitled "How Can We Compete With Communist Propaganda?" My opening remarks at that time were as follows:

In discussing this subject: How Can We Compete With Communist Propaganda? one important fact must be kept in mind. The most successful Communist propaganda is not openly labeled as such. Propaganda which has an evident, unquestioned Moscow origin rarely attracts much sympathy except among those who are already devoted party-liners. When the hand of the Kremlin is not so visible, such as in the case of the famous Stockholm peace petition, there are many sincere and well-meaning individuals who are likely to fall for the Communist bait.

And the same is true of its exponents. Fellow travelers, either through intent or gullibility, are always more convincing mouthpieces than outright party members. To compete successfully with Communist propaganda, the type of individual concerned must be carefully considered. Arguments which might be useful with a British coal miner could hardly be used with a Bolivian Indian or a Chinese coolie. But every human being seeks freedom in some form—whether freedom from want, from fear, or what have you. And to the extent that we can show the basic opposition of Soviet communism to freedom in any form, and to the extent that this Government can stand for the rights of freedom in turn, to that extent will our opposition be successful.

But this does not involve attempting to remake the world in our own image. Too often in the past our efforts to export an American standard of living, without proper educational preparation, have aroused resentment and jealousy, instead of exciting friendship and admiration. If people have freedom, they should then be permitted to develop themselves and cultures in their

own way—a way in which neither capitalism nor socialism may predominate.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that since the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8 was put into effect, our overseas information program has been measurably strengthened and has resulted in a more effective job of salesmanship abroad. I do not intend to oppose the committee's reduced figures although, frankly, there are certain places where I would even support a large appropriation. I hope the other body will restore some of these cuts, specifically in the programs relating to certain geographic areas.

I presume, however, that the committee is aware that the agency has unrestricted authority to transfer program funds between geographic areas as it sees fit to do so. I question, therefore, whether the geographic designation of program funds really means very much in the final analysis. Now with regard to the stepped-up program increases in Latin America, I understand that these increases are earmarked for six countries. Although I would approve of an increased program in, say, Guatemala, I think the question of our economic assistance there is of even greater importance in view of the fact that country was left practically bankrupt after the Communist government was ousted last summer. All the information activities in the world will be practically valueless unless the Guatemalan economy receives a much-needed shot in the arm.

No program increase has been contemplated for Europe. Regarding the Far East, I think the requested amount of $11.9 million, representing an increase of more than $2.5 million, is a necessary one and I hope that our programs there will be stepped up, in view of the critical developments taking place in that part of the world.

There is a requested boost of more than $3.6 million for the Near East, south Asia and Africa. I was amazed to discover how disproportionate such an increase has become. I would be completely unable, for example, to explain or justify a requested program of $1.4 million for India alone while the entire area of the Middle East, including Israel and the Arab States, as well as the entire African Continent, only receive a little more than half a million dollars' increase. I must confesss I cannot understand the thinking which guided such an allocation of program funds.

I am not disposed to quarrel with the increases requested for the Voice of America. I understand that approximately three-fourths of its programs are beamed behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and their effectiveness is shown by the large efforts of the Soviets to jam or otherwise disrupt such transmissions. In spite of this Communist counterpropaganda, however, the Voice of America is getting through. A young resident of Michigan, John Noble, who was recently freed after 9 years' imprisonment in a Soviet slave-labor camp, told me that even at Vorkuta, in Siberia and north of the Arctic Circle, the Voice was heard. I have not always admired the content of some of the Voice's programs but, on the whole, I think it is doing a commendable job and I approve of increased appropriations for this purpose.

However, I have grave misgivings about the requested $1.3 million increase requested by the Agency for nonallocable domestic media services, that is, nonallocable by area. This represents merely a request to make the program larger in order to buy more films, pamphlets, books, and so forth, for worldwide use. The committee has properly criticized the way in which funds have been spent for such purposes in the past and I myself would be unwilling to support further increases in this direction at this time.

I agree with the committee that the USIA budget that was presented was not a tight budget. I agree that substantial savings could be effected in this program. Further, I believe that the budget puts too much money into certain geographic areas to the neglect of others equally if not more important to this country's national security.

I think our overseas information program has vastly improved in the last 2 years but is still a long way from perfection. I hope efforts will be made in the future to realize an even more dynamic and positive role in the cold war. I intend to vote for the committee figures although I think in some places the cuts have been too drastic and in others they may not have gone far enough. But I am sure my colleagues will realize the importance of strengthening our worldwide propaganda activities and will vote to support this amount.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the House some of the facts as they have been presented to me at various times relative to the international educational exchange program and the possible effects of the—to me—very drastic cut.

I think in many instances there is a good deal of misunderstanding about this whole program and which exchange students belong to the educational program and the administration's program and which are privately helped, and the different values of each group.

The report of the House Committee on Appropriations on international educational exchange activities for the fiscal year 1956 has noted that there were 33,833 foreign students in the United States in the academic year 1953–54. The committee concluded that approval or denial of funds for the Department's foreign student program would not have a great impact on the coming of foreign students to the United States.

A considerable part—more than one-third of the total foreign student population—of the movement of foreign students to the United States is unrelated to the country programs of the Department of State. For instance, 4,775 students were from Canada, with which the Department of State has no exchange program; a large number were refugee students from Iron-Curtain countries, including almost 2,500 stranded Chinese students; and an undetermined number were students on immigration visas, who plan to remain in the United States. Such exchanges place a premium on the student who can afford to come to the United States instead of the one who should come. As a result, certain fields in which this Government is particularly interested—for example, American studies—are often not represented at all.

In striking contrast to these privately supported exchanges are the Department grantees who are selected after rigorous competitions. These students, outstanding in character and quality, are already key young people of great potentiality for future leadership in their own countries—most of them already launched on their careers. The term "student" as applied to these grantees is intended only to describe their activity in the United States; three-fourths of them are young professional persons in the 25–35 age group—teachers, journalists, government officials, lawyers, representatives of labor and of management, and so forth.

The Department brings these people to the United States to specialize in fields of particular importance to this country. Some are brought in small groups for especially tailored programs at universities possessing special resources in certain fields—representative government projects, labor-management industrial-relations projects, comparative law projects, and the like. In 1953–54, for example, 549 of these students were teachers at all levels or educational administrators in their home countries. Still others are selected, regardless of field, entirely because of the potential for future leadership that they have revealed.

In many countries in which it is particularly significant that we develop better understanding toward the United States, the Department's foreign-student program represents from 15 percent to 50 percent of the total number of foreign nationals from these countries studying in the United States.

In addition to limiting the Department's opportunity to improve mutual understanding between the United States and these countries, the elimination of reduction of the Department's student program would result in a decrease, rather than an increase, in private support of student exchanges in these and other countries. The Department's program gives concrete evidence of this Government's interest in promoting such exchanges and thus stimulates voluntary agencies and institutions to earmark some of their own resources for this purpose.

Further, much of the private financial support for the program now utilized would go to waste if it could not be supplemented by funds from the Department made available through congressional appropriations. Approximately two-thirds of the foreign nationals who obtain study grants under the Department's program obtain most of their funds from private sources with only supplemental funds supplied by the Department. Without these supplemental funds, most of these highly qualified persons presently being selected by the

Department would be unable to realize their educational experiences in the United States.

Similarly, the program for American students stresses high standards of selection and planned study projects which contribute to objectives of mutual understanding and are productive for the individuals concerned. This factor of planning for desired results cannot be present in the undirected movement of individual private students of varied purposes and qualifications.

Approximately 900 exchange students were abroad under the program in 1954. This contrasts with an estimated 2,359 students studying abroad but not under the Department, as reported in a survey made in 1953. American students abroad on their own resources include members in such countries as Canada, in which the Department has no program, undergraduates in a variety of fields, and students taking several years of specialized training, such as medicine. These students are largely self-supported.

The Department's program offers grants only to students who have entered a rigorous competition, judged by selective screening committees on college campuses, in each State and a national committee. Awards are restricted to students doing graduate study, who are mature enough to accomplish independent work of value in a year's time and to adjust to different educational and social conditions. They engage in study in fields which have been recommended as offering special facilities not available in the United States, often subjects in which there is a paucity of trained individuals in this country.

As unofficial ambassadors, the American students demonstrate to their foreign friends the high qualities of educational and personal excellence found in the young people of this country. Students under the program do not enter the universities haphazardly according to undirected choice; they are placed with careful consideration in the university best suited to the productive pursuit of their study. Before they begin the regular university sessions, they attend orientation programs to brief them on the customs and problems of the country and give them a complete understanding of the objectives of the program and their role in advancing international understanding.

Students who go abroad on their own resources are, of course, those with the financial ability to do so and not necessarily those who can either personally or academically gain from the experience or who represent the highest type of American youth. The educational exchange program sends abroad many excellent students who would be financially unable to go on their own, thus enabling the participation of persons and communities who would otherwise not have this experience. The presence abroad of well-qualified Americans, selected on the basis of merit, is effective in combating the rather prevalent opinion abroad that Americans are solely materialistic and lacking in cultural and educational excellence.

It would appear from these facts, therefore, that a serious reduction in the Department's student-exchange program which would result from the cuts in this bill, would eliminate from the general flow of students a very important group that is presently contributing significantly to the promotion of international goodwill and understanding basic to world peace.

May I insert at this point in my remarks two paragraphs from the report of the Special Study Mission to Southeast Asia and the Pacific. The study mission included Congressmen JUDD, CHURCH, ADAIR, and ZABLOCKI who made the trip in 1953, where they saw the tremendous importance of the exchange students in those areas.

The exchange program in this part of the world (that is southeast Asia and the Pacific) is particularly important because of the preference previously shown by students for European university training. There has been a long-standing impression in much of the Orient that European universities provide better training in academic subjects while American schools stress primarily technical subjects. The students and leaders who have had the opportunity to study in this country have not regretted their experience and are correcting this erroneous impression.

The exchange program has already demonstrated its value. The individuals with whom the study mission spoke regarded their American experience as contributing immeasurably to their work and to a better attitude toward the United States. The study mission recommends that the program not only be continued but that it be expanded. What it can mean in terms of providing influence within the countries in this critical period of their national history is best seen in Indonesia where about 100 labor leaders have studied in Moscow or Peiping. They provide the leadership for about 75 percent of organized labor.

Upon inquiry in regard to the point made by the very distinguished gentleman from New York in the matter of our sending students from one European country to another European country, I find that out of an appropriation request of $22 million, only $35,154 would be devoted to grants to students for study in such so-called third countries. This money would be used to send two students from Iraq to study at the American University in Beirut and some 220 students to the well known Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Austria, and at certain American institutions which have been inspired by the Salzburg Seminar and which utilize the hospitality and facilities of universities in Norway and Holland. Provision for such limited studies in American institutions in so-called third countries are explicitly authorized by the Fulbright Act and carried out under the supervision of the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President of the United States from among distinguished educators to supervise the educational aspects of this program.

The rest of the 1,300 are given grants to attend similar American institutions in their own country under the authority of the Fulbright Act. Only $2,200 in all—in United States foreign currency equivalent—out of the total requested $22 million is spent on these 1,300—1,354—grants.

I inquired also relative to the giving of scholarships twice to the same individual.

As a matter of policy and practice, grants are not given to persons who have previously visited the United States. Exceptions to this rule are rare and are restricted to persons who, because of their present prominence or influence or because of the special purpose of such a visit are awarded grants to carry out specific activities in this country. A recent survey of this situation reveals that these "second grants" are extremely rare; they have been given notably to certain outstanding governmental figures in key European countries, who may have visited this country years ago. Even these cases are extremely rare and are considered highly unusual.

May I turn to the financial picture for a moment, Mr. Chairman. Of the $22 million requested by the Department of State for its International Educational Exchange activities, $8.2 million was to be used for the purchase of foreign currencies.

Of the $12 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for this program, $8 million is specified to be used to purchase foreign currencies.

Thus the effect of the committee's action was to reduce the funds available for use in dollars by 10 million, leaving the sum of foreign currencies almost untouched.

The $4 million available in United States dollars under the committee's recommendation is insufficient to pay the dollar cost for this program in the United States. These dollar costs include (a) administration; (b) dollar support grants in the United States; and (c) the balance of the program throughout the world—for example, Latin America, where no foreign currencies are available.

Even where foreign currencies are used, certain categories, leaders, and specialists, are excluded from foreign currency grants and must be paid in dollars.

Foreign currencies are used by the Department to the greatest extent available and possible, but even these must be supplemented by dollars for expenses in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, in the report on appropriations for the international exchange activities of the Department of State, the Appropriations Committee has commented that "certain limitations on expenditures for programs which admittedly are of some value but which cannot be classified as necessary must be made." I do not believe that the exchange program is a luxury. It is a necessary arm of our foreign relations. It has proved one of the most effective means at our disposal to influence those

foreign nationals who are directly or indirectly responsible for molding public opinion in their respective countries. The comparatively modest outlay of Government funds asked by this agency for this program has several values.

For these reasons it is sometimes necessary to carry out exchange projects which are timely and required by the international situation. In other instances, worthwhile projects would not be undertaken and would not receive nearly as much acceptance abroad if it were not for the official endorsement and support of our Government. Similarly, in this country, the endorsement and support of such projects by our Government serves as a very real inducement to private initiative and cooperation in this field.

Many of you are aware of the stringency of college budgets in this country today. These institutions realize the benefits they receive from having foreign students and lecturers on their campuses and for this reason are willing to put up partial scholarships as far as their budgets will allow. If the Government were not able to match these funds, many of these opportunities would have to be withdrawn.

The committee also appears to be concerned about the very large expenditures for international exchange programs of this Government and the possible duplication of effort as between the State Department's program and those of the Foreign Operations Administration. This concern appears to be based on the assumption that the $136,528,000 shown as the cost for the FOA 1955 technical cooperation program is all spent for exchange of persons. Actually only about $13.8 million is being spent to bring foreign technicians for training in the United States. This is the only part of the FOA program which is directly comparable with the activities of the International Educational Exchange Service. The balance of FOA's Technical Cooperation budget is for sending Government- and contract-employed United States technicians to work overseas—about $37 million—and for contract services, supplies, equipment, grants to cooperative agencies, and other costs which are a part of the technical cooperation program but which are not comparable with the exchange program.

There also appears to be some confusion concerning the differing purposes of these two programs. The distinction between the exchange of persons incidental to the technical assistance program of the Foreign Operations Administration and the educational exchange program was clearly pointed out in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on H. R. 9678 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, which says in paragraph 59 of section 107:

> In authorizing legislation for development assistance and technical cooperation, the intent of Congress was that such activities be oriented toward specific economic and technical objectives, leaving the noneconomically oriented activities authorized by the Smith-Mundt Act to the more permanent program carried out by the State Department.

If one could summarize in one phrase the difference between these two programs, one might say the FOA's programs emphasize know how and the Department's, know why.

Certain military and economic aid are important and necessary. However, they are no substitute for a permanent program to lay a solid base of mutual understanding expressed in the legislation authorizing the educational exchange program. A drastic reduction in this program will confirm what many people abroad say about us—that we care only about military expediency and have no real interest in their problems and their aspirations and do not really want them as friends in building a free society of coequal nations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, Red Russia and Red China are mass-producing engineers, doctors, physicists, and other scientists at a rate which has not been before approached in world history.

The metropolitan press and various trade journals have reflected the growing alarm of the free world because of this situation. During the last quarter of 1954 and in the first quarter of 1955, production experts throughout the United States have called attention to the assembly-line method of graduating trained technicians from the schools of higher learning in the chief Communist countries.

It is high time that this situation be subjected to critical examination in the House of Representatives.

The most frequently quoted figure is that, in 1954, 150,000 trained technicians completed their training in the Soviet Union's colleges and universities. This compares to approximately half of that number graduated from similar institutions in the United States. The next most frequently quoted figure is that there is, at present, some 250,000 students engaged in higher education in Red China; and that approximately two-thirds of that number are working toward degrees in some phase of technical study.

The impact of the release upon the world of millions of technically trained men and women, dedicated to conquest for the Communists, is enormous.

Americans are naturally inclined to look upon this development as a menace. Reckoned in terms of tanks, planes, and atom and hydrogen bombs—it is a menace. These mass-produced technicians are literally guns aimed at America.

Shortly after my return from an inspection tour abroad, during which I spent several weeks in the U. S. S. R., General Ridgway declared in a speech before the West Point Society of New York, that the Kremlin had in the neighborhood of 20,000 military planes available for use at that time. Those planes are efficient planes. Our Air Force knows that from its Korean experience. When I was in Russia, I saw many planes—chiefly the IL–10 and MIG–15 types—around airbases. I did not see many large planes. And I had it forcibly brought to my notice that numerous commercial and jet planes land on sod runways, even when concrete runways could be used.

While no figures are at hand to substantiate this, it is a reasonable conjecture that high priority in the system is given to the technical training of all experts connected with the Soviet Air Force—from plane construction, plane flying, and plane armament to those charged with building air strips.

The guns side of the guns-and-butter dispute have the best of it in the Kremlin. The cream of the crop of Soviet technicians have been siphoned off by heavy war industries, leaving only the skim-milk technicians for consumer goods.

You are a Russian. You make good money. You are of the elite. You are permitted to buy a TV set. You must pay from $400 to $700 for a 17-inch picture. In Moscow, where the best programing prevails, you may watch from 7 p. m. until midnight over two channels. There is not an oversupply of TV technicians available to John Q. Soviet.

Suppose you are a Russian. You have been cleared of any suspicion of deviating from the party line. Your parents and grandparents have been investigated. You are close to commissar rank. You are allowed to buy an automobile. No. You do not go to the used-car lot of Manny, the Maniac. You buy from the state. Perhaps, you want a four-door model. The Pobeda comes in that class. It is much like a 1940 model of a Ford or Chevrolet. You can get it, if you wait a year, and if you have $4,000. Perhaps, you are very high in the party. Then, you just might get a Zis, which looks like the 1942-model Packard, or the Zim, resembling the 1946 Buick. You would have to pay practically double the amount you would pay for a 1955 Packard or a 1955 Buick in the United States of America.

More than likely, you would settle for a Moskvich, patterned after a 1947 German car, or a Paveda, a great deal like our jeeps.

The private automobile industry did not draft too many topflight technicians from the Soviet institutions of higher learning. The director of one of the automobile factories talked to me. He worked in Detroit in 1936. He gets the Russian equivalent of $15,000 a year. His salary has the buying power of less than $5,000.

You are a Russian. You are a telephone subscriber. You get more than your fair share of wrong numbers. That is logical, because the Moscow telephone directory is merely 2 years out of date.

You are a Russian. You cannot afford a TV set. You cannot afford an automobile. But you are better off than most of your comrades. How about

shopping in the spacious Gum department store on Red Square? Better put on your heavy coat. The building is cold. Better have your official papers with you. Have them up to date, signed, and countersigned. Or you will not even be able to get in the store. Get in a line. Wait your turn. Buy what they let you buy—not what you want. The clothing and shoe business, from producer-manufacturer to sales counter, could do with a few well-trained technicians. What you buy is very little and of poor quality. It costs many times what the same articles would bring in capitalist America.

You are a Russian. You are tired and cold from your shopping expedition. You want something to eat, warmth, a bath, and rest. You go home. You are lucky. You live in an apartment building. You warm yourself at a stove that would have been old fashioned 20 years ago in the United States. You share that stove with the equivalent of the Smiths, the Joneses, and the Browns. You get your cheese and sausage out of an icebox which also serves the Smiths, the Joneses, and the Browns. You wait your turn for a bath in cold water in a communal bathtub. Comrade, this is really communism, with a big "C."

You are still a Russian. You are sick. It is easy to get sick in poorly lighted, cold factories while working 12 to 16 hours a day, over machinery not designed to protect you. You are sent to a hospital. The beds are small, with sagging straw mattresses. Your surgeon is dressed in a 15-year-old suit and a necktie worn out from use. He gives you a local anesthetic, for nearly all operations are handled in this way. The operating room and the therapy division are quite modern. Their equipment was the latest thing in medical science in 1943.

Commissar, can you spare a technician?

You are a Russian. You are a farmer. You are an agricultural college graduate. You work on a collective farm. You have seen many mechanical farm implements at Moscow in exhibitions. You have a few of these marvels. Not many. Your superior tells the world you surpass the world in raising hogs. Your superior petitions his superior to petition the United States Government so that you can be sent to Iowa where you can learn how to raise hogs.

Eeny, meeny, miny, mo; where did those technicians go?

You will find technicians—good ones—in heavy, war industry.

You will find only an infinitesimal number of technicians in industries and professions which should either serve the consumer or produce consumer goods.

That great Oklahoman, Will Rogers, once said, "All I know is just what I read in the papers."

It is good for us—and it was good for Will Rogers in his time—that Soviet papers have a limited circulation outside of the Iron Curtain.

Knowing this, we can immediately discount heavily their claims of their overwhelming superiority in numbers of trained technicians.

We must realize that the Red Russia-Red China supply of this vital commodity does not necessarily mean experienced trained technicians. Educated people often fail under the stress of practical demands. We have educated people who have succeeded in the face of practical demands. Schooling is important. But, know-how is, also, important. It is hard to come by experience and know-how in countries where private enterprise is nonexistent.

Progress is the result of independent research. Our Edison, our Wright brothers, our De Forrest represent proof of that statement. There is no such thing as independent research in present-day Russia or China. Your Communist scientist does just what he is told to do—no more. If he did more, he would be confronted with the threat of the firing squad.

Mr. Chairman, I do not fear the sudden surge of an output of technicians from Soviet institutions of higher learning. Fear does not enter into this. It might even be that Communist propaganda in this particular field has done us a favor.

American youth learns to drive and service a car only a little after he learns to walk. Hundreds of thousands of American boys have a well-based knowledge of aerodynamics gained from their association with organized model aeroplane clubs. Four-H Club members have a better understanding of elemental farm problems than some of the 40-year-old students in Soviet agricultural colleges now interested in securing admittance to the United States.

If I need add more, the so-called do-it-yourself fad has swept, is sweeping, this country to such an extent that America is in a fair way to become a nation of trained technicians. Instead of a former political slogan, "a chicken in every pot," we might better say, "a technician in every home."

I say, advisedly, the Soviet propaganda about educated scientists and engineers might eventually help us. It should put us on the alert.

I believe that Americans should do all within their power to open up opportunity for educating more doctors, more physicists, more engineers, more scientists of all kinds, in our institutions of higher learning. We should not put unnecessary obstacles in the path of our young people—the technicians of tomorrow—to deprive them of their manifest destiny. What we should do is to help all talented young people, irrespective of their financial status, to get the education that they deserve. In that way, the call of private enterprise for young technicians can be met. In that way, we can be assured of the inexorable power of the mightiest national defense which has yet been made known to man.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the privilege of serving with the distinguished and able Members from both sides of the aisle who make up this subcommittee; to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for his many courtesies, and my commendation for his great ability; and to state that I am certain our committee is fortunate indeed in having the services of its very able clerk, Jay Howe.

I shall speak principally on the appropriation for the State Department.

When we consider this request for funds for the State Department, perhaps it will be well also to remind ourselves that it is the only State Department we have. It is the only medium we have for exchange of ideas with other governments. If ever we are to know peace, it logically will be through the agreements which are worked out by the State Department. The State Department is the real Voice of America in our dealings with other nations.

As we consider the importance of the State Department, we must consider also the weaknesses of America's foreign policy in so many instances in the past. Then consider the fact that we now are making very slight progress in terms of reality in achieving the treaties we seek, the international reforms we advocate, and the disarmament we propose. If there are those who would seek to use the nearly approved German treaties as one example for refuting that statement, let me remind you that it has taken many years and many billions of dollars in giveaway programs to bring us part way to that logical achievement.

Perhaps the trouble lies in the fact that we in America have never placed enough emphasis on or importance in the work of the State Department, or adequately delineated its field of endeavor, or given it sufficient backing.

Be that as it may, it still is the only State Department we have. We sink or swim with it. I mean that literally. It is not enough to win wars. We have to win the peace also. For that in modern times we have demonstrated little know-how. Certainly we cannot say we won the peace after World War I or after World War II, or even after Korea. It appears we are now in the process of losing the remainder of Indochina or even the remainder of Southeast Asia. Indonesia hangs in the balance. Its trade is largely with Red China and it is now the host nation to an Afro-Asian conference where the Reds and the so-called neutrals predominate. The coastal islands of China are being given up one by one.

Even in this hemisphere there are misgivings about American leadership. A good many people in uneasy Guatemala, for instance, are wondering whether it really pays to ditch the Communists and line up beside the United States. It is more than 9 months since a revolution led by Col. Carlos Castillo-Armas toppled the government of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, the only pro-Communist regime ever to run an American country. As President, Castillo-Armas soon found that the Communists and fellow travelers had looted the treasury of its last centavo, boosted the Government's debts from $300,000 to $38 million and brought the country to the brink of collapse. Fast, generous help from the

United States was counted on, once the pro-Communists were thrown out. Those expectations are not panning out. There is an undercurrent of political uncertainty. Things there are not good. Some people, trying to find a simple reason, put the blame on the United States, complaining that help from Washington has been neither generous nor fast. Certainly Government redtape in Washington is slowing up the aid program. After Guatemalan and American officials in Guatemala finally agree on a project, details have to be gone over in Washington by officials of the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration. That means more delay. Thoughtful people admit that the United States is not to blame for all their troubles. But they are beginning to wonder why the United States—which has handed out billions in Europe and Asia—is not giving more help, with fewer strings attached, to the one country since World War II that has thrown out a pro-Communist government.

Throughout Latin America we allow trade to be lost to American businessmen because we have refused to develop a realistic credit program with which our friends in the Western Hemisphere can purchase supplies and equipment from us. Our European friends and near-friends have developed such a program for Latin America. France and Germany in particular are pouring equipment into those areas after having instituted a very liberal credit program. I scarcely need remind you that money from the United States made it possible for them to extend that easy credit and to take business away from American manufacturers.

Again, good or bad, it is the only State Department we have. It could be better than it is. Possibly more liberal policies by the Congress would encourage a more realistic program by the State Department. That, of course, is getting on dangerous ground. More liberal expenditures can never be a guaranty for a better program. But at least it would present the opportunity and I would be willing to take such a gamble. It is much cheaper than war, even if we count only money and ignore lives.

I am speaking about the appropriation for the State Department, but what I say about it applies very closely to the United States Information Agency. Their work coincides and their objectives are similar. The USIA is an agency designed to tell the world something of America's aims, its ideals, and its policies, and thereby to combat and to offset Russian propaganda. The phenomenal success of Russian propaganda is something we often choose blithely to ignore. Not having been able to compete on equal footing with it, we sometimes are inclined to bury our heads in the sand and happily assume Russia's success is nonexistent.

Communism is not a figment of the imagination. Half a century ago few people had ever heard of it and fewer cared whether it existed. Now communism controls twice as many people as are united under the combined banners of America and our allies. Even the so-called neutrals admit they do not know whether to believe us or the Reds. Talk about the value of propaganda—what stronger argument could you ask?

Here in America, many place altogether too much trust in military security. That type of security, important though it may be, essential though it is, still it is not enough for a nation which refuses to start wars. The other fellow who is free to choose his own weapons and battlegrounds can run circles around us if we rely only on one source of strength. Yet the combined budget for all nonmilitary policy endeavors by this Government—if we eliminate the Marshall plan and similar programs, is infinitesimal compared to military expenditures.

I do not think we can take much pride in the fact that Congress never seriously questions either the number or the cost of bombers. Yet it dissects and tears into little shreds any requests for funds for the State Department or for USIA. A smart opponent who sees us continually leave one flank exposed will certainly take advantage of his opportunity. Russia has built a tremendous empire since World War II—I emphasize the words "since World War II"—without the loss of a single Russian soldier. She did it with diplomacy, deceit, and double-cross, strongly laced with propaganda.

I do not approve of or argue that we should adopt those policies, but I do say most emphatically that bluff, blunder, and bombers are not enough. We ought to know, for these in some instances have marked our own policies.

There are many earnest, sincere, conscientious, capable, and devoted people in the State Department. They are fully aware of the importance of the job that is theirs. They want to do it well. But they are frustrated by policies which change monthly, weekly or even hourly. They are confused by conflicting statements from administration spokesmen. Or, they are tied down by inertia inherited from years of virtual denial of responsibility to them.

Again, and for the last time, it is the only State Department we have. Its people are on our side—not on the side of the enemy. They are Americans, too. Let us be sure that Congress gives them at least the status of an ally. There are ways to make the State Department a stronger vehicle. I doubt there will ever be a greater need for it than now.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the recent enactment of the provisions of the Wriston report has been something to strengthen the Foreign Service and has raised the morale of its people?

Mr. SIKES. This committee is implementing the provisions of the Wriston report through funds carried in this bill. I feel, as the gentleman does, that it does strengthen the Foreign Service.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman believe that the enactment of the law by the Congress on the report by the Foreign Affairs Committee has helped strengthen our foreign relations?

Mr. SIKES. The action of the Congress is indication that such has been our hope and our intention.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman feel with respect to his reference to Southeast Asia that the success of the Secretary of State in working out the SEATO Conference and the development of those areas strengthens our position in the world today?

Mr. SIKES. I cannot agree that it has strengthened us in that part of the world. Certainly I would like to hope that it has. I know that the Secretary of State has given much time and effort to that part of the world but I cannot say that SEATO gives us any real strength; clearly it does not bind anybody to anything. What is going to come out of Southeast Asia nobody knows. The gentleman is aware of the grave and uncertain situation that exists in Indochina today. He knows there are disturbing activities elsewhere in the area. I am seriously concerned about Southeast Asia, and I could not agree to put any other interpretation on it at this time.

Mr. BOW. I think that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my recollection of SEATO correct, in substance, that no particular agreements were made; that the only real agreement—and I do not say this in any derogatory sense, because I realize that there are difficulties—but as a fact, in substance, SEATO provides, in case of further Communist aggression against any countries parties to it, that they will consult again?

Mr. SIKES. They will talk some more. SEATO is an effort to acocmplish something towards the security of the region, of course, but, as I said a moment ago, it does not bind anybody to anything.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But the committee did turn down flatly the request that the entertainment allowance be changed to foreign operations; is that not correct?

Mr. SIKES. That is scarcely of equal importance with the other matters we are discussing at the moment. Since the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment later on that subject, we will have ample time to discuss it at that time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, a few questions about the international education exchange activities. I wonder if you would enlighten us, Mr. Chairman, as to the effect of a cut of $2 million in a proposed $22 million program for these activities?

Mr. ROONEY. The cut is not $2 million but $10 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. $10 million out of a $22 million program?

Mr. ROONEY. I think it will bring us back to some sort of a sane level.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Could the gentleman expand on what a sane level might be? I am a little puzzled about the justification for a cut of that size.

Mr. ROONEY. This is the sort of a program that could be handled for $1 million, $5 million, $20 million, or $100 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How did you arrive at the figure of $12 million under those conditions?

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman has read the hearings in regard to this?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the committee, and I have not had access to them until just a short time ago.

Mr. ROONEY. This request contained a proposal to send 1,300 foreign students from one foreign country to another foreign country. For instance, they would take a young Norseman from Oslo and send him down to Salzburg in Austria to school at the taxpayers' expense. In regard to the gentleman not having access to the hearings, I should like to point out that these hearings have been available to every Member since the 5th of April.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. For the elucidation of those who have not read the hearings, I wonder if you could give us the reasoning behind the justification for the $10 million cut in a $22 million program of this kind.

Mr. ROONEY. We found so many things wrong with the program outlined in these hearings that the committee and staff sat down, and one gentleman said, "I think we ought to cut it out completely." Someone else said—and this is all hypothetical—"It should be $18 million." Someone else said, "Well, maybe it should be so much." And the committee came up with the figure which is now before the House.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does that represent a realistic estimate, in the view of the committee, of what an adequate program represents?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. They should be able to carry on a fine program for the amount of money allowed in this bill,.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], referred just now to the scalpel which the Appropriations Committee has used on various items in this bill. In my personal opinion, there is no case where the "scalpel" has been used more clumsily than in the $10 million cut made in the State Department's request for funds to continue our internatonal educational exchange activities. These activities have inestimable value in demonstrating to the world the advantages of our way of life. They should not be crippled by false economy.

Despite an earnest attempt to discover the reasons for so drastic a cut, I can find no adequate justification for this action. How does such a cut result in "a sane level" of expenditures? Obviously a cut of this size would have radical effects on a program which by now has proven its effectiveness to virtually all of us. Yet to justify its action, the committee states merely:

> With the fiscal situation of the Nation as it is, certain limitations on expenditures for programs which admittedly are of some value but which cannot be classified as "necessary" must be made.

Few of us will argue with the proposition that the Congress should save the taxpayers' money where they can. Certainly we Members of the minority have a good record in this respect. Unnecessary expenditures should be eliminated. But it is quite another thing to argue that the axe should be applied indiscriminately on sound and proven programs. It seems particularly absurd to argue that international educational exchange activities are "unnecessary," and therefore can be eliminated or drastically curtailed. The basic purpose of this program is to acquaint foreign peoples with what we stand for in this country. It has proven its worth. Perhaps the other body, therefore, will recognize the lack of wisdom in this severe cut, and take appropriate action.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio stated previously in her thoughtful presentation, this educational exchange program is too often misunderstood. Perhaps it would not be amiss to mention briefly what other countries are doing in this field, particularly the Soviet Union.

There has been a good deal of talk recently about the increasing importance which the Russians are attaching to so-called cultural exchanges. In 1954, we are told, over 1,000 delegations entered or left the Soviet Union—an increase of nearly 100 percent over the previous year. Sixty percent of the exchanges were with the free nations of Western Europe.

I should like to call your attention to the different ways in which we and the Russians approach this matter of exchange of persons, and what effect these differences have on the people who take part in the exchanges.

The Soviet approach is to invite groups of people, delegations, who can be banded together and herded about to see those things which suit the purposes of the government, and who can be protected from exposure to the less savory aspects of the Communist state. The tours are short-term ones, and rigidly guided. They preclude any opportunity for the visitors to participate in the day-to-day life of the country.

Our own exchange programs provide a direct contrast. Foreign grantees visiting the United States live and carry on their projects in American communities in all parts of the country. There is no need to turn to Washington for permission to go to an unscheduled town or city, unlike visitors to the Soviet Union who often complain about having to go back to Moscow every time they want to change their plans. Our visitors observe American life in all its variety, they exchange ideas with individual Americans, and draw freely their own conclusions about us, while they engage in professional pursuits of their own choice.

The Russian method has certain superficial attractions. With people who want badly to be convinced, it undoubtedly has had its successes. But it has failed notably with those people who subscribe to the same standards of freedom of inquiry and of objectivity that we do in this country. It has failed with the very people who are most impressed by our adherence to these principles of democracy and freedom and with its embodiment in our methods of conducting an exchange program.

For instance, a European journalist, adhering almost instinctively to the principles which make a free press possible, commented in print on the fact that while her treatment in the U. S. S. R. was lavish and cordial, she was literally too well attended to. In her own words, an "invisible hand" seemed to be directing her every move, and she questioned whether this hand was necessarily that of a guiding angel. She came away uncharmed by the vision of "the people's paradise."

Another journalist, visiting both the United States and Rumania, wrote articles for his home paper about both trips. He saw some of the seamier side of the United States, a Washington slum, but told his readers that he was simply reporting what he had seen and not trying to draw any conclusions about the United States from it. He told them that it should be considered in the context of an America where material well-being was not merely a statistical average between the very rich and the very poor, but something that most citizens participated in. He further presented the slum area in the context of a progressive and unafraid America, facing its problems and working on their solution.

On the contrary, he saw no slums in Rumania. He saw well-stocked stores and attended sumptuous banquets. But when he peered down side-streets where he was not allowed to wander, when he noticed that he was not allowed to talk with people, take the pictures he wanted, or otherwise investigate freely, he concluded, and so informed his readers, that there was want and poverty abroad in the land, and that there was as well, fear and the desire to conceal these flaws.

It seems evident to me that the American way, based on free inquiry and a firm faith in our own institutions, is not only the most sound approach, but the most successful. It is paying the kinds of dividends we want by increasing real understanding and respect for us in foreign countries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to question the limitation recommended by the committee with reference to the congressional liaison personnel of the United States Information Agency. The proposed reduction in the expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, in which the liaison office is located, from the present level of $113,000 annually to $75,000 appears too drastic a cut. If this staff is eliminated, it can only

have the effect of curtailing and reducing the services presently furnished to all Members of Congress.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], I would like to ask a question after a brief preliminary statement.

I am very much interested in the proposed removal of the Bureau of Narcotics from New York to Geneva and am considerably concerned about it. It involves not only the removal of the office, but it means giving up the use of a laboratory belonging to the United States Treasury Department and building a new and probably more expensive laboratory abroad, for at least $35,000.

When I came on the floor I brought with me an amendment intending to wait until we had reached its place in the reading of the bill and then offer it at line 11 on page 6. I now read it, because it is self-explantory:

Strike the period and insert a semicolon and then the following: *"Provided,* That no money in this appropriation shall be spent in connection with any proposal to move the office of the United Nations Bureau of Narcotics from New York City."

In informal discussions on the floor I have come to the conclusion that perhaps there is a general feeling of support of such an amendment; but that we might meet the same situation, without certain technical complications which would be involved, by a colloquy on the floor. This is a part of the United Nations reorganization plan. Much has been made of a reduced expense, if it takes place. No other reason has been given in my hearing.

My question to the gentleman is whether there is a reason, because my observation has been, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that we do not save much by these reorganization plans. We would probably move many of the present personnel to Geneva; we would pay their expenses over there, and on any theory of economy, if we accept that statement, it would be infinitesimal.

The disadvantage is very great. At Geneva we would not have a friendly press such as we have in the United States. We would not have the publicity; we would not have the public opinion reaction that we have in the United States. And I am afraid that the inevitable result would be the gradual stifling of this bureau, of this division of the U. N. as it would then be called, if there were any attempts at investigations that would be inconvenient to the major powers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman from California knows, I share his apprehension and concern on this particular transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division from New York to Geneva, Switzerland. I first learned of this possible transfer in December of 1954. At that time I wrote to Mr. H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Nacotics for the United States, asking his views on this proposed transfer. I have a letter from him dated December 30, 1954, in which he makes this statement:

We are not in favor of this transfer.

In addition, I contacted our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., asking him to take into consideration the views of Mr. Anslinger and the views of others who were greatly concerned over this transfer. I have a letter from Ambassador Lodge dated February 8, 1955, in which he says as follows:

The Department of State is responsible for defending the United States' position on this question. I am sending a copy of this letter to the Department. Presumably the question of the transfer will be raised in the Commission in New York in April this year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. May I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the subject?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in deploring the moving of the headquarters of the U. N. Narcotics Bureau from New York to Geneva.

It is my responsibility to produce the last-minute word from the Department of State concerning this important matter. I am today in receipt of a letter from Assistant Secretary Key of the Department of State which I shall read:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 14, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee for Department of State, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: The Department requested Ambassador Lodge's views on the possibility of an amendment to restrict the use of appropriations for the United States contribution to the United Nations if the U. N. Narcotics Division is moved to Geneva. He replied as follows:

"In reply to your request for my views on the proposed rider withholding the United States contribution to the U. N. if the Narcotics Division is transferred to Geneva, I would say this:

"1. It would be a clear violation of our treaty obligations for us to default on our contribution to the U. N. and, of course, to violate any treaty obligation injures our standing in the world.

"2. Failure to send our contribution would deprive us eventually of the privileges of membership and consequently of influence in the U. N. As the Soviet Union has not defaulted, and presumably will not default once it realizes that we have defaulted, this will mean an enormous increase in Soviet influence.

"3. If we default on our contribution whenever the U. N. Secretariat contemplates some action with which we disagree, then we cannot deny the right of others to do the same thing. This would be a serious blow at the existence of the U. N. and would be against our own long-term interests.

"4. The failure to make our contribution to the U. N. would give a pretext to enemies of the United States to say that we were trying to dictate the international narcotics control program and were using the money power to blackjack the rest of the world.

"5. A member of a legislative body does not withdraw from the legislative body because it happens to pass a bill with which he disagrees. The U. N. is not a legislative body, and has none of the powers of government, so that there is even less reason for a state to withdraw from the U. N. because of some action with which it disagrees.

"6. I say this as one who has left no stone unturned to present to SYG all arguments against the proposed transfer of this Bureau."

Sincerely yours,

DAVID MCK. KEY,
Assistant Secretary.

In this connection I should like to make part of the RECORD a statement on the United Nations Narcotics Division and a summary statement of facts relating to the transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division to Geneva:

UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION

The Department of State has for some time been concerned with the several aspects of the transfer of the Division of Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations Secretariat from New York to Geneva and is aware of the general interest in this matter. Officers of the Department have discussed the problem many times with Mr. Harry Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and officials of the Treasury Department. The most recent action taken was to arrange for a discussion of this matter between Mr. Anslinger and the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold.

This meeting took place in New York on March 30, 1955. It is our understanding that there was a complete and cordial exchange of views and that the Secretary General, while recognizing the interest of certain groups in the United States in the problem and the matter of affording adequate publicity to meetings of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, did not consider that he could ignore the mandate given him by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to transfer the Division of Narcotic Drugs to Geneva as part of his overall reorganization plan. The Secretary General pointed out that this action has been approved by unanimous votes in both bodies. The Secretary General did not agree with Mr. Anslinger that the transfer of the Narcotics Secretariat would affect publicity given to the meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs which may well continue to be held in New York. In this connection it may be noted that publicity stems from the meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and not from the Secretariat of the United Nations. The location of meetings of the Commission is a matter for annual determination by the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The Department considers it highly unlikely that all meetings of this Commission will in the future be held in Geneva since there is a great demand by various United Nations bodies to meet in Geneva and there are only limited possibilities for holding meetings there.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF FACTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION TO GENEVA

Transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division to Geneva has been under discussion for about 2 years. When Mr. Hammarskjold was appointed Secretary General of the United Nations one of the first tasks he undertook was a scrutiny of the work of the United Nations Secretariat as a whole. To this end he appointed a survey group composed of certain top officers of the United Nations. This group submitted a report which, among other things, recommended the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva. The report of the survey group stated its conclusion was reached in spite of the disadvantages of locating a part of the Secretariat away from headquarters.

Such disadvantages would tend to be minimized in the case of this largely technical and self-contained Division. On the positive side, such a move would enable closer contact and cooperation to be had with the World Health Organization as well as with the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body all of which are located in Geneva.

Savings would result on such items as travel, New York cost of living adjustment, United States tax reimbursement, possibly home leave commitments and better utilization of the United Nations facilities located at Geneva. It has been estimated that the United Nations would save approximately $37,000 annually by this transfer.

On the basis of this report, the Secretary General in the summer of 1954 developed a plan for reorganization of the Secretariat including the transfer of the Narcotics Division in the interest of economy and administrative efficiency and submitted the plan to the Economic and Social Council. His proposals were approved by this Council without any specific discussion of the issue of the location of the Narcotics Division.

The Secretary General then submitted his reorganization plan, including the proposed transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva, to the General Assembly where the plan as a whole was approved by a unanimous vote on December 17, 1954. The present situation is, then, that the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva has been approved by the General Assembly.

There appears to be no question but that the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva will result in economies in the costs of operating the United Nations, a problem which has been of continuing concern to the United States Government. Opinions differ on what effect, if any, the transfer will have on international control of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. As far as publicity is concerned any adverse effects would be minimized if the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were to meet from time to time in New York.

I regret to advise that as far back as the 17th of December 1954 this transfer from New York to Geneva was approved, after having gone through committees and after a unanimous vote in the General Assembly.

The reason is alleged to be that they would save $37,000 annually by this transfer. It is further claimed that any adverse effects as far as publicity on this country is concerned would be minimized if this Commission on Narcotic Drugs were to meet from time to time in New York.

The distinguished gentlemen understand that I am merely presenting the facts alleged by the State Department.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I am afraid the saving in money will be offset by a loss in the efficacy of the program.

Mr. ROONEY. The United States share with regard to this matter would come to maybe less than $10,000. As you know, we discussed this in the full committee yesterday morning.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the United States Information Service appropriation. I am unable to understand how the committee could possibly increase this appropriation by $3,386,000 in view of the evidence elicited from witnesses before the committee.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], during hearings brought up the question of the Information Service in Spain. It was proposed, I believe, that they increase the number of Information employees to 87. I wonder how many they presently have. I have been unable to determine from the hearings how many they have in Spain. As the gentleman from New York very well pointed out in the hearings, certainly if there is any country in the world that is opposed to communism it is Spain. Why we should be spending money to maintain a big staff of information specialists in Spain I do not understand.

Can the gentleman tell me whether the staff will be increased to 87 if this increased appropriation goes through, or what will be the story in Spain?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course not. That is one of the reasons the committee decreased the amount which was requested. The committee felt that we are entirely too extensively engaged in propaganda in friendly countries where there is no Communist influence, such as Spain, Ireland, and Norway.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many Information employees we have in Spain?

Mr. ROONEY. We have 82 employees, 17 American, and 65 locals.

Mr. GROSS. But all on the backs of the American taxpayers through appropriations by this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is his Republican administration that came in here and asked for $88.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am not concerned with what administration it is.

Mr. ROONEY. I would not dismiss that matter as summarily as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] might.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman again that I am not interested whether it is this administration or some other administration. I am interested in trying to balance the budget of this country. Now then taking up the question of Iceland, with a population of 150,000, there are 9 information specialists there plus, as your hearings show, the Armed Forces have 1 delegation of information specialists, an Air Force adviser, and 3 enlisted men and 1 civilian. Then, in addition, to the defense force staff, the United States Air Force maintains an information staff in Iceland, assigned to the Air Force Base, composed of 1 officer, 14 airmen, and 3 civilian employees. Apparently these information specialists are falling over each other throughout the world. Yet, you propose to increase this appropriation by $3,386,000. I do not understand it.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Iowa should be grateful for our having produced this information for him. It was this committee that asked the questions and you now have a printed record of that information. I could let you in on a few more things such as the extent of English broadcasting and how far superior our Armed Forces Radio Service is to the Voice of America. All these things were taken into consideration when the committee sat in considered judgment on these matters. The gentleman said he did not know the first thing about this bill until yesterday.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his part in cutting these appropriations from the budget requests, but I do not understand how you can add $3,386,000 to this particular item. In your hearings, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] very well established the fact that despite the millions of dollars we pour out on this information service, he questions Mr. Streibert from the Department of State and elicits from him the response that Britain today is more neutral than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Streibert is not from the State Department. He is not a diplomat.

Mr. GROSS. If Members of the House will read the hearings beginning on page 41, they find out how little we have accomplished throughout the world with the millions and billions we have spent. In Iceland the Communist Party is the third most powerful party in their parliament. You brought out that information in these hearings and so on down the line as to these foreign countries, and yet here you increase this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York if I may have some additional time?

Mr. COUDERT. We are very much pressed for time now, I would like to say to the gentleman, but I yield 1 more minute to him.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I thought that would be the case when I did not object to a limitation of time, and the next time I will feel constrained to object.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] if when the committee went into this business of the United States contribution to the United Nations whether the committee thought it wise or prudent and in the interest of the American taxpayers to cut our contribution to the United Nations and all its specialized agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee decided it would not be wise to make such a cut.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask him another question. Did you go into the question of the payment of approximately $180,000 to these 11 characters who were dismissed from the United Nations for alleged disloyalty to the United States? Was that question brought before the committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the gentleman found that in the hearings. We went into that to quite an extent.

Mr. GROSS. I read the hearings to the best of my ability in the short time that I had, but I do not find any evidence that you went into that question as to whether funds appropriated by the Congress were used to pay these 11 characters $180,000. The gentleman well remembers that a year ago the House passed a resolution with reference to that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman it was indicated by Ambassador Lodge and/or his staff that United States funds were not used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Did he indicate what funds were used for that purpose?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; and it is in the hearings. The page does not come to my mind right this second, but we did go into this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. This was a special fund to pay tribunal awards present or future, to be financed by the staff assessment scheme—entirely a tax which U. N. employees pay in lieu of national taxes.

Mr. GROSS. So funds contributed by the taxpayers of the United States, by the Congress of the United States to pay the salaries of employees of the United Nations were taxed to put together the $180,000 that was used to pay these 11 characters. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I advised the gentleman to the contrary just a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. But no matter how thin you slice it, you cannot have it that way, because we pay money into the United Nations; this Congress appropriates money to the United Nations and if a tax is levied upon the employees of the United Nations, that money comes in part from moneys appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand that after an employee gets his money, whatever he does with it is his business. If he contributes to such a fund as this, this is not a Government fund.

Mr. GROSS. May I remind the gentleman that the deductions were compulsory. They are payroll deductions. The employees of the United Nations did not voluntarily hand over any money. They were compulsory payroll deductions. Mr. Lodge calls the payments outrageous, yet went ahead with a tax on the employees, in violation of a resolution passed by this Congress last August saying that no funds appropriated by Congress should be used to pay these people.

Mr. ROONEY. It appears that when this matter of the special fund was before the General Assembly the only people who agreed with the gentleman from Iowa were the Soviets, because the vote was 52 to 5.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that the American delegates opposed this payment. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] opposed it, and you will find his statements in the handbook issued by the United Nations General Assembly and made available to the last session of Congress. I have it here in the Chamber and will read it to the gentleman later if he is not convinced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I am particularly interested in the operation of the radio station in West Berlin, RIAS. I looked through the hearings, and the only listing I find that was elicited after considerable difficulty by the chairman was that they were again asking for $2,500,000 for the year ending 1956. I would like to ask the chairman if that is being cut by the committee or is that full amount being given?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentlewoman that it is not being cut. The request was in the amount of two and a half million. This committee is acquainted with the fact that this has been one of the successful operations over all the years. We have never heard a bit of criticism of the operation of that station. The facts with regard thereto may be found beginning at page 141 of the hearings, and continued on page 142, where there is a breakdown of the total estimated cost.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have that before me. I thank the gentleman.

I also notice that the gentleman from New York said, "This is a very peculiar way to present a budget." I also agree that it is a good operation, but I think it could be cut without doing any great harm. The gentleman knows that the great fame of the station RIAS is that it operates 24 hours a day. I do not think that is necessary, in view of the fact that 54 percent of that time is taken up by musical programs. Taking music to the Germans or behind the Iron Curtain is like taking coals to Newcastle. Quite frankly, although it may be discouraging to hear it, the average German or Slav looks upon American music as an amusing aberration of American aborigines—nothing more nor less. Therefore, I think some of this could be cut down without doing the program the slightest harm.

After seeing the operation of RIAS I went on my own time to London to check over the BBC programs. They assured me in their usual courteous fashion but with tongue in cheek that, of course, they did not have anything like our money and, therefore, could not even attempt to carry out a program 24 hours a day, but they felt they were doing just as much good and possibly more, because owing to our 24-hour program we got the benefit of all the jamming. I just wanted to call that to the attention of the committee especially as the committee has made severe cuts—in fact I am very distressed to see the cuts they have made regarding the book The Profile of America. I think funds for this book should be very liberal.

Mr. ROONEY. That matter was quite fully discussed. I have read it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have read it too and purchased many copies of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentlewoman approve our spending $225,000 to put this book out all over the world as an example of American art and culture?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes; I may say that I do. I think it is a very fine example.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentlewoman taken this up with any member of the subcommittee on either side of the aisle?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to further say to the gentlewoman from New York that the testimony before the committee and the committee's reading of the matters found in the book were of such convincing interest to him, that the Director of the Agency, Mr. Streibert, withdrew the request after the committee had already acted.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that does not appear in his report.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I believe all this does not appear in the report, but I believe the report does state that we cut out the money.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That you did. I was just pointing that out.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have but 1 minute to talk about the United States Information Agency. I think this is a very important and worthwhile agency.

As far as I know, I am the only public-relations and advertising man in the House of Representatives, and I have a professional interest in this agency. I have studied its activities. I know the background, not only of the Director, Mr. Streibert, but of the men he has surrounded himself with since the agency has been reorganized. He is doing a fine job. I am extremely distressed to find its funds cut so drastically and to see the curtailment of the activities of this agency.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I have not time to yield.

Mr. BOW. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman tell us where we have curtailed any of the present activities of this agency?

Mr. WILSON of California. You have curtailed the funds $8 million under what the President asked for.

Mr. BOW. We have actually increased the appropriation.

Mr. WILSON of California. Over what we spent last year.

Mr. BOW. We have given them more than $3 million over what they had for this year, so there is no curtailing.

Mr. WILSON of California. But you have cut down what the President recommended.

Mr. BOW. Yes; we cut it down somewhat, but we have not curtailed the

activities of the Agency; in fact we have given them money to increase their activities.

Mr. WILSON of California. It will seriously curtail them. The President knew what he was doing when he asked for the increased appropriation. It is ironic that we should spend so much on armed might—I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, and we must spend $29 billion a year to protect our ideals. It does seem strange that we cannot sell our own system through propaganda effort constructively administered by the United States Information Agency. The United States Information Agency has functioned in an outstanding way. It needs encouragement in the form of additional funds.

Of all the new improvements brought into the Agency by Mr. Striebert and his associates, the most effective, in my opinion, has been the worldwide coverage of the President's atoms-for-peace plan. This proposal, properly publicized by the USIA, has electrified the free world. I have no doubt that today the wire services are carrying the story of President Eisenhower's offer of the Salk vaccine to the world as evidence of our own peaceful intentions.

Some 16 months ago President Eisenhower, speaking before the General Assembly of the United Nations, startled the world with a tremendous proposal for a cooperative international effort to put the atomic energy to work for the benefit, not the destruction, of mankind.

With this proposal, the President said, the United States pledged its heart and mind "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

It then became the responsibility of the United States Information Agency to acquaint the world with the United States proposal. For, as the President said upon another occasion:

It is not enough for us—

The United States—

to have sound policies, dedicated to goals of universal peace, freedom and progress. These policies must be made known to and understood by all peoples throughout the world.

Even before the President had left the United Nations rostrum, the Voice of America was broadcasting his speech. Later that day, in the Voice's regular foreign language programs, the speech, translated into as many as 38 languages, was rebroadcast. It was taken apart and sections were beamed to specific areas. Editorial comment in this country, comments by Government officials, Members of Congress, leaders of professional and civic groups, were included in these programs.

The Wireless File, a 7,000-word daily news summary of the Agency's press and publications division, was transmitting the text of the speech while the President was speaking. Overseas posts translated the text into the language of the countries in which they were located and distributed it to newspapers and magazines. Follow-up material, reprints from United States publications, editorial roundups, leaflets, pamphlets, were supplied to all 210 posts of the United States Information Agency.

The 157 information centers of the Agency and the 35 binational centers stocked their library shelves with publications on the subject. Previously, the Agency itself had prepared a simple pamphlet or booklet and this was made widely available.

The educational exchange program of the State Department sent scientists and other specialists in the field abroad to lecture under the auspices of United States Information Agency centers.

The motion picture division of the Agency prepared a series of short, documentary films, dealing with adaptation of the atom to industry, and medicine. It purchased similar films from private producers. All were sent overseas for distribution through normal commercial channels or to be shown to key groups.

In key overseas cities the Agency staged atoms-for-peace exhibits that were seen and are being seen by millions. The Rome, Italy, show clocked its millionth visitor before it went on tour. A West Berlin show drew crowds, not only from the West Zone of Germany but from the Soviet area as well. In São Paulo, Brazil, the city asked for and received permanent possession of the exhibit which was shown by the United States Information Agency in connection with the city's 400th anniversary celebration. In the first 3 weeks the exhibit in Karachi drew 350,000 visitors before taking to the road. All exhibits are sent on tour after the initial showing. The Indian exhibit in the next 2 years plans to visit 50 cities and universities. Dr. K. S. Krishnan, a member of India's Atomic Energy Commission, sponsored the opening in New Delhi March 10.

Each development of the proposal has been given equally thorough coverage. As I said, this is a continuing project, and the United States Information Agency proposes to make the most of it. All peoples throughout the world will hear of the hope-bringing program proposed by the United States.

The Communists at first tried to ignore the President's proposal. As interest mounted, however, they changed their tactics and concentrated on that part of the President's speech in which he had warned of the horrors of atomic war. This, they said, was atom rattling. It was warmongering, and so forth. Simultaneously, they increased their own phony peace campaign.

When this failed to get the reaction that suited them, they announced that the U. S. S. R. was sharing its atomic secrets with the satellites. Ignoring the United States proposal, they claimed credit for originating the atoms-for-peace idea. They made fantastic claims about what they had done and planned to do.

Communist propaganda attacked the United States atoms-for-peace program as evil, monopolistic, and a cloak for warmongering.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the peace-loving peoples of the world are being fooled by these efforts of the Communists. No proposal of the United States has ever met with such favorable world reaction.

And, let me add, it is indeed the atoms-for-peace proposal that is so gaining friends for the United States. The United States Information Agency is not, and cannot be, any more effective than United States policies. Deeds will always be more important than words. But deeds can be and, in this case, are properly interpreted. Above all, it is, as President Eisenhower has said, not enough for us to have constructive policies. Those policies must be made known to and understood by all peoples throughout the world. There would be a need to tell our story even if we were not confronted by this Communist anti-U. S. A. campaign. That campaign only lends urgency to our efforts.

The effort is being made. It must be supported by anything and everything this country can do to back it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in respect to appropriations for the USIA and in particular to the appropriation for the Office of Private Cooperation. It is my understanding that a request was submitted for $270,000. The committee saw fit to reduce this to $170,000, which is about $4,000 less than was appropriated for the operations of this important unit this year.

I feel that the Office of Private Cooperation is doing an excellent job in enlisting the services of private, commercial and noncommercial organizations and that the expenditures for this unit are magnified many fold in its effects on our overseas program. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from New York will enlighten the Members on the reasons why it was necessary to cut the request for this agency.

Mr. ROONEY. We agree with the gentleman to some small extent, but the committee did not go to such an extent as to allow $34,000 for the launching and development of new community and institutional projects, such as symphony salutes and community participation programs. We thought that was so delightful that we might very well pass it up in the interest of trying to help the President balance the budget.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, when a committee reports an appropriation bill with certain reductions from the budget request such as is the case with H. R. 5502 making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1956, I experience a feeling of sympathy for committee members. I know members do not enjoy cutting department requests.

Nevertheless, in spite of any such sympathy, I must express a far deeper regret, a much stronger emotion of disappointment, that in the case of the educational exchange program of the State Department the committee has seen fit to slash

$10 million from the President's request, cutting it to $12 million, which is $3 million below last year.

Let me confess to some misgivings as to our foreign-aid program, but at the same time let me say that I have no reservations, in fact nothing but the highest regard, for the effectiveness and value of educational and student exchange programs.

It has been apparent for a long time, it seems to me, that our weakness in the foreign relations field has been that as a nation we have had to deal with other governments, many of which, particularly in the Far East, have been governments which had little communication with or were far removed from the peoples of their respective countries. Meanwhile the Communists were dealing both on the government level and also on the level of the people. After the Communists enslave the people of a nation it may be different, but when they woo them and soften them up they concentrate on the masses.

On this account I have long favored the exchange of persons program as a powerful instrument in communicating and interpretating our American philosophy and way of life.

This cut to $12 million, as I understand it, would eliminate about everything in the program, with the exception of the Fulbright scholarships. In other words, $8 million is earmarked for foreign currency payments, which will require supplementation with 2 or 3 millions in American dollars, thus leaving approximately 1 to 2 millions for administration.

Meanwhile while we have been reducing our program with the countries of Western Europe and other nations in other parts of the world potentially friendly, there has been an intensification of Communist effort to win these peoples away from us. I have read that exchanges conducted by the Soviet Union in 1953 and 1954 indicated there was a doubling of known exchange delegations to and from the Soviet Union in the latter year, and that 61 percent of these efforts were concentrated in Western Europe.

United States expenditures in economic and military assistance has failed and indeed were never designed to explain our policies and combat elements hostile to or ignorant of the United States. Actually we were in the position of stimulating other nations' national pride, which in turn created reluctance to acknowledge our leadership and false ideas about what America is and stands for.

To me, the education exchange program combated these irritations and misunderstandings. It conveyed directly to other people, through personal experience, the truth about us, and that is something an ambassador or any high Government official cannot effectively accomplish.

Because of my personal interest in educational exchanges with friendly countries, I obtained from Mr. Russell Riley, who is in charge of this State Department program, some typical examples of individual foreign reactions to America. I think these speak for themselves.

For example, a Norwegian Member of Parliament writes that he was "highly gratified to observe in the American people a deep interest in the other members of NATO and a sincere desire to cooperate with and to help these member countries to maintain peace and their freedom. Further, the United States appears always to stand ready to help all countries in need and deserving of help, in order to further peace in the world."

An Irish newsman commented on the contribution which exchanges make to "the raising of journalistic standards internationally, the stimulation of news and information as between the United States and other countries, and, generally, to the removal of prejudices, based on ignorance, which can persist between the Old World and the new."

A British physicist noted that his countrymen "generally picture Americans as being self-confident, invariably wealthy, easy going, and concerned only with the material aspects of life. No doubt I shared this picture—to some extent at least—before I had the opportunity to visit the United States. There I had the opportunity to see the American people in their homes, in their churches, at work and at play. I had not been in the United States of America very long before I found my previous ideas about America to be wrong in many respects."

Our cultural life is often a surprise to Western Europeans. A French teacher said that she realized after her stay in this country that "the people of the United States of America are far more highly cultured than I expected. The impression remains with me that the United States of America is a success, the inheritor and continuer of the best European traditional culture, plus an absence of narrowmindedness too often found in European highbrows."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say I shall not offer an amendment to restore what I believe to be the necessary funds to carry on an adequate exchange program. This is because it would seem better procedure to hope that a more liberal understanding as to the value of the program will be taken by the Senate.

In this connection I do express the hope that if such is the case and the matter comes to conference, the House conferees will adopt a more generous attitude, because in my opinion the exchange of persons between friendly nations is one program that has really been effective in our effort to maintain the political alinements with free nations that are fundamental to our foreign policy.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I arise to protest the reduction in the appropriation to International Educational Exchange Activities from the President's request of $22 million to $12 million as recommended in H. R. 5502. This is a drastic reduction from even the present operating level of approximately $18½ million, and entirely unwarranted in my opinion, as I shall point out.

Secretary of State Dulles says in his 13th semiannual report under date of March 15, 1955:

> A true and lasting partnership between the United States and other nations of the free world requires that we better understand each other's positions, needs, and hopes. Economic, political, and even military cooperation depends upon more than superficial understanding of each other's countries and ways of life. The significance of the exchange program to our foreign relations is that it opens the way for the people of the United States and other countries to know each other better through person-to-person contact and through exchanging projects of mutual interest and value, this understanding develops.

Immediately prior to entering Congress this January, I was president of the Utah State Agricultural College, a land-grant college which has enrolled more than a hundred of these foreign students, supported in part, or in whole by the International Educational Exchange budget. This college is also under contract with the United States Government to employ and supervise a minimum of 42 agricultural, public health, and other technicians in foreign countries.

Also, up until last December I was chairman of the Utah State Fulbright committee which selected the Americans who were to represent the State of Utah abroad on the Fulbright scholarship program.

These positions enable me to speak to some extent from first-hand experience on the problem of educational exchange activities and the need for funds to promote these activities.

Let me relate one experience alone to show you why I disagree with the committee in its statement that these exchange activities cannot be classified as unnecessary Government expenditures.

Some years ago a lad named Zahadi was sent here by the Iranian Government through the aid of our international exchange program. He registered at the Utah State Agricultural College in the Department of Agriculture, and after 5 years study obtained a degree. This lad's father is now the Prime Minister of Iran, and our people who know say that he, his father, and his uncle, who also attended Utah State Agricultural College, were tremendously important factors in preventing Iran from going Communistic.

Furthermore, those in charge of the affairs in Iran have testified to me that one of our agricultural agents in the field of Iran is greater protection to all liberty-loving countries than a battleship in the harbor.

Is peace unnecessary? Exactly what is peace in the world worth? Of what use is all of our wealth, our great institutions and prosperity, if anything happens to our country? Is peace an expenditure or is investment in peace an expenditure?

I am here to say that an investment in this program is one of the best investments that America can make and that we cannot consider it an unnecessary expenditure.

The President has requested an increase of about 20 percent for this program—from $18½ million to $22 million. This modest increase was planned to be used for approximately a 50-percent increase in the program with our Latin-American neighbors to the south of us, an area long overlooked in our international relations. Part of the increase was planned to be used for a 50-percent increase in the program with the critical Asian countries. The amount recommended by our distinguished committee would eliminate these increases. Actually they will make drastic cuts in the program with these areas. These areas will represent the future balance of power within the free world.

I cannot see the wisdom of these penny-wise, pound-foolish cuts. I feel that this program, which is being operated by our State Department with the devoted cooperation of thousands of private citizens both here and abroad who serve the program without remuneration in a sincere effort to maintain peace in the free world will do more than anything that I can imagine to stop the surge of aggressive communism.

Members of our faculty who have studied in foreign countries under the Government's exchange program have returned with a changed attitude toward foreign countries and with a missionary zeal for making our foreign exchange students at the college feel at home, and with an understanding of the needs of these foreign students that is invaluable to the college.

In fact, these are men that we have placed in charge of the guidance program for foreign students in the institution. These are the men whom we assign to conduct the tours of foreign leaders brought here under the State Department's program to see our research and our extension activities. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that I might also add this thought that as our professors from our great institution in Utah work in these foreign countries their activities are not only limited to the classroom but they are extremely active in community activities. They deal with the local population in a grass-roots way that our diplomatic corps can never reach.

These men upon returning have felt the inspiration that comes through serving people who are dependent upon them. They have such a missionary zeal and see such great opportunity to direct the thinking of the people of the world toward our democratic way of life, that in spite of the sacrifices and hazards to which they were subjected overseas, more than the majority of them want to turn right around and go back. I wish they were here to testify to you now upon this appropriation which has been classified as unnecessary.

I object to the inference that inasmuch as there are 2,656 students as participants in this exchange program that it is unnecessary. In addition to these, we have 3,500 more leaders from foreign countries, as well as advanced research specialists who perform research who go back home to transform the living conditions in their home countries, to say nothing of the exchange teachers—school teachers which we bring to this country and the American teachers whom we sent to foreign countries. Certainly no one in any country has the lasting influence upon the youth of a nation equal to that of a school teacher.

I want to certify that these people are walking into the hearts of common people in foreign countries as no tourist, diplomat, or Federal employee can do.

May I call your attention further to the fact that $8 million of the $12 million set up in the bill does not represent a cash expenditure from our budget; it represents lend-lease funds which foreign countries owe us and which are used for the purpose of operating the program. So actually the bill calls for a cash budget expenditure of only $4 million, which I contend should be increased by the $10 million amount requested by the President.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, knowing that we would have under consideration today the budget request of the United States Information Agency, I felt this would be a most appropriate time to raise some fundamental questions concerning that program.

Unfortunately, the only real opportunity we have to examine this program is when it comes up for an appropriation.

Unlike other major programs of the Government, USIA does not benefit from a standing committee of the House being directly and continuously concerned with its efforts to serve the public interests.

Mr. Chairman, for some years I have maintained an interest in the work of our information services in various parts of the world. My work on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, afforded me the opportunity to observe first hand the manner and scope on which these programs are carried out in many countries. I have one basic criticism to make—which is in no way a reflection on the Appropriations Committee or the United States information Agency. That criticism is that we have failed to fully understand the tremendous power for good inherent in such programs and the relationship they have to the urgent question of peace or war. Consequently, we have put forth a mediocre effort in the development of a world-wide information program geared to the demands of our time.

It is true we have made some progress and there are signs that the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a full-scale information program. President Truman gave the program a great lift in 1950 when he called for a crusade of truth to offset the conspiracy of communism and to prevent further Russian aggression. Then in 1953, we advanced another step when the United States Information Agency was established as a separate agency of Government under an arrangement calling for the close coordination with the Department of State.

In between times the program has suffered setbacks caused by a wide variety of influences, not the least of which has been lethargy and lack of understanding concerning the crisis which now grips the entire world. Ignorance has been and remains the greatest enemy of freedom and individual liberty. Emotionalism and prejudice are still the children of ignorance.

Most of us at one time or another have characterized the struggle with the Kremlin as a fight for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of all the people of the world. Few among us would disagree on the accuracy of this description. Yet, what have we really done to harness the great scientific discoveries in the field of communications to this struggle for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of mankind. My judgment is that we have done very little—both by the measurement of comparison to what the enemy has done and is continuing to do in this field and against the possibilities which are ours for the using.

It is reliably estimated that the Russians spend somewhere between $1 billion and $1.5 billion a year on their propaganda program. That program, of course, uses the big lie, the platinum promise, and the Utopian dreams as tools to confuse, to divide, to drug, and to enslave mankind. The Russians maintain extensive experimental facilities and institutes for the scientific reesarch into the use of information media as a tool of the Communist conspiracy. Moreover, they maintain ideological centers such as the Lenin Institute where strategic campaigns are carefully worked out involving a massive propaganda output. They coin words and phrases calculated to put freemen to sleep and to further terrorize those under their cruel rule. We must recognize that they make maximum use of all information media—for evil and ugly purposes. While they lack truth and revolt the natural law, they possess great skill and experience in applying the propaganda weapons.

It did not take us long to recognize the need to harness nuclear energy for purposes of peace and, if needs be, war. We wisely established a joint committee of the Congress on atomic energy in order to make sure that this great power for good or for evil would be kept in the hands of the American people. The benefits we have derived for ourselves and for all mankind as a consequence of these actions are manifold.

It, therefore, seems strange that we have, up to the present, failed to see clearly the great power inherent in our information programs and then to harness them to our goal of peace, freedom and prosperity for all mankind. We must realize that an informed people are a people who will not be enslaved, that our strongest and most determined allies are the vast majority of the people enslaved within the Red colonial empire. When we understand that our information programs have a major bearing on the will to fight of the Armed Forces under the command of the Kremlin we are urged to push forward to their full development. If we are going to win and hold the friendship of the nations of peo-

ple of the world we must make known to them what our ideals and aspirations are. In so doing we will soon convince them that their own ideals and aspirations are very similar. That type of partnership can be established only by the transmission and exchange of ideas between the people of other lands and the American people. The information programs carried on by USIA are directed at attaining that objective.

What is needed to put our international information programs on a level and scope commensurate with their importance is a joint committee of Congress on international information programs.

The Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, on which I had the privilege of serving, made a very careful and thorough study of the international criminal conspiracy of communism. After study of the methods and techniques of the conspiracy on a worldwide basis it concluded that the work of the USIA was worthy of support because it was effective in the fight against communism. It reaches the people behind the Iron Curtain with the truth concerning the policies and actions of the free world, a service we must increase if we are to keep up the spirits of the enslaved people and offset the constant pounding of Russian false propaganda concerning our hopes and strivings for peace with freedom and justice. It does a good job in unmasking the lies, distortions and treachery of the Communist conspiratorial operation in the free world so that free people may know the signs of the scourge and thereby take proper action to eliminate it.

The select committee recommended that Congress give the USIA full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. The most practical way of strengthening the role of USIA in our political offensive for the cause of peace with freedom is by establishing a joint committee of the Congress on international information programs. I would ask you to consider these reasons as basic justification for such a joint committee:

First. Ideals and their transmission to the multitudes of people throughout the world form a weapon in the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Russian slavery which may, in the end, be more powerful than nuclear energy.

Second. The great ideals which have stirred and inspired mankind for many centuries form the basis of a real American foreign policy. We must learn to better communicate our ideals to all the people of the world.

Third. We possess all the scientific means to transmit our ideals to the world, some of which we have not as yet put to use. We must develop the capacity to use these scientific advances to the fullest.

Fourth. The American people will solidly support a widely expanded and intelligently directed international information program because they know that the question of peace or war could very well be resolved in our favor by such an expanded program.

Fifth. There has been an understandable hesitancy in bringing about a full-scale crusade of truth through the information programs but the time for hesitation has long passed. Full scale political action in behalf of freedom's cause is now self-evident.

Sixth. The Members of Congress being closest to the American people are in the best position to provide the impetus for an international information program commensurate with our capacities and the demands of the world crisis which now requires us to expand billions and billions of dollars each year for necessary defense preparations. It is up to Congress to lift this program of USIA up by its bootstraps and to place it on a level of government in keeping with its inherent potential.

Seventh. The ingenuity of the free press of the United States is everywhere recorded in the records of our struggles for individual liberty and a decent life. A dynamic on the American scene which has not been fully tested in the struggle for the minds, the hearts, and the allegiance of all mankind.

These are some of the basic reasons which best argue the need for a greatly expanded information program, which urge us to give consideration to the need for a joint committee of Congress as one way of assuring the American people that we are using all our weapons for peace with freedom to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to become involved in the debate of personalities which threaten to impede the proper functioning of the Refugee Relief Act. Anyone among us who, in the name of friendship, seeks to exploit for his own political gain those men and women hoping for refuge in this land does a disservice to the humanitarian principles upon which the legislation was inspired. It is apparent that not only in this, but other problems, that we try politically to exaggerate differences that do not really exist. When we do this, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we only play into the hands of evil forces which seek to exploit differences to the advantage of those who will charge this Nation with hypocrisy rather than the truth regarding our desire to help the unfortunate throughout the world.

I have heard and read many reckless statements in the last few days by some who profess to be friends of those who would seek the privilege of coming to our shores.

Mr. Chairman, the political implication may be understood in this country, but what will the meaning be to those who live in the free nations of the world?

This Congress and this administration believe in the principles of the Refugee Relief Act, and I hope serious consideration will be given to words before spoken, not only to their political implication but also the impact of those words upon the people we seek to help.

I would like today to speak about the progress being made toward the objectives of the Refugee Relief Act—that humanitarian legislation so firmly supported by President Eisenhower.

I was delighted to note that our Secretary of State, in his press conference Monday, paid tribute to the Administrator of that act, Scott McLeod. "Nothing," he said, "has come to my attention which in any way shakes my respect for or loyalty to Mr. McLeod."

In view of this consistent leadership of the refugee relief program, it is fitting that, as the half-way mark in this 40-month program is reached, we examine its accomplishments and consider the ways in which the American people must help during the next 20 months, to bring this program to a successful conclusion.

Mr. McLeod found himself—by specific provision of the Refugee Relief Act—the Administrator of this emergency law when it was enacted in August of 1953. From a standing start, his office tooled up a worldwide visa-issuing machine and were in business within a few months.

The Refugee Act involved international agreements, interagency understandings, financing problems, overseas installations, creation of regulations, hiring of workers in this country and in foreign cities, plans for security investigations, medical examinations, processing cases and myriad other details of a vast new system that was required to reach around the world on short notice. Is it any wonder that there have been expressions of impatience from those who thoughtlessly felt that some magic wand should be waved and refugees moved within days and weeks? The interests of the United States are expressed in the law of Congress on this matter and must be protected above all else.

No one person could be brought into this country until an American citizen acted to become his sponsor. That is the law. An American citizen must furnish an assurance of a job and housing for every principal applicant under this act. There must be assurances further that the newcomer will not become a public charge, and the job he takes will not displace an American worker. This was not a group movement project, as in the previous Displaced Persons Act, where boatloads of persons were brought to our shores and the newcomers distributed to jobs after they arrived.

Under the Refugee Relief Act no person leaves the other country for the United States until he has an American citizen sponsor and a job, housing, and a friendly assurance that he will not become a burden to his new community. Today, this refugee program, which calls for the entry of 209,000 persons during the life of the act, has 107,523 in its pipeline, and the program is just reaching its halfway mark. This pipeline figure is the cumulative total of all applicants who have been notified of the documents required to speed their cases to completion. Of the more than 30,000 cases that have so far been processed, approximately 25,000 visas have been issued to date. More than 30 percent of these visas have been issued in the last few

months. In addition, more than 75,000 applications are in some stage of processing, an increase of more than 30,000 within 2 months.

This stepped-up tempo of the program sustains the confidence of the Administrator that with present and planned staffing, financing, and organization, there can be issued—within the time limit—sufficient visas for all who can qualify under the act and for whom there are required assurances.

A major limiting factor in this important program is the attitude of American citizens themselves. They can provide or withhold the needed assurances. Many of them are contributing liberally to finance the church, fraternal, and national group voluntary agencies that are recognized by the Department of State for cooperation in the program. Are the staffs of all these voluntary agencies extending every effort for constructive assistance to their Government? Or, do some yield to a temptation to criticize, yet avoid a self-analysis that might reveal their own shortsightedness?

Persons and groups who profess a deep concern for the plight of the refugee have a heavy responsibility for public sentiment on this subject. By their own spirit and optimism they can influence the giving of assurances. Or, by giving way to criticism of the program, they can make the way harder for themselves, for their Government, and for the refugee.

I am pleased to point out the voluntary agencies' optimism with respect to their ability to produce a greater number of assurances, as well as the increasing number of assurances received from individual American sponsors, indicating a tremendous increase in the workload in the 1956 fiscal year. It is interesting, I am sure, to many Members to consider the assurances received by the Administrator of this act up until April 1, 1955.

A breakdown by agency of the 16,858 verified assurances is as follows:

Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc	22
American aid for expellees and immigration	7
The American Branch of the International Social Service, Inc	15
American Committee for Resettlement of Polish DP's	140
American Federation of International Institutes, Inc	435
The American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc	100
American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc	2
American National Committee To Aid Homeless Armenians	12
Baptist World Alliance Relief Committee, displaced persons resettlement program	162
Calvinist Resettlement Service of the Christian Reformed Church	6
Catholic Committee for Refugees	50
Chinese-American Civic Council	8
Church World Service	3,043
Federation of Russian Charitable Organizations of the United States	1
Greek American Progressive Association	39
International Rescue Committee, Inc	229
National Lutheran Council	2,496
Order of AHEPA, Refugee Relief Committee	503
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc	666
United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit	16
United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc	182
United HIAS Service	756
United Ukrainian American Relief Committee	755
War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference	7,141
Miscellaneous agencies	72
Total	16,858

President Eisenhower has elicited from a high proportion of the 48 States a firm response to his suggestion for governor's advisory committee for the refugee relief program. These committees are kept in close touch with the program and are watchful for ways in which their States can benefit from it. These citizen groups go out and get job assurances. They place potential sponsors in touch with voluntary agencies in position to endorse sponsorships and to attend to details of cases. They are key factors throughout the country in informing the public that sponsors of refugees are the big need to bring this program to full success. They need the cooperation of citizens, if this humanitarian legislation really does mean that the heart of America—in the tradition of old—reaches out to those oppressed in other lands.

I bespeak for the refugee relief program around the world the confidence and support of American citizens, whose job, housing, and support assurances must be on record before the refugee program can move a refugee.

To those who would know the real nature of Mr. McLeod's assignment, I would point out that as administrator of the Refugee Relief Act his job, and the job of his staff, is that of assisting intelligent, hard-working, healthy aliens, who are free of criminal and subversive taint, to migrate to this country. All of us interested in the program, as citizens and taxpayers, have the common duty to make certain that the best interests of the United States are safeguarded. This is particularly the case with the Refugee Relief Act, since it contains basic provisions not subject to broad interpretation. There are areas of discretion, however, in both the law and the regulations, when application of good judgment is not only possible but essential if the program is to succeed.

This is the spirit of the program and of its administrator and his staff. But the final accomplishment of the refugee program lies not with an administrator, it lies with American citizens themselves. Their individual sponsorships of applicants are the key to success.

Refugee relief program—Status of visa applications Apr. 8, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	58,785	16,658	1,061	16,820	8,701	2,115	3,383	107,523
2. Visas issued	16,398	4,130	468	1,138	1,911	497	268	24,810
3. Visas refused	1,349	639	22	1,580	804	537	197	5,128
4. Canceled action	536	66	86	697	373	51	189	1,998
5. Applications still in process	40,502	11,823	485	13,405	5,613	1,030	2,729	75,587
6. Assurances received by Administrator	5,076	8,224	244	10,465	3,968	2,440	3,191	33,608
7. Assurances verified and sent to field	4,169	7,182	124	9,147	3,655	1,989	2,428	28,694

"Pipeline"	107,523
Visas processed	−31,936
Applications in process	75,587

NOTE.—All figures cumulative. Items 6 and 7 reflect principal aliens only.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, under the State Department appropriation, funds are made available for the International Joint Commission, an agency whose work is taking on greatly increased importance as a result of the power and seaway development on the St. Lawrence River.

Under the terms of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which the International Joint Commission was created to implement, the Governments of the United States and Canada are authorized to enter into joint development of the water resources along the United States-Canadian border. They are also required to provide protection and compensation for damages which may result from such developments.

Heretofore, water resources developments along the border have been such that the Commission required relatively modest appropriations; and except for the chairman, the services of part-time commissioners, drawn from other agencies, have sufficed. Now, however, we are entering into an era when the hydroelectric power of the St. Lawrence River is about to be harnessed, and a great new inland waterway is about to be opened up to deep water shipping. The effect of these developments on shore property along the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario may be profound; and unless the Commission faithfully and diligently discharges its duty to provide protection and indemnity to injured parties, the effect may be disastrous.

While I expect to vote for the bill before us, including the modest sum allocated to the International Joint Commission, I wish to suggest to the House that the impending developments on the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario may portend and require significant expansion of the activities and responsibilities of the Commission in the near future, if the rights of United States citizens, guaranteed to them under the Constitution and under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, are to be protected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been very much concerned about the lack of comprehensive research and intelligence material dealing with Communist propaganda emanating from every quarter of the world. During the 2-year period in which I was connected with Radio Free Europe the fundamental importance of this information was demonstrated again and again. The most subtle shifts in Soviet policy can often be recognized by thorough and exhaustive analysis of the direction or emphasis of the propaganda emanating from a particular Communist-controlled nation.

For that reason, I direct attention to the fact that the budget for the Office of Research and Intelligence contained in the committee report is $173,000 short of the budget estimate of the United States Information Agency. The Office of Research and Intelligence was created as a result of a survey done by Mr. Allen Dulles and has provided a unique service which has long been overdue. This is the first time that the United States Government has had an organization specifically charged with following the vast and complicated activities of Soviet propaganda.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with the cut in the international educational exchange program funds. I subscribe to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Utah. I think it is very unfortunate that the committee has characterized these funds as not necessary.

With all respect to the committee, I feel that they have put a foolish dollar sign on international understanding. The benefits from this magnificent program simply cannot be measured in terms of dollars.

I like the educational exchange program just as I like point 4 and as I like SUNFED and the other programs which help to sell the ideologies which we have to the remaining free peoples of the world. I consider it somewhat tragic that this expenditure has been cut down so much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the bill now before us, under the able chairmanship of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has done its usual fine job in the preparation and presentation of this bill. What I have to say at this moment is only indirectly related to the bill, and must not in any way be considered as a criticism of the committee or any of its members. I appreciate that if the matter I am about to refer to were to be dealt with by legislation it should be presented to the appropriate legislative committee and not dealt with as part of an appropriation bill.

I am referring to the Corsi-Dulles controversy, a wholly Republican controversy, within the Republican State Department, which, however, reflects badly upon our Government regardless of its political complexion.

While I am not personally acquainted with Edward J. Corsi, as a fellow New Yorker, I have known about him and his governmental and political activities for many years. I believe he is a lifelong Republican. I know that he has held many important public offices and I have been told that it was at the instance of high Republican Party officials, including the former New York State Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, that Mr. Corsi became the candidate of his party for the New York City mayoralty.

The latest task assigned to him was at the hands of Secretary of State Dulles, and was one which required him to deal not with money or property, but with human destinies. No matter who may be right in this controversy between the appointing power and the appointee, one thing stands out clearly and that is there is an utter, if not a reckless disregard of the character and reputations of American citizens who undertake to serve their Government. The whole matter is as sordid as it is unfortunate. No government can expect its citizens to undertake to serve it in high and in important places when they are treated as shabbily as Mr. Corsi has been treated by the Secretary of State. If Mr. Corsi is as incompetent as the Secretary now pretends him to be, then the Department's methods and procedures of recruitment of personnel is sadly in need of revision. On the other hand, as is more likely the case, if the reasons that are now being given for the dismissal of Mr. Corsi are but poor excuses, then there is every justification for his demand for a congressional investigation of the whole affair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including the cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than the others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen from United States vessels in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, held under leaseholds of less than 10 years and fuel and utilities for such properties, and (5) rental or lease, for periods less than 10 years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; $63,760,000, of which not less than $8 million shall, if possible, be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed $3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that 15 such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed $3,600 each) and $1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this appropriation shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of the Metals and Minerals staff in the Office of Economic Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 11, after the semicolon, strike out the remainder of the line, and all of lines 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of several amendments which I propose to offer this afternoon. I shall not take long on any of them because I am pretty well aware of the fate which will attend the efforts to economize. This amendment would strike out the following language:

Expenses of the National Commission of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6

of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r).

Mr. Chairman, I challenge anyone in this room to give me evidence of substantial accomplishment on the part of the National Commission for UNESCO. Despite the language in previous appropriation bills, and despite language contained in this bill that no funds appropriated under the terms of this act shall be used to promote one-world government or one-world citizenship, the National Commission for UNESCO in its conference at Minneapolis a year or so ago gave recognition to an individual who advocated one-world government, and the State Department using funds appropriated by Congress, published several hundred, if not several thousand copies of the speech made by this individual who incidentally was branded by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being a fellow traveler with many years of experience in that game. I know of no accomplishment, I say again, on the part of the National Commission of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation, and I offer this amendment so that the expenditures made for this Commission can be ended here and now, and so that money will be saved to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman has challenged any Member to rise to offer proof of any accomplishment by the National Commission on UNESCO. I have had some experience with it, and I am prepared to state from the observations I have made of the National Commission that I am convinced personally that it has served a most worthwhile and useful purpose in creating in this country an atmosphere of support for this organization, and in backstopping it in all of its activities which have been worthwhile. I have found no softness on the part of the National Commission and no weakness or any tendency toward one-world government or one-world citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to show the gentleman proof.

Mr. PRESTON. Is the gentleman speaking of this minister? Is he referring to the minister?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am referring to a minister; an individual who purported to be a minister.

Mr. PRESTON. I am not undertaking to defend the minister—I know nothing of him whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. But the National Commission for UNESCO recognized this same fellow traveler and then the State Department printed his speech and broadcast it throughout the world. If the U. N.—if UNESCO is the great and fine organization which the gentleman says it is, why have a commission to promote it? Why have a commission living off the taxpayers of this country? Why maintain this commission; what for?

Mr. PRESTON. You received a letter of apology from the National Commission?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I had to drag it out of the chairman.

Mr. PRESTON. Quite accidentally, but any reference made to the gentleman from Iowa was not in any way derogatory?

Mr. GROSS. That is the gentleman's opinion. It is not my opinion.

Mr. PRESTON. Did you not say in your district what this minister accused you of saying?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I said what he accused me of saying, but the gentleman from Georgia has not quoted any of the statements made by this individual. I refuse to be a party to supporting an organization which goes out to harass a Member of Congress and uses tax funds appropriated to the State Department to do it. Not for a moment am I going to sit quiet when that happens even though the gentleman apparently approves it. So I have offered an amendment to get rid of this superfluous commission, and the gentleman has not justified its existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that I would deplore readily any attack by anyone connected with the National Commission of UNESCO against a Member of Congress. The facts in this case are that there has been no attack made on the gentleman from Iowa. The language about which he complains is simply this, "And Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, assures his constituents that the United States is being taken for a ride by a bunch of foreigners."

The gentleman admitted a moment ago that he said that. Shall we condemn a man for simply repeating the truth? That is what has been done in this case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. In just one moment.

I do not defend this minister. I know absolutely nothing of him. He may be everything that the gentleman from Iowa says he is. But when we come to fixing blame we must go to the language used.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also read into the RECORD, since he seems to have been well coached on this subject, what this gentleman had to say about the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic organizations? Will he also read a number of other things that this gentleman had to say?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, I am not upholding this man.

Mr. GROSS. What is the gentleman doing, then?

Mr. PRESTON. I am simply saying that the gentleman has no right to complain when he admits that this minister said what he said he said.

Mr. GROSS. But I have a right to complain when the gentleman does not read into the RECORD this individual's reply.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, I agree. I am not upholding this minister.

Mr. GROSS. What are you upholding him for?

Mr. PRESTON. I am not upholding him. I am upholding the National Commission of UNESCO.

Mr. GROSS. How can you, when they invite this kind of a man to speak to their conferences?

Mr. PRESTON. Let me put the gentleman straight. This gentleman was not invited to speak to the conference.

A board of ministers was appointed to select material for this conference in Minneapolis to use in considering wherein religion and our spiritual resources could be used to advantage in UNESCO. This board of ministers recommended that the speech written by this minister should be used as background material. The minister was not there. His speech was referred to a panel to consider as background material and in the speech was found the reference to the gentleman from Iowa.

Now, the National Commission has apologized. It said it got this thing up hastily, that had they known it they would never have considered that speech to be used as background material.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also read into the RECORD the statement about the emerging one-world institutions?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, now, understand me, I am not upholding him one minute.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman uphold the National Commission in prevailing upon the State Department to spend United States taxpayers' money to have this published and broadcast throughout the country?

Mr. PRESTON. I will say there were only a few copies of it printed.

Mr. GROSS. You bet there were a few.

Mr. PRESTON. Fifty dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent to multigraph 2,000 copies.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and more than that.

Mr. PRESTON. That is what the record shows here. It was published, 2,000 copies.

Now, if we are to remain in UNESCO, we must use outstanding American citizens in this country, such as the brother of the President of the United States, such as Dr. Athel Spillhause, head of the department of science of the University of Minnesota, and other great men, to look in on this organization, UNESCO. We need this organization in our country. I am convinced it is going in the right direction. After having attended two international conferences of UNESCO, I am prepared to state that while at first I had some doubt, yet after this last conference I am satisfied of the importance of what it is doing.

So I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated. Let us continue to use this national commission composed of outstanding Americans to act as a watchdog and supporting committee over UNESCO.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking today with some feeling. For a number of weeks some of my constituents and outstanding men and women in other districts and in other States have been working on a grass-roots program which they wished to submit to the Congress—a program of reaching more effectively the hearts and the minds of all the people of the world with the classic messages of American democracy that were the inspiration of our forefathers and from early reading have implanted in us an abiding and understanding faith in democratic government.

I have here a large file with a content that represents weeks and months of effort by good and distinguished Americans to find the path to understanding that leads to peace. That effort has resulted in a program, American grass-roots in its origin, representing I believe the commonsense thinking of the American people. I had hoped to present the program in the debate today when we had under consideration a bill of appropriations making funds available for spending in this field.

That you may understand the wide interest, here is a card from Dr. Harold E. Fay, managing editor of the Christian Century, a publication of large national circulation and of unsurpassed standing and prestige. It reads:

> Will you please send me a copy of your forthcoming speech on getting the classics of democracy into the languages of nations now trying to establish democratic institutions. We want to provide some editorial support.

Here also is a letter from Mr. Burch, the associate editor of the Chicago Daily News, concerning the expected early publication of dispatches from all the foreign correspondents of that great newspaper on the availability or nonavailability of the classics of American democracy translated into the languages of the respective countries.

The file is filled with letters from editors, educators, and others, men and women who represent a high cross-section of American thinking.

Now, having in mind my responsibility to present to the House to the best of my ability a program of such transcending promise, I telephoned yesterday four times to get a copy of the bill, of the committee report and of the printed public hearings. I was told they were not available, that the committee was still in executive session and meanwhile the documents were not being released. At 11:30 I called the distinguished Democratic whip and reminding him that within a half hour the House would be convening said that certainly I should have an opportunity to see the report. Through his graciousness and appreciated intervention, I finally did get a copy of the bill and of the report at 11:45. When I reached the floor I got a copy of the public hearings. I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] in raising a point of quorum for the matter going over a day, thus affording me some time to examine the documents inaccessible to me until 15 minutes before the bill first came up.

Yesterday I spoke to my beloved friend, a great American, the chairman of the subcommittee and I told him of my interest. He said, "I will see that you get time in general debate." I said that I did not want to take too much time but I did owe it to these people who had put in so much hard work. He said that I would get the time.

I spoke to him again today and he assured me once more. He said, "Of course, you are not a member of the committee but I will see that you get at least 5 minutes." Then later on the dean of my Democratic delegation from Illinois came and asked, "Have you spoken yet?" I said, "No, but I am sure my good friend, the chairman of the committee, will give me this time." He went and spoke to the gentleman and the word came back that I would be recognized.

Then general debate was closed. I am sure it was an inadvertence. I have no feeling for the distinguished chairman other than one of great respect as an able and outstanding statesman and of warm personal affection. I appreciate the difficulties of his position, with so scant an amount of time at his disposal, and I certainly excuse him from any intention to overlook me. I mention the incident in the hope that hereafter when bills of the vast importance of the one before us come up, general debate will not be limited to 1 hour a side. That amounts to shutting out any real debate and more or less closing the doors to those not members of the committee. All of us must share the blame for the too-brief limitation of the general debate since it was by unanimous consent. I hope we will be more alert on another occasion. For one Member I would sooner remain here in session until midnight every day rather than have one representative of the people feel that he had had no opportunity to speak the sentiments of the people of his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and Mr. ROONEY) Mr. O'HARA of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I most humbly apologize to the distinguished gentleman. The situation with regard to allotment of time during general debate was entirely within my control. There were only 26 minutes left for all those on this side who wanted to speak, of which 15 minutes went to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the committee. The rest of the allotment were all for periods of 1 and 2 minutes, with the exception of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who came to me before the gentleman from Illinois. I am sorry I did say he would get 5 minutes. After all it was within the province of the Member in charge of the bill to make a motion to limit debate. I assured the gentleman he would get his 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule. I do hope he has no hurt feeling because I love and respect the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I accept that as a very great compliment to my appearance of youth. I thought I was a little older, I thought life had given me enough years and experience to have learned that when a bill is up for reading and amendment a Member gets 5 minutes on his own and not as a gift from the Chairman who controlled time in general debate. The graciousness of the gentleman, however, in joining with me in the request for additional time now I genuinely appreciate. All I object to is being thought young and naive.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes remaining I shall address myself to the truly inspiring program which can be carried forward with negligible expense and which holds real promise of bringing all the peoples of the world in tune with democratic ways and aspirations.

Briefly stated, this is the program: Select 20 or 30 classics of American democracy, such as the Federalist and the writings of Thomas Jefferson, translate them into all the languages of the world, issue them in inexpensive paper editions and make them available at trifling cost to the little people everywhere. This was the literature that inspired and guided our forefathers in the task of building this democracy. It will inspire and guide those who now, in foreign lands, are looking for the light. It will bring them into closer understanding with us since the founts of our faith will come to be the founts of their faith.

The challenge to us in our generation is to win the hearts and the minds of the peoples of the world. Reports coming to us from observers all over the world are not reassuring. Our intention is good, our purpose is pure, but we are failing to make the most of our opportunity of impressing men and women in all the lands of the earth with the unselfishness of our mission.

We seek not 1 foot of foreign soil. Furthest from our thought is the dream of world dominion. All that we seek is to help others, as we have helped ourselves, to attain, under God and a good and just government, the physical well-being and the spiritual contentment made possible by an earth of rich fertility and the progress of science and industry.

Unfortunately, our purpose is not being projected in some of the programs of the present that take the negative rather than the positive approach and rely upon controversy rather than appeal to reason.

Constantly we tell ourselves that out of World War II has come not one world but two: the world of democracy and that of communism. Moreover, that the Communist world is dedicated with fanatical zeal to the objective of making one world, a Communist one. In our concern about subversion within our own portals, we pay tribute to the ways and wiles of Communist propaganda. At this point, it may be well to analyze our own propaganda coldly, objectively and to ask ourselves whether we are being outdistanced in that field by our opponents.

If our objective is to fire the imaginations of the people of the world with our own conviction that democracy,

which is our way of life, should be theirs, we must reach their minds and their hearts. That is our avowed purpose; how are we attempting to achieve it?

We are spending large sums on radio and television programs. The vast majority of the people we are endeavoring to reach have neither radio nor TV sets. But their leaders can read. Have we made available to that leadership the classics which have fired our own imaginations and been the cornerstones of our democracy in this Western World?

My information in this field is fragmentary but significant. For example in Paris, so I am told, we maintain one library on the Champs Elysée while the Russians have six book stores in the parts of Paris frequented by the "little people" where the classics of Marxian philosophy written in French may be purchased for a few centimes. This may not be the sole reason, but it is a factor in the growth of communism among the rank and file in Paris. The Communists have six book stores with the classics of communism vendable at a price the Frenchman can pay, while in all of France, the United States has six libraries, some not too inviting to the ordinary Frenchman.

The special study mission to southeast Asia and the Pacific of which the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] was a member, and the gentleman from Minnesota was chairman, reported:

> The book translation program is making available to Asian peoples literature, both technical and general in content, that otherwise would not be available to them. In Rangoon, the study mission visited the headquarters of the Burma Translation Society. A well-stocked library of American works was being translated into Burmese by local translators. In an adjacent building, a modern printing plant, designed and serviced by American technicians and equipped with American machinery turned out inexpensive editions.

Further, the report concludes:

> The literate minority represents an influential segment of the population.

As to libraries, the mission:

> Most of the works are in English. In contrast, the study mission noted the large number of Communist works printed in the local language on sale in local bookstores for small sums because of heavy subsidy.
>
> The market is there, as evidenced by the eagerness on the part of the population to absorb foreign ideas.

The criticisms which have come my way of our methods are: not only that in Europe but in Asia and Africa our library facilities are not located in areas accessible to the people we wish to reach but also that our books are not published in the language which those people who are literate can read.

Moreover, whereas in sending radio and television programs we judge others by ourselves, we do not project that thinking to include the influences which have built western democracy. Democracy is not a new model hat to be donned. It is a way of life which the Western World has developed during the centuries. A major factor in that development has been the printed as well as the spoken word.

That must be the media through which democracy should be presented as a positive and constructive idea and method. Checks of books available in our information centers indicate a negative, not a positive, approach. Many of the books which are available have been concerned not with a presentation of democracy but rather with attacks upon communism.

Moreover, many of the books listed by the USIA have been of recent vintage. For example, titles listed in special list SL–7 are of books published since 1940. I need not remind this body that democracy is a positive concept which did not begin in 1940, and that the literature in which our forefathers developed this concept must still have a spark of divine fire capable of further inspiration for people hungering for a philosophy which in 1776 produced a document founded on the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

A second criticism of our effort has been that instead of making available to readers the output of our geniuses, political and philosophical, we are presenting secondary sources, histories—not the works which have made important contributions to the evolution of democratic thought.

Are we making it easy for people to read our classics of democracy in their own language? Spot checks have elicited the following facts:

(a) There is one copy of de Tocqueville in the information center in Rome in English.

(b) There was available for sale in Italy an Italian translation of Democracy in America, but it is not cheap; therefore, it will not be widely read.

(c) A good Spanish translation of the Federalist was published in 1943 by the Fonda de Cultura Economica of Mexico. Has the USIA made this available, not only in Mexico but throughout Latin America? The objection has been made that the Federalist is hard reading. Is it fair to assume that the literate minority is less capable of serious reading and thought than were our own forefathers, among whom schools were rare when the United States was born?

If we are to appropriate funds for the continuation of USIA we must demand from them a report of their stewardship so that we may in turn report to our constituents whose questions as to the disposition of the dollars we spend for them deserve and must have answers.

Some of those questions are, or may well be:

First. To what extent is our USIA reaching a "grass roots" level?

Second. What classics have been translated into the languages which the literate of all nations can read?

Third. Who are the people who frequent the libraries which we have made available?

Fourth. What are they reading?

Fifth. To what extent have we subsidized the classics of democracy, thus making them available in their own language to people? If my information is correct, the answer here is "No"; since there seems to have been very little publication.

Sixth. Is there a demand for translations? Again referring to the report of the Judd committee:

> The market is there as evidenced by the eagerness on the part of the population to absorb foreign ideas.

Let me remind you, the Communists are subsidizing extensively the publication of their books in native languages all over the world.

Further evidence of demand comes from the UNESCO translation program. My information is that their appropriation is overdrawn by requests from Italy, Germany, Spain, and India for assistance in getting out editions of such books as Locke on Toleration.

On the other hand, the Committee for Free Asia has found it necessary to expand their publication plans beyond their original conception because the demand for books has far out-distanced their supply. The book is the only thing that can get to any village in Asia where there is a schoolmaster or someone who can read.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note in the committee report that USIA requested an amount of $350,000 for the Nonprofit Book Corporation.

I have looked into the Nonprofit Book Corporation and have made inquiry as to its purposes and its operations. It is my understanding that the primary purpose of this Corporation is to publish abroad in the languages of the various countries selected American books in full length, supplementation, paper backs, periodicals, and other interesting and informative condensations. It also establishes effective distribution and marketing arrangements for the sale of American books overseas, and assists in breaking bottlenecks in foreign publishing firms by lending technical assistance and facilities to them. The Corporation is governed by a board of educational, literary, and publishing leaders of the United States. It works with recognized foreign publishers abroad. This policy makes it possible to secure the cooperation and endorsement of distinguished civic and educational leaders of the foreign countries concerned to a degree that would have been impossible if the work had been done directly by a Government agency.

By using the local publishers, it is possible to reproduce a large number of useful publications at a minimum cost—at a fraction of the cost they would require here in the United States. Through this arrangement the Corporation has achieved remarkable success in distributing American books in quantities heretofore unheard of in the countries involved.

I believe its most important purpose is that this arrangement permits the publication of carefully selected books and pamphlets in large quantities without attribution to the United States Government so that the books thus produced are not stigmatized by the Russians and their stooges as false propaganda.

I note the committee report states:

No funds are included in the bill for the so-called Nonprofit Book Corporation for which $350,000 was requested.

I would like to inquire why the committee recommended that USIA place greater emphasis on getting out unattributed materials rather than those which bear the USIA label, and then in the next breath, failed to appropriate funds by which the agency can most effectively do this very thing?

In raising this question, I am mindful that the committee eliminated all funds for the use of reproduction of "Profile of America" which I have had an opportunity to review and which I find to be objectionable, even obnoxious in parts, and otherwise not representative of American life and ideals. I can well understand the position of the committee and I compliment them for stopping immediately any further reproduction and dissemination of this ill-conceived and damaging book. Obviously, I do not have in mind this type of book when I advance the cause of the Nonprofit Book Corporation. There is no shortage of books or other publications which adequately and objectively present the truth about the American way of life and its ideals, and to me, the problem is simply that of selecting those for dissemination abroad which do objectively and fairly depict the American scene.

I wonder if the committee was aware that the Kremlin schemers in Moscow alone in 1953 subsidized the publication of a billion volumes of books in a wide variety of languages, many of them reproduced locally in the foreign countries. Most of this work is carried on by the International Book Publishing Corp., a semiautonomous branch of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade. It would be difficult to accurately estimate the exact amount of money the Russians put into unattributed publications, but it is safe to say that the amount is greater than the entire budget requested by USIA. I wonder, distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, whether the facts I have here presented, were taken into account when this decision was made, particularly in view of the fact that the committee urges USIA to place greater emphasis on getting out unattributed materials?

The Russians are far in advance of us in the issuance of pamphlets, books, and other information. As an example, in Moscow they have a Russian Printing Bureau which is going full speed ahead printing in 40 different languages, 24 hours a day. I would like to cite but one example of their activity. They have produced a book titled "Marxism and the National Question," two copies of which I hold in my hands. In my right hand I have a copy of that book in English published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow. In my left hand I hold a very fancy bound copy of that volume which was printed by International Publishers Co., Inc., New York City, an organization which is a subsidiary of the International Book Publishing Corp. in Moscow, a branch of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade. This book is put on the American market at 30 cents a copy. The copy printed in the United States sells for 50 cents and as you can see, it probably cost well over a dollar to produce this book, making it evident that a heavy Russian subsidy goes into the printing of such books.

According to their own admission the Russians have produced slightly over 80 million copies of this book in 37 different languages. This book, I assure you from my own reading and analysis, lays out the strategy for the destruction of all nations and the destroying of the sovereignty of all peoples. This book was a primer for the agents and stooges of the Russians to subvert and to reduce to absolute tyranny all the non-Russian nations within the red colonial empire. This book sets forth the basic plan of the Russians to make all the nations of the world abject colonies of Moscow.

I have cited only this one example of the evil effectiveness of the false propaganda machine of the Kremlin.

Freedom's cause has yet to make an effort anywhere comparable to this single example I have cited.

I have other examples of the tremendous volume of books subsidized by the Communist conspiracy. For example, I have here a book from the Little Lenin Library, volume 14, called State and Revolution. This book also sells for the modest price of 30 cents. It is produced by the International Publishers Co., Inc., of New York. In the back of this book there is a listing of 29 different books of this same type, but of different titles, which are available in English. The price range of these books is 5 cents up to 50 cents. The vast majority of them, however, range between 15 cents and 20 cents per volume. Here again is clear evidence of the tremendous subsidy the Russians put behind the publication of the evil works of Marxism.

I also have here a de luxe edition of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This was produced by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow in 1945. As you can see, this is really a de luxe edition with high grade paper, exceptional binding, and would cost at least $2 if produced in the United States. I repeat, this de luxe edition was published in Moscow in 1945, the year World War II ended, at a time when the suffering people of the Soviet Union were in grave need from the long effects of war. This is but another demonstration of the fact that the Russian Communists place greater emphasis on their propaganda tools and production than they do on the welfare of their own people and very likely even on the production of weapons for use in the traditional forms of warfare.

As an example of the special de luxe publications put out by Moscow, I hold here in my hand a color pictorial called Union Sovietica of May 1954. This is put out by Pravda and is in Spanish tailored for Latin American countries. This very expensive piece of false propaganda came to my attention as a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression on the occasion of our investigation into the Communist seizure and takeover of Guatemala. This propaganda piece depicts life within the Soviet Union as a Utopia—a worker's paradise—the ideal life for the struggling masses. Obviously, this piece of high-powered false propaganda does not tell the reader about the realities of life within the Russian Communist Empire, such as the man-made famines which in 1 year alone took the lives of over 5 million people of the Ukrainian nation—mass deportations which brought about the destruction of entire nations in the course of 24 hours, such as the Chechen-Inguish nations, the Crimean-Tatars and the Kalmyks—it does not give shots of the slave labor camps such as Vorkuta, Magadan, and thousands of other such infamous places of terror and tyranny. Nor does it give the slightest hint about the Communist elite of the new superrace which the Russian Communists have created and who live a life of luxury which their own propaganda piece very well describes. The unsuspecting, after reading this clever and highly expensive propaganda piece, could very well be duped into believing that communism could bring benefits to humanity.

I have before me the Foundations of Leninism, published by the International Publishers, 381 Fourth Avenue, which is, of course, a subsidiary of Moscow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to show appreciation of the able and fighting chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the majority chairman, and also the able and fighting minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], and the other members of the committee for their great interest in the appropriation for the Department of State. Certainly there is no department today that really should supersede the Department of State in view of our very serious international problems. Much of the solution of whether or not we shall have war depends upon them. Of course we should not relax our efforts in building a very strong national defense in guns and ships and bombs. A strong national defense is essential. Our national defense should be second to none.

I hope very much the members of this Appropriations Committee will see fit to ask those in charge of the exchange of teachers and pupils to see that Ireland has an exchange of teachers and pupils with the United States. It would be very beneficial to both countries, the United States and Ireland, and to the other nations of the world.

I am so glad the committee has recognized the persons who have labored for years and who are laboring today in the Department of State and Foreign Service, often under great handicaps, often when they are misunderstood. They have been efficient; they have been fine; they have been courageous, and it has not been easy.

Again I express deep appreciation to all of the members of the subcommittee

who have fought to give the State Department a chance to do its best and most effective work. I like to have our fine, loyal representatives, especially those who are in foreign posts, know that they have the support and loyalty of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I first say to the chairman of the subcommittee that in speaking on the subject of the international educational exchange activities section of the bill I think the committee has done a very outstanding job in pointing out the deficiencies in the present execution of that program. But I think it would be a very sad thing if we allowed the deficiencies in the execution of the program to obscure the overall objective which I think today is one of the most worthy efforts in seeking a lasting peace throughout the world.

I would like to associate myself with the very wonderful remarks of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] from the other side of the aisle and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] on this side of the aisle, and particularly to call the attention of the House to that part of the report of the committee which makes the statement that "the committee feels that the program could be substantially reduced with regard to friendly countries where there is not Communist influence." I cannot help but believe that if we will carefully examine that we will recognize that in essence it says, "If you aren't against us we haven't got much interest in you."

It was only the day before yesterday when I had the privilege of a discussion with the former President of Mexico, President Aleman. He told me that throughout Central and South America one of the great criticisms of the United States is our lack of appreciation of their desire to understand more clearly what it is we are trying to do in our leadership of the free nations of the world. Rather than less, I think we must have more effort in this direction.

So I hope that in the legislative process on the Senate side we may have a reconsideration of the reduction in the amount of money appropriated for this purpose, and that we may show that not only are we interested in fighting communism where communism today has such a great influence but we are also interested in keeping communistic influence out of those countries that are our present friends or would be our friends if we would do a little to win them to our side.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to complement the remarks of the gentleman from California if I am able to do so. He has made a fine statement.

The world has shrunk a lot since my boyhood. When I was a boy in high school it took me longer to go the 16 miles from my home to Green Forest, Ark., than it would now take me to go to London or Helsinki.

I want to refer briefly to the international student exchange program. I am not quarreling with this great subcommittee. I know what a problem they have to try to solve. But I do want to call attention to this phase of this program that they may have overlooked. It is not so much the know-how that concerns me. That is being taken care of all over the world by other programs of this great Government. We are sending our know-how to every corner of the earth that we can. The international student exchange program is our effort to send know-why to the uttermost parts of the earth. Even here in our own country, here in our own respective districts, there is often a great misunderstanding of the know-why. I represent a great district in the northwest corner of Arkansas in the Ozark Mountains. They want to know why, and they want to know why the boys in the cities think one way when, perhaps, they think another way. It is our responsibility as Members of this Congress to understand each other—not necessarily to know how but to know why. One great section of our country likes this sort of a program and another section of our great country wants another part of the program when we are all together in this great country. So one of the key features of the international student exchange program is not to teach know-how but to teach know-why, and while I am not quarreling, I hope that this appropriation can be increased so that it can go ahead with the work that has already begun and can continue to the end that the rest of the world will understand us and we will be able to understand them.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks on the same subject discussed by the gentleman from Arkansas, namely, the international exchange program.

I note from the report of the committee on page 6 that some 6,660 grants were handled in the past fiscal year by the exchange program of the State Department at a cost of $18,700,000. The same table reveals that the Foreign Operations Administration in its technical-assistance program had 5,005 grants at a total cost of $136 million.

The committee has seen fit to cut down to $12 million the appropriation for the State Department's exchange program. I would like to say to the committee that the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on which I served last year and on which I continue to serve, had occasion to go into the exchange program and technical-assistance program of the Foreign Operations Administration and the point 4 program, and found that it was very poorly administered.

On the other hand, I have had some contacts with the exchange program handled by the State Department covering teachers, students, and foreign officials and have been impressed with the fact that that program has been very efficiently administered.

The fact that 6,000 persons were handled for $18 million compared with 5,000 of FOA grants for $136 million raises the question in my mind whether the committee in this instance is not straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. When the $136 million item for the FOA comes up, I hope they are going to be equally assiduous in reducing it.

I would like to point out that my interest in this subject stems in part from the fact that the University of Michigan in my home town of Ann Arbor, Mich., has always been regarded as a favorite educational institution for foreign students. This afternoon I received from the vice president and dean of faculties of the University of Michigan the following telegram:

> This year 10.56 percent of our foreign student enrollment of 805 had United States Government scholarship aid. In 1952 15 percent of the same group had such aid.
>
> On return to their homelands most of our foreign students assumed position of leadership in professional fields, many in governmental positions.
>
> Because of the lack of scholarship support we are losing prospective foreign students of high caliber every day. We receive hundreds of applications from Korean students many of whom are excellent academic prospects who are often recommended by members of our military personnel who were stationed in Korea. Almost to a man we must turn them down for lack of funds.
>
> Compared to the efforts which the Red Chinese and the Russians are making to draw into their educational system the promising young people from the free Asian countries the effort America is making is small. It should be increased rather than diminished.
>
> May I urge you to do all in your power to extend our Government's program of scholarships for foreign students at American universities.
>
> MARVIN L. NIEHUSS,
> *Vice President and Dean of Faculties, University of Michigan.*

I would like to express, with my colleagues who have spoken before, the hope that in the event there is a conference on this item, this subcommittee will not feel that they are bound to stand for the cut they have made in the international exchange program, and that they will feel, because of the sentiments expressed on the floor, they can accede to any increase in this item which the Senate may make.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to associate myself with the statement you have just made. The University of Minnesota happens to be in my district. Identically the same claim is made by the University of Minnesota regarding the exchange program.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself on the subject matter which is presently under discussion: the student exchange program. I shall try to make my remarks as brief as possible.

In the first place, I would like to point out that many of the problems which exist today in Communist-infested countries, particularly the countries of southeast Asia and of the Far East, can be traced to the fact that many of the

local leaders there have been Moscow-trained.

For many years, the Communists have opened their arms to promising young people of various nationalities who wanted to study abroad. They invited them to Moscow, and trained them there. After they were indoctrinated, they were sent back to their own native lands, to preach the Communist doctrine.

Many of those persons never had the opportunity to be properly apprized of our way of life and our way of thinking. Our schools were closed to orientals for generations. We just kept them from coming to our country. Today we are reaping the fruits of those policies.

Through our congressional study missions and through other ways, we have learned and know what the situation is in the Far East. We know that our student exchange program is one of the finest and most warranted efforts that the United States has entered into with regard to that region.

The student exchange program represents one of our most successful endeavors to apprize future foreign leaders of our American ideals and ideas. A curtailment of the exchange program would be a serious setback to American prestige and influence.

In the course of the Foreign Affairs Committee's study missions to the Far East, I have seen the results of this program. In every country that we visited, we found that exchange students, and local leaders who were sent to the United States to become acquainted with our people and our ways, became the finest ambassadors of good will when they returned to their homelands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why these 35 Chinese students do not want to stay in this country, and want to go back to Communist China?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman will agree that if he were in China, he would be just as anxious to get back to the United States. I do not think that the students in question want to return to China because of the government there. After all, it is their own country. If we were kept in a foreign land contrary to our desires, we would be just as strongly intent on returning to our own land.

I do not think that this point is pertinent to the question whether we should or should not curtail the exchange program. However, I do believe that when those Chinese students some day go back to China, they, too, will become disseminators of a better understanding of our great Nation, of our way of life.

Mr. GROSS. If they are indoctrinated with our way of life, they cannot possibly want to go back to Communist China. Yet they do.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, they do, probably because they feel that they have a duty to perform. After all, the nationalistic tendencies are strong. Then, too, there are their families, their relatives, their way of life. However, as I already stated, I think that if they go back, they too will be able to instill into others in China what the United States stands for.

Mr. WILSON of California. Is it not your understanding that Mao-tse-tung and Chou-en-lai in their youth went to Moscow and studied the Russian traditions, and that perhaps that is responsible for their animosity toward us today?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is no doubt about it. They are not the only present leaders in the Far East who were Moscow trained. We closed our educational doors to the oriental people for generations until a few decades ago.

Today I believe we have a golden opportunity to win over the minds of Asiatics, the minds of people in all foreign lands if we just have understanding of the problems and the opportunities.

I want to say at this time that the appropriation subcommittee has done a grand job, but we ought not to try to balance the budget at the expense of this particular program. That is a mistake.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. These funds go also to support leaders from countries in Asia and other countries to come here and learn our ways.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. DIXON. Does not the gentleman think it is a wonderful opportunity to better relationships with other countries and to get before the leaders of all those nations what America is doing and our way of life?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that the great bulk of this money is to enable foreign students and leaders to come and learn our way of life, then return and teach their peoples the lessons they have learned.

Mr. DIXON. I think this program should be supported.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the committee will increase the appropriation for the student exchange program. We cannot cut the budget estimate practically in half, and still hope to have an effective program. I feel that the Congress would make a mistake in so seriously curtailing the funds provided for this purpose. I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to increase the amount for the educational exchange program to at least what was available in the current fiscal year. This amount will be substantially smaller than the original budget estimate for fiscal 1956, and it will represent a compromise between the budget estimate and the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some temerity and with great humility that I rise to challenge the gentlemen of the great Appropriations Committee, and particularly of this subcommittee, on any issue. I think moreover that many Members of the House know that foreign spending is not a subject on which I am apt to urge an increase; but I feel so strongly in regard to this proposed cut in the appropriation for the exchange of students that I cannot keep my seat.

I would testify that from my experience in Europe and particularly in southeast Asia, and in Japan, and in Korea, as a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Wisconsin who just spoke is the able chairman, I am convinced that there are only two instruments in our foreign-aid program which in my mind can go unchallenged in plan, yes, and in results: One, as far as Asia is concerned, is our libraries where we seem to be reaching down into the hearts of crowds of people. And I should perhaps exempt from that commendation some of the libraries of Europe which I think are not well placed. The second is this international-exchange program, which I commend on two counts: Nowhere have I been that I have not found a warmth for this country among students who have been here. Nowhere have I been that I have not found understanding of what we stand for in the hearts of those students who have studied here; and nowhere have I been where I have not found nostalgia for what they experienced in their sojourn here.

I cannot believe that for the sake of $3 million, or $10 million, we can afford to cut a program which to my mind actually works.

And there is a second part of it. I come from a great university town where I have seen how the students who come to us from foreign lands also teach us something and give us an understanding of how they think, why they operate as they do, an understanding of their long traditions, a better means of approaching them with what we have to sell. Of course, I think that we have the greatest thing on the globe to sell, the concept of human dignity and of freedom of the individual.

I am hoping that when the time comes the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer his amendment. I would rather that the House take this step than wait for a conference. I would very gladly lend my voice and my vote to support this program which I think is basic to mutual understanding, basic for the creation throughout the peoples of the world of belief and faith in each other.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to associate myself with the gentlewoman's remarks. She has expressed her feelings so eloquently. I speak for the University of California, in Santa Barbara, in my district. I know the things she has said apply so very, very correctly there. The system works perfectly and it is a highly desirable thing to continue.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to associate myself, on behalf of the University of Louisville, with the gentlewoman from Illinois who has so eloquently expressed herself.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject now being discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been very much concerned about the lack of comprehensive research and intelligence material dealing with the Communist propaganda emanating from every quarter of the world.

During the 2-year period with which I was connected with Radio Free Europe, the fundamental importance of such information was demonstrated again and again. The most subtle shifts in Soviet policy can often be recognized by thorough and exhaustive analysis of the direction or emphasis of the propaganda emanating from a particular Communist-controlled nation.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to the fact that the budget for the Office of Research and Intelligence contained in the committee report is $173,000 short of the budget estimate of the USIS.

The Office of Research and Intelligence was created as a result of a survey done by Mr. Allen Dulles, and has proved a unique service which has long been overdue. This is the first time that the United States Government has had an organization specifically charged with following the vast and complicated activities of Soviet propaganda.

The office was not established until the fall of 1954, so that the budget for the current fiscal year—July 1, 1954—June 30, 1955—of $658,100 not only does not cover the whole year's operation, but at no time has the office been fully staffed. Consequently, the amount recommended by the committee would actually cut back the operations of the office from its present level. The office is just now beginning to turn out the type of information required in something like sufficient quantity. I have just read one of their publications—Communist Propaganda Activity in 1954—which is a very valuable pioneer study. It must be done again next year, and done more completely. The additional $173,000 requested for this office for fiscal year 1956 would be the minimum required to permit this organization to adequately follow, and we hope predict the moves of the Communist propagandists.

Without the $173,000, the program of analysis of intelligence material, such as interrogation reports of Communist defectors and escapees, would have to be curtailed. Studies to detect inconsistencies between Soviet statements and actions would also have to be decreased.

The plans for research overseas would also have to be drastically reduced. This research not only gives unique information about the attitudes of people in the cold war, but also provides essential information in the effectiveness of both USIS information activities and Communist propaganda. At present, only a limited part of the world is being covered. More funds are necessary to permit this information to be obtained about all the critical areas of the world, especially the Far East.

The Information Agency can only reach the correct policy and program decisions when it has accurate facts both about the effectiveness of its own operations and also about Communist propaganda activities. The Office of Research and Intelligence provides these facts. The additional funds requested for this office are required for this work. I vigorously protest the recommendation of the committee to limit the operations of this office.

Mr. Chairman, I also note on page 6 of the committee report that a budget of $12 million has been set for the international educational exchange activities, a reduction of some $10 million in the amount estimated by the State Department for this tremendously worthwhile activity. The explanation of this cut is that with the fiscal situation of the country as it is, limitations must be placed on certain programs which are of some value but which cannot be clarified as necessary.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this type of justification hardly fits the educational exchange activities. To me, governmental programs in which we are engaged for the purpose of sending students abroad and extending educational opportunities to thousands of students from every part of the world, are as necessary a form of diplomacy as exists in the world today.

Another program which I think is vital to the best interests of our country and which I hold to be a potent weapon in the conduct of the cold war against totalitarian communism is the program calling for an appropriation of $350,000 for the publication of books illustrating the basic moral and philosophical foundations upon which American culture has been established. The subcommittee has seen fit to kill this appropriation in its entirety and thereby has scuttled a program which would have sent tens of thousands of booklets, appropriately entitled "Classics of American Democracy" into every part of the world.

The tragedy of this action, Mr. Chairman, is that it reflects little or no realization of the tremendous output of periodicals and publications of every character and description from the Communist world. These publications are not only for home consumption. Through an efficient system of distribution they find their way into every nation of the world including the United States. The essential point to me is that we simply are not competing with the Communists in the battle for the minds of men, women, and children in the critical areas where communism has not yet imposed its tyrannical yoke.

These are matters of vital concern, Mr. Chairman, for they play no small part in the cold war in which we are engaged and upon which civilization, as we know it, rests.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Western Hemisphere is our first line of defense. It is strategically, politically, economically a family of nations—of which we are a member. More than a third of all United States direct private investments abroad are in Latin America—about $6 billion. Two-way trade is $6.5 billion annually. Latin America is our largest foreign supplier and our largest market for commercial exports.

No part of the Americas can be allowed to pass under the domination of a hostile power. Yet our partners to the south are under systematic, subtle invasion by the Communist world conspiracy. Communists subverted the Government of Guatemala and controlled it, acting on orders from Moscow, until the Guatemalan people threw them out. Even then they went underground and are now active again.

Communist Party members in the area are increasing and total well over 200,000. Directly and through front organizations they ceaselessly attack and discredit the United States, exploiting existing misunderstandings. Communist shortwave broadcasting to the area has shown marked increases.

Mr. Chairman, during the 83d Congress I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. In its report our subcommittee stated:

> Most important, the continuous intervention by the Soviet Union in the affairs of our Latin American neighbors constitutes a real and serious menace to the security of the United States.

To combat the Communist menace and to expose it as an evil manifestation of a hostile force is a priority assignment of the USIA in this area. The resources available for the job are not large.

The Agency operates 43 posts—in all 20 republics and in the European dependencies, Martinique and Trinidad. Authorized American positions total 129. In some small posts one American is stationed. Local citizens employed currently total 469. The field staffs with Washington support use all communications media, and where practicable produce materials locally.

The job goes on in an area of social, political, and economic ferment 6,000 miles long, with 171 million people. Phenomenal population growth—now about 2½ percent annually, double the world average—will bring this to an estimated 600 million by the end of this century.

Total dollar support available for the information program in Latin America for fiscal year 1955 is $5.2 million—Agency and field; for fiscal year 1956, $7.5 million is requested.

The Congress is now considering the budget request for fiscal year 1956 of the United States Information Agency. The Agency received $77 million for its worldwide operations last year. It is asking for $88.5 million for fiscal year 1956—to win men's minds all over the world to freedom.

Russia throws large sums, variously estimated at $1 to $1½ billion dollars a year, into the same project—to win men's minds to slavery.

We cannot allow the Soviet Union to win a victory in this ideological battle.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the USIA will not be hampered in its motion-picture program by the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations

which would restrict exenditures for this purpose of $3 million. We should utilize every media of information available to carry on the war of ideas. When we consider that a single motion picture produced in Hollywood could easily cost $3 million, the same sum is a small figure to maintain a worthwhile program for 1 year.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee might give the impression that the international exchange program is concerned almost exclusively with the exchange of students. Student exchange is, however, only one of the ways in which this program is designed to promote our foreign policy. The activities in which grantees engage include teaching, lecturing, research, observations, consultation, and acquiring of specialized practical experience as well as study. I understand that in the current fiscal year, for example, about half of the persons financed in whole or in part are receiving grants for short visits in the United States for teaching and teacher development, for college lecturing and research, and for practical experience and training. While I have not been able to make a close study of the program, I am impressed by what I have learned regarding the interchange of well-selected and representative persons in all walks of life. I recall, for example, that in the city of North Little Rock, Ark., we had the benefit of an assignment of an exceptionally fine teacher from India, Mrs. Bhatia, who not only provided valuable instruction but was able to take back to the people of her country an extremely favorable impression of our way of life, and I know from what she had to say while here that she will eloquently present our point of view to the people of Asia.

Foreign leaders come to the United States to observe the American way of life and consult with our leaders in the fields of government, journalism, labor, management, youth, and community activities, and other fields. American specialists are recruited from among the most prominent persons in their respective fields of activity for the purpose of undertaking general lecture tours designed to acquaint foreign audiences with particular aspects of American life and institutions, or to advise and to consult with important foreign organizations and institutions at the request of the latter. Foreign specialists participate in planned programs of training or practical experience in this country. For example, foreign journalists work for short periods in American newspaper offices. Grants for the exchange of carefully selected professors or research scholars help to create or continue closer cooperation among schools, universities, and professional groups in our own and other countries. Many of these projects are directly related to an explanation of American institutions and practices—for example, the sending of lecturers to universities abroad to lecture in American studies and assist in the development of American studies programs at the request of the institutions abroad. School-teacher grants make possible the exchange of American and foreign primary and secondary school teachers, the major cost for which is provided by the schools themselves, but which could not be carried out without United States Government grants. Teacher development projects for foreign primary and secondary school teachers and school administrators are carried out under the sponsorship of universities and colleges in the United States, in cooperation with State school systems throughout the country, through Department grants to the teachers. These projects include such subject matter fields as American studies, primary, secondary, and vocational education, school administration, and the teaching of English as a second language.

Through every fruitful type of exchange experience, therefore, the program builds up cooperative international relations and contributes to sentiment overseas which is favorable to the United States.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the cause of world peace is served by the exchange of persons program.

It was very disheartening to me, therefore, to find that the Appropriations Committee has made such a drastic cut in the amount of money for this purpose.

President Eisenhower called the exchange program "an important step toward world peace." A poll of American Ambassadors found them saying the exchange of person is our most effective program abroad.

Faced with these endorsements, it is difficult for me to understand why the committee has treated this program so harshly.

Under title I of the table "Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1956" the committee leaves the impression that the reduction recommended in 1956 appropriations for International Educational Exchange activities amounts to only $3 million below the amount available in 1955.

In truth, the 1956 budget request included an amount for $3,577,547 for the educational exchange program with Germany and Austria which were consolidated in the 1956 budget. Instead of cutting the appropriation $3 million as the report indicates, the cut amounts to $6,577,547 or a 35.4 percent cut below the amount available in 1955.

We can make no better investment than in a program to create understanding and good will among the peoples of the world, and to increase American friendship and understanding abroad.

If the program is poorly administered, as some have said, steps should be taken to correct it, but we should not permit the program to be crippled or destroyed.

The estimate of $4,100,000 for administrative expenses of this program does not seem unreasonable, considering the fact it is only 13 percent of the total appropriation request of $22 million combined with over $9 million from private sources for the grant program.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we poorly serve the cause of international understanding by drastic cuts in this program and I urge the Members of the House to give serious thought to full restoration of these badly needed funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 6, strike out the figure "$63,760,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$61,900,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is late and I will be very brief. This amendment would cut the increase of $1,860,000 which the committee has provided the State Department for salaries and expenses; in other words, it would cut the bill back to the $61.9 million provided last year. The committee will say, I have no doubt, that this increase is necessary to take care of the increased salaries in the State Department, and so on, and so forth. Let me say to you that the State Department can absorb the increased salaries if it is so minded. We talk a lot about economy in this House and we seldom practice it. It is estimated we will have a Treasury deficit this year of $4.7 billion. I hope the Members of the House are aware of that and the inflationary pressures generated by these annual deficits. It seems to me this is a good place, with this amendment, to start to save a little money, and that is the reason I have offered it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out that the pending amendment, if adopted, would strike out the $1.5 million for the personnel improvement program instituted as the result of the so-called Wriston report; $100,000 for staff strengthening which the committee feels they need, and the indication of the committee's sincere feeling in regard to their needing this would be evidenced by the fact that the committee cut this item by $5,790,000. This amendment would also deprive the Department of $260,000 urgently needed for new posts at Belo Horizonte, Brazil; Fortaleza, Brazil; Puerto Oaiday, Venezuela; Aleppo, Syria; Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa; Hyderabad, India; Abadan, Iran; and Mombasa, British East Africa. Such would be the consequence of adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree that the State Department can get rid of some personnel and absorb the increase that you have given them?

Mr. ROONEY. I am afraid to make any decision the way the gentleman would try to induce me to. The functions of the State Department and the Foreign Service, our representatives throughout the world, are far too important to consider on a basis such as this. I think they need these new posts. I think they need this money for staff

strengthening, and I think they need this money in regard to the personnel program. This is the unanimous position of the committee, and I say that every single member of the committee agreed to the cut of $5.7 million, and every member of the committee agreed that this particular money was very urgently needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 7, strike out the comma following the word "shall" and strike out the words "if possible" together with the comma following the word "possible."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strikes out the words "if possible." In other words, the language of the bill presently reads "$63,760,000 of which not less than $8 million shall, if possible, be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States."

Nowhere else in the bill, so far as I can find, do the words "if possible" appear to direct the State Department to use credits owned or owed to the United States. In other words, this makes it mandatory that the Department of State use $8 million of credits that we have in foreign countries, instead of giving them the opportunity to crawl through the loophole of "if possible." I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

May I point out, in opposition to this proposed amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, that the words "if possible" were not inserted in this bill last year. We had to put them back at the urging of the other body. The committee has carefully considered whether or not we should insist that they use this amount of money in foreign currencies and credits. But it is possible that there might be one situation somewhere in the world which would throw this whole business out of kilter, with the result that there might be delay in getting funds to a post in some important area. For that reason it was the considered judgment of the committee—and again we were unanimous—to have the words "if possible" remain in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Could not that be true of other appropriations in this bill where you do not use the words "if possible"?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that his offer of this amendment might indicate that the members of this committee were not in full agreement with him that we should use every single bit of foreign currency and credit wherever possible. It would be utterly ridiculous to take any position such as that. But at the same time the committee must consider the possibilities, if we do not insert the words "if possible." We are in agreement. This is a matter of procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), $475,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 5, line 4, strike out the figure "$475,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get a little economy in this bill, if I can. Here is an item of almost a half a million dollars for entertainment purposes. It seems to me that we can dispense with an expenditure of $475,000 by the State Department for entertainment. Let us not forget that there are entertainment items contained in other provisions of this bill, too. But this $475,000 is the big entertainment item in the bill and should be stricken out. If the Members are interested in economy, they should vote for the amendment. If they are not, then continue this entertainment for foreigners. It amazes me that Congress spends this kind of money to entertain foreigners in order to get them to take our money. There is something wrong someplace, if we have to spend nearly a half a million dollars to get them to take our millions.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa ever entertains any of his constituents in his district.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. PRESTON. For what purpose?

Mr. GROSS. And the taxpayers of the country do not pick up the check, either.

Mr. PRESTON. For what purpose does the gentleman entertain his constituents?

Mr. GROSS. For what purpose?

Mr. PRESTON. To influence them?

Mr. GROSS. Because I want to entertain them.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman does not care about influencing them while he is entertaining them?

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman wants to state his personal position that is all right.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it true that the gentleman is not interested in influencing his constituents?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I am interested.

Mr. PRESTON. Surely. That is what we are interested in in the matter of using this money, influencing people abroad.

Mr. GROSS. But the taxpayers are not picking up the bill for the entertainment of my constituents. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is an expense account for Members of Congress to buy liquor to be used to entertain their constituents? If the gentleman wants to open up the subject, let us get right down and dig into it.

Mr. PRESTON. Very well. I have been here 9 years. I have not found any source that I can use to buy any liquor to entertain my constituents. But I do manage to dig up a little out of my own pocket to entertain my constituents on the theory that if I fed them properly they would be more likely to vote for me.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you not ask Congress to vote you an expense account? That is what you are doing here for the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Seriously, may I ask the gentleman, Does he realize that with regard to this item there must be taken into consideration the fact that a great many Foreign Service officers abroad, in fact the bulk of them, are not people of great means? That they must entertain foreign officials at various times? The people in the lower categories of the Foreign Service should not be called upon to use their own money for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that $475,000 will pick up the check for all the entertaining the Foreign Service officers want to do?

Mr. ROONEY. I think it might adequately cover it.

Mr. GROSS. For all Foreign Service officers?

Mr. ROONEY. There are other items of entertainment in this bill, such as for USIA. Has the gentleman not found them?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I have, but I would like to make a start on this one. Let us see what happens to this one, and then maybe we can strike out the rest of them as we go along.

Mr. ROONEY. Fine. I think we can depend on the commonsense of the House to vote down the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows this $475,000 is not the difference between having all millionaire Ambassadors.

Mr. ROONEY. This is one of the important things in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot convince me of that, and he knows it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acquisition of buildings abroad

For necessary expenses of carrying into effect the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292–300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $7 million, of which not less than $6,250,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $750,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from New York where these buildings are going to be constructed. Do I correctly understand we are going to spend money for the erection of an office building in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I should say to the gentleman from Iowa, my dear and very distinguished friend, that the amount of $5 million was requested for construction as follows. These are new buildings:

Three million dollars in London, England.

One million one hundred thousand dollars in New Delhi.

Nine hundred thousand dollars for staff housing in New Delhi.

The rest of it was entitled "Projects development, $400,000"; defense attachés' housing, $200,000; and maintenance items, $3.6 million. The committee cut this to $7 million, and insisted that all of it but $750,000 be used in foreign currencies or credits. The Department had requested $2 million in cash. I think that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is one of the best informed men in the House with regard to this subject, and that we did a pretty fair job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I did not yield for a speech. I yielded for an answer to a question. Do you propose to erect a building in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I thought I mentioned London, England, and New Delhi.

Mr. GROSS. Why at this time embark on the building of a structure in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman from Iowa brought Hong Kong into this picture. There is no money in this bill for a building in Hong Kong.

Mr. GROSS. Are you not proposing the immediate construction in Hong Kong of an office building?

Mr. ROONEY. What page of the bill is the gentleman looking at?

Mr. GROSS. Page 278 of your hearing. You have $10,500,000 worth of property in London, England, now, do you not?

Mr. ROONEY. We are going to trade that property in London, England, and I think the American taxpayer will come out the better. I am sure the gentleman is glad to hear about this because this is his administration running this program.

Mr. GROSS. Have you disposed of that building in Marseilles, France in the red light district?

Mr. ROONEY. That was taken care of a long, long time ago. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] would not briefly say a word to assuage the feelings of my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, my feelings are not hurt. I am just trying to find out whether you are going to build a building in Hong Kong and spend more and more millions in London on buildings when you already have $10,500,000 worth of property over there.

Mr. ROONEY. I have already stated and I will now once again state that there is no money in this bill for a building in Hong Kong.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is this that is proposed here on page 278 of your hearings. It says "proposed for immediate construction an office building in Hong Kong." You tell me about it.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. GROSS. All I can do is read what your hearings contain. I do not know just what volume this is, but it is on page 278.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Insofar as the Hong Kong building is concerned, that was authorized in a previous bill and the money has been appropriated, and so far as I know, it is ready for construction. That is not in this bill. It has been authorized. The funds were authorized prior to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Then what new buildings do you have in this bill now? Are you going to build buildings in Matsu and Quemoy and any other places?

Mr. BOW. There are no buildings to be built in Matsu and Quemoy in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because I have grave fear that we are erecting a building in Hong Kong that the Chinese Reds will one day gobble up and the same will probably be true of some other buildings proposed for the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has raised the question concerning a new Embassy in London. I think the House is entitled to know what the situation is in London and what is contemplated at this time by the committee and the Department of State. Many of the Members of the House who have been here for some time remember there is quite a good deal of history about our properties in London. We have on the Square in London, buildings on three sides. Some of them are very old. Some of them are under lease. We have one building which our Embassy office occupies where we have other tenants. Our own agency carries on its activities there, but under previous agreements we have tenants in the buildings of other nationalities. There are some security questions involved in that situation. Under the present arrangement, we are obliged to furnish the tenants in the buildings with meals and we furnish them with valet service. That is not a good situation. We have for some time been trying to work out the situation that we have gotten into in London which has not been good. A committee was appointed about a year and one-half ago composed of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], and myself to make some investigations which we did. To make it as brief as possible, may I say to you that the plan has now developed whereby there are firm offers for the acquisition of some of the properties we own in London, whereby money will be returned to the Treasury of the United States. We will dispose of much of the property around the Square, and on the west side of the Square it is anticipated to build a new, adequate office building for our Embassy. Actually, when all the transactions are completed, as they are now contemplated, not only will we be rid of a bad situation in London, not only will we be rid of our tenants to whom we give valet service, but we will have a new Embassy, properly built, for efficient operation, and when we are through we will actually return some dollars to the Treasury from the disposition of our properties in London.

Mr. GROSS. What do you mean by "valet service"?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will go down to the Statler Hotel and ask to have his suit pressed, he will find out what valet service is.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me we are giving them a little of their own Socialist treatment.

Mr. BOW. Well, I do not know whether valet service is socialistic or not.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we own the building, and we rent it out to private individuals, in part.

Mr. BOW. We took over the building. We took over the building some years ago, which had long contract leases in them. We have it and we are stuck with it and we are going to get rid of it. We are going to return some dollars to the Treasury.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the committee for the action it has taken in this matter of our buildings around the Square in London. I was there a couple of years ago. I learned about the problem. I was in our Embassy, and I will say that the condition of that Embassy is a disgrace to our great Nation. I am very happy to know that you are taking hold of this thing now and that you are going to dispose of these undesirable buildings and that you will build an Embassy in London that is in keeping with this great Nation of ours.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to add this one thing, that under the agreement we have now on our foreign currencies with Great Britain, those funds can be used for two purposes; namely, exchange students and the acquisition of buildings abroad. So we have a limitation on how we can use these foreign currencies. Actually, the currencies will be used rather than dollars. I think the work of the State Department there and of our committee certainly will be to the benefit of this country.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee for a clarification of the section relating to "Acquisition of Buildings Abroad."

I want to start with the investigation conducted by the Brownson Subcommittee in March 1953, relating to the erection of five residences and apartment buildings by the High Commissioner of Germany. Some $16 million was spent

of counterpart funds, in the erection of that housing.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest to him that this was not a matter within the jurisdiction of this committee, because this committee never appropriated the money for those buildings.

Mr. MEADER. That is just exactly the point. The man who did the housing construction or who was in charge of it was a Mr. Glenn Wolfe, who was Deputy High Commissioner. In a memorandum in which he described with great pride the housing development, there occurs the following passage in a memorandum of a conference:

> Mr. Wolfe pointed out the total FBO budget this year was only $2½ million and that he doubted whether an approach to Congress for additional funds for buildings at Bonn would be favorably considered.

In other words, this official of the American Government in Bonn, knowing that for all Embassy buildings around the world, Congress had appropriated only $2½ million, by stretching the language in other statutes, undertook to spend $16 million of nonappropriated funds on a project that was never approved by the Congress of the United States.

I would like to ask the chairman of this subcommittee whether or not it is the opinion of this subcommittee and the opinion of the House of Representatives that any such expenditure is not authorized under the language of this appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I am quite sure it is not.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contributions to international organizations

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, $28,079,977.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 6 line 11, strike out the figure "$28,079,977" and insert "$22,079,977." Insert a colon after the figure "$22,079,977" and add the following: *"Provided,* That the United States contribution as a result of membership in any international multilateral organization shall in no case exceed the percentage contribution of the highest contributing foreign government."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply cut the appropriation for contributions to international organizations. The amendment is directed in part to our contribution to the United Nations. It would cut the appropriation $6 million.

Members of the House know, I am sure, but to refresh memories I may say that our contribution to the United Nations is 33.33 percent or was when this handbook was brought out in the second session of the 83d Congress.

My amendment would reduce our contribution to 15 percent.

Remember, the Russian contribution is less than 15 percent; in fact, it is 14.15 percent. It would reduce our appropriation to 15 percent and make the further provision that in the future no contribution to the United Nations be more than 15 percent, and no contribution to any of the specialized agencies of the United Nations be more that that of the highest contributing nation.

The British are next to the Russians with a contribution to the United Nations of only 9.8 percent. France contributes 5.75 percent.

It seems to me that after all these years it is time for these foreign countries to begin to pick up their share of the check for the United Nations. Let me remind you again that this country today has a Federal debt of $280 billion, greater than the combined debt of all the rest of foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is eminently fair, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, there is just one short question posed by this pending amendment: Shall we or shall we not belong to the United Nations?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to point out 1 or 2 things with respect to our contributions to these international organizations and to the specialized agencies.

In the fiscal year 1946 our total contributions to these agencies was a little under $7,500,000. The figure reached the high mark in fiscal 1953, and that high mark was $25,351,000. The estimated contribution for fiscal 1955 was $23.7 million and I think the committee requests at this time an appropriation of $23.9 million, which is an increase of almost $200,000 over last year. This is nearly three and a half times the amount of money that we contributed to those same organizations in fiscal 1946. In other words, over a 10-year period we seem to have increased our contributions to the very same organizations by about 350 percent. I point out that in the case of the UN, in the case of the International Civil Aviation Organization, in the case of UNESCO, in the case of the World Health Organization, we contribute approximately one-third of the total budget. I am not in favor of withdrawing membership in any of these organizations. I have already spoken in regard to my feelings with reference to ILO, but I wonder if the Appropriations Committee has given consideration to the very decided increase in the amounts of our contributions, not in the amount of percentages but the increase in the actual amounts in the period I speak of, the last 10 years, and why it is felt necessary to continue these increases year after year after year.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I think one reason can be assigned to the fact that the maximum amount we are permitted to contribute has been increased from time to time since 1946.

Mr. BENTLEY. I understood that our percentage in the UN was being reduced.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes. I am talking about the overall amount dollarwise. The percentage has been steadily coming down until it has reached the point of 33⅓; but the ceiling has been lifted legislatively since 1946. I think that accounts for the increased budget of UN.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that even though our proportionate share has been decreased—and I led the fight to cut our share of U. N. contribution to 33⅓ percent—the activities of the U. N. during the decade referred to have increased, the total contributions of other countries have increased, so that it means our proportionate share is larger in dollars even though it is smaller in proportion.

Mr. PRESTON. That is true. That is a very accurate statement.

Mr. BENTLEY. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. In other words, the activities of the U. N. and these other specialized agencies over the past 10 years have increased if we follow the dollar amounts by 350 percent. That would seem to be an awfully big increase on the part of the U. N. and the specialized agencies.

Mr. PRESTON. I would not question the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. BENTLEY. I am quoting from a pamphlet entitled "United States Contribution to International Organizations," House Document 89, $7½ million in 1946, $24 million in fiscal 1956, a 350 percent increase.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, when an organization is created there is no active program. As it goes along, the program is enlarged. That is true of the U. N. and its related agencies.

Mr. BENTLEY. Is a similar growth going to continue in the future?

Mr. PRESTON. Frankly, I do not think so. I do not know what other field we can get into.

Mr. BENTLEY. For our contributions to these organizations you have requested an increase of $200,000 over the last fiscal year, or approximately $200,000, is that correct?

Mr. PRESTON. I am informed by our staff member that the overall appropriation for this purpose is less than that in the way of contributions.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the U. N. or any of these other organizations in which we are a member votes to increase, and we have a vote too, yet we have to keep on paying more money, is that it?

Mr. PRESTON. If we abide by the rules, we do. If the budget is increased annually or biennially, we are bound to increase our contributions.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Would this amount of money that the gentleman from Iowa wants to cut out close up the U. N.?

Mr. PRESTON. I think the answer is yes.

Mr. BENTLEY. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: As I understand it, our contribution for the current fiscal year was $23,729,000?

Mr. PRESTON. No, that is not correct. The correct figure for 1955 is $24,278,478.

Mr. BENTLEY. $24 million.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes. The estimate for 1956 is $23,901,243, or a reduction of $677,236.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to see it decrease.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, in view of the periodic agitation among some groups in this country to have the United States withdraw from the United Nations, I was pleased to see the statement in the record of the hearings on this bill by our Ambassador and chief delegate to the U. N., former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge.

In answer to a direct question from a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee as to what would happen if we did withdraw from—get out of—abandon the United Nations, Mr. Lodge said:

> We would be in terrible trouble. It would be a most imprudent thing to do.

After stating that it was his belief that had we not been in the U. N. last June when the Soviet Union tried to bring the Guatemala question into the Security Council the action would have torpedoed—to use his word—the whole Organization of American States, endangered the Panama Canal, and spread communism all through Central America, the United States Ambassador to the U. N. added:

> If we ever were to be imprudent enough to get out, we would be turning it over to them [the Soviet Union and its satellites]. They would regard us as the biggest fools in the world if we did a thing like that. We just can't afford to get out. That is the minimum to be said, because I think we get a lot of plus from it. It is actually a great asset for us. It is the biggest single engine in the world for influencing world opinion. It is a great asset for us to have a place like that where we can go and try to influence world opinion, where we can go and show up the Communists in debate and reveal the hateful and ruthless things about communism. But the very minimum of it is that if we are not there the Communists will be there and they will run it.

I was glad to read those words, Mr. Chairman, and to note the importance which Ambassador Lodge places on our continued membership in and participation in the United Nations.

For a time it appeared to many of us that the new American delegation to the U. N. these past 2 years was inclined to minimize the importance of much of the work and to indicate a feeling that our participation was in many respects a waste of time and effort.

I do not say that was general or that it characterized all of the official delegates, but it certainly was true of some of our representatives to the U. N. in 1953 and 1954 and in the attitudes they demonstrated.

RELUCTANCE TO JOIN IN SPECIAL CONFERENCES

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there was a reluctance on the part of the State Department to participate in conferences on proposed U. N. treaties in the areas of human rights and social welfare—reportedly because of a fear of attack from the groups supporting and promoting the Bricker amendment.

I hope we are safely through that gunshy or U. N.-shy phase and that Mr. Lodge's unequivocal endorsement of the value of our participation in U. N. affairs means we will have official representatives at any and all U. N. conferences on proposed treaties, whether we intend to sign the treaties or not.

The point is that it never hurts for American representatives to use their best efforts in these conferences to have such treaties and conventions come as close as possible to meeting the ideals of freedom and democracy. Staying away from these sessions merely gives other nations, including the Communist ones, the opportunity to sway U. N. decisions without hindrance from us.

My interest in this matter was first aroused by an editorial last fall in the weekly Baltimore Jewish Times, entitled "A Shortsighted Policy," protesting the failure of the United States delegation to participate even informally or in an observer role in the U. N. conference on the status of stateless persons.

The editorial declared that the State Department appeared to take the position that because American standards of treatment for refugees, and aliens generally, were so much more generous and enlightened than even the best U. N. treaty on the subject would likely provide, little purpose would be served in our participating in the conference. But, the Jewish Times added, this certainly did not absolve us of the responsibility to give leadership in the effort the U. N. was undertaking to raise the level of human rights everywhere. To take a contrary position, the editorial said, would be to justify our withdrawal from the entire area of international cooperation on human rights, for in virtually every field our own standards go far beyond what international agreement is likely to establish at the present time.

STATE DEPARTMENT VIEW SOUGHT

I brought this editorial to the attention of the State Department on November 4, with a request for comment.

In my letter I stated:

> While I am sure there is no official United States inclination to abandon the United Nations as a significant instrument for progress in the field of human rights (a fear indicated in the editorial), nevertheless I think the editorial is correct in pointing to a widespread suspicion among U. N. nations that we are somewhat halfhearted in this respect—a suspicion the Kremlin tries assiduously to cultivate. It is ironic that the Communists, who deny all human rights, seem able so often to make capital out of the alleged shortcomings of the free governments; we should certainly not provide them with opportunities on a silver platter to claim we are unconcerned about U. N. matters of this nature.

In a reply on behalf of the State Department, the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, assured me that Department's policy is to participate in discussions of human rights proposals in the United Nations, and has proposed an action plan on human rights.

His report on the matter of the conference on stateless persons was as follows:

> Your concern for a positive expression on human rights matters by this country is fully shared by the Department, and we are glad to be assured of your interest in effective action in this field. The editorial in the Baltimore Jewish Times takes the position that since the United States standards regarding human rights are higher than may be possible to achieve through international agreement, a justification of our absence from the conference on stateless persons on this ground might likewise justify our withdrawal from the entire area of international cooperation on human rights. In our view, this conclusion is not supported by the particular facts relating to the conference on stateless persons, nor by our record in the United Nations.
>
> The United Nations conference on stateless persons, which met in New York in September of this year, was called for the relatively limited purpose of drafting a protocol to extend to stateless persons certain provisions of an earlier convention for the protection of refugees. The United States participated in the conference of plenipotentiaries in 1951, which drafted the convention for the protection of refugees, in the hope of encouraging liberal provisions. Our experience there indicated that the problems faced by countries where large numbers of refugees are located differ substantially from ours. Much of this difference arises from their proximity to areas of persecution and also from the fact that these countries seldom accord the privilege of naturalization to any large number of aliens. Further difficulty arose because many of the proposals which seemed likely to be helpful to refugees and stateless persons in these countries dealt with matters of education, employment, and social benefits, which under our Constitution are wholly or in part within the jurisdiction of the States. There seemed little possibility, therefore, of our making a useful contribution to a conference designated to extend the provisions of the convention as adopted to an additional group.
>
> As Secretary Dulles has stated on several occasions, the policy of the United States is to participate in discussion of human rights proposals in the United Nations, including conventions desired by other nations. In accord with this principle, United States Delegates have participated regularly in the Commission on Human Rights and related meetings. In the current session of the General Assembly, our delegation has participated in discussion of the proposed Covenants on Human Rights, even though the United States has already announced that we do not expect to ratify the covenants when completed. In addition, the United States has proposed an action plan on human rights in the United Nations, and is actively seeking support of other countries to bring it into effect. I am enclosing a statement on the program presented by the United States Delegate, Mrs. Lord, in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in 1953. Enclosed also is a folder regarding the celebration of United Nations Human Rights Day, December 10, in which the United States has

cooperated regularly with other members of the United Nations to celebrate the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES POSITION ON THIS CONFERENCE WAS CAUSE OF SURPRISE

According to news accounts of the United Nations Conference on Stateless Persons which occurred in New York last September, Mr. Chairman, the position of the United States in declining to participate caused much surprise—and was attributed to the drive for the Bricker amendment. Interestingly enough, the Assistant Secretary's letter to me on the conference touched on the edges of this matter by referring to conference consideration of "matters of education, employment and social benefits which under our Constitution are wholly or in part within the jurisdiction of the States."

A very interesting editorial in the New York Times of September 14 commented on the absence at this conference of both the United States and the Soviet Union, and said:

This is the sort of conference in which one would expect the Russians not to participate, because Russian totalitarianism has been since 1917 one of the primary reasons why there are so many stateless people in the world. And it is the sort of conference in which one would equally well expect the United States to participate because of the deep humanitarian interest this country has always had in alleviating the problems of refugees and particularly of political refugees.

The people involved in the category "stateless," Mr. Chairman, are often in a most pitiful situation—citizens of nowhere, aliens in whatever land they happen to be, and often unable to acquire citizenship.

The stateless status may have been through accident of birth or marriage, through the conflicts of different nationality laws, or even through political changes of frontiers.

For instance, untold numbers became stateless after World War I in the breakup of the Austria-Hungarian empire, when new countries were born and tens of thousands of the inhabitants of the old empire lost their nationality without acquiring a new one.

Children born of stateless persons have inherited that man-without-a-country status. A woman may lose her nationality on marriage to a foreigner without acquiring the nationality of her husband under his country's laws, and so on. There are also cases of persons who have renounced the protection of the states of which they are nationals—I assume many escapees from behind the Iron Curtain fall into that category.

It is, I believe, too bad that our delegation to the United Nations did not sit in on these discussions, because these are questions involving basic rights and freedoms which we hold dear as a people.

The full text of the New York Times editorial on this subject is worth reading, Mr. Chairman, and I include it as follows:

THE STATELESS

A conference of 26 countries opened at the United Nations yesterday to consider the broadening of legal protection and of civil rights for the millions of stateless persons who, as a result of wars, territorial transfers, and political persecutions, have no citizenship or land they can call their own.

This is the sort of conference in which one would expect the Russians not to participate, because Russian totalitarianism has been since 1917 one of the primary reasons why there are so many stateless people in the world. And it is the sort of conference in which one would equally well expect the United States to participate, because of the deep humanitarian interest this country has always had in alleviating the problems of refugees, and particularly of political refugees. But the fact is that neither the Russians nor we are taking part.

The official and doubtless the principal reason that no United States representative will be present at the sessions is that the conference is of limited application so far as we are concerned and that stateless persons legally here already have all the rights of aliens in this country and no discrimination is practiced against them as such. However, the United States has been a welcome participant in the drafting of other United Nations conventions and pacts that we have said in advance we would not sign.

This is why we are conspicuous by our absence from the present conference; and it is also why there has been a tendency to look for further reasons for American nonparticipation. The account in this newspaper yesterday suggests that one such reason may be the pressure put on the administration during debate over the Bricker amendment, to steer clear from deeper involvements in U. N.-sponsored treaties, especially in the area of human rights and social welfare. There may be good reasons why the United States should not sign and ratify such conventions; but participating in their drafting is another matter. It will be most unfortunate if the impression gets abroad that we have become U. N. shy as a result of Brickerism.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks immediately preceding the last vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

International educational exchange activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to enable the Department of State to carry out international educational exchange activities, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431–1479), and the act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), the act of August 24, 1949 (20 U. S. C. 222–224), and the act of September 29, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 225), including salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $1,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; and actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; $12 million, of which not less than $8 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,400,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: On page 12, delete lines 14 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu the following:

"Under this appropriation $18,500,000 of which not less than $12 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, provided that not to exceed $3 million may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed would partially restore the amount of the budget estimate for the international educational exchange activities.

The entire budget estimate for these activities for fiscal 1956 amounted to $22 million. The Appropriations Committee reduced that amount to $12 million, at the same time placing a $2.4 million limitation on administrative expenses and recommending that not less than $8 million of the $12 million be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

I sincerely believe that this substantial reduction would strike at the heart of the program and severely cripple our international educational exchange activities. While the motives of the Appropriations Committee are understandable, in view of the fiscal situation of the Nation, it would appear to me that a severe curtailment of this particular program could prove very disadvantageous in the long run.

It has been pointed out in the committee report that a relatively small portion of the foreign students attending institutions of higher learning in the United States during the 1953–54 academic year participated in the State Department's international educational exchange program. While this is very true, it would appear shortsighted to even further curtail the number of foreign students participating in this program.

Further, because I believe that the number of exchange students mentioned in the committee report has not been adequately broken down, for example as to how many are participating under private sponsorship and how many are participating under public sponsorship. Then too, the number is not broken down by areas or countries. We do know that there are some foreign countries that are better able to send students for higher learning to the United States while there are certain areas in the world where we cannot expect either the people of those countries or the countries themselves to send students to the United States for higher learning.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, although I do it rather reluctantly because I, too, do not like to see additional foreign spending, and it is not very pleasant to sponsor an amendment to an appropriation bill to increase an amount for any purpose—but because the exchange program is vital and proven effective I offer the amendment which proposes to increase the appropriation for this purpose by $6,500,000, making the total $18,500,000 as compared with the Budget estimate of $22 million, and with the committee recommendation of $12 million. I have recommended the $18,500,000 figure because it roughly corresponds to the amount spent for the program during the current fiscal year.

In addition, the amendment that I have offered calls for a limitation on the administrative expenses, which has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee. I feel, however, that the $2.4 million recommended may be overly stringent, and I propose to increase that amount to $3 million. I believe the principle is sound and good.

Finally, my amendment would retain the third feature of the Appropriations Committee's recommendation to the effect that foreign currencies and credits be utilized to a larger extent in this program. That feature of the Appropriations Committee's recommendations I think represents sound and good policy. However, I have increased the amount to not less than $12 million for that purpose.

It is my sincere belief that the amendment which I have offered proposes a compromise between the original budget estimates and the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. This compromise, nevertheless, would enable the Department of State to continue the International Exchange Program to the extent to which it has been carried out during the current fiscal year. It would at least keep the program alive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have given a great deal of thought to this exchange program during the 7 years I have been on the committee which dealt with it. I have participated in appropriating various sums for this purpose. I have taken every opportunity to interview people who have been engaged in this program either as professor or as student. I am now of the opinion that the time has come when we must reappraise this entire program. At one time the situation was quite different in Europe from what it is today. I think it is a fair statement to say that the real good that we hope to accomplish from this program comes from the people whom we plan to bring into the United States rather than the people whom we send abroad.

Our difficulty largely stems from the fact that the American movie industry has portrayed this country in such an unfavorable light throughout the world. It was before travel was as easy as it is today—before people had the opportunity to visit abroad and find out for themselves—that we became known as a nation of soft people who spend most of their time in revelry and good times rather than in hard work and productive effort.

The people who come over here are convinced that that is not true once they come here and see our system, but we are the misunderstood nation of the world. No one will argue with me, I think, when I say that, despite all the great altruistic effort we have made in the field of foreign aid, we get very little credit for it in the countries where it has been largely applied. But when they come here and find out that the bighearted American people are really bighearted, that they have the altruistic motive in mind when they send these sums abroad, and that we are not trying to make money on the foreign people, that we are trying to help, I think they do change their mind.

I have talked to many Americans who have gone abroad and come back with a disillusioned idea about the country they went to.

So I think the time has come that we should reappraise this program. Let us keep it on a $12 million level until we can study it again and see where the emphasis should be placed. I personally think it should be placed on bringing people to this country and letting them see the unbelievable; open the eyes of the people who have been blinded by the wrong kind of movies and propaganda that has been used against us. I do not think we are going to accomplish anything by sending a professor to the University of Zurich, and that is in here. I do not think we are going to accomplish anything by sending people to Australia. They are among our most loyal friends in all the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman believe the amount you are recommending is adequate to bring people to this country?

Mr. PRESTON. If we applied it all to bringing people over here, we would double the amount we have in here, I am sure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Could the gentleman give us a breakdown percentagewise of the amount of money appropriated in the bill in the exchange program for people coming to this country and those being sent abroad? Does the gentleman have that?

Mr. PRESTON. I will refer that question to Mr. Howe. If he will produce the information, I will gladly give it to the gentleman later during the debate. But I am strongly of the opinion, having watched this thing in practically every country, I think, that we ought to bring more people here and send fewer professors and students abroad.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I have worked with these professors who have been sent abroad. I have worked in institutions where I plead with our American professors to try to understand the point of view of these foreign students. For the life of me, in our institutions I could never get our own professors to understand their point of view. These professors who have gone abroad I have placed in charge of the guidance functions for foreign students. They are the most invaluable people you could find. Does not the gentleman think it is worth a little money to do that?

Mr. PRESTON. It is worth something, of course. It is not all waste. But I think the real good comes from those we bring to this country. We have a country difficult to understand. We have the Utopia. There is no other place in the world like it. You cannot compare it to any other country in the world.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I ask whether anything in the wording of this bill guarantees that the reduction will be made completely on those who are going to be taken from this country to a foreign country? I find nothing there.

Mr. PRESTON. Not at all.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wanted to be sure there was something that stated it would be so used.

Mr. PRESTON. I prefaced my remarks by saying I think it is time to reappraise the program. Let us see what ought to be done, whether we ought to place emphasis on Americans going abroad or whether we should bring people here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would these funds be used to bring Russian farmers to this country to study our farming methods?

Mr. PRESTON. That could be, I suppose. I do not know. There we have gotten into the question of the Immigration Act.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder what funds would be used for bringing Russians here.

Mr. PRESTON. I would not want to prejudice these funds by saying that is true. I am afraid I would not be in a position to answer it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like, if I could, to get an answer to the question put by the gentleman from Wisconsin because I think it is important. I think it will show this money is being used approximately 5 to 1 to bring people to this country and not to send Americans abroad.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, if you looked at the sheet that I looked at in the hearings, you will find that we are sending plenty of them abroad to places, as I said Australia, the University of Zurich, England, and friendly countries with which we have the finest relationship.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman will agree it is necessary to have some degree of reciprocity. We do not want to have it entirely a one-way street, but I am interested in a specific answer if we can get it.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes; Mr. Howe I am sure, will do so in just a moment. There are plenty of Americans going abroad. They are flying and sailing. There is no

problem of getting Americans abroad. The world is overrun by American tourists today.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But I am talking about Government employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not take the 5 minutes, but I would like to clarify further the discussion which I had with the gentleman from Georgia. I would thoroughly agree that my own major interest in the program, sir, is in bringing foreign students to this country. But I am concerned because I find nothing in the bill or in the report which would guarantee that the reduction would not be across the board; or in other words, that there would not be a very substantial cut in the bringing of students to this country. May I therefore ask if you understand that the limitation would be put only on the students from this country whom we would otherwise be sending abroad, or will there be a four-fifths proportionate reduction in the number of those foreign students whom we otherwise would bring over?

Mr. PRESTON. If I may respond to the gentlewoman, we do not make that reduction. There is nothing here that would do what I would like to see done. The Department outlined a program and it provides for 1,727 Americans to go abroad and 5,443 foreigners to come into this country.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. I hope he will not think me unduly unkind, if I, therefore, point out to the House that I think his very well-turned argument against the amendment was perhaps a bit irrelevant. I wish to add this testimony. Quite recently, some of us had with us one of the most able Americans in the Far East, who told of having taken a boat from Djokjakarta, en route to Manila. Practically at every dock where that boat stopped there were young Indonesians taken aboard to go to Communist China for higher education. Why? Because in the Orient today, with the closing of the Christian-American universities in China itself, there is almost no place for higher education except Communist China. To me that presents a challenge. I was delighted during recent months to note that Singapore was to have a great university, to take care in particular of the needs of the millions of overseas Chinese; but I understand this week that probably by Communist influence, the building of that university has been stopped. I feel strongly that the danger of letting students from southeast Asia be forced to go to Communist China alone for higher education, is something this country might well face at this time when we are spending billions upon billions of dollars to send guns and jet planes and all the instruments of war abroad, in an effort to combat Communist aggression. I certainly hope that this amendment may be accepted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we cannot agree on a limitation of debate. We have discussed the subject of the educational program for quite a bit of the time today, and there has been no objection to the prolonged debate. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have been making progress toward world peace. We have been doing it by the old-fashioned method of getting people from around the world better acquainted with us. That program, which has brought students, teachers, technicians and leaders to our shores to see America, is known as the exchange-of-persons program.

A German teacher, after spending a year in America, said, "I do not believe that the world became smaller by technology, but it becomes smaller in making friends."

For many years, this effort to create friendship and respect by an exchange of persons has been an important instrument in our foreign policy. I should like to see it become stronger and more effective.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the actions of the Appropriations Subcommittee in slashing funds for the program will do this Nation any good. A budget request was made for $22 million—and that has been cut to $12 million, with $8 million coming from foreign currency. That means drastic cuts in our programs, with sharp slices in the administrative budget.

It is estimated that, if the House report is accepted, the entire exchange program will be cut about one-third.

This cut will effect the highly important leader and specialist program by reducing it 50 percent in most areas of the world and in Europe by more than 90 percent. That means we will not have foreign editors, political figures and opinion leaders visiting our shores and carrying home the message of America.

The program of exchanges with Latin American countries will be reduced by 40 percent. After our recent nasty experience with some Latin American nations, it would appear to me that it would be better to increase that program 40 percent, to increase the friendship, respect, and understanding for our country in that area of this hemisphere.

All of us are familiar with the teacher-exchange program. Probably every Member in this body has had a foreign-exchange teacher in his district. A check will reveal the great good that has come from that opportunity to expand international understanding. If we adopt the House report to cut this program to $12 million, we will cut the teacher-exchange program well over 50 percent.

In addition, we will practically eliminate programs in such important and sensitive areas of the world as Indonesia, Iceland, Iran, and Spain.

I say that we are making a mistake if we withdraw from this very important activity—especially at a time when the Soviet Union is placing more and more emphasis on a stepped up cultural offensive. It has been estimated that in 1953, the number of exchange visitors to the USSR was more than 10,000 people. In addition, Soviet artists, scientists, dancers, musicians, and athletes are touring the world, trying to create a picture of Soviet cultural superiority.

It is no secret that the men in the Kremlin are active in every section of the world where there may be oportunities for making ideological inroads. We are mistaken, I am sure, if we believe we can capture the hearts and minds of men with an overpowering military machine, without giving the citizens of other nations a chance to observe us and to know us better.

Surveys have shown that attitudes of foreign people change dramatically after face-to-face meetings with our people. We should heed the testimony available to us on the far-reaching favorable effects of the exchange of persons program.

Our exchange selections include teenagers, teachers, specialists, and administrators. It attempts to reach into every area of the world where United States prestige may be threatened, and it attempts to bring, as far as it is feasible, representatives from academic circles, workers in factories, farmers and miners, and certain people generally classified as "opinion leaders" in their own countries.

Over and beyond the Government program are the exchanges provided by private groups in cooperation with the Department of State. It is estimated that at least $7,800,000 was contributed from non-Government sources in support of the program last year. In turn, the Department of State assisted many groups, individuals, and foreign governments as well, in carrying out exchanges that will contribute significantly to the goals of the program. About 450 projects under auspices of persons outside Government, involving 3,400 exchanges, were promoted during last year. This cooperation, not alone for the number of exchanges encouraged, is worthy of note because it signifies opportunities for further expanding the program.

A program of this type is measured not alone on the basis of bigness nor on the basis of money spent. Its effectiveness is best calculated by sounding sentiment among those who are in contact with it.

In reply to a questionnaire, 193 out of 300 academic institutions polled, showed overwhelming support for the exchange program. Eighty-seven percent of the college administrators consider the Educational Exchange program to be worthwhile and effective.

Two special congressional committees recommended strengthening the whole program. The first, headed by Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, reported:

In comparative rating of the various media, it is generally conceded that the

exchange-of-persons program under the Fulbright program is among the most effective instruments for the creation of mutual understanding and good will.

The report goes on:

The strength of the exchange-of-persons program appears to stem from divers factors. The program enjoys a high prestige, both at home and abroad, and is therefore able to attract a voluntary participation of leading citizens. It is nonpolitical and nonpropagandistic in character so that it is acceptable in all parts of the non-Communist world. More than any other part of the program, exchanges are a two-way undertaking to stimulate foreign participation. Exchanges often are, and may become, prominent in government, business, and professions, and their potential impact on the attitude toward this country is considerable.

A special study mission of the House of Representatives, with Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, as chairman, visited southeast Asia and the Pacific, and reported in January 1954:

The exchange program has already demonstrated its value. The committee recommends that the program not only be continued but that it be expanded. The exchange-of-persons program represents one of the most successful efforts to infuse local leaders with American ideals and ideas. Its contraction would be a serious setback to American prestige and American influence.

I would like to repeat here the statement made by Gilbert White, president of Haverford College, of Haverford, Pa., when he testified before the Appropriations Committee. I think the reaction which he had to possible cuts in the appropriation are valid and should give us concern. Mr. White, who appeared on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, said:

1. Experience with such exchange shows that if it is properly carried out it is fundamentally sound in promoting understanding in both directions of movement. American students and faculty gain deeper insight into the problems of foreign countries and see themselves in a fresh light. The visitors come to understand American goals and methods. Warm bonds of friendship are created. Because the programs are highly selective, a large proportion of the people involved are ones who later assume leadership in their home communities.

2. Experience also shows that such exchange if not properly carried out may heighten international tensions and promote misunderstanding. If the selection is casual, if the financial arrangements are incomplete, if new arrivals are not adequately prepared for American ways, if the visitors are either neglected or displayed unduly, if they are placed in the wrong institutions, the effects will be unhappy. It is a great mistake to think that any kind of international exchange of persons is good. It can lead to personal disappointment, to hard feelings and resentment. It can strengthen distrust and feed envy. There is absolutely no doubt about this. This leads to my third and last point.

3. It would be better for the United States not to sponsor any kind of program than to do so in a grudging, halfhearted, and penurious way. For many visitors who come to this country the trip is the great event of their lives to that point. For all of them the decision to come is a momentous one, often years in the making. They can sense immediately whether the reception is warm and adequate. They need stay only a few weeks before discovering whether genuine thought and consideration is going into preparations for them. Mechanical treatment will not do. It is necessary and deep in the American tradition to treat people as individuals.

The answer would seem to be to assure that each person involved in an exchange program is treated as an individual. If we are to obtain the benefits so often claimed, we must show in practice a genuine loving consideration for each person who is treated as someone with distinctive needs to meet and with distinctive help to offer his associates. This requires competent administrative help all the way along the line from the time the first announcement is sent out until the person returns to his home country.

This is a simple lesson learned wherever education—under Friends' auspices or not—concerns itself with individual development.

From some familiarity with the present United States program, it would seem that it is approaching this kind of effort at many points and that it is on a reasonable scale of expenditure for the objects intended. It does not border on the luxurious. Friends have felt strongly that the program should be expanded in the interest of building international good will. If cuts must be made in the long run, they should be made gradually in such a fashion as to preserve the concern for individual people. It would be better to eliminate gestures in this direction entirely than to maintain ones that are empty of friendship and human concern.

Let me say that I support the sentiments of Mr. White. The President has spoken favorably of the program as a great force for world peace. Our Ambassadors endorse it. Newspaper correspondents abroad write in glowing words of praise for it. It does not seem timely for this body to cripple a program that is a positive force for world peace and understanding among nations. I urge, as strongly as I am able, that we continue the program to carry out our goals in international affairs. If we want others to see us as a peace-loving nation, we must first provide the opportunity for them to see us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because I feel that this drastic cut from $18,700,000 to $12 million will hamstring the whole program. I would even favor the President's recommendation of $22 million, but inasmuch as this amendment is before us for $18 million, I favor it.

First of all, it is my firm conviction that a good county agent in the fields of Iran or the Dominican Republic or any other foreign country is as much protection to this country and as great contribution to the peace of the world as a battleship in the harbor. I know what these county agents and these teachers in foreign countries are doing. I know how the people love them. They have walked into the hearts of the common people. They are counteracting the impressions that our movies and our cheap literature have made upon the people of the world. Those men and women are good men and women. They are humble men and women. They are not arrogant. They are beloved by those people.

In the second place, I believe we should continue to bring the foreign leaders here. They go away with warmth in their hearts for our hospitality. They go away to counteract all of the false propaganda of the Communists, because they can see what America is. They can see what liberty will do. They can see what it means to give a farmer some incentive, rather than the system of the Soviet Union.

I have toured with dozens of these groups as the representative of our institution. I know the good that it is doing. It is good to the leadership of those countries. Let us not strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to hear this afternoon that despite the $60 billion we have spent on foreign countries since the end of World War II, and despite the millions that have been spent upon the student exchange program we are the least understood country in the world. Something apparently is sadly amiss in the handing out of our money throughout the world and with this so-called educational program.

I am opposed to the amendment that has been offered to increase this item and I am opposed to this appropriation bill as it relates to the State Department and to the United Nations.

We have appropriated millions of dollars to the United Nations since its organization in 1945, yet today we find the organization so impotent that it cannot secure the release of the 11 American flyers held in Red China. More than 3 months, well above 3 months, have passed by since a mission was sent to China to obtain the release of the 11 American prisoners of war, yet they are still rotting in Chinese jails. An organization so impotent as that ought to have been given a reduction in the appropriation on the part of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROONEY yielded 2 minutes of his time to Mr. COUDERT).

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the debate on this subject. I have sometimes wondered if we have been losing sight of the essential question before us.

No one is trying to destroy this activity; the committee is not trying to hamper this activity; there is no question of drastic curtailment or cutting. The sympathy of this committee is wholly with this activity, and for years this subcommittee has appropriated or recommended appropriation of funds for it. So let us have the facts before us.

The facts are that in the current fiscal year $15 million was appropriated for this activity exclusive of transfers. For the next fiscal year for which we are now appropriating $22 million—an increase of $7 million—was requested. In reducing the amount to $12 million the committee was very mindful of the fact that this bill must ultimately clear another body which has an almost irresistible predilection for increasing the amounts carried in House bills. This item happens to be one of the favorites of our friends on the other side of the Capitol. It is perfectly certain that any amount that appears in the bill as it leaves this

House will be substantially increased on the other side.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, No. 1: That the $12 million carried in this bill if it stands will, in fact, represent $15 to $16 and perhaps even $18 million ultimately.

No. 2: In supporting the subcommittee action personally I have done so with the greatest sympathy for the program; I believe in it. Other members of the committee believe in it. There were some members of the subcommittee who thought it should be less, some who thought it should be more, but we agreed on the amount in the bill. It must be remembered that this is not the only educational exchange program carried on by the Government of the United States at the expense of the American taxpayers. The fact of the matter is that there are 12,000 annual grants in the 1955 budget costing $156 million, not $15 million; and of that only 6,000 grants are carried in this particular program. FOA has something like 5,000; the Army has some. You will see the whole picture on page 6.

Now, FOA is about to go out of business. The activities of FOA, are going to be transferred to other Government agencies. Undoubtedly the educational program will go to the State Department, another reason why we should not go too fast in extending and enlarging the program in the State Department.

The amendment now before us would substantially enlarge and increase the amount appropriated for this activity in the coming fiscal year. What the committee is proposing to do would in ultimate effect retain the activity at about present level.

In view of our budget condition, in view of all the circumstances that confront us, the sound, reasonable compromise of all factors involved is represented by the $12 million in the House bill. I hope, therefore, that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman form Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's position and in opposition to the amendment now pending. I may say that I have a great university in my district. I am also a member of the board of trustees of another great institution of learning. I am deeply concerned about this program and strongly in favor of its objective. However, I hear too often on these various programs the oratory pleading to accomplish these fine things with a failure to recognize the fact that it is not necessary to go to the Federal Government all the time in order to do these things. In fact, these programs, including the student exchange program, have existed a long time before the Federal Government ever decided to move in. The situation is such today that perhaps the Federal Government should have entered this field to a certain degree. The conditions are such that probably the Government should remain in there. The question to be decided now, is the extent to which the Federal Government should and need be in the program. I sponsored an amendment, which is now law, in connection with the tax revision act of 1954 increasing the amount of deduction for charitable donations to educational, medical, and religious institutions, by 10 percent, having in mind the object to channel some of this endeavor back to private enterprise, to get away from this government-to-government operation. I submit it is the government-to-government operation in these welfare programs that we have indulged in which is causing a great deal of our difficulty so far as our relations abroad are concerned.

If we would only think of the objective of these programs as being fine, and we all do, then get down to the detail of how we can best accomplish these objectives, we would keep our feet more firmly on the ground.

The subcommittee has done a very fine job of analyzing this picture and I think it should be supported. In my opinion, private individuals and agencies are moving more and more into this field of interchange of students. I hope this will continue because it is a worthwhile program, but the results are better accomplished on a people-to-people basis rather than a government-to-government basis. More private funds and less governmental funds should be our objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, in many respects I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who just preceded me. I share his desire that these very salutary exchanges between the people of our own country and the nationals of other countries may be financed more and more through private funds rather than through Government subsidies.

It is interesting to note on page 7 of the committee report that in the 1953–54 academic year, there were 33,833 foreign students attending institutions of higher learning in this country, of which only 2,656 were participants in ths international exchange program. In other words, approximately 93 percent were financed outside of the Government program.

This is not a new program to our Government. The goodwill the United States of America gained in all of Asia, perhaps in all the world, through the use of the Boxer Rebellion fund for the education of Chinese students in this country has paid dividends down through the years. Exchange teachers, teaching in Europe or some other country, reach hundreds of students abroad as well as faculty colleagues and help spread the free enterprise doctrine upon which our Government and economy are founded.

I think of the Fulbright program as one of the intelligent things we did with our surplus property abroad at the end of World War II. We provided that some of the credits should be used for this educational exchange program. We also provided that some of the proceeds of the sale of our surplus property abroad should be used to acquire real estate for our use. Outside of those two programs, the disposal of surplus property abroad after World War II was a story of squandering of great magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to close debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the unanimous action of the committee in regard to this item and in opposition to the pending amendment, I should like to assure those present who might think that Congress has been niggardly concerning exchange programs in the past that that is not the fact, because to date for exchange and technical-assistance programs there has been expended between the Department of State, the Department of the Army, and FOA a total of $848 million. We now find a request for 7,160 grants; 5,423 to bring foreign students to the United States and 1,727 to send United States students abroad. What is so sacrosanct about these figures? Why not, instead of 7,160, make it 5,429? Why not, instead of an exactly and delightfully rounded out $22 million, should we not make it twelve million and one? After all, when the committee finds a situation where they propose 1,300 foreign students to be taken from their native countries in Europe and at the American taxpayers' expense sent to schools in other foreign countries in Europe, and when it finds that they are bringing people here under this program who have been previously in the United States, 1, 2, 3, and 4 times, why, I think it is time to look very carefully into the situation. Our problem today is communism. Is it so highly important that we have an extensive program in Spain, where there is not the slightest threat of Communist influence? Now, if you talk about doing something in southeast Asia, I might go along with you, but the people running this program, who wanted $4.1 million to administer a $22 million program, proposed to send $9.7 million of the program to Europe and only $5.3 million to the Far East, Hong Kong, and Pacific Trust Territories. Now, these are indications of the way the whole business is being run. I think it is time we called a halt. I think it is time that Congress took another look-see in regard to spending the taxpayers' money for this expensive program. We are not crippling the program. Every member of the committee has been for this program for years and years, but we believe in taking at least some look-see at Uncle Sam's Treasury and the condition of it today, and that is what this committee meant when it allowed $12 million, a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be defeated.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin would restore a part of the money cut by the Appropriations Committee from this important educational exchange program. I support his merito-

rious proposal because I believe that good results come from the interchange of the good-will ambassadors financed by this program.

The gentleman from Georgia tells us that students and teachers who come to this country on the exchange program accomplish much good in giving to people from other nations a better understanding of America and our good intentions.

It is true that we are misunderstood by other peoples, but it is equally true that folks in foreign lands are misunderstood by the American people. American tourists, and particularly those with plenty of money to spend, often give the wrong impression of America. Furthermore, these tourists, who spend comparatively little time in any one place cannot hope to learn much about the people and the things which concern them. American travelers in Europe cannot be expected to accomplish what exchange students and teachers can who go abroad and live with and close to the people.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is just as important that the people of America should know and understand their fellow humans in other lands, as it is for others to know and understand us.

There is much that all mankind holds in common. The desire for peace and happiness, for security and freedom is not only held by those of us whom by fate are privileged to be citizens of the United States. In every normal human being there is the eternal hope for an end to war and for the opportunity to live in tranquility and peace.

No funds are wasted when spent in a sincere effort to build the kind of understanding which can bring closer to man his agelong desire for peace.

The appropriation is small indeed for an essential program such as this. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZABLOCKI) there were—ayes 38, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rama Road, Nicaragua

For an additional amount for necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 160), as supplemented by section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, approved May 6, 1954), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Communist Party, in all countries of its operation, has always sought to control trade unions, and to speak for labor, in order that through labor it might communize the world. Look at France and Italy and we see how the Communist Party destroys unity and patriotism through the trade unions which it dominates and controls. The Communist Party in the United States has been no exception. From the earliest days of the American trade-union movement, the United States Communist Party has attempted to infiltrate the labor movement, with a great measure of success.

This Communist infiltration, carried out by members of the United States Communist Party, has been supervised at all times by their Soviet masters, the architects of world communism. When their penetration was neither deep nor swift enough for the Kremlin, new faces replaced the old. In 1929 the governing body of world communism, the Communist International, ordered the United States Communist Party to "widen its agitational and organizational work in the big plants, in the main branches in industry."

However, even with the direction of the Communist International, the success of the Communist Party within the American trade-union movement was slow. After all, the American could not be molded into the conspirator as fast as his European counterpart. The American, even though a member of the Communist Party, felt that the Communist Party was the vehicle to a successful trade-union movement. His masters, however, wanted speed, for they saw the trade-union movement as the means to a successful Communist revolution.

To speed the Communist Party in its task of capturing the trade-union movement of the world, Nikolai Lenin, the father of this godless ideology, spoke:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade union, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.

The Communist Parties of the world heeded the advice and the Communist Party of the United States grew strong at the expense of the trade-union movement.

This Congress, through the investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities, has for nearly 20 years exposed the devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge on the part of Communists within the trade-union movement. We have seen how Lenin's instructions have turned basically honest, patriotic workers into traitors against the United States while acting as agents for the Soviet Union. We have seen Communists using their trade-union positions to engage in espionage on behalf of Russia. We have seen the unions, which the Communists control, use their membership to brand Franklin D. Roosevelt a warmonger when America's foreign policy was against the policies of Russia. We have seen these same unions condemn Truman for his aid to Greece when America saved that country from communism. We have seen these same unions condemn Eisenhower for America's foreign policy with respect to Germany and Asia.

Not only did the Congress see these devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge on the part of Communists within the trade-union movement, but so did the American people, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The American people demanded action, and this Congress enacted legislation to curb the Communist. The CIO expelled from its ranks the unions which the Communists dominated. The A. F. of L., which had prevented wholesale infiltration into its ranks, strengthened its organizations against those who had infiltrated it.

Since these unions were expelled from the CIO in 1950, much has happened to threaten the Communist position within the trade-union movement. The Communist was finding it extremely difficult to continue to follow Lenin's direction to "penetrate the trade union, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs." Since 1950, thousands of workers have repudiated the Communist-dominated unions and their Communist leaders, and returned to patriotic unions affiliated with the CIO and A. F. of L. As these workers and their local unions joined the CIO or A. F. of L., their Communist leaders were eradicated from leadership in the labor movement.

The gradual loss of membership suffered by the Communist-dominated unions, plus the enactment of the Communist Control Act of 1954, faced the Communist labor leaders with the realization that they were slowly reaching the point where they could no longer carry out their Communist work through the trade-union movement. To correct this condition, the labor commission of the Communist Party of the United States established, as the No. 1 objective of all Communists, ways and means to combat this destruction of their dreams of revolution and conquest.

The Communists knew that by their devices and maneuvers they could keep the bulk of their membership in line. They had with success, since 1950, defeated the CIO and A. F. of L. in many of their attempts to capture Communist-dominated locals. Of course, they had to sell the workers that the CIO and A. F. of L. were selling out the worker to Wall Street. Yes, they had to sell the workers on the idea that they could win more advantages for the worker; while, at the same time, hide the deals which they had made with management. But the Communists reasoned that, inasmuch as they had sold this to the workers in the past, there was no reason why they could not in the future.

To disgress for one moment while on this point, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the argument we have heard over the past several years, about some companies working in behalf of the Communist-dominated unions, is not false. The committee has under subpena the vice president of one such company. This company officer, according to documents, advised his supervisory personnel not to encourage employees to vote against the Communist-dominated United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union. Why? Because they had made certain arrangements with the UE which guaranteed 130 percent production and other gains which would financially help the company.

Returning to my original point, the Communist Party was faced with the problem of overcoming the Communist Control Act of 1954 and the forthcoming merger of the A. F. of L. and CIO. As the Communists saw things, the Communist Control Act of 1954, which act, incidently, was first recommended to the Congress by the Committee on Un-American Activities under the chairmanship of John Wood, of Georgia, would place each of the unions kicked out of the CIO on trial before the Subversive Activities Control Board on the charge that each was a Communist-dominated organization. The Communists knew that the majority of the members of these unions were patriotic Americans, even though gullible, and therefore they would not continue their affiliation in Communist-dominated unions if the Board found them guilty. The Communist Party also knew that, after the merger of the A. F. of L. and CIO, the members of the Communist-dominated unions would demand affiliation with the merged union.

The Communist Party therefore arrived at a decision; a decision which since the early part of 1954 has been the Communist Party line; a decision which is the No. 1 directive of all Communists, whether they be in or outside the trade-union movement. This directive protects the Communist against prosecution under the Communist Control Act of 1954. It defeats the purpose of the act and defeats one of the dreams of the A. F. of L.–CIO merger. The directive is very simple; merge with a union now affiliated with the A. F. of L. or CIO. The Communist dreams are in reality facts. A successful merger would protect the Communist member in his position of leadership of a union, and, at the same time, gain for the Communist-dominated union an exemption from the Communist Control Act of 1954. A successful merger would force upon the A. F. of L. or CIO the decision of either accepting the Communist leaders or expelling the A. F. of L. or CIO union. A merger with a CIO union would repudiate the action of the CIO in 1950 in expelling the union. A merger with an A. F. of L. union places the A. F. of L. in the position of repudiating its insistence that the CIO expel its Communist unions.

With the Communist directive to merge before them, the Communist leaders started their work. Harry Bridges started his campaign. Bridges was even offering to eliminate himself from leadership of his longshoremen if someone would give the other Communists a home. Fitzgerald and Emspak, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, were willing to cut themselves out of any merger. Ben Gold was peddling his fur and leather workers. This is not exactly the fact. More properly, Gold was calling the shots. Abe Feinglass was peddling the deal; a deal which cut out Ben Gold. Of course, this had to be the case, for, after all, Gold had been convicted of perjury, so, therefore, no union would take him as an officer. The Fur and Leather Workers could have waited for the Gold case to go before the Supreme Court on appeal—but that would take time—and, of course, time they did not have.

Fortunately, for the security of the United States and the welfare of the trade-union movement, most of the merger talk fell on deaf ears. Unfortunately, as of today, there has been an exception. The Fur and Leather Workers Union found a home within the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, A. F. of L. On December 28 of last year, these two unions entered into a marriage. Like the bride's mother, the Communists did not lose their union but, rather as the agreement shows, they gained additional workers employed in the leather trades, which workers were formerly under the Meat Cutters and Butchers.

In January, the Fur and Leather Workers held a convention to ratify the agreement. We see, through the agreement and the convention proceedings, the Lenin directive of over 20 years ago being followed to the hilt. How the Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen permitted this deceit, evasion, and subterfuge to be worked on them, only they know. The Meat Cutters and Butchers have in the past always fought for the security of the United States and against international communism. Maybe they feel they can eliminate the Communists after they have them within their ranks. Only by expulsion could the CIO rid itself of them, and the expulsion followed years of internal strife. Why the Meat Cutters and Butchers subject themselves to the same strife when, after action by the Subversive Activities Control Board, or the A. F. of L.-CIO merger, they could have the workers without their Communist leaders, here again only they can answer.

The merger agreement and the Fur and Leather convention proceedings prove without doubt that the Communist leaders of the Fur and Leather Workers did not enter the agreement with clean hands. These documents prove that the Fur and Leather leaders have not changed. Instead of admitting the acts of former years on behalf of international communism, they insist they never happened. The convention proceedings deal with their disaffiliation by the CIO in 1950. The CIO, in expelling them, found, on the basis of the evidence, "that the policies and activities of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution."

The Fur and Leather convention proceedings claim they left the CIO for its strikebreaking activities in Gloversville, N. Y. This reminds me of the charges leveled against the committee last month when we subpenaed a few Communist leaders of the UE.

Before the CIO expelled the Fur and Leather Workers, a hearing on the charges was conducted. Ben Gold, president of the Fur and Leather Workers, refused to attend. Instead, he condemned the hearing as a "kangaroo hearing." After hearing and reviewing the evidence, the delegates, by an overwhelming vote, found the International Fur and Leather Workers Union to be subservient to the Communist Party. In spite of this, their convention proceedings state that they proved to the Meat Cutters and Butchers that the charge of Communist domination was slander, and that they were not dominated by any political party.

Let us examine some of the acts of the Fur and Leather Workers Union on which the charges of Communist domination are based.

In 1938, they denounced America's neutral position in Europe, and condemned England and France for appeasing Hitler.

Following the Nazi-Soviet pact of August 22, 1939, they supported Hitlerism and denounced President Roosevelt as a warmonger.

During this same period, they denounced lend-lease as totalitarian and un-American, while calling the Governments of France and England monopolist-dominated governments, and accused these countries of fostering an imperialist war.

On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia. On July 7, 1941, Fur and Leather called for unlimited and immediate aid to Great Britain and the Soviet Union in the fight against Nazi fascism.

Now that the Soviet Union was at war, the Fur and Leather Workers pulled all the stops. They demanded that the United States enter the war. John L. Lewis was denounced as a traitor for his isolationist views. Roosevelt became our greatest President. America's military strategy was not swift enough; they demanded a second front in Europe, quoting authorities such as Molotov, Ben Gold, and Irving Potash.

In December 1943 came Teheran. From then until the war's end, the Fur and Leather Workers found no fault with either the foreign or domestic policies of the United States. But, in October 1945, they demanded that the United States "stop assisting reactionary forces in China and other Pacific countries in their attacks against the rising democratic forces."

Following the war, the Fur and Leather Workers Union followed the Communist line on these issues:

(a) It ridiculed charges of Russian espionage in Canada.

(b) It denounced the Bikini bomb tests as designed to intimidate the Soviet Union.

(c) It accused the United States of fomenting the civil war in China, and denounced the use of American arms against Chinese Communists and other democratic groups.

(d) It opposed the Truman Doctrine from its inception.

(e) It denounced the Marshall plan and described it as "used by big business against both the European workers and the American workers."

(f) It condemned the Atlantic Pact as Wall Street's plan for a third world war.

(g) It supported the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions and opposed the CIO and A. F. of L.-sponsored international Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

(h) It condemned the intervention and participation by the United States

in Korea; and, following the Soviet policy, demanded a cease-fire and withdrawal of American troops.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the publications, public statements, and utterances of Fur and Leather Workers Union, I have been unable to find one statement of disapproval of the foreign or domestic policy of either the Soviet Union or any of its satellite countries. Even in the merger agreement, it does not condemn the Soviet Union, while it pledges unalterable opposition to all who seek to destroy the Government of the United States. However, when it pledges to accomplish its historic objective, namely, a democratic form of government, the Fur and Leather Workers Union could be saying to its Communist masters: "Don't misunderstand. Haven't we in the past called the Governments of Russia, Communist China, and North Korea, as well as the Soviet satellites, 'democracies'? We have not turned on you. We are merely following Lenin's directive to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge."

The merger agreement also provides that officers, managers, organizers, business agents, representatives, their assistants, and other administrative and staff personnel of the Fur and Leather Workers Union shall be required, as a material condition of holding office or serving in any such capacities or receiving compensation therefor, to execute annually valid individual non-Communist affidavits. This provision must have given the Communist Party its greatest pleasure. Why, the Communist Party has had its members signing such affidavits for years—not mere pieces of paper, worth no more than the paper itself, but, rather, affidavits which subject the individual to perjury conviction if proved false. Through technicalities attached to Communist Party membership and the affidavit requirements, only a few Communist trade unionists have had their illegal acts uncovered. One of these was Ben Gold, the former president of the Fur and Leather Workers. His successor is Abe Feinglass, who heads the Fur and Leather Department under the merger. He becomes a member of the Meat Cutters' and Butchers' executive board. Feinglass is required to sign and, I understand, has signed a non-Communist affidavit. Yet this same Abe Feinglass, 1 year ago this month, refused under oath to deny his affiliation with the Communist Party. He appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities in April 1954 and, when he was asked if he had been a member of the Communist Party, he refused to answer, invoking his privilege under the fifth amendment. While he admitted to having been a candidate for public office in 1935, running on the Communist Party ticket, he would not state whether, either in 1935 or 1954 or at any time in between, he was or was not a Communist. Yet he files with the Meat Cutters' and Butchers' Union a non-Communist affidavit.

Feinglass is not the only Communist officer who will submit this worthless non-Communist affidavit, and who has previously invoked the fifth amendment when questioned under oath about his Communist affiliation. A score of their officers have invoked their privilege before committees of the House and Senate, on having been identified before committees and other governmental bodies as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know at this point if legislation is needed to protect the American people and the American worker from this latest attack on one of America's free institutions by the Communist Party of the United States. As chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities I intend to find out. On the basis of the evidence in the possession of the committee, I have ordered a full and complete investigation. If necessary, I shall ask the committee to summon before it every leader filing a non-Communist affidavit with the Meat Cutters and Butchers Union, where we have evidence of their one-time affiliation with the Communist Party. We hope, through them, to learn of their activities and the activities of the Fur and Leather Workers in support of communism, past and present, and their plans for the future.

In calling for this investigation, I am confident that I can count on the full support of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's Union, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and all Americans possessing evidence on this subject.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to draw the attention of the committee to the item of appropriation of $2 million for the Rama Road in Nicaragua. This is an old boondoggle that has been with us for years and years and years.

May I refer to the statement made by the witness before the committee as it appears on page 418 in the prepared statement in the committee's hearings. I quote as follows:

> The Rama Road represents a commitment of this Government which has been partially fulfilled. The agreement by the United States to construct the Rama Road stems from conversations held in 1939 between President Somoza of Nicaragua and President Roosevelt.

And then on page 419 the witness in behalf of this appropriation characterized it this way:

> It is an old political commitment made back in 1942.

I wanted to call attention of the House to the way these things get started.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, this is the brainchild of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Of course, that is the fact. But does the gentleman know that in connection with this same matter of highway construction, President Eisenhower has just sent up here to Capitol Hill a supplemental request for $69 million—that is, for the Inter-American Highway. Maybe there is something to this.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is always aware of these high personalities in the administration, but I am calling attention to this as an original commitment that the Congress never approved, but which was paid out of the President's defense emergency fund in order to mollify President Somoza of Nicaragua who was disappointed that we were not going to build a sea level canal across Nicaragua.

Originally, this thing started out to be a $2 million highway; 160 miles of it to be built according to Nicaraguan standards. Along came the Public Roads Administration, which thought such a highway was not anything that they would want to be connected with. So they increased the specifications and estimated that the road was going to cost $4 million. By the time the committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel, investigated this matter in the summer of 1946, Mr. James, of the Public Roads Administration, said that the $4 million estimate was too low and he thought it was going to cost $6½ million. Now it costs $8 million. And the testimony before the committee is that it will not provide a surface for this highway. As soon as they spend the $8 million, they will be back in here asking to put a bituminous top on this highway that has nothing whatever to do with the Inter-American Highway but runs crossways of Nicaragua to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Escondido River which has a port on the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to correct something I said a while ago. The amount contained in House Document 126 submitted by President Dwight D. Eisenhower under date of April 12, 1955 for the Bureau of Public Roads, Inter-American Highway, was $69,230,000.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is talking about a completely different road. This Rama Road was not advanced as a part of the Inter-American Highway. It is not a part of the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. ROONEY. The situation is comparable, there is no question about it. The gentleman and the distinguished former member of the other body from the gentleman's State have been misled with regard to this. We have had arguments concerning the Rama Road in every conference on this particular bill, because the gentleman to whom I refer was always a conferee on it.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman to whom the gentleman refers happened to have been on the spot and gotten the facts, on the basis of which the report was made from which I have been quoting to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I regret to advise the gentleman that the other gentleman was never proved right, for no one else in the conference agreed with him.

Mr. MEADER. That does not prove anything.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think I should point out that the gentleman said this is going to be an all-weather road. He is correct. It is an all-weather road that is fully capable of utilization without black-topping. It is a road that the Nicaraguan Government is participating in. They are putting up a considerable part of the money. They are very interested in it, or they could ask that the road be dropped. It is opening a comparatively undeveloped part of their country, and linking the two oceans which border that country.

Mr. MEADER. There are plenty of roads around the world that we could build that would be very useful, but I think when we start on that kind of a proposition we do not know where to stop.

May I ask the gentleman, When they come back and ask for the black-topping of the road, are you on the Appropriations Committee going to grant such a request?

Mr. SIKES. It is not going to be necessary to black-top this road for it to be usable in all types of weather for all types of traffic. It would be desirable to have it black-topped at some time in the future, but that is not essential to achieve the purpose for which it was set up and which those people want and need very much. We are performing a good-neighbor service in enabling them to do this.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, under leave obtained in the House, I am inserting at this point in my remarks comments on this subject made in a 1947 Report of the Senate War Investigating Committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel.

Excerpts from Senate Report No. 440, 80th Congress, 1st session, relating to the Rama Road:

The other important United States road construction during the war in Central America was the Rama Road. This road extends from San Benito on the Inter-American Highway, a short distance north of Managua, Nicaragua, to Rama, a river port on the Escondido River, a distance of 160 miles. The purpose of this highway is to provide an overland route from Rama to the central and western part of Nicaragua, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific coastal sections of Nicaragua.

In 1914, the United States obtained an option to construct a canal across Nicaragua. In 1939, the Army engineers completed a survey and located a proposed canal. The estimated cost of such a canal, however, was very high and construction was not recommended. President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, obtained from President Roosevelt an agreement to build the Rama Road instead of a canal. The original estimated cost of this highway, to be built to Nicaraguan highway standards, was $2 million. However, the Public Roads Administration recommended that higher construction standards be used in order to provide a road less susceptible to erosion, estimated the cost of such a road at $4 million. Construction standards similar to those of the Inter-American Highway, with the exception of width, were adopted. The Rama Road was to be surfaced to a 5-meter width rather than 6 meters.

Rama is a river port. Up to this point, the Escondido River Channel is at least 30 feet deep, a sufficient draft for large ocean-going vessels. However, a bar at the mouth of the river, where the depth is only 12 feet, now blocks its navigation by oceangoing vessels.

Mr. E. W. James of the Public Roads Administration testified that about $3 million had been spent on this highway, and that the $4 million estimate to complete the work was no longer accurate, as it was now thought that total construction would cost approximately $6,500,000.

The funds for the Rama Road were taken from the secret or emergency fund of the President, thereby avoiding the need for approval by, or accounting to, the Congress. Although Congress has never had an opportunity to debate the merits of the Rama Road, nor even knew about it until this committee's investigation, State Department representatives take the position that the United States is committed to complete this road regardless of how high its cost may mount.

The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense as to justify them as proper defense expenditures in World War II. Furthermore, with respect to the Rama Road, the use of funds from the secret or emergency fund of the President, an appropriation available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense, appears questionable.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $3,100,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the Justice Department appropriation bill earlier in the day reference was made by the gentleman from New York to the failure of the Justice Department to prosecute Judith Coplon and William Z. Foster.

The situation with regard to Judith Coplon was made quite clear during the debate last year on the so-called wiretapping bill, which was designed to permit the use in court of evidence obtained by tapping wires. The bill that was urged upon the Congress by the Attorney General and brought before the House would have permitted the use in court of any evidence obtained by intercepting communications, provided that had been done upon express written authority of the Attorney General, as was the case with the evidence obtained relating to Judith Coplon. The bill was amended here on the floor. The bill which went from this side to the other body provided for the use in court of wiretap evidence obtained up to date upon the written authority of the Attorney General, but hereafter required a court order in order to use that evidence in court. It met with a dire fate in the other body and was buried in the Committee on the Judiciary there I believe by an even vote of 7 to 7 or some such vote as that. If that legislation had been enacted, which was urged by the Attorney General upon the Congress, it would have resulted in the Attorney General being in a position to successfully prosecute this defendant for whom none of us hold any brief. It is significant that she was not prosecuted under the preceding administration and probably—and I am not critical of them—for the same reasons. But, it does not lie with those, particularly any who may have opposed this wiretap legislation to make it possible to successfully maintain such a prosecution, to be critical now of the present Attorney General for his failure to proceed with that prosecution.

The same thing applies to William Z. Foster who is a well-known Communist figure in this country and who has been indicted and is now awaiting trial. The Attorney General has moved on several occasions to bring him to trial and each time the defendant's attorney has come in with medical affidavits as a result of which the court has decreed he shall not now be brought to trial.

I think in order to set this record straight with regard to the administration of the office of the Department of Justice, which has been so diligent in bringing to book these enemies of our country, it is important to have in the RECORD at this point some explanation of the reason why these two cases have not been brought to trial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly a matter of great concern to the people of the Western Hemisphere.

It is significant that on Pan-American Day the Congress is giving consideration to the President's request that sufficient funds to complete the Inter-American Highway in the next 3 years be provided. His request merits prompt and favorable action.

I know much of Central America first hand and have in recent years traveled over portions of the highway. I have seen the positive economic benefits that already resulted in those areas in which the highway now exists, and it takes little imagination to realize the future economic progress and social betterment which will come with the completion of an all-weather Inter-American Highway from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal.

Economically, the highway will serve first of all as a stimulus for trade both between the nations of Central America and between the United States and each of those nations. We have great economic ties with the countries of Central America which have long been prime markets for our exports and important suppliers of our imports. This trade can be expected to increase with the completion of the highway. Annual exports from the United States to this area have already increased many times since the highway was first started. A fully completed highway would give even greater impetus to our trade relations.

Second, economic effect of the highway would be in the economic development field. Our policy has been to urge the countries of Central America to attain the greatest degree of economic development. We do this not only for purely altruistic reasons. We do it also because it is as much in our interest as it is in their interest to develop economically. One of the main factors which has thus far limited and retarded economic development, however, has been the lack of adeqaute surface trans-

portation. There can be no doubt that completing an all-weather highway in Central America will foster economic growth in the area, and increase the opportunities for free trade and new markets.

Still a third economic benefit which will accrue from completion of the highway is an increase in tourism. As many of the Members of this House know from their own visits to the area, Central America is a wonderland for tourism, which is still virtually unknown because of inadequate surface transportation facilities. I have a daughter who lived in San Jose, Costa Rica, for several years, and I have visited that charming city. Costa Rica is a land of eternal spring and startling beauty. It is close by. Its people and government are friendly. Yet, because it can only be reached now by boat or plane from the United States, this wonderful country is known to only a handful of our citizens. A tourist trade in Central America would contribute a great deal to the economic betterment. It would also mean, and I think this is equally important, that the peoples of the area would get to know our people better and be less inclined to listen to the falsehoods of Communist agitators. At the same time we would get to know better the people of the area who could more easily travel to the United States. The importance of the strong cultural and spiritual ties which would result from this interchange cannot be exaggerated.

I have spoken at length of the mutual economic benefits which are to be anticipated from the completion of the highway. They are not the only factors which we should consider when we approve the President's request for its speedy completion.

Political considerations are present too. Only a short time ago we saw how international communism, by capitalizing on misinformation and the physical isolation of the people of Guatemala, succeeded in dominating the political institutions of that Republic and establishing a beachhead for international tyranny. Fortunately the people of Guatemala, through courage and determination, were able to throw out the false leaders who had delivered their country to communism and reassert the independence of this Republic.

But the fact that communism has been repulsed does not mean that new attempts will not be made. We know that international communism nourishes itself by conquering free peoples. And we must make every effort to see that it never again becomes rooted in this hemisphere. The completion of the highway would serve as a deterrent to Communist infiltration because it would contribute positively to the political stability of the area. Such political stability would also greatly increase the growing influence which these Central American countries and the other republics of this hemisphere are constantly bringing to bear in world affairs.

Still another factor which cannot be overlooked, when we discuss the completion of the Inter-American Highway, are the strategic benefits which we may anticipate. A great number of the strategic materials which our country needs if it is to fulfill its role as defender of the free world, come from areas which will be served by this highway. Many of these countries have concluded special military agreements with the United States for defense of the hemisphere. As a result defense sites have been developed. These sites, of considerable strategic consequence to our country, will be linked by the highway.

Our country has, for many years, made large expenditures for this highway. The countries of Central America through which the highway passes have also made considerable sums available. But if we and our neighbors are to enjoy the maximum returns for our contribution—in terms of economic progress and political stability—it is essential that the President's proposal for completion of the highway within 3 years be acted on favorably. The sums involved, unlike those of many requests which reach this House, are small. The returns to be expected by us and our friends in Central America are predictable. The time for action is now.

(The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $1,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; purchase of space in publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 United States Code 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; purchase of caps for personnel employed abroad; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script-writing translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; $80,500,000, of which not less than $8 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $35,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That funds may be exchanged for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of information establishments abroad without regard to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed $1,400: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the ceiling of $3 million which the committee report recommends for the Motion Picture Service is dangerously low. The

Motion Picture Service is operating at a level of about $3,087,000 for the current fiscal year, and had requested $4,484,000 for fiscal year 1956. Most of the increase requested for the Motion Picture Service was for the support of this program in the danger areas of the Near East and Far East.

I believe that there is general agreement that in these two critical areas of the world, where there is a high degree of illiteracy, the motion picture is the most effective medium that can possibly be used to support the foreign policy objectives of our country. It seems to me that there is a high degree of risk in limiting arbitrarily this important service in these danger spots where the United States is doing all in its power in other respects to hold back the red tide of communism and to support the governments and peoples who stand with us in Asia and the Near East.

The committee was shown a single powerful Soviet film which was made at an estimated expense of $750,000 to $1 million, and we know that the total amount the Soviets are spending for propaganda motion pictures, attacking the United States and our allies, is very large. In the face of the large-scale effort by the enemy, it seems highly questionable for us to curtail our own efforts in this field.

I therefore strongly object to the recommended limitation of $3 million for the USIA Motion Picture Service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: On page 35, line 14, strike out *"Provided"* and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That not to exceed $350,000 shall be used for the establishment of a nonprofit book corporation to provide facilities for the translation and publication of books and other printed matter in the various foreign languages: *Provided further."*

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that this amendment would be accepted by the Committee.

All that this amendment seeks to do is to make available to the peoples of the world the classics of American democracy that were the inspiration of our forefathers and have been an inspiration in our own lives.

I think we have a great deal that is unnecessary in the way of frills in our present program. This is no frill. This simply provides that there shall be printed from selected books or classics, the Federalist and books on which we can all agree, in cheap editions, paper bound, and placed on sale in native languages in all lands of the world. It is the only practical way to win the hearts and minds of people. Our own hearts and our own minds were won for American democracy by reading these classics. These are not books of controversy. Books that are being written today may be, some of them, but these are not. These are the gospels of what we believe as a free people.

I hope that the Committee will accept this amendment and that the point of order will not be raised. It may be if the Committee accepts it and it goes to conference, then the conference may decide to put it in a little different way, but I am just hoping the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It occurred to me to ask the gentleman whether there had been at any time an appropriation such as the gentleman has suggested. I am very much moved by his argument in behalf of the amendment. I am simply inquiring whether there has been a precedent for this type of work.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not know of any similar program. I was surprised to learn that our classics of American democracy were still so unavailable to the people of the world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order. There is no authority in law for the appropriation, and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] offers an amendment which the Clerk has reported, against which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order on the ground that it is not authorized by law. Can the gentleman from Illinois, the author of the amendment, cite to the Chair any authority in law for this appropriation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am embarrassed by replying that I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's reply.

Obviously, the amendment is not in order. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and that I may include in the remarks I made on the bill, extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of ascertaining the program for next week, which I understand is now ready.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday, the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar; House Resolution 174, to amend the rules, to increase pay of witnesses; and H. R. 2225, concerning certificates of public convenience under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, H. R. 4393, construction of naval vessels; H. R. 4644, the postal pay raise bill; House Joint Resolution 256, the Mutual Health Study Act of 1955.

I know of no conference reports at this time, but any conference reports may be brought up at any time, and I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR DR. JONAS SALK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 277 authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to have struck and presented to Dr. Jonas Salk a gold medal, in honor of his contribution to mankind, through the successful development of his polio vaccine.

Through this resolution, I believe I am voicing the gratitude of all America. This medal of honor would be a fitting expression of the thankfulness of the people of this Nation to this great doctor and humanitarian for his brilliant achievement.

Dr. Salk's antipolio vaccine was revealed on April 12 as an effective weapon against that terrible disease. In 1954, the vaccine was administered to children in 44 States and in the intervening months the results of the test have been evaluated.

When I first heard the news of the proved effectiveness of the vaccine, I recalled the grief-stricken faces of the mothers of those children afflicted with the poliomyelitis, the strained movements of their tortured little bodies, and the accompanying pain. With this great discovery of Dr. Salk's, I could foresee such suffering reduced to a very minimum. Now, there is optimism and hope for the millions of parents of small children. It seemed to me that such a man deserved official recognition from the Congress of the United States. For these reasons I have introduced my bill. I believe that my feelings are shared by all my colleagues and that this legislation will be speedily approved.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for appropriate reference, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a gold medal for presentation to Dr. Jonas E. Salk. I need not repeat here the details of the monumental discovery which Dr. Salk has made. We have all read with unbounded rejoicing and thanks of the marvelous effects of Dr. Salk's vaccination for poliomyelitis.

The contribution which Dr. Salk has made to the well-being of mankind is infinite. In this hydrogen age, his discovery of principal benefit to our little children is all the more welcome and appropriate, coming as it does from the long and arduous work made possible by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. It clearly emblazons for all the world to see, that we in the United States, with our freedom and enterprise, are seeking the ways and means to preserve and save lives.

It is most fitting that the thrilling announcement of Dr. Salk's success was made on April 12. On that day 10 years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt died. It was President Roosevelt who showed us the way and led us through the dark night of war. It was his foresight, courage, and determination which has also led us to this dawn of a new era in medical history.

There is little that we can do to express our thankfulness and joy at Dr. Salk's discovery. He has given it to mankind. I am sure that you will all join with me and that we can unanimously approve this bill for Dr. Salk. The recognition of achievements such as his is most fitting. We can do no less than award to him this medal on behalf of his countrymen in grateful appreciation.

AMENDMENT TO WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, I am pleased that hearings on bills to amend the wage-hour law will begin today by the Senate Labor Committee. A substantial increase in the minimum wage is now long overdue. The last increase, effective in January, 1950, was enacted in 1949 when the country was suffering an economic recession. Congress almost doubled the minimum at that time, raising it by 35 cents, from 40 cents to 75 cents.

Thirty dollars a week is not a living wage in any part of the United States. The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that the average four-person family in the area with the lowest cost of living in the country needs more than twice that amount in order to maintain a modest standard of living. But $30 a week, 75 cents an hour, is the minimum wage now set by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and thus that is the incredible sum which, for example, thousands of cotton textile mill workers in the southeast region of the United States are paid. What sort of homes, food, clothing, and medical care, can these workers obtain for themselves and their families?

Protection of minimum labor standards is essential at all times in order to assure at least a minimum level of living to low wage workers and their families. It is of strategic importance at the present time that the Nation's statutory minimum wage be raised to a realistic level fully reflecting the increase in the general level of wages. This would give a powerful boost to the purchasing power of low income workers and help restore prosperity and full employment throughout the economy.

The Nation's ability to produce wealth and distribute it has increased many times since wage and hour legislation was proposed in 1937. This has been due to rising productivity in which labor was a major influence.

The fact that the buying power of wages and salaries generally has failed to rise as rapidly as the economy's increasing man-hour output, is ample justification for the proposed minimum wage of $1.25. If average wages have lagged behind the continuous growth of the economy as a whole, then the many factory workers, and especially those unorganized white collar and service workers, have seen their spending ability cut in half by the lag in incomes. These workers represent a majority of the American people.

The primary case for the $1.25 minimum wage is the fact that much of the business community has failed to share the benefits of industrial progress with wage and salary earners. From 1946 through 1952, man-hour output rose 16.3 percent in the private and nongovernment part of the economy. But the buying power of the straight-time average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers increased only 12.8 percent. This fact was due partly to the low-paid workers in unorganized plants which in some cases received the bare minimum wage of 75 cents per hour.

The buying power of wages and salaries must not merely catch up with the past productivity increases; it must forge ahead, if the growth of the economy is not to be distorted by imbalanced incomes and inadequate consumer buying power.

Industry can take in stride a substantial increase in the minimum wage if it has to. Persuasive evidence to this effect is provided by a new study of what happened when the minimum wage was last increased in 1950. The study by the United States Department of Labor finds that there were practically no plant shutdowns or worker layoffs as a result.

Both economic justice and economic wisdom require an immediate increase in the Federal minimum to at least $1.25 an hour. This would do no more than bring the objectives of our minimum wage legislation up to date. American industry will have no more difficulty adjusting to this change than it had to the 40 cents minimum in 1938 and the 75 cents minimum in 1949.

The policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to correct and, as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers. A higher minimum wage is certainly necessary if the stated purpose of this law is to be carried out. A wider coverage of workers is also necessary, not only for the personal good of the worker, but for the good of the economy and the country as a whole.

Certainly the workers of America—the most prosperous country in the

world—are entitled to a reasonable share of the products of their labor.

The growth of America has not been due to the efforts of any one factor in the country, be it business, government or labor. Rather, this growth has been due to concerted efforts on the part of good government, good business, and good labor. Since all have shared in the building of this great country then it is certainly fair that all should share in the fruits of these concerted efforts.

Ahead lies the task of strengthening minimum wage administration, a task in which the fair-minded people of this country must provide leadership. It is imperative that effective action be taken to maintain the full force of protection of minimum labor standards and to obtain changes necessary to give these programs genuine effectiveness. We should amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for a realistic upward revision of the minimum rate above the current 75 cents to the $1.25 level, and to extend the protection of the law to the largest possible number of workers.

The very people who oppose an increase in the minimum wage are the ones who expect these poorly paid Americans to be their customers. It does not make even business sense. A higher minimum wage would serve as a prop to our economy, helping to maintain purchasing power upon which all business depends. It is no good to have customers in name only without means to buy the products they want and need.

Greater still than the economic justification for the proposed $1.25 minimum wage is the justification based on human decency, humanitarian appeals, and concepts of consideration for the welfare of one's fellow man. This Nation throughout its history has been dedicated to these principles.

We can expect the usual statement in opposition: Such legislation would "cause mass unemployment," "interfere with free enterprise and collective bargaining," and "discriminate against small business." However, as stated before, events since the 1938 act and 1949 amendments amply disprove these claims.

Thirty dollars a week today is an insult to any American, even to the organized industrial workers who rightfully enjoy an average pay that is double the minimum. For there is always the danger, in time of adjustment, that the hard-won victories of organized labor may be imperiled by the downpull of these low minimum wages.

Most American enterprises are conducted by men and women who know and live up to the obligation they owe to their employees.

Apart from these are the few exploiters who manufacture misery and drive a wedge between employer and employee that threatens the teamwork upon which our progress depends.

Many Members of Congress and other citizens have registered keen disappointment with the recommendation by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message that the minimum wage be increased to only 90 cents per hour. I feel that this small increase is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of millions of American workers and their families and to meet the needs of the national economy.

In the interest of justice and fair play, it is the responsibility of Congress to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to provide for enforcement, because there is no room in the United States for those who profit from the underpayment of those who produce for them.

ONE - HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. EMILO NUÑEZ

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the celebration of Pan American Day, I believe it appropriate to remind my colleagues that this year is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Emilio Nuñez, one of the principal leaders of the Cuban movement of independence. General Nuñez' ties with the United States were particularly close, since it was he who was in charge of gathering together in the United States the expeditionary forces and the munitions which were sent to reinforce the Cuban forces in the revolution of 1895.

General Nuñez was born in Las Villas Province in Cuba on December 27, 1855. He distinguished himself as an officer in the abortive 10 years' war between 1868 and 1878, when Cuba made its first major attempt to throw off the Spanish yoke. His brother was killed in action during this period and General Nuñez swore to fight against Spanish tyranny until his country should be free.

Although the revolution ended in 1878 with the Pact of Zanjon, General Nuñez and a dedicated group of followers revolted again against the Spanish Government the following year and continued to hold out until, on instructions from the revolutionary junta in New York, headed by Cuba's illustrious José Martí, he was forced to capitulate. By the terms of this capitulation, he agreed to go into exile in the United States, along with the principal leaders of his revolutionary forces.

He took up residence in Philadelphia, where he entered the tobacco trade and studied dentistry in the University of Pennsylvania, where he obtained the degree of doctor of dentistry. Here he married the distinguished Cuban lady, Dolores Portuondo y Blez, whose family, like him, was in exile in the United States.

In 1884 he returned to Cuba as a sailor on an American ship in order to see his family briefly before returning to the United States on the same vessel; he was taken ashore by the Spaniards, imprisoned and later tried for conspiracy. As a result of this trial, he was again exiled to the United States in 1885. In Philadelphia and New York he maintained contact with the principal leaders of the Cuban independence movement in exile, including José Martí.

When the war of independence commenced in Cuba in 1895, General Nuñez was put in charge of the Department of Expeditions of the Council of Government of Cuban Exiles Abroad. In this capacity he tirelessly strove to gather together and transport to Cuba men and munitions to reinforce the revolutionaries. Because of the United States neutrality laws and the efforts of representatives of the Spanish Government to prevent revolutionary preparations in the United States, this was no mean task. In spite of these deterrents, General Nuñez managed to equip and dispatch many shiploads of arms and men to his compatriots in Cuba. His accomplishments in this regard played a significant role in assuring the success of the revolutionary movement.

After the war ended in 1898, and until his death in 1922, General Nuñez made significant contributions to the peacetime life of his country. He was elected a delegate to the Constituent Assembly in 1901, and in the same year was also elected Governor of Habana, a position which he held until 1908. He became one of the most active leaders of the Conservative Party, and served as Secretary of Agriculture and finally as Vice President between 1916 and 1921. His son, Ambassador Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, who is Cuba's chief delegate to the United Nations, has carried on the fine tradition of public service exemplified by the career of the elder Nuñez, distinguishing himself by the great contribution he has made to the cause of the free world.

It is believed that this brief résumé of General Nuñez' service to the cause of Cuban independence, which was so intimately tied up with our own fight against Spain, should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in this memorable year of the 100th anniversary of his birth.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the independent Federal agency responsible for the conduct of scientific research in aeronautics, is quietly observing its 40th anniversary. Its 17 members, appointed by the President and serving without pay, act as a board of directors, establishing policy and providing guidance for the paid staff of 7,500 scientists and supporting personnel at the NACA's laboratories.

As one who for almost 20 years has enjoyed a ringside seat from which I could watch the workings of this little-know Government agency, I should like to take this opportunity to express my good wishes to an organization composed of scientists and other workers dedicated

to the task of providing the fundamental information so largely responsible for performance improvement of our airplanes and missiles.

In 1937 when I was a freshman Member, the United States was preeminent, as now, in the world of aeronautics. The late Dr. Joseph S. Ames was Chairman of the NACA at the time. He had been one of the original members appointed to the Committee by President Wilson; he was internationally respected as a teacher and as president of Johns Hopkins University.

In 1937, the NACA was concerned, and very properly, with the very determined effort being made across the Atlantic, especially in Nazi Germany, to overtake us in aeronautics. As Dr. Ames put it at the time, this action constituted "a scientific challenge to America's present leadership."

The Congress, I am proud to say, took necessary action to increase the level of aeronautical research activity in the United States so that our leadership in the skies could continue. In 1939 funds were appropriated to enable modernization and expansion of the NACA's Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. In addition, a new aeronautical laboratory was authorized for the NACA, on the west coast. As a result of this farsighted action, the NACA was performing useful research at what is now known as the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory at Moffett Field, Calif., and on an accelerated basis at Langley, prior to Pearl Harbor.

In 1940, a third forward step was taken, when the Congress authorized construction of a powerplants laboratory, action which resulted in the building of the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland.

The war years for NACA were a period of especial urgency. The scientists had to change their research programs from investigations of fundamental matters to specialized research to bring about immediate improvement in military aircraft already designed. Fortunately, work accomplished by the NACA over the previous 20 years had resulted in a large backlog of data awaiting application.

Of this period, the late Frank Knox, at the time Secretary of the Navy, said:

> The Navy's famous fighters—the Corsair, Wildcat, and Hellcat—are possible only because they were based on fundamentals developed by the NACA. All of them use NACA wing sections, NACA cooling methods, NACA high-lift devices. The great sea victories that have broken Japan's expanding grip in the Pacific would not have been possible without the contributions of the NACA.

Unfortunately, V–E Day and V–J Day did not result in a return to the days when the threat of aggression no longer existed. To the contrary, it became imperative for the United States to increase its efforts to remain first in the air. And because the years of World War II had resulted in the consumption of most of the basic research information previously accumulated, the NACA had to expand further its efforts, beyond even the wartime growth.

I have made it my business to visit the NACA laboratories—Langley in Virginia, Ames in California, and Lewis in Ohio—to see for myself what is being done, and what needs to be done. I have counseled with Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was Chairman of the NACA from 1939 to 1941, and with Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, who has been NACA Chairman since 1941, about the equipment needs of the NACA, and about the necessity for further increases in the drive for information which can be used to build supersonic aircraft that will fly even faster than the best we have today, and to construct guided missiles that will be even more efficient, over longer ranges, than the ones we are now designing.

I am well acquainted with Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director of the NACA, the man who is the operating head of the agency. He is internationally known for his work as an aeronautical scientist. Among scientists he is recognized as a man of rare ability; the Nation is fortunate to have men of his caliber carrying such great responsibilities.

None of us question how vital it is for the United States to maintain, and extend, its aeronautical leadership. We can gain comfort from the fact that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is doing its work so well.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE DIFFERENCES AND COURTESIES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that earlier in the day there was a misunderstanding on my part with a great and beloved Member of this House, a gentleman who has always been kindliness itself. When I came here as a freshman in the 81st Congress no one could have welcomed me more warmly. I am so very much indebted to him for the many helpful services he rendered me and for the inspiration he has always been to me.

Today, when there was a limited amount of time, and I was not a member of the Appropriations Committee, and it was impossible for him to give me recognition in general debate, being so engrossed with interest in the particular topic to which I had given some study, I am afraid I may have been misunderstood. Certainly any remarks that may have seemed disrespectful did not come from my heart. I know that the fine gentleman from New York intended to extend to me every courtesy and every privilege that he possibly could. It is not in the heart or character of my friend to do anything that is not forthright, generous, considerate, helpful. In my book he is the finest type of manhood, and I am happy to have the opportunity to say so. I am going to love him all the more now that we had a little flash of the Irish between us today. I apologize humbly if my remarks were construed as reflecting upon one I admire and love.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that these remarks now being made should be made by the gentleman from New York rather than the gentleman from Illinois. We have been friends since we first met one another. We have spent many pleasant moments together, both here in the Capitol and elsewhere, and certainly we would not intentionally hurt one another. I surely would never do anything to hurt my friend, a great American, the distinguished and lovable gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. You know, it makes me very happy to hear my friend from Illinois make the remarks he has just made because I know how close he is to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I know the high regard the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

I can assure you I was sitting here when my friend was talking earlier in the day, and I knew that he was disturbed, because knowing the tranquility of his mind, I know that he would not have expressed himself, as temperately as he did on that occasion, unless he was disturbed. I knew, without knowing any of the other facts, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], was in a situation where he could not, during general debate, yield time, but he was protecting the gentleman under the 5-minute rule. Now, it is true that under the 5-minute rule you could be recognized by moving to strike out the last word. On the other hand, the chairman is there with his protecting hands to be extended in case any effort was made to prevent the gentleman from having his time; for example, he could move to close debate, which he certainly would not do. But, over and above everything else, this pleasant exchange is most pleasing to me as majority leader because it symbolizes more powerfully than any other action or any other words of mine good conduct to others and the unity that exists among the Democratic Members of the House.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I feel somewhat guilty about this controversy, and I am glad it ended in this happy vein. For a moment the gentleman from New York absented himself from the Chamber and left me in charge of the time. I was under instructions previously to yield 5 minutes to one Member, and as the gentleman from New York stepped out, two gentlemen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], came up to me and asked for a small amount of time, unaware of the fact that my chairman was undertaking to yield time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. I granted the time, but I am afraid I put him in a position where he was not able to do what he would like to have done in the premises, and I apologize to the gentleman and my chairman for it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The reason that there is so much love on the Democratic side is the example that is set by our majority leader. I do not think it is possible for one Democrat to remain at odds with another Democrat for over 3 minutes, because when he is disturbed for the moment he looks around and sees that smiling face of JOHN MCCORMACK and then he gets up and puts out his hand and shakes the hand of the other fellow. We just live in love and brotherhood here on the Democratic side because of JOHN MCCORMACK and the great gentleman from Texas, our beloved Speaker.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1600. An act to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARY).

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN).

Mr. DAGUE and include a letter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. WIER) and include an article.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. SCUDDER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MEADER to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE).

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DEANE), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on account of illness.

Mr. FLOOD, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

686. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with B. L. Carver, which, when executed by the superintendent, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., will authorize Mr. Carver to provide boat dock and boat-rental facilities along the shore of Fontana Lake on Tennessee Valley Authority lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service adjacent to Great Smoky Mountains National Park, during a 3-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

688. A letter from the Managing Trustee, Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 15th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946," approved August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

690. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the progress and feasibility of toll roads, with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, including recommendations with respect to Federal participation in toll roads (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

691. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

692. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Acadia Corp., authorizing them to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Acadia National Park, Maine, during a 20-year period from January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with the Avondale Farms, authorizing them to deliver fresh milk to the Chimneys campground for the period January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

694. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

695. A letter from the Presidential Adviser on Personnel Management, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H. R. 4753. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5550. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5551. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Buggs Island Park Authorities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5552. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued under that section on the 5-year level premium term plan may be exchanged for or converted to insurance on any other plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 5553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5554. A bill to provide that the holder of a mining claim in Alaska may deposit $100 each year, to be used for the construction of mine access roads, in lieu of performing the assessment work otherwise required on such claim; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5555. A bill to amend section 302 (b) of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provide for payment of adjusted compensation in certain cases involving correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5556. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5557. A bill to amend section 542 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of a personal holding company; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5558. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5559. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5560. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5561. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5562. A bill to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 5563. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 5564. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "Aid to State or Territorial homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARY (by request):

H. R. 5565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, effective for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1955, to provide a deduction from gross income for depreciation of buildings owned by all classes of Federal income-tax payers engaged in a trade or business, originally acquired for demolition purposes but subsequently used or rented for a period of more than 6 months in one or more taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5566. A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5567. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 5568. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to establish more clearly the policy of Congress as to expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 5569. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, spouse, or parent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 5570. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5571. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5572. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 631) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 5573. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on the Iowa River, Iowa and Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5574. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5575. A bill for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by Communistic authorities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 5576. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5577. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5578. A bill to amend paragraph 207 and schedule 16 of the Tariff Act of 1930; To the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5579. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for direct popular election of the President and Vice President, in place of the electoral college system: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of the Congress to Dr. Jonas E. Salk for his discovery of an effective weapon against poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 206. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Res. 207. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. PFOST: Senate joint memorial No. 5, Idaho State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact an excise tax on imports of wool, lead, and zinc, as well as other products, metals, and minerals with similar problems which may be suspended whenever prices are at an economic level that will permit the domestic mining and woolgrowing industries to maintain an adequate mobilization base for national security;

To remove the authority of the executive department to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations, and to place such responsibility for approving or disapproving such recommendations in the hands of Congress where the constitutional authority rests;

To allow the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, to expire on June 12, 1955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Senate concurrent resolution No. 45 of the State of New York, memorializing Congress relative to a revision of the defense manpower policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5581. A bill to convey jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the

claims of Kate Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5582. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5583. A bill for the relief of Lorna Isabel Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Louis Mavros (also known as Elias Mavrodontis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5587. A bill for the relief of Murrell C. Prescott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5588. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Castro-Carmona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 5589. A bill for the relief of Louis F. Cremers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5590. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5591. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5592. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Leason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 5593. A bill for the relief of Koa Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. Res. 208. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5543 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

199. Mr. CANFIELD presented resolutions of the New Jersey Lumbermen's Association passed at the annual session in Atlantic City on March 23, 1955, concerning retail exemption under the fair labor laws and on extension of title 1, FHA, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Senator Neuberger Before the City Club of Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the recent trip of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Pacific Northwest for hearings on S. 1333, to authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon high dam, I had occasion to address the City Club of Portland on April 8, 1955. This is an organization known throughout my home State for its conscientious and thorough approach to public affairs. The City Club has gained national fame for its painstaking research into critical public problems. For example, its study of corrupt-practices laws and election expenditures now is winning the study and approval of political scientists and governmental officials throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks to the City Club in Portland on April 8 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, TO CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND, OREG., APRIL 8, 1955

CONGRESS FACES A CRISIS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

In the 3 months that I have served in the Senate, many important matters have come before the Congress. The list would be well known to you. It includes the most important of all, our foreign policy, and urgent domestic needs such as schools, highways, resource development, adequate pay for Federal and postal workers, and taxation. I shall return to some of these later. But I want to stress first what I believe to be the most critical problem now plaguing our domestic economy: the continued decline in American farm income.

In recent months, the scope and the dangerous characteristics of our deepening agricultural crisis have been brought to the consciousness of the Congress and of the Nation from many sources and with ever greater urgency.

Let me cite just a few random examples:

Less than 2 weeks ago, the New York Times reviewed the drop in farm income caused by falling prices and stringent acreage limitations in an article headlined "Crisis in Farming Threatens Boom." The subheads read "Income Sliding Fast," "Small Farm Forced Out." A well-documented article in the U. S. News & World Report for March 25 reminds us of the sinister parallel with the 1920's, when a spectacular industrial and financial boom obscured the early danger signals of a prolonged agricultural slump. The article states the facts with the logic of simplicity:

"Farmers are getting less for their crops. They are being forced to grow less. Their costs are high. Their incomes are shrinking."

And it concludes that "the farm problem is worsening, now that more trouble lies ahead."

THE FACTS SHOW THE OMINOUS TREND

Congressional committees have repeatedly studied the farm problem and have reported the ominous downward trend. In reporting out the Agricultural Act of 1954 in the 83d Congress, the House Committee on Agriculture reported a 13 percent decline in net farm income in the preceding 2 years, while the rest of the economy reached new heights. In reporting out a new farm bill last month, the same committee again reviewed the facts:

"Farm prices down an average of 22 percent since 1951. Net farm income down 28 percent since 1947—10 percent below 1953, with further declines scheduled for this year and 1956."

The House Appropriations Committee reports that "the cost of farming continues to increase, with a 14-percent increase in prices paid by farmers during the past 5 years." Farm mortgage debt has nearly doubled since the end of World War II.

Farmers' share in the national income has dropped from 9.4 percent in 1951 to 7.2 percent in 1954.

Yet consumers have not benefited from lower prices. Packaging and other costs of distribution and merchandising have increased the spread between farm and grocery store prices. Thus, between 1949 and 1954, food grains dropped 9 percent, but cereals and bakery products rose 22 percent; dairy products rose 6 percent at retail but brought the farmer 8 percent less, and fruit and vegetable growers got 4 percent less while housewives paid 12 percent more. Farmers now receive only 43 cents—gross, not net—of each dollar spent on food, while the other 57 cents go for distribution charges.

The crisis is not confined to 1 or 2 sectors of agricultural production. In the Capital, we know that the squeeze between high costs and reduced acreage and support levels has hit cotton, corn, and other commodities as well as the wheat and the sugar beets of Oregon. The farm problem exists for the growers of fruits and vegetables in the Willamette Valley, and—as my wife's mother has graphically told me of her own farm—it is acute for the dairy farmers of the Northwest, of the Midwest, and elsewhere.

But perhaps the case of wheat will serve as a good single example.

THE CASE OF WHEAT

In its April issue, the Farm Journal poses the question, "Can We Rescue Wheat?" This article, and the other sources I have mentioned, give us some of the dimensions of the problem.

The carryover of wheat on July 1 will be nearly a billion bushels—as much as 5 times the amount considered a normal carryover—and $2½ billion worth of that is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The carryover will be more than a whole year's supply of wheat for this country, without this year's crop.

Yet acreage restrictions—which have forced 24 million acres, about 30 percent, out of wheat—and reduced support percentages show little promise of restoring order to wheat production. Rather, they add to the pressure to grow varieties which will yield the most bushels per acre, regardless of quality—to produce more wheat, of types which no one else may want, for the number one customer, the Federal Government.

What kind of a national farm policy can provide a solution?

I do not pretend to know the answer. I declined to pose as a specialist on agricultural legislation during the campaign last year, and I have not become an expert in 3 months in the Senate. But I return to my original point: The danger to our national economy of the threatening farm depression

is the greatest present problem we face in the field of domestic policy.

In the case of wheat, perhaps the domestic parity certificate plan—sometimes called the "two price plan"—offers some hope. That is not a new approach; Congress approved parts of it long ago in the McNary-Haugen bill, and the House of Representatives has recently revived it. Its relation to the support programs for corn and other feed grains, and to a stable world market, will require careful scrutiny.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS INADEQUATE

But in this field we cannot seek perfection; we must choose between imperfect alternatives. The administration offers no leadership beyond its insistence on the economic wringer of its "flexible" support program, which seems designed to seek a kind of agricultural "survival of the fittest" by putting a substantial number of farm families through bankruptcy. To call this approach inadequate is an understatement. Over 20 million people live on farms, and over 30 million live in rural areas economically dependent on farm prosperity. It is completely illusory to contemplate a continued boom for big business, for banks, for the stock market, while an agricultural depression knocks the economic props out from under these 50 million Americans—one-third of the Nation.

* * * * *

RURAL AMERICA NEGLECTED

The purely economic future of our farm population and of our small rural communities presents problems of great difficulty and, as I have said, of immense importance. But in the formulation of other national policies which affect farmers, whether as farmers or simply as citizens living in the rural areas of our country, their interests are often neglected by the present administration.

I shall take time only to mention briefly a few examples.

The great tax reduction bill of 1954 gave billions of dollars in tax savings to industrial corporations and their shareholders, but it gave no or very little relief to individual taxpayers, including the average farm family.

The second Hoover Commission—not to be confused with its predecessor, which avoided policy questions and stuck to administrative efficiency—recently recommended sharp curtailment of a series of Federal lending programs which have made low-interest credit available for necessary purposes, many of them of special value to farmers. Chief among the latter has been the rural electrification program. Already starved for power by the power policies of the present administration, this valuable program, which has brought modern civilization to millions of farm families, faces extinction if the views of the Commission prevail.

The ambitious road construction program submitted to the Congress by the administration recommends total expenditures on highway construction in excess of $100 billion. Twenty-five billion dollars are to be furnished by the Federal Government to be expended over the next 10 years. Only $4½ billion of this is "pay-as-you-go" financing; $20½ billion are to be borrowed at a cost of $11½ billion in interest, at rates significantly higher than those usual for obligations of the Federal Government.

You may have read about the weird financing scheme devised to raise this large Federal contribution without adding to the national debt. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, which is considering highway legislation, and I have heard administration witnesses explain this project. But the best thumbnail sketch was provided by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, the Senate's chief watchdog of fiscal probity, who appeared as a witness to tell the committee:

"It establishes a Government corporation without income or assets and authorizes this corporation to borrow $21 billion for 32 years without declaring it as a debt, and by legerdemain excludes this debt from the debt limitation fixed by Congress. The interest will be $11.5 billion or 55 percent of the funds borrowed."

In view of Senator BYRD's stinging dissection of this scheme, it is widely conceded that the fiscal features of the administration's program will not be adopted. But beyond that the program itself places far too great an emphasis on completion of the interstate network, at the expense of the secondary and farm-to-market roads.

We need a network of safe and fast limited access highways for long-distance travel and transportation. But the needs of our rural population to travel between the smaller towns and to take their produce to market must necessarily be met from the same sources of financing which will pay for the interstate system. We cannot afford a program which will dry up those sources in the interest of fast transportation between our metropolitan centers and starve out the badly needed improvements of the other types of roads.

I expect the Subcommittee on Roads, under the able chairmanship of Senator GORE, of Tennessee, to strike a reasonable balance between these needs. At the same time, I think it essential that the necessary financing be more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore, I have proposed a 1-cent increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels, while exempting farmers and fishermen who use gasoline or diesel oil in off-the-road equipment.

* * * * *

REAL AID FOR EDUCATION NEEDED NOW

The same preoccupation with fiscal gimmicks rather than with real needs is delaying progress in a field equally important to urban and rural communities—the approaching crisis in our educational facilities. Again, the administration's proposals are expressed in terms of very large sums of money, but offer virtually no real assistance. The only direct aid offered by the administration program—a very small amount—would be available only to so-called impoverished school districts. The districts of Oregon—and the same is true elsewhere in the Nation—are staggering under an ever-growing burden of school needs to cope with rapid increases in school population, but they are not "impoverished." Yet, except for the small sums offered to impoverished districts, the administration offers only new borrowing facilities.

Not only are our overburdened school districts thus to be encouraged to add to their debts, but, as Mr. Rex Putnam, the State of Oregon's superintendent of public instruction, wrote me, the administration's proposal to underwrite a 3⅛-percent interest rate on school loans might stimulate a wave of borrowing so as actually to drive up interest rates which now average less than 2½ percent.

The need is urgent for real help now, not for studies and conferences. A generation of children who get part-time education in old, overcrowded schools is forever lost to our vital reservoirs of skill and leadership. Therefore, I have cosponsored and urged passage of Senator HILL's bills for immediate aid to school construction, and to earmark for aid to education the Federal oil revenues from the outer Continental Shelf.

* * * * *

PRIVILEGE TO SERVE WITH SENATOR MORSE AND REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN

In much of the legislative work of which I have spoken, and in our efforts to assist our constituents with problems in the National Capital, I have been privileged to cooperate closely with my two colleagues who also represent Multnomah County in the Congress—our senior Senator WAYNE MORSE and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. I have benefited much from Senator MORSE's wide knowledge and the experience he has gained in 10 years of representing the interests of the people of Oregon in the Senate. And Mrs. GREEN has at once established herself, as we who know her knew she would, as one of the outstanding freshmen of this or any other session. I look forward to working in close association with these two fine, liberal, public servants in the years ahead.

Many issues which come before the Congress appear there in forms shaped by party programs and party strategy. This is a necessary result of the organization of Senate and House committees by the majority party with proportionate minority representation, and it is essential if our great national political parties are to remain alternative instruments of representative government.

Sometimes the lines get badly blurred. The reciprocal-trade agreements law, for example, is a program of Democratic origin which the Republican administration of President Eisenhower has made a cornerstone of his legislative program. Yet, although a Republican President has called its extension essential to our national interest, the reciprocal-trade bill can be passed only by the efforts of a majority of Democrats over the opposition of a majority of Republicans. Our own legislature in Salem, dominated by the party whose chief slogan is that it likes Ike, has memorialized the Congress to defeat the reciprocal-trade bill. The resolution against granting the President's urgent request for this important authority passed the State senate with the support of 17 of the 24 Republicans and the house with the votes of 30 of the 35 members of the President's party.

In this field, I think my own party in the Congress has shown a sense of responsibility for putting national above sectional and local interest.

SEARCH FOR PEACE ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

But I want to close by referring briefly to that area of congressional responsibility which must transcend partisanship, the field of foreign policy.

In the short 3 months since the day I first took my seat in the Senate, our Government has made foreign policy decisions of historic importance. My seat in the Senate is No. 96, and I have been most conscious of being the most junior of freshmen Senators during consideration of these important decisions.

In domestic matters bearing upon the economic and social direction of his administration, I have—as I have discussed earlier today—felt both competent and free to oppose the President's policies. But in matters of foreign policy I have, sometimes in spite of misgivings, voted to give the President the support he needs to carry out his responsibilities as the spokesman of our Nation in its relations with foreign governments. Thus, I voted for the Formosa Resolution, for the mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China, and just last week for ratification of the agreements admitting an independent West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and paving the way for its rearmament.

I believe that, as long as we have confidence in the purposes and objectives of a President in foreign affairs, we must permit him the authority to match his responsibility. During the last administration, the opposition in Congress constantly fought this principle of Executive responsibility in foreign affairs—a fight that culminated in the near-passage of the Bricker amendment.

But I am confident that President Eisenhower's objective is peace. We know in

Washington that the American people do not want war over Quemoy and Matsu, and I think the desire for peace will prevail. If, as I have said, I have had misgivings, it has been because the deliberate uncertainty of our position toward those island outposts of Chiang Kai-shek has seemed to me unnecessarily costly.

Eventually, I think, the President will decide against war. But in the meantime, a heavy strain has been put on our Atlantic Alliance, which must remain the keystone of our global policies. Attention has been diverted from more important crises in Southeast Asia, which are of greater significance to the free world. And ammunition has been given those who picture us as a nation dedicated to atomic militarism, when the real problems of Asia require economic solutions, technical assistance, and above all, mutual confidence and understanding.

Thus, critical issues and room for disagreement remain even in the field of foreign policy. But the record shows, I think, that this debate is generally being kept at a level above party politics, and that most of us seek alternative ways to the goal which is common to the entire Nation—peace with security.

Disposal of Projects Built by the WPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an opinion of the General Counsel, General Services Administration, concerning the rights of municipalities in the disposal of buildings or projects constructed under WPA. I believe this opinion will answer questions which have arisen in many communities throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1955.

Re WPA-built barn, Belvidere, S. Dak.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Reference is made to your letter of January 21, which was referred for reply to this office by the Archivist of the United States. The inquiry sought information concerning any interest the Federal Government may have in a barn erected by the WPA in the town of Belvidere, S. Dak., which is presently being considered by town officials for disposal by sale.

An exhaustive research of the files of the Works Project Administration reveals that the town of Belvidere, Jackson County, S. Dak., acted as official sponsor of project OP-65-1-74-2324 to "tear down and salvage materials from abandoned lumberyard, storage sheds on private property for use in constructing horse barn, hog house, stock pavilion and corrals, 500 feet of 2-inch water main from town system to project and perform incidental and appurtenant work thereto on town-owned property."

The foregoing quotation appears in an agreement signed by W. E. Kuhn, chairman, town board, June 1940, which also contained the following restriction: "No sale or other division of the property from public use and control will be made during the useful life of the improvements created under this project." The completion date of this project was October 29, 1940.

In the case of the *United States* v. *City of Columbus*, decided December 3, 1943, United States District Court of North Dakota, N. W. D. (54 Fed. Supp. 37), the United States sought to recover from the city of Columbus, N. Dak., the amount expended by it for the cost of materials used and labor performed in the construction of a community recreation building as a WPA project, leased by the city as a liquor store. The court on motions for judgment on the pleadings stated as follows:

"A review of plaintiff's complaint indicates that by virtue of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 (15 U. S. C. A., secs. 721–728), the United States of America agreed with the city of Columbus for the erection of a certain project described as: 'Demolishing old building and construction of the community recreation building'; that the project was properly approved, and that 'the project herein alleged was by this plaintiff in all things performed and completed on January 31, 1939, in the total cost of materials and labor in the sum of $3,729.90.'

"The complaint alleges that the defendant 'did convert the project herein * * * in that the said defendant leased same to a private individual for the operation of a liquor store, and by reason thereof, the plaintiff herein is entitled to recover from the defendant, the sum of $3,729.90, the amount expended by this plaintiff for the project herein described.' In effect plaintiff contends that all projects constructed by or through the authority of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 shall be or are impressed with an easement or a restriction limiting the use of such completed projects to the uses described in the act, and that a local municipality, incidentally benefited by the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, could use the project thus created only for the purposes set forth therein.

"(1) It seems to me essential, in order to determine whether or not plaintiff's complaint states a cause of action upon which relief could be granted, and that examination be made of the act in question and its purposes ascertained. The evident and declared policy of Congress in passing the various Emergency Relief Acts was that of reducing and relieving unemployment. The joint resolution of June 29, 1937 (ch. 401, 50 U. S. Stat. 352; 15 U. S. C. A., secs. 721–728), begins by stating:

" 'That in order to continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful public projects, * * * there is hereby appropriated, * * * (money) to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, * * * and no non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under this appropriation unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as it is not to be supplied from Federal funds.'

"Numerous courts have had opportunity to define the purposes of the various Federal Emergency Relief Acts:

" 'Courts have judicially noticed the fact that the primary objective of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (15 U. S. A., sec. 728 note) was not to benefit particular municipalities or localities, but to provide relief for unemployment.

" 'By contributing a small part of the necessary expense and by contributing the services of a superintendent and a small number of employees the city of Los Angeles was able to obtain the benefit of the project. It was not, however, city work of which the city had control, but was under the rules and regulations of the Emergency Relief Administration. (*Hoover* v. *Independent School Dist., supra* (220 Iowa 1364, 264 N. W. 611); *Shelton* v. *City of Greenville*, 169 Tenn. 366, 87 S. W. 2d 1016; *Todaro* v. *City of Shreveport, supra* (La. App. 170 So. 356, 360)).' (*Taylor et al.* v. *City of Los Angeles* (29 Cal. App. 2d 181, 84 P. 2d 242, 243).)

" 'We are dealing here with emergency measures which represent the exercise of policy power and have for their purpose the relief of persons in distress by reason of the financial and economic depression. Their primary purpose is to furnish work to the unemployed. The question of making public improvements is secondary; and is but a means of carrying out the primary purpose.' (*Village of Larchmont, et al.* v. *Town of Mamaronec, et al.* (249 App. Div. 741, 291 N. Y. S. 716, 718).)

" 'The sole and primary purpose of the various emergency relief appropriation acts and the executive order of the President made in connection therewith, is to give employment to persons requiring relief, and involves a work relief program.' (*Block* v. *Sassaman* (D. C., 26 F. Suppl. 105, 106).)

"The Supreme Court of Massachusetts had occasion to pass upon the purpose of the various emergency relief acts. In doing so that court stated:

" 'Running through all the laws enacted, the purpose of the Federal Government is found to relieve unemployment directly, through projects, so called. The plan of employment involved the doing by the Government itself of these projects, which, as in the case at bar, theretofore were carried on by the municipalities themselves with some possible assistance from the Commonwealth and county. But we view these projects as undertaken not for the benefit of the municipality, but primarily for the purpose of relieving unemployment, and incidentally for the utility and convenience of the general public, as distinguished from the municipality itself.' (*Benoit* v. *Hathaway* (1941, 310 Mass. 362, 38 N. E. 2d 329, 331).)

"(2) It is apparent from plaintiff's complaint that '* * * the project herein alleged was by this plaintiff in all things performed and completed on January 31, 1939 * * *.' We are then confronted with the question of what control the United States of America could exercise over the project after its completion. It is apparent that the primary purpose of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts had been accomplished when the project was completed. Unemployment had been lessened; relief in the way of public work had been granted. The United States had paid those properly certified as needing relief for such work as they performed on the project, which, according to the complaint, the plaintiff itself completed. The money was not paid by the United States to the city of Columbus. The city of Columbus, by having a completed building in place of an old and inadequate one, was incidentally benefited. But the purpose of the act was not to benefit the city of Columbus, nor to erect a community building for the city of Columbus. The primary purpose, as stated, was to relieve unemployment, and when the project was completed that purpose had been served. Nowhere in the act do we find any authority or justification for the theory that projects thus completed may be used only for the purposes designated in the act. If the contrary were true, and if the Government's theory were sound, then the Federal Government could exercise control over the many thousands of non-Federal projects created out of WPA labor. That control would not be for any limited time, but theoretically would be forever, or at least until such projects were no longer susceptible of any practical use. The public ball park of a municipality would forever remain a public ball park unless the Federal Government (provided even it had the authority under the theory advanced) consented to its being used for other purposes. Congress intended no such control over incidental benefits of the relief program, and I find no justification for such theory in the acts involved. It is quite true that Congress, in its appropriation, limited the proj-

ects upon which such appropriations could be expended. Had the city of Columbus asked for the approval of a project creating a privately operated apartment house, the project would not, of course, have received departmental or executive approval. But once a project, which in its application meets the specifications required by law, and receives approval, and is constructed under the supervision and control of WPA officials, is completed and turned over to the municipality, it is turned over without being impressed with an easement or right or restriction controlled by the United States, and may be used thereafter by the municipality in any manner which the laws governing that municipality allow. A contrary conclusion would, in my opinion, result in entanglements of such infinite complication as to be impossible of administration, judicial or otherwise, and was never within the contemplation of Congress.

"(3) It is true that the plaintiff's complaint alleges that the defendant agreed that 'the work proposed will be done in full conformance with all legal requirements,' and also that 'All operations will be in accordance with regulations prescribed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, and orders and regulations issued thereunder,' and that section 8 of Operating Procedure G–1, issued by the Works Progress Administration, provided that 'Projects must be genuinely useful to the public' and 'Projects shall not be undertaken for the benefit of private * * * individuals * * *,' and that '* * * improvements may be made only to public property * * *, which property is held either for the conduct of normal governmental function or for the general use of the public.'

"It will be observed, however, that nowhere in the complaint is it alleged that the defendant had any control over the construction of the project, nor is it alleged that in the actual construction there was any deviation from the bare provisions of the law, nor from the regulations which were duly issued by proper authority thereunder. The United States, plaintiff herein, through its officials and its agents, had full control of the construction and completion of the project sponsored by the city of Columbus.

"The type of project or proposal, as alleged in the complaint, was a proper one, and the complaint alleges that the plaintiff 'in all things performed and completed' the project. Nowhere in the complaint is there an allegation to the effect that the defendant agreed that after the completion of the project the same would be used in any specified manner or for any particular purpose or purposes. There has been alleged no fraud on the part of the defendant. The complaint merely alleges that the defendant 'converted' the project, that is, 'the community recreation building,' by leasing the same to a private individual for the operation of a liquor store. The answer, incidentally, denies that the defendant leased the building to another for the operation of a liquor store, but asserts that it operates a municipal liquor store therein and has a contract of employment with the one who manages it. There may be some question whether, under the laws of the State of North Dakota, the city of Columbus could itself operate a municipal liquor store. But, with such questions the United States has no concern. The interest of the United States in the project ceased when the primary purpose of the act had been served through giving work relief, by completion of the project, and its release to the defendant.

"For the reasons stated I am of the opinion that the complaint fails to state a cause of action and the case will be ordered dismissed."

Accordingly, it would appear that the several Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts do not require, in the absence of fraud, any WPA projects authorized thereunder to be used only for the purpose contemplated in the act after their completion.

The completed project when turned over to the municipality is not impressed with any right or restriction controlled by the United States but may be used or disposed of by the municipality in any manner allowed by the laws governing it when the project has served the purpose for which Federal assistance was granted, viz., the relief of unemployment, or when its useful life, as determined by the responsible town officials, has lapsed.

Sincerely yours,

GENERAL COUNSEL.

FHA Facilities for El Paso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit the following letter which, as the date indicates, was written by me on April 7, 1955, as the result of an incident which transpired during the time Congress was in recess for the Easter holidays:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1955.

Mr. GEORGE HERVEY,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MR. HERVEY: In connection with our telephone conversation of yesterday, you implied that a newspaper report had intentionally or unintentionally left the impression that I was condemning or was critical of persons who sent me telegrams in support of a Federal Housing Administration insuring office in El Paso. Such was not my position or intentions, and I therefore want to state very clearly and as concisely as possible the full situation.

I was recently contacted by an individual who informed me that he was the authorized chairman of a committee of the El Paso Home Builders Association, the purpose and sole function of this committee being to obtain and present factual information to the FHA supporting the office for El Paso. I was specifically told that the approach and procedure would be to present these facts to the district office of the FHA in Lubbock, and then here in Washington.

I was told by this committee chairman that their intent was to show the need and justification for establishing the office in El Paso, and not to engage in political pressure tactics which might be harmful to the project. In this, I concurred.

This report had been transmitted, I understood, to Mr. Norman P. Mason, Chief of the Washington FHA office. The officials requested time to study the report and conduct an investigation and survey so that subsequently, if possible, such an office might be established in El Paso.

Within a few short hours after Mr. Mason had started the survey, an attorney from El Paso, who said he represented you, Sam Guido, Jr., and a Mr. Kirkpatrick et al., presented himself in my office and stated that he was interested in obtaining the office. He made it clear that he represented only a small group of the El Paso Home Builders Association and that he was not to be considered as spokesman for the majority of the members of this organization. He explained to me that under the conditions of a contract he had with you and others, he would be paid the sum of $5,000 if the office should be obtained for El Paso.

He also stated to me that he urged his clients to engineer a telegram campaign to coincide with his efforts. Now bear in mind that at this time I had not received formal, informal, official or unofficial requests to exert efforts in behalf of obtaining the FHA facilities for El Paso.

I had not received any fact, information or statistics which would place me in a position to make a formal or logical request, and present to the official here the case, founded on facts and not fancy, in behalf of El Paso. Neither you, nor anyone in your particular group, at this point had contacted me in regard to the project requesting the establishment of such an office in El Paso, nor of the status of the situation. As stated, I had no facts whatsoever. Instead, I was greeted by 98 telegrams, and, I presume, others will come.

My position as regards those who sent the telegrams is this: These persons, I assume, were informed by you or your group that their help was needed in obtaining this facility. You possibly told them that the congressional officials here—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator PRICE DANIEL, and myself—had all the facts and all we needed was an avalanche of telegrams expressing interest in the project, in order to be able to get it.

These people who sent the telegrams were sincere, civic-minded citizens who, upon the advice given by uninformed and unfair individuals, were given an erroneous impression and were denied the benefit of the full facts. These people were unaware of the true status and situation.

Had you and your group taken the time and effort to have checked with the Texas Senators and myself, we would have told you that we would be happy to work on the project if you would but furnish us the facts we needed. Then after we had presented the case to the FHA and the proper officials had made a study, should the request have been denied, we would have welcomed and, in fact, solicited additional statements from business and civic leaders in El Paso.

Not only were your actions ill-timed, and of such nature as to possibly hinder our project, but if you had checked you would have known that Congress is not in session due to the Easter holidays and that both Texas Senators are out of town and will be for 2 weeks hence. (I might add, I am here because although the House is in recess, there is much other work than House action to be done here in Washington.)

May I sum this up by stating that at no time will I condemn people for expressing their opinions, and, in fact, I encourage and cordially invite such opinions. But it grieves me deeply when the expressions are engineered on unsuspecting and sincere people who believe in their hearts and minds that they are rendering a service; when, unknown to them, their sincere desire to be helpful is being used for other motives.

Furthermore, I think it was unethical and improper for anyone to pay, or to offer to pay, anyone else a sum of money for obtaining a legitimate project from the Government, for the good of the community. This in itself casts an undesirable reflection upon the project and besides is unkind in its implied purpose of discrediting the sincerity, ability, and desire for cooperation and achievement of the two Members of the United States Senate from Texas, and myself.

I feel that because of a lack of cooperation on your part and the lack of sincerity and purpose of a few individuals, the possibility of obtaining the office for El Paso has been endangered and possibly destroyed. And, I might add, until these tactics were used I think the project had a better-than-fair chance of being obtained.

For your information may I state that I am still personally and officially in support of the project to obtain these FHA facilities

for El Paso. I think the request, if based upon fact and legitimate information, is fair; I believe the facility is needed and desirable. And I am hopeful that we can wash away the dirt which has been splattered on this project, making it eventually possible to obtain this service.

Mr. Hervey, the case is not a new one. Such instances have happened in the past, and I suppose, will continue to happen in the future. But it is unfortunate when a few selfish individuals by their intentional or unintentional actions, take a decent, fine, and respectable thing and cause it to be smeared or destroyed.

As I stated to you on the telephone yesterday, in addition to the tactics outlined above, certain improper, illegal, and unethical proposals were made to me in conjunction with this project and I deeply resent such actions. My present position is not to further amplify these advances. My sole reason is not to further jeopardize or cast an ill reflection upon the project and a host of decent citizens who are sincere in their efforts to obtain this FHA facility. However, I will not hesitate to recall the situation around these advances should it justify the purpose.

I hope in the future it will be possible for us to achieve a unity in purpose, brought about by a sincere desire to be of service to the community, in this and other projects. I'll assure you such service to the people of west Texas is my sole purpose and intent.

Sincerely,

J. T. RUTHERFORD,
Congressman, 16th District, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose here is to serve notice to this group and to all concerned that I shall not tolerate such tactics or procedure, and that the situation and position stated, by request is here given. It is my hope that we will now go forward for the benefit of all. Nothing could be accomplished by continuing this affair further except to destroy this project and friendly relations.

Proposed Revision of McCarran-Walter Immigration Act—Excerpts From Statements by Governor Harriman, of New York, Senator Lehman, Paul M. Butler, and Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 9, 1955, the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee held what was called a strategy dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. The dinner was presided over by the eminent and truly distinguished Governor of Michigan, Hon. G. Mennen Williams, who is the new chairman of the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee.

At that dinner a most impressive group of leading figures in American political life addressed the gathering. One of the recurrent themes of most of the remarks made at that meeting was the need to revise and overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act. I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the remarks made by Gov. Averell Harriman, of my own State of New York; by Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and by Mr. Carmine G. De Sapio, National Democratic Committeeman from New York, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with pertinent excerpts from a message which I addressed to the assembly, and which was read in my behalf by my administrative assistant, Mr. Julius C. C. Edelstein.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MARCH 8, 1955

* * * * *

You who are here tonight have an especially deep and personal understanding of the need for the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the world.

No nation can go it alone—not even powerful America. From a military standpoint, we cannot. From an economic standpoint, we cannot.

But over and beyond these materialistic reasons are others just as compelling—reasons of history and religion and culture, of sentiment and emotion. America will always be bound to the lands where all of us, whether recently or long ago, have our family roots.

The sons and daughters of every one of the nations bordering on the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and the European seas and rivers have made their contributions to America—contributions of industry and enterprise and character. We have a common heritage. And so we who happen to be on this side of the Atlantic can never forget that we are part of a larger community. And none in that community can be secure unless all are secure.

Nor can any of us be truly secure as long as a large part of our community—reaching from the Baltic States through Poland and Czechoslovakia, to the borders of Greece—remains enslaved. We know that the flame of freedom will never be extinguished in those countries, and that they will again one day carry on their proud traditions in liberty and self-government.

So our common goal—and the goal of our Nation's foreign policy—must be to strengthen the ties that bind together the North Atlantic community, and beyond that the larger community of all the free countries of the world.

I need not tell this audience how injurious to this whole objective is our own immigration policy. Two and a half years ago the President said the McCarran Act had to be revised to eliminate its discriminatory, un-American features. But today the McCarran Act still stands as written—and still proclaims to the world that America does not really practice what she preaches about the equality and innate worthiness of all people of every land and creed. We can thank Senator LEHMAN and Congressman CELLER and their Democratic colleagues for taking the initiative to revise the act in the absence of the leadership the President had pledged.

Equally injurious is our refugee policy. An act of Congress proposed to admit 209,000 refugees over a 3-year period. Yet, as of January 28, when half the life of the act had passed, fewer than a thousand bona fide refugees had been admitted to this country. The administration of the act has made a travesty of what was to have been a great humanitarian undertaking.

Unhappily, in the last 2 years, there has been a tragic decline in American prestige and influence among our friends and allies throughout the world.

Why is this? Why has it come about?

I believe it can be traced to a basic cause—and that is the unwillingness of the Republican administration to do those things necessary to fulfill the role of world leadership which the circumstances of history press upon us.

The last 2 years have been a period of retreat from leadership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF HERBERT H. LEHMAN OF STATUETTE OF LIBERTY AT NATIONALITIES DIVISION DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA, MARCH 8, 1955, READ ON BEHALF OF SENATOR LEHMAN BY JULIUS C. C. EDELSTEIN

There was a time—not so long ago—when our country received immigrants annually, not in thousands or hundreds of thousands, but in millions. And who is there who can say that our country is not the greater for it today—a country which 300 years ago was impassible wilderness, unconquerable desert, and storm-swept mountain range. Our country today is the world's center of power—the leader in productivity and in technological progress: a land of challenging opportunity for all its citizens.

Yet today our immigration laws reflect not these great facts of our history and tradition, but rather the fearful prejudices of fearful minds which contrived 30 years ago to place on our statute books—and to maintain it ever since—a law steeped in bias and dedicated to the proposition that all men are not created equal, as far as admission to the United States is concerned.

We have slammed our gates shut, cut admission of legal immigrants down to a trickle, converted our immigration system into a series of hurdles and hazards built around race and national origin, and make a shabby mockery of our national traditions.

The national origins quota system, enshrined and revalidated in the McCarran-Walter Act, is a travesty upon America. It is a rebuke and insult to every one assembled at the Waldorf tonight; it is a reproach to every American. There are other provisions in that law, the McCarran-Walter Act, which demean the status of American citizenship, which make a joke of justice and fair dealing, and which treat every alien—imigrant or visitor—as a potential spy, saboteur, and criminal. All of this holds us up to contempt and criticism in the eyes and in the opinion of free mankind.

If there is one law, above all others, which furnishes grist for the Communist propaganda mill, and which is contrived to lend aid and comfort to the Kremlin, it is the McCarran-Walter Act.

How ridiculous we appeared in the eyes of the world only last week when a great chain of American newspapers proposed editorially that Russian farmers be invited to visit the United States to study our farming methods, and the Soviet Government quickly endorsed the proposal.

For it developed immediately, regardless of the wisdom of the idea itself, that the Russian farmers couldn't be admitted to the United States as visitors because of the McCarran-Walter Act * * * unless the Russian Government accredited these farmers as Soviet diplomats.

So, my friends, it seems to me that one of the first goals to be marked out, not only for the Nationalities Division, but for all Americans of goodwill—should continue to be the drastic amendment and overhaul of the McCarran-Walter Act, to eliminate its bias and prejudice: the iniquitous national origins quota system, and to humanize and liberalize that law in all its aspects, both citizenship and immigration, in order to make that law conform to the great traditions—the true traditions of America.

And I hope the Nationalities Division, and all its friends, and all those with whom it

has contact—and the Democratic National Committee—and all those with whom it has contact—will mobilize all possible support—in ever-increasing amounts—for the drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. And in this connection, I invite attention—and support—to the omnibus immigration and citizenship bill, S. 1206, introduced in the Senate on February 25 by myself and 12 colleagues—and in the House by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, and a number of his colleagues. I hope that in due time the Lehman-Celler bill will prevail.

I am glad to extend a similar invitation of support for this bill to the Republican National Committee, and to President Eisenhower. While my hopes are not high, I would be glad—and I know all of you would be glad—if that invitation were accepted.

SPEECH BY PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AT THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION DINNER, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 8, 1955

In this connection, let me speak of one of the men to whom we pay particular tribute tonight, the great Senator from New York, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who is one of the very finest statesmen of our times. Senator LEHMAN has for years been a leader in the fight of the Democratic Party for fairer immigration laws, the fight to rid our country of racial injustices, the fight to secure a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and in no end of other causes where equality and liberty are at stake.

Senator LEHMAN continues to devote his time, his energy, and his life to these great goals. We in Washington look for him to be with us not only for another term, after 1956, but for many more terms.

Senator LEHMAN'S ideals represent in a sense what the Democratic Party seeks to accomplish for our citizens of foreign birth. Many of you are familiar with the bill of which he is a cosponsor, the Lehman-Celler bill, to revise and replace the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which contains so many inequitable and discriminatory provisions.

The introduction of the Lehman-Celler bill to put our immigration laws more in step with the best in American traditions, is just one more example of how Democrats are offering positive and constructive policies to meet our Nation's needs. When Mr. Eisenhower was a candidate back in 1952, he said in a speech here in New York on October 16, 1952, that he thought the McCarran-Walter Act was discriminatory and ought to be revised.

But since January 1953, the Eisenhower administration has offered little more than talk about this matter, as is the case with so many other problems facing the American people. In the field of fairer immigration laws, it is left to the Democrats in Congress to introduce constructive proposals, while the Eisenhower administration backtracks, sidesteps, and doubletalks, exactly as it has done on schools and housing, tax reductions, and national defense.

You will recall that President Truman vetoed the McCarran-Walter act because he believed it discriminated, by means of the national origins quota system, against Italians, Greeks, Poles and others from Southern and Eastern Europe. This demonstrates the courage and devotion to principle that made Mr. Truman the great President that he was.

George Washington spoke from the heart of America when he said: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the Opulent and Respectable Stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

The several bills introduced by distinguished Democratic Members of the Senate and the House to make our immigration laws a more faithful reflection of Washington's great affirmation ought to receive a full hearing in Congress and the support of all those who reject as un-American the discriminatory National Origins Quota System.

In considering these proposals, some of us might well remember what Will Rogers, a great Democrat who was part Indian, used to say: "My ancestors went down to the shore to meet the Pilgrims."

Just as we must turn to Democratic leadership if we are to expect intelligent revision of the Immigration act of 1952, so we must look for little forthrightness on the part of the Eisenhower administration if we hope to do anything about the mockery of humanitarianism represented by the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

That act was supposed to allow 214,000 refugees, escapees, expellees and orphans to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants. Yet under this act only 14,106 visas have been granted as of January 29, 1955. In other words, just a fraction of the total provided for has been admitted with the act due to expire next year. And of those who have come only 68 are escapees, only 204 are refugees. This from the Eisenhower administration which boasts that although conservative in economic matters, it is "liberal" with respect to human beings.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, pointed out only a few days ago that the operation of the Refugee Relief Act is "tangled and snarled in nightmares with nightmares, forms, questionnaires, security checks, duplication."

That we should seek to insure that no Communists or others who would subvert our free institutions enter America is something on which all of us certainly agree. But as Congressman CELLER said, the State is "playing a cruel game by pitting legal paragraphs against human lives. Escapees from behind the Iron Curtain (of the Communists) into free territory, beckoned by the light of liberty, have dared to cross barbed wire, risk gunfire, spend harrowing days and nights in escape from the Iron Curtain countries only to find themselves finally barred by bits of paper * * *."

Yet the Republican administration talks glibly of liberating enslaved peoples.

In the first 18 months of the Displaced Persons Act, enacted and administered by Democrats, over 126,000 displaced persons came to this country to build lives for themselves and to enrich American life by their presence.

Compare this number—these numbers of human beings, if you please—with the pitifully few persons admitted by an Eisenhower administration ostensibly devoted to a liberal attitude toward human life. You will then understand more deeply, I think, why it is the Democratic Party which offers most hope and most opportunity of realistic action on one of the problems of greatest interest to Americans of foreign descent.

ADDRESS BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN CARMINE G. DE SAPIO BEFORE THE 1956 STRATEGY DINNER SPONSORED BY THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 8, 1955

Although I have been able closely to observe the activities of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee through the years, tonight its effectiveness, its activities, and its significance have been brought home to me with vivid reality. This division, in every sense, is representative of our American population. Thirty-four million of us were born in other countries or are immediately descended from parents born in other countries. The rest of us are of ancestors who came to America not many generations ago in search of liberty, of faith, of hope, and of a secure future.

New York City itself is representative of the population of the world, and we New Yorkers are so proud of the achievements by Americans of French descent; Americans of Polish descent; Americans of German, Italian, Rumanian, Danish, Spanish, and South American descent; in fact, Americans who can trace their ancestry to every corner of the globe; Americans of all religious beliefs—Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic. We take pride—all of us—not only in our ancestry but in the fact that here we are just good American citizens, particularly devoted to our country, its ideals, and our fellow men and women.

This city, like our country, is enriched by the varied backgrounds from which our people come, and this city, in turn, has enriched our State, our country, and all of the world.

* * * * *

In our party's platform in 1952, we advocated the admission into our country of a considerable number of refugees, principally from lands behind the Iron Curtain.

These people have been the victims of barbarous totalitarianism, the cruelty of which staggers the imagination. They come from places in the world from which the relatives of many of us in this room come and they need haven and help. But the Republican Party, while giving lip service to the idea of extending aid to these refugees, wrote a law which contains so many obstacles and barriers as to be entirely meaningless. It is incumbent upon our conscience as a party and as a people to remedy this situation, so that the provisions for the admission of refugees will parallel our national heritage.

Likewise we have an immigration law which cruelly discriminates against countries from which many of our recent ancestors sent so many people who have made incalculable contributions to the welfare of our Nation. This immigration law disgraces both the dignity and the philosophy of our country and casts a cynical shadow upon the ideals expressed by Thomas Jefferson and the other authors of our national independence.

Medical Services to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution of the council of administration of the Michigan department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This resolution protests the suggested drastic reductions in Federal medical services to veterans and others as recommended in a recent report by the Hoover Commission.

I should like to add that I support the dissenting view to this report submitted by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD. It is not in keeping with the often expressed intent of Congress to take a narrow view of medical facilities for veterans. The veteran population continues high, and

as it grows older the need for medical service will increase.

It is essential that waste and inefficiency be eliminated but this should not be used as a guise to drastically reduce these important Federal medical facilities.

The following resolution was adopted at a meeting in Clare, Mich., and was transmitted to me by Christie J. Braun, department quartermaster, adjutant of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

I hereby move or resolve, as the case may be, that this council of administration go on record as opposing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission task force as they pertain to the treatment and handling of the veterans and their benefits in this country; and that the Hoover Commission be reminded that if they would serve these United States, they would cause to be worked out some method whereby the aged, the tubercular, the paraplegic, and the mentally disturbed veteran be taken care of as befits the greatest, and wealthiest, and the most powerful Nation yet to inhabit the face of this earth; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Michigan congressional delegation.

Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce Endorses Development of Trinity River Power by Private Utility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Santa Rosa, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, on March 29, 1955, endorsing development of power facilities on the Trinity River by a private utility.

We in Californa are very proud of the fine service and cooperation which we have had from private utilities. We feel that the best interests of our citizenry can more properly be served through private enterprise and numerous organizations and individuals throughout the First Congressional District of California have endorsed the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposal by which they would construct a considerable portion of the proposed Trinity River project.

I, personally, am of the opinion that the project should not be developed until a survey to determine present and future water needs in north coastal counties has been completed. However, if it should be authorized I firmly believe the "partnership plan" should be put into effect.

The resolution referred to above is as follows:

"Whereas the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has offered to enter into partnership with the United States Government on the Trinity River project; and

"Whereas they have offered to furnish, install, and operate at power company cost all of the electrical elements of the project, including generators, switch gear, and lines; and

"Whereas this will constitute a saving of $50 million in capital outlay to the United States Government; and

"Whereas they would pay the United States Government an agreed price per kilowatt hour for all current generated in the various powerhouses on the project; and

"Whereas the power company would agree to wheel power for the United States Government to agreed points connected with this project; and

"Whereas this would result in the producing of taxes from the electrical end of the project to the counties where said electrical equipment is located as well as to the State and Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce does sincerely support and endorse this partnership proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. with the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman HUBERT SCUDDER, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL."

Adopted at regular meeting of the board of directors of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce the 29th day of March 1955.

Approved:

JAMES H. HURLEY,
President.

Attest:

SCOTT GORDON,
Acting Manager.

Would Lincoln Have Dismissed Corsi?—Remarks on the 90th Anniversary of His Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, April is a month of significant anniversaries. Ninety years ago on this April 14 Abraham Lincoln was assassinated at Ford's Theater in the Nation's Capital. That tragic event not only has made a lasting impression on American history but saddened and shocked the American people—even the leaders and the people in the South were shocked. For, as you know, the first memorial service for Lincoln was conducted by former Confederate veterans. The body of the President rested for a while under the dome of this Capitol Building and throngs of grieving Americans passed his bier.

It is to be regretted that the great crowds which visit the Nation's Capital each year cannot visit Ford's Theater where this tragic event took place. They cannot visit the Ford's Theater because there is no Ford's Theater. It is advertised as such but, in reality, the present building is merely a warehouse museum to which an admission is charged. Steps should be taken to restore the building as it was on that fatal night, when the mad actor, Booth, struck his fatal blow. Only last year the Congress authorized studies looking toward a partial restoration at least. Let us hope that these studies go forward, and that the admission charge to enter this shrine be eliminated. There is no admission charge to the Lincoln Memorial, and there should be none at Ford's Theater.

Every school child knows the Lincoln story. Everyone who comes to our shores as visitors or as immigrants knows and is moved by the story of this great American who belongs to the ages. But, today, it is clear that some of the present-day leaders in the great political party which he played a major part in establishing have forgotten, if they ever knew, another part of the Lincoln story which is equally vital and valid, and equally important to our times.

Lincoln, the man of the people, had a high regard for the contribution which the immigrants to America through the years, and the descendants of those who reached our shores in earlier years, have made to our country, for the richness and variety of cultures they brought; for the sacrifices they have made in the battles fought to preserve and strengthen our country; and the contributions these peoples from all the countries of the earth have made to every phase of our lives.

In a speech in Cincinnati, on February 12, 1861, Lincoln said:

In regard to Germans and foreigners, I esteem them not better than other people, nor any worse. It is not my nature when I see a people borne down by the weight of their shackles—the oppression of tyranny—to make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens; but rather would I do all in my power to raise the yoke than to add anything that would tend to crush them * * * if there are any abroad that desire to make this the land of their adoption, it is not in my heart to throw aught in their way to prevent them from coming to the United States.

One thinks of the lonely railsplitter, the war President, the man of the people, enshrined forever in the magnificent Lincoln Memorial in Washington which is visited by thousands each year from all parts of the country, whose writings and deeds live forever in the lives and minds of his countrymen. And one finds in his words spoken to the German community at Cincinnati an echo in the immortal stanzas of Emma Lazarus which are inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores.
Send these, your homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Yes, we recognize that the political party which Abraham Lincoln helped to establish has contributed much to American life, to the realization of Lincoln's ideas, to the fulfillment of the American dream. But Lincoln's concern with the workingman, with the common people, the concern that was expressed in so many of his speeches, and in such phrases as: "God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them," and his concern with the foreigner who comes to our shore to make

a new life has been often forgotten and often betrayed.

The political party which made him President has come upon evil days, indeed, when one of its leading figures can take the position he has in regard to the refugee problem, and in regard to Edward J. Corsi, an immigrant born in Italy. I would like to quote here from an editorial in the Trenton Evening Times of Tuesday, April 12, 1955:

THE CASE OF CORSI

A great deal of difficulty has been experienced during recent years in retaining desirable and highly qualified men in the Federal service. Washington holds little appeal for them and for one reason or another they pack their bags and depart for home, with or without a friendly note of regret and thanks from President Eisenhower.

There has never been any deep mystery as to the reasons for the continuing turnover in high places in the Government service. It is to be found principally in the readiness of the administration to offer a victim in sacrifice once the wolves begin to howl.

The case of Edward J. Corsi stands as a notable example of official cowardice. Mr. Corsi was regarded as ideally fitted for the post of special immigration adviser when he was named 3 months ago. He was a leading New York Republican who had been the party's candidate for mayor and had held important public offices.

But he proved to be a champion of liberal immigration policies and as such aroused the opposition of the restrictionists.

There were no definite and specific charges, nor is there anything in the record to support a suspicion against Mr. Corsi. In fact, only 8 days ago he was lauded by President Eisenhower for his "integrity and ability." Nevertheless, Secretary of State Dulles, surrendering supinely to a single critic, has dismissed him.

Why should men of ability and loyalty bother with public service when they are aware that there is always the danger that they will be subjected to such indignity?

One can think how saddened Lincoln would be were he alive today to see the ignoble position taken by his party's leaders.

I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill, H. R. 4533, to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes.

I can think of no greater tribute to Abraham Lincoln than to make the Refugee Relief Act work as it was intended to work by the Congress, and to enact into law H. R. 4533, which would carry out the noblest of the American traditions.

Mendocino County Chambers of Commerce Endorse Proposed Trinity River Power Development Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a telegram signed by chamber of commerce officials from various communities in Mendocino County, Calif., endorsing construction and development of power on the Trinity River by private enterprise.

Considerable interest has been generated throughout my congressional district in the proposal offered by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to develop power phases of the proposed Trinity River project. One such expression of interest is a telegram dated April 13, signed by the president of the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce; the president of the Ukiah Chamber of Commerce; the president of the Willits Chamber of Commerce, the president of the Fort Bragg Chamber of Commerce, and the director of the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce. These leaders endorse the "partnership plan" as a sound business proposal which would result in a savings of several million dollars to Federal taxpayers in construction costs, and return to the Federal and local governments tax revenues amounting to multimillions of dollars.

I firmly believe the proposal made by the Bureau of Reclamation by which private enterprise would develop power facilities on the Trinity River should be favorably considered by the Congress.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

UKIAH, CALIF., *April 13, 1955.*

Representative HUBERT SCUDDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We note by press release Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has made a formal proposal to the United States Bureau of Reclamation for partnership construction of the Trinity River project. We endorse this plan as a sound business proposal which would result in a tax savings of several million dollars to the people as well as a saving to the Federal Government by private capital investment.

DON MACMILLAN,
President, Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce.
CLAUDE FALCONER,
President, Ukiah Chamber of Commerce.
OSCAR GRUTER,
President, Willits Chamber of Commerce.
GUS NICHOLAS,
President, Fort Bragg Chamber of Commerce.
JAMES PELLASCIO,
Director, Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce, Point Arena.

Fortieth Anniversary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the youngest of the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which is observing its 40th anniversary today, is located at the edge of the Cleveland Hopkins Municipal Airport. Its name, the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, tells its mission—power plant research.

Here, more than 2,500 specialists are searching for ways and means to make our engines—the turbojets, the ram jets, and the rockets—more powerful and more economical in fuel consumption. Upon the success of their efforts depends, in large degree, how much faster and higher and farther can fly the airplanes and missiles we build tomorrow.

One of the most interesting and inspiring days I have ever spent came not long after the voters of the 23d District of Ohio elected me their Representative. Then, I visited the NACA's Lewis Laboratory to see at first hand what was being accomplished.

From Dr. E. R. Sharp, director of the great research center, I was told how the Cleveland location was chosen in 1940 as the site of the NACA's greatly expanded powerplant research activity. I was proud to hear again how the Cleveland businessmen had done everything within their power to assure that the site would be ideal, as in fact it has proved to be.

I was told, too, about the late Dr. George W. Lewis, for whom the laboratory is named. Director of NACA's research program from 1919 to 1947 when he retired because of broken health, as much a war casualty as any man who fell on the battlefield, Dr. Lewis had considered the new powerplant laboratory a personal responsibility, and despite the immensity of the burdens he carried at NACA headquarters here in Washington, he traveled each week to Cleveland to give personal attention to the many complex problems associated with improvement of aircraft engines.

As Dr. Sharp took me around the laboratory, I was impressed by the youth of the technical staff engaged in work which could mean victory or defeat for the United States in any future war. I was equally impressed by the intensity with which these young scientists were working.

Military security limits my telling you what is transpiring today at the Lewis Laboratory. But, by a single example, I believe I can illustrate how valuable is the work being done. Right after World War II, NACA research men at the Lewis Laboratory began pioneering work with thrust augmentation—burning additional quantities of fuel in the tailpipe of a turbojet engine. The problems were many; they were very difficult to solve. The result: today, afterburners are used on the engines which power most of our fast military aircraft. These afterburners can provide as much as a 100 percent increase in the thrust which the turbojet engine provides.

I was interested, just as I know every Member of Congress is interested, to learn what is being done at the Lewis Laboratory about harnessing nuclear energy to airplanes. Again, military security prevents me from making detailed comments, but this much it is proper to note:

The performance capabilities to be realized from using nuclear energy for aircraft propulsion will enable nonstop supersonic flight to any point on the face of the earth, and return. With so large a gain the goal, industry, the Atomic

Energy Commission, the military services, and the NACA are participating in vigorous, sustained attacks on the formidable technical problems that remain to be solved.

The huge, complex equipment that is used at the Lewis Laboratory in study of powerplant problems is very necessary, but in the last analysis, it is the caliber of the men and women who work there that counts most. From Dr. Sharp, on down, the people at the Lewis research center are representative of the best in the many scientific fields which have a bearing on aircraft propulsion. They are dedicated people. All America can be proud of the work they are doing.

Bolitha J. Laws, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Reports on Public Defenders Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I received as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2, in connection with the public hearings on bills relating to representation of indigent defenders in United States district courts by public defenders:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
April 1, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: As requested by you when I appeared before your committee in Congress as a witness on Wednesday of this week, I am sending you herewith a statement of average sentences imposed by judges of this court compared with those imposed at other points. You doubtless will recall that in our court we handle major cases which customarily arise in State courts, as well as those which arise in United States courts. Therefore, the figures which we have assembled include certain types of United States cases such as narcotics, interstate car theft, fraud, and other thefts, assault and robbery on United States Government reservations and high seas, in respect of which our average sentence is compared with the national average; and we also compare cases usually arising in State courts such as various types of homicide, rape, larceny, robbery and burglary, in which we compare the average sentence here in comparison to the average sentence imposed in each of our neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. We do not have readily available at this time the national average in State cases, since we have not been furnished figures from other than the two States mentioned. The figures which I am sending were furnished our court by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the United States Bureau of Prisons.

At various times in the past we have read about statements being made that our sentences in narcotics cases have been low. You will note from the chart that the sentences in the District of Columbia in narcotics cases average over 2 years more than the national average. You will also note that with the sole exception of robbery cases, the average sentence imposed by our court in the District of Columbia in all of the categories listed is higher than the national average. I do not know the full definition of robbery in other jurisdictions, but I do know that in Washington robbery includes stealthy seizure and purse snatching, as well as armed or other robbery by force.

I am especially interested in calling your attention to our average sentence in rape cases. You may recall Congressman FORRESTER stated at the hearing on Wednesday he understood our average was around 2 years. In fact, the average sentence in rape cases for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, was 12.7 years, and in assault with intent to commit rape the average was 9.1 years. In addition to this, rape cases in the District of Columbia include the statutory crime of carnal knowledge, that is committed when a male has relations with any female under 16 years of age, even with her consent.

The chart I am sending you is not in any great detail and relates only to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. (The Virginia figures cover the last 6 months of the fiscal year.) However, we have made similar studies as to previous years so far as cases in United States courts are concerned and the results have been substantially the same. I think you will agree the information I am sending you strikingly refutes some of the unfounded talk which has resulted from published articles within the last several years. In submitting these figures I do so in order that the true facts may be known to Members of Congress, some of whom apparently have been misinformed. I do not intend to convey the impression that I believe lengthy sentencing is the sole, or necessarily, the principal deterrent to crime.

I am grateful to you and the other members of your committee in making it possible to send you this information.

Sincerely yours,

BOLITHA J. LAWS.

Average sentences imposed for the offenses listed

Offense	United States District Court for the District of Columbia, year ended June 30, 1954		United States District Court for the District of Maryland, year ended June 30, 1954		United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, year ended June 30, 1954		The 86 United States district courts (District of Columbia excluded), year ended June 30, 1954	
	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)
Interstate car theft	10	3.0	31	1.5	36	1.5	2,693	2.2
Car theft (local) [1]	71	2.9						
Fraud and other theft	73	4.1	68	1.7	34	1.5	3,567	1.9
Narcotics	201	5.7	7	4.6	2	3.5	1,483	3.4
Larceny [1]	95	3.0						
Grand larceny	55	4.3						
Petit larceny	35	1.0						
Gambling [1]	56	1.4						
Assault	95	4.5	[2] 2	2.0	[2] 3	2.8	[2] 25	2.6
Robbery	174	9.6			[2] 3	4.0	[2] 175	11.2
Burglary [1]	172	6.8			[2] 1	3.0		
Murder: [1]								
First degree	1	Death						
Second degree	[3] 13	28.5						
Manslaughter [1]	31	9.9						
Manslaughter	26	11.3						
Negligent homicide	4	.7						
Abortion (death)	1	10.0						
Rape [1]	28	11.3						
Rape (carnal knowledge)	17	12.7						
Assault to rape	11	9.1						

[1] Local offenses not usually tried in a Federal court.
[2] Offenses committed on United States reservations and high seas.
[3] Includes 2 life sentences, computed at 45 years.

Average sentences imposed for selected local offenses in the District of Columbia during the year ended June 30, 1954, and in Virginia and Maryland during the 6 months ended June 30, 1954

Offense	Sentences imposed for District of Columbia local offenses by the District Court for the District of Columbia, year ended June 30, 1954		Sentences of prisoners received in State institutions, 6 months ended June 30, 1954			
			Virginia		Maryland	
	Number	Average maximum sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)
Murder	[1] 13	28.5	[1] 42	19.9	[2] 41	11.4
Manslaughter	31	9.9	23	3.4	29	4.7
Robbery	174	9.6	[1] 59	12.8	186	7.5
Assault	95	4.5	101	2.8	266	1.6
Burglary	172	6.8	330	4.3	399	2.8
Larceny	95	3.0	195	2.6	361	1.7
Auto theft	71	2.9	30	2.1	42	1.9
Rape	28	11.3	[3] 31	9.1	[1] 29	8.9

[1] Includes 2 life sentences, computed at 45 years.
[2] Includes 7 life sentences, computed at 45 years.
[3] Includes 1 life sentence, computed at 45 years.

Data from Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D. C., Apr. 1, 1955.

Rigid Farm Supports Result in Lower Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pledged to support any program that will improve our farm economy, short of outright grants from the public treasury, but I remain unpersuaded that 90 percent of parity can accomplish that end. In fact, the direct opposite has been the result, and we know that farm prices dropped some 22 points while rigid supports were in full force and effect. I also believe that our overall economy can best be improved by a reduction in the cost of government with a consequent reduction in taxes. The Agriculture Act of 1954 and the revision of our Federal tax laws, both of which were enacted during the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, will in my opinion operate to the improvement of our economy through the stabilization of farm prices and the retention by all of our citizens, through tax reductions, of more of their earnings for their own use. The following letter from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson addressed to Mr. J. Claude Hammond of Gettysburg, Pa., explores these views and is included with these remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 5, 1955.
Mr. J. CLAUDE HAMMOND,
Gettysburg, Pa.,

DEAR MR. HAMMOND: Your letter of February 26 addressed to President Eisenhower has been referred to me for reply. I want to say first that I deeply regret the difficulties in which you find yourself as a result of the adjustments that have to be made in this transition period from one of war to one of peace. These adjustments are particularly hard for agriculture because as we move into a peacetime economy prices for the things the farmer has to sell are the first to adjust to peacetime levels. This is true this time as has always been the case in the past. However, this administration takes pride in the fact that the adjustments that have had to be made in agriculture have not been anywhere near as difficult as those that farmers experienced following the First World War, or the Second, or in fact any other war in our history. This lessening of the impact has been brought about through careful management of our Federal affairs including those of agriculture.

I think you will be interested to know that total agricultural assets stood at $162 billion at the beginning of 1955, up slightly over a year earlier. Farm debt, as a percentage of current assets was 23.9 percent on January 1, 1955, compared with 49.3 percent in 1940 and 70.4 percent in 1930. Following World War I, farmland values fell nearly 20 percent below the 1920 peak in 2 years. From the post-World War II peak reached in 1952, farmland values had declines less than 4 percent by January 1, 1955.

The parity ratio, which measures price received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, has been relatively stable during the past year. It dropped from a Korean war peak of 113 percent in February 1951, to 94 percent in January 1953. Since then it has averaged about 90 percent. Currently it is 87 percent. Thus nearly three-fourths of the decline in farm prices came in the 2 years before this administration took office. All of the decline occurred while we had rigid supports at 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities. The flexible price support provisions of the Agricultural act of 1954 do not become effective until the 1955 harvests.

Since dairy price supports were reduced from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent on April 1, 1954, there has been real improvement in the dairy situation. Consumption is up. Milk production has leveled off. Government purchases of dairy products are sharply down. Surplus stocks are moving into use. In recent months dairymen have been receiving from 84 to 86 percent of parity for all milk—approximately the same as in March 1954 when 90-percent supports were still in effect.

The second part of your letter deals with the tax legislation of the last Congress. First, let me say that everyone agreed—Democrats and Republicans alike—as to the need for a general revision of our Federal tax laws. Such a revision was long overdue. Second, the tax reduction of our administration was unparalleled in the life of our Nation, totaling $7,400,000,000. This is hard to grasp, but the money the American farmers got last year for all the corn and all the wheat grown in our entire country was $7 billion. This reduction was made possible through careful elimination of wasteful, duplicating, and often ridiculous spending policies of the big Government operation built by the Democrats. Of the total of $7,400,000,000 in tax savings brought about by Republican policies, nearly two-thirds, or $4,700,000,000, goes directly into the pockets of the wage earner and the family and other individuals. This meant a saving for the average American family—a taxpaying family of 4—of $200 a year.

This 900-page Republican law containing some 3,000 independent tax-law changes contains a long list of benefits to the low-income taxpayer, such as additional child dependency, deduction of tax credit on retirement income, extension of split-income provisions to widows and widowers with children, lowers medical-expense deductions requirements, gives working widows, widowers, and mothers a tax reduction, liberalizes soil-conservation expense allowances for farmers, permits additional allowances for charitable contributions, and a long list of other low-income benefits.

In short, the largest tax saving in history has been handed to the American people—not to any one group but to all—and, it seems to me, that is the American way.

Sincerely yours,
E. T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

A Vote of Thanks to Dr. Jonas E. Salk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in Congress a concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to Dr. Jonas E. Salk for his great achievement in developing an antipolio vaccine.

We all owe this brilliant young scientist a heartfelt vote of thanks, and it is fitting that the elected representatives of all the people should offer a word of sincere commendation in behalf of the American people.

This historic contribution to preventative medicine proves again that America leads the world in the development of weapons to save human life and we freely share with the world the noble humanitarian benefits of our greatest scientific achievements.

Dr. Salk, the son of a garment worker, is an example of how an American boy in our great land of free enterprise can achieve success and attain the highest honors.

I wish to add that I am deeply gratified that United States Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele is taking immediate steps to extend the facilities of the United States Public Health Service in distributing the new polio vaccine.

Forest Conservation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency our valuable national forest lands are being nibbled to death by "weekend miners" who have been using the Nation's mining laws to lay claim to valuable stands of timber and choice summer home sites.

These "weekend" miners are not to be confused with the legitimate prospector upon whose optimism, energy and ability the future wealth and safety of our Nation depends. The legitimate miner presents no problem. His diggings—if he is fortunate to find an ore body—are few and far between and present no hazard to our forest watershed areas.

The minority, however, that are abusing the law have in their capacity created a national scandal.

The problem of correcting this situation has not been easy to solve. The legitimate prospector and miner understandably objected to changes in the mining law that would, in preventing abuses, put him out of business also. The forest service, commendably zealous, had difficulty in recognizing this fact.

Now, however, after lengthy meetings legislation has been drafted and I have introduced it today in the House. This legislation has the strong support of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

The new legislation recognizes the requirements of the legitimate miner and prospector but it also will bring to a halt the abuses of the mining laws who seek to obtain areas of the public domain for nonmining purposes.

Briefly, the new legislation would:

First. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act.

Second. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent:

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

Third. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a "quiet-title" action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area.

This legislation is fair and long overdue. I urge Members to study it and to press for its speedy passage by Congress.

NACA 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Federal agency responsible for fundamental, scientific aeronautical research in the United States, is observing its 40th anniversary. I should like to express felicitations. I should like also to wish that in the years ahead the NACA may continue to provide the essential foundation of information upon which our continued aerial supremacy must rest.

I should like to speak briefly about the oldest and largest of the research centers which the NACA operates. It is the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, located at Langley Field near Hampton in the First District of Virginia which I am honored to represent.

During its first year, 1915, the NACA was little more than what its name implies, an advisory committee. Composed at the time of 12 members instead of 17 as at present, the NACA promptly decided that if the United States, the birthplace of the airplane, was to regain its lead in aeronautics, intensified research activity was imperative. Within its first year, the NACA had taken the beginning steps to acquire such needed research equipment, and before 1916 had ended, the site now known as Langley Field was chosen.

What a proud name for an aeronautical institution to bear—in honor of Samuel Pierpont Langley. Even before 1889 when Professor Langley went to the Smithsonian Institution, that national repository of historic treasures, he had undertaken trailblazing in the infant science of aeronautics. He continued his aeronautical experimentation, and by 1896 he had flown large, powered airplane models for distances of more than half-a-mile. His standing in the scientific community gave encouragement to many, including Wilbur and Orville Wright, to undertake aeronautical experimentation. Following two accidents late in 1903, his own work was ridiculed. But his failures do not detract from his greatness.

The NACA's first wind tunnel, located at the Langley Laboratory was in today's terms, very small. But it, and the equipment that was soon built, were used so effectively that by the late twenties, the technical journals of Europe were conceding that the work at Langley Field had placed the United States in the forefront of aeronautics. In the years since, our continued aerial supremacy has, no less, been due to the work of the NACA.

It is the paid staff of the NACA, the scientists and the other workers, whom we should salute as being so largely responsible for American leadership in the air. Until 1939, the Langely Laboratory was the only research establishment the NACA operated. The laboratories and field stations constructed since were given a good start by top men being sent from Langley to head them up.

I wish time permitted my naming every one of the men and women at Langley. Instead, I must be content to mention but two:

First, the director of the Langley Laboratory, Henry J. E. Reid. With the NACA since 1921, he was only 25 when he was named head of the scientific staff at the Laboratory. Over the years, Dr. Reid's splendid work as administrator of the Langley Laboratoy has become a model for others who would encourage highly trained young men to become the competent researchers so urgently needed.

Second, John Stack, now assistant director at the Langley Laboratory. In 1947 he was a co-winner of the Collier trophy, aviation's premier trophy. This was for his conception of the high-speed research airplane program which resulted in the first supersonic flight. In 1951 Mr. Stack was again a Collier trophy winner, this time for the work he and his associates did in conceiving, developing, and applying practically, the transonic wind-tunnel throat. I am no scientist, but I have been informed that this development—the transonic wind tunnel—has provided the United States with a research tool of utmost value in the design and production of tactical supersonic airplanes.

Today, the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the NACA has more than 3,000 scientists and supporting personnel working intensively on all manner of aeronautical problems. For example, those having to do with enabling our new military aircraft to fly at ever faster supersonic speeds; those which must be solved before the true intercontinental ballistic missile will have become an actuality; in hydrodynamics, making flying boats equally efficient at near supersonic speeds and while floating upon the uneasy waters of the seven seas; in structures, learning how to construct airplanes that will be stronger and yet lighter and safer.

All this, involving the use of giant wind tunnels and other research tools so complex as to make description difficult—all this has been possible because succeeding Congresses have authorized the necessary new construction and have appropriated the funds needed to make fruitful use of that new equipment.

Today, as I salute the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and speak briefly of the important role Virginia's Langley Aeronautical Laboratory has played in achieving aerial supremacy, I pray that in Congress we may continue to have the wisdom to provide adequate support for this essential Government activity.

Address by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, to the West Point Society of New York at the Annual Founders Day Dinner, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include a splendid address made by a great military leader and great American, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, on March 19, 1955, to the West Point Society of New York at the annual founders day dinner held in New York City.

The views of General Ridgway are worthy of profound consideration in connection with our national defense, and particularly in connection with the strength of our Army during these trying days. In addition to showing that the "land arm" is indispensable in seizing, holding, and controlling portions of the world's surface, he also makes the pointed assertion that—

> It is, I believe, indisputably true that weakness in the strength of ground forces anywhere in the free world invites aggression in those areas. Where free-world ground forces are in position in strength, conditions tend toward stability, and the chance of successful aggression lessens.

Also, the further pointed statement:

> By remaining strong militarily, and by taking full advantage of our Nation's human, industrial, and scientific potential, we can best hope to deter aggression, or, should it occur, to deal with it in the manner that our national interests require. As a decisive factor in war, there is no substitute for

determined troops, adequately trained, properly armed with modern weapons, well led, and imbued with the will to close with the enemy on the ground and crush him. I believe any contrary concept is a dangerous fallacy.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Baruch, General Byran, distinguished guests, and members of the West Point Society of New York, it is an honor to be one of this gathering tonight, an honor to share once more in honoring our illustrious alma mater, an honor to be permitted to address this group of eminent Americans and sons of West Point, whose high achievements and dedicated service to God and country, in peace and war, testify eloquently to the worth of West Point's teachings, and to its continuing contributions to the Nation's progress.

Let us first recall with reverent pride the many sons of the United States Military Academy who have given life or limb in battle, defending with unswering loyalty the values and ideals which inspire the people of our Nation. Let us, too, express our abiding appreciation to West Point's sons, who are serving the Nation in our Armed Forces and in civil life, alongside of their patriotic fellow Americans whose service equally elicits our admiration.

Ninety years ago a great human drama was closing—a great historical era in our evolving society was about to begin.

Early in April of that year of 1865, two men of high principle faced each other in that climactic scene at Appomattox. They were famous then. They were to attain still higher eminence. Yet, in spite of the greatness Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee achieved in later years, perhaps neither ever knew more greatness of soul than that to which adherence to their principles had elevated them at that moment.

I seem to discern, in the perspective in which time now brings those war years and that scene into focus, a parallel with the American scene today. Not since then, I think, has destiny confronted America with such decisions. Not since then has principle stood so revealed as the instrument by which our future shall be decided.

Then, as now, apathy and complacency dragged at the feet of principle, and the search for a less arduous path threatened to sap national resolution. Today, fateful decisions, as in those days, confront our Nation, and the paths which we as a people choose to follow, will no less vitally affect our future before God and man.

We live in an age when science and technology appear to challenge the capabilities of man to control the fruits of his own rapidly increasing knowledge. To the normal hazards of life, as we have known it, there has been added in recent years the power of modern weapons, with destructive capability on an almost unimaginable scale, the magnitude of which goes on increasing—and with it the number and magnitude of the problems we confront.

There can be no dodging these problems, no escaping our national destiny for decisions, no evading our responsibility as a people for the results which will flow from their execution.

These results can have such a staggering impact in future years that I think it pertinent to discuss one or two of them briefly, even if this introduces a somewhat somber note into this pleasant evening. Most of us are members of the active Army. As such, we may well review what the Army's role is expected to be, and how it and we can discharge that role to our country's best advantage, in our evolving destiny.

I think no mind, however fine, can perceive with any sureness the course of events beyond the immediate future. Yet we may be sure that there will be continuing danger of war, while there exists the present combination of implacable hostility toward us by Kremlin leadership, and a great and growing capability under its control for military aggression and political subversion.

So long as this combination exists, the risk of war will remain, in spite of all we do to seek by all honorable means, to prevent war's occurrence. This risk has become an accepted fact in our daily life. We must reduce this risk of war, not ignore it, and we can, if we resolutely maintain our determination to remain strong at all costs, and to take the measures necessary for our protection, while with the dynamic force of faith we renew and intensify our efforts to solve this greatest of all problems—the preservation of peace and the extension of freedom.

Weapons of mass destruction are a two-edged sword. Under our control, they may serve as a deterrent to aggression. In the hands of the Communists they pose a threat. But they are still weapons, with definite limitations as well as capabilities, and subject, like all weapons, to man's control. The United States Army is prepared to employ tactically an impressive family of modern weapons against legitimate military targets.

Until some major change occurs in the world power ratio, and none is yet discernible on the international horizon, I firmly believe we must continue to employ our industrial and technical resources in ways most likely to increase our national security; that we must maintain, and to the maximum practicable extent, increase our superiority in all these modern weapons, atomic, and otherwise; that we must preserve adequate strength in all our Armed Forces, properly proportioned between the land, sea, and air arms.

The Army has inherent military characteristics indispensable in warfare, capabilities which we are ceaslessly seeking to increase. First in importance is the capability of the land arm to seize, hold, and control portions of the earth's surface, and the people who inhabit them. No other service has that capability. It is significant that in many instances where Communist aggression has occurred in the world, Communist ground forces have been the principal instruments of aggression, and that where aggression has been halted and defeated, this has been accomplished mainly by ground forces, with supporting sea and air strength.

It is, I believe, indisputably true that weakness in the strength of ground forces anywhere in the free world invites aggression in those areas. Where free world ground forces are in a position in strength, conditions tend toward stability and the chance of successful aggression lessens.

By remaining strong militarily and by taking full advantage of our Nation's human, industrial, and scientific potential, we can best hope to deter aggression, or, should it occur, to deal with it in the manner that our national interests require. As a decisive factor in war, there is no substitute for determined troops, adequately trained, properly armed with modern weapons, well led, and imbued with the will to close with the enemy on the ground and crush him. I believe any contrary concept is a dangerous fallacy.

Since, in the final analysis, man is the most important element in war, the intangibles that inspire men—the great moral and spiritual influences—are of the utmost importance in deciding issues between warring groups. An army's success in modern war will depend upon its possession of the highest attributes of bravery, patriotism, professional skill, and devotion to duty. The soldier in combat will be placed under the severest stresses to which war has yet subjected him. He will need and must receive the highest type of leadership and that type of leadership the Army will provide.

We can take deep pride in our officer corps and our noncommissioned officer corps—two reservoirs of leaders of character and competence, highly trained, many tested in combat, imbued with confidence, and sustained by those principles which have made our alma mater and our Nation great.

Today these leaders bear, and in the years ahead their successors will bear, heavy responsibilities. The manner in which they are discharged will be of incalculable importance to us and to mankind. If, in reaching decisions which lie ahead, our Nation remains true to the principles of the Founding Fathers; if our Nation matches the dedication to principle exemplified by the victor and the vanquished at Appomattox; then we need have no fear of future trials. For the principles on which our country is founded are rocks, and like the heights of the Hudson at West Point, they are the hills unto which we lift up our eyes, for from them, in truth, will come our help.

Youthful Energies and the Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year when life begins to stir and tree buds burst, many men in their early forties recall how they once lived and worked in a CCC camp. They recall the depression of the early thirties when they were left with nothing to do—and nothing to do it with. These thoughts come to them because just 22 years ago this month, the first CCC camp was established on the George Washington National Forest in nearby Virginia. It was appropriately called Camp Roosevelt in honor of a great President whose quick action in approving the Emergency Conservation Act helped relieve unemployment by putting men to work on the national forests, the national parks, and others of our public lands.

During nearly 9 years after the act of March 31, 1933, was signed, the people of every State saw young men standing in line to enroll in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Before the camps were closed in 1942 there were over 2,600 such camps in which over 3 million young men had seized the opportunity to build self-confidence while serving their country. I know what it meant, for I was with them.

Like thousands in those days, when I graduated from the Winona State Teachers College in my State, I stood with a diploma in my hand and no place to use my training. The CCC looked good, and believe me, it was good to me. For the better part of 2 years I worked with other young men on the Superior National Forest in northeastern Minnesota as camp educational adviser. The tasks we did depended upon the time of year and the ingenuity of our camp superintendent. We planted trees and built roads, strung telephone wires, searched for the elusive gooseberry bush to free the white pine trees from blister

rust, and fought forest fires. As camp educational adviser it was my task to provide educational opportunities in addition to the relief and work programs for which the CCC is more widely known. We worked in warm weather and in cold. There was plenty to do, but we were young. We liked the work; we liked the life; and especially, we liked the opportunity to be a recognized part of American life.

I believe I am the only Member of this Congress who was in the CCC. From this vantage point, I see it as a great movement to renew a spirit of adventure in youth, and to dramatize the protection and restoration of our natural resources. Our efforts up there on the shores of Lake Superior stand out as part of a job being done by thousands of young men in hundreds of CCC camps across the country.

Because of our work, millions of acres of forest land now yield crops of pulpwood and sawlogs, on millions more, fat livestock feed on good grass that we made possible, everywhere sportsmen find better places in which to fish and hunt, and families have places where they may picnic. Now, as never before, I see in the CCC, an evidence of what can be done when direction is given to the energies of youth.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant, quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and dangers of a new age.

O Thou who hast led us out of bondage with a vision of man's righteousness, Thou who hast taught us that we are faithful to Thee only when we labor for Thy children, guide us in our deliberations so that we shall find the path that leads upward, the way that builds new strength and new hope for the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise Thy standards in our time, the men who guard the rights of their fellow men, the men who are not neutral in time of evil, the men who do not turn away their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage of petty gain, the men who have the self-discipline of the disciples of Thy sacred law as children of a just God.

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this great moment of history we shall in truth be the living witness of Thy covenant, and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ELLENDER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, April 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate commencing at 4:30 p. m. today, and for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet on Wednseday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, during the sessions of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LIST OF PRINCIPAL AND ALTERNATE CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1955 REGULAR NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1955 Regular Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTION FOR DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ENTITLED "USE AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY" BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission entitled "Use and Disposal of Surplus Property" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract within Acadia National Park, Maine (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, TENNESSEE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit, in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tennessee (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on synthetic liquid fuels, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on

the payment of claims from the correction of military or naval records, for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED MINIMUM POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSIT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A law enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 230

"An act creating the Senator McCarran memorial statue committee; stating the membership and powers and duties of the committee; providing for public meetings, the election of officers and duration of the committee; allowing the acceptance of contributions and creating a special fund; making an appropriation; and other matters properly relating thereto

"Whereas the late United States Senator Patrick A. McCarran, during his service in the United States Senate, was associated with the enactment of legislation having for its purpose the arresting at its source of the poisonous pollution of the Godless ideology of communism which was permeating the lifestream of this Nation; and

"Whereas in furtherance of the fight against the enemies of the Republic, both within and without, he authored and caused to be enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, known as the McCarran Act, and coauthored and guided the enactment of the Immigration Code of 1952, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, these acts being the two principal security laws of the United States; and

"Whereas this most distinguished statesman and courageous patriot, during his 22 years of service in the United States Senate, brought great distinction and credit to his native State of Nevada and to the Nation at large and prior to such senatorial service he was instrumental in shaping the laws of this State as a member of the legislature, district attorney and supreme court justice; and

"Whereas Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States at Washington, D. C., was designated by the 38th session of Congress as a place for the States to honor their statesmen and leaders by the donations of statues, not to exceed two from each State; and

"Whereas the rules for admission of statues to Statuary Hall provide that the statues are to be a gift from the State, not from individuals or groups of citizens, that the statues must be in marble or bronze, and that the person commemorated must be illustrious for his historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service so that the State deems him worthy of national commemoration; and

"Whereas Nevada is 1 of the 8 States that have not as yet honored any of their respected sons by contributing such a statue; now, therefore, the people of the State of Nevada represented in senate and assembly do enact as follows:

"SECTION 1. There is hereby created the Senator McCarran Memorial Statue Committee, which shall consist of the governor of this State, the president of the senate and the speaker of the assembly of the 47th session of the legislature, and four other citizens of the State of Nevada to be named by the three officials specified.

"SEC. 2. The members of the committee shall serve until their successors are appointed or the purposes of this act are fulfilled. A vacancy in the regular membership created by death, resignation, or any other cause shall be filled by election of the majority of the entire committee remaining.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall holds its first meeting within a reasonable time after the passage and approval of this act and shall elect from its membership a chairman and a secretary-treasurer. Thereafter, the committee shall meet at such times and places as shall be specified by a call of the chairman or a majority of the committee. Four members of the committee shall constitute a quorum, and such quorum may exercise all the powers and authority conferred on the committee. All meetings of the committee shall be open to the public, and a complete record of all its proceedings shall be taken and preserved as a matter of public record.

"SEC. 4. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation but shall be entitled to the per diem expense allowance and travel expenses as provided by law for attendance at committee meetings and other necessary official committee business.

"SEC. 5. The primary purpose of the Senator McCarran memorial statue committee is to facilitate and make arrangements for the placement of a statue in Statuary Hall of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran. To fulfill the provisions of this act, the committee shall have the following powers and duties:

"1. To investigate and determine the steps to be taken to enable this State to have placed in Statuary Hall in Washington, D. C., a marble or bronze statue of Senator Patrick A. McCarran.

"2. To select a sculptor or sculptors to create or cast the statue and to hold deliberations and determine the type, size, material and cost of such a statue.

"3. To direct the method of obtaining, furnishing and expending the funds necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"4. To contract for and employ a sculptor or sculptors to create or cast the statue, and to pay the necessary costs, such as, but not limited to, the fee of the sculptor, building and material expenses, cost of a pedestal or base, freight costs for transporting the statue to Washington, D. C., cost for temporary placement and erection of the statue in the Rotunda in the United States Capitol for unveiling ceremonies, cost for permanent placement and erection of the statue in Statuary Hall, cost of printing the announcements, invitations and programs for the unveiling ceremonies, and other incidental and necessary expenses which the committee may find it necessary to incur.

"5. To determine whether or not unveiling ceremonies are desired and, if held, to arrange such exercises and appoint a presiding officer to take full charge of the presentation. If the committee decides to hold unveiling ceremonies, it shall take the necessary steps to be granted permission by concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States and it shall consult with the congressional delegation from Nevada to introduce such a resolution.

"6. To contact and consult with the Architect of the Capitol of the United States for any procedural information desired with regard to the contribution of the statue and to confer with the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and Statues concerning the final determination as to where the statue will permanently be located in the United States Capitol.

"7. To receive contributions from any source whatever to cover the cost of erecting the statue and to deposit such contributions with the State treasurer to the credit of the Senator McCarran statue fund hereinafter created.

"8. To report to the next ensuing session of the legislature of the State of Nevada on what action has been taken and what results have been achieved under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 6. This act shall remain in full force and effect until the objective intended and enunciated by the preamble and context of this act have been accomplished.

"SEC. 7. To carry out the purposes and provisions of this act there is hereby created a fund in the State treasury to be known as the Senator McCarran statue fund, which fund shall consist of legislative appropriations, contributions and donations of any kind or nature whatsoever. State funds to apply to the necessary costs of procuring the statue shall be provided by direct appropriation of the legislature and there is hereby appropriated the sum of $500 out of any money in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated to the credit of the Senator McCarran statue fund and claims against this fund shall be paid out as other claims against the State are paid.

"SEC. 8. This act shall become effective upon passage and approval."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein*, That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts, so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative

branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from Mississippi, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from Mississippi, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives February 15, 1955.

"WALTER SILIERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, March 24, 1955.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to set aside the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan adjacent to Denver as a Veterans' Administration domiciliary

"Whereas there is no Veterans' Administration domiciliary available for Colorado and the Rocky Mountain area veterans in the area from Fort Meade, S. Dak., to Wadsworth, Kans.; and

"Whereas the domiciliaries previously mentioned are constantly crowded and having waiting lists, as are the other domiciliaries throughout the United States; and

"Whereas the need for domiciliary care is increasingly more acute for each year and month that passes; and

"Whereas there is a saving of over $15 a day per patient for all veterans who can be transferred from a general medical and surgical hospital to a domiciliary; and

"Whereas Fort Logan has adequate buildings available at a small cost in preparation for service and with ample ground for expansion in necessary Veterans' Administration activities for the future: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact a law which will provide that the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan, near Denver, Colo., be made a permanent Veterans' Administration domiciliary; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"STEPHEN L. R. MCNICHOLS,
"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to the storage of surplus wheat in California

"Whereas the United States Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, has on its hands a vast quantity of surplus wheat which is estimated to exceed 2 billion bushels, and which is stored in various places; and

"Whereas none of this surplus wheat is now stored in California while in the Pacific Northwest area there is now reported to be stored some 30 million bushels of surplus wheat in 140 ships, in addition to that stored in warehouses, and it is proposed to use 105 additional ships in that area for the storage of approximately 25 million additional bushels of such wheat; and

"Whereas there is available now in the State of California grain warehouse facilities for the storage of approximately 10 million bushels of such wheat, and further facilities could be made available if necessary; and

"Whereas from an overall strategic standpoint it would seem that the best interests of the United States would be served by preserving shipping facilities for their intended purpose and by dispersing the storage of its strategic assets, including such surplus wheat, as widely as possible; and

"Whereas irrespective of the ultimate disposition of this surplus wheat its storage within California would be advantageous because if it is to be exported, California has the ports and shipping; if it is to be sold, California has its livestock industry and other purchasers to buy it; and if it is to be stored indefinitely, California has facilities for such storage; and

"Whereas this surplus wheat is the property of the people of the United States as a whole and whatever economic benefits may ensue to labor, trade, and industry from the handling and keeping thereof should be equitably distributed throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas there is now no reason why plans for the storage of such surplus wheat in California may not be put under way pursuant to which such wheat may be stored in California at least as advantageously as elsewhere, thus conferring a great economic benefit to this State at no additional cost, and possibly a saving, to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cause to be stored within the State of California such quantities of the surplus wheat under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be stored therein to the best advantage and benefit to the people of the State of California and the people of the United States; and be further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its many agencies, continues to acquire vast holdings of land and improvements, particularly for military, experimental, and defense purposes, and since the Federal Government is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, the property thus acquired is removed from the local tax base; and

"Whereas not only has the Federal Government acquired considerable land for war and defense projects, but in recent years it has enlarged its holdings of public lands set aside for national parks, Indian reservations, forest reserves, experimental areas and other similar purposes, which activity has been particularly noticeable in the 11 Western States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, within which States the Federal Government has greatly expanded the public domain since 1937, now owning over 55 percent of all the land in these States; and

"Whereas because general property taxation is the major source of revenue for counties, cities, school districts, and other local governmental units, the acquisition of property by the Federal Government has seriously impaired this source of revenue of local governmental units and consequently the financial stability of such local governments; and

"Whereas while the acquisitions of additional Federal property have adversely affected the source of revenue of local government, at the same time they have also enlarged the local problems and responsibilities of furnishing many necessary public services, not only directly for Federal activities, but also for the large numbers of families being attracted to the sites of Federal projects; and

"Whereas Federal property ownership has had a crushing impact on local governments, striking at the very heart of local government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Whereas the right of national self-determination is universally accepted as inherent in all peoples; and

"Whereas Slovakia was one of the first countries to suffer Communist aggression at the end of World War II and her peoples were denied their right of national self-determination; and

"Whereas Slovakia's strategic geographic location—on the flank of eastern Europe—is anchored in the politically, militarily, and economically vital area of the Carpathian Mountains, possessing as she does the finest area defense lines, which, if free, would add materially to the safety and security of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution that it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the people of Slovakia are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States, by the secretary of state.

"Adopted by the senate April 12, 1955.

"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas water and soil are the most valuable resources of Kansas; and

"Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

"Whereas many cities, industries and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts and

"Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control and soil conservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body March 31, 1955.

"JOHN M. CUISK,
"President of the Senate.
"SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature

"Whereas section 41 of the Hawaiian Organic Act provides for biennial sessions of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, such section having been in effect since April 30, 1900; and

"Whereas subsequent to the enactment of the Hawaiian Organic Act the population of the Territory has more than tripled and it is now necessary for the legislature to meet annually for the proper and adequate consideration of governmental problems and determination of policy for the Territory; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the State of Hawaii as agreed upon by the delegates of the people of Hawaii in convention on July 22, 1950, made provision for annual regular sessions of the legislature: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii,' approved April 30, 1900, as amended, known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, as follows:

"(a) By amending section 26 to read:

"'SEC. 26. Compensation of members: That the members of the legislature shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of $2,500 for each general session, and $1,500 for each budget session, payable in 3 equal installments on or after the 1st, 30th, and 50th days of each general session and on or after the 1st, 15th, and 25th day of each budget session, such amounts to be appropriated by Congress from any moneys in the Federal Treasury not otherwise appropriated, based upon regular estimates submitted through the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, that the members shall receive from the Territory $750 as compensation for any special session held under the provisions of existing law: Provided further, that the sums herein authorized to be appropriated from the Federal Treasury for mileage and per diem of members for general or budget sessions shall constitute the only sums to be appropriated by the Congress for legislative expenses.'

"(b) By amending sections 41, 42, and 43 to read:

"'SEC. 41. Sessions of the legislature: That regular sessions of the legislature shall be held annually. The governor may convene the legislature, or the senate alone, in special session. All sessions shall be held at the capital of the Territory. In case the capital shall be unsafe, the governor may direct that any session shall be held at some other place. Regular sessions in odd-numbered years shall be known as "general sessions" and regular sessions in even-numbered years shall be known as "budget sessions."

"'At budget sessions the legislature shall be limited to the consideration and enactment of the general appropriations bill for the succeeding fiscal year and bills to authorize proposed capital expenditures, revenue bills necessary therefor, urgency measures deemed necessary in the public interest, bills calling elections, and bills to provide for the expenses of such sessions. The legislature may also consider and act upon matters relating to the removal of officers. No urgency measure shall be considered unless a statement of facts constituting such urgency is set forth in one section thereof and until such section has been first approved by each house. The approval of such section and the final passage of such measure in each house shall require a two-thirds vote of all the members to which such house is entitled, taken by ayes and noes and entered upon its journal.

"'SEC. 42. Commencement and duration of sessions: That regular sessions shall commence at 10 a. m. on the third Wednesday in February. General sessions shall be limited to a period of 60 days and budget sessions and special sessions to a period of 30 days, but the governor may extend any session for not more than 30 days. Sundays and holidays shall be excluded in computing the number of days of any session.

"'SEC. 43. Adjournment: That neither house shall adjourn during any session of the legislature for more than 3 days, or sine die, without the consent of the other.'

"(c) By amending section 53 to read:

"'SEC. 53. The budget: That within such time prior to the opening of each regular sessions as may be prescribed by law, the governor shall submit to the legislature a budget setting forth a complete plan of proposed general fund expenditures and anticipated receipts of the Territory for the ensuing fiscal period, together with such other information as the legislature may require. The budget shall be compiled in two parts, one setting forth all proposed operating expenditures for the ensuing fiscal period and the other, all capital improvements expenditures proposed to be undertaken during such period. The governor shall also, upon the opening of the session, submit bills to provide for such proposed expenditures and for any recommended additional revenues or borrowings by which the proposed expenditures are to be met. Such bills shall be introduced in the legislature upon the opening of each regular session.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, District of Columbia Branch, Washington, D. C., signed by Eugene Davidson, president, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide suffrage in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego Chapter, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the repudiation of the Yalta agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego Chapter, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of legislation to reveal the Potsdam Agreement and certain other agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Civic Club and the Lions Club, both of the city of Downieville, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the construction of the Trinity River development in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Chamber of Commerce of Salt Lake City, Utah, relating to the exemption from Federal regulation the activities of producers and gatherers of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a salary adjustment for Post Office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ferenc Horvath, of Wrightstown, N. J., relating to the national highway program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present, for appropriate reference, three resolutions adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly, and sent to us by Armand H. Cote, secretary of state of Rhode Island.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution urging the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to obtain from the Public Housing Administration an extension of time for occupancy of Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B, at Fort Kearney, R. I.

"Whereas in the town of Narragansett upon South Ferry Road upon a hill overlooking the bay is situated Fort Philip Kearney, which became a housing development for the University of Rhode Island in 1946 under the provisions of the Lanham Act when contract with the Public Housing Administration converted the barracks at the installation into apartments; and

"Whereas the deadline date for vacating this Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B (Fort Kearney, R. I.) was extended to July 1, 1955; and

"Whereas a formal extension of the closing date for such housing project is now necessary since the facilities are located on land under the control of the United States Government and, therefore, subject to the requirements of section 604 of the Lanham Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to have an extension granted for another year until July 1, 1956, by the Public Housing Administration to permit Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B (Fort Kearney, R. I.) to continue in residence there; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour

"Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering, legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

"Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages and help to solve the problem of runaway shops; and

"Whereas in the State of Rhode Island many industries are getting serious and unfair competition from plants in low-wage areas because of the inadequacy of the present minimum wage, and the State may lose more of its industries unless action is taken quickly to raise the Federal minimum: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island calls upon the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour and urges our Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support such legislation, in the interests of both of our own State and of the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

"Resolution memorializing Congress endorsing the resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States; and

"Whereas in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which hears health matters, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, gave figures on the toll of mental illness. The press coverage is herein quoted:

" 'She spoke in support of President Eisenhower's program for dealing with the problem.

" 'She endorsed a resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey. This was submitted by Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the committee.

" 'No dissenting voice was heard as Mrs. Hobby and her experts urged much greater efforts immediately in the mental health field. As much as 6 percent of the population, or about 9 million persons, are believed to have serious mental disorders, she said.

" 'Mrs. Hobby put the direct cost of mental hospitals, plus benefits to veterans with mental disorders, at more than $1 billion a year.

" 'Dr. Wilfred Overholzer, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital here, a leading mental institution, added to the tragic picture.

" '"In the first year in a mental hospital," he said, "patients have a 50–50 chance of release. In 2 years, the odds against being released alive rise to 16 to 1. By the time a patient has been hospitalized for 8 years, the odds are more than 99 to 1."

" 'Dr. Overholzer reported that a 99-year-old woman had been in the hospital since 1885.

" '"Of the more than 500,000 patients in our State mental hospitals, one-quarter have been hospitalized more than 16 years, one-half more than 8 years, three-fourths more than 2 years," he said.

" '"Schizophrenia, a baffling type of mental disease, accounts for half the cases," he added.

" 'He added that virtually no special studies had been made on improving care and treatment in mental hospitals. However, he told of a California hospital that had increased its discharge rate 2½ times by intensifying care and therapy.

" '"There are very interesting new drugs coming along," he said. "They are not a panacea, but I believe we are on the verge of a new era in drugs."

" 'Secretary Hobby explained that the President's special program would complement an appropriation increase from $14,147,500 to $17,501,000.

" 'It calls for an additional $6,750,000 in grants to States, $1,250,000 in "demonstration projects," and $1,500,000 for training workers, and $1 million for research.

" 'Both Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Robert H. Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, stressed the shortage of medical personnel in the field': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly requests Congress to endorse this movement calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States; asking our Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island to work for enactment of this legislation; directing the Secretary of State to transmit to them duly certified copies of this resolution."

REGULATION OF PRODUCERS' PRICES OF NATURAL GAS—RESOLUTION AND STATEMENT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in favor of Federal regulation of producers' prices of natural gas, adopted by the City Commission of Grand Rapids, Mich., and a statement by Mr. Samuel H. Himelstein, city attorney for the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., to the mayor and the city commission of that city. The statement is a particularly straightforward and enlightening exposition of the compelling reasons why such Federal regulation must be kept in force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the Harris bill (H. R. 4560) is now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Harris bill would nullify the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which gives the Federal Power Commission the right and duty to regulate a fair and reasonable price for natural gas at the wellhead; and

Whereas if the Harris bill is enacted into law it would destroy consumer protection in the price of natural gas and permit the natural-gas producers to charge the consumers any arbitrary price they chose to fix and would result in increased cost of millions of dollars to the many thousands of natural-gas users and result in great harm to the people of this city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this city commission, That we do hereby declare our opposition to the Harris bill, so-called, and urge upon the President of the United States and our representatives in the Congress that the Harris bill be defeated: Be it further

Resolved, That if the Harris bill is passed by the Congress, we urge the President of the United States to veto it; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, to Senator CHARLES POTTER, to Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA, and to Congressman GERALD R. FORD, JR., at their respective addresses in Washington, D. C.

The statement presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

SHOULD CONGRESS VOTE A $1,700,000 YEARLY INCREASE FOR NATURAL GAS CONSUMERS OF GRAND RAPIDS?

(Statement by Samuel H. Himelstein, city attorney of Grand Rapids, Mich.)

Mayor Veldman and gentlemen of the commission, you have before you a resolution asking the Congress of the United States to defeat the Harris bill. I desire, through you, to alert the people of this city to the great danger that the Harris bill will be enacted into law by the Congress unless the people make themselves heard. It is necessary that the people become fully aware of what this Harris bill will mean to them in the very near future if it does become law.

Most people think that what happens in Congress in Washington is far away and doesn't concern them. Of course, that is not

true. And it is especially not true in this situation. If this bill passes it will cost the people of the city of Grand Rapids millions of dollars. I am not overstating the case.

To understand this situation I must give you a brief factual background. Natural gas, including that for Grand Rapids users, is produced in 3 or 4 States in South and Southwest United States. The principal producers are Texas and Oklahoma. Two or three other States contribute some natural gas. Natural gas, as it comes out of the ground, is called well-head or field gas. From the ground, the gas is piped by long pipelines to its destination, most times to other States far away, e. g., Michigan. It is sold to local distributing companies, such as the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., which bases its rates, in part, on the price paid for the natural gas at the field or well-head (as it comes from the ground).

In two decisions, the United States Supreme Court has decided that when the gas is transported across States lines neither the State where the gas comes from the ground, e. g., Oklahoma or Texas, nor the State of destination, e. g., Michigan, has the right to regulate or control the price of natural gas as it comes from the ground. This is what is known as the well-head or field price. Investigation by the Federal Trade Commission proved that the sellers of natural gas before 1938 always charged whatever they thought the traffic would bear. This resulted in price gouging and exploitation of consumers.

To correct this situation, the Congress of the United States in 1938 enacted what is known as the Natural Gas Act of 1938, whereby the Federal Power Commission was given the right and the duty to regulate the price of natural gas at the field or well-head. This regulation sets a price which would, on the one hand, guarantee a fair rate to the producer of natural gas, but, on the other hand, would not be unfair to, nor would it gouge the consumer. This Natural Gas Act of 1938 was upheld by the United States Supreme Court. But the Harris bill, if it becomes law, would nullify and kill the Natural Gas Act.

Since 1938 the natural-gas industry has grown and prospered. Much natural gas has been found, and millions of customers have been added. It has been profitable to the producer and, despite some increases because of inflation, etc., the price of natural gas has remained within reach of millions of consumers.

Now the gas and oil industry (oil companies own most of the natural gas wells) are making an intense legislative drive in Congress to sabotage and scuttle effective regulation of natural gas rates. The oil companies are spending well over a million dollars on this lobby. There have been six bills introduced to nullify the Natural Gas Act, and the principal bill is the Harris bill, against which this city commission resolution is directed.

If this Harris bill becomes law, the Federal Power Commission would no longer have the right to regulate just and reasonable prices for natural gas as it comes out of the ground. If this happens, consumer protection will be destroyed. With the Federal protection removed, and with the States constitutionally helpless to protect the consumer, then that which happened before the Natural Gas Act was passed will happen again: the producers will again charge whatever they think traffic will bear; there will be price gouging and exploitation of consumers. What this will probably mean in dollars and cents to Grand Rapids I will shortly point out.

Under the present law a tremendous network of pipelines bring natural gas to nearly all the major cities in the Nation, Grand Rapids included. The pipelines were built, for the most part, under the representation that natural gas would be available to consumers at a regulated, reasonable rate. Municipalities, cities, and consumers in cities, supported this pipeline development in reliance on these representations. In city by city, Grand Rapids included, thousands upon thousands of people changed over their equipment to heat and cook with natural gas.

Consumers, including those in Grand Rapids, are now absolutely dependent on those who sell natural gas in interstate commerce. They are as dependent upon natural gas as a public service commodity, as they are on water and electricity. Heating units, stoves, hot water systems, etc. have been converted to this fuel at a cost of millions of dollars to the consumer; and gas is the only fuel which can be utilized by and in this equipment.

Furthermore, distributors, e. g. Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., are committed by contract to buy from the pipeline which comes a long distance in interstate commerce. Unless, therefore, the Federal Power Commission has the right to control that initial price in the field, no effective control exists. The only choice open to the consumers, and there are thousands of them in Grand Rapids, would be either to pay the gouging price, or to use another fuel. Everyone within the sound of my voice will understand the cost to him of reconverting back to coal or oil.

This is no choice at all. We, who have installed costly gas equipment with which to heat and cook, know that the cost of changing back to another fuel measured in terms of inconvenience and time, and of money, is prohibitive, and yet this is exactly what faces every user of gas in the city of Grand Rapids if the Harris bill is enacted into law by the Congress.

In terms of money the effect of removing the consumer protection if the Harris bill becomes law, is illustrated in a pending rate increase in the city of Denver. There the producers asked that the field or wellhead price be substituted for regulation by the Federal Power Commission which now exists. According to the figures presented there, this change means an increase in rates to consumers in Denver of $4 million extra per year; and the company there claims that the field price is not as high as it should be.

Now Denver is a city with 415,000 population. It is an American city just like Grand Rapids is. Figuring the population of Grand Rapids at 180,000 and using simple arithmetic, if the increase to Denver is $4 million each year, then, if the Harris bill becomes law, Grand Rapids users would have to pay for natural gas in addition to the present prices, the sum of $1,720,000 extra each and every year thereafter.

Imagine $1,700,000 extra in gas rates each and every year. Here the city commission is trying to save a dollar here and a dollar there. We are trying to save a million dollars on our sewage works which is a one time capital investment. Yet if the Harris bill becomes law it will mean over $1,700,000 extra in just gas rates every year to most of you within the sound of my voice. And think of the increase in cost of articles in which gas is used to manufacture. That figure could be greater than $1,700,000.

I should state here that this implies no criticism of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. They, too, would be helpless if the Harris bill becomes law. They would simply have to pay the price of gas whatever is charged at the wellhead, and they would have to pass that price increase on to you the consumer.

So that you may know the arguments used on the other side I want to state and analyze them briefly. The claim of the proponents of the Harris bill is that there are over 4,000 natural gas producing companies and that if the Government will just let them alone, competition will set in, and with free enterprise, prices will settle down.

What are the facts? True, there are over 4,000 natural gas producers. But most of them are so small that they produce very little gas and at the most only enough to supply one little surrounding community. Of these thousands of producers 7 (not 70, not 700, but 7) mostly big oil companies, produce one-third of all the natural gas used in this country and less than 100 of these companies produce 85 percent of all the natural gas used in this entire Nation. All the remaining 3,900 or more companies produce only 15 percent of the gas.

Nor is that the whole story. For example, 4 or 5 big companies produce our automobiles. But if you don't like an automobile you can, by simple choice, buy a competing product at about the same or even a lower price. You cannot do that with gas. Gas comes through a pipeline from Oklahoma or Texas or Louisiana, and once that pipeline is laid it would cost millions to change. In other words, there is no room for maneuverability or choice in the buying of natural gas.

Thus in the light of facts, the illusion of competition in the gas industry vanishes. The fact is that the natural gas industry is a monopoly and not a competitive industry.

I have stated before that there is a well-organized lobby now driving in Congress to scuttle and sabotage the protection which you have. Congressional committee hearings are now being carried on and there is real danger that the Harris bill will be enacted into law.

But there is no lobby as powerful as the people, if they make themselves heard.

It is imperative that you communicate with your representatives in Congress at the earliest possible time. Write them letters or post cards, or wire, or telephone your Senators and your Congressman in Washington, D. C. Let these Senators and Congressmen know, in your own words, that you are opposed to the Harris bill or anything like it. And watch how these Senators and Representatives vote in this.

You should also write to the President of the United States and ask him to use the influence of his high office to prevent the enactment of the Harris bill; and you should ask the President that if the Harris bill is passed by the Congress, that he veto it.

Protect and defend yourselves from the serious menace of the Harris bill. Write and get your friends to write to your Senators and Congressmen. Do it now without delay because the bill is now being considered.

INCREASED SUGAR QUOTAS—RESOLUTION OF KENNEDY (MINN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kennedy, Minn., Chamber of Commerce, relating to increased sugar quotas.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural life of the Red River Valley of the North; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity

per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of the valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota; and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce April 13, 1955.

ROBERT PETERSBURG,
President.
WILLIS LILLIQUIST,
Secretary.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted at the annual meeting on March 26, 1955, of the Isanti County Cooperative Association, endorsing a long-range permanent farm program of not less than 90 percent of parity, and supporting the family-sized farm.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Cambridge, Minn., March 31, 1955.

At the annual meeting of the Isanti County Cooperative Association, which was held March 26, 1955, the following resolution was brought in by Roman Jaloszynski, Cambridge, Route No. 1, and recommended for passing by the resolutions committee consisting of Hilmer N. Johnson, chairman, Isanti, Route No. 2; Linden Erickson, Cambridge, Route No. 2; Edwin Dobe, Dalbo; and John Spier, Bethel, Route No. 1. This was duly seconded and passed unanimously by the 300 members present. Copies of the resolution to be sent to Senator THYE, Senator HUMPHREY, and Congressman WIER.

Resolution as follows:

"Since net farm income has fallen off about 30 percent since 1948, while nonfarm income has increased about 43 percent since 1948, no amount of scrambling of figures can convince us we are better off now under flexible price supports than we were before. In view of these facts we submit the following resolution:

"Calling upon the President and the Congress to work out a long-range permanent farm program on all commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity—produced by the family-sized farm (a family farm can be described as one of which the family lives on the land, makes all the major decisions, and supplies the major part of the labor).

"We further resolve that the Government stop giving aid to the rich hobby farmers and the large cooperation farms who really produce the surpluses if there are any, and that the Government provide enough money through low-interest credit for the farm program, CCC, crop insurance, REA, SCS, etc."

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
RAYMOND STOECKEL,
Secretary.

ZIMMERMAN, MINN.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN INDIAN PROPERTY TO CITY OF PIPESTONE, MINN.—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter I received from the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association, and a copy of a resolution adopted by the Pipestone City Council, requesting that property belonging to the Indian school, and not needed for the proper enlargement of Shrine Park, be deeded to the city of Pipestone for the sum of $1.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIPESTONE CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
Pipestone, Minn., March 28, 1955.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request of Lawrence Cunningham, State representative, Pipestone County, we are forwarding a copy of a resolution adopted March 17 by the Pipestone City Council.

This resolution has been heartily endorsed by the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association and the Pipestone Community Council.

Very truly yours,

ROY E. SMITH,
Secretary.

Whereas the Pipestone Indian school building and building area and adjacent lands belonging to the Federal Government lie contiguous to the city of Pipestone; and

Whereas said Indian school buildings have been vacant for some time; and

Whereas it appears that said buildings, building site, and any other lands connected with said Indian school not deemed necessary or desired to enlarge and improve the national park adjacent thereto are no longer needed by the Federal Government and that it is possible that said property will be deeded to the State of Minnesota for the sum of $1; and

Whereas it appears that the State of Minnesota does not desire to have said property for use by said State: Be it

Resolved, That the city of Pipestone desires to have said buildings, building site, and any other real property belonging to said Indian school not necessary for the proper enlargement of Shrine Park deeded to the city of Pipestone for the sum of $1 with no restrictions involved and that the city of Pipestone will accept such transfer for which it will pay the consideration of $1.

THE CASE OF COMMISSIONER CORSI—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Congress Club of Kings County, a Republican organization in the Fourth Assembly District, County of Kings, State of New York, with headquarters at 694 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. I ask that the entire resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress Club of Kings County, regular Republican organization, since its incorporation over 50 years ago, of an area known as the Fourth Assembly District, County of Kings, State of New York, and active in Republican affairs and campaigns throughout the years of its existence, has been and still is interested in the welfare of the Republican Party and the enrolled and active members thereof; and

Whereas the Congress Club believes in party loyalty, the principles of the Republican Party, and good government by competent and forthright individuals of good character and attainments; and

Whereas the Honorable Edward Corsi has been a lifelong loyal Republican who has served the city, State and Nation with honor and distinction, and has been a proponent of good government for the benefit of all, irrespective of race, creed, religion, or ancestry; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has held numerous public offices, including delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1936; Commissioner of Naturalization and Immigration, under Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt; director of home relief and deputy commissioner of public welfare under Mayor La Guardia, chairman of the industrial board and industrial commissioner of New York State under Governor Dewey, and Special Assistant to the Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, without reflection upon his honesty or integrity for more than 25 years; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has also been the Republican candidate for such other offices as United States Senator, mayor of the city of New York, and councilman of the city of New York; and as one of the standard bearers of his party has actively participated and worked unselfishly in all campaigns in behalf of the party in the city, State, and Nation, being instrumental in establishing and building up many organizations and campaign committees throughout the years to further the cause of Republicanism and good government; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has been one of the outstanding progressive and liberal Republican leaders of the present generation, and has helped in furthering legislation, and taken other actions, both in his official capacity and as a member of the party, to advance the social welfare of the inhabitants of the city, State, and Nation; and

Whereas the Congress Club has learned with deep shock of the great injustice that has come to Commissioner Corsi through the recent action taken by the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, a fellow Republican and an influential leader in the party, in dismissing him from his post as Special Assistant Secretary of State without opportunity to carry out the humanitarian task assigned to him; and

Whereas this dismissal by Secretary Dulles was without just cause and apparently motivated primarily by the actions of a Democratic Member of Congress who leveled unjustified and unsubstantiated charges against Commissioner Corsi; and who did not afford him an opportunity to be heard in his own defense of such charges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress Club of Kings County resents the action of Secretary of State Dulles as an injustice to Commissioner Corsi, a loyal, competent, and intelligent veteran of the public service and Republican of the highest caliber; and be it further

Resolved, That this dismissal be condemned and repudiated by the people of the city, State, and Nation and by the President of the United States, the New York State Republican Committee and the National Republican Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the leaders of the Republican Party take appropriate steps to correct

this deplorable action which is both detrimental to the Republican Party, the Nation, and an affront to the basic standards of human decency; and be it further

Resolved, That such action be taken as necessary to prevent any similar unfortunate future occurrence in the best interest of the country and the party.

Mr. LANGER. I wish particularly to invite the attention of Senators to the last four paragraphs of the resolution:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress Club of Kings County resents the action of Secretary of State Dulles as an injustice to Commissioner Corsi, a loyal, competent, and intelligent veteran of the public service and Republican of the highest calibre; and be it further

Resolved, That this dismissal be condemned and repudiated by the people of the city, State, and Nation, and by the President of the United States, the New York State Republican Committee and the National Republican Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the leaders of the Republican Party take appropriate steps to correct this deplorable action which is both detrimental to the Republican Party, the Nation, and an affront to the basic standards of human decency; and be it further

Resolved, That such action be taken as necessary to prevent any similar unfortunate future occurrence in the best interest of the country and the party.

I was asked to present this resolution by the Republicans of Brooklyn, N. Y. I am well acquainted with the Republican leaders in Brooklyn, although I have not seen them for some years. I submit the resolution entirely without prejudice. I promised to submit it, and I therefore send it to the desk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor (Rept. No. 140);

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger (Rept. No. 141);

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Selma Rivlin (Rept. No. 143);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen (Rept. No. 144);

S. 89. A bill for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers (Rept. No. 145);

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman (Rept. No. 146);

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Luzia Cox (Rept. No. 147);

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen (Rept. No. 148);

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius (Rept. No. 149);

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) (Rept. No. 150);

S. 99. A bill for the relief of Xanthi Georges Kimporozou (Rept. No. 151);

S. 100. A bill for the relief of Hermine Lorenz (Rept. No. 152);

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer (Rept. No. 153);

S. 119. A bill for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea (Rept. No. 154);

S. 120. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos (Rept. No. 155);

S. 121. A bill for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch (Rept. No. 156);

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek (Rept. No. 157);

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro (Rept. No. 158);

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Borys Naumenko (Rept. No. 159);

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski (Rept. No. 160);

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Olivia M. Orcuich (Rept. No. 161);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro (Rept. No. 162);

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) (Rept. No. 163);

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger (Rept. No. 164);

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen (Rept. No. 165);

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela (Rept. No. 166);

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael) (Rept. No. 167);

S. 341. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti (Rept. No. 168);

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka (Rept. No. 169);

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri (Rept. No. 170);

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Lucy Personius (Rept. No. 171);

S. 449. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas (Rept. No. 172);

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura (Rept. No. 173);

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family (Rept. No. 174);

S. 570. A bill for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo (Rept. No. 175);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov (Rept. No. 176);

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller (Rept. No. 177);

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark (Rept. No. 178);

S. 633. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders (Rept. No. 179);

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp (Rept. No. 180);

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis (Rept. No. 181);

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo (Rept. No. 182);

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas (Rept. No. 183);

S. 713. A bill for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni (Rept. No. 184);

S. 714. A bill for the relief of Alfio Ferrara (Rept. No. 185);

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Pietro Meduri (Rept. No. 186);

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim (Rept. No. 187);

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Jacob Grynberg (Rept. No. 188);

S. 892. A bill for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez (Rept. No. 189);

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Henry Duncan (Rept. No. 190);

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Edward Naarits (Rept. No. 191);

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra (Rept. No. 192);

S. 1197. A bill for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic (Rept. No. 193);

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child (Rept. No. 194); and

S. 1367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jacoe (Rept. No. 195).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 36. A bill for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez (Rept. No. 196);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand (Rept. No. 197);

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Johanna Schmid (Rept. No. 198);

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic (Rept. No. 199);

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Priska Anne Kary (Rept. No. 200);

S. 758. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Quirk (Rept. No. 201);

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani) (Rept. No. 202); and

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez (Rept. No. 203).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiadis; with amendments (Rept. No. 204).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day (Rept. No. 139).

OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IN OR NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. REPT. NO. 142)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report favorably an original bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, and I submit a report thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, reported by Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

FUNDS FOR EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 92), which was placed on the Calendar as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to

make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of May 1, 1955.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; and

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1697. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life; and

S. 1698. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Takis Yuanidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1699. A bill for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1700. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1702. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

S. 1703. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947 (ch. 433, 61 Stat. 715), as amended, to increase the number of professional and scientific positions authorized for the Department of Defense; and

S. 1704. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the establishment of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1705. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri; and

S. 1706. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1707. A bill for the relief of Vasil Theodosovitch Stepanchuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1708. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh; and

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia S. Prims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1710. A bill providing for the designation of a highway between Echo Junction, Utah, and Ogden, Utah, as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1711. A bill to grant career appointments to certain employees in positions under temporary or indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1712. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1713. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1714. A bill to define "wheat unfit for human consumption" for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 1715. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1716. A bill for the relief of Cheuk Wa Leung and his wife, Camilla Ying Ling Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1717. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to union welfare funds; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1718. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1719. A bill for the relief of Zanis Rigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1720. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the county of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1721. A bill for the relief of Renate Dressel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1722. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he reported the above bill, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1723. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AWARD TO DR. JONAS E. SALK, DISCOVERER OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 1697) to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I have asked for the floor today to speak briefly on a matter which I feel is of importance to the people of our country.

The people of America and of the whole world have been told during the last few days of a tremendous advance in medicine. The discovery that has been made ranks in importance with such milestones in medical history as the development of the vaccine against smallpox, Lister's antiseptic procedure, the inoculation against diphtheria, insulin, the sulfa drugs, and the antibiotics.

Inasmuch as my own great State of Michigan and the University of Michigan made great contributions to this historic event, I think it fitting that I should make some remarks about it, and that I should introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to make my remarks effective.

I am referring to the discovery and the successful tests of the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis. It is the opinion of the medical profession that this is one of the great steps forward in man's steady march toward victory over disease and deformity. Polio is a particularly dramatic and frightening malady, for it strikes almost without warning; in many instances it kills or cripples, and its incidence is particularly high among our children.

Our own late illustrious President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a victim of the disease. Only by indomitable courage was he able to adjust his life to its cruel damage.

Now a great scientist has found a way to prevent the disease on a nationwide scale. Soon his discovery will be available not only to the people of America, but to the people of all the world. This is far better, it seems to me, than the atomic bomb, which speaks of destruction. Here is a profound discovery that speaks only of healing and of peace. It is our gift to the world.

But I do not think the American people would wish to be accused of ingratitude to the scientist who made this great discovery. As Dr. Jonas Salk, himself said on a television program on the anniversary of Franklin D. Roosevelt's death, "You can't patent the sun." And so Dr. Salk, in the great tradition of the highest level of ethics of the medical profession, gains nothing material from his great discovery. Therefore, I propose in the bill which I am now introducing, that Dr. Jonas Salk be given an award of $10,000 a year throughout his natural life. This is not to be considered in the light of a payment for his services, but as an award from a grateful people to a great scientist, so that Dr. Salk may be removed from the anxieties and disturbances of seeking a livelihood, and may be able to continue to devote his great talents to the service of mankind in dignity and in peace.

The manufacture of the Salk vaccine appears certain to ensure earnings of many, many millions of dollars to the pharmaceutical manufacturers who produce it. It will mean the addition of important revenue to the Treasury of the United States through the corporation income tax. In good conscience, we can do no less than see that an award which will give the great discoverer financial security shall be made.

This bill to give an award to Dr. Salk, if enacted, will be something new in our history, or at least so I am told. It seems to me that our Nation can well afford to do honor in a practical way to Dr. Salk, and in so doing to honor all the selfless scientists and physicians who make great sacrifices for the well-being of all of us.

ALBERT WOOLSON

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief statement in connection with the introduction of a bill for the relief of Albert Woolson.

Albert Woolson, the last surviving Union veteran of the Civil War, who celebrated on February 11 his 108th birthday, has incurred considerable personal expenses in connection with his recent hospitalization. Mr. Woolson, unfortunately, has now been compelled to return to the hospital, which will involve additional personal expenses for his care.

As soon as I learned that Mr. Woolson, a Union Army veteran, one of the oldest citizens of our Nation, was not qualified to receive outpatient care from the Veterans' Administration or any assistance from the Veterans' Administration, I proceeded to obtain all of the details concerning Mr. Woolson's problem.

Mr. Woolson is the embodiment of those elements in our national character which are responsible for the greatness of our Nation. He is the remaining participant on the Union side in one of the most important events in our Nation's history. I feel that in recognition of the unique position in which he resides at this time, the American people would wish to assist in the financial difficulties confronting Mr. Woolson as a result of his illness and hospitalization. The bill I am introducing will authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the hospital and medical-care expenses incurred by Mr. Woolson, as a result of his illness.

Mr. President, this veteran does not come under the act providing for outpatient medical care. Therefore, I am introducing this bill, for which I request appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1699) for the relief of Albert Woolson, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEFINITION OF WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to define wheat unfit for human consuption for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared for me by Harker T. Stanton, counsel of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, pertaining to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1714) to define wheat unfit for human consumption for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The memorandum presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

This responds further to your request for legislative suggestions arising from the committee's hearings on the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption.

Attached are (1) the letter of June 24, 1954, from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the committee; (2) the draft bill referred to in the Acting Secretary's letter; and (3) a redraft of this bill prepared for introduction should you desire to use it.

The redraft does not differ in substance from the draft submitted by the Acting Secretary and its purpose is to clarify certain provisions, particularly with respect to the application of existing reciprocal trade agreements and the existing proclamation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. An additional consideration in preparing the redraft has been to create the possibility that it might be referred to this committee for which it was prepared and which has shown so much interest in the problem. However, since it affects customs as well as agricultural laws, it should, under the Constitution, originate in the House.

I have spoken to Mr. Higman of the Customs Bureau about this several times within the last few days. He advised that their present regulation appears to be working satisfactorily. This legislation may therefore not be needed, but I thought you would probably like to consider it as it was prepared at the committee's request. If you should decide to introduce this, you might want to consider whether other members of the committee might be interested in joining with you.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Counsel.

MARCH 31, 1955.

REVESTMENT OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN LAND AT UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION, HOUMA, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La. I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement, prepared by me and my colleague, regarding the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1715) to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La., introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The joint statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATORS ELLENDER AND LONG

We are introducing legislation to revest in certain individuals, the town of Houma, La., and the Parish of Terrebonne the mineral and royalty interests underlying lands formerly belonging to them and now comprising the United States Naval Air Station at Houma, La.

In 1943 the Navy filed condemnation proceedings to acquire 1,700 acres of land upon which to establish a lighter-than-air station near Houma. Some 640 acres of this land belonged to South Coast Corp. and the balance to those on whose behalf this bill is being introduced.

The filing of the 1943 condemnation suit constituted a taking of the title of the lands involved; the only issue left open was the fixing of just compensation, as required by the Constitution. As a matter of practice, the price to be paid could have been left to a jury or negotiated by agreement. The Government and the landowners decided to negotiate.

Southwest Louisiana is rich in natural resources; the oil and gas potential in that area is common knowledge, and was such in 1943. The question of reservation of mineral rights is, and for some time has been, the subject of specific discussion in connection with practically every land transaction in this area. This is particularly true in Terrebonne Parish. As a matter of fact, the property of one of the landowners in this instance was under oil lease prior to and up to

the time of the condemnation proceeding, and as early as 1936 some of the parties had sold royalty interests from about 400 acres of the land in question. Accordingly, during the 1943 negotiations, the landowners repeatedly told the Navy representatives that they desired to retain their mineral rights. Some of them made the request in writing. All of them were informed that the Navy insisted on the mineral rights because the Navy demanded a full and complete title. Open meetings were held and similar representations were publicly made to the landowners and others by representatives of the Navy.

It must be remembered that the war was on. Houma is only a short distance from the Gulf of Mexico, where the submarine menace was very great. As patriotic American citizens and in order to facilitate the war effort through the rapid installation of the base near Houma, these landowners did not insist on their demands that they be permitted to retain their mineral rights, believing, as they had been told by the Navy representatives, that such rights were needed and that their acquisition was required under existing Navy policy. They assumed, as they had a right to assume in view of the declared policy of the Navy, that all landowners were being treated alike with respect to their mineral rights.

Only last year, however, these landowners learned that their Government had broken faith with them. They discovered in 1954 that about a year after construction of the base began, the Government revested or returned to one landowner, the South Coast Corp., all mineral rights under 640 acres of the property of that corporation which had been taken in the very same condemnation suit, involving a total of 1,700 acres. Moreover, the South Coast Corp. received an average compensation of $120 per acre, while the other landowners, whose land was generally of equal value, received an average of $99 per acre.

Mr. Harvey W. Hillyard, who was officer in charge of construction of the base, has this to say concerning the unequal treatment of the landowners:

"I am at a loss to explain the apparent discrimination since my firm impression during my duty period in Houma was that the Navy desired a policy of fairness and equality of treatment to all of the landowners. I attempted to reflect this general attitude and policy in my personal relations with them. The failure to return mineral rights to all owners alike is, in my opinion, an inequitable situation which should be remedied if at all possible. I personally recall the full cooperation these people gave me as an individual and as a representative of the Navy, and I am embarrassed that the confidence they undoubtedly placed in my personal and official assurances of just and equitable treatment has been compromised."

Equality of treatment of citizens by the sovereign is a fundamental principle of our democratic form of government. Whatever the explanation, the bald fact is that the landowners in whose behalf the bills are introduced received an average of $99 per acre for their surface rights, and the South Coast Corp., for the surface rights of exactly similar land, received $120 per acre. These landowners, without being paid any compensation therefor, lost their mineral rights, whereas those of the South Coast Corp. were revested in that corporation. The purpose of these bills is to right this wrong.

In this connection, it should be noted that Senator LONG introduced a bill on January 26 which would prevent similar situations arising in the future. His bill, S. 748, provides that the United States shall not acquire any mineral rights or interest in land acquired for public purposes, unless (a) the acquisition of such mineral interest is necessary to serve the purpose for which the land is being acquired; (b) the national security requires that the United States own all right, title, and interest, including mineral interest, in and to the land being acquired; or (c) the use to which the United States intends to put such land renders impractical its development for mineral purposes.

Unfortunately the legislation proposed by Senator LONG could only apply to instances arising in the future, but it is entirely consistent with the circumstances which justify relief in connection with the specific private bill offered.

UNION HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to modernize and strengthen our laws with respect to union health and welfare funds.

I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1717) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to union welfare funds, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the really great advances which collective bargaining has made in recent years has been the development of health and welfare fund provisions in union-management agreements. Although these provisions are widespread, I think it is fair to say that unions and management are still experimenting with the kinds of provisions that offer the best protection for the lowest cost.

Abuses have crept into the administration of these programs. These abuses have taken the form of shady or unethical practices engaged in by a few insurance company officials, brokers, union officers, and employers. In terms of the magnitude of the health and welfare schemes, these alleged shady or unethical practices have been limited to a relatively few situations. This fact, however, must not blind us to the need for dealing with the problem in a constructive way.

The bill has as its objective the advisability of making all financial affairs and transactions of these funds public knowledge.

I introduced a similar bill in the 83d Congress. As we all know, hearings are under way in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in which the so-called health and welfare activities of union management agreements are being investigated.

We have learned through experience that disclosure is one of the most effective weapons against dishonesty and corruption. My bill, therefore, requests that the following information with regard to union health and welfare funds must be made public every year:

First. The assets and liabilities of any trust fund established as a union health and welfare fund.

Second. Payments made into such fund and the sources of such payments.

Third. Disbursements made from such fund during such year for payment of benefits or for other purposes, including salaries and other expenses of administering such fund.

Fourth. A list of any investments made by the fund.

Fifth. The amounts paid to officers, employees, or agents of the fund as commissions, fees, gratuities, or otherwise, by any insurance company doing business with the fund, or by an officer, employee, or agent of such insurance company.

My bill also would provide standards for investing moneys from union health and welfare funds on a par with standards established by State laws for insurance companies. This means that no moneys may be invested unless the laws of the State in which the principal office of the union fund is located allow insurance companies to invest in those same securities or investments.

The safeguarding of the financial integrity of union health and welfare funds, and/or employer health and welfare funds, must, of course, in the final analysis rest on the States. Nevertheless, there is an important area for the Federal Government activity in this field. It is to help the Federal Government live up to its responsibilities that I introduce this proposed legislation.

I do not pretend to be an expert in this highly complex subject, but my experience during the 82d Congress as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations leads me to suggest that the following factors be taken into account in any kind of public policy which we develop:

First. We ought to be concerned with the malpractices and not with casting a rigid mold to which all plans would have to adhere. We should allow flexibility and experimentation in collective bargaining.

Second. We ought to explore the extent to which malpractices are illegal under existing State statutes and to see that these statutes are enforced to the hilt.

Third. We ought to be certain that we do not subject collectively bargained health and welfare programs, operating on an interstate basis, to a crazy quilt of conflicting State legislation.

It is my hope, therefore, that the Congress will proceed with intelligence and calm reason based on experience to formulate legislation affecting the health and welfare funds which are established as a result of collective bargaining. There is no room for rancor and vindictiveness in considering this very complicated fiduciary relationship area. I stand ready to join with my colleagues in giving this very serious question careful study and consideration.

The Senate is indeed fortunate to have an energetic subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee now studying the overall problem of

union health and welfare funds. In the last Congress that subcommittee which was under the Chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the subcommittee is now being chaired by the learned and able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This leadership insures a thorough and equitable study which will provide the basis for intelligent, statesmanlike legislative action.

I am delighted that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO are themselves devoting their energies so as to help the Congress arrive at a sensible solution to the problem. They are certainly working energetically to resolve the problem through self-discipline, and I commend them for that action.

I introduce the bill in the hope that it will provide a central point or a set of standards around which the subcommittee can conduct its investigations and hearings. My bill applies not only to funds which are administered by union officials, but also to funds which are administered exclusively by employers when those funds have been established in collective bargaining agreements.

MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JONAS SALK DISCOVERER OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the entire country has honored and paid homage to Dr. Jonas Salk for his antipolio vaccine. We of Michigan are particularly proud because the final phases of his great work were conducted at the University of Michigan. Therefore, in recognition of this notable achievement, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STUDY OF EXTENT TO WHICH OFFICERS OF ANTICRIME CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS MAY BE REQUIRED TO DIVULGE CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas there are now in active operation throughout the Nation about 25 privately financed and operated anticrime civic organizations, devoted to the gathering of information, statistics, data, and evidence relating to law enforcement; and to reporting to the public and appropriate public officials any indications of lax or inefficient law enforcement; and

Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are generally composed of responsible and reputable citizens motivated by patriotic efforts in behalf of clean government and civic decency, who voluntarily dedicate their time and money to this commendable public cause, and who usually employ capable and well-qualified directors of investigations who are often former FBI agents; and

Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are endeavoring on their own volition and resources to further the objectives outlined and recommended in the 1951 Senate Crime Investigation Committee report for citizen participation in, and public insistence for, high standards of community law enforcement; and

Whereas the national public interest and welfare critically require the continuing and active support of all respectable and law-abiding citizens throughout the Nation, if the rising menace of crime is to be suppressed and kept under control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government should encourage, and aid by all reasonable and proper means, the continued active cooperation of citizens and functioning of civic anticrime committees; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate Judiciary Committee, or an appropriate subcommittee thereof, is hereby directed to conduct an immediate study and report promptly to the Senate body as to the extent to which the officers and directors of such anticrime civic organizations should or should not be required to divulge confidential sources of information, except in cases involving treason, where such confidential information was obtained by agreement that its source would be kept confidential, but wherein the substance of such information has been duly reported to an appropriate public official.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF MANGANESE-BEARING ORES AND CONCENTRATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 920) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States. The amendment would authorize the extension of our Government's manganese purchase program to the Minnesota Cuyuna Range.

There is a national self-interest in developing practical and economical processes of concentrating manganese ore from the very large low-grade deposits which can be found in the Minnesota Cuyuna Range. Nothing could be more important for the security of the United States than to develop a self-supporting process of beneficiating low-grade manganiferous ores. The evidence is clear from all the Government agencies who have studied the problem that the supply of manganese in the United States is limited, and that it is all-important to make our country as independent as possible of foreign-produced manganese and the hazards which attend such imports at times of national emergency.

Our Government has recognized this problem and in fact through its loan program helped to establish a manganese pilot plant at Ironton, Minn. This pilot plant has demonstrated the economic feasibility of beneficiating low-grade ore to usable products.

S. 920, which is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was introduced on the assumption that our national security demands a continuation of the manganese stockpile program. Based on that assumption, it appears clear to me that a depot should be established at Ironton or Crosby, Minn., so that we may as a nation make use of the low-grade ore to be found in the Cuyuna Range in northern Minnesota. It is estimated that anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000 tons of ore per year could be made available from northern Minnesota if a purchase depot could be established in that area to encourage operators to open manganese deposits and produce the units for stockpile.

It is with that purpose in mind that my amendment is submitted.

Later, Mr. President, I shall testify before the committee concerning the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill:

"SEC. (a) Paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended by inserting before 'wood flour' the following: 'hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in this act, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, 33⅓ percent ad valorem.'

"(b) For the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be deemed to have been 33⅓ percent ad valorem: *Provided, however*, That so long as any foreign trade agreement that shall have heretofore been entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and any amendments thereto, that is applicable "to manufactures of wood or bark, or of which wood or bark is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for" in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that are not specifically described in said foreign trade agreement, shall remain in force and effect, the rate of duty for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be 16⅔ percent ad valorem, with like effect as though that rate had been included in said foreign trade agreement, excepting that said rate shall be subject to being increased or decreased hereafter by foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to amendments to said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930,

as amended, or other statutes that shall authorize the President to proclaim modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or additional import restrictions, or the continuance for minimum periods of existing customs or excise treatment of any article. Such hardboard, when the product of any nation or area designated by the President pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, shall be subject to a duty of 33⅓ percent ad valorem.

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on and after the 30th day following the date of enactment of this act."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, at Indianapolis, Ind., on April 16, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before Society of Business Magazine Editors, in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Addresses delivered before annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association by Senators DUFF and DIRKSEN; and Representatives RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, and CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; also an address delivered by himself upon the same occasion.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

A report to the citizens of New York broadcast by him on April 17, 1955.

Address delivered by Senator MCNAMARA on the State of Israel bond drive, delivered at San Francisco, Calif., on April 2, 1955.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF JOHN T. WILLIAMS TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee for 4-year term, vice William Ernest Smith, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Monday, April 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN M. TASHIRO TO BE JUDGE OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be judge of the Fifth Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 4 years, vice Philip L. Rice, elevated, to file with the committee in writing on or before Monday, April 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE LEGAL EFFECT OF CERTAIN TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 27, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, April 25, 1955, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

MARKETING QUOTA FOR DOMESTIC BEET AND MAINLAND CANE SUGAR—LETTERS FROM GOVERNOR FREEMAN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received today from Gov. Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, together with a letter the Governor wrote to the President.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 1, 1955.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Governor of Minnesota I want to commend your efforts in behalf of our domestic sugar beet producers and add my support to the appeal of our growers for an increase in marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane sugar.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have today sent to President Eisenhower informing him of my concern. I want him to know that Minnesota solidly backs up the personal presentation you made to the President in behalf of our sugar beet industry.

The Minnesota State Federation of Labor and the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce are both supporting the request of our Red River Valley sugar beet producers, presenting a solid front of farmers, organized labor, and business interests of our State in behalf of our domestic sugar industry.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

APRIL 1, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Extension of the Sugar Act with amendments permitting domestic beet and cane growers to share in the annual increases in consumption of sugar and also a special marketing allowance for 1955 and 1956 to aid in disposing of surplus domestic sugar is urgently needed.

I know that the problems of the domestic sugar industry have been brought to your attention and are now being studied. I, therefore, will review only a few facts that have brought about the present sugar situation.

When the Sugar Act was amended in 1951 Cuba was granted temporarily a substantial share of increasing consumption, to enable her to dispose of surplus sugar resulting from overproduction following the war period. At this time it was pointed out by representatives of domestic areas that because of improvement in farming practices and increase in production per acre that the time was approaching when consideration would have to be given to increases in domestic quotas. That time has arrived.

In my State substantial increases in acreages are needed for the Red River Valley and two smaller areas. Sugar beets is one of our most needed and dependable rotation crops. I am therefore deeply concerned by the requirement to reduce acreage in 1955 and until such time as marketing quotas permit us to dispose of surplus sugar on hand.

I therefore most respectfully ask you to give all possible assistance in bringing about the prompt extension of the Sugar Act with an increase in marketing quota beginning in 1955 for domestic beet and mainland cane sugar.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

MILK FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been interested in having made available to the members of our Armed Forces a maximum quantity of healthy, nutritious milk. I have prepared a statement on the subject. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement prepared by me printed in the body of the RECORD, as well as a copy of a letter from Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, addressed to me.

There being no objection, the statement and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

For many years I have been interested in making available to the members of our Armed Forces a maximum amount of healthy, nutritious milk. This is a part of my overall effort to make available nature's best product for the school lunch program, the patients in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, and through every other channel where Uncle Sam can appropriately take action of making milk available.

Recently, I brought to the attention of Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson the importance of having all United States Armed Forces installations alert to the advisability of encouraging the installation of automatic vending machines to dispense milk.

Throughout our country today, wholly aside from Armed Forces installations, there are some three-quarters of a million vending machines dispensing cola and other type beverages, while there are only around 16,000

machines dispensing milk. Obviously, therefore, there is tremendous room for expansion of milk vending machines, and one area for doing so is among the Armed Forces.

I was pleased to hear from Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense that "as a result of (my) inquiry, we have given additional emphasis to increasing opportunities for sale of milk in Armed Forces exchanges."

Sales to members of the Armed Forces constitute, of course, but one of innumerable phases toward the end of increased dairy consumption, but it is an important phase, and I am hoping that the Department of Defense acts comprehensively on it.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is in further reply to your letter of March 10, 1955, relative to installation of automatic milk vending machines in Armed Forces cantonments.

The importance of making milk available to members of the armed services from the standpoint of both health and morale is recognized by the Defense Department. Vending machines dispensing packaged milk are authorized for use in Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps exchanges. At the present time a considerable number of dispensing machines are in operation on a contract basis.

The placing of milk vending machines on an installation is accomplished through the execution of an agreement between the exchange and the vending-machine operators. Such agreements are negotiated and awarded by the individual installation commander.

Any concern that is interested in installing vending machines dispensing packaged milk at military installations should contact the local exchange officer, as the requirement for this type of machine varies by installation.

The contents of your letter have been brought to the attention of appropriate officials in the services, and information on the availability of vending machines for the sale of milk is being sent to all installation commanders and exchange officers.

In this connection, it is desired to invite to your attention that in addition to milk being used in the commissary departments of military activities, it is sold at exchange operated cafeterias, soda fountains, snack bars, and mobile canteens.

We appreciate this opportunity to forward this information to you. As a result of your inquiry, we have given additional emphasis to increasing opportunities for sale of milk in Armed Forces exchanges.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. DUFLON,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

FORMOSA AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald of today carries a significant headline which reads "Chinese Reds Mass Opposite Formosa, Dulles Warns Ike," and contains the statement that Secretary Dulles has flown to inform the President of the facts. I might say, in view of those facts, that I was particularly impressed with the statement the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, made a few evenings ago, parts of which I shall now read:

I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men. Let us guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness, lest we fall into shame and so into oblivion.

He said also:

We Democrats have conducted ourselves with the highest responsibility toward the President in his direction of the country's international relations.

I repeat the statement that we should "guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness" in this troublesome hour, lest worse things come upon us.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF BENEFIT TO ALL MANKIND

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, with all the disquieting news of the day, including the threat of shooting in the Far East, we can all rejoice over the dramatic announcement, last week, of the apparent effectiveness of the antipolio vaccine, discovered by Dr. Salk and his collaborators. And also there are rumblings of real advances in the field of atomic energy for the peaceful benefit of all mankind.

It is a great regret to me that on the occasion of the well-deserved dinner last Saturday in honor of Speaker RAYBURN, whom we all love and admire, some of our Democratic brothers should have used the opportunity to threaten in the eyes of the world the unity of America by purely political attacks on our President. What a chance they had to rejoice with us over these great human achievements that mean so much to a suffering and apprehensive world.

Along the line of the antipolio vaccine discovery, I have had recent contacts with dedicated men and women who are working here, and especially abroad, in the field of new health discoveries. We are really contributing to the elimination of such scourges as malaria, the devastating destructiveness of human life and happiness by "yaws," and the inevitable diseases that accompany famine conditions.

I desire to pay a special tribute to a friend of mine, Dr. R. Townley Paton, of New York, an eye specialist. In spite of the overwhelming demand of his private practice, he is giving of his time and energy to help build and support the eye institutions in Iran and other Middle East points which promise to save the children from the dreaded trachoma and other eye-destroying diseases. I wonder whether we realize the possible benefits to the world and to America's place in the world, if such ambassadors of goodwill could be given support reasonably commensurate with our military programs and defense mechanisms, important as they are.

And now there comes to our attention another great work carried on by people of good will throughout the world. I refer to the Children's Fund, originally inspired by former President Hoover's work for the children of the world, and now carried on at the U. N. under the brilliant and inspired lealership of Mr. Maurice Pate, one of Mr. Hoover's early converts.

Mr. President, the April 29 issue of Collier's magazine, released April 14th, contains an article entitled "Asia's Best Friend." It describes the great work of Spurgeon M. Keeny, known as Sam Keeny, one of the chief bulwarks of the work of the United Nations Children's Fund. He is the director of the Asia Regional Office for the Fund. At one time Mr. Keeny worked under former President Hoover in the American Relief Administration in Russia. He symbolizes the spirit of the ambassadors of goodwill about whom I am talking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the informative and inspiring article prepared by Mr. Howard Lewis, for Collier's, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA'S BEST FRIEND

(By Howard Lewis)

Check the guest list of any glittering international function; ask the doormen outside the world's major embassies; eavesdrop in the cocktail salons of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington or Claridge's in London. From none of these usually alert sources of cosmopolitan information will you glean any recognition of the name of Spurgeon M. Keeny—yet a great many people who should know rate this man as one of the most successful diplomats of our day and, among Westerners, the best friend Asia ever had. These people will also tell you, sometimes with dismay, that Keeny has achieved his remarkable success by violating most of the rules of his subtle trade—that he is monumentally indifferent to protocol, and that his tongue is often too sharp for his own good.

Other Keeny fans contend he cannot properly be called a diplomat—although he has frequently conducted intricate separate negotiations with three governments in 1 week. Rather, they say, he typifies a totally new breed of international operator, a breed on whose shoulders may well rest the future of the Western World.

Sam Keeny—only his family insists on calling him Spurgeon—is director of the Asia Regional Office for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In that role he is almost miraculously changing the lives of uncounted millions of people in the non-Communist Far East. Under his supervision, 2,000,000 children in South Korea receive a pint and a half of milk every school day to supplement their almost nonexistent diet, and the youngsters of 15 other Asian nations also get milk in some form. Through 5,000 maternal and child-health centers in his area, Keeny acts as a kind of honorary midwife at nearly a million births a year. By the end of 1955, projects spurred by his intense drive will have brought protection against malaria to 150 million people, against TB to 100 million children, against yaws to 47 million persons formerly menaced by that loathsome skin disease.

These staggering statistics boil down to this: Keeny and the handful of men with whom he works are influencing to an incredible degree just how many children of Asia will survive to reach adulthood.

Keeny's attack on yaws is an example of how he operates. In the files of his headquarters at Bangkok, Thailand, are a pair of photographs marked No. 1077 and No. 1078. The first takes some strength to look at. It is a picture of an Indonesian mother holding her child. The mother's face is not so frightening; although blotched by constellations of suppurating sores, the face still shows. The baby's face is frightening; running sores hide its very outlines. Only two pain-filled eyes, a twisted mouth, and an ear are visible.

Then, as if the miracle accomplished had taken merely the time required to flip a photograph, there is picture No. 1078, showing the same faces a fortnight later. On the mother's face are still faint color blemishes where the sores had eroded the skin. But the baby's face is smooth and healthy. The look of pain is gone.

The difference: two shots of penicillin.

Here is how Sam Keeny fits into the story of the two pictures. When UNICEF first offered its help in Indonesia's yaws-eradication program, the Indonesian Government agreed to pay one-third the cost of the pencillin required; UNICEF paid the rest. After a year, the Government's expenditure for the drug became a part of its regular budget.

But as Keeny went from one Indonesian village to another—by puddle-jumper airplane, by mule, and often by pulling himself bodily up the steep slopes of mountains—the sight of thousands of disfigured children preyed increasingly on him. The penicillin had proved itself; why not expand the program until the entire nation had been freed from this terrible canker?

He flew back to Government headquarters in Jakarta to argue his point. The minister of health smiled wanly. Like most Asians, he did not have to be told of the existence of misery, but he also knew that his new government could grant him no more money.

"Would you approve expansion," Keeny asked, "if it didn't cost you a single rupiah?"

"Of course!"

"All right. UNICEF will pay for all the penicillin if you will spend your share in hiring more nurses to visit the villages."

ENOUGH PENICILLIN FOR YAW VICTIMS

Keeny was playing a hunch, and it worked. During the 2 years it took Indonesia to hire and train 400 additional nurses, mass-production methods brought down the price of penicillin. It dropped so low that UNICEF was able to furnish all the drug needed without spending an extra cent. Yaws cures shot up from 33,700 in 1950 to more than 1 million in 1954.

Keeny was taking one of the chances for which he is celebrated. UNICEF headquarters would not have been too happy had he exceeded his budget; overall it averages a mere $5 million a year—less than Portland, Maine, spends on all its municipal affairs annually. But, says Keeny, "We are dealing with big problems. People who tackle them must take big risks."

The basic job of the United Nations Children's Fund—which is financed mostly by voluntary contributions from U. N. members—is to work with the World Health Organization (WHO) and other U. N. agencies to provide healthier living conditions for children in underdeveloped areas, mostly in Asia and South America. UNICEF provides the supplies; WHO, the expert medical advisers.

One of the U. N.'s standing rules is that countries receiving help must make an even greater contribution of their own in money, material or labor. To Sam Keeny this arrangement means that with a budget of about 2 cents per child per year, he must offer so much hope to the impoverished countries in his orbit that they will almost bankrupt themselves to take part in a program only the wildest dreamer could believe in.

Luckily Keeny is that kind of dreamer. He has brought to Asia an unorthodox notion and a staggering ambition. The notion: that Asia is not only sick because it is poor, but also—much more important—that it is poor because it is sick. The ambition: to raise the standard of living 50 percent or more by stemming the tide of disease that has flowed through Asia since time out of mind. How? By adding to the enormous energy of the awakening East the essentially American idea of mass production.

Keeny puts it this way: "In fighting the big killers like TB and malaria, there is no point in treating a handful of patients with individual doctors. We'll use mass assault, cheap drugs, and presto chango! the disease is gone—if you have the nerve to go after it big."

Keeny is going after it big. Under his inspiration, hundreds of local spraying teams, armed with tanks full of DDT, are marching like an avenging army to wipe out the malarial mosquito. Their wages are paid by their own countries, the DDT is supplied sometimes by UNICEF, sometimes by the country, and now in large measure by our own Foreign Operations Administration in Washington. Tuberculosis gets a cavalry attack: jeep-mounted squads of four are now spreading out through India armed with hypodermic needles and a vaccine called BCG. Although not a complete preventive, it will give a child 75 to 80 percent immunity.

With a couple of new miracle drugs in his arsenal, Keeny is preparing fresh attacks. He plans a double-barreled aureomycin-terramycin assault on trachoma, a miserable eye infection which now threatens 50 million Asians with blindness. Almost 75 percent of Formosan children suffer from trachoma or conjunctivitis. And he will use recently developed sulfone drugs to treat the 2 million lepers in his area; the drugs hold out the promise of a complete cure in 2 years. (The Philippine Government now spends almost $1 million a year just to care for its lepers. With the sulfone drugs, they may all be cured for less than $100,000.)

Sam Keeny is a chunky, bespectacled man with a lantern jaw obviously designed for a 16-hour grip on a pipe. Should the visitor to his Bangkok office have the rare opportunity of finding him seated, he will see what looks like a pile of old clothes on which someone has dumped an ashtray. But atop it he will see the face of a man who, at 61, looks vitally alive, for Keeny is intensely aware that within his hands he holds the power to do good works unparalleled in modern times.

Keeny carries with him another unspoken but vital responsibility. As a U. N. employee, he is technically an international civil servant. But wherever he goes throughout Asia—more than 100,000 miles a year by plane, jeep, and oxcart—he knows that he bears the indelible stamp of an American, and that as such he is being watched with particular care by the east.

Keeny is an interesting man to watch. A good place to start would be right in Bangkok, where he holds forth the 4 months of the year he isn't out in the field. Let's follow Sam as he takes the long way to work in the morning. He has fed the two families of sparrows that nest in the chandelier over his dining table. Now he is ambling along the Chao-Phya River, inspecting the bird market. It is a familiar route with him.

"From the bird market," he once revealed, "I draw philosophic sustenance for the day's work. First of all, there are the toddlers who rise with the dawn and busy themselves with the mysterious occupations of childhood. They are the daily reminders of the 250 million children in the 21 countries or territories we serve.

"Then the birds, ranging all the way from chickens to scarlet-crested cockatoos, recall the variety of the task, the humdrum, but useful, I trust, nature of most of it and the color in the crises.

"These sights encourage contemplation rather than action. The antidote is to watch my favorite gibbon do his daily dozen on a clothesline stretched from a boat in the river to a convenient tree on the bank. Thus, vicariously, I take my morning exercises and, somewhere about 8, arrive at the desk positively eager to write the letters that, hopefully, will slowly improve the lot of my small friends along the canal."

PROJECTS ARE MANY AND WILDLY VARIED

Keeny's gentle self-portrait is deceptive. Out of his office comes a veritable blizzard of activity. Besides the major campaigns, he is also responsible for more than a hundred wildly varied projects such as supplying bicycles to midwives, new X-ray equipment to Pakistan, soap to Afghanistan, blankets to typhoon victims in Japan, and fish-oil capsules to malnourished tykes in Hong Kong.

Many of his letters go to his mission chiefs, scattered all over Asia and adjacent islands. So hard does he drive them with the lash of his own example that one of them once complained, "I'm always glad when Sam goes off on an inspection tour. That way there's only 1 chance in 7 of his dropping in on me. When he's at that Bangkok office, it's every darned day."

If his subordinates feel the whip, they suffer no more than Keeny's superiors. Keeny is a man with a mission. When he feels he is being held back by the people who pay his salary, he sees no reason why he should spare them any more than anyone else.

Sometimes, however, even he is abashed at his own truculence. But not for long—as this quote from one of his confidential messages would indicate: "If we seem impatient at times, will those who suffer from it please think of the sick babies and mothers in the waiting line of any typical dispensary and be tolerant or, better still, get busy."

Son of a Pennsylvania Dutch farmer, Keeny has an instinctive fondness for the truth and courts it with a fine passion. His straight-from-the-shoulder approach stamps him as a maverick among his breed. When he was head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Italy after World War II and had to settle some involved negotiations with that country, he asked Premier Alcide de Gasperi for an appointment.

SOUND ADVICE FOR ITALY'S PREMIER

At the interview, Keeny came to the point at once. "Mr. de Gasperi," he pointed out, "in the previous UNRRA program Italy lost $15 million by taking its time about an agreement while other nations were acting fast. The present offer is 10 times as large. I don't want to see Italy lose $150 million; do you think we could agree on principles, say, within a week—and settle the details afterward?" They agreed on principles in 5 days.

Keeny's ideas about his relationship with the rest of the world are simple. "Back on the farm in Shrewsbury, Pa.," he says, "you had to be a good neighbor. That was the way we put barns up. There were barn raisings all the time, one neighbor helping another.

"And then there was the way we felt about the land. The idea there was you'd get a good crop from the soil and then you'd put something back for the next year. Why, if a farmer didn't do something to make his land a little better, he was looked down on as a lower type in our part of the world.

"Since I left the farm, I've moved around a lot. I've seen enough sickness and death. I know people don't like it and I don't like it. If we can change all that with a little effort, it would not only be absurd not to do it, it would be criminal."

His private good-neighbor policy is sometimes put to the acid test. Once, in Indochina, an insurgent's hand grenade exploded less than 50 feet from Keeny's cot. When a friend asked him if the incident had unnerved him, he replied, "Why, no. The man wasn't throwing it at me." (As a matter of fact, most local rebellions in Asia go on a standby basis when UNICEF crews come through.)

The majority of problems Keeny encounters in the East are of a less violent, but more crippling nature. There is the extreme poverty, almost inconceivable to the

Western mind. In South Korean school districts, officials tried to assess families 10 cents a month to provide for school kitchens; they found that many families literally couldn't afford it. UNICEF child-care centers in Thailand had to advertise for empty bottles because many of the mothers had nothing in which to carry free milk home. In Cambodia there are only four fully qualified doctors for 4 million people.

Among other obstacles are the eastern superstitions which tell mothers it is bad luck to bathe a baby before it is 2 weeks old, and then only in a broth of onion rings; that the severed umbilical cord should be covered with a poultice of ground betel nut; that emaciation can be cured by making the child a bracelet of wheat kernels.

Keeny must also contend with local mores. Once, in Karachi, he arrived at a half-finished maternal and child-health center being constructed under UNICEF guidance to find that a Moslem crisis was in the making. The contractor, who had already received one polite warning, was still dawdling on the project although several young ladies from the veiled seclusion of purdah were due to arrive at the center within a few weeks to work as student assistants. Moslem tradition demanded that all male workmen be off the premises by the time the young ladies arrived.

Keeny averted the crisis by combining firmness with recognition of Asian customs. The much-abused contract in his hand, he called on the builder. The following conversation took place:

"KEENY. You don't seem to have got very far with the building.

"CONTRACTOR. Oh, yes, sir. We are working like Superman.

"KEENY. But the building isn't nearly finished. As a matter of fact, there doesn't seem to be much improvement since last time.

"CONTRACTOR. We have been working very hard, sir. If it weren't for the evil forces——

"KEENY. What evil forces?

"CONTRACTOR. The evil forces, sir, that keep us from finishing the construction. They are working against us.

"KEENY. Ah, yes. Well, I would suggest March 31 as a good day for getting rid of the last evil force. Agreed?"

The contractor hastily agreed, possibly because his fear of losing money on the job was greater than his concern over the evil forces. The contract which Keeny was idly waving as a fan contained a penalty clause which began on April 1.

Last month, Keeny returned to the United States for the semiannual meeting of the UNICEF executive board. It was an emotional homecoming. He was reunited with his wife, who accompanied him throughout the world until she was stricken with arthritis. (The former Amelia Smith, of Atlanta, Ga., she traveled to England in 1921 to marry Keeny, then associated with the American Relief Administration. They spent their honeymoon in a Polish delousing center.) There was also a grandson to see, born in December to Keeny's son and daughter-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Spurgeon Keeny, Jr. And there was Keeny's mother, who still lives in Shrewsbury.

Coming back to the States is always something of a shock to Keeny, who has lived so long in the East he now finds it miraculous that this country is able to produce so much food without a single water buffalo in sight.

But it also gives him time for reflection. One night as he sat in an office high over New York, he said to a friend: "At a time when half the world is anticipating extinction by a hydrogen bomb, it's good to know that modern science is also making it possible for us to wipe out diseases that make life a misery for millions. There may be greater satisfactions, but I haven't discovered them."

FREE ASIA TAKES THE INITIATIVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, several weeks ago on the floor of the Senate, I delivered a speech proposing a new partnership program for strengthening freedom in Asia. In that statement I said:

We must proceed on the basis of a genuine partnership with the free Asians in helping and encouraging them to express and achieve their deepest yearnings for freedom, independence, and economic development. Let them take the initiative. And let us keep within the framework of their social structure as we assist them.

In my statement, I went on to suggest that the Far Eastern Columbo plan powers should be encouraged to take the initiative in holding an economic conference for the purpose of working out their various problems of trade and development. I pointed out that in order to solve the problems facing these Asian countries, Asian initiative and concerted action on a regional basis would be required.

On April 14, Mr. President, it was reported by the Associated Press that India had called for a preliminary 11-nation conference on possible regional uses of new American economic aid. The conference will meet in Simla, India, for a week, starting May 9. The nations invited are Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nepal, Malaya, South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia.

This demonstration of Asian initiative and cooperation is good news, especially in the light of the Bandung Asian-African conference. It is my sincere hope that this news marks only the beginning of a new period of Asian initiative and responsibility, and of mutual cooperation and partnership between East Asia and the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a news article on this subject, appearing on April 14 on the first page of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1955]

INDIA CALLS 11-NATION TALK ON NEW UNITED STATES ASIAN AID PLAN

NEW DELHI, India, April 13.—Authoritative sources said today that India had called an 11-country conference on the regional use of new United States economic aid. The new aid is expected to total $200 million.

The conference has been summoned to meet in Simla, starting May 9 or May 16. It was learned from qualified quarters that the so-called Stassen plan would be the main topic of the meeting.

Director Harold E. Stassen, of the Foreign Operations Administration, has proposed that United States aid to Asia be placed on a regional basis, possibly with Western Europe contributing.

It is understood here that the United States Government intends to continue its current bilateral economic aid to Asian countries at the present levels but that President Eisenhower plans to ask Congress for an additional $200 million to start a regional program.

Washington officials have made it clear that Asian nations must display a willingness to help themselves before the United States can be expected to appropriate this additional amount.

The summoning of the Simla conference is obviously intended to show that Asia is ready to take this initiative—and today's disclosure comes only a few days before President Eisenhower is scheduled to make known his new aid plans.

The countries reported invited to the Simla conference, besides India, are Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nepal, Malaya, Burma, South Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos.

RED CRITICISM ASSAILED

NEW DELHI, April 13.—The influential morning newspaper, the Hindu, lashed out today at Communist Chinese criticism of United States intentions in Asia.

The Indian newspaper particularly attacked an article in the Peiping's daily which said United States aid to Asia was intended for "military aggression, economic exploitation, and colonialist expansion."

The Hindus said the Communist organ was entitled to hold that Washington was "lukewarm" toward the forthcoming African-Asian conference in Indonesia. But it described as a "travesty of fact" the Communist charge of American imperialism in Asia.

UNITED STATES READY TO HELP

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The United States said today it was ready to share responsibility for improving the lot of African and Asian peoples.

The United States position was carried in a statement issued by the State Department just 5 days before opening of the African-Asian conference in Indonesia. The United States was not invited.

Henry Suydam, State Department spokesman, said he was making the statement in response to inquiries about the American attitude toward the forthcoming conference. He said it hardly seemed necessary to restate the United States "deep and sympathetic interest" in all efforts of Asian and African people to achieve material and spiritual well-being and other "blessings of liberty."

TRANSPORTATION OF LIVE SCORPIONS IN THE MAILS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week the Senate, in its wisdom, passed Senate bill 35, a bill which I introduced on January 6, for the purpose of permitting the transportation in the mails of live scorpions. It was impossible for me to be present in the Senate at that session. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the remarks which I had prepared for that occasion, together with an article entitled "Arizona's Scorpion Man" written by Keith Monroe and published in Coronet magazine for March 1955.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON S. 35 BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

On January 6, 1955, I introduced S. 35 for the purpose of permitting the transportation in the mails of live scorpions. It was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which reported it on March 22 without amendment.

Venomous reptiles and insects are improperly considered a major threat to persons living in and visiting in the southwestern part of the United States, which includes the State of Arizona. Although many tales have been told about these creatures stalking and viciously leaping out at every human being they see, I can assure my colleagues that these are merely another chapter of

unfounded superstitions which have grown up with a section of our Nation.

Of hundreds of interesting, harmless and beneficial reptiles and insects in the Southwest, only a few are capable of inflicting damage by biting or stinging. Ants, wasps, and bees are among the less venomous of these. However, the only dangerous members of these species to be found in the Southwest are the rattlesnake, the Gila monster, the black widow spider and the scorpion. The bites of the mildly poisonous centipede and still less poisonous tarantula are of relatively little consequence. Without exception, all of these venomous creatures tend to be timid and nonaggressive and want to get away from humans and be left alone. Their poisonous devices, basically intended for use in procuring food, are only used against humans when they are startled or molested.

S. 35 deals specifically with a tiny arachnid, which has been called the real public enemy No. 1 of the poisonous animals of Arizona—the scorpion. There are at least 40 species of scorpions found in three-fourths of the United States, in Canada and Mexico, but there are only two known lethal species and both of them are found mostly in the lower areas of Arizona and neighboring States.

The two scorpions, the Centruroides sculpturatus and the Centruroides gertschi, are in the minority among the scorpion population, but their sting can be very serious and even deadly to children or adults in poor health unless prompt treatment is administered. During the 20-year period from 1928–48 these two species of scorpions were responsible for more than twice as many fatalities as all other venomous animals in Arizona put together including rattlesnakes, Gila monsters, black widow spiders and venomous insects, according to the Arizona Department of Health. Nearly 3,000 persons in Arizona are stung by scorpions each year, but, fortunately, only a small percentage of the bites are by the dangerous type of scorpion.

The sting of the nonlethal scorpion causes primarily a local reaction such as swelling, painful burning feeling and discoloration at the site of the sting and even some distance from the sting. However, under ordinary circumstances there is no danger from this venom even to a child. A sting from the lethal species, on the other hand, produces primarily a systemic reaction, but does not produce a swelling or discoloration at the site of the sting. It is a convulsant neurotoxin affecting the nervous system and causing convulsions. The first symptom at the site of the sting is a prickly-pin sharpness which may become quite painful. That spot becomes hypersensitive at once so that bumping it causes additional tingling sensations. A sort of prickly-pin sensation and numbness travels from the sting site causing a woody feeling. Some people have experienced severe tingling and electric sensations throughout their entire body, but the feeling produced by the sting of a ground scorpion and that of a centruroides species is very different.

The simple ice water or equivalent cold treatment applied promptly will offset even the serious effects from the sting of the sculpturatus and gertschi, in most cases. However, in the few advanced cases where first aid is not applied promptly enough or for some reason does not take care of the situation, a serum has been developed which has invariably brought immediate and satisfactory results. The serum was developed after extensive scientific research with venoms in Arizona for nearly a quarter of a century by Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, head of the department of biological sciences and director of the poisonous animals research laboratory at Arizona State College at Tempe. His work is more completely described in two articles which I shall insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

However, the "Arizona venom man," who came to my State in 1928 from Chicago, developed this scorpion serum, which involves the collecting of many scorpions, milking them of their venom, freezing the venom and removing its moisture, accurately weighing it and rediluting it with distilled water. Then it is periodically injected in nonlethal doses into the blood stream of a laboratory animal, generally cats, until an immunity is built up. When this occurs, a small sample of blood is drawn from the immunized animal, put through an intricate sterile processing, again frozen and dehydrated, weighed and bottled for distribution. It might be added here that these cats live a very soft life in temperature-controlled sanitary quarters with a balanced diet and little to do except receive doses of venom, which cause them little or no discomfort, and donate blood which is no more bothersome than giving a pint of blood to the Red Cross is for a human.

However, the problem still existed as to how to provide general relief all over Arizona and the lethal scorpion area. To make sure that ample serum was available in all this area, many, many live, lethal scorpions are needed. In fact, Dr. Stahnke requested and got 10,000 to start with—through public cooperation.

Even with this wholehearted public cooperation of Arizonians and residents of neighboring States, there was still no satisfactory way of sending live scorpions to the laboratory. Despite the fast, efficient mail service, postal regulations forbid using the mails for the transporting of live scorpions. Other methods of shipment were too costly or too slow or the packages often were in the hot sun so long that the scorpions were either in very bad condition or dead when they arrived at Dr. Stahnke's laboratory.

Another obstacle was the lack of a suitable container for transporting the scorpions. However, the ingenious Dr. Stahnke designed a simple lightweight cylindrical mailing tube with a plastic inner bag which is completely airtight and escapeproof even if damaged or crushed. Since a scorpion could easily spend a week in such a sealed container and suffer no ill effects, it is the ideal answer for scorpion mailing.

The final step is the legislation embodied in S. 35 which will allow the mailing of live scorpions with regulations as to their packaging to protect postal personnel and facilitate handling by the research workers in the laboratory.

This bill not only has the recommendation of the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, but it also has the backing of the Arizona State Association of the National Association of Letter Carriers, the Arizona Federation of Post Office Clerks, the Arizona chapter of the National Association of Postmasters, and the State Legislature of Arizona.

Mr. Summerfield, in stating that his Department has made a careful study of this matter, gives full approval to the legislation, says it will not result in any additional cost to the Department, and fills a "worthy purpose."

[From Coronet of March 1955]

ARIZONA'S SCORPION MAN

(By Keith Monroe)

"I need 10,000 deadly scorpions—alive," Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke appealed to Arizona parents back in 1951. "Will you catch some for me?"

This request was no crazy whim. It was a grim plea from one of the world's leading authorities on venomous creatures.

After almost a quarter-century of dangerous research, Dr. Stahnke had at last found a way to win Arizona's age-old war against scorpions—if people would help him. They would have to hunt the vicious little animal whose two lethal species are more dangerous than all other poisonous creatures in the Southwest. And when they found one, they would have to get it safely to the sinister-looking laboratory at Arizona State College where Dr. Stahnke works, surrounded by hundreds of live creatures—many of them lethal.

Now he wanted 10,000 live specimens of the two deadly types of scorpions: The sculpturatus and the gertschi. But Arizonans respect Stahnke so deeply that they promptly went after them. If he said that catching live scorpions would wipe out a widespread danger in Arizona, it must be so.

Some 3,000 people are stung by scorpions in Arizona each year. Most of the victims are children poking into places where these little menaces lie hidden: Under rocks and logs, behind the loose bark of trees, in trash piles and lumber stacks, in cellars or attics.

It isn't unusual for the little scorpions to scuttle into a house through a door crack or crevice. When inside, they are not easy to see because they are straw colored and avoid the light, and hide in dark corners.

At night they crawl out and explore the floors, where any bare foot may step on them. When daylight returns they again seek a dark hiding place—which may be a shoe or the folds of blankets.

At least 40 different species of scorpions (some growing to lengths of 8 inches) are scattered across three-fourths of North America. But only two species are known to be deadly, and both of these are found mostly in and around Arizona. Even these usually fail to kill an adult in good health—but without prompt treatment, their sting can be fatal to a child, or an adult in poor health.

There seemed to be no sure treatment until Dr. Stahnke developed a serum at the end of a 23-year fight against the scorpions.

The doctor had arrived from Chicago in 1928, married a year later, and eventually became head of the Department of Biological Sciences at Arizona State College in Tempe.

By the time his first child was a few years old, Stahnke was as troubled as are all Arizona parents by the recurring news items about children killed by scorpions. Instead of just fretting, he went to work to wipe out the hazard.

Because no college funds were available for such research, Stahnke had to make his own laboratory equipment by hand, and perform experiments at night, on weekends, and in his spare time.

He learned how to milk live scorpions of the venom in their tails, how to freeze it, then dehydrate it, redilute it with distilled water, and inject it little by little into a cat's bloodstream until the animal built up immunity. Then he drew blood from the cat and put this through other complex treatments to make a serum. The serum worked. All he needed now was enough scorpions and money.

In the spring of 1951, he began explaining these needs to the public. The Tucson Daily Citizen joined his efforts and launched a campaign to persuade people to catch scorpions. It also appealed for funds to buy equipment with which Stahnke could manufacture serum.

Thousands of Arizonians put on gloves and boots, and began prying into dark places where scorpions might lurk. Everyone knew the first-aid method Stahnke had developed for treating snakebite or scorpion sting: Wrapping a string tightly around the injured part, then keeping it in ice water for several hours.

Boxes and bottles of scorpions poured in to the Poisonous Animals Research Laboratory that Stahnke directed at Arizona State College. On June 26, 1951, the Daily Citizen

invited Stahnke to Tucson to receive a check for $4,500. Two days later the State legislature appropriated $1,500 more.

In appreciation of the Tucson donations, he took with him the only two vials of his precious serum and presented them to the Tucson Health Center. Three days later a 4-year-old girl was stung, and the serum saved her life.

Today there are vials of Stahnke's antitoxin in hospital refrigerators all over the State. The menace of the scorpion has been conquered and Stahnke cherishes a stack of letters from parents whose children are alive today because of his serum.

TRIBUTES TO SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, those of us who serve in this Congress are privileged to be associated with one of the truly great figures of American history, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

SAM RAYBURN has served his country in the House of Representatives for more than four decades. He has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man—including even the immortal Henry Clay. He has presided with a dignity and fairness which have won him the respect and the admiration of all Members, regardless of party or philosophy.

I believe that even the minority leadership of the House would join with me in saying that no other man in Congress is held in more affection and trust.

As for myself personally, my respect and affection are motivated by much more than ordinary ties. All my life, I have known SAM RAYBURN as a close personal friend, as my father before me was his close personal friend.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN last Saturday night at a testimonial dinner in his honor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AT RAYBURN TESTIMONIAL DINNER, NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I want to thank, from the bottom of a grateful heart, everyone who has had anything to do with bringing about this occasion. I especially want to thank the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Paul Butler, and the treasurer, Mr. Matt McCloskey, for the great part they have played in this affair. I would also like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the dinner committee, Mr. W. John Kenney, and the cochairmen, Mr. George C. McGhee and Mrs. Oscar L. Chapman.

I want you to know that I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this evidence of your partial friendship, and above all, to feel that I have your respect.

I accept this gracious gesture with the deepest feeling of inadequacy and humility. You honor me far beyond what I believe to be my desserts.

I belong to a party that has been, is, and will be, the party of responsibility. We have demonstrated this time and time again, it matters not whether the administration in power be Democratic or Republican.

It is the party that has the vision of Thomas Jefferson and the dauntless courage of Andrew Jackson.

I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman in the first administration of Woodrow Wilson. He didn't know that I was in town but I was well aware that he was in the White House. Since then some forty years have passed. Yet if today our Federal laws reflect a strong sense of social responsibility toward the people, much is owed to Woodrow Wilson. Anger rose in his soul at the sight of injustice done the helpless. Then he became as stern as a Hebrew prophet.

In his inaugural address Wilson made one thing clear, and years later another Democratic President—Franklin D. Roosevelt—would make the same thing clear in another inaugural address. They put the Nation on notice that their election as Democratic Presidents was not merely a meaningless shift from one political group to another. It meant something of profound significance to the Nation; something that would alter its course and touch the lives of all men. It was that there had been a true change of government.

Woodrow Wilson told his countrymen that the Nation had made great industrial strides. But he said that we had paid a high cost for it in terms of the men, women, and children upon whom crushing burdens had been laid. The Government we loved, he added, had been made use of for private, selfish purposes by those who forgot the people. Thundering against these evils in his mighty Presbyterian wrath, he pointed out that it was the duty of government to shield ordinary people from the consequences of great industrial and social processes that they could not singly alter, control, or cope with.

The First World War stopped the march of Wilson's new freedom. But nothing stops, or can stop, or ought to stop, the rightful aspirations of all our people for a better life than they ever had before. And nothing can stop the Democratic Party in its efforts to help them attain that life. This was the conviction of the first Democratic President under whom I served. It was equally the conviction of the last Democratic President under whom I served. Thank God he is with us tonight.

This is what President Truman said in his very first message to Congress:

"Let me assure the forward-looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people."

Thus Mr. Truman expressed his humane heart. And so doing he expressed also the humane hearts of Jefferson, Jackson, Bryan, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. He stated the doctrine that is with us at our rising up and at our lying down. He reiterated the unchanging basic principle of the Democratic Party. For, I ask you, what is the use of being a rich, populous country if large numbers of our citizens are too poor to lead good, abundant lives?

Yet, within our memory, great numbers of Americans endured in poverty. Their plight was not wholly economic. Potentially there was enough for everybody and to spare. What was the trouble? It was clear that if the often desperate inequalities among our people did not flow from purely economic causes, economic change alone would not be enough. What was needed was moral change, a change of heart. Then and then only could economic change help all Americans.

Therefore the great Democratic Party reforms of the recent past were not merely changes of economics. They were primarily moral changes. They proclaimed at the crossroads and at the doors of every house in this land that people come first; that if you destroy a man's self-respect you destroy the man; that he who tramples on the Bill of Rights tramples on us all.

But between the brief, bright day of Woodrow Wilson and the warming sun of Franklin Roosevelt, there came a long Republican eclipse. In its murk and gloom this Nation almost lost its way.

The profound changes wrought in American life by recent Democratic administrations rooted this Nation so strongly in freedom's soil that no storm of alien doctrine can uproot it.

The tempests of communism blow but not a leaf of our tree is disturbed.

And bear this in mind. We did not move to improve the condition of all of people because we feared communism. We moved for the best of all reasons and motives—because it was right to move; because we could not bear it that some stuffed themselves with cake while others, equally worthy in God's sight, went without bread.

Today this Nation is one in its devotion to freedom.

Today the American people are so deeply devoted to the Democratic reforms of this generation that no Republican administration would dare tamper with them; certainly not in open daylight.

We wrought in the spirit of the great men who gave the Democratic Party life and light.

Even now the name Andrew Jackson rings sharp on American ears. It means a leader who would fight for the ordinary man. It means a man who could not be deterred by the devil himself when he was fighting for the people's interest. It means a patriot. And it still means a patriot even if some spiritually dead Republican leaders call Jackson's political party the party of treason. We've seen lies and libel before, wholesale and retail. But this is the first time that lies and libel have been used on an atom bomb scale to besmirch millions of people with the black charge of treason to their country.

Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Truman—these were quite different men. But they were alike in these things. They cared about people. They had courage. Their hearts were big. They burned with the humanitarian spirit that has always animated the Democratic Party.

Hence the people took the Democratic Party to their heart and made it the one enduring institution of our national life.

This is a great achievement. But endurance alone is not enough. Age may bring dry rot as well as wisdom. Yet, somehow our party has found the fountain of youth. It has a continuing vitality. It responds to changing times. It is receptive to new ideas. It welcomes experiments. Therefore, while you may find a few amiable idiots among us, you won't find any old fogies or those who are worse than old fogies—young fogies.

The Democratic Party, therefore, has constantly produced great national leaders; men who performed a twofold task. They sought, first, to redeem the Nation from its follies and its crimes of indifference toward a large part of the population; and, second, they sought to bring the Nation to rededicate itself to the life of democracy. Their achievements have made this the greatest of all nations.

During the past 40 years—the term of my own service in the Congress—we Democrats have scarcely a day to walk beside still waters. For our long period of service was one of almost endless struggle here and abroad.

It was our somber privilege and responsibility to lead the Nation victoriously through the two greatest wars of all time.

It also was our privilege to lead the Nation out of the greatest depression it has ever known into the greatest prosperity that it has ever known.

Time after time we had to make decisions affecting the lives of millions of soldiers and the survival of this Nation and of our allies.

Time after time during the great depression we had to move to redeem the great promises of American life.

In so doing we had almost to recast the Nation's economy, without affecting the constitutional structure upon which that economy rested.

Moreover, it was during our period of service that this great Nation, once strongly isolationist, became the leader of the free world and is today the hope of all men everywhere who are free, and of those who aspire to freedom.

In the name of freedom we mobilized our resources and, together with our allies, hurled them against the enemy and crushed him.

Here at home, 20 years ago, we mobilized the material and spiritual resources of the Nation and broke the depression that was destroying us.

I think, then, that the Democrats have learned something about the nature of responsibility, and because we have learned something about it, I know that I speak for all Democrats when I say this. Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower as, in the terrible loneliness that surrounds Presidents, he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation. We Democrats, I am happy to say, have conducted ourselves with the highest responsibility toward the President in his direction of the country's international relations. And, as duty dictates, we have maintained a loyal opposition. It has remained for prominent members of the President's own political party to confront him with a disloyal opposition.

Sobered by long responsibility, tempered by trial, matured by experience, mellowed by time, the Democratic Party now stands at the heights of its powers to serve the Nation. And as a life-long Democrat, I have never seen our party so united in spirit, resolution, and purpose, as it is today.

But this is not all. In the fullness of time and service to the Nation, the Democratic Party, I believe, has come to be more than a political party. It has become an idea; an essential part of the American idea. Political parties have their victories and defeats but great ideas go on forever. Hence we Democrats may look with equal serenity to 1956 or to 1976.

I hope now you will permit me a personal word. It has been given me to see much in the long years that the good Lord has allotted me.

But now we have come upon times whose like is not in the annals of mankind. For today it is possible to enshroud all men in a seamless, cloudborne garment of poison, and make our plant as lifeless as the moon. I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men.

Let us guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness, lest we fall into shame and so into oblivion.

Nearly two centuries ago there began upon this continent the noblest experiment in Government that men have ever undertaken. It has greatly succeeded. Whenever this country, faced with a grave foreign or domestic crisis, conducted itself greatly, it prevailed and moved on toward the heights.

Today darkness broods over the face of the earth. Evil stalks the hills. No man knows what devouring monsters tomorrow may bring. May I say, then, to my countrymen—let us in this desperate hour nobly conceive and nobly act in the greatness that is our heritage and our light and our life. So doing, within the eye of God, we shall triumph over evil as did the founders of this great Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to the dinner held in Washington last Friday evening to honor Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the Texas House of Representatives adopted unanimously a resolution paying tribute to this great American.

Our beloved Speaker was a member of the Texas House in his young manhood and served as speaker of that body. His career has been a lasting inspiration to those who have followed him as members of the Texas House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution adopted by the Texas House of Representatives be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS

Mr. Turman offered the following resolution:

"House Concurrent Resolution 82

"Whereas the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in the National Armory at Washington, D. C., on April 16, 1955, will pay tribute and do honor to a great Democrat and lifelong stalwart of the Democratic Party, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN; and

"Whereas Mr. Sam, a Democrat in the best tradition of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy, will be acclaimed by having April 16, 1955, known as Sam Rayburn Day; and

"Whereas the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States longer than any other man, always abiding by the motto: 'Be reasonable, be fair,' fulfilling a boyhood ambition and thus being assured of a prominent niche in American history; and

"Whereas SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN was born January 6, 1882, in the Clinch Valley of Tennessee, the son of William Marion Rayburn and Martha (Waller) Rayburn. And at the age of 5 Sam and his family moved to Texas near Bonham in Fannin County; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN, in that grand old American way, is a self-made man. He worked his way through college and law school and at the age of 24 earned his political spurs by being elected to the Texas House of Representatives, a place he held during the 30th legislature in 1907, the 31st legislature in 1909, and the 32d legislature in 1911, and being the third youngest speaker of the house in his last term; and

"Whereas in 1912 SAM RAYBURN was elected to the House of Representatives of the United States and arrived in Washington early in 1913, to serve in the first administration of Woodrow Wilson, thus beginning in the 63d Congress in 1913 continuous service and association with seven President, three Democrats and four Republicans; and

"Whereas the Honorable SAM RAYBURN was majority leader of the House in the 75th and 76th Congresses in 1937 and 1939, and was elected Speaker of the House on September 16, 1940, and has been Speaker of the House in the following Congresses: the 76th in 1939, 77th in 1941, 78th in 1943, 79th in 1945, 81st in 1949, 82d in 1951, and 84th in 1955; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN came to full flower and national eminence during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He helped write many of the keystone acts of the New Deal, among them were the Wheeler-Rayburn Utilities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Rural Electrification Administration Act; he was influential in establishing the Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Tariff Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communication Commission, and the Federal Reserve Board; and

"Whereas the Nation will be forever grateful to SAM RAYBURN for preventing the Army from being disbanded 4 months before Pearl Harbor when on August 12, 1941, the House voted 203 to 202 to extend the Selective Service Act and before anyone could switch his vote he gaveled down all moves for reconsideration and announced the total vote; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN has been a tower of strength in the legislative branch of the Government to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, a valuable colleague to Members of Congress, and an exceptional leader; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the 54th Legislature of Texas to honor and pay tribute to a former colleague who has now become the famed Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, and to commend the Democratic Party for naming the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day assembly the Sam Rayburn Day: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the 54th legislature (the senate concurring)*, That the brilliant career of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN will forever burn bright over the Lone Star State and that we do honor and commemorate this distinguished statesman; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the pages of the journal of both houses and that copies be forwarded to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, and to the National Chairman of the Democratic Party.

"HUGHES.
"TURMAN.
"HARDEMAN.
"BENTON.
"HUTCHINS.
"MORGAN.
"HOGUE."

(Signed by Lindsey, speaker; Allen, Allison, Anderson, Andis, Armor, Atwell, Baker, Banks, Bates, Bell, Bergman, Berlin, Berry, Bishop, Blaine, Bradshaw, Brashear, Briscoe, Bristow, Bryan, Burkett, Carmichall, Carpenter, Carr, Chambers, Chapman, Cheatham, Clements, Cloud, Cobb, Cole, Cooper, Cory, Cowen, Cox of Montgomery, Cox of Bell, Crim, Crosthwait, de la Garza, Dewey, Miss Duff, Dugas, Elliott, Ellis, Fenoglio, Ferrell, Ford of Nueces, Ford of Red River, Garrett, Gillham, Glass, Glusing, Hale, Hazlett, Heatly, Heideke, Heitman, Holstein, Hosey, Houston, Huffman, Hunt, Miss Isaacks, Jackson of Cass, Jackson of Navarro, Jamison, Johnson, Jones, Joseph, Kelly, Kennard, Kennedy, King, Kirkham, Kirklin, Koliba, Lane, Latimer, Lee, Lehman, Lieck, McDaniel, McDonald, McGregor of McLennan, McGregor of El Paso, McIlhany, McNeil, Martin, Maverick, Moore of Harris, Moore of Tarrant, Mullen, Murphy, Murray, Niemann, Osborn, Parish, Patten, Patterson, Pipkin, Pool, Puckett, Pyle, Reeves, Ross, Sadler, Sandahl, Sanders, Saul, Sayers, Schram, Schwartz of Galveston, Schwartz of Washington, Seeligson, Shannon, Sheridan, Slack, Smith of Hays, Smith of Tarrant, Smith of Jefferson, Spilman, Spring, Stewart, Stilwell, Stone, Storey, Strickland, Stroman, Talasek, Thurmond, Walling, Ward, Welch, Wheeler, White, Wilson, Winfree, Wohlford, Wood, Yancy, Yezak, and Zbranek.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader regarding the outstanding public service of the Democratic leader in the other body.

For 14 years it was my privilege to serve with and under Speaker RAYBURN in the House of Representatives. No

young man ever had a finer friend. No country ever had a more devoted public servant. Patriotism never flowed more genuinely in the veins of any man than in those of SAM RAYBURN. In him also there is a large measure of compassion, human understanding, and wisdom; and a full measure of courage.

DEATH OF DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that I announce to my colleagues the death this morning in Princeton, N. J., of the eminent scientist, Albert Einstein. Mr. Einstein was a personal friend of mine. He had been a resident of New Jersey for a number of years. He was well known for his great scientific achievements, and especially for his contribution toward the discovery of atomic energy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief biographical sketch relating to Dr. Einstein's remarkable career.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

It is with deep regret that I have just learned of the death, in my home town of Princeton, N. J., of America's most distinguished scientist, Albert Einstein.

To the day of his death, Dr. Einstein never gave up his search for knowledge and in particular his search for a unified, mathematical concept of the laws governing the universe.

No one in the world in our time has had as great an influence on the advances of science as did Dr. Einstein. Discoverer of the theory of relativity at 26, great contributor to the enormous discoveries in electronics, television, and atomic energy, and recipient in 1921 of the Nobel Prize in Physics, Dr. Einstein came to Princeton in 1933 as a voluntary exile from his native Germany. A familiar and colorful figure in Princeton, Dr. Einstein was always friendly and always humble. He was never overly impressed with his great fame.

As with so many scientists who shared the responsibility for developing weapons which may be used in peace or war, Dr. Einstein fought continually to assure that these advances in science would be used for the benefit and not for the destruction of mankind.

As a person and as a neighbor Dr. Einstein will be greatly missed in Princeton.

As a man of science, searcher for truth, and great contributor to humanity's progress, Albert Einstein will never be forgotten.

Men everywhere are indebted to this great scientist. And today, all mankind will join together in tribute to one of civilization's greatest figures.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the death of Albert Einstein is more than a loss to the world of science. This great pioneer in the realm of physics was also a warmhearted, deeply thoughtful human being. He recognized the impact of modern scientific discoveries upon our daily lives, and never forgot that the laboratory of science is often the doorway to the households of mankind.

Those of us who live in the free world must thank God for the providential events which led Albert Einstein from the Old World to our shores. It was his intervention which induced our Government to move rapidly and boldly into the all-out struggle for atomic power. Without that timely and fortunate event, the history of our time might have been far different.

Every free American owes a debt of gratitude to this humble, earnest scholar. He has joined the immortal list of those scientists whose brilliant minds have charted new paths for the world to follow.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. Frank Ahlgren, publisher of the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, and addressed to Mr. DeWitt Wallace, publisher of the Reader's Digest. In this letter, Mr. Ahlgren effectively answers the article published in the current Reader's Digest, which speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1955.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Publisher, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: The mail brings us a proof from your April issue of William Hard's account of the Dixon-Yates deal. Your memorandum calls it an "informative over-all story" and a "complete picture."

It is nothing of the kind.

It is complete only in its presentation of the power trust lobby version of this situation. It ignores questions of sound public policy as asked by the numerous objectors during months of controversy.

Leaving to one side the unquestionable fact that fears for the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority have bearing on the views of the objectors, and the fact that the Democratic Party is using the question for political advantage, this is a purchase contract for payment of more than $500 million in tax money for electricity ($20 million for 25 years—and then the plant goes to the company). The very size of the purchase demands close examination on its own merits and demerits. For your account to lump this examination as "hot air" is a disservice to the public interest.

Your account tells of an earlier Dixon offer to sell power to TVA, without saying what his price was, or how very much higher it was than cost of other power to TVA, or how high this price was in comparison with prices offered by Mr. Dixon a few months later, or the price now mentioned after the spotlight was turned on.

Your account says the Dixon-Yates deal obtained approval of all present members of the AEC. The record shows only 2 members of a 5-member board approved and that 1 of them has since attacked it, saying he only approved in the hope of getting AEC back to the atom business and away from the power-brokerage business. (There was one neutral member, one unconfirmed appointment, and one vacancy at the time of the vote.) You say the Federal Power Commission approved without mentioning that this action was taken over the strong opposition of the head of FPC's Bureau of Accounts, Finances and Rates—the very men most likely to understand what the contract says. You say the General Accounting Office approved. You do not record that the head of GAO appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic energy in violent protest which resulted in partial modifications.

You put negotiation for power at Paducah and Portsmouth, when the war situation demanded more atomic plant production at any cost, on the same basis as negotiation for West Memphis power, after the war situation had calmed.

You explore timidly the "guaranteed profit" angle of Dixon-Yates, without mentioning the fact that two former high officials of Mr. Dixon's companies have said for publication that the company is guaranteed against loss. There is nothing in your "complete picture" to indicate that one interpretation of a clause in this contract requires the AEC to pay the full price of power even though the plant produces none. Neither is there any hint of the contract clauses which give the Dixon company the chance to take power it is selling to the Government at 3.99 mills for its own use at 1.863 mills, under terms which could mean as much as $12 million a year profit to the Dixon companies. The figures have been published, without challenge, by Walter Von Tresckow, who is biased to be sure (because he wanted to bid but was brushed off), but an experienced man in electricity and finance nonetheless.

Your "informative story" mentions the tax clause, without saying that the Dixon-Yates proposal was so far out of line with precedent in years of Government purchase contracts that the United States Senate adopted special legislation to bring it back into line. You do not mention the many "adjustments" made in favor of the Government after objectors such as the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, and the Commercial-Appeal brought the deal before the public.

We further object to this "complete account" leaving out the announcement of Memphis city officials that Memphis will answer its own power needs by financing its own generating plant, if necessary. This one fact removes the whole objective of the Dixon-Yates deal. It has a place in any fair summary of this situation.

And if you use some of your space to tell of the protective attitude of this region toward TVA, you surely should let your readers know that Middle South is the present-day heir of the very company which Memphis voted out when TVA was voted in.

We are close to this situation. We have worked through its details at great length and we are thoroughly convinced that it is against the public interest. You have only to ask: Why was there no opportunity to bid on this job? To realize it was rigged from the start. We are surprised that Mr. Hard, ostensibly a reporter, would approach the story with so little regard for objectivity—that he, and you, would violate the primary rule of journalism that requires examination of both sides of a controversy.

Your truly,

FRANK AHLGREN.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate. I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. After the roll is called, and a quorum is developed, the Senate will receive a visit from a very distinguished former Member of this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have in the Chamber today a former colleague who has come back to pay us a visit.

Many honors have come to him since he left our ranks more than a decade ago. One of those honors was the highest office in our land, the Presidency of the United States.

He led our Nation through some of the most serious crises in its history. He traveled abroad, and in the name of all our people, dealt with foreign potentates on an equal footing. At all times he displayed courage and fortitude and patriotism that gained him the respect even of his enemies.

However, Mr. President, I should like to welcome him back today as a man who is returning for a visit to a dearly beloved home, peopled by very beloved friends.

His life is an important chapter in Senate history. He is already a part of our traditions and a part of our lore. This is a better Senate because he was a part of it.

On behalf of my colleagues, I say: "Welcome back Mr. Truman. The latchstring is always out whenever you pass this way."

Mr. President, I believe it would be very appropriate if we might have the pleasure of hearing from our distinguished former colleague, and with that purpose in view, I ask unanimous consent that he be given the privilege at this time to submit whatever remarks he may care to make.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the request made by the distinguished majority leader, and to join in welcoming to the Senate a distinguished former Member of this body, one of two living ex-Presidents of the United States. He will always find here a most cordial bipartisan welcome.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of Mr. Truman, the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to enable Senators to greet our former colleague.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the former President of the United States, and our former colleague. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, thank you very, very much.

When I was a Member of the Senate the rules prohibited applause in the Senate. Has that rule been repealed? [Laughter.]

I cannot tell the Members of the Senate how very much I appreciate the privilege and the honor which has been accorded me. The happiest days of my 30 years of political life were spent at the desk where I now stand. I do not know of anything I could say that could impress you with the full meaning of the statement that my heart has always been in this Chamber. I wanted to remain here, but circumstances prevented it.

I met with an experience this morning which I never expected to have. I appeared before the distinguished Foreign Relations Committee of this body, on the wrong side of the table. I wish to say that never in my entire life have I been more courteously treated than I was at that meeting of the committee. I trust the statement which I made will be a contribution to the information of that great committee.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will always continue to be, as it has been in the past, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world. It is an honor for any man to serve in this great body, and I consider the 10 years spent here by me the greatest 10 years of my entire life.

I consider this visit a very great privilege, Mr. President, and I appreciate the honor which has been extended to me.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of the uncertainty of how the Senate will proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further morning business, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that the bill now before the Senate is the Colorado River storage project bill, and that it is now in order to proceed with the consideration of any amendments thereto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill is now before the Senate, and the consideration of the committee amendments is now in order. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "use", it is proposed to strike out "making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize" and insert in lieu thereof "commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, if he intends to propose to have all the committee amendments agreed to, and then to proceed to discuss the bill. I ask the question, in part, because I understand the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intends to offer an amendment, and I was wondering what the procedure would be.

Mr. ANDERSON. My thought was, if I may respond to the distinguished Senator from California, to have the Senate proceed to agree to the committee amendments, recognizing the fact that the Senator from Oregon subsequently will offer an amendment dealing with Echo Park Dam. I should certainly wish to protect his parliamentary right to offer that amendment. I feel sure that it would be in order at a subsequent time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments from the floor will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator from California get a sufficient answer to his question? The procedure being followed is merely the usual procedure, having the committee amendments acted on first. After the committee amendments have been acted on, then it will be in order for any Senator to offer an amendment to the perfected bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to be certain of my understanding with respect to an additional point. As I recall, 1 or 2 proposed amendments of which I was the author were offered in committee, but I do not believe they were accepted by the committee. Language somewhat different was adopted. If the amendments of the committee shall be adopted, is my understanding correct that I may, at a subsequent time, if I so desire, move to strike any of the committee amendments, or to substitute other language therefor?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to have the Chair rule on that question, but certainly it is my understanding that the Senator from California could subsequently offer an amendment to strike out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are subject to amendment, and if any Senator has any amendment to offer to one of the committee amendments, it should be offered at the time the committee amendment is pending

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I not have the right to ask that my suggestions be adopted? In other words, do I not have a right to ask that subsequently any Member of the Senate shall have the opportunity to move that a committee amendment be stricken or changed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Most certainly, if the Senator asks unanimous consent, and it is granted, that may be done. The Senator is asking that certain amendments he desires to offer to the committee amendments be deferred until all the committee amendments are adopted, and that he be permitted to offer them at that time.

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me phrase it differently, and see if the Senator from New Mexico will agree with the request.

I ask unanimous consent that at any time prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500, any Member of the Senate may have the right to offer an amendment by which a committee amendment previously adopted may be stricken or changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the Senator from California, his unanimous-consent request is that at any time prior to the final passage of S. 500 any Member of the Senate may offer amendments to the committee amendments which previously have been adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from California would modify his request so as to make it apply only to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think his original request was too broad. There is no disposition on our part to foreclose any amendments. If the unanimous-consent request were so limited, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I adopt the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico as my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request now is that prior to the final passage of S. 500, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be permitted to offer amendments to the committee amendments which have been adopted before that time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the second committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 16, after the word "works", it is proposed to strike out "Cross Mountain."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, after the word "Canyon", to insert "Juniper."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "level", to insert "and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board,"; in line 24, after the word "thereof", to insert "and of the Juniper unit."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of the agreement we have had with the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The remaining committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 15, after the word "Navajo", to insert "Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette;" in line 20, after the word "That", to strike out "(a);" on page 4, line 14, after the word "law", to strike out: "Section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as hereinafter provided for the San Juan Chama and the Navaho participating project, not be applicable to such supplemental reports; and, (b) that no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project or the Navajo participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress."

At the top of page 5, in line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: "Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navajo Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress:"; on page 6, beginning in line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

"(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

"(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law; and insert:

"SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated."

On page 7, line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "irrigation repayment"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "the", to insert "irrigation"; on page 9, line 12, after the word "Treasury", to insert "and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act."; on page 10, line 12, after the word "act", to insert "After repayments to the United States of all moneys required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress."

On page 12, line 24, after the word "year", to strike out "1955" and insert "1956"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "powerplants", to insert "and transmission lines"; on page 14, line 8, after the word "provided", to insert "for"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Cross Mountain,"; in line 23, after the word "Canyon," to insert "Juniper"; on page 15, line 19, after the numerals "12", to insert "(a)" in line 24, after the word "Compact", to insert "the upper Colorado River Basin compact,"; on page 16, line 6, after the word "States", to insert "either on its own behalf or as parens patriae,"; in line 16, after the word "River", to strike out "and its tributaries" and insert "System"; in line 17, after the word "purposes", to strike out "within any of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin"; and after line 18, to insert:

"(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of 1 representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, 1 representative of the Colorado River Board of California, 1 representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and 1 representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others,

of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho: *Provided,* That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and that construction thereof, and of the Juniper unit, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of each unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of each unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette: *Provided,* That construction of the participating projects set forth in this clause (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reexamined the economic justification of such project and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reimbursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this act can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each such project shall include, among other things, (i) a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project made by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the total cost of construction of each participating project or separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this act, to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further,* That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress: *Provided further,* That with reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided,* That (a) contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the irrigation obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under, or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the basin fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 7.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 7, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury, and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made within 50 years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277): *Provided,* That revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act. After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this act within a period not exceeding 50 years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during

the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by sec. 7 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorize nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided for, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, Navaho, and Echo Park initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colo., for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power and other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of its Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than water rights for the necessary functions of the United States Government.

SEC. 12. (a) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, either on its own behalf or as parens patriae, to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. No right to impound or use water for the generation of power or energy, created or established by the building, operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by this act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado River system for domestic or agricultural purposes.

(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of one representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

SEC. 13. As used in this act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin," "Colorado River compact," "Colorado River system," "Lee Ferry," "States of the upper division," "upper basin," and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

The term "States of the upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785); and

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, so that I may be correctly advised by the Chair, I should like to inquire whether amendments will be in order prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that is the unanimous-consent agreement which applies to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the Chair was engaging in a colloquy with the junior Senator from California, I did not hear all that was said. Am I to understand that an amendment to S. 500 will be in order up until the time of the final vote on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to S. 500 are in order now. The unanimous-consent agreement obtained by the Senator from California for himself and the Senator from Oregon was that amendments to the committee amendments would be received from those two Senators up to the vote on the final passage of the bill. Amendments to the bill which have nothing to do with committee amendments are in order now.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for my better information, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sentor from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Senate bill 500 is before the Senate, and the committee amendments to the bill have been adopted en bloc. Therefore, we now have before us the bill as reported by the committee, and all the committee amendments have been adopted. Do I correctly understand that the parts of the bill represented by the committee amendments are now sacred and are not now subject to amendment, except as amendments may be proposed by the two Senators who, by unanimous consent, were given the privilege of submitting amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the parts of the bill which have been amended by committee amendment can be altered

now only by the submission of amendments by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], or under a motion to reconsider a committee amendment heretofore adopted which some Senator may desire to have changed.

Mr. FLANDERS. So amendments to the committee amendments can be made now only through the process of reconsideration. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, within 2 days.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me state there is no desire on the part of those who are sponsoring the bill to shut off the offering of amendments.

The original request by the Senator from California, if granted, would have resulted in our going over and over the same ground. If the Senator from Vermont wishes to submit an amendment, I can assure him that he will not have to resort to any unusual practice in order to obtain consideration of his amendment. Nothing of that sort is in the heart of any Member of the Senate, I am sure; and I assure him that the bill is open to amendment by him or by any other Senator. The only desire is to prevent our going over and over the same matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I was as much interested in the general principle involved as I was in this particular instance. I have been here only 8 years, and I keep learning things I did not know.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my only concern in raising the point at all was in the interest of orderly procedure. I was acquainted with the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intended to offer an amendment. I wished to protect my own rights in opposing any of the committee amendments. However, it seemed to me that orderly procedure would require that the bill be first discussed generally, pro and con. Thereafter, Members of the Senate would be a little better informed as to what they might wish to do with respect to amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not the understanding that the action which has been taken by the Senate to expedite orderly procedure on the bill would permit amendments in the first degree, even with respect to those parts of the bill which were amended by committee amendments? Was that not the intent of the author of the unanimous-consent request, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he proceeded to clarify the situation? Was it not the intent to have before us for consideration a single piece of legislation?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator addresses that question to me, I think the Chair had ruled that, by the simple process of moving to reconsider any amendment which has been adopted by the Senate on the recommendation of the committee, any Member of the Senate may exercise his rights.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I understood the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, amendments in the second degree would also be permitted. I ask the Chair whether or not amendments in the second degree are also permissible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are amendments in the first degree, and that any amendments to committee amendments are amendments in the second degree. No further amendments could be offered, under the rules, to the same committee amendment, after one amendment to the committee amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have the honor today to present to the Senate for its consideration S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, as reported favorably with amendments from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with only one dissenting voice. Twelve Senators signed the report, No. 128; one presented separate views with respect to one feature of the bill; a thirteenth Senator filed minority views, and 2 members of the committee abstained from taking a position on the report.

To the minds of most western people concerned with the conservation for use of the precious water resources of the arid and semiarid areas, S. 500 is perhaps the most vital legislation of this character before the Congress since the reclamation law of 1902, which was sponsored by President Theodore Roosevelt. In the 53 years that have elapsed since that memorable and far-reaching law was enacted, most of the West has moved forward.

Irrigation, which is essential to the stabilization of agriculture west of the 100th meridian, has expanded under reclamation and private initiative. Multiple-purpose dams financed by congressional appropriations store water for irrigation, flood control, river regulation, recreation, and the production of hydropower for industries, rural and urban use. Power revenues assist in repaying irrigation costs beyond the ability of water users to repay. In 50 years, Congress has appropriated approximately $2.5 billion for reclamation construction. The areas in the West created or supported by reclamation developments since 1916 have paid more than that amount into the Federal Treasury in income and other Federal taxes.

I have many times pointed out, with respect to the Salt River project in the State of Arizona, that not only is the Federal Government receiving back the entire cost of the project, but the farmers under that project, because of the water which is supplied to their farms, have paid to the Federal Treasury, in income taxes alone, three times the entire cost of the Salt River project.

California, from Oregon to the Mexican border, has shared in this expansion stimulated by Federal appropriations. The Pacific Northwest has likewise set a pace for industrial growth, and the Missouri River Basin project, authorized by the Congress in 1944, is under way to protect seven more States from the ravages of drought, wind, and floods. Current estimates of the costs to complete the Missouri Basin project approach $5 billion, including the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Only the upper Colorado River Basin awaits recognition by the Congress of the United States as an area that needs and deserves conservation of its water resources for irrigation to stabilize its agriculture and hydropower to stimulate its industrial and rural development and aid in returning the costs to the Federal Treasury. Incidental recreational and flood-control benefits round out the multiple-purpose features of the project to be authorized by S. 500.

The States of the upper basin are Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

S. 500 has four principal purposes, which are outlined more in detail in the report, and which will be discussed more fully by other Senators.

First, it would authorize 6 holdover storage reservoirs, 5 of which have hydropower plants, transmission lines, and incidental works. These reservoirs are vital to the control of the Colorado River and to insure that the upper basin can fulfill the commitments in the Colorado River compact of 1922 not to deplete the flow of the stream below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years. The power installations will assure double or triple use of the waters of the Colorado without affecting the obligations of the upper basin. Power revenues will repay to the Federal Treasury not only the returnable costs of the reservoirs, facilities, et cetera, but will contribute materially to returning irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay. The ultimate installed power capacity to be authorized is 1,200,000 kilowatts.

Second, S. 500 would authorize 12 participating irrigation projects. In these projects are 132,360 acres of land to be brought under irrigation, and 234,000 acres to receive supplemental irrigation water to firm up their present supplies. Before construction can begin, the Secretary of the Interior must reexamine the projects and report to Congress.

Third, the bill recognizes by conditional authorization 21 additional projects or units in various stages of planning, and requires approval and authorization by the Congress before construction. In the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho projects in New Mexico, reports must be submitted to the State of Texas. In the 21 additional projects are 832,000 acres of land to be newly irrigated or receive supplemental water.

Finally, the bill recognizes that the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin, and that the specific authorizations in this bill are not intended to limit or preclude the consideration and authorization by Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned under the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The repayment provisions of the bill, following very closely recommendations

made by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior, are designed to achieve, so far as practicable, the concurrent return of expenditures for power and irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply purposes, insofar as expenditures therefor are made concurrently. The power and municipal and industrial water supply expenditures are returned with interest. All reimbursable costs are returnable within 50-year periods, and this is specifically required by section 4 of the bill as amended.

The Senate, of course, is aware that there is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States litigation between Arizona and California et al. The committee considered the propriety or advisability of authorization of the works set forth in S. 500. It was the conclusion of an overwhelming majority of the committee that nothing in the pending litigation warrants delay in authorization of the works proposed in the bill, and that such is the case even if Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming should be impleaded.

The works included in the bill as recommended by the Upper Colorado River Commission for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are fully justified because they are designed only to make effective part of the perpetual apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually made to the upper basin in the Colorado River compact, and partake of the character of works heretofore authorized under the Federal reclamation program. Therefore the committee concludes that the authorization of this plan of development, being plainly within the upper basin apportionment, cannot and should not be construed as detrimental in any respect to the rightful interests of Arizona, California, or Nevada, as lower basin States, whether as litigants or otherwise. However, the committee calls attention to section 12 of the bill which makes it possible for any Colorado River Basin State to institute litigation promptly in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the event questions arise regarding the legality of the operation of any works herein authorized or of any other works on the river.

Possible frustration of efforts effectively to litigate such questions is avoided by waiver of the immunity of the United States from such a suit. Thus, all States of the Colorado River Basin are fully protected against the operation of any works on the Colorado River system in contravention of the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Mexican treaty. Furthermore, the provision contained in the bill—section 12 (b)—for consultation with an advisory committee in connection with the operation of works on the river will tend, as a practical matter, to obviate misunderstanding and to reduce occasions for litigation.

We feel that it was satisfactorily established by the evidence that the aggregate of the consumptive use of water that will be made, if all of the works hereby proposed to be authorized are eventually constructed after meeting the various conditions imposed, when added to consumptive use already being made in the upper division States, will amount to less than two-thirds of the apportionment being made to the upper basin under the compact. When all storage units and participating projects named in this bill are constructed, the aggregate of all consumptive uses in the upper basin would not exceed 4.8 million acre-feet of water per annum. This would leave an unused apportionment of 2.7 million acre-feet of the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to the upper basin to meet any contingencies arising out of litigation over varying interpretations of the compact. In the circumstances, the continuity of the water supply for the lower basin would be assured.

Before outlining the estimated overall construction costs, I should mention the Eden irrigation project in Wyoming, previously authorized and now nearing completion. This project, as well as the Paonia irrigation project in Colorado, also previously authorized and partly constructed, will be aided financially by the Colorado River storage project power revenues.

The estimated construction costs of the Colorado River storage projects authorized by Senate bill 500 are: 6 storage units, $782,883,000; 12 participating irrigation projects, $310,116,800; total cost of authorized units, $1,092,999,800.

The estimated construction costs of the units requiring further approval and authorization by the Congress are: 21 participating projects, $558,173,300.

Including the Eden and Paonia projects previously authorized, the estimated construction costs of all projects mentioned in Senate bill 500 total $1,658 million, or $1.6 billion.

Mr. President, many Senators from the western States, who have been particularly interested in this subject and who have been very faithful in furthering the development, will undoubtedly speak at some length on the proposed legislation. Therefore, I do not believe it would be fair for me to inflict on them, before they have had an opportunity to speak, a discussion by me which runs to 30 or 40 pages, in which I try to point out that the establishment of the project involved in the bill will not in any way cause difficulty in the agricultural picture throughout the United States.

I hope the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is known as one of the financial geniuses of Congress, will discuss the financial implications of the proposed project. For myself, I feel that I have had some background in agriculture and have had an opportunity to study agriculture, and on the basis of that knowledge I wish to state for the RECORD my testimony that the project can be started and completed without in any way jeopardizing the agricultural prospects of any agricultural State of the Union.

However, I do not feel it would be right for me to make my further remarks before other Senators have had an opportunity to speak on the pending bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to yield to the very distinguished Senator from Utah, who has worked on the bill unceasingly and effectively. I congratulate him for what he has done.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to ask him whether he will be available to answer some questions with respect to the statement to which he has referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sure there will be a number of questions I shall wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico, and I believe other Members of the Senate will also wish to propound some questions to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I speak on the agricultural question, I hope any Senator who is interested in American agriculture and who feels he has a problem in connection with it, and desires to ask me a question on that subject, will feel free to do so.

I shall deal with present population trends and with a subject on which a study was started almost immediately after I became Secretary of Agriculture, namely, the question of how best to utilize the land mass of the Nation and how best to apply it and use it in order to provide all the food needs of the United States.

Anyone who can look at the agricultural picture and not conclude that we shall have some difficulty with our food supplies within the next 25 years, and probably even within the next 10 years, has not read the story of this country correctly. I shall want to discuss that subject as frankly as I can, and I hope some enlightenment may be afforded.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Finally, I should like to say that in our labors on the bill we have enjoyed very pleasant working relationship with the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who finds himself in opposition to the bill. I wish that the good people of his State could have kept their opposition to the bill on the high level on which the distinguished junior Senator from California has kept his.

A few days ago I received in the mail the pamphlet I hold in my hand, which refers to a "new $4 billion tax burden" threatening us. It sets forth the amount of the tax burden which will fall on the various States. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has read this pamphlet. I find that my State will be assessed $15 million of the cost. Arizona will be assessed $20 million of the cost. California will have to bear $372 million worth of the burden.

I mentioned a moment ago that anyone who will take the time to check the experience of the Reclamation Bureau throughout the West, will realize, as does the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that these vast projects and other prospective projects which are coming along will also be revenue-producing projects. I mention that because in one of these writings it is mentioned that the Arkansas-Fryingpan project will be helped on its way by the passage of this proposed legislation.

While the Senator from Colorado is on the floor I wish to say that I hope to have a final markup of his bill, in which he is so greatly interested, the Arkansas-Fryingpan project, next Wednesday. We expect to have the bill before the full committee on the following Tuesday. Here, again, is an example of the Federal Government stepping in to do what an individual State cannot do, and making it possible for the people of Colorado to enjoy benefits and to anticipate the population growth which is now ahead of them.

I do not wish to discuss the bill which is coming before the committee. It will be amply discussed on the floor. But one of the purposes of the bill about which the people of California are a little worried is that of supplying water to municipalities in Colorado. One of those municipalities, the city of Colorado Springs, is enjoying an unusual building boom, and the Federal Government, through the utilization of the water, will be able to develop that fine community.

Therefore, Mr. President, I welcome the bill which has been introduced and on which hearings have been held. I predict that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works will report favorably on the bill. I believe all these measures, such as the upper Colorado River bill, the Arkansas-Fryingpan bill, and proposed legislation dealing with districts in California which involve the conservation of water resources, are extremely important and that the attention of the Congress needs to be called to them as we plan the food needs for future years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the business of the Senate today is Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 500, dealing with the upper Colorado storage project.

On the 16th of March I was given the opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it was holding its hearing upon this bill.

I have before me the text of my testimony. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in an appropriate place in the body of the RECORD after the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shall have opened the debate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY AT HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, MARCH 16, 1955

I notice that you have before the committee a map of the upper Colorado River Basin. I would like to distribute to each member of the committee a miniature copy of this map so that you will have them before you while I talk.

I want to speak about a flowing river, but if I were to give a title to the talk I wish to make, I would call it "They Want To Throw Us to the Dinosaurs."

OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS CONTRAVENE COMPACT

The arguments which have been made against this upper Colorado River storage project, in my opinion, are completely contrary to the policy of the Government, since the Colorado River compact was signed by the authority of the Congress and approved by the Congress.

The attack rises from two sources: First, those in the lower basin, who fear that if the upper basin is permitted to use the water which was allocated to it, the lower basin will somehow be deprived of some of its rights; second, those who seem to believe that somehow or another the building of Echo Park Dam will create a precedent for raids upon national parks and national monuments all over the United States.

The answer to the first, Mr. Chairman, is that in drawing the bill which is before the Senate, S. 500, an attempt was made to provide that what is to be done in the upper Colorado Basin would be done solely in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the various acts which have been passed since that time.

BUILDING OF DAM CANNOT PRESAGE INVASION OF PARKS

The answer to the second is that the law and the facts prove that the building of this dam cannot be a precedent. I undertake to show you today, if I do not trespass upon your time, that is not true, and that, quite to the contrary, the expansion of the Dinosaur National Park—or national monument, I should call it, because it is not a park and never was a park—the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order in 1938 was an invasion of a policy already laid down by Government agencies to devote the area where the Echo Park Dam is to be built to the development of power.

Now let us take a look at this map.

The history of the Colorado River and its tributaries will never be told. The National Park Service has attempted to tell part of it in a little booklet which is entitled "Dinosaur National Monument: Past and Present," published by the Government Printing Office in 1949.

Here on the first page I will read a few lines:

"The chain of events that produced the area comprising Dinosaur National Monument began in what is known as the Jurassic period of earth history.

"This period, according to the best calculations of geologists, occupied an interval of time from 127 to 152 million years ago."

At another point in this document (the paragraph escapes my eye at the moment), the statement is made that in that ancient period this area was inhabited by the dinosaur and his relatives, who, in time, gave way to more intelligent beings—oh, here is the sentence from page 18:

"There did, however, come a day when the last dinosaur drew his final breath, leaving the world to new, different, and more intelligent creatures."

In the belief that man is to be classified among these more intelligent creatures, I appear before you today to beg of you to use the intelligence of the Congress to maintain the policy which was initiated after this history of over a million years of destruction. Congress was intelligent enough, and the States of the Colorado River Basin under their governments were intelligent enough, to do something about the control of the stream which had wrought so much damage through millions of years, and to use it for a constructive purpose.

As you will see from glancing at the map, the story of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin begins in the State of Wyoming, where the Green River has its rise—the Green River and its tributaries. It flows south past the towns of Green River and of Rock Springs, through the Flaming Gorge site, into the State of Utah, and then over into the State of Colorado.

Under the compact which was written by the Colorado River Compact Commission, of which former President Hoover was the head, and approved by the Congress of the United States, it was agreed to divide the waters of this stream, the main flow of this stream, the waters of this system, between the upper basin and the lower basin, and the delivery of the waters which the upper basin owed to the lower basin was ordered to be made at this point on the map—at Lee's Ferry.

COMPACT DIVIDED WATER BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER BASINS

The agreement in that compact was that each basin would be entitled to use for consumptive purposes just about half of the stream flow of that system.

The work first began in the lower basin. Of course, before the Colorado River compact was approved there was private irrigation both in the lower and the upper basin, and efforts were made to irrigate and reclaim certain amounts of land. But, according to the testimony of Mr. Northcutt Ely, a representative of California in the sense that he is one of the lawyers representing the California claims, the State of California today is using about 5 million acre-feet plus of water from this system. The lower basin, all of the lower basin, is using about 6½ million acre-feet. The upper basin, Mr. Northcutt Ely acknowledges, presently is using between 2 million and 2½ million acre-feet. We place that use at 2 million, but for the purposes of this argument I accept Mr. Ely's figures.

In his testimony before the Senate committee, he also acknowledged that all of the projects in the upper basin, which have heretofore been authorized but which have not yet been constructed, might add from 400,000 to 500,000 acre-feet to the future uses of the upper basin.

RATIO IS ALMOST 6 TO 4 IN FAVOR OF LOWER BASIN

Let us take the maximum figures mentioned by Mr. Ely, 2½ million acre-feet, his maximum estimate of present use, and 500,000 if authorized projects not yet built were constructed. Thus, according to the estimates of the California expert, we would have 3 million acre-feet. If all the participating projects included in the Senate bill (S. 500) and the Governor Johnson amendments which have been proposed were built, the upper basin use would not exceed 4½ million acre-feet.

The lower basin, on the other hand, has 6½ million acre-feet. Thus, considering present uses, heretofore authorized but unbuilt projects, and projects proposed by this bill, there is a ratio of almost 6 to 4 against the upper basin on the testimony of Mr. Ely, so far as California is concerned. But it is important to remember that Mr. Ely estimates the present uses in the upper basin at a half million acre-feet more than does the Bureau of Reclamation.

We have reason to believe that the lower basin may use even more than acknowledged by Mr. Ely, but the juxtaposition of these figures seems to me must convince every fair mind that nothing should be done or be permitted to be done to prevent the utilization in the upper basin States of the water allocated to it by the Colorado River compact, namely, 7½ million acre-feet annually.

UPPER STATES WANT ONLY THEIR DUE

The upper basin States are willing to be bound by the compact. The bill before you acknowledges that. Every attempt is made to avoid injuring any right, either existing or potential, under the Colorado River compact. We want only to have the opportunity of using the water as it flows through our States, while we deliver at Lee's Ferry, according to the obligation laid upon us in the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre-feet, which is 3 million more than is now being used and proposed in the whole upper basin annually.

Now this is the simple picture, but a great effort has been made to convince those who listen to the arguments against the

upper basin that this water system is almost a static business. We are asked to overlook the fact that the water moves and that it has been moving down that valley for millions of years. During all of those eons it has wrought only destruction. Man had not captured it, nor harnessed it, nor done anything to make it useful, except in a very small way, until by the authority of Congress the States in the Colorado River Basin were authorized to make a compact to bring these eternally flowing waters under control and to make this system an instrument of construction.

Fortunately for the lower basin, the lower basin States secured Federal legislation to store and divert water long before the upper basin States ever reached an agreement. Finally a percentage was allotted to each of these upper-basin States, and now we are here asking authorization to begin the construction of projects which, in the bill, must be supported by the certification, not only of the Secretary of the Interior, but of the President of the United States, that the projects are feasible.

UPPER STATES HAVE POURED MONEY INTO RECLAMATION FUND

Yet you are asked to believe that this is a project which will place upon the backs of the taxpayers of the United States an intolerable burden.

My colleague, Senator BARRETT, has just shown to you how the State of Wyoming alone, under the Federal Leasing Act, a law passed by the Congress, has been contributing millions of dollars ever since 1920 for the reclamation fund to build reclamation projects most of which, until 20 years ago, were built in other States.

And yet, gentlemen, propagandists have the—well, I should say, effrontery—to scatter broadcast through the Congress of the United States a little pamphlet with a red back and a red front, attempting to tell the people of the country that the upper basin States are not contributing to the cost of this project.

We build power; we have returns from the projects. Of course, it would be impossible to require the farmers on the newly irrigated farms in this area to pay the entire cost. Everybody knew that when the Colorado River compact was drawn and when it was approved. That was known when the Hoover Dam was built and made a power project to develop power and earn revenue.

I wish it were possible to display to you on a screen the pictures of the Colorado River and the lower basin before the Hoover Dam was built and after it was built. I have some photographs here showing the site after completion of the dam. But it is only necessary to refer to the irrigation of the Imperial Valley in California; it is only necessary to refer to the great expansion of the city of Los Angeles; it is only necessary to refer to the development of California industry as a result of the water and the power which was stored in these dams, to prove conclusively that it was a wise and salutary act of Congress to authorize the harnessing of this stream. Surely what was good enough for the lower basin ought to be good enough for the upper basin, too.

ECHO PARK DAM BILL LEAVES DINOSAUR UNDISTURBED

Now, it is said that the Echo Park Reservoir should not be permitted to be built. It is said that Congress ought to preserve the deep canyons which were worn in the terrain of the upper basin by the Green and the Yampa Rivers during all these centuries past, preserve them as a monument to the dinosaurs, and the public is sought to be convinced that those of us who advocate the construction of this reservoir are flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. It is not so.

In this same monograph of the National Park Service, written by William Lee Stokes, of the United States Geological Survey and the University of Utah in 1949, there is a map of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado, and this map contains a little diagram showing the original Dinosaur National Monument. I would like the members of the committee to see that.

Congressman THOMSON, the original Dinosaur Monument is this almost infinitesimal spot at the extreme western end of the Dinosaur National Monument, as expanded [indicating].

RECLAMATION HAS PRIOR RIGHTS IN AREA

Long before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson under the authority of the Antiquities Act, long before that, there was a reclamation withdrawal in this area because it was recognized that reclamation was one of the constructive purposes to which water could be put. Here was a stream that had been rushing torrents of wasted water down through an area larger than the whole New England States and part of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Here was this great area through which this river had been tearing and foaming and pouring torrential floods, carrying all sorts of silt and, maybe, mineral resources in its flood, but always digging in and digging in. Here was this river.

Then an attempt was made to store water, store it in the Hoover Dam, with great success. But they tell us, if we store water in the Glen Canyon Dam, that will deprive the lower basin, or at least California, of some of its uses. The words are written into the bill to prevent that.

But the point that I want to make to this committee with respect to these dams is that the only way by which the upper basin States can get the water which was allocated by the authority of the Congress of the United States to the upper basin is to build these dams.

It is said that the minute the Glen Canyon dam is built Hoover Dam or Lake Mead will be deprived of its supply. That assumes that to build a dam in the upper reaches of a stream it is necessary to stop the flow of the stream entirely. That is not the way the engineers build dams.

The members of this committee can look at pictures, some of them on the walls of the committee room outside, pictures from the Bureau of Reclamation, which show how the tunnels are dug so that the stream can continue to flow. You cannot build a dam with a flooding lake behind it; you have to make the stream flow around the construction work. Otherwise men could not live there very long; they would soon join the dinosaurs of 150 million years ago.

OBJECTIVE IS TO UTILIZE WASTE WATER

The dams at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park are structures that are designed to balance the flow. What the engineers have planned to do is to store the water that goes to waste, the water that is not claimed by the lower basin, the water that the lower basin could not get under the Colorado River Compact, the water that we can use if we have the intelligence to build structures that will save it. And all the time that those dams are being built the upper basin is still under the obligation of the Colorado River Act and of the compact to deliver at Lee's Ferry an average of 7½ million feet annually, or 75 million acre-feet for a 10-year period for the use of the lower basin.

The testimony before the Senate, as I said at the beginning, is, according to Mr. Ely's figures, that the maximum present use of water in the lower basin, including the use by Arizona, is about 6½ million acre-feet. So we have not reached their full allocation, and we intend only to take the water that is not necessary to meet what they need.

WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT ALWAYS HAD PRIORITY IN MONUMENT AREA

Now then, just a word about the creation of the monument. I wrote to the director of the National Park Service asking him for some pictures of the Dinosaur Monument, where the bones are found. His letter to me reads as follows, being dated December 23, 1954:

"DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In answer to your letter of December 16 requesting photographs of the original 80 acres of Dinosaur National Monument, I am enclosing three 5 by 7 prints of photographs taken in the quarry section, and two copies of a sales pamphlet on the dinosaur fossils which contain illustrations of several scenes in that area.

"We do not have on hand prints of the pictures in the pamphlet, but we can have them made for you if you will let us know which ones you would like and the size print desired.

"Although we cannot furnish the sales pamphlet in quantity, we can furnish you a few extra copies if you need them.

"Sincerely yours."

I wish to pass these photographs around because they prove conclusively that the 80-acre Dinosaur Monument set aside by Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson to preserve the bones of the dinosaurs is not a thing of beauty. It is like any quarry, a bleak and unattractive area.

Now, I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, 1954, from a statement made by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in which he set forth in orderly progress the history of the movement by which the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded.

"Official actions since 1902 which established the priority of water and power development in the Green and the Yampa Rivers follow:

"1. October 17, 1904, reclamation withdrawal;

"2. June 8, 1906, act authorizing the creation of national monuments."

I pause here to say parenthetically that that act, the Antiquities Act, authorized the President to set aside by Executive order, areas of historical or scientific value, but it contained a specific proviso that the area should be the smallest possible area to protect the historic site or the scientific area. The Dinosaur Monument was created by Executive order and it embraced only 80 acres.

As long after that as 32 years, the same forces which are now attacking the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin as some sort of a raid upon conservation succeeded in persuading President Roosevelt to issue an Executive order expanding that 80-acre monument of Wilson's by some 209,664 acres.

Where were those acres, Mr. Chairman? They were the acres embracing the confluence of the Yampa and the Green Rivers. There are no dinosaur bones there; there is nothing of scientific value there except the scientific value of flowing water which ought to be used.

So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States.

I return now to Senator WATKINS' statement:

"October 4, 1915, proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument of 80 acres.

"June 10, 1920, Federal Power Act passed; section 4 giving authority to issue licenses for the erection of dams both within and without a national monument.

"March 3, 1921, the Federal Power Act was amended to prevent the licensing of dams,

powerplants, or other works in national parks and monuments without specific authority of Congress."

That is now cited, I say parenthetically, by some of the witnesses against this bill as a congressional disapproval of this act; whereas, upon its face, all that that act does is to say that the Federal Power Commission cannot by executive action alone issue licenses within parks or monuments, but must have the approval of Congress. It was an act which retains for this committee and this Congress the authority to pass the bill which is before you, and the bill which we have before the Senate.

Now I return to Senator WATKINS' statement again:

"This amendment was limited to 'existing' national parks and monuments 'as now constituted'."

So that it was, you see, a limitation bounded by the date of the passage of that act, which was March 3, 1921.

Let me skip now a little bit to August 9, 1934:

"The National Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to restore its withdrawal for power purposes in the acres in Green and Yampa River Canyons so that a national monument could be established, and stated: 'Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights and a power withdrawal is an existing right.'

"On December 19, 1934, the Federal Power Commission replied, referring to withdrawals for the Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments, saying, after noting that the Park Service had acknowledged the withdrawal and stated that such rights would be exempted, the Federal Power Commission continues"—this I want to emphasize—I am quoting from the Federal Power Commission—" 'It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale.'

"Those were the words of the Federal Power Commission on December 13, 1934, when the National Park Service was endeavoring to expand the 80-acre monument by 209,664 acres in order to include the power sites. Who is rating whom?

"Then the Power Commission goes on: 'The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of those streams. The Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of a monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.'

"Clearly, the story of the expansion of this monument is the story of the attempt of the Federal Power Commission to protect the water resources and the power resources of this area. And then what happened?"

ASSURANCE WAS GIVEN THAT DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT SUFFER

I will skip so that I may not take up too much of your time:

"July 14, 1938," says Senator WATKINS, "after many local meetings were held, at which the people of the area were assured that the proposed expansion would not prevent the development of the water and the power resources, the President of the United States issued a proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument from 80 to 209,744 acres.

"The proclamation provides that this expansion"—this is in the proclamation by President Roosevelt—"this expansion shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

Then Senator WATKINS says:

"This proclamation, including the specific reservation, is a pledge to the people of Utah and Colorado that the expansion of the monument would not interfere with the development of their water and power resources. The construction of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument, therefore, cannot be an invasion of the national monument principle, nor establish a precedent that would be applied to other monuments."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this recitation by Senator WATKINS, briefly pointing out each step of the way, is conclusive proof that the passage of this act will create no precedent to injure any national park or national monument, and no power site can be granted thereafter, I think, without the consent of Congress.

MONUMENT TO DESTRUCTION, OR MONUMENT TO GROWTH?

So, Mr. Chairman, the issue before us in the Congress this year is simply whether or not we shall take the intelligent course of allowing the people in the upper Colorado River Basin to have the benefits which were allocated to them by a compact among the basin States and approved by Congress, whether they shall have the right to have the Federal Government do for them what it has already done for the lower basin, by building reservoirs to store the flowing water which otherwise would go to no use at all.

Now in closing—I have talked too long—I merely want to say that the area of the State of Wyoming, which is in this upper basin, is at the very top of the Colorado River system. The waters have been flowing down there through the Green River for ages. The land there needs the water. It can be placed upon the land. It can be placed upon the land by this plan, this comprehensive plan, by engineers who have not yet built any dam anywhere in the United States that has collapsed. The record of the Bureau of Reclamation is perfect upon that point.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say, please, please forget these emotional appeals without basis, and instead of making the upper Colorado River Basin a monument to the destruction of the ages that have gone, let us make it a monument to the growth and expansion and the development of intelligent action, using the discoveries of science and the learning of the colleges and schools we have built by public resources all over the United States, in order to make it easier and of a better standard for people to live.

If we were to follow the course of policy outlined by Gen. U. S. Grant, who testified before us, by Sierra witnesses, by the Wilderness witnesses, we would be turning our back on all that science has developed, and we would be saying, "The people of America may enjoy these great achievements of the century, except in the upper Colorado River Basin." And not there, because of fears entertained, without justification, because of the language in the bill, and because of sentimental and thoughtless appeals by people who do not know that when the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded the power resources of the area were protected in the President's executive order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with relation to the upper Colorado River project.

I should also like to ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my statement on the project, a resolution presented by Mr. Les Woerpel on behalf of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs and adopted at the 19th Annual Convention of the National Wild Life Federation. This resolution is representative of the many expressions that I have received on this specific issue.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

With respect to the legislation now pending before the Senate, S. 500, I may say it is a source of regret to me that this bill was brought so rapidly to the Senate floor, that, in my judgment, there has not been sufficient opportunity for all of the groups which are deeply interested in it adequately to appraise the committee report.

I do not, of course, question the desire of the leadership to have the Senate proceed expeditiously on its important agenda, although I do say that, in this instance, it is somewhat unfortunate that more time is not available for the most careful evaluation.

I shall not attempt at the present time to make a detailed evaluation of S. 500 on the Senate floor.

I shall only say that I share the deep concern which has been voiced by numerous conservation groups and authorities in our Nation on S. 500, particularly in regard to those provisions which would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument.

I have heard from conservationists in my own State who have questioned the advisability from the standpoint of possible danger to the Nation's outdoor heritage. I note, for example, that among the groups which are officially on record in opposition to it are such outstanding organizations as the Izaac Walton League; the National Parks Association; the Wilderness Society; the Wildlife Management Institute; the National Wild Life Federation, and others.

From another standpoint, I should like to observe that numerous members of the engineering profession are opposed to the bill, including the Engineers Joint Council; the American Society of Civil Engineers; the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; the American Institute of Electrical Engineers; the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers; the American Society for Engineering Education, and the American Institute for Chemical Engineers.

I have always believed that the expert judgment of groups affected by pending legislation should be carefully considered.

I do not believe in weighing, of course, the total number of groups opposed to a given bill, as against the total number of groups which may be in favor of a bill. Of course, it is not mere numbers which should be weighed, but the merits of their arguments. Nevertheless, I point out the above facts as indications of the significant sentiment of two important segments of American society—censervation and engineering—in connection with opposition to the pending bill.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., 19TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MONTREAL, MARCH 11–13, 1955

OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the National Park System, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed

Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our National Park System is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, speaking in support of S. 500, a bill authorizing initial units of a plan for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, it may be profitable to state the situation existing between the seven States which contain the drainage basin of the Colorado River.

In 1922, after several years of preparatory research and studies of the physical and legal factors, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming, through Commissioners, agreed upon a compact to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of this drainage basin. This compact was to become effective when ratified by the legislatures of the States and approved by the Congress, as required by law. The compact divided the basin into "upper" and "lower" subbasins containing approximately 110,000 and 130,000 square miles, respectively, in the United States. The area of the upper basin is that which drains to the stream above a point 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River. This point is in northern Arizona not far from the Arizona-Utah boundary line, and is called Lee Ferry.

The compact requires that the upper basin States, being Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, together with a portion of Arizona, shall be given the perpetual apportionment of 7½ million acre-feet annually for beneficial consumptive use; that the lower basin States, Arizona, California, and Nevada, be given a like apportionment. However, the upper basin agreed not to deplete the runoff at Lee Ferry, by their combined consumptive use, to a degree which would leave less than 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series. The compact contains other provisions which are not material to this legislation, except that which permitted the States of each of the two basins to agree by compact between them upon divisions of use of the apportionment made in the compact.

The upper basin States, including Arizona, did agree in 1948 upon such apportionments, based upon beneficial consumptive use, and Congress has approved that compact. S. 500 notes these two compacts, the Water Treaty with Mexico, the laws enacted by Congress with respect to them, and clearly requires conformity with each and all of them in the development and operation of reclamation works in the upper basin.

The effect of the Colorado River compact of 1922 is simply to eliminate as between the States of the upper basin and those of the lower basin, the doctrine of priority of water rights. The States of the upper basin since 1922 thus have enjoyed security in their rights to use their apportionments when and where it is to their best interests to do so. It was on such a premise that the upper basin States favored authorization of the construction of Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal to Imperial Valley, the Gila irrigation project, and the Parker and Davis Dams, all in the lower basin.

I am one of the 10 Senators sponsoring S. 500. We represent, in this body, the five States having perpetual water rights to the flows of the Colorado River and its tributaries in the upper basin. We are joined under the terms of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact which was ratified by these States, and approved by the Congress, for the specific purpose of securing the development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The bill under consideration is to initiate the fulfillment of that purpose. It is, in fact, a measure proposed by the Upper Colorado River Commission which was created by the compact. The Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, is to be authorized as the construction agency.

Under the provisions of the bill, water rights will vest in the lands to be irrigated and in the municipalities to be supplied with domestic and industrial water supply, all in conformity with the laws of the States and the Federal reclamation laws.

While the works will be financed and constructed by the Federal Government, the people directly benefited will pay for them. The expenditures for power and municipal water supplies will be returned with interest, including interest during construction.

As amended by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and approved by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, S. 500 would authorize the construction of five "holdover storage" reservoirs. These reservoirs will make possible releases of water to the Lower Colorado River Basin so that upstream uses of water can be made during periods of low flows, while the upper basin States, at the same time, fulfill their compact commitments to the lower basin. Hydroelectric power will be generated from the release of stored water. The need of power is marked throughout the seven Colorado River Basin States.

The function of these storage units is of vital importance to all 7 of the Colorado River Basin States and of particular importance to the upper basin States. From the functional point of view, they are of significance to each of the upper basin States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming because, without them, in the light of historical flows of the Colorado River, those States cannot hope eventually to make the uses of water that are apportioned to them as a group by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and among them by the upper Colorado River Basin compact. They are also of financial significance to each of the upper division States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, because the revenues from the power they produce will help to pay the costs of irrigation works that can be undertaken in each of those States. These storage units are extremely important to the States of the lower basin because they retain sediments which otherwise will finally impair the functions of existing storage at Hoover Dam.

In approximately 50 years from the date of their construction, these storage units will have returned their total cost. In addition to that, they will have returned 2½ percent interest per annum on that part of their costs which is allocated to power, together with interest during construction.

One of these holdover storage units is located in the Dinosaur National Monument. The Senate has received much information on this subject during the past year. Suffice it to say that when the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to take in the Echo Park area, the people of the States of Colorado and Utah, living in the vicinity, were assured that such enlargement would not prohibit use of the area for water storage purposes.

Good faith requires us not to bar the use of the area for those purposes. Every effort has been made to find an equally good reservoir site outside the area of the monument. None has been found. None can be found which combines all of the attributes of Echo Park.

Echo Park Dam can be authorized without, in any sense, setting a precedent that might endanger other national monuments or national parks. The reason is that the circumstances surrounding the enlargement of the Dinosaur

National Monument are unique in that there was a reservation for power and storage development.

The question whether the Echo Park Dam should be authorized has become, in large part, a matter of emotion rather than reason.

The experts testified before our committee with clarity and precision that no equivalent for Echo Park can be found. Others testified that they were opposed to Echo Park, not so much because of their love for the Dinosaur National Monument—many of them had never been there—but because of their love of nature and their desire to preserve it for posterity. I am certain many of my colleagues in the Senate have received numerous letters from these good people. Many of those letters were obviously written by persons who had been asked to write, and who were glad to do so; but they have no real knowledge or sympathetic understanding of the needs of our arid country for economical storage sites.

S. 500 authorizes a number of participating irrigation projects, and it is contemplated that others will be authorized in the future. These irrigation projects are called participating projects because they will participate in power revenues to aid in meeting their construction costs.

These projects authorized in the bill total 383,000 acres. To take this amount of acreage and to charge against it the entire cost allocated to irrigation, including holdover storage costs so allocated, when it is contemplated that other projects will be authorized containing an amount of acreage which cannot be accurately stated at this time, is obviously a grossly inaccurate and misleading method of estimating the irrigation costs on an acreage basis.

Even though the few participating projects contained in S. 500 constitute only a beginning on irrigation development in the upper basin, the bill contains a number of safeguards that are designed to prevent initiation of construction of works which require further economic analysis. Notwithstanding the many years of investigation which have preceded the bill, our committee concluded that it would follow, in the main, the recommendations made by the present administration in connection with such safeguards. Thus, under the terms of the bill, as amended, construction of participating projects may not be initiated until there has been a reevaluation of the relation of their anticipated benefits to their estimated costs, and consultation thereon with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Furthermore, the participating projects could not be started prior to the completion of soil surveys and land classifications in accordance with the requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954. No participating project can be commenced until the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied that its costs will be paid out in 50 years.

One of the unique aspects of the bill, as amended in our subcommittee, consists in its financial provisions. The total reimbursable costs of the holdover storage reservoirs will be returned within 50 years from the commencement of their operation. Costs of participating projects are returnable within 50 years from the date of their completion; and this includes both those costs that are returnable by the water users as well as the costs returnable from power revenues.

The bill is so drawn as to require the separate treatment of interest returned on the power and municipal water supply investments, and to assure that such interest revenues will not be credited as payments on account of principal. These financial provisions, which were recommended to us by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior, are more strict than the requirements of existing reclamation law.

In effect, these provisions of S. 500 constitute a financial arrangement between the Federal Government and the five upper basin States for the return of all costs of the project except those costs that are directly related to national benefits. Only 3 percent of the total cost of the project is nonreimbursable.

Under the very strict provisions of S. 500, as I have already pointed out, the interest returned on power and municipal water supply cannot be credited as payment on account of principal. Under S. 500, the rate of interest is determined by following detailed and specific provisions for computing the average rate prevailing for long-term Treasury obligations.

The rate of interest is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the formula provided in the bill. S. 500, as the committee has amended it, provides for 50-year repayment contracts, in which the irrigation water users are to repay their share of the costs. They may, where particular circumstances warrant, have a development period not exceeding 10 years.

One of the outstanding provisions of S. 500 is the requirement that, in every case where such a course is practicable, the organization entering into the repayment contract—to repay to the United States the irrigation costs of participating projects—shall be of the "conservancy" district type.

Conservancy districts normally include within their territorial limits not only the agricultural area receiving the irrigation water supply but also the contiguous urban areas. Conservancy districts have the power to levy ad valorem taxes. Thus, the burden of repayment is spread, as it should be, among all local beneficiaries of the project as well as among the irrigation farmers.

Since the participating projects authorized by S. 500 constitute only a beginning on the irrigation development that must eventually take place in the upper Colorado River basin, the bill lays down policies designed to encourage continued investigations, the preparation of additional reports, feasibility studies, and the possible authorization of new participating projects from time to time.

Our committee had before it the question whether pending litigation between Arizona and California, which raises a number of questions of interpretation of compacts, treaties, and laws affecting the Colorado River, is of such a character as to require delay in the authorization of the Colorado River storage project. We concluded that it is not of such a character and that the authorization of these works should not be delayed. However, we have afforded the fullest measure of protection to the lower basin States by providing barriers against the operation of any of such works in a manner contrary to the applicable compacts, treaties, and laws.

We have accomplished this in two principal ways. First, by specific direction that the Secretary of the Interior shall operate such works in accordance with such compacts, treaties, and laws; and, secondly, by waiver of the immunity of the United States from suit, so that any State which considers that such works are being or may be operated in a manner contrary to such compacts, treaties, and laws, may have redress in the Supreme Court without delay.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that the upper Colorado River Basin States have been waiting for more than a quarter of a century for the works which will be authorized if S. 500 becomes law. The investigations furnishing the solid foundation of knowledge upon which these States, working with the Federal Government, have been able to build a plan, on which we are now asked to act, have proceeded for more than 25 years. These investigations have been carried out by experts in the field. All possible reservoir sites have been looked into. Many sites have been drilled; so it is known what conditions the builders will run into. Irrigation needs have been examined. Domestic water needs for the long pull have been computed. Power markets have been thoroughly surveyed. The result of all these investigations is a plan, a part of which would be authorized by S. 500.

The total cost of the project, assuming the construction of everything which is authorized, will be $1,093,000,000. This seems like a large figure. However, it should be remembered that this amount will be divided among 5 States over a 25-year construction period. Looked at in that way, the project involves an average expenditure of only $9 million per annum for each State. We should remember that almost all of it will be paid back, much of it with interest, and that, after such repayment has been accomplished, the taxpayers will realize an income up to $20 million a year from power revenue alone, for many, many years to come.

I wish that those of my colleagues who have not done so would view some of the irrigated areas in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Here are farm upon farm where once the desert reigned. Here are homes where once there was no shelter. Here are prosperous communities, schools, and churches. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to know that those projects which have been built in the West pay for themselves many times over in income taxes alone.

The bill authorizes construction of 6 reservoirs, of which 5 provide hold-over storage capacity. These reservoirs, to-

gether, will regulate the runoff for better river control in the whole Colorado River Basin. Lake Mead will require a lesser reservation for flood control, thereby having a greater active holdover capacity. The average annual silt inflow to Lake Mead is about 105,000 acre-feet. Of this quantity nearly 80,000 acre-feet, or 75 percent, will be captured in Glen Canyon Reservoir. The benefits of the storage project to the lower basin States will, therefore, be of considerable magnitude.

In the Colorado River storage project, for which we now seek authorization, there will be installed 1,200,000 kilowatts for power generation, and the energy produced will be 6 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

This is what now is proposed by Federal projects in the lower Colorado River Basin. Authorized Federal hydroelectric plants in the Missouri Basin on the main river in Montana and the Dakotas will generate 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually. Constructed Federal plants in the Columbia Basin produce more than 36 billion kilowatt-hours annually, and authorized plants will produce an additional 26 billion kilowatts annually. At present, there is but one Federal hydropower plant in the upper Colorado Basin, and that is at Green Mountain Dam in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

The information submitted to us shows: That the average annual evaporation losses in the reservoirs authorized by the bill will be 754,000 acre-feet; that consumptive uses on the participating irrigation projects will average 413,000 acre-feet annually; that consumptive uses of existing and uncompleted projects will average 2,500,000. The total consumptive use and stream flow depletion will be the sum of these values, or 3,667,000 acre-feet annually. This is less than one-half of the waters allocated to the States in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair.) Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I noted that the Senator from Colorado, in speaking about the repayments, stated that we should remember that almost all the money expended will be paid back, much of it with interest. As a matter of fact, all of the items, except that part of the cost which will be allocated to irrigation, will be paid back with interest. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. Interest is not paid on irrigation costs. It has been the law for 50 years that it should not be.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator refers to the basic reclamation law which was enacted in 1902, does he not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The law deals also with flood control, and the program was adopted by the Congress many years ago. The law does not require any of the individuals, corporations, or others who are benefited to pay back any interest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Either interest or principal.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. I think he has made a very able presentation of the outline of a great project.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, since World War I and the preparations of the United States and our Allies in that conflict, World War II, and the conflict in Korea, this Nation has made heavy drafts upon its natural resources and productive energies. This has been measured in a sense by the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Obviously, our wealth-producing resources and energies spent in war, and in preparation for it, should be replaced or we will have indeed weakened ourselves in many tragic ways, which will reflect themselves most harmfully in our economy for a long time to come.

When we consider the expenditures contemplated by the project now under consideration, figured on a yearly and State-by-State basis, which in the end will pay for themselves and provide a constant replenishment of lost wealth in other directions, we can see that the expenditures here suggested are liberating and wealth-producing factors and are clearly in the interest of the national welfare.

We are simply preparing the seed beds and planting the seeds for a renewal and extension of activities which will help in overcoming the losses to which I have referred, by helping to restore the strength of our productive economy. This is consistent with good policies and in furtherance of good husbandry in the management of our national affairs.

Those of us who live under water conservation projects which irrigate arid lands and which develop power, can see every day the direct and indirect benefits of incalculable size resulting from those projects.

If I may mention my own State, I can say that wherever we have operating water projects, we have prosperity among individuals in the communities affected.

If it were not for its water projects which help to produce a more rounded economy, the State of Colorado would be a State of scattered grazing activities, and it would be sending to the Treasury of the United States only a small fraction of the income taxes and other revenues which now amount to about ¾ billion dollars annually.

The proposed reservoirs for water conservation, river regulation, power production, and the participating areas for watering arid lands, will be wealth-producing assets which will go far beyond the immediate benefits to those in position to share them.

Communities will be founded and expanded under the operation of those projects. They will help in the production of local and national tax revenues. There will be cumulative and expanding cycles of productive wealth and prosperity for the benefit of the United States and of the States involved.

When we divide the total cost of these projects by the States benefiting and the period of time necessary to complete the work to be done, remembering again the greater part of the expenditures will be repaid, I suggest that we are paying a very small price for the creation of assets which will replenish many of the productive assets which were lost in the wars and emergencies during the past 40 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, it is with very real regret that I feel compelled to oppose the passage of the pending proposed legislation, S. 500. It is a bill, Madam President, which, in my judgment, is wrong. It violates, and it seriously violates, the precedents of the Congress. Beyond that, it places in very real jeopardy the rights to water of the State of California.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate mine has been a record, I hope I may say, Madam President, of cooperation. I dislike obstruction and obstructionists.

As a United States Senator from the State of California, I am interested in progress for all sections of the United States, mine included. I wish to see the economy and the development of the people and the area of the United States dynamic, and I wish to see the Federal Government do what should be done in playing its part in the development of the Nation.

Nevertheless, Madam President, I feel constrained to oppose the pending bill. I shall endeavor to demonstrate for the RECORD why I oppose the bill and the reasons which have prompted me to bring my opposition to the attention of both the Senate and the country. That will require the devotion of a few moments to the history of the Colorado River.

Madam President, over three-quarters of a century ago—in the 1870's—people in the lower areas of California began to utilize the waters of the Colorado River, by way of irrigating their lands. As the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent continued to develop, and as her population increased, more and more water from the Colorado River was utilized. Under the laws of my State, people and public districts began to acquire rights to that water. I think it is generally conceded that the history of the Colorado River is one of being an erratic stream; at times there have been floods, and at other times there has been virtually no water at all in the river.

As the population of California began to develop with great rapidity, the people of my State believed that it would be in the public interest to have dams constructed for the storage of the water, not alone to regulate the flow of the river, but also to provide for necessary hydroelectric power and orderly development and beneficial use of the waters of the stream.

It was in 1922 that the United States Supreme Court had an important question before it. The State of Wyoming had sued the State of Colorado with respect to the rights in the Colorado River, running through both States. The United States Supreme Court held that "first in time was first in right," and that whoever appropriated first—whether it be in the upper stretches of the stream or in the lower stretches—was protected to

the extent that the appropriation could ripen into a legal right. That give rise to considerable apprehension on the part of the good people in the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River. Here was a State—California—whose population was growing by leaps and bounds, and was operating under a Supreme Court decision which said, "If you use it first, you have a right to it."

So, Madam President, when California, as represented on the floor of the Senate by those who then had been elected from my State, including the late and illustrious Hiram W. Johnson, urged Congress to pass measures providing for the erection of a multiple purpose dam and reservoir in the lower basin, in complete good faith the Senators who represented the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River raised some questions.

One of them was based on their desire to have a compact, agreement, or understanding among all the States of the Colorado River Basin, so that the rule laid down by the Supreme Court would not operate to the detriment of the upper basin States. The representatives of those States said, "Let us enter into an agreement with respect to the waters of the Colorado River. Let us substitute some other rule than 'first in time, first in right'; let us agree how to apportion the waters; and then we shall talk with you about Federal assistance in the development of dams and reservoirs."

There, Madam President, is the genesis of what is now the Colorado River compact. In any discussion of the water rights on that river—and, indeed, in any discussion as to what Congress and the Federal Government should do regarding the Colorado River Basin—it is necessary to refer to the Colorado River compact. That I propose now very briefly to do.

Madam President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Colorado River compact set forth in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the compact was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO. 6225—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I certify that the document annexed is a true copy of the "Colorado River compact," signed 24th November 1922, at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., the original of which is on file in this Department.

In testimony whereof I, Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Chief Clerk of the said Department, at the city of Washington, this 22nd day of December 1922.

CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.
By BEN B. DAVIS,
Chief Clerk,

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having resolved to enter into a compact under the act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 19, 1921 (42 Statutes at Large, p. 171), and the acts of the legislatures of the said States, have through their governors appointed as their commissioners: W. S. Norviel for the State of Arizona, W. F. McClure for the State of California, Delph E. Carpenter for the State of Colorado, J. G. Scrugham for the State of Nevada, Stephen B. Davis, Jr., for the State of New Mexico, R. E. Caldwell for the State of Utah, Frank C. Emerson for the State of Wyoming, who, after negotiations participated in by Herbert Hoover appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact—

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

ARTICLE III

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River System, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

(f) Further equitable apportionment of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Colorado River system unappportioned by paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), may be made in the manner provided in paragraph (g) at any time after October 1, 1963, if and when either basin shall have reached its total beneficial consumptive use as set out in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(g) In the event of a desire for a further apportionment as provided in paragraph (f) any two signatory States, acting through their governors, may give joint notice of such desire to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and it shall be the duty of the governors of the signatory States and of the President of the United States of America forthwith to appoint representatives, whose duty it shall be to divide and apportion equitably between the upper basin and lower basin the beneficial use of the unapportioned water of the Colorado River system as mentioned in paragraph (f), subject to the legislative ratification of the signatory States and the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV

(a) Inasmuch as the Colorado River has ceased to be navigable for commerce and the reservation of its waters for navigation would seriously limit the development of its basin, the use of its waters for purposes of navigation shall be subservient to the uses of such water for domestic, agricultural, and power purposes. If the Congress shall not consent to this paragraph, the other provisions of this compact shall nevertheless remain binding.

(b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(c) The provisions of this article shall not apply to or interfere with the regulation and control by any State within its boundaries of the appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

ARTICLE V

The chief official of each signatory State charged with the administration of water rights, together with the Director of the United States Reclamation Service and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio:

(a) To promote the systematic determination and coordination of the facts as to flow, appropriation, consumption, and use of water in the Colorado River Basin, and the interchange of available information in such matters.

(b) To secure the ascertainment and publication of the annual flow of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry.

(c) To perform such other duties as may be assigned by mutual consent of the signatories from time to time.

ARTICLE VI

Should any claim or controversy arise between any two or more of the signatory States:

(a) with respect to the waters of the Colorado River system not covered by the terms of this compact;

(b) over the meaning or performance of any of the terms of this compact;

(c) as to the allocation of the burdens incident to the performance of any article of this compact or the delivery of waters as herein provided;

(d) as to the construction or operation of works within the Colorado River Basin to be situated in two or more States, or to be constructed in one State for the benefit of another State; or

(e) as to the diversion of water in one State for the benefit of another State; the governors of the States affected, upon the request of one of them, shall forthwith appoint commissioners with power to consider and adjust such claim or controversy, subject to ratification by the legislatures of the States so affected.

Nothing herein contained shall prevent the adjustment of any such claim or controversy by any present method or by direct future legislative action of the interested States.

ARTICLE VII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

ARTICLE VIII

Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unimpaired by this compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5 million acre-feet shall have been provided on the main Colorado River within or for the benefit of the lower basin, then claims of such rights, if any, by appropriators or users of water in the lower basin against appropriators or users of water in the upper basin shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored not in conflict with article III.

All other rights to beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system shall be satisfied solely from the water apportioned to that basin in which they are situate.

ARTICLE IX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

ARTICLE X

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and by the Congress of the United States. Notice of approval by the legislatures shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the governors of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in a single original, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., this 24th day of November A. D. 1922.

W. S. NORVIEL.
W. F. MCCLURE.
DELPH E. CARPENTER.
J. G. SCRUGHAM.
STEPHEN B. DAVIS, Jr.
R. E. CALDWELL.
FRANK C. EMERSON.

Approved:

HERBERT HOOVER.

APPENDIX 231—THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

(Text of the upper Colorado River Basin compact entered into by the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., October 11, 1948)

The State of Arizona, the State of Colorado, the State of New Mexico, the State of Utah, and the State of Wyoming, acting through their commissioners, Charles A. Carson for the State of Arizona, Clifford H. Stone for the State of Colorado, Fred E. Wilson for the State of New Mexico, Edward H. Watson for the State of Utah, and L. C. Bishop for the State of Wyoming, after negotiations participated in by Harry W. Bashore, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, to determine the rights and obligations of each signatory State respecting the uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River, as follows:

ARTICLE I

(a) The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact; to establish the obligations of each State of the upper division with respect to the deliveries of water required to be made at Lee Ferry by the Colorado River compact; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controveries; to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the upper basin, the storage of water, and to protect life and property from floods.

(b) It is recognized that the Colorado River compact is in full force and effect and all of the provisions hereof are subject thereto.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

(e) The term "Lee Ferry" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River one mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "Colorado River compact" means the agreement concerning the apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system dated November 24, 1922, executed by commissioners for the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, approved by Herbert Hoover, representative of the United States of America, and proclaimed effective by the President of the United States of America, June 25, 1929.

(i) The term "upper Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(j) the term "Commission" means the administrative agency created by article VIII of this compact.

(k) The term "water year" means that period of 12 months ending September 30 of each year.

(l) The term "acre-foot" means the quantity of water required to cover an acre to the depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

(m) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

(n) The term "virgin flow" means the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man.

ARTICLE III

(a) Subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River compact and in this compact, there is hereby apportioned from the Upper Colorado River system in perpetuity to the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use of water as follows:

1. To the State of Arizona the consumptive use of 50,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

2. To the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use per annum of the quantities resulting from the application of the following percentages to the total quantity of consumptive use per annum apportioned in perpetuity to and available for use each year by upper basin [sic] under the Colorado River compact and remaining after the deduction of the use, not to exceed 50,000 acre-feet per annum, made in the State of Arizona.

State of Colorado, 51.75 percent.
State of New Mexico, 11.25 percent.
State of Utah, 23 percent.
State of Wyoming, 14 percent.

(b) The apportionment made to the respective States by paragraph (a) of this article is based upon, and shall be applied in conformity with, the following principles and each of them.

1. The apportionment is of any and all man-made depletions;

2. Beneficial use is the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right to use;

3. No State shall exceed its apportioned use in any water year when the effect of such excess use, as determined by the Commission, is to deprive another signatory State of its apportioned use during that water year: *Provided*, That this subparagraph (b) (3) shall not be construed as—

(i) Altering the apportionment of use, or obligations to make deliveries as provided in articles XI, XII, XIII, or XIV of this conpact;

(ii) Purporting to apportion among the signatory States such uses of water as the

upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact; or

(iii) Countenancing average uses by any signatory State in excess of its apportionment.

4. The apportionment to each State includes all water necessary for the supply of any rights which now exist.

(c) No apportionment is hereby made, or intended to be made, of such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact.

(d) The apportionment made by this article shall not be taken as any basis for the allocation among the signatory States of any benefits resulting from the generation of power.

ARTICLE IV

In the event curtailment of use of water by the States of the upper division at any time shall become necessary in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River compact, the extent of curtailment by each State of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be in such quantities and at such times as shall be determined by the Commission upon the application of the following principles:

(a) The extent and times of curtailment shall be such as to assure full compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact;

(b) If any State or States of the upper division, in the 10 years immediately preceding the water year in which curtailment is necessary, shall have consumptively used more water than it was or they were, as the case may be, entitled to use under the apportionment made by article III of this compact, such State or States shall be required to supply at Lee Ferry a quantity of water equal to its, or the aggregate of their, overdraft or the proportionate part of such overdraft, as may be necessary to assure compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact, before demand is made on any other State of the upper division;

(c) Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this article, the extent of curtailment by each State of the upper division of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be such as to result in the delivery at Lee Ferry of a quantity of water which bears the same relation to the total required curtailment of use by the States of the upper division as the consumptive use of the upper Colorado River system water which was made by each State during the water year immediately preceding the year in which the curtailment becomes necessary bears to the total consumptive use of such water in the States of the upper division during the same water year; provided, that in determining such relation the uses of water under rights perfected prior to November 24, 1922, shall be excluded.

ARTICLE V

(a) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed prior to the signing of this compact shall be charged to the State in which such reservoir or reservoirs are located. Water stored in reservoirs covered by this paragraph (a) shall be for the exclusive use of and shall be charged to the State in which the reservoir or reservoirs are located.

(b) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed after the signing of this compact shall be charged as follows:

1. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to assist the States of the upper division in meeting their obligations to deliver water at Lee Ferry imposed by article III of the Colorado River compact, the Commission shall make findings, which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir capacity allocated for that purpose. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall be charged to the States of the upper division in the proportion which the consumptive use of water in each State of the upper division during the water year in which the charge is made bears to the total consumptive use of water in all States of the upper division during the same water year. Water stored in reservoirs or in reservoir capacity covered by this subparagraph (b) (1) shall be for the common benefit of all of the States of the upper division.

2. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to supply water for use in a State of the upper division, the Commission shall make findings which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to supply water for use and the State in which such water will be used. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the State in which such water will be used shall be borne by that State. As determined by the Commission, water stored in reservoirs covered by this subparagraph (b) (2) shall be earmarked for and charged to the State in which the water will be used.

(c) In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference. Any reservoir or reservoir capacity hereafter used to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall by order of the Commission be used to store water for consumptive use in a State, provided the Commission finds that such storage is reasonably necessary to permit such State to make the use of the water apportioned to it by this compact.

ARTICLE VI

The Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water, which use is apportioned by article III hereof, for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin by the inflow-outflow method in terms of manmade depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

ARTICLE VII

The consumptive use of water by the United States of America or any of its agencies, instrumentalities, or wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE VIII

(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. The Commission shall be composed of one Commissioner representing each of the States of the upper division, namely, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State, and if designated by the President, one Commissioner representing the United States of America. The President is hereby requested to designate a Commissioner. If so designated the Commissioner representing the United States of America shall be the presiding officer of the Commission and shall be entitled to the same powers and rights as the Commissioner of any State. Any four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this compact, and which are not paid by the United States of America, shall be borne by the four States according to the percentage of consumptive use apportioned to each. On or before December 1 of each year, the Commission shall adopt and transmit to the governors of the four States and to the President a budget covering an estimate of its expenses for the following year, and of the amount payable by each State. Each State shall pay the amount due by it to the Commission on or before April 1 of the year following. The payment of the expenses of the Commission and of its employees shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of any of the four States; however, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified independent public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Commission, or an employee of any signatory State or of the United States of America while so acting. He shall serve for such terms and receive such salary and perform such duties as the Commission may direct. The Commission may employ such engineering, legal, clerical, and other personnel as, in its judgment, may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this compact. In the hiring of employees, the Commission shall not be bound by the civil service laws of any State.

(d) The Commission, so far as consistent with this compact, shall have the power to:

1. Adopt rules and regulations.

2. Locate, establish, construct, abandon, operate and maintain water gaging stations.

3. Make estimates to forecast water runoff on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries.

4. Engage in cooperative studies of water supplies of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

5. Collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage, diversions and use of the waters of the Colorado River, and any of its tributaries.

6. Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and in each State thereof.

7. Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year.

8. Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to reservoir losses and as to the share thereof chargeable under article V hereof to each of the States.

10. Make findings of fact in the event of the occurrence of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the upper basin, whereby deliveries by the upper basin of water which it may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States arising under the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, dated February 3, 1944 (treaty series 994) become difficult, and report such findings to the governors of the upper basin States, the President of the United States of America, the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate to the end that the water allotted to Mexico under division III of such treaty may be reduced in accordance with the terms of such treaty.

11. Acquire and hold such personal and real property as may be necessary for the performance of its duties hereunder and to dispose of the same when no longer required.

12. Perform all functions required of it by this compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, either independently or in cooperation with any State or Federal agency.

13. Make and transmit annually to the governors of the signatory States and the President of the United States of America, with the estimated budget, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding water year.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this compact the concurrence of four members of the Commission shall be required in any action taken by it.

(f) The Commission and its secretary shall make available to the governor of each of the signatory States any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide free access to its records by the governors of each of the States, or their representatives, or authorized representatives of the United States of America.

(g) Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

(h) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held within 4 months from the effective date of this compact.

ARTICLE IX

(a) No State shall deny the right of the United States of America and, subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, no State shall deny the right of another signatory State, any person, or entity of any signatory State to acquire rights to the use of water, or to construct or participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals, and conduits in one State for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, regulation, and releasing water to satisfy the provisions of the Colorado River compact relating to the obligation of the States of the upper division to make deliveries of water at Lee Ferry, or for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, or regulating water in an upper signatory State for consumptive use in a lower signatory State, when such use is within the apportionment to such lower State made by this compact. Such rights shall be subject to the rights of water users, in a State in which such reservoir or works are located, to receive and use water, the use of which is within the apportionment to such State by this compact.

(b) Any signatory State, any person or any entity of any signatory State shall have the right to acquire such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this compact in any other signatory State by donation, purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain. Any signatory State, upon the written request of the governor of any other signatory State, for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price satisfactory to the requesting State, or, if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or such entity as may be designated by the requesting State: *Provided*, That all costs of acquisition and expense of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining the requested property shall be paid by the requesting State at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State requested to acquire the property.

(c) Should any facility be constructed in a signatory State by and for the benefit of another signatory State or States or the water users thereof, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance, and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located, except that, in the case of a reservoir constructed in one State for the benefit of another State or States, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located shall permit the storage and release of any water which, as determined by findings of the Commission, falls within the apportionment of the State or States for whose benefit the facility is constructed. In the case of a regulating reservoir for the joint benefit of all States in making Lee Ferry deliveries, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located, in permitting the storage and release of water, shall comply with the findings and orders of the Commission.

(d) In the event property is acquired by a signatory State in another signatory State for the use and benefit of the former, the users of water made available by such facilities, as a condition precedent to the use thereof, shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes levied and assessed against the land and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the acquisition of such land. Said payments shall be in full reimbursement for the loss of taxes in such political subdivisions of the State, and in lieu of any and all taxes on said property, improvements and rights. The signatory States recommend to the President and the Congress that, in the event the United States of America shall acquire property in one of the signatory States for the benefit of another signatory State, or its water users, provision be made for like payment in reimbursement of loss of taxes.

ARTICLE X

(a) The signatory States recognize La Plata River compact [sic] entered into between the States of Colorado and New Mexico, dated November 27, 1922, approved by the Congress on January 29, 1925 (43 Stat. 796), and this compact shall not affect the apportionment therein made.

(b) All consumptive use of water of La Plata River and its tributaries shall be charged under apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XI

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the water of the Little Snake River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Wyoming in such quantities as shall result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Water used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(1) Water diverted from any tributary of the Little Snake River or from the main stem of the Little Snake River above a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered without regard to rights covering the diversion of water from any downstream points.

(2) Water diverted from the main stem of the Little Snake River below a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered on the basis of an interstate priority schedule prepared by the Commission in conformity with priority dates established by the laws of the respective States.

(b) Water used under rights initiated subsequent to the signing of this compact.

(1) Direct flow diversions shall be so administered that, in time of shortage, the curtailment of use on each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both the States.

(2) The storage of water by projects located in either State, whether of supplemental supply or of water used to irrigate land not irrigated at the date of the signing of this compact, shall be so administered that in time of water shortage the curtailment of storage of water available for each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both States.

(c) Water uses the apportionment made by this article shall be in accordance with the principle that beneficial use shall be the basis, measure, and limit of the right to use.

(d) The States of Colorado and Wyoming each assent to diversions and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(e) In the event of the importation of water to the Little Snake River Basin from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement, made by the representatives of the States of Colorado and Wyoming on the Commission, it is otherwise provided.

(f) Water use projects initiated after the signing of this compact, to the greatest extent possible, shall permit the full use within the basin in the most feasible manner of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries, without regard to the State line, and, so far as is practicable, shall result in an equal division between the States of the use of water not used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(g) All consumptive use of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of Henry's Fork, a tributary of Green River originating in the State of Utah and flowing into the State of Wyoming and thence into the Green River in the State of Utah; Beaver Creek, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Burnt Fork, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Birch Creek, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming, and Sheep Creek, a tributary of Green River in the State of Utah, and their tributaries, are hereby apportioned between the States of Utah and Wyoming in such quantities as will result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Waters used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

Waters diverted from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, shall be administered without regard to the State line on the basis of an interstate priority schedule to be prepared by the States affected and approved by the Commission in conformity with the actual priority of right of use, the water requirements of the land irrigated and the acreage irrigated in connection therewith.

(b) Waters used under rights from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, initiated after the signing of this compact, shall be divided 50 percent to the State of Wyoming and 50 percent

to the State of Utah and each State may use said waters as and where it deems advisable.

(c) The State of Wyoming assents to the exclusive use by the State of Utah of the water of Sheep Creek, except that the lands, if any, presently irrigated in the State of Wyoming from the water of Sheep Creek shall be supplied with water from Sheep Creek in order of priority and in such quantities as are in conformity with the laws of the State of Utah.

(d) In the event of the importation of water to Henry's Fork, or any of its tributaries, from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement made by the representatives of the States of Utah and Wyoming on the Commission it is otherwise provided.

(e) All consumptive use of waters of Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, Sheep Creek, and their tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided,* That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

(f) The States of Utah and Wyoming each assent to the diversion and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact. It shall be the duty of water administrative officials of the State where the water is stored to release said stored water to the other State upon demand. If either the State of Utah or the State of Wyoming shall consruct a reservoir in the other State for use in its own State, the water users of the State in which said facilities are constructed may purchase at cost a portion of the capacity of said reservoir sufficient for the irrigation of their lands thereunder.

(g) In order to measure the flow of water diverted, each State shall cause suitable measuring devices to be constructed, maintained, and operated at or near the point of diversion into each ditch.

(h) The State engineers of the two States jointly shall appoint a special water commissioner who shall have authority to administer the water in both States in accordance with the terms of this article. The salary and expenses of such special water commissioner shall be paid, 30 percent by the State of Utah and 70 percent by the State of Wyoming.

ARTICLE XIII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the rights to the consumptive use of the water of the Yampa River, a tributary entering the Green River in the State of Colorado, are hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Utah in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The State of Colorado will not cause the flow of the Yampa River at the Maybell Gaging Station to be depleted below an aggregate of 5 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification and approval of this compact. In the event any diversion is made from the Yampa River or from tributaries entering the Yampa River above the Maybell Gaging Station for the benefit of any water-use project in the State of Utah, then the gross amount of all such diversions for use in the State of Utah, less any returns from such diversions to the river above Maybell, shall be added to the actual flow at the Maybell Gaging Station to determine the total flow at the Maybell Gaging Station.

(b) All consumptive use of the waters of the Yampa River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided,* That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XIV

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and New Mexico as follows:

The State of Colorado agrees to deliver to the State of New Mexico from the San Juan River and its tributaries which rise in the State of Colorado a quantity of water which shall be sufficient, together with water originating in the San Juan Basin in the State of New Mexico, to enable the State of New Mexico to make full use of the water apportioned to the State of New Mexico by article III of this compact, subject, however, to the following:

(a) A first and prior right shall be recognized as to:

(1) All uses of water made in either State at the time of the signing of this compact; and

(2) All uses of water contemplated by projects authorized, at the time of the signing of this compact, under the laws of the United States of America, whether or not such projects are eventually constructed by the United States of America or by some other entity.

(b) The State of Colorado assents to diversions and storage of water in the State of Colorado for use in the State of New Mexico, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(c) The uses of the waters of the San Juan River and any of its tributaries within either State which are dependent upon a common source of water and which are not covered by (a) hereof, shall in times of water shortages be reduced in such quantity that the resulting consumptive use in each State will bear the same proportionate relation to the consumptive use made in each State during times of average water supply as determined by the Commission; provided, that any preferential uses of water to which Indians are entitled under article XIX shall be excluded in determining the amount of curtailment to be made under this paragraph.

(d) The curtailment of water use by either State in order to make deliveries at Lee Ferry as required by article IV of this compact shall be independent of any and all conditions imposed by this article and shall be made by each State, as and when required, without regard to any provision of this article.

(e) All consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XV

(a) Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact and of this compact, water of the upper Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(b) The provisions of this compact shall not apply to or interfere with the right or power of any signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use, and control of water, the consumptive use of which is apportioned and available to such State by this compact.

ARTICLE XVI

The failure of any State to use the water, or any part thereof, the use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use to the Lower Basin or to any other State, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

ARTICLE XVII

The use of any water now or hereafter imported into the natural drainage basin of the upper Colorado River system shall not be charged to any State under the apportionment of consumptive use made by this compact.

ARTICLE XVIII

(a) The State of Arizona reserves its rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as a State of the lower division and as a State of the lower basin.

(b) The State of New Mexico and the State of Utah reserve their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as States of the lower basin.

ARTICLE XIX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as:

(a) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

(b) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America under the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 944).

(c) Affecting any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, in or to the waters of the upper Colorado River system, or its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

(d) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation in the part of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

(e) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent which such laws would apply without regard to this compact.

ARTICLE XX

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination, all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XXI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and approved by the Congress of the United States of America. Notice of ratification by the legislatures of the signatory States shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governor of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the governor of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have executed six counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America, and one of which shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 11th day of October 1948.

CHARLES A. CARSON,
Commissioner for the State of Arizona.
CLIFFORD H. STONE,
Commissioner for the State of Colorado.
FRED E. WILSON,
Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.
EDWARD H. WATSON,
Commissioner for the State of Utah.
L. C. BISHOP,
Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.
GROVER A. GILES,
Secretary.

Approved:

HARRY W. BASHORE,
Representative of the United States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, article I of the compact provides as follows:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an opportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

Article II states certain definitions with respect to the phrases used in the compact.

Article III constitutes an attempt to substitute for the Supreme Court's ruling an agreement to apportion water.

Article III (a) reads as follows:

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

I observe that the upper basin means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry. That is set forth in article II in describing the upper basin.

The lower basin, which by subdivision (a) of article III of this compact is to be treated equally with the upper basin, consists of the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. I now read subsections (b) and (c) of article III:

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

I observe that subsequent to the adoption of this compact the Senate ratified a proposed treaty with the Republic of Mexico under which the people of the United States guaranteed to deliver to the people of Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually as the Colorado River enters the territory of our neighbor, Mexico.

Subsections (d) and (e) of article III provide as follows:

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

I omit comment on the remaining subsections of this article.

Thus it was agreed by those who drafted this compact that 7,500,000 acre-feet each year would be apportioned to the lower basin, and a like amount to the upper basin, irrespective of any rights of appropriation which might be acquired subsequent to the adoption of the compact.

In a subsequent section of the proposed compact it was agreed that any rights then in existence to water in the river would remain unimpaired.

There is a serious dispute—and an honest one—as to what article III means. Article III purports to divide the waters equitably, and it speaks of beneficial consumptive use. What is beneficial consumptive use? This question is both relevant and important in any discussion with respect to legislation such as Senate bill 500 contemplates.

One of the great experts on water law, who came from the State of Colorado, and who is called the father of the Colorado River compact, commented on the phrase "beneficial consumptive use." I refer to the late Delph E. Carpenter, who stated, in a report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Congress, pages 577 to 586, December 4, 1928:

The term "beneficial consumptive use" is to be distinguished from the amounts diverted from the river. It does not mean headgate diversion. It means the amount of water consumed and lost to the river during uses of the water diverted. Generally speaking, it is the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow. It is the net loss occurring through beneficial uses.

In Mr. Carpenter's opinion, the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow constituted beneficial consumptive use under the compact, in other words, diversions less returns to the river.

At any rate, the compact was approved by every State with the exception of one, namely, Arizona. Then it was provided by Congress that if the 6 States would approve the compact—in other words, all except Arizona—the compact would be approved by the Congress, provided that—a second condition—California, by her own legislative decision, limited herself in the use of water.

Before the compact could go into effect, and before any such development could take place in California with Federal assistance, not only would the compact have to be approved by all the States except Arizona, but, in addition, California was required to place a ceiling on the amount of water which she could use. That was the decision of the Congress. The State which I, in part, represent acquiesced and passed the required limitation statute, which the Congress at that time directed her to do.

When the bill which resulted in the Boulder Canyon Project Act was under consideration on the floor of the Senate, in December 1928, an amendment was adopted which now appears as a part of section 4 (a) of that act. It provided, in effect, that the project act should not take effect unless 7 States should ratify the compact within 6 months after the date of its adoption, and the President should so proclaim; or unless 6 of the States, including California, should ratify the compact and waive 7-State ratification, and the President should so proclaim; and California should agree, by act of its legislature, to limit the consumptive use—diversions less returns to the river—of water from the Colorado River system in California. So, as directed, California by law limited herself to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin by article III (a) of the Colorado River Compact, plus one-half of the excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact.

That is what Congress told the State which I, in part, represent it must do, and that is what the State did.

Meanwhile, however, a different theory of what constituted beneficial consumptive use was developed among those concerned with the problem in the upper basin. I do not have it in my heart to quarrel with reasonable people who disagree as to the meaning and intent of technical legal language.

I am sure it was upon a reasonable basis that those in the upper Colorado River Basin who are interested in the subject found that "beneficial consumptive use" was different in its intent and meaning from the sense which the State of California found. I vigorously deny the correctness of the upper basin definition.

Subsequently, Mr. President, in 1949, the States of the upper basin entered into their own compact. It contains a provision that "beneficial consumptive use," the phrase to which I have alluded, shall be determined "by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry"—appendix, volume II, page 60, article VII.

This constitutes an attempt to convert the compact from an upper Colorado River system compact into a compact relating only to the main stream.

By definition, the Colorado River system includes the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States. I

refer to article II of the Colorado River compact.

"Beneficial consumptive use," as California understood and understands the term, and as it was generally understood at the time of the compact negotiations, would include water lost to the system by evapo-transpiration, wherever such loss occurred.

Under the upper basin theory, only the effect at Lee Ferry of upstream uses is to be relevant and important.

Let me give an example, so that those interested in reading the RECORD may see what I am contending, under the theory of the upper Colorado River Basin States, the so-called inflow-outflow method. Assume a State diverted a million acre-feet of water and transported it to an area for use elsewhere. Had this water continued down the river, and en route through evaporation or transpiration, a loss of 200,000 acre-feet could have been expected by the time it reached the lower basin, the upper basin States would say, "We are chargeable under the Colorado River compact only with 800,000 acre-feet. We are not chargeable with the 200,000 acre-feet which would have been lost between the point of diversion and Lee Ferry." The lower basin States would disagree with that argument and say that evapo-transpiration is a part of the charge of the State which uses the water.

There we would have a question of interpretation, which has a direct bearing upon the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

I wish to allude to one or two more examples of that type of disagreement and then indicate what, in complete good faith, ought to be done with respect to the resolution of those situations.

Senators will recall that in article 3 (a) provision was made for the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum to the upper basin and to the lower basin, guaranteed in perpetuity.

The question arises: Does the apportionment under the compact of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year?

As in the interpretation of the phrase "beneficial consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins, the upper basin and the lower basin.

The State of California contends that "per annum" means what it seems to mean, namely, each year, and that under the compact that amount of water shall be sent down annually. It is the contention of those in the upper Colorado Basin—and I believe I can say that it is also the contention of the Department of the Interior presently—that it means an average, and that to satisfy the requirement of the compact the upper basin can send 6 million acre-feet down 1 year if it lets 9 million acre-feet down the next year.

We deny it, and we deny it vigorously.

Ever since the compact was approved, ever since the Hoover Dam was created and built, and ever since the Federal Government found a reasonable area in which to assist the people in my State to operate and to provide water, California, through various public agencies, has entered into contracts with the Government of the United States, under which water has been taken from the Colorado River into the city of Los Angeles and into most of the cities in southern California, to suply them with that which they need to live. That was done under contracts which are firm and exist at the present time, and which call for amounts in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet, to which California limited itself, but of which, by the same token, the statute passed by Congress permitted California to avail herself.

That brings up the question of how much water should come down into the lower basin States each year, and that, too, may well be a question upon which reasonable minds may differ. However, there ought to be some manner of arriving at who gets what before we enact legislation which involves more than $1,500,000,000.

I want the RECORD to indicate the views of a distinguished American. Those views coincide with my own, in great part, at least. This distinguished American graced the Senate as a highly respected Member. He is now the distinguished and able Governor of Colorado. I refer to the Honorable Edwin Johnson.

I do not remember ever meeting a man who was more generous to me with his time, when I was even less experienced than I am now, than our former colleague, Ed Johnson. I took a great interest in the comments he made on the compact which I am discussing.

Cn December 20 of last year Governor Johnson made a statement suggesting that "storage below the State of Colorado is not the answer." I shall not read his entire statement, although I think I shall, in a few moments, ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD in its entirety. I quote from his statement, as follows:

Either the seven-State compact—

And that, Mr. President, is the same as the Colorado River compact—

specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislatures of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

Mr. President, I again quote from Governor Johnson's statement:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

Who said that, Mr. President? That was not an individual residing in my State; that was the gentleman who is the present Governor of Colorado.

Here we have a compact which has been in existence since 1922 and which is susceptible, apparently, of various interpretations. I desire to be as fair and as frank as I can be in this discussion, but there is the comment which the Governor of Colorado made on the relative rights of the lower basin States and the upper basin States.

I read one more paragraph from Governor Johnson's statement:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

I cite that again, Mr. President, to emphasize that a prominent American, now the Governor of Colorado, agrees that a solemn compact to which all States in the Colorado River Basin except Arizona assented must now be lived up to and adhered to under any legislation which this Congress may enact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Gov. Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORAGE BELOW THE STATE OF COLORADO IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Statement released to press December 20, 1954, by Governor-elect Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado)

Interested persons on the eastern and western slopes of Colorado have expressed confidence in me, as Governor, to resolve the very controversial water problem that plagues both slopes. This is a tremendous responsibility and challenge but its vital nature demands my acceptance. Accordingly, I shall do my utmost to work out something which will benefit both slopes and injure neither.

However, before we begin the task of allocating Colorado's share of the water of the Colorado River system, we first must take stock of the quantity and the location of the water that is available to us. There are very serious misconceptions, widely held, in regard to the burdens placed on this State by the specific provisions of the Seven State Compact and the official interpretations with respect to them. These limitations should be understood clearly by all parties concerned, since they are basic to any plan to develop the upper Colorado River Basin. It

is with that purpose in mind that I have prepared this document. If my conclusions are in error I want to be shown wherein the error lies.

Either the 7-State compact specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislature of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, was appointed by the President to serve as chairman of the Seven State Compact Commission as the official representative of the Government of the United States, pursuant to an act of Congress. He was the chairman of the Colorado River Commission that drafted and signed the Seven State Colorado River compact. In answer to the question propounded by Congressman HAYDEN these points in the compact were interpreted officially by him on January 27, 1923, before any State had ratified the compact, as follows:

"Question 14. Can paragraph (d) of article III be construed to mean that the States of the upper division may withhold all except 75 million acre-feet of water within any period of 10 years and thus not only secure the amount to which they are entitled under the apportionment made in paragraph (a) but also the entire unapportioned surplus waters of the Colorado River?

"Answer. No. Paragraph (a) of article III apportions to the upper basin 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum. Paragraph (e) of article III provides that the States of the upper division shall not withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. Paragraph (f) and (g) of this article specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. There is, therefore, no possibility of construing paragraph (d) of this article as suggested.

"Question 19. Why is the impounding of water for power purposes made subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, as provided in paragraph (b) of article IV?

"Answer. (a) Because such subordination conforms to established law, either by constitution or statute, in most of the semiarid States. This provision frees the farmer from the danger of damage suits by power companies in the event of conflict between them. (b) Because the cultivation of land naturally outranks in importance the generation of power, since it is the most important of human activities, the foundation upon which all other industries finally rest. (c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission, including those representing power interests, that such preference was proper.

"Question 20. Will this subordination of the development of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses, combined with the apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water to the upper basin, utterly destroy an asset of the State of Arizona consisting of 3 million horsepower, which it is said could otherwise be developed within that State if the Colorado River continued to flow, undiminished in volume, across its northern boundary line and through the Grand Canyon?

"Answer. The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above, that cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

On December 15, 1922, Hon. Delph E. Carpenter, commissioner for Colorado, reported to Gov. Oliver H. Shoup his analysis of this compact which he helped to formulate. His comments and observations are especially pertinent. In this official report he said:

"Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes. The generation of power is made subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin."

On March 20, 1923, Delph E. Carpenter in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"All power uses in both basins are made subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

The interpretation of Hon. W. S. Norviel, commissioner for Arizona, published January 15, 1923, contains this language:

"The third principle established by the compact was to fix a time when the remainder of the water unallotted and unused might be apportioned.

"The fourth principle fixes a preference in agricultural uses over power.

"The fifth principle, that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses."

Senator Hayden, Arizona, propounded 19 questions to Hon. A. P. Davis, Director, United States Reclamation Service, to which the director made the following replies on January 30, 1923:

"Question 10. Is it true that, if the Colorado River compact is adopted, all of the water that Arizona will ever get out of the main river will be enough to irrigate only 280,000 acres of land, of which 130,000 acres are now embraced in the Yuma project and 110,000 acres in the Parker project?

"Answer. The Colorado River compact does not attempt to divide the water of the river between individual States. Except for rights already initiated by California and Nevada, there is nothing in the compact that will prevent the State of Arizona from taking from the river all the water that it can put to beneficial use.

"Question 19. Any further comment that you may care to make relative to the approval of the Colorado River compact by the Arizona State Legislature will be appreciated.

"Answer. The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

It should be noted that these official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State except Nevada and were not disputed by Colorado or any other State at the time it ratified the compact. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

At the time the seven-State compact was adopted and ratified, it was contemplated that a treaty would be negotiated later between the United States and Mexico which would allocate to Mexico certain quantities of water defined in acre-feet, out of the Colorado River system. Furthermore, it spelled out just how that burden should fall upon the lower basin and the upper basin. The compact specified that to the extent there is surplus water in the Colorado River system, such surplus water would be utilized and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by the upper and lower basins.

"ARTICLE III

"(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then, the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the seven-State compact.

Senator HAYDEN asked Chairman of the Commission, Herbert Hoover, about this and was answered as follows:

"Question 15. Does paragraph (d) of article III in any way modify the obligation of the States of the upper division, as expressed in paragraph (c), to permit the surplus and unapportioned water to flow down in satisfaction of any right to water which may hereafter be accorded by treaty to Mexico? Within any year of a 10-year period, could the States of the upper division shift to the States of the lower division the entire burden of supplying such water to Mexico?

"Answer. (a) No. It is provided in the compact that the upper States shall add their share of any Mexican burden to the delivery to be made at Lee Ferry, whenever any Mexican rights shall be established by treaty. By paragraph (c) of article III, such an amount of water is to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for. (b) In the face of the specific provision of article III (c) that the burden of any deficiency must be 'equally borne,' I can see no possibility of placing upon the lower division the entire burden. If the surplus is sufficient, there is no burden on anyone. If it is insufficient the plain language is that it must be equally shared, with the equally plain provision that the upper division must furnish its half."

Delph Carpenter in his official report to Governor Shoup said:

"Any waters necessary to supply lands in the Republic of Mexico (hereafter to be determined by international treaty) shall be supplied from the surplus flow of the river. If the surplus is not sufficient, any deficiency shall be borne equally by the upper basin and the lower basin."

I am certain that Mr. Carpenter would have added, had he thought such a doubt were to be raised, "Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper

basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper basin." Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student of the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

"ARTICLE III

"(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

"(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a) the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum."

But here is the catch in this award:

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

The following quotes from the questions by Senator HAYDEN and answered on January 27, 1923, by Chairman of the Commission Herbert Hoover leave nothing to the imagination with respect to the extra 1 million acre-feet of surplus water awarded the lower basin. The extra million acre-feet is to be met out of surplus waters over and above the 7,500,000 acre-feet allocated annually to each of the two basins and it does not take priority over the upper States award of 7,500,000 feet provided they use all of their 7,500,000 for agricultural and domestic purposes. If the upper basin stores water for power purposes at least a million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this demand.

"Question 6. Are the 1 million additional acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin in paragraph (b) of article III supposed to be obtained from the Colorado River or solely from the tributaries of that stream within the State of Arizona?

"Answer. The use of the words 'such waters' in this paragraph clearly refers to waters from the Colorado River system, and the extra 1 million acre-feet provided for can therefore be taken from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

"Question 22. Does the Colorado River compact apportion any water to the State of Arizona?

"Answer. No; nor to any other State individually. The apportionment is to the groups."

It should be noted, and I repeat, that Secretary Hoover's official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State; furthermore it was not disputed by any of them when they did ratify it.

On December 15, 1922, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter in his official report to the Governor of Colorado, the Honorable Oliver H. Shoup, submitted several tables explaining the allocation of the water of the Colorado River system.

Table 4 reads as follows:

Table 4

	Acre-feet
Upper division allocation, includes present consumption	7,500,000
Lower division allocation, includes present consumption	7,500,000
Lower division permissible increase in water consumption	1,000,000
Total allocated or permitted	16,000,000
Unallocated surplus (estimated)	4,500,000
Estimated average annual water supply	20,500,000

Mr. Carpenter also said in this report:

"At any time after 40 years, if the development in the upper basin has reached 7,500,000 acre-feet annual beneficial consumptive use or that of the lower basin has reached 8,500,000 acre-feet, any two States may call for a further apportionment of any surplus waters of the river."

On March 20, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter, in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"Paragraph (b), article III, permits the lower basin to increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet. The two paragraphs permit an aggregate annual beneficial consumptive use of 8,500,000 acre-feet, and no more. The words "per annum," as used in paragraph (b) are not synonymous with the word 'annually.' No cumulative increase is intended by that paragraph."

On February 10, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter addressed a telegram to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman, Colorado River Commission, and received a prompt reply. On February 13, 1923, he addressed a telegram to the Honorable R. T. McKisick, deputy attorney general, Sacramento, Calif., and that same day received a reply.

These exchanges of telegrams are pertinent to an understanding of this phase of the compact and are inserted here:

CAPITOL BUILDING,
Denver, Colo., February 10, 1923.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman, Colorado River Commission, Washington, D. C.

Do you concur with me that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact is as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 12, 1923.*

DELPH E. CARPENTER,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

I concur with you, and shall so advise Congress in my report, that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact was as follows:

Paragraph (b) of article III means that lower basin may acquire rights under the compact to annual beneficial consumptive use of water in excess of the apportionment in paragraph (a) of that article by 1 million acre-feet and no more. There is nothing in the compact to prevent the States of either basin using more water than the amount apportioned under paragraphs (a) and (b) of article III, but such use would be subject to the further apportionment provided for in paragraph (f) of article III and would vest no rights under the present compact.

HERBERT HOOVER.

DENVER, COLO., *February 13, 1923.*

R. T. MCKISICK,
Deputy Attorney General,
Sacramento, Calif.:

Do you concur with me that intent of Commission in framing Colorado River compact was as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 13, 1923.*

Hon. DELPH E. CARPENTER,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

Am of opinion that paragraph (b) of article III permits increase of annual beneficial consumptive use of water by lower basin to 8,500,000 acre-feet total or 1 million in excess quantity apportioned each basin in perpetuity by paragraph (a), article III, and no more. When both paragraphs are read together no other construction tenable. "Per annum" not synonymous with "annually."

R. T. MCKISICK.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 15, 1923.*

DELPH E. CARPENTER,
Denver, Colo.:

My interpretation of article III and VIII well expressed in McKisick's wire of the 13th.

W. F. MCCLURE,
Seven State Compact Commissioner for California.

Utah Commissioner R. E. Caldwell, in his report to the Utah Senate, among other things said:

"The lower basin States, for the most part, when they divert their water, wholly consume it and they get no credit for use of return flow for it does not exist, and they are, therefore, limited to the diversion of 8,500,000 acre-feet and are held strictly to the requirement of consumptive beneficial use of such as they do divert."

In the report to the Governor of California by Hon. W. F. McClure, commissioner for California, made January 8, 1923, appears this statement:

"In conclusion permit me to add that the terms of the compact do full justice to the States in interest, and the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system whereby the lower basin is allocated 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, with an allowable increase of 1 million acre-feet per annum by reason of the probably rapid development upon the lower river, and fully guarantees to California an ample water supply to adequately care for the enormous future growth of the Imperial Valley and adjacent territory."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, who, as I have said, was the chairman of the commission that drafted and approved by its unanimous vote the seven-State compact, said:

"The lower basin will, therefore, receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

The Honorable A. P. Davis, Director of the Reclamation Bureau, on January 30, 1923, announced that:

"The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses (in the upper basin) shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

This data proves conclusively that the extra 1 million acre-feet of water per annum allocated to the lower basin is to be acquired from the surplus and otherwise unallocated water of the Colorado River system. The

same is true of the 1,500,000 allocated annually by treaty to the United States of Mexico.

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified. In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

The Reclamation Bureau estimates that the proposed storage reservoirs in the upper Colorado Basin will cost the upper basin 880,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation. It will be charged to the upper basin as consumptive use. Colorado's portion of that loss would be 400,000 acre-feet.

Water still does not run up hill, and storage down the river from Colorado to generate electric energy, frowned upon by the 7-State compact, cannot secure for use 1 drop of water, but to the contrary, will cost us 400,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation, which under the upper Colorado Basin compact will be charged to Colorado as consumptive use.

Colorado is close to the bottom of the barrel insofar as Colorado River water is concerned. Colorado has a record of lavish generosity to all of her neighbor States. Now at this late date it will be State suicide unless she looks after her own interests with courage and wisdom. She positively cannot afford the loss of 400,000 additional acre-feet. She cannot afford to agree to a storage plan whose certain effect will be to create additional surplus water out of the upper basin's meager supply, which under the 7-State compact must go to the lower basin. Colorado must insist that the 42 reservoirs surveyed in the high country of Colorado be authorized simultaneously with the authorization of the storage plan and which will give Colorado an absolute right to the water which is developed.

The Hill report prepared pursuant to a contract with the Colorado Legislature indicates there is something over a million acre-feet of unappropriated water in the Colorado River system in Colorado. However, the Hill report did not charge Colorado with the burden of Colorado's portion of the priority commitment to Mexico, which under the 7-State compact cannot be less than 375,000 acre-feet. And, another thing, if Glen Canyon and the Echo Park reservoirs are built, Colorado's portion of the Mexican burden becomes not less than 750,000 acre-feet annually. Had Mr. Hill recognized these binding and irrevocable priorities and the evaporation of the down-river storage plans, which is to be charged to Colorado as "consumptive use" of 400,000 acre-feet, he could not have shown any unappropriated water whatsoever in Colorado for Colorado.

Colorado has entered into irrevocable compacts with all of the States to the east, west, north, and south. In each of these compacts Colorado has been generous to a fault. Now most of her water is lost forever, and yet her neighbors are asking her to surrender more and more of this most precious resource. The time has come when Colorado's dwindling supply must be guarded jealously and protected fully. That is a responsibility which I, as Governor of Colorado, must assume.

Who will say that the Glen Canyon Dam in the State of Arizona and the Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border are not extraordinary dams from an engineering point of view. Glen Canyon is the sort of project that makes an engineer's mouth water, and the Reclamation Bureau is a Bureau of engineers. Who will say that these projects will not be of incalculable value to the lower basin. Glen Canyon, which will collect 100,000 acre-feet of silt a year, will extend the life of the Hoover project 500 years, but what I want someone to tell me is, "Why should they be built with upper Colorado Basin funds at the water expense of the State of Colorado?"

There is only one route remaining for us to take. We must put our water to beneficial use in our own State if we are to gain any right to it. That is the plain language of the 7-State compact. It states that condition with equivocation. The Reclamation Bureau has explored 42 reservoir sites high up on the Colorado River system in Colorado. We cannot, we dare not settle for less than their authorization now. Congressional authorization does not mean immediate construction, but it will give to these proposed reservoir sites an official priority. Colorado contributes 72 percent of the water of the upper Colorado River Basin. Is it asking too much that we be allowed to use less than one-fourth of what we produce? If that is wrong, then I am wrong.

ED C. JOHNSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish now to speak very briefly concerning Indian rights to Colorado River waters.

The 1922 compact provides in article VII thereof that nothing therein shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States to Indian tribes. article VII of the upper basin compact of 1948 requires that uses of water by the United States and its wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made.

Let me quote one of the witnesses testifying in favor of similar legislation before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last year. I refer to Judge Jean Breitenstein. He said, page 290 of the 1954 report on Senate bill 1555:

A California spokesman in the House hearings on this project has stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has construed the compact as meaning that the Indian claims in effect are prior and constitute the first demand upon the water supply. If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize the importance of that statement, on the part of a witness appearing in favor of legislation similar to that with which we are today confronted:

If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, across the street in the United States Supreme Court there is pending a lawsuit brought by the State of Arizona against the State of California and other parties. The Government of the United States has intervened in that lawsuit. At issue are interpretations of the Colorado River compact to which I have alluded. In part the controversy revolves around the rights of Indians to waters involved in the Colorado River compact. That is a serious question in this controversy. As I have said, the Colorado River compact provides that nothing in that document shall impair the obligations of the United States to the Indian tribes.

In the report of Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, to whom I have previously referred, it is stated that the apportionment to each basin includes all diversions necessary to serve Indians and Indian tribes.

The upper Colorado Basin has a similar provision in its compact. However, in its petition of intervention in the pending case of Arizona against California, the United States alleges that the rights to the use of water by Indians and Indian tribes are in no way subject to or affected by the Colorado River compact.

During the hearings this year, the committee heard testimony by the head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the Department of the Interior. I attempted to elicit from him exactly what the position of the Government of the United States was with respect to Indian rights in the waters of the Colorado River. I asked him the following question, which appears on page 41 of the printed hearings:

Mr. Emmons, what is the present view of your office respecting the rights of Indians to water on the Colorado River?

Mr. Emmons replied:

Senator, first and foremost, I am interested in the rights established by treaties for the Indians—all Indians of the country. I believe that the Indians' requirements should be considered primarily.

On this matter, however, the Indians, the same as they have in most other places, have been practical and have indicated just what their absolute requirements might be.

I then asked Mr. Emmons this question:

Does your office have a firm position with respect to any priorities on the rights of Indians to Colorado River water?

Mr. Emmons answered:

I do not believe I am prepared to answer that, Senator.

Indeed, I think I may say, Mr. President, with complete sincerity, that the Department of the Interior has taken one position on the question of Indian rights to the waters of the Colorado River, and that the Department of Justice has taken, or at least has been inclined to take, a diametrically opposite position upon the same fundamental question. If the rights of Indian tribes are finally determined to be a first claim on the waters, then the whole basin will be thrown into chaos.

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues who may desire to read the record that there is only one place in which a fair, honest, and impartial determination of who is right and who is wrong on these legal problems can be made, and that is in the Supreme Court of the United States. As a matter of fact, the State

of California, as a defendant in the action, the other day asked the Supreme Court to consider joining in the lawsuit all the other States which are parties to the Colorado River compact. The Supreme Court appointed a master and referred that question to him.

As the debate on the bill proceeds in the Senate today, and as I suppose it will continue tomorrow, the problem of whether the other States in the Colorado River Basin should be joined in the lawsuit is presently under consideration by a master appointed by the Supreme Court.

While I rather regret that it sometimes is necessary to resort to litigation when the public interest is involved, and I believe that negotiation is the best way to handle these problems, nevertheless, so long as a lawsuit, which involves the question of the interpretation of the Colorado River compact, is being tried in the Supreme Court then I think, and I hope, that the other States may be joined, so that a final judicial decision may answer those questions for all time. But that is not a matter on which I should pass judgment, and I assume I should make no comment concerning it.

I wish to make one more statement with respect to the responsibilities of the States in the Basin. The two predecessors in the Senate of my able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and me, many years ago objected on the floor to the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Mexico. They were joined by a handful of Senators—no more. Finally, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, ratified the treaty. I make no comment today on that action, except to say that some present Members of the Senate, with whom I have discussed the problem, take a little different view from that held by their predecessors in days gone by, when an additional burden was placed upon the States in the Colorado River Basin to carry water to our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico.

The bill before the Senate provides for the construction of 6 storage dams, capable of storing 40,390,000 acre-feet of water, costing $821,886,000; plus 33 participating projects. It calls for an investment of $874,281,800 to supply 1,208,645 acres with new supplemental water. Six storage dams and 33 participating projects, Mr. President.

It is true that the present administration recommended legislation designed to assist in the development of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin. It is also true that the development plan as outlined by the administration consisted of 2 major storage dams, not 6; and 11 participating irrigation and reclamation projects, not 33.

I am certain that my friends, particularly the able junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], will permit me to make the statement, and will agree with it, that the great majority of the projects authorized, or tentatively authorized, in the bill have not been approved by the Department of the Interior, nor have any reports on feasibility been issued.

I must say that, to me, a comparative newcomer in the Senate, it is a little difficult to follow a theory of legislation which would authorize any project in advance, and then would say that when an administrator in the Department of the Interior has subsequently approved it, Congress will approve it. That is putting the legislative cart before the legislative horse, in my judgment.

It is true—and I wish to speak with specific accuracy—that the measure contains a group of projects which it is provided must come back to Congress for a second time. But, again, what useful purpose would be served by such qualified congressional authorization, only to be followed by a second?

I believe a portion of the answer can be found in the discussion in the committee with respect to the intention of the bill. I think the proposed legislation, in its present form, attempts to indicate, if the bill be passed, that the projects included are only a part of an overall development which would follow automatically if the bill became law.

I read from page 7 of the bill, beginning on line 7, as follows:

> SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

This constitutes, I think I may say in complete accuracy, something of a brand new or novel approach to authorizing legislation. Here some projects are authorized; others are authorized, subject to an administrative finding; and a third category is authorized, subject (a) to an administrative finding, and (b) to a second congressional authorization. And here also all these indicated other unnamed projects will in the future be authorized.

In committee I asked what useful purpose could be served by that device and a so-called declaration of intent. I need not say that one Congress cannot bind another, and that a declaration of intent indulged in by the 84th Congress will be of no force and effect on the 85th or any subsequent Congress.

I shall again in all frankness say, Mr. President, that the committee did revise section 2; and I should like to repeat what I said earlier in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that I have been treated in his committee with all the courtesy and friendship that any man could expect. I only regret that I was not more effective in the efforts which I made.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yied?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. While I recognize there is a problem in trying to commit future Congresses—a problem which the Senator has mentioned—this procedure grows out of the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has said, in respect to utilizing water in these Western States, "There are certain of those projects we would like to sponsor, but unfortunately the States own the water within their borders. Will you give us some directions as to how you would like to see it done, and we will study those projects?"

This is not an attempt to bind the Congress. This is an attempt on the part of certain States, Colorado particularly, to say, "These are the projects we would like to see studied."

That is the reason why I agree it is loose language, because some projects will have to come to Congress again for confirmation. However, we tried to indicate that we were not endeavoring to commit Congress to anything in the future; we say only that Congress shall have a look at it. I think to that degree and to that extent the Senator from California has made a good contribution to the work of our committee, even though he may think he returned empty-handed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. On the same point I wish to refer to the hearings. When Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl was testifying, and when he was asked if the Department endorsed all provisions of S. 500, his answer was:

> I do not think that I would care to make a full and straight answer to the question that you have asked.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer very briefly to the official letter from the Bureau of the Budget. I wish to read from that letter on S. 500, which is dated March 17, 1955, and reads in part:

> In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navajo participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
> BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
> *Washington, D. C., March 17, 1955.*
>
> Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
> *Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge Mr. Stewart French's letter of January 20, 1955, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 500, a bill "To authorize

the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Enactment of legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project was recommended by the President both in his state of the Union message and his budget message this year. The views of this Bureau concerning the details of such legislation were expressed in letters of March 18, 1954, to your committee and to the Secretary of the Interior, which are printed in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, 2d session. On April 1, 1954, a draft bill, which was developed in collaboration with the Department of the Interior, was submitted to your committee.

With respect to the detailed provisions of S. 500, this Bureau has the following comments:

1. In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navaho participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

2. There would appear to be ample justification for the closest cooperation between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior concerning the agricultural aspects of the participating projects. The use of the word "consultation" on page 3, line 25, would, therefore, be understood to mean consultation in its broadest sense.

3. Section 7 and reference to it in section 1 (2) (a) (iii) is interpreted to mean that all costs for improvements in fish and wildlife, as well as mitigation of losses not attributable to the construction of the project, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable and shall be financed by the agencies responsible for these programs. However, the cost of preventing damage attributable to the construction of the project should be treated as a part of the cost and allocated to the various purposes in the same manner as other damages. The addition of clarifying language would avoid misinterpretations.

4. The inclusion of section 10 in our draft bill referred to above, namely, "Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country," would appear to be a desirable addition to S. 500, since this would be the principal consideration in determining rate of construction and development.

5. It is considered that the authorization should be limited to $950 million, as proposed in the draft bill, in order to give the Congress a greater measure of control over the extent of the development and an opportunity to review the program from time to time.

6. Since we do not have detailed information concerning the city of Denver's proposed Blue River project or the effects of the provisions of section 11 of S. 500 on the interests of the Federal Government or on pending litigation, we are not in a position to comment on this section at this time, and have requested the Department of Justice to review this section.

7. The Bureau of the Budget also is not in a position to comment on section 12, until we have received the views of the Department of Justice on this section.

8. It is recommended that the title be amended to read, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Accordingly, it is recommended that S. 500 be amended as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

(At this point Mr. KUCHEL yielded to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, who addressed the Senate and reported on her recent world tour. Her speech appears in the RECORD, following Mr. KUCHEL's remarks.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly now on the question of quality of water as it is raised in the pending legislation. Article VIII of the Colorado River compact provides:

> Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unhampered by this compact.

In the lawsuit Arizona against California, California alleges that the word "unhampered" as used in that article of the compact means unhampered as to both quantity and quality of water to which the perfected rights relate. California alleges that as of the effective date of the compact, her present perfected rights are to be not less than 4,950,000 acre-feet of water.

When the hearings were held on S. 500, one of the distinguished citizens of my State who testified was Mr. Evan T. Hewes, a member of the Colorado River Board of California and past chairman of it, and a long-time resident of the Imperial Valley in southern California, where he has made his living as a farmer.

Mr. Hewes said, in part, when he was testifying:

> The major participating projects included in S. 500 would be transmountain diversion projects. These would divert water from high elevations out of the Colorado River Basin. This is water of the highest quality, and, therefore, the result would be a serious impairment of the quality of the water coming into the lower basin at Lee Ferry.
>
> At the present time water in the lower basin contains about 1 ton of salts per acre-foot. This means that if we apply, say, 4 acre-feet of water per acre of crop during the year, we put 4 tons of salt on that acre. Whether the salt content of the water may be increased, and if so, how much, without affecting the production of the types of crops we grow, has not been determined.
>
> We say that until this matter of quality has been finally determined in all respects, there should be no additional transmountain diversion projects constructed in the upper basin.
>
> S. 500 would authorize the construction of six large storage reservoirs, from which there would be evaporation of large quantities of water, also increasing the salt content of the lower basin water at Lee Ferry. These reservoirs are not needed to deliver water for domestic and agricultural purposes in the upper basin and, therefore, under article III–e of the compact, this water lost through reservoir evaporation is water to which the lower basin has a right for domestic and agricultural purposes.

Mr. Hewes in good faith raised a serious question. I say to you, Mr. President, that no adequate scientific research has been conducted by any agency of the Government of the United States, or otherwise, to determine the quality of water in the Colorado River, and at what point salinity would become a serious hazard or problem.

It seems to me that the representatives who appeared in opposition to the pending bill were on sound ground in suggesting that before enacting any such proposed legislation of the magnitude here envisioned, there should be a thorough scientific study by the Federal Government of what effect the projects contemplated by the bill would have on the quality of water as it reached the lower basin.

Mr. President, that does not seem too unreasonable a question for me to raise. It seems to me it is a logical position for the representatives of California to assume.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to allude very briefly to the fact that the two largest storage dams originally encompassed in Senate bill 500—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams—would be geographically located so that it would be practically impossible for any of the impounded waters in either of those reservoirs to be used beneficially in the upper basin of the Colorado River. Geographically, they approach the dividing line between the two basins. Indeed, I think the proponents of the bill would be frank to concede that those 2 dams—and now 4 more storage dams—are contemplated, not in the interest of the beneficial use of water, but primarily in the interest of the generation of hydroelectric power to foot the bill for the 33 participating projects.

Earlier I referred to the Colorado River compact, and particularly to article III (e), reading as follows:

> (e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer to article IV (b), reading as follows:

> (b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

I suggest that in the absence of a complete agreement, which is not present here, there would be a constant question of administration of the upper Colorado River project and a continuing disagreement as to the responsibility of the Department of the Interior with respect to the waters impounded in the dams provided for in the pending bill. All parties will concede that not one drop of the water in the storage units would thereafter be utilized for agricultural or domestic purposes in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from California understand that in order to comply with the terms of the compact storage dams have to be built to hold water with which to supply the lower basin with the amounts of water it was given under the compact, and that also in order to permit the upper basin States to apply their water supplies to irrigation and domestic consumptive use, they must have these dams, so that, by exchange, they can send to the lower basin water from the dams, and can take out water from the streams higher up? Is the Senator from California acquainted with that principle of irrigation and reclamation law in the West?

Mr. KUCHEL. I reply to my friend and able colleague, the Senator from Utah, by saying that in raising this question, I confine myself—as I suggest he confine himself—to the provisions of the Colorado River compact. To that extent, he and I must agree that the water in the dam—the water in Glen Canyon Dam, for example—can never be used for beneficial and consumptive use in the upper basin of the Colorado River.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot concede that, if the Senator from California is asking me that question. The physical water at that point may not actually be used there; it is given in exchange for other waters which would have to go down to the users in the lower basin, if it were not for these dams. That principle is now well established in the West—namely, that water can be exchanged. If there is stored in a bank, so to speak, water which can be sent to the users in the lower basin, then water can be taken, in exchange, from the stream from which the users in the lower basin might otherwise obtain their supply. In order to take water from the higher reaches in the upper-basin territory, it will be necessary to have water which can be sent to the users in the lower-basin territory, in order to fufill the terms of the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish that my friend, the Senator from Utah, would agree with me; but I am afraid that he will not. But I do not think there should be any disagreement here when I say that the water stored in Glen Canyon Dam, for example, cannot thereafter be used for beneficial purposes in the upper basin of the Colorado River. The sections of the Colorado River compact to which I refer raise a question, which would be a continuing irritant unless in advance it were clearly understood by all the parties exactly what Senate bill 500 purports to do.

Mr. WATKINS. How could there be any damage to the lower basin States if they obtain the amount of water the compact calls for, regardless of whether it is the exact water which would flow down the stream through these reservoirs or whether it is water taken from these rivers and held back for a time and then allowed to flow down, while at the same time the users in the upper basin are taking water directly from the streams?

I could show the Senator very directly how that operates, if I had time in which to do so. It is a technical matter, which would not involve any substantial damage or any damage whatever to the lower basin States. They would get all the water they require, and it would be water from the identical streams, except it would be water which would have been stored for a while.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall listen with great interest to the presentation my friend, the Senator from Utah, will make.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have indicated to the Senate some of the disputes over the meaning of the compact. Everyone agrees that the Colorado River compact must be complied with. Some persons may not like it; but it was entered into in good faith, and it is the law. I do not propose to have it breached to the detriment of California.

My only suggestion on that point is that until the Supreme Court of the United States decides the meaning of the various sections of the compact, my friend, the Senator from Utah, and I will not be able to arrive at what the lower basin is entitled to and what the upper basin is entitled to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to understand the Senator from California. Is he now contending that by reason of what he thinks the compact means, the lower basin States would be in a position to block us from using for power purposes any of the water which we may have stored in the upper reaches of the Colorado River?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I would not say that. I would say specifically—and then I ask the Senator to allow me to sum up the few remaining points—that the answer to his question is article IV, section (b) of the compact, which I have just read, and which, in essence, says that while water may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, such impounding must be subservient to consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with the use for such purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. I will say that the storage of water in all those dams, the main dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River, will be for that primary purpose, so that we can use the water consumptively in the upper basin States; and incidental thereto would be the development of electricity. It would be a case in which there could be no damage to the lower basin States. They would get the water. So far as concerns the ability to determine whether it is the exact water they think they should get, or some other, they would have extreme difficulty in making any kind of case in any court on the theory that they had been damaged. They would get the full amount of water. It would be regulated. It would come to them under even better conditions than the compact would call for, because with the building at Glen Canyon, there will be no silt. The silt would be deposited in Glen Canyon, and the Mead Reservoir would have its life extended 200 years as a gift from the upper basin States, and without any cost whatever to the lower basin States. They would have clear water, much better quality water than they would have without such a reservoir.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend for his views. I disagree with them. On the question of quality of water, I do not believe there is anyone connected with the Government of the United States who can point to a sufficient study and survey of the problem and give a correct answer to the question as to the quality of the water.

Mr. President, last December the Department of the Interior wrote a letter to a local Washington firm of attorneys. The letter was introduced in a hearing which a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held. It has a bearing on this problem. The letter is from Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and is dated December 2, 1954. There was involved a dispute between two cities, one in California and one in Arizona, with respect to a continuing supply of water. That letter says in part:

> As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover power plant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt hours during a period of ten months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 2, 1954.*

COX, LANGFORD, STODDARD & CUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You submitted a proposal in behalf of California-Pacific Utilities Co. in your letter of September 1, 1954, that the United States contract with the company for 20 million kilowatt-hours annually of the storage credit (sometimes referred to as "pink water") energy available to the Parker-Davis project. The energy would be used to supply the Needles, Calif., system of the company which is presently obtaining energy under the Boulder Canyon project contract No. 11r–1366.

The present circumstances as to Hoover powerplant generation are significant to this matter. The streamflow into Lake Mead during the period April through July 1954 was the second lowest April-July runoff of the 31-year record of flows at Grand Canyon. The integration meeting held June 14, 1954, resulted in the adoption of a generation schedule for Hoover powerplant of firm energy only for the year ending May 31, 1955, because of the low level of Lake Mead and the prospect for deficient inflow. The Parker-Davis project was not to make any net withdrawal of storage credit during the year. As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover powerplant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt-hours during a period of 10 months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Approximately one-third of this Hoover reduction must be absorbed by the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, both preference customers of the Parker-Davis project. In the circumstances, the United States was obliged to decline the requests of these preference agencies for storage credit energy, and they have accordingly completed arrangements to purchase steam energy from non-Federal sources to augment their available supplies of Hoover and Parker-Davis energy. It will be seen, therefore, that the requirements of preference customers have not been met, because the United States is unable presently to meet those needs.

We regret the necessity of informing you that until Lake Mead makes substantial recovery, the United States will not be in a position to offer storage credit energy for sale. The time of such recovery cannot be forecast. However, when the reservoir has recovered sufficiently to permit the United States to withdraw storage credit energy, such energy will be disposed of in the manner prescribed by law, and the California-Pacific Utilities Co. will be informed of its possible availability.

Very truly yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KUCHEL. I point that out to underline the fact that there is now a shortage of water in Lake Mead which has required the Government of the United States to curtail the production of power at Hoover Dam. Is there any wonder why the more than 6 million people in southern California are alarmed over the implication of this bill?

When Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, was testifying on Senate bill 500, as reported on page 26 of the printed hearings, I asked him the following question:

Senator KUCHEL. Why are you curtailing the use of the water now at Hoover Dam?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Because we have had low run over the past year or so, and we have had to save that water so it can be utilized at the proper time as the first priority calls for it to be used.

Senator KUCHEL. Assume that low runoff period with the Glen Caynon Dam constructed; what would be your guide lines in determining how much water to send from Glen Canyon Dam down to Lee Ferry?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. The contracts and commitments of the United States in the lower basin, which include the Republic of Mexico, the various irrigation and municipal uses in the lower basin.

Senator KUCHEL. When you say the contracts, you would include the Colorado River compact, obviously.

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes; that is the provision for the development.

Let me now invite the attention of the Senate to page 10, line 12 of the bill, where we find the following language:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be paid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

It is to the credit of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], a distinguished member of our committee, that he raised a question as to where the money should go after repayment had been effected. That is an important question. A different yardstick was applied when Boulder Canyon Dam was authorized by the Congress. Then the Congress did not provide that moneys for repayment should go to the lower basin, or to any State in the lower basin. The Congress then provided that the money should go into a special account to be expended for the advancement of the entire Colorado River Basin, not half of it, not the lower basin alone, but all of it.

In the authorization by Congress later on of Parker Dam and Davis Dam, provision is made for revenues, after repayment, to go to the general fund of the Treasury. Why not apply the same yardstick in this bill? Why in this bill should similar revenues benefit only the upper States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from California will remember that the question which arose was whether we should write a new yardstick or whether we should pass the pending legislation, perhaps in the Senate, and then decide if modifying language should not be added to the Boulder Canyon Act, as well as to the law which is now applicable to the Parker and Davis Dams, in order that uniform treatment may be given to all.

I wish to assure the Senator from California that I for one feel myself obligated to follow that pattern. In the case of the Boulder Canyon Act, it has been seriously contended by Members of the Senate that once the Boulder Canyon Dam project is paid off and the funds have been completely retired, it should belong to the people in the States surrounding it. In other words, it is contended that it should belong to the people of Arizona and Nevada, and perhaps with some rights being given to California, too, because they would have paid most of the money in the form of payments for electric current. The provision now is that it all go into the Treasury.

I am sure that if there had been a provision placed in the act that upon completion the money might be used for additional development within the lower basin, it would have been desirable.

I am merely trying to assure the junior Senator from California that whatever language is finally put into the pending bill, it will be the desire of many of us to bring the language of all such acts into conformity. I do not believe that this project or any project under it should be placed in a preferential position.

The language was put in the bill only because we felt a solution had not been reached in the case of the Boulder Canyon Dam. We have now had 30 years of experience, and are coming within 30 or 40 years of the payout period, and perhaps less than that. The situation that existed when the Boulder Canyon Act was passed has changed materially. I believe if we were to do it again, we might feel differently about the repayment of the money.

I remind the junior Senator from California that at the time the Boulder Canyon Act was passed, a great many people thought the so-called Hoover Dam or Boulder Dam would never pay itself out and that the Government would be stuck with the whole $165 million, and, furthermore, that there would be no demand for power comparable to that which was anticipated by the proponents of the project. The same experience was had on the Columbia River and elsewhere in the country.

Therefore, taking the experience of 30 years, I believe we should revise the legislation of this character so as to make all of it uniform.

I pledge my assurance that just as soon as there is a demand by the people of Arizona, Nevada, and California for a different deal in the case of Hoover Dam, I shall be glad to see that accomplished.

Mr. KUCHEL. I greatly appreciate the comment of my friend, the Senator from New Mexico. Tomorrow I may wish to suggest to the Senate that the language to which I have just referred be brought in line with the language of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. However I do appreciate the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that all should be treated uniformly so far as the disposition of receipts is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. In that connection I should like to recall to the Senator that in the executive committee hearings on the bill I raised the question whether, in the proposed legislation, the Juniper project was to be authorized in the absence of any requirement whatever that the Department of the Interior make an administrative finding on feasibility. The Senator from New Mexico, when I called that to his attention, said he agreed that that should not be, and he suggested the change which the committee agreed to.

That is one more evidence of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico is fair. I may disagree with him upon occasion, but no man will deny the fairness of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will also recognize that the Glen Canyon Dam, which would involve $400 million in the beginning, and would be the largest project, probably would be the first to be constructed if the plans of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have any bearing. It should be remembered that not one drop of water stored behind that dam would be stored for any other purpose than to permit the people of Nevada, Arizona, and California to have the water to which they are entitled under the compact. It is water that is now wasting into the Pacific Ocean.

Therefore, while the bill calls for a substantial sum of money, whatever will be done will be done in furtherance of the Colorado compact, which I know the Senator from California is anxious to see carried out fully at all times.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act now requires $500,000 a year to be deposited in a special account for the States of the entire Colorado River Basin, and that will continue until 1987. I wonder whether my friend would consider tomorrow joining in the recommendation of an amendment to that particular language in the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from California that there is a reason why the $500,000 is spent partially in the upper basin States. At the time of the negotiation of the original compact, it was anticipated that the power from the Hoover Dam would be available to all the States. Certain blocks of power were to be sold to Arizona, Colorado, and other States. When the dam was finished, because of the necessities of financing, none of the power was made available in any of those States. Instead of that, money was made available to them. Therefore, there was an exchange, and we would have to bear that in mind if we were to try to take the money away from them. As the work in the upper basin States proceeds, cancellation of that $500,000, so far as the upper basin States is concerned, may be desirable.

That, however, is a matter about which the officials of the various States may want to be consulted. The day may come when that amount properly should be canceled, as the Government itself takes a larger part of the burden of investigation in the upper Colorado States.

The provision was inserted, as the senior Senator from Colorado and I know—and I was present in Santa Fe when the compact was entered into—because of the statement, which was constantly made, that all the work which would be done would be done for the lower basin States; therefore, some money ought to be made available to investigate the whole stream.

It was wise that it was done that way, and the bill before us is a partial result of those investigations.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I might also point out, in connection with the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico, that much of the power that has been developed at Hoover Dam was developed from water that belonged to the upper basin States. We were able to take out only a small amount of that water. The water which ran down into Lake Mead was used to generate power which in theory was emergency power, and California was able to get it at a lower rate. It was able to get it for even less than 2 mills, because of the fact that it was supposed to be emergency power. In actual practice it turned out to be firm power practically all the time. Therefore, when we speak of the $500,000, it should be remembered that California and the rest of the lower basin area have been fully compensated many times over in the kind of water they have been able to get.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all I wish to do on that point is to suggest that what is considered a fair basis for legislation in the lower basin ought to be considered fair when legislation in the upper basin is considered. We should not have two different yardsticks. Mr. President, we do have two yardsticks in this instance, and we adopt a corrective amendment.

Mr. President, I have not commented thus far on the economics involved in the pending bill. I wish to do that, but I should prefer to do it tomorrow. I believe I have touched upon most of the points this afternoon other than the question of economics. I have tried to do so dispassionately. I have tried to do it on a basis that will be accepted by Members of the Senate as sound.

I recognize my responsibilities as a Member of the Senate. They run to my country and to my State. As a United States Senator with those two types of responsibilities, I wish to help my brethren from the other States of the Union develop their own commonwealths as they should be developed. I do not wish California, which I have the honor to represent along with my able colleague, to have one drop of water more than that to which it is entitled under the law and under the compact. By the same token, Mr. President, I do not wish my State to be deprived of one drop of water to which it is entitled and which is so vital to the continuing growth of the magnificent empire which I call my home.

Because I am convinced that there is in this proposed legislation a direct assault upon the rights of the people of my State, I stand on the floor of the Senate today and urge that Senate to reject this bill.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss some of the economic aspects involved.

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL'S speech,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the Senator from California yield so that I may make a speech which will last 30 or 40 minutes, if it is understood that my remarks will appear in the RECORD following his remarks?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

WORLD TRIP REPORT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services, it is my responsibility to make decisions on many matters every year involving the national security and defense of our country. With the leadership of the free half of the world thrust involuntarily on the shoulders of the United States, the decisions that I make on matters coming before the Committee on the Armed Services involve even more than the security and defense of the United States. They involve the security and defense of all countries allied with the United States. They involve the mutual security and mutual defense of the free half of the world.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my responsibility to make decisions on appropriations involving billions of taxpayers' dollars every year. Those decisions are not only concerned with the objective of the most efficient use of that money and of accomplishing the goals of our country at the least possible cost, but also with the very economic security of our country.

This is particularly the case in my work on two of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee—the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations—because the great bulk of annual appropriations—thirty-five to forty billion dollars—is first handled in the Senate by subcommittees of which I am a member. In the Senate these subcommittees have the primary responsibility for more than 65 percent of our annual national budget.

How do we make our decisions on matters of such importance and gravity? Principally by the information provided at committee and subcommittee hearings by official representatives of the executive branches and by the supporting printed information they submit, by other witnesses, and by our interrogation of the witnesses appearing before the committees and subcommittees.

SEEING FIRSTHAND

Of course, we have to depend upon the experts in the various fields and be guided by what they tell us. But we are not necessarily limited to such second-hand information, in equipping ourselves for the making of these important decisions. Instead, we can personally seek firsthand information. We can go, and see with our own eyes, hear with our own ears, and feel with our own hands, what is being done with the billions of dollars that the Appropriations Committee appropriates each year, and with the legislative authorizations that the Armed Services Committee makes each year.

For example, I have gone to make observations in my own home State of Maine, by visiting Air Force bases and naval installations there. Having done this, I was in the position that, when witnesses testified before the committees about these bases and installations, I knew from first-hand, personal inspection what they were talking about. And what I could do in Maine, I could do with respect to places overseas.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

It was with this basic thought in mind that I made 2 overseas trips in the past 6 months, to see for myself about our activities, aid, and policies in foreign countries. While I could have made these trips as a member of either the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee legitimately at Government expense, I chose to do it on my own; and as as a result my two trips were not at Government expense, and did not cost the taxpayers a penny.

My first trip was last October. My second trip was during the latter part of February and the early part of March of this year. Total mileage on the trips was approximately 50,000, covering 23 countries—Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Russia, Finland, Denmark, Spain, Ireland, Japan, Formosa, Philippines, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, and Italy.

CONFERENCES WITH WORLD LEADERS

I shall never forget the experiences of these trips. In them I had the good fortune of having conferences with prac-

tically all of the leaders of the major nations of the world. A few of the leaders and prominent people with whom I talked were:

Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Aneurin Bevan, and Arnold Toynbee, in London; Mendès-France, Faure, De Gaulle, Bidault, Monnet, and Mollett, in Paris; Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Nauman, and Saar representatives, in Germany; Molotov, in Moscow; Tani and Tanaka, in Japan; Chiang, in Formosa; Magsaysay and Recto, in Manila; Diem, in Saigon; the British Governor General, in Hong Kong; Prince Wan, in Bangkok; U Nu, in Rangoon; Nehru and Rahdakrishnan, in New Delhi; Mohammed Ali and the King of Jordan, in Karachi; Nasser, in Cairo; Menderes, in Ankara; Scelba, in Rome; and Franco, in Madrid.

MEETINGS WITH LITTLE PEOPLE

I did not confine my conferences and contacts merely to the officials, political leaders, and prominent personages in each country, because I felt that to get a better feel of public attitudes I should go to the little people—to the common, everyday people.

So, in Great Britain, I spent an afternoon with a typical middle-class London family; in Tokyo, an afternoon with a successful Japanese farm family; in France, with a prosperous farm family and with a poor farm family.

In Germany, I took a train through part of East Germany occupied by the Russians, and from the train studied people on the farms; and in East Berlin, I went into the stores.

In Russia, I walked the streets of Moscow, went into the subway, ate in the restaurants, went on a collective farm and talked with the farmers, went to a hospital, went to a grade school.

In Formosa, I went to nurseries, inspected Chinese soldiers in the field, went into a farmer's rice mill, a medical center, a textile mill.

In Vietnam, I spent an afternoon in a dusty, hot refugee camp on the edge of a jungle.

In Thailand, I went to schools and food markets.

In Burma, I met young Burmese children at the United States Information Service Library.

In Manila, I sat in a session of the Philippine Senate during its debate on the Formosa defense issue.

In Hong Kong, I went to a fishing village.

In India, I attended sessions of state legislatures and the national parliament. I passed beggars sleeping on the streets. I visited small villages and attended their community meetings.

In Pakistan, I attended a state dinner.

In Egypt, I visited the slums.

In Turkey I went to schools, visited small villages, and went into the homes of the poor.

In Italy I went to the session of the Italian Parliament when it voted to ratify the Western European pacts while Communists were demonstrating outside the Parliament building.

In Spain I drove into the country and into small villages.

These are a few of the things I did. Admittedly they are not enough to make me an expert in the field of foreign relations or international military security. But they surely made me a better informed and more intelligent legislator on security, defense, and foreign relations matters—and surely a better equipped member of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittees on Defense and Foreign Relations.

GOODWILL

Reports from our Embassies credit me with having achieved some goodwill and better understanding for our people and our country in the nations I visited. However, the Communist press of Russia has denounced my travel, calling me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose. Such criticism I welcome, for this denunciation of my trip must mean that I did such a good job for my country that it hurt the Communists enough for them to start screaming about me.

I do not wish to burden the Members of the Senate with details of my trip. Rather, I would give my overall impressions of our position in the world today and of our relations with some of these countries.

PESSIMISM AT TIME OF TRIPS

At the time of my first trip, which was to Europe and Russia, the free half of the world had been shocked by France's rejection of the European Defense Community, which she herself had originally proposed. Russia was elated. The United States and her Western allies were dejected and disillusioned by France. Frantic attempts were being made to salvage the situation with new pacts.

At the time of my second trip, which was to Asia and the Mediterranean area, there was considerable dejection and pessimism resulting from the ignominious defeat the democracies of the world had suffered at Geneva at the hands of the Chinese and Russian Communists in the ceding of the northern part of Vietnam to the Communists. This, coupled with the tendency of India through the leadership of Nehru and Burma through the leadership of U Nu to snuggle up to Communist China and Communist Russia, gave rise to some extreme despair for us and our allies in the Asian part of the world.

And at the time of both trips—even now—the great preponderance of all that we read in the newspaper columns and heard from the news commentators and analysts, was to the effect that America and Americans were disliked and resented throughout the world—that our prestige had dropped to its lowest point in all history.

Consequently, I expected to go into an atmosphere of hostility almost everywhere on my two trips. I expected to experience great discouragement, and even defeatism, about the United States abroad. It could not be denied that we had suffered serious setbacks in Asia topped by the Geneva humiliation, and in Europe by the disillusionment that a vacillating France had caused. These developments alone were enough to give great credence to the gloomy reports made by the columnists and the commentators.

AMERICA IS LIKED

But I did not find dislike, resentment, hostility, pessimism, and defeatism. Perhaps my impression is not completely in focus, because I went looking for these unpleasant things. Perhaps because I expected to find conditions so bad, on the basis of what I had read and heard, they looked relatively and comparatively good to me. Perhaps if I had expected to find conditions very good I might have found them to look relatively and comparatively not so good.

Whatever the case may be, and regardless of attempted rationalization of objectivity, I was pleasantly surprised by the warm feeling and friendship shown me by the little people, as well as the leaders, in every non-Communist country that I visited. Even in Russia the little people were warm and friendly to me.

Perhaps we are not liked as well as we would like to be. Perhaps the reception I got was not typical. But it is clear to me from what I saw and heard that America and Americans are far better liked and respected in these foreign countries than I think we realize.

VICTORY IN EUROPE

I am glad to report to the Senate that from what I saw, we are gaining ground in the struggle with communism for the minds of men. Much of the debacle caused by the French rejection of EDC has now been salvaged, and was salvaged during the time of my trips. The London and Paris pacts have been ratified by Great Britain, Western Germany, the United States, France, Italy, and other nations. These pacts were being frantically worked on during the time of my first trip. On my second trip I was present at the session of the Italian Parliament when it voted final ratification.

This has been a clear-cut major victory for our side. It has been a smashing, devastating defeat for Russia. Her attempts to stop this action finally failed miserably after many uneasy touch-and-go weeks.

Yes, we have achieved and secured a very definite victory in Western Europe in the struggle to prevent the Communists from taking over that part of the world. I think the latest proof of that is Russia's sudden reversal of attitude in agreeing to a peace treaty with Austria. Russia would never have done so if the London and Paris pacts had not been ratified.

GAINS IN ASIA

But part of the price of that clear-cut victory was that our preoccupation with saving Western Europe from the Communists caused us to neglect what should have been equal concern about resisting the Communist threat in Asia. So now our principal world struggle with communism is in Asia, particularly Southeast Asia. Let us hope that, with Western Europe fairly well secured, we can concentrate on the objective of at least saving Southeast Asia from communism.

Since I started on my trip, and particularly during my second trip, we made gains in the struggle with communism in Asia, with the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization meeting in Bangkok, and the Communist election reverses in India.

The situation in Vietnam is bad, but not as hopeless as it appeared to be a short time ago. These gains have been somewhat offset by the further deterioration of our relations with the Arab nations in the Middle East and the potentialities of the Afro-Asian Conference just now starting.

BASIC PROBLEM ON ASIA

Much of the success in solving a problem is in the analysis of the problem and determining just what has to be solved. Analysis must precede action. That is certainly true with respect to Asia.

What we may fail to realize about Asia is that that part of the world is going through a most critical period as the people of that area shift from past colonialism to future independence and self-reliance. In going through such a transition, the nations of Asia are suffering from growing pains.

The greatest danger in this growing-pains period is that in the process of throwing off centuries of colonialism—just as we threw off British colonialism by our Revolutionary War or War of Independence, after which we set up our new, free, and independent nation—the peoples of Southeast Asia may have tragically mistaken communism as the quickest means of destroying colonialism. They may have tragically mistaken communism as the antithesis of colonialism.

COMMUNISM IS RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

Those who may have made this mistake fail to realize that communism is nothing less than Russian colonialism or Russian imperialism—something far more drastic than the past colonialism they seek to throw off. But an increasing number are beginning to realize this. For example, the people of Northern Vietnam are learning the hard way. There is a growing recognition that communism is a drastic form of colonialism as they look at Russia's Communist colonies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Estonia, and Latvia. Some are beginning to realize that Russia would make a Communist colony out of their country and every other country in the world.

Therein lies the greatest potential gain that we have made in Asia. Therein lies our basic hope for Asian rejection of communism and of Russian domination and control—a growing fear and hatred of the modern colonialism, communism.

ASIANS MAKE DECISIONS FOR ASIA

In nurturing the expansion of this self-enlightening realization on the part of Asian people, we must be careful to recognize that the people of Asia want decisions concerning Asia to be made in Asia rather than in London or Paris as they have been for centuries in the past. We should assure them that Washington will not attempt to make the decisions controlling Asia. We should assure them that we feel that decisions concerning India must be made in New Delhi, concerning Burma in Rangoon, concerning Vietnam in Saigon, concerning Indonesia in Jakarta.

We must convince them that the primary interest of the United States is to assure that they make their own decisions, that no outsiders will make those decisions, that there will be no attempt to make the decisions in Washington, and that unless they oppose communism, the modern drastic form of colonialism, those decisions in the future will be made in Moscow rather than in New Delhi, Rangoon, Saigon, or Jakarta.

We must point out to them that the decisions for Peiping are being made in Moscow instead of Peiping, for Hanoi in Peiping and Moscow instead of Hanoi, for Budapest in Moscow instead of Budapest, for Prague in Moscow instead of Prague, for Warsaw in Moscow instead of Warsaw.

EUROPE

First. The brightest spot for us in Europe is Western Germany. The free German people have done an amazing comeback job. Western Germany will steadily become the backbone of our resistance to communism in Europe.

Second. Britain is a trusted ally—but a tired ally beset with the weakness of the dwindling of a once great empire and of the resulting psychological effect. Her weakness and her disappointments make her more vulnerable to economic compromises with the Russian-dominated half of the world. This is most ironic since Red Russia is the present day successor to the role of dominant colonialism.

Third. France's heart is good—but her will is weak. She has not toughened up under adversity like Western Germany has. She lacks in political stability and will as long as she continues with her multiparty system. While we can be sure of her friendship, we cannot be sure of what she will do when the chips are down or of which way she will go in a crisis. It will be a long time before we forget her disappointing behavior on the very EDC she originally proposed herself.

Fourth. The tide against communism in Italy is increasingly going our way. But the weakness of our relations with Italy is that she continues to request and expect heavy financial and economic aid from our country. Italy, unlike Western Germany, is not learning fast enough how to stand on her own feet. Italy continues to lean too much on the economic crutch from the United States with the plaintive warning that unless she can continue to lean on that crutch the Communists will take her over.

Fifth. Except for the fact that she is not so successful at bluffing now, Russia is the same she has been for nearly four decades—all wishful thinking to the contrary. Her leaders may change, but they all continue the same policy of hate and dreams of world conquest. She is not nearly as strong as her propaganda claims. But she is not nearly as weak as we would hope. The little people of Russia are neither for nor against communism—they are simply resigned to it—with no enthusiasm to resist it or defend it. The position of the little people of Russia on communism is a policy of coexistence—they merely coexist with communism. In other words, the status of communism with the great mass of Russian people is simply internal coexistence.

THE FAR EAST

First. It is generally recognized that the place coveted most by the Communists in the Far East is Japan. They want to kidnap the industrial power of Japan. While Russia is a traditional and historical enemy of Japan, unless Japan is able to find a market for her goods outside the Communist world there will be great pressure to secure her economic survival, to trade with Russia. In spite of the Sino-Japanese War of the thirties and World War II, there is a great cultural tie between the Japanese and the Chinese. This militates for trade between industrial Japan and agricultural Red China.

Yet, if we are to prevent trade between Japan and Russia and Red China the pressure then mounts on the United States to buy Japan's products to assure her economic health, survival, and resistance to communism. The dilemma for us on this is that this policy would be at the sacrifice of our own American industry and labor. For example, unrestricted purchase of Japanese textiles could destroy the textile industry of New England and play havoc with the textile industry of the South because of the low textile wages paid in Japan.

Second. As one who has wondered about the manner in which American equipment and aid given to Chiang Kai-shek during the Chinese Civil War ended up captured by the Chinese Communists, I went to Formosa with considerable curiosity. I left Formosa with firm answers to some of my questions.

The spirit of the Free Chinese is tied up completely in Chiang. As long as he lives, he is their symbol of return to the mainland—he is literally their last hope. One Chinese civilian expressed it by saying, "If we do not retake the Chinese mainland before the Gimo Chiang dies, all hope is lost. Should the Gimo die, we will never try to return to China."

I am convinced that as long as Chiang lives Formosa will not fall to the Chinese Communists. But I am equally convinced that unless the Communists try to take Formosa and the United States is consequently drawn into a mainland conflict, Chiang will never have a chance to try to retake China. That is one thing that my interview with him brought out. He said he expected air and naval aid and moral aid from the United States on such an undertaking. Within a few days at a press conference President Eisenhower said emphatically and unequivocally that the United States would not give such aid.

So that the real question now is "What will happen to Formosa when Chiang is gone? What will happen to our personalized foreign policy on Nationalist China?"

Third. We have a strong line from Japan in the north through Formosa down to the Philippines in the south.

Fourth. The strength is essentially consistent down through the entire line, with the greatest feeling of loyalty being in the Philippines.

Fifth. But there is a thread of weakness running through the whole—from the nationalist anti-American feeling and economic difficulties in Japan to the policy of personalization on Formosa to internal political opposition within the Philippines.

Sixth. The overall weakness of our Far East line is in the military and economic dependence of Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines on the United States—a dependence of long-term aspects as contrasted to the other areas.

Seventh. It is a matter of holding, rather than increasing, our strength in this area.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

First. India's Nehru is making a very strong bid to be the leader and spokesman for Southeast Asia. Many of us have been disappointed that Nehru has not seen fit to aline his country with our side. We have felt that his brand of neutralism worked to our disadvantage and to the advantage of Communist Russia and Communist China. We cannot understand his neutralist talk in which he says that he admires communism but deplores its methods.

He is a man of great intellect. But at times we find his thinking difficult to understand. For example, he says that Formosa should be given to Communist China and taken away from Chiang on the thesis that China should not be divided. Yet, he opposes Syngman Rhee's desire for a united Korea instead of a Korea divided in half between the Communist North and the free South. I doubt if we could ever understand what appears to be his contradictory thinking on this score.

But I do think that perhaps generally we have not understood him—or made a real try to understand him and his desire to make India a first-rate power as soon as possible after having gained her independence from Britain. Too few of us realize that he has quite a long record of fighting the Communists and communism inside India. And as of now it would seem that the Communist threat to India is receding with the stunning election defeats given the Communists in India while I was there.

I think that we may have had too much of an inconsistent policy of excessively flattering Nehru at one time and then being tactlessly blunt with him at another time. Instead, I believe that our policy should be one of polite firmness. We should not force ourselves on Nehru. We should not force our aid on him. Rather, we should wait for him to ask for our aid. We should convince him of our friendliness—but not cater to him. And I am inclined to think that he would respect us more if we put our relations with him on the basis of loans not gifts. For example, Russia does not give him anything, but rather deals with him strictly on a businesslike basis on loans requiring the payment of interest as well as the repayment of the principal.

And I do not think it would hurt us to ask for his advice about Asia. The mere asking would not commit us to follow his advice. But the mere asking for his advice would be good psychologically.

It would be a tragic mistake for us to write off Nehru and India to the Communist side. I have hopes that within the next 2 years there will be real improvement in our relations with India. At least, I want to withhold any pessimism on my part on Nehru and India for a while.

Second. Some observers have been inclined to write Burma off to the Communists. That is a mistake. They overlook the fact that U Nu has opposed and beaten the Communists in his country. Some observers have charged that U Nu is under the influence and control of India's Nehru as one of his disciples of neutralism. That, too is a mistake. U Nu is a very independent little man—and Burma is a very independent little country. From my talk with U Nu, I am not only convinced of this independence, but I believe that there is a good chance that within the next year or two Burma will turn away from her neutralism and toward our side of the free half of the world.

Speaking of U Nu, I want to digress just a bit with a personal detail. I do so because I think it will be of personal interest.

I asked him what criticism he might have of America and Americans. He answered that he liked Americans very much—but that he felt that American politicians talk too much and make too many different and contradictory statements. As a result, he said, he was confused as to just what American policy was.

I told him that while I had to admit that there was much in what he said, and could understand his confusion, still he should realize that America was a free country, with freedom of speech, and that such contradictory statements were inevitable. I said that was part of the price of freedom in America, but that we would rather pay that price than to be a slave state where there was no freedom of speech.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in Southeast Asia from Vietnam on the eastern end to Pakistan on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in Vietnam and India, but we are picking up strength in both of those nations.

Fifth. The strength in that line is in the middle of Thailand and on the western end of West Pakistan, where our position is extremely strong.

Sixth. The greatest potential gain is also in the middle of that line in Burma, which could turn to our side before too long. To a lesser extent, there is a similar potential in India.

Seventh. We must recognize that Southeast Asia is in a critical and most difficult period of growing independence and self-reliance and that we are handicapped in our relations there by the growing pains of suspicion of our intentions and the mistaken belief of some Southeast Asians that communism offers the quickest road to elimination of colonialism and to independence.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

First. The stand-out impressions that I came away with from the Middle East and Mediterranean areas were those with respect to Spain and Turkey.

I think that perhaps some of us in the past have misjudged Spain and Franco. We had misgivings about where Franco and Spain stood during World War II—thinking his neutralism was benevolently for Hitler and Mussolini. Perhaps we misinterpreted what was actually the intense opposition of Franco and Spain to Communist Russia. Today, at least, there is no possibility of misinterpretation about Spain being on our side and against Communist Russia. My conference with Franco increased my belief that our aid to Spain and the establishment of our air bases in Spain are wise investments in security.

I do not understand the attitude of opposition of admission of Spain into NATO. It apparently stems from the fact that Franco was neutral in World War II and seemed to have sympathies with Hitler and Mussolini. I do not like such sympathies—if he did have them. But after all, Western Germany was an active enemy against us under Hitler in World War II—and so was Italy under Mussolini—and yet we have forgiven them and taken them into NATO for mutual-security purposes. If we can do that with former active enemies like Germany and Italy, then why can we not do the same in the interest of real security with a Spain that was not an active enemy but rather a neutralist?

Second. In some respects the biggest inspiration of all that I saw and heard on my trip came in Turkey—that little tough country that neighbors on to Russia and lives under the very threatening shadow of the giant Russian bear. The Turks have refused to let Russia frighten them. They have refused to be intimidated. They have stood right up to Russia and literally thumbed their noses at, and defied the Communist threats.

Our past aid to Turkey was easily among the smartest and most productive acts we ever took in our foreign policy. It has certainly paid off real dividends in combating the spread of communism in this part of the world where Europe meets Asia.

There is another refreshing thing about the Turks. They do not want any gifts from us. Instead they seek loans which they want to pay back as soon as they can. And they do not want a long-term period of loans—but rather only for the next 5 years or so. After that, they say they will be able to carry their own load and pay us back.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in that area from Turkey on the eastern end to Spain on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in the middle, as contrasted to the Southeast Asia line where the middle is our strongest area. The weakness is in our position in Egypt to the south, Yugoslavia to the north, Italy and France in the center.

Fifth. The weakness of France and Italy is in the instability of their multiparty systems and their psychology of pushing for American economic aid by talking about the Communist threat.

The bright spot in Italy is Clare Boothe Luce, our Ambassador there. In a policy of polite firmness, she is giving a very effective administration of a law passed by Congress which directs that offshore procurement contracts be taken away from plants that show a trend toward communism—plants where Communist membership among the workers is increasing, however slightly. That offshore procurement policy is paying dividends in fighting communism in Italy.

It should be followed more firmly by our representatives in other countries.

Sixth. A promising potential gain is Egypt, in that in her newly acquired independence her leaders are receptive to advice and guidance, provided suspicions about our policy on colonialism and Arab-Israeli relations can be overcome. This is a particularly important potential because of the Afro-Asian Conference and attempts to knit Africa and Asia together against the rest of the world.

The Communists have so exploited the issue of colonialism that the leaders of Arab nations have to be very careful in their expressions and acts against the Communists lest they be accused of being the paid puppets of so-called British and American colonialists.

There are two favorable aspects in an otherwise unfavorable situation in Egypt and the Arab States. The first is in the tremendous respect the Arabs have for President Eisenhower. They have no major criticism of him. The second is in what I believe to be the case with Egypt's Prime Minister Nasser. He is feeling his way along. I think that he wants Egypt ultimately to be alined with the United States, but feels that he will have to lead his people gradually away from their suspicions about American foreign policy being designed to take over where Britain leaves off on colonialism.

Seventh. I think that in this area we must recognize that our strength is dependent upon the very will and determination of each nation; that Turkey and Spain show the greatest will and determination, and therefore merit our aid and support the most; that France and Italy show less determination and will, but that part of their lack of firmness and response stems from our own lack of firmness on such matters as offshore procurement policy; that Egypt in its uncertain steps of national "childhood" can be developed into an ally.

EISENHOWER RAISES AMERICAN PRESTIGE

I am glad to report, from what I saw and heard, that American prestige abroad is no longer on the wane. It may have been a year or two ago, but not now. To the contrary, it is going up. And I think this is largely because President Eisenhower in the last few months has begun to exercise real leadership.

I saw a difference in reaction on this attitude abroad between the time of my trip in October, when repeatedly people said to me that they wished President Eisenhower would give the world more vigorous leadership, that they were almost hungry for him to do so, and that they would quickly follow, and my trip in February, when I found that the attitude had changed. Now people in the various countries are inspired by the manner in which President Eisenhower has been asserting world leadership. They want him to continue to do it, and in even greater degree. It has done much to build up their courage to resist the threat of communism.

LEADERSHIP MUST INCREASE

That leadership must increase in boldness and firmness in the future if we are to cope successfully with the threat to the freedom of the world.

In spite of the pessimism that prevails in some circles, we have plenty to be thankful for and confident about. Our strength, prestige, and position in the defense against the aggressive advances of the Communists is greater than we realize and is gradually increasing. While we are gaining, we still have a great deal to do and we cannot let up in our alertness and vigilance.

I have heard the State Department and its employees attacked time and again, but I want to say that I am proud of the personnel in our Foreign Service. They are doing a real, patriotic, and effective job for our country.

One of the principal criticisms I have about the State Department is leaving such key ambassadorships as those to India and Burma vacant and unfilled for so long. This, I believe, is inexcusable. Another criticism is the failure to recognize the necessity of having career personnel in the top spots.

NEEDED CHANGES IN FOREIGN POLICY

The time has come when there should be some changes in at least the approaches of our foreign policy. We should stop trying to force our aid on countries. Our policy should be to let nations ask for our aid rather than to attempt to force it on them. We should give more aid in the form of loans on a businesslike basis than in the form of gifts. Such a policy will not only provide wiser investment in truly mutual security, but will breed greater respect for us. We should concentrate more of our aid in those countries on whom we can depend.

ACT FROM CONFIDENCE INSTEAD OF FEAR

Every American should be made to realize that the cold war is something that we will have to cope with for many, many years—perhaps decades—perhaps for the rest of our lives. Even so, cold war is preferable to hot war.

The time has come when the very basis of our foreign policy must change. It must shift from the past negative basis of fear—fear of Russia—to a positive basis of confidence in ourselves and nations friendly to us. We have every reason for confidence in ourselves. We are the greatest nation in the world. If we do not have confidence in ourselves then surely we cannot expect other countries to have confidence in us.

The free, liberty-loving nations of the world must stop living in fear and acting from fear. We must act from confidence. We cannot accomplish our goal of peace if we continue to think in terms of fear of Russia.

I believe that we must start charting our course on the basis that we are not going to let Russia scare us any more; that we are plenty capable of taking care of ourselves; and that we must strive for positive construction instead of fear minded, negative defensiveness.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL's speech,

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield with the understanding that the Senator's remarks will appear at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, when a former President of the United States undertakes to attack his successor, it behooves him to check up on his own history. Mr. Harry Truman's speech last Saturday evening was a sorry attempt to revive the name-calling, inflammatory methods used by one element of the Democratic Party in years gone by. Fortunately, the American people have learned to evaluate this technique, and its value today is zero.

Mr. Truman declared that President Eisenhower has been "playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources." These charges come with peculiar grace from a former President who threw American military forces into war without consulting Congress, who froze thousands of temporary employees into permanent civil-service tenure, and whose administration was marked by a series of the most shocking scandals in our history.

I prefer to believe that the bitterness of our former President is based upon the amazing contrast between the Washington atmosphere under Truman and the Washington atmosphere under Eisenhower.

Irresponsible criticism is a luxury which our country cannot afford in these perilous times. I am certain that the overwhelming majority of American people look at President Eisenhower through the eyes of another spokesman of the Democratic Party, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN said: "Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower as in terrible loneliness he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation."

Americans are accustomed to the extremes of partisan debate. We have learned to take them with more than a grain of salt, but in these troubled times, we can stand a moratorium on political oratory designed to confuse the mind and comfort the enemy.

President Eisenhower is not the one who reduced the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the national debt from $21 billion in 1932 to $267 billion in 1951 to $277,600,000,000 in 1955.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the cost of Government from $5 billion in 1932 to $74 billion in 1952.

President Eisenhower is not the one who recognized Soviet Russia.

President Eisenhower is not the one who coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, and blocked every effort to smoke Communists out of Government.

President Eisenhower is not the one who made the disastrous agreements at Yalta.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose blundering policy lost China to the Reds.

President Eisenhower is not the one who ordered the "police action" in Korea.

President Eisenhower is not the one who fired General MacArthur.

President Eisenhower is not the one who has brought us a spurious prosperity through war and by mortgaging the future through debt.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose extravagance and fiscal policy have brought on inflation, and then has cried to high heaven for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation.

President Eisenhower is the leader of the party which has made it so hot for the former administration that they were forced to order crime investigations; but he is not the one whose political connections with the underworld have been revealed by the same investigations.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY OF REPORT BY HIM TOMORROW TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as a courtesy to the Senate, I desire to make an announcement.

The former Gillette committee, as the Senate knows, was concerned with McCARTHY's finances for a number of years, as were also the Watkins committee and the special session of the Senate last year.

The Internal Revenue Service has just completed a 3-year investigation of a 7-year period. In view of the amount of money which has been spent on the investigation by the two committees, and the time spent during the special session, I feel I owe an obligation to the American people to give them a detailed report of what the Internal Revenue Service has discovered after a 3-year field investigation.

Therefore, tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock I shall make a report, not to the Senate, but to the American people, by way of the press, in a press conference.

I felt that as a matter of courtesy I should let the Senate know that the report would be made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The message also anounced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. CLEVENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield without his losing his right to the floor, so as to permit me to place 2 statements in the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement entitled "The Origin and Characteristics of the Colorado River and the Colorado River Storage Project," and a statement entitled "Western Water Law and the Colorado River Storage Project."

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLORADO RIVER AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The United States is blessed with 10 great river systems providing water for consumptive use, power generation, and irrigation. Of these, the Colorado has for months been the topic of discussion in the press, on the radio, and in the Halls of Congress where legislation relating to its control, development, and use have been under consideration since 1954. Approval of this legislation will make possible the full utilization of the Colorado River, provide the water and power necessary to maximum, municipal, agricultural, industrial, power and recreational development and make the beginning of 100 years of round, consistent, and economic growth in the four upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming).

The Colorado River drains parts of seven States in the arid West where water is literally the lifeblood of the economy. The States are California, Nevada, and anyone in the lower basin and Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming in the upper basin.

The Colorado is a unique river. It is long and crooked. It rises in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming and after dropping swiftly down its numerous tributaries, which drain the snow-capped peaks, it enters a deep gorge which cuts through the Colorado plateau for several hundred miles. This gorge is often more than 3,000 feet deep with nearly vertical side walls. Along this stretch of the river there is little usable land and few people. Getting the water out of the river and transporting it to the irrigable, populated valleys through this section of the river is impossible. After the river leaves the deep canyon section near Toposh, Ariz., diversions of water for irrigation are possible and several such divisions were made late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century. The diversion works, however, were subject to frequent damaging floods which seriously limited irrigation development. On the upper tributaries of the river many small diversions were made during the same period. These too were limited by the difficulty of controlling the widely fluctuary flow of the river.

The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream. Its origin is in the great snow blanket which accumulates each winter on the high watersheds of the Colorado River drainage basin. This snow blanket is a huge natural reservoir the outlet of which cannot be controlled by man. The snow melts with the rising temperature in the spring and the rapidity and duration of rise of the temperature together with the extent and water content of the snow cover determines the waterflow. Contrary to indications in eastern streams precipitation falling as rain, being a minor part of the total annual precipitation, has little effect on the flow of the Colorado River. The lower elevations in the Colorado Drainage Basin are extremely arid and contribute very little to the total flow of the river. The lower basin (Arizona, Nevada, and California) being at low elevation contribute only 10 percent of the total flow of the river which the upper basin (Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming) containing most of the high watersheds and the heavy snow pack produce 90 percent of the total flow. In fact California produces none of the waters of the Colorado and Nevada very little.

Depending solely on a precipitation (rain or snow) which varies widely from year to year and on an unpredictable temperature, the flow of the Colorado varies widely from month to month and from year to year. This wild, unruly river, which defied the efforts of man to control it up to the time the Hoover Dam was built, varied from a virgin low flow at Yuma, Ariz., of 1,200 cfs to a virgin high flow of 300,000 cfs.

The maximum development of water source of this kind, which varies widely and is difficult to control, is limited to its low water flow without storage for regulation. Prior to 1920 the low water flow was fully appropriated and put to use and continued development but in the upper basin and the lower basin began to impinge upon existing rights. This situation prompted the development and signing of the Colorado River compact which divided the waters of the river between the upper and lower Basin States prior to its being put to use.

This compact by itself had no effect on the flow characteristics of the river but it provided a basin for the development of necessary physical controls which would effect the flow characteristics. Shortly after the Colorado River compact was signed the Hoover Dam was proposed and by 1935 it

was completed and the Colorado River below the dam was under complete control. This control made possible the full and complete use of the waters allocated to the lower basin.

Since the completion of the Hoover Dam the Parker and Davis Dams, in the lower basin, have been completed for the purpose of generating power, the All American Heading and Canal have been completed to deliver water to the Imperial Valley and authorization to build the Pilot Knob power plant on the All-American Canal has been granted.

This power plant will discharge water into the Colorado River just above the Mexican border where it will be of no further use to the United States. The construction of the Hoover Dam and other facilities in the lower basin has completely changed the flow characteristics in the lower basin and made possible the full use of this water and power resource, not only that which the Colorado River compact allocates to the lower basin, but the entire flow that passes the Hoover Dam.

But what about the Colorado River above Lee Ferry? In the 32 years since the signing of the compact, except for the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion and a few other very small projects, nothing has happened except investigations. These investigations, costing between $7 and $10 million have been thorough and exacting. These investigations show that no further development is possible in the upper Colorado River Basin without storage for regulation of the river. Based on these investigations, a proposed plan for the control and utilization of the waters allocated to the upper Colorado River Basin under the Colorado River compact has been made. This plan when carried out will completely control the river and make possible the beneficial consumptive use of the water allocated to the upper Colorado River States by the compact, the generation of power which will provide revenues for the repayment of the power costs with interest and have left over revenues to help pay the irrigation costs all within 50 years and then yield a net annual revenue of millions of dollars for public benefit.

Legislation relating to this project is now before the Congress. Its approval means the control of the Colorado River for the benefit of the people by providing water and power for the agricultural, industrial, and municipal development in the upper basin States and constitutes an investment in the future for this Nation.

Western Water Law and the Colorado River Storage Project

The Colorado River storage project legislation now pending before the Congress presents another forward step in the development of the Nation's land and water resources. It involves a planned basinwide development supported by a compact agreed to by the United States and the seven Colorado River basin States. This compact departs from the basic principles of western water law in that it divides up the water resources before it is put to use in order that the areas that, due to physical or other handicaps, develop more slowly will not lose their share of the water to those who could and would put it to use first.

The first law relating to waters to be established in the United States was based on the common law of England and is known as the doctrine of riparian rights. It is a humid area law because it does not depend upon nor has any relation to the consumptive use of water. In effect it says a man owning land on the bank of a stream has a right to have the water in that stream flow by his land undiminished in quantity and unpolluted in quality for all time by virtue of his ownership of the land. Use of the water does not create a right and nonuse does not forfeit it. It did not permit a consumptive of water. A man owning land not abutting on the stream has no rights whatsoever in the stream. This doctrine still remains the basis law in the humid areas.

When the arid West was settled it became apparent from the first that consumptive use must be the basis of the right and inasmuch as there was never enough water to satisfy all needs the principles of first in time is first in right, became established. Thus a new doctrine of water law was born. It is called the doctrine of appropriation: "First in time is first in right and beneficial use is the basis and the measure of the right." The Intermountain States (Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona), from the first abrogated the doctrine of riparian rights and accepted the doctrine of appropriation. The other Western States (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, California, Oregon, Washington, and Montana) retained the doctrine of riparian rights but have since so modified it by statute and court decisions that the basic water law of these States is practically the doctrine of appropriation. The principle of beneficial use is paramount in the States signing the Colorado River compact with some modification in California and is recognized as between States. Furthermore, the State contributions provide in most States, and only a right to use can be acquired.

The Colorado River, being a wild and unruly stream, subject to wide variations in flow, and traveling rugged topography developed slowly. The early users of water in the lower basin had appropriated the entire low-water flow. Development on the tributaries in the upper basin began to effect the low-water flow in the lower basin. Water users on both basins became fearful of their rights based on priority of use and proposed a compact which would circumvent the doctrine of appropriation and divide the waters of the river between the States in advance of its use. Thus was born the Colorado River compact now accepted as the basic law of the river. Under the compact use does not establish the right nor does nonuse forfeit it.

The law of gravity, however, operates in spite of the compact. Since the signing of the compact facilities have been constructed in the lower basin to permit the use of the entire flow of the river for consumptive use and power generation. Already water belonging to the upper Colorado River States, but not being used because there are no facilities for storage, diversion, and conveyance, is being used in the lower basin to generate power which is now supporting industrial and domestic users in the lower basin. They will probably not establish a right by such use in spite of the compact but continued for power and a developed consumptive use on lower basin lands would make it difficult if not impossible to secure an authorization to build facilities in the upper basin if such action would destroy developed uses in the lower basin.

It is therefore apparent that nonuse in the upper basin for an indefinite period would result, practically, in the loss of the right given by the Colorado compact. Such nonuse will be forced on the upper-basin States if the facilities proposed in the Colorado River storage project are not authorized.

Inasmuch as water runs downhill, failure to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project under the same ground rules as have been afforded other reclamation projects will be tantamount to giving away the water and power resources of the uper basin States to the States of the lower Colorado River Basin and Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of real regret that I take the floor to oppose the upper Colorado project. My feeling of regret is due largely to the esteem and affection which I have for the Senators from the States in the upper Colorado Basin; notably the Senators from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, but of course, not excluding the Senators from Arizona and Nevada. I am aware that the bill means a great deal to them individually as representatives of their States; and I am aware that it means a great deal to the States themselves.

The Bill and Its Effects

The bill calls for the expenditure of $1,658,460,000, as the report on pages 16 and 17 shows. But this, as I shall show, is only the beginning, because it has been the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation that the actual costs are more than twice the originally estimated costs.

It is also true that the interest upon the irrigation features of the project, for which the construction costs will be approximately $915 million, is forgiven; and ultimately the taxpayers themselves will have to pay the interest on the bonds which will have to be floated. This will amount, probably, to $1,153,000,000, according to Mr. S. W. Crosthwait, Acting Commissioner of the Department of Interior as given in his letter on page 555 of the hearings on S. 500.

Lurking behind the projects which are authorized in the bill are additional projects, the magnitude of which we cannot guess, but which we can be quite certain will be very great indeed. Among these will be the completion of the Central Utah project.

So the bill before the Senate provides for direct and indirect expenditures of $2,750,000,000, and probably substantial sums will be required in addition to that amount.

The direct outlay of over $1,600,000,000 in the upper Colorado River region, distributed over an area roughly shown by the map I hold in my hand, will, of course, result in a great deal of employment in that area. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of persons will be employed in constructing the dams, laying out the irrigation projects, and installing the generators. This will have a very stimulative effect upon the trade and industries of the region.

Furthermore, the acres to be irrigated, even though at a high cost, will increase the population of the region and will be of economic benefit to it. So I am quite well aware of the interest which the people of those four States take in the proposed legislation, and of the obligation which the Senators from those States feel, in a sense, as ambassadors from their States to defend the interests of their localities.

Burden Borne by the Whole Country

Mr. President, if this were all to the story, I would, of course, support the measure. But I cannot do so, because it is not all. Whence will the money come with which to pay for the projects? It will certainly have to be advanced by the country as a whole. The States to be affected will, in their payment of taxes, contribute only about 2 percent of the amount which will be invested. If it should happen that the national deficit

will be increased, as will probably be the case, bonds will have to be floated. But the interest on those bonds will have to be met by the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole. Further it looks as though the principal is not to go back into the Treasury but is to be used for more irrigation projects. Therefore, the bill is not a matter of concern merely to the States immediately affected.

In my opinion, too often in these matters we turn the issues over to the States which will be benefited, and which naturally wish to have representation on the committees which deal with them, while the Senators from the other States of the Union largely wash their hands and take what the States immemediately interested decide upon. But obviously the burden ultimately has to be borne by the Nation as a whole.

I have great affection not only for the Senators from the four States concerned, and the neighboring States, but also for the Senators from the great northern tier of States—Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and the upper New England area. They are all fine members, and their localities could also be benefited if Congress appropriated over $1.6 billion with which to erect hot-houses in which to grow bananas and luscious strawberries. Think of the employment which would be created in those regions if Congress decided, as a public project, to grow bananas in the wintertime, and thus alleviate the shortage of fruit. Prosperity would bloom throughout the northern area. But someone else would have to pay the bill.

As I recall Benjamin Franklin, in his autobiography, described how he used to walk along the waterfront of Boston. One day, as he was walking, a hawker approached him and asked him to buy a whistle. Franklin wanted a whistle, so he bought the one which the hawker offered. Later he found that he had paid about five times too much for the whistle, and he repented his purchase for the rest of his life. Franklin said that ever afterward, when he contemplated making an expenditure, he asked himself, "Did you pay too much for the whistle?" I think perhaps that was the only time in his life when Franklin made an imprudent purchase.

In connection with the projects under consideration, the Federal Government and the people of the entire country will be committed to uneconomic expenditures, which will largely be borne by other sections than those directly benefited. Granted that it is fine to generate electricity from water power and to develop irrigation projects; granted that it is fine to see the desert blossom as the rose; nevertheless, the question today is, just as it was in the time of Franklin, "Are we paying too much for the project? Are we paying too much for the whistle?" The money spent on these projects in a normal period must be withdrawn from other purposes. The taxes which the taxpayers pay decrease the amount of money which they can spend for their private purposes. The interest which the taxpayers will pay upon the bonds to be floated will diminish their incomes and decrease their purchases.

THE GOOD OF THE NATION SHOULD BE THE YARDSTICK

We can foresee the expansion of employment in the four upper Colorado Basin States, but we cannot calculate the precise decrease in purchasing power and the decrease in employment in the regions which will pay the taxes. As a Senator from an industrial State, one of the "conquered provinces" of the Nation which have very little voice in the Senate of the United States, or, if they have a voice, very little effect upon the processes of legislation, I am of the opinion that we should look at this question from the standpoint of what is good for the country as a whole. How can the labor and the purchasing power which we have be used most advantageously? Is what is proposed the best use of the money and the labor we have to furnish? If it is, we should pass the bill. If it is not, we should reject it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois has ever visited the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I have.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find there automobiles made in Detroit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find products from all over the United States being used there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that, as I remember, the Salt River Valley was almost the first of the irrigation projects. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the water not come from the Roosevelt Dam?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr, DOUGLAS. The Roosevelt Dam, I think, was the first large-scale dam constructed to impound water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not at the moment making an attack on all irrigation projects. In fact, I think the early irrigation projects were beneficial. The cost was low, the land which was irrigated was fertile, the growing seasons were long, and I think those projects were desirable. My point is that on the upper Colorado—and I hope to develop this point—there is a short growing season, costs per acre are enormous, benefits per acre will be comparatively low, and what is projected is not a good way to spend such enormous amounts of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say that I shall be happy to hear the Senator's discussion. I merely want to point out that a very natural thing happened with regard to irrigation projects. The best and the most available dam sites were used first. Subsequently it was difficult to find additional dam sites. I think that if the Senator will compare the growing season where the pending projects are located with the growing season in the Grand Coulee Dam area, he will find that the areas embraced in the Columbia River projects do not have a much longer growing season than do the areas where the projects contemplated by the pending bill are located. He will find in those areas projects which have worked out extremely well, and have turned out to be of value to the country generally.

As I hope to develop in a short time, if we do not continue to develop these projects to be used for the production of food for the people of the United States, people who live in States like Illinois may a little later confront more problems than they might have from the competition they are anticipating in connection with these projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Mexico that if money is spent on an uneconomic project, it is taken away from other portions of the country, and their purchasing power is diminished. The Senator may be able to say that there would be more automobiles in New Mexico, Colorado, or Utah, but there would be fewer automobiles in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

ARE ADDITIONAL ACRES NECESSARY?

There is one final point I should like to make with respect to the argument that it is now necessary to have large amounts of additional land put under cultivation. At the moment the cry is intended to withdraw land from cultivation. Wheat acreage is being cut by 20 million acres. The Secretary of Agriculture wanted to have the cultivation of other crops cut by 20 million more acres, and to have withdrawn from cultivation 40 million acres which were, to be put into grass and nitrogen fixing legumes. So at the moment the desire is not for additional units of land to be put under cultivation; it is quite the contrary. It is said we have a surplus of land under cultivation, and that some of it should be withdrawn from cultivation.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we were legislating for the moment, I grant that what the Senator has said would be correct; but if we are trying to legislate for the future, even 15 years from now, I think the Senator will not then find land will be withdrawn from cultivation. I shall demonstrate later this afternoon that before the proposed projects are completed, we will be a have-not nation agriculturally; and it is for that reason that I desire to have the proposed legislation enacted, and not for the advantage of the moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a much better expert on the subject of agriculture than I am, since he was once Secretary of Agriculture, and was a very distinguished official in that role. However, I may say that I think we are going to find that there will be a continued increase in output per acre, and that such continued increase in output per acre in the fertile sections of the country will largely remove the necessity for putting under cultivation the less fertile, semi-arid, and arid regions of the Nation.

I might mention one final point. Probably the greatest authority on the geography of the country is Mr. Paul Sears, who was once a professor in Oklahoma, then in Ohio, and I believe is now

at Yale. He has pointed out that if we really want to increase farm output, the thing to do is to put more water on the fertile sections of the country, on the land of Iowa, on the land of Illinois, on the land of Indiana, on the land of Ohio—and, yes, on the land of Minnesota—at much less expense than would be involved in the pending legislation, not $800 an acre, but somewhere between $30 and $60 an acre. That is, water would be taken from the Mississippi, from the Great Lakes, or from other great rivers of the country, would be put on land which is fertile, at much lower costs, and the land would produce a much larger yield, and it would pay off.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know of Paul Sears and of his book Deserts on the March, and other works of that nature. I agree there is much in what he has said. It will gladden the heart of the Senator from Illinois to know that in the delta of the Mississippi, one of the greatest agricultural areas of the country, irrigation is today starting to be practiced.

The Senator referred to land which is designated as fertile. I want the Senator to remember, and I am sure he knows this well, that there are many areas of the country where land is not regarded as particularly fertile, but where the light, sandy soil is easily adapted to the growing of crops.

It is interesting to note that the proposal which has been made to bring water from the Mississippi Valley to the high plains of Texas would involve cost far in excess of that contemplated for the pending project, yet a cost which the country would be prepared to pay, because it would be the only course by which it would be possible to feed the population of this country.

I intend to deal with the question that merely by increasing the fertility of our present cultivated lands we will not be able to feed our increasing population and maintain our present standard of living, to say nothing of improving it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not proposing that the waters of the Mississippi River should be shipped overland a thousand miles to Texas; but I do say that for an acreage cost of one-twentieth of the cost contemplated by the pending bill, we will be enabled to obtain a greater output of farm production by putting water on already fertile land, than by carrying on this project on the Colorado, and putting water on very high land where the growing season is short.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield, Mr. President. Today, I seemed to have stirred up the lions, as usual. I hope to proceed with my speech, but meanwhile I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not of the types that are in surplus supply?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quite well aware that this project will provide for the raising of feed for livestock—in other words, for the raising of hay and a little corn. This project will not result in the rich yields which are obtained in certain sections of Arizona or southern California. Instead, this project is primarily—insofar as its agricultural phases are concerned—for the purpose of providing feed for livestock; and I say that is about the most unprofitable use which could be made of irrigated land.

Mr. WATKINS. That depends upon the section involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have studied the reports for each and every one of these irrigation projects; and in each and every case the Bureau of Reclamation, which certainly is not prejudiced against this product, since it is its baby, says that primarily the project is for the production of hay and other livestock feed.

Mr. WATKINS. In some sections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In virtually every section.

Mr. WATKINS. In some of the high sections of Colorado and elsewhere, but not everywhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know the altitude of Salt Lake or of the beautiful section in the Wasatch Mountains; but on the profile map, the altitudes are between 5,000 and 7,000 feet above sea level; and, inevitably, that means a short-growing season.

Mr. WATKINS. In Salt Lake Valley we cannot use irrigated land for the growing of feed for livestock. We do not attempt to raise hay, grain, or oats on the land made available by these projects. Most of the water which will come from this dam will be for industrial use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Utah is shifting to industrial use. But I am talking about irrigation. I say that insofar as irrigated land is concerned, this project is about of the least possible value; and the proof is that the landowners are supposed to pay only about 15 percent of the cost of these projects.

Mr. WATKINS. The landowners are also the power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are not identical with the power users.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But not in the same proportion.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all in the same community, and they are cooperating to build these projects. That is the only way by which we could build these projects. All the people—both those on the farms and those in the cities—cooperate to build these projects. All of them are willing to pay the costs for power in the same area; all of them are willing to pay enough to retire all the expenditures for construction. The only part which would not be retired with interest would be the part allocated to irrigation. The principal would be repaid, but not the interest.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to check on these projects, I shall undertake to show exactly what happens, namely, that the benefits coming from these projects are sufficient—on the basis of comparing construction costs with the benefits—to justify them; and the benefits are sufficient to pay for all the costs, but not including interest, after they have been in operation for, let us say, 10 years.

That is the actual history of these projects. One of the worst of them, I think, is the Seedskadee, in Wyoming, where the irrigated land has been used for production of the type of crops the Senator from Illinois has been mentioning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will examine the hearings beginning on page 59 and continuing for approximately 25 pages, he will find that in virtually every one of the projects the analysis shows that the primary production is that of crops for the feeding of livestock. My point is that of course in the past, irrigation projects have not been used for this purpose because they are uneconomical when so used; but now it is proposed to use the water for this purpose—about the most uneconomical use one could imagine.

IRRIGATION FEATURES ARE NOT SELF-SUPPORTING

Furthermore, the irrigation features of the project do not stand on all fours; there will have to be more surplus for power; and I shall point out that it is possible and, to my mind, probable, that the surplus for power will not be sufficient to meet the irrigation costs, and that therefore not only will the interest on the irrigation costs have to be met by the taxpayers—and that will mean at least $1,153,000,000—but that also the principal of the irrigation cost itself will have to be met by the taxpayers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we shall show to the contrary. The history of these projects shows that they have been beneficial.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course if the rest of the country pours money into a certain area, that area can be made prosperous. But the purchasing power which is withdrawn from the other sections of the country——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the benefits which come from the deveopment make it possible for the other sections of the country to be more prosperous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if the money had stayed in the other sections of the country, it would have built up employment and purchasing power still further in those areas.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention—as we have done over the years—to the flood-control program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if my good friend, the Senator from Utah, will permit me to do so, I should like to develop my argument. I am trying to make an introduction to it. Then I shall speak of power, and then of irrigation; and then I shall take up the reserve

water supply; and then I shall say a few words about recreation. But I do not wish to be drawn immediately into a discussion of flood control.

Let me say that I have been down into the valley of the Colorado, as a great many others have been. I walked down there and I walked back and I got very sore walking there. I have camped in the deep gorge of the Grand Canyon. There are no great industrial settlements in that canyon, and there is no danger of flooding farms or industries there. The problem on the Colorado is entirely different from the problem on the Columbia or on other rivers on the banks of which there are great industries.

The Senator from Utah knows this region. It is where a great river flows through a series of deep canyons—beautiful canyons, awe-inspring canyons.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that for many years my home was on one of the large tributaries of the Colorado. I have been up and down it, more or less, and am acquainted with it from New Mexico to the headwaters, in Wyoming. I say, Mr. President, that there are no great industries on the river itself because the river is crooked and for most part flows through deep canyons; and we have to spend money to bring the water from the river to the farms where it is needed, and also to take the water over a mountain range to Los Angeles and that area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we could build hot houses in northern Maine and northern Minnesota, and in them could grow bananas and strawberries, and that would seem at first blush to be a fine thing. But the question is whether it would be an economical expenditure of funds. That is all I ask.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that the people out west are grand people. The outdoor life has a splendid effect on their character. But they cannot expect to do with about 14,000,000 acre-feet of water a year what they could do if they had 140,000,000 acre-feet of water a year.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course that is simple arithmetic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is too bad that these fine people live in a semiarid region, with a river running through deep canyons. We are sorry for them, but I do not think that creates for them a perpetual claim on the Public Treasury.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask about flood control. The Senator from Illinois lives in an area which itself could take care of its rivers if it wished to do so. Why should the rest of the Nation pay millions of dollars for flood control on those streams, in view of the fact that those expenditures are not of direct benefit to the people in the other States? It is just the opposite.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah is well aware of the fact that I have not been a very ardent advocate of the rivers and harbors bills and the so-called flood-control projects. I think probably more land has been reclaimed by the Army engineers than by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. That is not surprising. They spend a great deal more money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What happens in those cases is that the stream is deepened, the water is drained off from the swamplands, levees are constructed, and land which was swampland and virtually useless has bulldozers turned onto it, and, at slight cost, what was worthless land becomes extremely valuable land.

Mr. WATKINS. And the landowners do not pay any of the cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois once proposed that half the cost of the improvements should be paid by special assessments upon the land benefited.

Mr. WATKINS. Why did not the Senator go all the way?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to go all the way. Will the Senator from Utah agree to support any effort in that direction, and vote for it?

Mr. WATKINS. If a different rule is set up for reclamation, I certainly will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But two wrongs do not make a right. We are not dealing now with rivers and harbors, or with the Mississippi River or the Missouri River. We are dealing with the upper Colorado River, and I would appreciate it if the Senator from Utah would let me discuss it, instead of bringing in extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the case. "The flowers that bloom in the spring, tra-la," as Gilbert and Sullivan wrote, "have nothing to do with the case."

Mr. WATKINS. In 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 the appropriations for flood control were $2,587,112,298, none of which was returned to the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Army engineers' bill comes before the Senate, I am perfectly willing to discuss it, and I hope my good friend from Utah will "man the pumps" on that occasion. But for the moment, let us discuss the pending bill, namely, Senate bill 500, which deals with the upper Colorado project.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator from Illinois "man the pumps" last year when the flood-control annual authorization was before us?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I would give the new administration a year to see if it would not reform, and I was ill. But no, it is just as bad as ever.

Mr. WATKINS. Just as bad as previous administrations which have been inaugurating flood-control projects through the years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. There has been no improvement.

ACTUAL COSTS WILL EXCEED ESTIMATES

If I may return to the subject, what is the upper Colorado project? In the first place, it calls for an expenditure of $1,658,460,100, of which $915 million is allocated to irrigation, $656.6 million to power, and $72 million to municipal water. In all probability, the actual cost of these projects will be greatly in excess of the estimated cost. I hold in my hand a report from the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress, entitled "The Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army." It is House Committee Print No. 21. There is also in the report a section on the Bureau of Reclamation. On pages 17 and 18 it is pointed out that in the case of the Corps of Engineers, the actual cost of 182 projects exceeded the estimated cost by 124 percent from the time they were initially considered in Congress. That is to say, if the Corps of Engineers estimated the cost to be $1 million, the actual cost, on the average, would be $2,240,000.

The Bureau of Reclamation was not quite as bad as that, but the actual costs of the projects studied exceeded the estimated costs by 106 percent. That is to say, if the Bureau of Reclamation estimated the cost at $1 million, the actual cost would prove to be $2,060,000. In other words, the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation has been that it understates the final cost by at least one-half of the final cost. Interestingly enough, the report states that the present estimated cost of the Missouri River program is approximately 274 percent greater than the figure used at the time the project was approved by Congress. For example, if the estimate had been $100 million—of course, it was much more than that—it now appears that the cost will be $374 million.

Therefore, when a project comes before us with respect to which it is admitted that the costs will be $1,658,460,100, in view of the past record, I think we can be fairly certain that the actual costs will be greatly in excess of that amount.

I may say in this connection that only about 30 percent of the added cost of the projects studied by the Public Works Committee was due to changes in the price levels. Forty-three percent was due to structural changes. Having had some experience with public works on a local and State scale, I can say that that is a phrase which is used to cover a multitude of sins. A slight change in plans can be made, to justify a huge increase in cost.

Approximately 27 percent was for other reasons, such as structural engineering modifications, changed local needs, unforeseen conditions, inadequacy in planning, administrative decision, and so forth. So I think we can be certain that we are not only being let in for $1,658,460,100 of capital expenditures, but for what may run into $2, $2½, or $3 billion worth of capital construction costs.

In addition, there is the interest factor, which is quite important. On power projects capital costs are repaid, and interest costs are repaid. That, I think, is as it should be. I believe that interest is a true and proper charge. In the case of irrigation projects capital costs are repaid, but not interest. In the case of land redeemed from flooding, as the Senator from Utah said, neither the capital cost nor the interest charges are repaid. I think we need a real reform in connection with such expenditures. In the past the Senator from Illinois has advocated such a reform. I was almost alone in such advocacy, I may say. I hope that when the Senator from Illinois brings forward such a proposal again, he will have the support of the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Last year I thought probably the Senator would bring forward such a proposal, after he told me he was introducing a bill requiring payment of half the costs, but, as I gather from the RECORD, I do not think the Senator from Illinois raised the question, and, as I remember the RECORD, he did not even vote on the legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was not in good health during the concluding days of the session last year, and was in bed a great deal of the time, so he missed a number of the late rollcalls, although his attendance record in general has been very good, namely over 90 percent. I am sure the Senator from Utah does not wish to criticize the Senator from Illinois because at that period he was physically worn out. I believe the Senator from Utah has suffered physical incapacity upon occasion. He knows how difficult it is to be present always.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois was incapacitated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the attendance record of the Senator from Illinois was about 93 percent, as shown by the rollcalls.

Mr. WATKINS. I was not aware of the disability of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not blazon my illness publicly, nor make any appeal for sympathy because of it; but since the Senator from Utah implied that I ran away from a fight, I think perhaps he is entitled to know the truth.

Mr. WATKINS. I am only taking the RECORD as it stands. It indicated that the Senator did not vote.

ANNUAL FLOW OF COLORADO RELATIVELY SMALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe certain fundamental facts about the Colorado River project need to be noted. The first is that in spite of all the talk of the flow of water in the Colorado River, in relative terms, it is limited. I know that the lower valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, that the upper valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, and that by a subsequent treaty entered into with Mexico, that country is given a million and a half acre-feet. Therefore we have pledged 16½ million acre-feet of the Colorado. I know, however, that over a 40-year period the average flow in the Colorado at Lee Ferry is a little more than 15 million acre-feet. Am I in error?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator is in error. I believe the water allotted to Mexico must come from the water of the various States in case there is not a surplus of water in the river.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then over a period of 40 years there has been enough water to fulfill the claims of 15 million acre-feet. Of course, for the past 10 years, largely because of low rainfall, the average flow for a 10-year period has been 13.6 million acre-feet. Therefore, at the present time there is a deficiency in the flow of the Colorado River water below that which has been pledged.

However, that is not the precise point I wish to make. The flow of the Colorado is relatively small in comparison with other great rivers of the United States. Let us take, for example, the flow of the Columbia River. The flow of the Columbia River at The Dalles is 141 million acre-feet a year. That is more than 10 times the average flow of the Colorado River. The flow of the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, upon which some of us want to erect that great dam at Hells Canyon, is 32.2 million acre-feet a year, or more than twice the flow of the Colorado.

The basin figure for the flow of the Tennessee is 48 million acre-feet a year, or more than 3½ times the flow of the Colorado. The Niagara—and we do not hear many people talk about the Niagara—has a flow of 140 million acre-feet a year.

If we want to develop power, Mr. President, the place to develop it is on the Columbia, the Snake, or the Niagara, not on the Colorado.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to ask the Senator, if a citizen of Utah wanted to develop waterpower, would he be able to develop it on the Columbia, the Tennessee, or the Niagara?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber when I said that I understood and appreciated and did not attack the motives of the Senators from the four States concerned. Those Senators are not only Senators of the United States, but they are also, in a sense, ambassadors from their respective States. I can quite understand that they should wish to defend the interests of their States. I do not attack them for their advocacy of this bill. It is understandable. For them to do otherwise would be political suicide. It is not unethical for those Senators to do what they are doing. Quite to the contrary, I should say.

However, I feel it is time that we consider this issue from the standpoint of the national interest; namely, whether it is best for the welfare of the country as a whole, and whether this is the best place to put the people's money.

So far as power is concerned—and I shall come to irrigation later—the place to develop power now is on the Columbia, Snake, and Niagara Rivers, not on the Colorado River.

I have already pointed out that, so far as putting water on the land is concerned, if Professor Sears is correct—and I believe he is—more crops can be raised by putting water on already fertile land, such as in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, western Massachusetts, and the lower Mississippi Valley, than on semiarid, high altitude land.

Professor Sears wrote an article on the subject, which was published in the Annals of the American Academy. In it he gives the acreage costs. According to Professor Sears, the acreage costs in those areas are one-tenth or one-twentieth of what they are in the area under discussion, and his figures do not take into account interest.

Mr. President, let us take up the various purposes for which this money is to be spent. I take it there are three purposes, namely, power, irrigation, and water supply.

I do not believe anyone takes very seriously the "red herring" which the senior Senator from Utah has injected, that of flood control. There is not much of a flood control problem on the Colorado River.

EXCESSIVE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION PER KILOWATT OF CAPACITY

Let us start with power. Power developed on the Colorado is extremely high-cost power. It is upon this high-cost power that the advocates of the project depend for meeting 85 percent of the irrigation costs of the upper Colorado River Basin. I believe that is a correct statement, Mr. President.

Glen Canyon is to have a construction cost of $421 million, and $370 million allocated to power. It is to generate 800,000 kilowatts of power. There will be $463 of construction cost per kilowatt capacity.

Echo Park is to have spent on it $128 million allocated to power. It is to generate a capacity of 200,000 kilowatts. That will be generated at a cost of $640 per kilowatt.

The figures for the Central Utah project show a construction cost of $765 per kilowatt. At Cross Mountain, the construction cost per kilowatt will be $605. At Curecanti, the cost will be in excess of $1,030. At Flaming Gorge, the cost will be $722 per kilowatt capacity. The average cost will be $500 per kilowatt capacity.

What have been some of the construction costs at other major dams? The cost at Bonneville was $115 per kilowatt. At Fort Peck, it was $156 per kilowatt capacity. At Dennis Dam, on the Red River, it was $279. At Norfolk, Ark., $184. At Marrows, Ark., $290. At Bull Shoals, Ark., $314. Fort Gilson, Okla., $519. Tenkiller, Okla., $416. Whitney, Tex., $407. Hoover Dam, $112. Grand Coulee, $90. Shasta, Calif., $130. Parker Dam, on the lower Colorado, $134. Davis Dam, near Parker Dam, $278. The construction cost of the 17 multiple-purpose dams on the TVA was $166 per kilowatt capacity.

Therefore, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity is about 3 times as high as it is in the Tennessee Valley, over 4 times as high as it is at Bonneville, almost 5 times more than at Hoover, and almost 6 times what is is at Grand Coulee.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to spend $656 million on power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS PER KILOWATT-HOUR

What will this mean in terms of costs per kilowatt-hour?

I shall discuss only generating costs. Gen. U. S. Grant, the grandson of the great General and President of the United States, testified before the committee that the generating costs at Glen Canyon, which is the lowest of the dams just before Lee's Ferry, will be from 4.2 to 4.7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

At Echo Park, the costs will be from 5.9 to 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Upstream from Echo Park, the costs will be greater, and it is provided, as everyone who has studied the report knows, that the power is to be sold at 6 mills a kilowatt hour.

Let us see what these costs are in comparison with Columbia River costs and TVA costs.

The generating cost at Bonneville, in the year 1954, was a little over six-tenths of a mill. If we include all indirect charges, it would not exceed 1 mill.

The cost at Grand Coulee was less than half a mill a kilowatt hour, and if we included all indirect charges, such as interest and depreciation, the total cost per kilowatt-hour was less than a mill.

At Hells Canyon the best estimates range somewhere between 2.5 and 2.6 mills.

I may say that the great advantage of a high dam at Hells Canyon is not so much lower costs of generation at the spot but the fact that a great deal of water will be stored which can then be released to the dams downstreams, reducing the costs at those points still further.

In other words, the costs of the Columbia River are from one-sixth to one-fifth as much as the costs on the Upper Colorado River, where they are from 5 to 6 times the costs on the main stem of the Columbia, and over twice as much as at Hells Canyon.

What about TVA, Mr. President? I hold in my hand the Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the year 1954. There we find the production costs for the multiple-use dams and the single-use dams on page A25. These include not only operating costs, but interest and depreciation charges. What do we find?

The cost at Kentucky Dam was 0.487 of a mill, or less than half a mill.

Pickwick Dam, 0.900 of a mill.

Wilson Dam, 0.669, or approximately two-thirds of a mill.

Wheeler Dam, 0.795, or about four-fifths of a mill.

Guntersville, 0.723, or about seven-tenths of a mill.

Hales Bar, 1.227, or about one and one-fifth mills.

Chickamauga, 0.739, or approximately three-fourths of a mill.

Watts Bar. 0.726, or a little over seven-tenths of a mill.

Fort Loudoun, 1.009 mills.

Norris, the first dam of the Tennessee system, 0.894 of a mill.

Hiwassee, 0.617 of a mill.

Cherokee, 2.073 mills.

Fontana, 0.588 of a mill.

South Holston, 1.552.

Watauga, 3.048 mills.

Douglas, 1.505 mills.

Boone, 2.371 mills.

There is a grand average for the total of multiple-use dams of 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour contrasted with the 4.2 to 4.7 mills at Glen Canyon or the 6 mills at Echo Park, or the more than 6 mills on the power dams high up on the Colorado or on tributary streams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator give me some indication of how long he will speak.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to speak for approximately an hour, but I had so many interesting interruptions from the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Utah that I am just getting warmed up in my argument.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator be agreeable to the Senate's taking a recess at approximately 6 o'clock——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with the understanding that I may have the floor tomorrow after the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is what I intended to propose to the Senator if I could have concluded my sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought that was what the Senator intended, but I wanted to stake out my ground so I would not forget it later and so the Senator from Texas would not forget it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may yield the floor at this time with the understanding that tomorrow, following the morning hour, he will be recognized and will have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend substantially to object—I should like to finish the argument on power costs so that the record on that point may be complete.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so. I then wish to be recognized, Mr. President, and shall then yield to Members who wish to introduce bills or make brief statements.

Has the unanimous-consent request been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have indicated, the costs per kilowatt-hour in the case of the projects contemplated by the pending bill, are four times the average costs of the multiple dams on the Tennessee River, and the cost at Echo Park is six times the average cost on the Tennessee River. The cost of the farther-upstream dams is over six times the cost on the Tennessee River.

Mr. President, what about the single-use dams on the Tennessee River, where nothing is charged off for navigation or flood control?

The average cost of these 10 single-use dams is 1.575 mills per kilowatt-hour, or about one-third the cost at Glen Canyon, only a little over one-fourth of the cost at Echo Park, and probably less than one-fourth with reference to the other dams upstream.

Mr. President, if we wish to generate the power in this region, is the Colorado River the best means of generating it? There are large deposits of coal, shale, and oil in Colorado and Wyoming. These are all potential sources of fuel. I wish to point out that on the upper Colorado River power can be generated more cheaply from coal, in all probability, than it can by the use of waterpower.

We have more material on this subject from the reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have a number of steam plants, 9 steam plants plus 3 small plants. Their average cost of generation is 2.988 mills per kilowatt-hour, or just under 3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The waterpower cost is about one-third of this, and about one-half of the amount in connection with the single-use dams.

So hydroelectric power is economical in the valley of the Tennessee. Similarly, it is economical in the valley of the Columbia, because there are no alternative sources of power or heat in the Columbia, unless atomic energy should later be used.

But the point I wish to make is that the upper Colorado region has coal. We know that the region back of Pueblo, in Colorado, has coal. We know of the coal mines and coal resources of Wyoming.

If it costs 3 mills to generate power by steam, which comes ultimately from coal, in the valley of the Tennessee, will it cost much more than that to generate power from coal in the upper Colorado? Possibly it will cost a little more. There may be differences in the quality of coal and in the costs of transportation. But by locating the powerplants close to the mine mouths transportation costs could be reduced, and lower cost power could be obtained from coal in the upper Colorado area—I venture to predict—than could be obtained by using the waters of the Colorado River.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTING PUBLIC POWER AT WORST SITES

It is extraordinary that this administration, which has frowned upon additional dams on the Columbia, which has turned down a high dam at Hells Canyon, and which certainly has frowned upon power projects in the Niagara, should choose the upper Colorado as the place where it intends to launch a public power program. It has chosen the worst possible place for its public power program, while it is giving away the best locations such as on the Snake to private industry. If it were the intention of the administration to discredit public power, and I wish to make this statement carefully, it could not have proceeded in a more effective fashion than by giving to the private companies the rich pickings, while pushing the public projects away up in the mountains where there are inadequate water flows, inadequate power facilities, and high costs; where the experiment will be discredited and will be regarded thereafter as an indication of a failure of public power.

Mr. President, though I come from Illinois, where the rivers flow gently and there are not great possibilities for hydroelectric development, I have voted for public power projects on the Tennessee and on the Columbia. I was very proud to place my name on the Hells Canyon bill, because I think that will be a justifiable project, which will pay out, even though the direct benefit to my section of the country will not be great.

I say this to indicate that I try to take a national point of view on these issues. However, I object to the expenditure of

hundreds of millions of dollars on projects which, in all probability, cannot pay out; which involve a waste of public funds; and which will discredit the system of public power.

So I urge that we look to see whether we "are paying too much for the whistle."

There are many persons who favor irrigation and will support any irrigation project, lest it be thought that they are enemies of irrigation. There are many persons who favor public power and therefore feel compelled to vote for every public power project, no matter whether or not it is justifiable.

If I may use the analogy, I think we should look each of these projects in the mouth, to see whether they are justifiable. If they are justifiable, we should proceed with them. If they are not justifiable, we should not go ahead with them.

The projects on the Columbia and the Tennessee are sound and of great public benefit. The Hells Canyon project would be sound and of great public benefit. Additional dams for the generation of power on the Columbia and the Niagara would be of great benefit. But, for heaven's sake, let us not start the project on the upper Colorado. To do so would be a waste of money, because it would produce high-cost power which, in all probability, would be driven out by steam plants, and might result in not even the paying back of the capital cost, let alone the interest.

Yet it is upon the believed surplus earnings of the Glen Canyon project that all the rest of the program is based, because 85 percent of the capital cost of the irrigation projects is to be met by charges for power. The rate is to be 6 mills. That is a high rate. The only dam which can possibly produce power at less than 6 mills is Glen Canyon. It is possible that a dam at Glen Canyon might be justifiable. But certainly the project as a whole would be a wasteful, high cost project, which should not be carried out.

Mr. President, I shall now yield the floor. When I resume tomorrow, in addition to summarizing the ground I have covered, I shall discuss the question of irrigation costs, water reserves, and recreation.

FOREIGN TRADE—PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION VERSUS 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, all that the American workingmen and investors of this Nation have ever asked for is an even break in their own American markets.

FLEXIBLE DUTY TO EQUALIZE EFFECTIVE WAGES

They have demanded a flexible duty or tariff to equalize the effective wages and taxes here and in the chief competing country on each product.

DUTY REDUCED AS FOREIGN LIVING STANDARD RAISED

Such a duty would be reduced as the foreign wage standard of living increased, and when the cost of production approached our own then free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The principle of air and reasonable competition was the answer of Congress to the low-wage foreign competition for almost a century of time. It established the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

The principle established equal access to the American market for the American workingmen and investors.

DUTY TAKES PROFIT OUT OF SWEATSHOP LABOR

Such a flexible duty, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, simply takes the profit out of foreign sweatshop labor. It does not prevent imports, but brings them in on our wage standard of living basis.

AMENDMENTS TO SAVE INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

The desperate effort of investors' and workingmen's groups to save their own particular industry or product from annihilation by amending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is proof enough of the damage the act has done and that it offers for the future.

I introduce a bill proposing to amend the 1930 Tariff Act. The amendment provides the flexibility needed, after 22 years, to establish foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and to provide equal access to his own American markets for the American workingmen and investors.

MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

It is well known that the low-wage foreign nations manipulate the price of their currency in terms of the dollar and subsidize their own exports through grants, multiple rates of exchange and by other methods to defeat any regulation of imports into this country, and to prevent American imports into their own nation.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION COST

The amendment provides that the Tariff Commission may take cognizance of such manipulation in the adjustment of duties or tariffs, and may take into consideration the "landed duty paid price," and the "offered for sale price" in the determination of the cost of production of an imported article.

QUANTITATIVE LIMITS

The amendment also provides that the Commission may impose quantitative limits—quotas—on the importation of any article in its determination of the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

THE AMENDMENT TO 1930 TARIFF ACT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, my bill—amending the 1930 Tariff Act—regulating foreign trade on the principle of fair and reasonable competion, giving to the American workingmen and investors equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1723) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domes-

tic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Sudivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this Act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exists."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding the provisions of section 101, title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect as of June 12, 1955.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my bill amending the 1930 Tariff Act would return the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, through the adjustment of the duties or tariffs in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from the determination of foreign policy.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution places the regulation of the domestic economy and of foreign commerce in the legislative branch, and article II, section 2, places the determination of the foreign policy in the executive branch.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to adjust the duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce to the executive branch, thus amending the Constitution through a simple act of Congress.

TO DEVELOP THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 proposed to adjust imports or tariffs—"So as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country."

That principle held, in general, until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. This act provided, and still provides, that the

President may trade any sector of American industry for a concession in foreign policy.

ABANDONED PRINCIPLE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The 1934 act for the first time abandoned the principle of regulating foreign trade through the adjustment of duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition for all products produced in appreciable amounts here—and made the domestic jobs and investments pawns in the hazardous game of international politics.

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is a "dead-fall" over the head of American jobs and investments.

The President may at any time trade any sector of the economy—dependent upon a duty or tariff to equalize the standard-of-living wages—for a foreign political adjustment that he may judge to be important. Investors and workers are even required to show their importance in national defense as well as serious injury to be eligible for the "escape clause" which even then may or may not be invoked.

Mr. President, let us return to constitutional government—treating all industries alike—on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, TO BE EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior surgeon

Shih Lu Chang

To be surgeon

Wilton M. Fisher

To be senior assistant surgeon

Tamarath K. Yolles

To be assistant surgeon

Calvin L. Young

To be scientist director

Louis C. McCabe

To be senior assistant scientist

Thomas E. Anderson

To be assistant scientists

Virgil R. Carlson
Donald S. Blough
Donald S. Boomer
Philip Roos

II. PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant sanitarian

James V. Smith

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for Thy kind and beneficent providence which is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength for the duties and responsibilities of each new day.

Grant that nothing may ever disturb or destroy our faith in Thy greatness and righteousness as we seek to bring to fulfillment our aspirations and longings for world peace.

Inspire us with moral and spiritual stamina and courage in our dedication to the arduous task of conquering the forces of evil which would impede us in the struggle to release the hidden splendor of humanity.

May our own personal life be more firmly rooted in those lofty ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained and which alone will enable us to remain strong and steadfast in these days of crisis and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 14, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 35. An act to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, ROONEY, PRESTON, TABER, and CLEVENGER.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, May 2, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday, April 19, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TVA BONDS TO FINANCE POWER FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great interest that we have learned that the Tennessee Valley Authority, with the concurrence of the full Board, has now prepared a plan under which the need of the TVA for power facilities in its area could be met by the issuance of bonds to be paid off through receipts from the sale of power.

This plan was developed at the suggestion of the President and I assume will have the wholehearted support of the present administration.

It seems to me that this is a natural and logical development of the Authority idea. It will require no increase in the national debt. It will allow the people of the TVA area to pay for needed power facilities on an orderly basis. It will make the TVA far more flexible than it is today.

This plan, I believe, marks the coming of age of the TVA. While there may be many and perhaps valid reasons for restricting TVA from moving into new areas, it is an established and vital organism of the area it now serves. It should always be able to produce sufficient power to maintain the steady and normal economic growth of the area. This new self-financing plan will make this possible.

I hope and trust that the plan will have the unqualified approval and support of the Eisenhower administration and that its leading policymakers will not throw stumbling blocks in the way.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], acting chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret reading in yesterday's newspapers that President Eisenhower has ordered Secretary of State Dulles to create a new foreign giveaway agency.

Despite the fact that Congress ordered the liquidation of these so-called aid programs in 1952, the President is now calling for the establishment of a new agency to be known as the International Cooperation Administration and an appropriation of nearly $4 billion. And the President is quoted as saying he recognizes this foreign handout business as an "integral part of the fabric of our international relations."

I would remind Mr. Eisenhower that this profligate foreign spending is also an integral part of the fabric of our stupendous Federal debt and annual deficits.

And so, Mr. Speaker, a brandnew three-letter contraction—ICA—for another perfumed title—International Cooperation Administration—is to be added to our vocabularies; the moving vans will back up to the doors of the expiring and unlamented FOA, and the game of tossing out the taxpayers' money to foreign governments will open at a new stand.

PAY RAISE FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star I was more than disturbed to read in the Federal Spotlight by Joseph Young this statement:

> The outcome of the postal pay fight will determine whether Federal classified employees will get a pay raise this year.

Now, I have a great sympathy for the employees of our Post Office Department, but why, why in the name of ordinary common decency, should the classified Federal employees suffer because of postal reclassification and other issues which have delayed this legislation?

Joseph Young's article—and he is certainly informed on the situation—says if the postal pay bill is vetoed and Congress does not override the veto, the pay raise chances for classified employees would be very dim.

Is that fair? Of course it is not. Last year the classified employee failed to get a needed adjustment and lost out completely on account of the postal wrangle. Surely we cannot let that happen again.

THE RIGHT-WING REPUBLICANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], admonished the Republicans that they should not talk about a party of traitors, or the party of treason, or something of that kind.

Any statement, if such a statement was made, that the Democratic Party was the party of treason was, of course, an absurdity.

The Speaker quite properly, when this session of the House convened on January 5, gave us all to understand that we should be tolerant, rather than critical, when expressing an opinion of the opposition. Expressing that thought, he said:

> * * * I want to say as I said on the stump last fall, that we as Democrats do not indulge in personalities; we are not an accusing kind of people; we do not have to be that way.
>
> * * * It matters not what the heat may be, here or out there, we are not going to indict people en masse. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 10.)

Yet yesterday in the Washington Post and Times Herald I read this statement:

> The 73-year-old Speaker, first Democrat ever to be so honored—

Of course, that honor was richly deserved, and we all join in honoring him—

> lashed out bitterly at the Republican right wing. He termed it a disloyal opposition.

If I know what that term means, I am a right-wing Republican, and I would like to know what the Speaker meant when he implied I was disloyal because I am classified as a right-wing Republican. Disloyal to whom? To the administration? To my country?

I wish the Speaker would read what he said some time ago about being careful about our language, about not indicting people "en masse."

I know of many former and present Members of this House, Democrats from the South, some from the Speaker's own State, as well as many Republicans who have political views with which I am in full accord. Many of them might be accurately described as right-wing Republicans. They certainly are far to the right of many of the views announced and followed by left-wing Democrats and left-wing Republicans.

Since when has it become permissible to characterize a political opponent, for example one who does not accept the views of the gentleman from Texas, whatever they may be, as above criticism or opposition, as being disloyal?

If we concede, as we do, that the Speaker is a man of exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity and patriotism, it does not necessarily follow that all or many who have a thought which is not in accord with his thinking are disloyal to either the party or to the country.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had to say about the proposed new International Cooperation Administration and the consideration of an appropriation of some $4 billion, I presume, for the fiscal year 1956. I was also interested in listening to my good friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] discuss the postal pay increase. I understand that there is approximately $140 million differential in the final determination of this postal pay increase legislation. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee and this House have spent hours and days and weeks discussing and debating this postal pay increase and the approximate differential of $140 million. This pay increase has been long overdue. It has been screened carefully; in fact, meticulously. It has been reviewed from every angle, given hours of discussion and consideration and will again be debated sometime during this week.

Now the point I am trying to make is this—when this proposed International Cooperation Administration legislation comes up for your consideration for $4 billion—and let me preface my remarks by stating that a million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars—that this international cooperation legislation is a 4,000 million dollar project that you will be just as technical and will screen this proposal just as meticulously and carefully as you have the postal pay increase for our workers. Let us give a little attention to some of the people in our own back yards and along with postal pay increase legislation that legislation for increases Federal workers be given immediate consideration.

We talk continuously about a balanced budget, effecting economies and reduction in taxes, and we are faced with a deficit in fiscal year 1955 estimated at $4½ billion. We have a debt of approximately 280 or more billion dollars. If we paid off this debt at the rate of $3 billion a year, it would take almost 75 to 100 years to pay it off. So, in my opinion, it is about time that we cut down on our foreign spending, or screen it as carefully as we screen every appropriation that affects the welfare and well-being of our people to see if we cannot effect some economies by reducing this foreign spending. These countries have benefited now for the past number of years and their economic and industrial rehabilitation is about complete. We

should, therefore, reduce these appropriations, balance the budget, and give some relief to the long-suffering American taxpayers who have generously and willingly carried these burdens for a number of years. At least I hope this proposed International Cooperation Administration appropiation will be given the same meticulous study and careful screening as we have given to the postal pay increase legislation.

TROUBLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Budapest this morning significantly points up the trouble the Communists are having behind the Iron Curtain. It tells of the ousting of Premier Imre Nagy from his job and from Communist Party posts.

This latest Red purge follows on the heels of the Malenkov ouster in the Soviet itself and other international difficulties the Reds are having in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Communist China, and other areas. Whenever the Communists have to shake up their leadership, it means that the day can come when the Red empire will come apart at the seams.

The American people who have been told of the invincibility of the Communists should particularly note the fact that the Reds are having trouble in their own backyard. These difficulties prove that the Communists are nowhere near as strong as they would like us to believe and that the chances of a Soviet-launched third world war at the present time is remote.

It is also important that we recognize the need to keep alive the hopes of the millions of people behind the curtain who would like to be free and whose resistance to the Reds is helping to cause the present difficulties outlined in the Associated Press dispatch which I include in these remarks.

[From the Washington Post of April 18, 1955]

PREMIER NAGY OUSTED IN HUNGARIAN SHAKEUP

BUDAPEST (Monday), April 18.—Hungary's Communist Party announced today it has fired Premier Imre Nagy from his top government job and stripped him of all his party posts.

The purging of the 58-year-old government chief had been expected since the party's central committee 5 weeks ago accused him of right wing deviationism. He had been the spokesman in Hungary for the New Look emphasis on consumer goods production, which the Communist countries abandoned with the demotion of Georgi Malenkov from the Soviet premiership.

An official announcement said that in addition to Nagy, Mihaly Farkas had been fired from the party's five-man secretariat and expelled from the political committee (Politburo).

The action against Nagy and Farkas was taken at a session of the central committee April 14, today's announcement said. It added:

"Imre Nagy represented ideas which were controversial to the interest of this people's democracy. His activities caused grave damage to the party, to the people's democracy and to our social building.

"For that the central leadership expelled him from the party's political committee, its central leadership and recalled him from every function which he had, and from the confidence of the party."

"Farkas," the announcement said, "supported Imre Nagy's ideas for a long time and his expulsion from the central leadership, and the political committee also was decided."

Farkas' disgrace was not as complete as Nagy's however. The announcement said that although he was being removed from the party secretariat, he would be commissioned with other party work.

Hungary's Parliament was expected to elect a new Premier at a session convening later today.

BAREFACED POLITICAL FRAUD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, returned to Washington over the weekend for the dinner honoring the Speaker of this House and correctly branded the policy of the present administration in regard to the 7th Fleet and Formosa as a "barefaced political fraud."

Members of the House may recall that after the first state of the Union message of President Eisenhower, in February 1953, I took the floor to say much the same thing.

When war broke out in Korea in June 1950, President Truman ordered the 7th Fleet to impose a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. He ordered the 7th Fleet to act as a fire warden, to prevent the conflict in Korea from spreading elsewhere.

This was not, as President Eisenhower later shabbily suggested, to "defend" mainland China and its Communist overlords from Chiang Kai-shek. The Chiang forces on Formosa did not have the strength to threaten the mainland seriously.

As Mr. Truman said on Saturday night, at the dinner honoring the Speaker, the warships of the American 7th Fleet were there "to protect Chiang."

The leader of the present administration did not do well when he pretended, in his 1953 state of the Union message, that Mr. Truman's orders to the fleet must be changed. He did not do well when he intimated, unmistakably, that there had been something evil about these orders which protected Formosa with American ships and men.

President Eisenhower used his first definitive message to the Congress for narrow political purposes. He did what a President should never do—he acted in a partisan manner in the field of foreign policy. He distorted the facts and the motives of Mr. Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet.

The administration, having played with peril, now is talking about negotiating a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. It issues background assurances to the people that we have not given Chiang Kai-shek a blank check to involve us in war.

We have a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits, however, from 1950 to February 1953—a practical, enforceable cease-fire controlled by our Navy. If Harry S. Truman's policy had been continued, we would not now be forced to negotiate something we should never have given up.

I made the statement in 1953 that the Eisenhower administration had blundered in trying to deceive the people, about Mr. Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet. Mr. Truman himself hit the nail on the head when he described this partisan deceit as a serious mistake which the administration is trying to correct by putting the fleet back.

I hope that the Eisenhower administration has learned a lesson from its blunder regarding Formosa and the 7th Fleet. The lesson is simple: It is a capital error for a new administration, dizzy with political success after 20 years in the wilderness, to go around changing orders merely to change orders. The trouble is that the whole country may have to pay the piper for a barefaced political fraud.

PROTECTION OF RECREATIONAL AREAS FROM MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, April 14, a Nike broke loose from the launching rack at Fort Meade and exploded directly over the new Baltimore-Washington Parkway, about 3 miles from the point of escape. The military authorities issued a statement:

All normal devices to prevent a launching were in effect.

An investigation followed, the report of which stated in part that the escape of the Nike was due to malfunctioning of a device for holding it securely in its moorings.

Fortunately, the accident did not have the serious consequences which might have attended it. On the other hand, it may have been providential: a warning to all of us and a call to duty. It is the province of the Congress not only to provide for national defense but to be assured that installations of new, and in many respects experimental, devices are safeguarded. A congressional investigation may be the answer.

Perhaps I should explain, in pointing out these facts to my colleagues, that I have a very personal interest in Nike installations. For some time the Army has been proceeding with such an installation at Promontory Point, a recreational area in beautiful Jackson Park in the Second District, Illinois, the district I have the honor to represent. This is a beauty

spot in a busy, crowded, industrial area, and the people of Chicago have invested many millions of our taxpayers' dollars in building and maintaining it. My constituents have been concerned over the possibility that the Army, concerned only with military expediency, should destroy that which the people, through the years, have invested in an effort to beautify their city and provide recreational facilities for themselves and their children. In their concern, the people have enlisted my services, as their representative, the only elective officer whose services they have a right to command. As their spokesman, I have presented the case to the Army whose reply has been:

> The established location, on which construction has been started * * * is considered to occasion the least adverse effect on the Jackson Park area.

Must the residents of Jackson Park accept as a "least adverse effect" the possibility that one of these still experimental devices may break loose and effect the destruction destined only for an enemy? May I recommend to the Army that it reexamine the location of these installations in light of the warning from Fort Meade? I have but recently directed attention to the plan for the construction of mid-Atlantic and mid-Pacific bases for defense against atomic attack. My thought, at the time, had been to request consideration by the Department of Defense for such bases as a means for conserving the beauty and recreational facilities of Jackson Park. The accident at Fort Meade has served to alert me not only to the need for placing such bases in Lake Michigan as a means of preserving these facilities but also as a precaution against an accident similar to that of last Thursday resulting in wholesale murder in Jackson Park and South Lake Shore Drive.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding organization of the Daughters of the American Revolution is meeting in Washington this week.

These very fine and outstanding ladies are the direct descendants of our forebears, those people who established this great democracy of ours. I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to this outstanding organization of fine women of America and to commend them for the outstanding work they have done in keeping alive the principles of democracy upon which this country of ours was established.

PRISONERS HELD BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have properly heard a great deal about the 15 American airmen of which 11 have been unjustly charged and imprisoned, all of whom are held by the Chinese Communists in violation of international law and of procedures of decency. But there are other Americans held in custody, some civilians. There are also an unaccountable number of Americans who served in Korea, and undoubtedly some of them are still living and being held as prisoners.

Our country is interested in all citizens who are held prisoners by the Chinese Communist regime, whether they are civilians, or one who wore the uniform.

The action of those now in control of China mainland in their violation of both international law and the rules of decency cannot be expressed in words.

Even the cloth of the clergy and the garments of the nun are not respected by the Chinese Communists.

While there may be spiritual leaders of other religions held as prisoners, and my remarks apply to them as well as those I mentioned, I do know there are at least three Catholic priests that are still prisoners at the present time.

There is now going on at Bandung, Indonesia, an important meeting of 29 Asian and African nations. I sincerely hope that far-seeing statesmanship will be represented there by the great majority of the participating nations. I also sincerely hope that the conference will be a great success and that the great majority of participating nations, through their representatives, will take action that will bring about a better economic outlook for their people, and make a decided contribution toward world peace.

I think I can convey to the nations represented at this conference that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of America is just as strong against colonialism as it is among their own people.

I hope that in conection with American prisoners, as well as the nationals of other countries held prisoners by the Chinese Communists, that the other nations participating in the conference will take steps either by open action or by negotiation, to bring about the immediate or early release of all prisoners.

It would seem to me that the representatives of Communist China would be in a position where they could not very well refuse such a request. The conference has a real opportunity for service in this matter.

THE CONSENT CALENDER

The SPEAKER. Today is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3560) to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to advise us whether or not this bill involves an appropriation of over a million dollars.

Mr. CELLER. It does not involve any appropriation whatsoever. All it does is to forgive certain claims that would be established against certain general and warrant officers.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all payments of station per diem allowances heretofore made to commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force permanently stationed at Fort Richardson, Alaska, or Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, after January 31, 1949, and before October 13, 1950, for service at Fort Richardson, Alaska, or Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, are validated to the extent that those station per diem allowances were paid, because the military department concerned determined that no Government mess was available to those commissioned officers and warrant officers under regulations promulgated pursuant to section 12 of the act of June 16, 1942 (ch. 413, 56 Stat. 364), as amended by section 203 of the act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 756, 60 Stat. 859). Any commissioned officer or warrant officer who has made a repayment to the United States of the amount so paid to him as station per diem allowances is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the military department concerned for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3561) to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, 55 Stat. 880), as amended, is further amended by—

(1) amending the first section by deleting the words "arising in such foreign country" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "arising outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions";

(2) amending the first section by substituting the figure "$15,000" for the figure "$5,000" wherever it appears therein;

(3) amending section 7 by deleting the words "In time of war" and by capitalizing the next following word "any"; and

(4) adding immediately after section 7 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of Defense may designate any claims commission or commissions, appointed under section 1, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payment with respect to claims, as described in section 1 hereof, for damages caused by a civilian employee of the Department of Defense other than a civilian employee of the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. Claims under this section shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the same manner provided in this act for the settlement of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps claims. All payments in settlement of claims under this section shall be made out of appropriations available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the payment of claims."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by clauses (1) and (4) of section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to claims accruing after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER AMENDING MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "not in excess of $2,500."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of this amendatory act is effective as of July 2, 1952, and, notwithstanding section 1 (e) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, any claim heretofore settled in the amount of $2,500 solely by reason of the maximum limitation established by the act of July 3, 1952 (ch. 548, 66 Stat. 321), may, upon the written request of the claimant made within 1 year from the date of enactment of section 1 of this amendatory act, be reconsidered and settled in accordance with the amendment contained in that section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5089) to extend the time for filing applications by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill according to information contained in the report, indicates that it is not in accord with the program of the President. Furthermore, I am certain and positive that the total cost will be substantially more than the $1 million limitation which is one of the guiding lines for the objectors on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OUTPATIENT DENTAL TREATMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5100) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill affect the right of the Spanish War veterans to outpatient dental treatment?

Mr. LONG. It does take care of the Spanish-American War veterans. That is one thing this bill does that we did not do last year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I know the great interest of my friend from Louisiana in the Spanish War veterans. I want to be sure they are protected.

Mr. LONG. May I say to the gentleman that this was voted out of the committee unanimously. I am chairman of the subcommittee that reported it to the full committee and am the author of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman is satisfied this will protect the right of the Spanish American War veteran to outpatient dental treatment?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this apparently is a very laudable bill and one for which all Members would vote, but if I am not mistaken it is also one that will call for about $17,564,000.

Mr. LONG. I think the gentleman must have this bill confused with another.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was misinformed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Veterans' Regulation No. 7 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"II. Outpatient dental services and treatment, and related dental appliances, shall be furnished under this regulation only for any dental condition or disability—

"(1) which is service connected and compensable in degree;

"(2) which is service connected and is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge or release from active service, but only if application for treatment is made within 2 years after discharge or release, or by December 31, 1954, whichever last occurs;

"(3) which is a service-connected dental condition or disability due to combat wounds or other service trauma or of a former prisoner of war;

"(4) which is associated with and is aggravating disability from some other disease or injury which was incurred in or aggravated by active service; or

"(5) of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection): *Provided*, That benefits afforded under clause (2) shall be on a onetime completion basis, unless the services rendered on a onetime basis are found unacceptable within the limitations of good professional standards, in which event such additional services may be afforded as are required to complete professionally acceptable treatment."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish dental services to veteran trainees under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), or under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended.

SEC. 2. The provisos in the paragraph "Outpatient care" under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "2 years" and insert "1 year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLACE FARM LOANS ON PARITY WITH CITY LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5106) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 694a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding section 502 of this title, but subject to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, any loan made to a veteran under this title may be guaranteed if the proceeds thereof will be used for any of the following purposes:

"(1) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

"(2) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

"(3) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

If there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan for the construction of a farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "specified in subsection (a)" the following: "or subsection (c)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5177) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans'

Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of approximately 110 acres of land which constitute a portion of land conveyed to the United States by Richland County. The 110 acres now comprise a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C., lying west of the main hospital buildings. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator or his designate and, in the event that a survey is required in order to make such determination, Richland County shall bear the expense thereof.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act may contain such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OATHS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4221) to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgements by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4004, title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§4004. Oaths and acknowledgements

"The wardens and superintendents, and associate wardens and superintendents, of Federal penal or correction institutions, and such other officers or employees of such institutions as may be designated by the Attorney General, may administer oaths to and take acknowledgements of officers, employees, and inmates of such institutions, but shall not demand or accept any fee or compensation therefor."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the second "and."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "superintendents", insert "chief clerks, record clerks, and parole officers."

Page 1, strike out lines 9 and 10 to and including the word "Attorney General."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JULY 31, 1947 (61 STAT. 681)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 230) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sections are hereby added to the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by the act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 571; 43 U. S. C. 1946 edition, supp. IV, secs. 1185–1188):

"SEC. 5. Deposits of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders when situated on public lands of the United States shall not be subject to acquisition under any law other than this act, except a law providing for the disposition of such materials on specified areas or authorizing their disposition for the purposes and in a manner provided in the Federal reclamation law (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That this shall not prevent the location and patenting under the United States mining laws of lands containing such materials, if such locations are based upon the discovery in said lands of other minerals, specifically named in the notice of location, which are subject to location under the mining laws. Rights acquired under such mineral location and any subsequent patent issued pursuant thereto, however, shall be subject to and shall not interfere with the rights of any purchaser to purchase and remove materials which have been sold under the terms of this act where such contracts of sale were made pursuant to notice of sale first published prior to the date of the recordation of said mineral location.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this act insofar as it relates to the materials described in section 1 shall apply to lands in national forests and such materials when situated on national forest lands may be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the terms, conditions, and limitations of this act, as hereby amended. All moneys received from the disposal of materials by the Secretary of Agriculture under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as other receipts from the land from which the materials are disposed of. The word "Secretary," as used in said act, shall refer to the Secretary of Agriculture where lands within the national forests are involved."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, following the word "sand," insert the word "common."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike the words "pumice, pumicite," and insert in lieu thereof the words "common varieties of pumice and pumicite."

Page 2, line 16, add the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this act, common varieties of pumice and pumicite shall not include so-called block pumice, which occurs in nature in pieces of 2 inches or more in one dimension."

Page 2, line 19, following the word "forests", insert the words "and other lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike the words "national-forest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

Page 3, line 1, following the word "in" strike the words "said act," and insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 5 and 6 of this act."

Page 3, following line 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Nothing in sections 5 and 6 shall affect the validity or patentability of any valid mining claim located before the date of their enactment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. There is no department report on this bill and the report of the committee does not conform to the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF BUY-BACK PROVISION OF PUBLIC LAW 480

The Clerk called the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder to domestic exporters, surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In supplying such commodities to exporters under this subsection the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price restrictions in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3092) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to

claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1835) to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any law, prior determination, statute of limitations, or prior acceptance of judgment of partial allowance, the United States of America hereby accepts as a binding obligation and agrees to pay to the treasurer of Sedgwick County, Kans., from such funds as shall hereafter be appropriated for that purpose, the sum of $259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of the base taxes assessed and levied for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947, against three tracts of land in sections 11 and 14, of township 28 south, range 1 east of the sixth principal meridian in Sedgwick County, Kans., constituting the aircraft factory and grounds owned of record in such years by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and leased to the Boeing Airplane Co. and deeded on or about February 25, 1948, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States, subject to unpaid taxes for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947.

Payment of said sum shall be contingent upon and subsequent to the enactment by the Legislature of the State of Kansas of a law authorizing and directing the treasurer of Sedgwick County, Kans., to accept said amount as full payment of the unpaid balance of the base tax assessed and levied for the years aforesaid and as a release and forgiveness of all interest, penalties, liens, and charges on or in connection with said taxes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2194) for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Military Department of the State of Florida is hereby held free from all claims of any nature for damage to, or monetary liability for, certain properties under license to the State of Florida from the Department of the Army, United States engineers, through its district engineer office in Jacksonville, Fla.; said property at one time being used by the State of Florida to house equipment issued to Battery A, 712th AAA Gun Battalion, Key West, Fla., and consisting of two and fifty-nine one-hundredths acres of land and certain improvements thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF AUGUST 18, 1941, AS AMENDED, PERTAINING TO EMERGECY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1945, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT BONNEVILLE, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3879) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if there is some Member present familiar with this particular item who could answer questions? If not, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4052) to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone familiar with this bill a question. Has not the Comptroller General always opposed the continuance of this power in the past?

Mr. CELLER. As I understand it, that is not the case. These emergency powers were reactivated during the Korean emergency and have been reactivated yearly ever since that time.

Mr. PATMAN. It is really providing for renegotiation of contracts, although it does not state that it is. It is really to renegotiate contracts?

Mr. CELLER. For clarification, I might read just briefly from the report:

Under the act, executive departments and agencies are empowered to amend or modify Government contracts without additional consideration, where, for example——

Mr. PATMAN. Without additional consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Well, for the reasons which will be stated—

for example, an actual or threatened loss on a defense contract will impair the productive capacity of a contractor whose continued existence is needed for the national defense.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, does not the gentleman construe that language to mean a renegotiation of existing contracts to the extent it could cost the Government more?

Mr. CELLER. That may be, but the departments involved would have to justify their actions.

Mr. PATMAN. How much could it go to? Could it go to $1 million, $10 million, or $100 million?

Mr. CELLER. There is no limitation. You must remember this, that under the act these powers can cease by concurrent resolution of both Houses or by Executive order issued by the President. In emergencies we have always granted these powers. Are we not in an emergency, considering the state of the world today, especially in the Far East? We have always extended these powers from year to year, and there is real urgency for the extension now.

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously it is a renegotiation of contracts, and since it is likely to involve a large amount and certainly over $1 million, it occurs to me that it would come within the unwritten rule that bills like this one should not be on this calendar; that a special rule for its consideration from the Rules Committee should be sought.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I differ with the gentleman on that. This bill itself provides for no specific appropriation whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. I know it does not, but it provides for a change in existing contracts. Where there is a threatened loss of any kind, they can change it and give the contractor more money. They can make lots of changes. They can renegotiate it. They can exempt the requirement of a performance bond. They can relieve the contractor of the performance bond although he has given one in the contract. They can say under this act here that "We will not require it in the future, and we will also exempt you from liquidated damages" that the statute says shall be paid and the contract says shall be paid. If we pass this bill, we are giving them the power to exempt them from liquidated damages on performance bonds, contracts, or anything else.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope my friend will not object. This is emergency legislation. And, of course, everybody recognizes that an emergency exists at the present time. The very fact that the present administration asks for this extension, despite statements to the contrary that no emergency exists, is confirmation of the fact that a grave emergency not only confronts our country but the world, and there is no question but what that is so. Under those circumstances, the extension of this law is of vital importance to the best interests of

our country, and I hope my friend from Texas will not object to the consideration and the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. On the basis of the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it would probably be justified in view of the fact that we are in a national emergency, and being in a national emergency, the President of the United States has asked for the passage of this bill, and I assume we should let it pass without objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), as amended, is further amended by striking out "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 7 OF THE ACT APPROVED SEPTEMBER 22, 1922

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4426) to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922 (Public Law 362, 67th Cong.), as amended by section 203 of the act approved May 17, 1950 (Public Law 516, 81st Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 414; 54 Stat. 175; 31 U. S. C. 679), or any other law prohibiting the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences, shall not be construed to apply to or forbid the installation and use of such telephones as may be necessary for the prosecution of Government business in connection with the construction and operation of locks and dams for navigation, flood control, and related water uses, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. Not more than $30,000 shall be expended for such telephone services in any 1 fiscal year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACADIAN MIGRATION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas this year marks the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia and their journey to find refuge and haven in Louisiana and other areas; and

Whereas this exodus, immortalized in Longfellow's poem Evangeline, parallels the landing of the Pilgrims in America and their quest for freedom, independence, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas the original Acadian settlers vigorously participated in the early development of Louisiana, and they and their descendants have contributed in full measure to the history, culture, character, and way of life of the people of that great State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States joins the people of Louisiana in commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, and pays tribute to their spirit of courage, perseverance, and loyalty that has inspired the Nation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated shall be transmitted to the Acadian Bicentennial Celebration Association.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes all the eligible bills on the calendar.

FORT POINT CHANNEL AND SOUTH BAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1816) to declare the tidewaters in the waterway—in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay—above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I understand this is a request from the State officials of Massachusetts and the bill comes out of committee with no opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. It was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was requested by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through the commissioner of public works, Mr. Volpe, and also by Mayor Hynes, of Boston. This area is in my district, and the bill is designed to declare a certain area of water up there nonnavigable for the purpose of filling it in.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the tidewaters in the waterway in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay in the city of Boston, Mass., lying above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. NELSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with immeasurable sadness that I must inform the House of the death on Monday last of a former Representative from the district I now represent, the Honorable John E. Nelson. It would be ungrateful to divine providence should I say I did this with regret, for he died full of rich, golden, fruitful years and the hand of God took him mercifully from what would have been unendurable suffering and pain to what he knew to be the resurrection and the life. His fine mind clear to the end, he joyfully welcomed death.

John Nelson's full and extraordinary life cannot be written only in words of praise. All that is necessary is a simple recital of the facts. And a recital of those facts begins with the simple annals of the poor.

John Nelson came of very poor parents living in a small town in Maine. Everything he got he had to earn himself, his college education at Colby, his law degree at the State university, and the slow fees of early law practice. He was laborer, hack driver, and schoolteacher. As he worked his way through college, he somehow found time to become an outstanding debater and to make the national honorary society, Phi Beta Kappa.

And so this man who had the courage, the faith and the dogged perseverance to overcome so many handicaps and fight his way upward went on to become the finest trial lawyer in Maine and then a Member of this House.

It has been truly said that the basis of American life is the family and family life. John Nelson was rich in that fundamental. Married to a wonderful woman who was a loving, devoted, and tireless mother, he was all that a father could be to his family of 8 children—5 girls and 3 boys.

Years ago in a talk to a service club John Nelson expressed his own philosophy when he said:

I should, of course, tell you to teach your boy to love the truth, to hate a lie, to value friendship, and to know that friendship means not receiving but giving. He should be taught the nobility of labor, that genius is but the capacity for hard work. He should be shown that there is something more important than making a living, and that is making a life.

This to him was not book philosophy. It came from the sweat, the heartaches, and the anxiety of the life he had had to live. He constantly endeavored to pass it on to his children.

To all of his children John Nelson was friend, companion, counselor. To each of them he was an ever-present help in time of need. To each, a sense of constant security in a rather frightening world. He gave freely and unstintingly of his love and understanding and wisdom.

To all of them he gladly proffered all the advantages he had so hardly earned, a college education and to the three boys years of schooling for graduate degrees.

Nor was this done without a very great deal of effort and sacrifice on his part.

John Nelson was the grandest of fathers.

There are some few among you who served with John Nelson in this House. You will remember how impeccably he dressed with an ever-present buttonhole bouquet. You will remember far better than I the caliber of his service in this House.

For 1 year I had the priceless privilege of serving as John Nelson's secretary. I am sure you will forgive me if out of deep personal interest I recount a few of the guideposts he left for me. These things I shall always remember.

From his early experiences John Nelson carried through life a deep and abiding faith in the dignity and integrity of the workingman. Because of this he was a champion of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to outlaw yellow-dog contracts, a bill that became the Magna Carta of organized labor. Because of this he was the individual member of the Fish Committee To Investigate Communism created way back in 1931 who concluded:

> We found that for years, unknown to us here, radicals had been active in the United States seeking to undermine our institutions, and that it was organized labor that had been, and then was, patriotically and uncompromisingly bearing the great burden of the Communist attack in this country; that they constituted the great bulwark of defense against the potential dangers of communism in America.

And with prophetic vision far beyond his time he went on to forcefully point out:

> The solution of this problem lies in the wisdom of our legislators and in the unselfishness of our industrialists. In proportion as we work out economic justice here in America and so order our social system that labor shall share in the economic life of the Nation as fully and fairly as it now shares in its social and political life, in just that proportion will radicalism fail of its own inanition and the threat of communism cease to disturb us.

These words I shall always remember.

In 1932 the shadow of impending defeat fell darkly across the life of John Nelson. Repeal of the prohibitory law was an overriding national issue. During all of his congressional career he had voted for prohibition and unfailingly practiced his political convictions in his personal life. A major depression had laid its heavy, cruel hand on the lives of all Americans. Because John Nelson was the strong man in Maine, redistricting had given him the strongest voting precincts of the opposite party.

And yet at that critical time, when veterans were camped on Washington grounds, John Nelson had the conviction, the courage to speak against what he considered a premature cash payment of the soldiers' bonus. Everyone was suffering, so help, he thought, should go to all, not just one class. In that speech he said:

> Better to die politically conscious of our own respect and intellectual honesty, than to preserve a mean political existence through hiding behind others or refusing to listen to the voice of duty whose call a man must answer or lose his soul.

At the conclusion of that speech the House accorded him a standing ovation. That I shall always remember.

The dark shadow became a reality. Defeat came to John Nelson. He took that defeat regretfully, because of the many fine friends he would now seldom see. He took it sadly because of the service he could no longer render. But there was in him no bitterness or rancor. Rather, there was courage, good heart, and a fine spirit of good sportsmanship. In defeat as in victory, John Nelson showed the measure of a real man.

The fine man who defeated him and served ably in this House, Hon. Carl Moran, had these sincere and heartfelt words of tribute to say:

> Just before commencing my duties in 1933 as a Member of Congress, I was invited by my predecessor, whom I had defeated for reelection, to share his office and learn the ropes. His cordiality and kindness to me were unlimited; his introduction of me to his friends in Congress resulted in some lifetime friendships. He left for my use his thousands of files, which aided me immeasurably in completing such cases as veterans' claims in process at the time he left office.
>
> The man who did all that for his political opponent was John E. Nelson.
>
> At this time of his passing, I want the people of Maine to know how he placed their interest far above partisan considerations; he was a real public servant.
>
> John E. Nelson was a statesman, and far ahead of his time in his thinking. I join with his relatives and many friends in mourning his passing.

John Nelson carried throughout the rest of his life the richness and depth of the friendships he had made in this House, friendships welded the closer in the sharing of a common, a great responsibility. His was ever the lasting confidence and assurance that can only come to one who has been the chosen representative of a sovereign people and who has, on their behalf, made critical and momentous decisions without compromise, without evasion, and without fear.

So has ended a life that in its living immeasurably enriched the lives of others, his family, his countless friends, his colleagues. He died full of years and rich, purposeful memories, memories of love and friendship and service, and an unflagging pursuit of truth and beauty. He died as he wished to die. His was a passing beautifully expressed in the poetry he loved so well and often quoted:

> So be my passing!
> My task accomplished and the long day done,
> My wages taken, and in my heart
> Some late lark singing,
> Let me be gathered to the quiet west,
> The sundown splendid and serene,
> Death.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was a happy privilege that I had of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with John Nelson. He was a man who, from the very beginning, challenged my respect because he was honest; and he was able—he was a good American. He loved this country and he loved his fellow man. He had a wonderful sense of humor and splendid judgment. You always knew where John Nelson stood—that was at the place where he thought he could be of the most service to mankind and to his day and generation. It is a rich heritage and a splendid memory that I have of my association with him, and the friendship I had, as he had mine, of this doughty, this splendid, able American statesman.

Mr. NELSON. I am very grateful, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I learned last Monday of the death of John Nelson of Maine. It was my privilege to enjoy his friendship for many years. During this long period I came to know him well and to appreciate his splendid qualities. He was one of the ablest men who ever served in the House of Representatives. His outstanding ability, his eloquent oratory and his rugged courage won him the admiration of all. John Nelson served as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our beloved Speaker was at that time, I believe, chairman. He served at a time when there were many great difficult problems before the country. His fine talents and his knowledge were helpful in bringing about a proper solution of these problems. John Nelson, with his farsighted vision, was one of the first to discern the clouds of communism slowly appearing. He warned the people of America against communism over 20 years ago, and as a member of a subcommittee presented a report which so stated publicly. John Nelson was a great lawyer. Everyone who knew him knew him not only as a great trial lawyer but a man of profound legal ability. Death has removed a fine man; a man who was kindly and helpful to all; a man who had but one purpose, and that was to serve the country he loved to the best of his ability. The world is better for his having lived in it. I know he was very proud of the fact that his son was elected to his old seat in Congress. He wrote me to this effect and I am glad to see the splendid services of the son equalling that of his illustrious father. CHARLIE NELSON is carrying on with the splendid Nelson tradition.

So I pay tribute to a friend who has passed away. He has left his impress upon his day. To the living members of his family my deepest sympathy is extended in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, some 33 years ago, when I was a relatively new Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John Edward Nelson was elected to the 67th Congress from the State of Maine. On last Monday I received the regrettable announcement of his death.

John Edward Nelson was an able and respected lawyer when elected to the

Congress of the United States and his 10 years of service in this body was in full keeping with his sterling character and ability. He served both the Nation and his district with honor and distinction.

Few who have the honor to serve here enjoy the additional honor and great personal satisfaction of having a son elected to the Congress. But such was his deserved reward. John Edward Nelson's son, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, is our colleague today, serving his fourth term.

Few men have the privilege of serving their country in the Congress, with honor and distinction, living to see a son elected to the Congress, and completing 50 years of active and distinguished service in the honored profession of law. But our colleague of yesterday was one of those few so highly privileged.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who remember him so well, deeply regret his passing, even in the twilight of a rich and happy life. I know my colleagues join me in this sincere expression of sympathy to our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, and the other members of the family who mourn this inevitable but unhappy occasion.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can add to the eloquent tributes paid to the memory of the late John E. Nelson, but I can assure the House that the mourning in the House for the memory of our distinguished former Member is shared by all the people of the State of Maine. His death was recognized by everyone as a great loss to our whole community.

John Nelson sat in this body for 10 years, from 1923 to 1933, representing the old Third Congressional District in Maine, in the days when Maine had four Representatives instead of three as at present. He might have continued to sit here for many years thereafter had it not been for the redistricting of the State. As it was, he went down in the great political overturn as a result of the depression which brought a full Democrat delegation to the House of Representatives from the State of Maine, something that had never happened before.

Mention has already been made of Mr. Nelson's outstanding service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and of his remarkable service on the special committee headed by Hamilton Fish to consider the operation of communism in America. Bear in mind that this was in the twenties when things were very different from what they are now. John Nelson, as others have already said, showed his statesmanship and moderation in his understanding of this problem, later to become so impressive.

When John Nelson left Congress to return to the practice of law in Augusta, he served as the liquidator of the largest bank in his county and his part of the State which did not reopen after the bank closings in 1933.

As has already been said, John Nelson was a very eminent and able lawyer, who had not his superior certainly in the State of Maine. He made a name for himself at the bar before he came to Congress, but his ambition brought him here for perhaps the most fruitful years of his life.

John Nelson struggled with great valor and fortitude against the ailment which finally proved fatal to him.

It is gratifying to me that there are so many Members here who remember John Nelson, and everyone who remembers him remembers him with the utmost affection and the utmost admiration. I have known John Nelson myself ever since the year 1922. I followed with great interest the primary contest which led to his nomination and ultimately to his election. I had the highest esteem and warmest personal friendship for John Nelson. He was always extremely kind to me. My sympathy goes to his widow and to all his surviving children; and, above all, I wish to express my sympathy to my colleague, his son, who now succeeds him and whose service here was so justly a source of pride and satisfaction to his father.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to assure the distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. NELSON] that each and every one of us appreciates and understands the trying position he is now in of announcing to the House of Representatives the recent death of his beloved father. But I am sure the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON] will derive great consolation in the knowledge that his father is smiling upon us, knowing that his son is rendering such outstanding service in the House, making announcement of his death, and also the very dignified and deep eulogy that he so properly paid to his dear father.

I arrived in this body in the latter part of 1928, and I served with your distinguished father for a period of over 3 years. During that time your late father and I became very close personal friends. That middle aisle means nothing to us in our personal contacts and in the development of our friendships, and that middle aisle meant nothing to your late father and to myself, in the strong feeling of friendship on my part and the strong feeling of respect which I am sure he held for the character of service we both rendered.

Your father's contribution during his period of service in this body leaves to you and your loved ones a heritage that you can always appreciate, to which you can always look with pride, and to those who are left behind constitute an inspiration for continued service of like nature.

So I extend to my dear friend and colleague my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of his father, and I extend through you to your loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlemuan from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have paid tribute to a distinguished man, the late John Nelson, of Maine. Mr. Nelson was a Member when I came here.

I no doubt like nearly every other new Member made my appraisals of those I met and sometimes I made them quickly, and with good reason, of course. I very distinctly remember the impression I got of Mr. Nelson. He impressed me as being a man not only of keen ability but of great honor and integrity. I enjoyed talking with him because he was a courteous, sensible man upon whom I could depend. He was truly a capable, courteous and honorable man.

I want you, his son, to know that your father was a great statesman and a great American. I extend to you and the other members of your father's family my profound respect and sympathy.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deepest regret of the death of our old friend and colleague, John Nelson. For a decade he was one of the notable Members of the House of Representatives, from the State of Maine.

I felt particularly close to him because he and I came here together in the 68th Congress. I believe he filled out an unexpired term; however, he was elected to his first full term in the 68th Congress. There remains, in addition, in the House at this time only the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who were Members of the class of the 68th Congress.

Congressman Nelson was particularly fortunate in his associations. He came from a historic district. Although the district has been changed in many respects in subsequent revisions, he represented an area, for example, in which a great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, was born and reared. The district also included counties which had been represented by Asher Hinds, author of the Precedents of the House, the greatest parliamentarian who ever served in the American Congress.

And he and Asher were alumni of the same alma mater, Colby College, an institution which has graduated an exceptional number of eminent and useful men.

Mr. Nelson served also as a member of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the chairmanship of the present Speaker of the House, Speaker RAYBURN, and collaborated with the great Speaker in the drafting of some of the most important legislation of the day. He was the senior member of one of those rare instances in the history of the House of father-and-son teams which occur in the Congress from time to time and which had their counterpart in the Elder and Younger Pitt, of the British Parliament.

He was the worthy sire of a worthy son and that son carries on the tradition which he established, and adds honor and luster to the name, in distinguished service in the House today.

Perhaps the most notable feature of his service here was his membership on the committee chairmanned by the gentleman from New York, Hamilton Fish, which in a historic investigation extending over a period of more than 8 months, pioneered the investigation of communism in congressional jurisprudence. After detailed and exhaustive inquiry they reported to the House a measure which, had it been carried to its ultimate and complete conclusion, would have disposed once and for all of a subject which has been one of our troublesome problems down to this day. That report recommended the outlawing of communism. It recommended the deportation of all known and convicted Communists. It recommended the establishment of an embargo against entrance into this country of any known and recognized Communist and in that respect anticipated disastrous developments. He was one of the pioneers who led the way and subsequent events have demonstrated the correctness of his views.

His death removes a man who has served in the House and in other capacities in his home State with great distinction; a man who exemplified the finest attributes of citizenship; a man whose farseeing statesmanship made him the ideal leader in public affairs under our American form of government.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with the noble father of the distinguished gentleman from Maine. I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable John Nelson, of Maine, a man who possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man of outstanding and recognized ability and devotion to public service. He served with great credit and distinction as a Member of this House for a decade and enjoyed the greatest degree of confidence, respect, and esteem and genuine affection of all of his colleagues. His distinguished son, who is now rendering such outstanding service as a Member of this body, may look to his great record as an inspiration to continue the great service that he is rendering here. Other Members of this body may likewise emulate the great record of public service as was rendered in such an outstanding manner by the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Mr. John Nelson, in whose honor we utter these brief words of tribute today. So I join with other colleagues in conveying to my good friend, his noble son, our distinguished colleague, and other members of the family, my sincere and heartfelt sympathy in the hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, deeply regret that a close friend, and an outstanding Member of this House in bygone days, has been called to his reward.

When I first came to Congress, John Nelson was a Member from the State of Maine, serving here, as has been pointed out, for a period of more than 10 years.

I shall never forget him.

He was a man of the highest character, with a fine mind, and a fine personality. He had outstanding ability both as a lawyer and as a legislator. He was a splendid speaker. He had great courage and a broad knowledge of human nature.

I can see him now standing here in the well of this House, formally dressed for the occasion, addressing the Members on the floor with his great influence on both sides of the aisle.

I have always considered him one of the ablest Members of the Congress during my entire period of service here.

I am saddened by his death and I join in heartfelt sympathy to his widow; to his son, our beloved colleague, who today represents the Second District of Maine with such ability; to the other members of his large family; and to all those close to him.

John Nelson was a fine man. He was a fine lawyer. He was a fine public servant.

He made a great contribution here in the Congress to his district, to his State, and to the Nation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, as the father of a dear friend, Hon. John Edward Nelson has my thought today, and his passing has the attention of this House, of which he was an able and beloved Member from March 27, 1923, to March 3, 1933.

Mr. Nelson was born in China, Maine, July 12, 1874, studied at the Friends' School in Providence, R. I., and was graduated from Colby College and University of Maine College of Law. One who took his parenthood and citizenship seriously, his interest in education led to his principalship of one of Maine's larger high schools for 4 years, while the rest of his active years, except for those here, he gave to the practice of his profession. When Hon. John A. Peters resigned as Representative of Maine's Third District, John E. Nelson was elected to serve his unexpired term, and was thereafter reelected for five more consecutive terms. Redistricting placed Augusta, our State's capital and the home of the Nelson's in Maine's Second District, which his son, our beloved CHARLIE NELSON, now represents ably and well.

As a lawyer, the late Mr. Nelson's quickness of mind was reflected in the reputation he earned as a cross examiner, which led to his association with outstanding members of Maine's bar—two of them ex-governors of our State.

While I was not privileged to know him personally, I recognize that John Nelson's contribution to his State and country was outstanding. Father of a fine family whose intelligence their inheritance guaranteed, he gave each the educational privileges which would insure their usefulness to society, and his interest in their careers remained keen to the end of his days.

Because their professional and public service followed similar lines, our colleague, the gentleman from Maine, CHARLIE NELSON, was perhaps particularly close to his father, and his concern for the latter's health, failing for some years, was apparent to those of us who knew of the frequent trips made to the bedside of one whose passing was anticipated with sorrow.

We mourn one who was formerly a Member of this House. I voice the sympathy of the people of the Third District of Maine for the family of the deceased. Whatever there is of solace in the love and regard of one's friends we offer to CHARLES NELSON here today.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I have learned of the death of our former distinguished colleague, John E. Nelson of Maine. I had the pleasure of serving in the House with John Nelson for 6 years. I came to have a high regard for him. To me he seemed to typify the traditional virtues of that part of the country from which he came. To his family and especially to his son, Charles, our able colleague, I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate the very difficult task that has confronted the gentleman from Maine this afternoon in bringing this information to our attention. I know his father would be most proud of the manner in which he has performed this task. I did not know the gentleman's father, although I did meet him on one brief trip to Maine. From what has been said here by those who served with him in the Congress and from knowing his son, there can be no question but that he was a great American. I certainly want to assure the gentleman who is addressing us of my sincere sympathy in the loss that he and the rest of his family have sustained.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late John E. Nelson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the death of the Honorable John E. Nelson, of Augusta, Maine, a former Member of this House and who held the seat now so ably filled by his distinguished son and our colleague, CHARLES P. NELSON.

When I first came to the Congress it was my great privilege to be taken into

the confidence and to enjoy the friendship of John E. Nelson. I feel today, as the news of his passing is announced to the House, a very great sadness and a very distinct personal loss. John Nelson was a brilliant man, generous, warm, and considerate. He was kind enough to take me under his wing and into his confidence as a freshman Member when I needed the counsel and the help of those men more experienced than I. I looked upon him in many ways as a father. I went to him for advice. I got it freely, generously, and expertly.

John Nelson was a giant of a man physically and he had a heart to match his size. It has been a number of years, it is true, since he has been here in these Halls; but over those years I have never forgotten the warmth and the kindliness of his friendship; and the privilege that was mine in having been associated with him during his service in the House.

I am saddened and grieved to hear that he has passed from among us. There are no adequate words to fully express the integrity that was his, the brilliance of his mind, nor the generosity of his great heart. I hope that I have learned well and have practiced the lessons which he gave me because John Nelson made a great contribution to this House, and the country is richer and better for his having been a Member of this House. So as the pupil to the master, I should like in my humble way to pay my respectful tribute of thanks for the privilege of having known him and to say with the deepest of feeling that his passing has created a void which for many will not soon be filled.

To his son, following so ably in his footsteps, and to his family, may I express the deep sympathy which I feel for them in the loss of so distinguished a citizen and so generous a father.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding the passing of our late colleague, John E. Nelson, of Maine, I hereby express my sympathy to his distinguished son, our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, and to the members of his family.

John E. Nelson was a Member of this House when I first came to Congress to serve. During the time I was here he was considered by his colleagues to be an extremely able Member of Congress. Always he had time to help a colleague in his work and to offer helpful suggestions in regard to difficult matters. John Nelson was a great friend in the truest sense of friendship.

A deeply patriotic American, John Nelson was that type of individual whose word was his bond, who was completely dependable, who was always honest and fair above all with his colleagues and fellow men.

During the decade he served in this Congress, from 1922 to 1932, John Nelson etched his name in the distinguished history of this country. His decisions on the great issues of that period disclose his wisdom and his loyalty and his feeling toward the welfare of Americans throughout the country.

In the early days of my service here in this House John Nelson gave me many helpful suggestions and helped me greatly in my committee assignments and in the parliamentary work of the Congress. His unselfish interest in helping others will stand forever to his credit. He was one of the very distinguished gentlemen who have helped down through the years to make this House the greatest representative parliament of the people in any country in the world.

John Nelson was my colleague and was my friend. With his thousands of friends in his home State of Maine and the thousands all over America, I join in mourning his passing. His gentle qualities, his great ability, and his fine character will be forever enshrined in the history of the House of Representatives here in Washington and in the history of his country.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress as a youngster in 1929, one of the men I first became acquainted with was Hon. John E. Nelson, of Maine. He had served with high distinction and great honor in this body for 10 years, and few men impressed me as much as he did.

John Nelson possessed not only Yankee shrewdness, Southern chivalry, Midwestern warmth, and hard sense, but also the daring and adventuresome spirit of the Far West, and he also displayed a comprehension and understanding of our national problems which few men then or now possess. Always he fought for the interests of his own constituents, but he never overlooked or neglected the needs of others.

Modest in victory, strong in defeat, John Nelson worked hard in committee and was an able debater on the floor of this House. He was devoted to his family, helpful to his friends, and loyal to his country. He followed in and upheld the fine tradition of the statesmen whom Maine has given to this Nation. I shall not attempt to enumerate these great men of Maine, but John Nelson will follow along with Thomas Brackett Reed, James G. Blaine, Hannibal Hamlin, Frank Fellows, and others.

We are indeed fortunate to have serving with us today John Nelson's fine son, CHARLES NELSON, a respected and valuable member of our Committee on Armed Services. Like his illustrious father, Charlie knows the necessity for hard work, and is following faithfully in the footsteps of his distinguished father.

To our understanding and cordial colleague, CHARLES NELSON, of Maine, to all the family and many friends of John Nelson, we extend our sincere sympathy and can truthfully say that earth's loss is Heaven's gain.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

OUR FOOD SURPLUSES ARE BEING PUT TO WORK MEETING HUNGER AND NEED

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include some tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has just issued a report which clearly shows the extent to which surplus food distribution activities have been stepped up during the past year in order to gain maximum benefits from our food abundance. In this way greatly increased quantities of food have been made available to help feed needy persons both at home and abroad and also to improve the nutrition of our children through the school-lunch program.

Through the intensified efforts of the Department of Agriculture, our agricultural surpluses are being put to work in filling hungry stomachs and in improving the diets of our growing children. New legislation enacted by the last Congress played an important part in making possible the increased utilization—particularly in the relief of hunger and need—of foods acquired by the Department under price-support and surplus-removal programs.

It is apparent from the record that the aim of the Department of Agriculture is to make the best and most effective use of the agricultural surpluses acquired under these programs. While making strenuous and effective efforts to expand market outlets, the Department is also mindful of the needs of those who are in want and has been pressing hard for increased use of the surpluses, both at home and abroad. This is evident from the greatly expanded volume and the broadened distribution of surplus foods among eligible recipients.

The striking fact shown by the Department of Agriculture's report is that this distribution of surplus foods to meet hunger and want has been so stepped up since the middle of last year that it now is at the rate of a billion pounds a year. During the first 9 months of the present fiscal year the Department distributed for use of eligible recipients more surplus food than in all 12 months of the last fiscal year. The details of this expanded distribution of surplus foods are given in the Department's report as follows:

USDA SURPLUS FOOD DISTRIBUTION CONTINUES TO INCREASE

Distribution of surplus foods to users in this country and abroad continued to increase sharply during the first quarter of 1955, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today. Principally responsible for the continued gains were the new legislation enacted by the last Congress, and the intensified efforts to make best use of these foods acquired under price support and surplus removal operations.

Food donations by the Department during January through March of 1955 totaled 407 million pounds, raising the total for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year to 849 million pounds, compared to total donations of 602 million pounds during the 12 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

Donations to schools, institutions, and needy persons in this country totaled 392 million pounds in the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, against 418 million pounds during the full 12 months of the previous fiscal year. Donations to United States welfare agencies for distribution

abroad during the same 9 months totaled 457 million pounds—almost 2½ times the 184 million pounds distributed during the entire 12 months of the fiscal year ending last June.

Recipients of the food distributed in this country included 11 million schoolchildren, and over 1 million needy persons in charitable institutions. In addition, there are currently about 3,388,000 needy persons in family units certified by State agencies to receive commodities. The number of people actually receiving commodities at any one time is always somewhat below the number certified. During these 9 months greatest increases were made in donations to these needy persons, who received about one-third of the total distribution.

Foods distributed domestically included butter, cheese, dry milk, cottonseed oil, shortening, beef and gravy, dry beans, rice, and several other commodities in smaller amounts. All of these commodities continue to be available for donation except beef and gravy, the limited available supplies of which have now been completely distributed.

Commodity distribution abroad increased to 258 million pounds during the first 3 months of 1955, more than one-quarter larger than distribution during the last 6 months of 1954. The sharp gains came as the new Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act took full effect, following the period of its administrative organization, after its passage last summer by Congress.

The number of countries receiving commodities increased from 41 to 53 during this 3-month period, while the number of participating United States welfare agencies increased to 17. Commodities distributed abroad included butter, cheese, dry milk, shortening, and cottonseed oil.

The following tables show quantities and costs of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use:

Quantities of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1954, and estimated, July 1–Mar. 31, fiscal year 1955

[Millions of pounds]

Commodity	Domestic						Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons					
	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955
Butter	42.6	42.3	24.2	20.8	4.9	23.9	60.2	68.6	131.9	155.6
Butter oil								[1] 49.6		[1] 49.6
Cheese	26.7	27.3	13.4	11.7	5.0	26.5	31.0	75.0	76.1	140.5
Dry milk	13.5	19.8	11.0	10.1	5.0	28.4	92.7	219.2	122.2	277.5
Beef and gravy	114.7	25.2	52.7	7.2	10.4	5.6			177.8	38.0
Dry beans	2.0	25.7	5.5	9.3	2.4	25.1			9.9	60.1
Rice		3.3		4.2		6.1				13.6
Shortening [2]	15.2	24.5	10.0	13.1	3.7	20.1		44.4	28.9	102.1
Other [3]	31.3	9.5	17.5	1.9	6.1	.1			54.9	11.5
Total	246.0	177.6	134.3	78.3	37.5	135.8	183.9	456.8	601.7	848.5

[1] Butter equivalent of 39.7 million pounds of butter oil.
[2] Includes cottonseed oil.
[3] Includes several commodities in limited amounts.

Cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1954, and estimated, July 1–Mar. 31, fiscal year 1955

[In millions]

Commodity	Domestic						Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons					
	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955
Butter	$29.5	$25.7	$16.8	$12.6	$3.4	$14.5	$41.7	$41.6	$91.4	$94.4
Butter oil								34.1		34.1
Cheese	10.4	10.8	5.2	4.6	2.0	10.5	12.1	29.8	29.7	55.7
Dry milk	2.8	3.7	2.2	1.9	1.0	5.3	19.0	41.0	25.0	51.9
Beef and gravy	45.0	10.1	20.6	2.9	4.2	2.3			69.8	15.3
Dry beans	.2	2.7	.7	1.0	.3	2.6			1.2	6.3
Rice		.8		1.0		1.4				3.2
Shortening [1]	3.8	6.1	2.5	3.3	.9	5.0		10.8	7.2	25.2
Other [2]	2.5	1.1	.9	.2	.1	[3]			3.5	1.3
Total	94.2	61.0	48.9	27.5	11.9	41.6	72.8	157.3	227.8	287.4

[1] Includes cottonseed oil.
[2] Includes several commodities in limited amounts.
[3] Less than $50,000.

Mr. Speaker, another significant development this year in expanding the distribution and use of agricultural surpluses was the inauguration of the special school milk program by the Department of Agriculture. Milk, that otherwise might be processed into manufactured products and sold to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program, is being consumed in fluid form by children at school.

This new program was authorized by a provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provided for the use of $50 million of CCC funds annually to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children during this and the next school year. Despite the fact that the 1954 act did not become law until August 28—when most schools were about to open for the fall term—the program has made considerable progress in its first 7 months of operation.

By mid-February, 45,000 schools throughout the country had been approved for participation in this new school milk program. Some of these schools had never before made milk available during school hours. Others, which previously had served milk at the lunch hour, started to make milk available at the midmorning or afternoon recess periods.

Because the program did not begin to operate on a nationwide basis until January, the full $50 million will not be used this year in increasing milk consumption among schoolchildren. With improvements growing out of this year's experience, and with a full school year's operation in 1956, the special school milk program is certain to make a continuing and increased contribution to the expansion of domestic markets for fluid milk.

Another program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture to open outlets for surplus foods is the channeling of additional quantities of healthful dairy products to the men in the Armed Forces.

Legislation passed last summer—section 202, title II, Agricultural Act of 1954—enabled the Department to speed up the regular movement of surplus dairy products, particularly butter, into military rations. As a result of this legislation, dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation are made available to the Department of Defense throughout this year and next without charge except for packaging costs.

Recognizing the need for additional consumption of fluid milk, the Departments of Defense and Agriculture have also worked out an arrangement under which the Department of Agriculture underwrites increased milk rations for our military forces, thereby reducing the quantity of surplus milk that would be purchased by the CCC as butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk under price-support operations. Under this program fluid-milk consumption by our military forces is now being increased at a rate of around 12 million pounds a month.

Earlier steps taken by the Department of Agriculture sought to move additional butter into Army messhalls by stepping up total military consumption of this protective food. Last summer's legislation accelerated this movement, and through March 1955 approximately 60 million pounds of butter acquired in support operations had been channeled into this highly useful and desirable outlet. Over 2 million pounds of surplus cheese and nearly 6 million pounds of nonfat dry milk also have been moved into these military channels.

Arrangements have also been worked out to supply the Veterans' Administration surplus dairy foods for rations in veterans' installations. This program got under way considerably later than the movement into military channels, and about 1.5 million pounds of butter have been moved so far.

Altogether, it is apparent that the Department of Agriculture is following a wise course in making its surplus food stocks available for use by eligible recipients and also encouraging increased consumption and improved nutrition. It must be recognized, of course, that this Department is not a relief or welfare agency. This is as it should be. However, it is clear from the record of what is being accomplished that the Department of Agriculture believes that as long as there is a Government-owned accumulation of surplus foods, full advantage should be taken of the opportunity to avoid waste when market conditions are such as not to permit resale of these holdings. This is being done by making those surplus foods that lend themselves to donation programs available for use by the needy and other eligible recipients who otherwise would not get enough of them. By following such a course, the Department of Agriculture has made great progress since last year in moving sharply increased quantities of many surplus foods into consumption among people who need and could use this food most advantageously.

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, back in February I had a most interesting exchange of letters with Gen. Douglas MacArthur concerning his suggestion to abolish war. That exchange of correspondence is reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1955, on page 1655. For those of you who may have overlooked it, I urge you to read these two brief letters. General MacArthur's letter, in particular, is thought-provoking and challenging.

Briefly, it concerns the following:

On January 26 General MacArthur delivered a major address in Los Angeles in which he urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war in concert with the other powers of the world. Several days later, on February 3, I wrote to General MacArthur and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes." In his reply, February 7, General MacArthur expressed the viewpoint that it would require more than a congressional declaration "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war." He suggested that, instead of a resolution, I should present the matter on the floor of the House and from this rostrum "build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept."

That was a challenging thought. I, subsequently, stated that I would be happy to take up the general's suggestion and bring this matter to the attention of this House, at which time I would discuss it in greater detail and present my views on the subject. I am now prepared to do so. I shall welcome any comments or discussion at the conclusion of my remarks, for only in the free exchange of opinions can we hope to make a worthwhile contribution toward the solution of so difficult a problem. The late great Justice Louis D. Brandeis once observed:

> If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold.

Mr. Speaker, at the very outset let me emphasize that I am extremely interested in the idea of developing a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace. In conducting this discussion I shall follow your sage words uttered last Saturday evening at the national Democratic dinner in your honor.

I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men.

In this atomic age, it seems to me that this approach is one of our avenues leading toward hope for the future and the survival of human civilization. I feel we should explore this avenue to the fullest degree in our search for peace.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that the most important concern of the nations of the world today is to remove the fear and the threat of war, which is hanging over the heads of mankind like the sword of Damocles. Soviet Russia and Communist China are the two nations most responsible for engendering this fear. Red China, so prominent in the news these days, is a threat to world peace not merely by virtue of her alliance with Russia. Swelled by her successes in the Far East and possessing tremendous resources of manpower and a strategic location, she constitutes a menace in her own right. The threat to the free world lies in the possibility that Communist China may overrun Formosa, that Japan may fall, and that all of Southeast Asia may eventually be lost.

In years past, the tradition of friendship between the United States and China was an accepted fact in our international relations. Our open door policy helped to protect China from partitioning by the great powers of that period. In World War II, China was allied with us in bringing Japan to a crushing defeat. We had reason to believe and to look forward to the existence of a strong China, friendly to the democratic nations of the West, as a central stabilizing force in Asia. Unfortunately it did not work out as we had anticipated, but we have not lost hope for the future.

In 1950, the Chinese Communist armies swept over China and the Nationalist Government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, withdrew to the island of Formosa. Almost overnight the vast land area of China, with its 400 or 500 million people, was lost to the free world. The victory of communism in China overturned the historic basis of our relationship with that country. This change affected not only United States policy in Asia, but it set in motion a reappraisal of the global policy of the rest of the free world.

The transformation of China from a free nation to a police-state of the well-known Communist brand is by now a matter of history. In Red China today brainwashing has replaced freedom of thought. In this overpopulated and underdeveloped country, where for centuries the people have eked out a marginal existence, the effect of the social and economic changes introduced by the Communists spreads very thinly. Soviet Russia appears to be the model which the Chinese Communists seek to emulate, and Russian experience and advice are being fully utilized.

What are the issues in our relations with Communist China? What, specifically, makes that country a threat to world peace?

In its new-born flush of power, the Communist regime of Mao Tse-Tung bitterly resented the fact that the United States continued to recognize the Chiang Kai-shek government in Formosa, and also the refusal of the United Nations to admit Red China. Frustrated and embittered, the Communists embarked upon a "Hate America" campaign which resounded throughout China and beyond its borders into many parts of Asia.

Then, in November 1950, China entered the Korean conflict and waged war against the United Nations until the armistice was reached in 1953. Red China also aided the Communist Viet Minh forces in Indochina and succeeded in gaining control of North Vietnam during the armistice concluded last year with the French. Now, the same Chinese Communist regime is threatening Formosa and the adjacent islands. All of these events are regarded with some alarm, because they are interpreted by many in this country as an indication that the Chinese Communists are not

satisfied merely with control of their own country, but that they are seeking to extend their realm and to expand their power.

Naturally, this situation calls for a high order of statesmanship—and that applies to both sides. For us, it means that our methods of thinking must assume newer and more dynamic proportions. We need not be frightened by bold and provocative ideas, because the times require dynamic leadership and bold action if we desire to survive as a free Nation. It also means that we must continue unrelentingly our search for world peace, we must explore every possible angle, every hopeful idea, as long as the opportunity for peace still exists.

I have given much thought to this whole problem in recent weeks. I have thought about it day and night. I have no panaceas to offer, no solutions to suggest which would bring about miracles. All I know is that we have been losing ground, slowly but steadily, in the ideological conflict of freedom versus slavery. We have been fighting a cold war with Communist Russia for nearly a decade, and we have not fared too well in that struggle. Ten years ago, in 1945, Russia's armies were almost destroyed and her land laid waste. Today, Russia and Communist China control some 800 million people and together they have enslaved about one-third of the world.

Russia's planned propaganda has been responsible in large measure for the Communist gains. We are depicted as the capitalist aggressor, while Russia is shown as the champion of the oppressed peoples of the world. This form of propaganda has been used with great success by the Communists and has enabled them to exert a terrific impact on those areas of the world which suffer from illiteracy, a low standard of living, periodic famines, and no mass media of public information, such as a free press and radio, whereby the people can learn the true story as presented by the free world.

I believe the time has come for us to meet this type of propaganda head-on. Let us remember that people who are oppressed and hungry will listen to anything, to any idea, that holds out a ray of hope for them. We have no quarrel with the Russian people as people, or with the Chinese people, or with any other people. We want to live in peace with all of them. In the past, our quarrel has been with the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, the Japanese warlords. In recent years, it is with the Stalins, the Khrushchevs, the Maos, and others who set themselves up as dictators by exploiting their people and instigating them to hate their fellow men.

What the United States badly needs in Asia now is not guns and atomic weapons, but ideas to counteract the Communist propaganda in sweep and dynamic appeal. Our major weakness to date has been that we have been thinking primarily in terms of guns and atomic weapons, but we have failed to develop bold ideas to combat communism whose false ideology still appeals to untold millions in Asia. Ideas are no less important than weapons in this world-wide struggle. Unquestionably, we can produce more guns than any other country or combination of countries, but guns alone are not enough. Ideological warfare has become a very important part of the struggle for men's minds and hearts, but when it comes to producing dynamic ideas to combat communism we are suffering from mass hardening of our intellectual arteries.

It is getting very late in Asia, but still not too late. We must face up to this whole complex problem and seek to regain the ideological initiative and the confidence of the peoples of Asia, including the undecided fence-sitters and those now under the yoke of Communist imperialism. In determining this approach, in setting our Asian policy to convince the hundreds of millions of people of this vast continent that their hopes for freedom and a better way of life can be achieved through cooperation with the free nations of the world, we must better understand these people and their aspirations, we must know their political problems, we must have a better conception of their efforts to attain economic and social equality. One thing is certain: We cannot offer 20th century democracy based on an industrial society to underdeveloped countries and illiterate peoples who in many instances are still pulling their own plows. They will not understand us.

There are many millions of people throughout Asia, and also in Europe, who are undecided as to whether they should cast their lot and life with the Communists, or follow our leadership and our way of life. Their decisions may change the whole pattern of the world. In order to win the cold war and to avert a world catastrophe, we must reach the people flanked against us and those who are undecided, with sincerity and understanding, with charity and love—not with acts of hatred which will further inflame them to support their leaders against us. We must appeal to their minds and their hearts, to their feelings and emotions. We must give them the necessary assurances that we desire peace and that we want them to live in peace, too.

I have stated earlier that I have no solutions to offer. But I do want to propose three ideas in the way of suggestions for consideration by the Congress. I want to share these ideas with my colleagues here. I ask you to mull over them. You may agree with one or more of these, you may disagree with all. I am primarily interested that we discuss this whole problem together in our search for permanent peace. I am interested that we give serious consideration to these and other ideas, instead of assuming a frozen posture of fear when faced with the problem of communism. We shall never solve it in a state of fear. An exchange of ideas may lead to some concrete plans or action, in which case our efforts here will not have been in vain.

My first suggestion is that the Congress of the United States should adopt a simple resolution along the lines indicated in my letter of February 3 to General MacArthur. This resolution is to state in clear and unmistakable terms that it is the will of the American people to abolish war and bloodshed as a means of settling international grievances. The resolution should be so framed that it will leave no doubt in the minds of other nations that we abhor war, that we devoutly hope and pray it will be abolished as an instrument of national or international policy, and that we call on all peoples to join with us in this effort so that mankind will not continue to crucify itself on the cross of war as it has done several times in the last four decades since 1914.

True, General MacArthur in his reply voiced the opinion that it requires more than a congressional resolution "to trigger a world-wide movement for the abolition of war." Nevertheless, I feel that as a preliminary step it is logical and advisable to have this country go on record with an expression such as I have indicated a moment ago, so that the whole world would know where we stand in the matter. Certainly, it can do no harm; it might even help to convince some of the undecided fence-sitters to see us in a more favorable light and to cast their lot with us. My colleagues, what I am aiming at is a people-to-people approach to our international problems. I feel that when the House of Representatives speaks in unison, it is echoing the voices of 165 million men, women, and children in America. Such a resolution will be more effective and more appreciated by the peoples of other nations than the statement of any single individual in our Government.

Furthermore, by proclaiming our readiness in concert with other major powers to outlaw war we will demonstrate moral leadership, courage, vision, and strength, as is referred to in General MacArthur's letter. I am thinking of course, of the moral leadership of nations, not the leadership of an individual. I fear that under an individual, no matter how well-intentioned, leadership tends to disintegrate into dictatorship—a notable example being present-day Communist Russia.

There was a time not so very long ago when our Nation was regarded as the moral leader of the world. I am afraid that in recent years we have lost our initiative; if you doubt that, let me remind you that even our friends and allies at times voice the fear that we have become trigger-happy and that we fail to comprehend the madness of an atomic war.

A resolution, such as I suggest, will help restore our initiative and responsibility. It will help dispel all doubt concerning our views on atomic war. It will also serve as unimpeachable evidence that, in the light of the awesome atomic and hydrogen developments, men of good will and universal responsibility are reconsidering and reappraising all possible means of abolishing war.

I now come to my second suggestion, namely, that the United States propose to the United Nations that it devote its sessions in the fall of 1955 to a revision of the United Nations Charter along the following lines: (a) To grant it greater power to halt aggressions; (b) to control atomic materials; (c) to facilitate universal disarmament; (d) to give it

wider scope in undertaking projects to raise the standard of living in underdeveloped and semideveloped countries; (e) and to institute the enforcement of a limited degree of international law.

The United Nations is today the only medium for world peace, the only mission working for peace on a large international scale. But let us be frank about it: It has not been effective. Unfortunately, it has turned out to be little more than a debating society on the one hand and a forum for propaganda on the other hand. Each nation publicly is voicing the righteousness of its cause, but never yielding from its predetermined position or attempting to understand the viewpoints of other nations. No nation publicly will admit any weakness on its part. No diplomat publicly will agree to anything which might be interpreted adversely in his own country. This is understandable to students of foreign affairs. Still, the fact remains that this system of international give-and-take—which is mostly take and very little give—is gradually stiffling the United Nations and pulling it down to the level of ineffectiveness as the late and unlamented League of Nations.

Even the most ardent friends of the United Nations today admit that a revision of the U. N. Charter is badly needed. Gen. Carlos Romulo, one of the founders of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and a former President of the U. N. General Assembly, stated recently that its charter is dangerously obsolete. Calling for an overhaul of the U. N. Charter, Romulo said that an enforceable world law is the only means to save the world from total destruction.

Sometimes I am not so sure but that the old-line form of private and secret negotiations between nations was much more productive in settling international disputes. The give-and-take bargaining was never aired in public. Only the final agreement was announced, with each participating nation stressing the advantages it had gained for its country. I am not advocating a return to secret diplomacy or an end to open international negotiations. Perhaps a middle course between the two might be advisable whereby these diplomatic meetings would result in greater accomplishments for world peace, instead of degenerating into propaganda platforms. The United Nations must take steps to assure specific achievements in international relations so that its progress can be measured by practical achievements and not by the scoring of propaganda points.

The Charter of the United Nations must be so amended that this international tribunal will be able to provide certain facilities and a proper atmosphere for private consultations among the nations. Just as we in Congress are given the opportunity to do part of our work in executive sessions of the respective committees, so a similar system should be adopted by the United Nations to provide conditions under which the diplomats can rationally discuss conflicting interests and seek to reach an understanding. Yet there will have to be certain assurances whereby the United Nations or the countries directly concerned will be able to keep the people informed of the progress made and the results accomplished.

There is a provision now in the U. N. Charter which states that a majority vote of the U. N. General Assembly is sufficient to call for a conference to review and amend the charter after a lapse of 10 years. It will be 10 years in June that the charter was completed at San Francisco: hence, the time for a revision is both timely and logical.

My third and final suggestion is to establish a mission for peace. This mission is to work independently of the United Nations and is to be a high-level group of elder statesmen. Each nation would select several of its outstanding men and women whose background indicates that they can be dedicated men and women to the cause of peace. In our own country I am thinking, for example, of people like our two former Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, of General MacArthur, Bernard Baruch, and others of their stature. Other countries should select persons similarly renowned for their leadership and prestige.

The United States peace mission would conduct private talks with the peace missions of other countries, perhaps separately at first and as a group later. It matters not how long these talks continue. They could possibly extend over many months. The main goal should always be to explore all possibilities leading toward peace until a final understanding is reached. Notwithstanding all developments and tensions, these dedicated men and women would go on with their search for peace. Eventually, it is hoped and prayed, they would come up with a plan for peace, agreeable to all concerned, which would accomplish two major tasks: First, bring about better understanding among the nations of the world; second, permit all nations to live securely in a world of abundance.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize my three suggestions or ideas which I am proposing to the Congress:

First, a resolution by both Houses of Congress stating that it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes.

Second, to revise the U. N. Charter by extending to the United Nations greater authority to halt aggressions, control atomic materials, facilitate universal disarmament, undertake projects to raise living standards, and enforce international law.

Third, to set up a mission for peace comprised of elder statesmen who would conduct private discussions leading toward peace.

I believe it is logical to assume that the people of Soviet Russia and their leaders are no less worried by the increasing destructiveness of atomic weapons than are the people of this country and of the whole world. I think also that the people of Russia do not like the present atomic race to achieve superiority of armaments, because it is retarding the economic progress of their country. They must surely be aware that they stand to gain greater economic benefits and a higher standard of living under conditions of improved international relations and world peace.

If this be the situation, then let us frankly say to Soviet Russia: If your objective is still world revolution, if you still persist in your policy of world conquest, if you still continue to point up all your efforts in that direction, then it will be well for you to keep in mind at all times that we are prepared to resist you and that we shall not hesitate to use all our might to destroy you. But if you really desire peace and will show the slightest indication in that direction, we shall be glad to meet you half way and to recognize any legitimate claims you may have.

Mr. Speaker, we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to explore every possibility to avert a new world conflagration. We must extend our search for peace in every direction until we find the right path which will lead us to our ultimate objective.

I should like to conclude with the famous prayer for peace by St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love.
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, light.
Where there is sadness, joy.
O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console;
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love;
For it is in giving, that we receive.
It is in pardoning, that we are pardoned.
It is in dying, that we are born to eternal life.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid address he has given.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York on his very splendid talk and associate myself with his remarks, especially with reference to the prayer he quoted at the end of his remarks, and to the revision of the United Nations Charter. I think this whole talk was very timely. The gentleman is certainly to be commended on the forethought, the wisdom, and the research he has placed into this very excellent speech.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

THE CRITICAL NEED FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments today to speak about H. R. 5057, the bill which I introduced in this House on March 18. H. R. 5057 is a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, for their wives, and for their children.

This is not a new proposal. Its merits have been considered and debated at length by congressional, executive, and other authorities for a number of years. Unfortunately, no action has been taken to date to implement these discussions, and to meet a critical need, through the enactment of a sound, comprehensive, legislative program of disability insurance.

More than 2 years ago, I introduced in this House the bill H. R. 3554, 83d Congress, which proposed a disability insurance program. My current bill, H. R. 5057, represents a considerable measure of improvement over the earlier measure. Its contents have been carefully reviewed and revised on several occasions, and the bill incorporates various constructive suggestions received from our legislative counsel, from the people in the Social Security Administration, and from various other persons who have written or spoken to me about this legislation.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF H. R. 5057?

Under our present law, workers covered by social-security insurance can first begin receiving benefits when they reach age 65. This age limitation applies both to men and women. The law, as it stands today, has no provision for those insured workers who become totally disabled and lose their income-earning capacity before reaching age 65.

H. R. 5057 would remedy this situation, by providing regular primary benefits to insured workers who become totally disabled, after they have been so disabled for 6 months and have applied for these benefits.

In this manner, the bill would benefit two general categories of persons insured by the Social Security System: In the first place, it would aid those insured workers who may become totally disabled for a period of at least 7 months, but who eventually return to their gainful employment. In addition, the bill would benefit those who become totally and permanently disabled before reaching age 65.

This is the first major provision of H. R. 5057.

Secondly, H. R. 5057 would authorize the payment of secondary or supplemental benefits to the wife and the minor children of the totally disabled worker. These dependents would receive the same type of payments as those to which they would ordinarily become entiled upon the worker's retirement at age 65. This provision is included in the bill because the insured worker's primary benefits provide only for his own needs, and are insufficient to aid in the support of his family.

Thirdly, the bill would continue the provision of the social-security law, approved by Congress last year, which freezes the worker's earnings record during the period of his disability.

This needed provision states that periods of disability shall not be taken into account in determining insured status or average monthly wage for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. In this manner, it safeguards the worker's insurance benefits. Previously, long periods of disability, during which the worker was unable to earn any wage credits, reduced the amount of his retirement payments and in some instances could wipe them out altogether.

Fourthly, the bill would utilize the present procedure used by the Social Security Administration in determining disability status of insured workers. The services performed in this regard by the various State agencies would continue to be fully utilized for this purpose.

In other words, the bill retains the best provisions of the present law and supplements them by authorizing the payment of total disability insurance benefits regardless of the wage earner's age.

THE DIRE NEED FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE

The problem of total disability is a serious problem to the thousands of disabled persons all over the country who write to their Representatives in Congress for help that cannot be given to them under our present law.

Each year, many thousands of our workers meet with physical disasters which rob them of their earning capacity. The majority of those workers cannot depend on any income during the period of their disability. As a result, their families must suffer privation and hardship, and frequently look to local, State, and Federal agencies for relief dole.

For almost two decades, this problem has been noted in practically every serious study made of the problems of disability. These studies recognized the need for Government action to protect workers and their families against this risk—against the financial drain which is even more serious than that of unemployment, old age, and death.

As early as 1938, the Advisory Council on Social Security agreed unanimously on the desirability of providing social insurance for permanently and totally disabled persons, and for their dependents. By 1948, the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance recommended immediate incorporation of disability protection into the social-security system. The council said this:

> There can be no question concerning the need for such protection. On an average day the number of persons kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months is about 2 million. The economic hardship resulting from permanent and total disability is frequently even greater than that created by old age or death. The family must not only face the loss of the breadwinner's earnings, but must meet the cost of medical care. As a rule, savings and other personal resources are exhausted. The problem of the disabled younger worker is particularly difficult because he is likely to have young children and not to have had an opportunity to acquire any significant savings.

More recently, other groups and study commissions further stressed this need, recommending the enactment of legislation to provide social insurance against the hazard of permanent and total disability.

EXISTING PROVISIONS FOR THE DISABLED

At present, we have a multiplicity of programs which provide limited and selective insurance against the risk of disability.

The fact remains, however, that existing Government programs, industry, union, and private insurance plans protect only a minority of the working population. The majority of the people are still without protection—short of the ultimate resort to public relief—once prolonged disability has brought destitution and hardship to them and to their families.

This is due to the fact that the hodgepodge of programs in this field provides only partial and selective protection to given groups, and to the fact that our basic social-security system does not as yet provide for disability insurance for the population at large.

PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY AND RETIREMENT

It has long been widely recognized that physical old age is not always closely related to chronological age. While many workers may be able and willing to work past age 65, others are compelled to stop working at a much earlier age because of incurable diseases such as inoperable cancer, advanced heart condition, tuberculosis, arthritis, and so on. For all practical purposes, these individuals are prematurely retired from the labor market.

Unless disability insurance is provided for persons in this category, this lack may create pressures which may have serious effect on the old age and survivors insurance program. We may be gradually forced to adopt a considerable lowering of the retirement age. If this happens, it will not be because people in general wish to retire earlier, but due to the pressure of an increasing number of disabled persons—particularly those in the upper age group—who are in dire need of assistance.

If we try to meet this very real need by enabling all persons to retire at an early age, it will cost us much more than a direct approach of providing disability benefits only to those who are totally disabled and who can therefore qualify for them.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF DISABILITY

Many income studies conducted during recent years point out that disability and low income go hand in hand in many instances. These studies point out that among the urban families in the low-income class, one of the chief causes of poverty was traced to the disability of the head of the family.

Other studies also show that disability accounts for a very large portion of public relief expenditures. This also applies to private charity which helps an additional number of disabled persons.

By providing a systematic program of social insurance against disability—such

as the program outlined in H. R. 5057—it would be possible in time to reduce the need for relief and public dole.

THE DESIRABILITY OF SOCIAL INSURANCE APPROACH

The enactment of the proposals contained in H. R. 5057 will not eliminate the economic cost of disability. However, this proposal would provide a systematic contributory method for workers to help meet those costs before they occur. It would also sharply reduce the present financial burden of relief and public assistance.

The risks of disability can be made a budgetable expense for workers, just as the risks of old age and death have been made budgetable expense through the old age and survivors insurance program. This social insurance method is applicable to this problem, and should be adopted.

Social insurance, geared to the workers' earnings, would afford protection as a matter of right to those insured workers who become totally and perhaps permanently disabled. The benefits would make it possible for them to live on an income they had previously helped to purchase. It would prevent them from being forced into destitution, and from turning to charity and public relief.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to describe the serious need for a comprehensive disability insurance program, and how H. R. 5057 would meet this need.

I believe that the proposal contained in H. R. 5057 is sound and equitable, and that it merits prompt and thorough consideration. The estimated cost of this disability-insurance program would be reasonable; the level premium net increase in costs would be approximately 1.5 to 1.92 percent of covered payroll. For that modest increase in contributions to the social-security fund, it would be possible to provide monthly benefits for temporary-total and for permanent-total disabilities.

It is my intention to continue to work for early consideration of this legislation, and I earnestly hope that these efforts will merit the support of other Members of this body.

BLENNERHASSETT ISLAND NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Blennerhassett Island in order to create the Blennerhassett Island National Monument. This project has received the endorsement of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia and was the subject of a communication from that body to the Congress on March 22, 1955. Likewise the proposal has the approval of the West Virginia Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are familiar with the romantic history of this famous island. During a turbulent time of western expansion, Harman Blennerhassett settled there, building a mansion luxuriously furnished in the Old World tradition. To this showplace came Aaron Burr, with grandiose plans for his ill-fated conspiracy. There, he met in Harman Blennerhassett, a willing partner. In this stately setting, plans and arrangements for the western adventure were made. The island was the point of departure for that band of men, led by Burr, who were to carry out those plans.

Today the old house is no longer standing. Many of the landmarks of the Blennerhassett occupancy have disappeared. But Blennerhassett Island in the beautiful Ohio River Valley remains a lovely spot, a scenic attraction of major interest. It is ideally situated for a national monument not only because of its historical interest, but because of its geographical location and its excellent recreational possibilities.

The central Ohio Valley is a region of great promise. It looks forward to future industrial development and expansion, with consequent increases in population. No part of our national-parks system is now readily available or conveniently located to meet the recreational needs of the area. Certainly Blennerhassett Island, if properly developed, could satisfy those needs. Therefore, I sincerely hope that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

INCREASE IN SUGAR MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the domestic sugar producers of this country are the victims of an extremely unfair set of circumstances. Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds and is consuming more sugar each year. And yet, our domestic sugar producers are denied the right to grow and sell one single pound of this increased consumption. Today, I have introduced a bill which will correct this situation, and I urge the support of my colleagues.

In 1948, American sugar producers took an important step. In farsighted recognition of the necessity to give the Republic of Cuba an opportunity to reduce its sugar production from abnormally high wartime levels, the domestic producers temporarily relinquished their right to share in the growth of the domestic market. Under the 1948 act, domestic sugar producers can market no more than 2,300,000 tons in 1 year, while Cuba was given the right to market 95 percent of the amount by which the war damaged Philippine industry would fall short of its quota while rebuilding. At the same time, Cuba continued to share with domestic areas in making up deficits. Thus, Cuba has marketed some 5,250,000 extra tons of sugar in the United States, almost 30 percent more than its basic quota.

As I have stated, the domestic producers relinquished their own just rights to give Cuba an opportunity to reduce production. What has happened? Cuba not only did not reduce, but increased production, and in 1952, it produced 8 million tons, one-third more than could be marketed anywhere in the world.

Here at home, due to improved technology and better farming methods, sugar beet tonnage yield per acre has increased 20 percent since 1948. Last year, sugar beet acreage was 10 percent less than before the first sugar act went into effect, but production was 14 percent more. The fixed quota of 2,300,000 tons is forcing further acreage cuts of 10 to 15 percent by established growers. Hardly any other farmer will be permitted to plant sugar beets at all, and many of the latter are war veterans on newly opened reclamation projects of the West, where sugar beets are vitally needed in the crop rotation.

Mr. Speaker, if we now increase the 1955 marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane areas, we do no more than to restore a just and basic right to a domestic farmer, that of sharing in the economic growth of his own country. Right now, in spite of the acreage cuts, production is exceeding marketing quotas, although the markets exist. The prime beneficiary, Cuba, has had ample opportunity to comply with the spirit of the 1948 Sugar Act by reducing production from wartime levels. In contravention of this spirit, Cuba has increased production. We now feel that the right to share in our own growth, which we temporarily relinquished, should be restored to our growers.

Passage of this bill will not be a repudiation of the historic rights of Cuba to market sugar in this country. It will only restore what has been the historic right of the American producer.

I sincerely urge your support of this bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, for the period from April 19 to April 26, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. LANKFORD, for the period from April 19 to April 22, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business (Board of Visitors of Naval Academy).

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 35. An act to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LONG and to include a radio address.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a speech.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include an address.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WILSON of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

696. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report on use and disposal of Federal surplus property, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 141); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

697. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of the Department of Defense pertaining to the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to sections 106 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

699. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on synthetic liquid fuels for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

700. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules of records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

701. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

702. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4954. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5594. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 5595. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5596. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall pay the premiums required of a guardian of any incompetent veteran by the court of jurisdiction or by the Administrator; to the Committee on Veterans' Administration.

By Mr. ENGLE (by request):

H. R. 5597. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 5598. A bill to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5599. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5600. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5601. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 5602. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5603. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5604. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to certain institutions engaged in scientific research which are taking part in educational or public health programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5605. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5606. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to certain institutions engaged in scientific research which are taking part in educational or public health programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 5607. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5608. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 5609. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Blennerhassett Island National Monument on Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River near Parkersburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5610. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to repeal the exemptions for retail and service establishments and for processors of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5611. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5612. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 5613. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for monetary forfeitures in the case of violations of the Federal Communications Commission's rules and regulations relating to radio stations other than broadcast stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5614. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization with-

out hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5615. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5616. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 5617. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to extend certain survivors' benefits under such act to widowers of employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5618. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to certain survivors' benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5619. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5620. A bill to regulate the hours and wages of Federal Government employees whose wages are established by wage boards and administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5621. A bill to regulate the payment of overtime wages paid to Federal Government employees whose wages are established by wage boards and other administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5622. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5623. A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 5624. A bill to grant career appointments to certain employees in positions under temporary or indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 5625. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution for the preservation of Rock Creek Park; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte, Luzon, and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Res. 209. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee, and other matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress endorsing the resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental-health problem in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: Joint resolution of the State of Nevada Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to match State offerings for continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resouces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from the State of Nevada to forbear any action leading to the termination of the Federal trusteeship over American Indian wards and properties held in trust for American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to introduce and endeavor to pass legislation requiring the exploration of radioactive minerals in Nevada; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Assembly, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to facilitate national centennial celebrations in commemoration of the 1857 act of Congress allowing the creation of the Pacific Overland Mail Route; urging local agencies and groups to cooperate therein; commending the American Association for State and Local History; and other matters properly relating thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning the Congress to amend present laws so as to enable a highway to be constructed as part of the interstate highway system between Utah and Colorado without regard to present mileage limitations; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the President of the United States, the Nevada congressional delegation and others to do their utmost to effectuate the construction of a four-lane highway over the Sierra Nevada Mountain Ranges as a matter of public defense and necessity; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the storage of surplus wheat in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to set aside the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan adjacent to Denver as a Veterans' Administration domiciliary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an act passed by the Nevada Legislature, designating the Honorable Patrick A. McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, to be honored by a statue to be placed in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting a revision of the Federal defense manpower policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to aid the farmers, peach growers and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and other counties in the State who have suffered so disastrously from the recent unseasonable cold weather; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5626. A bill for the relief of Fred Mazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5627. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Demos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5628. A bill for the relief of Maria Alexandrina Martins Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5629. A bill for the relief of On Low Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5630. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5631. A bill for the relief of Antonio Hernandez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 5632. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5633. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5636. A bill for the relief of Luigi Valas (also known as Louis Rick); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5637. A bill for the relief of Kim Sung Il; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5638. A bill for the relief of Henry Luis Gilbert Labayen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5639. A bill for the relief of William Franklin Rollins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5640. A bill for the relief of Sister Philomena Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 5641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takayo Uota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 5642. A bill for the relief of Amado Martinez-Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5643. A bill for the relief of Tsutomu Fujinami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5644. A bill for the relief of Hermann Weyl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

200. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution in support of H. R. 4746, to permit broader Federal participation in protection of shore lands from erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

201. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor, Chicago, Ill., requesting Congress to consider salary adjustments for post office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

202. Also, petition of Clara Patalita vda de Rosanegro and other claimants Valladolid, Negros Occidental, Philippines, relative to claims of claimants composed of deceased veterans' dependent parents, widows, guardians, and veterans themselves, of Valladolid, Negros Occidental, Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address of the Honorable Daniel J. Flood to the General Assembly of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, April 17, 1955, at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

This evening gives me an opportunity to speak to the exiles from central Europe who have come to my country to work for the restoration of liberty in their subjugated countries. I see here my friends from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, and other central European countries.

All these countries have great political and cultural histories.

More than 1,000 years ago, the ancestors of the Czechs and Slovaks of present Czechoslovakia set up the great Moravian Empire that had its continuation in the ancient Kingdom of Bohemia known throughout the world for its famous rulers and statesmen, St. Venceslas, Charles IV, and George Podebrad, and for its warriors who braved the armies of all Europe.

Already in the 11th century the great Hungarian King Stephen introduced western Christianity and with it western civilization to his people. Hungary became the bulwark of this civilization and of Christian culture. Together with the other central European states she defended them against the invader until that moment in history when the great King of Poland stopped the invasion at the gates of Vienna.

The historical record of Poland goes back to the 10th century. From the 14th to the 17th century Poland was a great power which influenced the destinies of Europe for centuries. Poland's contribution to the formation of the ideology of national freedom was especially impressive. Torn asunder in the following centuries by three powers which stifled her national life, Poland never resigned herself to defeat and battled her way in repeated uprisings, through unfavorable conditions, to a new freedom and independence.

Yugoslavia, inhabited by the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes has a long, heroic history of struggle for freedom against foreign invaders. The defeat of Kosovo Polé in 1389 marked but the beginning of the centuries long struggles that fortified the peoples of Yugoslavia to supreme national heroism.

A cruel struggle for national survival and independence has been the fate of the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians throughout the centuries. The position of these countries and nations was most difficult. There was no neighbor, who was not far more powerful and who did not covet the rich commercial centers on the Baltic Sea, and who did not attempt to break up the organized national life of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Nevertheless, the peoples survived and lived to see their freedom restored.

The cultural contribution of your Central European states and nations is even more impressive. One hundred and fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the University of Prague was founded and soon after, the University of Cracow. Central Europe has given us such great pioneers of human progress like Jan Amos Comenius. Modern democracy also had its root in these countries. A Czech statute in 1579, which underlined the concept of the "due process of law", was the predecessor of the American Constitution.

American democracy is especially grateful to men like Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski who came to our country to help us win our independence. From their long suffering homeland they brought with them an enthusiasm for liberty and showed by their deeds and sacrifices that human freedom is indivisible.

After World War I the countries of Central Europe renewed at long last their national states. They built up their internal democracies and were highly successful in their cultural and economic development. They contributed to international cooperation by their sincere support of the League of Nations and the legal system of postwar Europe.

Thomas G. Masaryk and Dr. Eduard Benes from Czechoslovakia were helpful in laying the foundations to international compulsory arbitration, disarmament, and the executive power of the world organization. In cooperation with other statesmen from Central and Eastern European countries, they created a network of international treaties which, if observed, would have stabilized Europe and guaranteed peaceful development. Unfortunately, this favorable evolution was broken off by Nazi aggression. After Austria came Czechoslovakia whose dismemberment at Munich was soon followed by the destruction of Warsaw and Belgrade and by the subjugation of the Baltic States and, in fact, of Hungary as well.

The victory of the Allies in 1940 liberated the Central European countries from the yoke of Nazi German imperialism. But their liberation was a sham. In fact, one totalitarianism, imperalism, and dictatorship was exchanged for another. And in this way ancient historic countries, the cradles of culture, the friends and allies of Western democracies that had played such an important role in the family of free nations, became captives of Soviet Russia.

We often ask how this was possible; how could it happen; what were the real causes of this so unhappy and catastrophical development. Our Congress has even investigated the background and causes that had led to the takeover and enslavement of the Baltic and Central European countries.

As in every phenomenon, this new subjugation of Central Europe may be attributed to a number of causes both internal and external. We may, for instance, speak of the errors committed by the leading statesmen of the Western democracies. We may censure them for Europe's division into military zones, agreed upon in Teheran and Yalta. We may question the Western negotiators for not realizing fully that a military zone in Soviet terminology means also a political zone and that democracy in Soviet terminology means a "people's democracy," actually the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

In this way, the Central European countries, one by one, and finally Czechoslovakia became Communist captive states, the Baltic States were actually absorbed into the Soviet Union.

But it is not enough to stop at Teheran and Yalta. One must go much further in analyzing the past to discover the real cause of the subjugation of Central Europe. It lies deep in the past policy of world democracy. Long before Yalta and Teheran, I would say immediately after World War I, the cause was laid which molded the conditions as they are today in Central Europe. At that time, democratic Europe, born of the victory of the Western democracies over the feudalistic central powers, should have been defended in time. Instead, Hitler's aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia was not resisted by the Western Powers. Even before that came to pass, the Western Powers should have made it clear that the clauses of the peace treaty were meant seriously. An effective world organization should have been set up and all democratic states should have defended the legal system of the world and the sanctity of international treaties. But complacency set in. The slogan "Peace in Our Time" weakened the determination of the democracies and led to such an inflation of Nazi power that it could be broken only with the assistance of the Soviet Union. This unhappy development brought the Red army into the very heart of Europe, to the Elbe and the Vltava (the Czech name for Moldau).

I think it not only fair but wise to let these errors in the past be a lesson to us. The lesson is obvious. The political life of a country should be something more than the pursuing of everyday interests; it should be the implementation of a general plan based on objective thinking and moral law.

Your platform of the Christian Democratic Union and the addresses of your officers emphasize this very important character of sound politics.

I am sure that if we stress logic and the moral law in political life we can avoid the errors of the past, those errors that led a considerable part of the world and within your countries to the present state of slavery. The demand for the liberation of Central and Eastern European countries will then be accepted as a logical consequence of a policy that is the result of both clear thinking and sound moral evaluation. For Americans this demand is Lincoln's creed on a world scale: That the world cannot be half free and half slave.

The liberation policy is, however, not only a logical conclusion of our American doctrine that the political life should be the implementation of a general moral principle, valid for all the nations and times. It is also in line with the political, economic, and strategic interests of the United States.

Our independence and our economy is closely connected with the conditions in Europe, I would say with a free Europe, in which a balance of power is maintained and economic prosperity is assured. Twice already in our generation we had to defend our political interests on the battlefields of Europe. For us it is obvious that a Europe subjugated by a dictatorship, aspiring to world domination, is tantamount to a constant danger to our shores. And an impoverished Europe is our concern, too. For such a Europe would be a spawning ground for social upheaval leading to a victory of negative and bellicose political trends.

I conclude that the liberation policy is the strength of democracy and the only guaranty to the free world against aggression and internal subversion from a totalitarian threat. We Americans have no other choice: We must be strong if we want to save peace and our freedom. And our strength is inseparably connected with the freedom of the world. Your Congress has for its guiding motto: "Freedom—a prerequisite of lasting peace." This motto is no less true for American foreign policy. We can be free only if our friends, too, enjoy freedom. Peace, like freedom, is indivisible.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Indiana Republican Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address I delivered before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, in Indianapolis, Ind., on Saturday, April 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Craig, Senators Capehart and Jenner, and fellow Americans, in the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks we broke the 1948 Communist blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of that island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad? These have indicated that we must placate Communist countries when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have no further territorial demands in Europe.

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression.

The guarantee given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory.

That these outposts have a military value no man can deny for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assult out of the harbors of Amoy and Foochow as long as the free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere where people understand the true brutal aggressive nature of communism.

I again want to emphasize that in my opinion the morale value of Quemoy and Matsu is as high for Free China as is that of Western Berlin for free Germany.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as stepping stones toward Formosa and the Pescadores. What nonsense is this? When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-Lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts?

If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and they reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reinforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-face violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

I was amazed and shocked by the speech of Adlai Stevenson on last Monday night. He not only appears to be giving the green light to the loss of Quemoy and Matsu, but he also cast reflection upon the future of the island of Formosa itself.

Less than 2 months after the Congress approved the Formosa resolution by a vote of 410 to 3 in the House and 85 to 3 in the Senate and after the ratification of our mutual defense pact with the Republic of China by a vote of 64 to 6, Mr. Stevenson stated that we should seek to get certain of our allies to line up with us in the defense of Formosa against any aggression "pending some final settlement of its status—by independence, neutralization, trusteeship, plebiscite, or whatever is wiser."

What a way to build confidence in our ally, with whom we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty.

There was no suggestion by Mr. Stevenson that there might be a plebiscite on the mainland of China to see if the Chinese are satisfied with their loss of freedom by Communist aggression supported by the Soviet Union.

Does not Mr. Stevenson know that the free people of China would look upon a United Nations trusteeship as only a form of multiple colonialism for such a trusteeship would undermine if not destroy the sovereignty of the Republic of China?

Certainly the Republic of China will not consent to a United Nations or any other type of a trusteeship over the island of Formosa.

What United Nations mouse is expected to "bell the cat"? In the first United Nations action against overt aggression in Korea only 17 members of the United Nations supplied any armed forces whatsoever. The 16 nations outside of the United States which made a contribution supplied only 45,000, whereas the United States of America contributed more than 450,000 and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Far Eastern theater during the Korean war.

Certainly neither Mr. Stevenson nor the members of the United Nations expect to have the United States of America supply the armed forces to disarm the defense forces of the Republic of China with whom we have just entered into a treaty of mutual security.

This would be such an obvious treachery that no responsible citizen of this country would tolerate it and no public official that advocated it would continue in office beyond the next election.

Would the trusteeship be established then by the United Nations members other than the United States of America? It could only be done by that organization committing an act of aggression against the Republic of China. Not only do we have a treaty of mutual assistance with free China, but does any responsible person believe that having only contributed 45,000 troops to resist Communist aggression in Korea that organization would now furnish a larger force to neutralize the approximately 400,000 who constitute the armed force of the Republic of China?

Or does Mr. Stevenson believe that India, which furnished only an ambulance unit in the Korean war, will be the one to do the job? Does he really believe that the free Chinese on Formosa would tolerate an Indian occupation of their island?

What sense does it make to on the one hand be building a collective security system in the Far Pacific and on the other giving consideration to the neutralization of one-third of the available non-Communist armed forces in that area of the world. During the early days of our Republic we had an expression "United we stand, divided we fall."

As a matter of national policy are we now to preach a doctrine for our friends abroad "Divided you stand until the Communists gain sufficient strength to make you fall?"

As one American, I get no satisfaction at all from a divided Korea, a divided Germany, or a divided Vietnam. I see nothing in either example that should want us to put our stamp of approval on a divided China which is the meaning of a so-called two China's policy.

Let's put ourselves in the unlikely position of facing the situation wherein Communist forces, by armed action supported by the Soviet Union, should be able to take over mainland America and our Government was temporarily forced to the Territory of Hawaii or Alaska. Would we accept a two-Americas policy? Would we give up the effort to restore constitutional government to our people and to our homeland? The answer is, of course, a resounding "No" on both counts.

There will never be an easy solution to the problems facing this country and the free world. Whenever a line is drawn there will be cogent reasons advanced for making it at some other time or place.

There are some who oppose the drawing of the line at Quemoy and Matsu who say that they would be willing to stand on the line of Formosa and the Pescadores, but would they really be willing to stand even there?

Will they not, like some of the British, Prime Minister Nehru, and Adlai Stevenson then being to throw doubt even upon the future of Formosa?

In a final desperate effort to avoid facing up to the realistic issue of Communist aggression, will they at that point urge that the problem be thrown into the United Nations?

There a combination of the Communist nations, neutralist powers, and some of our fair-weather friends presently tending toward a "peace at any price policy" could join forces in agreeing to a far eastern Munich that will give to the Communists at a conference another substantial victory at the expense of the Republic of China.

The smaller nations of the world should stop, look, and listen before they join their voices to those of the other appeasers. If the Republic of China, with 9½ million people, can be sold down the river at a far eastern Munich so then could the more than 30 independent nations having populations of less than that figure.

With the record of a quarter century of broken agreements by the Soviet Union, I have questioned the advisability of entering into another meeting of the heads of state until the Soviet Union has shown by deeds rather than words that they are prepared to respect agreements entered into.

Yalta should have been a warning signal to the American people that there is no moral right for large nations, including our own, to distribute the territory and the people of our allies such as was done with Poland and with China.

The rather dubious argument is advanced that the Soviet forces were already in occupation of Poland and would have been in a position to occupy much of China if we had not consented to their demands.

Since when has America come to subscribe to the strange new doctrine that if the bandit is in possession of the loot he should be given a clean bill of health morally and a legal title to the same?

Have we allowed international morals to fall so low that we now are prepared to accept the doctrine that might makes right?

I think not. Any public officials who in the future, regardless of the party in power, try to shackle the moral position of the American people in such chains will, in my judgment, be overwhelmingly repudiated.

Do we have a right to be concerned with the revelations of the Yalta papers? I believe we do from a constitutional viewpoint. The facts of the Yalta agreement were misrepresented to the Congress of the United States, a coequal branch of the Government, by President Roosevelt when he said in his official report to the Congress on March 1, 1945, regarding the Yalta Conference:

"Quite naturally this Conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war."

This was a false official report.

Do we have a right to be concerned with what went on at Yalta?

The record clearly shows that the Government of the United States was first advised regarding the connections of Alger Hiss with a Soviet espionage ring as early as the fall of 1939 and at several subsequent times before the Yalta Conference of February 1945.

Those who had some share of the responsibility in permitting Alger Hiss to go to Yalta have tried to cover up their dereliction by claiming that he had little more than office-boy status and at most limited his activities to United Nations affairs.

Now for the first time in the 1945 official papers of the Government of the United States, on page 91 of the Yalta papers, we learn that:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

Does this even demonstrate a reasonable degree of caution for protecting the vital interests of this country? It was not necessary for Alger Hiss to carry on negotiations at a high level to do great damage to this Nation and to our allies. It was only necessary for the Soviet Union to have advance information as to the agreed policy positions that this Government would take, where we would stand firm, where we would be prepared to yield, and what agreements we would seek to get.

I see by the papers that former President Truman is in Washington tonight where he is scheduled to join in the attack on the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Perhaps he will clarify why he termed the congressional investigation of the Hiss case a "red herring."

Perhaps he will state why he wrote a letter of commendation for Harry Dexter White, another member of the conspiracy who played an important part in the pre-Yalta decisions.

Perhaps he will tell why his Secretary of State Dean Acheson in January of 1950 drew a defense line in the Pacific leaving Korea and Formosa on the outside. Many believe the Communists then determined they could take Korea without great risk.

Perhaps he will tell why his Secretary of his administration in 1945 and 1946 was to put pressure on President Chiang Kai-shek urging him to accept Communists into his government when coalition with communism has been fatal wherever tried.

Perhaps he will explain why, contrary to the advice of his commanders in the field, MacArthur, Van Fleet, Clark, and Stratemeyer, he permitted the hands of our Armed Forces to be tied and the Communists to have the advantage of the Yalu River sanctuary.

Perhaps he may even explain on whose advice and why he neutralized the Formosa Straits and made it possible for the Communist coast defense troops to be safely moved to Manchuria and then to Korea where they were used against our own forces there.

Perhaps he will, but I doubt it.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. Frankly, I would much rather take his view on the dangers we face than I would the views of the 1952 Democratic candidate for President of the United States. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm stop the Communist march movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain one island or one small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Watch Bandung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Carlos P.

Romulo printed in the Sunday Washington Star magazine This Week, under date of April 17, 1955.

I hope that every Member of this Congress has read this article. It contains statements of facts and a very penetrating analysis of what could happen at the conference of Asian and African nations at Bandung, Indonesia.

It is extremely important to the United States and to the free world that Mr. Romulo is a delegate to this conference. Those of us who have served in the House with Mr. Romulo know of his thorough understanding that our country has no desire whatever to promote colonialism, directly or indirectly, which was conclusively indicated when in 1946 we passed the law liberating the Philippines and thereby making them a free nation.

Because of his vast experience as a member of the United Nations and influence wielded as President of the United Nations Assembly, he has a deep understanding of the problems and the outlook of the verious peoples of Asia. Very important also is that he is an Asian who has a profound understanding of the United States and its policies. He knows that we are determined to bring world peace, if possible, not only for our own welfare but for the good of all the peoples of the world. He can talk the language of and understand the viewpoint of the Asians. He understands thoroughly that communism must be checked if we are to have world peace. He also knows that the colonial system is what developed hatred in the minds of Asians and Africans against the western democracies. As he says, nothing could be more terrible and ruinous than a war between whites and nonwhites.

He could be a key figure at this conference that might bring the understanding and mutual respect between the Americans and the Asians that is needed to weld the world together in respect and understanding. The small and explosive world of today cannot take another war without consequences that are terrible to contemplate.

The article referred to follows:

This Monday my country, the Philippines, will take its seat at a high-level diplomatic conference which some of our closest friends in the West initially urged us to boycott.

Thirty Asian and African nations, Communist China among them, have been invited to Bandung, Indonesia, ostensibly to promote peace and cooperation. While this may sound like a fairly routine get-together, it actually can shift the course of history. Its effects a generation from now may be catastrophic.

Why is this meeting so ominous? For two reasons:

1. Here are the makings of a dynamic new alignment of political forces—an alignment which, if it solidifies, must make more and more difficult the free world's struggle to stay the advance of communism.

2. Here, too, are the makings of a broad racial alignment—more dangerous in the long run than the political. The roster of nations invited to Bandung is pointedly overbalanced with nonwhites. The meeting may prove to be the first important manifestation of a conscious, deliberate banding together of the nonwhite world against the white. And nothing would be more terrible than wars between whites and nonwhites.

Now Bandung—a city of elegant hotels, European-style residences and native shacks in the hills of West Java—is thousands of miles from Boston and Bakersfield. And though this is exclusively an Asian-African gathering, called by the Colombo powers (India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia), it is of tremendous importance to America.

It is because of my deep concern that the import of the Bandung meeting—the political and racial dangers it raises—may not have received sufficient notice that I have sought this chance to speak to you.

Our Filipino delegation, which President Magsaysay has asked me to head, is likely to be a minority pro-Western voice at Bandung. The reason my government was advised at first not to attend was that, since we were allies of the United States and vigorously anti-Communist, we would be embarrassed at a meeting bound to be largely dominated by the Communists from Peiping, not to mention the neutralists from New Delhi.

But we in the Philippines don't look at the situation that way. We are in Asia and of Asia. Not to attend a meeting of our fellow Asians, no matter how we may differ with some of them, is to make of ourselves outcasts in Asia. Also our belief in democracy is not timid. We welcome the chance to express our views to our fellow Asians, including the delegates sent by Mao Tse-tung.

WHAT THE FILIPINOS WILL DO

We expect to be outvoted at times. But we have hopes of exercising enough influence on the proceedings to prevent, at least for the time being, the solidification of the political and racial tendencies we feel would constitute a terrible threat to peace.

Meetings of Asians and Africans are nothing new, of course. The nations of these two huge, restless, underprivileged continents have been joining forces with growing frequency in recent years to promote a variety of causes, some good, some questionable. Asian and African nations took steps in 1948 for the worthwhile purpose of helping Indonesia shake itself loose from Dutch colonialism.

At the United Nations, the Asian-African group has occasionally played a useful role in spotlighting colonial and racial oppression in Africa. But more and more, of late, a core of influential members of the group has shown a disposition to take a neutralist stand in the East-West struggle.

Now at Bandung this group is being joined by Red China—the trophy of the Indochina deal dangling from its belt, its ego inflated by the Hammarskjold visit to seek release of United States flyers, its propagandists demanding liberation of Formosa. Consequently, the former neutralist coloration takes on an anti-Western tinge.

It is India's Premier, Jawaharlal Nehru, of course, who has been the apostle of Asian-African neutralism, though he shuns the label and argues that he merely opposes the creation of blocs on grounds that they lead to war. It is Nehru, too, who engineered the invitation to Peiping to come to Bandung.

In this respect, it is easy to go along with him in rejecting the label of "neutralist." On the other hand, he would probably dispute a charge that he has been unneutral. It would be politically naive, though, to imagine that it is neutral to invite one—and only one—of the protagonists of the cold war to a conference whose avowed purpose is to promote peace. Ironically, any increase in Red China's leadership in Asia must certainly be at New Delhi's expense.

What are the main issues that trouble our fellow Asians and the Africans?

1. COLONIALISM: ASIANS HATE IT

Last fall, I wrote in This Week that, as a free Asian, I was gravely worried that what was left of free Asia might soon follow north Vietnam into the Communist orbit. I argued that the basic reason some Asians were so cold to the propaganda of democracy and so vulnerable to Communist blandishments was that the so-called democracies, in times past, had brought them, for the most part, not democracy but colonialism. Not democracy but 5-cents-a-day wages and racial barriers. I have spoken to audiences in scores of American communities, and I find that a most difficult point to put across is the intensity of the Afro-Asian hatred of colonialism.

The United States, instead of exploiting territories over which it exercised sovereignty, has generally guided them peacefully toward self-government or outright independence. When the United States governed the Philippines, it dealt with a population that was basically content because it was being openly prepared to assume sovereign control of its affairs. There is a genuine friendship between Filipino and American, and Manila is considered by the fleet probably the most hospitable port of call in all Asia.

Nowhere has the United States dealt as a nation with its population grudgingly, bitterly submitting to the yoke of empire.

The American people have not grasped the real nature of anticolonial emotionalism. But it must be grasped. Otherwise, the United States cannot formulate workable policies to keep former colonial areas from being overwhelmed by communism's new and more ruthless colonialism.

Remember this: while it is true that the colonial powers have only shreds of their old influence left in Asia, the old bitterness remains. Urged by the Western Powers to join in resisting further Communist advance, many Asian nations are understandably wary. They are not sure it is to their interest to choose sides; they are not sure they have anything to gain by lining up with the West; and they would certainly have to make sure first that their former oppressors had really reformed.

It is the Asians' sensitivity to colonialism that makes Communist prattling about American imperialism in Formosa—false as it is—logical propaganda. Asians and Africans are watching to see if the powers controlling colonies in Africa follow a more enlightened policy there than in Asia.

Britain's bold experiment in speeding self-government in the Gold Coast is a plus mark for the West. There are reassuring signs in Nigeria. But Britain wins no confidence with its nineteenth-century repression in Kenya, home of the Mau Mau. A French premier tries to put across a policy of autonomy for North Africa and—for this and other reasons—he is overthrown.

2. RACISM: "CHINESE NOT ALLOWED"

Hatred of the white man is colonialism's legacy in vast areas of the world. Starvation wages would have been reason enough for hatred of the colonial powers, if that is all colonialism had meant. But it also meant signs in Shanghai parks: "Dogs and Chinese not allowed here." It meant rules barring all natives from admission to the white man's club. Racial scars left by discrimination take years, decades, generations to fade. Most of the nations gathering at Bandung bear still-fresh scars. Racial resentment is common ground for the fashioning of alliances.

Significantly, the invitation list for the conference emphasizes the racial aspect of the meeting. South Africa, carrying policies of race discrimination to especially revolting extremes, was not invited. The Arabs are coming, but they made sure Israel did not get an invitation. It may even be significant that Russia, an Asian as well as a European power, was not asked to come.

Armageddon between whites and nonwhites is not an immediate prospect. But limited, local racial wars are going on today. The struggle in Kenya is largely racial. How long will it be before South Africa explodes? In a generation or two, if current trends are

not reversed, race war on a vast scale could shake the earth.

3. ECONOMICS: WHO'LL HELP?

The masses of Asia and Africa are impoverished. They are looking desperately for help from more fortunate nations. Whoever eases their misery—democracy, communism, the political system doesn't matter—will have their friendship and their trade.

4. PEACE: NO MORE BOMBS!

At a meeting of the five Colombo powers last year, a resolution was approved calling for an end to hydrogen-bomb and atom-bomb tests. Passage of the resolution was understandable. The injury to the Japanese fishermen (one of whom later died) by the radioactive fallout from an H-bomb explosion terrified masses of people in Asia.

But while the resolution to ban tests theoretically applied equally to East and West, it unintentionally reinforced Communist propaganda. The Communists, with their superiority in manpower, have been trying for years to eliminate atomic weapons from the world's arsenals. With the West's atomic deterrent neutralized, the Communists would be ready to march. Neutral resolutions are not always so neutral as they sound.

My fellow Asians and the Africans may adopt so-called neutral policies in hopes of staving off world war or staying out if it should erupt. But protestations of neutrality will not stop Communist imperialism. The only way to insure that the Communists dare not move is to help the free world build an unchallengeable defense.

At Bandung, the Filipino delegation will urge our Asian and African colleagues—those still uncommitted—to take that course. We will do what we can to expose the fallacy of neutralism. And, taking the longer view, we will try to prevent the nurturing of a racial alliance which could develop into an enormity that would convulse the earth.

We have been working hard in recent weeks readying ourselves to answer the Communists, and the neutralists, point by point; to counter their resolutions with constructive resolutions of our own. We fully appreciate the intensity of Asian-African suspicion of the West. But we are working on the assumption that the West intends to follow through on its promises, that it will share its knowledge and wealth with the world's less fortunate people, that it will hasten the day when all people will be truly independent.

Many specific projects to counter the dangerous drift in Asia and Africa have been blueprinted. But programs do not take hold unless the people who must put them into operation are made to realize with painful clarity how urgent they are.

The Bandung conference is a measure of that urgency. It will not get the news coverage of a Tachens evacuation or a congressional resolution on Formosa. But the free world would do well to watch it with as much attention—and guide itself by what it sees.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has set an example for our people by his regular church attendance and by his devotion to religious principles. Furthermore, he has surrounded himself with devout men and women of various faiths.

Visitors to Washington who have had contact with members of the Cabinet and other top officials have been impressed with the religious atmosphere prevailing here.

Faith in God is something that is beyond politics. No political party nor particular sect can lay claim to a monopoly on a faith in the Almighty. Devout leaders can stimulate that faith in the hearts of others by their example. By their daily lives they can create an atmosphere that will draw their associates and their fellow men to a closer walk with the Creator.

Recently while returning to California from Washington by airplane, Arthur S. Maxwell, editor of the Signs of the Times, a widely read religious journal, found himself seated beside a charming lady who, on learning he was a minister, readily discussed "many things pertaining to the kingdom of God," as the editor put it.

That lady was Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States. Impressed with her deep religious devotion, Editor Maxwell told Mrs. Priest he felt sure an article setting forth the spiritual treasures that money cannot buy might be a source of great inspiration to millions, especially if written by the Treasurer of the United States.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy is the title assigned to Mrs. Priest's article, which appears in the current issue of Signs of the Times, and I commend it to your reading. It follows:

TREASURES MONEY CANNOT BUY

(By Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States)

All the dollars in the United States Treasury taken together could not buy the dedication and devotion of people to the principles of freedom.

The irresistible, relentless progress that has given the United States the highest standard of living in the world was not purchased with money.

Money cannot buy patriotism, progress, or security. These are primarily spiritual things that live in the hearts of a people and cannot accrue to a government because of money or any material objects it gathers around it.

The price of our heritage was not money, but the ceaseless toil and prodigious efforts of those courageous pioneers who settled this land, tilled the soil, blazed the trails, extracted the minerals from the bounteous earth, and pushed the frontiers from the Atlantic to the far reaches of the Pacific. Then in their great generosity they bequeathed to the generations that followed, to us, the freedom that they purchased so dearly, the precious liberty which money could not buy.

Our American way is more than a treasure, indeed it is a treasure chest of treasures, for in truth it is composed of not one, but a multitude of related rights and freedoms, the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, the freedom to experiment, to change, to seek knowledge wherever research leads.

By material standards our system has succeeded. It is giving the greatest outpouring of material wealth that the world has ever seen and is providing the most equitable distribution system yet attained.

By spiritual standards it is an even greater success, surpassing any philosophy of government ever put into practice. The spiritual power of our way of life is derived from the Bible. Faith in God's wisdom and in our own abilities to work out our problems with divine help are deeply embedded in the great American tradition.

Belief in God gives an inner peace and contentment that is beyond the power of money to buy. Faith in the precepts and commands of God nurtures faith in man and leads to fair dealing, inegrity, honesty, and understanding among all. Understanding lays the groundwork of confidence and cooperation and encourages a striving to help those less fortunate. It gives us the humility to learn from others, and stamina and strength to make our own decisions. It teaches us patience in the face of obstacles and encourages us to be generous enough to share our good wealth with others. It enables us to turn a smiling face to cares, to preserve a buoyant, hopeful, youthful spirit, to abide by rules of virtue, to shun folly, and keep uppermost in our thoughts the eternal things of life.

Money cannot buy education or character for growing youngsters; it cannot give them a wholesome assurance, a confident ability in their capacity to meet life. Character can only be built when the aspirations of youth are lifted beyond worldly goods to lofty ideals that challenge them to be and do their best.

Money cannot buy progress, which comes from asking, seeking, knocking at all doors before us, sometimes evolving slowly from plodding, patient research into the mysteries of the unknown, and sometimes leaping into life from flashing, brilliant insights.

Truth cannot be bought with dollars. Money cannot buy the peace and contentment that come from an understanding heart. Happy homes, education, character, confidence, self-respect, kindness, generosity, and peace—these different forms of worthwhile treasures money cannot buy.

Nor can they come to those sufficient unto themselves. These treasures come only to those who look to God for leadership, who tap the inexhaustible sources of strength in the Bible.

It is because we as a people have placed our faith in God's wisdom that we are strong.

The motto, "In God we trust," long engraved on American coins, and recently engraved on postage stamps, has always been deeply engraved in our hearts. It has enabled our forefathers to stand, figuratively, on their own two feet and pull their solid weight.

If we but resolve to rededicate our lives to Christan living, the treasures money cannot buy will continue to multiply and America will be invincible and secure.

The Late William Sebastian Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, while on a short visit to Arkansas I was grieved to learn that a close, dear friend of mine—and a friend of the Congress—former Representative William Sebastian Jacobsen, of Iowa, had passed on.

Only the week before I left to visit in Arkansas I had received the tragic news of the passing of his sainted mother, and I had written to Bill expressing the sorrow of my family at his loss. Bill had continued to correspond with me after he had retired to Iowa from the Congress

to resume his work as owner and operator of a radio station along with other extensive business enterprises.

When Representative Jacobsen came to the Congress for the first time, I had the pleasure of meeting him. He was familiar with the workings of the Congress because his father, the late Bernard M. Jacobsen, had served in the Congress. Indeed, Bill took his father's seat in the Congress.

Thus, through many sessions of the Congress, the fine people of the Second District of Iowa were represented by noble men of the Jacobsen family. Both gentlemen made outstanding records of public service.

Those of us who had the honor and privilege of serving with Bill Jacobsen will miss his friendship and his counsel. He was a fine man and one whose friendship I was proud to have. Iowa has been most fortunate in the fine men who have represented her interests in the Halls of the Congress, and Bill Jacobsen will take his honored place in the ranks of those whom Iowa will long remember.

To the present delegation who represent Iowa in these Halls, may I express my sorrow and sympathy in your loss.

Misrepresentations in Billions, Blunders, and Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about Mr. Castle's book, Billions, Blunders, and Baloney in which he strongly criticizes United States foreign policy generally and the foreign assistance and overseas information programs particularly. Mr. Castle has made a lot of noise about this book; he has promoted it through a lavish advertising campaign, and, at this opportune time, when USIA appropriations are being considered, he has sent a self-serving circular about his book to the the Members of the Congress.

Unfortunately, the charges in Mr. Castle's book have received some attention, although they are little more than an indiscriminate collection of epithets and invective. The overseas information program is just crackpot, and incredible baloney to him. The Voice of America is yackety-yak-yak; and the film program flicker foolishness. In passing Mr. Castle criticizes just about every feature of American foreign policy from both the Democratic and Republican administrations. He condemns the Democrats for losing China and the Republicans for giving away Korea with an equal hand.

Mr. Castle is against almost everything but he is mostly against the United States Information Agency. In his book he makes charge after charge to show that our information functions are ineffective, wasteful, and mismanaged and he urges that they be stringently curtailed. Mr. Castle's opinions would be worthy of more respect if he were more careful with his facts. Wherever I have been able to test the accuracy of Mr. Castle's charges I have found them wanting. Let me give a few examples.

Right at the beginning of his book Mr. Castle tells of a conversation with two Arab publishers named Amin, in Egypt. He sets forth what purport to be actual quotations of their remarks, all of which are highly critical of the USIA program in Egypt. Now, almost nothing that Mr. Castle said was accurate. First of all, he didn't even get the names of the Arab publishers right. Secondly, he said the Voice of America broadcast to Egypt comes in during the early morning so that nobody listens to it when in fact it has always come in during the best evening hours. Although Mr. Castle was ostensibly quoting actual remarks, he admitted to the Appropriations Committee that he had lost his notes of the conversation with the publishers and was relying on his memory.

And, finally, at the request of the appropriations subcommittee, a letter was obtained from the publishers in which they state flatly that Mr. Castle not only misspelled their names but their ideas, and they asked expressly that the distortion of the facts about their views be set straight.

Mr. Castle also took the United States Information Agency apart for the elaborate quarters it occupies in Europe. Yet when the charges are examined against actual facts very little remains. In Paris, for example, Mr. Castle accused the Information Agency of occupying three swank buildings—the Rothschild Mansion, the Cafe des Ambassadeurs and the Hotel Astoria. What are the facts? The Hotel Astoria is a seven-story building. The USIA library occupies a part of the ground floor. That is the only space in the building occupied by the USIA and that space is being vacated this summer. As for the Cafe des Ambassadeurs—the Agency does not now occupy this building and did so only for long enough to close down the operations housed there before it took over the information program. Except for the library, then, USIA operations in Paris are entirely housed in one building, the Rothschild house, and not three separate buildings as Mr. Castle would have it. As for the Rothschild building, it was purchased by the State Department a long time ago and was simply inherited by the USIA, which has been trying to get out of it ever since.

Another sample of Mr. Castle's charges is in his discussion of the USIA film program. Mr. Castle has some claim to being an expert on motion pictures and his opinions on the USIA film program would, therefore, seem to command respect. Mr. Castle inveighed in the strongest terms against the "flicker foolishness" engaged in by USIA and flatly asserts the ineffectiveness of this "movie madness." Yet in the recent hearing before the appropriations subcommittee Mr. Castle had to admit that he had only seen 1 out of some 12 or 13 of the pictures recently made by the United States Information Agency and which he had presumed to criticize so harshly in his book. Hard-hitting anti-Communist movies like Poles Are Stubborn People, Dance to Freedom, Rape of the Baltic, and My Latvia were dismissed by him as worthless with the same easy disregard for fact which caused him to dismiss Mr. Cecil B. DeMille's opinion on the brilliant and costly propaganda films being made by the Soviet Union. Members of the subcommittee who saw the Soviet film entitled "The Doomed Vilage" can testify to the need for a hard-hitting film program to combat effective Soviet propaganda of this kind.

In my opinion a good many of the charges in Mr. Castle's book are reckless and not founded on fact. I feel that it has been harmful to the interests of the United States.

AKHBAR EL YOM,
SHARIA EL SAHAFA,
Cairo, March 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. WEATHERSBY: We were surprised that Mr. Eugene Castle in his recently published book claimed he had interviewed us about the USIA in Cairo. He not only misspelled our names but also mispelled our ideas. The fact is that this gentleman met us for a few minutes before a luncheon given by Mr. Saba Habach in the Mena House Hotel. All what he attributed to us is what he said himself. We disagreed with him, but he insisted he was right. He said he had come to Cairo and have visited many capitals to prove what he actually was convinced of before starting off from the States.

Will you please try to use your influence and correct this distortion of facts.

Yours sincerely,

MOSTAFA AMIN.
ALI AMIN.

Family Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange in St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, I wish to point out, is a cooperative wholesale organization serving 350,000 farmers in six Northwest States.

There has been long a feeling on the part of the Nation's family-type farmers that the Congress of the United States should adopt a statement of policy with respect to family-type farmers. Bills have been introduced on this matter. The resolution adopted by the Farmers Union Central Exchange delegates expresses the views of farmers on the need for such legislation.

Following is the full text of the resolution which I recommend to my colleagues:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY,

of Montana, entitled the Family Farm Policy Act which sets forth the family farmers' bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates in attendance at this 24th anual meeting of the Farmers Union Central go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address titled "Our National Security" was delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, United States Navy, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the annual meeting of the Macon (Ga.) Chamber of Commerce, April 6, 1955:

Tonight, I should like to discuss with you one matter that is most important to all of us: The security of our country. I hope that you will join with me in considering some of the important problems of security—and some of our hopes for the future.

First of all, why do we want security? The answer is: We want to live in freedom and truth. Such an answer goes back to the ideas brought to the eastern seaboard by our adventurous forefathers—and to the principles upon which our country was founded.

Later, these ideas were set forth for all to know, in our Declaration of Independence. The purpose of the Declaration, said Thomas Jefferson, was "not to find out new principles * * * but to place before mankind the commonsense of the subject."

Then, once the shooting phase of the American Revolution ended, General Washington and the Congress set about building the Nation and providing for its future safety. There seemed to be two fundamental ambitions in their hearts and minds:

First, they wanted to perpetuate freedom and preserve a large degree of individual liberty.

Second, they wanted to build a strong nation, able to withstand aggression from outside and factionalism from inside.

This Nation lives today as a testimonial to the foresight and wisdom of those early American patriots who realize that freedom and strength would have to march hand in hand if our Nation were to long endure.

Today, we have strength—great national strength. The President outlined some strengths in his state of the Union message at the beginning of the year—natural resources, a growing economy, good health, and national defense.

The President also pointed out in this same report to the Congress, that foremost among the broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice, and peace.

Yes; our overall national purpose is to provide for the welfare and security of the United States through peace—not war. This is a national decision, based on our entire national experience, and is worthy of our best national efforts.

Everything we are doing—our treaties with other nations, our current defense program, our assistance to other countries—is the result of our determination to work for peace and security.

But it is harder and more dangerous than we would like it to be because of the apparent refusal by two large nations to carry out the spirit and principles which must underwrite a real and lasting peace.

One is the Soviet Union. It is abundantly clear that Moscow schemes to create one Communist world with all that it means—one giant Red world with slavery and subordination for all.

The other is Red China. Red China wants one completely Red Asia, one which includes Formosa and the Pescadores. They have so stated, not once, but many times.

And the danger is made more acute because of the alliance these two countries have with one another.

This danger of which we speak is not theoretical. It occupies space and derives its power from the resources of that space.

From the military viewpoint, the spectacular aspect of Communist strength is its combination of a vast land area, a huge supply of people, and very large armed forces—including an increasing strength in air forces and nuclear weapons. Their massive military machine is an important part of their continuing effort to dominate and intimidate free nations on their periphery.

This in no way, however, describes the full scope of the Communist threat. Subversion, infiltration, persuasion, indoctrination, and nonviolent techniques of control also are important tools of the Kremlin. These more silent weapons can be just as lethal as cannon.

The result is that free nations are faced with a very real threat. The threat is many-sided. It is clearly a global problem. And because of the provocative attitude of the Chinese Communists, it seems somewhat more threatening than in previous years.

All in all, their evil forces have applied great internal and external pressures against all things we hold right. In 1949, the Chinese Communists conquered China. In 1950, they openly invaded North Korea with large forces; and in 1951, they seized Tibet. For years, they have supported guerrilla operations and sabotage in Indochina and Malaya, and have sworn to seize Formosa. And they may be expected to try to infiltrate other countries in Southeast Asia.

It is useful, I think, to remind ourselves that the major purpose of Communist strategy appears to be to break apart ties with allies, isolate free nations from each other, and prevent us from moving ahead to build collective strength on which our safety depends.

Communists like to pick off free nations, one by one. They do that to build up the idea that the march of communism is irresistible. They think if they can spread fright and hopelessness, then we will become rattled, and some free nations will move in one direction while we move in another.

As it has happened before, so can it happen again. The creeping militant expansion of communism backed by guns and bombs and several millions of troops—unrestrained by a solemn agreement, or moral restraint—is the primary long-term challenge to every one of us.

Now, in such a world, there is much that we in the United States can do to meet the challenge. The conduct of foreign affairs is of course a civilian responsibility, and the role of the military is to give advice on defense matters. However, our foreign policy and our military policy have certain common basic undertakings.

First, and this is our foremost line of action—we can protect and maintain our freedom, our form of government, and our way of life against any challenge. On this point, we recognize no limitation of expenditures or exertion.

Why do I put a strong defense of freedom first in priority? Because in my judgment, it is fundamental to our way of life. All other lines of action flow from it. Our natural resources, our prosperous economy, and our way of life could go for naught if we did not have the burning, fighting faith to protect them from danger.

Francis Bacon said this rather well in his essay on the Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates:

"Walled towns, stored arsenals and armories, Goodly Rases of Horses, Charriots of Warre, Elephants. * * * Artillery and the Like. All this is but a Sheep in Lion's skin except the Breed and Disposition of the people be stout."

I wish it were possible for me to tell you whether or not another shooting war will be forced upon us; and if one is, exactly where, when, how, and in what form it would take place. If I knew—my own job would be less difficult.

Obviously, our country does not want war, as our enormous patience clearly attests. We will not provoke a war against anyone. And we will not wage a so-called preventive war—even against an enemy. But neither will we surrender the principles which made our country great.

Unfortunately, another aggression could be initiated secretly almost any place, anytime—by a handful of men whose only allegiance is to themselves, and who have no Christian standards to govern their actions.

This being the case, then what should be the pattern for our Armed Forces?

Well—we do not pretend to have all the answers, but it certainly looks as if we must have Armed Forces which are ready for tremendous counteroffensive blows in event of a global war; and also ready for lesser military actions when and as directed by our Government.

Accordingly, based on these requirements, and the current world situation, the President decided that our defense program should be geared to the provision of a flexible but sturdy military posture—one which could be maintained over an extended period of time—and one which would take advantage of technological developments.

If we should be confronted by hostile aggression, naturally it would not make sense to let the enemy pick only those battle conditions and weapons which are best suited to him.

Consequently, in defense planning, we consider it important to have a capacity to retaliate—to counter an aggression—at the proper place by whatever military means are best suited to the situation at the time. One of the best safeguards for peace is the possession of such power that a would-be aggressor knows his aggression will be countered, and that he will receive far more devastation than he gives.

This is not a new defense policy this year. Nor is it a policy that commits us to atomic retaliation against all forms of aggression. It is not a "solve-all" nor is it a "do-everything" answer to the Communist menace. Nor has it ever been.

Sometimes one hears the question: Are we concentrating unduly on a certain weapon or type of warfare?

Here, I might take just a moment to emphasize, as I did in an address a year ago this month, that: Our military planning does not subscribe to the thinking that we can rely exclusively on one weapon, or one service, or that we can anticipate just one kind of war.

Actually, undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to some other. No one form of military action could be considered sufficient to meet all our modern security needs.

As time passes, changes do take place in our Armed Forces. We would not prepare to fight a next war with exactly the same weapons and methods as the last. Nor would

we prepare to fight a next war with "wonder" weapons alone. We cannot base our defense on pushing a button, and then dreaming that the menace has vanished.

Instead, our program for defense is based on a realistic and continuous assessment of the world situation. It is based on the maintenance of forces which could be used in a variety of situations whenever and wherever required. And should there be some fundamental change in the situation, for better or for worse, then military requirements for security probably would change too.

It is my personal conviction that our present defense program—the one submitted by the President to the Congress—provides the right combination of forces and facilities. The program maintains a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear.

Today, we have strategic air forces and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation, and we are going to keep them strong. Our country is particularly well suited for providing these two vital elements of the free world's capacity to counter an aggression.

We also have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending upon what the target requires. We have naval forces which can clear the sea lanes, and Army and Marine Corps forces which can do their part toward the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have armored, airborne, amphibious, and other modern forces, all of which are important to our national defense.

In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful forces, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. The fact that we have these ready forces, and that we have them with flexible nuclear capacities, should make it possible for free peoples everywhere to sleep a little safer at night.

At the same time, accelerated emphasis is being given to continental defense measures, to improving the readiness of our Reserve forces, and to continuing close cooperation with our friends to strengthen collective allied defense arrangements overseas.

Speaking of allied strength, it would be the greatest folly for us to drift back into weakness and disunity. Now is the time to pull together. Our great American poet, Mr. Longfellow, once wrote:

> "All your strength is in your union
> All your danger is in discord."

These words are true today; for when bound together in a pact, individual nations gain strength from close ties.

Gentlemen, just as in many aspects of business, we never seem to reach a point where we can feel sure we have all the answers. We do know, however, that the basic ideas of freedom are right and they are definitely worth defending.

The crux of the problem for free nations is that we are confronted with a large Communist menace whose aggressions should not be rewarded, ignored, or appeased. Communism would control all of us if it could.

Therefore, collectively we must have an inner strength and unity, and with this must go unselfish solidarity. We must never be afraid to fight intelligently and purposefully for life and honor against the vicious, ruthless enemies of freedom.

When all is said and done, one unassailable fact remains: Now, as never before, real preparedness is vital.

Speech by Hon. George S. Long, Member of Congress, Eighth District of Louisiana, Over Radio Station KSYL, Alexandria, La., April 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Friends, this is your Congressman, GEORGE S. LONG, speaking. I would like to thank this station for making it possible for me to bring you this message at this time.

I have been your Congressman for almost 3 years. I feel that I can say with pardonable pride that I have done a good job. I have one of the best voting records of any Member of Congress of the United States House of Representatives.

The record of my first session was 99 percent. During the second session I had to make a campaign and that voting record was not so good, but it was better than 85 percent. This time I expect to make it 100 percent.

May I say that I am on the job all of the time; that you have no trouble reaching me at any time, either at my office or at home. I have a telephone at home and can be reached there during the night if anyone cares to call me. I earnestly invite each and every one of you, if and when you come to Washington, to call me, come by and give me the benefit of your advice. If it is at night, do not hesitate to call me at home. I am always glad to hear from anyone from my district.

Many years ago the Congress wisely provided its Members with the franking privilege. One important reason for this was to afford Members of Congress a measure of protection against those who would mislead the public regarding their activities in Congress. Another reason was to insure that the public had correct information on activities and issues of interest and of importance to the people.

By distorting statements, twisting meanings, omitting pertinent parts, etc., it is possible to change the meaning of a comment or statement into something it was not intended to be. Some newspapers, either through carelessness or through deliberate intent, all too often present misleading and distorted information to the public. After all, it is well to remember that the voice of a newspaper is actually the voice of a single individual and not the infallible consensus of an informed group. The issues of a newspaper are just as much subject to personal and individual opinion, to bias, to display of that individual's likes and dislikes as the views of any individual. The main difference is that they have the advantage of using their newspaper to serve as their personal sounding board—to circulate their personal views.

As pointed out above, the Congress wisely afforded the public a measure of protection against those who misrepresent and distort the views and policies of Members of Congress, which are issued for the information and enlightenment of their constituents. No apologies are necessary in connection with the franking privilege for by its use can we more completely insure real freedom of speech and a well informed public. By use of a Member's frank his position on matters affecting the welfare and best interests of his constituents can be presented without distortion and misrepresentation.

The Alexandria evening newspaper complained of my sending out so many speeches under my franking privilege. Had I not mailed out these speeches to you, you would not have had the truth because this newspaper so distorted what I had to say that you could hardly recognize it.

I am only sorry that I have not been able to send you more speeches and official information about the doings of Congress, but my secretarial staff only permits me to send a limited number each year. But you may rest assured that I promised you when I went to Congress that you would hear from me and when you receive one of my speeches or information from my office, it means that I am carrying out the promise I made—that you would hear from me.

This same newspaper carried an article recently branding as socialistic prospective Government participation in a hoped-for project which would be of immeasurable benefit to many of our citizens. Is the effort to secure a fair share of Government benefits for our taxpayers to be branded socialistic? Would it brand as socialistic the policy of the Government to help the aged and the needy through our fine and humanitarian welfare program? Would it brand as socialistic the participation of the Government in our highway program, our agricultural conservation program, our flood control and drainage program, and the many other useful and beneficial programs which return to the people something worthwhile for the taxes paid? The possible utilization of portions of Kitsatchie National Forest for worthwhile purposes has merit and fits into land development and reclamation which are important to our citizens and to our Nation.

That same article was critical of a delayed-payment plan. Is the financing of your home or automobile or electrical appliances in any way un-American? Such installment-plan financing makes possible many necessities and conveniences which otherwise would be financially impossible to many.

Further, that writer, who has the earmarks of being antisocial and contrary to the betterment of the individual, appears opposed to a realistic tax reduction which would reach every taxpayer. About taxes there has been much said, and the load has increased through the years. The relief so far afforded has gone to the big man. The proposed $20-per-person exemption is exactly what it says—it will provide $20 relief for every person. Thus a family of 5 would benefit by $100 tax relief. Most of us consider $20 to be $20, and $100 to be $100. If that much relief can be obtained from the tax load, it will help all by that sum.

The public should understand that through the years everything changes. For example, insofar as a Member of Congress is concerned, the scope of his activities has broadened to the extent that he is called upon to perform many functions beyond the field of legislation. This is as it should be, and in order for a Member to do a creditable job certain expansions and improvements must be worked out.

Outlined below are certain items which accrue to every Member of the United States House of Representatives, 435 Members in all. Recently the evening newspaper criticized me because of what they called the trimmings I am receiving. These extras do not accrue to your Representative alone, as this newspaper would have you believe. They said, if I remember rightly, that I get 2,700 minutes per year for long-distance telephone calls in order that I may talk to my constituents on official business, if necessary. That is right. That I get 1,800 words per year for telegraph service; that is true. That I get $900 per year district

office rent. I do. That I get $1,200 yearly for stationery allowance. That is right. That I receive $200 per year airmail and special-delivery stamp allowance. That is so. An office is furnished each Member, with sufficient furniture and equipment to enable his office to function properly. Your Representative maintains a staff of competent employees, both in Washington and his district, to enable him to fully care for your requests and interests. But, my friends, all this they complain about does not increase my salary or the money that I take home one dime. Nor will it increase any of the salaries of the 435 other Members. All Members of Congress receive exactly the same salary and benefits that this newspaper has complained that I receive.

It is my aim to always fight for progress and reform; never to tolerate injustice or corruption; to always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers; to never lose sympathy with the poor; always to remain devoted to public welfare; never to be satisfied with merely printed news; always to be drastically independent; never to be afraid to attack wrong.

I have said in many of my speeches and I repeat here that I wanted to be elected to Congress, and it was my purpose to speak on the floor of the Congress and elsewhere when opportunity permitted for those who have no one to speak for them. This pledge I am carrying out to the best of my ability.

Problems of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a copy of a United States Information Agency magazine that is practically unknown in this country, but overseas, in the past 2 years, it has gained tremendous prestige.

The magazine is called Problems of Communism. It is published bimonthly in English, French, and Spanish, and monthly in Japanese.

Recent editions include articles such as:

Collectivization in China: A Story of Betrayal, by Richard L. Walker, No. 1, 1955.

Soviet Cinema: A History and an Elegy, by Dwight Macdonald, No. 1, 1955.

Poland After the Death of Stalin, by Jean Malara, No. 2, 1955.

Of this publication, Ost Europa, a magazine published in Stuttgart, recently said that it has "acquired a distinguished position among organs concerned with East European affairs," proving that "political orientation is compatable with factual treatment and high scholarly standards." In other words, the increasing prestige of Problems of Communism is proof that a highbrow magazine can have tremendous political weight if it adheres strictly to facts.

In further tribute to this United States Information Agency publication, several members of the French and British Parliaments recently requested that their names be put on the mailing list. Government officials throughout the free world have commented on its value in the fight against international communism. This little publication is proving important ammunition in the fight freemen everywhere are making to keep freedom alive in the world.

Incidentally, Problems of Communism is beginning to win recognition in the United States. Herbert A. Philbrick, of the New York Herald Tribune, recently congratulated the editors, declaring that "of all the material which I read and study concerning communism, problems of Communism is one of the most valuable sources of information available today."

In a letter to the editor, Fortune magazine called it "a most impressive set of documents from an impressive panel of authors."

The United States Information Agency, of course, has not made any effort in this country to build up circulation for the magazine. It is, however, available through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at 35 cents a copy or $1.50 per yearly subscription. As Theodore Streibert, Director of the Agency, sees its job, it is strictly an overseas operation. The purpose of the entire program is to make friends of overseas for the United States and to influence people in other lands, not the United States.

Problems of Communism illustrates another point seen as important by the Agency. The Agency does not have, and does not expect to have the resources to compete with the Communists in volume of operation. It must concentrate on targets where its efforts will be the most effective. Problems of Communism, which numbers among its contributors scholars, specialists, topnotch political analysts and journalists, both American and foreign, that is, Lazar Volin, Soviet specialist at the Department of Agriculture; Merle Fainsod, famous Harvard University authority on Russia; Hugh Seton-Watson, British authority on Eastern Europe; Raymond Aron, distinguished French political analyst, and so forth, is written for opinion molders. It goes to Government officials, writers, educators, and, yes, students. This, as I see it, is intelligent. Unless we plan to put billions into our overseas information program we must operate on this theory.

I might add that the coeditor of Problems of Communism, Abraham Brumberg, writes with firsthand knowledge of his subject. In 1941, he fled from the Soviet occupied city of Vilma, Poland. Coming to the United States, he served first in the Army. Later, he studied at Yale University, where he received an M. A. in Russian studies. Mr. Brumberg has edited the magazine, in cooperation with Miss Therese Thompson, for the past 3 years. The lady is an expert in the field of Communist affairs and in stylisitic editing.

Speaking of his work with the United States Information Agency, Mr. Brumberg told me:

I believe that there are many people throughout the world who have been misled by the promises and appeals communism has been offering over a period of years. It is our aim to reach these people with facts and irrefutable evidence, to point the gap between Communist promises and performances, myth and reality.

Mr. Brumberg came to Washington in 1952. Problems of Communism was then only an infant. It was taking its first faltering steps. It took the new coeditor only about a year to put the publication on its feet. Today, it is going places.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Society of Business Magazine Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me before the Society of Business Magazine Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, tonight with your kind indulgence, I should like to talk about the American economic way of life—and the deadly peril it faces.

Before I conclude, I hope to arouse in each of you the evangelistic fervor so badly needed to persuade millions of Americans their greatest hope for the Good Life lies in our competitive private enterprise system.

It is a marvelous machinery when you stop to think of it—delicate and sensitive to change—yet remarkably strong and sturdy. It is not perfect by any means, but it is far superior to any other system yet devised by man to satisfy his wants and needs and still allow him to call his soul his own.

You and I already know all this—or we wouldn't work where we do. We'd be with the ADA'ers and the Walter Reuthers, and with the rest of the left-wing pack now hotly fighting tooth and nail to destroy the very system which has made America at once the marvel and the envy of the world.

Whether we like it or not, those who would build a new social order based on the iron fist of Big Government have gained considerable ground through a calculated campaign of deceit and demagoguery. Already they have enlisted millions of gullible folks in the battle to overthrow the economic freedom we all enjoy and the political freedom that goes with it.

Make no mistake, gentlemen, this is a life-and-death struggle between two ways of economic life as different as night and day.

Under the private competitive system, the amount and kinds of goods produced are determined in the marketplace by the decrees of fluctuating consumer prices. Countless individuals decide what they will buy and what they will pay. Government acts as referee to prevent excesses on the part of any one group at the expense of other groups. Government itself avoids excesses of power.

Under the Reuther-Keyserling system, Government decrees determine the amount and kinds of goods produced. Herein consumers are economic captives—and likewise political prisoners. Government no longer is the referee. Government is the boss.

In essence, this is what the battle today is about.

Old stuff, you say?

Gentlemen, I submit that it is as new as tomorrow's headlines. And the consequences of the proposed social reforms are as potentially devastating as the hydrogen bomb.

As a matter of cold reality, the battle is already upon us. Enemy snipers man the firing lines 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Only a few weeks ago, they came close to winning a major contest. I refer to the recent tax fight in Congress.

There is no neutral ground in this battle. There are no innocent bystanders.

If you sincerely believe—as I do, with all my heart—in the fundamental rightness of the private competitive system, you must be willing to fight for it.

You may recall that following the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin was questioned about the results. "What have you given us?" someone asked.

"A Republic," he replied, "if you can keep it."

Gentlemen, we of this generation were given another precious inheritance—the private competitive system. The question is, "Can we keep it?"

Before we can launch a counterattack to keep our way of life, we must first size up our enemies.

Strong in numbers, they are firmly entrenched in powerful associations—political parties, some labor organizations, some farm groups, the egghead clans, and in the press. They are well-financed and even now are fattening their war chests. Clever and unscrupulous, they wage relentless war—day and night, Sundays and holidays—under the rules of jungle warfare: No holds barred and no quarter given.

Nevertheless, there is one thing in our favor—they telegraph their punches. We have advance notice of their intentions.

Less than a month ago in Washington, D. C., Americans for Democratic Action penciled out their blueprint for America. After much clackety-clack about preserving the free-enterprise system, they outlined their domestic policy recommendations, which, if actuated, of course, would torpedo the free-enterprise system.

Less than 1 week ago the United Automobile Workers, under Walter Reuther, convened in Cleveland and went down the line for a program that is a dead ringer for the ADA plan.

What the Keyserling-Reuther boys advocate is prosperity through greater Government spending, coupled with lower personal-income taxes for the poor, and higher taxes for the rich. They demand heavier taxes on so-called excess profits and surplus savings of business and people.

They want more Federal ownership, more Federal development, more Federal operation, more Federal bureaucracy, more Federal debts and taxes, and more Federal controls.

This is the same eyewash that was peddled to the country in the thirties and forties. It wasn't good for us then, and, I submit, it isn't good for us now.

Starting in 1932 the New Deal spent billions of dollars to increase purchasing power, and Federal bureaucrats pulled the strings in every major field of endeavor. Yet in 1937 the country was down to 1932 levels. In 1939 there were 9 million unemployed. And that doesn't count the part-time unemployment, which Mr. Keyserling now insists on using to exaggerate present unemployment.

The butterfly economists struck out time and again. But they are still in the game pitching, anticipating another turn at bat.

They, and their political-empire-building brethren, have just staged a grandstand play in the Congress. The Reuther-Keyserling wing of the Democratic Party tried for a double play, votes for Democrats at $20 a head and a black eye for Republicans who opposed that kind of tax relief at this time. It was a close play, but the majority umpires in Congress called them out.

This is not ancient history, gentlemen, this is now.

On the floors of Congress, the Nation was told that the way to economic health was to increase purchasing power of low-income people, who in turn would spend most of the tax cut. This would stimulate demand for consumer goods, which would increase production and employment and eventually factories would expand and new jobs would open up.

This was called the percolate-up theory.

The trouble with the percolate-up theory is that you keep adding water to the bottom of the pot, but you don't put coffee in the top.

At the same time, we were urged to kill off tax policies which encouraged people to risk their savings in business investments so production can expand and new jobs result.

The policies that would prevail should the Reuther-Keyserling crowd run the Government were never more clearly revealed than in the political, hypocritical tax proposals submitted to the Congress this year.

Despite the existing Federal debt, despite an anticipated deficit for the current fiscal year, despite the danger of inflation, per capita tax cuts were proposed without offsetting revenues to pay for them.

To make up the loss in revenue, the Government would have to borrow money and pay the interest charges.

So what the Democrats really proposed was increased purchasing power for consumers achieved with borrowed money, printing press money.

Well, if this is valid for a small increase in purchasing power, why not let the Government borrow without limitation, print a lot of money and increase consumption even more?

Obviously, no nation can long endure by this process. Yet this is what the left-wingers proposed.

The per capita tax cuts were not only unsound and irresponsible, they were vicious in their impact. Instead of being based on ability to pay, they were across-the-board reductions. Had the proposal been to increase taxes by a flat amount, there would have been howls of anguish heard around the world.

Incitement to class warfare marked the impassioned speeches of tax-cut sponsors. "Soak the rich" was an underlying theme. But elementary arithmetic shows it can no longer be done. Taxes have already squeezed all but the last remaining drops of juice out of this source. The Tax Foundation says that if Uncle Sam grabbed 100 percent of everyone's income over $10,000, he would collect less than $5 billion—not enough to run the Government for a month.

No, the great middle-income class in this country is the only remaining source for substantial tax revenues. And that is already heavily tapped.

Certainly, no one today will argue that our tax laws have not whittled down the upper-income classes.

Are the middle-income classes to be likewise whittled down and eventually destroyed through oppressive taxes?

In these wonderful United States, we have managed to avoid division of our people into two income groups—the very rich and the very poor—a characteristic of many other nations of the world and one which we do not wish to acquire here.

Instead of yawning chasm between the immensely rich and the poverty-stricken in the United States of America there is a strong, broad bridge of middle-income families. The Commerce Department tells us more than 40 percent of American families earn over $5,000 a year. Fifty-five percent of the families in the United States have incomes of $4,000 or more a year.

These are the people who keep this country going—who run the factories, who till the soil, who sell the goods—who buy what is produced—and who pay the taxes that support the Government.

And these are the people—the Reuthers and Keyserlings notwithstanding—who own shares in American business.

Available studies disclose some 6 to 7 million individuals hold stocks in publicly owned corporations; some 3 million individuals, in personal holding corporations. How many own both types, we do not know, but undoubtedly there is some overlapping.

In addition to individual stock ownership, institutions also hold shares. The extent of institutional stock ownership is not available, but there are at least 1,000 such institutions. Through them, untold millions of Americans have an interest in stocks as a result of their equities in life insurance policies, pension plans, and the like.

What happens when the power to tax is used to wipe out the middle class? The wheels of industry stop turning, and Government steps in to manage the economy.

This is not idle speculation. Just a few years ago Mr. Truman seized the steel mills, claiming he had inherent power to grab private property. If the Government can seize business property, it can also take individual property. The social reformers have shown their hand—there can be no doubt as to their intentions should they regain power.

Socialism never worked in other countries and was a miserable flop when tested in the United States.

Why then can the Reuthers and the Keyserlings continue to capture ground with this proposition?

Why indeed?

In the first place, of course, they disguise their proposals in sheep's clothing. The wolf fangs don't show to the uninitiated.

And that's where you and I, and everybody else who recognizes the Reuther-Keyserling scheme for the hoax that it is—have fallen down on the job.

We have failed even to get this simple message across. If it is true that Government should have more responsibility—in other words, more control—over the economy so people can have more freedom, then those pitiful masses of humanity behind the Iron Curtain should be the freest in the entire world.

We have failed to convince the workers of America of their personal stake in our system of private ownership and production where opportunity beckons to those willing to work to progress.

We have failed to rally our forces in every walk of life to spread the golden gospel of opportunity for all.

Opinion Research Corp., at Princeton, N. J., conducted a poll of high-school seniors in 86 communities throughout the country. When asked "Is the theory 'from each according to his ability, to each according to need' a valid basis for an economic system?", 55 percent replied "Yes."

Over half the high school seniors—the citizens of tomorrow—accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Think of that.

Sixty percent said owners get too much of the profits.

Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Do you people here in this room think there is no competition in your business?

Seventy-six percent believed that owners get most of the gains from new machinery.

Sixty percent said a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, gives an idea of what we are up against.

How fertile is the soil for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

Well, how shall we counterattack?

Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our sytem—let us seize every opportunity to lambaste theirs.

We can begin in our own homes with our own children to extol the virtues of private ownership of property and to explain the benefits of competition. There are countless examples of everyday products and services used in the home which, because of competition, have increased in quality while dropping in price. Television is an outstanding example.

In our daily work we can spread the gospel and at the same time expose the Reuther-Keyserling hokum that is bewitching and bewildering our people. We should constantly show up the concept of more personal freedom under more Government control as a hoax—a snare and a delusion.

Every day in every way we should cite chapter and verse where socialism—the real name for the Reuther-Keyserling program—has failed.

The greatest socialist experiment in world history is Soviet Russia. It is a gold mine of examples to turn our people away from the honey-poison ideas of the Reuthers and Keyserlings and the other leftwing Socialists. Russia is first and foremost the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It should be so identified to our people who think of it only as a Communist political government.

Should the Reuther-Keyserling Socialist movement win out in the United States, business editors would soon go the way of Russian writers—urging the poor devils on the production line to greater efforts, rationalizing the inevitable failures under the socialist system, and rewriting history to suit the purposes of political ruling bosses.

We can bend every effort to get business people to set aside a portion of their advertising budgets to preach the gospel of the free, competitive way of life.

Enlightened management is already moving in that direction. Every now and then I notice an advertisement in a national magazine dedicated to informing workers and consumers how the profit system benefits them. But so far we are using only BB guns—when the battle demands heavy artillery.

We need spokesmen who understand our system and can explain it to the man on the street. At the same time, they must also counteract the Reuther-Keyserling poison that has already infected a great body of people. We need advocates for our cause on radio and television programs, on discussion panels in church and educational groups. We need writers in our newspapers and magazines who will help us carry the ball. We must make meaningful to various groups in the country—the teachers—the miners—the farmers—the factory workers—the college students—the big stake they have in the private economic system—and what they stand to lose under Socialist schemes so ardently and artfully peddled by enemies of economic freedom. How many union members realize that when Government operates business, the right to strike evaporates. By law Government employees are forbidden to strike.

It is not enough just to talk with each other. We must reach those who are falling for the Socialist line because they know not what they do.

The big showdown will come in November 1956.

What will be decided is not just the future of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

The free way of life as we have known it is at stake. The system which offers the greatest opportunity for individual advancement according to ability and the greatest rewards for effort is under attack by enemies who are playing for keeps. Their burning arrows have already set the house afire.

I for one am not going to stand idly by and let it burn to the ground.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on last evening, April 17, I made a broadcast over station WMCA, of New York City, on 2 subjects which in my opinion are of the utmost importance to the people of the United States. First and foremost is the question of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, the question of war or peace. Second is the case of Edward Corsi. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The past month, since I last reported to you, has been another eventful one. There has been no great activity here in Congress. We had a 10-day recess for Easter. But there has been no recess on the world front—no recess in the Formosa Straits. And there has been no recess in developments of national political interest.

Two subjects have been the main objects of attention in Washington: First and foremost, the question of Formosa, of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands—the question of war and peace, and second, the case of Edward Corsi.

President Eisenhower has often referred to his administration and to his Cabinet as a team. If they are a team, it is the strangest team in history because it seems to make plays which have no relationship to the signals being called, in public, by the quarterback. President Eisenhower makes fine public statements, with many of which I agree, but his team continues to act as if they had never heard these statements. The Eisenhower team seems to be playing on a different field, in a different game, under a different set of rules, than President Eisenhower himself. For this he must be credited with full responsibility. It is his team.

The 1A test example of incredible conduct on the part of the Eisenhower administration is the case of Ed Corsi, former industrial commissioner of the State of New York, former Republican candidate for the United States Senate, and until very recently, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Immigration Matters.

As everybody knows, Mr. Corsi was fired by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles—kicked out of his job—because we was trying to do a job—the job he was assigned to do.

Mr. Corsi took the job at the request of the White House, to try to unsnarl the red-tape and to clean up the mess involving the refugee relief program. Under this program, enacted in 1953, the United States was going to admit 209,000 escapees and refugees from Europe and elsewhere into the United States. Well, to date, almost 2 years later, about 1,000 actual escapees and refugees have been admitted, along with a number of relatives. The entire program has turned out to be a fraud and a failure.

So the White House called in Mr. Corsi, who has a considerable reputation as an administrator, and who is known as a friend of immigration. Corsi's job was to break the administrative logjam. He was to see to it that as many refugees and escapees as possible were admitted into the United States in the remaining months during which the Refugee Relief Act is still in effect.

But in Washington, Mr. Corsi made a critical mistake. He took his job seriously. He pushed, he scolded, he insisted that the red-tape be cut and that refugees be admitted into the United States. He even spoke out against the racist and discriminatory McCarran-Walter Act and urged its drastic amendment.

In Congress, powerful elements committed to the discriminatory principles of the McCarran-Walter Act attacked Mr. Corsi. They went over his past with a fine-toothed comb. They made veiled allusions to vague organizations he had belonged to 20 or 30 years ago. The witch hunt was on.

Secretary Dulles, Mr. Corsi's boss, reacted to the attack against his subordinate by beating an inglorious, shameless retreat. He announced publicly that Mr. Corsi was being investigated for security, and that anyway, Mr. Corsi was in Washington on a temporary 90-day appointment only.

This was news to Mr. Corsi, who had come to Washington prepared to stay and see the refugee program through.

Secretary Dulles had more news for Mr. Corsi. He announced subsequently that Mr. Corsi was no longer to be special assistant for immigration problems. In short, he was fired.

It was not a question of Mr. Corsi's loyalty, Secretary Dulles said. It was just that Mr. Corsi was such a poor administrator.

Mr. Corsi has accused Secretary Dulles of lying. Secretary Dulles has suggested that Mr. Corsi is not telling the truth.

In the light of this development, and of these charges and countercharges, I felt a congressional investigation would be a good thing. I urged that such an investigation be instituted. It is now in progress. I trust and hope that the facts will be brought out.

There is one fact, however, which is perfectly clear without further investigation. That is the fact that the refugee relief program has been a tragic disappointment and a dreadful failure.

You may be interested to know that I am preparing to introduce a set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. Those amendments would eliminate the unwise and unsupportable provisions of the present refugee law. My amendments would make the refugee relief program easier to administer. My amendments, if enacted, would make it possible to admit most, if not all, of the 209,000 refugees and escapees authorized to be admitted under the basic terms of that law.

But, no matter how good a law, its purposes can be totally frustrated by unsympathetic and obstructive administration of the law. In reverse, even a bad law can be made to work by liberal, sympathetic, and intelligent administration of it.

I do not know whether we can get this kind of administration of the Refugee Relief Act from the present regime in Washington, even if my amendments to the law are adopted. Mr. Corsi tried, and you know what happened to him.

The question of Mr. Corsi is not the only one troubling Secretary Dulles and the Eisenhower administration these days.

There is a far more explosive problem to be dealt with—and far more important for the United States. That is the question of Formosa, of Quemoy, and Matsu.

Quemoy and Matsu are, of course, those little islands directly off the coast of China, within the very tidewaters of the Chinese mainland. The administration has half-committed the United States to defend those islands, which are now occupied by Chiang Kai-shek, if the Red Chinese attack them.

Maybe we will defend those islands. Maybe we won't. One week we hear in Washington that the administration is prepared to go to war over those islands. The next week we hear that the administration definitely will not go to war over those islands. It is a war of nerves. The chief victims of this war, however, are the American people and the people of the free world.

The chief of naval operations, Admiral Carney, is reported to have predicted that Red China would attack Quemoy and Matsu by April 15, and that by that date we would be in war.

Admiral Carney has denied that he made the prediction. It was another incident in the war of nerves.

But make no mistake about it. The experts in and out of Washington are agreed—they have no doubt—that the Red Chinese are planning to attack Quemoy and Matsu, and are only waiting for the most opportune moment.

What will we do then, when and if an attack is launched, against these islands which have always belonged to the Chinese mainland and are part of the Chinese mainland?

Military experts tell me that there is no way to defend these islands except by bombing the Chinese mainland. There is little question of what would happen then. That would mean all-out war with China. Would it be an atomic war? I do not know. I suspect it would. Red China may not have atomic bombs, but Red Russia has. Are we going to risk atomic war, with all its frightful, world-shattering implications, for the defense of islands which we have no legal right to defend under international law?

Let us not deceive ourselves. In such a war we would fight alone. Alone in the world, with not a single major ally at our side.

We are, of course, committed—I do not question that commitment for a moment—to defend Formosa against a Communist attack. That is what we should be concentrating on—the building up of strength and free-world solidarity for the defense of Formosa. We should be trying, with all the means at our disposal, to associate as many allies as possible with ourselves for the defense of Formosa against aggression. We cannot, and should not, try to do it or go it alone.

A united world front in defense of Formosa against aggression will surely deter the Red Chinese, if anything can deter Red China.

Let us ask ourselves: What is Red China really after? Is it Quemoy and Matsu or Formosa? No; these are only tidbits—means to an end. What Red China really wants is the domination and control of all Asia.

Quemoy and Matsu offer Red China such an opportunity, if we defend them. The masses of the people of Asia are convinced that Quemoy and Matsu should belong to Red China. They believe Red China would be justified in taking possession of these islands by force if necessary. And this same view is held by the vast majority of the peoples and governments of Europe, too.

If we, the United States, undertake to defend these islands against a Red Chinese attack, and thus initiate a war with Red China, and possibly with Russia, too, it will be a war under the best conditions for the Communists, and the worst for us. If we make it an atomic war, we may win temporarily in China, but we will lose permanently in the rest of the world.

We dare not contemplate this prospect. On the contrary, we should make clear, immediately, that we have no such thought in mind. We must make clear that we not only seek peace, but we seek to avoid war.

Formosa represents a point where we can rally the free world; yes, even the peoples of Asia.

I am not trying to run the foreign policy of the United States. That is President Eisenhower's responsibility. But he shall have my views when I honestly differ with him, as I do now, and my support when he is following what I consider the right road.

This is an obligation I owe to you, the people of New York State, whom I represent in the Senate, and to my country. It is an obligation I owe to my conscience.

Thank you, my friends, for listening to my latest report from Washington.

A Great Democratic American and a Great American Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to join with many thousands of fellow citizens and fellow Democrats last Saturday night in paying a well deserved tribute to a really great man, the Speaker of this House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

It is now my privilege to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made on that occasion by former President Harry S. Truman as follows:

TRUMAN SPEECH

I assume that it is no longer "top secret" that I am an early riser. It runs in the family. My father was always out of bed at about 4 a. m. My mother used to sing a song to my brother, sister, and me about the sluggard who liked to lie abed and what awful things happened to him. Solomon and Ben Franklin, too, had things to say about late sleepers.

Anyway—the other morning a neighbor caught up with me on one of my regular walks. There was a touch of spring in the air, and I was up earlier than usual. I missed some of the neighbors who usually join me on my walks and who talk with me about everything under the sun.

These good people are so typical of Americans throughout this wonderful land. They are friendly, alert, and inquiring and vigorous in their questions.

On this particular morning, my walking companion said: "I hear you are going to Washington to make a speech. What are you going to talk about?"

I said: "No, I am not going to make a speech. I am making this trip to join in the honoring of a great American, my friend and former colleague, SAM RAYBURN."

RECALLS ROOSEVELT'S DEATH

No doubt you remember, Sam, that meeting which took place in your office on the 12th day of April, 10 years ago last Tuesday. I came to see you to get an agreement between the Speaker and the Vice President on certain legislation and to discuss the domestic and world situation generally.

While I was in your office, I received a telephone call to come to the White House as soon as possible. When I arrived at the White House, Mrs. Roosevelt informed me that the President was dead.

Just 10 years ago last Tuesday one of the greatest of the Presidents of the United States passed away.

Mr. Roosevelt, in my opinion, was one of the few great men of the ages whose interest and life were devoted to the welfare of the everyday man. You and I, Sam, missed him very much at the time. The country and the whole free world missed him. And we will continue to miss him as long as it is necessary for someone to look after the interests of the common people who make up the population of this country and the world. I did my best to continue the policies he advocated for the welfare of this country and for world peace.

Sam, you have set an example for conduct and leadership in the Congress and in political life that has earned you the affection and the respect of the entire Nation, regardless of party. Your place in history is secure, not only because you have served longest as Speaker of the House of Representatives, but because you never yield to partisanship on the basic issues affecting the welfare of the Nation.

So, it is well that we remind ourselves tonight that if the United States is a world leader among the nations today, you will find that SAM RAYBURN played a large part in helping our country to achieve this leadership. If the United States today is a leader in democracy for its enlightened social legislation, you will find that SAM RAYBURN in Congress had a large role in shaping that legislation. I know of few Americans who symbolize the good deeds of this country so much as SAM RAYBURN. It took something more than ordinary talent and courage to look over the horizon beyond the interests of his own district and his own State to the broader view of this country and the world.

CRITICIZES PRESS

That is why I am so glad to be here tonight. (You know I have been working hard lately to put together the important facts about our own administration so as to set the record straight.)

In paying tribute to SAM RAYBURN we are taking this opportunity also to remind ourselves and the world of the reasons for America's great achievements and leadership. At this time, when many of us are worried, and even fearful, about what is happening in this country and abroad, let us not forget how soundly and securely we have built this country so that it has even been able to withstand some pretty bad management of the Government during the last 2 years.

A most remarkable display of publicity and cooperation from the newspapers has tried to keep much of this bad management from the people. There has been no parallel in our history to the cloak of protection thrown about this administration by so much of the press.

You know, we have heard a good deal about a slogan intended to impress our enemy—and that slogan is: massive retaliation. Well, the Democrats know something about massive retaliation. It's the kind of press the Democrats get everywhere, all the time.

Future historians will be puzzled when they come to judge our times, when they see how so much of the press distorted the facts so that no Democratic administration could do right and no Republican administration could do wrong.

What the press and radio commentators said about me never worried me personally. But I have always felt that there is no sense in having a free press under the Constitution and yet not have it free in fact. The people should not be limited to what the publishers choose to tell them. The people are entitled to all the facts and all the news.

There is only one rightful purpose for a government to use publicity, and that is to inform the public of all the facts and the

whole truth. But publicity is no substitute for performance. Yet never in the peacetime history of this Nation has there been such a vast volume of persistent publicity to praise and extol an administration.

We know that in certain sections of the world this is an automatic practice.

I ask you, why the big buildup in this free country? Why?

I, for one, am glad that SAM RAYBURN is again Speaker of the House. Sam is an old and experienced hand in sensing what the real issues are. He knows what is best for all the people and how to attend to their interests in Congress. He is not easily deceived by ballyhoo. And when the security of the Nation is involved, he always rises above partisan politics.

He is a remarkable example of that courageous statesmanship which this Republican administration would do well to emulate. For this administration has been playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources.

I regret to say that we have not seen such cynical political behavior in any administration since the early twenties. The price of compromise with the extremists within the Republican party has led this administration to surrender on basic principles on foreign policy. It has resulted in confusion and disturbing the American people and in frightening our friends and allies.

The administration has talked about an "agonizing reappraisal" of foreign policy. I can well understand their agony. After repeatedly getting into trouble with their own policy, it must be agonizing indeed to realize that sooner or later they must reverse themselves and return to the sound policies of the Democratic administration.

There is no room for partisan bickering over the great issues of national survival. Our foreign policy ought to be the foreign policy of the United States and not the foreign policy of 1 Senator, or 1 general, or 1 admiral, or 1 party. The Democratic Party understands this.

The Republican administration has repeatedly played political tricks with the grave and serious issues of both foreign and domestic policies.

CITES MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The state of the Union address by the Republican administration in 1953 launched this business of conducting foreign affairs for domestic political advantage. It was in this address that the administration announced it was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek to attack the mainland of China. They announced they were moving the Seventh Fleet, which was there only to protect Chiang. Anyway, it was a serious blunder, and they had to put the fleet back.

The Republican administration must have known that the picture of an unleashed Chiang Kai-shek invading China was a barefaced political fraud. But the idea behind all this was to attempt to discredit the sound policy of the Democratic administration which was carefully designed to limit the conflict in the Far East.

And now the Republican administration is desperately trying not only to limit the conflict in Asia but to get a permanent cease-fire there. I fervently hope they do. But the administration, by this unfortunate political maneuver in its state of the Union message, has enabled the Communists to picture us as instigating and preparing an attack on China and has embroiled us in controversies with almost all our allies in Asia and in Europe.

If we are face to face in Asia with the prospect of war, a war which the administration says may have to be fought with atomic weapons, nobody is going to get any political advantage out of it. If we are pushed into the abyss of a new war, the whole world may tumble into that abyss with us.

I suggest that as Americans, working together in good faith, we ought to back a national bipartisan foreign policy with these simple fundamental aims:

First, let us keep the free nations together for a common purpose, and that is to defend our common freedom.

Second, to uphold the principles of international peace and order, the principles that are embodied in the United Nations.

Third, to strengthen in every way we can the weaker members of the free nations of the world and to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world so that all may have enough to eat, enough to wear and a decent place in which to live. Our aim is not to make people fight for us, but to win them over to freedom and to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Fourth, we must keep our country strong in every way, militarily and economically.

ATTACKS SERVICE CUTS

And we cannot keep the country strong militarily by cutting the Army and the Navy. We must keep our Armed Forces in line with our military commitments. Important as atomic weapons are, there is as yet no substitute for men. It takes men in the Armed Forces to make even a pushbutton war work. In fact, in atomic warfare, it takes more men, better-educated men and better-trained men than in preatomic warfare.

These are the basic elements of a foreign policy on which the whole nation could unite. We ought to be giving all our attention to this task instead of trying to make political capital out of the dangers and difficulties of world affairs.

The Republicans ought to know that the best hope of avoiding ultimate tragedy depends upon the full and free cooperation of the Democratic majority in Congress and the majority of the people in the country.

The times are critical, and we face serious decisions. They demand the best that is in us. They require leadership of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many more years of life and good fortune and of service to the Nation. And my best wishes to you, Senator JOHNSON, and to your colleagues in the Senate and the House.

The Department of Commerce and the Alleged Defense Essentiality of the Watch Industry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter which I addressed to Secretary of Commerce Weeks some 10 days ago:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 15, 1955.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This morning, I read newspaper reports of your press conference and was very much surprised to learn that you told newsmen you had never seen the report prepared last year by the Defense Department concerning the jeweled watch industry.

It was particularly disturbing to me that you were unaware of the contents of this report in view of the fact that: (1) Your Department took the lead in persuading ODM last year that the domestic jeweled watch industry was essential to national defense; (2) you and other Commerce officials have frequently testified before congressional committees concerning the vital role which the four jeweled watch companies supposedly play in our defense production, and (3) at the present time, the Commerce Department is sponsoring an exhibit by the domestic watch industry emphasizing the unique importance of these firms in the defense procurement picture.

I think you will agree with me that the Defense Department is in an excellent position to evaluate whether the skills and facilities of the watch industry are truly vital to national security. Certainly, it would have been advisable for you and other Commerce officials to have studied the Defense Department's report on this subject—which was made available to you although it was suppressed from the public and the Congress for obvious reasons.

For your information, I am attaching a copy of the Defense Department report, which was recently declassified. You will note that the report can hardly be considered as obsolete since it was prepared less than a year ago after the most exhaustive study. Mr. C. S. Thomas, who was then Assistant Secretary of Defense and is now Secretary of the Navy, emphasized that "the report has had the benefit of the most thorough examination by technical experts of the three military departments. The conclusions have been reached after careful consideration by cognizant officials of the Department." Certainly, nothing has happened within the past year which would give the Defense Department a valid excuse for changing the findings and recommendations in this report.

The conclusions reached by the Defense Department were as follows:

(1) "The timing devices used in the ammunition program were produced by the jeweled watch manufacturers, nonjeweled watch and clock manufacturers, and others completely outside the horological group. There does not appear to be any part of the manufacture or assembly of mechanical time fuses that is peculiar only to the jeweled watch industry."

(2) "Only 11 percent of the total mobilization requirement (for all timing devices) planned with industry, is with the jeweled watch industry."

(3) "There is in no way a unique requirement for it (the jeweled watch industry) in the fuse program." Many manufacturers outside the jeweled watch industry "are capable of producing mechanical time fuses and rear fitting safety devices. Every part is being produced by some company other than a jeweled watch firm."

(4) Mobilization requirements of the Defense Department for jeweled watches and chronometers are "nominal," far below World War II levels. Sufficient capacity "will remain and can be used for current procurement needs and be the basis for supplying the mobilization requirements. If, in the future, it should become apparent that sufficient capacity will not be maintained and available, the Defense Department can then procure all of its requirements of jeweled movements for the mobilization reserve"—i. e., can easily be stockpiled.

(5) The needs of the Defense Department for industrial capacity clearly demonstrate that "no special nor preferential treatment for the jeweled watch industry is essential."

I hope that you and other Commerce Department officials will study this document carefully. In view of this authoritative report by the Department of Defense, it seems hard to understand why the Commerce Department continues to insist upon further

Government protection for the domestic watch industry—particularly in view of the current prosperity of these firms and the hardships which have been imposed upon American watch importer-assembler firms, United States exporters, and milions of watch customers who now must pay higher prices.

Actions by the administration to curtail watch imports have a direct result on the ability of the Swiss to purchase American agricultural and industrial products. The farm population in my district is keenly aware of the fact that their market for cotton, rice, and other commodities is sharply reduced when other nations are deprived of the dollars they need to trade with the United States.

In view of the fact that the Defense Department has conclusively stated that there is no need for special Government action to protect the domestic watch industry, the administration should immediately reconsider its moves which have been so destructive of international trade and friendship with the Swiss.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the smoke screen created by the Corsi affair and other attempts to discredit our immigration program, the Eisenhower administration will allow almost four times as many Italians to enter the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, than are normally allowed under the immigration quota. This is a little known fact which has been deliberately obscured by certain elements who for political purposes are attempting to sabotage a great humanitarian undertaking.

The refugee relief program is designed to bring 209,000 deserving aliens to America by December 31, 1956. Under the act Italy is far in the lead with some 21,000 visas expected to be issued by June 30. This is in addition to the normal Italian quota of 5,645 visas per year.

The refugee program is now operating so well that there can be issued by December 31, 1956, sufficient visas for all who can qualify under the act and for whom there are required assurances. Those who are sincerely interested in the success of the refugee program can perform a great service by fostering the granting of assurances for the benefit of those who desire to come to America. An assurance, of course, is a guaranty that the alien will not become a public charge.

The refugee relief program is now at the half way point in its 40-month life. Some 108,000 persons have entered the pipeline—those are the applicants who have been notified of documents required to speed their cases toward a visa. Remember that the act calls for 209,000 admissions. Consequently, there is no reason why all qualified applicants cannot be processed in due course. The Department of State, starting from scratch in 1953, has established a worldwide visa issuing organization to administer the law.

Booze Broadcasting Is a Beast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4627, which is a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages. It is my hope and desire that my colleagues will study this bill carefully and then act favorably upon it for the sake of a more spiritual citizenship, a more stabilized American home, and a more serious-minded youth of tomorrow.

There are some things that should be strictly regulated while they exist or else put in complete subjugation among civilized peoples, for example, the rattlesnake, the brothel, the stalking murderer, the insidious thief, the troublemaker at home or abroad, and the nice, genteel advertisement of booze in whatever form may be best calculated to make strongest appeal to our boys and girls. You say it is a legal subject matter. So is the rattlesnake. You say freedom of speech and of press are inviolable. Yes; but under exercise of police power we do not allow the free-speech man to use indecent language in the public square nor do we allow the free-press man to publish obscene pictures in the Daily Times. Morals, health, and welfare may be, ought to be, and must be closely and firmly regulated under the police power concept breathed into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers more than a century and a half ago.

In the dusty annals of bygone history, there once lived a king named Belshazzar. He was "a man of distinction." So much so that one night he had a great feast and invited 1,000 of his lords, not to speak of many princes, wives and concubines that also came along in great numbers. Now it looked like everybody wanted to be a man of distinction and get on a big binge on that occasion. I suppose the 1,000 lords about all got tanked up and doubtless we have derived our current expression, "drunk as a lord," from the unseemly condition of Belshazzar's own lords at that famous festival when wine flowed like a mountain stream after a hard shower in the springtime. Strange handwriting suddenly appeared on the plastered wall, old Belshazzar took a bad case of delirium tremens and on that very night the drunken king was killed and a new and sober administration came into power under King Darius. Of course, the Belshazzar wine was perfectly legal. None whatever thought it should be regulated. "Let it flow freely," said everyone from the king on down. "Let it come into the very home of the king and let its free intercourse be unmolested in the name of complete liberty." But before that fateful night was over, there was some free writing on the wall, some free delirium tremens among the men of distinction, some free rigor mortis on the regal throne of Babylon.

In 1871 the Chicago fire raged over the city unregulated and caused $196 million in damages.

In 1889 the Johnstown flood surged down the valley unregulated and cost 2,200 lives.

And now, unrestrained and uninhibited, alcoholic advertising may well, in my humble opinion, cost much more than all the damage and loss of life of both the Chicago fire and Johnstown flood combined and then multiplied by two.

During my own lifetime my good State of Kentucky has continuously stood at the top of the list of alcohol producers and has frequently bragged about this, and yet during that same lifetime span I notice that whereas Kentucky once stood 11th in population among the States, it now stands 19th in the list of States. Cause and effect? Well you be the judge. The same handwriting that was once on the plastered wall of Belshazzar may now be appearing on the plastered wall of Kentucky or on that of America if we persist in going ahead with our total indifference toward the harmful influences that come within our homes and about our hearthsides in the form of alcoholic advertisements.

Twenty million people in America are offended every day by the alcoholic advertising that comes to their homes consistently and continually without even knocking at their doors, entering the very impressionable minds of boys and girls with the obvious purpose of making more customers for an industry that destroys, dooms, and damns human personality as it rolls along.

We would not think of allowing an offending beast to come into the American home unrestrained and uninhibited. Yet, booze broadcasting by TV, radio, or publication is a beast and it sorely offends millions every day in the American home. It is now time to illegalize it in interstate commerce. It may be later than we think.

State of Israel Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 2, our able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] made a speech at a trade-union dinner in the interest of the Israel bond drive. It was a most interesting and thought-provoking speech. It was a heartening speech to those interested in the welfare of Israel. I feel that the Senator's speech should be widely read. It should certainly be made a part of the RECORD of the United States Senate. Therefore, I

ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ISRAEL BOND SPEECH AT TRADE UNION DINNER BY HON. PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 2, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers, brothers, and sisters in the trade-union movement, fellow Americans, this is the first time since the voters of Michigan decided the time had arrived to send a member of organized labor to the United States Senate that I have had the pleasure of addressing a large gathering of the representatives of labor—A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions—all together in one place. It is a very great privilege indeed to be here and to know that this meeting is symbolic of the unification of organized labor that is now in process.

This gathering is of special interest to me, for if it had not been for the strongly concerted efforts of practically all groups of organized labor, I would not be addressing you tonight as the Senator from Michigan. Let me point out that I am only the third Democrat in the history of Michigan to be elected to the United States Senate. It is clear that the allegiance to the GOP of that rock-ribbed Republican State is crumbling.

How did this happen? It happened because Michigan has become an industrial as well as an agricultural State; it happened because the workers of Michigan rebelled against the reactionary policies of the Republican Party; it happened because the working people of Michigan joined with the disillusioned farmers and the disappointed business people to send to the Congress a Senator who would do his best for all the people. They had become tired of seeing their State represented by Senators who consistently voted wrong. Today, they have at least one Senator who tries to see their problems as a whole and who votes according to his conscience in what he sees as the best interests of the entire State.

I must confess that there are times in Washington when I feel somewhat frustrated. But this is part of the process of democracy; many times we must make haste slowly. But we must make sure that we are going forward, not backward. I see it as my job to keep trying for better things for all our people, and that's what I am endeavoring to do.

You will forgive me, I hope, for discussing politics a little in my remarks, because, I am sure, you have wondered how it happened that PAT MCNAMARA, from the pipefitting trade, reached the United States Senate. It was improbable, but it happened—not because of the particular merits of myself, but because the times are changing, and people are changing with them.

In addition, I can say honestly that my campaign for election was, in my belief, one of the cleanest campaigns in the Nation. There were no personalities. My opponent, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, ran on his record, and I attacked his and his party's record up and down the State. We fought it out on the issues, and the Democrats won.

I have a Jewish friend back in Michigan who used to say he had his own definition of a Jew. He told me: "Pat, I'm going to give you an answer that an Irishman will understand. The Jews are that branch of the human race who just won't take 'no' for an answer." The more I hear about Israel and its people, the more I can see the truth in my friend's remark.

I want to tell you a little about the story of Israel, not just because I want you, as Americans, to further the sale of Israeli bonds, but because I want you, as Americans, to understand how I see this business of refusing to take no for an aswer.

Here we are gathered, you and I, in this important meeting of organized labor. I am here because of my position as a Senator of the United States—but my position as a Senator of the United States is due to a lifetime in the ranks of organized labor. You and I know why we are here. We are here because all along the line of bitter opposition to labor unionism, there were men who wouldn't take no for an answer. I think that almost every man is here because in the battle for human dignity and workers' rights each of us refused to take no for an answer. That refusal to take no for an answer built America; it brought the workers who built America into a movement that will build America into something far greater than anyone has ever dreamed.

If there is one place in the world where that same spirit exists and permeates the life of the country and its people to an even greater degree than in the United States, that place is the land of Israel.

It took us generations of struggle and education to forge the mighty organizations which are our labor unions. It took determined effort and bitter conflict to gain for organized labor its rightful place in this country, and this is the remarkable thing about Israel that should make each of us feel a sense of partnership with that country and its people—they founded their country on the principles that we still are struggling for in America. Their labor organizations are the dominant economic and political forces of Israel, operating through the great Histadruth, their central labor organization. They have proven that the desert can be made to bloom, that the swamp can be drained, that men can accomplish the impossible where men have the will and faith to accomplish the impossible. Believe me, my friends, if Israel had the resources that America has, in the same proportion, there would not have to be the struggle or the threat of struggle to achieve the reasonable aims of its people.

What they have accomplished in Israel and what they are now accomplishing in the face of great hardship must arouse the admiration of every man who knows the meaning of struggle against odds. Even if we were not informed Americans, recognizing our kinship with them for their democratic ideals; for their indomitable courage; for their role in history past, present, and future; we would, just as good sports who like to see a man get an even shake, rise and cheer them on.

My friends, that is just what we are being asked to do. Israel is small, a little guy, fighting nature, fighting enemies, racing against time to build up an economy based on equity, learning his job while he is producing, welcoming the stranger and sharing his crust with him—such a guy needs friends. He needs friends as America needed friends during the Revolution. This little guy saw 6 million of his brothers and sisters wiped out in the world. He has memories of his people burned and stabbed and plundered in many parts of the Old World. Without allies, he has only himself and his eternal faith in God. He must do today at all costs what dare not be left for tomorrow. I tell you, my fellow Americans, it would be a poor kind of American who wouldn't admire that little guy and who wouldn't be cheering him on in his fight against such odds.

We are being asked to lend him some of our strength. America was in that same position during the Revolution. Abroad, we went to France for help. At home, that great American Jewish patriot, Haym Salomon, a Philadelphia banker, bankrupted himself in the cause of the independence of the United States. In our own wars, we go to our own people for assistance to our country through bond purchases. Israel, with its limited resources, must have outside help. I do know this: Every American who, whether through sentiment or for hardheaded business reasons, invests in State of Israel bonds has a fine, sound investment. Whether you are investing in a private business or in a country, your investment is safest when it is made with people who won't take no for an answer. And you are asked to invest—not in war bonds—these are bonds for peace. Jews are not a warring people.

Imagine a little country with half a million people at the end of a struggle for independence absorbing over a million refugees within a few short years. It was impossible—but they did it. Imagine a tiny nation having to break the soil and establish industries while fighting for independence. It was impossible—but they did it. So now you have a million and a half people, today neither at war nor at peace, building frantically because they know that events in the world may soon make it necessary to bring in another million refugees whose very lives are at stake in other parts of the world. It seems impossible—but they are doing it. Whole new industries are springing up. A vast chemical industry, construction, cement, plastics, machinery, roadbuilding, consumer goods, agriculture, shipping, aviation—these and many more are making the land of Israel throb with the urgent vitality that is so characteristic of America. It is only a question of time before their example revitalizes the whole Middle East and helps millions of the Arab peoples make progress in the civilized world.

But time is on the side of the people of Israel only if we give the people of Israel what they need to work with—right now and in adequate measure. The chemical and other industries which are needed cannot be built on a piecemeal basis; you cannot build part of a chemical plant today and another part the year after next. If you are going to build at all, you must build that plant all at one time. The same thing goes for all the other industries that have to be created right from the ground up. The people of Israel must have the tools they need—now. Otherwise, the year after next may find them worse off than they are today.

We are told that it took 6 days for the creation of the world, and only after it was all done were man and woman created to inhabit it. But in Israel the people are already there, and a new world is being created around them while they must be fed, clothed, and educated. It is this new miracle of creation under most difficult conditions that has earned the awe and respect of the other people of the world. It is in this miracle that we are being asked to invest.

You see, my friends, it is not just Israel you are investing in. You are making an investment in civilization itself. You are investing in the human spirit. The same people who, a thousand years ago, carried to the rude medieval Christian countries of Europe the first philosophy and learning and devotion to democracy and freedom nurtured in the Eastern World, have now returned to the East, bearing with them the science and the productive arts of living of the 20th century West.

These are not just bonds for Israel—they are our bonds with Israel. One could not understand America without understanding the part that the Jewish idea of one God, through the teachings of Christianity, has played in the founding and the history of America. Ours is not just a debt to repay, not just an acknowledgement of spiritual kinship. This is an act by which the common man in America declares to Israel and to all peoples of the whole world: "Wherever men fight the good fight for political and economic democracy; wherever men struggle to raise the levels of living and dignity of the common man; wherever

men, against whatever odds, refuse to take no for an answer—to that place and to those men the people of America will send their private help, their personal encouragement, their ringing message of the unity of all good men in a good cause."

In conclusion, my friends, let me say that there could be no more fitting group than this to give emphasis and leadership in the bonds for Israel campaign. You represent the working people of the San Francisco area. You are asking your people and your friends to make possible the success of a democratic working community far away in the Middle East—so that from their toil and their sweat they may make for themselves a prosperous and free homeland; and so that their success may shine as a beacon and an ideal for all the oppressed and poverty-stricken and disease-ridden and hopeless people who are their neighbors—as well as creating in that vast desert country an oasis of democracy, with kinship for all the freedom-loving nations of the world.

So, the beachhead is well established. I am sure you here tonight will want to see it expand, not only that a great people may find refuge from oppression but also that future generations will, with God's help, have a chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is man's rightful heritage.

Addresses Delivered Before Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on February 22, in Philadelphia, Pa., the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association was held. At that meeting addresses were delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DUFF] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; by the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, and by the distinguished Member of the House from Indiana, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, as well as an address delivered by myself. I ask unanimous consent that these addresses may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

I was thrilled, as I know you were, when the young man who just spoke to us created a picture of the businessman of the immediate future. I could not help but think of how this young man has been favored above many others who are in colleges today and who are getting their learning out of books only. He has been privileged to get some learning by practical experience with businessmen, and he expressed it so nicely when he said that he learned in effect that businessmen are not ogres, but on the contrary do try to get along with their employees.

And I say to you, young man, you have come to a group of Pennsylvanians who have made it a business for many years to provide jobs in Pennsylvania and they have done that by helping to create a healthy atmosphere in which business might thrive, and only as business thrives are there jobs for your neighbors and mine.

In Washington we have been told for some time that the Democrats and the Republicans would get along very nicely, be highly cooperative and bipartisan, and that the day had come when it didn't make a great deal of difference—this was after the election—whether the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate or not. Before that date we urged the election of Republican Congressmen, and if we had them we would not be in the mess we are today. But we didn't get them.

Then we began to listen to the will-of-the-wisp, the people who told us, "Well, the Democrats are pretty good guys anyway," and you could take their word and they would cooperate with us and give our great President the kind of legislation he wants and the cooperation he needs.

Not being on the inside, I cannot speak conclusively, but having read the newspapers and having listened to the Democrats talk, I know that the Democrats did come offering honey gifts and words, seeking to tie the hands of the Republicans and to pretend a close cooperation for Mr. Eisenhower's program. And what are we getting? Has the Democratic Party changed its spots and is it today any more willing to cooperate with Republicans than it has been in the past? Well, we have thus far had at least two instances in Washington which belie any such claim.

One was a bill purported to be the same as the administration had requested a year ago when the Republicans were in the majority of the Congress, a bill dealing with the foreign trade. It was handed to Mr. COOPER of the Ways and Means Committee for introduction. Between the time the bill left our party's leadership in Washington and the time it was introduced, it was changed, and things were written into it which were not in the administration bill a year ago, a bill based upon the Randall Commission report.

Now, the bill had been sold to the country on the basis of cooperation, on the basis of an agreement made with the Democrats because this was an international matter and it was believed that the legislation would go through unanimously. But the Democratic Party breached the faith that our party had placed in it even in that international field and only confirmed what I have said frequently and what I repeat: You cannot trust the Democratic Party in Washington to help us make a good record for our President. Certainly you cannot trust the Democrats in this year immediately preceding a Presidential election, for they are out to lick Dwight Eisenhower and elect their own man as President. I hope that we won't fall into their trap again.

CITES SECOND DECEPTION

The other instance became apparent only a day or two ago—and both of these examples involved the committee upon which I serve, the Ways and Means Committee. Less than 10 days ago the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said to all the members: Can we get an agreement that there will be no hearings held in connection with the bill providing for continuation of the present corporate tax rate and extension of the present rates on certain of excises due to expire in April? The matter was discussed by our committee and I said, "I assume this means that there will be no amendments made to the bill." An equivocal answer was given and I became suspicious, but inasmuch as the Democrats have a majority of 15 to 10 upon the committee, we did not argue because we didn't have the votes, and it was decided not to have hearings.

Well, you recall how last week, after disposing of the trade extension bill in the House without warning, and frankly without much careful thought on the part of the Democrats, they suddenly announced that they were going to amend the tax bill by a proviso that every taxpayer might deduct $20 for himself and his dependents from the tax which he figured he owed the Government.

We challenged them in the committee as to why they had told us one thing and done another and received an answer to this effect: "Well, we fooled you fellows; you'd better make the best of it."

A DISHONEST PROPOSAL

It is a dishonest proposal. It comes at a time when the President has assured us that if we continue with the very sound financial policies that we have been following for the past year or two, we will be able to next year make a tax reduction, in the absence of war, which will be sound, of a greater amount in my opinion, and a kind of a tax reduction which will not have to be replaced by a new tax in the immediate future for it won't tend to increase the national debt.

The Republican Party under President Eisenhower has given this country something we have not had for a generation, a sound Government, a Government in which we are endeavoring to make the outgo and the income match, a Government in which we have stabilized the value of the dollar so that the dollar you pay today for your social security, or for your life insurance will, if we maintain our policies, be, when you get it back, worth at least as much as it is today. That is what the Republican Party stands for, a country where a businessman can look ahead 1, 2, or 3 years and know that, if these policies are continued under a Republican administration, there will be a healthy climate under which his business can prosper and grow. That is what we stand for. That is why I am proud to tell them in Washington that I believe with Dwight Eisenhower as our nominee for the President, Pennsylvania will get back in the Republican column, and for another generation at least will stay there.

You businessmen owe an obligation not only to your business, but to your country and to the Republican Party, which is the medium through which you can express yourself. I would like to call upon each of you as you go into your respective counties to persuade others to get out and work the Republican ticket, and endeavor to get others who should be in politics as candidates to become candidates, and to sponsor in every way you can good government through the Republican Party.

If you do that in the next 2 years, there is no doubt but that Dwight Eisenhower will be our President for another 4 years and the Republican Party will again be in the ascendancy here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

Mason and Dick, my colleagues of the Congress, members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and friends, I am happy to be here and I would like to say that as a Republican from Indiana I haven't any allergy for men who are successes in business. It would be good for the country, for everybody, if people in business had no allergy for us who are in politics, because politics, my friends, is getting to be a right important business.

As I say, I come from Indiana and am a Republican, but this is going to be a nonpartisan Republican speech. We take our politics pretty seriously out there in Indiana. They say the first words spoken by every child born in the State are these: "I am not a candidate for any public office, but I promise if nominated and elected I shall serve to the best of my ability." And that is really the way we work at it.

Mason, you said I have been your longtime friend. I have. You had me come to

Tioga County in 1936, I think it was, to speak to a Republican meeting, and I was glad to come up there from Washington, but the opposition darned near wrecked the meeting. We had it out in the ballpark at Mansfield, and darned if the WPA didn't move in and put brand-new green paint on all the seats in the grandstand the day before we were to hold the meeting. But we went ahead and held the meeting anyway.

Mason, you have been a stalwart fighter in our cause for a long time.

DICK SIMPSON, I just want to say to you in the presence of these people from Pennsylvania that I have never ceased to be happy for what little I did to bring about your election. I have been happy to play and work on your team because you are the great kind of a fellow that we need.

I was at the White House this morning for our conference. It was stepped up by the reason of certain developments, principally this $20 deal. And are they going to give a mule with that or not? I don't know. I got out a copy of the Corrupt Practices Act. You know it says in there if you spend money to buy somebody's vote, that is a violation of the criminal law. I don't know whether technically this is such a violation, but certainly it is a violation of the spirit of the Corrupt Practices Act.

They also stepped up the meeting a little so that I could come up here, and the President was happy to do it. And as I left he said, "Good luck, Charlie. I am glad you are going up there to Philadelphia to talk to those folks."

If you could have been with me this morning and heard the President's expression on some of the problems that immediately beset us, why, there wouldn't be one of you who would not go out of there and say, "I am willing to go down the line on that program."

Now, I do want to say a few things about this program. First of all, folks, I don't care whether you are running a business or whether you have an association like this, you have got to have managers to run it.

NEW SET OF MANAGERS

A little more than 2 years ago the people of this country called for a new set of managers to operate their Federal Government. This change in political leadership resulted from a growing public discontent with the manner in which the country was being run. Not the least of the reasons for this discontent was a deep-seated conviction that America was being pushed toward socialism. Progressively bigger Federal spending programs, higher taxes, controls, competition with private enterprise, grandiose schemes for public power, and attempts to regiment medicine and agriculture were all part of the socialistic pattern.

The trend toward centralized government, with emphasis on the authority of Executive at the expense of Congress, was another alarming feature of the campaign to substitute government "over" the people for government "of" the people. Inflation and the illusion of "free money" from Washington were devices designed to perpetuate a political dynasty. Scandals and corruption were a natural byproduct of cynicism in high places. Even foreign relations were used as a tool to accomplish radical ends. Employing a "crisis psychology," previous administrations were quick to seize on events in the international picture as an excuse for new controls and regulations, new spending, and greater taxes.

No new management could have done a better job of giving the American people the kind of Government they wanted than has the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. In spite of inherited commitments involving upward of $80 billion, for which no provision to pay had been made by the old set of managers, we have succeeded in achieving substantial budget reductions. Economies in the Federal household have made possible the largest tax-cutting program in the Nation's history, amounting to $7.4 billion on an annual basis.

Controls were ended as one of the first orders of business.

Sound fiscal policies have halted ruinous inflation.

The Ewing plan for socialized medicine and the Brannan plan to do the same thing to agriculture have both been sunk without a trace.

RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

The new managers on the Washington scene are restoring public confidence in private enterprise as the best system mankind has yet devised for steady progress toward better living for all Americans. Two years ago that confidence was at low ebb because for two decades business had served as a convenient whipping boy for radicals. The climate has been changed from one of hostility toward important segments of our economy to one of friendly cooperation and fair treatment for all segments. This change results from a fundamental belief in our system on the part of this new political management, in contrast to the attitude of hot-eyed extremists who hoped they could make America over into something completely foreign.

The trumped-up Dixon-Yates controversy betrays the anguish of public-power advocates, especially in the Tennessee Valley area, who are afraid the gravy train is running out. The basic issue at stake is whether this Government is going to enter into a fair and equitable contract with private enterprise or soak the taxpayers of this Nation $100 million to build another steam generating plant to subsidize low-cost power. The contract itself confirms this administration's respect for the principle that Government should encourage private enterprise wherever possible and practicable.

This administration is further demonstrating its faith in private enterprise by moving to get Government out of business activities where it has no right to be.

President Eisenhower's respect for constitutional processes is reflected in his cooperative attitude toward the Congress, which he considers a partner in the business of Government operation.

We are also moving steadily toward the restoration of rights and responsibilities to States and communities with carefully considered aid programs that call for greater participation at the local level and less control at the Federal level.

We are getting more government back home, where it belongs.

The farm program adopted by the Republican 83d Congress marks a sure-footed approach to the problem of getting agriculture out from under the staggering burden of unmanageable surpluses which had built up under the rigid parity system. It is a major move toward the release of American farmers from the bondage of ever-tightening controls and restrictions and brings agriculture closer to the goal of 100 percent parity in the market place.

Handling of the Formosa incident is in striking contrast to the manner in which a previous administration met a situation in Korea. In the case of Korea, members of the Congress learned that American troops had been committed to armed conflict by reading the news in the Nation's press. In the case of Formosa, President Eisenhower called on the Congress for support of his policy in advance of action. Instead of the confusion and misunderstanding at home and abroad which characterized United States policy toward Korea, the American people, as well as our friends and potential enemies, know exactly where we stand on the issue of defending Formosa.

Beyond that, the calmness with which the Eisenhower administration has pursued its foreign policy, the absence of alarms and fanfare, has resulted in a quiet confidence on the part of our citizens that we now have managers at the helm who know what they are doing. This consistent and courageous policy may well prove to be one of our most effective weapons for safeguarding the peace of the world. Certainly the manner in which it has been developed, with forthright debate in and overwhelming support by the Congress of the United States, is our best guarantee of national unity.

GOALS OF ADMINISTRATION

The goals of the Eisenhower administration during the next 2 years will be to continue the gains we have made toward the establishment of a sound prosperity based on a just and lasting peace. Avoiding extremes of political philosophy, we are charting a course to which an overwhelming majority of Americans can subscribe. It is a course that calls for conservative policies where the people's money is concerned, but for sympathetic attention to the problems of human needs, where the public good requires Federal action. It is a course that minimizes Government interference in matters properly the concern of private enterprise or of States and communities. It is a course which emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to do those things for himself which are the traditional responsibilities of free American citizens.

This new set of managers strongly believes that incentive is the great motivating force in the American economy and that honest interpretation of the law, together with fair and impartial treatment for everyone, are foundation stones of good Government.

Pursuit of such policies and principles during the past 2 years has created a wholesome attitude of public trust in Government leadership. This faith, together with sound, forward-looking management of the Federal operation, has brought the Nation through a difficult transition period with a minimum of dislocations and adjustment. The prophets of gloom who were so loud in their predictions of a serious recession not so long ago have been shamed into silence by accumulating evidence that ours is a vigorous and expanding Nation.

Those who think the battle has been easy, or that it is won for all time, should be forewarned:

The radicals, the spenders, the socializers, the crisis-manufacturers are no longer in power, but they have not given up hope of returning. They are waiting in the wings. They are ready to come in. And believe me, they will come in if we don't win.

I can't believe the people of this country want that to happen. It won't happen if citizens in all walks of life who believe in our system and who want to help make it work better than ever before will take a continuing interest in Government at all levels. As manufacturers, you well know that any quality product starts with quality materials. By the same token, good Government in America is the end product of good citizenship. Good citizenship begins here—in this room—with you.

That is the way I feel about it. And if you feel about it the way I do, believe me you are going to do something about it. And if you do, then I am very, very sure that we are going to win through to the greatest period of peace and happiness and prosperity that this Nation ever saw.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES H. DUFF

This is a magnificent audience and it is a great privilege to be here.

I would like to tell you of an experience I had at noon today at Independence Hall during a meeting on the Voice of Freedom. There was a young man there every one of you would have been pleased beyond measure to hear: Polish Lieutenant Jerecki, who

had joined the Communist Party in Poland because he thought that was his best opportunity for service.

He happened to be the son of a Polish officer who had been executed when the Russians took over. Had they known that, he said, he would not have been trained for the air force in Russian Poland but would have been sent to Siberia.

Only 21 at the time, he became flight commander of a crack squadron of MIG's under Russian control in the land where his own government had been destroyed, where personal property had been confiscated, where the women had been violated, and where the people had been deprived of their civil and religious liberties.

He risked all for freedom, fleeing from behind the Iron Curtain so he could tell the people of America what it was like to be under the iron foot of communism.

As everyone here knows, and as he pointed out, the experience of Poland will be the experience of the world unless something is done about it.

I think that the challenge to our generation was never greater than it is today, with this country the sole roadblock between freedom and the overrunning of the world by the most vicious and evil and godless force that has ever attempted to conquer a country.

At such a time, we are favored beyond imagination in having as President one of the great diplomats of our time and one of the greatest soldiers in the history of America—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

And finally, as a Republican, believing in Republicanism and believing that the control of this Government by Republicans is necessary to keep it on the track and to guide our destinies in the most serious period of our history, I am confident that Dwight D. Eisenhower will again respond to the call of the people of this country and next year will be reelected President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN

It is an inspiration to come to this historic center of patriotism on the birthday anniversary of George Washington.

Here, in the city of William Penn, freedom of the individual took root and flourished for the first time in the world. Here American Independence was proclaimed and the world's greatest charter of freedom, the Constitution of the United States, was framed and adopted.

With that great tradition in mind I would like to discuss briefly our duty to our country and the dangers we must overcome to preserve our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

I have in mind also the great good that can be accomplished by the influence and example of the distinguished group of leaders in business and industry assembled here tonight.

The stability of our Government, the economic strength of the Nation, and the continuance of the American way of life depend upon men and women like you.

The Founding Fathers, meeting here in Philadelphia, erected a great landmark in world progress when they proclaimed that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are divine endowments bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. They framed a new concept of self-government by free men.

Their plan embraced the fundamental proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. They established the principle that government has no power over the individual beyond that granted by the people themselves.

The knew from their profound study of history that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption. They knew that tyranny and dictatorship have always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

I would like to direct your attention to three great dangers that threaten America.

First. Big Government and Government doing things that we should do for ourselves.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of Government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services. Under that pressure Government has become involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong. The result has always been excessive taxation and the steady flow of power from the hands of the people into centralized, bureaucratic authority and Government control.

Second. Too much private and public debt. Too many of our people do not seem to be concerned with the ever increasing burden of debt which is growing bigger and bigger at a sickening rate.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $600 billion, three times as much as the debt 15 years ago.

Twenty years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $20 billion. Today it is $278 billion, an increase of $20 billion since the end of World War II.

The debts of State and local governments have increased 16 percent in one year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline in business activity, jobs and income—this staggering burden of public and private debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

Please bear in mind that more nations have been destroyed by debt and taxes than by invading armies.

Third. Too little interest in Government. It is unfortunate that so many of our people have forgotten that taking part in Government is a patriotic duty. We cannot expect clean and economical Government unless we take a real part in it.

There will be disloyalty and communism in Government unless the people really demand loyalty. Greed, corruption, and disloyalty can destroy the strongest nation.

We must know our Government. It was President Woodrow Wilson who said, and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

Our people should be taught in schoolrooms, in our colleges, in union halls, and in business meetings, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts, the difference between our republican form of government and the communistic system of Soviet Russia. The blessings of individual freedom and human dignity should be compared with the terror and tyranny under which millions of people are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain of godless communism.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual as ordained by God is the firm foundation of our national strength. It is our responsibility to keep alive for future generations the freedoms and the opportunities that made the United States the greatest nation on earth.

It is a great honor to have as our guest the brilliant and forceful Senator from Illinois.

He is a great American statesman. He has deep patriotic and religious convictions. He knows and loves America. He is proud to be an American.

In World War I he enlisted as a private in the Army and was commissioned second lieutenant in the field. He served overseas for 17 months.

He came to the Senate after eight consecutive terms of outstanding service in the House.

It is an honor to present to this fine Pennsylvania audience the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

ADDRESS OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

I am delighted to be your guest and I trust you will settle yourselves comfortably in those comfortable chairs. I have just been advised that the train doesn't go until 11:20, so we have lots of time. [Laughter.]

I have come frequently to this great municipality and you have treated me with the utmost courtesy and hospitality, and on each recurring occasion I feel a good deal like the two Army Chaplains who were lost on the Western Front when I was a soldier in World War I. They had become detached from their respective military organizations and were floundering around in the mud and water of the shellholes in the darkness. After hours of fruitless wandering they heard a rich voice from an invalided friend say, "Who in the devil led the Ace of Spades?" They got up and embraced each other and said, "Thank goodness we are among Christians."

That is the way I feel when I come to your great commonwealth.

I want to say first of all that as I get around the country I find some confusion. I find some bewilderment in the minds of people and bewilderment and confusion so easily lead to frustration. And frustration in turn often develops a sense of misdirection. Frequently, then, we must get back to a solid orientation as citizens of the greatest Republic on earth.

When Lincoln was in the Legislature in Illinois long ago, they had a judge over across the way in Kentucky who had a fondness for corn liquor. He would sit on the bench all day and dispense equity and justice and puff on a pipe that never had any smoke curling from the bowl. But in the afternoon he was in what they call down in Kentucky a slightly mellow condition. That is where you fall on the ground and hold on to keep from rolling off.

It so happened that he had a rubber tube going from a bottle in his inside pocket up to his pipe. And that was the reason for his condition. He came out of the courthouse in the afternoon and threw the saddle on his horse and unfortunately he got the saddle on backward. A young lawyer observed it and he said, "Hey, Judge, you got the saddle on backward." And the Judge looked at him with that withering contempt that only our judicial friends know and said, "Well, how in the devil do you know in what direction I am going?"

THE CITADEL OF TRADITION

So we have got to have a sense of direction and know where we are going. And in an hour of misdirection and bewilderment there is no better place to go than the citadel of American tradition.

Now, that is a lovely mouth-filling word, but when all is said and done tradition is the great tapestry of America; it consists of individuals, great achievements and incidents, sweet things and little things and noble things.

Who can think of this country and not think of the Pilgrims, or the men who stood at Valley Forge, or Thomas Paine, or Samuel Adams, or Thomas Jefferson, or Abraham Lincoln? And all those other hallowed personalities who are a part of the cavalcade.

When we think of great events in the panorama, there come quickly to mind the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution,

the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation.

When we think of great men, we think of George Washington.

In my judgment, there is nobody in the whole history of mankind whose record of achievement can even approximate that of Washington. That is not a statement out of a story book. I think it can be established. For if we look at Washington's 3 great accomplishments and then at the accomplishments of Caesar, Napoleon, Bismarck, and Alexander, we find that theirs do not begin to approximate Washington's quality, in dimension, and in durability.

First, we think of independence when we think of Washington. He was 43 when he assumed command. He had a great farm situated on many lovely acres of land. He could have commanded preferment from the King. He had a family. He could have lived in ease and luxury. Why did he assume the responsibility and the unquenchable devotion to independence when life could have been so lush and easy for him? He had a bickering and reluctant Congress that would not provide supplies and munitions and equipment. He had the knife of conspiracy in his back as he looked upon trusted officers who tried to displace him. He had to listen to criticism.

What a load he carried. What frustrations must have stricken his heart at times. But, with unfailing fidelity to the cause, he remained with it until the sword went back into the scabbard. And to Washington more than to any other individual we can ascribe the freedom which we as legatees and beneficiaries are privileged to enjoy in this, the one great free remaining country on God's footstool.

His second achievement came here in your great city. What an amazing convention it was that started in May of 1787. What an outstanding complexion it had. The youngest man was 33 and the oldest man was 81. Every kind of diverse temperament was represented there, and it was Washington's restraint, his wisdom, and his patience, his capacity to inject cooling periods that finally resulted in an organic document which is the oldest writen Constitution in the whole wide world.

His third achievement was to breathe life into a new government, the first great experiment in free government on the face of the earth. He gave it form. For 8 years his steady hand was upon the helm and guided it through those days when the British were still fomenting Indian uprisings, when there was much caustic criticism because we were not on the side of the French in their war with the British, and when there were many other problems.

A LEGACY AND A CHALLENGE

So Washington, by his wisdom and kindly counsel and by his firmness, gave this organism of government the life necessary to have it march from infancy into the sunlight and achieve a majesty unmatched in any time or generation.

Those were the accomplishments. But out of the accomplishments he left us an inheritance. He left us a problem. And he left us a challenge.

The problem in this feverish and tumultuous age is, can a country conceived in liberty endure? That is it. Very simple. Why, it seemed academic 20 years ago. People would scoff at the idea, then. I say to you tonight that in my considered judgment the endurance of this country is no longer an academic matter.

We must clarify that. I don't mean that it is going to disintegrate. Not even the mightiest cobalt bomb can do more than destroy a portion of the physical substance of this Republic. The mightiest bomb might smite and kill a few million people, but there will be others, scores of millions remaining. When I speak of survival and the endurance of the country, I am speaking of a concept. I am speaking of a mode of existence under which we are still free to pick and choose, under which we are still free to buy and sell, under which we are still free to reject or accept, under which people are the masters and not Government, a mode of life that is a spiritual adventure and not merely a project. That is the thing that is in danger.

What are the dangers? At the very top of the list I would write socialism.

What is socialism? Control. Harold Laski, the late great British Socialist, put it simply: "The essence is control, not ownership." And we had better remember that, because when government moves beyond the lines of reasonable regulation into the field of control, look out for the freedom of your country. You cannot have socialism and freedom in the same land.

I think the second danger is what I call a delusion of form. Isn't it astonishing that a President of the United States could seize the steel industry and get three Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to concur in that action? But the fact of the matter is that the due process clause is still in the Constitution.

Isn't it amazing that a Secretary of State should send a message to the Congress some years ago and say—and I quote him accurately—"Constitutional doctrine is molded largely by practical necessity. For example, the power of Congress to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance." The exclusive power to put this country into war has been vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The form is there, but carry out that doctrine by a Secretary of State and what happens to the substance of this document? You see, we may be deluded by the form while the substance is being torpedoed.

I ask you very simply, how long can this blessed freedom last under circumstances like that?

There are people who do not regard communism as a particular menace. Frankly, ladies and gentleman, I do.

Remember Lenin's premise of conquest: "First, we shall dominate Eastern Europe. Then we shall dominate the masses of Asia. And then (and I quote Lenin accurately) we shall encircle the last bastion of capitalism in the United States, and, like overripe fruit, it will fall in the basket."

He has come pretty close to his timetable, with Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain and this brutal ideology moving in the Orient and elsewhere. And if it were not so, our warships and air carriers would not be in the Pacific tonight, and brows would not be furrowed, and brains would not be agitated at the dangers that are inherent.

Again we can be grateful to a President for firmness in this rather critical hour, because it is easier to drift into war than to go into it with your eyes open.

But let us not discount this force that has been moving across the world since 1917.

Malenkov, Khrushchev, and Bulganin are interested in only one thing, and that is to destroy the concept that has ennobled America and brought it to its present high state. There has been no retraction from that thesis. It is a grave danger.

THERE'S FISCAL DANGER, TOO

Senator MARTIN alluded to the fiscal danger. Nearly every country that actually lost its freedom went down the fiscal drain first. It is the hardest thing in the world to dramatize, and I am afraid we have gotten rather accustomed to a deficit situation. Your Government and mine has been in a deficit position for 23 years out of the last 26.

I think of a young man who filled out an application for an insurance policy. One of the questions was, "How old was your father when he died and of what did he die?" His father had been hanged. The son didn't like that. So he wrote, "My father was 65 when he died. He came to his end while participating in a public function when the platform gave way." [Laughter.] A wonderful way to say it—you disarm the severity of the circumstance.

So you speak about deficit financing. It means going in the hole. And when you go in the hole you toy with the inflationary fever that has destroyed so many countries. Oh, for the power of somebody or other to dramatize it and to bring home to people the necessity for the solvency of their Government under every circumstance, because when solvency goes out the window, it takes a frightful toll. It means that freedom goes out with it.

Let me allude to one other force, and that is indifference. There are 100 million potential voters in the United States. In November 1954—and mind you, I am not talking as a partisan—in November 1954 roughly 75 million were registered and qualified. How many voted on election day? Just a little fewer than 42 million. What happened to the other 33 million? They weren't interested enough.

The ballot is the symbol of freedom. And the way to lose freedom is not to use it.

Our hope of survival lies within ourselves and our hope of progress lies in preserving freedom.

I have said that on the 16th of July 1945, two ages were born when that bomb exploded in New Mexico. The atom age was born and the age of fear was born. But fear is a poor substitute for reason. And whenever it transcends reason there has been generated another force that can jeopardize and destroy the freedom of the country.

One thing will save freedom: when free men speak up, no matter what the sacrifice.

When the Apostle Paul was being prepared to be scourged, even though he had not yet been condemned, he said to the centurion: "How is it that I, a Roman citizen, uncondemned, could be scourged?"

Then the centurion asked: "Are you a Roman citizen?"

And Paul replied: "Yea."

And the chief captain answered: "With a great sum obtained I this freedom."

And Paul said: "But I was free born."

This freedom that we enjoy is no academic thing. It came at a great price. Those men without shoes at Valley Forge, this man Washington, whose heart must have been broken at times by the frustrations that were attendant upon his task; this man Lincoln who could see 3,500 crosses from where he stood on the speakers' platform in Gettysburg in 1863—they are just a few of those who helped to pay the price for what we have. And as successor trustees in these long, endless generations of Americans we too must pay the price in proportion.

SPEAK OUT FOR FREEDOM

The spirit of freedom expects us to talk up so that we can be found, found in a critical hour of the history of our country.

When I was campaigning in Illinois in 1950, I heard of a man who went down to a pet shop and bought a parrot. The proprietor said, "This is a fine, healthy, smart bird; speaks eight languages." The man said, "I will take him." He paid $35 for the bird and cage and said, "Send him out to my house and be sure he is there when I get home from work tonight." And when he got home he bounded up the steps and the door opened and there was his beloved wife, Mary. He said, "Mary, did the bird come?"

She said, "Yes, he did."

"Where is he?"

"In the oven."

When the husband regained his composure he said, "In Heaven's name, woman, that was a smart bird and could speak eight languages."

And Mary said, "Well, why didn't he speak up?"

Speak up for freedom.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Harry G. Griffiths, pastor, the First Presbyterian Church, Van Wert, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of the Universe, Judge of the Nations, Father of Mankind, we pause to acknowledge Thy sovereignty and to proclaim that Thou art greater than any of Thy gifts.

Thou art always present; it is our awareness of Thee that at times grows dim. Open the eyes of faith that we may endure as seeing Thee who art invisible.

We beseech Thee to give these representatives of the people a deep sense of Thy purpose for the Nation; for except Thou build the house they labor in vain that do build it. Guide them, we beseech Thee, in the way of righteousness and peace; be Thou the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night. Lead them into the soundest of all measures, obedience to Thee.

We pray for the people. Give unto them such a concern for the true welfare of this Nation that, through their representatives, they shall express truly great statesmanship.

Thou hast seen fit to shed Thy special grace upon our land. Grant that in the abundance of Thy favor we shall be found faithful. May we be instruments of Thine for peace on earth and good will toward men. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States withdrawing a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 230. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681);

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue, in the city of Boston, nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 2194. An act for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida;

H. R. 3560. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 5100. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care;

H. R. 5106. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; and

H. R. 5177. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 230. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 2194. An act for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida;

H. R. 3560. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5100. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care; and

H. R. 5177. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas this year marks the two hundredth anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia and their journey to find refuge and haven in Louisiana and other areas; and

Whereas this exodus, immortalized in Longfellow's poem Evangeline, parallels the landing of the Pilgrims in America and their quest for freedom, independence, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas the original Acadian settlers vigorously participated in the early development of Louisiana, and they and their descendants have contributed in full measure to the history, culture, character, and way of life of the people of that great State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States joins the people of Louisiana in commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, and pays tribute to their spirit of courage, perseverance, and loyalty that has inspired the Nation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated shall be transmitted to the Acadian Bicentennial Celebration Association.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, I should like to ask leave of absence for this afternoon and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate for a period of 3 weeks.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I requested the consent of the Senate that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet for the next 3 weeks during the sessions of the Senate. At

the time I made the request, I was not aware that the ranking minority member of the committee had not been informed of the request. Therefore, after consulting with the chairman and minority members of the subcommittee, I desire to modify the request so as to provide that the subcommittee may meet during the session of the Senate on tomorrow only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that, generally, it is the desire to follow the rule of the Senate and not to make such requests for more than 1 day, except in unusual cases, such as in the case of the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—WITHDRAWAL OF A NOMINATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Jesse T. Smathers to be postmaster at Canton, N. C.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Vietnam; and

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be representative of the United States on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., vice J. Chalmers Ewing, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty-one postmasters; and

Floyd C. Hammond, to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, S. C., reported adversely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be a United States circuit judge in the Fifth Circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be the sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens whose deportation has been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT ON NUMBER OF PENALTY ENVELOPES AND WRAPPERS ON HAND

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE FOR MEMBERS OF DENTAL PROFESSION—LETTERS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from two of my constituents, dentists, in Detroit, Mich., who argue cogently for social-security coverage for members of the dental profession.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *February 15, 1955.*

The Honorable PATRICK V. MCNAMARA,
United States Senator for Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you as my representative in the United States Senate to solicit your interest in including the dental profession under the Social Security Act at this present session of Congress.

I am of the opinion that the delegates to the American Dental Association should not be asked to speak for us on social security. They are selected to represent us in matters of policy relating to the practice of dentistry and not in the field of insurance and investments.

I also think the aligning of the dental profession with the medical and legal professions is a mistake. The physican carries on a limited practice while confined to a chair, as can an attorney. The dentist must have all his physical faculties, his hands dare not shake and he must have perfect vision.

May I give you some interesting facts which I have assembled:

On October 15, 1954, a secret ballot was taken by members of the Detroit District Dental Society, a component of the Michigan State Dental Society, all members of the American Dental Association: 946 votes were returned, 599 voted for social security, 260 voted no, 84 no definite opinion, 3 void.

At the national meeting of the ADA at Miami, November 1954: 235 compulsory inclusion no, 150 yes; voluntary inclusion: 180 no; 153 yes; losing the motion by only 27 votes.

The ADA only represents about 60 percent of the dentists in the United States of America. Approximately 25,000 dentists belong to no dental society, many in small towns have no opportunity for expressing a choice. It is my firm belief that 75 percent would favor voluntary inclusion.

Recent polls in Pennsylvania and other States indicate that the majority of dentists in those States favor OASI.

It seems to me that we should be given the same consideration as members of the clergy, as ours too is a personal service. We should be allowed to choose whether we want social security or do not want it.

I resent being told by any association that I cannot have this additional security in the latter years of my life.

I submit this letter for your serious consideration and am sure you will see that the information is presented through the proper channels for action at this present session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM N. MOFFETT, D. D. S.

DETROIT, MICH., *March 21, 1955.*

Hon. PATRICK MCNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please be advised that in a recent poll of the membership of the Detroit District Dental Society 68-plus percent voted for inclusion. Our membership includes those not self-employed and who are now a part of the OASI program or are in private insurance and pension plans, and they, it is reasonable to assume, will want to practice as self-employed after they get their pension and be exempt from the OASI tax. You can verify above by writing the executive secretary at 4421 Woodward Avenue. Naturally, they voted against inclusion.

I submit that the house of delegates voted against our inclusion; but, Senator, those delegates are uninstructed delegates. Here in Michigan those delegates are not elected by the membership; they are appointed by the president of the Michigan State Dental Association. If the American Dental Association wants the Congress to know what we dentists want, they could poll all their members inside of a couple of weeks' time and give you the result with the questions asked. They are, it appears to me, afraid to do so, fearful that that vote will repudiate them. I further understand that the Chicago Dental Society and some other societies in their polls voted overwhelmingly in favor of our inclusion.

Our Detroit society membership is about one-half of the membership of the Michigan State Dental Association. We are a component of the Michigan State association and the Michigan State is a constituent of the American Dental Association.

I trust that you will use your influence and get your Senate committee to include us and to get the Senate as well as the House to pass it. I understand Ike is favorable.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY W. MACK.

P. S.—I feel that every law should apply to everyone, Senator.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER — RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE SENATE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Resolution No. 16, adopted by the Kansas State Senate, relating to the construction of projects for the conservation of soil and water in the State of Kansas.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on Apr. 18, 1955, p. 4525, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of five resolutions adopted by the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RULINGS BY THE U. N. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

"Whereas the International Court of Justice has upheld the U. N. administrative tribunal's decision to indemnify, by approximately $179,000, the American employees of the U. N. Secretariat dismissed for refusing to answer questions in regard to subversive activities; and

"Whereas the General Assembly at the last session followed the advisory opinion of the court with our two American representatives, handling the question, concurring; and

"Whereas other incidents have occurred respecting the dismissal of American nationals on loyalty charges employed by the U. N.; e. g., the failure to dismiss Americans from the UNESCO Secretariat in Paris in which matter the Associated Press reported that our Ambassador to the U. N., Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., had criticized this lack of dismissal but said that UNESCO was outside his jurisdiction; and

"Whereas the U. N. Charter has been adopted on a treaty basis whereby, by constitutional provision, treaties shall be the supreme law of the land; and acceptance of such rulings by the United States acknowledges the authority of the World Court thereby paving the way, by precedent, for further implementation of the U. N. Charter into a world government; and

"Whereas doubt is expressed by an eminent legal authority as to whether a constitutional amendment could be drawn that would prevent this type of flagrant abuse to our American sense of propriety and justice since these matters have to do with the internal management of the U. N. in which we have only one voice; and

"Whereas American employees in the United Nations are required to take an oath with the interests of the United Nations only in view and the report on standards of conduct in the international civil service has advised United Nations employees to put loyalty to the United Nations above loyalty to their own countries: Be it

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress to deduct from the United Nations assessments on the United States the amount of the awards in question; and to consider legislation for retaining full authority over the activities of American citizens employed by the United Nations and its specialized agencies; and to nullify the loyalty oath to the United Nations; further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen from Kansas, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and members of the Internal Security Subcommittee."

"MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE U. N.

"Whereas the former Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, has recorded in his book, In the Cause of Peace, that the Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs has been since the inception of the U. N. a delegate from the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas it is further stated that the Big Five in London had agreed to the appointment of a Soviet national to this post, thus setting a precedent which has since perpetuated itself; and

"Whereas this assistant secretaryship and authority includes political questions, atomic energy, disarmament, and the military affairs; and

"Whereas the charter provides for a military staff committee composed of personnel of the permanent members of the Security Council and is to assist the Council in military matters relating to the maintenance of peace, the command of forces, and the regulation of armaments and in addition the responsibility for the strategic direction of armed forces available for use by the U. N. (Report by Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter Staff Study No. 7, p. 3); and

"Whereas our servicemen were under the command of the United Nations in the so-called police action in Korea and our American generals have testified regarding restrictions placed on their military movements by the U. N., thereby creating a sanctuary for the enemy: Be it

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, record its opposition to subjecting our armed forces in the future to any such arrangements as in Korea, restraining them to a 'war of containment,' not a 'war for victory,' and go on record for a strong American Armed Forces in these United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge our Congress to thoroughly investigate any such commitments as the London agreement by the Big Five, secret or otherwise, and take measures to protect the welfare and security of our armed forces and national defense of our country."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"TREATY LAW

"Whereas treaties 'shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby' when two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and

"Whereas executive agreements may have the same prerogatives; and

"Whereas the United States is one of the few nations in which a treaty becomes self-executing automatically: Be it

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily endorse an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as the Bricker amendment which provides 'that a treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement'; further

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request that the United States Senate consider the advisability of further amending the Constitution so as to require either a majority or two-thirds vote of the entire membership before any treaty can be adopted."

"NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

"Whereas the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, formerly an executive agreement unknown to most of the public and ratified July 18, 1953, by the United States Senate, abolishes the traditional right of the American Armed Forces stationed abroad, both civilian and those in uniform, to the protection of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and

"Whereas many countries consider the accused as guilty before trial and have no

conception of the American fundamental belief in the right of the individual: Be it

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress and the President of the United States to reestablish the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to Americans on foreign soil."

"AMERICANISM

"Whereas our American citizenship is our birthright to freedom; and

"Whereas to insulate our country against foreign schemes is isolationism in its truest form and the highest essence of Americanism: Be it

"Resolved, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its unwavering support of the Constitution of the United States of America and its faith in the Founding Fathers of our country in the preservation of our American way of life."

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN COLONISTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, 11 resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

"Whereas a general revision of the United Nations Charter is to be brought before the United Nations Assembly in 1955; and

"Whereas well-formulated plans are to be presented by world-government proponents which may threaten or destroy the sovereignty of the United States, as per example: A plan for the division of the United States into four unrelated zones, each ruled by a commissar who cannot be a citizen of the zone or a former citizen of the zone he rules: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, is opposed to any revision of the Charter of the United Nations which would result in the weakening of the Constitution of the United States or in reducing its sovereignty."

"REAFFIRMATION OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT 33D GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"Resolved, That the 34th General Assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, reaffirm the stand taken at the 33d General Assembly opposing ratification of the Genocide Convention and the Covenant of Human Rights; urging that the NATO Status of Forces Treaty be amended to give American servicemen their proper protection while serving in foreign countries; protesting the admittance of Red China to the United Nations; urging continued pursuance of the investigations into the causes of juvenile delinquency; and approving just and proper legislation protecting a man's right to work."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"AFFIRMATIVE STAND FOR OUR REPUBLIC AND FOR THE CONSTITUTION

"Whereas insidious plans which would destroy the Constitution of the United States and the sovereignty of the United States of America, are now being promoted under the guise of peace campaigns and are being inspired by fear propaganda: Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in meeting assembled, this 13th day of April 1955, reaffirm our adamant stand for the Constitution of the United States and oppose any and all forms of world government, and/or treaties or entangling alliances which would destroy the independence of action of our Republic."

"RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

"Whereas the Bricker amendment would invalidate treaties and executive agreements in conflict with the Constitution and the laws of the United States and the several States by amending article VI of the Constitution which now provides: 'All treaties, made * * * under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding'; and

"Whereas it is our opinion that this amendment should be passed with all possible speed as John Foster Dulles said in 1952, prior to his appointment as Secretary of State, that 'congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas, treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they deny rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights': Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in meeting assembled, this 13th day of April 1955, reaffirm strong approval and ardent support for the Bricker amendment and urge members of the State delegations in both Houses of Congress to use every effort to hasten the passage of this bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in both the Senate and the House and to Vice President Richard Nixon and to Senator John Bricker."

"RETENTION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

"Whereas admission to the United States is a privilege extended by our Government on certain conditions aimed to promote our country's best interests; and

"Whereas a renewed effort is being made under a recently presented bill, S. 519, which calls for amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act (Public Law 414), generally regarded as the most liberal immigration law in the history of our country, that will greatly reduce the protection afforded the United States in regard to quotas and requirements concerning aliens: Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, reiterate its endorsement of the McCarran-Walter Act and urge Congress to retain this law in its entirety, as passed by the United States Congress in 1952, without amendments and modifications that might weaken its rigid enforcement; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in both the Senate and the House."

"RELIGIOUS POLICY

"Whereas an Associated Press dispatch dated March 7, 1954, reported: 'The United States Information Agency announced today the creation of a new post, Chief of Religious Policy, and the appointment of Dr. D. Elton Trueblood to fill it;' and

"Whereas church and state have always been separated in the United States of America since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas this separation of ecclesiastical from political realms is based on the part of the Constitution, namely, article VI, 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States,' and the first amendment: 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;' and

"Whereas we believe the appointment of the Chief of Religious Policy is a violation of the Constitution: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in convention assembled, recommend the abolishment of the post at once; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies be sent to the President and other appropriate authorities."

"DISPLAY OF THE FLAG

"Whereas the flag of the United States of America is the symbol of our Nation; and

"Whereas there is an ever greater need for display of our flag, not only on public buildings, schools, and State institutions, but from every home throughout this country; and

"Whereas a general display of the flag by our citizenry would reaffirm faith in our Constitutional Republic: Be it

"Resolved, That the 34th general assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, through its active membership, urge all citizens to own and display the flag of the United States of America at their homes on all those days set aside for special display of the flag as designated by section 2 (d) of the flag code, Public Law 829; and be it further

"Resolved, That the flag code be observed as in section 2 (f) regarding display of the flag in or near every polling place on election days; and be it further

"Resolved, That funds be provided by the State and Federal Governments for the supplying, the cleaning, and/or replacement of United States flags in all Federal courtrooms and on Federal properties where United States flags are customarily flown; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in the Senate and House, and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee."

"CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

"Whereas duly constituted committees of both Houses of the United States Congress have rendered valiant and in invaluable service to the Nation in exposing Communist infiltration in our Government and many fields of American life: Be it

"Resolved, That the 34th General Assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, again commend the efforts of the various investigating committees exposing subversive activities and earnestly request the Congress to appropriate generous funds for the courageous campaign by our legislators and their staffs."

To the Committee on Finance:

"INVESTIGATIONS OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

"Whereas the Special Congressional Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (approximately 6,000 in number, controling over $7 billion) indicated in a recent report that grants by foundations had been used for 'directing American education toward an international viewpoint, and disregarding the traditions to which they had been dedicated': Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, urge that appropriations be allocated for further investigations, that the reports be publicized and that an end be put to tax ex-

emptions and preferential treatment for any foundation or organization found by the courts, the Justice Department, or the Congress to be subversive or disloyal to the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That foundation funds be invested in United States Government bonds bought in the open market."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"REQUIRING THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY

"Whereas the correct teaching of a course in American history in all schools, colleges and universities is in keeping with the object of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, as it enables our young people to have a better knowledge of our country and its governmental system, which is essential to good citizenship: Be it

"Resolved, That each State be urged to have laws passed requiring that a course in American and State history be taught in our elementary, junior and senior high schools and that at least one course in American history and civics be required for graduation in all State supported colleges and universities."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"APPROVAL OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 271

"Whereas there is a bill in Congress to authorize and pay for the copying of names of people whom the English ships brought to America between 1607 and 1807: Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists approve the House Joint Resolution 271 and that members be urged to write their legislators to support this bill."

DARK HOUSES FOR SPEARING FISH—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club on February 8, 1955, opposing the use of dark houses for spearing fish.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOKA SPORTSMEN'S CONSERVATION CLUB,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 1, 1955.

DEAR SIR: The following is the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club following due and proper discussion at our regular meeting, February 8, 1955:

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club, do hereby petition the members of the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Minnesota:

"To oppose the use of dark houses for spearing fish.

"To vote against any proposed legislation which would continue to permit dark house spearing, and

"To introduce appropriate legislation prohibiting the use of dark houses for spearing fish within territorial waters of the State of Minnesota."

We would appreciate your support and any comments or views you may have on this matter.

PETER W. LITTLEFIELD,
Recording Secretary.
RAY KEGLER,
President.
RICHARD LEWIS,
Vice President.
PHIL JOHNSON,
Treasurer.

RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a series of resolutions adopted by the stockholders of Farmers Union Central Exchange at their 24th annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., on March 2, 1955, printed in the RECORD. I commend them to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 24TH ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 2, 1955

DAIRY PROGRAM

Whereas farm price-support programs have been developed for all major farm crops but dairy products; and

Whereas the Farmers Union believes that dairy products are essential for the health and welfare of our increasing population; and

Whereas the sale of dairy products constitutes the major farm income of the dairy States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, go on record that dairy products be included as a basic commodity to be supported along the lines of the program adopted by the National Dairy Producers Conference held at Madison, Wis., on January 23, 1954.

FAMILY FARM POLICY

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY, of Montana, entitled the "Family Farm Policy Act," which sets forth the family farmers bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates in attendance at this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

FARM PROGRAM

As a wholesale supply cooperative serving the needs of farmers in a six-State area, the Farmers Union Central Exchange performs a vital function in the overall Farmers Union movement.

It has the endeavor and purpoes in common with the other Farmers Union cooperatives and the National and State Farmers Union educational organizations to preserve the family-type farm for our United States of America, and to secure parity of income and living standards for farm families. This is not just a high-sounding phrase.

The kind of farm program which individuals and organizations develop and support depends on their basic philosophy and purpose. Parity for farmers is not and should not be a matter of partisan poltics, but politicians and political parties must be held accountable for their record.

We condemn the 1954 Farm Act because it is in conflict with the goal and past accomplishments to achieve parity for agriculture. It seeks to regulate production by pluses by eliminating farmers.

When production control becomes necesary, it should be by democratic farmer participation in control programs, not by application of a protracted economic squeeze ending in bankruptcy and foreclosure.

Our State Department has found in a number of foreign countries that monopoly and large-scale land ownership resulted in conditions favorable to Communist expansion. In order to prevent such expansion, our Government has assisted these countries in land-reform programs to replace land monopoly with individual family owned and operated farms. However, the leading proponent and architect of these land reforms for foreign farmers was dismissed by our Secretary of Agriculture as a security risk.

And our present program for American farmers is leading toward, not away from, land monopoly.

We recognize that farming operations must keep pace with modern technology and know-how. And that measures for so-called rural-slum clearance are necessary. Such measures, however, are a supplement, not a substitute, for price supports. Those who say that we cannot achieve parity of income for farmers lack faith in our free-enterprise system and our democratic way of life.

The present administration has promised to develop new farm programs to secure full parity for farm products, both storable and perishable. It has not yet succeeded in doing so, and until it does, we urge that the 1954 Farm Act be repealed and that the 90-percent supports under the old parity formula be restored for basic commodities; that acreage allotments and marketing quotas be utilized to achieve a better balance between supply and demand.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The management of rural electric cooperatives by the farmers and rural people of the United States has proven to be a success, by the repayment of loans, together with interest on schedule or in advance, where ample wholesale power has been available at reasonable rates. In order to continue this most excellent record and thereby also to more securely safeguard the interests of the United States Treasury in these REA loans, it becomes necessary:

1. That an ample supply of power be available at all times;

2. That the preference clause, as embodied in the Flood Control Act of 1944 be not discarded;

3. That the power marketing criteria of 1954 as announced by the Department of Interior be better clarified; and

4. That rates for electric energy from multipurpose dam installations be not increased above present rates. Especially is this true in the Missouri River Basin, where the feasibility of all REA loans was based on cheap hydroelectric power and where the load growth of these rural electric cooperatives has been such that they will be facing a critical power shortage within a couple of years.

In order to alleviate this shortage of power and also to serve the best interests of all consumers of electric energy in the basin, public development of these installations must be continued until the maximum amount of firm power, which can be economically produced, has been reached.

Since the maximum amount of firm power which could be produced, can readily be sold at a much higher rate than dump power, giving a greater return to the Federal Treasury for the installations made in the basin and since an abundance of fuel is available in the basin, which, if developed, could produce an enormous amount of low-cost electric energy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., February 28 through March 3, 1955, do recommend that the Congress of the

United States authorize the construction of fuel powered generating facilities in the Missouri basin to firm up and support the hydro generating capacity of these installations; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegations in the area served by the Farmers Union Central Exchange.

RURAL TELEPHONE

We favor expansion of rural telephone service and urge the Congress of the United States to provide funds for an adequate rural telephone loan program.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Through the development of our natural resources, many benefits have been brought to the people of the United States, such as the generation of electric power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, recreation, and wild life and soil conservation. These hydroelectric generating facilities have brought to our people, through the rural electric cooperatives, electric power that would otherwise have never been available. Therefore we recommend that the Congress of the United States continue to appropriate funds for the development of such other natural power resources of this country, including Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho and the power and navigation development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with Canada.

PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE UTILITIES

Whereas the present policy of the administration in regard to private utilities and power development is:

1. To turn over to private utilities much of the Nation's public power construction and output, contrary to customary and legally established preference policies;

2. To permit a type of power construction by private utilities which will bring about the creeping destruction of multipurpose river development.

3. To compel electric cooperatives through so-called partnership agreements to consent to the expansion of private power while public power projects are being halted;

4. To subsidize private utilities by guaranteed profits and by various devices such as are contained in the Dixon-Yates contract: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., on February 28 through March 3 do hereby go on record as fully endorsing the valiant efforts of the State and National Farmers Union leadership to block the private power policies of the present administration.

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Whereas the administration has seen fit to promote a contract authorizing the private power combine Dixon-Yates to provide electric power to TVA for use by Atomic Energy Commission; and

Whereas President Eisenhower ordered this contract signed over the disapproval of both the chairman of TVA and the chairman of AEC; and

Whereas the Dixon-Yates group was awarded the contract in spite of lower bids from other private groups, and in spite of the fact that TVA maintains that it could build steam generators and transmit electricity to AEC at a lower cost than private utilities; and

Whereas the administration has refused to present all facts to answer the charges of preferential treatment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That inasmuch as the administration's conduct in the Dixon-Yates case raised many unanswered questions and inasmuch as there are no apparent reasons justifying such a power contract, the delegates attending this 24th Annual Meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, do hereby go on record calling upon Congress to conduct a thorough investigation of the Dixon-Yates controversy by the proper investigating committee.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UPPER RIVER HARBOR AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a regular meeting held March 25, 1955, urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbors at Minneapolis, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 29, 1955.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find copy of a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a regular meeting held March 25, 1955, urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.

Very truly yours,

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

Resolution urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That Congress be urged to continue to appropriate sufficient funds, as requested by the United States Corps of Engineers, for the continuance of the extension of the 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and that a copy be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed March 25, 1955.

EUGENE STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved March 25, 1955.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

DONATION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY TO STATE AND LOCAL CIVIL DEFENSE—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from the New Jersey State League of Municipalities endorsing my bill, S. 1257, which provides for the donation of surplus Federal property to State and local civil defense organizations by the General Services Administrator.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY STATE
LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES,
Trenton, N. J., March 30, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator From Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The New Jersey State League of Municipalities heartily endorses your bill (S. 1527), which provides for the donation of surplus Federal property to State and local civil defense organizations by the General Services Administrator.

Such surplus properties should be made available to civil defense organizations, and we urge enactment of S. 1527 into law at this session of Congress.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MADELEINE S. FROST,
Executive Director.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1724. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1725. A bill to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly; and

S. 1726. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1727. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force; and

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Marie Noelle Nelly Doulet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger;

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Lik Kiu Ding; and

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Nicolas Lalos and his wife, Antyro Panagiotis Lalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1734. A bill for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Feodor Tudhope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1735. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1736. A bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the

qualifications of directors of national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the armed services. Each of the bills is requested by the Department of Defense, and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department, explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the accompanying letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1725. A bill to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1725 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, March 22, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to permit salary payments to be made to members of the Army and Air Force more frequently than once a month.

Section 1268 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 861) would be repealed. That section reads "The sums hereinbefore allowed shall be paid in monthly payments by the paymaster." The reference to "sums hereinbefore allowed" is to the sums allowed as pay of officers in the preceding sections of the Revised Statutes (R. S. 1261–1267). Section 1268 relates to the payment of officers of the Army and Air Force. Periods of payment of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are not covered by specific legislation. There is, therefore, no need for this proposed legislation to be made applicable to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Section 1268 has always created differences of opinion as to whether the word "monthly" was restrictive as related to more frequent payments or should be interpreted as providing merely that payment should not be less frequent than monthly. In this connection the Judge Advocate General of the Army and the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force have rendered opinions to the effect that the intent of section 1268 was to require monthly payments of the pay of officers as opposed to annual payments, rather than to restrict payments to monthly periods. The Comptroller General, however (B–120757, August 9, 1954), has held that section 1268 of the Revised Statutes is a bar to semimonthly payment of officers. Notwithstanding that ruling the Comptroller General granted permission to the Air Force to test a semimonthly pay plan for officers with the understanding that before the plan is adopted on a permanent basis appropriate statutory authority therefor would be obtained by the Air Force. The semimonthly payment plan for members of the Air Force was established on a test basis only after thorough consideration of the need for such plan and the benefits which will result therefrom. Semimonthly payments serve to relate the period of pay of military personnel more closely to present practices in the payment of salaries of civilian employees of the Government and those employed in private industry.

Appropriate regulations of the Department of the Air Force established the basis for semimonthly payments to airmen and aviation cadets, effective in October 1954, on a 6-month test basis. Provision was made for officers and warrant officers to elect to receive payments either monthly or semimonthly. Payment for the 1st through the 15th day of the month will be made on the 20th day of the month. Payment for the 16th day through the last day of the month will be made on the 5th day of the following month.

Section 2 of the bill would repeal the last proviso in subtitle "Pay" of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 400; 10 U. S. C. 861a). That proviso reads "That the pay of the enlisted men, including the items of commutation of quarters, and commutation of fuel, shall be paid monthly to each enlisted man entitled thereto by one check upon one properly certified voucher." This proviso applies only to the Signal Service of the Army. The pay of all enlisted men in the Army is governed by the same law. The special provision concerning enlisted men in the Signal Service is not required or used and should be repealed.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would involve no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1726. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1726 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the payment of mileage allowance for overland travel by privately owned conveyance performed by members of the uniformed services outside the continental limits of the United States.

Under the present provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, mileage allowance for overland travel by privately owned conveyance may only be paid to members of the uniformed services performing that travel within the continental limits of the United States. Members of the uniformed services, performing overland travel beyond the continental limits of the United States at personal expense, are limited to a per diem allowance not to exceed $9.00 per day and a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation which allowance has been fixed under the joint travel regulations at 5 cents per mile. The per diem allowance is payable for the time which would have elapsed had the travel been performed by common carrier. The monetary allowance in lieu of transportation is payable for a distance computed over the shortest usually traveled route, normally the railroad route. Members of the uniformed services performing similar travel within the continental limits of the United States may be paid a mileage allowance fixed under the Joint Travel Regulations at 6 cents per mile. The payment of either the monetary allowance of 5 cents per mile plus per diem, or a flat mileage allowance of 6 cents per mile, results in approximately the same total dollar expenditure. Authority to pay a mileage allowance for travel performed outside the continental limits of the United States would simplify the payment by disbursing officers of mileage claims.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal will result in negligible, if any, increased cost in the fiscal year 1956. Any increased cost resulting from this proposal will be absorbed by existing appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. FRANKE,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Financial Management).

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department. I am introducing this bill at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Its primary purpose is to provide basic authority for several legislative provisions which have been included from year to year in Treasury appropriation acts. It appears that points of order might be raised as to these provisions, and basic legislative authority is considered desirable with respect to the items which have been approved annually within provisions of the Treasury Appropriation Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill reflecting in legislative form the proposal made by the President in his most recent message on the state of the Union, in which he said:

I shall * * * propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

I am happy to have as cosponsors of this bill the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I also invite any other Senators to join in cosponsoring the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that their names may be added when submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1735) to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, only 7 days ago a waiting world received news of a great scientific achievement, the development and successful mass testing of a potent preventive vaccine against paralytic poliomyelitis. From Ann Arbor, Mich., word came that very nearly all of the thousands of children innoculated with the new vaccine had come through a dreaded polio season unscathed, thanks to the superlative skill of Dr. Jonas Salk and the strong support, both moral and financial, that he received throughout his labors from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

It is strange but true that there is at present no established method by which the people of this Nation can honor such great benefactors of mankind as Dr. Jonas Salk, whose name will deservedly shine henceforth among the honor roll of those physicians and scientists who have conquered a dread disease.

There are numerous medals established by the Congress, Mr. President, for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen who distinguish themselves in battle. Last year a complete system of awards and honors was authorized for the benefit of Government employees who contribute outstandingly to efficiency and economy. Persons who distinguish themselves in connection with accidents at sea or on the railroads are also eligible for official awards of the Government.

But what of the scientist, working in his laboratory or hospital to lift from mankind the burden of a crippling or killing disease? What of the educator whose contribution to our society extends from generation unto generation? What of the businessman or industrialist whose activities benefit his fellow men in an outstanding manner? Should we not provide an orderly and considered way in which the gratitude of the entire Nation may be enduringly expressed to those outstanding individuals who contribute meritoriously to the progress of our whole society and of all mankind?

I commend to the earnest consideration of my colleagues the bill I have just introduced, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the letter from Secretary Hobby transmitting this proposed legislation to the President of the Senate, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is the purpose of the Congress, by providing public recognition for outstanding accomplishments in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, industry, and related fields, to foster those cultural qualities and innovations essential to the development of a high civilization and conducive to the maintenance of peace, which are of paramount importance to humanity at all times.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

SEC. 2. There is hereby established the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, with accompanying appurtenances and devices, which the President may award to persons recommended to him as provided herein as having distinguished themselves by outstanding accomplishments in the fields listed in section 1.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President from among persons of recognized competence in the fields listed in section 1. Each member shall hold office for a term of 5 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire as follows: One shall expire with the close of the first calendar year which begins after the enactment of this act, one with the close of the second such calendar year, one with the close of the third such calendar year, one with the close of the fourth such calendar year, and one with the close of the fifth such calendar year, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. The President shall from time to time designate a member of the Board to serve as its Chairman.

(b) The members of the Board, while attending meetings of the Board, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall recommend to the President, citizens of the United States who shall in the judgment of the Board have made the most notable contributions, not necessarily in the year any such recommendation is made, in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, industry, and related fields, to receive the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement. In considering potential candidates for awards, the Board shall weigh carefully the relative merits of contributions in the public interest and welfare of great potential effect but not yet widely acclaimed, as compared with contributions already well known and appreciated.

(b) The Board is also authorized to make recommendations to the President for the conferring of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement posthumously upon citizens of the United States in belated recognition of outstanding accomplishments during their lives. Persons so honored posthumously shall include only those deceased during the previous 25 years.

(c) The Board is also authorized to make recommendations to the President for the conferring of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement upon noncitizens who in the estimation of the Board have conspicuously forwarded the public welfare in the broader realm of international relations.

(d) All transactions of the Board with respect to the selection of candidates for awards shall be confidential.

(e) The Board shall select the design of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement and of accompanying appurtenances and devices, and the design of a parchment testimonial to accompany the Medal, and may contract for the designing and making of the Medal and the testimonial in such manner as it deems advisable.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The chief administrative officer of the Board shall be a Secretary who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Board. The Secretary shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Board. The Board is authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such technical, clerical, and other assistants and to make such expenditures, within the limits of appropriations available therefor, as may be necessary for conducting its business: *Provided,* That the functions of the Board relating to the processing of personnel actions, budgeting, accounting, procurement, and related routine management functions shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through such facilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as may be designated therefor.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

CONFERRING OF HONORS

SEC. 6. The President personally, or through a representative designated by him, shall confer the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement in a suitable ceremony, and shall present at the same time to each person honored an engrossed parchment testimonial recording the conferral of the award and the accomplishments or contributions for which the award is made. In the case of a posthumous award, the medal and testimonial shall be presented to a repre-

sentative of the deceased person being honored, to be designated by the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a proposed draft bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement.

The proposal is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President contained in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955. In that message he said:

"I shall * * * propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country."

We have developed appropriate awards of honor for persons who distinguished themselves in the defense of our country. The Congressional Medal of Honor and other military medals recognize exceptional deeds of valor and outstanding service on the part of military personnel. To a more limited extent distinguished civilian service in furtherance of our national defense or security has been recognized through medals such as the Medal for Merit and the Medal of Freedom. But our National Government has singularly failed to establish a means of honoring those who make notable contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of our country not directly associated with military or civilian service to the country in connection with our war or defense efforts.

It is, of course, true that numerous awards have been created by private institutions and organizations, and even by State and municipal governments, to honor those who have deserved recognition in the various walks of civilian life. Nevertheless, there are those whose contributions to the advancement of our civilization and our country deserve the accolade of a grateful Nation. The appropriateness of a national award for this purpose is manifest.

The draft legislation enclosed would authorize the President to award a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement in national recognition of outstanding accomplishments in civilian fields. Recommendations for this award would be made to the President by a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement Board from among citizens who, in the Board's judgment, have made the most notable contributions in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, labor, industry, and related fields. Special consideration would be given to contributions of great potential effect but not yet widely acclaimed, as compared with contributions already well known and appreciated. Posthumous awards could be made to those deceased during the previous 25 years. The Board could also recommend to the President the conferring of the medal upon noncitizens who have conspicuously forwarded the public welfare in the broader realm of international relations.

The Board would select an appropriate medal with accompanying appurtenances and devices, and a parchment testimonial for use in conferring the award.

The President would, in a suitable ceremony, confer personally or through his representative the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement upon those individuals chosen for such award. Posthumous awards would be presented to a representative of the deceased person being honored.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enclosed measure would be in accord with the program of the President. We respectfully request that the enclosed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Bank Act relative to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. This bill is requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from him. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter of transmittal, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

Section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, (12 U. S. C. 72) requires that at least three-fourths of the directors of a national bank must reside within the State in which the bank is located or within 50 miles of the location of the office of the bank. In the light of modern day transportation this fifty mile limitation is unrealistically restrictive. Accordingly, to give to national banks a wider range for the selection of their directors, it is recommended that the 50-mile limitation be changed to a 100-mile limitation. It is believed that no serious consequences would result from this change in the law.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TEMPORARY PLACING IN ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL A STATUE OF THE LATE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission of Louisiana is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Address delivered by Senator HENNINGS before the Chicago Law Club.

AMERICA'S CULTURAL OFFENSIVE IN THE WORLDWIDE BATTLE OF IDEAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the increasing evidences of America's counter-offensive against the worldwide Soviet cultural propaganda effort. That Soviet effort is two-pronged. It is (a) designed to defame American culture as allegedly "crass" and "materialistic;" and (b) it is designed to paint a rosy picture of what is actually the barren and enslaved so-called culture of the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that an invaluable instrument in our own accurate worldwide cultural effort is the American National Theatre and Academy, which was wisely chartered by the Congress under a bill signed by the President of the United States as far back as July 5, 1935.

I have earlier referred to ANTA in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 4000–02, on March 30.

I send to the desk a supplementary statement, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Man does not live by bread alone," and his attitude in the East-West battle of ideas is not determined alone by its material phases.

Man is a thinking, feeling creature, who searches for beauty and for truth, as well as for his daily bread and for shelter and material things for himself and his loved ones.

In the worldwide battle of ideas, America's arts and artists have an important role to play in upholding the banner of freemen.

It is up to the abundant talent of the American theater and of music, of American films, ballet, sculpture and painting, and other media of expression to get across to free men everywhere the full significance of the devotion of the American people to culture and their splendid achievements in indigenous creations.

We are fortunate that the present administration has wisely perceived the needs for our sending cultural ambassadors abroad throughout the world.

Wonderful reports have come back regarding the constructive achievements overseas of American artists. Time and again we have heard that a single great singer like Marian Anderson, a single outstanding troupe like "Porgy and Bess" can ordinarily accomplish more in establishing fraternal

bonds between our own and other peoples than tons of newsprint and masses of words.

I may say that the United States decision for this cultural offensive has not been a casual one to make because we Americans have been traditionally cautious toward leaving the things of art entirely to private endeavor and encouragement.

We have recognized that the creative artist must have the fullest freedom in which to grow and to express himself.

At the same time, world events have thrust upon us the need for Uncle Sam flashing the green light to private citizens to stimulate a concrete answer to the lies and smears which have been spread so viciously by our enemies throughout the world.

But even if there were no Communist problem in the world, we would want to solidify our relationships with peoples everywhere, and we know that one of the most helpful ways of doing so is by our becoming better acquainted with their culture and by them becoming better acquainted with ours. To send the branches of our culture abroad, we must of course have a healthy cultural tree and root system at home. Fortunately, arts here are flourishing.

Meanwhile, it is most appropriate that America, in particular through ANTA is now sending a "Salute" to our sister Republics of France, a great ally, a country in which the arts have flowered to as high a degree as virtually anywhere else on earth. Mr. Robert Dowling, chairman of ANTA, is in charge of the Salute, Mrs. H. Alwyn Innes-Brown is vice chairman and Mr. Robert C. Schnitzer is general manager.

There follow various items further descriptive of our overall United States cultural counter-offensive. The first is a New York Times article published in its February 28 issue describing our worldwide effort. Next are editorials from the New York Times of January 30 and the New York Herald Tribune of the preceding day on this same general subject. Finally, to indicate the distinguished individuals who give of their time and talent to the overall work of the American National Theater and Academy, I append the list of officers and directors of that fine organization.

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1955]

UNITED STATES LIFTS CURTAIN ON CULTURE DRIVE—BEST OF DANCE, DRAMA, MUSIC TO GO ABROAD TO COUNTERACT SOVIET PROPAGANDA TOURS

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The United States has begun a counteroffensive against Soviet "cultural propaganda."

Thanks to a fund appropriated by Congress last August, the best this country produces in the dance, drama, and music is now being put before foreign audiences on a scale never before possible.

And by next summer more Americans will be singing, dancing, acting and otherwise performing abroad than ever before in time of peace.

For instance, the former National Broadcasting Company Orchestra, now called the Symphony of the Air, will be touring Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and probably Hong Kong. These are places to which no major United States orchestra has ventured before because it did not seem commercially possible.

PERFORMERS PLAN TRIPS

The New York Philharmonic will appear at the Edinburgh Music Festival and then tour northern Europe. If plans materialize the American National Ballet Theater and a symphony orchestra will probably be in Latin America. The woodwinds section of the Philadelphia Orchestra will be demonstrating its skills to audiences in the Middle East, India, and Pakistan.

These and other tours are being underwritten by half of a $5 million congressional appropriation. The other half is devoted to financing United States representation in foreign trade fairs.

Officials of the State Department's international exchange program today described the cultural operation as follows:

The State Department has contracted with the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) in New York to select likely performers and plan their overseas trips.

By preference those selected should have planned a trip abroad on their own, on a strictly commercial basis. If they cannot quite make it financially, or an extension of their tour into "no profit" areas seems desirable, ANTA may recommend them for a grant. ANTA has panels of professional advisers to pass on artists' merits in the dance, drama, and music.

The State Department's international exchange program (which also handles exchange of students and leaders) then approves the project in consultation with an interagency committee. This committee is composed of representatives of the State Department, the United States Information Service, the Foreign Operations Administration, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and the Labor Department.

Budgets for projected tours are approved by the State Department's international exchange program, although the ultimate pursestrings are held by Theodore Streibert, director of the information agency, who has the title of executive agent.

Once overseas, information officials look after the performers. One objective is to see that the Americans meet the leading artists abroad.

Here is one way in which the United States hopes to make its cultural representation more effective than that of the Soviets.

As State Department officials noted today, the United States program does not begin to compete quantitatively with the Russian. But whereas the Soviet artists are closely watched by agents who accompany them and are prevented from getting too friendly with their capitalistic counterparts, the Americans are encouraged to circulate freely.

PORGY TOUR HAILED

The officials thought this had worked out well during the Mediterranean tour of the Broadway musical Porgy and Bess. This show closed a commercial tour in Paris last December and did not have another European booking until it was to appear in Italy this month.

With a United States Government subsidy, the group, in the meantime, was sent on a tour of the western and eastern Mediterranean, including appearances in both Arab and Israeli territory.

In Cairo one reviewer wrote: "If this is propaganda, let's have more of it." Other reviews indicated that observers had been impressed by the distinguished role played by Negro artists in the cast and by the artistic maturity of the performance.

The Philadelphia Orchestra will take part in a show called Salute to France in May and June. Others in the show are the New York City Ballet, the cast of "Oklahoma," Judith Anderson in "Medea," and a production of Thornton Wilder's, "The Skin of Our Teeth," with Helen Hayes and Mary Martin.

[From the New York Times of January 30, 1955]

CULTURAL AMBASSADORS

Next spring, Parisian theatergoers will have the chance to view samples of American artistic achievements in the fields of music, dance, ballet, and drama. This venture, privately financed with the assistance of the international exchange program of the American National Theater and Academy, will offer the Philadelphia Orchestra, under the baton of Eugene Ormandy; "Oklahoma" which has never been seen in Paris; "Medea," by Robinson Jeffers; "The Skin of Our Teeth," by Thornton Wilder; and a limited engagement of the New York City Ballet, starring Maria Tallchief and André Eglevsky.

The importance of this cultural exchange, which cannot be too strongly stressed, was best expressed by President Eisenhower in a recent letter to Robert W. Dowling, chairman of ANTA, who organized the project at the request of French and United States officials. The President said: "This will be of vast significance to the cause of friendship and understanding between the people of America and Western Europe. I wish you every success."

The artistic program, labeled "Salute to France," represents an attempt to repay that great nation, if only in a small measure, for its long tradition of friendship and assistance to this country. Since revolutionary days, France's men of letters, artists, and great military figures have had profound influence on American life. It is only fitting that we demonstrate our appreciation and goodwill through this cultural exchange.

ANTA is to be congratulated for wholeheartedly accepting the responsibilities of organizing this worthwhile project. It already has achieved a notable artistic success with the tour of Porgy and Bess in Yugoslavia and in the Near East, and with the sponsorship of the José Limon dance company in its tour of South America.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 29, 1955]

SALUTE TO FRANCE

Bringing ballet, music, and drama to Paris may seem like an approximation of carrying coals to Newcastle, but the American Salute to France project scheduled for the spring should win wide approbation on both sides of the Atlantic. Under plans just announced—plans which American Ambassador C. Douglas Dillon played a large part in formulating—some of the brighest ornaments of American cultural life will be put on display in France as a tribute to French leadership in the development of Western culture. The Philadelphia Orchestra, conducted by Eugene Ormandy, will give concerts at the Paris Opéra; the New York Ballet Co. will put on 8 performances; Oklahoma will have a 2-week run; and 2 dramas, Robinson Jeffers' Medea, and Thornton Wilder's The Skin of Our Teeth, will be staged.

At about the same time that America will be saluting France at this festival, an interesting art exhibition will be taking place at the Orangerie, the lovely little museum near the Tuileries Gardens. Here will be placed on view 100 paintings, watercolors, and drawings, the work of French artists, but long ago acquired by American museums and collectors. Many of these works, largely of the 19th century, have not been seen in France since their acquisition by American connoisseurs; now they are back on loan in their land of origin.

Mutual respect and understanding between the two nations are certain to be enhanced by these two intelligent programs. Although both are arranged under private auspices, they have received official blessings in the form of good will messages from President Eisenhower. Citizens of both France and the United States can take pride in these salutes to France, and many an American will be tempted to cross over to Paris this spring for a firsthand look.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATRE AND ACADEMY

President: Clarence Derwent.
First vice president: Sawyer Falk.
Second vice president: Peggy Wood.
Third vice president: Benjamin Kaye.
Fourth vice president: Richard Hoover.
Treasurer: Roger L. Stevens.
Secretary: George Freedley.
Honorary presidents: Helen Hayes, Vinton Freedley, Guthrie McClintic, Robert E. Sherwood, A. Conger Goodyear.
Honorary treasurer: Gilbert Miller.
Honorary chairman: C. Lawton Campbell.
Counsel: Walter H. Liebman.
Board of directors: Robert W. Dowling, chairman; H. Darkes Albright,[1] Campton Bell, Aline Bernstein, Mrs. Anthony Bliss, Robert Breen, Thomas Brock, Gilmor Brown, C. Lawton Campbell,[1] Mrs. Sara Spencer Campbell,[1] Warren Caro,[1] Lucia Chase, Arthur Cloetingh,[1] Edward Cole,[1] John A. Conway, Blevins Davis, Clarence Derwent,[1] Howard Dietz, Robert W. Dowling,[1] Marjorie Dycke, Fred Emmett, Sawyer Falk, George Freedley,[1] Vinton Freedley,[1] Mary Stewart French, Rosamond Gilder, A. Conger Goodyear, Paul Green, Verner Haldene, William Halstead, the Reverend Gilbert V. Hartke,[1] Helen Hayes, Mary Virginia Heinlein, Hubert Heffner, Barnard Hewitt,[1] Richard Hoover,[1] Mrs. H. A. Inness-Brown,[1] Rowena Woodham Jelliffe, Margo Jones, C. Robert Kase, Benjamin Kaye, Charles Lane, Walter Liebman,[1] Monroe Lippman, Gertrude Macy, Gilbert Miller, Albert Mitchell, Jack Morrison, Donald Oenslager, Thomas E. Poag, James E. Popovich, Donovan Rhynsburger, Elmer Rice,[1] Beardsley Ruml, Mrs. Dorothy Schwartz, Samuel Selden, Claude L. Shaver, Louis M. Simon, Roger L. Stevens,[1] Wesley Swanson,[1] Frederick G. Walsh, Winifred Ward, Margaret Webster, Milton Weintraub, Robert Whitehead, Peggy Wood, John Wray Young,[1] William Zeckendorf.
Executive director, Willard Swire.

PUBLICATION OF THE YALTA PAPERS—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made this morning by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in an appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. At that time Mr. Dulles gave a very forthright and complete statement on the events leading up to publication of the Yalta papers, and furnishing the committee with the information on that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Let me say at the start that I believe that it was right that the Yalta papers should be made officially public. I believed—and still believe—that the American public, historian and citizen alike, is entitled to all relevant information on this remarkable chapter in world history that could be divulged without jeopardizing the national security. In this respect I share the view expressed by the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who as Secretary of State participated in the Yalta Conference. He said, in 1949, that "it is important for the public to know exactly what took place in the Crimea, and, almost equally important, what did not take place." That was said in the preface to his volume Roosevelt and the Russians which very fully reproduces his detailed record of the Yalta Conference.

The official United States publication has now taken place. I am glad to review with you the background and the chronology of events in connection with it.

I

The volumes on the Malta and Yalta Conferences were two of a number of volumes in the Foreign Relations series requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its report for fiscal 1954. The request grew out of the supplemental hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on May 15, 1953, which considered a 4-year publication program submitted by the Department of State. This program involved the reduction of the backlog of 26 volumes which had been compiled but not published, along with the publication of a series of volumes on our relations with China during the 1940's and another on the World War II Conferences of heads of Government. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report of May 28, 1953 requested the Department of State to "allocate sufficient funds from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, 1954' to provide the necessary personnel and other related expenses essential to start reducing the backlog" of the Foreign Relations volumes, and referred with approval to the 4-year program submitted by the Department.

In the hearings for fiscal 1955 the Senate Appropriations Committee had before it a report from the Department showing the proposed schedule of publication which listed the Malta-Yalta volume as having top priority for publication in the series on World War II conferences.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's report for fiscal 1955 stated:

"The committee reiterates its firm conviction that the historic and documented record of our international relations as compiled in the Foreign Relations volumes should be continued aggressively and in unexpurgated form. Every effort should be made to make these documents available just as soon as security considerations will permit. Accordingly, the committee is recommending $227,280 for this specific purpose."

The Yalta papers were ready to be sent to the printer early last September. If they had been printed at that time they would have been ready for publication in October. The question of whether to publish in October was put to me while I was in the Far East in September. On my instructions, Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle cabled the Department from Tokyo on September 11, 1954, as follows:

"With respect to date of publication, Secretary believes that it should not be published until after the congressional elections. If the publication could have taken place a monh ago, that would have been all right; but to publish only 2 or 3 weeks before elections would, he thinks, damn the entire operation as political, and in the eyes of students discredit it as politically motivated. They would be suspicious that the selection and omission of documents had been politically motivated. He would, therefore, recommend publication sometime about the 1st of December."

That December date was not met because of unexpected developments. The British Foreign Office, in accordance with customary practice, had alerady been shown the documents of British origin, and had cleared these, with very minor exceptions, which did not affect our foreign policy. But toward the end of November 1954 the Foreign Office asked to see the entire collection of documents, including those of United States origin.

In view of the understandable British interest in the minutes and related conference papers, the Department sent the entire set of galleys to the Foreign Office for its information. This was done on December 2, 1954.

By early January, no comments had been received. So, on January 10, 1955, I sent a personal message to Foreign Secretary Eden telling him of our desire to proceed with publication without further delay and expressing the hope that he had no objections. On January 13, he replied that he still had some questions which he suggested we could discuss together at Bangkok the following month. He requested delay until then.

In deference to the Foreign Secretary's wishes, I postponed the publication. However, under the pressures of other matters, Sir Anthony Eden and I failed to talk about this at Bangkok.

Accordingly, upon my return from Bangkok I decided that, while awaiting British approval, a limited number of galleys should be printed and made available on an official basis for departmental use and use by those committees of the Congress who had a special interest in them. On March 10, I cabled Sir Anthony recalling that he had planned to talk to me at Bangkok about the publication of the Yalta papers, but that in the pressure of business we had both overlooked this. I said that, in deference to his views, I was still holding up general publication, but that I did plan to make copies of these documents available to the appropriate congressional committees, for their official use.

On Monday, March 14, at the regular noon briefing of the correspondents who cover the State Department, the State Department spokesman, Mr. Henry Suydam, announced this program. This announcement was premature, in the sense that it was made before Assistant Secretary Morton had had the opportunity to consult with the appropriate members of these committees.

Shortly after lunch on March 14, I saw news ticker reports which indicated that the chairmen generally preferred that their committees not take custody of the papers, but thought it would be better that the State Department make them generally public.

Assistant Secretary Morton confirmed this, and I then asked him to send the following letter to the respective congressional leaders:

"Pursuant to congressional authorization and appropriation concerning special conference volumes the State Department has compiled the papers relating to the Yalta and Malta Conferences of 1945. It is deemed inadvisable at this time to issue these papers in volume for public distribution. Since, however, the papers have actually been compiled and since they may be of interest to your committee members in their official capacity, but not for publication, the Department of State will, if your committee so desires, make a limited number of copies available on a confidential basis."

These letters were written Monday evening, March 14, and delivered by hand on Tuesday morning, March 15.

The Tuesday morning press indicated that the delay in publication was widely ascribed to British objections. So, at 9 a. m. on Tuesday, March 15, I telephoned the British Ambassador. I expressed the view that, in the light of the wide public interest which had, by then, been aroused, it was better for Anglo-American relations to publish at once rather than to allow the impression to gain ground that the United Kingdom had something to hide—which was not the case. The Ambassador indicated his concurrence. I said I would advise Sir Anthony

[1] Member of executive committee.

Eden of my views, and the Ambassador said he would do the same. He indicated that he felt confident that I would get a quick answer from Sir Anthony. Accordingly, at 10:30 a. m., I sent a message to Sir Anthony saying that I thought it undesirable to perpetuate a situation which created an atmosphere of mystery and concealment, and that, accordingly, unless he felt strongly against it, I proposed to publish.

I should, at this point, observe that I had already carefully considered the possible impact of publication upon the international situation and particularly upon the pending ratification of the Paris Accords by the German Bundesrat and the French Council. I had concluded that that impact would not be unfavorable.

At 10:30 on Tuesday morning, I spoke over the telephone with Senator GEORGE and informed him generally of the position and that I hoped shortly to be able to release the documents generally.

At 11 on Tuesday morning, I had my regular press conference, at which I said:

"The Yalta papers are at the present time in galley-proof form. They are available here in the State Department for consultation on a restrictive basis by Members of the Congress who are on committees that might be concerned with them, and we are still studying the matter of their full publication."

While Assistant Secretary McCardle and I were preparing for my press conference, Mr. James Reston of the New York Times telephoned Assistant Secretary McCardle's office and left the following message for him:

"Tell him while he is with the Secretary that I have had a long talk with George about the Yalta business and I think I ought to see the Secretary after the press conference if I can."

When my press conference was finished, Assistant Secretary McCardle brought Mr. Reston to my office. Mr. Reston said that his impression of his conversation with Senator GEORGE was that the Senator wished to see the Yalta record made public by the State Department. Mr. Reston urged that it was of the utmost importance that the papers be published as a whole and not in garbled form; that unless the New York Times did this, no one else would, but that this would be very expensive and take time. Therefore, if there was to be any comprehensive publication, they had to have an advance copy since it would involve setting up an enormous printing job.

I said that such matters fell under the jurisdiction of Mr. McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who was a former newspaperman. Thereupon the two left.

I subsequently learned that Mr. McCardle gave a galley proof to Mr. Reston about 8:30 p. m. that evening (Tuesday). This involved an exercise by Mr. McCardle of a discretion that was his. It involved no breach of security. On November 5, I had taken and recorded a decision to publish without deletion on an expedited basis. This constituted authority to declassify under Executive Order 10501. The galley proofs, on March 3, were marked "For official use only," under Mr. McCardle's instructions. This was not a security classification but a purely internal classification which Mr. McCardle himself had imposed and which he had full authority to remove.

At 10:12 a. m. Wednesday, March 16, the British Ambassador phoned me that his Government agreed to publish and that a confirmation cable from London was on its way to me.

At 12:45 on Wednesday I lunched at the Capitol with Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES. This appointment had been made 5 days before, on March 11. They mentioned that they had heard a rumor that the New York Times was going to publish the Yalta documents on March 17. I expressed surprise, but said that I thought that we would release the documents that afternoon to all news media. When I returned for lunch, I found the confirmation cable from Sir Anthony Eden agreeing that we should now publish.

Also, shortly after I returned from my lunch with Senators BRIDGES and KNOWLAND, Mr. James Hagerty phoned me that he, too, had heard that the New York Times was planning to run the Yalta papers the next morning and I made to him the same reply I made to the Senators, namely, that I planned a prompt general release.

At 3:45 I talked with Assistant Secretary McCardle and asked him to arrange promptly to release the documents generally. This was done and there was a general publication the next morning (Thursday, March 17).

II

The decision to publish the Malta-Yalta records required decision as to just what to publish. As to this I relied primarily upon Dr. George B. Noble, who has served as Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research or of the Historical Division since 1946.

The task was not easy. There were no agreed tripartite minutes. The only records available are those which were made by certain members of the respective delegations. These were done on a national basis and no distinction was recognized between formal and informal conversations.

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, minutes were kept of the meetings not only of the Council of Ten, but for the most part of meetings of the Big Four (France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States). These were circulated among the interested delegations and became substantially agreed minutes. These minutes, which have been published, contain many casual comments of the nature of those to be found in the records of the Yalta discussions.

Where the participants in a conference do not themselves make any distinction in their remarks, as by asking that certain remarks should be treated as off the record, it is extremely difficult for subsequent historians themselves to make the distinction. Secretary of State Stettinius in his volume did not eliminate all of the so-called chitchat. The record published by the Department of State was the actual record as compiled by certain of the participants and supplied by them to the Department of State for its records.

The most complete record is that of Mr. Bohlen who acted as interpreter. Early in 1949 he had checked and cleared for accuracy the proofs of Mr. Stettinius' book, and in July 1949 Mr. Bohlen transmitted his own record to the Division of Historical Policy Research.

It will be recalled that the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee for fiscal 1955 called for publication of the unexpurgated record. I should, however, say that a very few casual or informal remarks have nevertheless been omitted which might have done harm without adding anything of substance to the record.

In some cases remarks which otherwise might have been omitted by the above test have been included because they had previously been incorporated in authoritative memoirs and given wide publicity. The harm, if any, was done, and omission in the official record would merely have served to raise question as to the validity of the publication.

III

To sum up:

1. At no time have I had any doubt about the desirability of publishing the story of Yalta. This, indeed, seems to have been the view of three of my predecessors who have held office since the Yalta conference. I have already quoted Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State at the time, as to how important he judged it for the public to know exactly what took place at Yalta. His successor as Secretary of State, Secretary Byrnes, published in his memoirs his notes on the Yalta Conference. Secretary of State Acheson early in 1949 cleared the publication by former Secretary Stettinius of his extensive record of the conference.

The view that there should be publication was not only an executive judgment, but also explicitly endorsed by the United States Congress which appropriated the funds for prompt and full publication.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for approximately 2 years that publication was in process, and this has seemed to meet with general approval.

2. The timing was judged opportune, in the light of the general international situation, and I think it has proved opportune. Furthermore, the timing was such as to avoid any approximation to a domestic election period.

3. When publication was finally agreed upon, there was full publication of the volume which covers the Yalta Conference. I believe that at least two newspapers, within a few hours of the release, carried the full text of about 300,000 words, while others carried very substantial portions. This served the indispensable purpose of assuring that the American people and interested peoples abroad would easily and quickly get the main story in full and not be dependent upon extracts which might have been selected for partisan purposes or for reasons of pure readability.

4. The Yalta papers are now where they belong—in the public domain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RELIEF TO FARMERS AND FARMWORKERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on April 1, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduced a bill which proposed to afford a small measure of relief to farmers and farmworkers who suffered crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes. Very frankly, Mr. President, the bill grew out of the severe distress the farmers of my own immediate section of the country were undergoing, because of the unusually cold weather, which brought the temperature down to 12 or 14 degrees in the latter part of March, and destroyed their crops.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to put the kiss of death on this proposed legislation, by addressing a letter to the chairman of the committee, under date of April 11, disapproving the bill and recommending against its passage. I realize that it might be possible for the Senate to proceed to go through a course of hearings, consider the bill and pass it; but if that were done, it would be too late to afford any relief to those who are genuinely in distress.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture does not suggest any alternative. It says it is opposed to the bill, but it does not suggest any other measure which might afford relief to the multitude of farmers who are facing economic disaster. The Department says it sympathizes with them; but I say its whole attitude toward these disasters is one of careless indifference to human suffering and evinces no regard whatever for the economic distress of the farmers whom the Department of Agriculture is supposed to serve.

Mr. President, it is ironic that at the time when the Department says it sympathizes with these farmers who are in such great distress the Department has raised to 5 percent the interest rate on the disaster loans which were authorized by Congress. The interest rate on these loans has now been made practically that of bank loans, namely, 5 percent, which is charged to farmers who are supposed to be entitled to some assistance from their Government because they are unable to secure the means of relief elsewhere—farmers who have seen their crops destroyed by freeze or who have seen the products of their labor washed down into the rivers by flood or dried up on the vine and on the stalk as result of drought.

Mr. President, to me, it is almost shocking that the Department of Agriculture, which was created to assist the farmer and which at one time was a living, vital agency interested in the welfare of the farmer, could have become so deplorably indifferent to those in distress, and to the real privation and suffering of those whom it is supposed to serve.

I deplore, indeed, Mr. President, I resent the action of the Department in disapproving of this bill, without suggesting any alternative. I can understand why the Department might not like the bill, although, in my opinion, the objections the Department raises are captious and specious. If the Department were really desirous of fulfilling its mission as an agency of service to the farmers of the Nation, it would at least have offered some alternative rather than to increase the interest rate to the farmers, who can obtain credit nowhere else.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the able Senator from Georgia very highly for his effort to meet the distressing situation which exists throughout what might be called the southern freeze belt. I remind him that the freeze struck great areas of my State long before March of this year. It struck last November.

To meet that distress situation, certain changes were proposed in the law with reference to the allotment of cotton acreage. The situation was brought to the attention of the Congress, and aroused sympathy in the minds of a great many Members. The situation was not confined to my State.

Many officials of the Department of Agriculture were sympathetic, but, so far as the top level recommendations of the Department were concerned, no recommendation was ever made which would help the Congress to cope with the situation. In fact, the administration was opposed to the bill.

The recent freeze in March added to the distress which already existed. Many crops were destroyed. A proposal was made to allow a slight increase in the cotton-acreage allotment—only 2 acres—to take the place, in part, of perhaps 15 or 20 acres of tomatoes or cabbage which were destroyed.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, it was certainly reasonable to expect some constructive recommendation from the Department with reference to the bill he introduced. Instead we receive word that the Department is opposed to the bill. No alternative is suggested. Furthermore, there is the announcement of an increase to 5 percent in the interest rate on distress loans. The Senator from Mississippi has searched, but he cannot find any other Government loan which carries an interest rate as high as 5 percent. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he knows of any Government loan which carries such a high rate of interest?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not. Furthermore, when the Congress was dealing with the question of the interest rate on agricultural loans, in the case of rural electrification and telephone operation loans, it fixed the interest at the rate the Government was currently paying, which I believe was about 2½ percent, although I am not an expert in that field. That showed the congressional intent. However, the attitude of the Department of Agriculture in increasing the interest rate, while offering no relief in other directions, is the equivalent of saying to the farmers in my area, "root, hog, or die."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not want to acquire the reputation of being a complainer. I do not approach the question in that spirit. However, after we have made every possible effort to meet the situation by means of constructive legislation, I think a vigorous protest ought to be expressed here, and some ways and means should be devised to bring the question to a vote. The Senator from Mississippi agrees that if we could ever obtain a vote on this question, some relief measure could be passed.

I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly share the belief of the Senator from Mississippi that the United States Senate would not be so indifferent to human suffering and distress as the Department of Agriculture has been in these circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his alertness in bringing to the attention of the Senate and also of the people of the United States the condition which has arisen.

This bill was not introduced merely because Senators wished to introduce a bill. It was introduced because we found that in a great many of the States there was dire distress. For example, in my particular county in South Carolina, Spartansburg County, the loss in connection with the crop of peaches was approximately $10 million. The same situation will be found to exist in the State of Georgia. All the peaches in that State have been wiped out. The same is true in other States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The most conservative estimate of the loss to farmers in my State is $70 million.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Losses have been incurred throughout that section of the Nation not only in connection with the peach crop, but other crops.

The bill referred to was introduced to provide for an increase of 3 percent in the national acreage allotment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that it is predicted at the present time that approximately 7 percent of the allotments which were given to farmers in the first instance will not be used. That being so, the result would not be an increase in the national allotment originally given to farmers, so far as cotton is concerned. The proposal advanced referred not only to cotton, but other crops. It provided for an increased allotment of 3 percent on other crops, which still is 4 percent less than the predicted unused allotments. This was an effort to relieve the condition of distress.

What do we find? As the Senator from Georgia has said, the Department makes no recommendation whatsoever to relieve the condition of distress. However, we find in Saturday morning's newspaper a United Press dispatch stating that the interest rates on disaster loans were increased some 2 or 3 months ago, but the Department forgot to announce it to the people of the United States until after the recent disaster had occurred. Then it was announced that the rates had been increased from 3 to 5 percent.

I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture a letter telling him exactly how I felt, and pleading with him to change the interest rate back to 3 percent. I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of my letter printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1955.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I am writing you to protest in the strongest possible manner the Agriculture Department's order increasing disaster-loan interest rates to stricken farmers from 3 to 5 percent and your belated announcement of this action.

When Congress passed the law giving the Agriculture Department authority to establish rates of interest on these emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration, Congress felt sure the Department would understand that the act was intended to help farmers in distress and not to make money. It is almost inconceivable that a Government agency would raise interest rates on emergency loans to farmers

who have lost their crops and who are looking for assistance to save their farms.

This holds especially true when the Agriculture Department is still lending money in other fields at rates as low as 2 percent. I seek your cooperation to immediately reconsider your order raising interest rates on disaster loans and return these interest rates to 3 percent.

I have seen at first hand the tragic situation which the elements have brought about in the South and elsewhere, and unless immediate and practical aid is made available to farmers in these areas, the result will be disastrous. The farmers just cannot pay 5-percent interest on emergency loans and ever get back on their feet. I have discussed this matter with other Senators and find a number of them deeply concerned about this situation.

I was shocked at the Department's action in raising the rates and can only conclude that such a policy is one of "blood money." Also, I must call to your attention the seriousness of taking such a step without any notice (to my knowledge) to Congress or to the farmers who are affected the most. To take such a far-reaching step and then just "forget" to tell anyone about it until those concerned are in the depths of distress, reflects careless and loose handling of the affairs of the people. I wish to cooperate with the Agricultural Department in every way possible for the welfare of the farmers of this country, but I cannot stand idly by, approving such policies.

Again I request you to reconsider this move which has increased loan interest rates under Public Law 38 more than 65 percent, and urge you to return to the 3-percent level.

Thanking you for your immediate consideration, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my letter I say that the policy involved in the Department's action in raising the interest rate is one of exacting "blood money" from those who are suffering distress, and will suffer for the next 2 or 3 years, before they can get back on their feet. When they are charged such a rate of interest as 5 per cent, it amounts to "blood money."

I thank the Senator from Georgia for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate. I wish him to know that I am willing to try to bring about some affirmative and helpful action. However, as the Senator from Georgia has said, it is almost too late to afford the necessary relief if the Department of Agriculture does not place its stamp of approval upon the bill so that it can pass the House and Senate in time to be of some avail. Such relief is needed in my State, as well as in the States of Georgia, North Carolina, Florida, and other Southern States, where the freeze wiped out our crops.

Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated April 11, 1955, to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr.,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in response to a telephone request on April 5 from the clerk of your committee asking for the Department's views on S. 1628.

The purpose of S. 1628 is to provide relief to farmers adversely affected by weather or other natural disasters. It authorizes and directs the Department to increase farm acreage allotments of farmers who apply for an increase and whose livelihood is endangered by the destruction or damage by natural hazards of one or more of their important crops. The amount of increase to be granted in such cases is to be that acreage which, together with the other crops produced on the farm, will enable the operator to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. The Department would be limited in the acreage to be used in this manner to the smaller of (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national allotment established for any commodity.

The economic effect of disasters is recognized and the difficulties of the farmers affected are sympathetically understood. It is the desire of the Department to alleviate insofar as possible the difficulties caused by disaster. The Department is in complete accord with the laudable purpose of this bill which is to help relieve farm distress wrought by natural disasters. However, we believe the acreage allotment and marketing quota programs are not the proper vehicle for providing such relief. As you are aware, the purpose of these programs is to help keep production in line with effective demand. However, the provisions of this bill are contrary to this purpose.

All of our major crops except peanuts are in surplus supply, and for the first time in many years, acreage allotments are in effect for corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

We oppose S. 1628 for the following reasons:

1. It would be difficult to administer. Disasters of varying intensity occur in many parts of the country almost every year. There are few farmers who could not justifiably claim that they have suffered severe damage from the vicissitudes of weather, disease, and pests at one time or another during the growing season. This could involve us in a continuous review and adjustment of allotments of individual farmers adversely affected. It appears unfair that farmers adversely affected late in the growing season could receive no relief from this source, whereas their neighbors adversely affected at an earlier date, could. Also, it would be difficult, if not impossible to determine how much increase in allotment should be granted to individual producers. How much acreage would be required of any crop to assure a livelihood for the operator and his family, taking into consideration other crops on the farm and the size and economic status of the farm family, would involve the exercise of judgment decisions by our more than 3,000 farmer committees, which neither they nor we could discharge with a fair degree of accuracy or equity as between farmers.

2. The bill would be expensive to administer. As you are aware, our present budget includes $39 million a year to administer acreage allotment and marketing quota programs. The additional work in making necessary adjustments entailed in carrying out the bill would add greatly to the present expense. The exact amount would be difficult to determine in the absence of experience. In addition to the administrative expense, additional program expense would be involved in supporting the price of the commodities grown on the additional acreage allotted over and above that presently authorized or required.

3. The bill would set a dangerous precedent by using acreage allotment programs for insurance or relief purposes which they are not designed to serve. The bill is completely contrary to recent legislation authorizing additional reductions in Burley tobacco acreage allotments to adjust supplies in line with demand. The additional allotments called for by this bill can only serve to further aggravate existing disparities between supplies and market outlets for crops under control. Producers of basic commodities who are making very steep reductions in their acreage in an effort to bring about better balance in production should not be required to shoulder the burden of providing disaster insurance. Disasters are a matter of concern to everyone, and we believe that any relief granted should be through recovery measures in which the general public participates.

Under existing law the Department has authorized the making of emergency loans to eligible farmers who have suffered substantial losses as a result of the recent freeze and are not able to obtain from other established sources the credit needed to continue their normal operations, including the maintenance and care of orchards. Although it is expected that these loans will be repaid as rapidly as possible, consideration is given to the circumstances of the farmers in each area in the determination of terms and security policies relating to the making of these loans.

If the Congress feels that something more than the disaster loans or drought-relief programs presently provided by legislation is needed, such relief should be provided outside the acreage allotment and marketing quota program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is entitled to the floor.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday I was attempting to describe the main features of the Upper Colorado project and to give the reasons why I thought it was not in the public interest that the pending bill be passed.

I pointed out that the bill authorizes the expenditure, within the not too distant future, of $1,658,000,000, and that, of this authorization, $656 million was to be allocated to power, $915 million to irrigation, and a little more than $72 million to the supply of municipal water.

I also pointed out that, in all probability, this was a gross underestimate of what the actual costs would be, because in the past the final costs have been more than double the costs originally estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation. So, in all probability, we face an ultimate capital expenditure of at least $2

billion, and possibly very much more than that sum.

Moreover, no interest is to be paid on the amounts allocated to reclamation, in the minimum figure of $915 million. In the case of power projects, as we know, not only is the principal repaid, but interest is paid. In the case of irrigation, only the principal is repaid, but not the interest.

Since there is to be a 10-year developmental period, during which no interest is to be paid, and no return on the capital is to be paid, and a subsequent 50-year period during which the capital is supposed to be repaid, this means that for 60 years the public will either pay interest on bonds which are floated, or will forego the interest which might otherwise be collected. A rough computation, based on figures submitted by the Department of the Interior, indicates that the interest costs will be, at a minimum, in excess of $1,100,000,000. Therefore, the irrigation costs now run to approximately $2 billion, at a minimum, and the power costs are set at $656 million. In view of the fact that the Bureau chronically underestimates the final costs, we may be dealing with total costs vastly in excess of $3 billion.

In my opinion, the huge size of these sums requires much more careful consideration than the Senate and Congress have in the past given to this proposal.

POWER COSTS ARE EXTREMELY HIGH

Toward the end of the session yesterday I turned to the question of power, and pointed out that this would be extremely high-cost power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River. It is only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River. It is less than half the flow of the Snake River, in connection with which there has been considerable debate as to whether a high dam should be erected at Hells Canyon.

As a result of all this, the costs of installing generating capacity are extremely high.

EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION COSTS PER KILOWATT INSTALLED

I pointed out that at Glen Canyon, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity was $463; at Echo Park, $640; at Central Utah, $765; at Cross Mountain, $605; at Curecanti, more than $1,000; and at Flaming Gorge, more than $700. The average cost for the power feature of the project as a whole is somewhat in excess of $500 per kilowatt of capacity.

Let us compare that cost with the average cost in the Tennessee Valley of $166 per kilowatt of capacity. That is the figure for the 17 multiple purpose dams on the Tennessee River. In other words, the average cost of building the dams and installing the generators and the equipment necessary to generate power would be 3 times as great in the projects contemplated on the Colorado than in the 17 projects already completed on the Tennessee.

Furthermore, at Bonneville, the average cost was only $115. Therefore, the relative construction cost on the Colorado is between 4 and 5 times the cost at Bonneville. At Hoover, the cost was only $112. Again we have a figure for the Colorado which is between 4 and 5 times as high. At Grand Coulee, the cost was only $90. As a result, we have a cost on the Colorado more than 5 times and possibly somewhere around 6 times what the cost was at the great dam at Grand Coulee.

In other words, we are being asked to spend $656 million for power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed. This fact shows up in the figures on the generating cost per kilowatt-hour.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS

I cited the testimony of Gen. U. S. Grant, III, to the effect that the generating costs at Glen Canyon—the dam just above Lee's Ferry—which is the prize project, would be between 4.2 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is the best of all the dams.

I cited the fact that at Echo Park—the much discussed Echo Park—power would sell for 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and the costs are probably not far from that figure. At the dams higher up the river from Echo Park the cost would be in excess of 6 mills.

How do those costs compare with the costs in other great hydroelectric projects in the country? I pointed out that at Bonneville the generating cost per kilowatt-hour was a little more than 6 tenths of a mill, but if depreciation and interest were included, as they should be, the costs are about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

At Grand Coulee the power generating costs are less than a half mill per kilowatt-hour, and would still be less than 1 mill even if interest and depreciation were taken into account, as I believe they should be.

At Hells Canyon the estimated costs, with all items taken into consideration, would be approximately 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

On the TVA for 17 multiple-use dams, all costs, including depreciation and interest, amount to only 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour; and on the 10 single-use dams, where nothing is written off, either for navigation or for flood control, the costs are less than 1.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to authorize projects where the generating costs will be from 4½ to more than 6 times the costs on the Columbia River; from 2 to 2½ times the costs at Hells Canyon; from 4½ to 6 times the cost of the multiple purpose dams on the Tennessee River; and from 3 to 4 times the costs of the single-use dams. So, we are being asked to plunge hundreds of millions of dollars, and, indirectly, some billions of dollars, into the most unfavorable location in the United States.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IS INCONSISTENT

I pointed out that it was extraordinary that an administration which has declared public power to be creeping socialism, which has put the lid down on additional dams on the Columbia River, which has opposed Hells Canyon, and which has certainly turned a cold shoulder to the power development of the Niagara River, should go up into the mountains of Colorado and there locate public power projects where the costs will be 3, 4, or 5 times what they would be at these other locations.

Mr. President, I am not saying that the administration wishes to have this project fail. I wish to be very careful in what I say. But I will say that if the administration had wished to discredit the public power system it could not have proceeded in any better fashion than it has done in this instance, because it is turning over the favorable locations to private industry and concentrating enormous expenditures in high-cost areas where, in my judgment, the losses will be extremely heavy. Is it possible that this administration believes in the socialization of losses.

The power thus generated is to be sold at 6 mills per kilowatt. That will be about the cost at Echo Park, probably will be slightly less than the cost at the dams to the north of Echo Park. Therefore, the Glen Canyon Dam is expected to carry the whole burden of the program, to bring in virtually the only profit which will accrue, and then, in addition, to carry 85 percent of the enormous capital expenditures for irrigation. In other words, Mr. President, upon a very slender foundation of earning power there is being erected a tremendous superstructure of expenditure. If construction costs at Glen Canyon go up, if it turns out that instead of the $370 million allocated to power at Glen Canyon, the actual costs amount to $500 million, and if the Bureau of Reclamation runs true to form, and grossly underestimates the ultimate cost, as it commonly does, we shall find Glen Canyon costs approaching close to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour; so there will be no profit.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. WATKINS. I had no intention of making a speech at this point.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the figures of costs of power at these various projects the matter of retirement of capital is also included?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator also aware of the fact that the costs include transmission lines as well?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think they include transmission lines. I think these are costs at the bus bar. The 6-mill figure is the price at the bus bar.

Mr. WATKINS. At the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the site or close to the site of the dams themselves. It is not a delivered price.

Mr. WATKINS. It is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the price in Denver, Salt Lake, or Albuquerque. It is the price at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and the other power points.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand there is a difference between the price at the bus bar and the price at the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to show is that it is not a delivered price. It is the price at which the "juice" is fed

from the generating turbines into the system.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand it is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the Senator mean by "load centers"? Does he mean it is the delivered price for Denver?

Mr. WATKINS. It would probably be the price at the load center at Denver. I shall try to discuss that particular matter. I think the Senator from Illinois has been given figures which do not correspond to ours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is a delivered price, then the costs of the transmission lines must be figured in addition, and the margin of profit would be still less. If the generating costs at Glen Canyon are 4.5 mills, if the price of electricity delivered in Denver is 6 mills, and depreciation and maintenance costs of the transmission lines have to come out of that, then it is even less profitable than I thought it was. I was trying to give the Senator the benefit of every doubt. He has now convinced me that the project, even at Glen Canyon, about which I had some doubts, is totally unjustifiable.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see how the Senator can take the line of reasoning that the cost would be 6 mills at the point of use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The price is 6 mills. The cost at Glen Canyon is from 4.2 to 4.7 mills, according to General Grant. If the price is 6 mills in Denver and this includes transmission costs, then, obviously, the margin between the two is less than has been assumed, the profit will be less, and the ability to support the huge irrigation system which the Senator from Utah is advocating will be still less.

Mr. WATKINS. The fact of the matter is that the actual cost of producing the power at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park is approximately 2 mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have always thought General Grant was an extremely competent engineer and an extremely fine citizen. He was for many years a member of the United States Corps of Engineers. I think at one time he may have been the commanding officer of that corps. He is a grandson of the great Civil War general and post-Civil War President. His testimony will be found in the hearings at page 385. It is to the effect that the costs——

Mr. WATKINS. I simply wanted the Senator to have in mind, in connection with this discussion, that I intend to discuss the subject later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. But the Senator has raised this question. Let me now read the testimony of General Grant, which appears at page 385 of the hearings:

> The Glen Canyon Dam is all important in the program because it is the one and only one at which electric power can be produced at a cost, estimated by the Bureau at 4.7 mills and by the Federal Power Commission at 4.2 mills, or less, that will insure a substantial profit when sold at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.
>
> If the Federal Power Commission's estimate of cost is correct, the differential in cost between the cost of Glen Canyon and Echo Park power will be five or more times the profit possible on Echo Park power at the lowest estimate of its cost.

I only wish such figures as the Senator now brings out had been included in the report which was submitted to the Senate on yesterday.

I take it that the Senator from Utah has no further observations on this point.

STEAM POWER WOULD BE LESS EXPENSIVE

If the upper Colorado were the only source of power for this region, perhaps we might say, "Well, let us go ahead with the power features, at least." But there are alternative sources of power. There are coal deposits in both Wyoming and Colorado. We hear much about the shale deposits of Wyoming. There is also oil in Wyoming.

The TVA experience has shown that power can be generated from steam, and therefore ultimately from coal, at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, with all costs included, or appreciably less than the cost at Glen Canyon, and very much less than the cost at Echo Park.

So what is likely to be found, if the project should be undertaken and completed, is that the power, to the degree that it is needed, will not be supplied by the hydroelectric projects, but that private industry will be coming in, installing powerplants near the mouths of the mines, transmitting power, underselling the Government power, putting the Government out of business, and wrecking the whole public project. This can quite likely happen.

So while the Tennessee River was admirably adapted to hydroelectric development because of heavy rainfall in the Appalachian Mountains and I think could have been developed only by a public corporation; and while the Columbia and the Snake have a tremendous flow of water for the same reason, and while the Niagara River is admirably adapted to the development of electric power—and the scale of investment on the Columbia would have been impossible under private ownership—the upper Colorado is one of the worst places in the country in which to develop hydroelectric power.

PUBLIC POWER PROJECTS SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THEIR MERITS

I am distressed, because I find that the doctrinaires on the public power side and the irrigation side are falling in with the upper Colorado project simply because it is called public power and irrigation. I have talked with a number of Senators who have voted with me in the past to support Tennessee Valley Authority and Columbia River appropriations and who, with me, favor the public development of Hells Canyon. I am distressed to find now that they favor this project because it means public power.

Each of these projects should be judged on its own merits, without regard to doctrinaire considerations. If it is the purpose of Senators to discredit public power, then let them vote for this project, because I do not believe it will pay out. It will result in high-cost power.

But if it is desired to develop worthwhile facilities, then let the money be spent at Hells Canyon or on the Niagara or on some of the other dams of the Columbia. In fact, I think power could be transmitted down into this area through the interconnected power lines of both private and public power companies from the upper portion of the Columbia River Basin far more cheaply than it could be generated on the Colorado River itself. So I submit that the power feature of the program is unjustifiable and should not be carried out.

THOSE CHARGING CREEPING SOCIALISM AT TVA SUPPORT THE COLORADO PROJECT

Ironically, it is very interesting to note that a number of Senators who have opposed public power in the Tennessee Valley and in the Columbia River Valley, now suddenly emerge as great champions of public power when it is proposed to be placed in these areas of the mountains of Colorado. This is an extraordinary, "deep sea" change. These Senators, our good colleagues, at various times have denounced the TVA and the Columbia projects, but now they emerge as champions of the public development of the upper Colorado.

Was it Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who once said that "abstract considerations have no effect on concrete decisions"?

IRRIGATION COSTS EXCESSIVE

What about the irrigation costs of the project? It should be remembered that $915 million admittedly will be spent upon irrigation, and in all probability additional hundreds of millions will be spent in the future.

It should be remembered that while the principal is to be repaid, 85 percent of it is to be repaid from the hoped-for profits over and above the cost of the power features of the program. In reality it will be paid from Glen Canyon, because that is the only possible feature of the program which can earn any net surplus—and, to my mind, it is very doubtful whether any net surplus will be earned at Glen Canyon.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that during the long life of the reclamation law, there has been a steady lengthening of the period during which no interest is paid.

When under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, an eminent predecessor of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who now occupies the chair, the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed—and it was one of the great acts in the history of this country—it contained a provision that interest was to be forgiven for a 10-year period, in order to start the projects and get them under way.

As I pointed out yesterday, in colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the original projects tended to be at low altitudes and in fertile soil, and to involve low costs. The first project was in the Salt River region of Arizona, in the Phoenix area where Roosevelt Dam was erected, the last of the great masonry dams, before concrete came into use. I have gone over Roosevelt Dam and have inspected it rather carefully. That project and other irrigation projects were successful.

But gradually, as the accessible sites were exhausted, and the hunger for reclamation continued, the influence of the

arid and semiarid States in Congress, particularly in the Senate, was great.

As Senators probably have observed, an interesting tendency exists for Senators from those States to congregate on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations, which consider irrigation and reclamation bills. There is a sort of affinity. Just as sugar draws flies, so those committees draw members from the States which can benefit from the authorizations and appropriations which are made for such projects.

REPAYMENT PERIOD WITHOUT INTEREST EXTENDED

In 1914 the repayment period of 10 years was extended to 20 years. In 1924 it was made a 5-year developmental period plus 20 years for repayment. During the developmental period no payments upon the principal were to be made. So for 25 years there was to be no interest paid.

In 1926 this arrangement was changed to a 40-year repayment period during which no interest was to be paid. In 1939 the time was extended still further, to a preliminary period of 10 years during which no payment on capital or interest was to be paid, and then to a period of 40 years of gradual repayment but without interest. At no time in the 50 years was any interest to be paid.

Now Congress is being asked to authorize the projects provided for by the pending bill upon the basis of a 10-year developmental period, with no payments on the principal, and a 50-year period of retirement of principal at straight-line rates, presumably, or a total of 60 years during which no interest is to be paid.

The result is that the interest component in the cost, though hidden, has been constantly increasing. It was only slight 50 years ago; but now it amounts to appreciably more than the principal itself. According to the Department of the Interior, which is advocating this project, the ratio is about 1.25 to 1. That is, the interest cost will be about 25 percent greater than the cost of the construction itself.

So, Mr. President, the actual costs of the irrigation projects, and I am one who believes that interest is a cost, will be in excess of $2 billion, at a minimum, and may, to the degree that costs are underestimated, run to $3 billion.

IRRIGATION COSTS PER ACRE EXCESSIVE

Now we can figure out what the costs an acre will be. I have been making some computations to that effect. A total of 132,360 acres of new land, so called, will be irrigated in the first 12 projects, and 250,000 acres of land will receive what is known as supplemental water. A very interesting question is how one can equate the land which receives supplemental water with the land on which water is furnished for the first time, and which apparently will be the almost exclusive recipient of the water.

We have canvassed that situation, and the facts seem to be as follows: It is contemplated that on the so-called new land, water will be furnished to a depth of 18 inches a year, or 1½ acre-feet a year for each acre. On the supplemental land, so-called, it is understood that the average amount of water furnished a year will be approximately to a depth of 6 inches per acre or one-half acre-foot a year.

Therefore, for irrigation purposes 3 acres of supplemental land can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. This produces a figure of 216,000 acres of "equivalent new land."

We have the irrigation figures of cost for these various projects, and I shall read them, first excluding interest costs, dividing the total cost allocated to irrigation by the number of acres of "equivalent new land."

In the LaBarge project, in Wyoming, $210 an acre.

In the Seedskadee project, in Wyoming, $383 an acre.

In the Lyman project, in Wyoming, $780 an acre.

In the Silt project, in Colorado, $878 an acre.

In the Smith Fork project, in Colorado, $670 an acre.

In the Paonia project, in Colorado, $949 an acre.

In the Florida project, in Colorado, $618 an acre.

In the Pine River project extension, in Colorado-New Mexico, $332 an acre.

In the Emery County project, in Utah, $922 an acre.

I would appreciate it if my good friend the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would give me his very close attention now.

In the Central Utah project, $1,757 an acre—more than $1,700 an acre on an equivalent acre basis.

On the Hammond project, in New Mexico, $627 an acre.

On the Gooseberry project, in Utah, $1,047 an acre.

There is a general average of $952 an acre for the 12 projects taken as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre for irigated land in the 12 authorized participating projects on the Colorado River storage project be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project	New land irrigated (acres)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis
		Actual	New land equivalent					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. LaBarge	7,970			7,970	7,970	$1,673,300	$210	$210
2. Seedskadee	60,720			60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman		40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida	6,300	12,650	4,217	18,950	10,517	6,503,600	343	618
8. Pine River project extension	15,150			15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond	3,670			3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry		16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we should add to the costs given in the table the interest costs. We have applied the ratio of 1.25 for interest as compared with one for principal. In this connection we should remember we have made no allowance for construction periods. If the construction period is 10 years, the period of no interest is 10 plus 10 plus 50, or 70 years. We have been using a lesser figure than that, in our desire to be fair to the sponsors of this project.

If the interest is added, the figures of costs of irrigation are as follows:

For the LaBarge project, $472 an acre.

For the Seedskadee project, $861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, $1,755 an acre.

For the Silt project, $1,995 an acre.

For the Smith Fork project, $1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, $2,135 an acre.

For the Florida project, $1,490 an acre.

For the Pine River project extension, $747 an acre.

For the Emery County project, $2,074 an acre.

For the Central Utah project, $3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, $1,411 an acre.

For the Gooseberry project, $2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is $2,142 an acre.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre of irrigated land, including interest, in the 12 authorized participating projects be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Exhibit 1

La Barge	$210 × $1.25 =	$262.50 +	$210 = $472.50
Seedskadee	383 × 1.25 =	478.75 +	383 = 861.75
Lyman	780 × 1.25 =	975.00 +	780 = 1,755.00
Silt	887 × 1.25 = 1,108.75 +		887 = 1,995.75
Smith Fork	670 × 1.25 =	837.50 +	670 = 1,507.50
Paonia	949 × 1.25 = 1,186.25 +		949 = 2,135.25
Florida	618 × 1.25 =	872.50 +	618 = 1,490.50
Pine River project extension	332 × 1.25 =	415.00 +	332 = 747.00
Emery County	922 × 1.25 = 1,152.50 +		922 = 2,074.50
Central Utah	1,757 × 1.25 = 2,196.25 +		1,757 = 3,953.25
Hammond	627 × 1.25 =	783.75 +	627 = 1,410.75
Gooseberry	1,047 × 1.25 = 1,308.75 +		1,047 = 2,355.75
Total	952 × 1.25 = 1,190.00 +		952 = 2,142.00

IRRIGATED COSTS AN ACRE ARE 3 TO 4 TIMES HIGHER THAN THE VALUE OF AMERICA'S MOST FERTILE LAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in my State of Illinois there is a belt of land which runs across the State, through what is known as central Illinois, continuing on into Iowa, which, we believe is the most fertile natural land in the world. The price of this most fertile land in the world is now between $600 and $700 an acre. In the project now under discussion it is being proposed to use arid and semiarid land—and I shall go into the question of the crops which can be raised on that land in a moment—and to put that land under cultivation by the use of water, when in only one case will the cost be less than $400 an acre, and that is the LaBarge project, which is a relatively small project. In only one other case would the cost be less than $800 an acre. In one case the cost would be $861 an acre. In the remaining nine projects the cost would be more than $1,000 an acre. In the largest project of all, the central Utah project, the cost would be nearly $4,000 an acre—six times the cost of the most fertile land in the world—all done in the name of development. Paraphrasing Madame Roland I say, "Development, development, what crimes have been committed in thy name."

IRRIGATED LAND TO BE USED FOR LOW-VALUE CROPS

What is to be grown on the land? The Senator from Utah yesterday challenged the Senator from Illinois as to the accuracy of his statement about the crops to be grown. I have before me an abstract, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, taken from the hearings, beginning on approximately page 60, and continuing for some 25 pages thereafter, which shows the crops to be raised.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, of the 16 projects reported, 8 of them were stated as being suitable for livestock only, through the raising of alfalfa and pasture. Seven were stated as being primarily for livestock, but with some vegetable and fruit production; but I believe such production is incidental. Ninety-five percent of the projects contemplate the production of alfalfa or grain or are intended directly or indirectly for the feeding of cattle. As a consequence, this land, after irrigation, will not be worth very much—probably not more than from $100 to $150 an acre—$150 an acre at the outside. Yet we are being asked to make an average expenditure of $2,000 an acre on land which, when the projects are finished, will sell for only $150 an acre.

A BOONDOGGLE PROJECT

Mr. President, the WPA was attacked as a boondoggling operation, although I do not think it was boondoggling. But this proposal, so far as I am aware, is the biggest boondoggle I have ever heard of. Of course, the result will be, after the period of repayment is extended for 50 years, in addition to 10 years during which no payment is to be made, that even then the owners of the land can bear only 15 percent of the cost. Eighty-five percent of the cost will supposedly be laid on power, and on high-cost power—not low-cost power, as in the case of the Tennessee, the Columbia, or the Niagara, but on high-cost power, almost as high relatively as the Rocky Mountains themselves.

So, Mr. President, neither on the irrigation features nor on the power features is the expenditure of these vast sums of money justifiable.

WATER RESERVES AVERAGE THREE TIMES FLOW OF COLORADO RIVER

The third consideration is, of course, the water resources or water reserves. I do not pretend to be an expert on this question, although I have been in the Colorado Valley a number of times. The flow of the Colorado River in the past 10 years has been something less than 14 million acre-feet a year. The reserves contemplated in the big storage lakes lying behind the dams will be something over 43 million acre-feet, or about three times the average flow of the river. But this is not all, Mr. President. Seven and one-half million acre-feet, or half the flow—whichever we may wish to take—is pledged to the lower Colorado Valley, so that the amount available for the upper valley will not exceed 7½ million acre-feet, or possibly a little less than that. Yet the reservoirs will hold 43 million acre-feet, or six times the amount of water to which the upper Colorado is annually entitled or which it can obtain. In view of the fact that the dam which is farthest down, namely, Glen Canyon Dam, will have to generate a great deal of power at almost full capacity in order to pay out, although I am not an expert, personally I would be very doubtful whether these reservoirs would even be largely filled. In order to fill the Glen Canyon Reservoir it may not be possible to fill Echo Park Reservoir and the others.

The point I should like to make is that the reservoir capacity of the project is grossly overpledged, with enormous capital outlays which will not be utilized.

PROJECT PAID FOR BY STATES NOT BENEFITED

Mr. President, who is going to bear the cost of all this? It will not come out of the air. I think we are in for great and heavy losses in this region, and the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. Only 2 percent of the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of these four States. It will be the great industrial States of the country, whose citizens pay the largest proportion of the Federal income and corporation taxes, which will bear the great part of the burden. The drawing down of the income of the rest of the country will diminish their ability to consume and hence to stimulate industry. These are the unseen costs which far outweigh the benefits derived from this project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, and I think I know what the question is going to be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is mistaken. He asked a question, and I should like to answer it, briefly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming answer it, if he does so briefly, so that the flow of my argument may be preserved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has asked, "Who is going to pay for this?" In reply, let me state that it will not be paid for by the taxpayers of the country as a whole, not by the taxpayers of Illinois or New York or Pennsylvania, but it will be paid for out of the wealth which will be developed in this great storehouse of natural resources through which the Colorado River has been flowing, unused, for millions of years, until the Congress of the United States, with the vision to see that the water could be put to productive uses, authorized the Colorado River compact and the building of the dams. That is where the payment will arise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Wyoming. His eloquence is always charming, and at times is almost overwhelming. But, Mr. President, even the eloquence of the Senator cannot overcome the facts of high power costs, enormously higher irrigation costs than the subsequent value of the land, and the tremendous losses which in all probability will be suffered by the community if it launches upon these projects.

No, Mr. President; I say to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that the cost of these projects will not be paid for by the wealth of this particular region. It will be the governmental deficits, the forgiving of interest, and the burdens heaped upon the rest of the country which will pay the cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for another moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be happy to yield, provided it is only for a few moments, and provided the Senator from Wyoming does not attempt to take the floor away from me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not do so, and I did not attempt to do so before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming did not attempt to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I shall not attempt to do so now. But, Mr. President, when the time comes for me to take the floor, to speak my piece about this matter, I shall display to the Senator from Illinois, and to other Senators who may be willing to listen, photographs which will show what the lower Colorado River Basin was before the dams were built, and what it is now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply to my good friend from Wyoming, that I do not wish to enter into a discussion as between the claims of the lower Colorado River States and the claims of the upper Colorado River States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not raise that controversy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so understand and I do not wish to enter into it, and I do not wish to have it thought that I am advocating the claims of Arizona, California, or Nevada in this respect. But

I should like to point out that the irrigation projects of California and Arizona to which the Senator from Wyoming has referred are in low altitudes, with long growing seasons and extraordinarily rich land, so that, when water was turned upon those projects at an earlier date and at low cost, the total investment has probably in the main been beneficial, although not in all cases.

But in this case we are being asked to irrigate lands in the uplands, at altitudes between 5,000 and 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, and where the chief products will be hay, corn, livestock, and alfalfa. These are low-value crops.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to ask a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can see that, as usual, I have stirred up the lions, in the form of my two dear friends who now are encompassing me.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President; I only wish to ask a question. I have been hearing the constantly repeated statements of the Senator from Illinois that the land in California and Arizona is so fertile, and that the land in the area of these projects is so infertile. Has the Senator from Illinois ever examined a map of the United States dated about 1860, and seen on it the area which was labeled "The Great American Desert"? Yuma was about the capital of it. The very areas about which the Senator is speaking, which are so fertile today—areas such as the Coachella Valley and the Salt River Valley—were so bare that the areas in northern New Mexico looked like a paradise. It is possible to change that picture by putting water on the land. That is what has happened at Yuma. There was not a blade of grass at Yuma prior to the building of the project there. The soil is not a particle different from other areas along the Colorado River. On my own farm in New Mexico, there are areas which were formerly known as the Hubbell Lakes. We plowed up the sand in this area and eventually turned the land into fertile acres. I believe a similar distinction should be made in discussing the types of soil in this debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me touch briefly on this point. Am I not correct in saying that nearly all these proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than a mile? I think one of them is at an altitude of 4,500 feet.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. At these altitudes the winters are long and cold and the summers short.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that is so; but at the same time, it is also true that hay is valuable when it is scarce. I had some alfalfa which, last fall, was worth only $20 a ton. In the past few days I have received telephone calls offering from $45 to $50 a ton, because hay is scarce in other areas, and has finally become scarce in the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad my good friend from New Mexico is now implicitly admitting that hay and alfalfa are to be the chief crops grown on these irrigation projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has anyone been denying that these lands would be agricultural lands?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] denied that yesterday. He implied that forage crops would not be the chief products.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He pointed out that other products would be grown. All I am trying to say to the Senator from Illinois is that grass is not the worst crop that can be grown for the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All service ranks with God. All crops are beautiful and valuable; but grass is a relatively low-value crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Illinois will write to his experiment station he will find that within the past few months there was published a document dealing with the products to which grass can contribute, and the value which grass has, pointing out that 6½ tons of grass was recently taken off a pasture. This document was published in either the Farm Journal or Successful Farming within the past 6 months. I believe the Senator from Illinois ought to go back and persuade his farmers in Illinois who are getting 6½ tons of grass to the acre that they are doing wrong—that they ought to be growing high-value crops, which the Senator from Illinois says they should find desirable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main, we grow very high-value crops in Illinois. Primarily we grow corn and soybeans. We grow a little wheat, but primarily corn and soybeans. Not much hay is being grown in the great central belt of Illinois. That Illinois land, the highest valued land in the country, is worth only $600 to $700 an acre. However, in the upper Colorado, in the central Utah project, it is proposed to spend $4,000 an acre for land which, when we are through, will be worth $150.

MOST PROFITABLE IRRIGATION IS ON FERTILE LAND

I should like to mention one further point. I have said that if we wish to develop hydroelectric power we should not go to the Colorado, but to the Columbia, the Snake, and the Niagara. If we wish to obtain a greater yield of crops, we should not try to bring additional acres of arid or semiarid land into cultivation at enormous cost, but we should put a little water on the fertile lands already in cultivation and raise the output per acre still further.

Yesterday I referred to a recent article by Paul B. Sears, an eminent geographer, who some years ago wrote a very fascinating book entitled "Deserts on the March." This article appears in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. It shows that if we put additional water on the lands of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, and the Cotton States of the Mississippi Delta, at a cost of from $30 to $60 an acre—I believe in no case more than $100 an acre—we can obtain vastly greater production than by putting water on the arid lands of the Mountain States at a cost of many hundreds of dollars an acre.

So if we wish to enter upon a program of putting water on land to increase the acreage yield, let us do it on the already rich lands by taking water from the great rivers of the country, notably the Mississippi, the Hudson, and the Connecticut, and possibly the Great Lakes, although international complications might arise in that instance in connection with the level of the lakes.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED AREAS

Having discussed power, irrigation, and water reserves, I wish now to touch upon one final point. I refer to the point of recreation. That subject is involved, not at Glen Canyon, but at Echo Park, because the Echo Park Dam would flood a large portion of Dinosaur National Monument. This monument was started on a very small scale 40 years ago. The purpose was to protect the paleontological remains of the prehistoric dinosaurs which once roamed this region, believe it or not, and whose skeletons have been encased for all time in the rocks of this region, where they are visible from the canyon walls. By order of President Roosevelt, the very small reservation was extended to include a total of approximately 210,000 acres.

I wish to make it clear that the preservation of the dinosaur remains is not involved in the Echo Park Dam. They are downstream from the dam. They will not be flooded. It is very important to make that clear in the RECORD.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] bows to me at that point. However, I hope he will not regard this as an unusual performance on my part, because I at least try never to overstate my case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question, or for a brief comment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to acknowledge what the Senator has just now said. There is no Member of this body for his true sincerity, ability, and diligence I have greater respect than I have for the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am sure he knows that to be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are close and fast personal friends, and always will remain so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much. That is a very great compliment to me.

I was happy indeed to have the Senator say explicitly upon the floor that the dinosaur quarry will not be touched by any arm of this project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, I wish to add—and this is why I bowed to the Senator—that those who are taking the position he takes in opposing this project are seeking to condemn the upper basin of the Colorado as the graveyard of the dinosaurs, not to be developed, not to be inhabited, not to be used by the American people who are seeking land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That brings us to the point upon which I wish to touch.

What will be affected by the Echo Park Dam is not the dinosaurs, but the beautiful, awe-inspiring, tremendous canyons which lie in this region. The Echo Park Dam is to be 525 feet high, and the water level is supposed to approximate a level 10 or 15 feet below that. In other words, there will be a depth of approximately 500 feet, provided everything turns out as the sponsors suggest, although I have previously indicated my doubt as to whether there will be sufficient water to raise the lake level above 500 feet. But let us take the claims at their face value. That means that the beautiful canyon there will be submerged for a great many miles, and there will be a placid lake in its stead.

I know that there is an honest difference of opinion on this last question. I know that those who live in the mountains and in the wide-open spaces of this region have nature in plentitude. They are surrounded by nature. They see the beautiful mountains with the occasional snow-capped peaks. They drive enormous distances, by eastern and even middle western standards, to see their friends. They experience hail storms and snow storms, and occasionally a little rain, though not too much rain. Nature is all about them. They have so much of it that it does not have too great an attraction for them. To the splendid outdoor residents of this region, men and women brimming over with vitality and virility, the preservation of a set of canyons does not seem particularly important.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has correctly stated that we have little rain. These are the semiarid land States we are speaking about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to him: "Pity us. Let us store the rainwater which for thousands of years has been rolling down the Colorado Valley without use. Let us save it. Let us keep it for awhile. Please have some pity on the area, which is the arid land area of the country. It wants to conserve the great natural supply of water which the Almighty placed there, for man to use, if he has the intelligence and the courage to use it."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming, with his characteristic eloquence, is now making an appeal for pity. Pity is not the most desirable of human qualities. Friendship is better than pity. Of course the Senator from Wyoming is so superior to the Senator from Illinois that I cannot pity him. I look up to him, not down at him. I have for the Senator from Wyoming, as for all the Senators from this mountain area, the warmest friendship. I should like to help them. But the Senator in his appeal that the rest of the country be merciful to those arid or semiarid States has forced me to say something I had hoped I would not be compelled to say. It is that already the rest of the country is paying through the nose for the 16 votes which the great Mountain States have in the United States Senate. It is a region with a population of only 5 million, representing only about 3 percent of the population of the whole country. However, that region has 16 percent of the representation in the United States Senate.

The Senators from those States are fine gentlemen, able Senators, good ambassadors from their States, and they are able to secure the enactment of legislation which enormously benefits their States at the expense of the rest of the country.

LIST OF BENEFITS RECEIVED BY MOUNTAIN STATES

Let me call the roll for a minute. Reclamation, with interest forgiven. Sometimes I think the arid and semiarid States enter into joint combinations with the States of the lower Mississippi in a process of rolling each other's logs, the States of the lower Mississippi getting big appropriations for rivers and occasionally for harbors, and the States in the mountain areas getting appropriations for reclamation, but in neither case is interest being paid, and in the case of the lower Mississippi States not even principal is being returned for the land that is reclaimed by the deepening of the Mississippi.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was citing specific instances in which we have been extremely generous to the Mountain States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois was in full flight with a very eloquent castigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He spoke of the Senators from the arid States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I insist I was not. I merely pointed out——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the Senator not indulging in a little castigation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not in the slightest; no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did he not refer to logrolling?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Strike out logrolling. Strike out "logrolling", and insert instead "mutual and tacit agreement upon essential features which will benefit the respective areas."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator, speaking for the State of Wyoming, that the oil revenues of the Federal Government from that State have produced millions of dollars for the Reclamation Service. From this arid ground, upon which I would like to spread a little water, we have produced great quantities of oil, and that oil——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not said that water and oil do not mix?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We can mix them if only the Senator from Illinois will devote his great talents to our cause. I believe he will before we have finished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was just beginning to call the roll of the great benefits which the rest of the country has conferred upon this region. I believe the Senators from those States have not been passive on such issues.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator will permit me to say that the people of those States are people of high standards.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. They are worthy Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, they are; but so also are the people of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New York, and the other States of the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know many people in my State who came from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they probably have regretted it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should hesitate to say that. They are in Wyoming and in the other Rocky Mountain States, where there is the plentitude of nature to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. We have certain great advantages which the teeming cities of the East do not have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. That is a point I shall come to, if the Senator will be forebearing enough to let me continue my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will permit me to go to lunch now. We can continue this exchange when I return and I take the floor in my own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Having been attacked by Wyoming, I now yield to New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not for the purpose of attacking the Senator. I listened very carefully to what the Senator from Illinois said about a tacit agreement between the States of the lower Mississippi Valley, under which we have voted sums of money for flood control to them, and they in turn have taken care of our reclamation projects.

I merely wish to state for the record that never in my life has a Senator from the lower Mississippi Valley approached me and asked me to vote for a flood-control project, with the understanding that he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I echo what the Senator from New Mexico has stated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Never have I gone to a Senator from any one of those States and told him that I would vote for a flood-control project if he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

It is a rather serious reflection upon the Senators from the Western States and upon Senators from the lower Mississippi Valley States, and I believe that the Senator from Illinois ought to produce evidence that such an arrangement has been entered into if he makes that charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not charge that any open agreement was ever entered into. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico, who is a highly honorable man, never entered into such an agreement. I merely wish to say that frequently there has been a tacit understanding, which is sometimes more binding than a definite pledge.

The Senator from Wyoming had been making a plea for mercy. In a sense, since he has left the floor, what I have to say may seem to be taking advantage of his absence. However, it was by his

choice, not by mine, that he absented himself.

In addition to the reclamation funds which are appropriated from the taxes contributed by the rest of the country and on which no interest is paid, when those reclamation funds are repaid, they do not go back into the General Treasury. Instead, they are used for further reclamation projects. Therefore, when the original appropriation is made for irrigation from tax funds, it is gone forever.

To paraphrase the old miner's song, Oh, My Darling Clementine, the irrigation money once appropriated is lost and gone forever; no matter how dreadfully sorry we may be, it will avail us nothing.

In addition to the funds voted for reclamation, we purchase as a government every year, as I remember, approximately $30 million of silver. That is a big subsidy to the silver mining industry of the Western States. I am aware of the fact that the silver is purchased at less than the amount at which silver is minted into silver coins or is used as a reserve for silver notes. However, we could use Federal Reserve notes at a cost of 1 cent per dollar, and save 49 cents. So, we are virtually keeping the silver mining industry going, keeping up the price of silver, and striking a heavy blow at the jewelry industry of the country in so doing. We are raising the price of the silver sets which the young brides have to have when they start housekeeping, and we are raising the price of jewelry in the city of North Attleboro and other manufacturing cities in New England.

Then, Mr. President, there is the high price of sugar, maintained, in part, as a subsidy for the cane-sugar growers of Louisiana but also for the beet-sugar growers of Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Then there is the price support upon wool, not at 75 percent, as Mr. Benson would have the price support on corn and wheat, but more than 100 percent; I believe it is 110 or 120 percent of parity.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] says, sotto voce, that it is maintained between 105 and 110 percent. It would be much cheaper if we obtained our wool from Australia; but, no; we maintain a high price to keep the wool growers of the Mountain States in business.

Then, of course, we help to maintain the cattle industry in those States, because, somehow, the Argentine cattle never pass the health tests, and, as a result, cheap Argentine beef is kept out of the United States.

I am not tilting against windmills in this matter, but when the Senator from Wyoming implied that the rest of the country was being mean to the Mountain States, I thought a full record should be made on that point. I would say that if these supports were not held up, directly and indirectly, for the Mountain States, the population of that area would decrease and the prosperity of that area would decline.

The country is already paying through the nose for the support of those States. By the terms of the Constitution they have great political power, with equality of representation in the Senate, which cannot be changed, against which I do not protest, but which it is not unpatriotic to point out.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED NATURAL AREAS

Mr. President, let us go back to the fourth point, namely recreation. What would be affected by the Echo Park Dam would not be the remains of the dinosaurs, but the destruction of the deep canyons, enormously deep, with swift-flowing rivers, even with relatively low-water content, and high, towering cliffs. I have not had the privilege of taking a canoe trip through that portion of the Colorado River. I have seen photographs of it, and I have seen a brief movie of it. I have on two occasions been down to the very depths of the Grand Canyon and pitched a tent there and lived there for a weekend. It is, of course, one of the great sights of the country.

It is highly important for persons who live in closely packed centers, who live in the great cities, to be able to visit places of natural beauty which are awe-inspiring, which give to man a sense of his littleness in the presence of the mighty forces of nature, which cause his imagination to go back into the deep aeons of time, and enable him to feel the exhilaration which comes from personal knowledge that nature is powerful and that man is mighty little. This is something which we city folks lack in our ordinary lives and which the people of the Western States always have. How inestimably richer the country is because of the great national parks which have been constructed, such as the Yosemite, the Yellowstone, Rainier, Glacier, the Smokies, and perhaps most of all, the Grand Canyon.

I have been in most of those parks. As a young man I used to tramp through some of them in the summertime. Those summer experiences are some of the features of my life upon which I look back with the most intense pleasure and the greatest deepening of consciousness. But these parks, as we all know, are now being overused and are overcrowded. I have not had the opportunity or the time to visit Yosemite Park or to go into Yellowstone Park or Glacier Park in recent years, but I receive letters from my constituents regarding them. The universal complaint about these parks, and, indeed, about the park at Mt. Rainier, is that they are overcrowded and badly maintained, particularly in the past few years. There are swarms of people there. Therefore, some of the glory of the parks is being rubbed off by overuse. Millions of distraught city folks, pressured by the strain of city life, are not getting the exhilaration and revivification which contact with nature brings.

The Dinosaur National Monument has opportunities in this direction if properly developed. It has enormous canyons where, with proper trails and roads, people can go down to the very bottom, where others can take canoes and float down the river and have a quickening of life from contact with the awe inspiring features of nature. A sense of humility and of peace would come to them.

This would be largely lost if the canyons were to be replaced by a placid lake. I know there are those who say that a lake is just as recreational as a deep gorge. I have spent a day on Lake Mead, which is back of Boulder Dam. I would say that in the case of Lake Mead it has not decreased the recreational facilities of the region, but has greatly improved them.

But, certainly, Mr. President, we should keep some wild places. We need these wild places to enable and benefit the human spirit. Dinosaur National Monument could, with proper development, become such a place. What is going to become of this country if we dam every stream and create placid lakes in every portion where wild water formerly flowed. We shall reduce the entire country to a stale, tepid, flatulent level, good for weekend excursions with a picnic basket, but with the sternness of nature, the awe-inspiring cliffs and scenery, obliterated. Excellent as chautauqua is would we like to have the whole country converted into an extensive chautauqua?

If that should happen, a great glory would have passed out of the country. This, I think, is what the Bureau of Reclamation, with the best intentions in the world, is seeking to do. It is trying to dam all the streams, install power, provide irrigation, displace the gorges, and turn scenery into the growing of hay and corn and the production of electricity—all well in their own way, but not all of life, because men must live by something more than beefsteak and fruit. As our population increases, the need for such wild places will be still greater.

There is another feature about the proposed project. If a power dam shall be erected in the Dinosaur National Monument, may we not have power dams in Yosemite, in Yellowstone, and in Glacier National Park? The National Park Service has been fighting a rear-guard action for many years to keep the Bureau of Reclamation out of these areas. If the wall is broken, or if the foot goes in the door, we can be pretty certain that it will be harder to resist the raids when they are made, as they will be made, on the other national parks of the country.

SUMMARY

So, Mr. President, the upper Colorado project from any standpoint is unjustifiable. It is unjustifiable on the basis of power, because it contemplates about the highest cost power that could be generated. It is unjustifiable on the basis of irrigation, because the costs are astronomical compared with the benefits. It is of extremely doubtful value on the basis of the actual amount of water which will be put in reserve as compared with the reserve capacity behind the dams.

The upper Colorado project would cripple the recreational features of the country and tend to transform the Nation physically, into a placid, tepid place, greatly unlike the wild and stirring America which we love and from which we draw inspiration.

Thus, while I have the friendliest feeling for the Senators from that region, who in defending the interests of their States are doing something which is very natural, I hope that the Senate of the United States and the other House as well, will disapprove this project in its entirety.

In yielding the floor, I now ask unanimous consent that certain data which I shall submit may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The data are as follows:

Exhibit 2

Project	Acres	Chief crops
LaBarge project, Wyoming (p. 59)	7,970 new; no supplemental	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. Project lands would generally be utilized for support of livestock enterprises.
Seedskadee project, Wyoming (p. 61)	60,720 new; no supplemental	Hay, pasture, and small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. With project development, the irrigated lands would be utilized primarily for the support of live stock enterprises, particularly dairy cows and sheep.
Lyman project, Wyoming (p. 62)	40,600 supplemental; no new	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Only grasses for hay and pasture, alfalfa, and some small grains can be produced to any extent because of short growing season.
Silt project, Colorado (p. 65)	1,900 new; 5,400 supplemental	Alfalfa, small grains, sugar beets, potatoes, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Would increase with late season water.
Smith Fork project, Colorado (p. 68)	2,270 new; 8,160 supplemental	Alfalfa, pasture, grains, dairy cows, and beef stock.
Paonia project, Colorado (p. 70)	2,210 new; 14,830 supplemental	Alfalfa, grain, apples, peaches, dairy cows, and beef cattle.
Florida project, Colorado (p. 72)	New: 900 Indian; 5,400 new non-Indian; supplemental: 100 Indian; 12,550 non-Indian.	Alfalfa, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, largely livestock, some beans, potatoes, and fruits.
Pine River project, Colorado and New Mexico (p. 75).	New: 14,520 Colorado; 630, New Mexico.	Utilized largely for support of livestock.
Emery County project, Utah (p. 72)	3,630 new; 20,450 supplemental	Livestock, some small farming, 90 percent of area produce hay and grain for livestock.
Central Utah project, Utah (p. 78)	28,540 new; 131,840 supplemental	Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, beef cattle, and sheep.
Hammond project, New Mexico (p. 85)	3,670 new	Alfalfa, corn, beans, barley, dairy cows, and sheep.
Eden project, Wyoming (p. 87)	10,660 new; 9,540 supplemental	Hay, pasture, dairy cows, and beef.
Curecanti project, Colorado (p. 88)	Power unit	
Gooseberry project, Utah (p. 91)	16,400 supplemental	95 percent alfalfa, pasture.
Navaho project (p. 95)	137,250 new Indian land	Alfalfa, grain, pasture, some fruit and vegetables.
San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico (p. 96)	225,000 supplemental	Municipal and industrial use.

SUMMARY

Projects reported	16
Stated as being for livestock only—alfalfa, pasture, etc	8
Stated as being for livestock with some vegetable and fruit production	7
Stated as power unit	1

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] well knows, there are very few issues which seem to divide us. I rejoice in that fact. But I must say that upon this issue I find it impossible to refrain from commenting on some of the things which have been said.

I agree fully with what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said with reference to the delightful Senator from Illinois, namely, that he is fair; that he tries always to present a fair picture.

The only things I desire to comment on, although I shall deal with agriculture at substantial length later, are some of the inferences which have to do with the character of soil. If the fine, rich, fertile soils which have been referred to were always the sources of the greatest agricultural returns, we would find record crops being produced each year in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and, yes, in Pennsylvania and similar areas.

Strangely enough, some years ago there was a discussion of the areas which raised surpluses of potatoes. For reasons which many persons may recall, I had a deep interest in the surplus of potatoes. It was found that the great surplus was being grown not in the areas which had been the normally large producers of potatoes, but was coming in large measure, from the State of California. The record yield of potatoes, which only a short time before had been in Lancaster County, Pa., one of the richest of the agricultural counties in the United States, had suddenly shown up in Kern County, Calif. Whereas the area in Pennsylvania had set a record of some 150 bushels of potatoes to the acre, it was only necessary to sit back for a few years until Kern County, Calif., in the desert sand, produced 1,400 bushels to the acre.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], now occupying the chair of the majority leader, has in his State a small valley called Pahrump Valley. Only a few years ago that valley was a desert of marching sands, which Paul Sears talks about. A group of farmers had the courage to go into that valley and try to make it an agricultural empire. Today the valley has an agricultural production which can equal anything that can be done in what were the old fertile areas.

I am not opposed to increasing agricultural production in other parts of the United States, as well, because I say that this land of ours will need greater agricultural production if the population continues to increase.

I only point out that the areas which we regard as desert finally end by becoming extremely fertile land, and that light soils, even though they be very largely sandy, respond to certain types of crops. Farmers now think nothing of getting a production of 150 bushels of oats to the acre in irrigated areas.

As to the parks, let me say that there are many, including myself, who have a record for supporting, maintaining, and protecting the park system of the United States. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when, in the first few years of World War II, an effort was made to economize in almost every possible direction, and the appropriation bills which came to the floor of the House carried very drastically reduced appropriations for the national parks. A group of Members from the Rocky Mountain States, Republicans and Democrats alike, gathered together and, at

my insistence, decided that we would fight for the parks and for appropriations which would protect and preserve them during the period of the war emergency. We succeeded in having our amendments carried and in raising the appropriations by narrow margins, thus taking care of the parks of the Nation during the period of the war.

There exists in my State a fine national park known as Carlsbad Caverns. That park was owned at one time by the State of New Mexico. A group of individuals, of whom I was happy to be one, felt that ownership of that park should be transferred to the United States Government. It was transferred by the State of New Mexico to the Government of the United States and thus became part of the national park system. Not 1 cent was paid by the United States to the State of New Mexico to acquire it; yet if one will examine the returns from the national parks, he will find that Carlsbad Caverns has been a bread winner for the other parks in the national park system, because Carlsbad Caverns has returned a profit to the Federal Government year after year, and that profit has been used for the benefit of the other parks.

We in New Mexico have not regretted that. We are happy that Carlsbad Caverns has been able to accomplish this purpose.

I merely point out that there are some Members who have been interested in the park situation for a long time; that there are some of us interested in the preservation of wilderness areas.

I can say that when, about 6 months ago, the Wilderness Society decided to dedicate a plaque to Waldo Leopold, who had taken the leadership in the development of the first wilderness area under the Park Service of the United States, the society did not have to go outside the State of New Mexico to find an individual who, they thought, deserved to make the address on that occasion. They chose me to speak because it had been my privilege to go into the area when an effort had been made to destroy the wilderness. I think I was the only elected public official who faced the proponents of division and said they could not invade the Gila Wilderness.

So I say, from long experience, that I do not regard myself as an enemy of the Park Service, nor an enemy of the national parks, nor an individual who tries to destroy the wilderness areas of America.

Today, however, I am very anxious to talk about another facet of this matter—farm surpluses and the whole problem that is posed by a series of bills which I hope will come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am hoping these bills will deal with the subject of irrigation development of additional lands and the production of additional crops, which I think will be badly needed.

Very soon, within the next 10 years, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture as late as 1953, we may well be speaking of farm shortages, and the need for an adequate supply of farm lands. Crop surpluses will have vanished.

How can this be? I am going to do my best to show my colleagues. I am speaking as a former Secretary of Agriculture and as a man who has had a rather extensive association with the food problems of the United States and the world.

Part of what I have to say will be based upon my experiences as chairman of the World Food Board a few years ago, and upon the knowledge I gained in food matters as chairman of the United States delegation to Quebec in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Certain conclusions I will draw will rest, in part, upon facts I gathered as United States War Food Administrator, and later as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Sometimes the things we keep may not be of significance to anyone but ourselves, but they are found to be interesting later. Shortly after becoming Secretary of Agriculture I asked what was going to happen when the wars finally ceased and agriculture was placed on a wholly different basis in a peacetime economy.

We created in the Department of Agriculture a long-range planning committee. We charged it with the responsibility of surveying what had happened after every great war, not only in this country but abroad. We asked it to make a study of what might happen to food habits of the people of this country, what was happening to the soil of the Nation, what unusual burdens were being placed upon it during the war period, and what we might expect in the years that would follow?

April 21 and October 6, 7, and 8, 1947, testimony on those subjects was presented to the Congress for the formulation of a long-range policy and program. I refer to that only because in the preparation of the report of the hearings we had to prepare a balance sheet. Opposite page 12 of the hearings, that balance sheet is set forth. We tried to survey, through every available governmental organization, every acre of ground about which we had any knowledge whatever. We tried to ascertain how many acres were suitable for intertilling, how many acres were fit for grazing only, and how many acres were suitable for forests only. In general, we tried to see what the general land pattern should be.

This was the work of the Department of Agriculture, of the Soil Conservation Service, and of the Department of the Interior. We queried every available official we could find. We then began making a study of diets, and a study to ascertain what would be the economic and agricultural needs of this country if the people ate the foods they ought to consume in order to produce fine and sturdy children.

We found that if the land then in cultivation were cultivated in the fashion best designed to preserve and conserve it, not having pastures plowed which should not be plowed, we would produce only enough for the people of the United States to eat, if they were going to eat the diet they should, at the right time of the year. We learned that within only a few years we would not be producing enough to meet our needs.

Most of the figures I quote, and nearly all of the facts I intend to outline, will be drawn from documents which Senators can check for themselves. I shall attempt to list them as I go along.

I have asked the question: How is it possible to have food shortages within 10 years when today we are speaking of food surpluses?

First of all, though, let us define the extent of our present surplus. We do not have an overabundance of most foods. We do have an oversupply of certain crops. One of them, cotton, is not edible, although some of its byproducts are. And, believe it or not, the United States imports some foods important to our diets.

So we can scale down the overall picture of surpluses right from the start. The foods now in oversupply soon will be used up, if present population trends continue. The first way in which we can predict that farm surpluses will vanish is through population increases, more people eating more food.

John H. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of Commodity Marketing and Adjustment, and president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, made a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 31, 1953, in which he said:

> Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population total close to 175 million people. And if our rate of economic growth continues as it has in the past, the average person should have a level of living at least 15 percent above that of today. Such a rise in the general level of living for this higher population total would mean greatly expanded domestic markets for food and other farm products produced by our agriculture.
>
> And even if the people we will have in our country by 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in 1952, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be 9 percent higher than in 1952. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952 as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other products.
>
> I want to stress that * * * over many years there has been a very distinct trend in this country to upgrade diets. This desire to expand food consumption and improve nutrition will express itself as long as our people continue to have adequate buying power.

I have been reading from a speech by Mr. John H. Davis, who said that, based on a population of 175 million people by 1960, that was exactly the point where we would find a balance existing between what this country could produce by sound agricultural policies and what the diet of the people of the country would require.

More can be said about population. Its growth in the next 10 years was predicted by Dr. Grover W. Ensley, staff director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, who said here last October 25:

> On the basis of present fertility rates, our population can be expected to increase to about 190 million persons by 1965, compared with just under 160 million in 1953 and something over 162 million today. * * * The effect of these population changes during

the next decade will be to increase the demand for food.

Mr. President, I have not tried to bring to the Senate floor today a library which deals solely with the problem we are discussing. I have, however, picked up three books from my own library which deal in a minor way with the problem. One of them is a book by Robert C. Cook, entitled "Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma." I should like to read from that book, beginning at page 321:

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization frankly admits that in spite of local surpluses of food in North America, on a global basis the per-capita ration is smaller today than it was in 1940.

The evil does not stop there. The world's growing population will force the use of marginal lands, which in general are extremely expensive to exploit. More and more human energy will have to be devoted to the basic problem of producing food, and the standard of living, instead of going up, will remain at the subsistence level in the areas where it now stands at that level, while the wealthier areas will find their standards of living declining. Already the pressures of population in most parts of the world have compelled an unwise exploitation of the good lands. Erosion has become a world-wide problem.

Mr. President, I listened while the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] talked about using these lands, which are not the most fertile in the Nation. Yet, as Mr. Cook, the author of Human Fertility, states, the world's growing population will force us to use the world's marginal lands; and of course he is as accurate as can be. A little later in his book he says:

In Japan the multiplication of those in want has now reached the point where each day it grows more doubtful whether the industry and technical skills of the people can ever bring about a balance of mouths and of loaves.

Then, Mr. President, if we consider the calculations of population which are made in this text, we find that the author believes that starting with the 1950 population of 2.3 billion, the population of the world will double by the year 2020, and then again will double in another 70 years, and finally will reach the figure of approximately 10 billion persons on this planet. Of course, it takes only 30, 40, or 50 years to reach a figure which already puts in jeopardy all our agricultural lands. That is why I say that the Senators who represent the Western States, which are interested in this problem, are not interested in it only as it exists today, but are interested in what will happen 20, 30, or 40 years from now.

Mr. President, I now call attention to the fact—and later I shall refer to it again—that in dealing with this problem, we are dealing with a proposal to construct dams and irrigation projects which will not be completed in 30 or 40 years.

At this time I should like to refer to a book entitled "Population on the Loose," by Elmer Pendell. In it we find the following:

The population of the rice-eating areas has increased by nearly 100 million people in the 1939–49 decade—about 10 percent.

Mr. President, recently we were trying to ship a great deal of rice to other countries of the world. Then we found that temporarily a sufficient supply existed there. But if this trend continues, and if the rice-eating areas continue to grow by 100 million people in a decade, or if perhaps they have a substantially greater growth than that, then we shall face some real problems in a very short period of time.

Finally, Mr. President, I read from the same book the following passage appearing on page 45:

As their population becomes dense in relation to soil, the inhabitants have to give a larger and larger proportion of their energy to the production of food for themselves.

Yes, Mr. President, the story by expert after expert is that we have some great problems; and in a few minutes I shall have more to say about population and its effect on the supply of food.

But there is already present in the picture a factor which should be mentioned now, because it increases the seriousness of the problem we face as our population grows and our food consumption goes up. That factor is the Nation's supply of farm land. It appears—and I shall tell you, Mr. President, where I gathered my facts—that we shall be faced with a demand for more food at a time when our total farm acreage is decreasing.

Volume I of the President's Materials Policy Commission Report in June 1952, says the United States will need 40 percent more food production by 1975 than it had in 1950. But it estimates that during that interval, 15 million acres of farmland will be lost in the construction of airports, highways, cities, and other nonproductive activities. I say nonproductive in terms of a source of food supply—not that cities are not productive in other ways. In that period we shall also be losing 25 million acres of land to soil erosion.

So here we are, Mr. President, needing 40 percent more production at the same time we are losing 40 million acres of farmland. The situation is not hopeless, thanks to technological advances in agriculture and increasing yields per acre; but, as we can see, the situation is not good at all.

In passing, let me make this observation: We can improve the use of our lands, we can farm every available inch, and still fall short. We can do the best we know how, and fail. We can do much worse than we know how, and create a crisis close to treason. What did Ghandi say? "To the millions who go without two meals a day the only way God dare appear is in food."

Mr. President, can you imagine Americans that short of food?

I say that while we are deeply concerned with conditions in other parts of the world, we should concern ourselves with the development of these United States lands, which offer a possibility of adding to the food supply of America—not now, to be sure, but 20, 30, or 40 years from now, which is when this land will come to its greatest usefulness.

Mr. President, Walter Prescott Webb, author of The Great Frontier, which was published only 3 years ago, has this to say of the productivity of farmland:

The land has only so much to offer, and when it is crowded, it has less to offer each one * * * regardless of any techniques which may be developed to extract more from the land, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. And if our techniques speed up the process of utilization and destruction, as they are now doing, they hasten the day when the substance * * * on which a swollen population temporarily subsists will approach scarcity or exhaustion.

We can look to the crowded nations of the world to see what Mr. Webb had in mind. Food, to the teeming lands of China and India, the miniature gardens of Japan and Europe, holds a different meaning than it ever has held in this country.

It might be said that we are talking in terms of guesses. That is true; but if our guesses sound too high, think back about 5 years. The 1950 census was being completed, and the experts were estimating a 1975 population of 175 million persons. I have already read to you estimates which place the figure at 190 million—estimates revised in 5 years of zooming birth rates and longer lives for the aged. The Census Bureau placed the Nation's population at the end of March—only about 3 weeks ago—at more than 161 million persons. This represents an increase of 400,000 individuals in 1 month—or more than 13,000 per day.

In the next 20 years there will be 7,300 days. If we multiply 7,300 by 13,000, we get 94,900,000. Add 94 million persons to the total today, and we get 255 million United States citizens by 1975. So it can be seen that our figures are decidedly conservative.

Mr. President, all these remarks are preliminary to what I really came here to say; they are a sort of introduction to certain facts already demanding attention. They indicate—today—that food surpluses are beginning to solve themselves. How? First, through population increase; second, through increasing consumption by the individual; third, through the usual inroads of drought, insects, and day-to-day farming hazards.

Our surplus stocks of certain items have not increased at the old rate during the past 2 years, although production has been at an all-time high. At my request the Agriculture Department checked its figures, and found that the rate of increase in surplus commodities is leveling off. It found that consumption has been gaining on production, and that in these surplus commodities, a balance soon will be achieved.

Officials in the Department of Agriculture, in testimony before congressional committees and in their various publications, point out that as early as 1962—only 7 years from now—a balance of production and consumption could be reached. This was mentioned by Mr. Davis, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in the same speech to which I referred a few moments ago.

It is my conclusion, based on these facts, that an increase in per capita consumption or more severe drought could

bring the date of balance by 1958 or 1959.

Where does that leave us? It leaves us with the problem of finding more farmland, increasing the yields of present farms, and easing the effect of drought. Strangely, no one has an adequate answer for any of these alternatives, although partial answers can be found for each.

Where are we going to find new farmlands? Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, testifying before the agricultural subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, said:

> If we were to consume 156 pounds of red meat, which was the consumption in 1954, it would require in 1962 some 35 million acres more land to grow feed than was used in 1953.

These figures are for the production of meat only, acres for pasture and grazing, as well as more acres in feed grains.

I have said that lands available for agriculture are diminishing, and I told where I got the figures. Is there any land not being used at present which could be put into cultivation? On page 17 of a study, How Can America Best Provide Food and Fiber for Its Future Population, Hon. John P. Saylor quotes the Department of Agriculture as follows:

> There is an estimated 50 million acres of wet land suitable for agriculture, once it has been properly drained (and) * * * an estimated 20 million acres * * * that could be brought into production.

If we need 35 million acres by 1962, as the statements I have read indicate, we shall have to look to these unclaimed lands—and look soon. We shall have to drain them, get them into production, and look around for still more lands.

I know where about 600,000 acres of potential farmlands are now awaiting the plow. They are in the upper Colorado River Basin. Compared with the 35 million acres we need, this acreage is a very small drop in a very large bucket. But when every additional acre becomes important, we must develop land in any quantity, large or small.

Some persons assert that farm yields have increased in the past to meet increased food demands and that it is likely that yields will be expanded in the future. This probably is true—up to a point. Mr. Webb, whom I quoted earlier, seems to believe that there is a limit on how much can be wrung from a given plot of earth. We got all the speed we could out of propeller-type aircraft and had to turn to jets for more speed. Perhaps there is just so much speed in an acre of farmland.

Let us do something about the drought if we can. Shortage of water affects the yield per acre, so this subject is tied closely with farm yields. Mark Twain said there was not much we could do about the weather. His observation still holds water, if I may use such an expression. We cannot do much about how much snow falls in the winter, or have much choice as to where it falls. But we can make better use of certain moisture we now have. Not only can we do this, but we can do it in a way which will answer, in a small way, each of the problems I have mentioned—finding new land, increasing farm yields, and easing the drought situation.

I refer, of course, to reclamation. I feel very strongly about this subject—the development through reclamation of currently arid and idle farmlands of the West. It appears foolish in the extreme for a nation facing agricultural shortages to sit idly on a stream bank while one of the means of meeting a shortage flows unhindered into the sea.

Senators know that I am referring to the upper Colorado River Basin and the water which accumulates as snow on the mountain peaks of the upper basin and flows, unused, past potentially valuable agricultural lands by the millions of acre-feet every year.

Some of this water has been put to use. It generates abundant and cheap electric power and has created one of the world's agricultural marvels. This use is in the lower basin—in California, the Golden State. Everyone has prospered, including United States citizens living on the eastern seaboard who manufacture products which prosperous California farmers consume. But there is much of the Colorado River water still unused by the States to which it belongs by law.

It has been suggested that if more land is brought into production by the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin, it will increase our stock of surplus commodities. Few suggestions have ever been made so foolishly. For one thing, the total new farm acreage contemplated in the completed upper Colorado project is somewhat less than 600,000 acres. As I said a moment ago, this is a very small drop in a very large bucket compared with the Agriculture Department estimate that we shall need 35 million acres of new land by 1962.

Even if every one of the proposed upper Colorado projects could be undertaken tomorrow and completed without delays of any kind, it would be 27 years before the full acreage would be in production. These figures come from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Why be concerned about so few acres? Because our population is expanding and we shall need every acre we can get. Furthermore, the people will have to find more than food. They must find work in order to live.

The power generated by the upper Colorado projects could create a vast inland empire, based on the virtually unlimited mineral, timber and agricultural resources of the upper basin.

It appears a reasonable guess, in my opinion, that not too many years will pass before Americans living in overcrowded areas will be looking around for somewhere to go. They may be emigrating to the very lands now under discussion, but presently incapable of accepting them.

I am hoping, in this discussion, to make a case for full development of the upper Colorado River Basin based on agricultural necessities. There are other reasons why the project should be authorized, and they have been eloquently enumerated. They fit into the picture and help carry the load. If the project were designed for agriculture alone, it would be too costly to undertake. But since one of its benefits is agriculture, I believe I should point out how great the benefits really are.

So let us take another look at what we like to call "unbalanced agricultural production," or surpluses. This is one of the least understood problems now facing the United States, although the effect of this production has been the accumulation by the Federal Government of more than $7 billion in stored, price-supported agricultural products.

Of all our price-supported stored crops, the one of major concern is wheat. Cotton and rice are beginning to become problems, but the economists do not anticipate their getting as out of hand as wheat has.

According to the most recent complete figures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Government has on hand approximately 702 million bushels of wheat, valued at $1.9 billion. This includes 500 million bushels, worth approximately $1.3 billion, which has been declared as a set-aside commodity by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Agriculture Act of 1954. If we deduct that amount from the supply owned by the CCC, which certainly was the intent of Congress, we have adjusted Government stocks of about 202 million bushels valued at about $534 million.

While the 1954 act has done much to eliminate a depressing effect upon the market, it has done little to reduce the annual carryover of wheat. Unless some of the marginal acres are taken out of wheat production and diverted to some other use such as pasture, the wheat problem will be with us for several years in spite of the continued upsurge in population.

A billion dollars worth of wheat sounds impressive, but wheat cannot be measured in dollars alone, due to the nature of the market and varying weather conditions. So let us measure the stock of wheat on hand in terms of annual supply.

According to the Department of Agriculture, we have enough wheat on hand to meet all our demands, both domestic and foreign, for 1 year. Does that sound impressive? Does that meet the growing demands of our population 5 years from now? Senators know how quickly that grain would vanish if we were to experience another drought as ruinous as that of the thirties.

As for our other price-supported crops, the supply, while it cannot be classified as short, certainly could not be considered in overabundance. In fact, we have only a 3-month supply of stored feed grains. This is serious, when you consider the dust bowl conditions in Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

On April 18, 1955, Life magazine published a very interesting article entitled "A Stormy Start for Farm Year." Picture after picture is shown of the effects of wind blowing in the Western States. It is an article which all should read because of its great significance.

Fairfield Osborn has published a book called The Limits of the Earth. The Conservation Foundation has circulated a great many copies of it. In that book he said, at page 77:

> The episode in the spring of year 1935, when the sun was darkened from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic by vast clouds of soil particles borne from the denuded grasslands of the Western States, jolted our people into action and gave birth to a conservation movement that is now well begun, though as yet far from adequate. We may hear dimly, like a navigator at sea, the low and distant warning from another vessel, but we persuade ourselves that she is horizon-distant and bearing another course. There are as yet no scarlet flashes on our roadway to the future, and should these appear we would assure ourselves the road is broad and the accident somebody else's.

To be sure, scarlet flashes have appeared on the roadway within the past few months. The New York Times printed a special article, written at Denver, entitled "Dust Bowl Looms in a Four-State Area. Only if Rain or Snow Falls in Next Few Days Can Blow Be Averted."

Mr. President, I flew to my home in New Mexico during the Easter recess. When we left Kansas City and had reached a flying altitude of some 16,000 feet, and were flying over western Kansas, the dust was all around the airplane. It was 16,000 feet in the air, Mr. President. The dust stayed with us across all of New Mexico. We dropped down over the Sandia Mountains into Albuquerque, but we were not able to land at the airport there. Occasionally we could see a little strip of runway, and a small white stripe on a highway, but, although the airplane made three or four attempts to land, it could not land and had to go on to Phoenix. When I wanted to return to Washington, the airplane in which I was to be a passenger could not reach the ground because of the mountain of dirt which was steadily floating through the atmosphere.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, I am very much interested in the development of all the land of our country and, as he has suggested, in getting more of it under cultivation. I feel that sooner or later—and perhaps the day is not far off—there will not be in this country enough land producing agricultural products.

I notice at page 15 of the committee report that the estimated total cost of the projects contemplated by the bill is $1,658,460,000. Does that include the cost of building canals, of reclaiming land, and of the various processes preparatory to the irrigation of the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that it does not include the cost of putting the water on the land of the individual farmer. It includes the construction of dams. It includes the construction of the high-line canals. It takes care of the construction of the headgates and other diversionary apparatus, and it carries the water to the farmer's land.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the farmer can then use the water. It is brought to his land.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from New Mexico any estimate of what the cost will be? I have reference to some of the projects mentioned in the report. For instance, at Fruitland Mesa, according to the report at page 11, there would be water for 7,700 acres of presently irrigated land, with a potential of 11,700 additional acres. How will the cost, so far as that additional land is concerned, be financed? Would it be necessary for Congress to appropriate funds in order to reclaim that land, or to build canals or to help construct facilities to carry the water, not only to the farmer, but onto the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it has not been necessary on reclamation projects to go that far. If the water is available at the edge of the land, the farmer has always been able to obtain financing to carry it onto his land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that financing done through commercial channels?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is generally done through the Farm Credit Administration. Sometimes it is done by the individual farmers themselves; they are able to borrow money from relatives or friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the repayment of the cost of bringing the water to the farmer be made? Will it be made in the same way as now provided by law?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; in the same way as now provided by law, with the exception that a basin fund would be set up, and receipts from the power projects, after the power projects are paid off, would be utilized to take care of the costs which are beyond the ability of the farmer himself to finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law, as I understand, the farmer pays whatever assessment is made on a per acre basis over a period of 30 or 40 years, without interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That principle will apply?

Mr. ANDERSON. That principle will apply to this project.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator has the figure, what percentage of the entire cost of this project will be repaid through the development of electric power? In other words, has the Senator separated the cost of developing electricity from the cost of bringing the stored water to the farm?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am afraid that my answer will be a little unsatisfactory to the Senator, but I shall try to give it in this way: We cannot calculate that figure exactly, because we do not know what projects Congress will finally approve. Under the pending bill, certainly, we would proceed with the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, which involves a cost of approximately $420 million. We would then proceed with the construction of the next dam, the one at Echo Park, which would involve an expenditure of approximately $176 million. We would then build the small dams, which run to approximately $700 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as the larger dams are concerned, most of their cost will be amortized through the sale of electric current; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Perhaps I should have had the figures available, except they vary so much, because we do not know what is going to be built in the final analysis.

We have provided for some Colorado projects, but we do not know how many will be found to be feasible. About 80 percent or perhaps as much as 85 percent of the cost will be paid eventually by the electricity users, and only about 15 percent by the irrigators themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us what is the maximum amount of money that could be spent under this bill per acre to irrigate land?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no maximum figure set up. However, I believe that the largest sum runs in the neighborhood of $1,000, possibly $1,200, an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe that that is quite a large sum for the Government to expend in order to develop land? It strikes me that there should be some kind of limitation placed on the amount that can be spent per acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator's question is, What would be the largest sum? I would say that at one time I leveled 180 acres of ground on my farm. The total leveling operation cost $21,000. I could say that the average cost was $120 per acre for the leveling. However, I spent $2,600 to level 1 acre. I undertook to take away some ground, and when the operation was finished, it proved to be very expensive. There will be certain expensive operations in connection with this project, but they will all fit into the general pattern.

On the La Barge project, the average cost per acre is $210. On the Seedskadee project, the average cost is $383. On the Lyman project the average cost is $260, and so on. The highest average cost would be at Central Utah, where it would be $794.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the average cost?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That means that some costs may be as high as $1,200 or $1,500 an acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. All the land does not lie exactly in the same way. It is not all flat. In some areas there is hilly land, and in those areas the cost will run relatively high.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the cost be prorated to the farmers in proportion to the average cost in a particular area?

Mr. ANDERSON. Within a specific project; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, it would be possible for a farmer to acquire a tract of land that may have cost $1,200, but on which the average cost to him would be only $700?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. In the instance I mentioned I acquired 1,700 acres of land. An average value per acre was fixed for the entire project, although my land had been in a state of cultivation for more than 250 years and

did not require one piece of leveling equipment on it. However, I paid the same rate as the man whose land was as hilly as any land could be. Once a man goes into an irrigation project, he becomes a participant and partner in the entire project. It takes the contribution of all in order to make the project complete.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sum derived from the sale of electric current will be used exclusively to repay the debt until when?

Mr. ANDERSON. Until every dollar of it is repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, every dime collected will be applied to the repayment of whatever sum is necessary to pay for the project, and thereafter, as I understand the Senator, it will be used to relieve the farmers where the cost may be excessive?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Senator has stated it exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, feed and forage crops are in short supply. Livestock growers in these drought-stricken States have been forced to reduce their herds. In many instances foundation herds have been liquidated entirely. With per capita consumption of red meat increasing steadily and herds being reduced due to drought conditions, we might already be facing a shortage of red meat.

It is interesting to note that since 1951 the consumption of red and poultry meat has reached record highs of about 180 pounds per person. Of this, we eat about 80 pounds of beef—an increase of nearly 24 pounds per person during the past 3 years. Total red meat consumption in 1954 was 154 pounds per person—a 12-pound increase since 1950. This figure was estimated at 156 but has been revised to a more accurate 154 pounds. I wanted to be accurate and submitted a draft of what I was to say to the Department of Agriculture for a careful check. Here is what the Agriculture Department has to say about the consumption of meat:

> In checking the draft of the speech it should be noted that a 1954 per capita consumption of red meat of 156 pounds was used. This, of course, was the latest figure available at the time Dr. Shaw's testimony was prepared. The latest revision indicates a per capita consumption of red meat of 154 pounds in 1954. In view of the complications that would arise with respect to estimated acres needed for feed grains, hay, and pasture by 1962, it is recommended that the 156-pound figure be retained.

This means that within 7 years, as I have said, we will need an additional 35 million acres of land or its equivalent in increased yields per acre. Then the question arises: "Will we be able to put that much new land into production and, if not, will we be able to increase our yields to meet this increased demand?"

During the past 15 years cropland and available pasture and range lands, combined, have decreased slightly. During the 10-year period ended in 1950, more than 13 million acres of this land went out of production—swallowed up by expanding cities, new highways, parks, reservoirs, game refuges, military reservations, airports, and erosion.

But let us get back to the red meat consumption and our needs 7 years from now. I have said we will need an additional 35 million acres of land for feed-growing purposes.

It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that we could divert 17 million acres which were planted to wheat and cotton in 1953 to feed and still produce enough wheat and cotton to meet our anticipated demands for wheat. However, we will need an additional 35 million acres, and subtracting 17 million acres from this would still leave a deficit of 18 million acres. The surplus of 17 million acres which would be diverted from wheat and cotton allows for 5 million more acres in wheat and cotton in 1962 than was actually grown in 1954 and would allow for 14 million acres more wheat and cotton than is provided in the 1955 allotments.

In other words, economic conditions could be such that the farmer would be forced, or at least encouraged, to raise more feed grains and reduce his acreage in wheat and cotton.

The shifting of land into forage to meet livestock demands can only be made by the farmers if it is profitable to them. Certainly they would not make the change if it were to mean a financial loss or increased work with the same return and neither could it be expected of them.

Even assuming that the farmers will make this change, we would still have a deficit of 18 million acres. We can look at this in two different ways: One, it would tend to absorb any increase in acre yields between now and 1962, or two, if the acre yields were not increased substantially, it would reduce the period required to reach a balanced production.

The history of increasing crop yields per acre shows that there is a tremendous lag in transferring the gains made in the laboratory to the fields and that the production reached in the lab under ideal conditions is never attained in the field.

I am reminded of the story of the farmer who did not attend the extension meeting, and when he was asked why he did not go, because there he would learn how to farm better, he said, "Well, I do not farm as well as I know how, now."

The Connecticut egg-laying contest is an excellent example which shows how much of a lag there is in transferring gains in the laboratory to the field.

In 1920, the average of the hens in this contest layed about 160 eggs—or, about 70 eggs more than the United States average. By 1930 the contest average jumped to 210 eggs, but the United States average increased by only 5 eggs during the same 10-year period. In 1936, the contest hens reached what appears to be very close to maximum production—about 235 eggs. Since then, the average production of the contest hens has dropped as low as 200, but in 1950 it reached the 235 average again. It must be remembered that hens entered in this contest are the best available and that the owners were taking full advantage of the new information about as rapidly as they possibly could. Their primary interest is to break records no matter what the cost of production would be.

Now let us take a look at the United States average egg production per laying hen and see what it has done during the same period. In 1920 it was 90 eggs per year. Taking the following consecutive 10-year periods, it was 95, 105, and 140. In other words, by 1950 the United States average had not reached the 1920 average of the hens in the Connecticut contest. Granted, the average United States production is on the upswing, but research has done little to increase production in the laboratory.

A similar situation exists in corn production. In Iowa, the number one corn-producing State, acre yields increased only 2½ bushels from 1870 until 1937. Then, from 1937 to 1944, yields increased 15 bushels per acre. We are now in a leveling-off period.

The Iowa average began to increase in 1935, but the United States average did not show appreciable increases until the late forties.

In view of these statistics, it would appear that acre yields will not increase to the extent necessary to meet our coming food demands.

By 1975, with a projected population of about 200 million—if we take the lowest Census Bureau estimate—we will need at least an additional 100 million acres of cropland. Again, this much new land is not available. From the birth of our Nation until the first decade of the 20th century, we have always been able to expand westward to fill the needs of our increase in population. Now we have literally reached the Pacific.

From 1880 until 1920 the number of acres in cropland increased at an accelerated pace. We had 188 million acres of land in crops in 1880 with an additional 935 million available pasture and range. Ten years later we added 60 million acres to our cropland total—43 million of which came from pasture and range land. By the turn of the century, 71 million more acres were added—about 7.1 million per year.

Again the biggest share of this land came from the plowing up of former pasture and range land, plowing up these acres in defiance of sound conservation practices.

Mr. President, I do not speak of this theoretically. In 1934 or 1935 I was a representative of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. I drove to a small community and loaded the people of that community into boxcars and moved them into the Rio Grande Valley where they had a chance to farm, because drought had taken away their opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator remember seeing any irrigated area which had been farmed for a number of years that ever became a dust bowl?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. That is a sight which fortunately I have never seen. Perhaps I would be even more enthusiastic about this project if I had ever seen

such a thing, but irrigated areas do not blow. I remind the Senator that we have developed in one of the eastern counties of New Mexico—Curry County—some pumping projects. They were in the very heart of the dust area at one time, but we can go through that area today and see how water has tied down the soil, reducing the blowing, although nonirrigated acres nearby are blowing as badly as in the past.

Across the Texas line from Curry County there are a number of farms which are irrigated by wells, and the entire county looks like paradise. Just below this county in Texas, where they have depended upon dry farming and do not have irrigation, the dust is blowing.

I thank the Senator from Utah for reminding me of the fact that with irrigation duststorms do not occur.

Mr. WATKINS. That is my belief. The soil is firmed down by plant growth, and the moist soil will not blow as it does in some other sections of the so-called dust bowl areas which we are constantly called upon to help. In such areas, one of the best things to do would be to get water on the land, and then the soil would not blow away.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. There are sections in western Kansas which possibly could be irrigated. If irrigation comes to those areas we will not see the dust blowing as it has been doing in the past few weeks.

While the United States was adding 7.1 million acres per year to the cropland before 1900, pasture and range land was being reduced at the annual rate of 6.1 million acres. The difference in range and pasture being put into cropland and the total acres in cropland was made up from clearing new land for crops.

Between 1900 and 1920, 83 million acres were added to our productive cropland, most of which again came from pasture and range. Although some tractors were in use by 1920, 90 million acres were being used to produce feed for horses and mules. We are now using only about 14 million acres for this purpose. So we gained 76 million acres there, but that day has ended.

For 60 years from 1880, the pendulum swung out, taking acres from pasture and range and converting them into cropland. Since 1940, the pendulum has begun to swing back. Land experts and economists see an increasing number of acres being converted to improved pasture and range with a proportionately increasing number of acres going into feed and forage crops.

I believe that a great saving can be made if these drought areas are protected.

The overall land area of the United States includes mountains and deserts which cannot be used for cropland. Of course, about 17 million additional acres can be placed into production through irrigation, but this is not anticipated within the next 50 years. Assuming that this much is placed under irrigation, it would still not be enough to meet the demands of our population 20 years from now, although it would be a needed supplement.

Assuming that the new land is placed under irrigation, we will lose at least that much land in the next 25 years through erosion, urban growth, airports, and highways. The land taken out of production for these reasons frequently is good farmland. Often we fail to realize the very large area of land taken out of production by highways.

For example, most of us see only the tremendous benefits to travel which will come when the Pennsylvania Turnpike is extended from Canton, Ohio, to Chicago. Others say it will be wonderful when we have a four-lane highway spanning the United States. I agree wholeheartedly—the roads will be excellent.

However, the turnpike extension from Canton to Chicago will take between 80,000 to 100,000 acres of excellent cropland out of production. Anyone familiar with the topography of that area knows what excellent farmland will be lost. It is not difficult, therefore, to visualize the number of acres which will be taken out of production by the President's proposed highway plan which calls for several thousand miles of four-lane highways. Highways and airports have one thing in common—airports need flat terrain and frequently it is excellent farmland; highways usually follow the flattest line and this too is often excellent farmland.

At present we are using about four-fifths of our land area for agricultural purposes—this includes pasture, range forest and woodland. Only 409 million acres, or about a fifth of all our land area, is used for cropland purposes. In 1954 crops from only 345 million acres were actually being harvested.

But a more important observation is that the number of crop acres per person has declined. In 1920 it was 3.8 acres per person and by 1950 it had dwindled to 2.7 acres. Estimates for 1954 have it at 2.5 acres per person.

Of course, increased yields per acre have made it possible for us to meet the demands of our population and some persons believe that we will continue to be able to meet these demands by increasing our yields. Research has done much to increase our yields, but nearly all of the increase was experienced during the 1939–49 period. In the years before 1936, total farm production was neither very much above nor very much below the 1935–39 average except for the drought period.

After 1939, total production started a fast climb, hitting its peak in 1953. Many persons believe these production records were attained only because we were on a war economy and practically everyone took advantage of the modern farm methods which were made available by American ingenuity and know-how. Everyone also was doing what he could for the war effort and this aided production.

It must be remembered that since 1940, at the direct request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States—during which time we were trying virtually to feed the world and win World War II—farm output has been at a greater rate of increase than the increase in population. One of the factors behind this increased farm output was the favorable weather which prevailed. In weather, we never had it so good.

Let us assume that we will continue for the next 20 years on a strictly peacetime economy. We will have to increase our yields more than a fifth above the 1950 average. This increase makes allowances for some additional cropland coming into food production for the first time and relies partly on placing at least 6 million more acres of land under irrigation. It might be well to point out that the 6 million figure is considerably more than all of the land which has been brought under irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation during the 52 years of its existence.

Will we be able to increase our yields per acre by the minimum 20 percent that will be required? In research and any other field there is a ceiling on how far we can go. Where that ceiling is, I am quite certain no one knows, but I do believe a parallel can be drawn to the track stars of our time even though they are completely unrelated fields.

For years, the 4-minute mile was the dream of many. The first time our modern day runners ran the mile, it probably took 5 or 6 minutes. As they trained, they were quick to reduce their time by the ten's of seconds. Yet, as they approached the dream mile the time it took to run the mile would be reduced just by a second or two or even by tenths of a second. I cannot help but believe that this is what will happen to agriculture. In improving anything, the first gains are the most pronounced—after that, they become less and less impressive and more difficult to attain.

There has been a rather parallel increase of farm output with population since 1880—the first year records were kept. Principal factors, landwise and researchwise, behind the increased output between 1910 and 1930, were bringing in more acres for agricultural production and the release of millions of acres from growing of feed for horses and mules.

The first 6 years of the thirties saw a pronounced decrease in farm output due to the drought. It is interesting to note that crop yields per acre have remained rather static since 1948 and that the increase in overall farm output has been due, primarily, to increased output per livestock unit.

Further evidence of this is the amount of carryover of major farm commodities. Each year this has become less. In 1953, for example, the excess of farm output over population requirements was about 6 percent. In 1954 it was less than 6 percent and estimates for the current year are even lower. The Agriculture Department says the rate of excess build-up is leveling off.

I need not remind my colleagues that America has become a great Nation because we have had abundance. We are known the world over as the land of plenty. Not only have we had an abundance of crops, but we have also had an abundance of people who were not afraid to look to the future and people who continually are looking for ways to do things easier and better. Many nations have become weak with decreasing standards

of living because they lacked the ability to produce enough to meet the food needs of their people. They lacked leaders with enough insight to prepare their country to meet the ever-increasing demands. I hope we who are entrusted with this great responsibility, will not lose sight of preparing for our future growth and development.

Our country is growing in many ways—in people, in resources, in ingenuity, in standard of living and in energy which makes progress possible. It does not take much vision to see the great expansion which is ahead.

I have been discussing various crops which are presently in overproduction and have predicted that we could reach a balance in their production by 1962.

Now let us look at a few specialty crops—crops without which the American diet would be incomplete—fresh vegetables, fruits, and others which once were seasonal crops but now find their way to the basic American table the year around.

The American standard of living demands more and more of these speciality crops.

Dieticians stress the importance of having these foods in our daily meals. A large share of these crops is produced through irrigation and reclamation. We are producing enough to meet our present demands, but only at the present rate of consumption. Here, again, we must increase production and this can be done in part by bringing new land under irrigation.

To illustrate how much we depend upon irrigation and reclamation for these speciality crops, I have had a table prepared showing the total production of these speciality crops in the United States and the amount raised under irrigation in the 17 Western States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table, entitled "Crop Production," printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crop production

Year	Crop	Total for United States (million pounds)	17 Western States	
			Total (million pounds)	Percentage
1954	Asparagus	307	189	62
1954	Carrots	1,550	1,108	72
1954	Celery	1,496	837	56
1954	Lettuce	2,834	2,527	89
1954	Peas	850	329	39
1952	Olives	114	114	100
1954	Tomatoes	7,390	3,766	51
1952	Apricots	354	354	100
1954	Cantaloupes	1,322	1,101	83
1954	Cherries (sweet)	200	170	85
1952	Grapes	6,347	6,028	95
1952	Plums	122	106	87
1954	Strawberries	427	265	62

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it must be remembered that only through the year-round growing season of the irrigated Southwest are most of these crops made available to the rest of the country during the late fall, winter and early spring seasons. In summing up the picture, there are certain facts which we must recognize.

First. We have approximately 1,904,000,000 acres land area of which about four-fifths is being used for agricultural purposes. A fifth of this is actually used for cropland.

Second. We are losing about 1.4 million acres per year through use of land for highways, airports, reservoirs, military reservations and expanding cities and erosion. Population increase could bring agriculture production in balance if production is adjusted to demand.

Third. We need, with the diet that we currently use, an equivalent of production from an additional 6 to 7.5 million acres each year.

Fourth. We need, by 1975, at least 20 to 30 million acres of new cropland.

Fifth. Present crop yields per acre will have to be increased at least 20 percent during the next 7 to 10 years. This assumes we will place at least 6 million additional acres under irrigation.

Sixth. A drought of 1 year's duration with as ruinous effect as experienced in the 1930's would almost deplete our present supply of stored crops.

Seventh. Population of the United States is now 162 million, increasing nearly 3 million per year.

Eighth. For 1975 the population projection now considered as the most reasonable is about 207 million persons. Five years ago 190 million was considered the most likely projection for 1975.

I have discussed what we can expect in 1962 so far as our agricultural supplies are concerned and brushed only lightly on what we can conservatively foresee by 1975.

Many persons believe this work can be done quickly and that the participating upper Colorado irrigation projects will be planted at once. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Projected Acreages and Completion Times for S. 500 Projects—Irrigation."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projected acreages and completion times for S. 500 projects (irrigation)

	Years	Acres
1. Central Utah	26	28,540
2. Emory County	9	3,630
3. Florida	9	6,300
4. Hammond	10	3,670
5. La Barge	11	7,970
6. Lyman	10	-------
7. Paonia	8	2,210
8. Pine River extension	13	15,150
9. Seedskadee	17	60,720
10. Silt	8	-------
11. Smith Fork	8	2,270
12. Gooseberry	9	-------
13. Navaho	27	137,250
14. San Juan Chama	15	-------
15. Savery Pot Hook	10	18,380
16. Dolores	12	35,450
17. Sublette	14	60,000
18. Fruit Growers Dam extension	6	1,850
19. Bostwick Park	7	1,040
20. Dallas Creek	10	15,750
21. East River	3	1,780
22. Fruitland Mesa	8	11,700
23. Grand Mesa	11	11,070
24. Ohio Creek	7	6,200
25. Tomichi	8	12,180
26. Battlement Mesa	7	6,780
27. Bluestone	6	8,660
28. Eagle Divide	6	8,990
29. Parshall	8	24,410
30. Rabbit Ear	6	13,955
31. Troublesome	7	8,990
32. West Divide	14	40,500
33. Woody Creek	4	645

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how does the upper Colorado Basin fit into this picture?

Let us consider what has been proposed. We have the initial storage projects. They will not add an acre of farmland. They will generate power, control the river flow, and provide downstream irrigation.

Next come the 12 participating projects. They will take as long as 26 years to complete.

The total for these 12 starting projects comes to 130,660 new acres—little more than 5,000 acres per year. We said a while ago that we would be needing more than a million acres a year. This is hardly adding to the surplus, is it?

Most of the acreage would come into cultivation toward the end of the 26 years, not at an average of 5,000 acres a year, due to construction requirements.

But let us say that every one of the projects could be started tomorrow and that every one of the contemplated acres would be in production at the end of 27 years, the length of time required to complete the biggest project—the Navaho project.

What would the increased farm output amount to?

At my request, the Agriculture Department this week made a projection based on a possible utilization of 270,000 acres, the new acreage planned under the upper Colorado bill. This figure was used because it represents the earliest acreage to be developed.

Here is what the Department found—

About 50,000 acres would be devoted to raising oats; 50,000 acres would be planted to barley; 105,000 acres to alfalfa hay, and 65,000 acres to irrigated pasture.

Converted to approximately 670 million feed units, this acreage would support annual production of approximately 60 million pounds liveweight of cattle and calves, or about 0.1 percent of our estimated requirements for cattle and calf production in the next 25 to 50 years.

Is this a threat to agriculture? An addition to surpluses?

Agriculturally, the upper Colorado River project will make very little difference in the total United States picture.

But when the acreage is fitted into the demands of the region, it becomes more significant, supplying a livelihood and sustenance to farmers in an area now lying unused while the water which could turn it into paradise flows unhindered into the sea.

From a power standpoint the upper Colorado project has perhaps even wider significance. Power could bring industry to these high, dry tablelands, exploiting the virtually untapped mineral and timber resources of the region.

There are many facets to the upper Colorado Basin story. Each of them has fabulous promise if allowed to develop. Each hinges, at least to some extent, on the other.

Therefore, the overall project should be undertaken and work should be started as early as possible.

It has been said that we are asking for huge sums of money, to be taken in one lump from the United States Treasury. This is not so.

The amounts we are asking will be spent over a period of 1 to 30 years. The smallest amounts to be spent will come first, with largest amounts coming between 5 and 10 years.

To show just what is being asked, I have prepared a short listing of the amounts needed and when they will be needed. As will be seen, they hardly can be considered a threat to the budget.

I desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the amount of money which would be asked, year by year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1956	$5,000,000
1957	30,000,000
1958	48,000,000
1959	91,000,000
1960	118,000,000
1961	134,000,000
1962	127,000,000
1963	133,000,000
1964	117,000,000
1965	91,000,000
1966	59,000,000
1967	47,000,000
1968	35,000,000
1969	21,000,000
1970	9,000,000
1971	5,000,000
1972	3,000,000
1973	9,000,000
1974	7,000,000
1975	1,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, now I wish to state my conclusions, as follows:

First. Surpluses will end.

Second. We need to start now to meet expected food shortages.

Third. The upper Colorado Basin is more than a reclamation project. It can supply jobs, food, and wealth.

Fourth. It will mean the creation of an empire to be built from materials at hand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the clerk's desk a proposed unanimous-consent request for an order limiting debate, which I should like to have stated. It is offered in behalf of the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, who in turn has consulted with the ranking minority Members. I have also talked to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators interested in the pending legislation. The proposed agreement seems to be agreeable to those concerned, and it will permit us to make plans for the remainder of the afternoon. Following the morning hour on tomorrow, the time limitation would start to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request? Without objection——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not hear the proposal from the beginning. I wonder if I might look at it for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, with respect to the limitation of debate on amendments, I suggest that the limitation should be 2 hours to a side, because I understand there will be only one principal amendment, and that will require some discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall have possibly three amendments to offer tomorrow. I am quite content with the half hour that would be allotted to those of us who would propose the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that we have the remainder of today to discuss the bill. Any Senators who desire to do so may offer amendments today.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the very able discussion by the Senate from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with regard to his views on the important issue before the Senate. In general I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. He and I part company on only one phase of the project involved. The upper Colorado project calls for 6 storage units, 12 participating units, and 21 projects which are subject to further authorization.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM ENDANGERED

One of the storage projects, Mr. President, would be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. It would constitute a most dangerous precedent in that it would lead to the breaching by a dam of our national park system for the first time in its history. If that happens, the entire national park system would be exposed to commercial development.

The theory of our national park system is that the beauty, the grandeur——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will suspend until Senators take their seats and attendants retire to the rear of the room.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thank you, Mr. President. I gather it might be more quiet in one of the magnificent national parks to which I was referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will proceed. Let us have quiet in the Chamber.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The theory of our national park system, Mr. President, is that the grandeur, the majesty, and the scenery of the national parks shall be unimpaired. The word "unimpaired" does not mean that a park or a national monument shall be inundated beneath a vast reservoir. The language means precisely what it says.

Before proceeding further to discuss the Echo Park phase of the Colorado River project and what it would mean to basic recreational and scenic policy, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself in general with the statements made by the Senator from New Mexico in defense of the development of the Far West.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION WAS ATTACKED AS WASTEFUL

Mr. President, throughout the entire history of this country, there have been men who have disparaged the inexorable movement toward the West. This year of 1955 marks the 150th anniversary of the greatest exploration in the history of America. Exactly 150 years ago this year Meriwether Lewis and William Clark arrived at the shores of the Pacific Ocean with the American flag, and for the first time Americans had crossed this continent. Yet, even then, there were people who felt that this was a foolish undertaking. Thomas Jefferson, that illustrious President, asked the Congress for the vast sum of $2,500 to finance this most important of explorations, which Theodore Roosevelt was to say later ranked in history with the explorations of Columbus. Yet there were Members of Congress who felt that the $2,500 requested by Jefferson was a waste.

Indeed, after Lewis and Clark had returned, and had brought back almost the first information Americans had ever had about the Rocky Mountains, the grizzly bear, the prairie dog, the bighorn sheep, and the mountain goat, there actually were in political life men who still insisted that the expedition had been a folly, and who seriously predicted that the area through which Lewis and Clark had traveled never again would be visited in the course of American history.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster was outstanding in his service in the Congress. Yet when it was proposed that cavalry be sent to protect the pioneers who had gone into hostile Indian territory, Daniel Webster insisted that tax dollars should not be spent in protecting those who had risked their lives in a foolhardy rush into the wilderness; and he said he would not give a silver dollar for all of Oregon—meaning, not the State of Oregon, but

the vast realm then known as the Oregon Country.

There also served in this Chamber, Mr. President, a man who felt that the western borders of the United States could never possibly be thrust beyond the Continental Divide. That Member of the Senate was one of the most famous of Senators; I refer to Thomas Hart Benton. On March 1, 1825, he said to the Senate:

> Westward, we can speak without reserve, and the ridge of the Rocky Mountains may be named without offense as presenting a convenient, natural, and everlasting boundary. Along the bank of this ridge, the western limit of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god, Terminus, should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down. In planting the seed of a new power on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, it should be well understood that when strong enough to take care of itself, the new government should separate from the major Empire, as the child separates from the parent at the age of manhood.

In other words, Mr. President, that very distinguished Senator, Thomas Hart Benton, believed it would be impossible to thrust the boundaries of the Nation beyond the divide formed by the Rocky Mountains, or the Shining Mountains, as they then were called; and he believed that if people were so foolish as to live beyond that boundary, there would have to be two separate sovereign nations.

LONG VIEW NEEDED IN WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

I cite these things in support of what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has so eloquently said about the need for developing the West and about the need for challenging those who would take the short view and the narrow view regarding the West.

I cite the fact that even in the time of Jefferson there were those who felt it was unwise to spend the trivial sum of $2,500 to send the first Americans westward to extend our sovereignty from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean. In other words, there were then in the Nation those who believed it was silly to spend $2,500 on an expedition to increase by nearly two-thirds the size of the United States.

Mr. President, I consider it opportune to say this because this is the 150th anniversary year of that greatest of all treks westward, the Lewis and Clark exploration.

I know that the Reclamation Act of 1906, passed during the administration of a great, progressive Republican President—and would that his views still prevailed in the Republican Party—has been a vital factor in the development of our Western States, particularly the 11 States which lie westward of the Continental Divide, in the vast area which Thomas Hart Benton thought could never become a part of this sovereign nation.

Parenthetically speaking, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 2 weeks ago held hearings on the Hells Canyon Dam bill, there were present a number of persons who opposed the bill—and they were members of Theodore Roosevelt's party, I may add—and who told us that the public-power preference clause was socialistic and un-American. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the public-power preference clause first appeared in the Reclamation Act of 1906, drafted under the supervision of Theodore Roosevelt, and passed during his administration. I said of several of those witnesses that that was the first time I had ever known that the man who founded the Rough Riders and led the cavalry charge up San Juan Hill was socialistic and un-American.

Mr. President, the party of Theodore Roosevelt has traveled a long distance since Theodore Roosevelt's time; but it has not moved forward. However, the policies that Theodore Roosevelt began in the Reclamation Act of 1906 have resulted in making possible the settlement of large areas of the West, which without irrigation supported by the Federal Government never could be inhabited to any considerable extent. We need to think only of the Central Valley of California; or of the Columbia Basin, near Grand Coulee; or of the Salt River section, in Arizona; or of the Madras project in Oregon; or of the Yakima Valley; or of many other great areas which, without Federal reclamation, certainly would not be the prosperous agricultural regions they are today.

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS IN WEST JUSTIFIED

So I say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that when we point out that often it is necessary for the United States Government to make capital investments in areas of the Nation which need development, this is part of the history of our country and part of the forward march of progress of our country, and without these developments our country would not be the great, free, prosperous, and powerful nation it is today.

Mr. President, I should like to say that it is not so far-fetched a policy for the United States Government to make capital investments in reclamation projects, even though they may not seem to be sound economically when they are first undertaken. As I recall, the Government of the United States in its infinite wisdom gave the Northern Pacific Railroad some $171 million in land grants so it could build a $70-million railroad line to the Pacific Northwest. Perhaps that was not wise economically. Yet if those land grants had not been parceled out in that way, the development of the Northwest could have been retarded from 30 to 60 years, because the railroad might not have been put through during the time in which it actually came. I believe the Northern Pacific arrived on Puget Sound in 1884 or 1885.

RIVERS AND HARBORS WERE DEVELOPED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Other parts of the country, Mr. President, have benefited by vast investments, and investments which have not returned a direct dividend, although they certainly have been justified in terms of the progress and prosperity they have made possible for the Nation as a whole. In that connection, let us consider the millions, if not the billions, of dollars which have been spent on the Mississippi River to develop navigation with locks and levees. Let us also consider the funds which have been invested in improving the waterways on the Great Lakes and the funds which have been invested to make New York Harbor the greatest harbor in North America, and perhaps the greatest harbor in all the world. Those funds have come from the Federal Government. They have been spent in dredging for locks, for canals, and so forth. No one has suggested that those expenditures were not wise, although relatively little of that money has been returned directly to the Treasury.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the vast areas of the intermountain West and of the West along the Pacific seaboard are entitled to Federal support in the form of reclamation and irrigation.

I say this as a matter of preface, because I support the bill. I believe that the upper Colorado storage project, as a whole, is justified. I feel that the intermountain region, which certainly has lagged behind the rest of the country in population with respect to area, is entitled to a capital investment which will enable it to support a far larger agricultural economy.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that the upper Colorado project, however justified it may be, warrants the establishment of a precedent which could lead, through all the years to come, to the impairment, if not the actual destruction, of one of the great institutions of America; namely, our national park system.

At this point in my remarks I should like to associate myself with a very brief statement of policy drawn up at an emergency meeting in November 1954 by nearly all the leading conservation and outdoor groups of America, called together by the National Parks Association. This statement makes it very clear that these conservation groups are not opposed to the upper Colorado storage project in its entirety, but they do oppose the Echo Park phase of that project, which would lead to the flooding out of the Dinosaur National Monument, which is an integral part of the United States national park system.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement by leading conservation groups of America, representing people in all 48 States—indeed, I may say, in perhaps every county of the United States, including those in the upper Colorado area. This statement makes it clear that the Echo Park project would breach our national parks system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.
>
> 2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would

flood any portion of any national park or monument.

3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.

4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or destroyed.

Signed by the American Museum of Natural History, the American Nature Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Conservation Department, Yale University, the Conservation Foundation, the Council of Conservationists, the Dartmouth Outdoor Club, the Emergency Conservation Committee, the Garden Club of America, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Conference on State Parks, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Life Conservation Society, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think we of the Pacific Northwest who are supporting the upper Colorado project really are showing a great deal of forbearance. I should like to point out that this national administration has taken an attitude with respect to power development which I do not believe can be justified by any stretch of facts or statistics, or by any operation of logic.

THE ADMINISTRATION CONTRADICTS ITSELF

This administration has said to the people of the country, "Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River is creeping socialism, but Federal dams on the upper Colorado are just good old free enterprise, which the Federal Government ought to support."

I should like to say that the distinguished governors of Oregon and Washington, who are members of the party which is in power—perhaps I should not use the word "power" with respect to this administration, because it might be confused with hydroelectric power—members of the party which is in authority in the National Government appeared at the recent Hells Canyon hearings and denounced the proposal to construct a Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Yet the very political party which thinks it is dangerous to the future of the Republic to build a Federal dam in Hells Canyon is for constructing many dams on the upper Colorado River.

My position is consistent. I believe that the upper Colorado project should be built, with the exception of Echo Park, but I also believe that the Hells Canyon Federal project in the Pacific Northwest should be constructed.

This administration has a policy of turning over to private utilities the cream of hydroelectric power sites and leaving for public development, out of the Federal Treasury, the dregs of the power sites. Let me point out exactly the situation.

The Echo Park project would cost $176,426,000. It would produce about 1 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

The Glen Canyon project, which is closely related, would cost about $421 million and would produce about 3,813,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In other words, these 2 projects together would cost nearly $600 million, and produce about 4,830,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Hells Canyon, which this administration has shunned, would cost $357 million and produce 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually.

In other words, Echo Park Dam would cost about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical than Echo Park power.

Glen Canyon Dam would cost 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams together would cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. Therefore Hells Canyon Dam power would be 1.9 times more economical, in respect to power production.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief table comparing the relative costs and power output of these projects.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative costs and power output

Project	Cost of project	Net annual output (millions of kilowatt-hours annually)
Echo Park	$176,426,000	1,017
Glen Canyon	421,270,000	3,813
Total	597,696,000	4,830
Hells Canyon	357,000,000	5,504

Echo Park Dam costs about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical.

Glen Canyon Dam costs 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 70 percent as much power. Therefore Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, together, cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is 1.9 times more economical.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What does this mean? This is what it means: Power from Echo Park Dam would cost around 6 mills a kilowatt-hour. Power from Hells Canyon Dam would cost between 2.1 mills and 2.6 mills. The national administration, which only a few weeks ago said that the average American citizen could not have a cut in his or her taxes because of the need for balanced budget, says, "We will finance out of the Federal Treasury the marginal, uneconomical power sites, where electricity is extremely expensive to produce, but we will give away to the private power companies the power sites where cheap power can be produced, which power would be in great demand by industry."

If the policy of this administration with respect to power sites were adopted with respect to the United States post office system, the administration would turn over to Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward—once the fight is settled at Montgomery Ward—the few profitable post offices, such as New York, Chicago, the great city of the Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. DOUGLAS], Cleveland, perhaps San Francisco, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Philadelphia, and say to them, "You operate these post offices. You can make a profit from them. We, the Government, will continue to operate the small, remote, scattered, isolated post offices. You could not make any money out of them."

ADMINISTRATION POLICY CANNOT BE MADE CONSISTENT BY ADVERTISING SLOGANS

The policy of this balance-the-budget national administration with respect to hydroelectric power is this: It says that it will use propaganda turned out by advertising agencies to convince the people that it is creeping socialism to construct a dam on the Snake River, because power on the Snake River can be sold to industry, and because such power can be produced economically, but the Government will develop the marginal sites on the upper Colorado River.

I may be very dense. I admit that I am a very new Senator, occupying seat No. 96. But no matter how dense I may be, I do not see how a Federal dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River can be creeping socialism, but a Federal dam on the upper Colorado River, particularly one which damages the national park system, can be good old Republican free enterprise. If some of the master minds of this administration can explain that to the people, I certainly will be interested in the explanation, because so far I have been unable to understand the logic of the administration's statements.

What the administration is saying to the people of the country is this: "We will build the dams on the upper Colorado, even at the risk of wrecking the national park system; but the sites in the Columbia River Basin, the finest hydroelectric power sites in North America, are too good for the United States Government. Therefore we must give them to the Idaho Power Co., or to the Washington Water Power Co., or to Pacific Power & Light Co."

Was there ever before such a policy? Power produced at Hells Canyon, and selling for about 2.5 mills, would be in demand by every great industrial and manufacturing concern which uses large amounts of power. How many manufacturing concerns want power from the upper Colorado at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour? Mr. President, if you were in the manufacturing business would you buy power at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour on the upper Colorado River

when there was power available at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, or at John Day, or Bonneville on the Columbia River for 2 mills or 2.5 mills?

Of course not, because if your competitor had 2.5 mill power, you would be out of business; you could not compete.

I am not saying that we should not build some of those so-called uneconomic projects, because, as I have already stated in my opening remarks, a capital investment from the United States Treasury is just as justified in arid areas as are projects to improve navigation on the Mississippi River, for instance. However, I say that the administration now in power should not try to turn over to private industry the cream of the power sites in the country.

DOES THE PRESIDENT KNOW THE ADMINISTRATION'S POWER POLICY?

Mr. President, in that connection, I was interested recently in reading in the New York Times the text of one of the press conferences held by the President of the United States. At the conference the President cited approvingly a book called Big Dam Foolishness. I believe it was written by a man named Elmer Peterson. I bought the book. The general thesis of the book is that it is foolish, to use an understatement, for the United States Government to build these big dams.

That is all right for the President to say. It is certainly the privilege of our distinguished and illustrious President to believe that the building of big dams is foolishness. However, has anyone told the President what the policy of the Government is?

The policy of the Government is that it is "big dam foolishness" when the Columbia River or the Snake River are involved, because both have excellent power sites with deep and steady flows of water, with heavy snowfall in the mountains. That is "big dam foolishness," according to the policy of the present administration.

However, on the upper Colorado, where there is infinitely less water, where it is much more expensive to produce power, through some sort of legerdemain, by some kind of wizardry of a Merlin or of a Houdini, that is not "big dam foolishness." In other words, when the President looks at the Snake River and the Columbia River, he has under his arm the book Big Dam Foolishness, and he quotes from the book at his press conference. However, when he looks at the upper Colorado River he puts the book away. He does not have that book with him when he looks at the upper Colorado River.

I still fail to see how hydroelectric development can be "big dam foolishness" at Hells Canyon, but not foolishness on the upper Colorado, where a Federal dam would flood out a national monument.

DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT A PART OF OUR PARK SYSTEM

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the creation of the Dinosaur National Monument. Let me say that the Dinosaur National Monument is a part of our national park system, as is every other monument. Many of our national parks today, such as the Olympic National Park or the Grand Canyon National Park, were originally national monuments before they were advanced to the status of national parks. If there is any one feature of our national life to which all Americans are devoted, it is our national park system.

I dare say that there are people in every State of the Union, including Colorado and Utah, who have expressed themselves against the proposed Echo Park Dam. I have letters from the upper Colorado area in which people ask that the Echo Park Dam be not authorized. People in every part of the Nation are pleading and praying that Congress will not, for the first time in history, authorize a commercial power development within the borders of a national park or monument.

Congress itself has been aware of this potential danger to the proper preservation of these areas in accordance with their fundamental purpose.

Less than a year following its enactment, the Congress, on March 3, 1921, amended the Federal Water Power Act to provide that thereafter no permit or other authorization should be granted for reservoirs or other works for storage or carriage of water within the limits as then constituted of any national park or national monument without specific authority of Congress. The language of the amendment is comprehensive and absolute, and its meaning clear.

In any event, all possible doubt as to the purpose of the act would be resolved by its legislative history. In calling up the bill in the House, Representative Esch stated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 66th Congress, 3d session; volume 60, part 4, page 4204:

> Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill is to modify the Federal Water Power Act so as to eliminate from its provisions national parks and monuments. When the act was originally passed we supposed we had sufficiently safeguarded national parks and monuments so that there would not be constructed therein any water power or reclamation projects. However, the President was in doubt as to whether he would sign the bill which was presented to him on the 4th day of June, the day before we adjourned. He referred the bill to the Secretaries of the Interior, War, and Agriculture. The Secretary of the Interior had great doubt as to the policy of giving to a commission control over national parks and monuments in the matter of water-power development. Senator Jones, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and Senator Walsh, of Montana, called upon the Secretary and conferred with him regarding the signing of the bill. The Secretary conferred with Senator Underwood and the majority leader, Mr. Mondell, and an understanding was reached whereby the bill was to be introduced at this session eliminating the parks and monuments from the operation of the Federal Power Act, and this bill carries out that understanding.

Similar statements were made in the Senate by Senator Jones, of Washington, and Senator Walsh, of Montana.

Since the 1921 act was, by its terms, restricted to areas embraced within national parks and national monuments on the date of the act, it was necessary, until 1935, to include in proposed legislation for establishing or extending national parks or national monuments a provision to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting power licenses therein. This is no longer necessary. When the Federal Water Power Act was amended by the Federal Power Act in 1935, the definition of the "reservations" to which the act was to apply was amended to exclude national parks and monuments, thus removing these areas from the authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to the issuance of power licenses, without regard to the date of their establishment. The intention of the Congress, by this amendment, to afford unlimited protection to all national parks and national monuments from encroachment of power development, is made undeniably clear by the legislative history. In the report—No. 1318, 74th Congress—of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, accompanying the bill, S. 2796, which became the Federal Power Act of 1935, it is stated, page 22:

> The definition of the former term ("reservations") has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under an amendment to the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of "reservations" is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses.

The question whether the authority of the Federal Power Commission to issue power licenses could be preserved by an appropriate provision in a proclamation of the President reserving lands for national monument purposes under the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, has been considered by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. In an opinion dated December 5, 1939, he held:

> Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character.

ECHO PARK DAM COULD BE BAD PRECEDENT

I now wish to speak about the proposal to build the dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. There are pending in various parts of the Nation, generally in the West, not fewer than 15 or 16 requests or demands that within national parks or monuments there be built dams, diversion canals, diversion tunnels, irrigation flumes, and similar undertakings. This is natural, Mr. President, because our national parks and monuments have been deliberately placed in realms of great scenic beauty. Water is a great contribution to the scenic beauty of many areas in the West. This means rivers and lakes.

For example, Yellowstone Lake is, I believe, the highest large body of water in the United States. Some irrigationists would like to get into the park and utilize the waters of that lake which can be coasted downhill in a great gravity sweep for reclaiming arid land. In my own region, the Olympic National Park encompasses the greatest rain forests left on the North American Continent.

I have camped with my wife in those forests. I have not been fortunate enough to visit tropical forests, but if there are any forests which can match the denseness of the tropics and still retain the cool grandeur of evergreens, it is the groves which grow within the Olympic National Park.

Some of the largest lumber operators in the country would like to get in there. There are some of the most compelling reasons why they should. In the northwestern part of the State of Washington, which is represented in part by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is now present on the floor, a large number of trees have been cut out. Some families are jobless. Mills have lost their log supply. If 60,000 or 70,000 acres could be trimmed from that magnificent park, many mills would have a supply of lumber for years and years to come, because the trees are the old virgin, original growth, comprising the highest quality of timber ever grown in North America. The timber was standing when Christopher Columbus landed in the New World, and it was old when the members of the Lewis and Clark expedition reached the mouth of the Columbia River.

If the timber companies could log the trees of the Olympic Park, it would assist the families who need jobs and the mill owners who want to amortize their investment. There are sound economic reasons elsewhere, as well as in the upper Colorado Basin.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has asked a question. The question was, if the Echo Park Dam is permitted to be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument, will it not open up the Olympic area for the construction of dams? The answer to the Senator's question is, emphatically, no.

The entire argument which the Senator has been making with respect to the Echo Park damsite is based upon a mistaken set of facts. The Echo Park site was withdrawn for power purposes by the full authority of the Government of the United States long before the Dinosaur National Monument was extended to include that site. As the record made at the hearings of the House and Senate, and upon this floor, clearly demonstrates, when the executive order of President Roosevelt was issued, these lands had already been set aside for the development of power. Dinosaur National Monument was created by Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act, which specifically recited that although the President would be entitled to withdraw from the public domain sites of historical and scientific interest, in so withdrawing them he was compelled to withdraw the smallest area possible. So, when Woodrow Wilson created the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order, he withdrew 80 acres.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To protect dinosaur bones.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To protect dinosaur bones. Then, in the effort to deceive the conservationists and to take land which had been set aside for power purposes, the National Park Service and its adherents sought to bring about an extension of that monument, taking over 200,000 acres of land, including power sites.

The Department of the Interior, under Harold Ickes, specifically stated that the power sites were conflicting rights which were not to be affected. The invasion was an invasion by the National Park Service of the law, in the first place, and, in the second place, an invasion of the power rights which had been previously established.

National parks are created by acts of Congress. National monuments are created by Executive orders under specific limitations. Whatever may be done with respect to a monument is by no means a precedent with respect to what may be done with a national park.

I stand with the Senator from Oregon in favor of the Hells Canyon project. I was one of the sponsors of the bill. I have spent many years in this body, and I venture to say that the national parks have not had a more persistent defender than I have been; but when the Senator from Oregon suggests that a national monument created by an Executive order which specifically preserved existing rights would set a precedent for invading national parks, I say the facts are all against him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that if national monuments which often preceded national parks in the same location had not——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator name one?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; the Olympic National Park.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How was it created a national park?

Mr. NEUBERGER. By act of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. Was this monument, with 203,000 acres along the river, ever by act of Congress declared to be a national park? It was not.

The law authorizing national monuments provides that they must consist of the smallest acreage possible and that existing rights must be preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If we had not in the early days protected national monuments there would be very few national parks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to protect public-power sites just as much as the Senator from Oregon does, but the Senator is speaking of destroying power sites which the people in the upper basin need, power sites which would help Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am supporting the bulk of the power sites called for in the upper Colorado storage project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And for that I am grateful.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What I am saying is that I believe an alternative site could be found that would not result in flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. I am fully aware that a national monument is created by Executive order and that a national park is created by an act of Congress. I am aware of that. But very often our great national parks have begun as national monuments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that if it could be demonstrated to him that the Dinosaur National Monument would not be flooded out he would have no objection to the proposal?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say that if there would be no commercial development within a national monument, I would not object to the Echo Park Dam. But it would flood out the Dinosaur National Monument——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not. It would flood a part of the 203,000 acres within the extension, preserving the power rights. It would not cover the entire extended national monument, and not 1 acre of the original monument.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wyoming and I could argue from now until next Christmas about what the Executive order accomplished. The Executive order reserved only the Brown's Park site, on the extreme northern edge of the monument. If it reserved anything, that was the only part it reserved. It did not reserve the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon is now making interpretations of the Executive order, which contains specific language. The Senator acknowledges that he is not a lawyer. I say to him that his argument ought to be satisfactorily answered for him by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior under Harold Ickes, who was a defender of conservation of the national parks, that the power rights were being preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. One of the specific things which Solicitor Margold said was that the Federal Power Commission Act did not apply so far as national monuments were concerned.

Again, I return to the status of national monuments and national parks. In most instances, if the original monument had not been preserved, there would have been no park later on for Congress to create. I cite the Olympic National Park as an example.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was no national monument preceding Yellowstone; there was no national monument preceding Grand Teton; there was no national monument preceding Glacier National Park in Montana. In fact, I do not know of any national monument which preceded a national park, except Olympic; and I would have forgotten that had not the Senator referred to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe there is still a Grand Canyon National Monument. Am I not correct? I cannot say definitely, because I do not have the documents with me. I believe there is still Grand Canyon National Monument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is in Arizona. I am not certain about that. The fact is that a national park is created by act of Congress; a national monument is created by an act of the Executive. In this instance, although the Senator may argue about it, there was specific language in the Executive order, and there were interpretations of the order, making it clear that what is happening now, on the part of those whom the Senator is now defending, is a raid on the possibil-

ities of power development in the upper Colorado Basin. If the Senator from Oregon wants power development in his area, I hope he will give it to us in our area.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to say to my good friend, whose career I have so long admired, that I remember, when I was a new member of the Young Democrats in 1934, hearing a speech by the man who is now the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming. I believe that then he was an Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. He came to my city of Portland, where I heard him deliver a very eloquent and persuasive address. The 21 years which have intervened certainly have not dimmed his ability to make his point.

I appreciate his support of the Hells Canyon project. There are 39 various projects comprised in the upper Colorado Basin. I am supporting 38 of them. I wish, because of my admiration for the Senator, I could support all 39; but I am supporting 38 of them with all the vigor at my command.

If the Senator had been present during the early part of my remarks, I think he would have observed, as he will if he has the patience and forbearance to read my remarks tomorrow, when the RECORD is delivered at his doorstep, that my support of those 38 projects is no less enthusiastic than is his own.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I listened to almost every word the Senator has uttered. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the argument he presented at the beginning of his address. It seems to me that he has completely answered and utterly destroyed the arguments on the ground of alleged subsidy which have been made against the general subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator sincerely. I also wish to say to him that although he may not agree with me as to my stand on Echo Park—and it is obvious that he does not—I have tried to be consistent. I have applied to my own region the rule which I have tried to apply to his region.

RULE SHOULD APPLY TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

In the Pacific Northwest, where I live, and where I was born and reared, various demands have been made, which are still in progress, to bring about commercial development within the national park system. Much of that pressure has been brought to cut lumber in the Olympic National Park. This I have opposed. I have opposed it as a member of my State legislature, as a journalist, and as a Member of the United States Senate.

I have opposed the proposed construction of Glacier View Dam, within the Glacier National Park, although such a dam would provide storage that would increase the power production on the lower Columbia River, which is, of course, very important to my own State.

So the Senator from Wyoming can at least see that I am willing to apply to my own State and my own region the same standard concerning the national park system as I am applying to his region. I am not trying to propose one law for the goose and another for the gander.

Mr. President, I have been sent carbon copies of a number of letters which have been written to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] with reference to the views he has expressed in supporting the construction of Echo Park Dam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a telegram of April 16, 1955, from Mr. Richard M. Leonard, president of the Sierra Club; a letter dated April 15, 1955, from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation; a letter dated April 16, 1955, from Mr. Fred Smith, Council of Conservationists; a letter of April 15, 1955, from Gen. U. S. Grant 3d; and a letter dated yesterday, April 18, 1955, from Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: We acknowledge that this message is being rushed, but in view of the haste with which the Colorado River project is being considered in Congress we are wiring.

Thank you for your courteous letter of April 5, transmitting a copy of your statement of March 31 before the Senate.

The documents you cite concerning the effort of the 1938 Presidential proclamation on early power and reclamation withdrawals present arguments that have been fully set forth in the hearings before the previous Congress. Those arguments have been known for years to the Sierra Club and other competent national conservation organizations. They have been fully and objectively analyzed. The true situation can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Brown's Park withdrawal: There seems to be no question concerning the authority and intention of the President to enlarge Dinosaur National Monument, "Subject to the (repeat the) Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." The Federal Water Power Act of 1920 was made applicable to confirm the authority of the Federal Power Commission to administer that withdrawal.

2. All other withdrawals were superseded by the Presidential proclamation. It is part of our American way of life to have the opportunity for strong presentation of diverse viewpoints and then to have a final decision made by one who has authority and responsibility to settle the matter. The Federal Power Commission quite properly took a strong parochial interest in refusing voluntarily to release its jurisdiction over a number of the power filings and withdrawal which have been cited. The President concluded, however, after review of both sides of the matter, that the national interest would best be served by establishing the enlarged national monument subject only to the one (repeat one) reclamation withdrawal at Brown's Park at the extreme upper edge of the monument.

3. Evaporation: It is indeed amazing to see that the evaporating arithmetic of the Bureau of Reclamation is still being cited nearly 11 months after Under Secretary Tudor formally apologized to the previous Congress for the Bureau's miscalculations.

4. Finally, a precedent is established. I am sure you will agree, whenever Congress does something it has never done before. Congress has never permitted a dam to invade the national park system in any circumstances.

In the foregoing we use the repeat device only because Western Union has no better way to transmit emphasis. We appreciate your courtesy and again wish to stress that the Sierra Club does not oppose a sound upper Colorado project that does not adversely affect national parks, national monuments, or dedicated wilderness areas.

Respectfully,

RICHARD M. LEONARD,
President.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your long letter of April 5 in which you sent me a copy of your statement and brief which you presented at the House subcommittee hearing on the Colorado storage project. I had picked up a copy of your brief from the press table in the hearing room and, therefore, had enjoyed a previous opportunity to study it.

I have been interested in this latest argument advanced by yourself and other proponents of Echo Park Dam: That Dinosaur National Monument is subject to various previous withdrawals and reservations for power and reclamation, and that as a result Echo Park Dam would not be an invasion but rather the national monument "invaded the previous reservations." This conclusion, Senator WATKINS, can be arrived at only by the kind of double-jointed logic which lawyers have to be capable of in order to represent clients on either side of a case.

Because opposing advocates in the legal profession can take the same set of facts and arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions, yet pretended to be completely logical, the court has to use commonsense in reaching a decision. I am not a lawyer, but it is obvious to me that Congress and the public are going to have to use commonsense to arrive at a fair and intelligent conclusion in the Echo Park Dam controversy.

All of the old withdrawals and reservations listed in your brief and cited in your arguments were made by proclamation or Executive order by various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me only commonsense that a later proclamation by the highest executive officer, namely, the President, in the 1938 proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument, takes precedence over and cancels the previous withdrawals and reservations. Such was the opinion of a Department of Interior Solicitor who was quoted by your distinguished colleague in Congress, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, shortly after you left the House committee hearing on March 28. As I recall, that particular document was overlooked in your own argument.

As you know, the 1938 proclamation made the national monument enlargement subject only to one previous reservation, and that was the reclamation withdrawal for a dam at the Brown's Park site near the extreme northern edge of the area.

Here is another point of commonsense that I feel the Members of Congress will understand: Even the Brown's Park site reservation does not authorize construction of a hydroelectric dam by the Bureau of Reclamation in the national monument area. Only Congress can vote such authorization. For that reason the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior are at the present time asking Congress to enact authorizing legislation.

Congress has been asked to authorize dams and reservoirs in national parks and monuments before. It has never done so since the establishment of the national park system in 1916. Hence, if Congress should vote to authorize Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument, it would be the first time. It would be a clear precedent. And it would be a precedent that would be used

as a powerful argument in favor of any future proposals to build a similar project in another national park or monument.

I agree entirely, Senator WATKINS, with the view expressed in the last paragraph of your letter. There is no place for bitterness in the discussion and debate on the issues.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 16, 1955.*

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your very long and involved speech concerning the needless invasion of Dinosaur National Monument discloses several routine documents and makes interesting speculations about them. The case it sets out to build, however, is academic.

Your point is that power withdrawals were made in the present protected Dinosaur area long before this area became a national monument. The proclamation specifies that valid existing rights would be honored. You contend that the withdrawals are valid existing rights because the Federal Power Commission did not voluntarily vacate the withdrawals, but gratuitously offered to let the President proclaim a monument as long as he did not interfere with the Federal Power Commission; therefore, the Federal Power Commission claims are still in force. This point of view is concurred in by the Federal Power Commission, which is not surprising, but since when does the unilateral declaration of a participant in a dispute settle the dispute?

You attempt to bolster your case in an oblique way by slipping in commentary and references to law intended to convey the impression that the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument may in itself be illegal or improper because the area is now larger than necessary to protect the bed of bones in the original 80 acres. But do you find anything in the proclamation of 1938 indicating that this enlargement was intended to provide further protection for the bones? You will find evidence of such intent in Wilson's original proclamation, but not in Roosevelt's. Isn't it possible that the new area was set aside for quite different reasons—for the preservation of the historic canyons and the striking evidences of early Indian life that abound in Echo Park and other parts of the new area? You will recall that your evidence reveals the new area was originally planned as the Yampa Canyon National Monument, obviously to protect the Yampa Canyons, which you now propose to flood out.

Sometime before the proclamation the name was changed and the new and old areas were consolidated, probably because it would simplify matters to have one national monument rather than two in tandem.

Since it was the obvious intention of Messrs. Roosevelt and Ickes to prevent invasion of the Yampa Canyons, perhaps because they knew these dangerous withdrawals had been made in the area, there is little wonder that repeated efforts were made to eliminate possible bureaucratic conflicts by getting the Federal Power Commission to vacate its claims, which your legal advisers say could have been established by "the mere filing of an application for water privileges." And the continued refusal of the Federal Power Commission might easily have inspired the President to insert the important word "valid" before "existing rights" in the proclamation. Looking forward to the day when the Federal Power Commission might want to invade the area, he determined to protect the public interest. Only Congress could determine the validity of a claim staked out prior to the establishment of an area in which the claimant has, by law, no rights.

So the matter falls back into the lap of Congress. There is no easy way out. If Congress decides to continue protection of the area which is now threatened, the area which the monument was proclaimed to protect, then it can strike Echo Park from the upper Colorado project, and can do it without seriously interfering with the lives or economics of the 3 million people you speak of, a small portion of whom will be served by Echo Park Dam, and no other. Such an action will automatically nullify the withdrawals, if indeed they still exist, as a result of the very same law which specifically places national parks and monuments beyond the reach of the Federal Power Commission.

It may be a neat legal question as to whether the proclamation of 1938 actually creates a monument, or whether it only provides elbow room for mud flats. But it will be settled finally and forever by the action of this session of Congress when it rejects, as we hope it will, or authorizes Echo Park Dam. And there is only one issue before Congress on this matter—whether or not it wishes to nullify the fundamental intent of President Roosevelt in creating what was originally conceived as Yampa Canyon National Monument, in which it is reasonable to suppose he hoped there would be only 1 power development out of the 11 staked out by the Federal Power Commission. This one was at Browns Park. It would not interfere with the Yampa Canyons, and it was specifically excepted, by name, in the proclamation.

Whatever profusion of words is hurled about to confuse the issue, posterity and lobbyists for private interests will regard this vital congressional decision as either a reaffirmation of the traditional policy of protecting national monuments and parks—or as setting a precedent that in the judgment of Congress such areas have lost their value.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SMITH,
Director, Council of Conservationists.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your sending me a copy of your recent speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, together with your letter of April 5, was very much appreciated, especially as I had not previously been able to obtain a copy. Your speech and the exhibits accompanying it are evidence of your ability as a lawyer and advocate, a fact which I have never doubted and for years appreciated.

It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to argue at length any legal points with you. Moreover, I do not have the means or facilities to search for possible evidence upon which to base such an argument. Therefore, I am constrained to accept the withdrawals preceding the enlargement of the monument and the refusal of the Federal Power Commission to vacate them as established facts. However, since the Utah Power & Light Co. voluntarily withdrew their application, it appears that the withdrawals in force in 1938 were not vested rights in private property, but merely the earmarking of certain areas by a bureau of the Federal Government (by authority of Congress, to be sure) for a certain future use, that they did not establish any vested private property right, but were an administrative reservation of those areas for a use subsequently not made of them. Therefore, they were not recognized or protected by the subject to all valid existing rights clause, a general formula to protect the Government against the possible unintentional taking of private property without due process of law.

I do not believe it can be denied that such an earmarking of an area for a future use by one Government agency, which could have been disallowed by the President in the first place, may, if not so used in a reasonable length of time, be transferred to other Federal use by the President. This is what it seems to me to have been done by the 1938 Executive order enlarging the monument. To my simple mind, it seems logical to assume that the writer and issuer of the Executive order said what they meant and meant what they said. This view is confirmed by the explicit exemption in the order of one withdrawal (the Brown Park site) and no others, and by the specific provision for any exceptions to the full park use in the laws establishing certain national parks. I have always understood that the courts have generally held that the explicit mention of one exception in a legal document precludes others from being inferred.

It is pertinent and conclusive that the Executive order, after the clause "subject to all valid existing rights," goes on to say explicitly that the lands added "are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument"—manifestly all the withdrawals for power or irrigation previously made under the public land laws, which the courts have held do not apply to national parks and monuments, were explicitly rescinded by the proclamation with the one exception of the Brown's Park site. I do not see how there could be a clearer prescription contrary to your interpretation and in support of mine. The inter-agency correspondence between Mr. Demaray and Mr. McNinch was manifestly and intentionally overruled by the President and is no longer pertinent. It is hardly necessary to point out that, in order to prevent any doubt, the proclamation goes on to warn explicitly all against any inconsistent invasion or use of the land within the enlarged monument and even rescinds previous Executive orders making certain withdrawals.

The subsequent paragraph makes the specific exception of the Brown's Park site, but, in order that there could be no misunderstanding, says that the Federal Power Act shall prevail and it, as amended in 1935, denies to the Federal Power Commission any authority to issue permits for power development in the national parks or monuments.

Thus, Senator, on a mere layman's analysis of the question—and I have truly studied your presentation before the Senate carefully and conscientiously in the light of my nearly 50 years experience in Government administration—I am constrained most respectfully to stand by my previous interpretations of the legal status of the case against the Echo Park and Split Mountain dams, and as Shakespeare said—

"It must not be; there is no power in Venice
Can alter a decree established;
'Twill be a precedent;
And many an error by the same example
Will rush into the state."

We are more fortunate than Venice and Congress can by direct legislation, as now proposed, provide for this exception to its own previous enjoinder as to the maintenance of national parks and monuments to "leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations"; but it will still be a precedent, a breach of a sound policy adhered to since 1916, and we hope the Congress will be wise and foresighted in this case, as in the past, and not pass the legislation.

Of course, I am confident that in your advocacy of the proposed legislation you are conscientiously acting for what you believe the best interests of your constituents and of the Nation; just as I am conscientiously advocating the contrary. How the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to convince so

many intelligent and experienced men that this program is sound and economically feasible, is a great mystery to me. Having felt that Mr. Brown's and my statements sufficiently showed the contrary, and that the water your region so much needs and the requirements of the interstate compact can be otherwise provided for at less expense and with greater actual benefit to the region, it is hard to understand the ignoring of these statements and the continued support of a program which is evidently going to be so damaging to the Nation both economically and by destruction of one of its important assets, which should be preserved as part of our natural heritage.

The fact that the impossibility of the Echo Park Dam paying out, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the extravagance of power costs in its program, certainly established the fact that its cost estimates and economic analysis do not merit your confidence. As president of the American Planning and Civic Association, I was more or less constrained to focus my statements on the objections to the Echo Rock Dam and the fact that it is unnecessary because there are alternative and better solutions. But as a citizen and a former officer, owing so much to the Government and loyal to what I believe to be the best interests of the country at large, I did venture to indicate the program's unsoundness and the superficiality and probably untrustworthiness of the Bureau's analysis. But nothing has come of it. Neither the Chief of Engineers nor the Federal Power Commission, nor even the National Park Service, have been called in to testify, nor any nationally known engineers or economists. Only we conservationists, former Governor Miller, and the opponents from the lower basin were heard, and our statements have been treated with courteous disregard. We have been voices crying in the wilderness. While I realize that your committee could not expect to take my lone statements, however carefully prepared and still unanswered by the Bureau, without supporting views of competent persons in whom you had more confidence, you have continued to believe in a bad and unsound program, and in the assurances of those proven wrong in so many instances.

My high regard for you personally, and your splendid services in the National Congress, make it very painful to differ with you so radically on this subject; and my appreciation of human fallibility apprises me of the audacity of my differing with one of such long experience and great ability. However, I can find nothing in my 4 years connection with this case to raise a doubt as to the correctness of my analysis and conclusions, so I am constrained to continue to differ with you and to believe that the Congress and the Nation are entitled, when the question is raised, to a candid statement of the views to which I have been impelled.

Respectfully yours,

U. S. GRANT 3D.

NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your 5-page letter of April 5, and the enclosed copy of your March 28 speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, have been studied carefully. While we expected that an eminent lawyer of your known ability would present a strong legal argument for that billion-dollar project, it occurs to us that the Echo Park Dam issue was documented too well.

When you charge that the Dinosaur National Monument actually constituted an invasion of previously authorized power withdrawals, and that those withdrawals have priority over the use of the land, you should not have so conveniently included that December 5, 1930, opinion of Nathan R. Margold, former solicitor of the Department of the Interior. All of your contentions were refuted by Mr. Margold's statement that "It is clear that the Federal Power Commission is by statute expressly prohibited from granting licenses for power works within national monuments. In my opinion of August 19, 1938, I so held. It follows that if the lands affected by the power site classifications are included in the national monument, the Federal Power Commission will be without authority to grant licenses affecting them. Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character."

It has been charged repeatedly that the National Park Service promised in the 1936 hearings in Utah that Echo Park Dam could be built within the expanded boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Surely, an agency vested with the tremendous responsibility of administering our national park system was cognizant of the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Act, which provides that no power licenses shall be issued in any existing or new national parks or monuments. The National Park Service had no authority to make such a promise—that authority rests with the Congress. Furthermore, the Park Service representatives who conducted those Utah hearings were instructed by the then Interior Secretary, Harold L. Ickes, that the future development of water, power, and minerals would be determined by the Congress. In fact, the recorded proceedings of those hearings show that not one word was said about water development.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Secretary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to say further, with respect to the general policy of protecting scenic areas, that in the Pacific Northwest it is my opinion that the last commercial projects which should be undertaken anywhere, be they in the national parks, the national monuments, the national forests, or elsewhere, should be those which will destroy scenic or wildlife values.

FISHING SHOULD BE PROTECTED

For example, the Governor of Oregon, in testifying during the Hells Canyon hearings in Portland several weeks ago, suggested that perhaps greater flood control than that to be achieved at Hells Canyon could be gained by damming the Salmon River in Idaho. Perhaps the Governor of Oregon is right; I do not know. But if the suggestion of the Governor of Oregon were followed about possibly damming the Salmon River in Idaho, that would be the end of commercial fishing and of sports fishing on the Columbia River, because about 80 percent of the annual spring run of chinook salmon spawns in the headwaters of the Salmon River. I have been camping at the headwaters near Agency Creek and have seen the fish spawning where Lewis and Clark came. They nearly form a bridge across the Salmon River. But if we would follow the notion of the Governor of Oregon and dam the Salmon River for flood control, needed though it might be, the salmon-fishing industry and the great sports fishing on the lower Columbia would be destroyed.

We have proposals in the Northwest to build dams at Bruce's Eddy and at Penny Cliffs on the Clearwater River. They would be great dams. Yet those dams would flood out the great Selway Wilderness area and the Lochsa Wilderness area.

I have camped with Mrs. Neuberger on the Lochsa and on the Lolo Trail, which is one part of the original Lewis and Clark trail that is still wild. I think it would be shameful, now, to have a lake or reservoir at the Lochsa and at the Selway and to flood out those great elk meadows and to eliminate the areas that stretch up the Lolo trail where Lewis and Clark bivouacked and which is the last place where Americans can see what our country must have been like as the first white men camped there. I think to build dams in scenic areas before the very last potential kilowatt is utilized elsewhere would be a crime against future generations of Americans.

I have taken the position, and have held to it all my adult life, that the last power and irrigation projects that ought to be built are those that destroy scenic and recreational values and the wildlife of our country.

As we pass the 160 million mark in population, we have all too few places like the Lochsa Wilderness area and like the Dinosaur National Monument, where people can go and somehow get away from the tensions and anxieties of the civilization we have created.

OREGON WILDLIFE FEDERATION OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

On April 14, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] wrote to me a letter stating that the State wildlife federations of some States had dissented from the stand against Echo Park Dam taken by the National Wildlife Federation.

The resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur Nation Monument was adopted at the Federation's 19th annual convention in Montreal last month. The letter of the Senator from Utah said that the delegate from the Oregon Wildlife Federation, which supported this stand last year, had voted against the resolution at the Montreal convention this year.

However, Mr. Carl B. Ramsey, the fine president of the Oregon Wildlife Federation, has wired me that the Oregon group is still opposed to construction of any dam within a national park or monument. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing Echo Park Dam, the letter of the Senator from Utah to me, and Mr. Ramsey's telegram to me, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 9, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently

cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our national park system is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 14, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the national organization, which opposes this unit of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The Federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

WALLA WALLA, WASH., *April 17, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Wildlife Federation is on record as opposing any legislation that would constitute an invasion of our national park system. If F. R. Brown, our alternate delegate to the National Wildlife Federation meeting in Montreal, voted favoring Echo Park Dam, he voted uninstructed and certainly did not express the sentiment of the Oregon Wildlife Federation.

CARL B. RAMSEY,
President, Oregon Wildlife Federation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I was impressed by the able speech of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico when he cited the reclamation history in our country. Yet, a very illustrious American who was closely associated with the Senator from New Mexico when the Senator served so ably as the Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Truman, and who has great affection for the Senator from New Mexico, has taken an opposite position. When the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, who served under the Senator from New Mexico and served so closely with him, was Lyle F. Watts. Mr. Watts is not a man who opposes sound commercial development where it can take place. Under his tenure as Chief of the Forest Service, timber cutting showed an increase of 200 or 300 percent to meet the exigencies of our wartime needs during World War II. Yet Mr. Watts, who is now one of the most beloved and most distinguished residents of my home community of Portland, Oreg., has taken the position that the proposed dam at Echo Park should not be built.

I realize, I might point out, that Echo Park is not in the truest sense a park, but is merely a point within the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read the letter which I received from the distinguished ex-Chief of the Forest Service:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 15, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: For many years I have been interested in the development of the upper Colorado Basin. I lived in the intermountain region for 18 years and know that the area badly needs to store its available water for agriculture, power, and industry. I retired as chief of the United States Forest Service on June 30, 1952.

Again I have opposed the invasion of our national parks and monuments for commercial purposes. Generally we have too little rather than too much area set aside for that purpose. The present overuse of existing areas coupled with the rapid increase in our population substantiates that belief.

It is my considered opinion that the above two premises need not be conflicting as related to the Colorado River.

S. 500 now before the Senate would authorize the development of the upper Colorado Basin. As the bill now reads one of the many projects for which authorization is sought is the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. It is my interpretation of the situation that the rest of the development would be feasible without Echo Park Dam.

I strongly urge that the Senate approve S. 500 only if the Echo Park Dam is excluded.

Sincerely,

LYLE F. WATTS.

I have read the full text of this letter so that I may call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that many of the people who oppose Echo Park Dam are not enemies, in any sense of the word, of the upper Colorado storage project as a whole. Mr. Watts, up to the time when he reached the pinnacle of his career as chief of the United States Forest Service, was regional forestry director at Missoula, and he served in Utah, Montana, and Colorado. He knows the Upper Colorado region. He knows the truth of what the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have said about the need for putting water on this arid land, which can support many crops if only it can receive irrigation. He supports the project as a whole, but he, like many other people who understand the situation, are opposed to the Echo Park Dam.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a considerable number of messages which I have received from other persons who are interested in conservation and the protection of our resources, regarding the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAZAMAS,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: We are very pleased and proud of your stand against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado project.

We believe that any breach in the national park system will result in further violations, and we can see no justification for the violation of Dinosaur National Monument at this time.

In appreciation for your action, we shall do all we can to support you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT and MARTHA PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you oppose outrageous inclusion Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado River development.

PAMELA S. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. H. C. Olmstead,
VIRGINIA B. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. L. S.,
ROBERT S. BOUTELL.

EVERETT, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you go through with your amendment to the upper Colorado bill. It is certainly desirable.

PHILIP H. ZALESKY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to be on record as supporting the amendment to S. 500 for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado River storage project.

WILLIAM A. DEGENHARDT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We object to Echo Park Dam being included in upper Colorado River storage proj-

ect and urge your support in having it deleted from present bill.

WARD and LOIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The questionable economic soundness of upper Colorado project is poor excuse for wrecking Dinosaur National Monument. Urge deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500. Reservoir recreation abundantly available elsewhere but no amount of money can ever replace the national park system. Let's save it.

V. L. and M. L. FISCHER.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your continued and unswerving opposition to inclusion of Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado development. Genuine justification entirely lacking. Log-rolling and political back scratching passes rivers and harbors bills but whole national park principle is at stake today. Delete Echo Park site and upper Colorado development acceptable to all.

NICK ELBURN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. I strongly urge you to support an amendment to upper Colorado bill to eliminate this dam from project. I appreciate need for water in West's arid regions but also see increasing need for national parks of exceptional natural beauty.

VICTOR JOSENDAL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We proudly commend your stand for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado project. We strongly oppose any invasion of Dinosaur Monument and urge Senate consideration and study of alternate sites without the monument. Best wishes.

MARTHA and ROBERT PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please help preserve Dinosaur National Monument by voting against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the Colorado River project.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN D. HEATH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest against Echo Park Dam Dinosaur National Monument.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA WIRTANEN.

OSWEGO, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Dinosaur National Monument must not be scuttled to build Echo Park Dam. The National Park System was created to perpetuate singular irreplaceable natural features and violating its policy for cheap hydroelectric power is false economy and short-sighted with atomic power's potential uncertain.

Mr. and Mrs. W. H. OBERTEUFFER.

CI——293

TACOMA, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Hon. R. L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Knowing your interest in our national parks I urge that you work for deletion of Echo Park Dam site in Dinosaur National Monument from the upper Colorado storage bill.

LEO GALLAGHER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I oppose any needless encroachment upon our national parks and monuments and urge the deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500.

DONNEL N. WILLIAMS.

PASADENA, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: While I don't live in Oregon, I lecture to about 2,000 Oregonians a year and could perhaps influence quite a few. I don't like the Echo Park Dam. I hear you oppose it too and hope you can persuade a lot of Democrats to go along with you.

Any breach in our National Park System would encourage other selfish groups to try it. Our National Parks are shabby, rundown, understaffed, and overwhelmed by the crowds of tourists already. It seems almost treasonable that the Department of Interior should propose to destroy one of the very areas it is entrusted to protect. Dinosaur is the only sanctuary on the whole upper Colorado that was supposedly safe from that type of venal exploitation.

Echo Park Dam's proponents should be reminded: Strike out the Echo Park Dam and its pressure groups will in time forgive and forget. But conservationists will never forgive those responsible for desecration like that. The dam would stand as a reminder for all time. In fact, I can be counted on myself to remind a few hundred thousand people a year about the folly of Echo Park Dam. Let's hope I don't have to.

Sincerely,

STAN MIDGLEY.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,
Hanover, N. H., April 17, 1955.
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Comparable letter to the attached has been mailed this date to each United States Senator from New England and New York.

Good luck with the Echo Park amendment. We appreciate your interest—and your promise of action.

Yours truly,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
College Forester and Manager of College Outing Properties.

APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB,
Boston, Mass., April 17, 1955.
Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NORRIS: I have been authorized by the officers of the Appalachian Mountain Club, with 5,000 members sufficiently interested in its outdoor program to pay annual dues of $7.50, to express the club's opinion on the following subject.

We have followed with understandable interest congressional action with respect to S. 500, which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project with amendments, as reported (No. 128) on March 30 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We understand that when this bill reaches the floor shortly, probably on April 20, Senator NEUBERGER will offer an amendment that would exclude the controversial Echo Park Dam from the project.

Proponents of the Echo Park Dam, having failed to present a convincing case for its need for national defense, irrigation, or power purposes are currently concentrating on its alleged recreational benefits. We have personal knowledge and firm convictions in that field which oblige us to express our opinion that the Dinosaur National Monument will produce far greater public recreational benefits by not allowing the invasion of its unique terrain with a man-made dam and a fluctuating flowage.

The Appalachian Mountain Club hopes you will support the Neuberger amendment, thereby eliminating that portion of the project to which we strenuously object and leaving the balance of the program for such authorization as the Congress may consider feasible.

I have not forgotten your comment at the last session that you had received more correspondence on this one subject than upon any other, even those affecting New Hampshire directly. Vote for the Neuberger amendment and you'll hear no more from the opponents of the Echo Park Dam.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
Chairman, Conservation Committee;
Forester, Dartmouth College.

APRIL 16, 1955.

Senator NEUBERGER: I am in favor of the amendment excluding Echo Park from the upper Colorado project.

JUNE HAIGHT.

ALAMEDA, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to sincerely commend you for your vote in committee to delete the proposed dam in Echo Park of the Dinosaur Monument. I am sure conservationists all over the country were happy about that evidence of your understanding of the value of our national park system, and your intention to resist their invasion. I suspect too few of our law makers in Washington do have that clear understanding, and do recognize that outstanding values, even if in intangible denominations, are sometimes too great to sacrifice for local or regional economic gain. In this case there are so many other solutions to the problem, by which both park values and the desired conservation of the water can be secured, that it seems incomprehensible that the sacrifice should be condoned. Not incomprehensible for men from Utah, western Colorado and perhaps New Mexico and Arizona. Human nature does not change much—and the presentation of potential billions to the economy of the region, in the form of pork barrel, can be counted on to submerge more logical and far-sighted attitudes.

I do not happen to be one of your constituents—though I know a good many of them quite well. Your election was not entirely a surprise, because Secretary McKay did some very telling campaign work for you among those dedicated to preserve our fine parks unimpaired. Needless to say he did not realize it at the time he was adding his verbal approval for a tramway up Ranier, to his written approval of the Dinosaur sacrifice. I was delighted that you won the election. I have the feeling that we desperately need a Senator who really understands park values, and who is not unwilling to fight to preserve them. Your newness in the Senate may indeed be an advantage—if you are willing to take up the challenge, and take

upon yourself the role of park champion. So far as I know there is a vacancy at that very point—and I am sincerely hoping you will fill it, and that you can do so very effectively. It will be a grand role to play—and will bring you the sincere admiration and gratitude of millions of our people who do love our park system because they enjoy it, and other millions who have in the past visited and enjoyed the parks. One fifth of our total population will visit them this year, and the number mounts each season. The number actually visiting the Dinosaur—by the river route, which is the only way it can be really seen—will be up way above the number who visited Yosemite in 1893 when I first saw it. Yosemite now attracts a million a year.

My congratulations and sincere good wishes.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD C. BRADLEY,
Professor Emeritus,
Medical School, University of Wisconsin.

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., April 15, 1955.

SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are in back of you 100 percent and we are writing our opposal of the Echo Park Dam, in hopes that it will be of some value when the fight comes to the floor.

We oppose Echo Park Dam, but not sound development of the Colorado River.

Respectfully,

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
FRANCES SWIMM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

P. S.—Letters have been sent to Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, also opposing this dam.

BOULDER, COLO., *April 15, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is just a line to tell you that "we the people" are greatly pleased at the stand you have taken on the Echo Park Dam controversy.

We were asked to send copies of our letters of prqtest to you. I cannot do that—but I can say that I have just written to Senators HARRY F. BYRD and PAUL DOUGLAS.

Very truly yours,

AMY M. BOWEN
(Mrs. Albert).

COLORADO CONSERVATIONIST OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I stated earlier in my remarks that one of the things which surprised me very much was the fact that I had been receiving a number of letters from people in the upper Colorado Basin who themselves are opposed to Echo Park Dam. I have not chosen to put these letters into the RECORD, because I realize that perhaps feeling in those States is quite tense on this issue, and I would not want to subject the persons to embarrassment. I should like, however, to read parts of a letter from one of the most distinguished Colorado conservationists, Mr. Arthur H. Carhart, whose articles and books in the field of conservation are well known. I read from his letter:

The most serious issue involved in this controversy is the breaching of national park policy. Proponents of the dam argue it was contemplated that dams would be permitted in the Dinosaur National Monument at the time President Roosevelt's proclamation enlarged that park unit in 1938. * * *

The comparatively few who seem to think they will benefit or fulfill some commitments if they can force this dam into the national park unit will cry out that this will not be a breach in protections we have maintained for our parks, but the record denies their contentions. Congress can not afford to be confused in this issue; the future of the entire national park system is at stake.

Mr. President, I shall not read further from the letters; but I desire to comment on two editorials which have appeared in one of the finest newspapers in the intermountain West, namely, the Denver Post. The Denver Post, which supports the upper Colorado River project and the Echo Park phase of that project, has been critical of my position in this matter. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials from the Denver Post, one being from the issue of April 10, 1955, and the other being from the issue of April 14, 1955, both taking the opposing viewpoint from mine, and urging that the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project be authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of April 10, 1955]

A BAD ENTRANCE

It is reported that Senator NEUBERGER, Oregon's new Democratic Senator, will try to kill the Echo Park Dam when the upper Colorado River storage project bill comes before the Senate for vote. Mr. NEUBERGER is siding with the conservationists who believe the dam is a precedent-setting invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The young Senator rejects the relative need and merits of that dam, as an essential unit for power production and water storage. He does not, in other words, accept the findings of engineering and economic justification which have compelled the Bureau of Reclamation to insist upon the Echo Park barrier as essential to the whole upper Colorado Basin project.

NEUBERGER does accept, however, the Bureau's case for the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. He embraces that project as an essential part of a basinwide river-control and power-producing plan to harness the Columbia and its tributaries. His whole case for the Hells Canyon Dam rests upon the studies and recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation—the same Bureau whose findings of fact and firm proposals in the case of Echo Park he rejects.

The legal questions involved in withdrawing the dam site from the national monument, and the effect of such withdrawal upon the inviolability of other monuments and national parks, were exhaustively explored a few days ago in the Senate by Senator WATKINS of Utah. NEUBERGER, we feel sure, is somewhat less of an authority on the administrative history of the monument and the statutory implications in the Colorado project bill, than is his colleague from Utah.

This suggests to us that the freshman Senator from the Pacific coast is plunging somewhat blindly into a controversy, and exposing himself to the grossest inconsistency of viewpoint in doing so. As champion of the Bureau's choice on the Snake his neck is out a mile for spurning one of the two essential facilities for the Bureau's plan on the Colorado.

Lacking full information on the history of the monument (as we believe he does), NEUBERGER appears to be working both sides of the street on this issue.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would "invade" the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would "threaten" the national park system.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which:

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by Presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Water Power Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally "vacated" the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Water Power Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not "invading" this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying in effect to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational

reserves. Once the inviolability of the park system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks. * * *"

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an "onslaught" similar to that of "private enterprise" imperiling the national park system?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent of those who believe the dam "would set a fatal precedent."

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—with whom we have pleasurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

PRESERVE OUR PARKS, REGARDLESS OF THE REGION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to discuss very briefly my reply to the editors of the Denver Post. I wish to say that these editors are personal friends of mine, and for them I have very great personal affection and respect. I should like to say that my reply points out what I said earlier to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] namely, that the position I have taken regarding Dinosaur National Monument is the same as the position I have taken regarding proposals that there be commercial development in the national parks within my own Pacific Northwest region. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my reply, dated April 19, 1955, to the editors of the Denver Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1955.

To the EDITOR OF THE DENVER POST:

Because of my respect for the editors of the Denver Post and their integrity, I would value the opportunity to reply to your editorial criticism of me because I am opposed to the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

1. You claim I am inconsistent because I favor Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River but oppose Echo Park Dam on the Green River.

If Hells Canyon Dam were inside a national park or monument, I would not recommend it. As a resident of the Northwest, I favor commercial timber-cutting in many areas but I oppose such cutting within the forests of the Olympic National Park. Is this being inconsistent? For many years, I have been against any commercial activity inside parks and monuments. I oppose Glacier View Dam in Glacier National Park, for example, quite as much as I oppose Echo Park Dam—although the Glacier View project would add to power production in the Columbia River basin, where I live.

2. You criticize me for accepting the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation at Hells Canyon and rejecting them at Echo Park.

The engineers who made the recommendation to build Echo Park Dam may not have given much weight to the intangible values of protecting the scenic beauty of a national monument, which they may have felt too irrelevant, but which the Senate has an obligation to consider. Remember that until Secretary McKay, no Secretary of the Interior had recommended authorization of Echo Park Dam. Secretary Chapman, himself from Denver, Colo., modified the report of the Bureau of Reclamation to omit Echo Park Dam pending further study of alternative sites.

For your information, it was the Army engineers—in their famous 308 report—who made the original and basic recommendation that Hells Canyon Dam be erected.

3. You might comment on the inconsistency of some of the Senators from the Rocky Mountain States who advocate Echo Park Dam, Glen Canyon Dam, and others on the upper Colorado, but subscribe to the administration viewpoint that Hells Canyon Dam is "creeping socialism."

4. You accept without question Senator WATKINS' claim that the 1938 proclamation reserved the Echo Park waters for irrigation, power, etc. Yet this is by no means the only legal viewpoint. Legal experts as familiar with the upper Colorado as Senator WATKINS claim that Browns Park, and that alone, was the sole site preserved by the 1938 proclamation—and this on the extreme edge of the monument. Furthermore, the Solicitor of the Interior Department held as early as 1939 that the proclamation could not give the Federal Power Commission authority over dinosaur sites which exceeded prevailing national monument policy.

To argue these legal points could become endless without reaching the basic question at issue, as I see it: Shall a commercial dam be authorized by Congress, for the first time in American history, for construction within the boundaries of a national park or monument?

I believe the answer ought to be in the negative.

There are approximately 15 similar proposals all over the land for dams, tunnels or water diversions in parks and monuments. I oppose them all—those in my own region and in other regions.

You contend Echo Park would not be a fatal precedent, leading to these further invasions. Can you safely make so categorical a statement?

I fear Echo Park would lead eventually to the other invasions. After all, the irrigationists and power users proposing the other park and/or monument invasions can make arguments quite as compelling as those of the upper Colorado advocates.

I believe there can be found alternative sites to Echo Park which would leave our national park system intact. This is important in an era when so few wonder spots actually have been preserved for future generations.

I believe you will be interested to learn that my mail, including letters from the State of Colorado, is running heavily in support of the conviction that our national park system should be left alone so far as any exploitation or diversion is concerned.

You have said I plunged blindly and recklessly into the controversy. For 20 years as a journalist and a State legislator, I have held firmly to the position that commercial activity was undesirable in national parks and monuments. I have maintained this stand in the Pacific Northwest, despite the desire of major lumber interests to fell some of the magnificent fir and spruce "rain forests" of the Olympics. It has not always been easy to stick to such a stand in the face of local pressures and opinion, but I have not deviated.

I hope that the editors of the Denver Post, for whom I have a high personal affection and regard, will come eventually to think that my stand on Echo Park Dam is at least worthy of their respect—if not their agreement.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

BOOK DEPICTS GRANDEUR OF DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, through contributions from conservationists throughout the country, there has been sent to every Member of the Senate, I believe, during the past week, a book entitled "This Is Dinosaur." The book is published by Alfred A. Knopf & Co., one of the leading book publishers in the United States. The book includes essays by leading advocates of conservation, by river runners, by wildlife experts, by geologists, by botanists, and by others, who do not wish to see a dam constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read three paragraphs from the book, so that the gist of what these conservationists have said will appear in the RECORD. I shall read from the chapter entitled "The National Park Idea." It is a contribution to the book by Mr. Alfred A. Knopf, himself.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the book was edited by Mr. Wallace Stegner, one of the most widely known and talented novelists in the Nation.

I read now what Mr. Knopf says:

Thirty-five years ago one George K. Davol wanted to build a cableway across the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. To Stephen T. Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, this seemed, as it would seem to almost anyone today, simply monstrous. John Barton Payne, his Secretary of the Interior, supported Mather's denial of the request, and that was that. Another proposal called for the building of an elevator alongside the 308-foot Great Falls of the Yellowstone. And Secretary Franklin K. Lane was at one time eager to use Yellowstone Lake—the largest body of water in America at so great an altitude, 7,731 feet—for irrigation. That would have made it a draw-down reservoir, with results to its beauty that we can imagine but do not like to visualize. In his 1919 report, Mather wrote: "Is there not some place in this great Nation of ours where lakes can be preserved in their natural state; where we and all generations to follow us can enjoy the beauty and charm of mountain waters in the midst of primeval forests? The country is large enough to spare a few such lakes and beauty spots. The Nation has wisely set apart a few national parks where a state of nature is to be preserved. If the lakes and forests of these parks cannot be spared from the hand of commercialization, what hope can there be for the preservation of any scenic features of the mountains in the interest of posterity?"

The story of the years-long attempt by Ralph Henry Cameron, onetime Senator from Arizona, to keep the Grand Canyon region from being adequately developed as a park is too long to tell here. Mining claims were the chief basis of Cameron's power, and only the Supreme Court was able finally to polish him off.

There are always some people who want to mine in the parks, cut timber, graze cattle, build ski lifts and aerial tramways, turn into four-lane superhighways the roads that now are quiet and self-effacing and built

so that those who drive them can see in peace and relaxation what they came to see. There is constant pressure to develop resort and recreational facilities which could not be placed in any park without impairing it for the present as well as for future generations. Such facilities, moreover, are not needed in the parks; they exist in abundance outside, in hundreds of resort areas as well as on most reclamation lakes and to a limited degree in the national forests.

Mr. President, that is the end of the quotation I shall read from Mr. Knopf. I cite it merely to show what a very distinguished representative American thinks of this basic issue.

WOMEN'S CLUBS URGE CONSERVATION OF SCENIC WONDERS

Mr. President, before I conclude, I wish to say this issue is important to many Americans. I now hold in my hand a telegram from a very beloved lady in my own State, Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg. She is conservation chairman of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States. She supports the upper Colorado project, but urges deletion of the Echo Park plan.

I also have before me a telegram from Howard Zahniser, Washington representative of the Council of Conservationists. His telegram is along the same general theme. I ask unanimous consent that both telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to delete Echo Park Dam from Senate bill 500.

Mrs. MARION T. WEATHERFORD,
Conservation Chairman,
General Federation of Womens Clubs.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 17, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The upper Colorado storage project, S. 500, is scheduled for Senate action today, Monday, April 18. This bill includes the unnecessary location of a dam, the Echo Park Dam, in the Dinosaur National Monument. This dam would destroy the natural beauty of the scenic wild canyons of this monument and would set a dangerous precedent. Millions of Americans are relying on you to take the Echo Park Dam out of this bill and thus protect the national park system from invasion by dams.

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Washington Representative,
Council of Conservationists.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not a particularly pleasant task for a freshman Senator, who has been a Member of this body for less than 4 months, to oppose his views to those of such distinguished Members as the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and many other outstanding Members of this body. However, this is a stand which means a great deal to me. It was a part of my general philosophy long before I entered politics. My wife and I share it together. If anyone will take the trouble to do so—although I am sure no one will, because people have more urgent things to do—he could see many articles, listed in Readers' Guides, which I have written, and which have been published in leading periodicals, setting forth the definite conviction that there should be no commercial development—whether by private industry or by the Federal Government or by any other unit of government—in our national parks or national monuments. I have adhered to that philosophy, whether it affects the regions represented by other Senators or whether it affects the region I represent, as a United States Senator from the State of Oregon.

PROJECT SUPPORTED IN GENERAL—SAVE FOR ECHO PARK

Mr. President, I have tried to be fair about this matter. When I made the motion that the Echo Park proposal be eliminated from the pending bill—which motion I made as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—I did not do so in opposition to the entire upper Colorado storage project. Indeed, my name is signed to the majority report; it is signed as one of the supporters of that project. My dissent applies only to Echo Park. I think the other Senators know that; and I have made that position abundantly clear, not only here today, but also in speeches and writings which have taken place off the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. President, I say to the Senators who are supporting the upper Colorado project that I urge upon them this position: Some day, perhaps, as our vast Nation develops, not only in the intermountain region, but everywhere else, it may be necessary to flood the Dinosaur National Monument, in order to obtain kilowatts costing even 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, and to get water storage. It may even be necessary to cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, if we then have come to the end of our timber supply everywhere else. It may be necessary to flood out the Lochsa Wilderness area and the Selway Wilderness area, and to flood out Glacier National Park. It may be necessary to take water from Yellowstone Lake to irrigate land when we are near the end of our food supply, as the Senator from New Mexico prophesies might happen some day. I agree with him that despite our present food surplus, this eventually could occur, as this vast Nation increases so rapidly in population. But I say to Senators who are sponsoring the upper Colorado project, "Do this last, when every other single kilowatt has been developed, when every other canyon which can be filled with water has been filled with water. Develop Echo Park at the very last. Wait until the end of all our other resources to flood out this magnificent scenic area and to breach our national park system." I say that to Senators, just as I have said to those in the lumber industry in the Northwest—and the lumber industry is still the basic industry in my region—"When every other tree has been felled and there is not another stick of timber left, then cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, but not one day before then."

So I announce in conclusion that it is my very firm belief that the Senate should pass Senate bill 500, providing for the upper Colorado storage project, but that we definitely should eliminate the authorization for Echo Park Dam in order to preserve the integrity of our national park system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss some of the economic implications and aspects of the pending legislation.

It is fair to say that in my judgment the economic and financial feasibility of the program proposed by S. 500 is open to serious question. Even the limited plan of development recommended by the Interior Department has been challenged on the ground it would require a tremendous subsidy in the form of interest payments added to the national debt. The justifications for the more ambitious and comprehensive plan embodied in the bill, by reason of the amendments recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are even more difficult to accept.

The findings of feasibility are achieved by a very novel approach to the problem of reclamation projects.

The novel bookkeeping used to justify the projects in this bill acknowledges that the agricultural lands to be served by the participating projects cannot bear the costs that would have to be charged if the established repayment formula for irrigation projects should be applied. This is true even in the case of the 11 new participating projects recommended by the Reclamation Bureau. It is even more true as regards the 22 other units the committee saw fit to add.

The Interior Department figures show that $164,702,600 of the construction cost of $304,356,000 for the participating projects it proposed would be repaid by revenues from sale of power generated at the six main dams. The dependence upon sale of hydroelectric-energy is even more pronounced when the projects added by the committee are examined. The 22 additional units would cost $569,925,800. Irrigation water users would repay only $73,165,700 and $492,983,300 of the reimbursable outlay is expected to come from power revenues.

This means that if the Federal Treasury ever is be reimbursed for the repayable portion of the outlay of $874,281,800 for the 33 participating projects contemplated by this bill it will have to collect $657,685,900 through sale of electricity. The repayment by agricultural water users would be less than one-eighth of the expenditure to build the works which would put water on their land.

Two of the participating projects would provide municipal and industrial water. From these, San Juan-Chama and Central Utah, the repayments would be increased by an estimated $72,275,000. Even including this figure, the total return by water users would be only $180,487,200 toward an investment of $874,281,800, or less than 22 percent.

The percentage of cost to be repaid by irrigators varies amazingly. It ranges from 1 percent in the case of the Ohio Creek unit, estimated to cost $3,402,000,

to 100 percent for the small Woody Creek unit, which would require an outlay of merely $177,700.

The repayment by water users ought to be vital to consideration of this legislation. Federal money is being sought on the grounds these projects will carry out the principles and aims of the Reclamation Law of 1902. The analysis demonstrates that the repayment ability of the irrigators on the 22 units added by the committee is only 13.8 percent overall.

Another test of financial soundness is the actual cost of putting water on the lands to be served. For the 22 projects added by the committee this figure is $680 per acre just to get water where it can be used. For the 11 more carefully surveyed and planned units recommended by the Interior Department, the cost would be $410 per acre. There is a question whether an average cost of $545 to get water to land where irrigators can repay such small fractions is an economically feasible expenditure.

The participating projects can be justified only by using a rubber yardstick. The construction cost in terms of land to be served ranges from $60 per acre on the Woody Creek unit to $1,530 per acre on the Navajo unit.

Uncertainty about economic feasibility extends beyond the participating projects. The soundness of some of the major storage dams and hydroelectric plants can be questioned on the basis of Interior Department reports.

I recall, for example, that during the hearings some discussion occurred with respect to the background of Glen Canyon, and the feasibility of that particular project. On page 108 of the hearings on Senate bill 500 I quoted from a letter which the present Secretary of the Interior had written to a citizen of my State. I wish now to quote from that letter. The Secretary wrote:

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time."

On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or 60 feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

Mr. President, some of us on the committee, who are admittedly not experts in the technical and professional fields, assuredly possess the right to have some concern when the Secretary of the Interior indicates in a letter that his professional advisers feel some anxiety with respect to one of the major projects involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, let me cite, as an instance, the Curecanti project. That is one of the key structures to be built only after plans are reviewed by the Department, and after the Secretary has certified to Congress and the President that he is convinced the benefits will exceed the costs.

The Reclamation Bureau report on the Curecanti unit, according to the printed hearings, says that "detailed studies are necessary to refine the economic scale of development and to confirm the present reconnaissance appraisal."

Another major structure to be built only after further investigation is similarly doubtful as to feasibility. This is the Juniper Dam, which the committee substituted for the original proposal to build a major structure and powerplant at Cross Mountain. The Reclamation Bureau told the committee that the combined Juniper and Little Cross Mountain units would be "less attractive for power development than the large single Cross Mountain unit" which was dropped from the original plan.

Another question can be raised about Juniper. The Reclamation Bureau has failed to come up with any estimate of revenues from the Juniper powerplant, although it includes in the cost figures an item of $4,584,000 for generating equipment, and another of $1,250,000 for transmission lines, and says the hydroelectric output will be 125 million kilowatt-hours annually. Apparently the Interior Department has some reservations about the marketability of the power from this plant.

Mr. President, again I wish to refer to the hearings before the committee, at page 232. Forty lines of type are devoted to a description of the Juniper project, upon which there is no kind of feasibility report whatever.

There is considerable doubt whether the demand for energy from the six big units will be as great as sponsors of the development believe will be the case. Since the feasibility of the whole program depends so much on power revenues, I want to point out that the record made by the Interior Committee does little to remove this uncertainty whether the sales will bring in the tremendous amounts expected, or the $1,566,838,200 shown in Bureau reports as prospective income from power sales.

The price which will be charged for energy from these units will be 6 mills per kilowatt hour. This hardly can be called low-cost power, when compared with rates of 2 mills for Hoover Dam power and 2.5 mills for Columbia Basin power. The Reclamation Bureau acknowledges that in two cases, Curecanti and Flaming Gorge, "a power rate of more than 6 mills would be required for these units to repay their construction cost in 50 years at 2.5 percent interest."

The difference between the financing proposed for the Upper Colorado River project and the first development in the Lower Basin, Hoover Dam, is startling. Before any work was started on Hoover Dam, firm contracts had been negotiated for sale of power. The private utilities operating in the Upper Basin have told the committee merely that they are ready to take large blocks providing the price is right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I would prefer not to yield until I have concluded my remarks, which will be within 3 or 4 minutes.

On the question of feasibility, I want to point out that according to the principal spokesman for the upper basin utility companies water is needed more than power. In addition, according to this witness before the committee, the market is much thinner, with only an average of 3 persons per square mile as compared with a national population density of 51.

David Moffatt, vice president of Utah Power & Light Co., testified that the upper basin is "one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world. The potential thermal power resources of this area stagger the imagination." He qualified his offer to take large blocks of power by saying the energy must be "reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs."

On this point, I quote from page 312 of the hearings, Mr. Moffatt testified:

We believe that the financial feasibility of the project depends upon the sale to private utilities of the power output of the project plants not contracted for by such customers as may be entitled to preference and that such sales should be made at the powerplants or along the backbone transmission tie line upon terms such as that the cost of project power will not exceed the cost of power from alternate sources.

The proponents of the bill maintain there is an assured market for the hydroelectricity to be produced. Yet Mr. Moffat said:

We are willing to buy the entire output provided the plants are put in on a schedule in consonance with the load requirements of the area. If too many of the units were put

in at one time, of course, we could not contract to buy all of that at one time.

Furthermore, Mr. Moffat said in response to an inquiry that no tentative contracts have been worked out and the companies have only discussed prospective purchases with the Interior Department.

The doubts about economic feasibility as it relates to power revenues can be illustrated by a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Moffat. He told the committee:

> Electric power from this project is not a necessity; it can be used and that is our principle for cooperation. * * * I do wish to reemphasize that what we need in our area is water.

Since the construction of these dams might undermine the financial structure of the existing lower basin projects, I must emphasize the contrast between the conditions which preceded building of Hoover Dam and those in which the projects proposed in this bill might be constructed. I will quote the testimony of Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles. He told the committee:

> California * * * succeeded in obtaining congressional approval of the Boulder Canyon project. But not, it must be noted, until the city of Los Angeles, through its department of water and power, and other California agencies, had underwritten the entire cost of its construction by obligating itself to purchase the energy generated at such a price as would amortize the Government's investment and pay 4—later reduced to 3—percent interest.

There are a few other items of testimony that are of minor significance but have the effect of heightening uneasiness about statements this program is economically feasible. I wish to cite some statements from Reclamation Bureau reports. According to the hearings, it is assumed that sufficient water can be made available to supply higher lands in the Grand Mesa project but if this assumption is wrong the development could be "considerably less desirable economically than indicated."

Bureau admitted that payments by water users on Tomichi Creek will not be sufficient to pay operation and maintenance costs and replacement. The plans for the Eagle Divide unit may need to be modified "to provide the greatest degree of economic justification." These comments relate to projects we are being asked to approve with a condition that before any work is done they will be brought back to Congress for further authorization.

Of the 39 separate works enumerated in this bill, formal feasibility reports exist only for 14 at this stage. There is 1 partial report on 2 units and a report subject to review on a 17th. In the light of these facts, it is exceedingly difficult to see how the sponsors of this program can maintain as they do on page 13 of the majority report that "the Colorado River storage project and participating projects plan is financially sound."

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, and wish to repeat today, as a Member of the United States Senate I desire to cast my vote in favor of proposed legislation which will be of benefit to the States in the upper Colorado River Basin, and, indeed, to the benefit of all the States of the American Union, but I think I have a duty to recall that when we dealt with problems concerning Hoover Dam, we followed one yardstick and made the people of that area guarantee in advance that they would reimburse the Government of the United States for all costs, and I think I have a duty to point out that a different yardstick has been followed in this instance. It seems to me that the Department of the Interior ought to give the Senate committee and the Members of the Senate a complete feasibility report upon the project, and that we should follow with reference to this proposed legislation exactly the practice followed in days gone by, and on that basis, not in advance of a departmental determination of feasibility, the Congress could then proceed in an orderly fashion and determine on the merits of the report whether we should pass authorizing legislation.

Mr. President, those are some of the views which I wished to present today; and in view of the comments I made yesterday and today, I shall tomorrow offer some amendments to the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had expected to ask to be recognized at this time, but I yield that privilege to my senior colleague.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has told me that he has a very short statement he wishes to make at this time, and I should like to extend him that courtesy if, by unanimous consent, I shall not lose my place on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, at the outset, let me thank the Senator from Utah for his kindness in yielding at this time. It so happens that I have an engagement early this evening and it is necessary for me to leave the floor very shortly.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the REA's in my State are finding themselves in great difficulty in obtaining sufficient power to satisfy their needs. As a matter of fact, two groups of REA's, one in the southeastern section of my State and another in the northeastern section, are presently endeavoring to obtain a loan for a plant to generate electricity so they can have available a sufficient volume to meet the needs of their subscribers. In both cases they are required to pay an amount in excess of that quoted by the distinguished junior Senator from California. So I have no reason to doubt the veracity of the statement furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation that power companies in the upper Colorado River Basin area will take all the power which can be produced at the various sites involved in the project.

Mr. President, the great State of Wyoming falls like a saddle astride the top of the Continental Divide. We are blessed with an abundance of water. It flows from our mountains in all directions. The snow that is packed on our mountain tops in the wintertime and the rain that falls on the hills of Wyoming in the summertime contribute tremendously to the welfare of each of our neighboring States. Sometimes our water comes down in a soft and gentle fashion for the accommodation of man, and at other times it rushes down in terrific torrents and wreaks destruction, devastation, and death on its march to the sea.

The Colorado River rises high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, and its major tributary, the Green River, rises in the high mountains of Wyoming. These mountain streams are formed on that pyramid which forms the backbone of North America. The Colorado River cuts deeply into the living rock, gouging out literally thousands of spectacular canyons.

Water, when controlled, can be one of man's greatest assets, yet when uncontrolled, it can be a terrifying liability of devastating force. Congress long ago determined to do something about our water problem. And so it was, Mr. President, that Congress in its wisdom set up some very definite water policies. The Congress determined to control the water where there was too much, and to save and conserve it where there was too little. The twin programs of flood control and reclamation have been the accepted policy of the country for many years. In the long run probably as much money has been spent for one as the other. Both are sound policies in the public interest.

Reclamation is the cornerstone upon which the hopes and the aspirations of our Mountain States are built. It is the hallmark upon which our progress is based. The growth of the western empire depends largely upon the wise use of our water resources. We want to make water serve as many masters as possible and to use it time after time. We want to use it to produce power not once but many times.

About $2.4 billion has been spent on Federal reclamation projects in the 17 Western States in the last half century. But, Mr. President, the crops produced on these lands have brought to the farmers over $8 billion. Reclamation has poured thousands of dollars into the pockets of not only the farmers, businessmen, and manufacturers, but also large sums in the form of taxes into county, State, and national treasuries. In 1952 nearly 7 million irrigable acres under Federal reclamation works produced a little less than a billion dollars worth of crops. Our reclamation States have been helped immeasurably by the new wealth created by these projects. The tax base has been broadened and our economy has been placed on a sound basis. The irrigated farms of the West produce crops that do not compete to any large extent with crops grown elsewhere in the country. The steadily expanding population of the West has created a market not only for its own agricultural products but those grown in other areas. Some people may say that we have more irrigated lands than the country needs. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the 5½ million acres of irrigated lands only offset our losses in

farmlands through soil erosion and depletion.

Federal tax revenues since 1916 from Federal reclamation areas now stand at more than $3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all our federally constructed projects to date.

The construction of the upper Colorado River project will signal the development of the last big water hole in the mountain west. The Colorado River compact, negotiated nearly a third of a century ago, is now known as "the law of the river." Under it the upper States are bound to deliver to the lower States at Lee Ferry 75 million acre-feet in continuing 10-year periods. There is the sticker. The upper States cannot deliver the water unless dams are built to conserve and store floodwaters in wet years so that delivery of water to the lower States can be made during dry years. And another thing, big dams and powerplants must be constructed on the main stem of the river to supply badly needed power which, in turn, will produce the revenue to make the project pay out.

Mr. President, we are here today knocking at the door of Congress with a plan of action looking toward the development of the immense water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin States. The project is sound and feasible. By and large, Mr. President, the passage of this bill will serve as a guarantee to the people of these sovereign States that they will not be deprived of their heritage to use the waters bestowed upon them by a beneficent Creator. It will serve as an insurance policy protecting them against the loss of the right to use their rightful share of their own water.

The Colorado River storage project consists of a team of dams, reservoirs, and powerplants to be constructed in conformance with the compacts and the Mexican Treaty. The bill would authorize storage units at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo, and Flaming Gorge.

The Flaming Gorge Dam would be a concrete structure 440 feet high, costing $82 million. It would store 3,940,000 acre-feet of water and would produce 72,000 kilowatts of power. That dam would be located 2 miles south of the Wyoming line just above the junction of the Green River and Henry's Fork in Utah. The reservoir behind Flaming Gorge Dam would back up the water to within 3 miles of Green River in my State.

I can say to my distinguished friend from California that all the power will be needed and used very readily in the towns of Green River and Rock Springs, in my State.

The 12 initial participating projects also authorized are supported by reports showing their economic and engineering feasibility. Except for approximately 3 percent allocated to recreation the upper Colorado River storage project is self-liquidating. The costs assigned to power features will be repaid, with interest, in less than 50 years. The costs assigned to irrigation will be repaid, without interest, by the water users within their ability to repay and the balance will be repaid out of power revenues.

Now, Mr. President, let me take a few moments to mention the Wyoming projects. Under the 1948 compact, Wyoming was allotted 1,043,000 acre-feet of water each year. Wyoming now uses about 248,000 acre-feet, and thus 795,000 acre-feet will be available for new uses each year.

As previously mentioned, the participating projects in our State are the Seedskadee, Lyman, and LaBarge. A fourth project, the Eden project, was authorized in 1940 and is now under construction.

The Seedskadee project, largest of the Wyoming group, is located about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. It will irrigate more than 60,000 acres of virgin land located along both sides of the Green River between the mouth of Fontenelle Creek and the town of Green River. The Seedskadee project appears to present the best opportunity for a substantial development of new land in southwestern Wyoming, if not in the whole upper Colorado River Basin.

The LaBarge project includes approximately 7,600 acres of land that will be irrigated by diverting flows of the Green River at a point between Big Piney and LaBarge.

The Lyman project would provide supplemental water for irrigation of approximately 40,000 acres of land along Blacks Fork, now badly in need of late season water. The type of farming on Wyoming's participating projects is limited by climatic conditions. Because of relatively high altitudes, the crops grown will be largely forage and small grains. The construction of these four participating Wyoming units will bring water to 79,390 acres of land for the first time, and supplemental water to 49,900 acres presently under irrigation. The Eden project, north of Rock Springs, involves construction of a 40,000 acre-foot storage reservoir on the Big Sandy and will impound 40,000 acre-feet of water and will irrigate 10,660 acres of new land and supply water for nearly that much more of irrigated lands.

Mr. President, I was very pleased to see the Sublette and Savery-Pot Hook added as additional participating projects with construction to commence when feasibility reports are made and authorization by the Congress is obtained. The Sublette project is located in Sublette County. It will provide water for 72,000 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 12,000 acres of presently irrigated lands. The lands are located along the Green and New Fork Rivers. The project includes three reservoirs, namely, Kendall, Burnt Lake, and Boulder Lake, and a 2,200 kilowatt powerplant.

Kendall Reservoir site is located about 100 miles upstream from the Seedskadee project lands. Studies of development possibilities of the Kendall Reservoir have disclosed that a revised plan can be developed for the Seedskadee project which would give a greater economic utilization of the available land and water resources. By providing storage at Kendall Reservoir site some 15,810 acres of additional land in the Seedskadee project area can be served.

By using surplus flows of streams in the Little Snake River, the Savery-Pot Hook project will provide additional water for 13,000 acres presently irrigated and water for 18,000 acres of new lands. The project lands are near the Colorado-Wyoming line and located in both States.

Mr. President, in the long run the yardstick by which you can measure the growth and development of our section of the country is in the amount of water that can be and is applied to our dry lands and, secondly, the volume of power that can be generated for use by industries now located in the area and that may be attracted to our country.

It is true that this is a large project. Certainly it will cost a lot of money, but it will be under construction for more than a quarter of a century, with the appropriations spread over a long period of time. More important, Mr. President, it will pay its own way.

By building this project the people in other sections of the country will, in the long run, pay less rather than more taxes. Thousands upon thousands of new taxpayers who will produce new wealth from the soil of this great valley, year after year, will be added to the tax rolls and will bear their full share of the tax burden. We believe in the Christian precept of "live and let live."

Mr. President, this project has the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Secretary of the Interior and of the President himself. Mr. President, simple justice demands the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I attempted to interrupt the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] when he was speaking a few minutes ago about the requirements with respect to contracts and guaranties which were met before Hoover Dam was built.

After some 14 years of experience in working with the reclamation program before I came to Congress, while representing a group of water users, not the United States, I had some opportunity to observe what the United States actually requires before projects are constructed.

We are now at the authorization stage; we are not asking for appropriations at this moment. If the Bureau of Reclamation follows its usual practice, this is what will likely happen: A project may be authorized, and then appropriations will be made and contracts entered into before the project itself will be allowed to go forward. I refer to all the kinds of contracts which are necessary to insure the repayment of the costs of the construction program.

That is precisely what happened in the case of the Provo River project, which I represented as general counsel. All contracts governing the repayment of the entire cost of that project had to be entered into, signed, properly executed, and approved by the Department of the Interior before one shovel full of dirt could be turned in connection with the construction of the project.

What the Senator from California said was that before the construction of a

project in California could proceed it was necessary to enter into a firm and binding guaranty or contract that the costs of the project would be repaid. That is the usual practice. What was being argued, apparently, was that Congress might not proceed with an authorization before contracts were made. I have never heard of a case in which a legal, binding contract could be entered into before a project actually was authorized. United States officials never would be permitted to enter into that kind of contract unless firm authority was granted by Congress. So, as to the objection made with respect to that particular requirement on the part of California, there is no reason on earth why that case was any different from the case we are now considering.

Before Glen Canyon and the other projects can be built, it will be necessary to have definite, concrete, final checks on everything. As to all the participating projects, it will be necessary to have some sort of guaranty or contract for repayment.

Thus, as to storage and power projects on the main stem of the river, much has been learned from the past. Hoover Dam was the first of the great dams to be built. Since that time it has been demonstrated beyond any doubt that there is a power market, and that all the power can be sold. Today there is no longer the gamble that there was in the days when Hoover Dam was authorized. In those days there was much doubt expressed whether the cost of construction ever could be repaid. It was said that the cost was too large; that there would be too much power produced; that there would be no market for the power.

Of course, the Government was then embarking upon a pioneer project and wanted to be secured. Before construction began, after the authorization, it was necessary that there be contracts. That will be the case with respect to the upper Colorado project. I take it for granted that the United States will require the utilities, including the REA's and the other public agencies, who are preference customers, to have contracts for the purchase of power before the dams are actually built.

Under the program the building of the dams is not to proceed with all of them at once. They are to be developed in accordance with the report which I believe has been submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

The development under the program will go forward, as the Engineers have planned, with the construction, first, of Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams. Those dams will have to be built in advance, in order to bring about the filling of the reservoirs with surplus waters. Those reservoirs, it has been estimated, could have been easily filled in past years with surplus water which has been wasted by being allowed to flow into the Gulf of California.

Since a number of years will be required for the filling of the reservoirs once the dams have been constructed, it is important to have that program move ahead; and for that reason Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams will be the first to be built.

After those dams have been constructed, power operations can begin, and the consumers will be able to take the power, thus enabling that program to go forward.

At the same time, some of the smaller participating projects may be started. The Emery project, in eastern Utah, can be begun, as can the Central Utah project. Projects in Wyoming and Colorado can be started, and in New Mexico the building of the Navaho project can proceed.

This is a program which will not call for construction all at once. That point should be kept in mind. This is a program for the future. In my judgment, it will take at least 10 years to build the big dams. My judgment is based on the experience I have had with the Reclamation Bureau and other agencies. Some of the smaller projects can be gotten under way and be finished a little sooner; but the demands upon the Treasury will not be for huge sums in any single year. Construction will be started and will proceed over the years until the final program has been consummated. This may take all the way from 35 years to, I should say, based upon my experience, 50 years.

When the total cost is divided among 4 States, possibly 5, the money which will be appropriated will not be very much per State over that period of time.

All that is necessary to be done, to ascertain how the proposed project will compare with others, is to consider California and note the number of reclamation developments which have been made in the Central Valley, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and in the other sections of the State.

I have been very much in favor of those national investments, although they run into huge sums. I point out to the distinguished junior Senator from California that in the case of the Central Valley projects, there were no contracts of any kind for the repayment of any of the costs before the great dams were built. Those dams were built during the depression; they were started in a hurry. Some of them were begun by the Army engineers and later were turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation to operate. The Bureau went ahead without having contracts for repayment of or guarantee of the construction costs. They do not have contracts even today for the repayment of the costs of that great project.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is acquainted with the fact, is he not, that the people of California approved legislation to have themselves build the Central Valley projects?

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean to buy it?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, sir; to build it. The State legislature of my State enacted legislation to provide for the construction of the Central Valley projects and thereafter, at a referendum election, the people of my State approved the Central Valley legislation, and subsequent to that time, during the depression days, it is true, as the Senator suggests, the Federal Government, of its own motion or ipse dixit, came in and built the Central Valley projects.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember all of that history, but the fact is that California did not go ahead with the construction, and the United States did not require contracts before the construction was started. It is one of the most costly projects in the history of reclamation. The Army engineers also had a hand in its construction.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Utah is my good friend, and he is an able and honorable Member of this body. I do, however, want to suggest, with respect to the Central Valley project, that, from the standpoint of economic feasibility, it is one of the soundest projects in this country. I have figures, which I shall subsequently ask to have printed in the RECORD, which the Department of the Interior prepared.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to say that the upper Colorado River project is one of the soundest in the country, and probably has been studied more closely than has any other project in the history of the United States. The project will be expensive, and that is one reason why there had to be such extensive study of it. Nature was not so kind to us as it was to the people of southern California.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If I understood his statement correctly, it was to the effect that the upper Colorado River project will be paid for by 4 or 5 States. Did I understand correctly?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. The States in which the actual participating projects will be located are Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. One of the storage dams on the main stem of the river will be in a fifth State, Arizona. Of course, we count in the area the State of Nevada, which is close by, with respect to the purchase of power.

Mr. BIBLE. It was the purpose of my question to determine the Senator's thinking as to the sale of power from Glen Canyon. Would the Senator care to elaborate as to whom the power which will be developed at Glen Canyon, which will be the largest of the dams to be constructed in the upper Colorado River, would be sold?

Mr. WATKINS. First I should like to say there are the 4 States I have just mentioned, the upper basin States. Secondly, Nevada is in the area, and there undoubtedly will be power to sell for a long period of time before Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams will be constructed in Arizona, which will be even nearer to Nevada. There is not any doubt that the people of Nevada will be able to obtain power from the project.

Mr. BIBLE. How will that be determined?

Mr. WATKINS. By the Bureau of Reclamation, which will have charge of the operation of the dams.

Mr. BIBLE. Can the Senator indicate the power rate?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Bureau of Reclamation will be required to get from the customers downstream the same rate it will get from the customers upstream, within the basin States. That will be about 6 mills delivered at the load center; that is, at the market center. Of course, there can be no absolute guaranty of that until the authorization and the construction, but the testimony was that 6 mills will be the approximate market price of the power at the load center.

Mr. BIBLE. Would the Senator care to indicate the duration of the contracts the Secretary would enter into with the public agencies involved?

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot answer that, because I cannot speak for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Government which will be operating the power plants. All I can say is that I have a very strong feeling and belief that no one in that area will be deprived of power before there is other power provided to take its place. If the power should be required in the upper basin, it will never be taken away unless there is other power to take its place.

As the Senator knows, there are other big developments contemplated on the Colorado, at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon. Even if the project at Bridge Canyon alone were to be built, it would furnish an immense amount of power, which would be easier to transmit to Nevada users.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Am I correct in understanding that the cost at the load center will be somewhere between 4.2 and 4.7 mills?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the Engineers arrived at a figure in that neighborhood. I think I know what the Senator has in mind. The situation is very much like that which would obtain in a power company with a half dozen plants. It might have plant A, which would produce power at a certain cost; plant B, which would produce power at a different cost; and perhaps two or three of the plants in its system would produce at rather high cost, but all the power would be sold at one rate. The power would probably be sold at the same rate. In other words, all the power should be pooled and should be sold at one established rate.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question along that line?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. It is my understanding that Glen Canyon will be the first of the projects to be completed, or among the first, as now planned.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it will probably be the first. If not the first, it will be completed at about the same time as Echo Park, if that project should be authorized.

Mr. BIBLE. Between the time Glen Canyon is completed and other dams are completed, will there be the same differential in power cost?

Mr. WATKINS. I think so, because the projects were planned on a comprehensive basis. It was impossible to consider only one unit and say it would be built according to certain costs and standards and say that others would be built under another plan.

Let us get back to the planning work with which the Bureau of Reclamation was confronted. It was a very difficult project to get the water out of the deep canyons, store it, and find some economically feasible way in which it could be used and paid for. So the program had to be operated as one, and the States had to cooperate in order to get a program which would be feasible. We could not plan as has been planned in other projects where the problems were not so difficult, and in which one project could be proposed at a time and completed. We have had to present the whole program, which would take into consideration the highest cost and the lowest cost, and arrive at a feasible program. I do not know what the Bureau which will operate the dams will do. I cannot commit it, as I think the Senator understands.

Mr. BIBLE. I understand.

Mr. WATKINS. I should say the theory would be that even in the beginning the power must be sold at about 6 mills in order that the program may work out.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that aspect of the question. I know he has a great interest in the project, and that he is watching and following the debate with an eye to the welfare of his State.

I firmly hope we may make plain to the people of the entire Colorado River system the fact that there is only one way we can succeed in building the projects out of the resources which God has given us, and that is to cooperate, to live and let live, as my distinguished friend suggested a while ago.

Mr. President, that brings me to the matter of cooperation in the building of these great projects. I have mentioned the difficulties we have in the upper Colorado. The canyons are deep. There is a steep gradient. Not only is it necessary to build one large storage dam, such as the one that was built at Boulder Canyon, known as Hoover Dam, but it is also necessary to build others. We have to build nine, as I understand, in the beginning, in order to completely regulate and tame that river and store the water which must be used for consumptive purposes in the lower basin States and in the upper basin States. All that must be done before we can really get anywhere with the program. We must tame and regulate the river. That is one of the big problems we have.

By examining the map which has been placed in the rear of the Chamber—a map published by the Bureau of Reclamation, and bearing the title "Colorado River Storage Project and Supporting Projects"—it will be seen that we have, by means of the map, a portrayal of the situation in that area. The Uinta Mountains cross the area. There are a number of streams, beginning with the Strawberry River, which runs into the Duchesne, the Rock Creek, the Lake Fork, the Uinta, and the Ashley Creek, all of which flow into the Green River. Those streams are fed by snows which fall in the winter on that high mountain range which runs east and west, by the way. It does not have sharp peaks and ridges, as does the Wasatch Range, which runs north and south through Utah. But it is a natural watershed. On the north, the water runs into Wyoming. On the east slope, the water runs into Colorado. The water runs into the Green River, from the various short tributaries which come from the mountains.

In order to give to the States in the lower basin the amount of water the compact calls for, it is necessary to build these storage dams. That statement has been repeated so many times that it should now be well established.

The reason for building the storage dams, largely for irrigation purposes, has not been sufficiently emphasized. The water users in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming must take their water from the higher tributaries of the Colorado River; and before they can take the water, they must be sure that the commitments to the lower-basin States will be fulfilled. In order to do that, it is necessary to build the large dams, such as the one at Glen Canyon. The dam will be built below the Utah border, just above Lee Ferry. Then, going up into the basin, we have the Echo Park, the Flaming Gorge, just over the Utah boundary from Wyoming; and then the Juniper, which was substituted for the Cross Mountain; and the Navaho, in New Mexico, all of which are shown on the map.

When the water is taken from the smaller streams, it will have to be stored again, because the water falls in the wintertime in the form of snow. Some rain falls on those mountains, and seeps into the ground, and comes up later as springs; but the major runoff occurs at the time of the year when very little water can be used for irrigation purposes. The water runs down the steep mountain slopes and the steep canyons and the streams with heavy gradients, and flows into the Green River, and thus down into the Gulf of Southern California. It is necessary to store the water which is in the tributaries. We have to have secondary storage there, in order to hold the water until the time when it is needed.

The big dams on the main Colorado require holdover storage. That is a term which many persons, including some Members of Congress, do not understand, I am sure. Holdover storage means holding over from year to year, from the wet cycle of years to the dry cycle of years, a supply of water sufficient to take care of the needs during the droughts which occur at times. As history shows, there will be a series of wet years, and then a series of dry years. During the dry cycle, the Colorado River becomes a very small stream; and in its natural condition, before any reservoirs at all were built, there was hardly enough water in the Colorado during the

dry cycle or the so-called low-water season, to take care of the commitments to the farms and other areas downstream, which had commitments and priorities by means of early use of the water of that stream.

After Hoover Dam was built, the lower river was regulated; and, of course, that made it possible for the users downstream to obtain a sufficient supply of water. But it did not regulate the water upstream.

By means of a series of exchanges, we can take the water from the dams we build downstream, below where we make our diversions, and send it down for use in the lower basin States; and then we can take a corresponding amount of water out of the tributaries in the higher streams or mountain valleys, and use it on our lands. That is a common practice at present in the West, namely, the exchange of waters. It is about the only way by which we can make such a project work satisfactorily.

A while ago I stated that cooperation is one of our greatest programs in the West. When the pioneers first went into that area, they came into the valleys where small streams were running across the land—for instance, in Utah, to the great Salt Lake. They decided to take out the water, because the land was barren. Instead of having each one take water through his own canal or ditch, leading directly from the stream, they decided to take the water from one canal, with each to take the water in his turn, as the canal passed through or around his land. That meant that the man at the end of the canal would have to pay—if the same system of economics was followed—more than anyone else would pay, because it would cost more to bring the water to his end of the canal than it would cost to bring the water to the land owned by those who would first take water from the canal. They soon found that those who had the advantage of being at the head of the canal, and who would take out the water a short time after it left the rivers or streams, would have to cooperate with the others, and would have to pay an equal part of the cost of taking the water from the stream through the ditch. That is where we learned about cooperation.

I know that at times, strong individuals decided they would take what they wanted from the streams. But if every farmer had done that, there would have been a whole series of canals which would have cut up the land to so great an extent that it would not have been usable. Moreover, enormous amounts of water would have been wasted. The necessities of the situation forced cooperation.

We have followed cooperation, now, and have applied it to the large projects. Today, the States are cooperating in very much the same fashion in which the farmers cooperated in the early times, in connection with the development of their communities. That is an excellent thing. We have combined the resources, and we have planned to pool the water resources which come into full development in the large dams on the main stem; and even in central Utah there is a power situation which can be developed and will go into the common pool.

At any rate, we take the total income from the sale of water and the sale of power, and put the total income into one pool, and from it pay for the cost of the project. We even form local entities known as conservancy districts, which bring into the picture even those who do not use water for irrigation. That situation or system exists at the present time. For instance, in the Weber Basin project, in north-central Utah, a conservancy district has been formed; and it brings in the cities, counties, towns, and irrigation companies. The irrigation companies pay, through assessments; but the districts and towns pay for their water; and even the counties which do not use water from the project will levy and pay taxes to help the project, on the theory that everyone who benefits directly or indirectly from the water, should help pay for it.

So the program is, with respect to all these participating projects, to have the conservancy type of organization provided, so that the contracts will be with the communities, the cities, counties, and town governments, and the taxpayers generally, as well as those who use the water for specific purposes such as irrigation.

It should also be kept in mind that all the people of the States will get the benefit from the use of the water. Most of the people of the States under modern conditions, use power. In a measure, it is correct to say that it does not make any difference, so far as the people are concerned, whether they are billed for the costs on the basis of all power, all water, or simply "power and water," or "water and power." The same people would largely pay both the water costs and the power costs. Under those circumstances we cannot understand all the concern for the power users of our State. It is said, "Look at the load the power users have to carry for irrigation. They are going to pay a large percentage of the cost of these projects, at least that part which is allocated to irrigation. Why should they do that?"

Why should they not do it, if they are willing to do it? That is exactly the situation. They have considered that situation. They say, "We are willing to help. We need the water. We cannot get anywhere without water. Power is of no use to us without water. We cannot build industries in our States without water. We need power as well." It so happens that by reason of the combination of the two and the building of the big storage dams to store water primarily so that we can complete our commitments downstream and at the same time have water for irrigation and other important uses, we can also, as an incident thereto, produce great quantities of electric energy.

I wish to say something about a situation which has been described a number of times by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. They say that this is one of the most expensive places to produce power. I will not undertake to argue that point with them. I think actually, when we consider the increases in costs which have occurred in recent years, power can probably be produced as cheaply under this project as it can be produced in some other areas. But after all is said and done, we cannot move, and do not want to move, to the Columbia River Valley. We do not want to move to the Missouri River Valley. We are not anxious to go down to California, even with all the advantages of climate. We want to live where we have established our homes—in our own States. We know that there are vast quantities of raw materials, such as zinc, lead, copper, chemicals, uranium, coal, oil, oil shale, and numerous other minerals and natural resources in that area, which will require a great deal of refining before they can be used. That work can be done only by having an abundant supply of water, an abundant supply of labor, and an abundant supply of power.

We have lived there before, on the basis of paying more than 6 mills for our power. We can still continue to do it, and I believe we can compete with other areas which have cheaper power. It is unfortunate that our power in that area will cost more, but that is the way it is. That is where we want to live. We want the same rules to apply as are applied in other areas of the United States, and we want to receive the same benefits as have been received by other areas of the United States, such as the Columbia River area, southern California, northern California, and other areas. All we ask is that the program be not changed, now that it is our turn to receive some benefits.

Other areas have received large benefits in past years, and the people in those areas now tell us how cheaply they obtained their power. It may make us feel sad because we cannot duplicate their experience upstream. At any rate, we are willing to try. Our record is good. We have been repaying the costs of the smaller projects according to contracts and we know we can do it in connection with the larger program. Four States are involved. Some power will be sold in Nevada, and possibly some in California. We know that under that arrangement, with what we can pay for water and power, we will pay the cost of the entire project and all its units. If need be we can take care of it in the upper basin States. We shall have firm commitments for the purchase of power and for the repayment of costs of participating projects before construction actually is under way. I am sure the Bureau of Reclamation will go ahead with the other program. There will be firm contracts for the purchase of power from powerplants on the main stream, and there will be firm contracts with the conservancy districts for the repayment of other costs, in accordance with the overall program.

I wished to explain that situation, because there has been much misunderstanding. I feel that those who discuss the problem are sincere. There must be a misunderstanding, when they try to make it appear that we cannot carry that burden.

The Bureau of Reclamation—at least, Region 4, with which we are acquainted, and which has developed this program—

is one of the most conservative groups of public officials I have ever worked with. I have worked with them for 14 years. I know how conservative they are. They will want contracts before construction begins. They want to be sure that the costs of the projects will be repaid, and that a heavy burden will not be cast upon the rest of the United States.

I have before me a series of questions and answers with respect to specific problems which have been raised in the debate. I know that these questions bother some Members of Congress.

I read:

1. Water supply: Why is the Colorado River so difficult to control and why has its development been so long delayed?

(1) The Colorado is one of the longest rivers in the United States. It drains the most rugged topography. In the upper basin, the canyons along the main stream are so deep that direct divisions are impossible except on the tributaries. Basin-wide development is mandatory because the entire river must be put under control before its waters can be made available for consumptive use at the time they are needed.

2. Why does the river have to be controlled before its waters can be made available for consumptive use?

I have partially answered that question.

(1) The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream.

(2) Its maximum flow occurs during the snow-melting period.

(3) This period of high flow does not coincide with the demand for consumptive use.

(4) The low-water flow occurs during the late summer when the irrigation water requirements are greatest. The high-water flow may be as much as 100 times the low-water flow.

(5) Storage reservoirs are necessary to hold the early runoff from snow melt so that it will be available for late summer use.

(6) The total annual discharge of the Colorado varies widely from year to year. A high year may be as much as six times a low-water year.

(7) In order to fully utilize the entire flow of the river it is necessary to put the water available during wet years into large holdover storage reservoirs so that it will be available for use during the dry years.

3. What do you mean by consumptive and nonconsumptive uses of water?

Strange as it may seem, some persons are in doubt on that question.

(1) Uses which consume the body of the water such as domestic and irrigation are consumptive uses.

(2) Uses which do not consume the water such as power generation, navigation, recreation, and cooling are nonconsumptive uses.

4. What is the primary objective of the storage portion of the proposed project?

By that I assume is meant the five main stream reservoirs on the Colorado River, the Green, Yampa, Gunnison, Grand, and San Juan, which run into the main stream.

(1) To provide water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange at the time and in the quantities needed to meet the demands for irrigation and other consumptive uses.

(2) Such storage is mandatory in order that the wet season flow may be held over to the dry season and the flow during wet years held over to meet the consumptive use demands during the dry years.

(3) Regulation of the river flow by storage is also necessary to insure delivery of water to the lower basin to meet the requirements of the Colorado River compact and at the same time permit the consumptive uses apportioned to the upper basin by the same compact.

5. How can the storage of water in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs, for example, supply water for consumptive use in the upper basin participating projects?

(1) Water may be used by direct diversion out of Echo reservoir by pumping, to replace water owned by lower users in Utah which is intercepted on the high tributaries in the Uinta mountains for diversion by gravity to the Bonneville Basin.

That fact has not been sufficiently emphasized in connection with the Echo Park project. Echo Park is tied in intimately with the use of the Central Utah project, at least in its advanced stages, although perhaps not in its initial stages. If we take water from the Uinta Mountains, which runs into streams which flow into the Colorado River, we must have water to supply to the present users of the waters of the tributaries in that basin. In order to do that, probably it will be necessary to take water out of Echo, and it may have to be necessary to pump it from Echo.

Two alternate programs have been suggested. One is to bring in water through a tunnel from Flaming Gorge. The other is to take it out of Echo. It may be that when the final program is set up it will be found to be cheaper to take it out of Echo by pumping it.

That is one of the strong reasons why Echo is necessary to irrigation. All of these dams would be built for the primary purpose of the consumptive use of water. Otherwise we could not consume the water from the other stream, because it would run into the Colorado River and on down below to satisfy the rights of the people there.

(2) Water out of Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs will be used to replace water diverted to the participating projects from the high tributaries of the Colorado, which water during periods of low flow before regulation belonged to water users in the lower basin.

(3) Therefore, water out of the storage reservoirs in the upper basin will be used consumptively, by exchange, for irrigation, domestic, and industrial uses.

6. It has been said that the proposed project is a power project and that the production of power is the primary objective. Where does power fit into this program?

(1) Power is an incident, and a very important incident, in the proposed project, but not the primary objective.

(2) It is energy resulting from water, falling from the high watersheds to the valley floor.

(3) This energy is made available at the storage dams which provide river regulation and water for consumptive use.

(4) It would be a gross waste of a resource not to use it. Furthermore, this energy resource will provide revenues, not only to pay for power features with interest, but to help pay the costs of the participating irrigation projects.

(5) Summarizing, the proposed storage project will:

(a) Provide water, controlled and regulated, for consumptive use in the upper basin States without interfering in any way with water rights in the lower basin.

(b) Provide for longtime holdover storage to make water running off during wet years available for use during dry years.

(c) Provide power, the revenues from which pay costs of power facilities with interest and help pay the irrigation costs.

I might mention the fact that storage in Glen Canyon and Echo Park may be carried over for a period of as long as 25 years, at least in part. That is what makes those dams so necessary. They are called key dams, and they are that, because of their qualities for holding large quantities of water with the lowest evaporation cost.

7. Why was Hoover Dam built?

We in the West have always assumed that everyone knew the answer to that question. However, in discussion with people in the East and with Members of Congress, I find that many people still do not know why it was built. I will give the reasons why I believe it was built:

(1) To provide for river regulation and flood control, so as to store the water and prevent floods, and to store the water that was running into Salton Sea and destroying the farming areas in that area.

(2) It was not built primarily to provide water for consumptive use or power.

(3) Once the river was controlled, however, the water from Lake Mead became available for both consumptive uses (irrigation and domestic) and for power.

(4) The consumptive users of this water pay nothing for the cost of river regulation and control which made their consumptive use developments possible.

By that I mean that the people who get the benefit of having water in the low seasons do not pay anything for the cost of the storage. That is why it is possible for some persons to talk about the low costs in Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley, and other valleys. They have not had to pay for the storage.

(5) The power from Hoover Dam is sold at very low rates. We hear a great deal about the cost of power being 1½ mills for emergency power, and probably 2½ mills for firm power.

(6) Water for consumptive use and power resulting from the Hoover Dam construction have made the remarkable growth of southern California possible.

In that connection it should be stated that the cost of the power that has been quoted is the cost at the busbar, at the generator. It has cost Los Angeles and the other power districts a considerable amount of money to build the transmission lines, which is one of the heaviest costs connected with a power investment. Los Angeles does not get its power at 2½ mills. Los Angeles pays a little more than that. That fact has not been brought out too clearly.

8. Why it is necessary to plan for a basin-wide development?

(1) The full development of the Colorado River is totally dependent upon storage reservoirs to make early season flow available during the late season of any one year and to hold water running off the watersheds during wet years so that it can be made available during dry years.

(2) The widely fluctuating and erratic flow of the Colorado River requires large capacity reservoirs and long time holdover periods.

It should be mentioned that not only are large reservoirs required to store the water, but at Glen Canyon we must have a large capacity for the storage of silt. The Colorado River is a muddy river.

One writer has stated it belches mud all the way down into Mead Lake. It carries a great deal of sediment. It has been estimated that the Glen Canyon construction alone, with the amount allowed for silt control, will extend the life of Hoover Dam 200 years. An extension of 200 years is almost like providing a new dam without cost.

Not one dime is allowed in this measure for the great benefit to be contributed to the lower basin States, particularly the States that get waterpower at the Hoover Dam.

(3) Hoover Dam provided the necessary holdover storage to entirely regulate the river below Hoover Dam.

(4) It will require 9 storage dams to do an equivalent job in the upper basin; of these 9 only 2 are large. The bulk of the storage load must be carried by the Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs and they must be built first.

9. What are the capacities of these two reservoirs and why must they be built first?

I have partly covered that point, but I will give a summary of it:

(1) Echo Park, 6½ million acre-feet; Glen Canyon, 26 million acre-feet.

(2) The lower basin is well along with its development, both consumptive uses and power. The filling of the upper-basin reservoirs must be done without interferring with those rights.

(3) The consumptive uses in the upper basin are now only about 2½ million acre-feet. This leaves 5 million acre-feet per year available for filling upper-basin storage reservoirs without interferring with lower-bason uses.

(4) As consumptive uses upstream increase the water available for filling the reservoirs decreases. If built now, before full consumptive use of water is made in lower basin, additional water would be available for filling, because that water, along with the upper basin's water that is not being used, is going into the sea. It is wasted forever.

10. The annual evaporation losses from Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs are reported to be 613,000 acre-feet. Can this huge loss be justified?

Some Members of the Senate, in discussing that point, have stated that it is a waste of water to store the water behind those dams, because, they have stated, the only reason we are building those dams is for the production of power; therefore, it is a wasting of water to store it for power production, because a great deal of the water is lost by evaporation. Furthermore, it is claimed that the power could be as easily developed by the use of coal, oil, oil shale, or uranium. That is why, they claim, we are wasting all that water. In answer to the question about the evaporation losses, I should like to give this answer:

(1) It is estimated that 12 percent of the water apportioned to the upper basin will be lost through evaporation. This is the price the upper basin has to pay for the opportunity of utilizing the remaining 88 percent of its water resource. No one objects to burning coal or oil because they cannot get 100 percent efficiency out of it.

I do not know of any electric power production plants using oil or coal which have a 100 percent efficiency in the use of their fuels.

(2) No one objected to Lake Mead because it loses 600,00 acre-feet annually by evaporation or because another 600,000 acre-feet annually is lost below Lake Mead in the reservoirs downstream and in the stream itself.

11. What are the power generating capacities at the proposed storage reservoirs?

	Kilowatts
1. Glen Canyon	800,000
2. Echo Park	200,000
3. Juniper	25,000
4. Curricanti	40,000
5. Flaming Gorge	72,000

6. All are small except Echo Park and Glen Canyon.

12. Do the Echo Park and Glen Canyon Reservoirs have to be filled before they can produce power?

(1) No. The greater portion of the power head will be available before a third of the storage capacity is filled.

(2) Building these storage reservoirs now will provide early power revenues and make possible an orderly filling of the storage reservoirs without damage to lower users.

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

Mr. President, I am going to summarize this case tomorrow. I expect to answer the contention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] that the building of the Echo Park Dam will constitute an invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument and will create a dangerous precedent. I might remark, for the benefit of those who will read the RECORD that on March 28 I presented a fully documented case on the Dinosaur National Monument showing who tried to invade and did invade to a limited extent the water reservations and power reservations made many years before. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said in the debate with the Senator from Oregon, the invasion came from the other direction. An effort was made to accomplish an invasion which the President of the United States would not permit when he extended the area from 80 acres to 203,000 acres. Mr. Ickes went along with an agreement with the Federal Power Commission and with the people of the States involved and said there would be no interference with the water program in the areas included in the monument enlargement area. They got together long ago. If Mr. Ickes and Mr. Roosevelt were alive today I am sure they would testify that that was the program.

Now, when the proposals are presented to make effective those water reservations, objection is raised and we are told we are invading the monument. Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Ickes, and the others involved at that time knew exactly what was happening, and there has not been one single piece of evidence presented to meet the challenge which I laid down before the Members of the Congress. There has not been any evidence brought to this body or to the people of the country showing that I was wrong in any way. They did not impeach that record, and they cannot do so.

Mr. President, here is the summary on the Echo Park Dam:

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

WHY ECHO PARK DAM SITE WAS SELECTED FOR DEVELOPMENT

Here are the principal advantages of including the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado River Storage project plan:

(1) With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

(2) Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored at Echo Park would be less than at any other major storage site in the upper basin.

(3) Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 120,000 acre-feet in evaporation losses annually—a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

(4) Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating flows of the rivers. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at the Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River.

(5) Use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economic development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to the upstream power market, the proposed system of dams and powerplants, and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer and chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many important minerals.

The opponents of Echo Park Dam claim two objections. First, development of the dam would invade the Dinosaur National Monument. Secondly, it would destroy scenery and rapids. Let's review the facts.

Documents show that the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded in 1938 with the understanding that dams could be built in the area. In fact, the Presidential proclamation states that it shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, and that the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

Echo Park Reservoir would partially inundate 2 or 3 scenic areas, but in so doing it would make possible boating through the beautiful Lodore and Yampa Canyons by many people—not just the adventurous few who now dare to ride the river. The rapids here would be gone, but there would be plenty left for the daredevil river rider on other stretches of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

Mr. President, there are other questions to which I have prepared the answers. I shall not read them into the RECORD tonight, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

14. Under article IIIa of the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre feet annual beneficial consumptive use were apportioned to the upper and lower basins, respectively, with a further provision in IIId that the upper basin States could not deplete the river at Lee Ferry more than 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10-year period. Based on current streamflow records is there enough water in the river to satisfy article IIId and leave 7½ million acre-feet annually for the upper basin?

Answer. (1) The Colorado River compact, apportioning the beneficial consumptive use of the water between the two basins, is predicated upon regulation and control of the river flow by means of holdover storage reservoirs.

(2) The records of streamflow made by the USGS show an average virgin flow at Lee Ferry of slightly above 15 million acre-feet.

(3) Holdover storage capacity provided in the nine proposed reservoirs (ultimate phase) would be adequate to deliver annually at Lee Ferry not less than 7½ million acre-feet and

leave in the upper basin for beneficial consumptive use 7½ million acre-feet.

(4) 7½ milion acre-feet annually equals 75 million acre-feet every 10 years as per article IIId of the compact.

15. What is the current consumptive use of water in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) Approximately 2½ million acre-feet annually.

(2) Five million acre-feet annually remain to be put to use before full development of compact apportionment is realized in the upper basin.

16. What will the total consumptive use in the upper basin be after the proposed project is built? Will this use interfere with lower basin rights under the compact no matter what the interpretation of the compact by the Supreme Court?

Answer. (1) The total consumptive use after full development of the proposed project will not exceed 4.3 million acre-feet annually. It will take at least 30 years to put this water to use.

(2) The total use leaves 3.2 million acre-feet annually before the full apportionment to the upper basin is used.

(3) Therefore, the construction of the proposed project can in no way jeopardize the rights in the lower basin no matter how the Supreme Court interprets the compact.

17. Will the proposed project make the quality of water unsuitable for use in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No.

(2) Transmountain diversions take both salt and water out of the basin.

(3) Storage of water precipitates salt with silt and thus reduces the salt content of water in storage about 12 percent.

(4) Based on studies on the Rio Grande River below Elephant Butte Dam and Lake Mead by the Salinity Laboratory (USDA) and studies on Lake Mead recently completed by the USBR and others, the maximum salt content at Lee Ferry cannot exceed 1 ton per acre-foot. Such water is classified by salinity effects as good and equal to or better than that available at the heading of the Alamo Canal diverting water to the Imperial Valley before the construction of Lake Mead.

(5) Julian Hinds, formerly chief engineer of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, says "Exhaustive studies show that the mineral content under the most unfavorable future conditions will be lower than the average for waters diverted and successfully used in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys prior to the construction of the Hoover Dam.

18. Senator DOUGLAS has said there is a current water shortage at Lake Mead and that, therefore, the upper basin project should not be built. Is this a true statement?

Answer. (1) No. There is no water shortage at Lake Mead.

(2) The level of water in the lake is at the lowest point since the dam was completed. This, however, is not due to a water shortage. It is due to the fact that more water has been taken out of the reservoir to make power than has come in.

(3) At Hoover Dam an acre-foot of water is about equal to a barrel of oil for purposes of power generation. Falling water costs nothing. Oil costs money. Therefore there is an incentive to use water to make power rather than oil. This incentive has overcome judgment and the power head at Hoover Dam has been reduced resulting in a further reduction of power. A depleted reservoir indicates a water shortage. Perhaps this depletion at this time has been deliberate in order to indicate a water shortage.

19. Does the presence of reservoirs in the upper basin jeopardize the water rights in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No. The Colorado River compact governs the water uses, and the pending legislation provides for integrated administration of the works in the best interests of the parties and the public and the remedies provided for each State in case of controversy.

20. What will be the impact of the proposed project on the agricultural surplus?

Answer. (1) The current agricultural surplus is limited to wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, corn and rice.

(2) Of these, only wheat and corn are grown in the upper-basin States and to a very limited degree. Most of the wheat in these States is grown on dry land, so is not involved; and only a very little corn is produced.

(3) Forage for livestock, some small grains, fruit, vegetables, and sugar beets are the principal crops. These are not in surplus. They are necessary for a balanced diet. They come on the market off season to other parts of the country, and more and more the local market will absorb the entire production.

(4) USDA reports that by 1962, at the present rate of consumption, the production of surplus crops will be in balance with consumption and the surplus will have disappeared.

(5) USDA forecasts a need by 1975 of an additional 115 million equivalent acres of land in production to meet minimum needs.

(6) 70 million of these equivalent acres will come from increased efficiencies of production. 45 million of these acres will have to come from new lands.

(7) The maximum that can be reclaimed from cutover and swamplands is about 21 million acres.

(8) A maximum of 6 million acres of irrigated land can be developed.

(9) It appears that by 1975 there will be a shortage of food supplies.

21. How does cost of installed power capacity at hydro and steam plants compare?

Answer. (1) They are not really comparable. Steam power plants use expendable fuel. The first cost of the boilers and steam turbines are much less expensive than the hydraulic turbines, penstocks, pipelines, and storage or equalizing reservoirs required in hydroelectric plants. Furthermore, dams and storage reservoirs are usually multipupose but the cost is allocated to power alone.

(2) Steam plants use fuel which is expendable. The costs of operation are very much higher. The advantage of lower cost installation is more than offset by the higher operation costs.

(3) The real criteria to compare the cost of steam and electric plants is the cost per kilowatt-hour produced and delivered to the load centers.

(4) Federal Power Commission and private power companies in addition to the USBR state that steam power cannot compete with hydropower from proposed plants on the upper Colorado.

(5) USBR figure for cost of steam power in the upper-basin area is 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. Equivalent costs of power at Echo Park and Glen Canyon computed by Federal Power Commission is 5.6 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

22. How does the cost of hydroplants on the Columbia, Tennessee, St. Lawrence, and the lower Colorado compare with the projects in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) They are not comparable.

(2) In some cases the reported costs include the transmission lines, substations, transformer, and all other appurtenant works. In other cases they do not.

(3) At Hoover Dam you are comparing costs as of 1930 with costs as of 1954. The cost of materials and labor has increased several times, and, at the same time, the value of the dollar has decreased. Therefore you can't compare the cost of two plants built 20 years apart. Improved design and increased efficiency have also increased cost.

(4) The cost of power per kilowatt-hour depends partially on the point at which it is delivered. Some cost reports give cost at bus bar, some for falling water, and some at load centers. It is misleading and unfair to compare costs that are not comparable.

(5) The 6-mill rate proposed for power from project plants is a competitive rate and not the cost of generating and delivery at load centers. The net profits from power revenues will be used to help pay costs of irrigation.

23. The proposed project is claimed to be a reclamation project. The cost figures show that the cost of power and municipal installations greatly exceed the cost of irrigation. How do you justify this project as a reclamation project?

Answer (1) S. 500 shows a total cost of $1,092,999,800.

(2) Nonreimbursable costs $8,238,000.

(3) Cost allocations for 5 dams and 12 participating projects:

(a) Power, $655,651,000.

(b) Municipal, $45,500,000.

(c) Irrigation, $378,109,900; water users will pay $82,921,500, power will pay $295,278,400.

(4) Cost of additional participating projects which are subject to further approval and authorization by Congress—21 projects:

(a) Total, $558,173,300.

(b) Nonreimbursable, $470,000.

(c) Power, $953,000.

(d) Municipal, $26,775,000.

(e) Irrigation, $529,975,300; water users will pay $103,365,700, power will pay $426,609,600.

(5) Total cost of storage and the two groups of participating projects, $1,658,460,100.

(6) The total cost is large. Power and municipal features represent 44 percent of the total cost. Irrigation 56 percent.

(7) Water for consumptive use in irrigation is the first objective. Power is incidental thereto but a valuable byproduct, the use of which makes the reclamation project economically feasible. The energy of the falling water costs nothing. The cost of facilities necessary to develop it is repaid to Government with interest.

24. How can the per-acre costs of irrigation be justified?

Answer (1) The irrigation costs per acre are high but not as high as have been reported by the opponents.

(2) It is dishonest arithmetic when per-acre costs are computed by dividing the total cost of the project, including power and municipal features, by the number of acres served. Costs as high as $5,000 per acre have been reported. Such figures are just not true.

(3) The following tabulation shows typical costs per acre and average costs for the 12 participating projects proposed for authorization.

Project	Land to be served (acres)			Total	Irrigation allocation	Cost per acre
	New	Supplemental	Indian			
Central Utah	28,540	131,840	42,630	203,010	$127,354,000	$627
Emery County	3,630	20,450		24,080	9,865,500	400
Gooseberry		16,400		16,400	5,727,500	349
12 participating projects	132,360	250,330	42,630	425,320	205,476,900	483

(4) These costs are not excessive:

(a) It is true they exceed the market value of the land today. The true measure is the present worth of this joined land and water resource 50 years from today.

(b) Joining good land and good water makes good management, creates renewable wealth.

(c) This new wealth provides homes and jobs and other general public benefits.

(d) The record shows that farms are bought and paid for once each generation. In 100 years this means a given farm would be bought and paid for, out of its earnings, four times. If the land and water were to become nonproductive at the end of 100 years, the present value would be worth at least $1,000 per acre.

(5) Any project which will join good land and good water under management which will keep these resources producing in perpetuity and return annually sufficient income to pay the operation, maintenance and replacement costs and enough in addition to build up a reasonable equity is fully justified.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in addition, I have statements with respect to various questions which have been raised before this body, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. PAYMENT OF COSTS ALLOCATED TO IRRIGATION: THREE UTAH PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

The central Utah project will provide a full water supply for 28,540 acres of new land and a supplemental supply for 131,840 acres of land which is now partially irrigated. The estimated total cost of the project as of 1953 is $231 million dollars, of which 6 million is nonreimbursable. For this total, power will repay $47 million, municipal water will repay $45 million, $127 million will be charged to irrigation. Of this, the water users will repay $15 million, and the balance will come from power revenues from the local projects and Echo and Glen Canyon power plants. Consumptive water users will pay 35 percent, revenues from project plants will pay 27 percent, and revenues from main stream power plants will pay 35 percent. The power, municipal, and irrigation allocations will be paid out within 50 years.

STATEMENT ON CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT—UTAH INITIAL PHASE OF PROJECT

The initial phase of the project would provide for the irrigation of 28,540 acres of new land and 131,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water. Full seasonal regulation would be provided for 42,600 acres of land in the Duchesne River area, more than half of which is owned by Indians or has been acquired from them; 48,800 acre-feet of water would be provided annually for municipal, industrial, and other miscellaneous uses. Power plants with an installed capacity of 61,000 kilowatts would generate approximately 373 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. Approximately 2.2 million kilowatt-hours of energy would be required by the project for irrigation and drainage pumping. Central Utah project powerplants would be interconnected with plants of the Colorado River storage project.

Preliminary land classification surveys of the project lands indicate that they would be suitable for sustained crop production under irrigation farming.

Summary data, central Utah project initial phase, Utah irrigated acreage

New land	28,540
Supplemental	131,840
Total	160,380

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, tomatoes; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Gooseberry project located in central Utah consists of a storage reservoir on the Price River, a tributary to the Colorado, and a transmountain diversion tunnel to the San Pitch River, a tributary to the Sevier River in the Bonneville Basin. The Sanpete Valley, which is supplied with water from the San Pitch River, is an established agricultural area. Its agricultural production, however, is limited to subsistence by annual water shortages. These annual water shortages will be practically eliminated on 16,400 acres of land by the construction of this project which will provide supplemental water for this area and stabilize its agriculture. It will cost $5,760,500, of which $33,000 is nonreimbursable. Of the reimbursable costs, $3,352,000 will come from power revenues.

Gooseberry project, Utah: The potential Gooseberry project would divert water from a headwater tributary in the Colorado River Basin to improve the irrigation water supply and thus the agricultural production, of 16,400 acres of arable lands in the Bonneville Basin in Sanpete County, central Utah.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 95 percent of the irrigated area producing alfalfa, pasture, and small grains for livestock feed. Principal livestock would include dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

A preliminary land classification survey indicates that the project lands would be suitable for sustained production of crops under irrigation farming. Detailed land classification would be required to confirm the suitability of all the lands.

Summary data, Gooseberry project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land	None
Supplemental	16,400
Total	16,400

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, pasture, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Emery County project consists of a storage reservoir, a diversion dam, and a main canal to distribute the storage water to the existing irrigation companies. The Emery County project will provide a supplemental water supply for 20,450 acres of land and a full supply for 3,630 acres. This additional water will expand the agriculture of the area through the introduction of late-season crops and stabilize both the production of forage and the livestock industry which is dependent upon it.

The Emery County project will cost $9,865,500, of which $229,000 is nonreimbursable. Of this reimbursable cost, the water users will pay $3,715,000, and the balance of $5,921,500 will come from power reserves.

Statement on Emery County project, Utah: The potential Emery County project is planned primarily to improve the irrigation water supply and thus better the agricultural production of 24,080 acres of land in Emery County in east central Utah near the towns of Huntington, Castle Dale, and Orangeville. The project is in the Green River Basin, a part of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 90 percent of the irrigated area producing hay and grains. The increased production in livestock feed would permit increased production on the farm of beef, sheep, pork, and dairy products.

Summary data, Emery County project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land	3,630
Supplemental	20,450
Total	24,080

Alfalfa, grain, peaches, vegetables; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

B. RECLAMATION PROJECTS AND THE SMALL FARMER: UTAH A TYPICAL CASE

There are two major weaknesses which confront farmers in Utah. The most important impact of these weaknesses is upon farm income, which I shall comment upon in detail in a moment.

The first of these weaknesses or handicaps is the small size of the average farming unit. In a country such as the United States where 9 percent of our farms produce 51 percent of the total value of all farm produce sold (and 22 percent produced 74 percent), it is evident that the most basic problem confronting American agriculture is not price support but the great number—over 80 percent—of our farms which are just too small to yield their operators satisfactory levels of living. Utah agriculture is a typical case in point, and it comprises part of this basic national agricultural problem.

Twelve and four-tenths percent of Utah's population in 1950 was engaged in agriculture. These people received in 1952 only 7.4 percent of the State's total income payments which went to Utahans. These people lived by and large on irrigated farms which averaged only 23 acres. But 23-acre farms, cultivated intensively as they are in Utah, are small family-sized farms, with a large number being classified, from the economic point of view, as marginal. As a result, an abnormally high percentage of Utah farmers are part-time farmers.

This problem has its roots in pioneer history. The size of farms has always been small; partly because irrigation made it a necessity, partly because of the philosophy of the early pioneers, which held that a family shouldn't own more land than its members could work. The small farm from the beginning was also an economic necessity because of the difficulty of physically developing an irrigation system. Modern canal and ditch digging tools were unknown. The task was so great that even with group action the canals could not be made of sufficient size to irrigate a large land acreage for each family. Nor was it possible to develop adequate water storage facilities for the same reasons. At present, therefore, the primary economic need of Utah agriculture is to expand the opportunity for full-time employment of its farming population.

How can this be done? Dr. W. Preston Thomas, former head of the Agricultural Economics Department at the Utah State Agricultural College, in a recent Utah Agricultural Experiment Station publication concludes that:

This can be done by expanding acreage of upland per farm or by using existing levels more intensively. In most areas of the State neither is possible because of a lack of irrigation water. (Farm and Home Service, March 1955).

The second weakness of Utah agriculture, however, is that the State lacks an adequate supply of water. This, in addition to making for irrigated farms which average only 23 acres in size, has also been responsible for the inability of Utah farmers to adjust the type of farming which prevails to meet the present day market demands which Utah farms are geographically best situated to supply. The result: Smaller markets and low potential farm income. As Dr. Thomas of the Utah State Agricultural College has so aptly put it:

"The home market and the California market normally need, for example: more dairy

products, more slaughter beef, more pork, and pork products, more chicken meat, more potatoes and similar products. Because they cannot be produced here, it is necessary to pay transportation costs."

C. How Reclamation Projects Can Stabilize Agriculture on a Regional Basis: the Colorado-Big Thompson Project

The 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland, but only 25 percent of the Nation's water supply. Yet, as of 1950, 94 percent of all the irrigated farmland in the United States, was located in these 17 States. As the President's Water Resources Policy Commission so ably phrased it in 1950: "Crop production in the Colorado River basin is dependent almost wholly on irrigation" (vol. 2, Ten Rivers in America's Future, No. 5, the Colorado, p. 11).

It is the shortage of water which has and will continue to limit land development in the western United States. Reservoirs of all sizes have been built to serve two major purposes:

1. To impound the early run-off waters; and

2. To control the flow for use as needed.

From a practical standpoint, as Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director, farm and land management research, Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture told the National Association of County Agricultural Agents last October, "The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir."

The part played by the reclamation project known as the Colorado-Big Thompson in alleviating the effect of the 1954 drought in Colorado is standing proof of the validity of Dr. Johnson's observation. Almost simultaneously with the completion of the major project works in the spring of 1954 came the worst drought in Colorado history. In this respect, the Bureau of Reclamation in its publication, The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954, stated:

"The basic water supply for the irrigated lands was, in most respects, the worst on record. Soil moisture content had shrunk to approximately 15 percent of normal, precipitation averaged about 50 to 60 percent of normal, and natural runoff dwindled to less than 40 percent of normal" (p. 6).

The Big Thompson's storage reservoirs, however, made possible the delivery of 300,352 acre-feet of supplemental water, which, when added to the natural runoff supply, though way below normal, and nonproject storage, brought up to normal the farmers' total water supply for the 1954 crop year.

What did this mean to Colorado agriculture? Namely, that the normal crop production level was nearly attained. Specifically the economists of the Bureau of Reclamation put it:

"Had the project water not been available, less than half a crop could have been harvested. Translated into terms of dollars, the difference amounted to $22 million. The worst year on record was licked. Widespread financial distress, delinquent payments, foreclosures, and all the other painful spawnings of drouth were prevented.

"Throughout the area which normally provides about one-fifth of Colorado's agricultural production, and also purchases about one-fifth of the products needed by all the State's farmers, business activity remained strong and healthy, some 75,000 nonfarm residents had a better income as a direct result of the project's victory over drought."

(The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954, p. 6.)

The stabilizing effect of reclamation projects in general is not limited to the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This observation is the essence of a letter dated February 8, 1955, which I received from W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. In part this letter pointed out that:

"There is a striking parallel between this story of success and the contributions other reclamation projects are making to the local, regional, and national economics. What the Colorado-Big Thompson project contributed in 1954, and will continue to contribute in the future, to the economic well-being of Colorado and the Nation in a large measure was being duplicated on other reclamation projects throughout the 17 western States.

"This record of accomplishment, moreover, leads to the inescapable conclusion that similar substantial gains to the local, regional, and national economics can be expected from construction of other projects."

In this respect the Colorado River storage project with its dozen participating projects is no exception. There projects will provide supplemental water for 250,333 acres of irrigated land, and in addition will also provide water for 152,360 acres of new irrigated land.

D. Payment of Costs Allocated to Irrigation: Entire Project

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission was created on January 3, 1950, by Executive Order 10045 for the purpose of recommending to the President "policies which should be followed by the Federal Government in fulfilling its proper responsibilities for the development, conservation, and use of the Nation's water resources." One of the major problems which had to be resolved involved the extent and character of the Federal Government's participation in major water resources programs.

With respect to multiple-purpose dams, such as those contemplated by the Colorado River storage project, the Commission concluded that:

"When multiple-purpose dams are built with Federal funds, the Federal Government enters the field of economic enterprise. The justification for this is beyond question: No other agency can command sufficient capital resources or provide the coordination necessary for the construction of these great projects. But Government enterprise does not in any way supplant private enterprise. Rather, its purpose is to provide the opportunity for the further expansion and healthy functioning of a free, competitive economy" (p. 8).

This conclusion has particular significance for financing the irrigation construction costs associated with the Colorado River project, since all lands easily irrigated have been developed primarily by local and private sources.

Dr. W. P. Thomas, former head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Utah State Agricultural College, writing in the Farm and Home Science magazine for March 1955, published by the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station, has summarized this problem as it affects Utah as follows:

"Utah is an arid region. Irrigation was born of necessity, and Utah settlers were forced to be pioneers in irrigation development. * * * The building of homes, the growth of communities, and the entire culture of the area have been closely interwoven with the progress and development of irrigation. From the beginning, the construction and rise of irrigation facilities were considered community problems, and now, after more than a century of development, the irrigation enterprises are dominantly small, cooperative, mutual companies. With the exception of a few Federal projects, irrigation development has been by community groups. It is quite natural that under such conditions and in a pioneer economy, the development should include only the lands and water facilities that could be most economically developed. A program for development of all the land and water resources is a vital need for Utah.

"As a result of this type of development, some irrigated lands have an inadequate water supply and some of the better lands have no water at all—yet in some places water remains unused. The financial requirements for developing these resources, however, are beyond the capacity of community groups alone."

The great effort which generally has been made by private sources to develop the water potential of this area has been described by Rainer Schickle, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, in his excellent book, Agricultural Policy, as follows:

"In 1948, an estimated 22 million acres of land were under irrigation on about 300,000 farms, most of it in the 17 western States. The water for approximately 70 percent of this land was supplied by private individuals or cooperative enterprises, 20 percent by irrigation districts, and 10 percent by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and other public agencies. Most of the land that can be irrigated at low cost is now so used, development and water cost per acre of additional irrigated land is rising sharply. This rise in per acre cost is only partly tempered by technological progress in construction methods and by the fact that the new water supply often comes from reservoirs which are not primarily built for irrigation purposes. This means that most of the land to be brought under irrigation in the future will depend upon public projects for water supply" (p. 125).

Repayment of all irrigation costs by farmers is not possible. On most of the projects now contemplated, irrigators will be unable to repay all such costs. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, in cognizance of this fact, recommended that:

"The primary beneficiaries of reclamation activities should repay without interest an amount assessed according to their ability to pay, based upon annual net income which the farmers derive from the project, under a formula adjusting repayment to production and marketing conditions, this amount to include the full costs of operation and maintenance of facilities. An agreed portion of the remaining investment cost allocated to reclamation should be assumed by the local communities, conservancy districts, or interests receiving secondary benefits from the project under arrangements with the State or States in which the projects are located.

"The remaining cost should be borne by the Federal Government as a measure of national interest." (A Water Policy for the American People, vol. 1, pp. 84–85.)

Dr. Schickle, head of the department of agricultural economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, and an outstanding student of the economics of the irrigation aspect of multiple-purpose dams is of a similar opinion. He concludes that:

"The rate of repayment of irrigation development costs by farmers should be geared to what they are able to pay, under average management and prevailing prices after farm operating expenses and minimum adequate family living requirements have been met. This can perhaps be done by allocating to irrigation only those original investments which otherwise would not have been made and by extending the repayment period over a sufficiently long period of time to keep the annual payment rates within farmer's ability to pay. Any residual cost not covered by repayments would then be mainly for the multi-purpose structures, such as major dams, and should be borne by society as a whole." (Agricultural Policy, p. 125.)

The ability or inability of irrigation users to pay the costs of multiple-purpose dams, however, is not the controlling factor in determining the economic justification of irrigation projects which will result in a net gain to society as a whole. Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of Interstate Streams

for Utah gave an excellent analysis of benefits compared to costs before the House of Representative's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on March 14 of this year. Dr. Clyde said:

"The Bureau of Reclamation benefit-cost analysis recognizes three main types of tangible benefits:

"Direct benefits: Benefits derived from increased production of farm products (from detailed farm budget analysis); increased production of electric power; reduction of damage from floods; pollution, and sedimentation; recreation and conservation of fish and wildlife; provision for domestic, municipal, and industrial water and other directly beneficial effects.

"Indirect benefits: Benefits derived from the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers.

"Public benefits: Represent the increase or improvement in settlement, job, investment opportunities, community facilities and services, and the stabilization of the local and regional economy.

"The construction of a reclamation project which brings together land, water, and people creates new wealth. New wealth is a benefit in any language. A good index of the value of the benefits is the broadened tax base and rise in income taxes which have followed the construction of every reclamation project in the United States.

"The cost side of the benefit-cost comparison includes all costs: Construction, interest on all unpaid balances, and costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement.

"All recommended units of the Colorado storage project and participating projects, collectively and individually, have tangible benefits greater than costs. For the projects in my State the benefit-cost ratios are as follows:

"Central Utah, 1.23 to 1.

"Gooseberry, 1.2 to 1.

"Emery County, 1.38 to 1."

The bill, S. 500, contemplates the use of electric-power revenues from project powerplants in order to keep the repayment schedules for irrigation farmers within their ability to pay, rather than relying entirely upon the Federal Government to meet this expense or as recommended by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. The use of power revenues from the project to pay off a portion of the irrigation costs is not a subsidy to irrigation, since, as Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner on interstate streams for Utah, told the Senate Interior Committee:

"There are many indirect benefits to citizens in both the local, and State, and the national areas. Property values increase where agriculture is stabilized. Business improves when the farmers are making money. The tax base is broadened and industries and services are established in prosperous agricultural communities. It is the accepted national policy that reclamation projects be supported with interest-free money for construction because of the indirect benefits accruing to the general public at all levels. The water users and the indirect beneficiaries from an irrigation project are the same people. Therefore, the use of power revenues to pay indirect benefits is not a subsidy but an equitable method of assessing indirect beneficiaries for their share of the cost of the irrigation works. Interest-free money for irrigation works is no more a subsidy than the use of Federal funds for flood control or river and harbor improvement, none of which costs are ever repaid. The use of power revenues to pay costs of irrigation works above the ability of the water users to pay is not a subsidy and this money does not come out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is compensation for the use of the water belonging to the upper basin States for the purpose of producing power. The upper basin States are the owners of the right to use the water allocated to them by the Colorado River compact for all beneficial purposes, including power. It, therefore, follows that if these waters are used to make hydropower, the upper basin States are entitled to compensation for such use. The upper basin States are not asking for all the revenues from this use, but only sufficient to pay a portion of the irrigation costs. The power revenues from this project will be sufficient to pay the cost of power facilities with interest and the cost of irrigation facilities, without interest, over and above the ability of the irrigators to pay in a period of 50 years. After that time the recurring water will produce power revenues in addition to the annual cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement of $15 to $20 million a year which will pour into the public treasury." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 142.)

All units: Storage and participating

Construction costs:	
Total	$1,092,999,800
Nonreimbursable	8,238,900
Reimbursable	1,084,760,900
Irrigation	378,109,900
Repayment: Water users	82,921,500
Repayment: Power revenues	996,339,400

E. Agricultural Economic Studies Indicate Need for Project

In order to appraise the impact of the Colorado River storage project upon the agriculture of the upper basin States, or that of any other like project upon the agriculture of a given area, basic economic projection studies are needed. Such studies in advance of construction, and followup studies, have been made for other projects in the upper Colorado Basin area either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations of the States concerned.

For example, the justification of one such project in Utah, the Weber Basin project, from an agricultural standpoint, was the subject of such a study by three agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the USDA. Headed by Dr. G. T. Blanch, presently the chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics of Utah State Agricultural College, these economists concluded with respect to the Weber Basin project that:

"Based on the results of their own work and their confidence in the conclusions reached by others * * * working on the project, the economic investigators believe that lands proposed for irrigation within the Weber Basin project could be developed into satisfactory farms through the proposed development of irrigation and drainage facilities; that it is highly probable that an economically and socially satisfactory system of agriculture would result; and that, in addition to supporting the farm families and community institutions at a reasonable level, agriculture can contribute substantial amounts toward the cost of operating and construction of the project and the repayment of construction costs." (Fuhriman, Blanch & Stewart, Weber Basin Reclamation project, Utah (Logan: Agricultural Experiment Station, USAC, Special Rept. No. 7, Dec. 1952, p. 32).)

Prior to the authorization of the Weber Basin project, the Echo and Pine View Reclamation projects were constructed making possible the delivery of a full supplemental supply of water to farmland located in the area served. Have the results confirmed the findings of the USDA agricultural economists referred to above? Have they justified the cost involved? During the 1954 hearings of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the Colorado River project, I asked these questions of Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation, which encompasses the upper basin States. The colloquy was as follows:

"Senator Watkins. Do you have in mind any project, for instance, in the State of Utah where you could illustrate the benefits that come to the United States, or anywhere else for that matter? It does not matter to me which one you use. I could direct your attention to the Echo project in Utah, which I think is a very good example.

"Mr. Larson. The Weber River project, or Echo project as it is sometimes called, is not to be confused with Echo Park. It is a very good illustration. On that project, in the early days of the pioneers, about 65 percent of the land was used for the growing of grain, and most of the remainder for alfalfa. Today, the area totals about 75,000 acres. Out of that 75,000 acres only about 8 or 10 percent is used for the growing of grain. There are now many very important crops, such as truck crops, and vegetable and fruit crops for canning. For instance, the tomato crop is very large and is canned there. I might say, too, that the total gross crop value of that project, before the construction of the Echo Reservoir, never exceeded about $1¼ million and most of the time less than that. Since the construction of Echo Reservoir and a full supplemental supply of water made available, the gross crop value of that project has been as high as $14 million in 1 year, and $10 million in many years.

"Senator Watkins. Of course, that means increased income taxes paid to the United States.

"Mr. Larson. Several canning factories have been brought in, and there are new businesses of all kinds, and I daresay that increased income tax to the United States as a result of that water is many times the construction payment by the water users.

"Senator Watkins. It has provided for employment of additional men and women? That is a general result, is it not, on a project of that kind?

"Mr. Larson. Yes." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 82.)

It is significant to point out that Mr. Larson's reply indicated not only that agricultural income of the farmers concerned had been increased nearly 10 times, but also that the supplemental water provided had been instrumental in changing the type of crops produced. A few short years ago 65 percent of the 75,000 acres were used for drain production. Today only 9 percent are used for that purpose. What is significant about this trend? Namely, that reclamation projects such as this do not result in the production of commodities which are in surplus supply today. Most of this land—over 90 percent—is used for the production of forage for livestock, truck and canning vegetable and fruit crops—crops which are not even subject to price support by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in 1949 made just such an economic appraisal of the potential effects of the Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture. And in March 1954 their salient conclusions were contained in abbreviated form in the periodical Farm and Home Science, published by the State Agricultural Experiment Station. These studies revealed that:

1. Only 40 percent or 408,000 acres of irrigated land has an adequate water supply.

2. Only 2,875,000 acre-feet of water is now available annually for irrigation.

3. But 5,039,000 acre-feet of water will be available annually for irrigation if the water resources are developed.

They likewise revealed, if the water resources of the State are developed in a manner anticipated and provided for in S. 500, that—

1. Ninety percent of the irrigated lands within the area served after development would have an adequate water supply. This would represent an increase of 125 percent of land having an adequate supply.

2. Seventy percent increase in crop production after development.

In summarizing the import of Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture, Dr. W. Preston Thomas, head of the department of agricultural economics at Utah State Agricultural College, at the time of the basic study referred to, which was completed in 1949, stated:

"At the present time 80 percent of labor utilized in agriculture is employed on irrigated farms. Of the total agricultural income for Utah, 75 percent is derived from irrigated farming, 20 percent comes from range livestock, and only 5 percent from dry farming. According to range conservationists the number of livestock that can be grazed on Utah ranges is limited and the small amount of rainfall in most areas restricts the expansion of dry farming.

"It therefore follows that Utah's opportunity for agricultural expansion and development and the addition of new agricultural wealth lies in the further development and more efficient use of irrigation water within the State including its transfer from the Colorado River to the Bonneville Basin."

This problem is not peculiar to Utah's agriculture but is common to that of every upper basin State in particular, as concerns the Colorado River project, and all the western agricultural States in general. The significance of this situation was ably depicted by Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director of farm and management research, Agricultural Research Service, USDA. In a talk last October before the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in Salt Lake City, he dramatically told the assembled delegates that—

"Today the 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland * * *, they have (however) only about one-fourth of the Nation's water supply.

"About 94 percent of all of the irrigated land in farms in 1950 was found in the 17 Western States—77 percent of it in the 11 Mountain and Pacific States. In these 11 States, about a third of the cropland is irrigated. * * * Reservoirs of all sizes are built to impound the floodwaters and to control the flow for use as needed by crops and pasture, and by the cities and towns. * * * The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir.

"Looking ahead, the shortage of water will limit land development in the West. At the present time over 90 percent of the water that is consumptively used in the West is for irrigation. With rapid growth of population in the Far Western States, some of this water will have to be shared with cities and towns for industrial and municipal uses. Some new irrigation projects are under consideration, and taking the 17 Western States as a whole, perhaps some 5 million acres of additional land might be irrigated by 1975" (pp. 5, 6, and 9).

F. Reclamation Projects and Surplus Agricultural Commodities

One issue which has been raised with respect to the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects involves the use of reclamation to bring in new land, when, as the opponents say, we are plagued with the problem of agricultural surpluses. Why, they ask, should large sums of money be invested in projects which bring new lands into production through irrigation when large amounts of Federal funds are now being spent to support farm prices.

Here is the answer, which I shall try and condense, although it has many aspects which must be considered:

1. The crops grown in the four upper basin States are not in surplus nor are they crops now under price support. In addition, however, the new water supply made possible by the project will not be used in their production.

In Utah, only 7 percent of the cash receipts of farmers are from basic commodities, notably wheat. In Wyoming, farmers receive only 8 percent of their cash from receipts from the sale of basic commodities. Colorado farmers received 18 percent of their income from basic commodities, of which 17.6 percent is derived from wheat. This wheat, however, is grown in eastern Colorado on lands which will never utilize water from the Colorado River. New Mexico farmers received 38 percent of their income from the role of basic commodities of which cotton, grown in southern New Mexico, constitutes 37 percent. No water from participating projects authorized by S. 500 will find its way into the agricultural production of this area. As President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission reported in 1950:

"Livestock raising is the basin's principal agricultural pursuit, particularly in the northern region. * * * Moreover, 30 percent of the basin's irrigated land is used to grow alfalfa as winter feed for the many kinds of sheep and cattle that graze the range."

2. Agricultural production due to the increased supply of water from the participating projects will not be a fact for many years to come if this bill were passed by the Congress and signed by the President today.

It will require 25 to 30 years to construct the initial phase of the project, over 20 years to fill the reservoirs in the project, and 100 years to develop complete utilization of the upper basin's share of the water. So it is evident that even if the crops which are produced in the upper basin States did constitute a surplus problem, which they do not, it would be impossible for added production due to project water to make a material contribution for at least 10 years.

3. By the time when the initial phases of the upper Colorado River project are completed—25 years from now—the American people will need all of the agricultural production our farm economy can produce.

President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission estimated in 1950 in the light of future food requirements that not only are the present food surpluses temporary, but also that 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975.

This estimated need of 100 million additional acres of cropland takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and that export acreage would remain constant. The Commission estimated the potential sources of meeting this additional need as follows:

Source	*Acres*
1. Acre equivalent of ordinary farm land reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection	21,000,000
2. Newly irrigated land (equivalent)	9,000,000
3. Increased productivity on present lands under cultivation (assuming that productivity would increase 18 percent by 1975 over the base period 1945–49)	46,000,000
Total	76,000,000

This potential of 76 million leaves a need for an additional 24 million acres of crop land.

On the basis of its analysis and conclusions, the Commission concluded that:

"Reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farm lands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities."

It is evident that the rate at which the land can be brought into production is much less than the demand for increased production can possibly be. It is for this reason that the United States Department of Agriculture estimated that by 1962 our present agricultural surpluses will have disappeared.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have a further statement on the many problems connected with the project, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS RELATIVE TO S. 500, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT BILL

Many people, essentially uninformed conservationists who should know better, have been challenging the engineering studies of the Colorado River storage project, questioning data as to dam structure foundations, and even charging that possible alternatives to the recommended project units have not been given adequate consideration.

At the risk of dignifying these unreasonable and wholly unfounded charges, I wish to take a few moments to review some of the historical background of the extensive and detailed engineering investigation that went into the Department of the Interior report which was the basis for S. 500, now before the Senate. As a serious student of reclamation policy and practitioner of reclamation law for 17 years before coming to Congress, and as a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since 1947, I can assure the Senate that no other water resources development project to my knowledge has come before this body with the thorough and competent engineering study which constitutes the foundation of this measure. Furthermore, S. 500 represents the type of well-planned, basinwide, multiple-purpose water-resource project that some Members of this body have been demanding for years, and it reflects the type of comprehensive engineering, economic, and resource planning that, in my estimation, should become compulsory for proposed water-resource developments in the future.

In making that statement, I do not wish to throw discredit on any other area that is obliged to bring individual water-resource projects before the Congress in advance of basinwide planning. Such basinwide planning takes time and demands that States agree on their basic needs and objectives. In our case, we were forced into a basinwide approach. Downstream delivery commitments agreed to by the four upper basin States in the Colorado River compact of 1922, forced us to regard holdover water storage as a first consideration in plans to utilize water from the Colorado River. The costs and complexities of fulfilling this requirement necessitated that we work together and cooperate with the Government agencies that undertook to work out a plan for solving the engineering and economic problems involved.

We also were fortunate in having the funds to finance such costly planning and engineering investigation. Roughly $10 million, derived from funds accruing to the upper basin States from Hoover Dam power, and contributions from States involved, has been allocated for these basinwide investigations conducted over 25 years.

Engineering investigations in the upper Colorado River Basin actually began as early

as 1904, over half a century ago. At that time, a reconnaissance survey of the Green River, covering portions of the stream now considered for some of the controversial units of the Colorado River storage project, was made by the Bureau of Reclamation. I hereby introduce at the end of my remarks, as exhibit 1, an extract from the seventh annual report of the Reclamation Service, 1907–8, which refers to this survey.

(See exhibit 1.)

You will note from this extract that by 1908, Flaming Gorge, 1 of the 9 storage-dam sites in the Colorado River project, had already been under engineering study as a reservoir site. Borings also had been made at the Browns Park Dam site, covered in the 1904 reclamation withdrawal exempted in the Dinosaur Monument proclamation of 1938.

Island Park also was under active consideration as a potential reservoir site at that time, but it subsequently was dropped in favor of two better adjoining sites, Echo Park and Split Mountain. Island Park, like its better known neighbor, Echo Park, also is not a National or State park in any sense of the word. Both are just wide spots on the Green River.

I will not bother to make similar citations from other annual reports of the Bureau of Reclamation or from similar reports of the United States Corps of Engineers, which also made river control studies of the Colorado at various times during the past half century.

Water studies on the Colorado River were summarized in the Department of the Interior's Water Supply Paper 395, published in 1916. It is significant that by this time, five more dam sites on the Green and Yampa Rivers, within the present boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument had been under active consideration. At that time, however, Dinosaur Monument was confined to its original quarry section of 80 acres, which had been set aside by Presidential proclamation in 1915.

Extracts from this study are interesting in that they point out that engineering studies already were well advanced by that date. I introduced these excerpts at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

(See exhibit 2.)

In 1920 another Federal agency came into the picture—the Federal Power Commission. This independent agency was established by the Congress pursuant to the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, in order to effect the systematic development of the country's hydropower resources. The FPC also assumed jurisdiction of existing Federal lands reserved for power development, and was given authority to make additional reservations, or withdrawals as they are also known, to protect the public's interest in other potential power sources located in the public domain.

Under authority of this 1920 act, the Utah Power & Light Co., a private power utility interested in developing the power resources of the upper Colorado River, was authorized to participate in a cooperative survey of large sections of the Colorado River and its upper tributaries. This survey resulted in the maps and river profiles published by the Department of the Interior in 1922.

The results of these cooperative studies and other engineering investigations were summarized in a 456-page volume published in 1930, Water Supply Paper 618 of the Department of the Interior. This volume was entitled "The Green River and Its Utilization," and it was written by the late Ralf R. Woolley, one of the all-time great field engineers of the United States Geological Survey and who was incidentally a member of one of the first scientific river-running parties to negotiate the Green River by boat.

I have made a few extracts from this publication to show how extensive were the engineering studies of the Green River by 1930, and I insert these excerpts as exhibit 3, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 3.)

Included in this exhibit are two plates which cannot be reproduced in the RECORD. These are profile maps of both the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, as then proposed.

At that time, the investigations authorized in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, had just been initiated. These investigations authorized by Congress were to be made by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of producing a comprehensive program for the development of the water resources of the Colorado River, including irrigation, power, and other multiple uses.

Authorization of this large-scale, multiple-purpose investigation in 1928 by the Congress indicates why both reclamation and power withdrawals within the area proposed for inclusion within an expanded Dinosaur National Monument in the mid-1930's would be of concern to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the four upper-basin States interested in development of their allocated share of the river.

Up to 1930, the major interest in the reservoir sites on the Green River in the Green and Yampa Canyon sections, was primarily for power development. This interest is expressed in Mr. Woolley's report. It also is reflected by the fact that there are 10 power site withdrawals valid and in effect within the Dinosaur National Monument extension, and only 1 reclamation withdrawal.

However, both types of withdrawals were clearly of interest to Government engineers engaged in the past quarter century of upper Colorado River water-development investigations. This is emphasized in a letter written on December 13, 1934, by FPC Chairman Frank R. McNinch, in answer to a request from the National Park Service that power withdrawals on the Green and Yampa Rivers be vacated to permit the proposed expansion of the Dinosaur Monument. I hereby introduce, as exhibit 4, the McNinch letter of December 13, 1934, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 4.)

You will note that Chairman McNinch enclosed a copy of Water Supply Paper No. 618 with his letter, along with Yampa and Green River profile maps, so there is no reason to believe that the National Parks Service was unaware of the tremendous importance of those power resources prior to the Dinosaur Monument expansion.

Now these reports to which I have been referring do not in and of themselves comprise the total field notes and engineering data assembled in that quarter century of earnest study. They represent only the distillation of many hundreds upon hundreds of pages of field notes and project studies.

These multi-agency studies had been extensive up to that time, but on July 19, 1940, investigations of the Colorado River received a tremendous financial shot in the arm. At that time, President F. D. Roosevelt signed the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, which created the Colorado River Development Fund and authorized allocation to it of $500,000 per year from power revenues. All of the fund revenues from 1940 to 1955 were to be utilized in the investigation of projects under consideration for the comprehensive basinwide water resource development program.

Never before, to my knowledge, has such a large engineering investigation fund been authorized for a river basin study in advance of congressional consideration of the overall project. We residents of the four upper basin States are indebted to President Roosevelt and the 76th Congress for permitting us to utilize our power revenues to supplement contributions by the States for such a thorough and competent basin-wide investigation.

These expanded Colorado River Basin investigations were culminated by the March 1946 publication of The Colorado River—A Comprehensive Report on the Development of the Water Resources of the Colorado River Basin for Irrigation, Power Production, and Other Beneficial Uses in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. This was a 293-page book, amply supplemented with well illustrated charts and maps.

This monumental document presented an inventory of 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for the consideration of the Congress and the States involved in arriving at a final comprehensive development plan. One hundred of these projects were included within the upper basin area.

The 1946 report makes this point: "A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate this information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of this development."

To indicate the nature of this report and the extensive engineering information assembled by 1946, I hereby introduce these excerpts from that 293-page document as exhibit 5, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 5.)

Information assembled in these very extensive reports and investigations was made available to the four States involved. Each of the States conducted independent studies on its own and made recommendations on projects to the Bureau of Reclamation. The Department of Interior reported that "important contributions" and substantiating materials were provided by the States and by the upper Colorado River Compact Commission.

On December 15, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted his formal report to the Congress on the Colorado River storage project, outlining a comprehensive program for development of the upper basin of the Colorado River. This report followed action by the 4 States involved which resulted in the upper basin compact of 1949, allocating among the 4 States the water apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact of 1922.

This detailed upper basin study comprising several hundred pages represents the last formal report issued on the proposed comprehensive development of the Colorado River. However, engineering studies have gone forward in the States involved and in the Bureau of Reclamation since 1950. Furthermore, investigations are still going on and will be continued on individual projects, including some special economic studies called for in this bill, right up to the start of construction.

All of this material, together with the concrete exhibit of a relatively small number of reports and field studies assembled as a floor display, suggests the tremendous scope of the engineering and economic investigations that have been made into this great comprehensive project for development of the water resources of the Colorado River.

All potential reservoir and dam sites on the river have been studied and catalogued. This includes all the so-called "alternatives" to Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

Projects recommended to the Congress are covered by detailed engineering reports, and represent the most efficient and most economical of those that are possible within the basin.

It is a sound project, planned to function for hundreds of years, but designed to pay back the construction costs, including

interest on power and municipal features, in 50 years.

Much of the planning was done under a Democratic administration, and the project is now backed wholeheartedly by the present Republican administration, so it is a true product of bipartisan planning and will stand as a monument to both our great political parties, each of which is solidly on record as favoring projects of this nature.

The Colorado River storage project was endorsed in the Senate hearings by Administrator Val Peterson of the Civil Defense Administration. In fact, it is my profound conviction, after hearing Governor Peterson's testimony that the development of this water and power in the mountain area is so important to national defense, that Congress would be justified in going ahead with its authorization and construction, even if the residents of the respective States opposed it, which they most assuredly do not.

From my years of experience with irrigation and reclamation projects, I can wholeheartedly endorse the Colorado River storage project and recommend that the Senate speedily pass Senate 500 so that the desert area involved, and the rest of the Nation, can start receiving its benefits in the shortest time possible.

EXHIBIT 1

EXTRACT FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE, 1907–1908 (P. 57)

The Colorado River projects consist of a number of possible irrigation developments on the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California, the principal of which are the Blythe, Parker, and Needles. Descriptions of the Colorado River projects will be found in the 1st and 2d annual reports. The lands of these projects are to be irrigated with water from the Colorado River, but there is an insufficient normal water supply in the river for the purpose of their proper irrigation. The success of the projects therefore depends on the storage of water in the drainage waters of the Grand and the Green River systems, forming the Colorado River.

A description of the storage reservoirs investigated on the Grand River and its tributaries will be found in the fourth annual report. During 1904 investigations were carried on in connection with certain possible reservoirs on the Green River. A reconnaissance survey of Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Ouray, Utah, was made for the purpose of determining the most feasible location for a storage reservoir that would control the entire flow of the river, and special investigations were made in connection with the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, Wyoming and Utah; the Browns Park Reservoir site, Utah and Colorado; the Island Park Reservoir site, Utah; the Narrows Reservoir site, Utah; the Ouray Reservoir site, Utah. No feasible dam sites were found in connection with the last two of these reservoir sites.

FLAMING GORGE AND ISLAND PARK RESERVOIR SITES

The Flaming Gorge Reservoir site is located about 40 miles south of Green River, Wyo. The fall of the river above Henrys Fork is quite uniform and light and there are no rapids in the river between Henrys Fork and Green River. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 300,000 and 350,00 acre-feet. This capacity is not sufficient to control the flow of the river at the dam. The dam site is located in Flaming Gorge, about 1½ miles below Henrys Fork. The length of the dam at the crest would be about 800 feet and at the present low-water surface about 380 feet. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta seamy sandstone. The stratification is irregular, especially on the right bank, which is a perfect anticlinal flexure. The land covered by the reservoir site is chiefly unimproved.

The Island Park Reservoir site is located in Utah, about 22 miles northeast of Vernal. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 130,000 and 15,000 acre-feet. The dam site is located in Split Mountain Canyon and a dam 100 feet high would be 700 feet long at the crest and about 350 feet long at the present low-water surface. The rock at the dams site consists of hard, seamy sandstone with irregular stratification. This reservoir might be utilized for storing the flow of Bear River, thus serving as an auxiliary storage to the Browns Park Reservoir in caring for the flow from this source coming into Green River below Browns Park.

BROWNS PARK RESERVOIR SITE

Browns Park Reservoir site is located in Utah and Colorado, about 55 miles south of Rock Springs, Wyo. The dam site is located in the upper end of Ladon Canyon. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta sandstone and is uniformly bedded. The reservoir would control the flow of the entire river except in the wettest years, and the site is the most feasible of those investigated by the Reclamation Service on Green River. The land covered by the reservoir site consists of winter pasture lands.

During the past season borings at the dam site have been in progress for the purpose of determining the distance to bedrock.

EXHIBIT 2

EXCERPTS FROM WATER SUPPLY PAPER NO. 395, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, 1916

What is to be the future of this immense region? Doubtless its forests will be utilized, its mineral wealth will be exploited, its wonderful scenic beauties will be unfolded. Its greatest development must come, however, from its water resources, on which the development of its other resources must largely depend. Without the water afforded by Colorado River and its tributaries this basin would remain forever a barren desert. These rivers make possible not only the construction of large irrigation systems and the growth of towns, cities, and prosperous agricultural communities but also the generation of hydroelectric power for lighting, heating, industrial uses, and the transportation of freight and passengers.

The United States Geological Survey began the study of the water resources of the basin by establishing gaging stations on Gila River at Buttes, Ariz., in 1889. Since that time records of river discharge have been collected at 180 points in the basin. In the collection of these records and in the study of water resources the United States Reclamation Service, the Indian Office, the Forest Service, and the Weather Bureau have cooperated. Each of these Federal bureaus has also made independent investigations of certain questions pertaining to the water resources. The Reclamation Service has investigated the available water supply for particular projects and the feasibility of proposed works that have been more or less definitely outlined. That service has also studied the possibilities of storage on the Gila, San Juan, Grand, and Green rivers, and on the Colorado below the junction of the Grand and Green. The Indian Office has investigated the available water, and its possible uses on the Indian reservations in the basin. The Forest Service has studied the water supply and possible water powers of the national forests. The Weather Bureau has collected records of precipitation, temperature, and evaporation at many points. In addition, the State officials who have had the responsibility of distributing the water among a great number of users and of recording, examining, and approving water filings, have collected a mass of information as to the present and proposed use of the streams in the basin. Much exploratory work has been done by private parties and corporations, irrigation and power projects have been examined, railroad routes have been surveyed, and the Grand Canyon has been traversed by several persons and parties since Major Powell made the pioneer trip. The diversion of water outside the basin to irrigate nearly half a million acres in the Salton Basin, the breach in the river banks and the diversion of the whole flow of the river to the Salton Sink with the resulting danger to and loss of valuable property in Imperial Valley, the spectacular struggle and final success of the Southern Pacific Co. in closing the breach and restoring the flow of the river to the Gulf of California, and the international questions involved in the joint use of the river by the United States and the Republic of Mexico have brought to the attention of the people of the country, as well as to State and Federal officials, first one and then another phase of the many problems involved in the utilization of Colorado River.

The information relating to the water resources that has been collected by many agencies has never been brought together so that a broad view of the possible utilization of the whole river could be obtained. Mr. La Rue has attempted the pioneer work of assembling the principal facts relating to the subject, and especially of studying the possibility of controlling the flow of the whole river by means of storage reservoirs in order to avoid further danger of overflow to the Salton Sink and to render available for profitable use the enormous quantity of water which now flows unused and largely unusable to the Gulf of California in the form of floods.

In discussing the broader problems of the basin, hundreds, yes, thousands, of the minor possibilities and even plans for expansion have necessarily been unmentioned, though future minor developments will have great local importance and in the aggregate considerable national significance. In general such projects do not preclude the larger use of the river but must be undertaken as part of that larger use.

This report does not, of course, contain the last word on the uitilization of Colorado River. Additional facts will become known that may modify the conclusions here recorded. It is hoped, however, that a foundation has been laid for future comprehensive discussion and treatment that will not ignore the effects produced on the present or future utilization of the river by developments in other parts of the basin. The importance of Colorado River to the prosperity of an area extending over seven States warrants broad consideration and perhaps Federal assistance not only in the construction of large irrigation systems and incidental storage works, but also in the important phases of river control.

* * * * *

UNDEVELOPED POWER SITES

Green River Basin

Flaming Gorge Reservoir power site (1): The Flaming Gorge power site is at the dam site for the Flaming Gorge Reservoir in northeastern Utah (pp. 199–201). The elevation of the low-water level of Green River at the dam site in Horseshoe Canyon is 5,825 feet. By constructing a dam to elevation 6,050 for storing to elevation 6,040 feet, the reservoir capacity would be 3,130,000 acre-feet. The storage capacity between the 6,000- and 6,040-foot contour would be 1,210,000 acre-feet, or sufficient to equalize the flow of the river at this point and insure a minimum flow of 2,700 second-feet. By constructing a 3-mile tunnel at elevation 6,000 feet, an effective head of about 290 feet could be obtained. With a head of 290 feet and a flow of 2,700 second-feet, 71,000 brake horsepower could be developed.

Swallow Canyon power site (2): Swallow Canyon is near the upper end of Browns Park, in northeastern Utah. This canyon is about 2 miles long. At its upper end, in sec. 31, T. 2 N., R. 25 E., Salt Lake meridian, an outcrop of solid rock extending across the channel of Green River indicates that

it would be practicable to construct a high dam. The water level could be raised about 150 feet without interfering with the development of the Flaming Gorge site. By utilizing the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, a uniform flow of 2,700 second-feet could be maintained, which, with a head of 150 feet, would make possible the development of 36,800 brake horsepower.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FOR WATER SUPPLY PAPER NO. 618, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, 1930

(Preface by Nathan C. Grover)

The Green River and its drainage basin are interesting economically, historically, and scenically. The river constitutes one of the great natural resources of Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. It has had an influence on the exploration, settlement, and development of the West and is woven into the history of the white man's progress throughout a broad region. Its canyons are grand and beautiful but unfortunately are so difficult to traverse that they have been seen by relatively few people.

The Green River is the largest tributary of the Colorado and brings to that river nearly one-half of the water flowing in the stretch just below the junction. The mean annual runoff of the Green from a drainage area of nearly 45,000 square miles is about 5,700,000 acre-feet; the mean annual runoff from a drainage area of 26,500 square miles of the Colorado above the Green is about 6,800,000 acre-feet. Although its drainage basin is more than 70 percent greater than that of the Colorado above the junction, the runoff of the Green is somewhat smaller because of the relatively low precipitation on much of the basin. It is far larger than any other tributary of the Colorado, the next in size being the San Juan, which has a mean annual runoff of somewhat more than 2,500,000 acre-feet.

The drainage basin of the Green, situated in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, ranges in altitude from more than 15,000 feet in the summits of the mountains to about 3,900 feet in the valley at its mouth. The average annual precipitation on the basin ranges from perhaps 50 inches or more near the summits of the high mountains to 6 inches or less in the southern valleys. The runoff from tributaries ranges from perhaps 30 inches or more in depth in the high mountain areas to a small fraction of an inch in the driest valleys.

Within the basin of the Green are mountain valleys that have excellent stands of timber, broad fertile valleys that are irrigated in part, excellent rangelands for stock, and vast areas of mountains and valleys that are essentially of desert character. Within it also are large deposits of phosphate rock, extensive coalfields which yield valuable bituminous coals, and vast areas of oil shales. Oilfields that may have considerable future importance may yet be discovered here. The population in 1920 was largely engaged in agriculture and devoted principally to producing forage crops and raising stock.

The basin is traversed by two transcontinental railroads—the Union Pacific-Oregon Short Line system and the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad. It is penetrated also from the east by the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad (Moffat line). Two transcontital highway routes also cross the basin, one by way of Green River, Wyo., and the other by way of Green River, Utah. Many highways of lesser importance make a large part of the basin reasonably accessible.

Because of resources in agricultural lands, in water for their irrigation, and for the development of power, and in the possibilities of producing electric power from coal and oil, the future growth of the region will doubtless be largely rural but in part urban, based on agriculture and industry. Water will be needed in large quantities as an important if not a controlling factor in such growth, in agriculture for irrigation; in the production of electric energy, for use through the turbines of water-power plants and through the condensers of steam-power plants; in manufacturing, for many industrial processes; and in the present and future towns and cities for domestic and municipal uses.

The ultimate area of land that may be irrigated in the basin of the Green River is estimated at 1,782,800 acres. There are four principal irrigable sections. The basin of the upper Green River in Wyoming, in which there is an estimated irrigable area of 755,000 acres, is all above 5,800 feet in altitude. Its agricultural possibilities are, therefore, limited to the forage crops needed for winter feeding to the great herds of stock that graze within the mountain valleys of the upper basin. The Yampa and White River Basins, in Colorado, have irrigable areas estimated at 467,400 acres, ranging in altitude from 5,000 to 8,000 feet and, therefore, utilized largely for producing forage crops. The Uinta basin in Utah, having an estimated irrigable area of 295,000 acres, lies at 5,000 to 6,000 feet above sea level, and forage crops predominate there. The lower Green River Basin, including the valleys of the Price and San Rafael Rivers, contains an estimated irrigable area of 265,400 acres. These lands, which are situated farther south and at lower altitudes, have a greater range in agricultural products than the other three irrigable sections.

Only 1,850 horsepower of water power is now developed in the basin of the Green River. The total of undeveloped water power, 760,000 horsepower, is more impressive. In general the undeveloped power sites are situated wholly or in part on public lands, and permits or licenses for their use may be obtained from the Federal Power Commission under the terms of the Federal Water Power Act, approved June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063).

The probable future uses of water within the basin of the Green River will not exhaust the supply. With the irrigable areas of the basin fully developed a large quantity of water will still be discharged by the Green into the Colorado and will be available for producing power in the long stretch of canyons below the mouth of the Green and for irrigating agricultural lands in the great valleys situated in Arizona, California, and New Mexico below the Grand Canyon.

Many excellent sites for constructing storage reservoirs are situated on the Green River and its tributaries. These sites will have great value both for local utilization and for equalizing the flow of the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green. Thereby the importance of the Green River is greatly increased, and its future large utilization for agriculture and industry is made probable.

The broad aspects of the Green River have been known by white men for nearly a century. Hunters and trappers penetrated into its basin in the early part of the last century, but until the migration and settlement in Utah of Mormons in 1847 and subsequent years, and the discovery of gold in California in 1848, followed by the overland rush of gold hunters to that State in 1849–50, relatively few white men had seen the river in any part of its course. Two great overland trails used in the migrations to California and Utah crossed the Green River—one in Wyoming near the site of the present town of Green River, Wyo., and one near the site of the present town of Green River, Utah. As would be expected, a few adventurers who came to the river at these crossings attempted navigation, but the canyons and rapids in the Green River between these two places and in the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green were so dangerous that transportation by boats was found to be impracticable.

A few men have succeeded in putting boats through or around all the rapids of the Green River. Powell started his bold trip through the canyons of the Colorado at Green River, Wyo., in 1869 and so traversed all the canyons of the Green as well as those of the Colorado. A few other adventurers, explorers, or scientists have followed him, as outlined in this report. The canyons were accurately mapped in 1922, when a party of topographers, geologists, and hydraulic engineers of the United States Geological Survey carried instrumental surveys from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah. Mr. Woolley, the author of this report, was attached to that party as hydraulic engineer.

Mr. Woolley is a resident of Utah who has spent his engineering life on problems related to the development of the resources of the region. In studying projects for developing waterpower and irrigation within the Green River Basin, he has visited all the principal power sites and agricultural valleys. He has traversed the river by boat from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah, through the beautiful and dangerous canyons that are rarely seen by man. He has, of course, made use of all available pertinent information collected by the personnel of the Geological Survey and others over a period of many years. His basis of information is therefore the best that could be obtained at this time. He speaks with authority and from first-hand knowledge, and his report has a value that could be obtained only by thorough familiarity with the river and its possibilities of utilization.

In this report, Mr. Woolley has presented the available physical facts that are related to the present and future utilization of the Green River and his estimates of the probable ultimate development and waterpower sites and irrigable lands. His conclusions are given without bias for particular schemes or projects. The facts will serve to guide stable growth in industry and agriculture; the estimates represent a probable measure of ultimate regional development. Similar facts and estimates for the Colorado above the mouth of the Green are contained in Water-Supply Paper 617, Upper Colorado River and its Utilization, by Robert Follansbee, and for the Colorado below the mouth of the Green in Water-Supply Paper 556, Water Power and Flood Control of Colorado River below Green River, Utah, by E. C. LaRue. These three reports are supplementary to Water-Supply Paper 395, Colorado River and its Utilization, by E. C. LaRue, which contained the facts related to the whole basin that were available at the time of its publication, in 1916. In the intervening years much of the river has been accurately surveyed, and additional records of discharge have been made. Because of the more complete information on which they are based, the three recent reports, Water-Supply Papers 556, 617, and 618, are more satisfactory in presentation and conclusions than the earlier report. The fundamental data presented in them are essential to stable regional development, and their compilation and publication in usable form will serve to promote proper utilization of the rivers and other natural resources contained within the drainage basin.

Mr. Woolley has not attempted to carry his study to such a degree of detail as to show to what extent a comprehensive plan of development of the Colorado River as a whole may involve correlation of development on the Green River, but he has presented basic information whereby this question may be considered by others.

The determinations of undeveloped power for this report are based somewhat arbitrarily on two time elements: (1) The ca-

pacity available 90 percent of the time, or that available during ordinary low stages and for so great a part of the time that comparatively little pondage will render it thoroughly reliable; (2) the capacity available 50 percent of the time, or that available when conditions of flow are such that, although development is ordinarily warranted, substantial storage regulation or auxiliary steam power must be provided to render the capacity thoroughly reliable. The power sites included in this report are treated only as physical possibilities, without strict regard to economic feasibility. Some of the sites that are physically possible are obviously unattractive in the economic sense, but those that are included in the report are believed to be the most attractive ones in the different basins. Accordingly they form a basis of comparison which shows the relative value of the power resources.

The 50 sites that were investigated are estimated to be capable of furnishing with the existing streamflow about 51,780 horsepower for 90 percent of the time or 88,565 horsepower for 50 percent of the time. With regulated flow the total would be about 759,600 horsepower. The Green River and Yampa River sites are considered only with regulated flow.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

The accepted principle in the States in which the Green River Basin lies is that the different uses to which the water of the streams may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. Economic conditions play an important part in the development of the water resources of the West, and it is recognized by many that more flexible rules should be applied to the use of the streams. It is conceded, of course, that domestic use should always come first, but power and irrigation uses are likely to be of coordinate importance, and both should be encouraged wherever possible. If conditions are such that the power value of a stream is greater economically than its irrigation value, development of its power should be encouraged by removal of all restrictions that would tend to preclude such development.

GREEN RIVER CANYONS—GENERAL FEATURES

The Green River in its course through the Uinta Mountains and the high plateaus to the south flows in alternate stretches of narrow canyons and small valleys called parks. The stream attracted little attention as a great natural resource until recent years. It first became a subject of careful study only as it might affect the regimen of the lower Colorado River.

Water was first diverted from the Colorado River into the Imperial Valley for irrigation in 1901, and the use for this purpose grew rapidly thereafter. It was immediately realized, however, that some protection against floods on the lower river should be provided if this irrigation development were to be preserved. Accordingly searches were instituted for storage sites to control the river, and in 1904 a preliminary report was made to the United States Bureau of Reclamation calling attention to Browns Park, on the Green River, as a possible reservoir site. Immediately after this report was submitted a plane-table survey was made of the park area and its capacity as a reservoir determined. The dam site was located in the head of the canyon of Lodore, and during 1907–08 more than $43,000 was spent by the Bureau of Reclamation in drilling explorations at two proposed dam sites. The results of these operations were not encouraging, and further investigations were made for other reservoir sites. A survey was made of the Flaming Gorge site in 1914. Soon afterward diamond drilling was done at the proposed dam sites in Horseshoe Canyon. Two sites were drilled, one about 4,000 feet above the mouth of the canyon and the other about 500 feet farther up. At the upper site 15 holes were drilled, at the lower site 6, and on the saddle above the Horseshoe Canyon 4. Further work was done here by the Utah Power & Light Co. in 1923–26 and is described in detail in the section on the Flaming Gorge power site.

After the survey of the Flaming Gorge reservoir site an attempt was made in 1916 to find a suitable dam site in the upper part of Desolation Canyon that could be used to create a huge reservoir of the Green River Valley in Uinta Basin. Several of the most promising cross sections in the canyon were surveyed. A topographic survey of the reservoir itself had already been made for private persons by Guy Sterling, an engineer. About this time the stream began to attract so much interest as a source of power as to induce the Utah Power & Light Co. to spend considerable money in making a topographic survey of a stretch of the river extending through part of Desolation and Gray Canyons and reconnaissance investigations of the power possibilities of the canyon stretches between Flaming Gorge and Uinta Basin. In this way there became available several maps of different stretches of the river. They were all independent of one another, and there was no complete map of the river as a whole. Accordingly in 1922 the Geological Survey, in cooperation with the Utah Power & Light Co., made a complete map, correlating the surveys that were available and filling in the stretches for which there were no surveys. The results of this survey are published by the Geological Survey under the title, "Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo.," consisting of 16 sheets—10 plans and 6 profiles. These may be obtained from the Director of the Geological Survey at $1.60 for the set.

When survey data became available for the Colorado River through its lower canyons storage possibilities were found large enough to afford complete regulation of the flow of the river into its lower valley, and the sites on the Green River were abandoned, except the one at Flaming Gorge, which has now been completely investigated as a power site under premilinary permit 165 of the Federal Power Commission.

In discussing the power sites in this report it is not intended to advocate the development of the river as here outlined, but merely to suggest a plan that seems to fit into the general topographic conditions without undue disturbance to agricultural developments along the stream. Obviously, it is impossible to say that suitable foundation conditions for dams will be found at any of these suggested sites where no drilling has been done. Accordingly some of them may prove infeasible after careful investigation, or some others not here suggested may prove to be better fitted into market and economic conditions.

CONDITIONS SUGGESTING PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

With a dam in Horseshoe Canyon complete regulation of the flow of the river at that place is possible. This is, of course, a very desirable result, because the regulated flow would then be available at all the power sites down the river.

To develop the fall through Red Canyon a dam is suggested near mile 285 of the river survey, because of the narrow cross section there and the fact that a dam of moderate height could be used to develop the entire fall between that locality and the Flaming Gorge site in Horseshoe Canyon.

The Swallow Canyon site is suggested in place of one near the upper end of the Canyon of Lodore, because the drillings made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the latter site disclose unattractive foundation conditions, which add materially to the engineering difficulties of the project, because the dam site is from 1 to 3 miles down the canyon, a narrow rock gorge with almost vertical walls nearly half a mile high. Furthermore, the reservoir that would be created would not be needed after the Flaming Gorge project is built and would only add to depletion of the streamflow by evaporation as well as inundate additional ranch lands in Browns Park.

With a dam at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, which is here suggested as the Echo Park site, advantage would be gained of the combined flow of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and it is believed that with the streams already regulated at developments above sufficient additional regulation would be created by this dam to take care of the inflow below the other points of regulation. The Canyon of Lodore would be the reservoir, and no serious inundation of lands in Browns Park would result. Evaporation losses would be a minimum, because of the narrowness of the canyon, the average width of the proposed reservoir surface being only about 600 feet. However, it would be about 30 miles long and have an estimated capacity of 200,000 acre-feet, about half of which could be used for stream regulation with a drawdown of 50 feet at the dam.

The Split Mountain site is at the lower end of the Green River Canyon through the Uinta Mountains. It contemplates by creating storage in Island Park the use of the total regulated flow of the Green River at this point. Here the river enters the open valley of the Uinta Basin, and for a distance of more than 80 miles it meanders through the valley with an average fall of less than 2 feet to the mile.

It is this valley that would be inundated by the proposed Ouray Reservoir, for which dam-site surveys were made at several sections in the upper end of Desolation Canyon. The building of this reservoir would completely control the Green River at this place, but it would inundate considerable improved agricultural land and serve no material benefit other than contribute to regulation of the lower Colorado River. No suitable dam site was found.

The fall in Desolation and Gray Canyons below Uinta Basin and the topography of the canyon suggest two developments, and these are selected with the view of utilizing the power of the stream with due regard to the agricultural possibilities along it in the Uinta Basin. They are described below.

FLAMING GORGE POWER SITE

Location: The Flaming Gorge power site is on the Green River just south of the Wyoming-Utah line. The dam site is in the upper end of Horseshoe Canyon, in the SW. ¼ sec. 31, T. 3 N., R. 21 E., Salt Lake base and meridian.

Physical characteristics: Hoseshoe Canyon is a narrow gorge with massive sandstone walls, in many places almost vertical. (See pl. 31, A.) In August 1923, a preliminary permit was issued to the Utah Power & Light Co. by the Federal Power Commission for the development of this site. Under this permit more than 20 drill holes were sunk in Horseshoe Canyon and 10 in Flaming Gorge. Bedrock was found in Flaming Gorge at depths of 40 to 45 feet and in Horseshoe Canyon at depths ranging from 50 feet at the upper end of the canyon to 73 feet at the lower end. As a result of these investigations and studies of cross sections at many places the dam site above indicated was chosen as best suited for the proposed development. At this section the average altitude of low water is 5,839 feet above sea level and a dam with its crest at 6,065 feet would have a crest length of 875 feet.

ECHO PARK POWER SITE

Location: The Echo Park Dam site is at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, just where the river leaves Echo Park. It is about 3 miles down the river from the mouth of the Yampa River.

Physical characteristics: At this site the river is in a narrow box canyon in the Uinta quartzite. The distance between the walls at the water surface is 150 feet, and a dam to raise the water 300 feet would be 600 feet long on the top.

Plan of development: A development such as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is also suggested at this site.

Water supply: At this site the flow of the Green River is augmented by that of the Yampa River, and it is estimated that with each of the streams regulated above a flow of 4,950 second-feet would be available here. The Canyon of Ladore and the Blue Mountain Canyon on the Yampa River would form a reservoir. The backwater would extend up each of the streams about 29½ miles and create storage capacity of about 575,000 acre-feet. The Sand Draw and Johnson Draw dam sites, on the Yampa River, would both be flooded.

Power capacity: The static head at the Echo Park site would probably fluctuate from 280 to 300 feet, allowing the top 20 feet of the reservoir to be used for regulation of the inflow into it below other points of regulation. With an average static head of 290 feet and a stream flow of 4,950 second-feet the power capacity of the site is 114,800 horsepower (86,100 kilowatts). All future irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably never reduce this capacity as much as 15 percent.

Right of way: No valuable agricultural lands would be flooded by this project.

Accessibility: The scite is accessible with difficulty. It is remote from any railroad transportation and would require expensive road construction to connect it with any present highway.

SPLIT MOUNTAIN POWER SITE

Location: The Split Mountain power site is about 1 mile above the lower end of Split Mountain Canyon, about 9 miles northeast of Jensen, Utah, just below mile 201 of the Green River survey.

Physical characteristics: The river at this dam site has cut its channel into the Weber sandstone. This rock is hard and dense and is considered satisfactory for the foundation and abutment walls of a dam.

Plan of development: The same type of development as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is adaptable for this site. The dam here would have a length of 150 feet at the water surface (altitude 4,800 feet) and a crest length of 1,000 feet at a height of 250 feet (altitude 5,050 feet). Another plan has been suggested, however, as a combination irrigation and power development. This plan contemplates a tunnel from a point immediately above the proposed dam extending almost due south to Red Wash. This tunnel, if taken out at an altitude of 4,900 feet, would be about 1 mile long, and a penstock from its outlet to the river near the mouth of Red Wash would be 1½ miles long. This would cut off about 12 miles of the river course and gain an additional head of 65 feet, adding about 25,500 horsepower to the capacity of the site after due allowance is made for irrigating about 12,000 acres of land to the west and south of the tunnel outlet. The large tunnel and pressure pipe necessary to handle 5,100 second-feet of water would add considerably to the cost of the development, but the irrigation feature may add to the attractiveness of the project when further irrigation development is needed in that locality. A small tunnel for the irrigation project might be more feasible. It has also been proposed that water be diverted from the Green River here to supply the Deadmans Bench irrigation project, which lies on both sides of the Colorado-Utah line to the southeast. This plan, however, was investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation and determined to be economically infeasible.

Water supply: From an analysis of the stream-flow records on the Green River at Little Valley, Ouray, Jensen, and Bridgeport, it is estimted that an equalized flow at the Split Mountain power site of about 5,100 second-feet is possible with the regulation provided by the other developments above and the storage that would be created behind this dam.

Power capacity: If the top 50 feet of the storage behind the dam is allowed for regulation the average static head would be 225 feet. With a flow of 5,100 second-feet the power capacity would be 91,800 horsepower (68,850 kilowatts). Ultimate irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably not decrease this capacity in excess of 15 percent.

Right of way: Development as here suggested would inundate Island Park, a part of which is used for ranching.

Accessibility: The dam site is not difficultly accessible from towns in the Uinta Basin, but it is remote from railroad transportation.

Waterpower sites on Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Green River, Utah [1]

Name of power site	Static head (feet)	Estimated regulated streamflow (second-feet)	Power capacity (horsepower)
Flaming Gorge	[2] 196	2,620	41,000
Red Canyon	266	2,720	57,900
Swallow Canyon	195	2,740	34,700
Echo Park [3]	[2] 290	4,950	114,800
Split Mountain	[2] 225	5,100	91,800
Rock Creek	[2] 180	7,000	100,000
Rattlesnake	275	7,000	154,000
Total			594,200

[1] Backwater from either the Dark Canyon or the junction power developments as described in Water Supply Paper 556, pp. 47-49, would extend to the town of Green River, Utah. For this reason the utilization of that stretch of the river below the town is not considered in detail in this report.

[2] Average head.

[3] Development of the Echo Park site would flood the Sand Draw and Johnson Draw Dam sites on the Yampa River.

Water powers of Green River Basin

RECAPITULATION

Minor drainage basin	Number of power sites	Horsepower			
		With existing flow		With regulated flow	
		0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50	0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50
Upper Green River Basin	9	1,530	1,933	11,100	
Yampa and White River Basins	9	[1] 7,150	[1] 17,460	[2] 86,500	
Uinta Basin exclusive of Green River	16	37,170	59,088	49,622	78,334
Lower Green River Basin	9	5,930	10,084	18,190	
Green River canyons	7			594,200	
Total	50	51,780	88,565	759,612	78,344

[1] Includes Cross Mountain site and sites on small streams. Other sites on main stream considered only with stream regulation.

[2] Does not include Sand Draw and Johnson Draw sites, as these would be flooded by development of Echo Park site on Green River.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

In the arid region the question how the streams may be used to best advantage is one that becomes more serious as the use of the water increases. One of the fundamental conditions involved in the question is the accepted principle that the different uses to which the water may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. In the early stages of development along the streams there is usually plenty of water and no difficulty attendant upon its use, but as the number of users increases and communities become dependent upon the streams for their water supply the problem becomes more and more complicated.

It is, of course, obvious that domestic use should have a preferred right, and it is also obvious that in communities where local irrigation is of primary importance in the production of the community's food supplies that, too, should have a preferred right. But there are few communities now that are solely dependent upon their own products for food. Only a little more than half of the food supply for the farms in the intermontane region is now produced on the farms, and in many places it is even cheaper to obtain foodstuffs by parcel post or freight than it is to produce them there. This condition has greatly changed the economic aspect of farming in the arid region where irrigation is necessary, and it has likewise affected, in some localities at least, the economic value of water rights for irrigation.

Throughout the arid region the cheaply constructed irrigation projects in climates adapted for general farming are all built, and the time when the more expensive ones will become economically feasible has been pushed farther into the future by increased transportation facilities and more efficient farming methods. Agriculture, including irrigation, was the basis upon which practically all the permanent communities of the arid West have been built, and some of these are still solely dependent upon this industry for their existence, but others have added different forms of industry such as mining and manufacturing.

The communities supported by irrigated lands are beyond doubt more stable than those subject to the ups and downs of prosperity that are not uncommon to other industries, and for this reason public opinion in the West places irrigation use of the streams superior to all other uses except domestic.

It is a somewhat common practice to measure the future growth of the arid West in terms of the total runoff of the streams and the area of undeveloped land, without any regard to the economic factor involved in the problem. However, the fallacy of such a criterion is very rapidly becoming apparent. The fact is now recognized that new problems must be solved in irrigation development to meet the profound changes that are reshaping our economic and social structure. Further irrigation development should be made only as economic needs demand, if it is to become permanently successful. This fact, however, seems to be entirely overlooked by those who wish to see every arable acre developed, and the result is that other uses of streams, such as power, are regarded as subject for all time to any proposed future demands for irrigation development, regardless of economic feasibili-

ty and without consideration of the relative economic value of the two uses. This attitude may preclude the use of a stream for power, as it may involve the water rights for that use in so much uncertainty as to make the power capacity too small to be attractive and also add to the difficulties of financing the project. In view of these conditions, each stream should be considered as an individual problem, and its utilization might properly be worked out according to the most comprehensive plan, based upon the weighted economic values of the various uses. Power now has a place in modern agriculture. Electricity has become the servant of the farmer and is the means by which he is enabled to do several times the work that he could do a few years ago.

EXHIBIT 4

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
December 13, 1934.

The DIRECTOR,
National Park Service.

DEAR DIRECTOR CAEMMERER: Reference is made to Acting Director Demaray's letter of August 9, 1934, in which the Commission was advised that you were studying the possibility of establishing a national monument along the Green and Yampa Rivers, in northwestern Colorado, which would embrace lands withdrawn for the proposed Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments included in the application for preliminary permit of the Utah Power & Light Co., designated as project No. 279.

Assurance was given in the letter that the Presidential proclamation establishing such a monument would exempt all existing rights, including power withdrawals, but a statement was added that if it were possible to release the power withdrawals the "monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration." This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the Upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by Power Site Reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and Power Site Classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site is estimated at 130,000 horsepower. This is based on the development of a head of 310 feet at the dam and a regulated flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second obtained by storage in the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir on Green River and Juniper Mountain Reservoir on Yampa River. At Blue Mountain the primary capacity is estimated at 19,000 horsepower based on the development of 210 feet of head and a regulated flow of 1,100 cubic feet per second.

Ralf R. Woolley in his report on Green River and its utilization (Water Supply Paper No. 618, U. S. Geological Survey), proposes the development of 114,800 horsepower, primary capacity, at the Echo Park site, based on an average head of 290 feet and a streamflow of 4,950 cubic feet per second. At Johnson's Draw, which is his designation for the Blue Mountain site, Mr. Woolley proposes a primary capacity of 43,200 horsepower based on a regulated flow of 1,800 cubic feet per second and a head of 300 feet. Either of these estimates would justify installations of something like 300,000 horsepower at Echo Park and at least 50,000 horsepower at Blue Mountain.

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I enclose a copy of the portion of the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. which describes the proposed development, and blueprints of exhibits H (a), H (b), and H (c) showing the location of the various units of the plan, river profiles, and cross sections of the dam sites. The Commission has no special reports on the area under consideration, but if you are not already familiar with them, it is suggested that you obtain the following publications of the Geological Survey:

Water supply paper No. 618 (previously referred to).

Plan and profile of Yampa River, Colo., from Green River to Morgan Gulch (5 sheets showing river profile and topography and 1 sheet of special dam-site surveys).

Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo. (16 sheets, 10 plans, and 6 profiles).

Yours very cordially,

FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 5

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLORADO RIVER, A DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR REPORT, DATED MARCH 1946

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

31. Ultimate development of the water resources of the Colorado River will involve the investigation and construction of such projects as will fully utilize for irrigation, power production, flood control, and other beneficial purposes all the water in the Colorado River system available to the United States. Looking toward the formulation of a plan for comprehensive development, this report presents for consideration 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for use of water within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River. Potential projects for the export of water from the Colorado River Basin to adjacent basins are also discussed. The inventory of potential projects in this report and substantiating material is intended to be of use in the selection of projects which will comprise ultimately the final comprehensive plan. It is not intended that the listing of projects in this report will preclude the consideration of others that additional investigations may show to be desirable. In the formulation of the ultimate plan, however, consideration must also be given the possibilities for expanding projects now existing or authorized. Because of the limited water supply, it is not possible for all the potential projects to be constructed and for all the existing or authorized projects to be expanded to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities. Each development can deplete the stream flow only insofar as permitted by the Colorado River compact and other legal limitations. The formulation of an ultimate plan of river development, therefore, will require selection from among the possibilities for expanding existing or authorized projects as well as from among the potential new projects. Before such a selection of projects can be made it will be necessary that the seven Colorado River Basin States agree upon their respective rights to deplete the water supply of the Colorado River or that the courts apportion available water among them. Each State also will need to select from the potential projects within its boundaries those it desires to have constructed to consume its allocation of water. The many decisions and selections to be made require a vast background of factual information. To assist the States in the selection of projects the several agencies which have prepared this report stand ready to make available their consultative services and all information presently at hand. A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate the information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of the development.

32. Although there would be enough water in the river system to serve all of the 134 within-basin projects or units of projects if no further exportation of water is made, it may be found more economical and the States may elect to forego construction of some irrigation projects within the natural drainage basin in order to make water available for exportation to adjacent watersheds within the basin States. When final allocations of water are made, moreover, some States may be unable to use their full amount unless part is exported. Power projects do not consume water except by evaporation from power reservoirs, but most of these reservoirs serve multiple purposes and are required for full river regulation and control.

33. If all the 134 within-basin potential projects or units of projects were constructed, they would deplete the flow of the Colorado River by more than 6 million acre-feet annually. New possibilities exist for the exportation of an additional 3 million acre-feet annually to areas outside the natural drainage basin but within the boundaries of the Colorado River Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River compact. If all existing or authorized projects were constructed to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities, they would increase present depletion by approximately 4 million acre-feet. With present uses depleting the stream by about 7 million acre-feet, the total depletions would aggregate more than 20 million acre-feet, or about 25 percent more than the estimated amount of water available. Predominant among existing or

authorized projects which could be further developed are those in the lower basin made possible by the construction of Boulder Dam. Possible future development of these enterprises would increase present river depletions by about 3,600,000 acre-feet annually, of which 2,800,000 acre-feet would be used in California outside the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River and the remainder would be consumed in Arizona or California or lost by reservoir evaporation. In the upper basin completion of existing or authorized transmountain diversion projects would further deplete the river by 474,000 acre-feet annually and expansion of within-basin projects would cause a depletion of 82,000 acre-feet.

34. The depletory effect on stream flow of all within-basin and export diversion projects, including existing or authorized projects and potential projects, is shown in table 1. The depletion shown under existing or authorized projects include present depletions resulting from projects in operation and possible depletions which would result from the extension of existing projects or the construction of authorized projects. Depletions are shown for the 134 potential within-basin projects and for the new export diversion possibilities.

TABLE I.—*Present and potential stream depletions in the Colorado River Basin*

Basin and State	Estimated average annual depletion (acre-feet) [1]			
	Existing or authorized projects		Potential projects	Total ultimate depletion
	Present depletion	Possible increase		
Upper basin:				
Arizona	10,200		39,000	49,200
Colorado	1,231,300	507,000	2,522,000	4,260,300
New Mexico	68,400		450,000	518,400
Utah	515,900	32,000	1,462,700	2,010,600
Wyoming	374,000	17,000	576,000	967,000
Main stem reservoir losses			831,000	831,000
Pasture irrigation	(2)	(2)	500,000	500,000
Subtotal	2,199,800	556,000	6,380,700	9,136,500
Lower basin:				
Arizona	1,407,700	571,000	2,015,400	3,993,600
California	2,680,000	2,946,000	176,000	5,802,000
Nevada	43,800		213,000	256,800
New Mexico	29,000		8,000	37,000
Utah	45,000		56,300	101,300
Main stem reservoir losses	713,000	66,000	91,000	870,000
Subtotal	4,918,000	3,583,000	2,559,700	11,060,700
Total	7,117,800	4,139,000	8,940,400	20,197,200

NOTE.—Average flow available for depletion in the United States, 16,220,000 acre-feet.

[1] Includes both uses within the natural basin and export diversions to adjacent watersheds.
[2] Included in depletions shown by States.

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

35. The 134 projects or units of projects included in the inventory of potential projects for development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin are all located within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River, 100 in the upper basin and 34 in the lower basin. These within-basin potential projects considered as a group indicate in general the ultimate potentialities of future development. For that reason these projects are summarized in the following paragraphs. If similar basin reports for adjoining basins or individual project reports indicate the need and desirability for exporting water from the natural drainage basin for use within the Colorado Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River Compact, this would result in a corresponding reduction of within-basin uses. New possibilities for exportation of water to adjoining watersheds, such as the Blue River-South Platte and Gunnison-Arkansas projects in Colorado and the central Utah project in Utah, are mentioned in the substantiating material but are not tabulated and summarized in the inventory of potential projects presented in this report.

36. If all of these 134 projects or units of projects should be constructed they would benefit 2,656,230 acres of land, 1,734,980 acres in the upper basin and 921,250 acres in the lower basin. Of this total 1,533,960 acres would be new land brought into cultivation, 1,230,810 acres in the upper basin and 303,150 acres in the lower basin, and 1,122,270 acres of inadequately irrigated land would be furnished a supplemental supply, 504,170 acres in the upper basin and 618,100 acres in the lower basin. (See par. 41, table III.) In addition to these lands vast areas of natural pasture lands in the upper basin would produce more abundantly under irrigation. These pasture lands, located mostly on gentle mountain slopes, have not been surveyed and consequently specific projects have not been planned to bring water to them, but in summarizing potentialities for new developments an ultimate river depletion of 500,000 acre-feet annually has been allowed for pasture irrigation.

37. These potential projects include 38 hydroelectric power plants with a total installed capacity of more than 3,500,000 kilowatts. (See par. 41, table IV.) Twenty-nine of the plants would be in the upper basin, mostly on tributary streams. The combined installed capacities of the upper basin plants would total 1,713,000 kilowatts and the annual energy output 9.2 billion kilowatt-hours.

This is more than the anticipated requirement for power in the upper basin and would leave some for transmission to adjacent areas. The 9 new plants outlined for the lower basin would have installed capacities totaling 1,945,400 kilowatts and would produce 10.2 billion kilowatt-hours of additional energy a year. This would satisfy all expected demands in the lower basin and the adjacent west coast power market area until 1960, at which time additional power developments would be required to meet growing demands. The potential power output in both the upper and lower basins could be maintained substantially even with full development of the river system for irrigation and other purposes.

38. Potential power and irrigation reservoirs would make a substantial contribution to flood control in the basin, but the extent of that contribution cannot, of course, be determined until the projects to be constructed have been selected. Some of these reservoirs would permit use of a greater part of Lake Mead's capacity for irrigation storage and power production.

39. Reservoirs provided for irrigation, power production, or flood control would have incidental value for fishing, boating, and other recreational purposes. Reservoirs could be operated to maintain or improve the fishing in mountain streams. Specific projects are described which would furnish municipal supplies to Tucson, Ariz., and the Grand Valley area in Colorado. Future water requirements for growing municipalities and industries could be provided as needs arise. Many of the reservoirs would have storage capacity for retention of silt and mitigate that menace for a great many years to come.

40. Construction of all these potential projects for use of water in the natural drainage basin, including transmission grids, is estimated to cost $2,185,442,000 with expenditures divided $930,142,000 in the upper basin and $1,255,300,000 in the lower basin. These preliminary estimates are based on costs as of January 1940.

41. These 134 potential projects or units of projects, together with their locations, sources of water supply, purposes to be served, and estimated construction costs are listed in table II. Potential irrigation and power developments that would result from the construction of these projects are summarized in tables III and IV, respectively.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

54. There is need for proceeding at an early date with the construction of certain of the potential projects. In areas such as would be served by the Animas-LaPlata, Hurricane, and Snowflake projects, existing distress resulting from the lack of opportunities in irrigated agriculture should be relieved as promptly as practicable. The power markets of southern California and southern Arizona will shortly require the construction of a major hydroelectric development on the lower river; similarly, the load growth in Utah and western Colorado will require construction of power developments in the upper basin. An existing economy in the Salt and Gila River Valleys in central Arizona is threatened with serious losses through overdraft of its water supply from underground sources. Key developments necessary in many instances before lesser developments can proceed, should be constructed at an early date in order that those dependent projects may follow in logical order and basinwide development be undertaken in stages.

55. To activate a construction program, it is suggested that the affected States decide from among the known potentialities which projects they desire to have the Bureau of Reclamation consider for construction and that such projects as are selected for construction comprise the next stage of development. The economic feasibility of the group of projects included in this next stage of development would be comprehended in the finding of feasibility for the overall ultimate development of the basin. The group of projects should include those for which there is an immediate need and for which adequate water rights consistent with the Colorado River Compact and its associated and dependent documents are assured. As has been stated, the agencies which have prepared this report stand ready with their consultative services to assist the States in this selective process. When the next stage of development has been decided upon, it may be presented to the Congress as a program for authorization of construction.

TABLE II.—*Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin*

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served [1]	Estimated construction cost [2]
UPPER BASIN				
Sublette	Wyoming	Green River	I, F, P	$36, 500, 000
West Side	do	do	I, F	
Daniel	do	do	I, F	
Elkhorn	do	do	I, F, P	
Paradise	do	New Fork River	I	
Eden	do	Big Sandy Creek	I	
Lower Big Sandy	do	do	I	
LaBarge	do	LaBarge Creek	I, F	
Fontenelle	do	Fontenelle Creek	I, F	
Seedskadee	do	Green River	I	
Opal	do	Hams Fork	I, F	3, 600, 000
Lyman	do	Blacks Fork, Smiths Fork	I, F	4, 330, 000
Henrys Fork	Wyoming, Utah	Henrys Fork	I, F	1, 470, 000
Flaming Gorge	do	Green River	P, F, H, S	10, 000, 000
Red Canyon	Utah	do	P, F	4, 100, 000
Little Snake River	Wyoming, Colorado	Little Snake River tributaries	I, P, F	21, 500, 000
Upper Yampa	Colorado	Yampa River	I, F	2, 300, 000
Wessels	do	do	I, F	1, 100, 000
Mount Harris	do	Tributaries of Yampa River	I, F	3, 300, 000
Great Northern	do	Elkhead Creek and Elk River	I, F	2, 700, 000
Yellow Jacket	do	White River and Milk Creek	I, F	4, 700, 000
Deadman Bench	Colorado, Utah	Yampa River	I, P, F, H, S	23, 800, 000
Maybell	Colorado	do	I	700, 000
Cross Mountain	do	do	P	5, 000, 000
Lily Park	do	do	P, F	1, 900, 000
Josephine Basin	do	do	I	300, 000
Piceance	do	Piceance Creek	I, F	800, 000
Moon Lake Extension	Utah	Duchesne River and tributary	I, F	7, 900, 000
Fruitland	do	Red Creek	I, F	400, 000
Castle Peak	do	Duchesne River	I, F	5, 300, 000
Mosby	do	Deep Creek, Whiterocks River	I, F	1, 100, 000
Vernal	do	Ashley Creek	I, F	1, 500, 000
Jensen	do	Brush Creek	I, F	300, 000
Minnie Maud	do	Minnie Maud Creek	I, F	100, 000
Green River Pumping	do	Green River	I	400, 000
Echo Park	Colorado	do	P, F, H, S	43, 000, 000
Split Mountain	Utah	do	P, F, H, S	23, 000, 000
Emery County	do	Cottonwood Creek	I, F	2, 500, 000
Buckhorn	do	Huntington Creek	I, F	1, 200, 000
Gunnison Valley	do	Green River	I	1, 100, 000
Desolation Canyon	do	do	P, F, H	21, 000, 000
Rattlesnake Power	do	do	P, F, H	23, 000, 000
Troublesome	Colorado	Troublesome Creek	I, F	2, 210, 000
Muddy Creek	do	Muddy Creek	I, F	500, 000
Gore Canyon	do	Colorado River	P	3, 800, 000
Fourmile	do	Fourmile Creek	I, F	600, 000
Cattle Creek	do	Cattle Creek	I, F	430, 000
Capitol Creek	do	Snowmass Creek	I	130, 000
Woody Creek	do	Roaring Fork	I	170, 000
Silt	do	Rifle Creek	I, F	1, 320, 000
West Divide	do	Middle Willow Creek	I, F	1, 300, 000
Hunter Mesa	do	Buzzard Creek	I, F	1, 500, 000
Roan Creek	do	Carr Creek	I, F	610, 000
Collbran	do	Plateau Creek	I, F, M	1, 940, 000
Grand Valley Extension	do	Colorado River	I	415, 000
Cisco-Thompson	Colorado, Utah	do [3]	P, I, F, H, S	34, 240, 000
Tomichi Creek	Colorado	Tomichi Creek	I, F	1, 860, 000
Cochetopa Creek	do	Cochetopa Creek	I, F	1, 150, 000
Ohio Creek	do	Anthracite and Castle Creeks	I, F	1, 080, 000
Lake Fork	do	Lake Fork	P, F	1, 300, 000
Sapinero	do	Gunnison River	P, F	7, 800, 000
Fruitland Mesa	do	Curecante and Sapinero Creeks	I, F	3, 500, 000
Smith Fork	do	Smith Fork	I, F	2, 200, 000
Paonia	do	East Muddy Creek and North Fork	I, F	1, 400, 000
Minnesota	do	Minnesota Creek	I, F	820, 000
Leroux Creek	do	Leroux Creek	I, F	2, 800, 000
Grand Mesa	do	Currant, Surface, and Tongue Creeks	I, F	1, 920, 000
Ouray	do	Uncompahgre River	P, I, F	4, 100, 000
Redlands	do	Gunnison River	I, F	367, 000
Saucer Valley	do	Disappointment Creek	I, F	940, 000
Nucla	do	Horsefly and Cottonwood Creeks	I, F	1, 500, 000
San Miguel	do	Anderson, Naturita, Dry Creeks, and San Miguel River	I, F	6, 590, 000
West Paradox	do	West Paradox, Deep, and Geyser Creeks	I, F	640, 000
Dewey	Utah	Colorado River	P, F, H, S	38, 000, 000
Moab	do	do	P, F, H, S	9, 900, 000
Pack Creek	Utah	Mill Creek	I, F	775, 000
Hatch Creek	do	Hatch Creek	I, F	400, 000
Dulce-Chama-Navaho	Colorado	Navaho River	I, F	1, 627, 000
South San Juan	New Mexico	San Juan River	I, F	35, 000, 000
Carracas	Colorado	do	I	36, 000
O'Neal Park	do	Piedra River	I	880, 000
Hammond	New Mexico	San Juan River	I	725, 000
Shiprock	do	do	I, F	21, 141, 000
Emerald Lake	Colorado	Pine River	P, F	6, 200, 000
Pine River Extension	Colorado, New Mexico	do	I	1, 835, 000
Florida	Colorado	Florida River	I, F	2, 290, 000
Animas-La Plata	Colorado, New Mexico	Animas and La Plata Rivers	I, P, F, S	63, 534, 000
McElmo	Colorado	McElmo Creek	I, F	390, 000
Montezuma Valley Extension	do	Dolores River	I, F	1, 300, 000
Dolores	Colorado, Utah	do	I, F, S	12, 200, 000
Blanding	Utah	Recapture Creek	I, F	567, 000
Navaho Indian Project	Colorado	San Juan River	I, F, S	2, 910, 000
Bluff	Utah	do	P, F	19, 000, 000
Goosenecks	do	do	P, S, F, H	5, 200, 000
Slick Horn Canyon	do	do	P, S, F, H	6, 300, 000
Great Bend	do	do	P, S, F, H	10, 000, 000
Fremont	do	Fremont River	I, F	800, 000
Torrey	do	do	I, F	200, 000
Escalante	do	Escalante River	I, F	900, 000
Dark Canyon	do	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	105, 000, 000
Glen Canyon	Arizona	do	P, F, S, H	64, 000, 000
Transmission Grid				170, 000, 000
Subtotal, upper basin				930, 142, 000

[1] Symbols used: I=irrigation; F=flood control; P=power; H=hold-over storage for river regulation; S=silt retention; M=municipal; U=underground water recharge; C=channel improvement. In addition many potential reservoirs would have value for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation.

[2] Preliminary estimates based on construction costs Jan. 1, 1940.

[3] Half the water required for this project would be diverted from the Gunnison River by exchange.

TABLE II.—*Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin*—Continued

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served	Estimated construction cost
LOWER BASIN				
Snowflake	Arizona	Showlow and Silver Creeks	I, F, S	$2,600,000
Black Creek	do	Black Creek	I, F, S	1,800,000
Holbrook	do	Little Colorado River	I, F, S, C	1,300,000
Winslow	do	Clear and Chevelon Creeks	I, F, S	19,000,000
Kanab Creek	do	Kanab Creek	I	200,000
Hurricane	Utah, Arizona	Virgin River	I, P, S, F	9,200,000
Santa Clara	Utah	Santa Clara River	I, F, S	1,700,000
Panaca Valley	Nevada	Meadow Valley Wash	I, F	1,300,000
Moapa Valley	do	Muddy River	I, F, S	700,000
Moapa Valley Pumping	do	Lake Mead	I	2,800,000
Marble Canyon-Kanab Creek	Arizona	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	382,000,000
Coconino	do	Little Colorado River	F, S, H	4,000,000
Bridge Canyon	do	Colorado	P, I, F, S, H	146,500,000
Virgin Bay Pumping	Nevada	Lake Mead	I	1,300,000
Las Vegas Pumping	do	do	I, M	8,400,000
Davis Reservoir Pumping	do	Davis Reservoir	I	500,000
Big Bend Pumping	do	Colorado River	I	700,000
Fort Mojave	do	do	I	800,000
Mojave Valley	Arizona	do	I	1,900,000
Alamo	do	Bill Williams River	F, P, H	3,200,000
Palo Verde Mesa	California	Colorado River	I	3,100,000
Wellton-Mohawk	Arizona	do	I	10,600,000
Sentinel	do	Gila River	F, H	15,000,000
River rectification and control	California-Arizona	Colorado River	F	5,000,000
Central Arizona Salt River. Paradise Valley. San Carlos. Charleston. Safford Valley. San Francisco. Duncan-Virden Valley. New Mexico.	Arizona	do	I, F, P, M, U	432,800,000
Chino Valley	do	Granite and Willow Creeks	I	150,000
Hassayampa	do	Hassayampa River	I, F	6,650,000
Transmission Grid				192,100,000
Subtotal, lower basin				1,255,300,000
Total, Colorado River Basin				2,185,442,000

RELATED INVESTIGATIONS

56. Various Federal agencies having an interest in development of resources in the basin have collaborated in the preparation of this report. These agencies have cooperated to the extent of funds and personnel available, and their specific comments are found in chapter VIII of the substantiating material attached.

57. The Geological Survey has furnished basic data on streamflow, ground-water supplies, quality of water, water utilization, minerals, and mapping. In order to obtain additional basic facts related to both surface water and ground water of the Colorado River Basin, the Geological Survey has outlined a 3-year investigational program estimated to cost about $650,000 a year. The basic water facts obtained by the Geological Survey are needed for use not only in the design, construction, and operation of potential projects but also in the planning, construction, operation, and administration of other structures, present and future, involving the use of water in the basin. Surveys and investigations should be prosecuted actively so that data secured will be continuous and representative.

58. The National Park Service has surveyed the recreational possibilities of the potential projects and has made a number of specific recommendations which will enhance their recreational value. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in the objectives of these proposals. The National Park Service, however, questions the advisability of the Moab power project on the ground that it "would inundate the lower slopes and bottom of an unusually scenic canyon and eliminate the existing road which runs through the canyon between Moab and Dewey, Utah." A road could be constructed along the edge of the reservoir, and in all probability this would add to the scenic attractions of the canyon. Such differences do not represent conflicts between the purposes of these agencies both of which desire to secure maximum overall benefits for the people of the basin.

59. The Fish and Wildlife Service has made preliminary studies of the potential projects reported herein and has made a number of specific recommendations which will assure the restoration and conservation of fish and wildlife resources. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in principle with these recommendations. Owing to very limited streamflows which prevail during dry years, however, it would be impracticable to maintain the minimum releases of water which are desired. As detailed project plans are prepared, the interest of the Fish and Wildlife Service can be correlated into a unified program. In order to provide the increased fish stocking required for the new reservoirs the Fish and Wildlife Service should develop and expand its present facilities at Springville, Utah, construct a new combination trout-bass fisheries station near Page Springs in Oak Creek Canyon, about 40 miles south of Flagstaff, Ariz., and supplement the facilities of this new hatchery by further developing the Williams Station for necessary incubation of trout eggs, as recommended in its report.

60. The Grazing Service has outlined the objectives of its range-improvement program and the benefits that will result from potential projects in stabilization of the livestock industry and conservation of natural resources. Results of the proposed reclamation program in the Colorado River Basin will be favorable from a Grazing Service viewpoint.

61. The Bureau of Mines has probed the minerals of the basin to discover how they might best be mined, processed, and utilized to support the metallurgical and industrial economy that is envisioned. "The mineral industries in the Colorado River Basin constitute one of the most obvious outlets for power generated at multiple-purpose dams."

62. The Office of Indian Affairs has outlined projects that will benefit the Indians of the basin.

63. The General Land Office, which administers about 6 million acres of public land in the Colorado River Basin, has outlined a program to obtain optimum use of these public lands and to coordinate their utilization with the development of water resources.

64. The Forest Service has emphasized the need for careful management of water on the national forest lands to insure adequate safeguarding of the water yields.

65. The Federal Power Commission has furnished data upon which power utilization and market trends are based and has commented generally on the power resources of the basin.

66. The interest and cooperation of State and local groups, as well as other Federal agencies in the basin, are reflected throughout the report.

CONCLUSIONS

67. Future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin is needed to relieve economic distress in local areas, to stabilize highly developed agricultural areas, and to create opportunities for agricultural and industrial growth and expansion throughout the Colorado River Basin. Such development should be comprehended in a basinwide plan for ultimate development of all water resources of the basin. The potential projects outlined in this report will form the basis for future detailed investigations and the selection and construction of sound projects. Considered as a group, these projects are an index of the overall results and benefits to be expected from the development and utilization of all the available waters of the Colorado River system. They indicate also the engineering feasibility and economic justification of an overall plan for basin development. Planning has progressed sufficiently to make possible a selection from among the potentialities of a group of projects to comprise a construction program for the next stage of basin development. These projects should be key features of or should fit into the final comprehensive plan to be developed through continued investigations and planning.

68. There is not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full ex-

pansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects outlined in the report, including the new possibilities for exporting water to adjacent watersheds. The need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents therefore is most pressing.

69. It is concluded that future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin would benefit the national and local economies and a plan for development of all the water resources of the basin should therefore be effectuated, that the selection of a group of projects comprising the next stage of development would represent a logical step in effecting that plan, and that detailed investigations to develop the succeeding stages should be continued.

RECOMMENDATIONS

70. The following recommendations are made in view of the fact that there is not enough water available in the Colorado River system to permit construction of all the potential projects outlined in the report and for a full expansion of existing and authorized projects, and that there has not been a final determination of the respective rights of the Colorado River Basin States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River:

(1) That the States of the Colorado River Basin, acting separately or jointly, recommend for construction, as the next stage of development, a group of projects, the streamflow depletions of which will assuredly fall within ultimate allocations of Colorado River water which may be made to the individual States.

(2) That the States of the Colorado River Basin determine their respective rights to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact.

(3) That additional investigations, summarized below, and appropriations to the Department of the Interior for use by the various agencies within that Department for these investigations, be approved.

(a) The Bureau of Reclamation to continue and expand its detailed investigations of potential projects within the States of the Colorado River basin to obtain adequate information by which the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the basin States can formulate a comprehensive plan for use of all the water resources of the basin and select and recommend projects for successive stages of development.

(b) The Geological Survey, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Grazing Service, Bureau of Mines, Office of Indian Affairs, and General Land Office to initiate or continue to conduct such investigations and studies as required by the Secretary of the Interior to formulate and carry out the comprehensive plan.

E. A. MORITZ,
Regional Director, Region III.
E. O. LARSON,
Regional Director, Region IV.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have statements of many prominent people in the United States, many of whom are officials, which I desire to place in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point. They include a statement made by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union, one from Vice President NIXON, one from the Secretary of the Interior, and others.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, state of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

"Now, of course, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, as quoted in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, October 25, 1954:

"President Eisenhower is for development of the upper Colorado. The administration is committed to it. So am I."

Department of the Interior, report to Congress on S. 500:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: A report has been requested from this Department on S. 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

In his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower said (H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., p. 8):

"* * * the Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Likewise in his budget message (H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., p. M65) the President said:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

In the budget itself it was pointed out (p. 830) that the administration proposes to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project during the next fiscal year if it is authorized and that the budget includes an item for funds to be requested for this purpose.

The substance of our views on the proper contents of a bill to implement the President's recommendation and particularly on those projects and units which should be covered in the initial legislation is contained in the draft of bill which was developed by the Bureau of the Budget in collaboration with this Department and submitted to your committee on April 1, 1954, in connection with S. 1555, 83d Congress, a predecessor of the present S. 500.

We recommend that S. 500 be examined in the light of the proposal there made and in the light of the two letters dated March 18, 1954, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to your committee and to this Department which are reprinted in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, and that, with suitable amendments, S. 500 be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,
FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Michael W. Straus, former commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation, as reported in the Salt Lake Telegram, August 7, 1952:

"He [Mr. Straus] described the upper Colorado Basin program as the greatest multiple purpose water conservation plan ever proposed for this continent."

Congress of Industrial Organizations:

"CIO VOICES SUPPORT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ECHO PARK DAM IN COLORADO

"DENVER, COLO., March 22, 1955.—CIO support for the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Echo Park, Colo., as part of the upper Colorado River storage project, has been voted by the CIO committee on power, atomic energy, and resources development, it was announced today by Chairman O. A. Knight.

"Mr. Knight, who heads the CIO Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Internatinal Union, said the decision followed an extensive meeting of the committee in Denver late last month.

"In reversing its previous stand of opposition to the dam, Mr. Knight said the committee now supports the dam project as a means of securing maximum benefits of water for irrigation and municipal purposes, as well as the development of electric power for expansion of the upper Colorado Basin area.

"Mr. Knight's statement:

" 'From a careful study of the facts which have been presented to me and my committee, I am persuaded that the maximum benefit to mankind will result from the earliest possible completion of the upper Colorado storage project including Echo Park Dam. The engineering prospects provide facilities for recreation for those now interested in the scenery and wildlife aspects of this area, as well as substantial regulation of the waterflow in the river and a head of water for the production of electric power. This power is needed for the expanding population and industrial growth in the Mountain States. Salt Lake City, Utah, and Denver, Colo., and the total area between these two growing cities will greatly benefit from the earliest possible development of the total upper Colorado storage project.' "

Indian Rights Association:

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, March 3, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Irrigation, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: At its regular meeting, held yesterday, the board of directors of the Indian Rights Association went on record in support of the Navaho project of the Colorado River storage project. The association urges that the Navaho project be definitely included in any legislation authorizing the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The need of the Navaho Indians for resources to enable a larger number of members of the tribe to earn a living on their reservation is fully recognized. Many thousands of Navahos should be enabled to support themselves from the use of their land to be irrigated through the Navaho project. The Navahos are entitled to first consideration in the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin.

We urge the inclusion of the full Navaho project in any provisions for the upper Colorado development.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE E. LINDLEY,
General Secretary.

National Farmers Union:

"STATEMENT OF ANGUS M'DONALD, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, IN SUPPORT OF THE UPPER COLORADO DEVELOPMENT

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to present the position of our organization in regard to S. 500 which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado storage project and participating projects. We fully endorse this legislation and feel that it is entirely consistent with the policies of the National Farmers Union adopted by delegates of the biennial convention at Denver, Colo., March 15–19, 1954. Furthermore, endorsement of upper Colorado development is entirely consistent with policies adopted by previous Farmers Union conventions—local, country, State, and National."

The Christian Science Monitor, January 27, 1955:

"The water resources of the Colorado River's upper basin must be developed. Here is an objective against which there is no open opposition of which we have knowledge.

"These resources must be developed even if it should prove necessary to build dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain, both of which lie within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Those who would argue seriously against that postulate are also few. But as to whether it is necessary to invade a long-established national preserve is a question being hotly disputed."

Ralph A. Tudor, former Undersecretary of the Interior, as quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, November 27, 1954:

"In connection with the proposed billion-dollar program for development of the upper Colorado River basin, the Bureau of Reclamation had made plans for a dam at Echo Park within the Dinosaur National Monument, a spectacularly beautiful area in eastern Utah. Conservationists and lovers of natural beauty were up in arms over this proposal—not to mention archaeologists who had the misapprehension that the waters impounded by the dam might cover lands containing the bones of dinosaurs which once roamed this territory. Actually the bone quarry is miles from the proposed reservoir.

"Secretary McKay dispatched me to the scene. For days, I flew over the area, looking at alternate dam sites. Then I spent 3 days in Echo Park itself, climbing around the mountains. It is a delightful spot, a beautiful natural resource and, other things being equal, I certainly would say that no dam should be built in there. But other things are not equal. This is a section of the country in which water is very precious. And I had to conclude that a dam built elsewhere that would be otherwise effective would lose enough water by evaporation every year to supply a city the size of Denver. And in this semiarid country, where the whole economic development is limited by water, and where scenery is abundant, the choice was pretty clear but nonetheless hard.

"I therefore recommended to the Secretary, and to Congress, that the dam in Echo Park be built, even though it would alter—I do not concede that it would destroy—a great natural beauty spot. It was a case of balancing one natural resource against another and of using my best judgment as to which decision would serve the greater public good. I do not imagine, however, that my popularity is any too high among nature lovers. Yet had I decided against the Echo Park Dam, I would have been just as big a villain in the eyes of the upper Colorado Basin water users."

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.—Charles J. Fain, legislative assistant, NRECA, in a statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, March 2, 1955:

"In summary, I would like to say that the rural-electric systems nationally, and especially those in the power-marketing area to be served by the proposed upper Colorado storage project, wholeheartedly support and urge its authorization provided the power is marketed in accordance with traditional principles of reclamation law, and provided that authorization for an electric transmission network capable of fully integrating the individual units of the project with each other, and the project as a whole with the existing transmission network of the Bureau of Reclamation, and capable of delivering power to the load centers of preference customers, is included."

Individuals and organizations

The following individuals and organizations also are included among the millions of Americans who have expressed approval, either individually or through their organizations, of the Echo Park and Glen Canyon units or of the entire Colorado River storage project:

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

Former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

The entire congressional delegations of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Bureau of the Budget.

Federal Power Commission.

United States Corps of Engineers.

Val Peterson, Administrator, Civil Defense Administration.

CONSERVATIONISTS AND CONSERVATION GROUPS

Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners.

Seth Gordon, one of the foremost conservation experts in United States.

Herbert F. Smart, former president of the Utah Wildlife Federation, finance commissioner of the State of Utah and member of land policy committee of National Wildlife Federation.

Thomas L. Kimball, director of Colorado Game and Fish Department.

Lester Bagley, game and fish director of the State of Wyoming.

J. Parry Egan, director of Utah's Fish and Game Department.

Leo Young, editor, Wild Life Notes (West Virginia).

Roy Despain, veteran professional Colorado River runner.

Harry Aleson, Colorado River boatman.

G. E. Untermann, ranger-naturalist at Dinosaur National Monument for many years, and at present, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History at Vernal, Utah.

Finis Mitchell, explorer and photographer.

George Harris, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

William E. Scheele, naturalist, Cleveland, Ohio.

J. Leroy Kay, Pittsburgh, curator, Carnegie Museum.

Loveland, Colo., Wildlife Association.

Hugh B. Woodward, Albuquerque, N. Mex., western director, National Wildlife Federation.

LETTERS

Letters to United States Department of Interior, tabulated April 21, 1954: 2,625 for Echo Park Dam, 2,602 against the dam (Salt Lake Tribune, April 22, 1954).

INDIAN GROUPS

Indian Rights Association.

Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc.

New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs.

Sam Akhea, chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

Jack Clime, Indian trader, Fruitland, N. Mex.

PRIVATE UTILITIES

Arizona Public Service Co.

Public Service Co. of Colorado.

Public Service Co. of New Mexico.

Southern Colorado Power Co.

Southern Utah Power Co.

Southern Wyoming Utilities Co.

Telluride Power Co.

Western Colorado Power Co.

Uintah Power & Light Co.

Utah Power & Light Co.

MISCELLANEOUS

LaPlata Electric Association, Inc.

Montezuma County, Colorado Planning Association.

Colorado River Water Conservation District.

Farmington, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce.

Yampa Valley, Colorado Development Association, Inc.

The Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado.

Gooseberry Project Water Users, Mt. Pleasant, Utah.

Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.

Uintah Basin Water Users, Vernal, Utah.

Federated Women's Clubs, Provo, Utah.

Utah Canning Crops Association, Logan, Utah.

Emery County Project Water Users, Orangeville, Utah.

Orem Chamber of Commerce, Orem, Utah.

Utah County Civil Defense, Provo, Utah.

Pacific States Cast Iron Pipe Co., Provo, Utah.

Sterling Price—National Wild Life Association, Provo, Utah.

Ashley Farmers Union Cooperative, Vernal, Utah.

W. R. Wallace, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Henry Roberts, chairman, Central Utah Projects Committee.

Provo Electric Power Co., Provo, Utah.

J. A. Howell, Ogden, Utah.

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Sevier County Groups, Richfield, Utah.

County commissioners of Salt Lake, Sanpete, Utah, Sevier, Garfield, Tooele, Carbon, Washington, Uintah, Duchesne, Juab, Iron, Kane, Emery, Millard, Wayne, Grand, Wasatch, and San Juan, Utah.

Utah Association of County Officials.

State and county water users associations in Wayne County, Iron County, Garfield County, Beaver County, Sanpete County, Uintah County, Wasatch County, Piute County, Salt Lake County, and Juab County, Utah.

Utah Water Users Association.

Colorado River Development Association (21 counties).

Springville Irrigation District and Springville Drainage District.

Weber County Water Users Association.

District No. 2—Utah Water Users Association.

Cache County Water Users Association.

Pleasant Grove Irrigation Co.

Utah County Water Users Association.

Salt Lake County Water Users Association.

Uintah County Water Users Association.

Washington County Democratic Central Committee.

Washington County Republican Central Committee.

Kane County Republican Central Committee.

Uintah County Republican Central Committee.

Utah County Republican Central Committee.

Garfield County Republican Central Committee.

Committee for Young Men in Government (Grant S. Thorn, Springville, Utah).

Utah Mining Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Associated General Contractors, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Greater Utah Valley, Provo, Utah.
Park City Consolidated Mines, Park City, Utah.
Springville Banking Co., Springville, Utah.
Cities and towns (Utah): Payson, Springville, Orem, Nephi, Vernal, Roosevelt, Duchesne, Price, Milford, Meadow, Eureka, Scipio, Ephraim, Salt Lake City, Grantsville, Murray, Richfield, Fillmore, Fairview, Salina, Marysville, Mount Pleasant, Pleasant Grove, Provo.
Utah Municipal League.
Chambers of commerce: Salt Lake City, Richfield, Roosevelt, Wasatch, Vernal, South Salt Lake, Price, Cedar City, North Sevier, Nephi, Springville, and Ogden.
Junior chambers of commerce: Vernal, Utah State, Nephi, Delta, Gunnison Valley, Pleasant Grove, and Provo.

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

Central Utah Vocational School.
Associated Students, Brigham Young University.
Students of the Uintah High School.
Associated Students, Utah State Agricultural College.

WOMEN'S CLUBS

Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (member).
Federated Women's Clubs of Nephi.
Women's Safety Council (Salt Lake County).
East Millard Fine Arts Guild.
Murray Women's Club.
Panguitch Women's Club.
Progressive Arts Club.
Price Federated Women's Clubs.
Richfield Study Club.
Richfield Culture Club.
Athenian Club of Lehi.
Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (Sanpete-Sevier).
Utah Federated Women's Club (State).
Roosevelt Culture Club.
Current Topic Club of Vernal.
Uintah Basin District, Federated Women's Clubs.
Mothers Study Club, Pleasant Grove, Utah.
Executive committee, Utah Federated Women's Clubs.
Junior Ladies Literary Club, American Fork, Utah.
Federated Clubs of Utah (Alpha Beta Club).
Ogden District Federation of Women's Clubs.
Provo Council PTA.
Timpanogos First District Federated Women's Clubs.

CIVIC CLUBS

Kiwanis Club of Nephi.
Kiwanis Club of Provo.
Kiwanis Club of Roosevelt.
Lions Club of Beaver.
Lions Club of Union.
Lions Club of Marysvale.
Lions Club of Park City.
Lions Club of Fairview.
Lions Club of Vernal.
Lions Club of Grantsville.
Lions Club of Panguitch.
Lions Club of Milford.
Lions Club of Salina.
Lions Club of Roosevelt.
Lions Club of Bingham Canyon.
Lions Club of Wayne County.
Lions Club of Moab.
Lions Club of Duchesne.
Lions Club of Mount Pleasant.
Lions Club of Pleasant Grove.
Associated Civic Clubs of Southern and Eastern Utah.
Kiwanis Club of Eureka.
Associated Civic Clubs of Northern Utah.
Cadmus Club of Pleasant Grove.
American Legion, Springville, Utah.
Central Utah Association of Engineers, Provo, Utah.
Utah Wildlife Federation.
Vernal Rod and Gun Club.
Mount Nebo Wildlife Association.
Utah Cattle & Horse Growers' Association.
Uintah Basin Soil Conservation District.
Utah County Central Labor Council, Provo, Utah.
Provo Real Estate Board, Provo, Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. This is only a partial list of supporters which have come to my personal attention. It does not begin to be a complete list of groups and prominent individuals in favor of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Utah Wild Life Federation; an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955; a copy of a letter I have written to Representatives and Senators who have changed their position of hostility to that of open support; and an editorial from the Denver Post of April 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 1955.

DEAR FRIEND OF CONSERVATION: You will, I am sure, be interested in the following analysis of wildlife resources in the area to be affected by Echo Park Dam. The analysis is by Thomas Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado. Mr. Kimball was formerly director of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, and is particularly qualified because of his studies and investigations of resources management at Lake Mead:

"FISH AND GAME ASPECTS—ECHO PARK RESERVOIR

"(By Thomas L. Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado)

"The Echo Park Dam is planned as a concrete arch type structure 525 feet in height above the river bed elevation of approximately 5,050 feet mean sea level. The maximum water surface elevation is 5,570 feet. The water surface area at this elevation will be approximately 43,000 acres. The reservoir will be of the narrow canyon-type and, when full, will back water 63 miles up the Green River and 44 miles up the Yampa River.

"The permanent outlet elevation (penstock height) is at elevation 5,325. This elevation represents the maximum drawn-down point of the reservoir and will leave a permanent water depth of 275 feet at the dam.

"The outlet works consist of an intake tower of the type constructed at Hoover Dam supplying the power penstock. The maximum discharge capacity will be 20,000 second-feet.

"In 1951 the Fish Research Division of the Colorado Game and Fish Department stationed two men in this area to gather physical data and make fish population inventories on the lower Yampa River and its tributaries. The findings showed the lower limits of trout and whitefish habitat to be in the vicinity of Craig, Colo. Siltation and high water temperatures evidently preclude the presence of cold water species in the lower sections of the Yampa River.

"The fish species which were inventoried in the portion of the Yampa to be inundated by Echo Park Reservoir are as follows: Channel catfish, Colorado River squawfish, bonytail chub, Northern Creek chub, flannelmouth sucker, bullhead catfish, roundtail chub, carp, Colorado speckled dace, and northern bluehead mountain sucker.

"This list is undoubtedly incomplete, but represents the major species now inhabiting this water. The same species are present in the Green River portion of the reservoir area although no collections were made in the Green River.

"It will be noted that the only game fish of consequence abiding there at present is the channel catfish. The Colorado River squawfish is occasionally sought by anglers for its large size.

"The fishing pressure in this area as it is now is quite low, possibly no more than 200 fisherman days per year for the entire reservoir area.

"Using United States Fish and Wildlife Service River Basin Manual evaluations, this usage amounts to a preproject monetary fishing evaluation of approximately $1,500 per year.

"A series of water and air temperatures were taken daily at various points along the lower Yampa River in 1951. The significant temperature stations with relation to Echo Park Reservoir were at Lily Park and Pat's Hole. The highest air temperature recorded was 91° F. and the highest water temperature was 79° F. These occurred in the last week in July 1951. Water temperature stayed below 60° F. until early in July.

"Water temperatures above 70° F. lasted from mid-July to the second week in August at which time they slowly began to cool to 65° in early September.

"This temperature data points up the fact that it would not take an excessive drop in temperature to make these waters within temperature tolerance ranges of cold water game fish species such as trout and whitefish.

"It is felt that the construction of Echo Park Reservoir would drop water temperatures at least in the lower and central strata to well within trout temperature tolerances.

"In all probability other game fish with greater temperature tolerance ranges such as walleyed pike and largemouth black bass would create a significant fishery in the upper strata of the lake.

"Utilization of a fishery in this area would not be as great when compared to reservoirs near larger centers of population; however, the eventual quality and quantity of the fishery would play a large part in its popularity and usage.

"Using the very minimum figure of one pound of fish to the creel per surface acre per year on the basis of a partially drawn-down reservoir of 20,000 acres (43,000 acres full) the reservoir would yield an annual monetary evaluation of $81,600 for a trout fishery or $54,400 for a bass and walleye fishery (River Basin Manual evaluation figures).

"This evaluation is considered for the reservoir fishery only. The stream fishery below the dam would develop into an excellent trout fishery if the water is drawn from underneath the surface of the lake as is planned in the schedule of operations. The Colorado River below Hoover Dam is a case in point here.

"There is no attempt made to evaluate the stream fishery as only a short portion is in Colorado; however, it should be a valuable adjunct to the State of Utah.

"This water suitability for trout should extend downstream as far as Jensen, Utah, due to the canyon terrain and absence of silt-carrying tributaries.

"There can be no other conclusion drawn than the fact that the construction of Echo Park Dam would provide significant enhancement to the region from the fisheries standpoint.

"The following is a summary by specie as to the effect the construction of the Echo Park and Flaming Gorge Dams will have on

wildlife. This portion of the report has been made by Gilbert N. Hunter, game manager for the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

"1. Deer: Generally, from studying the water levels, as well as the vegetative type, and deer populations within this area, I do not feel there will be a great amount of loss in the available deer range, because in the upper Green, namely around Smith Ferry, the depth of the water is not great, and the bottom lands that will be covered in this particular area have been severely overgrazed by domestic stock. The same condition applies in Little Brown's Park and Big Brown's Park. Furthermore, in these areas observations would indicate that the deer are inclined to hold more to the slopes rather than the bottoms. The general type is pinion juniper and sage, and outside of sage there is a very small amount of palatable browse. In the main canyons, that is from Ladore on the Green River, down to Echo Park Dam site, and the Yampa from Cross Mountain to Pat's Hole, the canyons are very steep and narrow, and inaccessible to large numbers of deer. The big wintering concentration on the Yampa will not be materially affected, due to the fact that deer generally winter well above the proposed high-water line.

"2. Mountain sheep: The area in Ladore Canyon is the only location where at present mountain sheep exist. Naturally they are on the slopes far above the water level and will not be affected. This is the area where a transplant should be made, and has been recommended.

"3. Migratory birds: The Green and Yampa Rivers have a very good population of the greater Canadian geese. At the present time the heavy nesting areas are confined in Big Brown's Park, and along the little shelves immediately adjacent to both the Yampa and the Green Rivers. Ducks are generally common throughout the area. It was observed that in the Yampa Canyon from Lilly Park down, the concentration of geese was not as heavy as that of the Green. This can be attributed to the fact that again the canyon walls rise abruptly from the water, and there is little or no area suitable for nesting. It is felt that by flooding the Brown's Park area that other swampy areas will be created, which should, unless the water level varies too much at the time of the nesting period, greatly increase the number of geese and ducks within this area.

"4. Beaver: In the upper portions of the Green River, that is above Ladore Canyon, beaver are quite common. They are bank beaver, and a great deal of their habitat will be destroyed; however, on the other hand, it may be that they will adapt themselves to the situation by moving to higher elevation, which in all probability will in time be reseeded by willows. If the water level does not vary too much this should not cause any great loss as pertaining to the beaver. (End of Kimball's statement.)

"Because of the great benefits to our western wildlife resources, the Directors of the Game, Fish, and Conservation Departments of the 11 Western States, at their annual meeting in May 1954, endorsed and approved the construction of Echo Park Dam. Why shouldn't all conservationists?"

Yours for better fishing and hunting,
D. KEITH BARNES,
President, Utah Wildlife Federation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955]

COLORADO BASIN WATER DISPUTE SWIRLS IN WEST

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—People of the States where the Colorado River originates regard the big dams and powerplants proposed in the Upper Colorado Basin Storage Project Act, favored by the Eisenhower administration and recently approved 11 to 1 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as absolutely vital to their continued growth and prosperity.

Therefore, they grow more bitter over California's strong and continued opposition to the authorizing legislation. They feel the project will only carry out, a third of a century later, the longtime arrangements made by the seven Colorado Basin States under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Much of the river's flow still runs unused into the Gulf of California, an intolerable waste in an arid land. Upper basin residents and officials feel that the project development, providing storage for this wasted water, would insure southern California's future water supply as well as their own.

POLITICAL TONES

They say California got more than half of all the money authorized by the 83d Congress for all reclamation projects in all 17 Western States, and that California now has pending before the Congress, requests for projects totaling hundreds of millions of dollars more.

Their attitude, right or wrong, was well put by United States Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee, when he declared that if California succeeds in defeating the upper basin project, "no new projects will be approved for California as long as I am chairman."

The water war might also have a bearing on national politics, particularly if Mr. Eisenhower should retire and a Californian aspire in 1956 to the presidency on the Republican ticket.

One angle that politicians notice, whether the public does or not, is that while giant California has 30 House Members against only 12 for all the other Colorado Basin States put together, the upper basin States—those which consider themselves peculiarly aggrieved by the California stand—have 10 United States Senators to California's 2. Nevada has traditionally been neutral.

Regardless of party, those 10 Senators are, by the pressure of back-home opinion, welded into a solid bloc in this matter. It would be political oblivion for any of the 10 to vote with California.

Two key dams

In what was regarded as a trial run for the fate of the big project in the 83d Congress, the House last year defeated by a very small margin the bill to authorize Colorado's proposed Fryingpan project which would divert about 80,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water over the mountains. The California delegation voted 23 to 7 against it. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, then Speaker of the House, therefore decided not even to bring up the upper basin project act.

Crux of the dispute over the project centers about the two enormous key dams planned. The Glen Canyon Dam on the Arizona-Utah border would cost about $450 million, would store about 26 million acre-feet of water, and would provide a huge power supply.

The Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border, within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, would cost about $175 million, would store about 6 million acre-feet, and would provide a power supply second only to Glen Canyon.

Californians are less opposed to Glen Canyon, for the reason that there is no place for either its water or power benefits to go, save downriver to them.

The big fight has been on the Echo Park Dam, as an allegedly precedent-setting invasion of a national monument. Conservation and wildlife societies all over the Nation have lined up to oppose this dam. Proponents say that it is so efficient, both for water storage and power, that no other suggested site will do.

In a recent speech in the Senate documented with maps and citations of Government records, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, sought to demolish the invasion contention, and in the eyes of upper basin people, at least, did very well.

He pointed out not only that President Roosevelt's original proclamation of 1938 enlarging the monument to its present proportions reserved a power site in the area, but that 11 successive reservations of power sites had been made in the canyons between 1904 and 1925. He said that all of them retain precedence over the dedication of the area for monument purposes, and that none have ever been withdrawn.

He cited correspondence dating back to 1934, when the National Park Service was working to establish the monument, in which the Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to cancel its power reservations in favor of the monument, and was refused. The power commission could not do anything else under the law, he said.

Letter cited

He further cited a recent letter from Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, that in the opinion of the Commission these power reservations are still valid.

In other words, said Mr. WATKINS, the monument is the interloper, and the victory of those who would leave it untouched would establish a precedent that valid and prior Government commitments can illegally be set aside at will.

He added that the advocates of the monument were perfectly willing in 1938 to have it established subject to the prior power-site withdrawals, once they had failed to get those canceled.

Reports of the Park Service show that in 1954 about 2,000 persons visited the disputed canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers by road, and about 900 made the perilous downriver run (which requires guides) by boat.

Senator WATKINS has also pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation plan includes an elaborate recreational development with access roads permitting many thousand Americans to see the big dam and the canyons, in place of the less than 3,000 who were able to visit the canyons in 1954.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 14, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the National organization, which opposes this unit, of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations

in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would threaten the National Park System.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which—

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of the Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of the Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal waterpower act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Waterpower Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, acting director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally vacated the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so, why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Waterpower Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not invading this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying, in effect, to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational reserves. Once the inviolability of the park system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks."

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an onslaught similar to that of private enterprise imperiling the National Park System?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent, of those who believe the dam would set a fatal precedent.

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—with whom we have pleasurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the limitation on debate which I understand we shall have tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks which I had prepared on certain aspects of the bill which is before the Senate printed as a statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the index to a book on The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me, by Freeman Tilden, there is an entry that reads as follows: "Hetch Hetchy, classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery, page 173." On page 173 Mr. Tilden says, "I recall the outburst of infatuation that led to the creation of a stupid Hetch Hetchy reservoir in what was once a treasured part of the wild beauty of Yosemite."

I should like to review with you this "classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery." Like millions of other Americans I am opposed to the Echo Park Dam, because it is proposed for construction within our national park system. And I am amazed, and also deeply shocked, to realize how closely we here seem to be repeating history.

I am shocked because the history that we are in danger of repeating is hardly creditable to us. It is history that rather should teach us a lesson of never-again.

It is history that shows that those who were defending a national park against a dam proposal a half century ago were right. Their opponents won out, but nevertheless they were wrong. We lost a marvelously beautiful valley in one of our greatest national parks.

Where once there was the beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park, there is now the stark drab reservoir of the O'Shaughnessy Dam. In a display of photographs entitled "Hetch Hetchy: Before and After" in The Living Wilderness magazine for winter 1953–54 (p. 36), there is a photograph of the tragic scene that confronts the few visitors who now seek out this valley, a photograph that I wish could be enlarged and seen clearly by all of us who share the responsibility for protecting the national park system. This photograph shows this reservoir, with the characteristic scar along its edge that comes with the "drawdown"—the great lowering of water levels that promoters of dams for playgrounds always neglect to describe in their visions of the future for which they strive. In the foreground of this scene is a stone wall. In the far background is a beautiful waterfall. But in the foreground is a stone wall and a bare gravel road. Standing ominously in this deserted scene is a large road sign: "One way, do not enter."

Once already we have proved that this is a way which we in America do not enter without a drastic disregard of the signs by which we are seeking to govern our national welfare.

And once is too often, as Robert K. Cutter puts it in an impressive article published by the Sierra Club. In this pamphlet, Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often, the tragic case of the once-beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley is strikingly presented. I am sure other Senators also have received copies of this booklet. The photographs of the noble valley of Hetch Hetchy before "alteration," with all of its loveliness, inspire reverence and awe. It is plain that were the valley still in existence today, there would be thousands of Americans enjoying it in the same way that they are enjoying Yosemite Valley. Hetch Hetchy's trees, its mountains, its tumbling streams, its majestic waterfalls were like a benediction. They would have provided for ages to come rest and relaxation for the mind and spirit of countless Americans.

But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site; and all that might have been was lost because Senators in 1913 believed the statements that a dam would not destroy the valley, but would instead enhance its beauty and create a great and attractive natural object.

Did these predictions come true? No. You have only to look, a little further on, at the picture of Hetch Hetchy today, to see how wrong were the prophets of 1913. Or, Mr. President, open once the folder called What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur? and see, above, the beautiful scenes of Hetch Hetchy half a century ago and then see the picture, below, of the reservoir today. That picture points to the fallaciousness of the reasoning that Echo Park will be improved by a dam. The photograph of Hetch Hetchy today shows a bleak expanse of dead water, made particularly ugly by the fluctuating water levels which expose stumps of dead trees and the muddy, rock-strewn shores.

Before Hetch Hetchy was inundated there might perhaps have seemed to be some possibilities in the reasoning that a dam would not destroy the beauty and wonders of Dinosaur National Monument. We did not then have concrete evidence that "alteration" really means ruin for such an area; that inundation of a natural area such as Hetch Hetchy and Dinosaur means its destruction.

What of the prediction that crowds of people would flock to the altered Hetch Hetchy? We have only to ask, Who hears of Hetch Hetchy today or who knows of it, except those who knew it once and who mourn its destruction, or those who see it and hear of it as a sad example? The crowds stay away

in droves. For every million people who delight in the beauty, the natural beauty, of Yosemite and spend vacations there, there are a thousand who drive up to Hetch Hetchy, turn around, and leave. The prediction that Hetch Hetchy Reservoir would become a playground for millions has evaporated under the bright sun of reality.

Today, we are being told that Echo Park, when flooded, will become the "playground for millions," and we are seeing the wide distribution of a brochure with artistic conceptions of Echo Park as such a playground. Thus history threatens to repeat itself—a threat that is indeed frightening.

In the Hetch Hetchy case, too, there was wide distribution of similarly pretty conceptions of the inundated Hetch Hetchy Valley as seen by an artist who was hired to make the drawings. One such drawing was distributed to the desk of every Member of the United States Senate the day of the final vote on the bill that, like this one we face, was supposed to create this beautiful lake. The drawing conjured up beauties which are not there. When we look at Hetch Hetchy today we know the answer to the question that was printed at the head of the drawing distributed to the Members of the Senate in 1913 when Hetch Hetchy was at stake. The question read: "Does this beautiful lake ruin this beautiful valley?" The answer as we look at Hetch Hetchy today is a resounding "Yes." It has ruined it. And it is not beautiful after all.

The irony of the story of Hetch Hetchy is that history has proved that it was not necessary to ruin the valley in order for San Francisco to get the water that it needed. There were alternatives which were ignored, which would have provided San Francisco with its water and at the same time would have kept for the Nation an incomparable recreation area of which it could be mighty proud.

There are alternatives to the Echo Park Dam, just as there were for Hetch Hetchy. We need not be the destroyers of our park heritage in order to provide the upper Colorado Basin States with the water and power they require. We can have both, if we make the necessary effort. I strongly urge that we do so. For once destroyed, the scenic splendor of the Dinosaur National Monument cannot be recreated.

So, let us look with some care at this once-is-too-often bit of history that is now threatening to repeat itself.

What was Hetch Hetchy?

In the final chaper of his great, now classic work on The Mountains of California, John Muir called Hetch Hetchy "a wonderfully exact counterpart" of Yosemite—the Yosemite that in the summertime now is crowded with thousands and thousands of visitors—in 1954. Yosemite, that great U-shaped valley with its magnificent cliff walls rising in grandeur and enlivened with waterfalls. The resemblance to Yosemite that John Muir noted in the Hetch Hetchy Valley, he found, as he said, "not only in its sublime rocks and waterfalls but in the gardens, groves, and meadows of its flower-park-like floor." Describing the valley's beauty and particularly a great waterfall that excelled even Yosemite's Bridal Veil falls "both in height and airy-fairy beauty and behavior," John Muir wrote as follows:

"Imagine yourself in Hetch Hetchy on a sunny day in June, standing waist-deep in grass and flowers, while the great pines sway dreamily with scarcely perceptible motion. Looking northward across the valley you see a plain, gray granite cliff rising abruptly out of the gardens and groves to a height of 1,800 feet, and in front of it the waterfall called Tueeulala's silvery scarf burning with irised sun-fire. In the first white outburst at the head there is abundance of visible energy, but it is speedily hushed and concealed in divine repose, and its tranquil progress to the base of the cliff is like that of a downy feather in a still room. Now observe the fineness and marvelous distinctness of the various sun-illumined fabrics into which the water is woven; they sift and float from form to form down the face of that grand gray rock in so leisurely and unconfused a manner that you can examine their texture, and patterns and tones of color as you would a piece of embroidery held in hand. Toward the top of the fall you see groups of booming, comet-like masses, their solid white heads separate, their tails like combed silk interlacing among delicate gray and purple shadows, ever forming and dissolving, worn out by friction in their rush through the air."

I am trying to suggest the value of this Hetch Hetchy Valley as part of a national park, to suggest how through the eyes of a great naturalist and explorer we all still can have some understanding of its splendor.

John Muir went on to describe the other magnificent waterfalls of Hetch Hetchy and the many smaller streams that come over the walls which he described as leaping from ledge to ledge with birdlike song and watering many a hidden cliff garden and fernery.

"The correspondence between the Hetch Hetchy walls in their trends, sculpture, physical structure, and general arrangement of the main rock masses and those of the Yosemite Valley," John Muir said, "has excited the wondering admiration of every observer."

With a sublimity of words appropriate to the scene of which he wrote, this great son of the wilderness called Hetch Hetchy a grand landscape garden, one of Nature's rarest and most precious mountain temples, and he said:

"As in Yosemite, the sublime rocks of its walls seem to glow with life, whether leaning back in repose or standing erect in thoughtful attitudes, giving welcome to storms and calms alike, their brows in the sky, their feet set in the groves and gay flowery meadows, while birds, bees, and butterflies help the river and waterfalls to stir all the air into music—things frail and fleeting and types of permanence meeting here and blending, just as they do in Yosemite, to draw her lovers into close and confiding communion with her."

"Sad to say," however, John Muir had also to record that "this most precious and sublime feature of the Yosemite National Park, one of the greatest of all our natural resources for the uplifting joy and peace and health of the people" was "in danger of being dammed and made into a reservoir to help supply San Francisco with water and light, thus flooding it from wall to wall and burying its gardens and groves one or two hundred feet deep."

It is our great national misfortune that Hetch Hetchy was thus dammed and is today thus flooded. It is our perplexity today that this same misfortune is now threatened for the scenic wild canyons of the Green and the Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument.

Listen to what John Muir wrote about the threat to Hetch Hetchy. Does it not sound shockingly familiar to us who have been hearing so persistently the arguments of those who now want to dam Echo Park?

"This grossly destructive commercial scheme," wrote John Muir, "has long been planned and urged (though water as pure and abundant can be got from sources outside of the people's park, in a dozen different places), because of the comparative cheapness of the dam and of the territory which it is sought to divert from the great uses to which it was dedicated.

"The proponents of the dam scheme"—and I am quoting John Muir writing about the Hetch Hetchy Dam—"the proponents of the dam scheme bring forward a lot of bad arguments to prove that the only righteous thing to do with the people's parks is to destroy them bit by bit as they are able.

"Their arguments"—and I am still quoting John Muir—"their arguments are curiously alike those of the devil, devised for the destruction of the first garden—so much of the very best Eden fruit going to waste; so much of the best Tuolumne water and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

I interrupt myself to point out that John Muir was the organizer and first president, and for a great many years the president, of the Sierra Club. He was not opposing the Hetch Hetchy Dam because of a hidden sympathy for California water interests. He was opposing California water interests. Today the Sierra Club suffers the inferences of insinuating opponents who suspect these devoted preservers of national parks of opposition to another dam in another national park for unworthy secondary reasons, because the supposed beneficiaries of this Echo Park Dam are in a rival State. The executive director of the Sierra Club today when he testifies before our Senate committee is subject to the duress of such inferences and of questioning that is diligently pursued with these insinuations, yet the club which he represents—and I hold it to be one of the outstanding forces for conservation in America—that club under its first great leader fought earnestly against a dam supposed to be for the benefit of the club's own headquarters city, and fought as earnestly as the Sierra Club leaders of our day now contend against the proponents of the Echo Park Dam. They do this for the same reason—because they are devoted to the preservation of our national parks unimpaired by such structures.

John Muir was not confronted with arguments about the waters of the Colorado but about those of his own California—"so much of the best Tuolumne water," he was told, "and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

Of his opponents John Muir said:

"Few of their statements are even partly true, and all are misleading."

This is strong language—not ours of our opponents, I hasten again to emphasize, but John Muir's comments half a century ago.

As an example of what he meant, John Muir cited his opponents' claim that the national park feature that he was defending was "like thousands of others." John Muir answered: "On the contrary it is a very uncommon feature; after Yosemite, the rarest and in many ways the most important in this national park."

I call special attention to another example of the arguments that John Muir heard from the people who insisted on building the Hetch Hetchy Dam, in Yosemite National Park—the people who insisted on and succeeded in building this dam in a national park. These arguments thus are especially interesting in this case because we can now see how true they were.

John Muir's opponents said this about the Hetch Hetchy Dam, which they were determined to build, and I quote:

"Damming and submerging it 175 feet deep would enhance its beauty by forming a crystal-clear lake."

Does not this sound familiar?

To this argument a half century ago John Muir replied, and again I quote:

"Landscape gardens, places of recreation and worship, are never made beautiful by destroying and burying them. The beautiful sham lake, forsooth, would be only an eyesore, a dismal blot on the landscape, like many others to be seen in the Sierra. For instead of keeping it at the same level all year, allowing Nature centuries of time to make new shore, it would, of course be full only a month or two in the spring, when the snow is melting fast; then it would be gradually drained, exposing the slimy sides of the basin and shallower parts of the bottom, with the gathered drift and waste,

death and decay of the upper basins, caught here instead of being swept on to decent natural burial along the banks of the river or in the sea. Thus the Hetch Hetchy Dam-lake," John Muir warned, "would be only a rough imitation of a natural lake for a few spring months, an open sepulchre for the others."

To see how right John Muir was, all we have to do is to go to Hetch Hetchy and see there, behind that O'Shaughnessy Dam, the reservoir that now inundates this valley. Or here today we need only see the photographs to which I referred in the magazine The Living Wilderness, or the photographs on the back cover of the pamphlet to which I referred called Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often. Or open once the folder called What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur? Thus in photographs and drawings we can see the original beauty of Hetch Hetchy, the fantasy of the would-be dam builders in their promises for recreation, and finally the actual result of the successful dam project.

Robert K. Cutter today, asking the question, "What is Hetch Hetchy now?" calls it "just another dammed artificial lake," and comments, as follows:

"Those of you who have only seen it since it was flooded will refuse to believe that it ever approached Kings River Canyon in beauty, let alone Yosemite. Hetch Hetchy now isn't worth a 35-millimeter Kodachrome film. So much for beauty."

"Now, what about it as an area for recreation?" Mr. Cotter goes on to ask, and he answers:

"Of the three canyons, Hetch Hetchy, Yosemite, and Kings Canyon, Hetch Hetchy is the nearest to the central California center of population, and there is a beautiful paved road leading right to it. If it were of equal recreational value there would be 10 visitors to every 1 at Kings River Canyon, which is the most distant. But are there?"

"No," he answers, "it's just the opposite. Why should anyone want to go to Hetch Hetchy now?"

Mr. Cutter concludes:

"Thus, we do not have to guess or debate. Hetch Hetchy teaches us that former Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor was right in 1954 when he advised that in flooding Dinosaur's Echo Park 'the alteration will be substantial,' and wrong when he advised that 'the beauty of the park will by no means be destroyed and it will remain an area of great attraction.' "

Here is how this "case in history" is summed up by our own conservationists of today who are defending again with zeal and determination the natural beauty of one of our superb dedicated areas. They write in this folder, What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur, as follows:

"Hetch Hetchy was not quite so beautiful as its neighbor, Yosemite Valley, but it had much of Yosemite's charm and living—great oaks, verdant meadows, tree-framed waterfalls, and one of the finest streams in all the Sierra Nevada. Here hundreds of thousands might have camped in these days of overcrowding in our parks. But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site. True, others existed downstream—and still exist today—and the water would flow down to them for diversion to a distant, growing city. Hetch Hetchy, though, could add a little more to hydroelectric power production, for which alternative sources were then available—and more and more alternatives are becoming available.

"A great battle waged. * * * San Francisco's mayor, urging the dam, said of the valley in 1911: '* * * its beauty will be enhanced, making the valley more sightly and accessible. * * * There can be no question but that the beauty of the scene, with a dam easily concealed by grasses and vines, will be enhanced by the effect of the lake reflecting all above it and about it and will be in itself a great and attractive natural object.'

"The dam was built. The valley is buried forever. It is more accessible. But for every million people who come to Yosemite Valley to stay, a mere thousand come to Hetch Hetchy's fluctuating reservoir to turn around and leave."

Mr. President, Patrick Henry in his famous speech entitled "The Alternative," delivered in the Virginia convention, in 1775, and best known for its eloquent conclusion, "Give me liberty, or give me death," said to his colleagues:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past."

In the light of experience, judging the future by the past, we most certainly should insist on an alternative to this proposed Echo Park Dam that threatens again to violate an area of superb natural beauty and wonder—an area that rather than be dammed should be forever preserved in our national park system. For, indeed, there are alternatives to this Echo Park Dam, just as there were to the Hetch Hetchy Dam. And it is with regard to this possibility of an alternative that history gives us our final admonition on this page with the running head "Hetch Hetchy."

Perhaps this page of history is most briefly read from Linnie Marsh Wolfe's great biography Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir, published in 1945 by Alfred A. Knopf, and in that year honored with the Pulitzer prize for biography. Here is how Linnie Marsh Wolfe concludes her account of John Muir's—and our—defeat in the Hetch Hetchy controversy. She writes:

"Muir felt no bitterness against the people of San Francisco over the Hetch Hetchy. He placed the blame at the door of 3 or 4 ambitious traders and politicians calling themselves the city of San Francisco.

"As the years went on, the citizens suffered for the acts of these leaders, but were obligated to make the best of a bad bargain. They had been told that the project would cost not more than $50 million; but engineering difficulties brought the total up to the neighborhood of $100 million.

"Long before the system was completed, the adjacent East Bay communities, worn out with waiting to share in the promised benefits had combined to develop their own project.

"In the midtwenties they chose the Mokelumne River as a source, purchased the rights, and built the system within 4 years at a cost of about $36 million.

"Before San Francisco had finished her Herculean task, in a year of great shortage (1931), the Mokelumne River was helping to supply that city with pure mountain water at the rate of 25 million gallons per day.

"One of the ironies of the situation was that the Mokelumne source had been rejected by the San Francisco officials in favor of the Hetch Hetchy."

Thus, not only do we see in this case demonstrated the destruction of an area of a great national park but also the demonstration of the value of an alternative.

In the light of this experience, so dramatically parallel to that through which we are again passing, let us earnestly resist the temptation to exploit the Dinosaur National Monument for the supposed advantages of the proposed Echo Park Dam. Let us rather insist that an alternative be selected from the many possibilities that have so far been considered or that may yet be developed with careful sincere effort.

By all means let us have the advantages of water storage and hydroelectric power production, but let us at the same time preserve our parks.

The one hopeful outcome of the Hetch Hetchy controversy was the determination on the part of the people of this country that in the future the national park areas should be firmly protected.

When Hetch Hetchy was in jeopardy there was no recognized National Park System. There was no National Park Service.

As William Frederick Bade, John Muir's early biographer, said, "the compensating good" which John Muir felt sure would arise out of the "tragic sacrifice" of Hetch Hetchy would have to be in "the consolidation of public sentiment against any possible repetition of such a raid."

That "consolidation of public sentiment," Mr. President, resulted in the establishment by Congress of a National Park Service and a National Park System, and it has today resulted in thousands of protests against this Echo Park Dam proposal.

On August 25, 1916, 3 years after the act that permitted the sacrifice of Hetch Hetchy, President Woodrow Wilson approved an act (39 Stat. 535) that set up the National Park Service, provided for the administration and protection of national parks and monuments, and defined their purpose.

This purpose, according to this act of Congress, is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Never since this declaration of national policy by Congress, never since the National Park System was thus established, never since we learned our Hetch Hetchy lesson has there ever been permitted the construction of a dam in our National Park System.

Let it not ever be said that the 84th Congress turned its back on this experience and, permitting itself to be misled, countenanced the invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument for this Echo Park Dam.

Let us rather heed the lesson of Hetch Hetchy and by reaffirming make still stronger our national determination to preserve a National Park System "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement from Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, regarding the upper Colorado River storage project and its relation to wilderness preservation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE DAM OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM?

The aim of the Wilderness Society is to represent the public interest in preserving and protecting our national park system and our other areas of wilderness and park lands that have been set aside for preservation.

So long as any project includes a proposal to use an area of the national park system in a way that is inconsistent with its purpose as defined by Congress, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations," so long would the recommendation of the Wilderness Society be against its approval. Yet I do not wish to be considered an opponent of the upper Colorado River storage project, except as it does threaten areas dedicated for preservation. It is rather my purpose to urge that any bill approved by Congress be one from which all such threats have been carefully excluded and in which provision is made for the protection of national parks and monuments. It is my belief that such a bill can be prepared that will adequately

meet the needs for a sound upper Colorado River storage project, and after 5 years of deep concern with the problems now being discussed, I can assure you that I should welcome such a bill with great eagerness.

Summer before last, on a trip through Colorado and Utah, my wife and I, with our then 15- and 7-year-old sons and our 12- and 10-year-old daughters, camped at the mouth of Split Mountain Canyon, in the Dinosaur National Monument, motored and hiked out to Harpers Corner, and then returned and motored on down into Echo Park.

A beautiful park it is, too, so named by Maj. John Wesley Powell, who camped there on his now historic expedition in 1869, and described Echo Park itself as "the size of a good farm."

There, along the Green River, in that lovely grassy park, with its beautiful cottonwood trees, across from Steamboat Rock, my wife cooked hamburgers and made a meal for us, while the children climbed on the rock slopes of the canyon wall and I wandered about, exhilarated, and overawed—and perplexed, as I tried to understand the dam-building proposal that has focused so much controversial attention on this area of our national park system.

Then, as I stood there along the Green River, a ways away from the others, I shouted across the river:

"Should we build a dam here?"

The echo came back with my question still in it:

"Dam here?"

That question is still echoing, in the corridors of the Department of the Interior, in the White House, in the Halls of Congress, and indeed throughout the country.

That is the question that we face here today in our concern for the preservation of our national park system. It is one of the great questions that face us all in our efforts to cherish and use wisely the natural resources on which our own, our children's, and our children's children's welfare depends.

Again and again we conservationists who have been compelled to oppose so earnestly the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams have insisted and have sought to emphasize that we do not object to dams, or to reclamation, or to water storage or hydroelectric power production, but to the proposal to use a particular site, or sites, in the Dinosaur National Monument for the Echo Park and/or the Split Mountain Dams.

This Echo Park question that conservationists all over the United States are asking, and answering so earnestly, is a question that challenges the very principle on which our national park protection policy is based. That is the principle that once an area has been set aside for preservation it should be held inviolate and used for commodity purposes only in the case of extreme national need.

Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug once stated this principle, in its application to dams, as follows:

"Large power and flood-control projects should not be recommended for construction in national parks, unless the need for such projects is so pressing that the economic stability of our country, or its existence, would be endangered without them."

It is with this principle of the integrity of the National Park System that we conservationists are most deeply concerned as we face this Echo Park question. The proponents of the Echo Park (and Split Mountain) Dam construction seem also to be deeply conscious that the controversy is in large measure over this principle, for it is hard indeed to escape the conclusion that the persistent advocacy of the Echo Park Dam is intended to modify this principle, reverse the national policy for park preservation, and secure for those who are responsible for impoundment projects the freedom to use any National Park System site that seems advantageous.

It is not the building of a dam or dams that is at issue but rather the choice of a site or sites. The Echo Park question is not whether to build a dam but "Shall we build a dam here?"

And my deep conviction, my most earnest persuasion is that this is indeed no place for a dam.

This is one of the great places of the world, a place of so great natural grandeur that it should most assuredly be protected with great respect.

I wish I could somehow express here something of its grandeur and wonder.

If we could raise the venetian blinds at those windows over there, Mr. Chairman, and look across the mall of this beautiful Capital City we would have in view the Washington Monument and in its nobleness we might find a measure of a sort of the magnificence with which we are here concerned—the magnificence of the natural features which we cherish in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine again the respect and admiration, the aspiration and noble inspiration which we feel as we place ourselves before its 555-foot thrust into the sky.

Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred feet and more still higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Steamboat Rock. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand against time and the elements.

Think, too, of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock—the Green River that has come through the canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa, waters which have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

Then realize again that you and this high rock more than a mile long, with the river moving around it, and the park where you stand—all are deep in a wild canyon, and behind you as you turn are sheer walls of rock that sweep even higher than Steamboat Rock.

Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—our Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain—inundating those whirlpool rapids.

Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters impounded by that dam. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high.

Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous Canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around its sequence of bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique, wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you thus have as good an idea as I can give you here of what I believe is the essential reason why the Congress should not authorize this proposed dam building at Echo Park.

It would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world.

This great beautiful area that you view from Harpers Corner and wherein you stood at Echo Park—this marvelous wild scenic area in our national park system is what the Bureau of Reclamation's Director for this region calls, with an admiration of his own, "the remarkable storage vessel at Echo Park."

As you turn then in imagination from Harpers Corner and make the hike back to your parking place, and the long wild-road drive back to the transcontinental highway (U. S. 40), you realize that you are within the Dinosaur National Monument—part of America's national park system, a system of a few superlative parts of America dedicated for preservation while all the rest is free for all man's purposes. You begin to feel a profanity in this dam proposal, a threat posed to all such areas you hold sacred, a challenge to the very idea of holding sacred any part of the natural earth.

Driving through the plateau land within the national park area that surrounds these canyon chasms, and sensing the violence that would be done to all this wilderness by the very construction itself—$200 million of sand and gravel and concrete, roads and trucks, men and materials, steel, and the noise of drills and dynamite, man's mighty power in bulldozer and all his great tools—you begin to realize that you are in the midst of a great debate over the very idea of preserving natural parks.

Will you dam the scenic wild canyons of the national park system?

That is the question.

The proponents of the dam tell you that it was understood when the area was established that such a dam could be built, but you look at the proclamation establishing the monument and read that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." You find that the Browns Park site is far up the Green River near the northern edge of the monument, many miles up the river from the now proposed Echo Park site. You understand why the possible construction of this Browns Park Dam could have been allowed, and you understand, too, that this proclamation can never be distorted into a true justification for constructing the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams in the heart of the monument, creating reservoirs along practically all of the area's scenic canyons which it was set aside to preserve. You recognize this new proposal as clearly an encroachment on a duly designated national park area.

You hear the proponents of these dams in the monument claim that the reservoirs will themselves provide recreation and attract many people, but you know that such recreation will anyhow be afforded by other reservoirs outside the monument, while the wild-canyon experiences of the unspoiled wilderness cannot be duplicated.

For, finally (I trust), you realize that these national park sites are not needed for reser-

voirs. The reservoirs can be built elsewhere, with all their advantages to the people of the Colorado River Basin and indeed to the people of the Nation, which we all appreciate. You hear an alternative program outlined, see its feasibility, hear its various features debated.

You see the proponents of the Dinosaur dams, nevertheless, build pretexts into arguments, and you realize after all that not necessity but supposed advantage tempts these would-be dam builders into the national park system.

Evaporation differences at various sites are pointed to in the 83d Congress as a compulsion to build dams in the Dinosaur National Monument, a compulsion that is yielded to reluctantly because it would do damage to an area that would preferably be preserved in its natural condition but for these evaporation-loss differences.

Then as the evaporation-loss differences appear in some cases at least to be much less than estimated earlier, the evaporation-loss argument seems itself to have been dissipated in thin air. Yet a new argument arises to prominence, and the reservoir anticipated by the proponents of the Echo Park Dam is urged not reluctantly because it would do damage to this marvelous area but because (and I am quoting from the brochure Tomorrow's Playground for Millions of Americans published by the Upper Colorado River Commission):

"Only by storing and putting to beneficial use the river waters which run through it, by approval of a combined reclamation-power project like the one proposed, can Echo Park and surrounding country truly become a park."

Thus the very nature of our preservation effort in the National Park System is threatened. Those with contrary concepts that better suit their other purposes are urging upon us a policy that would not leave our National Park System unimpaired as envisioned by Congress when this system was established but would rather develop and improve and adapt these areas to purposes that Congress after Congress and administration after administration have considered inconsistent with national-park principles.

The challenge is a challenge to the concept and integrity of the national park system.

I do wish to be understood as being interested in the welfare and prosperity of this great upper Colorado region of our country and its people. Just as I have come to value the privilege of visiting this region and breathing a little deeper in its outdoors, so also I have valued the privilege of knowing the people who live there. I value highly their hospitality and friendship. I share their aspirations, and wish accordingly to be understood as approaching this controversy with hope and confidence that it will be so resolved as not only to preserve the areas which have been set aside for preservation but also to provide for the wise development of the region.

I have been particularly sensitive to the claim that we who oppose the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam proposals are in danger of breaking faith with the people of this region.

I have read with deep interest David H. Madsen's March 27, 1950, affidavit regarding the June 11, 1936, and June 13, 1936, public meetings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., at which, he testified, he then authoritatively stated as a representative of the National Park Service "that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power or irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Colorado and Utah, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

I have read also with deep interest the March 27, 1950, affidavits by J. A. Chaney, Joseph Haslem, Leo Calder, H. E. Seeley, and B. H. Stringham regarding one or both of these meetings, at which they said, each with the same words, that "the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes."

It has been pointed out by others that such assurance could not have been given responsibly and authoritatively, because the letter of instructions from the Secretary of the Interior of June 8, 1936, expressly prohibited the National Park Service from making commitments on the subject of water development at the hearings. Nevertheless, I have still been disposed, personally, to have a regard for these discussions testified to by Mr. Madsen and these other residents of Utah, to try to look at this situation from the viewpoint of these people's own understanding, and to feel a moral responsibility to respect such agreements as were understood.

Yet I am without any belief whatever that any such agreements justify approval of the Echo Park or Split Mountain Dams.

The outcome of the discussions and considerations of which these meetings and so-called agreements were a part was the proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument as we know it today.

We have in this country what I believe is an excellent democratic process of discussing extensively (and intensively) all aspects of any proposed public action. Then we resolve our various points of view in some definite action. We adopt a constitution. We enact a law. We have a presidential proclamation. And then we pass on to future discussions of other problems with our past discussions and agreements made formal and finally resolved in writing—for our clear understanding not only at the time but in the future.

Such was the Presidential Proclamation of 1938. Some 2 years after the 1936 public hearings and following various governmental considerations, this proclamation enlarged the monument and at the same time included and defined the public understanding regarding reservoir projects, as follows:

"This reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

There is no evidence of any dissatisfaction with this statement—no evidence at all that provision for the Brown's Park Reservoir site was not an adequate recognition of such assurances as were understood. The proclamation's reservation is specific. It applies to a site and an area many miles up the river from the sites now being argued. And Congress by appropriating for and providing for the administration of the monument has in effect, repeatedly endorsed this proclamation. I can only conclude that we have in this respect no obligation to the people of this region other than our obligation to respect this proclamation's provision that the administration of the area is subject to a prior withdrawal for the Brown's Park Reservoir site. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay himself said, in my hearing, tapping the edge of his desk with his index finger, "Just because I give somebody permission to do something at this desk, it doesn't mean that he can do it anywhere in the room." Wrong as Secretary McKay is, in my opinion, in supporting the Echo Park Dam proposal, he does recognize that it is not authorized in the proclamation that establishes the national monument.

I also have been deeply interested in the implications of the proclamation's provision that "this reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

I am aware that in a memorandum published on page 719 and the following pages of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 4449, H. R. 4443, and H. R. 4463, Mr. George W. Abbott, counsel for the committee, concluded that the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with this provision of the proclamation, has the authority to license the construction of a dam in the canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument. Yet after a careful study of this contention I am persuaded that, on the contrary, only Congress has the authority to authorize such a dam and furthermore that such an authorization by Congress would be a departure from a policy in protection of national parks and monuments which Congress set in 1921, renewed and strengthened in 1935, and has ever since respected.

Here are the facts and my understanding of them that lead me to this conclusion:

The Dinosaur National Monument, in eastern Utah and northwestern Colorado, established on October 4, 1915, by proclamation of President Woodrow Wilson for the protection of the dinosaur quarry, was originally only 80 acres in size and did not include the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers until the monument was enlarged by 203,885 acres on July 14, 1938, by proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the protection of these canyons.

The Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, in section 4 (d) authorized the Federal Power Commission "to issue licenses * * * for the purpose of constructing * * * dams * * * upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States * * *" and in section 3 defined "reservations" to include "national monuments" and "national parks."

By an act of March 3, 1921, however, Congress amended the Federal Power Commission's authority under this Federal Water Power Act of 1920 to the effect "that hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits as now constituted of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of June 10, 1920 * * * as authorizes licensing such uses of existing national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed."

By this 1921 amendment Congress established a fundamental national policy from which it has never departed—providing an immunity for national parks and national monuments from the construction of dams.

The legislative history leaves no doubt as to the purpose of the 1921 amendment. In Senate debate on the amendment, Mr. Walsh of Montana said, "I understand that (the bill) was introduced by the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jones) for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission." Mr. Jones of Washington replied "that is correct."

It is true, as Mr. Abbott points out, that the 1921 amendment was confined to "existing" national parks and monuments, and to the areas "as now constituted." A reasonable interpretation was that the Federal Power Commission's authority would extend to any national parks or monuments enlarged or created in the future—unless Congress decided otherwise at the time.

The proponents of the 1921 amendment reluctantly made this concession to the Federal Power Commission in order to assure passage of the bill. They recognized that it was more important to assure the establishment of the national policy as to the parks and monuments as then constituted, and fight out the issue again, when new parks were created or present ones enlarged, than to risk delay in amending the 1920 act.

In House debate, Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, said:

"As the bill passed the Senate and as it was reported to the House, it limited its effect to existing national parks only, so that hereafter, if more national parks shall be created, or those already in existence shall be enlarged, we must fight out on every individual bill creating a new national park or enlarging one already in existence the question whether the water power in the national park shall be used. It was my thought that we ought to make this provision apply to all parks that exist now as well as those that may be created in the future; but if the House feels that such an amendment would endanger the passage of this bill and thinks it is better to get what we can under this bill than to try to get more, I have no disposition to offer an amendment. I do desire, however, to register my objection to the provision that limits it to existing national parks instead of including all that may hereafter be created."

Mr. BARKLEY proved to be farsighted; the policy established by the 1921 amendment has never been abandoned.

By an act of August 20, 1935, the Federal Power Commission's authority to license the construction of dams on "public lands and reservations of the United States" was significantly amended once again. This time the definition of "reservations" was changed, to provide specifically that the term "shall not include national monuments or national parks."

This unequivocal language restricting the Federal Power Commission's fundamental authority would seem to leave no room for interpretation. Its purpose was made doubly clear in Senate Report 1318, 74th Congress, 1st session, which stated at page 22:

"The definition of the former term ('reservations') has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under the amendment of the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of 'reservations' is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses."

It may be emphasized that the only "suggestion of authority" to be removed was in the phrase "as now constituted' and the word "existing" of the 1921 amendment.

As clear as the 1935 amendment is in language and purpose, Mr. Abbott argues in his memorandum that the new definition of "reservations" does not mean what it says. He argues that the language "shall not include national monuments or national parks" really means "shall not include the parks in existence on March 3, 1921, as then constituted." This conclusion is reached by a strained interpretation of a further provision in the 1935 act which provided:

"Nothing in the Federal Water Power Act, as amended, shall be construed to repeal or amend the provisions of the amendment to the Federal Water Power Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353), or the provisions of any other act relating to national parks and national monuments."

The purpose of this provision in the 1935 act was stated as follows by its author, Mr. Crosser, of Ohio, who said in the House debate:

"The national parks organization wants to make sure that the bill does not infringe upon their preserves, so to speak. We are offering this at their request."

The provision, offered at the request of the national parks organization, is construed by Mr. Abbott is a way that nullifies the plain meaning of the language that redefined reservations so as to exclude national parks and monuments. The purpose of the provision submitted by Mr. Crosser of Ohio certainly was not to preserve any authority of the Federal Power Commission to license the building of dams in parks or monuments, past or present. On the contrary, its purpose was to make it doubly clear that Congress subscribed to the policy of protecting national parks and monuments from invasion by dams.

Mr. Abbott contends that the purpose of the Crosser provision was to continue the effect of the language as now constituted and existing, which actually was eliminated by the 1935 act. It is inconceivable that this was the purpose of the Crosser provision. To construe it so against the interests and purposes of its sponsor, the national parks organization, would be ironical indeed. The redefinition of reservations removed any suggestion of Federal Power Commission authority over national parks or monuments. To argue that the Crosser provision was designed to reinsert such a suggestion is surely a distortion of legislative intent.

Thus the provisions in the Presidential proclamation of July 14, 1938, that "this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended," could not possibly give the Federal Power Commission authority to license construction of a dam in the enlarged area of Dinosaur National Monument. Any such authority of the Federal Power Commission may be conferred only by Congress, and Congress determined in 1935 that the Commission could not license the construction of dams in any national monument. To deviate from this well established national policy would set a dangerous precedent.

I am confident, therefore, both with regard to reclamation and power withdrawals, we are in no sense breaking faith with the people of Utah and Colorado and the other States of the upper Colorado region in urging that the preservation of this area be continued by Congress, and strengthened.

In emphasizing this I should like also, in as friendly a fashion as possible, to remind the people of Utah and Colorado, that all of us from all parts of the country share with them the public ownership of this unit in our National Park System. I would appeal to them to recognize that they share also a responsibility to all of us for its protection.

I recognize that our national welfare depends on the welfare of this region, and I feel that my own personal welfare is related to the personal welfare of fellow citizens in Utah and Colorado. I am interested in the national importance of the upper Colorado River program for the benefit of this region and its people. At the same time, I would urge all of them to keep faith with all of us throughout the Nation, and with those of future generations, by cherishing these scenic wild canyons and helping to preserve them unimpaired.

It is important, I believe, in discussing these so-called agreements and our various obligations, regional and national, to recognize that the Dinosaur National Monument was created out of lands that already belonged to the Nation, public domain that belonged to all of us. In some parts of our country private lands have been purchased for, and State lands have been turned over to the Federal Government for the creation of national parks. Those who have lived near these areas have given such parks to the Nation. Here, the Nation, already in ownership of this public domain, merely dedicated it for a special use of all the Nation—including the people of Utah and Colorado who indeed are in a preferred location—as one of the superbly beautiful parts of the land to become a part of the National Park System.

The purpose of the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument, it is clear, is to preserve the marvelous wild canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers. The shape of the monument, as readily seen on the map, shows that this is the purpose, its size being that which is necessary to preserve and protect properly these canyons. Only so much as was needed for this purpose was thus reserved, out of our own public domain, and set aside from the normal commodity uses that are made by local residents of other parts of the public domain or of the private lands which they own or rent.

During the public debate that followed the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal of this Echo Park Dam some 5 years ago, it has been clearly shown, I believe, not only that (1) the scenic wild canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument are superb and unique, a wilderness resource irreplaceable, invaluable, and increasingly popular, but also (2) that it is not necessary to destroy this national monument in order to realize the purposes of the upper Colorado River project. Others have spoken, and will yet speak, in greater detail and with better understanding of alternative programs. All of us conservationists have shown real interest in them. Far from wishing to enforce any denial of water storage or power potential on the people of the region, we have extended ourselves to demonstrate that there can be a program that will serve all public purposes, including national park preservation. Neither evaporation loss, which was once officially described as the fundamental issue, nor any other supposed sacrifice, I am sincerely convinced, will ever become any severe penalty on the people of Utah and Colorado for the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument. I am confident that in no way will they eventually regret joining with all of us in its preservation.

In the Living Wilderness, the quarterly magazine which I edit for the Wilderness Society, we have devoted earnest attention during the past 5 years to the presentation of information about the Dinosaur National Monument and its preservation within a successful program for the upper Colorado River storage project. In addition to numerous news items with maps and photographs we have published a number of articles of feature length. In our autumn 1950 magazine we published General Grant's definitive discussion with the title "The Dinosaur Dam Sites Are Not Needed." In this same magazine we published Margaret E. Murie's appreciation of the national monument entitled "A Matter of Choice," which concluded: "Water, yes, for those dry States. By all means. But, what if it can be had in some other way than by damming up the beautiful canyons of the Green and the Yampa in this particular 'convenient' spot." Mrs. Murie quoted Robert Browning:

"Oh, if we draw a circle premature
Heedless of far gain,
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain."

In the autumn 1950 magazine we also included Mildred E. Baker's "Lifelong Inspiration," recalling her 1940 trip on the Green River. These Autumn 1950 articles were combined later in a special reprint entitled "The Dinosaur Dam Case," a copy of which is herewith submitted for the committee's files, and additional copies of which will be gladly supplied. There similarly is submitted a reprint of Philip Hyde's article "Nature's Climax at Dinosaur" which we were privileged to publish with a selection of Mr. Hyde's brilliant photographs and

a special map by W. Frederick Freund in the Living Wilderness for Autumn 1952.

We have sought to emphasize, not only that the upper Colorado River program can be realized along with the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument, but also that our only way of preserving any such areas throughout our land is by dedicating them and not allowing any destruction.

Our whole American policy for preserving some of our wilderness is, in fact, based on two understandings that are here involved.

On the one hand is the understanding that our land and water resources are great enough and varied enough to make possible the preservation of a system of wilderness areas without sacrificing the commodity production and other uses that make it necessary to develop most of our areas.

On the other hand, our wilderness preservation program is based on the understanding that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited except those that are deliberately set aside and faithfully protected.

For this policy to prevail we must be faithful in respecting our dedications, for otherwise the dedicated areas will inevitably disappear one by one as it seems profitable to exploit them. We cannot merely set aside an area until we get to it with some kind of exploitation project without defrauding both our own and future generations.

To permit the would-be exploiters of Dinosaur National Monument to build the Echo Park and Split Mountains dams would certainly jeopardize this public policy of national park preservation. Rather than place this great and brilliant policy of the American people in such jeopardy let us instead strengthen it by reasserting our adherence to it and our determination that it must be respected. If we turn back now this threatened invasion, by reaffirming the sanctity of the areas which the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can be sure that the whole national system of parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas will, indeed, be safeguarded more surely than ever.

We cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

I would, therefore, recommend:

(1) That the Echo Park Dam be deleted from any of the bills now under consideration which the subcommittee may consider for approval and that the Echo Park Dam be omitted from any authorization recommended for approval;

(2) That any bill recommended for passage by Congress include a provision that the Glen Canyon project be so constructed that it shall not impair the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, a protection that we are assured by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior can be provided but one that should be specified by Congress as a requirement; and

(3) That any bill authorizing an upper Colorado project should include a provision that no project constructed under the authorization of this act shall be built within, or impair any of the natural features within, any area within the national park system.

Thus, not only does it seem possible to see authorized a sound project for the development and conservation of the water resources of the upper Colorado River region, but also, by reaffirming here in Congress the sanctity of the areas that the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can resolve this long controversy in such a manner as to make more secure than ever our great American policy for preserving some areas of our land forever wild and unspoiled in their natural beauty and grandeur.

It will be an achievement that I am sure will bring us the gratitude of American citizens during a long, long future, an accomplishment that all of us, I am sure, will be well satisfied to share. As I said before, we cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, stripped of all its complexity, the upper Colorado River storage project is designed to put water on the parched lands and into the water-hungry economy of Utah and the other upper Colorado Basin States—Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. It is water which rightfully belongs to us under the Colorado River compact of 1922, which apportioned the waters of the Colorado River and which was approved by the Congress.

It is a project of immense importance to the Nation, as shown by the strong support given by President Eisenhower and his administration. He recognizes that we cannot postpose development of our water resources in the arid Western States. His keen understanding was shown in a letter which he sent to be in September of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *September 8, 1954.*

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I appreciated your August 5 letter respecting an affirmative reclamation program which is so important to the Western States and the Nation generally.

I regret that some should feel that this administration has not sought to further a sound reclamation program. Recently a Cabinet Committee on Water Resources was appointed to make a complete review and submit recommendations on all major problems in this important field. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, established in the first session of the 83d Congress, also has included water resources in its studies. These efforts should lead to the formulation of a comprehensive and progressive water policy acceptable to the Congress.

The need for such reviews is evident, but we cannot afford to suspend all resources development until they are completed. The Colorado River storage project is a case in point. It is well conceived as proposed in the administration plan, which takes into full account the interests of the areas affected, both upstream and downstream. I consider the plan in this form to be essential to the proper development of the great intermountain region. I have so expressed my views publicly; the Secretary of the Interior also has urged the project on many occasions and in many places. Very unfortunately, action on it was not completed by the 83d Congress, but it is now much better understood as a result of legislative work already done, and I am confident that the 84th Congress will approve it.

In the future, I shall continue to support Secretary McKay's administration of a sound, progressive reclamation program and will count on your continued vigorous sponsorship of legislative proposals essential to the success of our recommendations.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the project, however, is a nonpartisan development enjoying the support of both parties in Utah and the upper basin.

Former President Herbert Hoover has shown also an acute perception concerning the foregoing problems, as well he might, for he served as Chairman of the Colorado River Commission. He portrayed the problems in a letter written in 1945 to former Senator Albert Hawkes, of New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this letter may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you know, I had the honor to be Chairman of the Colorado River Commission which settled the Colorado River compact in 1922 and other matters relating to the development of the river. During the following years I had many duties involving these questions. * * * In 1922 there was general agreement that the allocation of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum to the upper basin would be more than ample to meet their requirements. * * * It is now realized that the allocation will fall far short of ultimate needs of the upper basin. * * * In 1922 the compact requirement that the upper States never deplete the flow of the river to less than 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period was not considered burdensome. Studies now available show that to meet this obligation the upper States will have to provide at least 20 million acre-feet of holdover storage to be used during low-flow periods, comparable to 1931–40, or lacking storage, will have to limit their use to about 64 percent of their allocation, in order to make available 75 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry.

WATER: OUR PARAMOUNT RESOURCE—THE COLORADO RIVER: UTAH'S LAST WATER SOURCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, to us in the semiarid upper Colorado River Basin and in all of my own State of Utah, water is our paramount resource. Our water problem is all too serious to us in Utah, particularly as we contemplate the forbidding fact that virtually all of our available water has been, or will be, put to use in the near future. This, in general, is the plight of the whole upper basin.

The progress of our entire region, with our immense minerals and industrial potential, an expanding agriculture, and the growth of our cities, all hinges directly on the future availability of more water. Without water, our growth will be stunted; with water, a great new era of development lies before us—an era of benefit to the entire Nation.

The same recognition of the relative importance of water in the scheme of things in the West was realized by the pioneers who first entered Utah. Irrigation was begun almost immediately while the colonizers were instructed by Brigham Young to forego mineral development, even during the height of the 1849 gold rush. The purpose was obvious—the settlers must first have a solid economic base. As we all know, mining was to come into its own, but water and farming came first.

UTAH AND THE PROJECT

In agricultural development, to evaluate properly the upper Colorado River project, it is necessary to view the tremendous potential of the area. Because

I am best acquainted with Utah, I shall confine my remarks largely to my State.

At the present time, less than 2.2 percent of the land in the State of Utah is irrigated. Of the 1 million acres currently under irrigation, fully 60 percent, or 600,000 acres, has only a periodic supply of water and undergoes severe shortages annually. Utah's farmers, most of whom run small farms, need the water with its invigorating impact, which can come alone from ultimate development of the central Utah, Gooseberry, and Emery projects.

Mr. President, I have prepared a table showing the number of acres which may be irrigated, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects	Acres of new land irrigated	Supplemental acres irrigated	Total acreage
Central Utah	28,500	132,000	160,500
Emery County	3,630	20,450	24,080
Gooseberry		16,400	16,400
Total	32,130	168,850	200,980

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is hoped that with ultimate development of Utah's share of the Colorado waters, the total of new irrigated land will be about 210,000 acres, and that furnished supplemental water, 250,000 acres. This will still leave nearly one-half million acres in the Colorado and Bonneville basins needing either a full or partial supply of water.

The crops produced in Utah are not in competition with the major crops of the Nation, so the development would not contribute to the present surpluses. Except for fruits, vegetables, sugarbeets, and canning crops, our agricultural production is harvested through livestock. Moreover, it will take from 10 to 20 years to get the projects into operation. It is likely that any increase in production will be consumed locally by Utah's rapidly increasing population.

I have received from the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, a letter which points out that, on the basis of findings by the Agricultural Research Service, by 1975 we will be approximately 167 million acres short of land to produce enough food and forage to supply the population expected at that time.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Secretary Benson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 28, 1955.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR WALLACE: This is in response to a telephone request from a member of your staff indicating that you would like some information concerning the estimated increase in farm production necessary to provide food and fiber for the expected population increase by 1975.

Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of our Agricultural Research Service, recently discussed this matter before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. His estimates are as follows:

Based on population estimates made by the Bureau of the Census, Dr. Shaw believes that by 1975 we will need production from 167 million acres more land than we are now using. He assumes that 45 million acres can be brought into production through irrigation, drainage, land clearing, and the release of land from growing horse and mule feed. This would leave a deficit of 122 million acres that would have to be made up through improved technology (increased output per acre). Our research figures indicate that improvements in crop yields per acre have been slowing down in recent years.

Thus it would appear safe to assume that by 1975 we will need for agricultural production in the United States all of the new land that can be safely and efficiently brought into production. In addition to that, our research will have to keep pace to provide the increased output per acre.

I hope that this information will be of some benefit to you.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture has been further substantiated by an article entitled "Food and Fiber Outlook for the Future versus Current Farm Surpluses," written by Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen, and published in the Utah Economic and Business Review for March, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD AND FIBER OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE VERSUS CURRENT FARM SURPLUSES

(By Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen)

One of the most important issues with respect to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects concerns the use of reclamation to bring in new farmland while the Nation is plagued with the problem of surpluses under the farm price support program. Specifically, the question is: Why invest large amounts of Federal money in projects which bring new lands into production by irrigation or other reclamation means at the same time that the Federal Government is spending large sums to support farm prices under seemingly overproduction on existing lands?

Standing alone, this argument overlooks the multipurpose aspects of water resources development and ignores the importance of controlling and regulating such mighty streams as the Colorado River. Apart from this aspect of the problem, however, the basic question posed above should and can be answered from the narrower standpoint of agricultural production.

In attempting to answer this question, it is necessary to consider such factors as (1) changes in the productivity of land, (2) population trends as an indication of future requirements, (3) the relation of improved diets to changes in food consumption, (4) future feed requirements for horses and mules, and (5) export possibilities. Careful analysis of these factors was made by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950 with illuminating results for the Colorado River and similar projects.[1]

CHANGES IN PRODUCTIVITY

The Commission found that from 1910 until the late thirties, there were no substantial changes in per acre yields on American farms. Then, as a result of a combination of factors, including the greater use of fertilizer and lime, improved varieties of plants, control of insects and disease, shifting high-producing crops to better lands, improved soil building and conservation practices, and further mechanization of farms, crop yields increased sharply. Average wheat yields during 1945–49 were one-fourth higher than in 1920–39; corn yields were up about one-third; and hay yields increased 10 percent. In addition, improvements in the food value of hay contributed to an increase of 15 to 20 percent in production per animal unit.

Further improvements in farm technology will undoubtedly result in a continuation of the upward trend in per acre production. Of course, there are also limiting factors on the full benefits of improved technology such as the lag between the development and use of improved production techniques and the absence of proper soil management. The Commission concluded that:

"In view of all these considerations it seems probable that average per acre yields will continue to increase over at least the next quarter century although the rate of increase may be somewhat less rapid than during the past decade."

POPULATION TRENDS

An important aspect of the decision to reclaim more agricultural land through irrigation is the size and location of the population. Since 1940 there has been a significant reversal of the previous decline in the rate of population increase. On the basis of a medium projection, the Bureau of the Census has forecast a population of about 170 million in 1960 and 190 million in 1975.[2] With an estimated population of 163.9 million on January 1, 1955, the above forecast for 1960 will undoubtedly be exceeded by perhaps seven to eight million.

Of special significance to the Colorado River Storage project and the participating projects is the rapid growth of population in the West. Between 1940 and 1950 the population of the 11 Western States increased 40.4 percent, while the Nation increased only 14.4 percent. The estimated population of the 11 Western States in 1960 (medium projection) will be some 78–80 percent greater than it was in 1940, while the Nation will gain only about 28–30 percent. The gain of the Mountain States alone between 1940 and 1960 will be at least 44 percent, and individually all Western States except three will have gains considerably in excess of the national average.

The significance of these population trends was very carefully considered by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950. With reference to the Western States, the Commission stated:

"The existence of these large populations in relatively undeveloped areas will require new farm production, as well as industrial production in nearby locations. The new production can be developed smoothly, if plans for it are formulated promptly. Such

[1] The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, A Water Policy for the American People, vol. I (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950).

[2] Margaret J. Hagood and Jacob S. Siegel, Projections of the Regional Distribution of the Population of the United States to 1975, Agricultural Economics Research, III (April 1951), p. 43.

plans should be carried out under the basin development planning which the Commission is recommending."

With reference to the Nation as a whole, the Commission took the position that the real agricultural problem is how to assure sufficient production to meet the requirements of an expanding population. * * *

CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN DIET

Per capita food consumption remained fairly stable during the 25 years prior to the late 1930's. But the increased output of food in the following decade permitted an increase in per capita consumption of about 15 percent above 1935–39. In addition, changes in what Americans eat will also affect cropland requirements for the future. The proportion of grain products and potatoes has declined by about one-third since 1909–14, the proportion of livestock products has increased about 10 percent, and the proportion of fruit, vegetables, and other foods has gone up nearly 50 percent.

These dietary trends are a shift to a more adequate and more palatable diet and are very likely to continue inasmuch as diet improvement is due more to rising income than to any other factor, and real per capita income in the United States is steadily rising. On this point, the following statement of the Commission is pertinent:

"In spite of the bumper crops of recent years, there are still large numbers of the population whose diets are not adequate in nutrition or palatability. Some of the deficiency is due to lack of knowledge and some to habit. But most of it can be attributed to inadequate income."

The shift in diet toward the proportionate consumption of more livestock products and fruits and vegetables is also a shift to higher per capita land requirements. When crops go into livestock production rather than directly into human consumption, relatively more land is required because the calorie production per acre is decreased, although other nutritive factors are increased. The shift to fruits and vegetables also increases the cropland requirement, but not as much as does the shift to livestock products. It is especially important to note, however, that the shift to fruits and vegetables increases the demand for irrigated land.

EXPORT POSSIBILITIES

The amount of land needed for future agricultural exports is very uncertain. In the past, the acreage was varied from 55 million acres in 1920–24 to as low as 15 million acres in 1941, with an average of 48 million acres for the period of 1945–49. The Commission estimated in 1950 that the acreage needed for export production may drop from the present 50 million acres, leveling off at about 40 million.

CROPLAND NEEDED FOR WORKSTOCK

Acreage needed to produce feed for horses and mules declined from 90 million in 1910 to 30 million cropland acres in 1949. Studies by the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that by 1975 there will be only half as many horses and mules in use as there were in 1950. This reduction will release additional acreage for human use.

REMOTE CROPLAND REQUIREMENTS

On the basis of the preceding analysis and certain assumptions, it is possible to project the national cropland requirements for future years. The Commission made such projections for 1960 and 1975, assuming the average diet and production per acre remained about the same as in the 1945–45 period. Table 1 shows these projections.

From the table it is seen that the estimated cropland requirements will be some 99 million acres greater in 1975 than in 1945–49. If an adequate diet were made available to the whole population, it might require up to a 15-percent increase in cropland requirements, which would be about 96 million acres in 1975. An increase in per-acre yields would, of course, correspondingly reduce the acreage requirements.

TABLE 1.—*Projected acreage requirements for 1960 and 1975 (assuming 1945–49 consumption levels and acre yields)*

	1945–49	1960	1975
Population (millions)	144	169	190
Cropland requirements (millions of acres):			
For human consumption:			
From cropland [1]	297	348	391
From pasture (cropland equivalent) [2]	127	149	167
Total	424	497	558
For export	48	40	40
For horse and mule feed:			
From cropland	30	18	12
From pasture (cropland equivalent)	15	9	6
Idle cropland	25	25	25
Total cropland acreage or equivalent	542	589	641

[1] Requirements for domestic consumption of food, fiber, tobacco, and feed for livestock produces. Excludes double cropping; includes 25 million acres for fallow and crop failure. Per capita acreage equals 297 divided by 144 equals 2.06. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

[2] Total cropland equivalent of pasture, 142 million acres minus cropland equivalent of pasture for horses and mules equals 127 million acres. Per capita requirements equals 127 divided by 144 equals 0.88. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

Source: The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 159.

MEETING INCREASED REQUIREMENTS

If the above estimates of future requirements are realistic and defensible, then the present food surpluses are transitory, and about 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975. This increased agricultural production can come only from four major sources: (1) increasing production from existing farmlands, (2) bringing new lands into production through all forms of reclamation, (3) importing more from other countries, and (4) reduced future feed requirements for workstock. A possible additional source is "hydroponic" farming or nutriculture. Hydroponic gardens are shallow, gravel-lined beds through which chemical plant-feeding solutions are circulated. This method of vegetable production has been practiced to a very limited extent in Puerto Rico and Florida, and by the United States Army in Japan and other Pacific islands. The future of this source of supply depends on relative cost which is very uncertain.

Continuation or acceleration of the soil conservation program logically can be expected to result in increased farm output in the years ahead. However, the results of the program will not be all gain. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that about half of the present cropland is subject to erosion. Some of this land, perhaps as much as 50 million acres, might well be retired to grass and trees in the next 20 to 25 years. The major gains from soil conservation are expected in hay and grazing which will result primarily in increased livestock production. In summarizing the net gains from soil conservation, the Commission concluded:

"It is probable, therefore, that the soil conservation program, if effectively carried out during the next 25 years, can be depended upon to do no more than take care of the increased demands due to the correlative improvement in diet, insofar as that involves increased consumption of livestock products. The correlative increased demand for fruits and vegetables will have to be taken care of by other means, including reclamation. In other words, the 1975 requirements for an additional 100 million cropland acres is still to be provided for."

Of the projected requirements of 100 million additional cropland acres by 1975, it has been estimated that about 30 million equivalent acres could come from reclamation projects—about 6 million acres of newly irrigated land, which are the equivalent of 9 million of nonirrigated land, plus the equivalent of 21 million acres of ordinary farmland reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection. The ultimate acreage suitable for development for agricultural use through flood control, drainage, and clearing has been estimated at 75 million acres, which is the equivalent of about 43 million acres of new cropland of average yields. In addition, it has been estimated that ultimately about 25 million equivalent cropland acres could be developed by irrigation.[3] (Much more irrigable land exists, of course, than can be irrigated with available water supplies.) Total equivalent cropland acreage considered susceptible of development through reclamation was thus estimated by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission to be about 68 million acres. Table 2 summarizes these estimates.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural production potentials*

Type of potential	Considered susceptible of development [1]	
	By 1975	Ultimate
Irrigation	9.0	25.0
Flood protection	3.5	4.3
Flood protection, drainage, and land clearing	3.8	14.6
Drainage and land clearing	[2] 11.2	14.4
Land clearing	2.0	8.0
Subtotal	29.5	68.3
Improved technology: [3]		
Moderate increase	46.0	----------
Substantial increase	77.0	----------

[1] Expressed in millions of acres of average cropland equivalent.

[2] Based on the assumption that the present rate of drainage and land clearing development would be expanded as a result of Federal activity.

[3] Based on a cropland equivalent acreage of 542 million less 40 million acres for land to be removed permanently from the cropland base, and productivity indexes of 110 and 118 compared to acreage production for the 5-year period 1945 to 1949. The index of 118 is equivalent to 150 for the 5-year period 1935 to 1939. Ultimate improvement in technology is not estimated.

Source: President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 165.

The provision of about 30 million equivalent cropland acres through reclamation by 1975 would still leave about 70 million equivalent acres to be provided through other means. The estimate of the needed additional acreage in 1975 (100 million cropland acres) takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and mules (see table 1). The net export acreage is assumed to remain about constant. Hence, the equivalent of an additional 70 million acres can be secured only through an accelerated reclamation program or through a substantial increase in the productivity of existing farmlands.

---

[3] This estimate is based upon the following factors: "Yields from irrigated lands are, on the average, about 50 percent higher than from nonirrigated land. Delivery of additional water to already irrigated lands increases the yields by about one-third of the yield of irrigated lands. Pasture is also reckoned as about a third as productive as irrigated cropland." President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 160.

The Commission projected future land requirements on the basis of two assumptions with respect to yield increases: A moderate increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 5 and 10 percent, respectively, above the average for the period 1945–49—increases equal to a 33- and a 40-percent increase above the average for the prewar period of 1935–39. A substantial increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 10 and 18 percent above the average for the period 1945–49, or 40 and 50 percent above the period 1935–39. The results of these projections of technology improvements in terms of cropland acreage are shown in table 2. It is seen that the moderate-increase projection—46 million acres—falls considerably short of the additional needed acreage of 70 million, and that the substantial-increase projection exceeds the estimated land requirements only by 10 percent.

As a result of the above analysis and projections, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission reached the following conclusions:

"On the basis of these estimates, it appears that the increased productivity of existing agricultural acreage, if added to the production available from new lands brought in by irrigation, drainage, flood control, and clearing, is likely to meet the Nation's expanding requirements over the next 25 years by a rather narrow margin. Obviously, the program for meeting those requirements must include the combined efforts of those responsible for reclamation in its various forms and those responsible for improved farming practices."

In general, this analysis has shown that reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farmlands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is evident from Secretary Benson's letter that even with the reclaiming of lands, drainage of swamps, and the expansion of research, by 1975 we will still need many more thousands of acres just to feed our population. It would be most unwise not to proceed with the development of lands to meet this eventuality.

Many of Utah's towns and cities are in critical need of culinary and industrial water, particularly in central Utah. The sobering part of this picture is that virtually all of the water in these areas even now is tapped and in use.

Utah's population has increased 27 percent in the years 1940 through 1953, a growth well above the national average, and exceeded by only 10 States. Utah leads the Nation with its vital index—that is, a high birthrate and low death rate. If proportionate growth continues, the State's population will be well over a million by 1965, compared with 750,000 today, 1965 being the earliest date by which the initial phase of the central Utah project would be completed. The strain on our water resources can well be imagined if additional water is not forthcoming.

For years, one of Utah's major exports has been the trained intelligence of our young people who emigrate because of lack of job opportunities. They have enriched the Nation but it is a lamentable circumstance that they should feel obliged to leave the place of their birth, especially when it is possessed of a treasure trove of wealth and opportunity, given the vital elements of water and power. It has been estimated that Utah can support a population twice its present size if our share of Colorado River waters is made available through the full development of the central Utah, Emery County, and Gooseberry projects.

Water and power are needed for our industrial potential. It may be said without exaggeration, I believe, that Utah is the mineral storehouse of the Nation. By enlarging this statement to include the upper basin, there can be no contradiction advanced whatever. Utah is one of the most important world sources of such radioactive ores as uranium, vanadium, carnotite, and pitchblende. Together with western Colorado, the area provides the greatest domestic source for uranium. This is an area where we have a dependable supply not subject to the vagaries of political machinations abroad. Water and power are, of course, needed in the processing of these ores.

In terms of the variety of minerals from which new wealth was and is created, Utah is excelled by no other State. As processes for developing synthetic liquid fuel are perfected, the fact that Utah has 200 billion tons of coal, and that there are 800 billion tons within 350 miles of Salt Lake City, will be inincreasingly important. This comprises one-seventh of the world's known coal reserves.

Virtually all of the materials necessary for the development of a chemical industry are to be found in Utah, but the existing water and power supplies are not now sufficient to fully develop the great possibilities of such an industry.

Utah is one of the main producers of nonferrous metals and ranks at the top or near the top of the Nation in production of copper, zinc, lead, silver, and gold. There are great deposits of magnesium in the Great Salt Lake and in southeastern Utah, but again large amounts of water are required to obtain this metallic element.

Utah is now in the iron and steel business, with ever-increasing opportunities for satellite industries; 50,000 acre-feet of water per year is consumed at the Geneva mill, while at the same time circulating 146,000 acre-feet.

Phosphate fertilizer is critically short, and it is significant that the largest known deposits of phosphate rock are in the upper basin States. Power and water again are required.

Utah is at a critical juncture in its history with much of its future possibilities contingent directly upon water and power made available by this project. It is impossible to overdramatize our need, for it means either progress or stagnation.

CALIFORNIA HAS HAD FIRST TURN ON THE COLORADO RIVER WATERS

The Colorado River compact was signed in 1922 to divide equally the waters of the Colorado between the upper and lower basin in advance of their actual use. This was done so that southern California could commence the development of her share of the Colorado waters. The upper basin States were willing to step aside and allow southern California to develop first, providing it was agreed that the upper States could at a later date develop their half of the water. It was recognized by the people of Utah that at that time California was then climatically, geographically, and economically in a better position to proceed with irrigation and storage projects than was the upper basin. Moreover, we too were greatly concerned about the recurring floods which were then constantly menacing southern California, particularly the Imperial Valley. Consequently, we were willing to defer to southern California and give her first turn on the river.

UTAH BARGAINED IN GOOD FAITH

Had we in the upper basin States wished to be selfish in 1922, we could have effectively blocked any additional development in southern California including the Hoover Dam. However, the upper basin, in the interest of interstate comity and reasonableness, agreed to the 1922 compact. Utah and the upper basin States intend to abide by the compact. We in Utah have demonstrated our good faith by signing the compact and we have scrupulously adhered to its provisions, in the bill before the Senate. Southern California can now show her good faith by refusing to engage in further dilatory tactics and allow the project to proceed. Surely, their 33 year head start has not blunted their sense of fairness.

FIRST TURN OF INCALCULABLE VALUE TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

For a variety of reasons, the lower basin has been developed more rapidly than the upper basin, as is evidenced by such monumental works as the Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, and the All-American Canal among others. A comparison of the relative development of the two basins is most illuminating, particularly in the light of the approximate equality of development contemplated by the 1922 compact.

I have prepared a schedule showing the comparative use of water and power developed along the Colorado, as between the two basins. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colorado River water put to use:

(2.2 to 1 ratio)	*Acre-feet annually*
Lower basin	5,500,000
Upper basin	2,000,000

Total storage capacity of projects constructed or authorized for construction:

(23 to 1 ratio)	*Acre-feet annually*
Lower basin	38,600,000
Upper basin	1,700,000

Development of power by projects constructed or authorized for construction by Congress in generating capacity:

(53 to 1 ratio)	*Kilowatts*
Lower basin	1,700,900
Upper basin	32,000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the overwhelming bulk of this development

has been for the benefit of Southern California. Thus the lower basin has developed 53 times more generating capacity, 23 times more storage capacity, has put 2.2 more water to use, and is using more daily. In addition, millions of dollars are saved by halting the floods which previously devastated the lower Colorado, and particularly the Imperial Valley.

I wonder if our downstream neighbors really realize just what this first turn to the Colorado water and resulting power has meant to them? On the lower Colorado alone, under national reclamation law, approximately $450 million have been invested for the development of water and power for Arizona, California, and Nevada; and when there is added to that the fact that there has been an investment in reclamation of equal magnitude on other rivers in those States, one gets the very impressive total of $894 million.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HAS SAVED $1 BILLION BY HAVING FIRST TURN

But this is only half, or less than half, of the story. If these same projects were built today, at current prices, they would cost $1,825,000,000. In other words, the privilege of having first turn has saved our downstream neighbors a billion dollars—a billion which they will not have to pay back or pay interest on.

If the upper Colorado development project is authorized and built, we in the upper basin will have to pay back twice as much as they must for equal value. There are three ways in which our friends down river might look at this with us. First, if the development of both ends of the river had begun in the twenties, the cost to each would have been approximately equal, as our share of the water is. Second, at the prices of the twenties there would be no question of "economic feasibility." And third, even at today's prices, we can build the initial phase of the program on the upper river for the billion saved by the lower basin because they had first turn.

We in Utah have watched with pleasure the great progress made in the lower basin. We have witnessed the extensive agricultural developments, the growth of industrial developments, the population influx, and the overall increase in wealth made possible to a great extent by the utilization of the Colorado waters and the very important byproduct power.

The entire Nation has been inestimably benefited by the development of the lower basin, and there is every reason to believe a similar boon will be conferred by a corresponding development of the upper basin's share of the Colorado water. We believe that it is now our "water turn."

CONGRESS THE WATERMASTER

Out of the pioneer experiences with water there emerged a unique feature, the "watermaster," whose job it was to see that every man along the stream had his turn and his share. The Colorado River Compact of 1922 established our share, and we are now asking Congress as the watermaster to see that we get our turn.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER VERSUS ATOMIC POWER

It has been suggested by opponents of the upper Colorado River storage project that nuclear fuel will shortly displace hydroelectric and steam power. It is urged, therefore, that the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams would be obsolete before they are paid for.

While I was looking forward with great hope to rapid development of atomic power, I think that it would be imprudent and most unwise to summarily halt further hydropower and steam development.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to present to the Senate committee, while it was holding hearings on the bill, a letter signed by W. F. Libby, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, expressing the view that there would never be a time when power development by atomic energy would completely replace power developed by conventional powerplants. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1955.

Hon. FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, United States Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AANDAHL: This has reference to your letter of February 17 wherein you ask for an expression from the Atomic Energy Commission as to how soon we estimate that the goal of producing electrical energy, utilizing atomic energy, might be competitive in costs to other fuels; also our views as to the time period which might be involved before electric energy could be produced directly from atomic energy; and whether or not we feel that hydroelectric, or even conventional, fuel plants will soon become obsolete.

Generation of electricity from nuclear fuel should first become competitive with conventional fuels in areas of high cost electricity. We feel this could happen during the 1960's. However, regardless of this fact, it is our feeling that hydroelectric plants which can be economically justified at this time probably will not become obsolete during their useful life.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

ECHO PARK DAM NOT AN INVASION OF DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Echo Park Dam has been the object of considerable and often loose and inaccurate discussion. It has been urged by some conservationists that the dam is an invasion of a national monument, and that it will lead to the destruction of the National Park System. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1955, my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. WATKINS] completely refuted this contention, and demonstrated that the Dinosaur Monument expansion in 1938 was itself an invasion of valid reclamation and power withdrawals dating back to 1904.

It was only after repeated assurances from the Federal Government that the reclamation and power withdrawals would be honored, that the people of Utah and Colorado consented to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to 209,000 acres in 1938. Mr. David H. Madsen conducted the meetings for the Federal Government in Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., in 1936, which secured local approval. I ask unanimous consent that a sworn statement by Mr. Madsen concerning these meetings be put in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with five affidavits of men who attended the meetings.

There being no objection, the statement and affidavits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT, TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, IN THE MATTER OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT, ECHO PARK, AND SPLIT MOUNTAIN DAMS, APRIL 3, 1950

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: That he is over the age of 21 years and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah. That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit I was employed by the National Park Service under the title of supervisor of wild life resources for the national parks. Among my other duties I was acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity was ordered by the National Park Service to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the canyon unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these two meetings.

Among other questions which arose was the question of grazing and the question of power and/or irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future time. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development.

The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power and irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not unduly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the proper development of the area.

DAVID H. MADSEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1950.

KARL H. BENNETT,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Leo Calder, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional

acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of the future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

LEO CALDER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Joseph Haslam, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Jensen, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 35 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

JOSEPH HARLEM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

B. H. Stringham, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 40 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

B. H. STRINGHAM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

H. E. Seeley, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for 30 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

H. E. SEELEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

J. A. Cheney, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

J. A. CHENEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE,
Notary Public.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have prepared additional material, which includes quotations from newspaper reports of the period, setting forth very clearly the impressions which the people of Utah gained from those promises. I ask unanimous consent to have that material printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Madsen states that "I was authorized to state and did state, as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

Quite clearly, future power and irrigation projects were contemplated and the people of the area were promised that they would not be jeopardized by the monument expansion. Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes states in a policy directive governing the negotiations to create the Dinosaur National Monument that "The future development of mineral, water, and power resources, if and when it should become economically feasible, would be determined by the Congress."

The promises made were an outgrowth of concern expressed by local people, including Governor Blood, of Utah, who wrote Senator King, of Utah, requesting that reservations for the development of power, water, and minerals in the proposed monument be made. In May of 1938, Congressman Taylor and Senator Johnson of Colorado were notified by the Park Service that the Secretary of the Interior had approved the enlargement, subject to the reclamation and power withdrawals.

In response to a request from Secretary Ickes on June 6, 1935, asking that the Federal Power Commission release its power withdrawals in the affected area, Chairman Frank R. McNinch replied, "The Federal Power Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource in the proposed monument area is too great to permit voluntary relinquishment, but the Commission will not object to the creation of a monument if the proclamation setting aside the area contains a specific provision that the development will be permitted."

EXECUTIVE ORDER ALLOWS DAMS IN MONUMENT

As a result of these negotiations and promises, President Roosevelt provided in his 1938 Executive order expanding the monument that "the Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument * * * except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * * as amended and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." Significantly, the power reservations cover the Echo Park dam site as well as that of Split Mountain.

UTAH RELIED ON FEDERAL PROMISES

The Utah papers carried a series of stories on the President's proclamation. The Vernal Express for July 21, 1938, stated: "In bringing the 318 square miles into the national monument, which heretofore covered only 80 acres, the Park Service agreed to permit the Division of Grazing to continue operation on the land and recognized power and reclamation rights."

The Salt Lake Tribune dated July 29, 1930, in a front-page article entitled "United States Enlarges Dinosaur Area in Utah" chronicled the following: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

The Vernal Express carried two further articles, the first on July 28, 1938, saying,

"J. A. Cheney, cashier of the Uintah State Bank, has worked on the enlargement and the development of the Dinosaur National Monument for a number of years, representing the Vernal Lions. It was through the efforts of Mr. Cheney that the power and grazing rights were protected in the opening of the new scenic region." Then, on August 4, 1938, the Express said: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of Utah bargained with the Federal Government in good faith, and took the promises of its agents and the Executive order of President Roosevelt to be reliable. It is only natural, therefore, that we are nonplussed to discover that some misguided national conservationist leaders charge that the Echo Park Dam is an invasion. They have spent many thousands of dollars attacking the Echo Dam, saying that it would destroy the national park system. They could have used their money to aid the park system and build it up. Instead, they have chosen the weakest link in the monument system upon which to base a highly emotional stand, the only monument containing both power and reclamation withdrawals far antedating the creation of the monument.

The Echo Park Dam is patently not a precedent or an invasion to destroy national parks. Therefore, it should be judged on its merits. It is the second most efficient dam in the project in terms of storage, conserving water, and power production. It has a low rate of evaporation loss, so important in the arid West. Compared to feasible alternates, the Echo Park Dam will save 120,000 acre-feet of water annually in evaporation losses, enough to supply a city with a population over 400,000. The total population of the State of Utah is only 750,000. It is strategically located for the potential power market, located between Denver and Salt Lake City. Further, it is in the center of other lesser reservoirs, improving their efficiency.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the upper Colorado storage project culminates several decades of engineering study designed to put water on the dry lands of the upper basin States and still meet the commitments to the lower basin under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Utah negotiated the 1922 compact with southern California in good faith, so that it could proceed with its development. It is now our turn to develop our half of the water apportioned by the compact. I hope that Congress will recognize the good faith evidenced by Utah and the upper basin in honoring the compact, and that southern California will now show her good faith by also honoring it and allow the upper basin to develop its water.

Similarly, Utah relied on the promises and assurances made by the Federal Government when the Dinosaur Monument was expanded to include the Echo Park Dam site. We were promised by United States officials that the expansion would not preclude later irrigation and power development. I hope that the Congress will not countenance the proposal that the United States back out of its agreements with the people of Utah and Colorado.

We in Utah are in dire need of the water, which is rightfully ours, from the Colorado River. Our entire future is dependent on obtaining more water for our agricultural, municipal, and industrial expansion. I think that our water turn is long overdue, and I am confident that this body will recognize the wisdom and value of the project to the entire Nation as well as to Utah and the upper basin.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the upper Colorado River storage projects.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Before discussing the many and varied merits of the upper Colorado River storage projects, I want first to thank and congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for its full and complete hearings on this bill, S. 500. I was especially impressed with the vast and detailed knowledge of the subcommittee's chairman on every facet of the interstate compacts governing the use of water flowing in this great artery, the Colorado River. I would be pleased for the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, to accept my compliments.

The bill, S. 500, was sponsored by Mr. ANDERSON and nine other Senators through whose States the mighty Colorado courses. All members of the Senate are familiar and acquainted with the huge dams built in the canyons of this river to generate electricity, the tremendous man-made lakes which serve as storage for irrigation and reclamation of barren but highly productive lands once they are touched by water. In this respect, the complete report on S. 500 speaks for itself.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain six specified initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works.

After reexamination of the economic justification of each participating project including a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such participating projects will be constructed as economic conditions permit. It would declare the intent of the Congress to authorize additional units of the Colorado River Storage Project and additional participating projects. It also would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, construct, operate, and maintain public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for Colorado River storage project units and participating projects.

It is also very interesting to note on page 279 of the hearings the testimony of Hon. Val Peterson, administrator of the Civil Defense Administration. He said, in part, while endorsing this bill:

"My interest today is in the features of the project that lend themselves to the survival of the United States in time of war. I am, of course, familiar with the President's desire that the development go forward in the national interest.

"In this nuclear age, if an attack is made on the United States, it will be necessary, first, to get our people away from our critical target areas, our great centers of population and industry, and if a city is hit by a hydrogen bomb, we will not be able to reenter for some time, and possibly never.

"Second, the time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure.

"I will call your attention to the work that Russia is reported to have done in developing a second line of industry behind the Ural Mountains.

"Too, I have had the privilege of visiting many of the underground defense plants and military installations in Scandinavia. I refer to such installations as the great Bofors Armament Works, to the SKF plant, as well as to air hangars and destroyer bases created in the rock.

"While I am not proposing that our industries as such be relocated, I do urge that in expanding and extending our industries we should look to areas where they would be more difficult to attack.

"The upper Colorado development by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who, by necessity, may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities."

In discussing the upper Colorado River storage project, it is well to remember two facts about the general region it affects: First, the area is subject to erratic and unpredictable periods of drought and floods, and second, it is undergoing a period of rapid industrialization and accelerated development of natural resources.

These two facts help explain some of the most urgent needs for the construction of the project. Foremost is the need to store water so that the excess water during years of plentiful flow can be saved for use during years of low flow. The future economy of Colorado and four other Western States is dependent on the conservation and use of its available water resources.

This project is also vitally needed to supply municipalities and for industrial growth. In fact, present demand for municipal water in the project area is increasing rapidly. I think it should be made clear that the proposed upper basin development is the last of the water resources available in many parts of the area to supply additional water for municipal and industrial purposes.

Not only is there a great need for water. There is also a tremendously increasing demand for electric energy. The power demands of the region are expected to exceed the output of all the power installations now scheduled, including those of the Colorado River project, for years to come. So the generation of hydroelectric energy by the project should be considered an important contribution to the future of the region and of the United States.

Still another contribution of the project should be mentioned. At present, the Colorado River system is committing larceny on a grand scale. I am told that it annually carries away more than 131 million tons of good soil—enough to build a 4- by 5-foot wall around the earth at the equator. This soil is deposited for the most part in Lake Mead, where it is being piled to heights threatening the useful life of the lake. The silt retention benefits of the project will greatly minimize the deposit and the attrition upon the benefits of the Hoover Dam.

At this time, I want to clarify a misconception about this bill which opponents are prone to amplify. The opponents' lobbyist who would want all water in the Colorado River for unrestricted use in their particular State and the misinformed conservation and wildlife groups contend that the Echo Park project would be an invasion of a national park and would set a precedent which would endanger our national-park system. These opponents are confused people; they are well-meaning people who have been led astray

because they are not fully informed of the facts.

This issue has been debated on this Senate floor before. The most accurate record and explanation of facts was given by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, on March 28. He attempted to clear away some misconceptions by explaining the words "Echo Park" are themselves misleading.

In the West it has long been a custom to designate an open area or a valley, canyon, and similar spots as parks. These small areas are found along streams and rivers flowing through our great forests. To my knowledge there is North Park, South Park, East Park, and West Park, to name just a few. Only through misconception and usage of the word park, have people come to think of them as being national parks.

It is through this practice of naming such areas has the mistaken belief arisen among people that "Echo Park" is really a national park.

In order to set the record straight so that all may understand, I want to explain the circumstances and review developments chronologically regarding the origin of Echo Park.

As the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] explained, in 1915 President Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act set aside an 80-acre tract of land in northeastern Utah, where some skeletons of dinosaurs had been discovered, as a national monument. This area was called Dinosaur National Monument, and that monument probably has received more publicity in the past few years than any other monument in the United States.

This 80-acre tract was a part of the public domain. Later, on July 14, 1938—to be exact—President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by formal proclamation, added 203,885 acres of public land, which included parts of northwestern Colorado, to the original 80 acres and declared it, subject to some significant exemptions, to be a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The new area extends roughly 40 miles upstream on the Colorado River tributaries. The monument extension embraced lands on both sides of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and the area named "Echo Park" by the pioneers is included within its boundaries.

The opponents of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams contend that this 1938 proclamation made all the area along those streams, including the Echo and Split Mountain Dam sites, a part of a national monument, and they challenge not only the propriety but also the legal right of public use of these reservoir and dam sites for water, power, and reclamation purposes.

This claim is challenged by the sponsors of the Colorado River because documentary evidence shows conclusively that a tremendous acreage within the present monument boundaries was reserved for water and power development from 13 to 34 years before the extension of Dinosaur Monument in 1938.

These facts which I have just related are based on the documentary evidence from the files of the Department of Interior and the Federal Power Commission. The conclusions stated here have not been refuted in the 734 pages of hearings on this bill. The majority of the Interior Committee, composed of Senators from all sections of the country, after hearing testimony on both sides of the question, voted that there is no invasion of national parks or monument areas in the construction of Echo Park Dam.

These, in brief, are some of the more important reasons why we, in Congress, should vote the passage of this legislation. It must be borne in mind by the Nation at large that the developments of these benefits cannot be made available for our use in a few months. This project will not be completed until the next century—after the year 2,000, if we are to plan and develop our Nation's resources for the forseeable future, they must be commenced now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the Colorado River storage project, published in the Denver Post on March 2 and 5, entitled, respectively, "Upper River Called Defense Bastion" and "Water Hogging Try Hit."

The articles were written by Mr. Barnet Nover, chief of the Denver Post Washington bureau and a writer of wide experience and reputation, who has done outstanding work in covering the progress of the Colorado River storage legislation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of March 2, 1955]

UPPER RIVER CALLED DEFENSE BASTION—CD CHIEF TELLS OF WAR NEEDS

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The upper Colorado River basin area could be a defense stronghold in event of war, Val Peterson, Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration told a Senate subcommittee Wednesday.

The subcommittee is holding hearings on a bill authorizing the billion-dollar river storage project.

In response to a query by Senator WATKINS (Republican), of Utah, a member of the subcommittee, Peterson said he was voicing not only his own view but that of the Eisenhower administration, which has strongly endorsed the storage project.

CITES NORWAY, SWEDEN

Peterson said the mountainous region served by the upper Colorado was peculiarly suited to participate in a dispersal program.

He pointed out that such dispersal to mountain hideaways already is being carried out in Norway and Sweden where such installations as the great Bofors armaments works and the SKF ball-bearing plant have been built underground.

"The time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure," Peterson said.

IDEALLY SUITED AREA

"The upper Colorado development, by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who by necessity may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities. It would be fortunate if we had areas, with adequate water and power facilities, far removed from our vulnerable and heavily populated urban centers to which these people (those forced to evacuate from west coast areas) could go. The area in the upper Colorado Basin would be ideally suited for such development.

The civil defense administration chief cited the fact that the Nation's expanding economy requires new sites for industry.

"If uranium is a coming source of power," Peterson said, "it might be profitable for industry to locate near its source. If the oil shale developments prove out, new industries should be located near the source of this fuel. The entire basin has great coal reserves as well as other minerals and raw materials. Water and power will be sorely needed for such developments."

Citing a report on industrial concentration in the United States made by a group of universities for the Government, Peterson said that of the 96 million urban residents in the United States, 33 million live in the central cities of our 32 largest metropolitan areas which together occupy an area equivalent to a square only 55 miles to a side.

[From the Denver Post of March 5, 1955]

WATER HOGGING TRY HIT—UPPER STATE AIDES BLAST CALIFORNIAN

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Senators from the upper Colorado Basin, after listening to opposition voiced by representatives of southern California to the storage project vehemently denounced the Pacific-coast State for trying to hog all Colorado River water for its own purposes.

"I haven't the slightest doubt," Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN said, "that the representatives of California are sincere in their desire to get all the Colorado River water, although that State does not contribute one drop.

"It's been their course of action from the beginning."

Supporting this view, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, told a witness appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, now in its fifth day of hearings, that the fundamental issue is whether California "gets all the water or whether the upper basin States get a spoonful from time to time."

Similar views were expressed by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah.

RIGHT TO VIEWS

The California witnesses were defended by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California. He said that they had a right to state their views and "ought to be run out of town" if they failed to speak up.

ANDERSON is chairman of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee which is looking into the storage plan whose purpose is to enable the upper basin States to put to beneficial use the share of Colorado River water to which they are entitled under the compact of 1922.

Earlier, Ben P. Griffith, president, board of water and power commissioners, city of Los Angeles, like the other witnesses from southern California, had expressed strong opposition to the bill authorizing the upper Colorado storage project.

Griffith contended, as previous California witnesses had before him, that the bill "constitutes a reinterpretation of the Colorado River compact which is indefensible," since he alleged it would nullify contracts entered into by Los Angeles with the Government for the purchase of power from the Hoover Dam.

CITES HOOVER REPORT

Griffith also argued that in any case the report of the Hoover Commission task force on reclamation and water, which is headed by former Gov. A. L. Miller, of Wyoming, should be awaited before any action is taken on the bill.

This led Anderson to say:

"We couldn't put our case before a more unfriendly jury than the Hoover Commission task force on water."

He cited the fact that Miller already was on record as hostile to the storage plan and other large-scale multiple-use irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

Another argument made by Griffith and repeated by other California witnesses at the hearing, as well as by Senator KUCHEL, was that since there was such a sharp divergence in the interpretations of the Colorado compact by California and the other signatories, the upper basin States should agree to join in the Arizona-California suit now before the Supreme Court. This the upper basin States have resisted.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the

enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

RETIREMENT OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the recent retirement of Prime Minister Winston Churchhill ended the public career of one of the greatest men in history. We Texans have a deep appreciation for his tremendous contribution to the cause of freedom in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 203

Whereas on April 5, 1955, one of the great men of our time, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire, retired from a lifelong career of active public service; and

Whereas the cloth from which men of the caliber of Churchill is cut is seldom loomed, as expressed in the immortal prose of another Englishman of 3 centuries ago, Shakespeare—

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
We shall not look upon his like again"; and

Whereas the empire of Texas, mother of many patriots herself, wishes to congratulate the British Empire for her good fortune in having had available the services of this patriot; and

Whereas the empire of Texas wishes to pay tribute and honor to Winston Churchill for his superb leadership and innumerable contributions to the freedom-loving people of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we here and now pay our respects to a beloved world citizen, Winston Churchill, and congratulate the British Empire upon the outstanding services which it has received; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread on the pages of the senate journal, and that copies be forwarded to the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill and to the British Museum with the request that it be suitably displayed.

(Lock, Hardeman, Phillips, Ashley, Weinert, Aikin, Bracewell, Colson, Corbin, Fly, Fuller, Hazlewood, Kazen, Kelley, Lane, Latimer, Martin, McDonald, Moffett, Moore, Owen, Parkhouse, Ratliff, Roberts, Rogers of Childress, Rogers of Travis, Secrest, Shireman, Strauss, Wagonseller, Willis, Ramsey, Lieutenant Governor.)

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on April 6, 1955.

[SEAL] LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Jesse T. Smathers to be postmaster at Canton in the State of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Alec Gerald Nichols, First Methodist Church, Santa Ana, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, we come to Thee in adoration and praise, thanking Thee for life, liberty, and the glorious rights guaranteed to us as citizens of this Nation.

Grant that we may not be so concerned with the enjoyment of these rights as to forget the attendant responsibilities. May we ever be aware that in Thy sight we are the trustees—the stewards of these priceless privileges.

We pause for a moment to honor the memory of Dr. Einstein. Grant, O Father, that his great discoveries shall be ultimately used for the blessings of mankind.

We commend to Thee, O Lord, our President and all who are engaged in government; grant to them integrity of purpose and unfailing devotion to righteousness.

May Thy special blessing rest upon the Members of the House as they labor for Thee and their fellow men. May Thy guiding presence be with their families, wherever they may be.

Give them a sincere concern for freedom. Let it not become license but may each Member of this session love it so passionately as to preserve it for yet unborn generations.

Give to each Representative, O Lord, a discriminating sense of truth and the courage to be governed by it.

We thank Thee for their devotion to our country. May they represent their constituency with honor, sincerity, and pride. Give them courage, vision, and, at the end of the day, the inner approval of their heart and conscience.

May Thy grace rest upon our Nation. Guide her in the days ahead that she may become an instrument in Thy hand to relieve the oppressed, succor the poor, create social justice, and bring peace to all mankind.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday were read and approved.

DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today mourns the loss of one of its outstanding citizens, Dr. Albert Einstein, whose tremendous contributions to the world and to this Nation have literally changed the course of this century in which we live.

Many honors have been showered upon Dr. Einstein during the course of his life and many more will be dedicated to his memory. But I can think of no greater tribute which this Congress could pay to him—and certainly none that would be more fitting—than that the House reexamine the immigration laws of our country in order that future "Dr. Einsteins," whether potential or recognized, shall not be barred from our shores because of our preoccupation with unworthy fears, mistrust, and discrimination against the stranger who knocks at our gates.

Surely no finer monument could be erected to the great heart and great mind of Dr. Einstein than for this House to put life and meaning into the Refugee Relief Act. Need I remind any Member of the House that this act was passed by the 83d Congress for the humanitarian purpose of admitting to this country 214,000 of those who seek escape from tyranny and oppression, from hardship and suffering in their mother lands to reach America, where liberty was cradled and independence nurtured. Yet, today, this legislation stands a bar instead of a door to freedom.

In memory of Dr. Einstein, then let us engrave upon our hearts as well as upon stone those famous words of the poet, Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year 1956 and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair

hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, PASSMAN, SIEMINSKI, MURRAY of Illinois, CANNON, CANFIELD, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

PAY OF POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, now that the time is approaching for a showdown on the pay of our postal workers, the key question should be, What do they deserve? The facts say that a 10-percent raise for these hard-working and dependable public servants is no more than they deserve.

We have been told, while this question dangled, that the state of the Government's budget would not allow more than a pay rise of 6.5 percent or 7.6 percent. The budget matter has been presented as if the United States would go broke if it paid its postal employees fairly.

All of us are equally interested in a stable financial situation and in the faith and credit of the Treasury of the United States. There are differences, however, about how to balance the budget and what sacrifices should be called for from underpaid postal workers as a means to that end.

I refuse to acknowledge that the Government has to balance its budget by keeping the pay of its faithful employees hammered down below equitable levels.

We have been warned, almost too broadly, that if we dare to vote a 10-percent increase for postal workers the bill will run into a White House veto.

Well, it is the constitutional authority of the Chief Executive to veto any bill of which he does not approve. But it is our authority and responsibility to act as we honestly think wise and fair—not to be frightened from our duty by the menace of executive disapproval.

The constitutional system awards to this House the initiative in such matters. Let us exercise this right of initiative. Whatever may happen elsewhere, we should express our convictions clearly, in the belief that our expression has merit of its own, and may even prove persuasive in another coordinate branch of the Government.

The postal workers' claim to a 10-percent raise is based to a large degree on the hard fact of the rise in living costs. This is not something postal workers can control; they merely have to try to make ends meet, for themselves and their families, on what the Government is willing to pay them.

Our Government should not set a niggardly pattern for private employers. It should deal decently with postal workers whose only recourse is here. The proposed 10-percent raise would not break the Treasury and it will give the employees of our Post Office Department the pay to which they are entitled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD today at the conclusion of all other business, on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE MURDER OF THREE UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS IN PASSAU, GERMANY

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, early this year, Mr. Charles D. Hanlon, a resident of the State of Connecticut, brought to my attention certain information concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany, on the morning of January 7, 1946.

Mr. Charles D. Hanlon is the brother-in-law of one of the murdered officers.

I have tried since January to obtain information and to get some action on this matter, but thus far, I have been unable to do so.

I make this public statement today before my colleagues in the hope that the State Department, the High Commissioner of Germany, and the United States Army authorities will bring to justice the individual charged with these murders.

All of the information which I have been able to obtain convinces me that there has been incredible neglect with respect to this case.

Why the Government has failed to prosecute is beyond my power to understand.

Any prosecutor worth his salt in the United States of America would have presented this case promptly in the courts.

I will go further and say that any prosecutor in the United States of America who failed to present the facts as they are known in this case should and would be removed from office.

The following facts concerning this case have been presented to me by Mr. William D. Canfield, of Springfield, Mass., a former trial attorney with the United States High Commissioner in Germany.

Mr. Canfield investigated this case and he has assured me that all of these facts, which I shall relate to you, are true and that the official records will support every one of them.

Let me also point out that the United States High Commissioner for Germany has requested the extradition of the person accused of these crimes and that a warrant for his arrest has been issued, but nothing has happened.

At approximately 2:30 in the morning of January 7, 1946, 3 United States military government officers were murdered in the Koller Villa at Passau, Germany.

The victims, Maj. Everett S. Cofran, of Washington, D. C.; Capt. Adrian L. Wessler, of New Rochelle, N. Y.; and 1st Lt. Stanley Mac A. Rosewater, of Omaha, Nebr., were killed by being struck on the head with an ax and by being burned with gasoline which had been poured on them and then set afire.

Major Cofran, in civilian life an architect, was the military governor of Passau although he had only been in the area a few weeks. He was not in contact with the local population and only knew a few German officials and employees. Captain Wessler and Lieutenant Rosewater were both lawyers and stationed at Regensburg about 75 miles away. They had no prior connection with each other except that one had been assigned as the prosecutor and the other as the defense counsel of a court-martial. The offense had occurred in Vienna and both officers were en route to that city to take the depositions of witnesses. Originally they had planned to leave Regensburg on January 7 but, inasmuch as Rosewater desired to view some blooded stallions at Poching, Bavaria, he persuaded Wessler to leave with him a day earlier. At 3: 30 in the afternoon of January 6, the two were driving through Passau en route to Poching when Rosewater, remembering that his friend Cofran was stationed in the city, drove to Koller Villa for a few minutes visit. Cofran welcomed both officers, and after a short conversation, induced them to stay overnight as his guests. Thus without the prior knowledge of anyone including themselves Wessler and Rosewater arranged to stay the night in what was later known throughout Germany as the Horror House.

The Koller Villa itself was located on the bank of the Danube River and surrounded by a cement wall 9 feet high. Because the property pitched sharply down to the river there was a 20-foot drop from the top of the wall to the yard. Major Cofran lived in two bedrooms on the second floor of the villa. In one he slept and in the other, which was separated from the first by a hall, he kept his clothing. Maj. Hugo J. Hesson and a Miss Gerda Inez Weiss lived on the first floor.

Major Hesson was not a member of Cofran's unit but temporarily attached as an agricultural expert. He had received orders transferring him to a city 150 miles away. His bags were packed and he planned to leave on the morning of January 7. He and Major Cofran were on terms of the utmost cordiality and he and Miss Weiss were invited by the major to have a drink with him and his two guests after the trio had returned from a movie.

At about a quarter to 12, Cofran, Wessler, and Rosewater went upstairs to sleep while Hesson and Miss Weiss retired on the ground floor. The latter two locked their bedroom doors but, since an unlocked french door connected the rooms to a veranda which in turn was connected by another french door to the

dining room, any person within the villa could easily have entered their rooms.

Although the gates of the compound itself were locked at night, the house door of the Koller Villa was never locked and it was Cofran's custom to leave his bedroom door open whenever he had officers as overnight guests.

Adjacent to the Koller Villa and enclosed within the same walled compound was the Botschafter Villa which was occupied by Capt. George E. Peterson and James M. Leech, both members of Cofran's command. Botschafter Villa itself contained three overnight guests of Captain Peterson. They were Mr. and Mrs. Willy Kuchar, a German couple who were occupying a second-story bedroom, and a Mrs. Rosa Schicks.

At about 3:30 a. m. Hesson was awakened by what he believed to be an explosion, and, on going into the hall, he discovered the staircase to be in flames.

After unsuccessfully attempting to reach the second floor, he dispatched Miss Weiss to the Botschafter Villa to arouse the occupants. On gaining admittance to Botschafter Villa, Miss Weiss knocked on Captain Leech's door to have it opened immediately by Captain Leech who was dressed and had a flashlight in his hand. It was suggested that the fire department be phoned but Captain Leech vetoed that and left in his car to personally contact them although he later admitted that he did not know where the station was located. He did contact the Army unit which called the fire department. Captain Leech returned to the Villa after an absence of 30 minutes. During this trip the crankcase of his car was damaged to the extent that it had a large, gaping hole. He denied having had an accident.

Leech was deputy military governor and as such it was his duty to assume command of the situation. Instead he went to bed shortly after his return. He declined to view the bodies in the morning but went instead to the military government building where he moved into Cofran's office and directed that signs and stamps indicating that he was the military governor be made.

The fire itself was extinguished at 6 a. m., and German police entered the Villa and began taking photographs and searching for evidence. However, shortly thereafter a Lieutenant Spitzell of CIC arrived and ordered the German police to desist and leave because the matter would be handled by the occupation authorities. Lieutenant Spitzell directed that a guard be placed about the Villa with orders that no one was to be admitted. For 24 hours this guard was maintained and nothing was done. During this period a dispute raged as to whether the CIC which was responsible for subversive activities or the CID which handled criminal matters should conduct the investigation.

In any event, on the morning of January 8, CID agents entered Koller Villa and began their inquiry, an inquiry which I am told was later used by the military school at Camp Gordon, Ga., as an example of how not to conduct a criminal investigation.

The investigators learned that Major Cofran, who was the senior officer and known to be especially insistent upon the prerogatives of his rank had surrendered his quarters to the visiting officers and had slept on a cot in an unused attic room.

The body of Lieutenant Rosewater was found face down in Cofran's bed. Rosewater had been struck six times on the head with what pathologists described as an ax or meat ax or meat cleaver. Death had come almost instantaneously. Major Cofran's body lay on the attic cot. He too had received similar blows which caused injuries that immediately rendered him unconscious although he might have lived had he received prompt and competent medical attention.

Both officers had suffered well directed blows which because of the darkness of the night could only have been delivered with the assistance of some artificial illumination such as a flashlight.

Captain Wessler's body was found on the floor of his bedroom near the door. His unfired pistol was lying near the body. He had been struck by an ax, meat ax, or meat cleaver, on the head, face, neck, and thigh. These blows were insufficient to have caused death. Smoke and soot were in his lungs establishing that he had been alive at the time of the fire and had perished therefrom. The faucet on a washstand was turned on and the water still running, indicating that the murderer may have washed blood off himself after his struggle with Wessler. Wessler was well known as a man who was extremely security conscious. He never went to sleep without locking his bedroom door and placing a loaded pistol within easy reach, and never opened the door without ascertaining the identity of those seeking admittance.

About a week prior to the murders, Major Cofran had stored seven 5-gallon cans of gasoline in the attic. The murderer had taken these and poured the fluid over the victims and about the rooms, hallways, and stairs, igniting the fire from below. In each of the murder rooms a full can of gasoline was left which accounted for the explosion heard by Hesson.

It became quite clear to the investigators that the murderer was a person who was very familiar with Koller Villa and the habits of Major Cofran, who obviously had been the intended victim. The investigators believed that the murderer went directly to Cofran's room and killed Rosewater who was sleeping on his stomach. Discovering his mistake, the killer had gone to the only other place where Cofran could reasonably be expected to be sleeping and, finding the room locked, was compelled to knock, which caused Wessler to come to the door, pistol in hand. Even then Wessler would only have opened up after proper inquiry. Someone spoke to him in English and when he unlocked the door, with his pistol not in a firing position, immediately struck him down. After making two ghastly errors without accomplishing his mission, the murderer then knew that the only place where Cofran could be sleeping was in the attic and he went there forthwith and dispatched the major, then utilizing the gasoline, the existence of which was known to him.

The Botschafter Villa had been locked on the night of the murders, and, although no evidence of a forcible entry existed, an ax which had the name of its owner burned into the handle, and which had been seen in the cellar of Botschafter Villa at 8 p. m. on January 6 was missing on the morning of January 7. The investigators did not search for the missing weapon in the adjacent Danube River until 10 days after they had started to work on the case. They had been informed by a German neighbor who lived on a hill overlooking the Villas that she had been awakened shortly before 3 a. m. and had looked out to see the upper part of Koller Villa in flames. She then saw the form of a man leave Koller Villa and proceed to a point halfway to Botschafter Villa at which time he stopped and hurled an object into the river. He then entered Botschafter Villa. The neighbor had not left her house after this despite the fire because all persons not members of the Occupation Forces or accredited thereto without special passes were subject to arrest and imprisonment if found on the streets after 11 p. m. When the CID finally decided to look for the weapon in the river, they had an agent stand in the spot from where the German neighbor said the man hurled his object. This agent threw a stone of the approximate weight of the missing axe and a boat put a diver down into 12 feet of water at the place where the stone struck water. Thirty seconds later he came up with the identical ax missing from Botschafter Villa.

A housemaid reported to the CID that Captain Leech had been observed washing his Army uniform in a bathtub the day after the murders.

His explanation for this was that, although he had never washed his own clothing before, he nonetheless decided to do so the day after the murders because he felt that the maid was tired and had to much work as it was. No blood was found on his clothing.

The investigation disclosed the following additional facts:

First. Rosa Schicks had awakened at exactly 3 a. m. and heard someone walking around in Leech's room for a period of at least 10 minutes. When originally questioned, Leech stated that he had gone to bed at 9 p. m. and had slept soundly until awakened by Miss Weiss at 3:30. When confronted with the Schicks statement he said he had forgotten that he had actually arisen at about 3 o'clock to go to the bathroom and had also shaken down his fire. Mrs. Schicks was positive that the only noise was that of a person walking back and forth. Experiments disclosed that the flushing of the toilet and the shaking of a grate made noises louder than that of a person walking in the room.

Second. Leech was seen coming from the cellar of Botschafter Villa at 8 p. m. on January 6.

Third. Leech disliked Cofran, wanted his job, and had made attempts to have Cofran transferred from Passau.

Fourth. Captain Leech had ordered the city of Passau to finance his secretary's father in a peat business. On January 5 Cofran learned of this, countermanded the order, and discharged the secretary over Leech's strenuous objections. Thirty-six hours later Cofran was dead.

Fifth. After the secretary was dismissed, Captain Leech inspected Koller Villa on January 5. He entered the attic, observed 7 cans of gas, and lifted each one ascertaining that it was full.

Sixth. Captain Leech had applied for appointment as a Regular Army officer. On December 31, 1945, he returned from an Army hospital where he had been treated. The hospital report was on Cofran's desk together with the officer's efficiency ratings which the major was about to fill out and forward. Major Cofran had indicated his displeasure with Leech and his intention of lowering the latter's rating. This was action which would adversely affect Leech's hope of a Regular Army commission. After the murders the hospital report and the efficiency form could not be found.

Seventh. Leech was given five polygraph examinations, commonly known as lie detector tests, including two by Orland Keeler, inventor of the machine. In all of these the graph showed he lied when he denied killing the officers.

Eighth. All other occupants of Botschafter Villa from which the ax originated except Leech had an alibi. It had been Captain Leech's habit to have his secretary come to the villa almost every evening.

Ninth. On the night of January 6, he telephoned her from Botschafter Villa, telling her not to come to the villa, because he had certain files in his possession which he had to study. It was later established that the files in question were not in the possession of Leech that night.

Although the German police were not permitted to conduct an investigation of the crimes in the first instance, the matter was turned over to them after 3 months went by with the murders still unsolved. The German authorities provided a special team of experienced prosecutors and policemen who conducted their own investigation. Although they were not permitted to question Americans, they were given full access to the CIO file. Their report, along with that of CID, was sent to the judge advocate for evaluation. Curiously it was referred for decision to a captain, whose entire Army legal career had been in the claims section and who had not had any experience in criminal matters. He rendered the opinion that, only if Leech confessed, could he be brought to trial.

With this opinion, the case became practically dormant until 1948. It was again reviewed in 1950. Leech left the Army. Major Hesson was killed in an automobile accident.

In early 1954, Lt. Col. J. B. Manley, Jr., a new CID chief in Europe, digested the old file and, as he stated, "immediately felt that someone should have been court-martialed because Leech was not court-martialed."

He then transmitted the file to Lt. Col. Morton S. Jaffe, Military Justice Branch, Office of The Judge Advocate, who studied the case. Colonel Jaffe, a competent Army lawyer with plenty of experience in the trial of criminal cases, wrote as follows:

I have studied the documents and reports available in the Passau murder case. I am surprised that the case against Captain Leech was not brought to trial in 1946.

With that the colonel pointed out that Leech was no longer subject to court-martial jurisdiction and could only be tried before a United States High Commission Court. He recommended that the file be forwarded to High Commission prosecutors. This was done on May 7, 1954.

On May 21, 1954, charges against Leech, then a resident of Lima, Ohio, were filed with the United States High Commission Court at Frankfort. Warrants for his arrest for murder, intentional manslaughter, and arson were issued by the court.

It is interesting to note that on May 30, 1954, the German state's attorney at Passau announced that he would have long ago brought charges except that he felt he lacked jurisdiction.

Title 18 of the United States Criminal Code provides that when a person in the United States had been charged with certain offenses including murder within a foreign territory occupied by the United States Army, said person shall on the request of the highest United States executive authority within the area, be arrested and brought before the nearest United States court.

If the court makes a finding of probable cause then such person shall be delivered up to the foreign territory for trial. So far the law has been ignored in this case. The High Commissioner forwarded the case to the State Department in Washington which sent it to the Justice Department, which sent it back to State Department which sent it back to the High Commissioner. Each one of these offices denied possession of the file when queried by relatives of one of the murdered officers. Finally, on October 26, 1954, the High Commissioner forwarded the file back to Washington and at the same time notified Wessler's relatives of this action although the relatives were informed that the High Commissioner's recommendations could not be revealed.

I am writing to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in both the House and the Senate, and sending all of the information which I have reported here today.

All of the information which I have reported to the House today, I have also given to the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of Americans in our armed services in distant places throughout the world. The least that we can do for them is to make certain that crimes committed against them will be promptly punished.

Nine years have elapsed since these three brutal murders were committed. If this is an example of how the Government handles such cases, then there is need for immediate reform.

This is a classic example of red tape, buckpassing, great inefficiency, and failure and refusal to accept responsibility.

I have hesitated about making these facts public because I have no desire to prejudice any individual, but after careful deliberation and considerable reflection, I have decided that these dead men, who cannot speak for themselves, and their relatives and friends, are entitled to some answer and some explanation.

I shall continue to press this matter and to probe it with such means as are at my disposal.

At this point, I insert copies of correspondence which I have had with the State Department, which is in itself interesting:

JANUARY 17, 1955.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed you will find a letter and enclosure concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Bavaria, which has been received from one of my constituents.

Will you be good enough to advise me what the Department's records may show regarding this matter, particularly with regard to its current status.

Your courtesy is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS J. DODD, *Member of Congress.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
January 27, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I have received your letter dated January 17, 1955, with which you enclosed a letter and its enclosure addressed to you on January 9, 1955, by Mr. Charles D. Hanlon, concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

The case was brought to the attention of this Department by a despatch dated June 24, 1954, from the Office of the United States High Commissioner at Bonn, Germany. The file on the case was enclosed and the request was made that it be referred to the Department of Justice for such further investigation as may be appropriate, and for determination whether sufficient basis exists for instituting proceedings against the accused person under the provisions of 18 U. S. C. 3185. The file, and a copy of the despatch, was forwarded to the Department of Justice, and it was later returned by it with the statement that there appears to be no jurisdiction for the Department of Justice to make an investigation, and that the determination as to whether the return of the accused to Germany should be requested is clearly a matter for the United States High Commissioner.

A copy of the letter from the Department of Justice was sent to the High Commissioner on August 27, 1954, and at the same time the file was returned to him.

The Office of the United States High Commissioner on September 25, 1954, again returned the file to this Department with a formal request from the High Commissioner for the return of the accused to the United States Occupation Zone in Germany for trial. After some further correspondence between this Department and the Office of the United States High Commissioner, the request of the High Commissioner with its supporting documents was forwarded to the Department of Justice for such action under 18 U. S. C. 3185 as might be appropriate.

The Department of Justice has just returned the file again to this Department, and in doing so pointed out that it appears from the files that HICOG has conducted no further investigation in the case, although it indicated that further investigation was required, that a number of witnesses have not been interviewed since 1946, that it is not known whether several of the witnesses will be available for the trial and that HICOG does not assert that sufficient evidence exists to establish probable cause. The file was returned for transmission to the Office of the United States High Commissioner so that the necessary investigation might be determined what witnesses will be available for trial, and whether the evidence in good faith justifies a trial.

Action on the letter from the Department of Justice is being withheld pending a discussion of the matter with the General Counsel of the Office of the United States High Commissioner, who is temporarily in the United States.

Mr. Hanlon's letter and its enclosure are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

FEBRUARY 2, 1955.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge and thank you for your report of January 27 concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

In view of the fact that action on the letter from the Department of Justice is being withheld pending a discussion of the matter with the general counsel of HICOG, I would appreciate being advised of the outcome of this discussion.

Thanking you for your courtesy and assistance and awaiting further word, I am

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 3, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I refer to my letter dated January 27, 1955, in reply to your letter of January 17, 1955, concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

The case has now been discussed with the general counsel to the United States High Commissioner for Germany, and it has been determined to return the papers submitted in support of the High Commissioner's request for the return of the accused person, for such further action as may be deemed appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 8, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I have received your letter dated February 2, 1955, in further regard to the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

You have not doubt received by this time my letter dated February 3, 1955, informing you that the case has now been discussed with the General Counsel to the United States High Commissioner for Germany, and that it has been determined to return to the High Commissioner for such action as he may deem appropriate, the papers submitted in support of his request for the return to Germany of the person charged with the above-mentioned murders.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 11, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I refer to my letter dated February 8, 1955, concerning the case of James M. Leech, who is charged in Germany with the murder of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany, in 1946.

A report has now been received from the Office of the United States High Commissioner at Bonn, in which attention is called to the fact that all witnesses available in Europe (some fifteen) were interviewed by the Chief Attorney's Office of the High Commissioner in May and June 1954, and statements were taken from them and included in the file which was submitted in support of the High Commissioner's request for the return of the accused to Germany for trial. It was further pointed out that since the High Commissioner has no facilities or authority to conduct an investigation in the United States, the file has been forwarded to the United States Army in Europe so that the investigation can be brought up to date and so that it can be determined what witnesses will be available for trial.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works, or a subcommittee thereof, may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which amends requirements as set forth in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to voting in wheat referenda. Under the law as it now exists, any farmer whose acreage allotment is less than 15 acres is not permitted to vote in a national referendum and is thereby not given any right to express his views concerning the farm program and its problems, which, of course, are vital to him. I have received petitions signed by hundreds of Ohio farmers who are opposed to this restriction. They feel very strongly that they should be given the right to express their views in a referendum, regardless of the acreage allotment which has been allocated to them. I feel this subject matter deserves every consideration at this time and will welcome any support from colleagues who have found the same sentiment in their respective districts.

FATHER HAROLD W. RIGNEY, S. V. D.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on this 25th anniversary of the ordination to the priesthood of Father Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., I can best hope that the Congress and the administration will rededicate themselves to obtaining the release of Father Rigney and all other Americans unjustly held imprisoned by Communist China.

Few men have contributed more to their country than Father Rigney.

Father Rigney attended St. Mary's Mission Seminary in Techny, Illinois, where he was ordained in 1929, and later obtained a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Chicago. He was the first American missionary to be appointed to the flying corps in Africa during World War II, and later became chaplain for all Catholic American Air Corps personnel in Africa at that time.

At the time of his arrest on July 25, 1951, Father Rigney was rector of Peiping's Fu Jen University, a Catholic university supported by foreign mission funds. Father Rigney refused to approve Communist teachers on the staff, and he was arrested when he refused to agree to the discontinuance of religious education and the teaching only of dialectical materialism and the promotion of the revolutionary program.

I wish to take this opportunity to assure Father Rigney and his family that he and the other Americans held imprisoned by Communist China are not forgotten. The State Department has taken appropriate steps. Their immediate release must become our dedicated concern.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have permission to file a conference report on the supplement appropriation bill before midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ATSUKO KIYOTA SZEKERES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PHILIP MACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Philip Mack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Philip Mack may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "(9)", insert "and."

Page 1, line 7, after the words "*Provided*, That", strike out "this exemption" and substitute "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 8, after the words "apply only to", strike out "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the E. J. Albrecht Co., an Illinois corporation, the sum of $142,007.75, in full satisfaction of the claim of such corporation against the United States for reimbursement for actual losses sustained by it in performing its contract with the United States for the construction of the outlet works for Sardis Dam on the Little Tallahatchie River, near Sardis, Miss., which losses were occasioned by an innocent misinterpretation of the contract by the corporation and by an extended delay in approving materials by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTICA BREWING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the Utica Brewing Co., of Utica, N. Y., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $900, representing the amount paid by said company to the Internal Revenue Bureau for four fermented malt liquor stamps of the 25 barrel denomination at $225 each, which stamps were rendered useless and unfit for the purpose intended, having become lost between the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue and the office of said brewing company and remain unfound: *Provided*, That the Utica Brewing Co., of Utica, N. Y., shall first file in the Treasury Department a sufficient bond in the penal sum of $900 paid for such stamps, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the stamps herein described: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of the services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be termed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Revenue" strike out the word "Bureau" and substitute in lieu thereof "Service."

Page 1, line 11, after the second "the" strike out the word "Collector" and substitute in lieu thereof "District Director."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of William F. Friedman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to William F. Friedman, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, in full settlement for all rights in respect of his inventions in connection with military, naval, and air communications facilities which are now or at any time have been placed in secrecy status by the War Department or the Department of Defense, including but not limited to all rights with respect to his inventions covered by Patent Numbered 2,395,863 and by patent application serials 682,096, 107,244, 70,412, 443,320, 478,193, and 549,086 and with respect to all inventions for which patent applications have been withheld by the War Department or Department of Defense in order to preserve secrecy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH DOWDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MRS. ELLEN HILLIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Ellen Hillier shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAURICE MUMFORD

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 193) providing that the bill H. R. 2266, and all accompanying papers, shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2266) entitled "A bill for the relief of Maurice Mumford," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNE P. PERCEVAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 619 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to grant national service life insurance to Mrs. Anne P. Perceval, Orange, N. J., under the provisions of section 602 (c) (2) of such act if she applies therefor within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 947) for the relief of Carl E. Edwards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Carl E. Edwards, 3515, 12th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, for compensation for a disability incurred while in the employ of the National Military Establishment, United States Naval Yard, Brooklyn, New York.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Carl E. Edwards, 3515 12th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, for compensation for a disability allegedly incurred while in the employ of the National Military Establishment, United States Naval Yard, Brooklyn, New York, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the enactment of this act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. S. GOEDEKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1002) for the relief of L. S. Goedeke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to L. S. Goedeke, of Roswell, N. Mex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such payment represents the cost of one hangar which was destroyed by the Army Air Force at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., in late 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSBORNE W. RUTHERFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Osborne W. Rutherford, Sunland, Calif., the sum of $1,325.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Osborne W. Rutherford against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of household furniture and other personal property when the Government quarters which were furnished him were destroyed on March 2, 1938, as a result of a flood in Big Tujunga Canyon, Calif.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,325.60" and insert in lieu thereof "$650."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT H. MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1202) for the relief of Robert H. Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Robert H. Merritt, Los Angeles, Calif., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from appendicitis occurring in September 1943, with resulting thrombophlebitis, is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CABRILLO LAND CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif., the sum of $2,756, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for payment for petroleum products delivered by said Cabrillo Land Co. to the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, and as reimbursement of moneys withheld from Cabrillo Land Co. by the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRISCILLA LOUISE DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Priscilla Louise Davis, Milwaukee, Wis., the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to the said Priscilla Louise Davis under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period beginning November 14, 1943, and ending March 31, 1946, both dates inclusive, as death compensation benefits arising out of the death of her former husband, John Crockett Ravin (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC–3114411), if she had made application for death compensation within 1 year after the date of the death of the said John Crockett Ravin: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIRLEY W. ROTHRA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shirley W. Rothra (Army Service No. 42109864), Mayville, N. Y., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $150, representing overpayments made to him by the War Department as the result of its failure to make appropriate deductions from his pay

for class E allotments during the period beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1945. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES FIDELITY & GUARANTY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2052) for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the departure bond of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., New York, N. Y., executed May 16, 1949, in favor of the United States in the amount of $500 in the case of Christian Johansen Krogh, Alpharetta, Ga., is hereby declared to be canceled as of the date of its execution. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in the amount of such bond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. C. ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2470) for the relief of T. C. Elliott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. C. Elliott, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the suit of $15,000, as an extraordinary monetary award for special services rendered to the United States prior to 1944, in addition to his official duties as a Federal employee, in preparing and furnishing rate and transportation information for the use of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives, and various other officials and agencies of the Government, as a result of which the said T. C. Elliott helped to save to the United States approximately $15 million: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAPHIC ARTS CORPORATION OF OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2893) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the the Claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio. Notwithstanding any statute of limitation or lapse of time, suit may be instituted within 1 year after the enactment of this act in accordance with the provisions of section 1491, title 28, United States Code. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Such claim is for reimbursement of losses sustained as the result of actual expenses incurred under contract No. W33–038ac 2023 with the United States Army Air Force, dated April 17, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "claim", insert "upon a legal as well as an equitable basis."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID J. DAZÉ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2924) for the relief of David J. Dazé.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David J. Dazé (Veterans' Administration No. C–4107517), of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said David J. Dazé against the United States arising when, in order to preserve his eyesight, it was necessary for him to incur expenses for surgical treatment of a service-incurred disability which could not be provided by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK MICHAEL WHALEN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3022) for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 2401 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, no tort claim against the United States arising out of an accident which occurred on January 24, 1947, in the United States naval residential section of the Panama Canal Zone, and in which Frank Michael Whalen, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., the minor son of Mary Whalen, of such city, was struck and permanently injured by a United States Navy truck, shall be barred from trial in a United States district court if civil action is begun thereon within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE P. PROVENCAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3036) for the relief of George P. Provencal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George P. Provencal, Auburn, Mass., the sum of $2,500. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George P. Provencal against the United States for loss of use of his taxicab which was impounded by officers of the Department of the Treasury on March 10, 1949, for violation of certain provisions of the internal-revenue laws, while being operated by another person without knowledge on the part of the said George P. Provencal that his taxicab was being operated for such illegal purpose, and was not returned to the said George P. Provencal until approximately April 1, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAYMON H. MASSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Waymon H. Massey, Greenville, S. C., the sum of $10,000. Except as provided in section 2, the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Waymon H. Massey against the United States on account of permanent and disabling personal injuries sustained by him on February 24, 1943, as a result of an

airplane crash at the Auburn-Opelika (Ala.) Airport which was caused by the negligence of a United States naval aviation cadet to whom the said Waymon H. Massey, while in the employ of the Alabama Air Service under an assignment by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was giving flight instruction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 9 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 759), the injuries sustained by the said Waymon H. Massey on February 24, 1943, shall be held and considered to be injuries "sustained by an employee while in the performance of duty"; and the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the said Waymon H. Massey adequate medical, surgical, and hospital services, and necessary appliances and supplies, as provided in such section.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM FREDERICK WERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3180) for the relief of William Frederick Werner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Frederick Werner, Pawtucket, R. I. (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-3842760), the sum of $1,449.70. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Frederick Werner against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts which he paid for hospitalization for a service-connected disability during the period beginning March 1, 1946, and ending May 9, 1947, both dates inclusive, at a Veterans' Administration contract facility: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND GEORGE PALMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Raymond George Palmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), and hereby waived in favor of Raymond George Palmer, of 2020 Marshall Street, Little Rock, Ark., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps at Centaur, Mo., during 1936, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS ELTERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of Louis Elterman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis Elterman, of Boston, Mass., the sum of $179.17, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incident to the transfer and storage of his personal effects, from Eatontown, N. J., to Boston (West Roxbury), Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. BONIFACE LUCCI, O. S. B.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3975) for the relief of Rev. Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B., of Detroit, Mich., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund for security bonds posted for Rev. Fiorenzo Gregori and Rev. Rolando Conti which were declared forfeited April 27, 1953: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY OF OHIO, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Tax Court of the United States to finally determine the amount, if any, of excessive profits received or accrued by the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc., in an amount either less than, equal to, or greater than that determined by the War Department Price Adjustment Board for the calendar year 1942, under the applicable provisions of the Renegotiation Act, as amended: *Provided*, That the suit authorized hereunder shall be instituted within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Orrin J. Bishop, Presque Isle, Maine, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $761.14. Such sum represents the amount of certain overtime payments which the said Orrin J. Bishop (as postmaster in Presque Isle, Maine) made without legal authority to one of his employees for certain services performed during the June, September, and December quarters, 1951, and for which the said Orrin J. Bishop has been held personally liable.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Orrin J. Bishop, an amount equal to the sum of all amounts which he has repaid to the United States, or which have been withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due him, by reason of the liability of which he is relieved by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$761.14" and insert "$868.82."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4418) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims (a) to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract, dated July 25, 1941, which the said contractor had with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md., the work on which contract was completed on or about November 19, 1943, and (b) to enter judgment as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. If the said court shall find (a) that after the date of said contract the United States through any of its departments or agencies delayed the issuance of priorities which resulted in subjecting the said contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, or if the said court shall find (b) that after the date of said contract the United States, through any such departments or agencies, or either of them, including Defense Plant Corporation, sponsored any work program or programs in the general area of Fort Howard, Md., which rendered it impossible for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to achieve that degree of labor performance which they, respectively, would have achieved if such work program or programs had not existed, or which made it necessary for such contractor or subcontractors, or either of them, to pay higher wages for the labor which was available to them, respectively, than they would otherwise have had to pay, and that the result of such work program or programs was to subject the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, then the said court shall in either case, and notwithstanding the bar or defense, if any, of laches, lapse of time, or statute of limitations, enter judgment for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, against the United States in the amount of such additional costs and expenses incurred by them, respectively: *Provided*, That such judgment or judgments shall not include any profit to the said contractor and its said subcontractors, or either of them.

SEC. 3. Suit shall be filed in the Court of Claims by said contractor within 6 months from the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

SEC. 5. Private Law 643, 81st Congress, approved July 6, 1950, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSEZELLA MARIE PRESTON CURRAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4454) for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rosezella Marie Preston Curran, the sum of $11,541.96, plus interest up to the date of the enactment of this act, on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning on March 19, 1942, the date of her induction into the United States Army on the Philippine Islands, where her services as nurse were so greatly and urgently utilized and where she devoted her time to the care of those wounded in the great struggle on the Philippine Islands during World War II, wherein the records of the armed services to substantiate said claim were lost.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$11,541.96" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000."

Page 2, at the end of line 3, strike out the period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. A. ROSS & CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4506) for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. A. Ross & Co., of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $34,624.64, in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for compensation for the twelve thousand six hundred eighty-three and two one-hundredths cubic yards of compacted base-course material which such company actually used in carrying out its obligations under contract entered into between such company and the United States on September 14, 1943, but for which no compensation was received by such company, compensation having been denied by the United States Court of Claims in an opinion rendered on October 6, 1953, on the ground that the base-course material was provided for in such contract and that said company failed to register any protest when required by the United States to use such additional amount of base-course material: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 5 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. COWIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of John J. Cowin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of John J. Cowin, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as an employee of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., in May 1945, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT, MRS. MARY ELLEN DIMENT, AND MRS. GLADYS EVERINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4637) for the relief of Mrs. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. William Henry Diment and Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, 242 Grand Avenue, Ely, Cardiff, England, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their son, W. H. Diment, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army, acting within the scope of his employment as a sentry, at Antwerp, Belgium, on January 22, 1946; and to Mrs. Gladys Everingham, individually and as natural guardian of her 2 minor children, Michael Ronald Everingham and Maureen Everingham, 1 Montrose Avenue, Seymour Street, city of Kingston upon Hull, England, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Sergeant Ronald Everingham of the British Army, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army acting outside the scope of his employment, at Antwerp, Belgium, on April 27, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid out of the Treasury until such time as the Government of the United Kingdom has paid to Mrs. Gabrielle Evans, 85 Rue Olivier de Serras, Paris (15) Seine, France, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United Kingdom on account of the personal injury and

resulting death of her husband, Leroy R. Evans, who was a citizen of the United States and a civilian employee of the United States Army when he was severely injured on January 1, 1949, in an accident involving a British Army vehicle, which occurred at Fontainebleu, France: *And provided further,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE J. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4714) for the relief of Theodore J. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Theodore J. Harris, Rockville, Md., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $257.01. Such sum represents the compensation received by the said Theodore J. Harris for Saturday and Sunday overtime service performed during the period from February to April 1951, at the Rockville, Md., post office. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY RYDZON AND ALEXANDER F. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $2,074.50 and $1,550.25, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, San Antonio, Tex., during the periods July 1, 1950, to April 15, 1953, and April 9, 1951, to March 31, 1953, respectively, all dates inclusive, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by the act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Victor Helfenbein, the sum of $6,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for fatal injuries sustained by him in a collision involving a United States Army ambulance from Fort Hamilton on August 12, 1944, in Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or directed to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERSEAS NAVIGATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5196) for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,500 to the Overseas Navigation Corp., of New York, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, based on the fact that a deposit of $12,500 made by such corporation in connection with a bid which it submitted to the United States Maritime Commission in 1946 for the purchase of the coastal tanker *Blue Sunoco,* was declared forfeit on March 17, 1947, after such corporation failed to take delivery. Such amount is the decision of the United States Court of Claims in its findings of fact dated March 1, 1955: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL Y. LOONG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Paul Y. Loong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul Y. Loong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARION JOSEPHINE MONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationaity Act, Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUZIE BIONDO (LUZIE M. SCHMIDT)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 943) for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision in section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRIEDA QUIRING AND TINA QUIRING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 995) for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and (205) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius N. Neufeld, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRMGARD EMILIE KREPPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irmgard Emilie Krepps may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEIKO SHIKIBU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 998) for the relief of Meiko Shikibu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Meiko Shikibu, the fiancee of Earl A. Beach, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Meiko Shikibu is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Earl A. Beach and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Meiko Shikibu, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Meiko Shikibu, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Meiko Shikibu as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON WIESEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of Solomon Wiesel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Solomon Wiesel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMENOUHI ASSADOUR ARTINIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Armenouhi Assadour Artinian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT SHEN-YEN HOU-MING LIEU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Houming Lieu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILAD S. ISAAC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Milad S. Isaac.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Milad S. Isaac shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMANUEL FRANGESKOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1158) for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emanuel Frangeskos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYNTHIA JACOB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1205) for the relief of Cynthia Jacob.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cynthia Jacob shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROL BRANDON (VALTRUDE PROBST)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1247) for the relief of Carol Brandon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVIA MARY ORCIUCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olivia Mary Orciuch shall be held and con-

sidered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS TOSHIKO HOZAKA AND HER CHILD, ROGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Toshiko Hozaka, the fiancee of Normand Bessette, a citizen of the United States, and her child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Toshiko Hozaka is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Normand Bessette and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "she is" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "they are."

On page 2, line 13, strike out the word "fee" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUTHER ROSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Luther Rose.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luther Rose shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIN YORK GAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1357) for the relief of Chin York Gay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chin York Gay, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sam Chin, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STIJEPO BUICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1467) for the relief of Stijepo Buich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stijepo Buich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tom and Anfisa Buich, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA V. TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1468) for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Barbara V. Taylor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, after the words "visa fee." strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR MANUEL SOARES DEMENDONCA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares DeMendonca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA MARIE PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of Rosa Marie Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Marie Phillips (nee Vollmer) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge of prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOJCIK FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1655) for the relief of the Wojcik family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw, Janina, and Andrzej Wojcik shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. ZDZISLAW ALEKSANDER PESZKOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1684) for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGRID SAMSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Ingrid Samson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ingrid Samson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERTA MANSERGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2933) for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Berta Mansergh may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILBRAHAM ACADEMY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 202) for the relief of Wilbraham Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2699) entitled "a bill for the relief of Wilbraham Academy," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWINA L. LINCOLN, WIDOW OF W. IRVING LINCOLN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1296) for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the loss of the spring-water business owned by the late W. Irving Lincoln situated on Mount Blue in Hingham, Mass., and known as the Mount Blue Spring Water Co., as a result of the construction and operation of the United States naval ammunition depot, Hingham Annex, on land upon which such business was located, compensation having been received by the said W. Irving Lincoln for the loss of such land but not for the loss of such business: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID R. CLICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of David R. Click.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of David R. Click, Woodville, Ala., and his claim for compensation for disabilities incurred in 1942 and 1943, while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the War Department at Huntsville Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That sections 15 to 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of David R. Click and his claim for compensation for disability caused by an injury alleged to have been sustained while in the performance of his duties on October 23, 1943, as an employee of the War Department at Huntsville, Ala., shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERETT A. ROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1922) for the relief of Everett A. Ross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Everett A. Ross, Stockton, Calif., the sum of $712.61. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Everett A. Ross was held liable on February 4, 1952, in a civil action in the justice court of Stockton, Calif., as the result of an accident which occurred at the intersection of Chater Way and Sharps Lane in Stockton, Calif., on November 3, 1950, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Everett A. Ross, a temporary letter carrier in the United States post office, Stockton, Calif. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Everett A. Ross shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ORIN A. FAYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2904) for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Orin A. Fayle, of 4433 Yuma Street NW., Washington, D. C., the sum of $2,324, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of damage to and destruction of his household goods which were being shipped from Naples, Italy, where he had been quartered until approximately June 19, 1954, attached to CINCSOUTH, NATO, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,324" and insert "$612.22."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN JORDAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of John Jordan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Jordan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FERENC BABOTHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1255) for the relief of Ferenc Babothy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ferenc Babothy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLO NONVENUTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1281) for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carlo Nonvenuto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry into this country, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "date of," strike out the words "his entry into this country" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLGA JOANNOU GEORGULEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1283) for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Olga Joannou Georgulea, as of the date of enactment of this act, and upon payment of visa fee, and that she shall, for all purposes under the Immigration and Nationality Act, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence as of that date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one number the immigration quota of the country of her origin, for the current fiscal year.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olga Joannou Georgulea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID MORDKA BORENSTAJN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1287) for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger, who were admitted to the United States on January 8, 1948, at the port of New York, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of required visa fees. Upon payment of visa fees, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota for Poland, and one number from the quota for Germany for the first year such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the name "Reichlinger", strike out ", who were admitted."

On page 1, strike out all of line 6.

On page 1, strike out "New York", on line 7.

On page 2, line 1, after the words "visa fees.", strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTORINE MAY DONALDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Victorine May Donaldson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICH WOLF, ALSO KNOWN AS LADISLOV WOLFENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, after the word "fee", in line 8, strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9 and 10; and on page 2, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA NIZZIA CONSTANTINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1339) for the relief of Maria Nizzia Constantino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Nizzia Constantino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the

Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Constantino" and insert "Costantino."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANORE HAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1473) for the relief of Eleanore Hauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eleanor Hauser shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the apprporiate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN ODABASHIAN, M. D.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Odabashian, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MELINA BONTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1028) for the relief of Melina Bonton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Melina Bonton shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EBOLYA WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Ebolya Wolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ebolya Wolf shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISA GEMMA TOFFANI AND ROSA SOMETTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for on this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Toffani and" and insert "Toffani."

Page 1, line 4, after "Sometti", insert "Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "two" and insert "four."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIETRO MURGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Pietro Murgia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Murgia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT V. BLEDNYH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert V. Blednyh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the able.

EUFRONIO D. ESPINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eufronio D. Espina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LEE TAI HUNG QUAN AND QUAN AH SANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang, wife and minor child of Lloyd Quan, deceased citizen of the United States and World War II veteran, shall be held and considered to be nonquota immigrants.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR RAMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Eleanor Ramos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eleanor Ramos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEAN-MARIE NEWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3074) for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jean-Marie Newell shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIL WON (ALSO KNOWN AS VIRGILIO JACKSON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (b) shall be held not to apply to the case of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson), who was born in Nicaragua.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGEL MEDINA CARDENAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3852) for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angel Medina Cardenas may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "the", strike out "provision" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after "212 (a)", insert "(17) and."

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUADALUPE ZUNIGA (ALSO KNOWN AS BENITA CHAPARRAO-VENEGAS OR GUADALUPE ACOSTA)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3853) for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guadalupe Zuniga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ESTHER RODRIGUEZ DE URIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks at this point to explain my objection to House Concurrent Resolution 99.

Practically all bills on the Private Calendar are for the benefit of one individual or corporation.

House Concurrent Resolution 99 proposed to grant permanent residence in the United States to certain displaced persons whom the Attorney General has determined to be eligible for such privilege under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. In as much as the names of 432 persons are listed in the bill and the case histories are not in the committee report, I asked this resolution be passed over without prejudice to permit members to examine the list of beneficiaries in the resolution and to then examine the case histories that are available to them in the custody of the Judiciary Committee if they so desire.

MAX KOZLOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of Max Kozlowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Kozlowski may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9), (19), and (28) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Kozlowski may be admitted to the United States for permanent

resident if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES (CARLOS) GERLICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1), (4), and (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as required by section 213 of that act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSS SHERMAN TRIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ross Sherman Trigg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ross Sherman Trigg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WING CHONG CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Wing Chong Chan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wing Chong Chan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARDES ALBACETE YANEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1525) for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ardes Albacete Yanez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Ardes Albacete Yanez, and the said Ardes Albacete Yanez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, my reasons for objecting to this resolution and asking that it be passed over without prejudice are substantially the same as those for House Concurrent Resolution 99.

This bill carries 43 beneficiaries and the case histories are available to Members of the House in the Judiciary Committee if they wish to see them.

I will not object to either resolution at a time they are up for consideration on a succeeding Private Calendar.

MRS. ELIZABETH DOWDS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 170 the bill H. R. 973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice because I was against the passage of the bill. I merely wanted to point out what I believe to be a most unfair provision of the present immigration law. I refer to the retroactive provision.

In my judgment, aliens who lawfully entered the United States should not be deported for sins committed in the past having once paid their debt to society. To threaten people with deportation on the basis of what they did years ago is awfully cruel. After a person has paid his debt to society, rehabilitated himself, and becomes a respected member of his community, our Government should not harass him or his family for past action.

Since being an objector on the Private Calendar, I have never objected to the passage of any immigration bill; however, I have noticed many of the bills grant permanent residence in our country to those that have sinned a little bit. Are we in the Congress going to set ourselves up as judges and attempt to determine how much sin an alien must participate in before being deported? God has forgiven these people who erred. In like manner, should we not be helping rather than hurting them? This country cannot afford to ignore the spirit of forgiveness. I believe the immigration law should have the retroactive provision removed from it immediately.

I have never been a person to shun my responsibility or duties. When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] asked me to be an objector, I was pleased. I cannot, however, in clear

conscience participate in an action I believe to be wrong.

Until such a time that the injustices in the present law are corrected, I must cease to be an objector. I am, therefore, submitting my resignation to Mr. MARTIN.

NURSE TRAINEESHIPS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to authorize the Surgeon General of the United States to provide traineeships for graduate nurses. This is one of a series of measures I am sponsoring in this session in an attempt to break the bottleneck in the severe shortage of nursing services in America.

The purpose of this measure is to expand and improve nurse training and promote the more effective utilization of nursing skills through traineeships for professional nurses to prepare them for teaching in the various fields of nursing and to serve in administrative and supervisory capacities. One of the principal causes of the nurse shortage today stems from the scarcity of qualified teachers, administrators, and supervisors.

This bill is a companion measure to the administration's nursing proposals—title IV of H. R. 3458 and H. R. 3720—except that my bill limits itself to grants for nurses only.

The other nursing legislation I have sponsored this session includes H. R. 2559, which would make qualified men nurses eligible for commissions in the Armed Forces Reserves, and House Joint Resolution 171, which would establish a National Commission on Nursing Services.

House Joint Resolution 171 is receiving outstanding support throughout the country. Just recently a national committee for a Commission on Nursing Services was established to urge passage of this bill. Among members of the committee are:

Mr. Samuel Horwitz, chairman, trustee, Mount Sinai Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio.

David B. Allman, M. D., chairman, committee on legislation, American Medical Association, Atlantic City, N. J.

Miss Gertrude E. Cromwell, supervisor of nursing, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colo.

Mrs. Howard Egert, president, Cleveland Federation of Women's Clubs, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Stanley Ferguson, director, University Hospitals, Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles Higley, M. D., past president, Cleveland Academy of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. John R. Mannix, director, Cleveland Hospital Service Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. R. Louise McManus, director, division of nursing education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

George Sackett, M. D., president, Cleveland Academy of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio.

Miss Hilda M. Torrop, executive director, National Association for Practical Nurse Education, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Samuel Whitman, director, Cleveland Mental Health Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Robert Woodruff, Atlanta, Ga.

The membership of this committee is being expanded.

Many national organizations, including the American Medical Association, have strongly endorsed the Nurse Commission plan. Most recently this measure received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

I feel certain that with an intelligent legislative and administrative approach, and with wide public understanding, we can make much-needed improvement in the health of the American people.

STRENGTHENING INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, an editorial on Pan-American Day in the New York Times a short time ago makes an excellent point. It is that citizens in all the American Republics who support inter-American solidarity should, in the words of the editorial, "devote themselves to its realization not only today but every day."

For a number of years, in this Congress and elsewhere, I myself have been deeply interested in one of the most important factors in strengthening and perpetuating inter-American solidarity. That is the great Pan-American Highway, a splendid modern thoroughfare to run from Alaska to Argentina. Much of it is completed. Much remains to be done.

One extremely important link for which there is urgent need of completion is that section known as the Inter-American Highway.

On March 31 in letters to Vice President Nixon and to Speaker Rayburn, President Eisenhower recommended early completion of this Inter-American Highway. The President enumerated 4 considerations which lead him to believe that the United States should sponsor an accelerated construction program, as follows:

First. A completed highway will provide a very important contribution to the economic development of the countries through which it passes.

Second. There will be an opportunity for increased trade and improved political relations among these countries and the United States.

Third. The resultant increase in tourist traffic would not only improve cultural relations but also serve as a very important element in the development of their economies through earnings of foreign exchange.

Fourth. The existence of such an all-weather highway would be of substantial security importance, both in providing overland contact and communication as far southward as the Panama Canal, and in bringing an important physical link between these countries in our common defense of the Western Hemisphere against aggression from without and subversion from within.

The President also pointed out forcefully that those 4 stabilizing factors will be a great deterrent to communism, which as we all recall was a real menace in that area very recently in Guatemala. Happily, it was defeated by the will of the people of Guatemala and by the spirit of solidarity of the American Republics. Nevertheless communism, which struck once, will try to strike again. The Inter-American Highway is one realistic means of checking it.

The President's support of early completion of the highway demonstrates once again this administration's continuous interest in our relations with the other American Republics. Too often our policy toward Latin America has been characterized by a great deal of talk but too little action. The President's decision to support a program which will finish the Inter-American Highway in 3 years rather than in an estimated 10 years is solid evidence of the determination of this administration to develop a policy. The Inter-American Highway is important to all the nations of the hemisphere, since it is a regional link, from the United States-Mexican border to the Canal Zone, of the great Pan-American Highway system which when completed will extend from Fairbanks, Alaska, to Buenos Aires.

The important Inter-American Highway link in this system, as the President pointed out in his letters, has been intermittently under construction for the past 21 years. Its speedy completion would help the mid-American area immediately by contributing toward developing it economically, stabilizing it politically, and strengthening it strategically. Obviously, the highway is in consequence of great potential importance in hemisphere solidarity, which is itself of vital importance to the maintenance and defense of the free world. Its completion would benefit every country of the hemisphere, including, most emphatically, the United States.

POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include three amendments to be offered to H. R. 4644, the postal pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, my statement concerns the amendments to H. R. 4644, as reported, which are in order under the rule on that bill granted by the Committee on Rules.

Under the rule three amendments may be offered. These amendments were presented to the Rules Committee. I am placing them in the RECORD in the form in which presented to and considered by the Rules Committee so that the Members of the House may be informed as to the text of such amendments. The amendments proposed to be offered under the rule are as follows:

Page 81, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are assigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. This report shall be printed as a House document after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Page 82, strike out the entire postal field service schedule occurring after line 2 and before line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Page 89, strike out lines 4 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

Two language changes of a minor nature would clarify the intent as to the administration of these amendments. Accordingly, if the amendments under the rule are adopted by the House, I intend to ask unanimous consent for consideration of two minor changes in the language of such amendments as follows:

First, from the language of the amendment to page 81 of H. R. 4644, as reported, strike out the following last seven words: "after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Second, from the language of the amendment to page 89 of H. R. 4644, as reported, strike out "or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended," and on page 110, line 6, of H. R. 4644, as reported, after "as amended," insert "or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

The first change eliminates language which might cause a delay in the printing as a House document of the report of the Postmaster General required by the first amendment under the rule.

The second change removes a reference on page 89 of the bill, as reported, to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and inserts a reference to that act on page 110 of the bill, as reported. The purpose of this second change is to continue the Classification Act of 1949 in effect for payment of salaries of certain employees of the Post Office Department who will be converted from that act to the Postal Field Service Schedule, until the actual conversion is made. This change has been suggested by the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office.

It should be stressed that these changes in the amendments under the rule in no way change the purpose of those amendments. In my judgment these changes are desirable to clarify the intent of the amendments under the rule.

POSTAL FIELD COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 211, Rept. No. 423) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill, except that it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to offer any of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE TO INCREASE PAY OF WITNESSES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "6 dollars" and inserting in lieu thereof "9 dollars."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely gives the House authority to pay the expenses of witnesses who are called before congressional committees in the amount of $9 a day instead of $6 a day. There has not been any increase in the fee to witnesses before House committees since 1930. This merely brings about a long-delayed increase of $3 a day for witnesses who are brought before House committees. I have no requests for time to speak on this legislation.

There is no opposition to this rule, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the House Committee on Administration, provides in very simple language for increasing from $6 to $9 a day the expense allowance paid witnesses called before congressional committees.

For a considerable period of time travel pay allowances of Government employees has been $9 a day. Experience has shown that witnesses called before congressional committees are out of pocket when they are given only $6 to cover their actual expenses.

This resolution had the unanimous support, I understand, of both the House Committee on Administration and the Committee on Rules.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 200, which will make in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 2225, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

House Resolution 200 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 2225 would require that permanent certificates of public convenience and necessity be issued to the local service airlines now operating under temporary certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. These local service lines, Mr. Speaker, provide air service to the small- and medium-size communities of our country and have done a marvelous job since the end of the Second World War in providing rapid transportation to hitherto comparatively inaccessible sections of our country. They provide a linking-up service with the major airlines, and a nationwide network of air transportation has grown up. If these carriers did not perform their vital functions, many important regions and vital links between key cities of the United States would be without scheduled air transportation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2225's report disclosed that local service airlines have developed traffic in many areas far in excess of the traffic which the trunk airlines had developed, and this can be explained by the fact that the local service airlines are completely devoted to serving the small- and intermediate-size communities and have adjusted their operations to meet the needs of the smaller communities.

If permanent certificates are issued, a great financial expense will be eliminated for these local service lines, and their whole financial structure will thus be considerably strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the purpose of this bill is worth while; the rule itself is an open one, and, therefore, the bill is open to amendment on the floor. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason for not adopting the rule and thus providing for the full consideration of the bill on its own merits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Virginia has explained, House Resolution 200 grants a rule for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2225, from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and for the consideration of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill H. R. 2225 makes rather simple and direct amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act. It was reported favorably by the unanimous action of the legislative committee, and also by the unanimous action of the Committee on Rules.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2225, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 2225, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and also a companion bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], would have the effect of granting permanent certificates of convenience and necessity to the 13 local service airlines in the country now operating under temporary certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If you recall, extensive hearings were held on this legislation last year. The committee reported the bill unanimously last year. The House passed the bill, but it was bogged down in the last-minute rush of the legislative jam in the other body, and no final action was had on the legislation. It comes again today to the House with a unanimous vote of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

May I take just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to explain the background of this legislation? Local service air transportation was first begun as an experiment following an extensive investigation completed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1944 into the need for extending air service to small and intermediate-sized communities. At first, this service, as you know, was called "feeder" service or feeder airlines. It soon became apparent, however, that the term "feeder" was in a sense too restrictive. The service provided is far more than simply a feeder service, and it became an extensive and more important part of the airline system. It was changed from feeder service to local service airlines. These local service airlines provide service for small communities on a regional basis, and they link these communities to major air terminals. The oldest one of the airlines has been operating now slightly less than 10 years. The youngest one for something more than 4½ years.

If you have a copy of the report, you may turn to page 2, and there you will find listed by States all of the communities served by these particular airlines. The committee feels, and has felt since last year, that this experiment has now proved itself—that it is no longer an experiment and that these local service airlines are, indeed, providing substantial transportation essential to the national welfare and should no longer be regarded as on an experimental basis.

The committee feels also that the time has come to declare that this service is not experimental and to grant these carriers the right of permanent certification in order that some stability, the stability they need to develop, may be achieved. And to do so, we are proposing in this bill some very simple amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, in 1938, when the Civil Aeronautics Act was enacted, at that time all of the trunklines in the country were given the right of what we call the grandfather clause. They were granted permanent certificates at that time.

The pending legislation simply provides grandfather rights for local service carriers. However, from one standpoint it should be pointed out that H. R. 2225 is less liberal actually than the original

act in 1938, insofar as grandfather clause rights are concerned. Unlike carriers that were granted grandfather rights in 1938, each local service carrier has had to go before the Civil Aeronautics Board and qualify for a certificate under the terms of section 401 of the act. Each of them filed formal application, waited in turn for the Board's docket, for their appearance before the Board under the docket; each one then presented evidence in long, complex hearings, and each one argued its case before the Board. That was to get their first temporary 3-year certificate.

As required by section 401–B, each carrier had to prove it was fit, able, and willing to perform such transportation properly, and conform to the provisions of the act and its rules and regulations, as required by the Board.

In each case before the local service airline could get a certificate, the Board had to determine that the public convenience and necessity required the services. That was not all. In addition to the original full dress proceedings needed to acquire a temporary certificate, each of these carriers every 3 years has had to appear before the Board to ask for a renewal of that temporary certificate. That has been an expensive operation. One airline carrier witness testified it cost his company $80,000 in legal fees and accountant fees, and other expenses, to apply for a renewal of the temporary certificate, which was renewed only on a 3-year basis.

So it has been quite an expensive operation. Some of the carriers paid expenses in excess of $80,000.

Another factor should be brought to the attention of the committee at this time. The local service carriers operate on the basis of temporary certificates and have faced extreme difficulties in financing their operations. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible in many instances, to provide finances, when the lending agencies know that the certificate has life for only 3 years, and at the end of that 3-year period the carrier might be out of business. They have had that difficulty particularly with reference to buying new equipment. Most of them have been using the old, out-moded DC–3 planes for their local service operations. That has been an expensive operation, because the plane has not been manufactured for quite a number of years. Parts are becoming more and more expensive, and yet no airplane manufacturing company will be willing to go into the manufacture of a new plane suitable for this type of air carrier service on the basis of a 3-year certificate. That is just good common financial reasoning, I think, on the part of the manufacturing companies.

So these local service carriers have been unable to buy the equipment they need because they cannot persuade the plane manufacturer to take an order to build a lot of planes when that company does not know whether they will be in business for more than 3 years. The manufacture of aircraft is a risky business. Considerable capital must be committed to the development of the plane.

The local service airlines with temporary certificates are unable to make long-term commitments for the purchase of new equipment, so that the manufacturers have no incentive to take the risk necessary. Besides the problem of long-term commitments to buy needed equipment, the local service air lines frequently find difficulty in obtaining money for needed capital. Higher interest rates are demanded in many instances. One witness said that in 1952, when his company needed additional working capital, it was necessary to go to New York to get the money, and he had to pay 6 percent. Not only that, he had to make a personal guaranty for the repayment of the money.

It is amazing to me that the local service airlines have made the tremendous progress they have made, and have rendered the service to many communities across the country which they have rendered so well, under the difficulties they have faced in their operations.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I wish to state that I plan to support the legislation, but I think the fact should be brought out in this debate that since 1951 the Department of Commerce has issued certificates of convenience and necessity to airlines making it possible to write off on a 5-year basis, on a tax basis, over 600 aircraft, which permits them to depreciate the aircraft in a period of 5 years. I think the life of the average plane may well be 15 years. So this is indeed a terrific windfall for the airlines in the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman if that condition is not primarily confined to the trunk lines?

Mr. PRESTON. I would say that would be true as to the majority of it, but anybody who has a four-engined aircraft is eligible to receive this writeoff. There are, of course, some defense benefits inuring to the Government; there is no question about that; but I think in evaluating the cost of operating airlines this fact should be revealed, that they have this terrific advantage of a 5-year depreciation.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman for bringing that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that none of these local service carriers have any Boeing or other large aircraft?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. All of them, I believe, use old World War II DC–3 planes. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true. There were one or two that tried to use some others but were not permitted to do so.

Mr. HARRIS. It proved an unfortunate and expensive experience to them.

Mr. PRIEST. That is quite true.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that these DC–3's are obsolescent and completely out of date?

Mr. PRIEST. They are.

Mr. HARRIS. In fact it is difficult to find parts in order to keep them maintained. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that some of these local air carriers must set up their own machine shops and make their own parts in order to provide necessary machinery for these planes in order that they can continue to fly?

Mr. PRIEST. That was the testimony presented to our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Consequently for these particular operators the maintenance cost is exceedingly high.

Mr. PRIEST. That is true. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for further developing that point. I had mentioned the maintenance cost earlier in my statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the gentleman from Arkansas cleared up the point I was going to make, that most of the equipment used by the feeder lines is obsolescent or obsolete equipment. Because of that they cannot take advantage of the 5-year depreciation provision.

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. With respect to the depreciation figure, Mr. Chan Gurney, the acting Chairman of the CAB, testified to the committee that the Board does depreciate the airplanes, the largest expense item in the whole equipment field, in a period of 7 years; and I believe further in the testimony it was brought out that the youngest airplane now being operated by these local service carriers was 10 years old. Therefore, as far as these local service carriers are concerned, every airplane they have has already been written off long since.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one further statement, then I shall not consume more time.

As far as I know the only opposition to this legislation comes from the Civil Aeronautics Board. They feel that the legislation, so they testified, would freeze permanently a lot of these routes. The committee is very definitely of the opinion that the Board has all of the power necessary under existing law to alter local service routes just as they do the trunk lines today, and following the same procedure under 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The effect of the legislation simply would be to permit these carriers within a 120-day period to file for a permanent certificate; and unless there was something in its record of operation since its last temporary certificate was issued that indicated its unworthiness as a carrier the Board would be required to grant it the same rights they did the primary carriers in 1938 and give to the local service carriers a permanent certificate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has mentioned the CAB. The opposition of the CAB to this legislation is typical of the obstructionist policy of the CAB, it is typical of the confusion which exists in the CAB. There is not a major community in the United States of America that does not complain about the CAB and, as the gentleman knows, I have pending here a matter which would call for a complete investigation of the civilian air policy in this country. The gentleman is chairman of a great and distinguished committee and I would like for him to state to the House whether or not it is his intention to look into this situation which is causing criticism all over this country?

Mr. PRIEST. May the chairman of the committee state to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana that it is the intention of the committee to look fully into this matter, that a draft of subjects to be investigated already is under way, and that, in effect, we started such investigation several weeks ago. It was interrupted temporarily because we had scheduled hearings on the Natural Gas Act; but it is the intention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to do what the gentleman has suggested and to do it in as complete form as it is possible for that committee to do.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman's statement is very reassuring.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure the chairman of our committee, a very able chairman, has fully explained this entire legislation. I only want to make a few statements because I feel it is rather vital that another particular point be brought to the committee.

I am sure our chairman mentioned the fact that some of these feeder lines now are being forced more or less to cannibalize their planes in order to keep the present lines in operation. I think we should emphasize, furthermore, that the manufacturers of airplanes, those who have appeared before our committee, made it very emphatic that they do not want to bring out new models that would be useful for a shuttle service and for feeder line service until they think there is some permanency to this entire program; until they feel that there is some kind of permanency of certification available to the small lines so that they may be in business for some time to come.

I should like to point out another fact. I believe this should be emphasized, too, Mr. Chairman. The Federal Government is vitally involved and interested in this particular instance. We know they are paying the feeder lines, and all lines, including trunk lines, a certain subsidy depending on their necessity for support. The greater the earnings of these airline companies the smaller amount this subsidy is that will be paid to them by the Federal Government. Consequently, these smaller companies are permitted to enlarge their operations and they will be permitted to enlarge their operations if they know they have a certain degree of permanancy. Then, of course, they are going to be able to make greater earnings and consequently will require smaller subsidy payments from the Federal Government. I think that is very important.

In our particular area we have several of the smaller feeder lines. It is contemplated that it will not be too many years until some type of shuttle service will make it possible for every community in the United States, or nearly every community in the United States, to reach a main trunk line.

To become eligible for a permanent certificate, it is going to be rather simple for each of the smaller feeder lines, as well as the larger lines, to declare themselves and to become eligible to the CAB. I have thought, and I think many other Members have felt, there may have been some opposition expressed but it was very mild opposition on the part of the members of the CAB. Actually, all of the feeder lines and all of the operators of the larger lines were very much in favor of this legislation, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Those are 1 or 2 additional points that I thought should be explained on this side of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it was brought out before the committee very plainly that the longtime future planning of these feeder companies is almost impossible with this kind of certification which they are operating under at the present time. Until such time as they do have some permanency and opportunity to finance on a long-scale basis, it is almost impossible for them to give what we would call generally considered here trunk line service, first-class service. Is that not correct?

Mr. BEAMER. I think that is stating it very well. In other words, finance companies do not look with favor upon extension of credit, shall we say, to companies in a semipermanent position.

Mr. SPRINGER. Just like a landlord getting financing for just the length of his lease, and if his lease is not very long, his chances of getting financing in that field is not too great. That is a comparable situation which these feeder lines have been put into. I want to say this, that it was my feeling—and I listened to all of the evidence of the CAB—that there is possibly some merit about keeping these companies under their jurisdiction for a long period of time. I think the committee had to weigh the merits of that against the permanency which a company would have and the better service and the cheaper service and also the question of subsidy, and we had to view those features as being more desirable than some of the issues that were raised in behalf of the CAB. I believe that is about a true statement.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Illinois has expressed it very adequately.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am interested in this bill. We have one of these lines in our city, but I would like to understand a little bit better the objections of the CAB. I do not think that body is simply an obstructionist bunch of bureaucrats. I would like to know a little more of the nature of their objections. This gives these 14 companies grandfather-clause treatment, as it were, but it makes it extremely difficult for any new company to come into this field. Is that not true?

Mr. BEAMER. Yes and no. I would not say it would make it more difficult, because they still would have an opportunity to appear before the Civil Aeronautics Board and apply for regular certification. May I add another point. In case they do appear before the Board—I mean any of these other existing lines—it is necessary for them to continue under the direction of the Civil Aeronautics Board as far as rates and further extension of services are concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Under this bill, H. R. 2225, as I understand it, any line, either one of these local lines or one of the trunk lines, can have its rates suspended or discontinued if there is anything objectionable found about the operation; is that correct?

Mr. BEAMER. I think that is substantially a correct statement. However, it is now up to the Civil Aeronautics Board to prefer such charges. In other words, they are now considered not guilty until they are proven otherwise. That is in conformity with established law.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. That is part of the present Civil Aeronautics Act, and this bill here does not disturb that authority.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, these present lines do not have certificates that have no time at all, but they have up to 2, 5, or 7 years under the existing practice. Is that not correct?

Mr. BEAMER. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. They could be given permanent certificates by the CAB at the present time, is that correct, without this law?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes; that is true. Now, I take it there comes a time when any company which has a license or is seeking a license from the Federal Government ought to have a right to know whether it is in business or is not in business. I think these lines have been before the Commission on several occasions. This is not the first time they have been up here. They have presented all their problems and difficulties with which those companies were faced. They are not fly-by-night outfits. They have been in business for years. They are not the kind of firm that is going out of business tomorrow or some time within the next 6 months or even 5 years. In all probability, they are going to be in existence permanently, from now on. They have just as much right, they are just as much entitled to permanency, as a trunkline. The only difference is they are smaller; that is all.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know still what is the basis of the CAB's objection to this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. The CAB's primary objection to the bill, as we gathered it in listening to their testimony before the committee, was that they felt the passage of this bill would have the effect of freezing these routes. Frankly, the committee could not see that. We felt, even though they were well intentioned in presenting that viewpoint, but the facts in the case did not justify their position because section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act remains just as it is and that gives the Civil Aeronautics Board authority to do these things:

> To alter, amend, modify, or suspend such certificate, in whole or in part, if the public convenience and necessity so requires.

There is no amendment whatsoever changing that part of the act. It applies to every certificate of convenience and necessity, whether it be with respect to a trunkline, a local-service line under a temporary certificate, or a permanent certificate. The committee felt that that point was somewhat belabored, and without a great amount of justification, although granting that it was given to the committee in all sincerity by the Board. But we felt it did not carry any weight in view of the study that the committee has made of this problem.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that on page 9 of the report, in the second and third paragraphs there is given, I believe, an explanation of one of the objections that was presented before the committee a year ago and also the answer that was given, as was stated by the chairman of our committee. It says:

> This legislation does not substantially change the power of the Board to alter and modify the route structures of the local-service carriers. It is believed that section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which gives the Board power to "alter, amend, modify, or suspend such certificate, in whole or in part" provides all the authority necessary for route development.

I believe that answers the question.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I think it is well to point out that at the time we received the report from the Civil Aeronautics Board, there were only 4 members; 3 members of the Board stated their opposition to this proposed legislation. They felt that they should retain the authority to make a decision, whether it should be for a 3-year extension or renewal, or what should happen to the route structure. One member of the Board testified before the committee of the other body that he was wholeheartedly in favor of this proposed legislation and felt it to be in the best interests of the service. The fifth member, of course, is presently the Chairman of the Board but had not been confirmed at that time and therefore was not in a position to state how he felt about the legislation. So, in fact, when we refer to the Board, there were only three members of the Board who came to the committee to express opposition.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. It has been brought to my attention by one of these local-service lines, which is mentioned here, that the airplane industry could not or would not go ahead and develop a local-service carrier unless some such legislation were passed. With 444 communities to be served, with 14 lines, knowing that either their competitors or their successors will continue this local service, it is inconceivable that there is not sufficient initiative in the aviation industry that they should fail to develop a plane for this type of service, so that they will not have to depend on secondhand, broken-down surplus equipment any longer.

Did the industry attempt to justify that sort of position? I do not understand why they do not develop a carrier of the kind we need for this local service. It seems to me they do not need any Government assurance in order to feel sure of plenty of business if they get the right kind of airplane.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Tennessee answered that question. Would he like to elaborate on it?

Mr. PRIEST. We actually had only one representative of a plane manufacturing concern before the committee. He brought some very favorable news to the committee about a development that is now taking place to supply this type of plane. They have no orders for it and they probably cannot get orders for it until some of these carriers receive permanent certificates, at least. But the developmental stage is well advanced. He brought and presented to our committee a model of a type of plane that would be very well adapted to this sort of air traffic. I believe that is being done. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that certainly it should be done. They should develop the type and the model and get that ready for production so that if they get orders they can proceed to produce.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the passage of this legislation make it more difficult for an area to be served by a new or different airline?

Mr. BEAMER. The chances are, speaking from a speculative viewpoint, it would probably make it more simple, because the presently existing lines then would want to expand their activities because they would feel a certain degree of permanency. As it has been, they have not felt too much permanency. Consequently they do not go into areas where they feel there might not be sufficient income.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I point out to the gentleman from Ohio that I have exactly that situation in my own area in the Ozark Airlines, where we have been trying to get them to expand to take in new cities within our area. Last year we did get them to go beyond what they had done, to take in one new city. However, in the survey that resulted from this new service, it was pointed out to me what the difficulties of this company are, when you are in this sort of indefinite stage of not knowing whether you are permanently certificated, in making these plans, not for 1955 but for 1957 and 1960 and 1965. I can see that any company might object that with the hazards you face under this indefinite certification it is almost an impossibility to do that.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. This is essentially the same bill that was passed unanimously last year in the House?

Mr. BEAMER. Yes, it is essentially the same bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Also, this is granting no more to the feeder-line carriers than was granted to the trunk-line carriers under the grandfather clause?

Mr. BEAMER. It treats both of them equally.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right. It simply gives equal treatment to these feeder-line carriers which are so essential to our economy and to air transportation.

Mr. BEAMER. In fact, the larger lines would support this contention because they like to have the feeder lines supplying them with revenue passengers and revenue freight from their respective communities.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. I am strongly in favor of the legislation, but there is one question I should like to ask: As I understand, the legislation is limited to carriers in the continental United States. I was wondering if the gentleman would explain why carriers in our Territories, say in Hawaii, where two airlines are operating, are not qualified under the legislation.

Mr. BEAMER. I presume we would have to go back to the act of 1938 for the explanation.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield, as I understand, the international airlines are not under regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board but are regulated and certificates are granted directly by the President. Is that not correct?

Mr. JARMAN. Is it not necessary for these airlines to come in to the Civil Aeronautics Board and get a recertification? That is my understanding. That is the reason I ask the question.

Mr. BEAMER. The gentleman is asking now about international or national carriers?

Mr. JARMAN. I am asking the gentleman about, say, the two airlines in Hawaii that operate between the islands of Hawaii, not on an international basis but interisland.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the author of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not a fact that this bill would not be on the floor today had the CAB been realistic in terms of the operations of the local feeder lines, which are essential to the communities they serve and essential to the trunk lines which serve the country and overseas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in his analysis of the situation.

In my opinion, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been rather arbitrary in its treatment of the local service airlines problem. As I understand it, there are several other similar problems now before the Board in which the Board is also acting arbitrarily. But this bill deals solely with the question of local service airlines.

It would be repetitious for me, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to add to the statements which have been given to the committee by the distinguished gentlemen from Tennessee and Indiana. Basically, the Civil Aeronautics Board, by acting arbitrarily with respect to the certification of these local service airlines, has made this legislation necessary. The growth of the local service airlines in the United States in the last 10 years has been phenomenal. The Civil Aeronautics Board even in its opposition to this legislation admits through its Chairman, Mr. Chan Gurney, that the local service airlines operation is no longer experimental; that it has passed from the experimental stage and is now, according to him, in the developmental stage, which is the same stage of development that the trunk lines had reached in 1938 when they were granted permanent certification.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I compliment the gentleman for working up and introducing and sponsoring this measure. I am very much in favor of it. I have had some communications from home indicating the need for it. The gentleman, however, is from Mississippi and I am wondering whether there is anything at all in this legislation that would help us in our area to get through service from Louisiana and Mississippi into Washington and New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is a matter which is alien to the purposes of this bill. This bill does not deal with that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think that is also a matter that the CAB is very arbitrary about.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I say we have an application before the Civil Aeronautics Board now to grant "through" service from Jackson to Washington, and we are trying to get them to act on that application.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman would bring in some legislation on that, it might be a good subject also.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Mississippi for this very worthwhile piece of legislation. I think the chairman and the other members of the committee have made splendid statements in support of this legislation. Its merit should be very apparent, and the need for it from the standpoint of efficiency of these local airlines and the safety of these local airlines through the better equipment which may be obtained should also be apparent. I sincerely hope the bill will pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for the bouquets he is throwing my way, but I must confess this really is not my baby. The legislation was originally sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] in the last Congress; and in the present Congress, as a member of the majority party, I have sponsored it jointly with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Actually, he is entitled to the credit if and when this legislation is passed.

Mr. Chairman, there are several reasons why this legislation is a must insofar as the future of local air service is concerned.

First, permanent certificates will assist local service carriers to obtain financing by assuring investors and financial institutions of the industry's continuity of operation. It will also reduce the cost of such financing.

As has been stated before, several local service airline officials testified before our committee that they had to give 6 percent interest in order to get financing and that only on a short-term basis. In addition to that, they had to find a member of the board of directors who was personally able to underwrite the loan.

The issuance of permanent certificates will make this unnecessary in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The equipment question has already been covered. Permanent certification will certainly open the door to the possibility that a prototype airplane may be designed specifically for the purpose of carrying out these local service operations. It will permit the local service carriers to make long-range planning for their future operations and effect economies which can only be effected through long-term planning. It will obviate the necessity for each of these carriers coming before the Civil Aeronautics Board every 2 or 3 or 4 years for the purpose of having their certificates renewed, an expense which is no little item in the budget of these airlines.

With respect to the DC–3, which is undoubtedly the greatest airplane that the airlines have ever had to operate, but which is now antiquated, the last DC–3 came off the lines at Douglas in 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has again expired.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us represents an attempt on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to strengthen the local service airlines in this country. We are charged in the Congress and through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the duty of trying to develop a domestic air service. A great many people think we have done pretty well in developing intercity air transportation between our great centers of population. We have several very high-grade, first-class air carriers that will get you rapidly from coast to coast or from any two of the very great centers.

But one of the undeveloped segments of our air transportation is that of local service. That has been a very vexing and a very difficult problem for the committee and for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, as I remember the discussion in the committee on this bill, one of the great objections to the bill is that by granting a permanent certificate to the local service airlines we grant them an asset of considerable value which they may later want to sell or use in some way. Is it not true that, under the sections read by the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Civil Aeronautics Board still retains all of the necessary authority to review and change and suspend the operations of the local service airlines, so that the objection to which I referred is not a proper objection?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct about that. I might say that that is precisely the situation that the long airlines are in today, because many of them have what amounts to a permanent certification. So what is proposed in this bill for local service airlines is no different treatment than has been accorded to the long lines.

Of course, this whole matter is complicated by the proposition that in order to get an airline system inaugurated and under way, it was necessary for the Congress to provide a subsidy, which was done by means of an air mail pay.

Some of the long lines have gotten to the point where they are paid on a compensatory basis for the service they render in carrying the mails, without subsidy. Not so with numerous of the local service airlines. In order to get the local service airlines to the point where they can be self-sustaining and will receive only compensatory pay for the mail service rather than a subsidy, it seemed to the committee that it was absolutely necessary that they be given a longer tenure of life, that they be given a chance to prove over a longer period of time that they could carry on an economic effective operation. So far they have not been able to do it because of the facts that have already been alluded to in this debate.

One thing that has not been mentioned with respect to the local service airlines is a handicap which we feel would be alleviated were this bill passed and to become law. That is the question of retaining their personnel.

The place where the established airlines go to get pilots to fly their planes and people to run their business is to the local service airlines. As a consequence the local service airlines are confronted with a constant turnover of their good people who do not want to stay when they get a chance to work for a permanent line. This legislation if passed will give the local service airlines a stability similar to the trunk airlines with respect to the employment of personnel.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman used the phrase that the trunk lines have what amounts to permanent certification. As I understand, neither the trunk lines nor these local lines get a permanent certificate; they merely get a certificate that does not have a time limit. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct; the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield further, is that type of certificate for unlimited duration the type of certificate that the Federal Communications Commission, for instance, gives for radio and television stations? I am wondering whether there is any difference between the kind of unlimited duration certificate given an airline, both trunk lines and now these local service lines, and the certificate that is granted, say, to a common carrier or by the Federal Communications Commission. Can the gentleman or any member of the committee enlighten me on that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to respond.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, there is a difference. This is a permanent certificate. Under another section of the Civil Aeronautics Act the Board may on its own initiative by making the showing itself alter or change a route; and, as has been said here, completely eliminate it. This bill would not change that authority except that the Board would have to show that its action in changing or altering a route was justified.

Under the operation of the licensing of radio and television stations under the FCC Act, at each 3-year period or some other stated length of time, some cases automatically come in for renewal. The procedure there is for the station itself to file request for renewal, showing the record, the programing, the financing, and so forth; then without having to go through an expensive hearing the renewal is granted. That is the procedure here, but it is a lot more expeditious.

Mr. VORYS. But certainly the radio and television stations make enormous investments based on temporary or limited certificates. Is there so much objection to doing the same thing in the case of the airlines?

Mr. HARRIS. With only one exception. The operation, so far as the television and radio industry is concerned, is more or less automatic. As long as they are doing a good job, as long as there is no protest, then they come in and file their record; consequently, generally as a matter of procedure, the renewal is automatic. If there is some question about it, then, of course, the FCC makes the determination whether or not the renewal should be granted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would point out an additional difference in the two fields. The airways which carry the airplanes are not the same ether waves that carry the radio. In addition, there is no subsidy, either implied or in any other way, to the radio stations; whereas, the Government has a definite interest here in improving the stability and the permanence of these local airlines.

May I allude to another matter, which is the question of securing the right kind of airplanes to render this service. That is one of the more difficult problems. It has already been alluded to. It has been said that we had before us a witness who showed there was a model plane for local service which is presently on the drawing board ready to go into production provided they can get orders sufficient to justify setting up a production line. Those orders have not yet come. It did not seem to the committee they would come unless this legislation were passed to give these local airlines some permanence. Then they can get the financing, so that they can order planes which are presently ready for them to use.

Mr. SCHENCK. I should point out the great difference between a radio renewal and the renewal of an airline. That is, the airline has to have very expensive equipment to use; therefore, it is a question of financing, which is the basic reason for the difference in the method of doing business.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amount of financing required for an airline is far in excess, relatively, to the amount of financing required for a radio or television station.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Of course, we all realize that the most difficult time that any business has is during the beginning of its operation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BELCHER. In connection with these feeder lines, they are beginning, more or less, their operations, yet they are confronted with a lot of difficulties that do not confront the old established businesses in that line of operation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BELCHER. It is to the Government's interest to remove every single difficulty it possibly can, every obstacle they have to overcome, because the sooner these airlines can get on a proper basis the sooner the Government can get out of furnishing them a subsidy to operate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is one of the basic reasons for the passage of this legislation. In the considered judgment of the committee, this legislation will help the Government sooner to get out of the business of supporting these airlines and get them on a firm foundation.

Mr. BELCHER. May I say that I certainly appreciate the attitude of the committee, and I want to commend them for taking this very progressive step in furthering and helping the operation of these feeder airlines.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman, and I am sure the committee appreciates his remarks.

Let me conclude by saying again that there is no air service in the world that is better than the service which the American people receive from its domestic airlines. This is absolutely true. Anyone who has traveled in foreign countries by air knows that we have a far superior domestic service to any other nation in the world, either in Europe, in the Far East or anywhere else. Indeed, most of the foreign airlines depend on American operational procedures and upon American engines and planes. So we are leading in this field.

The thing we must do, Mr. Chairman, is to make it possible for the smaller and less populous communities to get the same kind of air service that is being accorded to the large centers of population to the end that all of us may have the advantage of this new and modern type of transportation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that there is very little, if any, opposition to this legislation. The committee was unanimous in approving it. But I wanted to point out one facet of this problem that is not covered by this legislation.

Although this legislation does not apply to helicopters I have noted with great satisfaction the great strides that are being made by the certificated helicopter carriers particularly in the commercial field. It is recognized that this new and radically different type of transportation is being ably developed.

Passenger helicopter service, on a scheduled basis, is now a reality and has been for nearly 2 years, with American aviation leading the way.

New and larger and more economical equipment is already in the air. Greater density of population in our large metropolitan areas means that the helicopter is now a part of our everyday life, both for commercial as well as civilian defense reasons.

In addition, the civilian fleets now in operation have already proved an invaluable training and testing laboratory for our armed services.

We are confident of the continued rapid growth of scheduled helicopter service and I hope that legislation similar to that being considered today be considered for the certificated helicopter lines.

May I say to the chairman of our committee that in the near future we should

consider comparable legislation with regard to helicopter service. These certificated helicopter carriers who are in the field at the present time are up against the same difficulties and uncertainties as the small feeder airlines that we have been discussing here, and I hope that before long we can consider similar legislation with regard to the helicopter service.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side, but I would like to make one point, if I may, that no emphasis has been placed on city planning for additional airport development. I think we should touch upon that very briefly, because there are many cities which have been reluctant to improve their airport facilities until they knew with a degree of certainty that there would be service rendered to their communities.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge most strongly the favorable consideration of this bill, H. R. 2225, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to provide for permanent certification of feeder airlines. We have come to a point in time when a decision must be made on the operating future of these local-service airlines. Last year the House gave its unanimous approval to a similar proposal, and I hope to see that same unanimity this year. That this may occur seems likely to me, for this body has as one of its prime functions and outstanding characteristics its knowledge of and effort for the many separate areas, taken either geographically or by economic units, that make up this great Nation.

Most of us here have seen in our time the establishment of our great trunk-airline systems, and have seen them grow from small, faltering companies to great concerns, playing an important part in our economic affairs. We have all come to be proud of our great airline systems, serving not only this Nation but the whole world, as the airplane has brought men closer together by shrinking the distance between points on the earth. We have seen also great advances in aircraft and in aircraft safety. American-built aircraft are in use throughout the world, and this achievement rests solely on the economic performance of these sky giants.

The picture is not perfect, however. We have fallen behind in the development of two types of commercial aircraft, and face presently the new phenomenon of foreign competition in aircraft sales. I speak, of course, of all jet aircraft and also of the turbo-prop—part jet and part propeller. I am sure, however, that we shall redress this imbalance, for the record of progress in the past in prototype development gives confidence for the future.

The feeder or local service airline is a postwar development and a development which has been of great importance to most areas of our Nation. I can speak with more knowledge of my own area and I would like to tell a part of the story of feeder service development in the Rocky Mountain West. Those of you who have had occasion to see this territory know well that it is rugged country, laced north and south by the great Rocky Mountains. In days gone by, we often spoke of distances out there as so much as the crow flies but we had few opportunities to ever take so straight a line. We have, of course, fine highways and main line rail service and I would not deprecate them one whit. Nonetheless, we have many towns and cities which have neither rail service nor any direct transportation links by surface transportation. We have long been accustomed to taking the long way from point to point as one just does not drive over the mountains. Roads are placed where there are breaks or passes in the mountain chain. In some instances, this makes the actual distance between two points a good deal in excess of the crow line distance between them.

Thus it is that the advent of the feeder service airline was so important to the mountain West. It presented to us the opportunity to go direct from point to point, and on occasion in the winter, almost the only way to go. Even so, the rugged terrain presents its own problems to the airline. It must cross mountain ranges in excess of 14,000 feet and that is quite a climb even if one begins from an airport some 7,000 feet above sea level. I think it is obvious that this great variation in altitude makes for increased cost in aircraft maintenance and in operation costs. I think it is obvious as well that we do not have great cities to be served, yet some of our small cities originate passengers in excess of the population of the city * * * or so to speak, everyone flies at least once and some more than once every year. A similar ratio in our great cities would present impossible numbers.

Do not let this comment on the rugged nature of the country indicate that it makes it impossible for the small airline to operate. Quite the contrary. The Frontier Airline using this particular area has a perfect safety record and completes well in excess of 95 percent of its scheduled flights. It has demonstrated its ability to serve this relatively isolated area; it has won the acceptance of the people as is shown by its steady increase in number of passengers, number of passenger miles, freight loadings and mail and express. It has shown also a steady decrease in the amount of subsidy required and permanency of its certificate would, I am convinced, give it the opportunity to reduce this dependency steadily in the future.

I should like to close by saying that it is my considered opinion that the local service airlines, the feeder lines, have ably vindicated the faith that gave them their start. They have grown enough and progressed enough down the road of service and solvency that they should be accepted as full members of our airline family. They have become important links between our small communities and the rest of this great Nation, and they have earned, by their enterprise and initiative, a right to permanency.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to join with my colleagues here today on the permanent certification legislation for local service airlines. I think that the local service airlines have done a remarkable job in rendering service to the small communities, communities under 100,000 population in the country. They have been very successful in their operations, and they are well respected by the various communities that they are operating in.

I am glad that it was suggested that we mention something about the benefits to the cities as far as this legislation is concerned. The cities are very much interested so that they can plan on a long-scale program for the development of airport facilities and for commerce into and out of the cities. It is quite beneficial to the cities to have this air service coming in both for air freight and passenger service, and they have made substantial contributions in assisting in the development of the local service airlines.

An important point to be made is the cost of recertification of your local airlines. The cost of recertification of an airline is great. It costs the individual airline usually in the neighborhood of $100,0000. It costs the Civil Aeronautics Board around $50,000 to $100,000. It costs the communities affected around $25,000 to $50,000. It is expensive. The taxpayers must pay for it. We, the Congress, are rendering a great service in encouraging the enactment of this permanent type of legislation. We will not only reduce the subsidies paid to the local service carriers but will also reduce the cost of operation of our Civil Aeronautics Board. Also we will reduce the cost to the cities receiving this service. I think we have made great progress with our local service airlines and with the airlines, in general. I believe air service is here to stay, and if it is here to stay, we should put it on a permanent basis. We should give a permanent certificate to the local service carriers so that they can plan ahead, so that they can procure equipment, and so they can guarantee their employees jobs for a definite period of time.

In this way the airlines can secure permanent employees and will be in a position to offer them security. They can operate on a sound basis and project their operation over a period of years in procuring new equipment. We do not like to be in a business we think we might be forced to terminate or sell out every 3-year period. That is the proposition the local airlines are faced with today.

The local service airline operating in the part of Illinois that includes my district has brought scheduled air service to several communities which previously did not have the benefit of this type of modern communication with the rest of the country. The improvement in the ability of residents of this area to expedite their mail, their freight, and their personal transportation has resulted in

a substantial increase in commercial activity throughout that region.

As a Member of the Congress I would like to emphasize one further feature of local air service which strikes me as particularly valuable in our overall efforts to increase the practical working of democracy. I refer to the increased ability of a Member of Congress to visit his constituency. We all know of the many demands that are made on the time of Members of Congress in this day and age and we all know of the time schedules under which we operate. We are at the same time equally conscious of the importance of visiting our constituency as frequently as possible so as to be as familiar with the current temper of the people whom we represent in the Congress as we possibly can. Local air service has greatly improved the ability of all of us to perform this service to the Congress and to our constituents better than we ever could before.

I would view with the greatest alarm, and so would my constituents, any suggestion that the local air service in our area is no more than temporary. We believe in my district that the soundness of the concept of local air transportation has been abundantly proved and its permanency demonstrated to be essential. It seems to me that the initial 3-year experimental and temporary certification period should be enough to prove the fitness, willingness, and ability of the individual carriers to perform the service in question in their respective regions. It seems to me also that requiring recurrent temporary certifications is expensive, unnecessary, and inefficient harassment of the carriers and I believe that permanent certification of all of them by legislative action in this session of the Congress is imperative.

So I appeal to the Members of the House to pass this bill so that we may have sound local air service operations and reduce subsidies as well as save the taxpayers money.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 (e) (2) of the act of June 23, 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e) (2); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding the following:

"(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the enactment of this section shall show that, from the date of enactment of this section until the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property, and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant for such period was inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this section and the date of its application."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "(2) of the act of June 23," and insert in lieu thereof "of the Civil Aeronautics Act of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(2)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "adding" insert "at the end thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, insert "date of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "for such period was" and insert "during the period since its last certification has been."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated by the members of our committee, we were unanimous in reporting this bill. However, I am not quite as convinced as some of the Members that the Board has adequate powers to regulate these companies.

In the first place, we must remember that we are conferring upon them franchises that will be worth millions of dollars. Of course, they could barter these franchises in the future.

It is true that under section 401 (h) of the act, upon petition or complaint or on its own initiative, after notice of hearing, the Board may alter, amend, modify, or suspend any such certificate in whole or in part if the public convenience or necessity so require, or may revoke any such certificate in whole or in part for intentional failure to comply with the act, the conditions of the certificate, and the rules and regulations of the Board.

With respect to the power of the Board to revoke, I have this fear, that it would be very difficult to prove a case of intentional violation.

With respect to the right to alter or modify in order to guarantee that the public would have adequate and efficient service, there have not been many decisions of the courts. The Board itself in Panagra Terminal Investigation (4 CAB 670) recognized certain definite limitations upon its powers to modify or alter the certificate so as to provide for better service. In the cases of *Western Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (196 F. 2d 933) and *United Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (198 F. 2d 100) the courts recognized certain definite limitations.

Therefore, it seems to me there is a serious question as to whether or not the Board has adequate power under existing laws and the interpretations of those laws thus far made to insure that the public will continue to get efficient and adequate service.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I think what the gentleman is saying is certainly well taken, but the gentleman will agree, I believe, that the pending bill makes no change in the law in that respect.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PRIEST. It would have to be done in separate amendments.

Mr. DIES. I agree with the committee that we ought to permanently certificate these companies. They have certainly demonstrated through a long period of time that they are entitled to certification. But the point I am making is that we may have to amend existing law in order to guarantee that these companies will not use their franchises in some areas solely to enrich themselves. I am not charging they will do it. But suppose there is an airline service that has borrowed some money, bought a lot of secondhand equipment, and gone into business. Then you give that company a valuable franchise. If that company's service in the future should not expand and develop to meet the needs of the communities it serves, there ought to be adequate power in the Board to revoke that certificate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman's presentation. Does the gentleman mean that Congress has authorized some Board to give a franchise which becomes some sort of vested right that the Board and the Congress cannot then revoke or amend? That would be a serious situation.

Mr. DIES. No. I did not imply that Congress could not do it. What I am saying is that I am not convinced from my limited study of the decisions which have interpreted section 401 that the Board now has adequate power to insure

efficient and adequate service once the certificate is granted.

If I had time to discuss these decisions I think you would reach the same conclusion I have.

(At the request of Mr. HARRIS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DIES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply want to make it clear, and I know the gentleman intends to do so, that if section 401 (b) needs amending to grant the Board the additional authority, which the gentleman thinks is somewhat questionable, that it will apply to trunklines now operating just the same as it would apply to these lines which we are considering today.

Mr. DIES. That is true, but there is this difference, as I see it, and I do not claim to understand this subject as well as our distinguished chairman and those gentlemen who have served on the committee for many years—but there is this distinction between the trunklines and the feeder lines. The trunklines serve a much more profitable territory and they have every incentive and every reason to improve their service and to give the public the kind of service the public is entitled to. Whereas, in the case of feeder lines, or at least some of them, that are operating on a shoestring, or dependent upon subsidies for survival, I think you have a different situation. In the Panagra Terminal Investigation case decided by the Board, the Board while asserting its power to compel route extensions in appropriate circumstances, concluded that its authority does not include—and I now quote from the Board's decision:

> The addition of new service, which would be so extensive as to amount to a new air transportation route or of such a kind as to substantially change the character of the carriers' system.

Under the facts there presented, the Board concluded that the compulsory extension in issue would transform the essential character of the carrier's operation, that the Board was not and could not be authorized to compel such a change, and, accordingly, dismissed the proceedings.

In the cases that have dealt with certain specific phases of this question, the courts have recognized a very definite limitation, and we ought to be frank with the Congress that the circumscribed jurisdiction granted by section 401 may not afford the flexibility in making route readjustments and realinements which may be required by the public interest and that is offered by a periodic reexamination of a carrier's entire route in a proceeding involving renewal of a temporary certificate.

I merely want to call your attention to the present state of the decisions and the uncertainty with respect to whether or not the Board does have adequate power, because if it develops that some of these feeder lines become inefficient or inadequate, and we are asked by our constituents to do something about it, we may be compelled to amend the existing laws to give the Board adequate power. I believe it is the intention of the committee and of the Congress that these companies who are given these franchises are expected to render an efficient and adequate service and to improve their facilities.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman has properly stated the opinion of the committee and the feeling of the committee toward that particular question. May I state to the gentleman I am sure the very question he has brought up, and I think it is an important one, will be subsequently considered by the committee when we go into a full study of civil aviation policy. I think it should be considered. I think the gentleman has rendered a service in plainly stating those doubts with reference to the authority of the Board to the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Texas has raised an excellent point which deserves full consideration by the committee and the Congress, and I am sure that this discussion of that point has clarified the record of this debate and will be of great value in terms of the interpretation of this law, which I am sure will be passed with unanimous approval. However, I did note that Mr. John Floberg, chairman of the conference of local airlines, seemed to address himself to this matter in part, at least, in a letter which he sent to the committee and which is incorporated in the record, and which I question whether many of us have seen.

I would like to read into the RECORD two short paragraphs which I think bear upon the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]:

> The argument was advanced at pages 62, 64, 66, and 68 of the printed record of last year's hearings and again in point 2 in Mr. Gurney's statement and frequently throughout the course of his questioning that one of the principal reasons for keeping certificates temporary was the desire of the Board to strengthen the routes of the local service carriers. Aside from the fact that section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act adequately answers this point, it may be further pointed out that the history of the Board's actions in this respect inspires little confidence. In the first place you can count on the fingers of one hand—with fingers to spare—the number of route improvements of the local carriers which have been the result of spontaneous inspiration on the part of the Board in the course of a certificate renewal. Nearly all the route improvements have been the result of either a route case as such (e. g. the Fayetteville case as pointed out by Mr. Harris) or have been the result of the proof of public convenience and necessity by the carrier and other interested parties in the course of a renewal proceeding. This proof of public convenience and necessity could have just as well been made in a separate case as in the renewal itself and at considerable economy to all concerned. In any event, the carriers have had to prove to the Board their right to any such route modification.
>
> The Board's argument is also effectively answered both by its recent decision in the North Central Airlines application for a temporary exemption permitting service between Chicago and Duluth-Superior via Milwaukee and Green Bay and also by its decision in the route 106 case in which the Board dismembered a route which the chairman's own statement on page 12 calls a "local service route," divided it between two trunklines, and thereby destroyed the opportunity of either of the two local carriers to strengthen its route with what could have been the strongest segment in its entire system.

I hope that may be helpful in terms of legislative history.

Again I want to make a statement of my own conviction, having some knowledge of one of the local carriers involved that has done an excellent job, the Civil Aeronautics Board having admitted that it should be just about ready to receive permanent certification. I do not believe this legislation would be on this floor today if the Civil Aeronautics Board had done its duty. I think they have been stubborn and unrealistic and have forced us to do something that possibly some of us might have some reservations about in terms of individual carriers. I think the net result is justice and equity in terms of all these local carriers which have done a magnificent job in building up their routes and serving our many communities well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to carry a little further the discussion presented by our esteemed colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES]. When we had former Senator Gurney, who was acting chairman of the Board at that time, before the committee, he expressed 4 reasons why a majority of the Board, 3 of them, took the position they did on this legislation. I would like to quote those reasons for you:

First. Permanent certification would lessen the incentive which these carriers now have to increase their revenues and hold down their costs;

Second. It would make more difficult the route systems of the several carriers;

Third. It would saddle the Government with an annual subsidy bill of over $20 million for the indefinite future; and

Fourth. The proportion of subsidy to total revenue is still too high, an average of 47 percent for all carriers, to warrant permanent certification of all carriers in the group.

Those are the four basic reasons given by the Board for their position, and in the discussions that followed the committee came to the conclusion that they were not as serious and they were not as justifiable as might seem on the surface.

The Board did not, except under questioning, have any feeling whatsoever about the problem which was brought to the committee here this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. The nearest to that issue was "that it would make more difficult the improvement of the route system of the several carriers." But in the development of this point the Board's idea was that the

burden would be on the Board to show the modification or alteration of the route was necessary. The burden as it now stands is on the airline which is operating on the particular route.

I do not have the same apprehension that has been expressed. I do understand that under the act it is entirely possible that the statement made by the gentleman would be true; because, in the first place, we must consider the entire section 401. Section 401 (d) provides for the issuance of the certificate, and "that the Board shall authorize a certificate authorizing the whole or any part of the transportation covered by the application if it finds that the applicant is fit, able, and willing to perform such transportation properly and to conform to the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations and requirements of the Board hereunder, and that such transportation is required by the public convenience and necessity."

Section 401 (f) then provides for the terms and conditions of the certificate. This is why I say it may be that what the gentleman has said could be true, but under the procedure of the Board it is very unlikely that any such situation could arise.

What does this provide?—

Each certificate issued under this section shall specify the terminal points and intermediate points, if any, between which the air carriers authorized to engage in air transportation, and the service to be rendered; and there shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by the certificate or amendment thereto such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as the public interest may require.

That is the certificate which is granted to the air carrier under which he must comply with all of its provisions, and so long as those reasonable terms and conditions are required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman may develop his point I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Then the application on the action referred to under section 401 (h) of course may be invoked by the Board. It may or may not be the intention of the local air carrier, but he knows what the terms and conditions are; they are included in his certificate, and if he is unable to comply, then, under the terms of section 401 (h) I think the Commission has the authority, as stated here, to make such alterations and modifications of any route as they may find after investigation, as the public interest may require.

Consequently, I do not share the feeling that it is going to be necessary that the committee take this matter up and report additional legislation. But I say generally to my colleague and other members of the committee that if there are conditions, or if there are certificates under which the Board did not make the proper requirements, reasonable requirements to which they must comply, when the certificate was issued, then it may be necessary for the committee to see whether or not they are in the best interests.

I do not know if there are any such existing certificates or not, certainly our attention has not been called to any of them, but what this legislation does is to provide an additional subsection to the paragraph which says that within 120 days from the date of this application if any applicant who has been operating under a certificate has proven himself as operating in the public interest and complying with the provisions and the terms of his certificate, then he may come in and under such application get a permanent certificate in order that he may proceed to develop the route and develop his own company in the interest of the public and certainly the area that he is to serve.

Just one other point which I think is highly important here and about which nothing has been said. I do not believe the hearings reveal any information on it. Presently there have been a number of these renewal certificates under consideration. Public hearings have been held in various places throughout the United States. There are some scheduled to be heard in the future. Some of these hearings have been concluded and the examiner has made his report as to renewal of the certificate for a given airline.

It might be important to note here that should this bill become law, I assume it would make those proceedings unnecessary any further. I assume, and it is important, in order to change or modify any existing route, the Board then, if this becomes law, would have to, under the application of section 401 (h), on its own initiative determine whether or not any particular intermediate point might be suspended from service. There are a lot of them involved right today, there are a lot of them hanging in suspense on a number of these local carrier routes, and I think it might be important here to say that the Congress is relieving that suspense of those particular communities today. Then they would have an opportunity to make response to any contention of the Board that that intermediate point is not being served in the public interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It has been pointed out that these local airlines and some of the communities that they serve have to go to a great deal of expense in going through the procedure of having these certificates renewed. It might also be pointed out that the Federal Government goes to a lot of administrative expense in considering these renewal certificates. I believe it was testified before our committee that on occasion it required some 18 months to 2 years for them to process certain of these applications and consider renewal certificates.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. And some of them have been undergoing consideration for a longer period of time than that. I just thought this was an important point to be made to emphasize the importance of this legislation and that it should be passed immediately.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not delay the committee but for just a few minutes. First I want to say that in looking over this list of names of cities to be served, I find some 40 cities that are to be served in my native home State of California, and I know how much these permanent certificates will amount to these small airlines that are rendering this service and how much it will stabilize their financial position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The cities that are listed are cities that are already being served, and I am sure that this list will even be increased.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know they are served.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I mean, after these permanent certificates are granted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize they are being served, but the granting of the certificates will stabilize that service and put them on a much sounder financial basis.

There are two other problems which I hope this committee will give attention to, which seem to me need attention, and I certainly do not profess to be an expert in this field. One is the amount of subsidy which is, in effect, being paid the major airlines in the field of airmail transportation. If I have been correctly informed, most of these large airlines are now receiving from 45 cents to possibly a little higher than that a pound for the transportation of airmail. I except, of course, some of these recent arrangements where, if space is available, nonairmail stamped envelopes are carried at a cheaper rate. However, I have also been informed that some of the freight lines have submitted bids to the Post Office Department offering to carry this mail at approximately 18 cents a pound.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I have been very much interested in the elimination of subsidies as far as it is possible to eliminate them for a number of years. I must say that I am surprised at the gentleman's statement, because it is my understanding that the major airlines, for the most part, are off subsidy today, and if they are carrying mail for 45 cents a ton-mile, it is only compensation for the carrier. The committee has given a lot of attention to the matter of subsidy. I think a great deal of improvement has been made, and I am sure a great deal more will be made under the Presidential order known as No. 10 of last year.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to have that information. I had been informed that that matter had been partly corrected, although, as I mentioned the fact, I knew that this Executive order had created a new service at a cheaper price.

There is another point that I would like to bring up, and that is the point of certificating transcontinental lines, competitive lines to those now in existence. If I have been correctly informed, since 1938 there have been no new transcontinental certificates granted; in fact, as I understand, by condensation there has been even a lesser number of operating airlines. I hope the committee will also give some attention to that, because in one case I know of a California company pioneered this air coach transportation which means a difference actually between here and Los Angeles of around $50 to $65 in price on a regular ticket of $165. There is some variance in the price of the nonscheduled lines, and even the scheduled lines have been forced, because of this competition, to give to the people this air coach service. I recently traveled to California on a DC–7, one of the latest and best type plans—I believe it was the American Airlines—for $115, where, if I had taken a regular flight on the same kind of plane, I would have paid $165. So, this air-coach transportation has brought air transportation to millions of people who could not afford the difference in price, and as far as I can see, it is also a great boon to the aircraft industry and the people as well. Certainly, competition in this field should not be curtailed nor should certificates be denied reputable and well-equipped firms to render this type of service. I know this is a complicated question, and I certainly do not have the answer for it, but I do hope that this committee in its future deliberations will give study to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 200, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the bill just passed; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ITALIAN IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTED BY LAW, IS BEING SUFFOCATED IN PRACTICE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our one-sided immigration laws, heavily weighted against southern Europeans, are responsible for much dissatisfaction within the United States, and are making us appear intolerant in the eyes of the world.

Under the guise of protecting the national security, they have become so narrow and harsh, both in theory and in application, they are playing right into the hands of the Communist propagandists.

And they are humiliating the very people who want to be our friends and allies.

Are these American principles and American practices?

Is this the way to win people to the cause of freedom?

No one disputes the need of reasonable security measures, but when the immigration laws are so slanted as to discriminate among peoples, the watching world may well question our code of justice and our security.

The quota system, conveniently pegged to immigration ratios that prevailed in the early part of this century, and in order to conform to certain prejudices, is an example of the favored nations treatment that exposes our immigration laws to the charge of hypocrisy.

Furthermore, they reflect the fears and hysteria of our times.

Violating the precept that no law should be retroactive, reaching back to plague and penalize a man for an offense that was committed before the law passed.

Let me cite an actual case.

A constituent of mine, who never became a citizen although he has lived most of his life in the United States, committed a crime over 40 years ago for which he served a term of imprisonment required by law. In the 37 or more years since, he has lived an exemplary life, working hard, raising a family, and investing several thousands of dollars from his modest earnings in United States war bonds.

Last year he made a pleasure trip to the old country, with a reentry permit issued by the United States Government in his pocket.

When he returned, he was detained by the immigration authorities in New York, and put on parole, pending the determination of exclusion proceedings.

All because of an offense that was committed and paid for long, long ago, and one that had no connection with communism or subversion.

Eventually, after much mental anguish prolonged by months of redtape, he was told that he would be allowed to return to his home in Massachusetts.

As he said to me: "I thought that by serving time for my offense, and having been on good behavior ever since, that I would never be placed in double jeopardy, but the immigration laws made me sweat it out for a while—all over again—37 years later."

This overstrict enforcement is putting fear into the hearts of many aliens who are beginning to wonder if the door that opens for them when they want to take a trip overseas will be shut in their faces when they come back.

The searching light of investigation should be turned not on innocent people but into the motives behind, and the operations of, the Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act.

When it comes to actual admissions, there is a strange flexibility in the figures.

One report states that out of 190,000 refugees authorized to enter the United States since the President signed the Refugee Relief Act over 18 months ago, less than 2,000 have been cleared for entrance. During the same period, more than 16,000 visas have been issued to relatives of American citizens.

On the other hand, the United States Embassy at Rome is quoted as having issued 16,394 visas under the refugee relief program, but only 289 of these went to persons who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

The program originally called for the issuance of about 60,000 visas in Italy.

It is rumored that the Italian Government has implored our State Department to relieve the inhuman existence these refugees must endure while they are waiting.

The mystery is compounded by the forced departure of the man who was appointed by the United States Government to speed up refugee admissions.

Italy, with whom we share a deep and abiding friendship, is the chief victim of our shortsighted immigration policy and its maladministration.

Suffering from the pressures of overpopulation, and beset by Communist infiltration which thrives on human misery, Italy looks to us for hope and mutual assistance only to be frustrated by a quota blockade that is deceitful, outmoded, and without mercy.

A foreign policy without compassion for liberty-loving people who desperately seek a haven here is stubbornly rejecting its greatest asset.

We realize of course, that we cannot accommodate all of the people who would like to live in the United States, for then we would be overwhelmed by a tidal wave of humanity seeking sanctuary in the new world.

This is no reason, however, for going to the other extreme by drawing the

immigration curtain tight with fear-ridden laws that ill-conceal their racial bias.

Revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 rates top priority.

Its ancient quotas and restrictions should be illustrated in a museum where naturalized Americans of the future may pause to wonder why some Americans of 1955 were so distrustful of freedom, and so afraid of themselves.

INDUSTRY: THE MOUNTAIN WEST'S MIRROR OF THE FUTURE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, future prosperity in the intermountain West is dependent not upon the enlargement of agricultural production but upon the development of industry.

This region—the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming and parts of New Mexico and Arizona—is essentially a water-short area.

Conversely, this region is unbelievably rich in other natural resources. Within it lie the largest coal deposits in the country, perhaps in the world. There are great reservoirs of oil and natural gas, mountains of oil shale, and deposits of uranium whose size has not yet been determined. There are large amounts of nonferrous metals, and there are gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, phosphate, gilsonite, limestone and many other minerals.

These are the measure of its future potential.[1]

The water resources of this area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture can be defined. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies can bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable. It can only be said that they would be of unlimited value.

An unbiased examination of the comparative benefits of agricultural and industrial expansion in the intermountain States leaves no question as to which course should be followed in the interests of both the local and national economy.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water.[2]

The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amounts to about $5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.[3]

Manufacturing produces about 50 times as many dollars of products with the same amount of water used by irrigation.

Furthermore, the consumptive use of water by irrigation is 5 or 10 times as great as for manufacturing.

Suppose, then, that water needs of western cities and industries should become more urgent. In such case, a great part of the crops now irrigated could be produced from lands in the East reclaimed by clearing and drainage in areas of adequate rainfall.[4]

What proponents of more and bigger reclamation projects do not admit is that by using the comparatively small water resources of the intermountain area for costly irrigation projects they are placing an impenetrable ceiling on the development of the area.

There cannot be both agricultural and industrial expansion to any great degree in this arid mountainous part of the United States.

The question to be answered is:

What do the people of the intermountain West want:

(a) A comparatively small and expensive agricultural expansion?

(b) A virtually unlimited industrial expansion?

An obvious disservice is being done the people of the intermountain States by the Reclamation Bureau, which advocates the unlimited use of available water for agricultural development. The Reclamation Bureau's plans do not take into consideration the possibilities of industrial expansion, yet it is upon industrial expansion that the hope of this region rests.

The fact that the Reclamation Bureau is not concerned with creating new industries may be understandable, but there is no justification for a branch of the Federal Government to promote a program within its own field to the detriment and possible destruction of better and more profitable programs in other fields.

If we are to be realistic as well as honest, we must face the fact that the Reclamation Bureau's program is selfish. It would, if followed, serve to perpetuate jobs with the Bureau and create a few new farms at enormous cost, while wiping out the chance to create large-scale employment in industrial developments.

The outstanding example of what the Reclamation Bureau proposes for the intermountain region is found in the plans of the proposed $1.6 billion upper Colorado River project. This project has the support of groups in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico whose philosophy is based upon getting all possible out of the Federal Treasury now without regard for cost, justification, or long-range benefits. It also has the support of the reclamation-at-any-price school, as well as the national and regional office holders considering political advantages.

The upper Colorado River project as approved recently by the Senate Interior Committee calls for the construction of six immense storage reservoirs. If these reservoirs were built, six great lakes would be created. The evaporation losses of these great lakes would be enormous, conservatively more than 1 million acre-feet of water a year from the Colorado River system.

That is valuable water lost forever. It is not water lost after being used. It is water lost through a wasteful and unnecessary program.

This is the reason. The great reservoirs in the upper Colorado River project are not storage lakes from which water would be drawn for beneficial consumptive use in irrigation. With a single exception, these immense artificial lakes, filling deep canyons for hundreds of miles, would be built to produce hydroelectric power.

The power produced would be sold at a high rate to pay for the participating irrigation projects of the upper Colorado scheme—more than 30 in all.

The Reclamation Bureau has told Congress that the proposed irrigation projects could not pay for themselves and must be subsidized by power revenues.[5] These revenues otherwise would be returned to the Treasury of the United States, thereby helping to decrease the national debt. But under the upper Colorado project proposal they would be spent to pay for totally impractical and infeasible irrigation projects.

As presently planned, the upper Colorado River project would mean a loss to the Nation's taxpayers of more than $4 billion.[6]

This great loss of valuable water and money need not occur. It could be avoided by the use of fossil fuels to produce electric power as required to meet the demands of this area. Steam plants could be built for a small part of the cost of the immense hydropower dams. In most cases, the steam plants could be built immediately upon, or adjacent to, adequate coal fields.

It is difficult to discover any justification for the building of new irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River. An analysis of the factors involved produces no convincing evidence in defense of the upper Colorado River project plan, unless it be political expediency.

Here are the factors:

First. The subsidy for the irrigation projects would amount to about $5,000 an acre.[7]

Second. With a full water supply the land would be worth $150 to $200 per acre.[8]

Third. More agricultural production, especially at this enormous expense, is not justified in the face of the immense food and fiber surpluses in this country

[1] David D. Moffatt, Jr., vice president, Utah Power & Light Co., Senate hearings on S. 500, March 1955.

[2] President's Materials Policy Commission, vol. 5, p. 85.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Hearings, S. 500, Senate Interior Committee, March 1955.

[6] Raymond Moley, What Price Irrigation? American Enterprise Association, Washington, D. C., 1955. Samuel B. Morris, general manager Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, hearings, S. 500, March 1955.

[7] Samuel B. Morris, hearings, H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer, Colorado River Board, hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, March 1955, Senate and House Interior Committees. Raymond Moley, supra. Oklahoma Expenditures Council, The Last Drop, March 1955.

[8] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra.

which the taxpayers have already subsidized at great cost.[9]

Fourth. The land to be irrigated lies at high altitudes with an extremely short growing season. Some of it has frost most of the year.[10]

Fifth. The farmers benefiting would be required to repay only a very small percent of the costs allocated to irrigation units of the project.[11]

There is little industry and manufacturing in the States in which the upper Colorado River project would be located. In Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico there are a total of approximately 115,000 persons engaged in manufacturing activities.[12] This amounts to about one twenty-eighth of the total population.

The political leaders of these States who are living only for the present recognize the significance of these figures. Translating them into terms of votes, they understand the value of proposals like the upper Colorado project. Such a project means enormous gifts of money and water; it means some brief boom times for a few towns; it means an influx of craftsmen and laborers; it means some more farms in the desert; it means a temporary era of wild spending; it means a successful raid on the Treasury of the United States.

Considering such a proposition in the light of cold analysis, it must be realized that the final results would be drastically different.

The enormous gifts of money and water would be made at the expense of the taxpayers of all States, and the generosity of these taxpayers is swiftly reaching a breaking point.

In the past, costly and infeasible reclamation projects got through Congress largely because the people of the East did not understand them, were unaware of their immense hidden costs, and did not take the trouble to investigate or study them. That situation no longer prevails, as reclamation-State Members of Congress are finding out.

No economy is improved by boom and bust. The boom that would ensue with the construction work of the proposed upper Colorado project would one day vanish into the clear mountain air. Only ruins built upon false standards would remain.

The craftsmen and laborers, the auxiliary itinerants, the peddlers, poets, and prostitutes, who would pour into the construction areas would suddenly fold their tents and fade away into another desert, leaving nothing good. They would not have been in one place long enough to vote.

The new farms would not be beneficial additions to the national economy. Most of what they would produce would be more surplus for the taxpayers to buy. There would be nobody to eat it. The farmers themselves would be living only at the mercy of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau would be, in turn, eating on the financial structure of the Nation. It would not be a pretty picture of rural prosperity and plentitude, for over it all would hang the depressing cloud of insecurity, and underneath it would be a crumbling foundation of false economy.

The temporary era of wild spending would bring just that and nothing more, except a lingering hangover during which the pain of foolish dreams would throb in the heads of the deluded people.

The raid on the Treasury would be both successful and real, and throughout the country the taxpayers would bend under an increased burden, paying tribute to a fiscal monster they had in their blindness permitted to grow, and paying penance for a crime they did not intend to commit.

The potential thermal power resources of the intermountain area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of such a land, the Bureau of Reclamation—and the States themselves—want to adopt a philosophy and a practice that would undermine their road ahead and cripple, perhaps forever, their opportunities to create an industrial economy that has no foreseeable limit.

The proponents of this misguided philosophy which is based solely on the utilization of water resources and ignores the greater potentialities of other resources, maintain that a point will be reached after which Federal assistance may be reduced. There is no indication now that such a thing will happen, unless it is forced by aroused taxpayers. Federal agencies have spent about $5 billion for interior water projects in the past, contemplate at least 10 times that amount for the future, with about one-half already definitely planned.[13]

For instance, a glance at some projects now before the Congress indicates the enormity of the Bureau of Reclamation's planned program. The proposed upper Colorado River project would cost about $1,600,000,000 to construct; the central Arizona project would cost more than $780 million; and the Missouri River project will cost between five and six billion dollars. In these three projects alone there is an estimated construction cost of at least $7.3 billion, about one and one-half times as much as has been spent on all interior Federal water development in the past century.

No longer is Federal participation only a stimulus for regional development; in many respects, it is also a gigantic relief program in which funds obtained from all citizens directly benefit only a few.[14]

On the very top of the largest coalfields in the world, variously estimated to contain between 400 and 800 billion tons, the advocates of water-power-development-at-any-cost want to build gigantic projects that inflict enormous new loads on the taxpayers of the Nation and rob the United States Treasury of immense amounts of income that by all sound fiscal standards is due it.

On this subject, the Engineers Joint Council states: [15]

> Every diversion of power revenues to amortize part of the cost of other works is in effect a subsidy. Waiver of interest on money expended in the construction of Federal irrigation projects is also a subsidy. It is inevitable that even greater subsidies to irrigation will be required in the future if agricultural production in the western half of the United States is to be increased materially.
>
> As each Federal subsidy must be offset by taxes levied on all the people of the United States, it follows that the benefits to be derived from subsidizing irrigation agriculture should be compared with the benefits which would accrue from the expenditure of like sums to increase agricultural production by any other means or at any other location in the United States.
>
> It is essential to the carrying out of a sound national water policy that each subsidy, regardless of the source of its payment, be recognized and authorized by Congress. "Hidden subsidies for the benefit of particular regions or class of beneficiaries cannot be in the best interest of the Nation." [16]

Steam plants to provide electrical energy in the intermountain States could be built by private capital, with no Federal tax money or subsidy involved. These would create new employment in the coal fields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the power available. A sound stone would be placed in the foundation of the area's economy by each plant and each new job. And the steam plants, the new industries, and those employed by them all would pay taxes to the local, State and Federal Governments.

But what would the irrigation units proposed as part of the upper Colorado River project, for instance, contribute to the local or national economy? To begin with they would have to be built at Federal expense and subsidized by the taxpayers of all States.

As an example, the comparatively small Seedskadee project in Wyoming may be cited. Here is the Bureau of Reclamation's own report on it:

Acres to be irrigated	60,720
Estimated construction cost	$23,272,000
Repayment by water users	4,785,000
Subsidized by power revenues from upper Colorado River project dams	18,487,000

The irrigated lands in this project would be utilized primarily for the support of livestock enterprises, particularly dairy cows and sheep—grasses for hay and pasture, small grain, alfalfa and some garden crops would be produced.

---

[9] Raymond Moley, supra. Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, How Can America Best Provide Food and Fiber For Its Future Population? Washington 1955. Leslie A. Miller, member Hoover Commission, hearings H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955. Evan T. Hewes, president Imperial Irrigation District, hearings S. 500, Senate Interior Committee, March 1955. Samuel B. Morris, supra.

[10] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra. Bureau of Reclamation reports, hearings S. 500, supra.

[11] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra. Bureau of Reclamation testimony, hearings S. 500, supra.

[12] Bureau of the Census, 1953 Annual Survey of Manufacturers, Washington, D. C.

[13] President's Materials Policy Commission, supra, p. 91.

[14] President's Materials Policy Commission, supra, p. 91.

[15] Principals of a Sound National Water Policy, July 1951.

[16] Quotes supplied.

The Bureau says that 9,030 acres would be suitable chiefly for pasture and that of the remaining 51,690 acres only a small proportion is first class land—most of it is third to fifth class land.[17]

The value of the irrigated land would be about $70 per acre.[18]

Increase in the national debt per acre—taxpayers' subsidy—would amount to approximately $2,200.

Total subsidy would be about $133,500,000.

The Seedskadee project is an average participating irrigation unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project. The subsidy for other units would run from a high of $4,700 per acre for the Central Utah project to $1,250 per acre for the LaBarge project.

Thus, it may be seen that the Reclamation Bureau is proposing to build the Seedskadee project, with a subsidy of $133,500,000 to produce more butter, milk, cheese, and garden truck a few months of the year on land that is largely third to fifth class in quality.

On some of the other participating irrigation projects the Bureau frankly admits that the water users can pay nothing, but get the entire project as a gift from the Federal taxpayers. On other units the beneficiaries would repay 1, 2, perhaps 3 percent. On a few they would repay 10 percent.

The Lyman project, with a subsidy of $58 million would be able to produce only hay and pasture because it lies at an altitude of 7,000 feet and suffers from untimely summer frosts.[19]

Pointing out that the intermountain area was extremely rich in fuels and minerals, Miller told Congress: [20]

> There are many, and I am one of the group, who believe the ultimate destiny of the region is involved in the development of those minerals. Haste in tying down the water to irrigation of marginal agricultural land could seriously impede industrial development which would depend upon the use of large amounts of water.
>
> It is interesting to consider the difference between industry and irrigation farming in the matter of capital requirements to provide a family with a living. * * * An average investment of $13,300 in an industrial manufacturing plant will provide 1 man with a job. * * * An experiment farm on one of the Missouri Basin irrigation units in Nebraska indicates that a capital investment by the Government and the farmer of $99,200 is required for 160 acres in that area to provide the farm family with a net income of $3,600 per annum.
>
> In the upper Colorado area the required farm investment would average more than double that figure.
>
> Thus, if Federal subsidy is required for the development of the Colorado River Basin, it would appear to be much wiser to consider all types of resource development, and not put all of our money on marginal agriculture.[21]

The United States Geological Survey estimates that coal reserves in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah amount to 374,641,000,000 tons.[22]

This is a conservative estimate of identifiable reserves. Actual reserves are probably much greater. For instance, with regard to Colorado, the Survey states: [23]

> No estimates were made for parts of the State where coal is perhaps present, but specific information was lacking. As more mapping and exploratory drilling is carried on in the coal-bearing areas of Colorado, the estimate of reserves should be substantially increased.

The spread of the coalfields in these States is tremendous. Coal lies beneath 25,400 square miles of Colorado, or 24 percent of the State's area. New Mexico has coal beneath 14,650 square miles, or 12 percent of its area. In Utah there is coal beneath 15,000 square miles, or 18 percent of the State. In Wyoming there is coal under 40,055 square miles, or 41 percent of the State's area.[24]

Another indication as to how conservative is the report of the Geological Survey is found in this statement: [25]

> Of the 25,400 square miles of coal-bearing land believed to be present in the State (Colorado), only 5,277 square miles, or 20 percent, was included in the estimate. Although the coal probably almost completely underlies several large basin areas, such as the Denver Basin and the Uinta Basin, the data used to compile the estimates were restricted for the most part to areas within 6 miles or less of the coal outcrops.

At recent hearings before the Senate and House on the proposed upper Colorado River project several witnesses testified to the advantages of supplying needed power in the area with coal steam power instead of waterpower.

Conservationist David R. Brower addressed himself in this regard to Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, two storage units of the proposed project. He said: [26]

> It seems well worth considering, for example, what would happen if power from coal were substituted for Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams' hydropower in the course of the Bureau's proposed payout period. There would be a saving of $147 million over the 44 years, and a market would have been provided for some 35 million tons of upper-basin coal, which could conceivably be pumped to the powerplants through a pipeline.
>
> There might be similar savings in substituting coal and coal mining elsewhere in the Bureau's project. This could be a boon to upper-basin mining economy 2 years from now, not 20 years or so.

Brower further stated: [27]

> Senator MILLIKIN. Make it clear to me how burning coal for power will provide any revenue for building participating areas.
>
> Mr. BROWER. What it provides is a differential in the resource of the basin as a whole. You would be using coal, yes, instead of falling water. The coal is there in predictable amounts. It employs people in obtaining it and in transporting it. Even allowing for that in the course of the 44 years of the proposed payout for Echo Park, you would be $149 million better off in the total economy."

Brower also testified: [28]

> Steam plants take far less time to build, are not involved in the controversy as to whether the dams could provide power in dry years. Furthermore, they could help the unemployed upper basin coal miners.
>
> Estimates on steam-plant costs are more reliable than dam-cost estimates and the waterpower may actually cost more than estimated.
>
> It appears that Federal hydropower from Echo and Split Mountain Dams would cost both the taxpayers and the power users substantially more than Federal steam power. Private utility steam power would cost the power users a little more than the proposed hydropower, but would cost the taxpayers a great deal less.
>
> The 1.4 mill difference between a 7.4 mill private-utility price and a 6-mill kilowatt-hour Federal hydroplant price would cost the power users an extra $2,320,000 per year, which is hardly enough to cause the users financial distress and is less than private steam plants would pay in income and property taxes. In order to save the upper basin power users this small extra power bill the United States taxpayers as a whole are being asked to provide the following subsidies:
>
> 1. Pay $2,565,000 per year of additional income and property taxes otherwise paid by the steam-plant utility companies.
>
> 2. Sacrifice one of the most scenic canyon parks in the world to become just another reservoir.
>
> 3. Increase the national debt unnecessarily by $282 million minus the cost of the same water storage at other sites.
>
> 4. Run the risk of an enormous investment which FPC data indicate may not have enough water to run the turbines.
>
> 5. Wait for a 6-year, or longer, construction job when steam plants can be built in less than half the time, and as needed, instead of being based on uncertain long-range predictions.
>
> 6. Run the risk that the dams may cost far more than estimated. It was stated in the recent upper basin hearings in the House that the Bureau's past project costs have averaged twice their original estimates. If the cost went up only 30 percent the Bureau's power price would have to go to about 8 mills, or the public would have to increase the subsidy another $80 million.
>
> 7. The Bureau's proposed 6-mill price is 0.2 mill below their admitted cost, or about $330,000 per year loss. They plan to offset this with cheaper Glen Canyon Dam power, but it is still an admitted loss for the Split Mountain increment of power generation.
>
> 8. Potential relief for unemployed upper basin coal miners is ignored.
>
> Mr. BROWER. This is the table which shows the total saving in 44 years:

(1) Echo Park, Split Mountain hydro, per kilowatt-hour at market (mills)	6.2
(2) Equivalent, steam-generated (mills)	4.9
(3) Saving, with steam alternative, per kilowatt-hour (mills)	1.3
(4) Echo-Split annual generation, billion kilowatt-hours (mills)	1.66
(5) Annual savings in operating and investment costs, steam over hydro	$2,158,000
(6) For 44 years, rounded	95,000,000

[17] Leslie A. Miller, chairman Hoover Task Force on Reclamation, hearings H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955.

[18] Highest value of general farm land as shown in USBR reports.

[19] Bureau of Reclamation Report.

[20] Leslie A. Miller, supra, March 1955.

[21] Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming.

[22] Circular 293, Coal Resources of United States, October 1953.

[23] Ibid., p. 19.

[24] Ibid, p. 14.

[25] Ibid, p. 19.

[26] Hearings, Senate Interior Committee, S. 500, March 1955, p. 653.

[27] Ibid, p. 654.

[28] Ibid, p. 656.

(7) Interest subsidy saved taxpayers by earlier retirement of irrigation allocation to participating projects, at 2½ percent	$52,000,000
(8) Total savings, 44 years	147,000,000

Former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, spoke to the Wyoming State Legislature in March 1955 on the subject of the proposed upper Colorado River project, and used Echo Park Dam, a key unit of that project, to illustrate the disparity between costs of steam and hydro power.

Pointing out that the plan for the dam called for the production of 200,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power, Miller said:

This dam is estimated to cost $176,426,000. As it is strictly a power producer, the said cost would be at the rate of $883 per kilowatt.

At Denver, Colo., there is a steam-electric plant at present being enlarged to a capacity of 232,000 kilowatts and the cost is $168 per kilowatt. At Salt Lake City, Utah, there is also a steam-electric plant under enlargement to a total capacity of 241,000 kilowatts at a cost of $166 per kilowatt. By which you will see that to secure hydroelectric power from Echo Park would involve the payment of over $700 per kilowatt more than is necessary.

In the general area of Echo Park, there are hundreds of millions of tons of coal which could readily be mined for around 75 cents per ton by stripping methods and under $3 per ton by underground mining. It is a proven fact that a steam plant located at or near the source of fuel, thus avoiding high transportation costs, and equipped with modern high pressure generating machinery can manufacture energy at very close to the cost of hydroelectric power. In this particular case, you will recognize that the use of coal would provide considerable employment in an industry which is woefully depressed.

* * * * *

Under current procedures, the sale rate on power at a Federal dam must include 3-percent interest on the construction cost. The interest on Echo Park would be then $5,295,000 annually. The interest on the $35 million it would cost to build a steam plant would be $1,050,000 per annum, a difference over 50 years of $212,250,000. A 200,000-kilowatt steam plant would consume 500,000 tons of coal per year—if it cost $2 per ton to mine, average, that would be $50 million over 50 years. Add that cost to the interest, if you wish, and you still have a figure of $110 million in favor of the steam plant.

Testifying on the upper Colorado River project, Samuel B. Morris stated: [29]

It appears most unfortunate that the Congress should be asked to approve a billion and a half dollar project involving hidden costs to the taxpayer of the order of $4 billion, through accumulated interest costs under the Collbran formula. This at a time when Congress is awaiting the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which it, itself, created, and the report of the Cabinet Water Policy Committee named by the President. Both of these are expected to make specific recommendations regarding methods of determining feasibility, financing, and repayment of Federal water projects.

* * * * *

As one directing the management of a large city-owned public power enterprise serving more than 2 million people I cannot refrain from recording my objection to the setting up of these large water storage-power projects on the main stems of the Colorado River, not for the purpose of furnishing power at low rates but for the primary purpose of serving as cash registers for the collection of excessive rates for a hidden subsidy for the so-called participating projects. This is an assortment of irrigation projects in which the irrigators are able to repay little more than 10 percent of their cost in 50 years, without interest.

Morris pointed out to the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation proposed to charge an artificially high rate of 6 mills to consumers for power from the upper Colorado River project, and to continue this charge for decades after the power investment had been returned with interest in order that a subsidy may be provided for at least 100 years to pay for irrigation projects which otherwise could not be built.

He asked the question: Why should power users be called upon to pay this high rate for a century in an area that is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world?

Said Morris:

Steam-produced power is being furnished to the Atomic Energy Commission at around four mills. Why should the people in the Mountain States sitting on this enormous potential energy be called upon to pay a 50 percent higher rate for the next 100 years?

In no other section of the United States as in the intermountain area are fuel reserves so large and developments so small.

Obviously the time will come when these fuel reserves must be tapped. When that time arrives, the location of the reserves will be of secondary consideration. Now we look upon them as far removed from the centers of population and industry, but when they are needed, geography will be merely a problem in logistics. It will be swiftly and efficiently solved.

The intermountain States would do well to consider this problem now. When the resources they possess are needed by other sections of the country, then those resources will be transported to the points where they will be consumed. In a very large measure, that need not happen. The intermountain States could very well launch a program of using their full resources at home, and transporting manufactured products to points of consumption.

In such a program lies the hope of these States for an expanding and profitable economy.

[29] Hearings, Senate Interior Committee, S. 500, March 1955. Morris is a former president of American Society of Civil Engineers, former dean of engineering at Stanford University, member of President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and at present general manager and chief engineer of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Congress received from the President a message urging an increased tempo to speed completion of the Inter-American Highway. Last week's request for supplemental appropriations included an item to put this program into effect. I wish to endorse the President's action wholeheartedly. I think it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this highway, extending, as it does, from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal Zone, linking the nations of Central America.

Last November and December Mrs. Bow and I traveled portions of the Inter-American Highway during our visit to Central America. We visited the Republics of Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador. In each of these countries we had an opportunity to see the highway firsthand and to discuss with the people of the countries and with United States officials and businessmen in the area what the completion of the highway would mean to them. Everywhere the answer was the same—completion of the highway would open new vistas for political cooperation and economic progress.

For almost 20 years Congress has appropriated funds for this highway. However, the rate of appropriation has meant that the benefits to both the United States and our good partners in Central America have not been fully realized. Under present authorizations many more years will go by before the highway becomes an effective reality. Economic, political, strategic considerations affecting both the United States and Central America tell us plainly that we cannot and should not afford to waste those years. Instead, we should, this session of Congress, take the action which the President has requested and which will mean that within 3 years an all-weather highway will extend, without interruption, from our southern border to the Panama Canal Zone.

I do not have to remind the Members of this Congress of the inroads which international communism was able to make in Central America recently. A good deal of their success resulted from the fact that although the countries of the area are contiguous, they lack easy, inexpensive land communication which would have afforded the people of each of the countries an opportunity to discuss their mutual problems. The highway, whose completion the President is strongly urging, will draw together the peoples of Central America. Through personal contact they will be able to spot more quickly subversive activities taking place. They will also be able to act in concert to defeat that force of evil which is international communism.

In addition to the political benefits which will accrue, the highway also will play an important part in the economic development of the countries of Central America. Increased trade, increased tourism, increased exchange of information—all these will come from the establishment of inexpensive, land transportation facilities. This economic development will contribute to the social betterment of the people of the area and lead to a higher standard of living.

One other factor which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress is the fact that we are not building this highway alone. Thus far, about $90 million has been committed to the construction of the Inter-American Highway. Of this total, $40 million, or almost 50 percent, has been made available by the countries through which the highway will pass. In this connection it is well to recall that the 1,618 miles of highway which extend from our border to the southern border of Mexico have been completed and fully paid for by the Mexican Government alone.

The amount of funds which the President's letter indicates will be necessary to complete this highway in the next 3 years is small in relation to the large sums with which this Congress frequently deals. But the benefits, both to us and to our good partners in Central America, are indeed large. And accordingly I urge that we delay no longer; that we act promptly to permit rapid completion of an all-weather highway which will connect the republics of Central America and our country.

PROPOSED AWARD TO DR. SALK

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the most exciting event of the week—in years, in fact—is the announcement that the polio vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk will be 90 percent effective in protecting against infantile paralysis. This must surely go down in history as ranking with the discoveries of Pasteur, Koch, Lister, Walter Reed, and Curie. The achievement of Dr. Salk is being applauded increasingly every day by prominent people all over the world and millions of parents will be forever grateful to the good doctor for the safety of their children.

President Eisenhower has announced his intention of recommending Dr. Jonas Salk as the first recipient of a proposed new honor to be the highest this country can confer for civilian achievement. The President in his state of the Union message recommended the establishment of such a new system of honoring those who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country. He said:

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

On March 1 I introduced a bill carrying out the President's recommendations, and on March 17 I revised it somewhat to include, as well, major recommendations made by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in a brilliant speech on foreign policy before the National Press Club in Washington on February 28.

Concern is being increasingly expressed these days regarding the role that the Federal Government is playing, or should play, in the Nation's cultural affairs. At the same time there is a growing restiveness being displayed over the cultural status of the Nation's Capital. The question is being asked: Is Washington a hick town or a world capital? An article in the New York Times magazine of April 17, 1955, is a case in point. This article is by Richard H. Rovere, who regularly writes the Letter From Washington for the New Yorker magazine. The title of his article is: "Hick Town or World Capital?—Washington, for This Observer, Is a Mixture of Both, a Global Center, Yet Parochial."

One may wonder, and many people do, Mr. Rovere declares, if much has not been lost as a result of having the Capital of the United States in a community that is exclusively political, or bureaucratic, and therefore by definition, parochial.

> Washington's parochialism bothers some visitors, but it does not upset them half as much as it does the more or less permanent residents. They criticize the city endlessly. It is dull, they say. It lacks culture. It is metropolitan without being cosmopolitan. It is a world capital with very little of the world in it. Anyone will tell you that it is a small town at heart (but don't they say that about every city?) and some describe it as a hick town—

Mr. Rovere says.

The President's recommendations to the Congress in his message on the state of the Union, if implemented, will be a long step forward in giving the Nation's Capital and the Federal Government its proper role in cultural affairs, and it was with this in mind that I introduced my bill, H. R. 5040.

Mr. Rovere goes on to say that—

> Washingtonians grouse about not having enough theater, no opera, no ballet, too little music, too little conversation of an elevating sort. Not much philosophy, they say, is talked there, not much poetry is written or read, there are several museums but hardly any painters of the first order. There are a couple of large universities, but they are not Ivy League or Columbia or Chicago or Berkeley. You don't get in Washington much of the stimulation that a leavening of academics can bring to a city.
>
> The discontent seems endless. Washington people are always running down their own restaurants, grousing about their shops, expatiating on the poor quality of local architecture. Those who acknowledge culture to be more than theater, music, academies, eating places, and the rest even go so far, at times, as to complain about the lack of industry. The point seems to be that industry is an essential element of modernity and an assurance of human diversity.

Mr. Rovere is an accurate observer as well as being a fine reporter and he is right about the main source of the criticism. We find that long-time resident of Washington, W. M. Kiplinger, reporting in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, for instance:

> Despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington, there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the Nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington, but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on.

Who is to blame, where does the fault lie, for the present cultural status of the Nation's Capital which is providing such a propaganda bonanza for the U. S. S. R. and the Communist Parties of the world who charge us in their richly financed cultural offensives with being "gumchewing, materialistic barbarians"? Brooks Atkinson, drama critic of the New York Times thinks he has found the villain in the piece. It is the various arms of the Federal Government that are to blame, he declares. He recently wrote:

> The most essential thing that art needs is freedom. Without freedom it is like the art of Soviet Russia or that of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. It is dead at the core. In the last 10 years the assaults on freedom by various arms of the Government and the public acceptance of this disastrous program have convinced me that in America we cannot expect the Government to leave art unregulated if it pays any of the bills.

I pointed out to Mr. Atkinson that his concern is shared at the highest levels of the Federal Government. Not only have leaders in the House and Senate expressed their concern but President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren have spoken out. The President, for instance, recently sent a message to the Museum of Modern Art on its 25th anniversary saying that—

> There is an important principle which we should ever keep in mind—the principle that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land.

Others have been specific in assessing the responsibility for the situation in Washington. In an article which appeared in the April issue of the Art News magazine, Charlotte Devree wrote in part as follows:

> Between sculptors (mostly members of the tightly governed and mainly academic group of sculptors who have formed the National Sculpture Society) who regularly get Government commissions, and sculptors who do not, there is a complex mechanism of suave Washington officialdom, with the Commission of Fine Arts its central cog. This is the machinery by which so many monumental sculptural errors are achieved; agencies that choose the architects, who usually serve the Neo-Classic tradition and who chose the sculptors, submit all plans to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval. In effect the Commission has life-or-death jurisdiction over the design of all Federal buildings and their decoration in this country, except those of the Treasury and the armed services; over all monuments in Washington parks and all local Government buildings in Washington;

over private buildings on conspicuous Washington streets; over acceptance of works of art offered as gifts to the Government; over Federal battle monuments, and over anything erected in Georgetown (a section of the Nation's Capital). Though the Capitol architect is technically a free man, he frequently seeks Commission guidance. Since its establishment by Congress in 1910, the Commission has passed upon more than a thousand items, from the Lincoln Memorial to the installation of a market at a Spanish-American War Memorial in Tampa.

The 83d Congress held hearings on some 14 bills which proposed to advance the cultural status of the Federal City and give increased encouragement and recognition to the arts by the Federal Government. So far in the present Congress some 40 related or similar bills have been introduced and hearings have been held on some of them. Among other things, some of these bills would provide for the establishment of a civic and cultural center in Washington. Even on this there is not complete agreement. We find the music critic of the Washington Evening and Sunday Star, Day Thorpe, writing in that paper on March 13, in part, as follows:

In a city like Washington an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center would raise the level of culture no more than a gallon jug would raise the level of the Potomac in flood.

One can only say that the issue of Government and art and the cultural status of the Nation's Capital seems to be provoking a nice clean fight with no holds barred. As the Washington Post and Times Herald comments editorially, "it is both interesting and refreshing to find that so much passion and pother can be aroused over some other subject than war or politics."

The New York Times article by Richard H. Rovere follows:

HICK TOWN OR WORLD CAPITAL?—WASHINGTON, FOR THIS OBSERVER, IS A MIXTURE OF BOTH, A GLOBAL CENTER, YET PAROCHIAL

(By Richard H. Rovere)

Washington as a site on the big, slow bend of the Potomac is more or less an accident. It could have been anywhere, and it very nearly was up on the Delaware River. But Washington as the Federal city was no accident. The founders had that in mind and provided for it in the Constitution—article I, section 8, paragraph 17: a "seat of government" with "needful buildings."

It cannot be said to have turned out badly. It is a handsome city, clean, relatively quiet, with a good deal of dignity, occasional beauty, some but not very much downright ugliness. No one with eyes and ears can visit the Capital of the United States and be unaware of the fact that affairs of state are happening all about. In Paris and London and most other capitals, it is very easy to be thus unaware, and if the Capital were moved to New York, it could be lost in the city, or nearly lost. If it is a good thing to know when you are at the seat of government, Washington is a good idea. Moreover, in periods when State and regional feelings have run high and hot, it has doubtless been advantageous to have the machinery of politics on the neutral ground of the District of Columbia.

Still, one may wonder, and many people do, if much has perhaps been lost as a result of having the Capital of the United States in a community that is exclusively political, or bureaucratic, and therefore by definition, parochial. Washington's parochialism bothers some visitors, but it does not upset them half as much as it does the more or less permanent residents. They criticize the city endlessly. It is dull, they say, it lacks culture. It is metropolitan without being cosmopolitan, it is a world capital with very little of the world in it. Anyone will tell you that it is a small town at heart (but don't they say that about every city?), and some describe it as a hick town.

People grouse about not having enough theater, no opera, no ballet, too little music, too little conversation of an elevating sort. Not much philosophy, they say, is talked there, not much poetry is written or read, there are several museums but hardly any painters of the first order. There are a couple of large universities, but they are not Ivy League or Columbia or Chicago or Berkeley. You don't get in Washington much of the stimulation that a leavening of academics can bring to a city.

The discontent seems endless. Washington people are always running down their own restaurants, grousing about their shops, expatiating on the poor quality of local architecture. Those who acknowledge culture to be more than theater, music, academies, eating places, and the rest even go so far, at times, as to complain about the lack of industry. The point seems to be that industry is an essential element of modernity and an assurance of human diversity. There are some people, one gathers, who would gladly put up with a bit of smog or smaze in order to have the feeling of being truly urban.

In many of the complaints there is something manifestly unfair. Granted that Washington is a one-industry town, that it is specialized to a high degree; but the United States is made up very largely of cities with specialties, cities in which one industry is dominant and sometimes dominating. And though some of them have smog or smaze or something disagreeable in the air, most of them are a good deal less cosmopolitan than Washington.

Vide Detroit, which is a much larger city and equally specialized. Vide Pittsburgh, a bit smaller than Washington but the center of what we nowadays call a "metropolitan area" that is quite a bit larger than Washington's. It could not, I think, be seriously argued that Washington is more parochial than either of these. Of course it can—and must—be argued that neither Detroit nor Pittsburgh represents us before the world, and that this is crucial.

Yet we are faced with the fact that Washington was planned this way. It was intended from the start to be a special kind of community, and it is possible to view it from one perspective and remark on how well it compares with cities that do not have its special problems and handicaps. As a city and as a metropolitan area, Washington is in a class with St. Louis, Cleveland, nearby Baltimore, the Twin Cities, Buffalo, and Cincinnati. Most of these are in some ways better rounded cities than Washington, and some are highly civilized communities.

But I rather think that Washington is at least as much an ornament of our civilization as any of them. How much theater is there in Buffalo? How many poets in Cincinnati? How much philosophy in Cleveland? How many good restaurants in St. Louis? (Quite a few, it may be said, but then it is chiefly the natives who complain of the lack of them in Washington. Visitors manage to find several excellent eating places.)

Measuring culture by the simplest, most obvious standards, Washington, it seems to me, compares very well indeed with many American cities that are its size or larger. I would say that only New York, Boston, and Chicago could support claims for any kind of superiority. Washington has three of the country's finest art museums. Its two legitimate theaters are not always open, but they provide the area with a richer fare than can be found in most comparable areas. Washington has several motion-picture theaters that specialize in films of high quality and, unless I am greatly mistaken, does much better in relative terms than New York does in this field. The National Symphony, under Howard Mitchell, is acknowledged by critics as a distinguished orchestra.

Of the three newspapers in Washington, one, the Evening Star, is principally a community journal, and it fulfills its chosen function with uncommon industry and integrity. Another, the Post and Times Herald, has as fine an editorial page as there is in this country, and that page is graced by a cartoonist, Herbert Block, who is perhaps the most widely admired member of his profession at the present time. The third paper, the Daily News, is part of a chain, but it publishes one local feature, a column by Tom Donnelly, who seems to many critical readers to be as wise and witty and literate an observer of life as any American newspaper can boast.

The broad trend of events has, in recent years, encouraged a considerable growth of culture and urbanity in Washington. There may be a powerful political, economic, and moral case against the Government's invasion of so many fields in which Government once had no part, but one byproduct of this historic development has been a broadening of outlooks in the Federal city.

There was a day when it seemed as if everyone in Washington were a Congressman, a cavalry captain, or some kind of glorified lettercarrier. But no longer. The Government now retains some of the best scientific and engineering brains we have; it sponsors scholarly undertakings of a staggering magnitude; it hires economists the way General Motors hires arc welders; it harbors hundreds of historians and social scientists of every known variety.

Indeed, it is probably safe to assert that there is no socially approved skill or profession which the Government does not have use for. And very often it commands the finest talent in the field. The Policy Planning Staff of the State Department, for example, is generally staffed by experts of a caliber unparalleled anywhere else in the country.

And yet, when one has said everything one can in Washington's behalf, the fact remains that there is an altogether pervasive parochialism about the place. It has a diversity of human types; it has its share and perhaps more than its share of cultural installations; it has become, in recent years, the crossroads of the world. It remains a community dominated by a single concern and governed by a passion for conformity that far antedates this decade—though this decade has seen the passion mount.

It is a world capital and the center of a global operation vaster and more complicated than any the globe has ever known, but only a surface aspect of its life is affected by all of this. New rites and ceremonies have been introduced, but they celebrate no fundamental myths of the community. The kings and emperors, shahs and rajahs, the prime ministers and commissars pass through, but they and all their underlings (there are foreign embassies with as many employees in Washington as the whole Federal Government had in its early days) do not impinge much on the life of the city. The presence of foreigners is most deeply felt when the foreigners have succumbed to the prevailing atmosphere and become, as it were, Washingtonians themselves.

Washington is obsessed with itself, a fact that perhaps measures the fascination of the place. Whatever it may measure, there it is, and there for some time it has been.

Henry James compared Washington with another capital he knew, London, and found a contrast. London, he said, was forever trying to escape herself. The object of all civilized conversation there was to transport the participants from the city. London, according to James, conducted "conversation in an effort * * * to get away from herself. * * * Washington talks about herself and about almost nothing else."

The impeachment is still valid, and the contrast with New York is as sharp as that with London. The virtue of New York, London, or any other truly cosmopolitan city is that in them one gets tidings not only from far-away parts of the earth but from far-away parts of the human mind and spirit. In the great cosmopolitan centers, conversation—the image of the mind, as the Romans said, and the surest register of social character—is wide ranging and various.

Mere shop talk, while of course it is heard, is not encouraged or admired for its own sake. Men and women are judged to be at the top of their form when they are able to move furthest from their day-to-day concerns—furthest either in terms of the distance away or of the penetration beneath.

In Washington, on the other hand, shop talk is everything. It is the stuff of life in office hours, in off hours, in the day, in the evening, on Sundays and holidays. And what is lamentable about this, what is the surest indication of the city's essential parochialism is that the shop talk is of the very narrowest sort.

Politics, broadly construed, can take in a vast amount of territory. Whatever bears on the good of man, according to Aristotle, bears on politics. But Washington is absorbed by politics in its littlest sense.

It cares a great deal about tactics, but is normally indifferent to strategy. It is fascinated by the events of yesterday and today, and breathless about tomorrow's probable doings; it may occupy itself with history to the extent of looking backward as far as the last election, but that is about as far as it cares to go. There are probably about a half dozen cities in the country where the talk of politics is more interesting and more rewarding than what one customarily hears in Washington.

New York, certainly, is one of them. New Yorkers are as stimulated by talk about political ideas as Washington is by political gossip, and the consequence is that New York, generally speaking, is really a more politically sophisticated city than Washington has ever been. The level of political discussion in a Columbia or City College classroom is far higher than anything one is likely to hear at most gatherings of elders in Washington.

A New York hostess could assemble a group of political thinkers and talkers that ought to make Washington hostesses turn green with envy. It would not, though, make the Washington ladies covetous, for what Washigton prizes is the man with today's inside information, however trivial, the guest with the hot poop from the White House, the Hill, the State Department, the Pentagon or Embassy Row.

There are other indexes. Books that treat seriously of politics enjoy far less of a sale, relative to population, in Washington than in many other cities. The best of our political journals are less widely read there than elsewhere. And Washington is not itself the birthplace of political ideas. Those that are translated into political acts are mostly imports.

Does all of this really matter? There are those who maintain that it most certainly does. They complain that our standing in the world is hurt when visitors discover the meagerness of Washington life. They complain that our politics is dehumanized by the cultural poverty of life in Washington and by the lack there of the cross-fertilization that occurs in truly cosmopolitan centers. Their sense of symmetry is offended by the fact that the scene of political action is not also the scene of political cerebration.

Undoubtedly there is merit in some of these contentions. It would seem, however, a meaningless kind of merit, since the separation of functions is here to stay, ordered not only by the Constitution but by irreversible later developments. Nothing much can be done about Washington, and in the circumstances it may be well to consider the advantages.

One that cannot escape the visitor is the real spirit of comity that prevails. There is a singular lack of bitterness in the Federal city. Forced into physical and social proximity, men of varying loyalties and persuations have no choice but to seek out each other's company. Party and faction play a large part in Washington life, but there is notably less political bitterness there than out in the provinces.

It might very well be otherwise if the capital were in a city in which the politicians could bivouac with battalions from the partisan armies, as they could, say, in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles. And it is conceivable, too, that were they to assemble in a city whose life had other facets, they would, all or most of them, be affected by the special character of the community. At the very least, they would be accused of this.

New York has a political character which is anathema to Chicago; Chicago, rightly or wrongly, is regarded by New York as a place where ridiculous and dangerous political ideas circulate. If one of these were the capital, the cry of contamination would be heard in many parts of the land. It is heard now about Washington itself; there are many who think it too easternized, too Europe-minded.

But the fact is that Washington appears to most level-headed observers to be about as representative a city as the mind of man could conceive. In this there are clear advantages. Whether or not they outweigh the disadvantages is surely a matter of opinion, but it is a matter of record that it is the capital of a nation that has held on to democracy longer than any other.

AMENDMENT TO COOPERATIVE HOUSING ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on cooperative housing.

April 20 marks the fifth anniversary of the creation of the section 213 cooperative housing program of the Federal Housing Administration. The legislation establishing such a program was part of the Housing Act of 1950 signed by President Truman on April 20, 1950.

In the 5 years since its creation, the cooperative housing program in FHA has provided homes at lower cost and carrying charges for 32,666 families in 292 cooperatives in both city and small town areas in many States throughout the country.

A report from the FHA showing the status of the cooperative housing program, as of March 31, indicates that there are commitments outstanding for 15 additional cooperatives which will provide housing for 1,255 additional families. There are applications in process, or eligibility statements outstanding for 147 more cooperatives which should bring fine low-cost housing to 17,900 families. Altogether, in these 5 years, the section 213 cooperative housing program in FHA has brought to completion, or has in process, nearly 500 projects providing over 50,000 homes or apartments with an estimated value in excess of $500 million.

This achievement is indeed commendable. There is, however, a serious situation affecting the cooperative housing program at the moment. One change made in the law last year has brought the program to almost a complete standstill. There are several other deficiencies in the act which have shown up in the 5 years of experience which call for perfecting amendments. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill containing a series of amendments aimed at strengthening the cooperative housing program.

Most important of these amendments would restore the earlier provisions which allowed mortgages for cooperative housing projects to be based on replacement cost rather than estimate of value. Frankly, the Congress was stampeded last year when hearings were under way on windfalls and prospective windfalls in the FHA program. The cooperative housing section, which had had no breath of scandal, and which was operated with greater safeguards than any other FHA program, was blanketed into a change which was unnecessary and has now proved to be very unwise.

Cooperative housing is of particular importance because it encourages home ownership in multifamily structures, as opposed to speculative investment in and operation of multifamily rental housing projects. When a group of families get together to build their own homes under the cooperative program, their chief concern is the long-range livability of the dwelling. They have less concern for dollar return on their investment, since the members of cooperatives build these projects to live in themselves. In a rental project the owner can make more money out of small efficiency apartments than he can out of a 3-, 4-, or 5-bedroom apartment or home. To the cooperative member, however, that investment possibly is not important. The member wants a large enough apartment or home to take care of a good size family, and to give his children the space and living room they so richly deserve. Statistics available from the FHA show that cooperatives 213 section dwelling units are uniformly larger in size, with a larger number of bedrooms, and result in greater livability than in the multifamily rental projects.

Since, however, the FHA has determined that all multifamily projects, including cooperatives, must be valued from the strict monetary investment return standpoint, the change from replacement cost to value in calculating the FHA mortgages available for cooperative projects has cut down the amount of available cooperative housing mortgages so sharply that the new projects coming to the FHA require much greater downpayments than the Congress intended in the program. When the law was enacted, it was expected that cooperative members would make approximately 5 percent, and not more than 10 percent downpayments as equity in the projects. The change in method of calculating mortgages has made it necessary for cooperative members to put up 20, 30, and in some cases as high as 35

percent of the cost of the project. As a result, the number of applications for cooperative projects has stopped almost entirely.

The other proposed amendments would strengthen the cooperative-housing program and give it the status which these 5 years of experience indicate is warranted.

First. The restoration of the post of assistant commissioner for cooperative housing, which was cut out by the Appropriations Committee 2 years ago. An effective, hard-hitting program calls for a status within the FHA which would give adequate prestige staff and direct responsibility to the proposed assistant commissioner, which would make it possible to serve many more families than it has in the last 5 years. A steady decline in cooperative housing activity and interest has been noted since the Congress eliminated the position of assistant commissioner. This action was unfortunately interpreted by some within and outside of the FHA as an indication of the Congress' disinterest in the measure.

Second. The Federal National Mortgage Association is already empowered to assist in certain types of important housing programs. This amendment would authorize FNMA to make advance commitments for up to $50 million worth of consumer-sponsored cooperative housing projects at any given time. Not more than $15 million, however, would be available in any one State. This would, in fact, be a revolving fund and would assure readily available financing for any project which might not be able to secure financing in the open market, either because of unfamiliarity with the program or an actual shortage of mortgage money.

Third. A fourth amendment would apply to the existing section 223 covering disposition of Government owned housing projects. The amendment would make it possible for cooperative groups of tenants of those projects to use the cooperative mortgage provisions of the act to purchase the Government-owned projects on a cooperative basis.

Fourth. Would provide for a reduction of the percentage of veteran participation in cooperative projects from 65 percent to 50 percent. This would allow the maximum available mortgage for such projects and give a broader group of home purchasers in multifamily projects and give a broader group of home purchasers in multifamily projects the kind of liberal mortgage already provided for single family home purchasers under section 203.

Fifth. The sixth amendment would lift the ceilings on mortgages for cooperative projects from the present $5 million limitation to $30 million for any single project. This would apply particularly in the larger cities where it is often advisable for economic reasons to build larger projects than were envisaged at the time the Congress fixed the $5 million ceiling.

To summarize: The purpose of these proposed amendments is to enable the cooperative housing program to recover its prior position of importance by restoring replacement cost instead of the value concept in mortgage insurance; and to allow for the eventual enlargement of the program so that it can serve a great many more American middle-income families by strengthening the existing legislation.

RESOLUTION FOR STUDY OF FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of a resolution I introduced yesterday for the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House at the request of the chairman, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky.

The resolution will authorize studies, investigations, and inquiries of the operation and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System. This 12-man committee, consisting of the 7 governors of the Federal Reserve Board and 5 presidents of Federal Reserve Banks, determines the monetary policy of the United States, and, in this capacity, exercises a direct influence upon the availability of credit for business, agriculture, home buyers, and the general consumer; the rate of interest charged for such borrowings; the market price of Government bonds; the investment policies of banks, insurance companies and other large investors; the cost and character of the national debt, the general price level and employment in American industries and businesses. The operations and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee have not been the subject of inquiry by a legislative committee of the Congress since it was established by Congress in 1933.

Since the Federal Open Market Committee exercises its credit influence principally by its purchases and sales of Government securities, or by being inactive in the market, the resolution would authorize a broad inquiry into Government security issues, including the various kinds of securities, the manner and purpose of issue, method of payment, character of investor, and the amount and degree of speculation therein. Of special importance in this respect is the question of whether the public interest is served by sporadic issue of long-term issues carrying high interest rates which must necessarily go to a premium in view of the large amount of outstanding long-term debt at substantially lower interest costs. The degree of speculation, which may be permitted by the manner in which such long-term securities are issued, would also be a subject of inquiry under the resolution.

Several programs have been proposed recently which envisioned Federal financial assistance and places primary reliance upon bank financing, yet would be outside the Federal debt limit. The programs in the field of highways and school construction especially propose a radical departure from normal methods of Government financing. Counter proposals in these fields have been proposed by banks which would reopen financing participations denied banks since 1933 following the 1929 crash in which bank assets were horribly dissipated through speculation investments promoted by investment companies with which they were affiliated. Considerable pressure is being brought to bear to permit banks to engage in underwriting and dealing in revenue obligations and to use depositors' money for these purposes. Other proposals would authorize banks to purchase stock in investment companies. A real study should be made of these various proposals to properly assess their significance and their purposes.

COPY OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

"House Resolution 210

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters concerning (1) the composition, operation, and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee; (2) the fluctuation in rates of interest and prices of securities issued by the United States and the effect of such fluctuations on the public debt, general price level, employment, the cost of State and municipal financing, and other segments of the national economy; (3) the various types of Government securities, manner of issue, method of payment, maturities, character of investors, and amount and degree of speculation therein; and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county, and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof), highway, and school programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under active investigation by another committee of the House.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the Continental United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses."

A PLEA FOR RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed, frustrated, and disgusted. It would be easier to quit, but I propose to fight. For several happy years I served on the Committee on Public Works of this House. It was my responsibility, along with my colleagues of that great committee, to recommend to this body for consideration sound public works on our rivers and streams looking toward the development of our country and the conservation of our water resources. I am grateful for and humbled by the

chance to serve on that committee and under its devoted leadership.

You have followed our recommendations and have appropriated money to study our river basins. You have authorized the construction of great multipurpose projects to provide flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, recreation, and water supply. You have followed through, where you thought wise, and have appropriated large sums of money for the construction and operation of dams, powerhouses, navigation, and irrigation canals. Upon our recommendations, you have turned over to the Corps of Engineers the job of making the field investigations of our great rivers to determine the facts upon which our committees and the Congress can act wisely. The Engineers have done a magnificent job. With the facts which they have developed we have begun a great program of construction, always keeping within our ability to pay, developing the best and most needed projects first.

Mr. Speaker, we thought we knew what we were doing. Apparently we were wrong. The Bureau of the Budget has set itself up as a sort of legislative usurper. No Government agency can come to the Congress requesting funds for any project until it has a password and a visa granted by that agency. We cannot even take a look at a project unless the Bureau of the Budget grants us permission. They are the chief high moguls of these river development programs. No project can get to Congress for appropriations unless the bureau approves. In order for the bureau to determine which thoroughbred, milk-fed, vitaminized project can get to us for consideration, it has to set up its own rules. These rules were issued December 31, 1952, and are known as Circular A–47.

Mr. Speaker, we never approved this Circular A–47. We never even saw it while it was being written nor afterwards for a long, long time. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, the real Committee on Public Works sits over in the Bureau of the Budget. They are not only determining policy for us on river development, but they are determining which projects and which river basins are to be given consideration by us. We are just errand boys and girls.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to abdicate our responsibility to a few men in the Bureau of the Budget? I hope not. I raise my voice not just for today but for tomorrow and for all the tomorrows. In behalf of our children and our children's children I raise it. I am distressed no end because I see the actions of the Bureau of the Budget stifling and choking our river developments, developments so essential to our continued strength in a troubled world. There is not a Member in this body whose district is not being affected by this decay in our river development program.

Let me pinpoint the problem by giving examples in our own State of Arkansas as follows:

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 and acts prior to that, the Corps of Engineers used a formula charging certain amounts of the cost of such projects to electric energy. We were able to say, for example, that the Water Valley project in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the Lone Rock and Gilbert projects in my own district on the White River, the Ozark Dam in my district on the Arkansas River, and the Dardanelle Dam on the Arkansas in the district of my colleague [Mr. HAYS] were all economically feasible. That is, they were economically feasible under the old formula before Circular A–47 was issued. This new formula of the Bureau of the Budget in simple language charges a great deal more of the cost of each project to power and assigns less benefits to power. The end result is to make the power come out of the project at such high prices with such low benefits that it completely changes the benefit-cost ratio. It makes Water Valley, Lone Rock, Gilbert, and Ozark completely out of the picture; and if Dardanelle is feasible at all, it is only by the skin of its teeth. The same situation is true with respect to the Beaver project on the White River in my district. Likewise, it will be true throughout the land where rivers need development programs.

My colleagues, this new directive does not stop at power projects per se. Many flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects which depend upon power for their feasibility will not be built if formula A–47 is to stand. So the policy of the Bureau of the Budget will affect not only power but flood control, navigation, recreation, irrigation, and all of the other purposes of these projects. I do not know what the intent of the Bureau of the Budget was, but if it intended to curtail and practically stop building of hydroelectric projects, it could not have done it better than by this new formula. It is rumored that something else is being considered which will be even more stringent. Let us hope the report is erroneous.

Mr. Speaker, the two principal factors in Circular A–47 damaging to the economic feasibility of multipurpose projects are, first, value of power; and, second, cost allocations.

First, value of power in A–47 is measured by the cost of the cheapest alternative source of power, whether private, Federal, or any other. Before Circular A–47, the test of value was the cost of privately developed and privately financed steam electric power in the area. If Federal hydropower could be produced at cost less than private steam electric power, it was economically feasible. Now A–47 requires that Federal hydropower must be compared with steam electric power produced and financed by the Federal Government. In other words, before Federal hydropower can be justified, it must be the cheapest power that can be produced by any method of generation and by any producer, even the Federal Government itself. The requirement of this Federal test is very severe and will be drastic enough to throw out many projects which heretofore were feasible.

For example, a memorandum of the Federal Power Commission, prepared in 1953 for its staff use, shows that the annual fixed charges of interest, depreciation, replacements, insurance, and taxes of privately financed electric plants would amount to 11.7 percent of the investment, whereas the same cost in federally financed steam electric plants would be 5.7 percent of the investment.

Assuming an investment of $125 per kilowatt of installed capacity, the following comparison of the annual fixed costs per kilowatt of steam generation is obtained:

Privately financed	$14.63
Federally financed	7.50
Difference	7.13

The application of this new test of A–47 would reduce the value of power at Greers Ferry by $456,000 a year; at Water Valley by $242,000; at Beaver by $613,000; and Gilbert and Lone Rock combined by $820,000 annually. It is evident that such great losses of value or benefits of power due to this test would throw out nearly all, if not all, of the projects in the Southwest. In addition to this loss, more of the cost of the whole project is charged to power than before as we shall see later.

The Federal Government is not now engaged in building steam plants in the Southwest, and there is no indication that it is now about to launch a program of federally owned and financed steam plants. Therefore, it appears that the Bureau of the Budget is resorting to a nonexistent and fictitious test. It appears that it is jousting with windmills that just do not exist.

To try to simplify what I want to say, let us take, for example, a farmer growing hogs. Suppose the Bureau of the Budget said to that farmer, "Your hogs are not worth any more than what it would cost the Government to grow them." Then in addition, the Bureau would say to him, "Of course, most of your farm investment and operating expenses must be charged against your hogs before we start." Do you suppose the farmer would grow hogs? Certainly not. Neither would you. Your benefit to cost ratio on hogs would be so low you could not survive financially. That is what the Bureau of the Budget is saying to all agencies that come up with hydroelectric projects. The answer is the same for all—not feasible.

Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Chief of Engineers, in a letter dated February 19, 1954, to the Secretary of the Army, made the following statement which bears on this problem:

> The Greers Ferry and Beaver projects are economically feasible in accordance with criteria normally used until recently, their overall benefits costs ratios being respectively 1.2 and 1.1. Since the completion of this report, however, new criteria of the Bureau of the Budget require such projects to be compared with the steam plants of comparable financing, i. e., Federal steam plants. This comparison indicates that the power to be produced by these multipurpose projects, although cheaper than the private steam alternatives currently developing to serve the region, would cost somewhat more than a Federal steam plant.
>
> If these projects are not to be built, there is no indication that Federal steam plants will actually be utilized to serve the market; in fact, it is almost certain that privately

owned generation will be built instead. The flood control and incidental benefits cannot be as economically provided by any other source.

You can see from this that Circular A–47 is a roadblock for the Corps of Engineers.

Second. Circular A–47 does not fix a specific method of making cost allocations, but it has led to the adoption of the separable costs-remaining benefits theory which allocates a higher percentage of cost to power than has heretofore been done. This method precludes the use of the incremental method of cost allocation although power may have been added to the project on an incremental basis. For instance, in authorizing Denison down in Texas and Norfork in Arkansas, the Congress stated that incremental methods should be used in allocating cost to power. According to formula A–47, Congress was wrong with respect to these two projects. The application of the separable costs-remaining benefits theory likewise results in higher annual operating and maintenance expenses being assessed against power because the allocation of these annual expenses follows the same pattern as in allocating investment costs between the multipurposes. This also helps to throw out projects. The Bureau of the Budget has not been consistent in the application of its Circular A–47. For example, it does not apply this formula to recreation, fish and wildlife, and pollution control abatement. All of these are given special treatment in A–47 and do not share in the joint costs of the projects. The result is that a greater part of the joint costs is assessed against power.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out again that this unrealistic formula of the Bureau of the Budget will stop practically all flood control, navigation, and soil-conservation projects on our rivers unless it is revised. We must remember that our thin crust of soil is our line of defense in the age-old battle between civilization and decay. The fertility of our soil is like integrity in man. When a man loses his integrity, he is lost. When a nation loses the fertility of its soil, the nation is lost.

Each muddy rivulet, creek, and river is an indictment of us of this generation and those who came before us. Next to our children, the good earth is the greatest asset God has given us. Yet for generations, we have abused, wasted, and exploited its fertility. Only in recent years have we begun to move from the exploitation of our soil to the conservation of it. This great program of conservation of the soil has many features, all good, including good farm practices, terraces, upstream check dams and water-control reservoirs, big flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects. It is upon these larger projects that Circular A–47 works devastation.

Some people think the small upstream projects will do the job alone. Others think that the big projects are all that is necessary. Still others think both programs are necessary. I happen to be in the latter group.

Our rivers are not manmade—they are nature's handiwork. By proper control, they become useful tools in the progress of mankind. Without proper control, they are destroyers. Since our rivers belong to all the people, the responsibility of their development, control, and use is a national problem. Through the years since the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, this country has been gradually evolving a great river development program which has the Nation's blessing. That program, in my opinion, is at a standstill today because of Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has the responsibility to spell out the formula to guide the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in their calculations of the cost benefit ratio in all these hydroelectric, flood control, and navigation projects and not leave it up to some executive agency such as the Bureau of the Budget to fix the policy. Our formula might include recreational benefits, municipal, and industrial water supply, and irrigation, which have never been figured by the Corps of Engineers in our projects in Arkansas so far as I know. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress declare its independence.

I, therefore, plan to introduce appropriate legislation which has for its purpose the setting up of a definite criteria or formula to guide the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in determining the benefits to cost ratio for the projects necessary to the development of our water resources. Let us return the control of our natural resources to the Congress where it belongs.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I also am frustrated regarding the Flood Control Act of 1944. In that act there were a number of projects for my area in the State of California. We have had only 1 or 2 of them completed, and we are trying desperately hard to get more of them completed. The ones I am thinking of particularly are the levee control projects on the lower San Joaquin River where we have lost almost $10 million by floods during the past 5 years. I hope we can find some way to make the Bureau of the Budget a little more liberal and generous in carrying out the laws which we pass and the projects which we authorized particularly in the law of 1944.

Also, I feel that the Budget Bureau should liberalize its criteria as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for his timely remarks on this subject, and to advise him that there are others who feel just as he does about the matter which he has brought to our attention.

The gentleman, as I remember, did not refer to the proposed order known as revised A–47. Has that been brought to your attention as yet?

Mr. TRIMBLE. No; it has not.

Mr. ASPINALL. The committee of which the gentleman from Colorado is honored to be a member has been questioning the authority and the assumed authority of the Bureau of the Budget in these matters, and especially in its issuance of A–47. For some time it was brought to the attention of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which handles reclamation legislation that there was in the making a new formula known as revised A–47. So, during the last few weeks we have had before our committee the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Honorable Rowland Hughes, and asked of him just how they considered the use of A–47, and whether or not there was to be a revised A–47. We suggested to him that we were aware of the contents of this proposed new order.

We were advised, as I remember the conversation which took place, that A–47 is to be used more or less as a measuring stick. It is not an exact criterion whatsoever, but as the Bureau of the Budget brings out the different projects upon which it must pass judgment it uses A–47 to see whether or not such project or projects measure up to what the Bureau considers to be a uniform policy.

On the other hand, their holdings under A–47 are not binding and should not be held to be binding upon the Congress of the United States. Of course, if it is possible for the executive branch of the Government to establish policy in this particular the gentleman is perfectly right when he suggests that it is a usurpation of the authority and the prerogatives of the legislative department.

Again I thank the gentleman and suggest that his remarks are most timely in view of the necessity of protecting our natural resources and making their full development possible.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado; and may I say that I heard the rumor that another circular or formula was under study.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wish to join the gentleman from Colorado in expressing appreciation to my good friend from Arkansas for the real contribution he has made to an understanding of what is going on in the field of reclamation and flood control when he opens up the discussion on the floor of the policies of the Bureau of the Budget, either actual or intended policies, which have recently come to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation was just discussing, that matter has been before the committee and it has been under very careful scrutiny of the very able chairman of the full committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] questioned the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at some length concerning just what the effect of the application of this revised Circular A–47 would be if it were actually placed in operation. I think in fairness to the Director of the Budget it should be stated

that he told the committee that this circular was in a preliminary stage or advisory stage at this time. But at the same time it is being widely circulated throughout the Government, and it is receiving the full authority which would accompany a directive of that kind from the Bureau of the Budget in the different Government departments. On questioning by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and other members of the committee, we sought information on the point as to whether the gentleman concerned with this policy could name any flood control or reclamation project in the United States—not just in the Southwest, mind you, but in the entire United States—which would qualify and receive the approval of the Bureau of the Budget under this new procedure set up under revised Circular A–47.

To the best of my recollection, they were able to name only one small project in the United States which they were satisfied would qualify under this new formula that is being set up on benefit-cost ratios. When they were questioned about specific projects which were of great importance in many States of the Union, they were unable to give us any instances, they were unable to give us any clear indication as to whether those projects would receive approval if the formula in Revised Circular A–47 would be adopted. Unless the Congress does assert its authority, unless the Congress steps in vigorously at this point, it is my apprehension that we are going to see the adoption of the formula in Revised Circular A–47, and it is going to throw a roadblock across the progress of the country in the field of reclamation. I think the gentleman will certainly do a service if he does introduce in the Congress a bill which will assure congressional control over this important question of the benefit-cost ratio on these important projects.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to compliment my colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for the position he has taken on it. I am sorry that I did not get here earlier to hear all of the gentleman's remarks, but I would like to say to him that we had Mr. Hughes, Director of the Budget, before our committee to inquire of him with regard to the provisions of this Circular A–47. In the course of the questions with reference to this A–47 which establishes standards for the construction of irrigation and reclamation projects, Mr. Hughes was specifically asked whether or not there is any project in the United States presently under study for authorization and construction which would qualify under those standards. He said that he had not studied the effects of the circular in that way. Then I asked him whether or not any project ever authorized and built in the United States under the reclamation law would qualify. He said that he did not know.

I make the assertion that if these standards were applied, the Central Valley project would not have been built, 50 years of reclamation progress would not have occurred, there would not be a single reclamation project in the United States and not one single project including the Colorado River project which has been vigorously recommended by this administration, could qualify under the provisions of Circular A–47.

The gentleman is doing the Congress a real service by bringing this matter to the attention of the public and I hope that before the final form of A–47 is adopted it will be appropriately revised and that it will go in the opposite direction from which it goes now; that is, move in the direction of a more liberal construction of reclamation law rather than the reverse.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] a question?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is it not a fact that the one project that was mentioned which possibly would qualify under these standards is the Ventura River project in California?

Mr. ENGLE. That is true. It was stated by Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, there was possibly only one and that is a project in the district which the gentleman has the honor of representing and which he seeks to authorize now through a bill pending before our committee. The other, of course, would possibly be the Trinity River project, which is already authorized. Other than those we are all through so far as irrigation and reclamation is concerned, if the standards of the Budget Circular A–47 are enforced.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

FATHER HAROLD W. RIGNEY, S. V. D.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" is a statement made by Christ that has long been recognized by Christians as a divine direction to mankind to respect civil authority as well as divine authority.

A casual examination of the New Testament discloses that this God-given instruction is also, if not primarily, a command to political leaders, or would-be political leaders, not to interfere with God's will or his emissaries. History is replete with evidence of God's vengeance against pretended political leaders who have interfered with divine commandments or with God's emissaries.

Today marks the 25th anniversary of the ordination to the Roman Catholic priesthood of Rev. Harold W. Rigney. The 25th anniversary of a clergyman of any faith, including the Catholic faith, is ordinarily an occasion of great joy to the clergyman, his family, and his friends. Father Rigney is a humble Catholic missionary of the Order of Divine Word, who has devoted his priestly life to winning the mind and the souls of men to God. His life has been devoted with following and preaching the word of God.

This 25th anniversary of Father Rigney, although it may be a day of great spiritual consolation for him, will be a day of great physical sadness for Father Rigney, his family, his friends, and Roman Catholics everywhere, for Father Rigney is presently being imprisoned in China by a group which apparently has decided that the divine command of "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" does not apply to them.

I would like to call attention to the Congress and to the world very briefly the facts concerning Father Rigney and his imprisonment.

Father Rigney was born on December 18, 1900, in Chicago, Ill. His family resided in the "back of the Yards" section of Chicago for some 26 years. The "back of the Yards" section of the city of Chicago has contributed to the Nation and the city of Chicago some of its greatest political, business, labor, and religious leaders.

Father Rigney, after attending parochial schools in Chicago, joined the Divine Word Missionaries at Techny, Ill., on August 31, 1918. He was ordained on April 19, 1930, by Bishop Weig, of China, and in the following years earned his master of science degree at the University of Chicago.

Father Rigney's first missionary assignment occurred in May 1939, when he was sent to the Gold Coast in West Africa. Four years later he joined the Army Air Force as a chaplain, holding the rank of captain. After 30 months' service, during which time he became chaplain for all Catholic American Air Corps personnel in Africa, he was discharged and was named by his order as rector of the Fu Jen University in Peiping. In July 1951 it was learned that Father Rigney had been arrested by Red authorities.

The background of Father Rigney's arrest and confinement, and the divine command to political leaders, creates a remarkable parallel. If you will recall the story in the New Testament, the Pharisees, pretended political leaders of their day, took counsel as to how they might entrap Christ in his talk. They sent emissaries with Herodious to ask Jesus of Nazareth this question "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar?" Jesus replied, "Show me the coin of the tribute." Christ then asked them whose inscription and image the coin bore. They said to him, "Caesar." Then he issued the divine command "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

Information concerning Father Rigney's arrest and incarceration discloses that it occurred when new contracts for the school term of Peiping's Fu Jen University arose in June of 1950.

Father Rigney refused to accept the contracts, which called for salaries to be paid by the headquarters of the Society of the Divine Word, when five of the professors revealed that they were Communists and enemies of the church. Father Rigney informed the Communist president of the university that his order's $12,000 monthly subsidy would be stopped unless a new board of trustees was formed and the church would be allowed to select the faculty. He desired to have the five Communist teachers fired at once. Father Rigney was warned he would be held personally responsible for lack of cooperation by his order and was placed under custody while the authorities awaited the $12,000 monthly stipend. When it did not arrive, Father Rigney was arrested and placed in custody. Thus it appears that Father Rigney's incarceration is due to his refusal to "Render unto Caesar the things that belonged to God."

Information of Father Rigney was completely cut off from his family after his arrest and he became known as Chicago's "Forgotten Man." Until recently, through the intercession of representatives of friendly governments, the rigors of Father Rigney's incarceration have been somewhat relaxed and communications have been made with his family.

Today, many thousands of persons of all faiths in Chicago, particularly in the "back of the Yards" section are petitioning the President to do all in his power on Father Rigney's behalf.

I am happy to report that the Department of State is doing everything within its power to secure the release of Father Rigney. Father Rigney was one of those referred to in the stirring address made by our distinguished majority leader yesterday. The British and other friendly governments with representation at Peiping have endeavored to persuade the Chinese Communists to consider on humanitarian grounds the release of Father Rigney. Father Rigney's case has been included with others by United States representatives at the United Nations and by the American representatives at the United Nation's Economic and Social Council.

I appeal to the representatives of the various Asian and African countries in the conference which is now being conducted at Bandung on this 25th anniversary of Father Rigney's ordination to take up Father Rigney's cause and prevail upon Red China's leaders to release Father Rigney and other religious representatives, not only in a humanitarian interest, but also in order to avoid the vengeance that history has disclosed that God inflicts upon those who ignore the command given to the world to "Render unto God the things that are God's."

I am certain that Father Rigney on this day is praying that his captors are spared divine vengeance.

I would like to add my prayer to that of the relatives and friends of Father Rigney that his release and his return to his family and friends is near.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], in whose district Father Rigney resided, may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the ordination of Rev. Harold W. Rigney to the priesthood. Father Rigney was born and raised in the "back of the Yards" community in Chicago, which I am privileged to represent.

Father Rigney is an Air Force chaplain. He has been imprisoned, without trial, by the Chinese Communists for the past 4 years. I have received hundreds of letters from individuals in my district urging that everything possible be done to effect his release.

I have contacted the Secretary of State and was advised that they will pursue diligently its efforts to effect his release.

The people from the "back of the Yards" district are commencing a letter-writing campaign to President Eisenhower urging he use the power of his great office to bring about the release of Father Rigney. I hope and pray this may soon become a reality so that he may celebrate his silver anniversay here in the United States in a fitting manner.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the incarceration of Father Rigney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, yes, today, Father Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., a Divine Word missionary, sitting in the confinement of a Chinese Communist prison, marks the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

Whether he will be able to celebrate that milestone in his vocational and religious life no one can ascertain.

This Chicagoan's present plight after 4 years in prison pleads passionately for his release. The record indicates our State Department is doing everything to effect his release. The case history of Father Rigney serves to remind us of the plight of the other five hundred and more similarly situated captive Americans.

It is a pleasure to join with Congressman MURRAY of Illinois and the other Members of Congress in his petition directed to the representatives of the various Asian and African conference to request their intercession on behalf of Father Rigney and at the same time to wish them well in their deliberations.

As we ask their assistance and help we are not unmindful of their many and varied problems. Theirs is no easy assignment, their acute capital shortages, primitive technologies, outmoded systems of land ownership, uneven natural resources, and tragic shortages of skilled personnel are not to be easily solved.

Their new found independence, dating from the end of World War II when western colonial governments were set aside, peacefully in India and Burma and through revolution in Indonesia and Indochina must be handled tenderly. In their rise to power native nationalist leaders cannot be faulted for their impatience with the leadership identified with colonialism. It is highly probable that in the excitement and exultation of newly won independence the resurgent nationalism of these south and southeast countries will construct an understandable barrier to progress.

Their population problem is magnified by their inadequate resources and rapid population growth. The rising level of living can only go higher and higher when production exceeds and increases faster than population.

The mere expulsion of colonial powers is not a surefire cureall and nation building is a slow and difficult process. Yes nation building is a matter of many years and even generations.

We feel confident that the leadership and people of Asia see their problem and will be able to effect its solution. In this task there is serious area for disillusionment. It would be shameful and sad to permit communism to exploit this ever present opportunity.

The free world must not only lend its assistance and knowhow to the economic development of south and southeast Asia, but also help these good people to see their problems in the light of reality.

The African-Asian conference gives testimony to the fact that the peoples of the less-developed parts of the world are aware of their common problems and aspirations. This new consciousness should be helpful in hastening world-wide advances in the standards of living, and promote and improve international understanding and reduce international tensions.

Our help and sympathy in helping them to understand and solve their problems has a direct bearing on our future and on the future, peace and prosperity of the entire world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], in this observance by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of the 25th anniversary of the priesthood of Father Harold W. Rigney. Today in all the lands of the free world men and women of pure hearts are thinking of Father Rigney and from many lips prayers are ascending for his early release.

On April 19, 1930 Father Rigney donned the robes of priesthood. His life he dedicated to God and the service of God's creatures here on earth. Humbly he walked with God, asking only to serve Him and the divine purpose. In 1951 he was made captive by Red China. It had been hoped that his release could be effected so that he might return to us to join in the celebration of his 25th anniversary but while he is not with us in person he abides with us in spirit and on this day we are renewing the pledge of our determination to persevere until the happy answer to our prayers has come.

From my district, lying on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Chicago, have come hundreds of letters. Some have come from children, some from men and

women walking into the evening of life. All have reflected a universality of sentiment throughout the free world of admiration for the purity of the life, the faithfulness of the discharge of his priestly office and a burning indignation over the continuance in captivity of this man of God. These letters I have brought on several occasions to the attention of the Department of State. On April 1, 1955, I received a letter from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, in which he said:

The Department understands and sympathizes with the spirit which prompts Father Rigney's relatives and friends to seek special consideration of his case as the date approaches for the celebration of his silver jubilee. The Department, too, is most desirous of bringing comfort and relief to Father Rigney and of persuading the Chinese Communists to permit his return to the United States. A meeting has just been held between our consul at Geneva and the Chinese Communist representative there during which the United States renewed its demands for the release of Father Rigney and other American citizens in Communist China from their unwarranted detention.

Your constituents may be assured that we shall continue our efforts to bring about the release of Father Rigney and all the other American citizens forced to remain in Communist China against their will.

On April 5, 1955, I received the following reply to my letter to Secretary of State Dulles:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 30, 1955, in which you report the receipt of many letters urging that action be taken to effect the release of Father Harold W. Rigney, who is under arrest in Communist China.

The Department, too, has received several hundred letters from friends and relatives of Father Rigney who are understandably increasingly exercised over his plight as the date for the celebration of his silver jubilee draws near.

I hope that you will inform interested persons that the Department is also desirous of bringing comfort and relief to Father Rigney and of persuading the Chinese Communists to permit his return to the United States. You may be sure that it will pursue diligently its efforts to bring about his release. There is enclosed a copy of a press release describing the latest approach made to the problem by our consul at Geneva. Father Rigney is one of the prisoners concerning whom specific inquiry was made.

Sincerely yours,

ALLYN C. DONALDSON,
Director, Office of Special Consular Services
(For the Secretary of State).

I am hopeful, as I am prayerful, that in the very near future we will receive the happy word that Father Rigney with other Americans wrongfully imprisoned in Red China have been released. That I understand, is the present expectation. That, I have the faith to believe, is the divine purpose. My colleague, Mr. MURRAY, has made a large contribution by arranging this celebration here on the floor of this House of Father Rigney's priestly anniversary. It gives notice to Red China that there is within the hearts and souls of the American people a spirit to persevere in the cause of righteousness that cannot be stamped out by brutal force.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Chicago, Mr. MURRAY, in paying tribute to Father Rigney, whose 25th anniversary of ordination is being observed.

Father Rigney cannot participate in the usual ceremonies attendant to such an occasion because he is being held a prisoner by the Chinese Communists. As a humble Catholic missionary, Father Rigney refused to yield to the evil pressure of the Chinese Reds, and as a result he has joined the host of captives held in China.

This Catholic priest brought nothing but good to the China which is being defiled by the godless Reds. He has devoted his life to winning the minds and the souls of men to God. His sole operation in China was preaching the word of God.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] has explained the details of Father Rigney's arrest and imprisonment by the Communists.

I add my prayers to those of countless thousands in Father Rigney's native country and his home community of Chicago that his release and his return to his relatives and friends is not far off. And as we pray for him, I am certain Father Rigney at this moment is praying for the spiritual enlightenment of his Communist captors.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 752. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an article.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SHORT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. MCGREGOR and include a poll.

Mr. SCUDDER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. PRIEST and include an address before the Civil Aviation Medicine Association.

Mr. MCCARTHY and to include a statement.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BROYHILL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Tuesday and Wednesday, April 19 and 20, on account of official business—attending a meeting at Naval Academy Board of Visitation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

703. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior on synthetic-liquid fuels for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

704. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

705. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter with reference to the case of Sabato Di Filippo alias Sam Phillips, A–2445124, involving suspension of deportation and requesting the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Justice Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

706. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter with reference to the case of Koshiro Mukoyama, A–6153080, involving suspension of deportation and requesting the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

707. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

708. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 143); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 211. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 5645. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2107. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 4903. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 426). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5645. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 5646. A bill to eliminate the 15-acre requirement for voting in any national wheat referendum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5648. A bill to authorize the Surgeon General to provide traineeships for graduate nurses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5649. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5650. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5651. A bill to provide for the burial near the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery of the participants in the famous flag raising at Iwo Jima; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5652. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5653. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of baliffs in the district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5654. A bill to provide for two judicial districts and the appointment of an additional Federal judge for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5655. A bill providing for the designation of a highway between Echo Junction, Utah, and Ogden, Utah, as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply to the transportation of certain farm commodities and livestock from farm to market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5657. A bill to allow the use of certain property in Volusia County, Fla., for civil defense purposes without payment of compensation to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5658. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of income which an individual may earn while receiving aid to the blind thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 5659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for refunds to farmers of the amounts of tax paid on gasoline used by them in farming operations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5660. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5661. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to increase the annuities of widows under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5662. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Government, for distribution to the States, of a supply of the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5663. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to stimulate the development and construction of cooperative housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5664. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 5665. A bill to establish that it is a crime for citizens or nationals of foreign nations to participate in undeclared wars against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5666. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 5667. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that persons who are awarded the Purple Heart shall be deemed to have a 10-percent service-connected disability; to the Committe on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5668. A bill to provide that where an injured employee is required, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to submit to a physical examination, he shall be furnished with a copy of the physician's report; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5669. A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prevent interference with, and to eliminate limitations upon, the power of the States to regulate health, morals, education, domestic relations, all property rights, transportation wholly within their borders, the election laws, with the limitations contained in this proposed amendment, and good order therein, to authorize the various States to change any action taken in respect to the proposed ratification of amendments thereto, until final action has been taken thereon, and to authorize the various States to contest the validity of any law or treaty made, or which shall be made by or under the authority of the United States or this Constitution, and the validity of the adoption, ratification, or promulgation of any amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement to be awarded to Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 23 as United States Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution requesting the American people to join in observing National Hospital Week; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution establishing an academy for page boys; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for placing of statue of late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White in the United States Capitol and for ceremonies of unveiling; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Senate Resolution No. 34 of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution that it is the

sense of the Congress of the United States that the people of Slovakia are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5670. A bill for the relief of John Baltrusaitis (Baltrusaitieni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5671. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Paul Alton Boyle, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5672. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Akbar Ashraf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 5673. A bill for the relief of Margarete Wanda Hockenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX (by request):

H. R. 5674. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Intriago Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 5675. A bill for the relief of Maj. Charles T. Root; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5676. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to Taylor Cole; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 5677. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Donato Vaio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5678. A bill for the relief of Rouhollah Amir Rouhi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5679. A bill for the relief of Helena Lubke, also known at Helena Liibke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5680. A bill for the relief of Monica Jackson Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5681. A bill for the relief of John Tong Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5682. A bill for the relief of Tam Chung Fay and Tam Fay Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5683. A bill for the relief of Andonios Demetrios Dilbois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5684. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Gerda Mayer Durkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5685. A bill for the relief of Robert Nai-Hsin Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvette J. B. Levin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5687. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5688. A bill for the relief of Fernando Galvan-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5689. A bill for the relief of Kam Man Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 5690. A bill for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5691. A bill for the relief of P. R. Markley, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 5692. A bill for the relief of Slobadan N. Stefanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5693. A bill for the relief of John F. Biba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

203. By Mr. WATTS: Petition of various citizens of Lexington and Georgetown, Ky., in support of legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

204. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to propose and enact an amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which will clearly and positively exempt from Federal regulation the activities of producers and gatherers of natural gas, including sale by them of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Internal Security and Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address recently delivered by my able colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], before the Chicago Law Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LAWYER LOOKS AT INTERNAL SECURITY AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Address by Senator HENNINGS)

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you tonight—to submit for your consideration some legal and political questions in matters that are increasingly on my mind, and I know upon yours, as citizens and as lawyers.

For a long time now I have been troubled by the unmistakable fact that civil rights—which are the cornerstone of our national life—are under attack and in danger of abridgement. And I am sure the uneasiness I feel is not just the result of vague impressions. Unfortunately, it is based on facts some of which I shall mention later on in the course of my remarks.

Yet, before I turn to the matter at hand, may I say, that I come before you in order to formulate questions rather than to offer conclusions. And I also come with a request that you, as distinguished members of the bar, should help our country find the answers that will preserve our civil liberties.

I believe we all agree that the erosion of civil rights, if true, is a paramount question of our political life and spells dangers of unforeseeable gravity. History, however, teaches us that civil rights are seldom lost solely by conscious deliberate action. More often than not the loss is, in great part, the result of an absent-minded, unconscious drift. When the citizens do not see the threat and when constituted legislative, executive, and judicial authorities do not realize the consequences of their acts, civil liberties are in danger of loss by default. As I see it, the trend that is now taking place in our country is just of this nature. There is, of course, no suggestion of repealing the Bill of Rights, but steadily, in unrealized stages, the rights guaranteed by the bill are invaded and in danger of becoming nugatory.

The birth of our Nation was a momentous fact in the development of mankind. An entirely new state entered the community of nations. Economically, politically, and legally it had no precedent. Economically it was free of the restraining shackles of feudal economy—a land where property was held in free and common socage and where there was unhampered internal trade and freedom of occupation for its citizens, with equal opportunity for all. Politically and legally it was a country with a written constitution that embodied the experiences of a protracted fight against inherited privilege and tyranny. This Constitution happily united practical considerations with deep theoretical insights. The student of our past is impressed by its closeness to political and social realities of American life. At the same time, the sociologist and the legal scholar realize how closely it materialized the theoretical formulations of Montesquieu on the separation of powers. These, may I say, "Un-American" ideas born in old Europe became not only an integral part of our political life but found in our country their first, true and only application. How new and how revolutionary all this had been becomes particularly clear when, for the sake of comparison, we look at the other parts of the American and European Continents at that time.

The Constitution formulated by the Founding Fathers is philosophically a complex document. It is at once optimistic and trustful—and pessimistic, skeptical, and suspicious. It is a supreme expression of the mistrust in political power; it splits the governmental authority into its component executive, legislative, and judicial parts, and it enumerates its powers. On the other hand, it is an equally strong expression of a supreme trust in man as the source of cul-

tural and political activity—the spiritual substance of all life.

We often recall and frequently mention that our Constitution is based on the principle of checks and balances in government. I am impressed by the further thought, however, that the principle of checks and balances permeates not only the governmental structure of our country. I am afraid we often forget that the framers of the Constitution knew that this principle lies at the root of societal life itself. They have visualized our country as a social construct where the freedom of the people as a whole and that of the individual are balanced against the state and its coercive powers. Neither the people nor the state has the upper hand. This relationship, however, is not coincidental or artificial. It is founded on the recognition that man, in his rights and freedoms, is secure only within the framework of society—the state.

The creative activity of man prospers best in conditions of security and peace of mind. Any invasion of human rights has a disastrous effect on the cultural and economic success of human endeavor and is justified, of course, only when the exercise of individual rights, in its turn, invades the concurrent rights of others.

The trust in the free activity of man and the care of safeguarding it faces us in all the basic provisions of the Constitution. I have mentioned the splitting of governmental powers as a proof of this trust. The right to vote does not even require mention. More in point, is the injunction against the passage of bills of attainder—the legislative means by which the English Parliament used to punish dissidents without trial and under accusations having no basis in the criminal law of the land. Article 1, section 9, clause 3 of our Constitution enjoins the Federal legislature from passing such bills and article 1, section 10, clause 1 extends this injunction to State legislatures. It is clear from these injunctions that we have here a fundamental provision prefiguring the Bill of Rights.

In this connection I want to mention that the opponents of the first 10 amendments in the first Congress based their opposition not on any objections to the rights to be secured but on the idea that these rights were already secured by the Constitution itself. But Jefferson and his followers carried the day and the Bill of Rights was adopted as an explicit statement of faith in individual freedom.

This faith, I dare say, never faltered. And the adoption of the 13th and 14th amendments was its forceful reaffirmation in the 19th century.

All these provisions, if observed, constitute a mighty bulwark which securely protects the individual against government interference as well as against invasions on the part of fellow citizens.

We know that legal propositions are not disjoined statements but constitute a contextual entity. Only within their context are they truly interpretable. Only by the token of this context do they find their proper place within the entire structure and exhibit their relative values. When from this point of view we look now at the Bill of Rights, I am inclined to believe, that the first amendment stands out as the cornerstone of the entire protective edifice. It is this amendment which, in protecting the freedom of his thought, of his beliefs, and of his speech, secures man in the exercise of those gifts which distinguish him from animals.

The language of the first amendment is unequivocal and all-embracing. It is a truly revolutionary declaration that democracy as established by our Constitution is alien to the idea of orthodoxy as a test of human rights. Therefore, no matter how unorthodox or unpopular the opinions held by the individual, he must be protected from persecution both on the part of governmental agencies and on the part of other individuals. And that is why I believe that second in importance stands out the due process clause of the 5th and the 14th amendments.

These remarks, I hope, truthfully describe the nature of American democracy and represent views traditionally held. We discern them at the cradle of our Constitution * * * And in this connection, permit me to quote to you from the Virginia Statute on Religious Freedom, written by Thomas Jefferson and regarded by him as his greatest achievement next to the Declaration of Independence.

The statute enunciates these propositions: "that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy * * * because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgment and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."

Now how does our 20th century practice square with our political-democratic tradition? Do we adhere to the precept that opinions and beliefs are within the sovereign domain of man as the builder of cultural values and that the State should intervene only when opinions and beliefs pass into overt acts in contravention of constitutional procedures? Or do we say, "We have changed all that," as the fake doctor in Moliere did when it was pointed out to him that traditionally the heart is on the left and the liver on the right side, and not vice versa?

Certain facts make me doubtful as to the answer.

The Smith Act, for instance, makes it a crime to teach and advocate (please note these words)—no matter how abstractly and philosophically—any ideas of overthrowing the constituted Government by force and violence. The wording of the statute seems, on the face of it, to contradict the first amendment and I am not convinced that the decision of the Supreme Court with its negative answer settles this question (*Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U. S. 494). The decision was not unanimous and we know that dissenting opinions have in more than one instance become the law of the future.

It would be well for us to keep in mind the prophetic words of Mr. Justice Black in his dissenting opinion in the Dennis case. He said: "Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions, and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the first amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

It would also be well for us to recall that Jefferson on his accession to the Presidency in the exercise of his Presidential powers pardoned all persons convicted under the Alien and Sedition Acts and thereby in effect invalidated these laws as they applied to those convicted. Jefferson, in a letter he wrote to Mrs. John Adams in 1804, explained the basis for his action in granting these wholesale pardons. In his letter he said: "I do not know who was the particular wretch alluded to, but I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law, because I considered, and now consider, that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palatable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage, as it would have been to have rescued from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image. It was, accordingly, done in every instance, without asking what the offenders had done, or against whom they had offended, but whether the pains they were suffering were inflicted under the pretended sedition law."

If Jefferson were alive today he would be a determined and bitter opponent of communism and the Communist Party and he would do all in his power to wipe out espionage and treason, whether practiced by domestic Communists or others. We may also be sure, however, that he would insist on acting against Communists in conformity with the Bill of Rights and its historic principles.

In addition to the Smith Act we have the Internal Security Act of 1950 aimed at registering and branding Communists and members of various ill-defined organizations solely on the ground that the mere holding of certain ideas deprives such persons of first class citizenship. I will be frank with you that this legislation aroused in me grave doubts as to its constitutional validity. I found it alarming that there should be a statute in the United States which would deprive individuals of their rights without due process of law, and limit, in such drastic manner, the right to hold opinions. For this reason, last year I voted to outlaw the Communist Party. Only in this way, some of us thought, could an abnormal situation be clarified, a situation in which we heretofore claimed that it was legal for people to hold Communist ideas and belong to the Communist Party and nevertheless forced such people to register, ostracized them, starved them economically, and yet refused to give them a trial in a court of law. I thought that if we do these things, we must do them honestly. If Communists are to be stripped of full citizenship, let us do so directly by a law making it illegal to be one. Then we can bring them to trial and they can test in the courts the constitutionality of our action. We owe this to our Constitution and to our democratic tradition.

The third example I would like to submit is the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act regarding the anti-Communist oath. In passing on its constitutionality, Justice Vinson, speaking for the majority of the Court, said: "The Government's interest here is not in preventing the dissemination of Communist doctrine or the holding of past beliefs because it is feared that unlawful action will result therefrom if free speech is practiced. Its interest is in protecting the free flow of commerce from what Congress considers to be substantial evils of conduct. Section 9 (h), the anti-Communist oath provision, does not interfere with speech because Congress fears the consequence of speech; it regulates harmful conduct which Congress has determined is carried on by persons who may be identified by their political affiliations and beliefs."

I am not unaware that the commerce clause of the Constitution played an important part in the determinations of the Supreme Court. And I am far from criticizing this trend of our law. Yet we must not forget that the Court itself, speaking through some of its members, on occasions expressed doubts as to the desirability and interpretative fruitfulness of overworking the commerce clause. I refer to the forceful concurring opinions of Justices Douglas and

Jackson in *Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 160). This was a case dealing with a California statute restricting the entry of indigent citizens of other States into California. The majority of the Court invalidated the statute as a restriction of interstate commerce, while the minority, concurring in the result, strongly urged a decision on the basis of the immunities and privileges clause of the 14th Amendment. Thus Justice Douglas said: "But I am of the opinion that the right of persons to move freely from State to State occupies a more protected position in our constitutional system than does the movement of cattle, fruit, steel, and coal across State lines."

I think the reference here to the relative constitutional depth of the two provisions is significant and should, I feel, never be lost sight of. Yet in this case there was no contradiction between the alternative grounds of the decision. In the quoted opinion of Justice Vinson, however, such contradiction not only exists, but it is even explicitly admitted. Are we not justified then in insisting that the validity of the oath provision be tested in the light of the First Amendment—the soul of the Bill of Rights? The right of Congress to legislate in a particular field can be justified on the basis of any applicable constitutional provision, but can Federal legislation be considered valid when its substance violates a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution?

Of course we know that all this raises difficult questions—perhaps questions which go to the very root of our entire cultural and political life. They are difficult not only objectively but also subjectively. For my part I decidedly disagree with communism—its doctrines and its practices. I should say more: I abhor them. It requires a great effort on my part to discuss anti-Communist legislation in terms of the democratic philosophy to which we adhere by tradition and by conviction. But the inner ideological core of our Constitution is involved and the faith in that type of world which lies at its foundation.

For us Americans the Constitution of the United States is not a passing document. It is the embodiment of our existence. Like any embodiment it is inseparable from the things it embodies. Our adherence to its provisions is not a half-hearted acceptance. It is a belief—an unshakable belief—in its wisdom. Once it was a prophecy and our history has shown that it came true. For these reasons, I feel, it is the essence of our life's task to live up to the precepts of our Constitution. And even when we think of amending it, we must beware lest we destroy that pessimistic-optimistic spirit which I mentioned in the beginning. We should shun amendments that would impair this spirit. I am convinced for instance that the Bricker amendment would do just this.

The way of life that the Constitution helped to create made our country, in the words of our anthem, "the land of the free and the home of the brave." And you will understand that, considering the way I feel, it would be insufferable to me to think of defending our Constitution by unconstitutional or even constitutionally doubtful means.

Now, I fully realize the stresses and trials of the tense international situation where the issue of communism plays such an important part. I know the temptations and I understand how the fainthearted feel, but our faith must be stronger than any doubts. And may we pray in the words of the Lord's Prayer: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." Let us remember that the Constitution is a living thing tested in the vicissitudes of history and let us not forget that doctrines come and go but that the Constitution is and must be always with us.

When I survey the program of our anti-Communist legislation, I am not convinced that it is always in accord with the principles and beliefs just expressed. In part, I regret to say, it is the result of doubts in the soundness of our social organization and in part it must be ascribed to dullness of mind and preference for conformity where initiative is required.

Recently the papers reported that there was a question whether a piano tuner who invoked the fifth amendment in declining to answer whether he was a Communist should be licensed. As I understand it, he was finally given a license, but consider what the raising of such question implies. Assuming that he was actually a Communist, how can the tuning of pianos by a Communist endanger our security. Is it not a clear case of persecution for holding unpopular views, a position inconsistent with the First Amendment? This case, to be sure, was favorably resolved. But we know that similar cases arise constantly. Would you not say that we tread here on dangerous ground?

I pass now to the loyalty-security program as a whole, and shall begin with the statement of some general propositions. I think that the following persons cannot hold positions in government agencies:

1. A traitor.
2. A spy.
3. A person whose opinions would prevent him from following established policy relevant to his tasks.

Treason and espionage are crimes, and criminals are subject to trials and, if convicted, to punishment. A person, however, who holds an opinion which prevents him from fulfilling his duties is not a criminal but an inappropriate public servant. I suggest that the reason for his dismissal or nonemployment is the lack of necessary qualifications. It seems that our difficulties with the loyalty-security program arise because we confuse these basically different situations and, also, because we disregard the cases where the opinions of an employee are irrelevant.

In stating these views, I do not close my eyes to the question of seditious conspiracy which must be considered when we deal with members of the Communist Party. I suggest, however, that it is inconsistent with the principles of democracy to imply the knowledge of criminal conspiratorial aims or to decide these matters by means of administrative determination. As a confirmed Jeffersonian, I personally feel that, in general, the scope of administrative law should not be unduly enlarged. In this instance, however, my reluctance has still another reason. The questions of guilt arising from participation in a criminal conspiracy traditionally belong in the domain of criminal law and its procedures. It does not require elaboration that according to the system of our law a person charged with a criminal offense has the right to be tried and to be convicted or acquitted by the verdict of his peers. This principle is universal, and I entertain the gravest doubts that questions of guilt raised by the loyalty-security program should be decided outside the established procedures of adjudication. To do so seems a violation of the due process clause. The crimes implied by the loyalty-security program are heinous crimes, and I do not think that persons whose very honor and economic existence is under threat can be deprived of a fair trial in the accepted Anglo-Saxon tradition.

In this question, I fully identify myself with the following words of Harry P. Cain, former Senator from Washington and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board:

"In other periods, we have abused the meaning of the Bill of Rights. We are so abusing some of its meaning today. This must not dishearten us because until the amendments have been repealed, and this prospect is not in sight, nor is it likely to be, men and women possessed of reason can prevail upon others to understand that the amendments constitute our American way of life, and with courage these same citizens can prevail upon authorities to live in accordance with every one of them.

"What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from."

The idea of allowing one accused to face his accuser is indeed not new. In St. Paul's day the Romans observed this rule.

In chapter 25 of the Book of Acts, verses 12 to 16, we find the following passage.

"Festus laid Paul's case before the king, saying: There is a certain man left a prisoner by Felix; about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and elders of the Jews informed me, asking for sentence against him. To whom I answered that it is not the custom of the Romans to give up any man, before that the accused have the accusers face to face, and have had the opportunity to make his defense concerning the matter laid against him."

When I think of the Federal loyalty-security program, I cannot escape the conclusion that a still further confusion prevents us from reaching calm and judicious decisions. The same, I believe, applies to congressional investigations. We seem to confuse mere advocacy of ideas with propagation of ideas by coercion. If anybody doubts this let him read the memoranda from the FBI and the Army and Navy intelligence services which were submitted to President Truman's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty and which dictated the original loyalty program set up on the basis of the Commission's recommendations. Copious extracts from these memoranda have been published in Miss Eleanor Bontacou's recent book on the Federal loyalty-security program. These memoranda make amazing reading. They tell us that disloyal and subversive persons—they are never once defined—are dangerous for two reasons. They are dangerous, first, because they are potential spies. And they are also dangerous—and I quote—"because of the propaganda they disseminate." The Director of the Office of Naval Intelligence tells us that—and I quote—"because it has its roots in humanitarian principles based on the rights of man, our democracy is particularly susceptible to subversive attack. It is easy to masquerade as protectors of civil liberties, or promoters of the interest of individuals whose level of economy is declared to be substandard. Making an emotional appeal for the downtrodden such groups loudly demand rights for particular groups, but usually fail to point out the corresponding duty which logically arises from any social contract."

A Jefferson would have regarded the rights of man as constituting the strongest foundation of our democracy, but here this is presented as its greatest weakness. A Lincoln would have said that you cannot fool the people very often, but here the people are pictured as the great gullible who needs a policeman to keep the Communists from subverting him.

Now, I have tried to stress that, if we want to preserve democracy the fight for the integrity of our institutions must be carried on by means approved by the Constitution itself. Any abridgement of rights which it guarantees would defeat the very purpose of

the fight. I have also pointed out that, in my view, we have gone far afield in stretching the limits of the permissible scope of action. At the same time, I indicated some of the political reasons for the present trends: I mentioned the emotional tensions of the cold war with Soviet Russia and the resulting fears lest our Nation be destroyed. It remains to point out some of the reasons which are anchored in home politics.

Indeed, I am troubled by the fact that when we speak of Communists, we are rather vague in stating what a Communist is. It is a matter of everyday occurrence that people of liberal views are called Communists. There is also evidence that such confusion is not limited to "neighborly" relations but tends to affect the Federal clearance procedures. In studying these attitudes, I feel that we have here a situation which threatens the integrity of our institutions and our way of life. As every other work of human endeavor, our country is not perfect. Only a steady process of improvement can prevent society from decay or revolution. We believe that the best way to bring about beneficial changes is the democratic process established by the Constitution.

The essence of liberalism is a keen feeling for the necessity of change when the existing state of affairs exhibits social and economic injustice or traits of a lifeless and trammeling past. Liberalism, therefore, is a structural element of the democratic process. To suggest that liberals are traitors or to intimate this covertly, represents a direct danger to our society.

Of late, the fight against liberals has been carried out under the slogans of the fight against treason. This new slogan came to supplement the older pretext that the liberals in our country had advocated "un-American" ideas.

Representative MARTIN DIES who was the principal proponent of the resolution creating the Committee on Unamerican Activities and its first chairman only last Monday issued a statement strongly urging fair hearings for persons accused as security risks. He said: "I know the accused ought to be confronted with witnesses * * * he ought to have a bill of particulars in advance, and he ought to know the criteria for judging—the rules on what constitutes guilt." He stated further: "When the committee started in 1938, I warned in my opening statement that such a probe could go to excess. I pledged if it did, that I would take the lead in correcting it and defending innocent people. So I felt a moral obligation. * * * I never wanted this to become an emotional, hysterical thing." Representative DIES indicated that he became alarmed concerning the Federal loyalty-security program in the process of representing a Federal employee, Dr. Edward Elliot, charged with disloyalty. This man Representative DIES had cleared before the Un-American Activities Committee back in 1942. In regard to this case, Representative DIES said: "I believe that in back of this thing was violent opposition to Dr. Elliott's views. He had liberal ideas, but we're not supposed to punish men for their ideas, it made me feel we were getting back to the star chamber. It frightened me, because it seemed so contrary to what I always believed was fundamental American fair play * * * I want to do something. I am trying to accomplish the purpose of keeping security from being used for oppression or political purpose."

I believe that the time has come to raise the question as to the place of the liberals in our society urgently and openly. The liberal must be restored in his constitutional rights and given the place which, in the spirit of the Constitution, he must hold in our democratic society. And, too, the liberal must be protected from unfounded politically inspired accusations of treason, communism and subversion.

At present the position of the liberal has become particularly difficult, not only because he has been placed in a state of general mistrust, but also because every one of his ideas or suggestions for the improvement of conditions in our country is immediately challenged in some political quarters as Communist inspired. In a certain historical situation there are only a limited number of measures for improvement and it is not surprising that men of different philosophies of life may in practice follow a similar train of thought. This coincidence of detail, however, does not justify the conclusion that similar solutions necessarily presuppose identity of political philosophies.

For example, John Foster Dulles has written at length how the Communists have adopted in their propaganda many basic tenents of the Christian religion. Mr. Dulles' inference was clear that an ardent Christian cannot be called a Communist because some of his social attitudes coincide with some of the views of Communists.

Do we not agree that this unworthy challenge should not be made a test of loyalty? I believe it is alarming that we are presently forced to fight for the right of the liberals to exist and to act in our society. This disturbing trend that we are forced to fight clearly shows that the questions discussed tonight bear directly on our entire future.

It is our tragic lot to live in the shadow of a possible new global war and we know that, if war should come, it is of little importance how we plan to shape our lives. With the new weapons and their devastating power civilization will hardly survive. But we all hope that mankind will succeed in avoiding this terrible end. We trust that reason will prevail and that it will be given to us to bequeath to our children the democratic heritage as unimpaired as we have received it from the hands of our fathers. This is a difficult task to fulfill. Only a firm belief in the social values of democracy, only intellectual integrity, thoughtful vigilance, and selfless dedication to serve our fellowmen can help us to prevail.

From an old past, from a different country comes to us an admonition. The scene is Rome. The time—a moment of grave danger to the Roman Republic. The speaker—Marcus Porcius Cato, the statesman and the patriot. At the Roman magistrates he threw his challenge:

"Caveant consules ne quid detrimenti res publica capiat!" * * * "Consuls, beware, lest disaster befall the Republic."

These words are always in my mind. They do not let me rest.

The People's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the American people, in a truly democratic fashion, could choose the military service they want to guarantee United States defense, there is no doubt what their choice would be. They believe in air power, and they know that only air power can guarantee our security. They know that the United States Air Force, with its intercontinental bombers, and its record of performance in World War II and in Korea, is the best bet for victory in world war III, if it comes, and for keeping the peace, in hopes of avoiding it.

A recent Gallup poll has proved this decisively. When asked which branch of the Armed Forces they thought would be most important in the event of another war, more than 70 percent of the people questioned reaffirmed, as they did in a similar poll in 1949, that they thought the Air Force would be the most important.

Comments the director of the Gallup poll:

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force—how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

It is not that the Air Force is the most popular of the services in general esteem, however. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Air Force must play the top role in the next war, if we are to win it; and that is what the American people know, and what we must keep in mind in our consideration of the defense budget.

I ask the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures assembled by Mr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, bearing on this inescapable fact. The news release containing this significant information follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—TOP ROLE FOR AIR FORCE IN NEXT WAR FORECAST

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 31.—If another world war comes, the average American today has one idea fixed firmly in his mind: the United States Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy.

More than 7 out of every 10 persons, or 71 percent, questioned in the latest institute survey think the Air Force would be most important, compared to 5 percent who say the Navy and 4 percent who think the Army would be most important.

About 1 person in 5, or 19 percent, believes all 3 branches will be equally important. This is an increase, however, over the opinion reflected by a similar question in 1949.

This is clearly shown in the results of interviews with a cross section of adults across the country, who were asked this question by institute reporters:

"In the event of another world war, which branch of the Armed Forces do you think will be most important—the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force?"

The vote today and that of a similar survey in October 1949:

	Today	1949
	Percent	*Percent*
Army	4	6
Navy	5	4
Air Force	71	74
All three equally important	19	9
Don't know	3	7

Today's table adds to more than 100 percent because some persons named two branches which they said would be equally important.

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force, how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

The same situation prevails by age levels, as shown in the following tables:

By education

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	6	3	6
Navy	4	4	6
Air Force	71	71	70
All three	19	21	16
Don't know	2	2	5

By age

	21–29 years	30–49 years	50 and over
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	7	4	3
Navy	3	5	5
Air Force	70	69	75
All three	19	21	17
Don't know	2	3	3

Ike Strong in Minshall Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the results of a poll taken by my colleague, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, who represents the 23d District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you join with me when I say that some of us who have been here for several terms look with pride upon the endeavors and accomplishments of some of the freshmen or new Members of Congress. I have that pride when I see the services being performed by Congressman MINSHALL, of Ohio. It was my privilege to serve with Congressman MINSHALL back in the Ohio Legislature. He is bringing to Congress the same excellent service and unceasing efforts on behalf of the people he represents. His endeavors to keep in contact with his constituents by means of many visits and polls certainly is commendable. In my opinion, we need have no fear of the future when the American people send to Congress young men with vision, integrity, honesty, and a willingness to work as exemplified by some of the new Members of this great legislative body, including the capable Member from the 23d District of Ohio.

IKE STRONG IN MINSHALL POLL

Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL today released the final tabulation of returns to his opinion poll which was mailed to a cross section of approximately 25,000 23d Congressional District residents in March.

The final tabulation of nearly 4,000 returns produced unmistakable evidence that President Eisenhower and his program are extremely popular with 23d District voters. Eighty-three and seven-tenths percent of those people answering the poll answered "Yes" to the question, "Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?"

This 83.7-percent support is an increase of almost 15 percent over the Eisenhower vote in 1952 when the President received 69.4 percent of the total vote cast for that office in the 23d Congressional District.

The largest number of "Yes" answers was in response to the question "Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?" Ninety-three and one-tenth percent of the answers favored this portion of President Eisenhower's program. Another portion of the Eisenhower program heavily favored by 23d Congressional District voters was the 89.4 percent support of the President's Armed Forces Reserve program.

Twenty-third District residents registered their greatest disapproval against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Almost as great a disapproval was registered against the further lowering of taxes when 84 percent of those polled answered "No" to the question "Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?" In this regard, a near majority, 49.3 percent, would even approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget.

Thirty-one and five-tenths percent of the people polled had no opinion on the Bricker amendment and 27.2 percent had no opinion on the reciprocal trade-agreements program, the two largest percentages in the "no opinion" column.

Congressman MINSHALL expressed his appreciation for the prompt and amazing response to his opinion poll and stated: "The results evidenced such a sincere and genuine interest in Government operations that future polls will be a regular part of my representing the people of the 23d Congressional District."

The final tabulation follows:

Final tabulation, Congressman William E. Minshall's opinion poll

Question	Answer in percentages		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor continued military assistance to Asia?	69.7	21.5	8.8
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Asia?	70.1	21.6	8.3
Do you favor continued military assistance to Europe?	72.4	21.3	6.3
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Europe?	56.2	37.5	6.3
Should nuclear weapons be used against Communist aggression?	73.7	17.7	8.6
Do you feel the United Nations deserves our continued support?	80.6	13.3	6.1
Do you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?	11.9	82.4	5.7
Are you in agreement with the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy?	74.3	11.9	13.8
Would you favor reductions in defense spending?	28.0	67.7	4.3
Do you favor wage and price "standby" controls for use in case of emergency?	79.3	13.7	7.0
Do you believe that the civil defense program is adequate?	34.2	52.3	13.5
Do you favor congressional investigations of Un-American activities?	75.2	19.7	5.1
Do you favor granting immunity from criminal prosecution and forcing people to testify who use the defense of the fifth amendment?	39.1	47.9	13.0
Do you favor the use in Federal courts of evidence gained by or developed from wire tapping in cases involving national security?	81.7	14.0	4.3
Do you favor an Armed Forces Reserve program to build and maintain powerful civilian reserves?	89.4	6.6	4.0
Do you favor universal military training?	76.8	19.3	3.9
Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?	12.3	84.0	3.7
Would you approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget?	49.3	46.3	4.4
Would you favor increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	56.5	36.3	7.2
Should the Taft-Hartley Act be amended?	34.9	49.7	15.4
Do you approve of Federal aid to education to assist States in providing more public school classrooms?	64.4	30.3	5.3
Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii?	76.4	10.2	13.4
Do you approve of statehood for Alaska?	73.6	15.6	10.8
Do you approve of the reciprocal trade agreements program?	65.5	7.3	27.2
Do you favor the administration's farm program of flexible price supports?	66.8	19.7	13.5
Do you favor the Bricker amendment?	35.6	32.9	31.5
Do you favor raising postal rates to reduce the deficit in the Post Office Department?	71.4	23.2	5.4
Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote?	40.9	53.6	5.5
Should the present 75 cents an hour minimum wage law be increased to 90 cents an hour?	56.6	32.6	10.8
Do you favor a salary increase for Federal employees?	51.8	29.1	19.1
Do you believe that Congress should authorize 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next 2 years?	32.8	43.8	18.0
Do you believe that the Small Business Administration which assists and encourages small-business enterprises should be continued?	81.7	10.8	7.5
Are you in favor of the administration's expanded Federal interstate highway program?	84.2	8.6	7.2
Do you favor a Federal health reinsurance program to encourage voluntary participation in health-insurance programs?	38.5	44.0	17.5
Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?	93.1	4.1	2.8
Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	83.7	5.1	11.2

Background on Parcel Post Size and Weight Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the parcel post service was created by act of Congress in 1912, and went into operation on January 1, 1913. It was recognized in the Congress at that time that the establishment of a parcel-post system would bring about some dislocations in the transportation business. Proof is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1912, where this statement is found:

> The proposed measure will benefit all classes of the people except those carriers now engaged in the business of transporting small wares. While the patronage of these will be lessened, it will have the effect to limit their business to the more weighty freight, which is distinctly the business of such carriers.

That statement also belies some allegations that the parcel-post establishment was for the principal benefit of rural residents in that it says the enactment would benefit all classes of people.

The impermanence of the original 11-pound, 72-inch limit on parcel post is pointed up by the Senate committee report of 1912, which said:

When the parcel-post service has once been inaugurated, details, such as insurance, collect on delivery, reduction in rates, increased weight limits, and so forth, can be rapidly added as experience indicates the character of the new service that should be provided.

The wants of the American public were quickly made known, and the first increase in parcels allowable in the mails was made in August 1913—just 8 months after the service began. Other increases were made periodically until 1931, when the 70-pound, 100-inch limit was reached. This was apparently the optimum, as it remained in effect for more than 20 years, half the life of the parcel-post system, until Public Law 199 was enacted in 1951.

During this 20-year period, the Railway Express Agency was making acquisitions to become a monopoly in its field, the final acquisition being made in 1938. During this 20-year period, the express agency enjoyed its greatest period of prosperity. During the latter part of this 20-year period, there began an upsurge in the businesses of motor carriers and freight forwarders.

In an economic period, when nearly all business was prospering, the early years after World War II, the business of the express agency declined. Rising costs of doing business forced railway-express rates up 123 percent, while parcel-post rates were increasing 125 percent. During this period, there was a 25-percent decline in railway-express shipments and a 50-percent decline in railroad less-than-carload shipments. At the same time, however, there was taking place a 180-percent increase in freight-forwarder activity, a 260-percent rise in over-the-road carriage—motor carriers, and a 7,251-percent increase in air freight. During this same period, the growth of the parcel-post service only paralleled the growth of business in the other three classifications of mail.

The express agency, supported by its parent-company railroads, found a convenient whipping boy in the parcel-post system. Apparently they felt that it would be easier to wreck this valuable service in an effort to recoup its losses than it would be to cope with their true competitors—the freight forwarders, motor carriers, and air transport.

They sold their case well to the Congress. The employee unions of the railroads and the express agency were mobilized, and the rank-and-file employees were recruited to write emotional letters to the Congress, and fallacious reasoning was employed so effectively that the Congress was persuaded to enact Public Law 199 in 1951, to become effective January 1, 1952.

That law says:

I. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the first and second postal zones can measure no more than 72 inches, length and girth combined, and can weigh up to 40 pounds.

II. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the third through eighth postal zones can measure 72 inches, length and girth combined, but can weigh no more than 20 pounds.

III. Parcels moving to or from a second-, third-, or fourth-class post office could still adhere to the 70-pound, 100-inch limit formerly available to all postal patrons.

The effect of this law was to provide a Government small-parcel delivery service to the least populous sections of the country; a parcel-delivery service of the most expensive kind to the areas of the country which by reason of their lack of development contributed least to the support of the cost of the service. But at the same time, the citizens of the more densely populated areas, from whom comes the major financial support to the Government, are being denied all but a small part of the parcel-post service.

The law was enacted over the protest of the shipping public who stood ready to pay any necessary cost of the parcel-post service commensurate with efficient operation; a shipping public which knew there could be no substitute for the parcel-post system, which reaches into every town, village, and hamlet of the United States.

The proponents of Public Law 199 had as their watchword "Get the freight out of the parcel-post service." While Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary provides no definitive dimensions for freight, traffic experts recognize freight as being only those shipments in excess of 100 pounds.

The effects of the law have been these:

Contrary to the claim that enactment of the law would increase Railway Express employment, the number of employees of that agency has continued to decline until now there are fewer employees than in 1940, and 1,155 fewer employees than when the law went into effect.

According to information filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Express Agency net profit has fallen from $556,000 in 1951, the last year before Public Law 199 became operative, to only $11,624 for the first 10 months of 1954.

Packaging costs of commercial users of parcel post have increased greatly due to the necessity of breaking packages formerly acceptable in parcel post into two or more packages in order to meet the restrictions of Public Law 199. This also has the effect of increasing operating expenses in the Post Office Department by reason of increasing the number of packages handled in moving a volume of weight formerly acceptable in the mail in a single package.

The private patron of the parcel-post system has met with utter confusion under the act. In many instances the son or daughter in college can no longer send their laundry home; food boxes from home are smaller. New patterns are being sent in Christmas gifts going through the mails in order to avoid the freight classification spelled out in Public Law 199. A lady's winter coat, when properly packaged for mailing, is now barred from the mails because it often falls into the category of freight.

Rural patrons of the Post Office Department, who were exempted from the restrictions of Public Law 199, were not able to escape the 36-percent increase in parcel-post rates, which is said by postal officials to be an increase nearly 60 percent greater than would have been necessary without Public Law 199.

The fiscal condition of the Post Office Department, in behalf of which the proponents of Public Law 199 assumed to speak at length, is said by postal officials to be around $70 million worse off than would be the case without Public Law 199.

But the efforts of the opponents to this law to get it repealed have not yet been successful.

Principal reasons for this lack of success to date are:

The proponents of the law are most adept at twisting statistics to picture conditions as favorable to their cause when such is not the case. They take the Post Office Department reports and interpret them to mean something entirely different from what was intended by that office. They quote statements out of context, and use different figures of their own to portray whatever picture best suits their need at the moment.

An outstanding example of the latter is this:

The express agency, when seeking ICC approval for increased minimum charges, said they had captured only 20 percent of the business lost to the Post Office Department by reason of Public Law 199. But, a few weeks later, when they went before the St. George subcommittee in the House of Representatives in January 1954 to urge retention of that law, they said they had gained 57 percent of the business lost to the post office by reason of Public Law 199. In the same connection, the agency often claims that competition from the Post Office Department had caused the layoff of 40,000 railway express employees. However, when they appeared before the ICC to get a rate increase, they presented information to show that 1,941 employees had been returned to their jobs. They told the congressional committee that about 4,000 had been returned to their jobs. Now, if they had recovered 20 percent of the business they claimed the parcel-post system had taken from them before Public Law 199, it would seem that 8,000 people would have been returned to their jobs. If they had recaptured 57 percent of the traffic driven out of the parcel-post system by Public Law 199, would not more than 22,000 people have been returned to their jobs? Yet, according to most recent employment figures available, there are 1,155 fewer employees in the agency now than when Public Law 199 went into effect. That leaves us completely in the dark as to just how has the parcel-post system affected railway express employment and profits? Indeed, is there any relationship at all? Was the parcel-post system ever competitive with the Railway Express Agency? The business on which the motor carriers, air carriers, and freight forwarders are prospering certainly did not come from the parcel-post system. Proof of this lies in the difficulties experienced when a shipper asks for the pickup of a shipment weighing less than 100 pounds. The prosperity of these carriers cannot

all be attributed to movement of merchandise that just never moved before. It had to come from some other carrier, and there is ample evidence to indicate that much of it came from the railroads and from the Railway Express Agency.

But the railroads and the express agency have the political strength to continue to convince the Congress that its competitor is the parcel-post system; they have "sold" the Congress that its losses were due to the dozen shirts, the fishing rod, the card table, the lamp shade, and any number of similar items formerly carried by the parcel-post system, but which, because of a strange act of Congress, are now classified as "freight," and, as such, are barred from the mails.

It is to be hoped that Congress will soon realize that interests of 160 million Americans—all potential users of the parcel-post system—are to be considered ahead of the interests of a single monopoly that cannot rightly tell who its real competitors are. When the Congress reaches such a realization, or when the true facts of the parcel post controversy are evaluated, there can be only one result: repeal of Public Law 199.

International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—GRANTS FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS TO STUDY AT INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The report of the House Appropriation Committee on the international educational exchange activities of the State Department includes a statement to the effect that the committee "doubts that it was ever the intent of the Congress to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a university of another foreign country." This statement read in connection with the hearings on this activity seems to reflect some concern over the fact that $220,155 in foreign currency equivalents, out of a total of $22 million requested for this activity, would be spent on grants to enable foreigners to attend American educational institutions in other foreign countries.

I should like to point out that the hearings indicate that the Department does not propose to spend this modest sum for studies in universities of other foreign countries but rather for studies in American colleges, American schools, and American institutes situated in foreign countries, and mostly in the countries of which the proposed students are citizens. It is true that to a limited extent some of these students would study in other foreign countries.

The information submitted by the Department and included in the report of the hearings (p. 334), however, indicates that something less than 16 percent of the local overseas grants or a total of $35,154 in foreign currency equivalents would be devoted to such studies in so-called "third countries." That information indicates that this small sum would enable two students from Iraq to study at the American University of Beirut and that less than 220 out of the 1,354 of these local overseas grantees would study for short periods of time at the well-known Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Salzburg, Austria, and at American institutes modeled after it in Norway and Holland.

As I understand it, the authority for such grants is to be found in the Fulbright act. That act provides, among other things, for the expenditure of foreign currencies for "financing studies, research, instruction and other educational activities * * * of the citizens of such foreign country in the American schools and institutions of higher learning located outside the continental United States" and its territories "including transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses incident to scholastic activities." I understand that this provision was intended to extend the benefits of educational exchange to a few foreign grantees, too many of whom could not come to this country and for whom such contact with American education and American educators would be the next best thing.

Pursuant to that provision, grants have been made for attendance at such American centers of American influence as Roberts College at Istanbul, the American University of Beirut and the American Farm School at Salonika and other such institutions. As the program has progressed, other additional institutions have been qualified to participate in this phase of the program by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the Board appointed by the President of the United States and consisting primarily of nongovernmental educators "for the purpose of selecting students and educational institutions qualified to participate in this program, and to supervise the exchange program authorized herein."

The hearings in the report would indicate that the committee was concerned primarily with the attendance of these foreign nationals at such American institutes abroad as the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies at Salzburg, Austria, and similar American institutes which have been established with the Salzburg Seminar as a model. I understand also that the focus of study in such institutes or seminars is American institutions and American studies, and that in most cases the students who receive these small grants are, in fact, teachers and mature people in positions where they can pass on what they have learned about American institutions in an influential way to their students, their associates, and their fellow citizens at home.

The hearings themselves contain a full description of the Salzburg Seminar which points out the fact that the Seminar is a private American institution which has received gifts from many private respectable American sources. The purpose of the Seminar is to enable Europeans to understand more fully the United States, its institutions, culture and way of life, and insofar as possible to correct the misconceptions concerning the United States which exist in Europe today. I call attention especially to the statement of the United States High Commissioner to Austria in 1951, which is quoted in the hearings: "Never before has it been so necessary for freemen to meet together in groups dedicated to better understanding and support of our free institutions."

I understand that the Salzburg Seminar and others like it also utilize fully American professors sent abroad under the FULBRIGHT program thereby expanding greatly the audiences for these spokesmen on American life and institutions. In view of all these facts, I would hope that nothing in the committee report would convey the impression that these seminars or institutes are universities of another foreign country. Rather, they are American centers abroad which, like the earlier and better known institutions like Roberts College, are islands of American influence and understanding overseas. I hope that this kind of activity can be continued on its current modest scale.

Will We Have To Ration Doctors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of my radio broadcast on Saturday, April 16, 1955, over WMEX, Boston, Mass.:

The health standards of the United States are rising.

More people recognize the importance of good health and want to protect it.

With our increasing population, however, there are not enough doctors, dentists, and nurses to go around.

The question "Will we have to ration doctors?" is intended to point up the shortage and to get us thinking about remedies for this malnutrition in the medical profession itself.

The Health Resources Advisory Committee, which includes distinguished doctors, has just made a report of its findings to the Office of Defense Mobilization of the United States Government.

Their diagnosis should be given careful consideration in the treatment of aid-to-medical-schools bills which are now before the Congress. Generally speaking, these bills intend to provide $250 to $300 million in direct-grant aid to medical schools on a matching basis for the construction of new facilities.

Why is this necessary?

To help meet the $330 million construction of new facilities by medical schools that was needed as far back as 1947–48.

Based on the estimate of 75 out of 79 medical schools that they urgently need additional or improved space.

The increase in the number of physicians is falling behind the more rapid increase in our population.

The gross ratio of physicians to population is now 1.32 per 1,000, and the net ratio (active physicans only) is now 1.18, both slightly lower than just before World War II.

By 1960 the United States will have a total of 177 million people who will, at some time or another, need medical care.

At the rate we are going in medical education there will be fewer physicians percentagewise in 1960 than we had in 1950.

As the committee summarizes, "We have a tight supply situation in the three major health professions—medicine, dentistry, and nursing. The supply, both of physicians and dentists, has not increased as fast as the population, in the period since the beginning of World War II. The supply of nurses has increased more rapidly, but there are still many unmet demands for graduate nurses. There is little prospect for improvement in the total situation in this decade."

The medical schools are finding it hard to maintain adequate staffs with money problems and the shortage of qualified health manpower exerting heavy pressures.

Most medical schools reply upon part-time personnel, especially for instruction in clinical subjects. In the 1951 survey, medical faculties included 3,933 members with full-time, and 11,630 members with part-time appointments. Many of the 11,630 part-time faculty members were able to devote little time to teaching, the average being less than 300 hours per year.

Only 21 of the 72 4-year medical schools reported staffing which was up to the standard recommended by the Joint Committee on Medical Education.

The most specific report on this subject is found in the 1953 Education Number of the American Medical Association which states that for the school year 1953, the number of unfilled fulltime positions in the instructional staffs of medical schools was 283.

A significant change in the pattern of medical education and practice in recent years, is the growth of hospital internship, and residency training programs. Hospitals and practicing physicians have come increasingly to rely on these "house staffs." The result is that the demand by hospitals has, for some time, been greater than the supply of potential trainees, and hospitals vie with one another for their services.

In spite of the rapid increase in the number of physicians in training, the opportunities for training have continued to increase faster than the number of applicants. In 1952–53, 28 percent of internships and 24 percent of the residencies in hospitals were unfilled.

An important aspect of the hospital staffing picture has been the increase in the number of aliens on house staffs. Alien physicians comprise over a quarter of the house staffs of general nonteaching and of tuberculosis hospitals, and almost a quarter of the staffs of mental hospitals. Without their services, the shortage would be acute.

Concerning physicians in private practice, the very long workweek reported, 60 hours on the average, shows that there is little reserve of professional time and skill in today's pattern of provision for medical care.

Although there has been a rapid growth of public health services in this country, at least 30 million people live in areas without organized health departments. As of 1951, budgeted vacancies in the existing State and local public health departments amounted to 20 percent for physicians, 21 percent for dentists, 14 percent for sanitary engineers, 6 percent for sanitarians, 10 percent for veterinarians, and 9 percent for public health nurses. Even without the threat of atomic attack, or biological warfare, a shortage of this size is serious. With these threats existing, the shortage might threaten preventable disaster.

Bear in mind that this whole report was on the subject of "Mobilization and Health Manpower" and was submitted to the Office of Defense Mobilization where you hear this conclusion, and I quote:

"The physician-population ratio has become essentially stabilized. There are unmet demands today in medical education, public health, mental and tuberculosis hospitals, industry and rehabilitation, to name only a few areas. Many rural areas and small towns are in need of practicing physicians. Hospitals in increasing numbers are using alien physicians for house staffs.

"If the threat of attack on the cities of this country were to materialize in any of the presently predicted forms, the combined effect of civilian casualties and casualties in the health professions would place a considerably heavier burden on the population than did the last war, when the civilian population suffered neither military attack nor such an occurrence as the influenza pandemic of the First World War. A civilian disaster of the magnitude possible today could put an incredible load on the civilian health personnel."

Concerning the overall question: "Is there adequate medical training in the United States?" a few of the following facts will help us to reach an answer.

There are 74 approved medical schools, and 6 approved schools of basic medical sciences in the United States, including 1 approved medical school in Puerto Rico.

Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and five students were enrolled in the country's medical schools and 438 students in schools of basic sciences in 1953–54, making a total of 28,043 persons now preparing to fill the Nation's need for doctors.

Six thousand eight hundred and sixteen students graduated from medical schools in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1954. However, it is estimated that about 4,000 doctors are lost each year through death and retirement, so that the actual net increase of doctors was only 2,816.

Fourteen thousand six hundred and seventy-eight individuals applied for admission to American medical schools for the college year 1953–54.

Forty-three percent of these applicants came from 6 States (New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and California).

Applicants from the following 7 States (Delaware, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, and Wyoming) represented only 1.4 percent of all persons submitting applications for admission to our medical schools. Only one of this number, Vermont, has an approved medical school.

By contrast, 2 years previously more than 20,000 applied for admission. The drop for 1953–54 reflects three factors.

1. The increasing cost of medical school tuition is pricing thousands of potential medical school students out of the market. New York University recently raised its medical school tuition to $1,000 per year.

2. The end of eligibility under the GI bill of rights.

3. A general feeling among college graduates that it is just too tough to get into medical schools.

Only 53 percent of the applicants were admitted as freshmen to the medical colleges in the United States in 1953–54.

Large numbers of qualified applicants are unable to gain admittance because of geographical restrictions. Thirty-eight percent of the State and municipally owned medical colleges (15 out of 39) restrict enrollment of first-year students to residents of the State in which the school is located. Twenty-three schools limit the number of out-of-State residents to less than 10 percent of the positions in the entering class. Only 22 schools admit out-of-State residents in numbers equal to more than 50 percent of the openings. As a result of these restrictions, some medical schools are forced to take nearly everyone who applies, while others can accept only 1 out of every 10 or 15 applicants.

The basic barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools. This means that the proportion of students who enter medical school has remained almost constant for the past 20 years whereas the proportion who receive a college education has more than quadrupled, and the proportion entering engineering has increased sixfold.

By 1960, the shortage of nurses for this country as a whole may exceed 50,000.

There are almost 300,000 auxiliary nursing workers in hospitals, and perhaps another 100,000 elsewhere. The need in 1960 for these workers is estimated at more than 450,000.

The technician shortage is a serious bottleneck in the provision of medical service. Hospitals in the United States recently reported about 18,000 vacant positions for workers in 7 major fields allied to medicine—laboratory technicians, therapists of all kinds, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, clinical psychologists, etc. In another 5 years, 35,000 will be needed.

In a nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times in 1952, it was found that "30 percent of the Nation's medical schools report that they are unable to get sufficient funds to meet their operating budgets." Of the $3,000 to $4,500 a year it costs the medical school to educate a medical student, the average student pays $600 to $900 a year in tuition, or only one-fifth of the cost.

In contrast to the $93 million to be spent for medical education in the academic year 1954–55, the American public spent in 1953 $5,300,000,000 for tobacco products and smoking supplies, $377 million for parimutuel net receipts, $105 million for make-up bases, face powder, and lipsticks.

From this comparison, it would seem that the Congress would be justified in making a modest appropriation to keep our medical schools alive.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by me commemorating the 212th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson, under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution held at Jefferson Memorial, April 13, 1955:

My fellow Americans, today, in an atmosphere befitting the occasion, we assemble to do honor to a great American. Standing here at the memorial he so richly deserves, we gaze upon the outskirts of Washington, a city which represents the capital of a nation he helped to mold. Lawyer, rebel legislator, Governor, Ambassador, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President, Thomas Jefferson perhaps more than any other man charted the course and served at the helm of a ship of state which has become through the years the envy of the entire world.

Though his capacities were many in service of his country, his greatest attainment was as an architect. He visioned and built Monticello. He visioned and built the University of Virginia. But, best of all, he visioned and built a Federal Constitution that guaranteed freedom to live the life of one's own choosing; to worship as our conscience dictates; to speak our own minds without fear; to participate in the affairs of our Government; to preserve our own dignity as God intended that it be preserved.

He made another major contribution to America and the entire universe. He was the architect of a political philosophy which is as rich and as right today as when he put it into words nearly 200 years ago. The philosophy of Thomas Jefferson has been a beacon light to guard America's future against dangerous adventures and false Old World philosophies which would compromise or destroy our birthright.

Indeed, dangerous times came about when prophets of socialism in other guises sought to belittle and brush aside the advice of the Sage of Monticello. And in these times our Nation ventured into strange waters which brought a degree of regimentation of the people; of peacetime controls over the economy; of inflation and unbalanced budgets.

Jefferson had warned that when we tell the farmer what to sow and what to reap we would soon want bread. He was so right when he said:

"My God. How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy."

And yet despite our previous misadventures and experiments away from the American form of government, there are still a number of national legislators backed up by a strong and vociferous minority who believe there is something wrong with the way we do things; that we can borrow parts of socialism and integrate them into our philosophy of government. My good friends, freedom and socialism are as compatible as a cat and dog. If we want to destroy freedom we have only to adopt socialism. Extreme danger exists even if we flirt with it as some of our nearsighted people suggest.

Thomas Jefferson had another architectual accomplishment. It was through his efforts that the great Democratic Party came into being. Throughout the years until the early 1930's, his political philosophy dictated the action of that party. But then the party began to depart from Jeffersonian teachings and direction.

But after a period of this transgression the American people became alarmed and through the voice that Jefferson gave them returned the Nation to the course decreed by our forefathers. In so doing, they reaffirmed their belief in and adherence to the principles on which America was founded and grew to greatness.

Today the political party Thomas Jefferson brought into being is content to team him with another patron saint—Andrew Jackson. That is somewhat of a shotgun wedding because Jefferson was a statesman with ideals that transcended political considerations and Jackson was a political and a very inept politician at that. He does not belong in the same company with Jefferson.

Jefferson is not a patron saint of the Democratic Party only. He is also a patron saint of the Republican Party. He was also the founder of the Jeffersonian Republican Party. And throughout the years the Republican Party has more consistently embraced and advanced Jeffersonian philosophy than has the Democratic Party. The critics of that philosophy and those who expound it say that we are behind the times; that we live in a forgotten age; that tradition mars our vision; that the world is passing us by.

If keeping step with a world of communism and socialism is necessary to progress; if following in the footsteps of Bevan and Stalin are essential to America's future then indeed we are a decadent nation and a decadent people. But I, for one, prefer to be decadent; I prefer that the world march by without us. I prefer to live in a forgotten age—an age that gave me cherished and inalienable rights; I prefer to have my vision clouded by tradition.

Of course we are not out of step with the world. By following the principles of Jefferson and others like him we are so far ahead of the world in government philosophy, in spiritual and material greatness that the world will never catch up with us. Those who advocate a departure from our course are either terribly misguided or they are purposely seeking to destroy our way of life. We shall not fall into their trap. We shall not guide our ship of state into dangerous shoals.

We most certainly would not forsake the American way for that of Russia or her satellites. We would certainly not lower our standards to those of England whose previous socialistic experiments have made it a nation of "have nots." Of France, Jefferson wrote and I quote:

"Indeed it is difficult to conceive how so good a people, so fertile a soil, so genial a climate, should be rendered so ineffectual for producing human happiness by one single curse—that of a bad form of government. * * * Of 20 millions of people supposed to be in France, I am of the opinion there are 19 millions more wretched, more accursed in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual of the whole United States." Jefferson wrote this appraisal in 1785. It still stands good. France is now floundering because of unstable government. Her standard of living cannot be remotely compared with ours. Do we want to keep in step with France? The answer is a thundering "no."

Name any nation, compare it with these United States, and you will quickly count your blessings. America became that way because of farsighted men like Thomas Jefferson. And America is going to stay that way by rededicating itself to the principles of Thomas Jefferson. These principles are given himself in what might be called a credo to a Democrat. In a letter written to Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, in January 1799, Jefferson said, and I quote:

"I am for preserving to the States the powers not yielded by them to the Union * * * and I am not for transferring all the powers of the States to the Federal Government.

"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all of the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt on the principle of it's being a public blessing.

"I am for free commerce with all nations; political connection with none. And I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering the fields of slaughter to preserve their balance, or joining in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty.

"I am for freedom of religion and against all maneuvers to bring about a legal ascendancy of one sect over another; for freedom of the press and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force and not by reason the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents. * * * The first object of my heart is my own country. In that is embarked my family, my fortune, and my own existence. I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fibre of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another, but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us."

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson and instead of the "credo of a Democrat," they should be the "credo of an American." Many have sought to tag Jefferson with the label of an isolationist. But harken to his words which I just quoted and which I now repeat. Said he: "I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fiber of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us." "More or less friendly to us." This phrase, in my opinion, gives Jeffersonian sanction to the mutual defense alliances between the free nations against the spread and aggression of communism. Indeed, communism would destroy all Jefferson worked and labored for and were he living today he would be one of its most vigorous opponents.

The Sage of Monticello was a doer. His accomplishments in behalf of his country were their own reward. His labors brought him satisfaction and a measure of contentment. He was essentially a family man and it was his regret that he could not spend more time with those dear to him. The great love of his life came to an untimely end with the death of his Martha, who gave him six children. On the white marble tombstone Jefferson inscribed a verse of such tenderness that, to shelter his emotions from the public gaze, he had it chiseled in Greek. Translated it reads:

"If in the melancholy shades below,
The flames of friends and lovers cease to glow,
Yet mine shall sacred last; mine undecayed
Burn on through death and animate my shade."

And though he had lost his most precious possession the great man found momentary relief in the unselfish service of the Nation he helped create. And in this process of service and eventual retirement his affections were transferred to his daughter, Martha Randolph.

When, after perhaps the most useful life of any American citizen, Thomas Jefferson himself saw the approach of his own death, it was to Mary Randolph he penned a private and deeply moving farewell. It was a little poem and he handed it to her in a little casket. It read, and I quote:

"Life's visions are vanished, its dreams are no more,
Dear friends of my bosom, why bathed in tears?
I go to my fathers; I welcome the shore
Which crowns all my hopes or which buries my cares.
Then farewell, my dear, my lov'd daughter, adieu!
The last pang of life is in parting from you!
Two seraphs await me long shrouded in death;
I will bear them your love on my last parting breath."

Death came to him, as it must to all of us, on July 4, 1826, just 50 years to the day after the Declaration of Independence.

Thomas Jefferson had lived triumphantly a full and rich life, the fruit of which will feed and inspire countless generations of Americans to come. Said James Madison: "* * * he lives and will live in the memory and gratitude of the wise and good, as a luminary of science, as a votary of liberty, as a model of patriotism, and as a benefactor of human kind."

To pay homage to this great man today is an honor and a privilege. Like Washington, he is "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Studying Our National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the job we have of studying national problems and enacting appropriate legislation is indeed a complex one. No longer are we in the slow-moving age of the horse and carriage, an age in which the great issues of the day are relatively simple, the day in which legislative problems can be resolved as matters of national policy with comparative ease.

That day is past, Mr. Speaker, and we now live in a most complex era, the atomic era, an era geared to rapid transportation and high-speed communications of all sorts. Our population is nearing 165 million. Our great system of transportation has reduced the size of the Nation in which we have overnight communication by mail from coast

to coast. We live in an age of pressure, tension, and speed.

And these many problems, I am certain my colleagues will agree, have greatly complicated our mission of legislating for our fellow Americans. And by no means the least of our problems is the task of enacting laws which will assure fair and equitable treatment for our public servants—the great army of men and women who do the Government's work at every level of endeavor.

Every member of this body does his conscientious best to see that fairness and equity are dispensed legislatively and administratively. There are wide differences of opinion, differences which are by no means alined to political disagreements, but differences on philosophy and interpretation of what should be done.

In our endeavors in the House we must by the necessity of things depend upon those who speak for substantial number of public servants. In depending on these representatives we thereby are able to see, through the eyes of the workers themselves, the problems of salary and working conditions. And in this task we meet many fine men and women, people who are dedicating their efforts, their time and talents to improving the lot of their fellow citizens whom they represent. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to one of these representatives, a man who is an outstanding leader in his chosen field—a leader as the representative of a great association of workers and a leader as a public-spirited citizen. I refer to one who most of the Members of this body know, some who may have acquaintanceship which antedates my own—I refer to William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I would like here and now to spell out some of the facts about the activities of Bill Doherty, some of which even some of his closest friends and associates may be unaware. Bill Doherty needs no praise from me, but I would like, as a matter of public record, to spell out some of the facts about this rather extraordinary American, for I am sure they will be praise enough. I would like to point out some of the salient activities of Mr. Doherty, as a labor leader and as a citizen—the man Fortune magazine this month calls the most important leader of Government unions.

Mr. Doherty began in the postal service in 1923 and was active in branch No. 43 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and 3 years later he became financial secretary. From 1928–31 he served as branch president and was elected the following year as president of the Ohio State Association. During that same year, 1932, he was elected to the national board of officers of his organization, and in 1935 became a member of the executive board. In 1941 Mr. Doherty was elected national president, and at each succeeding convention he has been reelected to head the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Most of the members of this House who have served during the last 10 or 12 years will be familiar with the fine work Mr. Doherty has done in behalf of the membership in Washington. He has been an eloquent and persistent spokesman for his people and for all Government employes. He was a founder and organizer of the Government Employees' Council in 1945, an association of more than a half million Government workers.

Not only has Doherty been a strong and able leader in behalf of the postal workers and Government workers, he has served with distinction as a member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, a post he has held since 1943. As an AFL council member, he has given strong support to efforts of the last few years to effecting a unity in the ranks of labor and is a member of the unity committee of the AFL and CIO which brought to a conclusion plans to merge the two great confederations of American workers. The unity committee is continuing in developing proper and smooth-working procedures for bringing to a successful consolidation the forces of the AFL and CIO. He has also served on AFL jurisdictional committees, helping to iron out some of the vexing problems caused by differences in interpretations of lines of authority known as jurisdictional disputes.

A bright chapter in the career of Bill Doherty is the many contributions he has made in the field of international labor relations. Mr. Doherty is an anti-Communist from way back. He fought the old World Federation of Trade Unions, a group dominated by the Soviets, and he was a founder of the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He has been a delegate to the world conventions of this group and has served on important committees.

Mr. Doherty is an executive member of the Postal Telephone and Telegraph International, Berne, Switzerland, and has addressed world meetings of the group from time to time. He has carried his campaign against communism into the camp of the enemy through Radio Berlin where he spelled out the differences between free labor and slave labor. And speaking of slave labor, Mr. Doherty turned over to a Member of this House who was a delegate at the conference founding the United Nations 10 years ago this month data on Soviet slave labor. This data was shown to a delegate from the U. S. S. R.—and this was at a time when it was not popular to discuss such topics with the Russians.

Not only has Mr. Doherty served in the international field abroad, he has been host to numerous visiting delegations of exchange labor leaders, students, and others coming to America under the auspices of the Marshall plan and other groups. The Letter Carriers has been singled out as a fine example of a Government union.

The public service of Bill Doherty includes service as a citizen and as a soldier. He served in Siberia in World War I with the American Expeditionary Forces as a telegraph operator in the Signal Corps on the Chinese Eastern-Transsiberian Railroad. After service there he was chief radio operator on Corregidor. And 4 of his 5 sons have seen foreign military service and a fifth son is nearing military age.

Mr. Doherty originated the first National Flag Day program in the Nation's Capital a few years ago. His union, under his leadership, directed the muscular dystrophy national drive 2 years ago and the record of Doherty's union in war-bond drives and other humanitarian crusades such as the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other efforts is too well known to require further comment. He has taken a strong interest as a citizen in civil defense, in labor-management problems and in civil service and he has served on citizens' advisory groups in each of these areas.

There is more that I could say on the work and activities of this leader, but I think the facts that I have listed spell out better than words of praise a tribute to the leadership, energy, resourcefulness, and great ability of this man. I am proud to call him my friend—and that is a sentiment I am certain is shared by a great many in this body. In the current problems of Government and postal pay, Mr. Doherty has shown characteristic energy and understanding—in forwarding the cause of those whom he represents and the cause of all public workers. His work and the results achieved are his best tribute and the few words I have added here merely point up the highlights of the career of this man.

"Thanks, Mr. Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a summation of the thoughts I have had as a freshman Member of the House about the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of the United States.

Speaker RAYBURN was honored by the members of his party last weekend, and these honors, plus the fact that I have had great respect for our beloved Speaker over the past several years, have moved me to write down some observations which I occasionally pass along to constituents in conversation and by letter.

As a young man in southwest Virginia, which borders east Tennessee where our Speaker was born, I often heard of "Mr. Sam" from the Honorable John W. Flannagan, who served the Virginia Ninth District for many years in the House, and later from the Honorable Tom B. Fugate, who followed Mr. Flannagan as the Ninth District representative. They spoke of "Mr. Sam" with praise in every respect.

Later, when I started my campaign for Congress, numerous citizens came to me and said, in essence, "You see 'Mr.

Sam" when you get to Congress and he will help you out." Those friends of mine, who had followed our Speaker's illustrious career through the years, were absolutely correct in their advice.

Even before I was elected, "Mr. Sam" came to my district and made a speech, met many of the citizens who have been his supporters over the past years, and discussed with them the phases of government which were of interest.

I have found in the short time that I have been a Member of this great representative assembly that our Speaker serves in his high position with dignity, calmness, and ability in every respect. He is a statesman with the qualifications of wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty. He uses wisely and effectively the powers of the high and honorable office he occupies.

I have already learned to love and respect him as one of the greatest Americans I have ever known.

This brief but sincere tribute cannot be ended without mention of his help and fatherly advice which he readily gives to the newcomer to Congress. On several occasions I, as I am certain many other freshmen have in the past, turned to him for counsel and guidance. He has never been too busy to discuss problems with me nor to give me the benefit of his many years of experience in the House.

So, "Mr. Sam," I say, "thank you" for your aid in the past. I express the wishes of hundreds of my constituents when I wish for you many more years of service in the House. You have our love, our respect, and our heartfelt thanks for your great contributions to the welfare of this Nation through the past years.

Footnotes on the 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a historic speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that the western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front. While in Moscow he gained the impression that communism was moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy overlooks. The arms race, he said, was not the only area in which they are competing with us. They have taken sports and culture and the impressionable years of youth and transformed them into arenas of the cold war. By inviting to Russia picked delegations from the satellite countries and the neutrals they strive to convey the impression that Soviet life is superior to that in the West.

Sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed. The United States is likely to have a tough time at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, when Soviet Russia enters a team which even now is being prepared for the big test, he warned.

America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has also been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

Of course, these Russian athletes are not really amateurs. They are professionals. They are trained under government guidance, with government help. They receive bonuses and money prizes.

"We should find some way," he said, "of making sure that our Olympic contenders get everything they need in the way of training opportunities."

Mr. Hearst went on to say that—

The lively arts are another field wherein the commissars are operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West. Ballet, the theater, literature all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

From Moscow radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism. It stands to reason that such extensive wooing of impressionable minds is likely to pay dividends—unless we compete vigorously with the Communist effort and even surpass it. We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.

But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete. Nor is it enough for our leaders to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think they have met the challenge.

Money is not enough. I came away from Russia convinced that only deep thought and long-range planning would suffice to prevail over communism in the conflict of coexistence. Money spent on foreign aid will not get the most effective results unless it is thoughtfully expended in those fields where it will do the most good.

We should seek to convey to the world—to our allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements. I believe that any cultural exchange between Russia and the United States is certain to develop in our favor. Within limits, I think such exchanges should be encouraged.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists. This board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life. It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. "Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems," Mr. Hearst said and added: "Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?"

I have introduced several bills which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Mr. Hearst. One bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee and action is expected to be taken on it shortly. A second measure, H. R. 5040, would "establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, establish a Federal Advisory Commission to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation, and provide awards of merit." This bill makes a specific finding that communism cannot be overcome by armed strength alone, and that competitive coexistence must extend to every field and every front. It also takes note of Communist material achievements, and the extent to which cultural and artistic programs are used to spread Communist doctrine, and approves the President's recommendations to the Congress on the fine arts in his message on the state of the Union.

A third bill, H. R. 4109, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Nation's leading sports organizations, to assist the Federal commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in establishing a national stadium for Olympic games as a memorial to the heroes of World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities.

I hope that a number of my colleagues from both sides of the House will join with me in sponsoring these measures, and I am very pleased that all of the Hearst newspapers have carried supporting articles on my measures similar to the following, which appeared in the Chicago American on March 19, 1955:

HOUSE GETS DETAILS—HEARST AIMS TO CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—The warning by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., that preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence with Communist Russia was recorded before Congress today by Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

In detailing on the floor of the House the "trenchant observations" made by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers in his recent speech before the National Press Club, THOMPSON explained he and congressional colleagues have introduced several bills "which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Hearst."

THOMPSON pointed out that one bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee after testimony from the country's leading cultural and business groups.

A second bill, THOMPSON continued, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Nation's leading sports organizations, to assist a proposed Federal commission in establishing a national stadium for Olympic

games as a memorial to the heroes of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. THOMPSON added:

"The third measure would provide, in the field of culture, the kind of flexible and imaginative strategy called for by Mr. Hearst as well as the kind of program which will show that America is not only proud of its motorcars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements and its creative artists."

In illustrating before the House how he was attempting to tailor the proposed legislation to fit the suggestions contained in the Hearst speech, THOMPSON paraphrased or quoted directly from the publisher's address, as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, the strength and ultimate survival of the free world's system, based on human freedom, the dignity of the individual, and private initiative, is being challenged by the Communists throughout the world.

"America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It also has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

"The lively arts are another field wherein the U. S. S. R. is operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West.

"Ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination.

"We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor. But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete."

I am including, also, an article by Ray Hasson which appeared in the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., on April 14, 1955, telling of the work which one of my constituents is doing at the local level and with his own means to spike the Russian plans to capture the 1956 Olympics. Michael (Mike) Dertouzos is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics committee. He is looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition and is one of the major battles being fought in the cold war.

As Ray Hasson fittingly points out—

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

The Trentonian article follows:

TRENTONIAN TOPICS

(By Ray Hasson)

Around Trenton: The boys in the Kremlin don't know it, but their grandiose scheme to strike a major propaganda victory next year may be spiked by guys all over the country like Trenton's Mike Dertouzos.

It's Mike's idea that the cause of freedom—and winning world opinion to our side in the cold war—will be dealt more good if the free nations win next year's Olympics in Australia than all the mouthings of the striped pants set.

The Russians are straining to prove their alleged superiority in all things, sports particularly. And they have been subsidizing their Olympic athletes and training them to win next year's competition.

ANOTHER HOOK

If they come out tops, it will give them another hook on which to hang their claim that their way of life is superior to ours. It could be effective on the world's uncommitted peoples.

America is the only country that doesn't subsidize its athletes. It's nip and tuck whether the National Olympics Committee will get up enough scratch to pay for costs of training, coaching, feeding, transporting our athletes to Australia.

If we don't get our best athletes in the games, we stand a good chance of ending up second best.

Mike is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics Committee. He's looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition. It's a battle in the cold war.

"We have to prove to the world that we have the best way of life because the world looks to us for leadership, not only in diplomacy, but sports, as well," Mike says.

AAU BACKER

Mike, who owns the Famous Restaurant, is no stranger to sports. He's been active for years in promoting amateur sports events through the American Athletic Union. Last year he was president of the State AAU and is a member of its national executive and foreign relations committees.

He started the hard way—picking up dimes. Born on the Greek island of Andros, 60 miles from Athens, he shipped out as a passenger liner seaman.

In 1919 he landed in New York with two bucks in his pocket. After a job on Vincent Astor's yacht folded, he came to Trenton and became a waiter. He took boxing lessons at night. Then he started a luncheonette. It interfered with his boxing, so he sold it.

In 1937, he started his present restaurant. He had a gym upstairs where he taught boxing to kids and sponsored other athletic events.

A lot of top Trenton amateur athletics were aided by Mike. Many worthy causes picked up the entire box office receipts from athletic events he staged.

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

John Garner: A Tribute to a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, when it was reported recently that former Vice President John Nance Garner might attend the dinner on Saturday night honoring Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the news was widely received with enthusiasm. And when the news came that because of a foot ailment Mr. Garner, upon the advice of his physician, would not be able to make the trip, there seemed to be universal regret and disappointment.

This evidence of interest in "Cactus Jack" Garner, after an absence of 14 years from Washington, is itself a tribute to a great American who as a dedicated apostle of good government over a period of nearly half a century contributed so much to the perpetuity of our institutions.

Perhaps it is appropriate that we pause in this busy life to pay tribute to that great individualist who perhaps more than any other living American typifies the rugged character and unyielding devotion to principle which actuated so many of the great men in our history. Let us hope his type will never vanish from the American scene. Today we can profit from the lessons which the public life and record of John Garner have taught.

As I think of Mr. Garner today I am reminded of the story of an incident that is said to have occurred one time at Boston. The story goes that an old man there had served for a lifetime directing ships through narrow channels in the harbor area. He had become a sort of institution, a symbol of safety and dependability. But, the story goes, there was a change in the city government and the new regime was cleaning house. It was decided that the old sea dog had served his time and that it was time to replace him. He was given a hearing, at which his capacity to do his job well was questioned.

At the hearing a critic asked the old man: "Do you claim to know where in the bottom of the harbor area all of the snares, rocks, and other obstructions are located?"

The old gentleman thought for a moment and finally replied, measuring his words carefully: "No, I can't say that I know where all the harbor obstructions are. But I know where they ain't."

And so as the ship of state was moored along turbulent seas, in and out of safe and unsafe harbors, during the first 4 decades of this century, John Garner's wisdom and guidance were of a man who may not have known where all the pitfalls were but who knew where they were not—and along such courses he chose to lead and direct.

Let us look for a moment at the life and career of this man whose judgment and counsel were so useful to America and to its progress. His grandmother brought 6 fatherless children in a covered wagon 600 miles over uncharted roads from the State of Tennessee, to seek a home in the prairie land of northeast Texas. There, in a log cabin built by his pioneer grandmother, near Blossom Prairie in Red River County, John Nance Garner was born—the first child from the marriage of Sarah Guest and John Nance Garner, the third.

General Grant had just been elected President. The Vice President was Schuyler Colfax, of Indiana, with whom the infant born in the Texas log cabin on November 22, 1869, was to share the distinction of being the only man to serve as both Speaker of the House of

Representatives and Vice President of the United States.

As was common in those days, John Garner was exposed to the rigors and hard work of a country youth. When old enough he began the study of law. He was admitted to the bar, then moved to southwest Texas. He became county judge of Uvalde County, then a member of the State legislature, and in 1902 was elected to Congress. Elected and reelected 15 consecutive times, he served continuously for 30 years. He became minority leader of the Democratic Party and in 1931 climaxed his congressional career by being elected Speaker. His final 8 years in public office were spent presiding over the Senate as Vice President of the United States.

John Garner's whole political life was devoted to quiet and unselfish service. During World War I President Wilson called on him twice weekly as confidential adviser. His keen insight into political problems and judgment of men, coupled with his modest yet frank and unassuming demeanor, often caused him to be sought for confidential duties of utmost importance—duties which he performed with characteristic statesmanship, fidelity and success, but without general public knowledge.

During the early days of the depression, shortly after a White House conference with President Hoover, Mr. Garner was asked by reporters what his party intended to do about some of the proposals of the President. He made this significant statement: "Politics will be a secondary consideration. Country should always come ahead of party, and now the country should be the sole thought of everyone."

I shall not take the time here to recount some of Mr. Garner's dramatic actions as he led, with tact and wisdom, the stormy sessions of the House of Representatives that occurred during those critical, depression-burdened days of the early 1930's. Those were days when all sorts of panaceas were offered to restore prosperity; when scores of inflationary and printing-press schemes were advocated. It was a difficult time in which to exercise calm judgment, restraint and decorum, and not be washed to sea with the tide. On occasions members of both parties broke ranks to join with those offering crackpot schemes for miraculous recovery. It was, indeed, a time that called for statesmanship in leadership. And John Garner was equal to that occasion. Although effective solutions to many problems were not found, many unsound and fantastic proposals were exposed and avoided.

There have been many times when we would have done well to have followed the philosophy of this wise man from Uvalde, when his words of wisdom and restraint should have been heeded—his advice to make haste slowly, to avoid regrettable errors. He is and was a practical man and has always believed that government, like individuals, should strive to live within its income; that all governmental action should be within the framework of the Constitution and with proper regard for law. As H. I. Phillips remarked, Mr. Garner and his compatriots believed in—

Sticking to what he's learned in school
And what he's been raised to believe * * *
Things like simple arithmetic * * *
Old-fashioned bookkeeping and squarin'
Accounts on Saturday nights * * *
Dependin' on a budget, never spendin'
More than he had; being orful keerful
'Bout not making promises he couldn't keep,
An' things like that.

Research in Civil Aviation Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of an address I delivered recently before the Civil Aviation Medicine Association.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will feel that I speak very sincerely when I say that it is a real pleasure and privilege to be with you on this occasion.

I am happy to be here because of my own personal interest in aviation and in research in general, but particularly in the field of medical science.

Among the legislative achievements in which I take most pride as a Member of the House of Representatives are the bills which I introduced and piloted through the House to establish the National Mental Health Institute, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the research program in neurological and metabolical diseases, and the National Science Foundation.

I want to express to you my personal appreciation for the very fact that you have such an organization as this. That fact in itself is a long step forward in progress toward still more far-reaching results.

It is my own opinion that there should be established some sort of institute devoted primarily to research in civil aviation medicine. As a matter of fact, I think it is becoming more and more imperative that this be done.

The time is not far distant when we shall cross the threshold into the era of jet-propulsion in civil aviation. In my opinion the time is not more than 5 years away. And I do not need to tell you who know even better than I, the problems of aviation affecting human beings will be greatly increased.

Aviation medicine is not concerned with fighting viruses or hunting microbes. Its foe is not the general diseases of mankind, but forces man meets for the first time only as he goes out of his natural environment. Aviation medicine is concerned with the medical effects of human flight.

Nature designed man's body for a life on earth, never more than tree-top distance from the earth's surface. In the upper reaches of the atmosphere or in the airless space beyond, man is as much out of his element as a fish trying to swim across a desert. But unlike the fish, man has the capability of altering his environment—if not himself. To alter that environment, or to make it possible for man to survive and to function in it, is the task of aviation medicine.

The goal of aviation medicine is to help man adjust himself to the new world of height and of supersonic speed that the airplane has opened to him, the area that has been intelligently called "the vertical frontier." Aviation medicine helps man to meet the challenge of two of his own accomplishments, to fly high and to fly fast. Today's technology produces planes capable of carrying men at speeds and to altitudes that the human body cannot tolerate. Aviation medicine quite literally seeks to take man out of his element, and to help him to reach the stars.

In the United States Air Force one man—Maj. Arthur Murray—has already flown up to 90,000 feet—17 miles above the surface of the earth.

Another Air Force pilot—Maj. Charles Yeager—has flown at a speed of 1,650 miles per hour—almost 2½ times the speed of sound.

Still another Air Force officer—Lt. Col. John Stapp—has ridden a sled projected along the ground at 632 miles an hour to test the effects of deceleration and wind blast on the human body.

Air Force rockets have gone up to 250 miles of altitude at speeds up to 3,600 miles per hour, and two rhesus monkeys—named Pat and Mike—have been rocketed to 190,080 feet, and survived.

Finding out the limits of human endurance and developing ways of keeping men—not animals, but men—alive and protected in the unnatural environment man has begun to explore, is the problem of aviation medicine. The problem is the problem of survival in a new world man has never penetrated before our own generation.

There are three main fields of activity in the investigation of human factors in aviation.

1. Human resources is a field concerned with problems of man's reaction to his environment, matters of psychology, aptitudes, training, etc.

2. Human engineering is charged with determining design characteristics of equipment, and man-machine relationships, so that an operator can use that equipment with the greatest accuracy and efficiency.

3. The aero-medical sciences—which are the chief concern of this discussion.

The aeromedical sciences are concerned with the biomedical, physiological, and psychological reactions of the individual to the wide range of situations and factors involved in aviation. Within the Air Force, for example, the chief research and development agencies are the School of Aviation Medicine at the Air University and the Aero-Medical Laboratory at the Wright Air Development Center of the Air Material Command. The first, which has the unique distinction of being the oldest organization in the Air Force that has operated continuously, without any essential change of function, does background and applied research in the basic life sciences and clinical sciences, as they affect the Air Force. Using the information developed at the School of Aviation Medicine, the Aero-Medical Laboratory develops information needed by aeronautical engineers to design aircraft without surpassing the physiological and psychological limitations of the air crew. It also develops the aero-medical protective equipment to offset man's physical limitations—equipment such as "G" suits, restraining devices, protective clothing, and escape equipment.

Frequent conferences and information exchanges are arranged with other organizations, such as the United States Navy Aeronautical Medical Equipment Laboratory, the Navy Electronics Laboratory, the Army Medical Research Laboratory, and the Johns Hopkins Operations Research Office (the latter an Army activity). Meetings of the Armed Forces-National Research Council Committees on Vision and on Hearing and Bio-Acoustics, provide additional opportunities for valuable interservice contacts.

The primary problem of aviation medical research is to find out in detail what happens to the human body during an ascent, and why. The problem is intensified as man learns to build machines that go higher and

faster, but the problem is still one of altitude.

As most people know, a man can ascend to about 8,000 feet with no ill effects, if the ascent is gradual, as in driving up a mountain, but above 8,000 feet, things begin to happen to man. As man flies even higher, the field of vision narrows. Breathing becomes extremely difficult because of the lack of oxygen. Delusions can develop. Consciousness can be lost. Gases trapped in the intestines begin to expand. At 50,000 feet altitude, the heart—unprotected by devices or equipment of any sort—would probably cease to function.

To counteract these changes in man's normal body functioning, the whole body must be kept under pressure, in either a suit or a cabin. The pressurized cabin was developed during World War II. The pressurized suit for the individual flyer is a more recent development. But neither alone solves all the problems of survival at high altitude. Man must eat, man must relieve himself of body wastes, and man must combat fatigue and boredom.

Next in importance to the problem of altitude is the problem of gravity. Every time the human body is subjected to acceleration or deceleration, it feels the pull or push of gravity, or "G" forces. A jackrabbit start of a hotrod sports car can throw a passenger against the seat back. In an airplane, the whole crew is affected by any quick burst of speed or abrupt change in direction of flight. And these movements of the plane can cause internal movements in the body: blood flows from head to feet, and organs of the abdomen are pushed down to the pelvis. If the turn is sharp enough or fast enough to develop forces double the ordinary force of gravity, or more, the drainage of blood from the head and heart may cause a "blackout," that is, a loss of consciousness.

The human body's ability to withstand "G" forces varies enormously, depending largely on what part of the body's surface takes the brunt of the shock.

Research in aviation medicine, which has produced such diverse products as Aeroplast, a new spray-on surgical dressing for treating burns; the nylon pressure suit; the anti-G suit; and new inflight meals takes equally varied approaches to its problems. It may be performed by means of rockets, loaded with delicate instruments, and shot many miles above the surface of the earth; it may take place in an anechoic room, where quiet reigns supreme, which is used to study the effects of intense sound on animals and human beings. One of the most dramatic, and most publicized, research facilities is the sled at Holloman Air Force Base on which Lt. Col. John P. Stapp has traveled 632 miles an hour.

Colonel Stapp, who holds a civilian degree of doctor of medicine, and is also a graduate of the Air Force's School of Aviation Medicine and a flight surgeon, has been described both as a human guinea pig and as the fastest man on earth. He is merely an able scientist who has made his most important experiments on himself. His most publicized research has been in connection with deceleration. In his research he makes use of a sled which hurtles him along a railroad-like track at 460 miles an hour, then slams him into a braking area with a bone-jarring jolt. Every time he rides his machine he suffers the same shock that's experienced in the abrupt stop of a crashing airplane.

In the course of his research program, Stapp has several times sustained shocks greater than those incurred in fatal plane crashes. His maximum jolt was equivalent to driving an auto at 120 miles an hour into a brick wall. On three other occasions, the shock was equal to braking from 60 miles an hour to a complete stop in only 3 feet. Last December, with the windshield removed from his sled he made a supersonic run on the ground, to find out what happens to a pilot who bails out at supersonic speed at low altitudes. Without protection from the violent wind blast such a speed will generate, and wearing no special protection except a plastic headgear and a special nylon harness, he withstood a force of 35 G's and a wind pressure of 2 tons, and suffered no lasting ill effects.

Information already developed in Stapp's deceleration experiments to find out just how much slow-down shock the human body can take will be used to redesign aircraft seats and safety belting, so that pilots and passengers will have greater protection against abrupt jolts in emergencies. The same information also can be applied to making automobiles safer. Information developed in the wind-blast experiment will be used in developing bail-out equipment.

Scientists working on the problems of aviation medicine do not hope ever basically to change man's earthbound nature. But they know that in the machine age, man has managed to adapt himself to conditions that seemed "inhuman" and "impossible" as recently as 50 years ago. To ease his adaptation to space and speed, scientists are continuously studying examples of such adaptations in nature.

Other scientists meanwhile are studying the problem of inventing machines or gadgets to take over functions previously performed only by man. The real question that the jet age poses is whether man-as-flier is being made obsolete by the lag between what his brain can invent and his body can perform. In fact, planes are rapidly approaching a point where they are penalized rather than aided by the presence of a human pilot.

One important result of research in aviation medicine is the discovery that the human body can endure a great deal more physical and mental stress than was once thought possible. The answers to the problems of flight in tomorrow's jets and rocket aircraft may be found in the human research now being done in the field of aviation medicine rather than in loading the planes with heavy and expensive equipment.

So the planning brain must continue, as now, to seek new ways and ever more ingenious devices to adjust the strains to the tolerances of the body.

And so I conclude as I began by reemphasizing the need of research in the field of civil-aviation medicine.

After I have had an opportunity to give some additional study to the form of the legislation, it is my intention to introduce a bill calling for the establishment of an Institute of Civil Aviation Medicine.

And once again I express my appreciation for the contribution your association has made in the field of air safety, and for the objectives you seek.

Independent Natural Gas Producers Fail To Testify on Harris Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the months of March and April, I attended most of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the Harris bill and other related legislation to release the so-called independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. I will endeavor to summarize the statements before the House committee.

During some 21 days of hearings, the committee heard slightly over 100 witnesses from various groups. Among the witnesses who testified for the Harris bill were the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Jerome K. Kuykendall; Mr. Ernest O. Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission; Mr. David T. Searles, of Houston, Tex., who represented some pipelines and some so-called independent producers; Dr. John W. Boatwright, of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana; Mr. R. G. Laughton, president of the Laughton Oil Corp.; Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America; Mr. Clarence T. Smith, member of the Illinois Oil and Gas Association; Mr. J. P. Jones, director of production of the Pengrade Crude Oil Association, of Pennsylvania; Mr. John F. Marion, president of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America and also president of the Northern Natural Gas Co., of Omaha, Nebr., also representing some interstate pipelines; Mr. William Jackman, president of the Investors League of New York City; Mr. Lloyd C. Halverson, self-styled economist; Mr. H. B. Fell of the Chamber of Commerce; Mr. J. Taylor of Amarillo, Tex., and president of the National American Cattlemen's Association; and Mr. Ray Willoughby, past president of the National Wool Growers Association.

The chairman of the Federal Power Commission testified for the Harris bill, and it is the first time I ever heard a public official in a so-called regulatory agency publicly ask the legislative body to give him less work to do and perhaps eliminate the necessity of the Commission itself.

I would hardly call the Standard Oil Company of Indiana an independent producer of either natural gas or oil. It would be difficult to believe that the Pennsylvania Pengrade Crude Oil Association is particularly interested in natural gas reaching northern homes at fair and reasonable prices. It would hardly be expected that the representatives of the interstate pipelines would be vitally concerned in the cost of gas to the homeowners of New York, Akron, or Chicago. It is not surprising to find the Investors League zealously interested in the Harris bill because through it the investors in oil and gas stocks stand a pretty good chance of a $5 billion windfall if the Harris bill becomes law.

The president of the cattlemen's association testified for the Harris bill—and I can well understand that. Some of the large oil and gas ranches raise cattle as a mere sideline. And I can understand the testimony of the former president of the Wool Growers Association. As gas becomes more expensive for the folks in the northern cities, they will have to keep their thermostats down and their blood pressures up and go back to wearing woolen underwear.

On the other hand, over 80 witnesses testified against the Harris bill, representing cities, consumer groups, public utility officials and distributing companies. The distribution companies are concerned with the possibility of issuing

increasingly higher gas bills to the consumers and are therefore on the firing line.

Throughout the hearings, I tried to determine just how many independent producers of natural gas there were. The Federal Power Commission reported to me that they did not know how many there were prior to 1953 because they were not required to determine that under the law. However, they report that in 1953 there were 4,545. The Standard Oil Company of Indiana in a letter to its stockholders stated on March 16, 1955, that there were 5,000 independent producers of natural gas while its neighbor, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio told all of its stockholders in a publication supporting the Harris bill that there were more than 4,000 producers. During the committee hearings I heard some testimony to the effect that there may be 6,000 to 8,000 independent producers. How can the committee intelligently arrive at a solution of this problem without knowing how many independent producers of natural gas there really are and what percentage of the natural gas they produce?

It may be entirely coincidental but it is interesting to note that the powerful gas and oil lobby with its one million and a half dollar plush campaign fund forgot the elementary requisite of bringing a single so-called independent producer of natural gas to the cross-examination of committee members. The simple fact is that there was not a single person present at the House committee hearings who looked as though he had ever been covered with drill dust or oil spray—at least not for a long period of time.

From these hearings and from the record, it appears to me that the so-called independent producers of natural gas are ghost riders in the sky created and dancing to the music of the oil companies of America and groups of investors in oil stocks and natural gas pipelines whose fundamental interest, whose basic desire is profit—pure and selfish profit—free from Federal regulation, free from Federal scrutiny and free from public calculation. Their interest is certainly incompatible and contrary to that of the great body of consumers of natural gas who can make no selection as to the source of their gas supply and who have very little to say about the price they must pay for it. These so-called independent producers—these ghost riders in the sky—are ghost riding against the public interest in the Harris bill.

Public Opinion Poll in First Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to poll public opinion in the First Congressional District. I arbitrarily sent a copy of this questionnaire to every fifth name in my card index. In addition the questionnaire was printed in over 20 weekly newspapers. Over 6,000 answers of one kind or another on the identical questions were computed.

Question No. 1 was the same as the first question of last year's poll. It is extraordinary to note that the percentages were identical. If all those who answered "No opinion" on question No. 3 had answered "Yes," which is more probable than not, we find an unusual change in basic American thinking. The overwhelming support of President Eisenhower's UMT and lower reciprocal tariff programs was particularly illuminating.

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Should nuclear weapons be used to stop clear-cut Communist aggression?	(73)	(18)	(9) 1
2. Do you think it possible for the free world to live in peace with Communist nations?	(39)	(52)	(9) 2
3. Should Communist nations be destroyed by "preventive" war?	(27)	(55)	(18) 3
4. Do you favor President Eisenhower's permanent manpower defense program (UMT)?	(83)	(12)	(5) 4
5. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's "Trade not Aid," lower reciprocal tariff program?	(83)	(10)	(7) 5
6. Do you favor the entry of the Federal Government into the field of education in the form of school construction grants?	(54)	(42)	(4) 6
7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour?	(71)	(21)	(8) 7
8. Do you feel postal rates should be increased to reduce the postal deficit (now running $1 million a day)?	(75)	(21)	(4) 8
9. Should statehood for Alaska and Hawaii be considered separately?	(60)	(26)	(14) 9
10. President Eisenhower said, "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree?	(68)	(19)	(13) 10
11. Should the United Nations be abolished?	(25)	(68)	(7) 11

Cruel Betrayal of the Polish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, March 28 marked the 10th anniversary of the treacherous betrayal of 16 Polish underground leaders whom the Soviet authorities in Poland arbitrarily apprehended, flew to Moscow and imprisoned and sentenced without due process of law in June 1945.

So far as we are able to ascertain, four of these Polish leaders are still detained in Soviet prisons and it seems appropriate and urgent at this time that our Government and the United Nations should demand their release.

A short summary of the background and developments in these cases will be helpful in understanding the monstrous unfairness and injustice of their plight. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the following is a factual account of the events leading up to their imprisonment and long confinement against the terms of the Yalta agreement and contrary to every rule of good faith that should obtain between nations.

In accordance with the Yalta agreement, the Moscow-sponsored provisional government of Poland had to be reorganized on a broader basis with the inclusion of leaders "from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Mr. Molotov and the Ambassadors of the United States and Great Britain, residing in Moscow, were entrusted with the task to cooperate in the forming of a new government along the above lines.

It was assumed from the very beginning by the American and British Governments that the most prominent leaders of the Polish underground, at that time hiding in Poland, would eventually enter the coalition. During the war they had fought, in close cooperation with the Polish Government in London, a bitter struggle against the Nazi occupants and thus had largely contributed to the Allied war effort.

At the request of the British Secretary of State, the Polish Government in London disclosed for transmission to the committee in Moscow the names and whereabouts of the Polish Vice Premier and government delegate for the homeland, and of the three members of the Home Council of Ministers. The Allied government gave assurance that they would do everything possible to insure the safety of the Polish underground leaders.

A short time after the Polish Vice Premier, Mr. Jankowski, and the last commander of the disbanded home army, General Okulicki, were approached by Colonel Pimenov, of the Soviet NKWD, with a request to attend a meeting with Colonel General Ivanov, a representative of the high command of the White Russian front. This invitation was confirmed by letter, on March 10, to Mr. Jankowski and General Okulicki. The purpose of the meeting, in Colonel Pimenov's own words, was "the clarification of the atmosphere and the coming into the open of the democratic Polish parties in order that they may take part in the general current of the democratic forces of independent Poland." Although absolute personal safety was granted by the Soviet representative, the 16 Polish underground leaders, when they arrived on March 28, 1945, at the meeting place, were arrested and flown to Moscow and imprisoned there.

The Soviets committed in cold blood another act of shameless felony. It was only on May 5, 1945 that the official Soviet agency Tass announced the arrest of the Polish leaders. This happened during the San Francisco Conference, and Molotov himself confirmed the news.

The British and United States Secretaries of State expressed grave concern to Mr. Molotov, and asked for full explanation. Their intervention remained nevertheless without response, and on

June 18, 1945, a trial of the Polish leaders was held in Moscow by the military colleagium of the Supreme Court of the U. S. S. R.

Following sentences were passed:

First. Maj. Gen. Leopold Okulicki, born 1898, commander of the Polish Home Army succeeding Gen. T. Bor-Komorowski, after the Warsaw rising—10 years prison.

Second. Jan Staniskaw Jankowski, born 1882, member of the Christian Labor Party and Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, appointed delegate in Poland—8 years prison.

Third. Adam Bien, born 1899, member of the underground government, Peasant Party—5 years prison.

Fourth. Staniskaw Jasyukowicz, born 1882, National Party, member of underground government—5 years prison.

Fifth. Kazimierz Puzak, born 1883, leader of Socialist Party and speaker of underground parliament—18 months prison.

Sixth. Alexander Zwierzynski, born 1880, National Party, deputy speaker—8 months prison.

Seventh. Kazimierz Daginski, born 1890, Peasant Party, deputy speaker—6 months prison.

Eighth. Staniskaw Nyerzva, born 1905, Peasant Party—4 months prison.

Ninth. Zbigniow Stkpuzkowski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months.

Tenth. Eugoniusz Czarnovski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months prison.

Eleventh. Jösef Chacinski, born 1889, leader of Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Twelfth. Francissek Urbanski, born 1891, secretary of underground parliament, Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Thirteenth. Staniskaw Michalowski, born 1903, Democratic Party, proved innocent.

Fourteenth. Kazimierz Kobylanski, born 1892, National Party, proved innocent.

Fifteenth. Jösef Stemler Dabski, born 1892, interpreter of Polish delegation, proved innocent.

Sixteenth. Antoni Pajdak, member of Socialist Party and of underground parliament was not tried in public, and the sentence, in his case, was not disclosed.

It is to be noted that in accordance with Soviet procedure the penal sentence is counted as from the day of arrest.

General Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak did not yet return to Poland. Okulicki should be released on March 28, 1955. Jankowski should have been freed on March 28, 1953, and Jasiukowski on March 28, 1950. According to information, Pajdak was sentenced by administrative decree to 5 years, and if so, had to be freed on March 28, 1950. It should be stressed that the fate of these four prisoners remaining in Soviet Russia is still unknown.

The remaining leaders were brought back to Poland after the period of their detention in Soviet jails had elapsed. Puzak and Mierswa were rearrested in Poland, sentenced, and Puzak died in prison. Czarnowski, Urbanski, and Chacinski died in Poland; the fate of Bien is not known, as well as of Zwiorsyoki and Stemlor-Dabski. Michazowski and Kobylatski acquitted during the Moscow trial, were again arrested in Poland, and are detained in prison. Stypuskowski is in England and H. Bagisaki lives in the United States of America.

In connection with the 10th anniversary of this shameless act perpetrated on March 28, 1945, against the 16 Polish underground leaders steps should be taken to, first, ask for full information as to the fate and whereabouts of these 4 leaders still kept in Soviet Russia; second, demand their release from prison; third, insist on the liberation of the underground leaders who have been submitted to new ordeals by the Moscow-sponsored regime in Poland after their return from Russia.

I urge, therefore, and sincerely request the State Department to make appropriate inquiries and efforts in these tragic cases.

Petaluma Chamber of Commerce Endorses Trinity River Power Development by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a letter from the Petaluma (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing development of power on the Trinity River by private enterprise.

By their April 5 action this organization has alined itself with many others in my congressional district and in other parts of northern California in support of the proposal to allow private enterprise to develop and operate power facilities on the Trinity River. The advantages lie in less construction costs to taxpayers, and in the return of millions of dollars in tax revenue to Federal, State, and local governments.

In appearing before a subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last week, I urged power development by private enterprise be adopted. This would serve the best interests of all concerned and, in support of that position, I submit the following:

PETALUMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Petaluma, Calif., April 6, 1955.

Upon completion of an intensive study of the Trinity project, this chamber of commerce has taken the following action at their regular meeting April 5, 1955:

The Petaluma Chamber of Commerce board of directors urge that should the Trinity project proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation be accepted our legislators give full consideration to the P. G. & E. Trinity partnership plan before any Government operation of powerplants is considered.

We consider the above proposal a decided advantage to the Federal Government.

Cordially,

CLAUDE D. BRADFORD,
Manager.

An About Face From War to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following abstract of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, April 1, 1955.

AN ABOUT FACE FROM WAR TO PEACE

At a time when strength and unity of purpose is urgently needed, America's leadership in our critically troubled world is fumbling and faltering.

In recent weeks the objective of our international relations has been lost in the twisting and turning of Presidential, State Department, and senatorial pronouncements and actions.

Let's look at the record:

Our ally on Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek, insists we are committed to the defense of the offshore islands. The Secretary of State, carrying out the policy of the President, says maybe we are and maybe we are not; possibly we will and possibly we will not. All add to the general confusion in a time of crisis.

The President and the Secretary of State informed us a week ago that we may very well use precision atomic weapons if the Chinese Communists attack the offshore islands. But on Wednesday, March 23, the President in his press conference states categorically that atomic weapons will be used only in case of a major war and not in police actions.

The chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Senator BRIDGES, persists, however, in stating that our national policy is to defend the offshore islands by dropping atom bombs on the mainland.

American policy runs hot and cold, uncertain and confused. Surely if these policies are indefinite and uncertain to the American people, they must be even more so to our allies and enemies.

On Monday, March 14, the official custodian of the Yalta papers in the State Department said their publication would adversely affect the Nation's security and our relations with our allies. On Wednesday, the Secretary of State, after conferring with Senate Republican leaders, expressed his astonishment at the revelation that the Yalta documents were in the hands of one of America's leading newspapers. On Wednesday night the documents were ordered released to the Nation's press. The White House expressed no knowledge of the release of the papers, and in fact the Presidential press secretary stated the President was not aware of their release.

This series of events reveals an unbelievable lack of coordination between the President and the State Department, and a degree of irresponsibility that exposes our Nation before the eyes of the world as erratic, unpredictable, and politically immature. Regretfully, this same degree of uncertainty and confusion prevailed concerning the proposal of Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in suggesting a meeting of the heads of state of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France.

For at least 2 days the State Department clearly stated that Senator GEORGE's proposal was in line with the foreign policy of this Nation. The President, at least through Monday and Tuesday of the last week, felt such a conference was premature. On

Wednesday, March 23, the White House and the Department of State double checked their signals, and came to the conclusion that in due time such a conference would be desirable. Since then, at a recent press conference, the President seemed to qualify his earlier approval.

These policy gyrations and conflicting statements can only add to the feeling of uncertainty and indecision as to American policy.

Perhaps we need a thoughtful reappraisal of what we are now doing—and what we should be doing.

Instead of alienating our friends through diplomatic blunders geared to domestic political expediency, now more than ever we should be seeking to strengthen our ties of unity and solidarity with our allies, to maintain a common front for preservation of the free world.

Instead of Presidential appointees deliberately stirring up the fires of domestic political controversy, now more than ever they should be devoting their attention to achieving some semblance of unity within their own party and within the Nation on vital foreign policy issues that affect the destiny of our Nation.

Instead of playing right into the hands of Red China's propaganda and helping turn Asians against us by our publicly brandishing a big club in threats to use atomic warfare, now more than ever we should be bending every effort to convince Asia our purpose is peace, not war—development, not exploitation.

Instead of letting the Communists choose their own grounds for a new international "showdown" where we may be forced to stand alone, now more than ever we should be taking the initiative in diversionary moves of our own to put the Kremlin on the defensive and upset its carefully calculated timetable of Pacific strategy.

The Yalta papers, internationally:

What kind of reckless diplomacy is it to needlessly insult your friends when you have nothing to gain and everything to lose? What possible constructive purpose could release of these documents against the wishes of England have in the present tense state of international affairs? As a result of this colossal diplomatic blunder, the free world's efforts for peace have been given a distinct setback rather than been advanced. Hereafter, frankness and candor will be ruled out of international negotiations. Diplomats of friendly countries will be as cautious as diplomats from unfriendly countries in dealing with the United States—and the cause of peace will suffer.

The Yalta papers, domestically:

Appeasement has never gained us any ground internationally, and it will not gain President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles any ground trying to appease opposition forces within their own party. Trying to turn the clock back 10 years might divert America's needed attention from problems and failures of today, but it cannot divert the consequences of those problems and failures. High sounding comments of the President against political exploitation of these documents cannot erase the responsibility of his own Cabinet appointee for releasing them for no purpose other than political exploitation. The President and his Secretary of State must accept responsibility for an apparent willingness to toss bipartisan foreign policy out the window, and risk playing deliberate politics with our country's future security.

About A-bomb threats:

Threats of A-bomb attacks might create caution in a country responsive to the fears and the will of its people, but have just the opposite effect on a country or a government holding human life cheap, unresponsive to any fears of its own people, and deliberately conniving to tag the label "warmonger" on the United States.

Nothing could serve the Kremlin better than to jockey the United States into a position of first using A-weapons against Asians, so that it can beat the drums of world opinion against us.

One American atomic weapon used on Red China would do more to turn Asia solidly against us, than all the propaganda the Communists have been able to contrive, and to them be well worth the price in human life it might entail.

Quemoy and Matsu:

The responsible leaders of our Nation are today in the process of making what may well be the most crucial and important decision of foreign policy since the beginning of World War II.

The issue is what should be American policy concerning the offshore islands from the Chinese mainland, namely and most important, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. What do we do in light of our commitments to the defense of Formosa if the Chinese Communists attack these islands?

Yes; we are in a pericd of self-examination, of self-questioning, and this is as it should be. There is still time for thoughtful consideration and for careful planning. The time is short; the urgency of the situation cannot be overestimated, and the necessity for clear thought and definite policy is evident to everyone.

This decision rests with the President of the United States who is, under the Constitution, the Commander in Chief, and the chief spokesman of our Nation in foreign affairs.

Prior to the passage of the so-called Formosa resolution, the President stated to the Congress that he alone would make the decision as to American policy with respect to the so-called related positions and off-shore islands. Our President, during the past weeks and today, has been and is seeking guidance and sound advice. This is no time for partisan prejudices or political expediency. The issue of peace and war is in the balance. The relationships between ourselves and our allies is involved in our decision over the off-shore islands. Our whole position in the Far East has been brought into sharp focus. Our strategy in meeting the challenge of Communist aggression is subject to intensive evaluation. We cannot afford to make a mistake.

Powerful weapons of mass destruction are in the hands of both ourselves and the Soviet Union. Huge armies have been trained to combat effectiveness. The whole world awaits the decision. It is not right nor true to say that what may happen in the Far East is in the hands of the Communists. We have a part in this decision—we and our allies. And we must always remember that if we take upon ourselves the sole responsibility for making a crucial decision, we are not only involving our own Nation but, due to the dynamics of modern warfare and the terrible tensions that exist in the world, we are involving all people everywhere.

The outbreak of hostilities today in any part of the world could be the spark that ignites a world-wide conflagration. We cannot safely assume that hostilities involving the off-shore islands will be limited to that area. We cannot safely assume that the Soviet Union will not honor her treaty of mutual assistance with Communist China. Nor can we assume that because of our great assistance to the other nations and our alliances in Europe and the Far East that our allies will stand with us on this issue.

It is true that the President yesterday expressed his belief that the Rusisans would not enter should war break out in the Formosa Straits. But look at the position we would be in should such a war occur. We would be thoroughly and endlessly engaged with our forces in Asia, while the real center of world communism—the Soviet Union—would be unleased to grab the prize, Europe—the core of world strength.

Therefore, with prayerful thought and the highest degree of statesmanship that we as a nation and our leaders can bring to bear, we must patiently, carefully, and objectively arrive at a decision, and do it within a matter of days.

These things we know: The Communist Chinese have declared to the world that they will take the off-shore islands. These offshore islands have historically been under the dominion and jurisdiction of the government of the mainland. Presently, these islands are under the control of the Republic of China and heavily garrisoned. There has been sporadic fighting in and around these islands for the past 6 months. These are acknowledged facts.

There are those who feel that if the islands are to be lost to Red China this would be a stunning blow to the morale of the free Chinese forces on Formosa. Commanders are split as to how much American support it would take to hold these islands against Communist attack—or if it is possible to hold them. The Navy and the Air Force have stated openly that these islands can be held with just naval and air support, plus the Chinese Nationalist troops. The Chief of Staff of the United States Army has testified before committees of the Congress that to hold these islands would require American ground forces. No member of the Chiefs of Staff has testified that the islands are essential to the defense of Formosa. They are essential only if there is to be an invasion of the mainland of China.

But, I, for one, have been led to believe by our President and the Secretary of State that our Government will not engage in any military action designed for the retaking of the mainland.

The question may very well be asked then—why is it that the defense of Quemoy and Matsu is so much more important than the defense of the islands to the north of Formosa, which were evacuated, particularly if there is to be no invasion of the mainland. It has been stated by our military commanders that these islands are not essential to the defense of Formosa—and it is to the defense of Formosa that we have pledged American strength and resources.

Our declaration of defense for Formosa has not disrupted our relationships with our allies. The British agree with us on this, and there has been no protest from other friendly powers. The legal and historical position of Formosa as to a government on the Chinese mainland is entirely different from that relation to the offshore islands. The final disposition of Formosa has never been arrived at. It is one of the byproducts of World War II yet unsettled. The offshore islands, on the other hand, represent a land area involved in the Chinese civil war. There can be no doubt about that.

From the point of view of international law, Formosa occupies a different position. Therefore, our declaration of defense of Formosa against Chinese Communist aggression is in the interests of international law and order; is in the interests of the United Nations; and is a proper and honorable policy. Quemoy and Matsu are not in the same legal or moral position.

I respectfully suggest that with respect to the offshore islands, before any decision is made we carefully and frankly discuss this matter with our friends and allies. For example, what does the Japanese Government think about American participation in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu? What about our main ally, the British? The Canadian Government has made its position clear and has frankly stated we will have to go it alone. This should cause us to pause and think. Canada is like a brother to the United States. A more firm and noble ally we have never had. And yet, the responsible leadership of Canada has notified our Government, and

notified its own people, that Canada will stand aside and not be a partner with us in any military operations concerning the offshore islands.

Have we consulted with the south Asian powers? What about President Magsaysay of the Philippines—a leader that represents the spirit of the new Asia, a stanch friend of the United States—what does he have to say?

The Secretary of State and the President owe it to the American people and to themselves to know exactly where these nations stand, and to seek their advice and counsel, before rushing headlong into conflict.

Our decision pertaining to the offshore islands likewise must take into consideration our future relationships with such countries as Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Thailand, and the other south and southeast Asian countries. It is fair to say that our relationship with many of these nations already is strained. The Prime Minister of India has spoken out forcefully against our policies relating to the offshore islands, and even to Formosa. We must keep in mind constantly that what we do now may very well determine what we ever will be able to do in Asia. I am sure that the men of the Kremlin and their partners in Communist China sense that in this crucial decision concerning the offshore islands they may well have discovered the Achilles heel in American Far East policy. It would be nothing short of tragic if a decision to defend the offshore islands should lead to a complete break between ourselves and the free Asian nations. It is ridiculous to assume that the defense of these islands is more important than a cooperative and effective relationship between the hundreds of millions of people of the free nations of south and southeast Asia.

These are some of the questions that appear on the international political scene. The answer is not easy, nor can anyone ever be sure that whatever decision we may arrive at will be the right one. Nor can we predict the future. All we can do, or should seek to do, is that which is right, which is legal, and which is honorable. Above all, whatever decision we make must be in concert with others. We must not stand alone in this area, nor can we condone statements by responsible political leaders to the effect that no white troops will be used if we should defend the offshore islands. Statements such as these do us irreparable damage in the Far East.

BIG POWER CONFERENCE

We are giving consideration to the desirability of a big power conference in an attempt to ease the world's tensions. If we are to participate in such a conference, it is absolutely essential that we go there in full agreement with our allies, with no major questions unsettled, in our friendly family of free nations. We must remember at all times that the Soviet will use any international conference to drive a wedge between us and our European and Asian friends. We must be absolutely certain, before going to the conference table with the Soviet, that the United States, Great Britain, and France have come to a meeting of the minds, not only on the unsolved questions in Europe, but equally so on the problems and questions in Asia.

The decision about American policy concerning the offshore islands is the single more dramatic problem that faces us today. Unless we can reconcile our point of view on this limited but crucial matter, a big-power conference would only lead to further differences and confusion among the Allied Powers. The leaders in the Kremlin know that so long as the free world remains united, so long as we are able to reconcile our differences, so long as we are able to agree on fundamental and basic policies, the Communist conspiracy cannot succeed. The immediate and long range objective of Soviet strategy and diplomacy is to divide us, to split us apart, and above all to isolate the United States from our major allies in Europe and the Far East. This we must not permit to happen.

In the months ahead our Nation will be faced with many more critical decisions and difficult challenges. If we are to have a big-power conference then every conceivable effort must be made to go there from a position of strength—I mean strength based on cooperation and understanding between ourselves and our allies. I mean strength derived from a positive and constructive policy for the Far East as well as for Europe. I mean strength that is based on scrupulous adherence to the principles of international law. Yes, strength that comes from doing what is right, not doing what may be politically expedient.

And also the issue has an effect on our talk of disarmament. Our President has appointed a special adviser in the field of disarmament. We are now participating in the United Nations Disarmament Conference. What could be more tragic in view of all of these future challenges and present problems, than for the United States of America to become involved in hostilities, standing alone without friends or allies. All we hope for could go down the drain. A war with Red China over the offshore islands would not be conducive to a big-power meeting. A war with Red China over the offshore islands surely does not lead to disarmament. Such a war would not serve the purpose of integrating West Germany into the great NATO organization. It is abundantly clear to me that the diabolical plan of the Soviet Union is to force our hand in the Far East, if we permit it to be forced, over an area that is questionable as to its importance and that involves us with grave differences of policy with our allies. If the Soviet is successful in this tactic and strategy, we may well have forfeited our leadership, both in Europe and the Far East. It is not improbable to assume that in case of hostilities over the offshore islands, that the Soviet may well threaten every ally we have if they should accede to American pressure to intervene and join with us, the war may be extended and enlarged. I do not say this will happen—but I do say we must take these eventualities into account.

Such is the world we live in today. On that scene, other nations are troubled and looking for solutions.

Bandung Conference:

We are nearing the date of one of the most significant conferences in the world's history—the African-Asian Conference next month from which white people are excluded. Have we no better bid for support of this vital block of the world's people than the threat of atomic warfare? Where is any positive, constructive policy to be offered these people as evidences of our goodwill and peaceful intent, evidence of our understanding of their own aspirations and our willingness to cooperate in their own progress and development?

A positive program for peace: Let me advance a suggestion.

Let us get away from the negative and move to the positive. Let's show the Asian peoples we recognize their importance under the sun by taking the lead in proposing India for a seat on the permanent Security Council of the United Nations.

Instead of just saying "No" alone to Red China on admission to the United Nations—and it is a "No" I have always supported—let us counter with a suggestion of our own that would give recognition to Asia without letting Communist power blackmail its way into the family of nations.

It is a reflection of a very rapidly disappearing past for the United Nations to continue to seat China as a permanent member of the Security Council. China at the end of World War II was a powerful ally. The Communist China of today is an enemy. The Nationalist China of today on Formosa is weak and not representative of the new Asia. Neither of these Chinas deserves a seat as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Our Nation should instead call for a revision of the United Nations Charter so as to give India the seat now held by China. Such a dramatic move would attract the attention and support of our friends all over the world. If the Soviet Union opposes this suggestion, our position in Asia would be strengthened. If our suggestion is accepted, we would have a strong, democratic Asian nation sitting in its rightful place of leadership in the councils of the world. Let us not forget that India was our ally during World War II. That India was one of the few nations making a contribution to the Korean conflict by providing ambulances and medical assistance. That India is a democratically elected nation committed to the principle of freedom. The only major defeat inflicted on the Communists in Asia in the last year was inflicted by Nehru against the Communists in India.

Such a bid to India—even evidences of our interest in creating such a bid—could have a powerful impact in our behalf at the African-Asian Conference.

Then let us strengthen our friends in that conference with our assurances of a positive, constructive development program for underprivileged nations—assurances of economic aid, technical assistance, an expanded exchange program to better understand each others' cultures.

On the economic front we have wasted valuable time in meeting the challenge of Communist infiltration due to economic distress, particularly in Asia. It is in this area where our participation through the United Nations, in technical assistance, in health and education programs, can check and push back the inroads of Communist political and economic aggression. Then, too, we must more boldly and meaningfully outline to the Asians the extent and degree of our own economic assistance to them, with particular emphasis upon long-term loans at low rates of interest for capital improvement projects. The development of new instrumentalities of international financing is a challenge to our political and economic statesmanship.

And let us strengthen them in that conference with assurances to the now neutral people of the world that this democracy will never start an atomic war but will stand firm on our resolve to swiftly retaliate in force against a nation that does risk starting one.

ABOUT CHOOSING THE GROUNDS FOR A SHOWDOWN

The time is long past when we can afford to back away from threats of Red aggression. But the time and place of any showdown need not be at Red choosing. It should be obvious that Soviet strategy now calls for forcing our hand at Matsu and Quemoy, in the hope of making us attack the Chinese mainland—a move which they could interpret as intervening in a China civil war, and a move which they know we might be compelled to make without the support of our allies.

What is to prevent us from taking the intiative ourselves by shifting the scene of decision to Korea, where international law is solidly on our side in view of Red China's violation of cease-fire agreements? What is to prevent us from calling the Kremlin's hand on such violations by calling on our Korean allies, through the United Nations, to enforce the Korean truce? Is it not reasonable to assume that a sudden buildup of our forces in Korea would do more to upset Red China's calculations about Formosa than

anything we do about Matsu or Quemoy? Moving of our bomber squadrons into Korea, where they would be in ready striking distance of both Red China and Moscow itself, would give the Kremlin more cause for concern than any threat to use A-weapons on the Chinese people.

At the same time, our Nation should assume the initiative in an attempt to resolve the issue of Quemoy and Matsu peacefully, we should propose the neutralization and demilitarization of those islands. We can propose that the Formosa troops be withdrawn from Quemoy and Matsu if Communist China agrees not to occupy those islands. They can then be placed under the supervision of neutral Asian countries or the United Nations itself. Such a suggestion places us in a peace-seeking, rather than warlike, posture, and would give our allies in Asia an opportunity to seek a constructive solution which will secure our national security in Asia.

Gen. Peyton Conway March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in 1898, a fews days before the Battle of Manila Bay, I was born in the Ozarks of Missouri, when most proud parents named their horses, cats, dogs, and kids after Admiral Dewey. I suffered that common fate by being named after the Admiral at the very time that Peyton Conway March saw action in the assault and capture of Manila.

By the time I was able to read I learned not only about Admiral Dewey, but became interested in Peyton March, who had seen action with the admiral and became interested in him not only as a great military leader, but also as a human being.

At that time, as a youngster, I little realized that it would ever become my privilege to meet and know Peyton March personally. That time, however, came.

For 15 years, Mrs. Short and I lived only 2 or 3 blocks from him and his beloved wife Cora, and I count it one of the greatest privileges and rarest opportunities of my life to have become not only well acquainted with him but to know him and to love him. To really know Peyton March—and not too many people ever did—was to love him. Underneath his tough skin was a warm and friendly heart, a courteous, kindly, and gallant gentleman.

Yesterday we buried one of America's greatest soldiers, patriots, and citizens of all time. The outpouring of both military and civilian people was an attest to his goodness and greatness. Even those who disagreed with him in life were present to pay their sincere and genuine respect and admiration to an outstanding leader.

Peyton C. March was a man of steel. He possessed an iron will and uncompromising conscience, an inflexible devotion to duty and boundless energy. Forever he will remain the epitome of the true soldier. He was a stern and strict disciplinarian—but he never made demands on others that he did not make upon himself. He drove himself hard and he drove everbody around him hard. At times he may have seemed petulant, impatient, irascible, and ruthless, but always he acted in the high manner which he felt was best for his country.

Stiff and straight as a ramrod unto death at 90 years of age, he refused to be pushed around by anybody. At times he was defiant. Presidents, Secretaries, and Congresses did not frighten him.

Peyton March was a man of unconquerable courage, indefatigable energy, and utter devotion. He was not perfect, but he always strived for perfection. Nothing but the best would ever satisfy him. Duty and service to God, country, and his fellowman were the watchwords of his life.

In the dark hours of World War I it was his brilliant intellect, his organizing genius, his administrative ability, his unfailing faith and tireless labors that transported more than 2 million men to France—when our methods of transportation were much fewer and slower than they are today. It was an incredible accomplishment which seemed next to impossible in those days. He cut through Government redtape without hoping to make friends, and realizing at the time that he would make some enemies, in order to get a great and important job done.

General Pershing, my fellow Missourian, could never have accomplished what he did on the battlefield without the drudging efforts that General March put forth on the home front.

The glamorous and spectacular publicity and boxcar headlines never appealed to Peyton March as much as doing his job well without pomp and public acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, General March had a fine family. His father was a great scholar who taught at Lafayette College and bequeathed to his illustrious son many of his scholarly instincts and talents. Peyton March himself was a great scholar and an avid student of history. His impatience with those less fortunately endowed should be forgiven because of his rare accomplishments. His two lovely daughters are married to two distinguished and outstanding retired generals of the United States Army, Lieutenant General Joseph Swing, now Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Major General John Milliken. These generals won their own spurs in their own rights and never depended upon General March for personal advancement. General March's present and second wife Cora, a brilliant woman and a devoted wife, all but worshiped him. Their life together was most happy and successful. To her and to all the members of his family we all extend our deepest appreciation and sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I might say something to assuage the sorrow of these dear ones and the many friends who mourn the passing of General March. All of us can take comfort and inspiration from the noble life, rugged character, and unselfish service which Peyton C. March rendered undyingly to his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following newspaper articles that fairly, but inadequately speak of this great American—scholar, soldier, patriot, servant of his God, his country, and all mankind. Following these articles is the 91st Psalm, the passage of Holy Scripture which General March loved best and cherished most:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 14, 1955]

GENERAL PEYTON MARCH IS DEAD HERE AT 90

Gen. Peyton Conway March, Army Chief of Staff in World War I and America's oldest general, died at 5 p. m. yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90 years old last December 27.

Death came peacefully to the tough, outspoken, loyal military leader in his third-floor suite overlooking the formal gardens of the hospital where he had been confined to a bed or wheelchair since he broke his hip 14 months ago.

His attending physician said he died of a degenerative condition of old age. His wife, Cora, was at his bedside.

The general amazed the Germans in 1918 by achieving the almost incredible task of ferrying more than a million doughboys to Europe to crush the foe. Later he won the Distinguished Service Cross for leading a charge on enemy breastworks in France.

CLASHED WITH PERSHING

The dynamic militarist was, however, overshadowed in World War I by his bitterest rival, Gen. John J. Pershing, who headed the Allied Expeditionary Force.

His verbal clashes with Pershing broiled on after the war ended. In 1921, after he lost his title of full general, being relegated to major general, he slipped into retirement. He continued to live a vigorous life, making his home in a spacious apartment with his wife at 1870 Wyoming Avenue NW.

But he avoided the public spotlight and was soon to be known as the forgotten soldier. In his vesper years, however, words of sage advice again came from his lips. At the outset of World War II, he advocated a cross-channel invasion with an Allied army of 3 million. He took sharp issue with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1930, General March regained his full rank, and in 1948, upon the death of "Black Jack" Pershing, he became the highest ranking officer of World War I.

General March's peppery temper and outspoken criticism did not gain him many implacable enemies. Among his fellow officers he had always enjoyed the reputation of being a brilliant military officer, organizer and strategist.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said in a statement last night that "the long and distinguished career of Peyton C. March is a lasting inspiration to the people of our country he served so long and faithfully. The Nation has lost a great American, whose military career will be long remembered."

Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens said:

"General March had a distinguished military career, spanning 33 years during which his leadership was an inspiration for all with whom he served. Long after he retired in 1921 as Chief of Staff, his devotion to the Army caused him to serve as a valued adviser on military matters."

INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, said March's "military record reflects an inspiring leadership which contributed immeasurably to the firm foundation on which our Army stands today."

Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and World War II Army Chief of Staff, said March "was throughout his lifetime devoted to the interests and welfare of the Army." He said

March played "an important and difficult role" during World War I and that "his contribution to that conflict and studious development of plans for demobilization were of great significance."

Born in Easton, Pa., December 27, 1864, March graduated from the United States Military Academy June 11, 1888. Before he became Army Chief of Staff on May 29, 1918, he had served in France as artillery commander of the AEF.

MADE GENERAL IN 1918

March first saw active service in the Philippine Islands in 1898 when he participated in the assault and the capture of Manila. Later, he was detailed to Tokyo, in March, 1904, as military attaché on duty in the field with Japanese troops in the Russo-Japanese war.

When the United States entered World War I, he was a colonel on duty with the Second Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed for France in May of that year. The following year May 25, 1918, he was elevated to full general.

At his Wyoming Avenue apartment, which was studded with maps and files, March was an assiduous reader and had retained remarkable mental as well as physical agility.

His entire family was together with him last on December 27, where the rail-thin, goateed general observed his birthday with a quiet family party.

Beside his wife, he is survived by 2 daughters, both married to retired generals— Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Immigration Service Director, 3055 Foxhall Road NW., and Maj. Gen. John Millikin, 5915 Ramsgate Road, Woodacres, Md. Three grandchildren also survive.

Funeral arrangements were not completed last night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19, 1955]

ONE-MILE CORTEGE AT MARCH FUNERAL

Gen. Peyton Conway March, America's oldest general, was buried yesterday in Arlington Cemetery amid pomp and circumstance reserved only for the Nation's greatest military heroes.

The World War I Army Chief of Staff died Wednesday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90.

Top military, civilian, and foreign dignitaries headed a mile-long funeral cortege bearing the body from downtown Washington.

Included in the special honor guard following the caisson were Vice President Richard Nixon, Bernard Baruch, Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Army Gen. John E. Hull, Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, and Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri.

Baruch was chairman of the World War I War Industries Board while General March was Chief of Staff.

A 400-man cadet battalion from the United States Military Academy, the United States Army Band, and the Third (Old Guard) Infantry Regiment led units of all the armed services in the hour-long march from 15th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Tanks from the Third Armored Cavalry, Fort Meade, Md., and an airborne field artillery battery from Fort Bragg, N. C., made up part of the procession down Constitution Avenue NW., across Memorial Bridge to the memorial entrance to the cemetery.

The general's body, borne in state on a caisson drawn by six white horses, was followed by a riderless black horse with stirrups turned backward in the traditional military service.

On a hilltop overlooking the Potomac, Brig. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Army Deputy Chief of Chaplains, conducted Presbyterian graveside services.

The service, in a grove of maple trees under a cold, gray sky, began as the band sounded Ruffles and Flourishes, then broke into a medley of hymns. General Tobey read the service and led in prayer as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen held the American flag taut over the coffin.

The flag was folded and presented to General March's widow, who stood with Lieutenant Gen. Stanley Embick and other comrades of the late general near the coffin.

The military units presented arms and a 17-gun salute from one of eight 105-millimeter howitzers in the cortege echoed over the hills.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was graduated from the military academy in 1888. He saw action in the assault and capture of Manila in 1898. He became Chief of Staff in 1918 after organizing the movement and supply of the American Expeditionary Force in Europe. He retired in 1921.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 16, 1955]

GENERAL MARCH

Gen. Peyton C. March was the beau ideal professional soldier. His whole life—90 years of it—added up to make a great military career. An honor graduate of West Point, he commanded the Astor Battery in the Philippines in 1898 and returned to the islands to work under Arthur MacArthur in the guerrilla campaigns which resulted in the capture of Aguinaldo in 1901. With the Japanese he saw the Russians beaten at Yalu and Liaoyang in 1904—terrible battles which taught him the importance, in war, of "force, force to the utmost."

This was the philosophy General March put into practice in World War I. The first of his missions in that struggle was to organize the artillery in France. Secretary of War Newton Baker called him home to be Chief of Staff and to weld the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Army into a single fighting power. The story of how 2 million men were carried over the Atlantic to smash the Kaiser's mailed-fist defenses and compel his surrender and abdication has been told repeatedly. It may be summarized in the words which General March himself used: "We did it."

But the principal architect of the institutional side of the victory was not the rough, tough, hard, sharp, sarcastic, provocative mechanician some critics supposed. Washingtonians who were his neighbors found him, instead, a courteous, kindly, friendly, modestly chivalrous person. He had his own ideas, his own fashion of getting things accomplished, and he did not like to be crossed. Yet it also was true that he could pull in harness, was a skilled cooperator, and in hundreds of instances a faithful friend of fellow officers. Above all, General March was a patriot. He loved his country and its people.

PSALM 91

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

2. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust.

3. Surely He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

4. He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust; His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

5. Thou shall not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

6. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

7. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and 10,000 at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

8. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

9. Because thou has made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

10. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

11. For He shall give His Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

13. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

14. Because He hath set His love upon me, therefore will I deliver Him: I will set Him on high, because He hath known my name.

15. He shall call upon me, and I will answer Him: I will be with Him in trouble, I will deliver Him, and honor Him.

16. With long life will I satisfy Him, and shew Him my salvation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou from whom to be turned away is to fall, to whom to be turned is to rise, and in whom to abide is to stand fast forever: We look to Thee knowing that Thou wilt give us in all our duties Thy help, in all our perplexities Thy guidance, and in all our weakness Thy strength.

We stand poised on the edge of this new day aware of its tremendous opportunities. As we launch out into its depths, may we be conscious of the wisdom in the investment of our time, our talents, and our lives for the betterment of our people and all the people who dwell upon the earth.

Let the zeal for right and truth burn within us and through us, and may there be an indelible mark of goodness upon our time. To this end we dedicate this day of service. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen You-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of John Jordan;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1296. An act for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1922. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Ingrid Samson;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2052. An act for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of William F. Friedman;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Daze;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3022. An act for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of George P. Provencal;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3180. An act for the relief of William Frederick Werner;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta);

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Rev. Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4418. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 4454. An act for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran;

H. R. 4506. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4637. An act for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; and

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen You-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of John Jordan;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1296. An act for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1922. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Ingrid Samson;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2052. An act for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of William F. Friedman;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Daze;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3022. An act for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of George P. Provencal;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3180. An act for the relief of William Frederick Werner;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta);

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriquez de Uribe;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4418. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 4454. An act for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran;

H. R. 4506. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4637. An act for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; and

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch; and

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; placed on the calendar.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambasador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Vietnam.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER—MYRTLE BEACH, S. C.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Floyd C. Hammond to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, S. C., which had been reported adversely.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. This is the fifth year I have been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is the first postmaster from my State whose nomination I have reported adversely, and for that reason I ask that the Senate do not advise and consent to the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination, which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported adversely.

The nomination was rejected.

OTHER POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read nominations of sundry postmasters which had been reported favorably.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills,

and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, TO PROVIDE SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RENTAL OF INADEQUATE QUARTERS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WITHOUT LOSS OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military, naval and Air Force installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL, CARVILLE, LA.

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Veterans' Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Memorial 1

"Whereas it has been stated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the policy of the present administration to administer our agricultural stabilization and conservation programs with the farmers themselves being given a voice in the supervision and control of such programs; and

"Whereas the State agricultural stabilization committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert as chairman has discharged 3 elected committeemen, suspended 4 elected committeemen, and forced 1 elected committeeman to resign in Texas County, Mo., with just the broad charge of certain irregularities without any specification of what particular irregularities; and

"Whereas at a hearing held by the State committee in February of 1954 on the proposed discharge of certain elected committeemen in Texas County, Mo., one William Young McCaskill, a qualified dealer under the emergency drought feed program and also a special correspondent for a metropolitan newspaper of this State was denied access as a member of the press to such hearing by Murray C. Colbert after the said Murray C. Colbert was requested by the committeemen of the local ASC committee to hold a public hearing; and

"Whereas William Young McCaskill was suspended on February 3, 1955, for alleged irregularities in drought feed certificates and on April 6, 1955, was reinstated after an investigation of the alleged irregularities by the Commodity and Investigation Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service, and on April 7, 1955, the said Murray C. Colbert again suspended William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co., alleging that William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. had made an agreement to circumvent the first suspension; and

"Whereas it has been charged that the State ASC committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert is not operating the ASC committee on an impartial basis free from personalities and pressures; and

"Whereas numerous counties in the State of Missouri have experienced similar wholesale dismissals and suspensions since Mr. Colbert assumed the office of State ASC chairman; and

"Whereas the farmers of Texas County and the State of Missouri are greatly disturbed by the aforementioned actions of the State ASC committee which is definitely hindering the successful operations of such ASC program; and

"Whereas a suspension of a dealer under the emergency drought feed program practically destroys the business of such suspended dealer and does great damage to the reputation of such dealer: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Missouri, That the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to investigate the activities of the State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri and the suspension of the said William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers for the purpose of bringing the true state of facts to light and of ascertaining whether the declared policy of the present administration of giving the farmers themselves a voice in the administration of the ASC program is being carried out in Missouri; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 7

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the house of representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in extraordinary session of the 22d legislature assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, on the recommendation of the President, did in 1954 create a Federal Unemployment Fund for the purpose of assisting the States and Territories in meeting unemployment insurance obligations; and

"Whereas in mid-1954 it became apparent that the unemployment benefit fund of the Territory of Alaska would, by early 1955, be exhausted and that its supplementation from said Federal loan fund would be necessary for continued payment of benefits; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Labor, as early as October 4, 1954, and repeatedly thereafter, urged the Alaska Employment Security Commission and the Governor of Alaska to apply for an advance of funds from said Federal Unemployment Account in contemplation of early exhaustion of Alaska's benefit payment fund, which total depletion has now occurred, together with the discontinuance of payments; and

"Whereas in January 1955 the Alaska Employment Security Commission was reported to have requested the Honorable Governor B. Frank Heintzleman to seek such an advance in order to avoid interruption in payment of Alaskan unemployment insurance claims; and

"Whereas by law, application for such Federal loan may be made only by the Governors of the several States and Territories; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Territorial Legislature did in the 22d session regularly assembled urge the Governor of Alaska by resolution adopted on the 28th day of January 1955 that he make immediate formal application for such Federal loan; and

"Whereas it had long been abundantly obvious that absentee controlled financial interests which operate in Alaska and which were opposed to employment security were adamant in their opposition to such an advance and to the continued payment of unemployment benefits; and

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska chose to disregard said house resolution and the need of Alaska's unemployed and destitute citizens, supporting thereby the aforementioned financial interests; and

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska has sought at the expense of Alaska's unemployed to encroach upon the authority of an elected legislature and has for political advantage attempted to embarrass the Legislature and has by coercion, delay, and deliberate direction sought to exert his will upon the elected Alaska Legislature; and

"Whereas the Governor did on the 26th day of March 1955 call a special session of the Territorial Legislature and did therein, in contravention of an opinion of the Territorial Attorney General, attempt to limit the deliberations of the legislators as to both subject matter and time; and

"Whereas on March 28, 1955, the Governor did advise the legislature that he would not seek a loan from the United States unless and until he was given control of the Alaska employment security program by power of appointment of the administrative board thereof and until $1 million was advanced from the Territorial general fund to the employment security commission fund; and

"Whereas, the Attorney General of Alaska in an opinion dated January 8, 1955, had held that in establishing the Federal Unemployment Account the Congress of the United States had clearly intended its use and availability to Alaska, and that there was no legal obstacle to the Governor's making application for such loan; and

"Whereas the Governor, in disregard of said opinion of the Attorney General of Alaska, 2½ months ago sought and has since obtained an opinion from the Attorney General of the United States and did advise the legislature on March 31, 1955, that under such opinion the Territory could not obtain a loan from the United States with which to meet unemployment benefit claims; and

"Whereas the failure of the Attorney General of the United States to render an opinion throughout the period the legislature was in regular session make it clear that his course of action was politically motivated and calculated to support the Governor in his attempt to intimidate the Alaska Legislature, and to force it to enact an employment security program which would deprive the Territory of the program's customary economic support; and

"Whereas in the interim the legislature has passed and sent to the Governor, a prospectively workable and sound Employment Security Act designed to meet the needs of Alaska's unemployed and to restore the Employment Security Fund; and

"Whereas the Governor stated in a message read to the legislature on April 6, 1955, that he 'will now complete the request for the loan,' yet in reliance on the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, suggested that such application would be ineffective without further legislation by the Congress; and

"Whereas it is clear to the legislature that only a Governor who is not answerable to the people may for political purposes so completely disregard the people's welfare.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the house of representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in extraordinary session of the 22d legislature assembled, earnestly petitions the Congress of the United States to make clear to the Attorney General of the United States, by special enactment, its already known intent that Alaska, like other jurisdictions, is entitled to make application for, and to receive the benefits of, Title XII of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"In full confidence that the Congress will so make clear to the Attorney General of the United States that Alaska was intended to participate in said title XII, along with the rest of the United States, the territorial legislature has authorized a temporary advance of $2 million from its general fund to meet immediate need for payments to those of Alaska's workers who are now unemployed.

"And it is further requested that the facts above recited be examined by the Congress in terms of their bearing on statehood for Alaska and the right of a free citizenry to elect a Governor who will be responsible to their needs, interests, wishes, and welfare.

"And it is further requested that the Congress investigate the flagrant abuse of the power and prestige of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Governor of Alaska for deliberate political purposes at the expense of Alaska's people and economy, to accommodate absentee-controlled interests, and to intimidate and harass elected representatives of resident Alaskans.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, April 7, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A letter in the nature of a petition from William H. Banck, of Washington, D. C., relating to the election of successors to the Congress for Members who have died or resigned from office, and the establishment, under the Comptroller General, of an office to receive suggestions from the people on national affairs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Grass Valley (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, Inc., approving the development of hydroelectric power on the Trinity River, Calif., by local enterprise; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the air pollution control board of the air pollution control district of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds to complete the study now in progress by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, concerning identification of atmospheric contaminants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Frank A. Hourihan, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to commend by joint resolution the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in establishing a national living memorial to the American Indian in the State of New Mexico

"Whereas there is at the present time no national living memorial to the American Indian commensurate with the great debt our Nation owes to the first inhabitants of this great Nation; and

"Whereas there has been chartered by the State of Michigan a nonprofit corporation named the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for the purposes of constructing such a memorial as conceived by sculptor E. Harlan Daniels; and

"Whereas the memorial, so conceived, shall forever acknowledge the contribution made to our Nation by these first American citizens, shall enlighten the American people on a civilization that is basic to our American heritage, and shall foster the collection and preservation of relics, artifacts, and documented knowledge of the Indian race in America; and

"Whereas the board of trustees of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation has by resolution dedicated the foundation to the placement of the memorial in the State of New Mexico and has received assurances of support from various prominent citizens and civic organizations in said State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact a joint resolution commending the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in the furtherance of this great project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 16th day of March 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A STRONG AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in support of a strong American merchant marine, which was adopted by the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held here in Washington, on January 13, 14, and 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 26—SUPPORT OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Whereas disturbed world conditions of the moment, resulting from the aggressive ideologies of international communism, make it imperative that our Nation take all possible steps to safeguard its security and to strengthen its position as the ultimate bastion of world freedoms; and

Whereas in the building and maintenance of a Military Establishment adequate to defend the United States from any and all aggression, cognizance must be taken of the strategic part our privately owned merchant fleet has played in two world wars and during the hostilities in Korea, and must inevitably play in any future wars; and

Whereas the increasing competition of low-cost foreign shipping in this sphere of world transportation focuses attention upon the difficulties faced by American-flag shipping in its efforts to serve the foreign-commerce needs of our people in peacetime, and to strengthen its position so as to be ready to meet any national emergency demands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegation to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., in convention assembled, put themselves on record formally as recognizing the urgent need for public and congressional support of the American merchant marine and ship-construction and repair industries, to the end that proper and sufficient Government participation be forthcoming to insure a long-range program of ship construction, vitally needed to keep the American merchant fleet modern and competitive in peacetime and adequate to serve national security requirements.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1516. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 998. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla. (Rept. No. 212);

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 213); and

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history (Rept. No. 214).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 4647. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 211).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1079. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests (Rept. No. 207).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1372. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (Rept. No. 208).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 153. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; with an amendment (Rept. No. 209); and

H. R. 1573. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 210).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1628. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; with amendments (Rept. No. 206).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1737. A bill to amend section 7 of article I of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, relating to inheritance taxes;

S. 1738. A bill to amend section 2 of article I of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, relating to inheritance taxes;

S. 1739. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 1740. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; and

S. 1741. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A. National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1742. A bill to incorporate the American Association of Firemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1743. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Jacob Massouda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1744. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1745. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran; and

S. 1746. A bill continuing the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY) (by request):

S. 1747. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1748. A bill to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1749. A bill adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE (by request):

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

S. 1752. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts;

S. 1753. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; and

S. 1754. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1755. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1756. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to permit the making of payments to farmers for certain water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1757. A bill to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans; and

S. 1759. A bill to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1760. A bill to require compliance with the National Labor Relations Act as a condition of receiving Government contracts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1761. A bill to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1762. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1763. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1764. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1765. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1766. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to make loans available to certain junior colleges to provide housing for students and faculties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1767. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1768. A bill to extend to persons entitled to receive medical care by or through the Veterans' Administration the right to elect to receive chiropractic treatment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1769. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the South Carolina coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of protecting human lives and property from hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1770. A bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of wheat marketing certificates; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO HOUSING FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining its provisions, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1744) to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. (a) To assist educational institutions in providing housing and other educational facilities for their students and faculties the Administrator may make loans of funds to such institutions for the construction of such facilities: *Provided*, That (1) no such loan shall be made unless the educational institution shows that it is unable to secure the necessary funds for such construction from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title, and (2) no such loan shall be made unless the Administrator finds that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

"(b) Any educational institution which, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has contracted for housing or other educational facilities may, in connection therewith, receive loans authorized under this title, as the Administrator may determine: *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made for any housing or other educational facilities, the construction of which was begun prior to the effective date of this act.

"(c) A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the construction, as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by him; and with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the College Housing Amendments of 1955 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2¾ percent per annum, or (2) the total of ¼ of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e) of this section.

"(d) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $500 million: *Provided*, That the amount outstanding for other educational facilities, as defined herein, shall not exceed $100 million.

"(e) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loan contracts entered into after the effective date of the college housing amendments of 1955 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ percent per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Administrator and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by educational institutions assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this section."

SEC. 2. That subsection (c) of section 404 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Development cost' means costs of the construction of the housing or other educational facilities and the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvements to permit its use for housing or other educational facilities."

SEC. 3. That section 404 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection (h):

"(h) 'Other educational facilities' means (1) new structures of a self-liquidating nature suitable for use as cafeterias or dining halls, student centers or student unions, infirmaries or other inpatient or outpatient health facilities, and for other essential service facilities, and (2) structures of a self-liquidating nature suitable for the above uses provided by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures which are otherwise inadequate for such uses."

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "College Housing Amendments of 1955."

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

In 1950, upon the initiative of my friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Congress recognized the critical housing need of students and teachers in colleges and universities all over the country. To help meet this need, the Housing Act of 1950 inaugurated a program of long-term loans at low interest rates to provide funds for the construction of dormitories and residences at rentals which college students and teachers could afford to pay. Because of the war in Korea, the program did not become effective until 1953. A complete summary of the program, as it has operated to date, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1955, by our colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

I have studied this summary and have studied data expressing the continuing critical housing situation facing our colleges and universities, and am convinced that the college housing program should be strengthened. Here are some of the factors which lead me to such a conclusion:

1. Increasing enrollment: In the fall of 1954 enrollment in our higher educational institutions reached approximately 2.5 million—an all-time high. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this enrollment will rise steadily. By 1960, enrollment will reach 3 million—an increase of about 20 percent over 1954. By 1965, it will reach about 4 million—an increase of about 60 percent over 1954. This increase of prospective students is inevitable, and is attributable to our normal population growth accentuated by the high birth rate of the 1940's.

2. Present inadequacy of college housing: Not only is present housing inadequate to meet the need for future enrollment—it is inadequate for enrollment in 1955. Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, reports that old barracks and other temporary structures pressed into use in the late 1940's are deteriorating beyond use. He says that, "Many of these must now be removed because they are fire hazards, uneconomical to maintain, and because the special permits under which they were erected have expired."

In March of this year the Tenth National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by a department of the National Education Association declared that present housing facilities are entirely inadequate for present and anticipated enrollments. The conference further declared an equally critical need for buildings to house other self-liquidating services such as cafeterias and dining halls. At the close of my remarks I will introduce the complete text of resolutions adopted by the conference.

(See exhibit A.)

Further evidence on this point is revealed by a recent survey of the financial status of colleges and universities of the United States. This survey was made by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., and was released on April 3, 1955. The council is a nonprofit organization established by leading businessmen to encourage greater financial support of higher education in this country.

The council surveyed roughly two-thirds of the Nation's degree-granting institutions—including all of the best known colleges and universities. The purpose of the survey was to assemble information which would help business concerns decide the amounts and types of contributions to make to colleges and universities in need of financial assistance—not loans, but outright gifts. Consequently the findings cover all phases of income and expenditures of these institutions. While I will not repeat the council's report in its entirety, I will call attention to some of their more alarming findings:

(a) At least one-half of the Nation's colleges and universities are operating in the red—average annual deficits range from $30,000 to $194,000.

(b) These deficits cannot be cured by raising charges to students—to do so would deny higher education to too many worthy students.

(c) Scholarships are financed primarily from general revenues—not from gifts and endowments.

(d) Average annual salaries of undergraduate teachers in the nine categories of institutions surveyed range from $3,737 to a high average of $5,462. Teachers in graduate schools average a little higher—ranging from

$5,112 to $6,371. On the whole, teachers in tax-supported institutions receive higher pay than those in independent schools.

(e) The 753 institutions surveyed were asked to express their need for funds in terms of preferred usage, i. e., buildings, endowment, salary increases, scholarships, new equipment—all but one category of institution placed capital funds for buildings at the top of this list.

(f) Six hundred and thirty institutions reported their need over the next 10 years for buildings, improvements, equipment, and maintenance to be over $2½ billion—or an average of over $4 million per institution.

The total impact of this survey reveals a need for funds for all purposes—but the greatest need is for buildings. These operating deficits, the ridiculously low salaries for teachers, and the shortage of buildings of all kinds exist right now.

3. Prospects for meeting this need: Enrollment is rising, present buildings are inadequate, and new buildings must be provided. New buildings cost money and there are only two sources for this money—gifts or loans. Gifts and grants can be made and are being made—by individuals and by both private and public corporate bodies. But these gifts and grants have not been sufficient in the past, are not sufficient now, and will not be sufficient in the future. This means that a significant portion of the necessary money must be obtained by loans.

Borrowed money cannot serve its full purpose in this program unless it can be repaid from the income of the buildings so provided. The record clearly shows that private loans are not available in sufficient quantity and at terms and interest rates necessary for self-liquidation of these buildings. Consequently, the only solution I can see is for the Congress to strengthen and liberalize the college housing program. The bill I will offer proposes necessary changes in this program.

BILL TO EXPAND AND LIBERALIZE THE COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

In approaching this matter of college housing, I have mentioned some of the general problems facing our educational institutions. My bill is not designed to solve all of these problems, but deals with only one small phase—what we might call the buildings for necessary services to students and faculties without which the institutions could not function. The Housing Act of 1950, as amended, established a program under which colleges and universities can borrow money from the Federal Government to construct dormitories and residences for students and faculty members. The loans can be for as long as 40 years and are subject to an interest rate determined by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The total of all loans cannot exceed $300 million and no more than 10 percent of the money may be borrowed by institutions in any single State.

The bill which I introduce makes the following changes in the present law:

1. It expands the purposes for which loans may be made to include cafeterias, dining halls, infirmaries, student unions or student centers, and other essential "service" buildings, all of which are capable of self-liquidation;

2. It increases the maximum term of the loans to 50 years;

3. It fixes the interest charge to the colleges at a reasonable rate, but at a rate lower than that available under the present law;

4. It fixes the interest charge to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator at a fair return to the Treasury, but at a lower rate than he is now forced to pay;

5. It fixes the conditions under which Federal loans may be denied on grounds that comparable private loans are available; and

6. It increases the overall ceiling on loans to $500 million.

Each of these changes is necessary and can be justified.

The first change recognizes that cafeterias, dining halls, and infirmaries are just as essential to the college campus as classrooms and dormitories. Such buildings must be financed by private or public gifts or grants, by general college revenue, or by income from the services which the buildings provide. There is no other way. Gifts and grants are apparently not forthcoming in sufficient quantity and general revenues cannot be spread to cover the cost of these buildings—which leaves self-liquidation as the only reasonable alternative. These buildings can be substantially self-liquidating if they are financed by long term loans at low interest rates.

The second change lengthens the maximum term to 50 years. This is not to say that all loans shall be for 50 years, but where such a term is required, it should be available. Permanent buildings, soundly constructed, and conscientiously maintained, can endure far beyond 50 years. I will present a table later in this statement to show the real advantage that accrues to students and faculty, from the standpoint of monthly charges, by increasing the term of a loan.

The third change is perhaps the most important—the interest rate to be paid by the colleges. Under the original law, this interest rate was fixed as ¼ of 1 percent above the interest rate in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more. Under this policy, effective until the law was changed in 1953, the interest rate averaged at approximately 2.88 percent.

Then came the so-called hard money policy. The law was changed in the 83d Congress to give discretion to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in this matter of interest. I am sure you can imagine what happened—the interest rate went up. This same law in 1953 also gave the Secretary of the Treasury discretion regarding the amount he could charge the HHFA—which also had an upward effect on the interest charge to colleges. As a result, since mid-1953 the interest rate has averaged at approximately 3.26 percent. This rise is made even more significant in view of the fact that, because of the Korean emergency, the program was deferred and most of the loans have been made at the higher rates.

The following table, prepared in the HHFA, illustrates the effect which higher interest rates has on charges to students. The table also shows the effects of short term as opposed to long term loans:

Annual rental (9 months) required per student for self-liquidating residence hall at various rates of interest and terms of years

(Assumptions: Cost per bed, $3,000; maintenance and operation, $100 per student; vacancy ratio, 10 percent; coverage 1.35 times)

[Computed on basis of no principal payments for first 2 years of loan]

	2 percent	2¼ percent	2½ percent	2¾ percent	3 percent	3¼ percent	3½ percent	3¾ percent	4 percent	4¼ percent	4½ percent
20 years	$412	$418	$425	$431	$438	$446	$452	$460	$467	$474	$481
25 years	358	363	371	378	384	392	399	407	414	421	429
30 years	322	330	337	343	351	359	366	373	381	389	397
35 years	298	306	313	320	328	335	343	351	359	368	376
40 years	281	289	296	303	311	319	327	336	343	352	360
45 years	268	276	283	291	299	307	315	323	332	341	350
50 years	258	266	273	281	289	296	306	314	323	332	341

This table shows that money borrowed at 2¾ percent interest for 50 years will provide shelter at approximately $31 per month. Loans for 40 years at 3½ percent interest (the present private loan rate which, if available, will cause the HHFA to refuse a loan) will provide shelter for approximately $36 per month. Five dollars per month savings for shelter alone is significant in determining whether a young man or woman can afford to go to college.

I believe that the public interest justifies loans at the lowest possible interest rate. Based upon the average cost of borrowed money to the Government during recent years, the interest rate on these loans can be fixed at a maximum of approximately 2¾ percent and still cover the cost of money obtained from the Treasury and the cost of administering the program. Two and three-fourths percent should be a maximum rate and I can see no reason for establishing a statutory rate which varies from month to month or which is subject to periodic revision by administrators of the program.

I agree wholeheartedly with a statement on this matter of term and interest rate in a recent article by Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Cole said: "Even with the 40-year maximum amortization and the current 3¼ percent interest rate provided under the College Housing Program, it is almost impossible to work out projects which are completely self-liquidating from the moderate rentals which are economically feasible for college students today. Nearly every college housing loan requires additional revenues from other debt-free buildings, student fees or other sources. Thus, each institution must work out its own individual solution to a financial problem whose principal components are the construction cost per bed and monthly rent per student." But I cannot agree with the solution which he advocates to relieve this impossible situation. He urges borrowing from private lenders at 3½ percent interest and at terms up to 40 years. Such a solution places an even greater burden on additional revenues to supplement income from the buildings themselves. A more reasonable, and the only practical, solution is to reduce the interest rate and increase the maximum term. By these means it is possible to achieve self-liquidation, which is the goal our colleges and universities are seeking.

The fourth change is concerned with the interest rate which the Treasury charges the HHFA. Prior to the "hard money policy" this rate was as low as 2 percent. I understand that the present charge to the HHFA is 3 percent. With money costing the HHFA as much as 3 percent, it is forced to set its discretionary interest rate to the colleges at some higher amount—and at the present time it is 3¼ percent. Thus the rate to the colleges is a full one-half of 1 percent higher than it was in 1950 when the program started. This rise is largely attributable to the manner by which the Treasury has exercised its discretion under the law.

For this reason I propose that this discretion be removed and that the statute fix a fair charge for money made available to HHFA. I think that 2½ percent is a fair charge. This exceeds the average cost of money obtained by the Treasury. If by any

chance this cost should rise above 2½ percent, the bill provides that the charge to HHFA and the charge to the colleges will rise correspondingly.

If the HHFA can obtain money from the Treasury at 2½ percent and lend to colleges at 2¾ percent, the return of one-fourth of 1 percent should be sufficient to offset the costs of administration.

The fifth change is to correct what I think has been an unwise use of discretion granted under existing law. As now written, the law requires the HHFA Administrator to turn down any loan application if the applicant can obtain a private loan upon "comparable terms and conditions." This concept of "comparability" is not defined in the law and is left to the discretion of the Administrator.

Up until July 1954, this discretion was exercised by a decision to deny any application if a private loan was available at not more than one-tenth of 1 percent above the rate being charged by the Administrator. In July 1954, however, this policy was changed and the private interest rate is determined to be "comparable" if it is not more than one-fourth of 1 percent higher than the rate being charged by the Administrator.

The Administrator's rate is now 3¼ percent, and this "comparability" policy means that the Administrator will not make a loan if a private lender offers money at 3½ percent. To my mind, this does not represent "comparable terms and conditions." Consequently, I propose a change in law to require that private loans be judged comparable only if their terms and conditions are equal to or better than the terms and conditions provided herein for Federal loans. If colleges need long-term loans at 2¾ percent interest, and I believe they do, then I think private lenders should meet this need or stand aside for the Federal loan.

The sixth change proposes to increase the statutory ceiling on funds available for these loans from $300 million to $500 million. This increase is essential and is but a small percentage of the total funds required for construction of residential and other service buildings on our college campuses over the next few years. These funds are not for gifts or grants—but are for loans at reasonable interest rates.

I am aware of the recent report of the Hoover Commission which recommends that this program be discontinued. But I believe that the Commission must have misunderstood the intent of the Congress when it started this program in 1950. On March 14, the Hoover Commission transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives a 126-page Report on Lending, Guaranteeing, and Insurance Activities of the Federal Government. On page 42 of this report there appears the following statement:

"In its consideration of the Housing Act of 1950, Congress was aware of the influx of GI students, though no reference to them is made in the act. Since then, any GI emergency has passed and this lending activity is only one of general aid to colleges and universities. The demonstrated ability of colleges to secure such loans elsewhere compels us to conclude that this program is no longer necessary. Recommendation No. 15—That the program of loans for college housing be terminated."

The Commission states that although the Housing Act of 1950 did not mention the need to house college students who are GI's, the Congress was aware of the housing needs of such students. The argument goes on to say that since the GI student emergency has passed, the college housing program is nothing more than general aid to colleges and universities. The obvious implication is that this program was for the GI emergency need only and that, therefore, the program is no longer necessary. Such an implication does not convey my understanding of the situation.

I have carefully reviewed the initial bills, the hearings, the reports, and the debates leading to the enactment of that portion of the Housing Act of 1950, known as the college housing program. This research makes it perfectly clear that the legislation was in no way predicated upon the enrollment of students receiving assistance under the GI bill. The only significant references to GI enrollment made the following points:

1. That enrollments would continue to rise in spite of the predicted and inevitable decline of GI enrollment;

2. That the emergency shacks utilized to meet the large influx of GI students in 1946, 1947, and 1948, were rapidly approaching dilapidation;

3. That although the housing need was not predicated upon GI enrollment, their needs did contribute to the urgency of the program; and

4. That far from being a GI housing program, the legislation was in fact the first peacetime Federal aid to higher education.

Furthermore, according to statistics of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, the ratio of GI enrollment to total college enrollment was at its peak in 1946—4 years before the Housing Act of 1950. This ratio has steadily declined since 1946. In 1946 the ratio was a little over 52 percent. By 1950 it had declined to 25 percent. By 1954, the peak year of total college enrollment, the GI ratio was down to 15 percent—and this includes Korean veterans. If limited to World War II veterans, which is what the word "GI" meant in 1950, the ratio was only 3 percent in 1954. (At this point in my remarks I would like to insert a table based upon information supplied by the Federal Security Agency.)

Fall enrollment—1939–60

[In thousands]

Year	World War II veterans	Korean veterans	Nonveterans	Total
1939			1,365	1,365
1941			1,180	1,180
1943			733	733
1945			1,074	1,074
1946	1,081		997	2,078
1947	1,122		1,216	2,338
1948	1,011		1,397	2,408
1949	860		1,597	2,457
1950	574		1,723	2,297
1951	389		1,727	2,116
1952	233		1,915	2,148
1953	143	145	1,962	2,250
1954	80	290	2,130	2,500
1955 [1]				2,591
1956 [1]				2,692
1957 [1]				2,776
1958 [1]				2,847
1959 [1]				2,940
1960 [1]				3,057

[1] Estimates.

The expansion of the facilities of our colleges and universities is central to the continued freedom and prosperity of our Nation. The programs of these institutions must be available to ever-increasing numbers of students and at prices they can afford to pay. The public interest demands that this expansion occur. The Federal Government can assist by outright gift, by subsidizing students, or by lending at low interest rates. This lending is the very least we can do, and I think that it must be done. I hope I can count on every Member of the Senate to support this necessary legislation.

EXHIBIT A

TENTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION SPONSORED BY ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 2, 1955

CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

College and university housing

Whereas the present housing facilities on college and university campuses are entirely inadequate for present and anticipated enrollments despite the welcome assistance already given by the college housing program, title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.); and

Whereas, the regulations under which title IV of the Housing Act, 1950, now operates prevent the program from being fully practical for self-liquidating projects: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education recommend a modification of the regulations governing the use of the funds by providing for the lowest interest rates consistent with the original act; reducing the reserve fund requirement to the lowest reasonable level; and by making available as soon as possible the full amount of the funds provided under the act; and

Whereas the 1953 amendment to title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 gives discretionary power to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to change the interest rate, thus introducing further elements of uncertainty for the colleges in the effective operation of the law: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education recommend that title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, be further amended to withdraw the discretionary power of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to change the interest rate.

College and university facilities for auxiliary services other than housing

Whereas the existing facilities for auxiliary services other than housing on college and university campuses fall far short of meeting the needs of present and anticipated enrollments; and

Whereas facilities for auxiliary enterprises of colleges and universities may be of a self-liquidating nature: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education urge amendment of title IV of the Housing Act, 1950, to include financing the construction and equipment of facilities for auxiliary services other than housing on college and university campuses.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO WHEAT MARKETING PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past few months, I have received many letters from wheat growers in Kansas and other sections of the Nation expressing concern over the possible defeat of the wheat quotas or the extension of the wheat marketing program, on which the wheat growers will ballot next June.

I believe everyone must agree that a substantial reduction in the parity loan price for wheat would have serious repercussions. These repercussions would be felt not only in the wheat-producing sections of the Nation but would have a disturbing effect on our entire economic structure. Such a reduction would most certainly endanger the entire farm program.

Under these circumstances, I think it is incumbent on the Congress to give serious consideration to some program that would be available in case this situation should develop.

I am today introducing a domestic parity plan, or what is sometimes called a two-price plan or a certificate plan for wheat.

Under the domestic parity plan the grower would receive parity prices for

wheat used in domestic human consumption and the remainder of the crop would seek its own price level in the market for feed, export, and industrial uses.

In the case of wheat the present supply situation presents problems, which cannot be avoided regardless of what kind of a program is in effect. It is essential that in the case of wheat, we have a strategic reserve, which in my opinion should be at least 500 million bushels.

On July 1 it is estimated we will have a carryover of approximately 900 million bushels of wheat. This would mean that our problem would be to distribute 400 million bushels of wheat, plus whatever increase over the reserve we accumulate with the 1955 crop.

Regardless of what program may be in effect, we will have this surplus to contend with until we have been able to reduce it to sizable proportions.

I do not contend that the bill I am presenting is flawless and I have no doubt that full hearings and a complete and searching study will suggest changes in the legislation I have proposed.

On the other hand, I firmly believe that the principle embodied in this bill merits the fullest consideration by everyone interested in the future of the wheat grower and agriculture as a whole.

It seems to me that the greatest single advantage of the program is that it would take the Government out of the business of buying wheat. There would again be an open market for wheat, where the price—whether for domestic use or for export—would be determined by buyers and sellers with reference to the demand and supply of the various kinds and qualities of wheat.

It seems to me this is far superior to the present system of support purchases by the Government which has led to the expensive and wasteful accumulation of huge supplies of wheat in Government storage.

The domestic parity certificate plan would protect the parity relationship between the cost of things the farmer buys and the price he receives for the products he sells for consumption in the domestic market, without the Government itself having to provide the market for wheat.

The provisions of this bill would not result in dumping wheat on the domestic feed market. The provisions in this bill for a floor under surplus wheat prices would protect the feed grain producer from undue competition. I doubt that wheat moving into feed uses under this proposal would exceed by more than from 3 to 5 percent the total feed grain supply.

Increased exports and expansion of markets are the only hope for the wheat producer, unless we are prepared to cut back production and continue heavy export subsidies.

A sound program must enable the producers to gain access to these expanded outlets without sacrificing a fair return for wheat used and consumed domestically.

The domestic parity or certificate plan is one that I feel should have the immediate consideration of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement in regard to the advantages of this program be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement of advantages will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1750) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2, title III, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: "Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates"; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: "Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations"; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

"SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and

importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

"SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issue pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term 'marketing' means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"CONVERSION FACTORS

"SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"CIVIL PENALTIES

"SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS

"SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 380d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"REPORTS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"REFERENDUM

"SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1956 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1956 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle and marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B.

"PRICE SUPPORT

"SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat-exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates."

The statement presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ADVANTAGES OF WHEAT-MARKETING PROPOSAL

The income-certificate plan has many advantages not inherent to other programs:

1. It would be self-supporting financially, not requiring congressional appropriations, nor parity payments. It is questionable how long we can expect Congress to continue to put up money to support farm commodities at high levels, and this plan should receive support for the above reason, from the taxpaying public.

2. Part of the wheat crop being available for feed, export and industrial uses should result in increased consumption, thereby minimizing the need for production controls. Each farmer would in effect establish his own allotment according to this own situation and conditions. Some would divert acreage to other crops when it could be done profitably. Some would probably continue to raise wheat in excess of their certificate allotment in areas where other crops could not be used. Some would no doubt prefer to use a part of their acreage for conservation practices rather than raise wheat to sell in excess of the certificate allotment. In other words, farmers would voluntarily make whatever adjustments were practical in their individual setups.

3. Certificates would be issued to farmers ahead of the harvest expense season, thereby helping to finance operations during the high expense season.

4. Farmers would receive their allotted number of certificates regardless of their actual yield for that year, thereby serving to some extent as an income-insurance plan.

5. Millers and other users of wheat would buy their supplies in the open market, through regular trade channels, thus eliminating the need to buy from a Government agency as has been the case much of the time in the past. This plan would not put the Government in the grain business. Since market prices would be at competitive levels, and since millers would not have to put up the money for certificates until first sales are reported, this plan would require less money tied up in wheat stocks by millers.

6. Under this plan millers would again be able to compete in the export market.

7. This plan recognizes the fact that high prices per bushel do not insure adequate income, particularly when compulsory crop reduction is necessary in order to maintain high prices; rather, total income, is the important thing and might be greater with a lower price per bushel, but more bushels to sell, as long as these bushels can be produced economically.

8. Any program that limits production has a very detrimental effect on our whole economy, as it results in less jobs, less services reuqired etc., while the certificate plan would have the opposite effect, creating jobs, wealth, etc., through production.

9. This plan would not increase the cost to the consumer of processed items. The cost of the raw material in grain products is so small that price to the farmer does not have much to do with the retail price to the consumer. At present, retail prices are based on about parity prices to producer and under this plan they would continue in about the same relation to parity, fluctuating as parity changes from year to year.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills which have been submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Administrative Office of

the United States Courts, and the Secretary of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. KILGORE (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1751 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill entitled "For the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney."

These three men are employees of this Department, employed in the helium activity, Bureau of Mines, at Amarillo, Tex. The purpose of the proposed bill is to relieve these employees of the necessity of refunding to the Government the amounts of $466.57, $923.47, and $66.90, respectively. These sums have been earned by these employees pursuant to promotions given to them on November 8, 1951 (effective November 11, 1951) which the Civil Service Commission subsequently held were in violation of the second Whitten rider set forth in subparagraph (c) of section 1310, act of November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 758). The latter provision required service in grade for 1 year before the employee could be given a 1-grade promotion, or in some instances, a 2-grade promotion. Since the promotions of these three employees were held to contravene the Whitten rider, the employees would be required to refund the excess salaries received during the period that the promotions were in effect. This was so held by the Comptroller General in decision B–119468, of May 5, 1954.

There have been three versions of the Whitten rider. The first Whitten rider was contained in section 1302 of the act of September 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 1066) and was effective from September 1, 1950 until October 31, 1951. It contained no specific provision requiring any time-in-grade before promotion to a higher grade. Accordingly, the three employees mentioned above could have been promoted before November 1, 1951, upon prior approval of the Civil Service Commission. Their promotions, in fact, had been proposed prior to November 1, 1951. Two of these promotions were approved by the Civil Service Commission on October 29, 1951, and the other was approved by the Civil Service Commission on November 1, 1951. The normal administrative processing of the papers resulted in the approval of the promotions by the authorized officer of the Bureau of Mines on November 8, 1951.

Although the second Whitten rider was enacted on November 1, 1951, information concerning it was not received by the appointing officer of the Bureau of Mines at Amarillo, Tex., until November 6, 1951. That office assumed that the approval of the Civil Service Commission constituted approval for the promotions. These promotions were effected by the Bureau and received by the employees in good faith. They have fulfilled the duties of their positions in an excellent manner, and are in no way responsible for the administrative errors made. To call upon them for financial reimbursement at this late date would impose a personal and undue hardship upon them.

Enclosed are copies of this Department's letter of January 4, 1954, to the Comptroller General, and the Comptroller General's Decision (B–119468) of May 5, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FELIX E. WORMSER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

S. 1752. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation and powers of bailiffs in the district courts.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1752 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill approved by the Conference which would provide that the baliffs furnished for the assistance of the criers in maintaining order in the district courts shall be appointed by the respective district courts which they serve instead of by the United States marshals of the districts as at present. The present law found in the second and third paragraphs of section 755 of title 28 of the United States Code is as follows:

"Each United States marshal may employ, with the approval of the judge, not exceeding four bailiffs as the district judge may determine, to attend the court, maintain order, wait upon the grand and petit juries, and perform such other necessary duties as the judge or marshal may direct.

"Each bailiff shall be allowed for his services $6 a day to be paid only for actual attendance on days when the court is in session or the judge or jury is present."

Continuous attendance upon a district judge is furnished by a crier appointed by him who, the first paragraph of the section provides, "shall perform also the duties of bailiff and messenger." But there are frequently times when the crier needs to be reenforced in maintaining order in the courtroom, as when there are grand or petit juries to be served, or large numbers of persons are in the courtroom to listen to cases of great public interest. The provisions of the statute above quoted are designed to meet these situations. They provide that the United States marshal may employ with the approval of the district judge the number of bailiffs that the district judge may determine, not more than four, to perform duties of the kind specified. They provide that a bailiff so appointed shall be paid $6 a day for the days of his actual attendance in the court.

There are two objections to the provision. First, inasmuch as the services are rendered to the court of which a district judge is in charge, the bailiffs should logically be apponted by the judge who is responsible for the conduct of the court. Second, the per diem fee now prescribed of $6 is obviously inadequate under present conditions. Furthermore it would seem unwise to prescribe rigidly in the statute the amount of the fee which plainly would be affected by the conditions of the time and better to leave it to administrative discretion, subject to review by the Congress from time to time in connection with the appropriations.

Accordingly the principal changes made by the bill which is recommended are (1) that the power to employ the additional bailiffs would be placed in each district judge presiding over a district court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Court; and (2) that the rate of compensation of the bailiffs to be paid only for their days of actual service, would be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under the supervision and direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 604 of title 28 of the United States Code, as he presently fixes the compensation of other officers of the courts referred to in that paragraph. In order to assure both to the crier and the bailiff the authority of a deputy marshal, the bill provides in the last sentence that "Each crier and bailiff in the performance of his duties may exercise the powers of a deputy marshal" under section 549 of title 28 of the United States Code. That section gives to a United States marshal and his deputies in executing the laws of the United States within a State the same powers which a sheriff may exercise in executing the laws of the State.

Prior to consideration of the matter by the Judicial Conference, it was considered by the Committee of the Conference on Supporting Personnel and the committee submitted the bill which the Judicial Conference recommended and which is enclosed. The bill is believed to provide for a more logical and effective method of providing for the necessary services requisite for maintaining order in the district courts. I trust therefore that it may meet the approval of the Congress and in due course be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

S. 1753. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1753 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the instruction of the Judicial Conference of the United States I inclose herewith a draft of a bill to amend United States Code, title 28, section 2254, relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. This legislation has the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States which considered it at its meeting on March 24, 1955 and directed that it be transmitted to the Congress with a request that it be enacted at the earliest possible time.

As you will see, the bill provides that an application for writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person imprisoned under the judgment of a State court may be entertained by a Federal judge or justice only if it presents a substantial, Federal constitutional question and then only if it has met three conditions prescribed by the subsection: (1) That the question must be one which was not theretofore raised and determined; (2) if it has not been theretofore raised and determined, that the prisoner has not had a fair and adequate opportunity to raise and have it determined; and (3) if the question has not been raised and determined and the prisoner has not had a fair and adequate opportunity to have it determined, that it is a question that cannot thereafter be raised or determined in a State court by an order or

judgment subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari.

The final paragraph of the proposed amendment requires that when a writ of habeas corpus to review a State court criminal judgment is denied by a district court, it may be reviewed only on a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States on petition filed within 30 days of the entry of the order of denial.

The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the delays and interference with the State criminal law and the consequent resentment on the part of judges of the several States which have arisen through the review by habeas corpus in the lower Federal courts of the judgments of State courts. This problem was called to the attention of the Judicial Conference by the Attorney General of the United States at the instance of the Conference of Chief Justices of the States and the National Association of Attorneys General. The legislation was developed by a committee of the Judicial Conference under the chairmanship of Chief Judge John J. Parker of the Fourth Judicial Circuit with Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips, Circuit Judge Albert Lee Stephens, and District Judges Frank A. Hooper, Edgar S. Vaught, and Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., as members.

In developing the legislation the committee had the assistance of a committee of the Conference of State Chief Justices and of representatives from the National Association of Attorneys General, both of which have approved the proposed legislation and urge its prompt enactment.

For the information of Congress in considering the proposal I am attaching hereto the following reports of Judge Parker's committee which explain in detail the reasons for its urgency: Report to the Judicial Conference dated July 16, 1954, supplemental report, dated September 16, 1954—both considered by the conference at its September 1954 session—and the final report of the committee, submitted to the Judicial Conference at its March 1955 meeting where it received the approval of the conference.

The Administrative Office and members of the Judiciary will be glad to assist any committees of Congress in considering the proposal. We hope that it may have the consideration of the Congress at an early date.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER,
Director.

S. 1754. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1754 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr. The submission of this proposed legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to reimburse this Reserve officer for the loss sustained by him as the result of damages to his household goods. The loss occurred while the officer was on active duty in the Army of the United States and the household goods were bailed to an agent of the United States incident to transportation in connection with orders releasing Captain Boyer from active duty.

Records of the Department of the Army show that John L. Boyer, Jr., was born at Maumee, Ohio, on August 14, 1921; that after commencing active duty as an enlisted man in the United States Navy on October 7, 1942, he attended the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., and the School of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, under the V–12 program; that he was married on February 24, 1945, released from active duty in the Navy on February 4, 1946, and appointed an ensign in the United States Naval Reserve on July 10, 1946; that he received a degree of doctor of medicine from the School of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, in June of 1949; that after receiving an honorable discharge from the United States Naval Reserve, he was selected for participation in the Army civilian intern program and appointed a first lieutenant, Medical Corps, Army of the United States on May 26, 1950; and that he commenced active duty in the Army in that grade on June 22, 1950, and, after serving a 1-year period of internship at the University Hospital, of Cleveland, Ohio, he remained on active duty, receiving a temporary promotion in the grade of captain, Army of the United States, on July 13, 1951.

On May 19, 1953, while Captain Boyer was stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., he received orders directing him to proceed to his home of record in San Diego, Calif., on June 28, 1953, and releasing him from active duty effective July 1, 1953. Pursuant thereto, and on orders of the transportation officer, at Fort Bliss, Tex., his household goods were stored in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer & Storage Co., located at 2301 Mills Street, El Paso, Tex., on May 26, 1953. During the night of June 3, 1953, a fire broke out in this warehouse resulting in extensive damage to and destruction of various property stored therein, including the household goods belonging to Captain Boyer.

Captain Boyer subsequently was released from active duty and, on September 21, 1954, he filed a claim with the Department of the Army under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended, for reimbursement of his loss in the amount of $4,075.83. The claim was processed within the Department of the Army under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra. After giving effect to depreciation of the items involved in the claim, it was determined by this Department that the claim was meritorious in the amount of $2,996.89. However, the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 322), placed a maximum limitation of $2,500 on the amount which could be paid administratively under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, which was the only statute under which the claim could be considered. Accordingly, Captain Boyer's claim has been allowed administratively in the amount of $2,500, and a check in that amount has been sent to him. After the making of said payment there remains a balance of damages sustained by the claimant in the sum of $496.89, for which he has not been compensated. There is no method by which he may be reimbursed for the remaining portion of this loss except through the enactment by the Congress of private legislation.

All of the household goods, for the damage to which this claim has been determined to be meritorious, were reasonable, useful, necessary or proper for the claimant to have owned and had in his possession under the attendant circumstances. The loss occurred incident to the service while the household goods were bailed to an agent of the United States and without any fault or neglect on the part of Captain Boyer.

On May 26, 1953, when Captain Boyer's household goods were delivered to the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer and Storage Co., in El Paso, Tex., that company, representing United Van Lines, Inc., issued to him a document which apparently insured against all risks of physical loss or damage to the property while it was stored and in transit to San Diego, Calif. However, after the loss was incurred, all liability therefor was denied completely by the Buckner company, both on the theory of lack of negligence and under the purported insurance. Paragraph 13, Army Regulations 25–100, dated August 20, 1953, implementing the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra, provides as follows:

"Transfer of rights against carrier or insurer.—Whenever a carrier or insurer denies liability or fails to satisfy such liability and a claim for the property in relation to which the claim is made is approved under these regulations without deduction of the amount for which the carrier or insurer is deemed liable, the claimant by the acceptance of payment of such claim under these regulations will be deemed to have assigned to the United States to the extent of his right, title, and interest in and to any claim he may have against the carrier or insurer and to have agreed that he will, upon request, execute and deliver to the United States a written assignment thereof, together with the original or a copy of the bill of lading or contract, insurance policy, and all other papers which may be required to enable the United States to press the claim against the carrier or insurer. Upon settlement of his claim by the United States, the claimant will be considered to have agreed to refund to the Government the amount of any subsequent recovery from the carrier or insurer."

Inasmuch as the Department of Justice has under consideration the possibility of instituting action against the carrier or insurer, and in order not to risk placing in jeopardy any right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the United States has as a result of this fire, a proviso to that effect has been inserted in this proposed legislation.

The Congress, from time to time, has considered favorably claims of members of the Armed Forces for loss of personal property in excess of $2,500 limitation placed upon administrative payments under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. Recent cases are Private Law 494, for the relief of Paul G. Kendall (H. R. 5025); Private Law 497, for the relief of Walter Carl Sander (H. R. 685); and Private Law 933, for the relief of Staff Sergeant Frank C. Maxwell (H. R. 7835), all enacted by the 83d Congress. An additional case, S. 3515, for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr., was under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, at the close of the second session of the 83d Congress, but it was not acted upon.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $496.89.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACTS TO MEMBERS OF CAPITOL GUIDE FORCE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force. I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate by the captain of the Capitol guide force relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1761) to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

CAPITOL GUIDE FORCE,
March 11, 1955.

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. DUKE: The Capitol guide force has been trying for some years to settle the problem of its retirement status, we would like to ask you to take up with the proper officials the matter of legislation to bring us under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

As you know, the Capitol guides are governed by regulations of the Capitol Police Board, which require that a minimum of 10 guides and not more than 12 shall be maintained by both the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House. The guides are appointed by the Sergeant at Arms and required to take the oath of office prescribed for Government employees. They are required to wear a prescribed uniform, to report at a certain hour each day and work a prescribed number of hours, and to conduct parties around the Capitol as assigned. A daily attendance record is kept, and the guides are permitted a certain amount of annual leave and sick leave. The attendance sheets, which are transmitted to the Sergeant at Arms of both Houses, serve to record satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress, and the guides are subject to suspension and dismissal by the Sergeant at Arms who appoints them.

The Treasury Department ruled in 1943 that the guides are employees of the United States Government and therefore subject to withholding tax, moreover, the Department, in 1954, ruled that the Capitol guide force was not subject to the penalty provisions of the law because such provisions do not apply to agencies of the Federal Government.

The rulings of the Federal Security Agency with respect to social-security coverage do not in any way aid in determining whether the guides are Federal employees in the legislative branch of the Government, or whether they are self-employed. Heretofore requests have been made to the Federal Security Agency for a determination as to their status. Conflicting decisions have been made. Some of the decisions are to the effect that since the guides are attached to the legislative branch of the Government, and under the Social Security Act of 1950, as amended, only Congress can determine whether or not they are Federal employees. In another decision rendered by the Federal Security Agency, apparently on incomplete set of facts, it was determined that the guides were licensees and were engaged in a trade or business; therefore, they would be considered as self-employed. This has resulted in some of the guides considering themselves under social security, while others do not. Some are paying social-security tax; some are not paying it. In other instances guides have paid the social-security tax, but the monies have been refunded because they are not self-employed. The question of whether or not the guides are covered under social security has in the past and is now confusing.

Apparently the one element of our employment which has caused the Civil Service Commission to consider that we are not covered by the Civil Service Retirement System is the method by which we are paid. This method arises from the manner in which the guide force was established. According to information in the hearings on the legislative establishment appropriation bill, 1926, the Philadelphia Centennial in 1876 caused throngs of people to visit Washington who had not been in this part of the country before. A few persons made a business of showing parties around the Capitol and other parts of the city for a fee. Eventually many complaints arose because of the character and practices of some persons who got into this business, and for the protection of visitors to the Capitol the Capitol Police Board (the Sergeant at Arms of each House and the Architect of the Capitol) decided to appoint special guides for the Capitol. In order to have funds for payment of the guides, the Board directed that a fee of 25 cents be collected from each sightseer, which was to be turned over to the captain of the guides. He was charged with keeping an accounting of the money received and distributing it equally among the guides in payment for their services. That method of payment has been continued ever since, the fee collected being still 25 cents per person, except that 15 cents per person is charged for school organizations. Some years ago the Board put into effect a system of numbered tickets with stubs in order to insure an accurate accounting, and at intervals it has the accounts audited by a certified public accountant.

Our understanding is that the Civil Service Commission does not regard the guides as permanent employees, solely because they do not receive a per annum salary, stating that the Capitol guide force is excluded by section 3 (c) of the Retirement Act which says: "The provisions of this act shall not apply to employees of the Senate or the House of Representatives whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration unless such employees are appointed at an annual rate of salary." However, while we may not be technically within the Commission's definition of permanent employees, we believe the facts show that our employment is no more temporary or of uncertain duration than many employees who are under the Retirement Act. One guide has spent 40 years on the job, 1 27 years, 1 26 years, and 1 15 years, the average length of service at this time being about 10 years. The amount of salary on which deductions and retirement should be based should not be difficult to determine, since careful records are kept showing the amount actually paid each month to each guide.

The view of the Commission that we are not permanent employees likewise denies us the protection of the Federal Employees' Life Insurance Act of 1954. We believe that the same facts which justify our being considered under the Retirement Act also justify our coverage under the Insurance Act.

If the proper officials are willing to consider legislation to establish that we are under the Retirement Act and the Insurance Act, we believe that a simple bill like the following would do it:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the members of the United States Capitol guide force shall be recognized as employees in the legislative branch of the Government for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; all service on the guide force shall be creditable as service under the act; and the act shall apply to them to the same extent as it applies to employees in the legislative branch who are appointed at an annual rate of salary.

"SEC. 2. The members of the United States Capitol guide force shall be recognized as employees in the legislative branch of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. The annual compensation for this purpose for each calendar year shall be determined by averaging the amount actually received for the previous calendar year by guides who worked the full regular tour of duty for that year."

Respectfully,

FLOYD KIRBY,
Captain, United States Capitol Guides.

EMERGENCY FARM LOANS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, in connection with the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1764) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum, introduced by Mr. Thurmond, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. THURMOND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

According to the present law, the Secretary has the authority to determine the interest rates on emergency loans.

It was revealed in the press a few days ago that the Department of Agriculture has raised the interest rates on these loans from 3 to 5 percent. This change comes at a time when thousands of farmers in my State and in other States across the Nation have suffered millions of dollars in crop losses due to recent disasters. The only Government aid available to them is this emergency Government loan program.

No segment of our economy has suffered more severe losses in recent years than our farmers. I strongly feel that those who have been hardest hit by these setbacks should continue to receive these loans at an interest rate of 3 percent annually. They should be given every consideration.

It is contended that by raising these rates by 2 percent, many well-to-do farmers would not be attracted to apply for these Government loans, which, they, in fact, could not qualify for under the law. As I understand the provisions concerning these loans, however, only those farmers who cannot receive aid from private lending agencies are eligible to qualify for Government assistance. Thus, I cannot see the necessity of raising these Government rates to make the loans less attractive to those who are not in need of emergency assistance. I believe this change in interest rates at this time of crisis is an unwise action.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

This bill is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purpose of the bill.

I ask that the letter of transmittal be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the listing of "Bills introduced."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1765) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter of transmittal referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military, naval and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that this legislation is in accord with the program of the President. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the construction of additional military public works that are urgently needed by the military departments at this time and the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency. Appropriations for construction will be requested at a future date.

Included in this proposal is authorization totaling $254,983,300 for the construction of approximately 17,000 units of family housing that are urgently needed for our military personnel and their dependents. This proposal also requests an adidtional $75 million for family housing to be acquired through the surplus agricultural commodities program. The housing units covered by this proposal, together with the housing authorized by Public Law 765, 83d Congress, constitute the initial stage of what is intended to be a long range housing program which should be a major factor in raising the morale of our military personnel. Moreover, the cost of providing such family housing will be more than offset in the future by savings in appropriations for quarters allowances.

This proposal would also repeal the authorizations for all military public works, with certain exceptions, that are contained in laws enacted prior to October 1, 1951. Such a repeal would eliminate those projects which are no longer deemed to be of sufficient importance to be retained in the military construction program and place that program on a more current basis. It will be a significant step in the development of a realistic military construction program and enable the Department of Defense to clarify its presentations of that program to the Congress. A report to the Congress pursuant to section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, 81st Congress, as to those construction projects which have been authorized by the Congress but which have not been financed is being submitted separately.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The total cost of the construction, exclusive of the construction of family housing totaling $75 million through the surplus agricultural commodities program, that is to be authorized by this proposal is $2,354,352,300. Of that amount $543,365,000 is for the Department of the Army, $581,197,300 is for the Department of the Navy, $1,173,790,000 is for the Department of the Air Force, and $56 million is for the Central Intelligence Agency. Increases in estimates for construction work previously authorized will call for additional appropriations totaling $91,051,000, including $75 million for family housing to be acquired through the surplus agricultural commodities program.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,
Director, Legislative Programs.

ISSUANCE OF WHEAT-MARKETING CERTIFICATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] introduced a bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the issuance of wheat-marketing certificates. On behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce a bill on the same subject, but not identical in all particulars.

I shall make an explanatory statement of the bill and an argument in support of it at the next meeting of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1770) to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of wheat marketing certificates, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTIFICATION TO INDIAN TRIBES PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF INDIAN LEGISLATION

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore enacted laws and resolutions affecting the social, political, and economic life of the American Indians and the natives of Alaska, including some laws affecting Executive orders, and treaties and agreements between the United States and Indian tribes; and

Whereas said Indian tribes have not in all cases been notified of the pendency of such legislation or accorded full opportunity to be heard prior to its enactment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that no bill or resolution directly affecting the rights, privileges, or property of any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians, particularly rights and privileges guaranteed by Executive orders, treaties, or agreements, should be considered in either House unless such tribe, band, or group has been given notice of the pendency of such bill or resolution and afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard thereon by the committee to which it was referred.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Address entitled "Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom," delivered by him before the second international congress of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, in New York City, on April 17, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by Senator GOLDWATER at commissioning of the U. S. S. *Hassayampa* at Philadelphia, Pa., on April 19, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone commemoration ceremonies, at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Statement by former President Truman before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial with reference to price support and Wisconsin dairyman, published in the Sharon (Wis.) Reporter.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial published in the Oregon Journal for April 12, 1955, concerning the immediate need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska.

INTEGRATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of a report entitled "Integration in the Armed Services," prepared by James C. Evans, civilian aid to the Secretary of Defense. The armed services have made great strides with respect to the elimination of discrimination and segregation within the services, and I feel that this record should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF JAMES C. EVANS, CIVILIAN AID TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The Negro citizen in the Armed Forces is now utilized on the basis of individual merit and proficiency in meeting the needs of the services.

Throughout the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, fully integrated units have replaced the all-Negro units which, until recent years, formed the only channel of military service for Negro enlistees and draftees since colonial times.

Thorough evaluation of the battle-tested results to date indicates a marked increase in overall combat effectiveness through integration.

Economies in manpower, material, and money have resulted from the elimination of racially duplicated facilities and operations.

The program has advanced more rapidly than had been considered possible in some quarters, and there have been no untoward incidents.

The implementation of policies providing for opportunity among civilian employees lags far behind as compared with Armed Forces integration.

The ROTC, the National Guard, and other civilian components pose complex problems involving some major factors which are beyond military control.

Community relations as regard race are greatly improved, but much remains to be done to harmoniously effect equality of treatment for Negro service personnel.

The military community as such has added new and valuable dimensions to such concepts as neighborhood and brotherhood.

The Armed Forces, within their own sphere, have developed notable examples of racial coordination and integration in housing, transportation, religious worship, schooling, recreation, and other aspects of community life for service personnel and their families.

Segregation has been eliminated in facilities for civilian employees.

PROPOSED STUDY OF EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Wednesday I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) favoring United States participation in a scientific commission within the United Nations to study certain effects of nuclear explosions and asked that it lie on the table until today to afford other Senators an opportunity to become cosponsors.

Twenty-one Senators have expressed their desire to cosponsor this resolution, which would request the President to work to establish within the United Nations a scientific commission to study the immediate and long-range effects of nuclear explosions on all living things on the earth.

Members of the Senate who are cosponsoring this resolution are: the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

In addition, the resolution has received the full endorsement of the Federation of American Scientists, a nationwide organization of more than 2,000 scientists and engineers devoted to promoting a stable world peace and the proper utilization of science for the general welfare.

The resolution, Mr. President, offers one small step toward world peace. It recognizes that possibly great danger may face all peoples of the world, and calls on the President of the United States to initiate action to look into the matter. Perhaps this is the place where the nations of the world can put aside their differences and; facing a common peril, work together for the good of all.

In offering the resolution I do not mean to imply that harm has yet been done. No one knows. But there is enough concern on the part of reputable scientists to warrant an international study. Nor do I mean to say that we should curtail our testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons. But I do say that we should not be afraid of the facts which may be developed by an international commission. Discovering the facts would, after all, be as beneficial to us as to everyone else in the world.

If adopted, Mr. President, this resolution would help to shift the spotlight from the threat of war and the atomic armaments race to the more hopeful area of human morality. It would serve as a telling blow to Soviet propaganda. It would show to the peoples of the world the true face of America, a warm and friendly face, interested in peace and the general welfare of mankind.

We must face up to our responsibilities by taking the lead in this matter, which is of the deepest concern to all nations. The resolution is a logical follow-up to the President's atoms-for-peace plan. That plan has done more good for America than millions of empty propaganda words.

This resolution could, Mr. President, be of equal benefit to us and to the other peoples of the world.

PURPOSE AND MEANING OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today we hear and read a great deal about the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, much of what is said and printed is based on a misconception of the purpose of this constitutional privilege, or on a distorted adherence to the principle of individual rights, as opposed to the rights of all our people.

An editorial by David Lawrence, published in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report, puts the whole matter in such correct perspective that it should be required reading for every loyal American who is concerned about the question. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of April 15, 1955]

THE RIGHT TO SURVIVE

(By David Lawrence)

Much has been said in recent months about the right of the individual under the fifth amendment of the Constitution to decline, for reasons of his own, to testify in formal proceedings.

Very little has been said about the right of the State to protect itself against infiltration by enemy agents seeking to undermine our own Government.

Does the Constitution really grant rights to the individual that are superior to those reserved to the people as a whole? Must a traitor in our midst go scot-free because someone who knows of his whereabouts, or about his plotting, refuses to testify on the ground that on the witness stand he might say something damaging to himself and hence be prosecuted?

Congress wisely met that dilemma by passing a law in 1954 which specifically grants immunity from prosecution to any citizen who is willing to tell all he knows about a suspected crime.

Already a test case has arisen, in which the individual, notwithstanding an offer of immunity, has invoked the fifth amendment and refuses to give to our Government the information he possesses about Communist infiltration. Last week that case was decided unanimously by the United States circuit court of appeals in New York, and the defendant was ordered to tell what he knows. Unless the Supreme Court now reverses this order, the judgment will stand.

For a long time there has been a controversy about the scope of the fifth amendment. It has been rightly argued that under its protection nobody should be required to give testimony that might incriminate him alone. But it has been difficult to understand why anyone should be protected who declines to divulge what he knows about other persons.

If a child is killed by a taxicab, does the driver of another taxicab who saw the accident have the right to say he will not testify because it might give him undue publicity or injure him in the chances of retaining employment from the same taxicab company, especially if it is to be sued for damages on the basis of his prospective testimony? Not at all. He can be summoned to court and required to testify as to what he saw. He cannot evade a subpena.

But, under the peculiar reasoning which has been publicized by some of the leftwing lawyers, a man who knows about a plot to assassinate a high official or to destroy our Government, can remain silent and claim immunity under our Constitution. This would mean that the right of an individual supersedes the right of the state to provide for its own survival.

If perchance the Supreme Court should accept this distorted reasoning, the American people would promptly approve a constitutional amendment to make clear that the state has a right of survival which transcends the refusal of an individual to give up the knowledge he has of someone else's guilt.

Congress gave careful consideration to the immunity law before passing it. There was not the slightest intention to compel anyone to testify against himself. There was every intention to remove the last excuse that Communist sympathizers have for evading an obligation to their own Government. They claim its protection for their own convenience, but are unwilling to recognize their duty to assist in the protection of all the people against a common enemy. Judge Samuel H. Hofstadter, of the supreme court of New York State, wrote recently an article on immunity laws in which he said in part:

"To meet the problem presented by the criminally implicated witness, the practice of granting pardons in advance of the testimony was adopted as early as 1742 in England. The first immunity law was adopted by Congress almost 100 years ago in January, 1857. Since then, immunity has been made available to witnesses testifying to violations of almost every regulatory Federal statute and there are immunity statutes in probably every State of the Union."

We sometimes hear it argued that it is better that 10 guilty individuals should be permitted to escape rather than that 1 individual who is innocent shall carry a stigma of accusation. If so, shall grand juries be deprived hereafter of the power to hand down indictments just because the publicity of a trial may be harmful to a defendant who is later acquitted?

Should a man who steals atomic secrets be allowed to furnish them to another government—which can use them to destroy us—rather than let the authorities risk drawing in some allegedly innocent persons?

It is debatable what the word innocent means. Individuals who have made bad mistakes in judgment by joining organizations later classed as Communists fronts are not disloyal, and they can be forgiven their error. But because of possible inconvenience and the publicity they may suffer—due to their own indiscretions—are they entitled to more consideration than should be given to the safety of all the people?

Clearly the right to survive, especially in a nuclear age, is the paramount right.

EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAXES OF 2,400,000 LOW-INCOME TAXPAYERS IN GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have noticed a very interesting item in this morning's issue of the New York Times, and I desire to ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD, because it seems to me that the progressive approach of the British Conservative Party to the question of tax reduction contrasts strongly with the approach of the present national administration in the United States.

The British Conservative Party, now headed by Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden, is giving 2,400,000 British taxpayers in the lowest income brackets complete exemption from the payment of income taxes. Yet, Mr. President, when it was suggested here, some weeks ago, that the United States taxpayers in the lowest income brackets be relieved from the payment of income taxes, the suggestion was denounced by the Secretary of the Treasury and by other administration leaders as being totally irresponsible.

The action of the British Government seems to me to be quite significant, and the American people should realize how much more progressive and enlightened is the approach of the new Conservative Prime Minister of the British Empire, to the question of taxation and to the needs of lower-income groups, than is that of the present national administration in the United States.

Prime Minister Eden, who is known throughout the world as a Conservative—in fact, he is even called a Tory by his opponents—is not afraid to remove 2,400,000 low-income British citizens from the tax rolls, because those persons need every penny they can scrape together for food, clothing, shelter, and the other necessities of life. Yet, Mr. President, when a similar proposal was made in the United States, some weeks ago, we were told how irresponsible it was.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, the article from the New York Times of April 20, describing the action of the British Conservative Party in taking this enlightened and progressive step with respect to taxation in Britain.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN CUTS TAX ON LOW INCOMES; 2,400,000 EXEMPT—PREELECTION BUDGET TRIMS PURCHASE LEVY ON TEXTILES—ALLOWANCES INCREASED

(By Thomas P. Ronan)

LONDON, April 19.—Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler announced sweeping tax concessions today. These will remove 2,400,000 persons from the tax rolls, cut basic rates, and increase personal and child allowances.

At the close of his budget speech in the House of Commons Mr. Butler estimated that these proposals and a cut in the purchase tax on textiles would cost the Government $375,200,000 during the current fiscal year. The cost next year will be $58,800,000 higher.

Even at that, he said, the Government should have a revenue surplus of $414,400,000 this year. This would compare with a surplus of more than $1,200,000,000 during the fiscal year ended March 31, a much higher figure than Mr. Butler anticipated a year ago.

In reaching the figure for the 1955–56 surplus, Mr. Butler estimated total revenue at $13,188,000,000 and total expenditures at $12,773,600,000. Defense expenditures were estimated at $4,304,000,000, including United States aid of $120,400,000.

Because of the imminence of the general election, the speech had been awaited with intense interest and the House was crowded.

AID EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

Some tax concessions had been predicted, but those announced were broader than most Britons expected. The most important was a proposed cut in the basic rate of income tax from 9s. ($1.26) to 8s. 6d. ($1.19) in the pound ($2.80). This reduces the basic rate of income tax from 45 to 42½ percent. This rate of tax applies to all taxable annual income above $1,400, whether reported by an individual or by a business.

For those with taxable incomes of less than $1,400, Mr. Butler cut the present graduated scales of 98 cents, 70 cents and 35 cents in the pound by 3½ cents. Thus each of the lower scales is reduced by 1¼ percent. These reduced rates do not apply to businesses. The Chancellor estimated that these cuts would cost the Government $285,600,000 this year and an additional $39,200,000 next year.

He also proposed to increase the tax-free allowance for a single person from $336 to $392, that for a married couple from $588 to $672 and the allowance for a child from $238 to $280.

In reducing the 50 percent purchase tax on a wide variety of textiles to 25 percent, Mr. Butler disappointed many in the textile industry, who had been hoping to see this tax wiped out. The tax is paid by the retailer or middleman to the manufacturer and then passed on to the consumer. Because of competition from Japan, India and other nations, the Lancashire textile industry is showing signs of economic distress. Unemployment has been increasing and mill operations have been reduced.

Boxing and other sports promoters were unhappy because the Chancellor had not cut the entertainment tax and there was some criticism of his failure to reduce the levy on gasoline. But the reaction of most industrial, business and taxpayers, groups were extremely favorably.

PRODUCTIVITY TO BE SPURRED

In reviewing Britain's economic situation, Mr. Butler said the country was highly prosperous, but that its balance-of-payments position had deteriorated. To increase production, productivity and exports, it is necessary to give fresh incentive to the forces of growth and expansion, he declared.

He regarded the cut in the basic tax rate as "the most positive and heartening encouragement to all, employers and workers alike, who can contribute energy and enterprise to the development of the economy." To industry this would offer a prospect of tax relief amounting to more than $112,000,000," which should give fresh encouragement to expansion and a keener edge to our competitive power," he said.

"To the individual it offers relief on existing income at all levels of tax liability; and it lightens the burden of tax on any extra income which he may earn by greater personal effort," he continued.

In addition to the usual allowances, British taxpayers are permitted a tax-free allowance of two-ninths of their earned income up to a total deduction of $1,260.

Under the proposed scale a single person earning $4,200 a year with no dependent would pay a tax of $1,053.73 after deducting his personal allowance and the earned-income relief. A married couple with two children in comparable circumstances would pay $696.73.

In the United States the comparable figures would be $665 and $281 for persons using Form 1040 and the tax table instead of itemizing their deductions.

In addition to the basic tax, there is a surtax here that applies to total (not just taxable) incomes above $5,600. This surtax, which Mr. Butler did not touch, is graduated from 28 cents to $1.40 on the pound on all incomes above $56,000.

The tax on incomes over $5,600 would thus take all but 21 cents of the $2.80 in each pound.

CRACKING DOWN ON COMMUNISTS' TAX RETURNS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested for some time in making sure that the fullest investigative scrutiny of the United States Internal Revenue Service is directed at the Communist conspiracy in our Nation.

In my judgment, the tax investigation power offers a vital weapon which should not be ignored or underused in the all-out battle against the law-breaking Communist network in our land.

I send to the desk a statement and attachments on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Will the United States Government use its fullest powers to investigate tax returns in combating communism in our midst?"

This is a question which I have raised on several occasions with the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and with various other Federal authorities, in both the legislative and executive branches.

In my judgment, the answer to that question must be "Yes."

I believe it is absurd not to use this tax probe weapon, on a group which, from all evidence, is violating our tax laws, just as it has been violating so many other laws.

I believe we could strike the Communist conspiracy where it would hurt the most,

namely, in its financial artery, by turning the fullest light of investigation on Red financial trickery. This is more than a matter of definitely denying tax exemption to Red-front groups; it is a matter of an all-out tax investigation blitz on the Red conspiracy.

Commissioner Andrews in his responses has commented on his organization's prompt followup in denying tax exemption to subversive groups.

He has, however, raised the overall question as to the extent to which the Internal Revenue Service could depart from its regular tax review purpose for an auxiliary objective of assisting in investigating subversive forces financial operations, as such. The question as to just what should be the policy role of the Tax Bureau is in my judgment a very proper one to raise.

However, in my view, the Internal Revenue Service can definitely find it administratively and legally feasible to do what I am asking. It can comply with both the letter and spirit of the law in making the type of comprehensive investigation which I am recommending.

I recognize, of course, that the Tax Service has a job already on its hands with 50 million law-abiding Americans tax returns.

So, I believe, that, if necessary, it should seek additional staff for the purpose which I am recommending today, cracking down on Red lawbreakers. I believe further, that such an investigation could produce very fruitful results, in cooperation with those Federal sources, notably the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, which are necessarily the most expert in meeting the subversive problem, as such.

In raising and reiterating this overall question, on which the Revenue Service has failed thus far to come to agreement with me, I should like to emphasize that I am not, of course, reflecting in any way on the stalwart anticommunism of Commissioner Andrews. He has been vigorously opposed to communism long before most folks were apparently even aware of this menace in our midst.

I should like to say, moreover, that Commissioner Andrews has done a tremendous job in reorganizing and strengthening the Internal Revenue Service, and the Nation appreciates his efforts along this line. I understand that further improvements of tax machinery are in the works.

I believe, however, that the antisubversive recommendation such as I am making today could add further credit both to his service and the Eisenhower administration as a whole.

There follow excerpts from a few of my messages to him. They are preceded by an International News Service dispatch which appeared in, among many other papers, the April 10 Sunday Mirror of New York City. The dispatch is by Rose McKee, and is based upon my contact with Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, along this same line.

As the initial item, I am reprinting important excerpts from the book Men Without Faces, written by Louis Francis Budenz and published by Harper & Bros. in 1948. These excerpts underline the importance of my efforts in exposing Red finances.

MEN WITHOUT FACES

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

The finances of the party were a complete mystery to most of the national committee members. Reports on finances were sometimes given and sometimes not; but it made little difference. As they were presented, very few people could make them out anyway. It was quite clear that a much larger payroll was being met than the party dues and collections could account for. With the complication of district and section financing, for which separate books were kept, the whole thing became completely confounded.

The party always discreetly kept its financial records private until the Hitler-Stalin pact period. Their publication then meant little since they did not include the big secret fund under Robert William Weiner's control. However, that there were huge sums of money in the conspiratorial fund handled by Weiner and the secret committee cooperating with him, I know to be a fact. At times Weiner had deposits amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in various banks. On occasion, William Browder also deposited amounts up to a million dollars, sometimes in his own name. The source of funds was frequently a mystery, further increased by the practice of conveying thousands of dollars in cash back and forth between Weiner and the various unions and other organizations under Red control. These transactions never appeared on the books of any organization since they were so arranged that the money appeared to be in the cash fund of the union or other body making the loan to Weiner.

A basic source of these mysterious funds is from abroad, flowing into Weiner's hands from Moscow. The late Joseph Brodsky was one of the connecting links in this transmission. But the Red international apparatus insists that every fifth column must stand on its own feet whenever possible. What Soviet financial aid does is to make the Communist group a going concern, always sure of capitalization. Whenever a fifth column in any country is in dire need, it receives the assistance it requires. On that foundation, it is supposed to hustle for itself and, by influence with Hollywood stars of a Red tinge, tired businessmen who want a thrill, and wealthy young people who have inherited huge sums, to raise as much money as it can.

In the big Daily Worker drives for the subsidy of $200,000 needed each year, there were large sums of money given to sections and reported as their donation whose original source was vague. In 1944, business manager William Browder reported to me that we had $50,000 in the Daily Worker drive which we did not know how to handle. Weiner had delayed giving it over to us for fear of possible inquiry, which would be embarrassing. For weeks the money was on hand, but the fund-drive reports could not show it publicly. It finally got on the Daily Worker books by allocating it to various local groups.

Week after week Bill Browder as business manager and I as president of the corporation had to work out various ways of getting money for the paper. It was a trying experience, when we knew that $50,000 which could relieve us of most of our effort and worry was lying in the till.

The secret fund was used for a number of purposes. It financed the beginnings of Communist-created front organizations, setting them on their feet and giving them an initial financial advantage over any genuinely American competitor. It was also used to supplement the regular salaries of leading comrades with cash gifts for personal emergencies. Vacation trips, special visits to health resorts, extraordinary medical care, and similar items were paid for in cash by Weiner from this fund. Some comrades bought houses with this assistance; automobiles were also purchased the same way. But a more important use of this huge cash account was to finance the secret and illegal trips of the leading Reds to other countries. It was with the aid of this fund that Eisler, Browder, Dennis, Stachel, and all the others moved into Asia and Europe and back with forged passports. Since the expenses of these trips were laid out in cash and never accounted for, they did not appear on the books of the party. In this particular illegal financial work, Weiner often used the name of "Blake."

Active in the administration of the secret fund with the alien Weiner was a native American whose wealthy family was connected with Wall Street brokerage interests. He was Lement U. Harris, who has long lived in an exclusive section of Westchester County near Chappaqua. From him I learned that this fund helped initiate a number of enterprises, including Barney Josephson's Cafe Society Uptown. The purpose was to make that night club a rendezvous for artists and entertainers and people of wealth, with whom Communists could there establish acquaintance.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 10, 1955]

WILEY PUSHES DRIVE FOR TAX CRACKDOWN ON REDS

(By Rose McKee)

WASHINGTON, April 9 (INS).—WILEY (R.-Wis.), invited the House Un-American Activities Committee today to join with him in pressing for a tax crackdown on Reds and Communist-front organizations.

WILEY, in a letter to House Committee Chairman WALTER (D.-Pa.), said he believes the Internal Revenue Service has the legal right to make such an investigation.

WILEY told WALTER he has had "considerable correspondence" with Tax Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews on the subject.

He said Andrews "has questioned whether his agency can depart from its traditional effort to secure tax revenue for an auxiliary purpose of helping to crack down on the Communist conspiracy."

TELLS OF METHODS

The Senator said former Communists such as Louis Budenz have said that front organizations have collected millions of dollars for one cause or another, frequently transferring the money from one group to another to escape accountability.

He said he had in mind a "blitz type" of investigation that would "hit the Reds where it hurts—in the purse."

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 29, 1954.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you with regard to a very important phase of the anti-Communist effort. I refer to the checking of tax returns of the great number of key individuals, organizations and businesses within the Communist orbit in the United States.

As you know, the Reds have hatched all sorts of enterprises—companies and fronts, have repeatedly transferred funds back and forth between them, and have otherwise juggled their books, according to strong evidence given to the FBI and to congressional investigative groups by ex-Communists.

It seems to me that we could sever the financial arteries of the Communist Party if a special effort were made to investigate the books of at least the major Red groups. In so doing, we could probably interfere with Red espionage in this country, which is dependent on disguised expenditures, of course. While they have probably covered their tracks carefully, an all-out probe would no doubt prove very fruitful.

I realize that this tax probe would be a very considerable undertaking, and that it would require a great deal of personnel. However, it seems to me that for too long, the Communists have been getting away with financial trickery, and that they should be held to account taxwise, as well as in every other way.

I strongly believe that they have broken tax laws in handling the books of their fronts and of their key functionaries, just as they have broken other types of laws, in all their nefarious activities.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible, as to your reaction to this suggestion for an intensified effort in investigating their tax returns.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1955.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: * * * Since the Internal Revenue Service is necessarily not the most expert source on antisubversion but must necessarily rely on other Federal agencies, I hope that it will actively seek out what I know will be the ready cooperation of these other agencies rather than to sit back and wait for pertinent information to come to it.

As an example of the pressing need for interagency cooperation, I point out that a New York State Joint Legislative Committee has just indicated that three subversive groups—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—raised alone, a total of $3½ million, but spent most of it apparently for subversive purposes. What about the National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, and similar well-financed ventures, I ask?

I am glad that action is being taken to deny tax exempt status to such subversive groups, but my feeling is that there is usually such a considerable time lag before these groups can be so officially designated that a great deal of money in the meanwhile pours into the Communist fronts.

I realize, of course, that there is a strict limitation on your available manpower, but I earnestly feel that if such manpower as might be available could be assigned to this task now, our country would reap significant dividends in terms of its security.

Moreover, if necessary, I believe that a request to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees for additional manpower to handle the task might be well received by the Congress.

I am enclosing herewith some remarks which I am making in my State this coming Sunday night, in which I urge an all-out effort.

In summary, I do think that if an investigative "blitz" could be launched on your own initiative against these Communist fronts, we could set the Communist conspiracy back on its heels for quite some time.

* * * * *

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

ATOMIC BOMBS TO U-BOMBS IN 10 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, few subjects are of greater importance to the Nation and, for that matter, to the world, than the rapid development of the destructive power of atomic weapons. A great deal of information on this subject has been published in the press both in this country and abroad. Yet we do not have this information collected in a form that brings home to those of us who are not specialists the full impact of developments in this field.

We need not approach the subject of atomic weapons with fear. On the other hand, we cannot pass it off as just another innovation in military science. Either of these approaches, it seems to me, can lead us into very serious errors of foreign policy.

What we require are the facts on the potentialities of atomic weapons development. We require them, moreover, in a perspective which will enable us to understand the life and death issues that are involved. Then, perhaps, we may have a chance of devising effective policies for dealing with the enormous forces which scientific knowledge is setting loose in the world.

As a step in my own education on this subject I have compiled a study of developments in atomic weapons, as reported in the public press and it is the information so obtained that I wish to make available to the Senate.

I reiterate that the material for this study has been drawn solely from public sources. Enough has been published, however, to make clear that there is an urgent need for a most penetrating study by the Senate as well as the executive branch of the implications of atomic weapons developments for our foreign policy. The time of decision on the question of the survival of civilization, if not human life itself, appears to be drawing uncomfortably close.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this study of developments in atomic weapons be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC BOMBS TO U-BOMBS IN 10 YEARS

It is almost 10 years since the first atomic-fission bomb killed 70,000 people and destroyed 2 square miles of the city of Hiroshima in Japan. Since that fateful day the scientists of the free world and those of the Communist world have made astounding advances in the physical sciences. Advances in this Atomic Age have been so great that it is predicted that it is now possible to build one bomb equivalent to 60 million tons of TNT. This prediction was made by Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, in a speech in Chicago on January 25, 1955.

Nine years after the bombing of Hiroshima, on March 1, 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission task group detonated a thermonuclear device of monstrous size. In its widest implications that explosion has not yet ceased to reverberate. A long chain of incidents, ranging from the curious to the tragic, has made it clear that peacetime nuclear explosions may be a possible threat to our well-being. Storm signals from earlier atomic tests such as fogged photographic fields and radioactive rain have given way to the storm—which has already resulted in the radioactive poisoning of several hundred people, according to news releases. The March 1, 1954, explosion also blasted the lid of secrecy from the AEC's thermonuclear experiments, giving the public its first real look behind the "uranium curtain"; thus it is now known that the AEC touched off three prior explosions, the third of which was detonated in November 1952. Likewise, we have been told that the Russians have set off three more atomic explosions since August of last year.

The March 1, 1954, bomb was expected to explode with a force of 4 to 6 megatons or, from 4 to 6 million tons of TNT. Instead, according to Joseph and Stewart Alsop, New York Herald Tribune, April 7, 1954, the force of the explosion was 14 megatons. It left scientific measuring instruments unable to record its full effects. The magnitude of this test can best be illustrated by comparison with previous explosions. The earlier hydrogen blast set off at Eniwetok equaled at least 1 megaton, or 1 million tons of TNT. The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima equaled about 20,000 tons of TNT. The largest blockbuster of World War II equaled 10 tons of TNT. Today, according to Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times, March 17, 1955, "our least powerful atomic weapon has an explosive force equivalent to about 3,000 tons of TNT." Sound waves from the March 1, 1954, blast were detected in London, and an American astronomer said the flash could have been seen from Mars. President Eisenhower admitted that the explosion astonished and surprised the scientists, but the AEC called it a routine atomic test, and clamped on the tight lid of secrecy. Then word leaked out that there were some inhabitants of the Pacific islands who were unexpectedly exposed to radiation.

On March 13, 1954, a grave new consequence of the routine atomic test was reported. The Japanese fishing trawler *Fukuryu Maru* docked in Yaezu, Japan, with its 23 crew members showing symptoms of acute radiation exposure. They told how on March 1, 1954, they were some 80 to 90 miles from Bikini, when at 4 a. m. they fancied they saw the sun rising prematurely in a strange manner. Six or seven minutes later they heard a roar, and 2 hours later they were showered with a white ash, which continued to fall for several hours. The ash was fallout from the explosion, consisting mainly of irradiated coral dust. Only after they had become quite ill did they suspect that they had been rained with "ashes of death" and headed for port. They had on board 40 tons of freshly caught tuna and shark, which according to the New York Times exhibited radioactivity "sufficient to be fatal to any person who remained for 8 hours within 30 yards of the fish." Two of them were in worse condition than the rest, having eaten some of the fish. The crewmen were hospitalized, the trawler was ordered burned at sea and sunk, and the fish buried but not before several thousand pounds of the contaminated fish had been unloaded and shipped to market. A "hot fish" panic ensued in Japan, and police, in a frantic effort to track it all down, ordered a thousand tons of other fish destroyed.

Soon after the mishap, Dr. John Morton, head of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission (ABCC) at Hiroshima, reported concerning the 23 fishermen, "they will recover completely within a month." But by the 23d of March 1954, 5 of the fishermen were reported in serious condition.

About March 25, 1954 it was reported that the United States Navy tanker *Patapsco*, operating with the H-bomb task force group, had received "light but not dangerous contamination by radioactive fall-out."

On March 27, 1954, two more "atom-dusted" Japanese trawlers came into port and were quarantined. One had been operating about 780 miles from the test site and the other 200 miles away. There were numerous other ramifications, of varying degrees of gravity, from the first March explosion.

On March 29, 1954, Newsweek magazine wrote:

"The subject isn't discussed openly around the AEC but scientists are worried about the whereabouts of the radioactive 'mushroom cloud' generated by the March 1st H-bomb explosion. * * * Within a few days after all previous tests, laboratories around the United States have reported detecting traces of radiation in the atmosphere. So far no traces have been spotted from the March 1 bomb, which shot its mushroom an unprecedented 20 miles into the air."

Against this turbulent background, the AEC detonated an even larger H-bomb on March 26, 1954. The March 26th bomb was intended to have been dropped by parachute

from a B–36 superbomber, according to reports, but for reasons of caution this plan was abandoned. This was probably for the best since the bomb, expected to develop 3 megatons, exploded instead with about 17 (according to the Alsops). And Newsweek later reported on April 12, 1954 that "Air Force officials refuse to talk about it, but a giant B–36 superbomber observing the March 26th H-bomb explosion was flipped completely over by the blast." The AEC had by now taken many new precautions, such as extending the "restricted zone" to an area 450 miles wide, covering several hundred thousand square miles. It had searched the area carefully, to make sure no ships were there. Nevertheless two Japanese fishing boats came into port April 8, 1954, with cargoes of radioactive tuna.

The guarded secrets and facts about the H-bomb were gradually coming out and, as we know, a vast clamor rose about the tests around the world. It seems that the test model we now have is a far cry from the H-bomb ordered by President Truman in 1950. Thus, we now have a sketchy résumé of the highlights following the March hydrogen bomb tests.

Strange incidents continued to show up in the newspapers but each received less notice than the last, until it was practically forgotten. Then, on September 23, 1954, Aikichi Kuboyama, a humble Japanese fisherman, died—the world's first fatality from a hydrogen bomb blast. He died in Tokyo Hospital, reportedly of jaundice brought on by radiation sickness. This one death brings very close to home the horrifying aspects of the hydrogen bomb.

I admit to being a complete amateur in the physical sciences. My entire source of information has been a large number of our national magazines, quarterlies, reviews, and daily newspapers. The material on the atomic and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, the cobalt bomb, radioactivity, and the various aspects of nuclear warfare that I have accumulated has been authored by eminent scientists and laymen. The end result has been enlightening but disturbing.

It is difficult to realize that science has progressed to such a point that 1 hydrogen bomb can destroy 200 square miles of a city and kill several million city dwellers. New York, London, Moscow or Peking could be effectively destroyed by a single H-bomb.

As I understand it, each exploded nuclear weapon sends into the atmosphere its share of radioactive byproducts. One result of this is an increase in the radioactivity of the gases which make up the earth's atmosphere. The other is "fallout." The increase in radioactivity now appears inconsequential and will remain so unless there is a general war with the all-out use of nuclear weapons, in which case the matter could become serious, according to the experts. Unless such a war occurs, radioactivity will continue to be less of a menace to humanity than automobile exhausts and cigarettes. (The Commonweal, December 10, 1954.)

Fallout, according to an article in the Commonweal, December 10, 1954, is quite another matter. When a nuclear explosion occurs, particles of radioactive matter—vaporized metal, sand, etc.—are thrown into the upper air and carried by the winds until they cool and resolidify. Then they drop like rain. It was such an unexpected fallout which struck the *Fukuryu Maru*.

Atomic weapons, particularly those in high-penetration missiles and "small" bombs, do not produce fallout of any drastic consequence. But the Commonweal article says that a strategy of attacks on industrial complexes would almost inevitably mean the large-scale employment of air-burst hydrogen bombs. Judging from published reports, an all-out air-burst hydrogen attack on a scale intended to cripple a modern State could render uninhabitable an area equivalent to the populated portions of Russia or North America. Unexpected winds, like those which affected the Japanese fishermen, could bring the fallout down upon the attacking—or an innocent—nation. The combination of these two dangers, general radioactivity and fallout, not to mention the incredible physical destruction involved, would mean that a nation launching all-out nuclear war would be toying with human suicide.

Overshadowed by the official announcements and speculation about the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb is the so-called C-bomb or cobalt bomb.

According to a New York Times article, March 28, 1954, "This in itself will not be an explosive weapon designed primarily for mass destruction by blast and heat, but a vehicle of radiological warfare. It would be an additive to powerful explosive weapons. The explosion would disseminate the radioactivity impregnated in the element cobalt."

In an all-out war situation, there might be a need for other means of incapacitating enemy troops or war workers or of rendering a big area uninhabitable for a period. In such a case the natural fallout of radiated material from an atomic cloud, with its short life, would be inadequate. The problem seems to be to keep alive, at a high level, the radioactive contamination. The mineral element cobalt is providing the answer.

Cobalt, according to the New York Times, is not fissionable. That is, its atoms cannot be split readily like uranium, nor fusioned, driven together, like hydrogen. But some forms, such as the element cobalt 60, have a prolonged radioactive life when impregnated. The contamination can last for several years. Of equal significance militarily, other atomic forms of the element have much shorter life spans, so the contamination can be imposed for days or even years.

Prof. Otto R. Frisch, the noted British professor of nuclear physics at Cambridge University issued a warning in a speech in January, 1954, that he believed that a cobalt bomb could wipe out all civilization. Frisch helped build the first American atom bomb.

According to a February 13, 1955, news release from Hamburg, Germany, Nobel Prizewinner Otto Hahn, first man to split uranium, declared that the explosion of 10 cobalt-coated hydrogen bombs could endanger continuation of human life, no matter where they are dropped. The scientist said radioactive explosion dust, coated with cobalt 60, would retain its fatal effects for years and destroy all life. He said the danger for mankind is even bigger since the price of radioactive cobalt is only a small fraction of that of the same amount of radium.

As a finale to the intrigue and speculation over the atomic and hydrogen tests, the Washington Post and Times Herald reported on March 5, 1955, that the thermonuclear device detonated on March 1, 1954, in the Pacific was more than a single hydrogen bomb—it was an incredibly enriched superbomb offering the most potent weapon of death and destruction thus far known.

It was not the long-dreaded cobalt bomb, either, but its fireball blast and lethal radioactive fallout quickly outdated even the concept of the C-bomb.

The International News Service has learned authoritatively the March 1 blast used a hydrogen bomb core surrounded by a deadly jacket of natural state uranium (U–238), a relatively inexpensive substance. The result of this new superbomb, the U-bomb, surpasses the death potential of the theoretical C-bomb. This conclusion has been verified by top nuclear scientists.

The February 15, 1955, AEC report revealed that the death zone from radioactive fallout in the March 1 blast covered a cigar-shaped area up to 7,000 square miles.

According to the press the same principle works in both the U- and C-bombs. A cobalt jacket would surround the bomb core and—when exploded—lay down a lethal radioactive blanket of dust over large areas. The difference, as already noted, is that cobalt decays very slowly while uranium decays rapidly. Since the rate of decay is related to the radioactivity given off, this means that cobalt has a relatively low lethal value per day. On the other hand, uranium gives off a high dosage in the first few hours.

So, while cobalt can contaminate an area for a long period of time, its low radioactivity gives populations a chance to evacuate. With uranium, enough radioactivity is laid down to give an immediate lethal dose. One of the advantages, if that can be said, is that the new U-bomb is cheap and very effective. There is no need to refine uranium into the precocious U–235. Scientists have been unable to experiment with the cobalt bomb because it would leave a large area contaminated for a long period of time, years perhaps.

The United States is far advanced in many respects as compared to the Soviet Union. While their military strength is considerable and increasing, we outstrip them in most fields except mass manpower.

Published estimates of comparative nuclear strength in the New York Times, March 4, 1955, indicates that the United States stockpile of all types of nuclear weapons is probably more than 5,000. The Russian stockpile may be more than 500, perhaps as many as 1,000. If a more accurate yardstick is used—the total yield of the two stockpiles—the combined power of available Russian weapons today is between 20 and 40 megatons, or the equivalent of 20 million to 40 million tons of TNT. One United States thermonuclear test device, detonated a year ago in the Pacific released the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT.

Moreover, according to the New York Times, there is no clear-cut evidence that Russia yet has an operational hydrogen bomb, one that can be carried by plane. There is no physical evidence that the Russians have practiced air refueling. Another illustration, the bulk of their long-range bomber fleet is still composed of more than 1,000 B-29 type propeller-drive aircraft, which are obsolete in our services except for special missions.

My immediate concern is not that the Russions are going to take the lead in this race very soon or that the United States will ever take a secondary role.

The danger which has disturbed me above all the mysteries of the atomic age, is whether or not there is a worldwide cut-off, or danger point. Will the abnormal amount of radioactivity released in each explosion have a very slow but definite cumulative effect upon the earth's atmosphere and or upon its vegetable and animal life, and hence upon human life?

There are many scientists and lay people who are worried about this possibility and they do not know the complete answer. According to a November 8, 1954, article in the New York Times, "The increasing worry—and it is nothing more definite than that—is primarily about the ingestion and inhalation and absorption of tiny radioactive particles—not at the moment about the external menace of these particles to the human body."

According to the press, there seems to be a real possibility that continued explosions could slowly raise radioactive levels around the world to the detriment of health and human genetics, and there is the sure knowledge that the area of immediately dangerous fall-out is much larger than had been expected before the last tests in the Pacific. Views on this topic extend from one extreme to the other. Nevertheless there is genuine concern about this problem, and I am in complete sympathy with that concern.

In November of 1954 Prime Minister Winston Churchill stated in the House of Com-

mons that it was his "understanding" that the radioactivity released by the explosions of nuclear devices might be "cumulative" and that the detonation of an "undue number" might have serious effect upon the earth's atmosphere for 5,000 years. This statement may have created unnecessary fear, but at the same time no one has the answer.

During the CBS Years of Crisis broadcast on January 2, 1955, correspondent David Schoenbrun, spoke of the great scare that was raised in France last December when Nobel prize-winning physicist Prince Louis de Broglie claimed that the danger point in atomic saturation of the earth's atmosphere has already been reached, perhaps it has even been surpassed, by the result of 10 H-bombs being exploded experimentally in the last 2 years. He warned that life on earth might be changed or even wiped out if 10 or 15 more bombs are exploded in the next year or two, even without war.

Is there a biological threat? As nuclear tests go on, will the earth's atmosphere become contaminated? Will animals and humans occasionally subjected to small but more than normal amounts of radioactivity, absorb, breathe or eat these particles to such an extent that development, growth, or life itself might be affected?

In a series of articles in the Washington Evening Star by Science Editor Thomas R. Henry, he writes of the threat to the continued existence of man on earth during this atomic age.

What is involved in this threat is not the frequently voiced fear of slaughter and destruction in war on an unprecedented scale, but of the effects of a hidden, insidious, largely undetectable and uncontrollable poison which perhaps is capable of destroying the human race as a biological genus.

According to this thesis, which admittedly is far from satisfactorily established, it is not members of the present generation who are being injured. It is their unborn descendants for generations to come.

These implications were stated forcefully by Prof. A. H. Sturtevant in an address before the Pacific Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "There is no possible escape from the conclusion that the bombs already exploded will ultimately result in the production of numerous defective individuals—if the human race survives for many generations. The risk is one to which the entire human race, present and future, is being subjected," the California professor said.

Scientists are very concerned over the possible effect of radiation on the genetic structure of man. The series of articles by Thomas Henry is only one of many attempts to bring the problem to the general public in words they can understand.

In the face of warnings from some of the world's foremost geneticists that the human race may suffer serious deterioration over a course of generations because of the inevitable buildup in the background radiation of the earth due to atomic bomb detonations, experiments to date indicate the danger may be quite exaggerated.

This is reassuring but at the same time there is no positive proof that future generations will not be affected.

On February 15, 1955, Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, announced officially that a hydrogen bomb such as was exploded in the Bikini Atoll last March is capable of blanketing a 7,000-square-mile area the size of New Jersey with deadly radioactive fallout.

According to the Washington Post and Times Herald:

"Such a bomb, if exploded over Norfolk, for example, could shower enough fallout particles to:

"Kill all the unprotected persons living as far north as the southwest edge of Washington.

"Kill half the unprotected persons living between Washington and the outskirts of Baltimore.

"Kill 5 or 10 percent of the unprotected living between Baltimore and the Maryland-Pennsylvania line.

"Allow the residents of Harrisburg, Pa.—more than 220 miles away from Norfolk—the dubious privilege of being left alive to gaze at the holocaust within the deadly fallout ellipse.

"The projections, drawn from figures in the report, are extremes, based on the assumption that the inhabitants remained fully exposed to the radioactivity over a 36-hour period, taking no shelter or other protective measures. Even simple shelters, Strauss said, greatly reduce the danger from radioactivity."

This belated admission of this new atomic hazard has come long after unofficial analyses had described the newest danger. It is assumed by some that this report was planned to coincide with the start of the new series of atomic tests in Nevada and may have been intended to assure the American people that the Nevada tests represented only a very slight danger. As I understand it, atomic weapons, particularly those in high penetration missiles and "small" bombs, do not produce fallout of any drastic consequence. Presumably these are the type atomic weapons which are being tested in Nevada. The second test of the 1955 series in Nevada, a small nuclear device—the probable prototype—exploded on February 22 with a force that jarred cities 135 miles away. The predawn flash was seen 400 miles away, according to the February 23 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The device tested on the Yucca Flats is said to have been one of the smaller weapons. The shot rattled windows in Las Vegas, 75 miles away, and jolted St. George, Utah, 135 miles eastward. It gave the Congressmen, AEC scientists, and 200 military observers a sharp jolt or two, depending on where they were standing. Wind and atmospheric conditions were such that the rumble of the blast was heard in Bishop, Calif., about 140 airline miles west, but skipped the Charleston range where many observers were watching the tests.

The orange flash was reported to have lit up the morning sky in Los Angeles, about 250 miles away, and was visible in Sacramento, Calif., and the San Francisco Bay area, 400 miles distant.

The biggest blast of the new atomic test series on March 7, this year, flashed forks of light visible in a dozen States including Montana, caused an earth rumble 360 miles away, and sent scientists and soldiers scurrying for safety from the Nevada test site. The predawn flash of a nuclear device believed to be at least 1½ times the strength of the standard A-bomb was seen in the Black Hills of South Dakota, more than 800 miles northeast, south of the border in Mexico, and in all 11 Western States. The fireball lasted 20 seconds, according to the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Incidentally, in statements to the press, two Colorado University professors said that fallout from the Nevada tests can no longer be ignored by persons concerned with public health and safety. Dr. Ray R. Lanier and Dr. Theodore Puck were not suggesting that necessary nuclear tests be discontinued but stressed the importance of continued study of the effects of these experiments on the human race.

I recognize the necessity and value of tests and experiments, but at the same time it is difficult to reconcile this with the possibility of miscalculation and the number of hydrogen and atomic bomb explosions that it will take to make the atmosphere radioactive, if there is any basis to the numerous fears of some of the world's greatest scientists. In addition to the remarks of scientists and statesmen that I have already cited, a statement made by Dr. Edgar D. Adrian has been brought to my attention. He is quoted as saying last fall, "We must face the possibility that repeated atomic explosions will lead to a degree of general radioactivity, which no one can tolerate or escape." Adrian, president of the Royal Society, is a former Nobel prize winner and serves officially as the master of Trinity College, Cambridge University in England.

President Eisenhower and Chairman Strauss have answered the question: Should we continue to test hydrogen weapons? Their answer was yes. There is a great element of risk in this decision, but at the same time it is the only answer at the moment, for it might very well be disastrous if the Soviet Union was allowed to gain an advantage over us.

There are those who feel that continued atomic and hydrogen bomb tests are a crime against humanity and will only intensify the jeopardy to the human race. Others feel the program should be expanded and accelerated in this race with the Soviet Union. Few will argue against forging ahead in the nuclear sciences, but relying on the hydrogen bomb as our principal offensive weapon is something else again. It is definitely a deterrent but complete reliance on such a suicidal weapon may lead to self-destruction.

The latest move along this dangerous path is the new doctrine of "limited" atomic war with tactical weapons, recently expounded by Secretary of State Dulles, with the endorsement of President Eisenhower. This new doctrine has merit in time of war when considering our present nuclear power superiority when faced with the Communist advantage in ground forces. But this argument seems to be rather shortsighted.

Tactical atomic weapons used on military targets only is a wishful attempt at minimizing the dangers of nuclear warfare. Can we rely entirely on this increased precision and accuracy? We must not overlook the unpredictable changes in weather, human error, and mechanical failures. Military targets, particularly airfields, are usually near towns and cities. A weapon large enough to insure the destruction of such targets will almost inevitably take a toll of nonmilitary areas. To completely paralyze an enemy it would be necessary to hit the cities, the centers of industry. The nuclear bombardment of cities might well turn war into suicide. I find very little assurance in the possibility of limiting an atomic war once it was started.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss the merits and demerits of the present military and defense program in general. An excerpt from an address by Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on March 1, 1955, at this point might be very timely. He said:

"The hydrogen bomb has made an astounding incursion into the structure of our lives and thoughts. Its impact is prodigious and profound, but I do not agree with those who say, 'Let us sweep away forthwith all our existing defense services and concentrate our energy and resources on nuclear weapons and their immediate ancillaries.' The policy of the deterrent cannot rest on nuclear weapons alone. We must, together with our NATO allies, maintain the defensive shield in Western Europe."

We do not have the answers to substantiate or discredit the fears about continued hydrogen tests, or if answers do exist, they are kept under a tight lid of secrecy. Until such time as we know of these things, we should not for one moment forget the earth-shattering and destructive power that we are placing so much confidence in.

The working paper before the United Nations sponsored by the United States proposes the establishment of a United Nations disarmament and atomic energy development authority composed of the members

of the Security Council and Canada. The objectives in establishing this authority were:

1. To provide international control of atomic energy so as to enforce compliance with the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and insure that nuclear materials are used for peaceful purposes.

2. To supervise programs for limitation and balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, and prohibition and elimination of major mass destruction weapons.

3. To supervise the various safeguards necessary to enforce a disarmament program, including disclosure and verification.

4. To assure each participant that the other states are observing the various agreements.

It is the opinion of many that such a disarmament program as this is somewhat of a lost cause in many respects. The Soviet Union has placed many obstacles in the course of any plan which would meet the approval of the Western World. The most recent was the new Soviet demand, made public almost on the eve of the latest London negotiations, for a preliminary "freeze" on armed forces and armaments as of last January 1. Such a freeze would prevent the armament of Japan and, more particularly, West Germany. This is unacceptable to both the United States and Great Britain. At this point it is very unlikely that any system of inspection can be arranged to meet the approval of all nations concerned.

In recent months a great deal of interest has been rallied around a proposal to seek an international moratorium on experimental detonations of hydrogen bombs.

Such a moratorium was suggested last fall by David R. Inglis, of the Argonne National Laboratory, and proposed informally to the President and the Secretary of State by Pierre Mendès-France during his Premiership. It also has the backing of the Asian Prime Ministers who met at the Colombo plan conference in Jakarta last December, though they suggested it not only because they thought it would be a substitute for disarmament but because so many of them do not like the nearness of the Pacific proving grounds.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, on February 11, 1955, suggested in its editorial columns five significant advantages of such a proposal. They are briefly: (a) The plan would be a step, even though a small step, away from war; (b) the ban would be self-enforcing, no elaborate enforcing machinery; (c) it would tend to curb the development of new nuclear devices; (d) the ban would relieve fears about the further accumulation of radioactivity in the atmosphere; (e) a careful proposal would help convince the world of the sincerity of this country's efforts to reverse the drift toward war.

Before I conclude I wish to make note of a proposal sponsored by the Federation of American Scientists which would establish a United Nations commission to study the effects of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. The 2,000-member federation suggests that the U. N. commission examine the extent of radioactive contamination as the result of past tests, evaluate the potential genetic effects on human beings of future tests and attempt to establish a "danger threshold." This proposal is more or less a modification of the plan I have just discussed.

If the United States were to initiate a program along these lines, it would undoubtedly have a great effect in quieting many fears.

It is difficult to understand how a great nation, such as ours, which has shown such genius in the fields of science and nuclear warfare and, at the same time, has had such poor success in charting a path away from the destruction brought on by these discoveries. Need we advance beyond the point of no return?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce, after consultation with the minority leader, that when action on the unfinished business is concluded, it is my plan to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 651, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. That bill, which is Calendar No. 127, provides for permanent certificates for local air-service carriers.

It is planned to have a call of the calendar on Monday; and at that time I shall have a further announcement to make.

We hope we shall be able to take up the agricultural appropriation bill after we have disposed of the calendar.

We also have on the calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 58, to designate the 1st day of May, 1955, as Loyalty Day. As soon as the author of the joint resolution can obtain the floor, I expect to ask unanimous consent to have that joint resolution considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Mansfield	Young
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CONSERVATION OF THE WATER OF THE COLORADO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, owing to the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement was reached last evening by which debate has been limited, and that it is possible to speak only now upon amendments offered to the bill, and inasmuch as I was unable to make some remarks which I desired to make upon the bill last night because the unanimous-consent agreement was reached without my knowledge, it becomes necessary for me, in order to be within the parliamentary rules, to offer an amendment. I shall do so, Mr. President, by moving that there be added to the bill a provision repealing a law which was enacted by a recent Congress. I am waiting for a copy of the bill in order that I may submit my amendment in proper order.

Mr. President, I move that there be added at the end of the bill the following new section:

> There is hereby repealed the act of July 28, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses, from the Santa Marguerita River, Calif., and other purposes."

Mr. President, that is a pro-forma amendment which I do not wish to debate at the present moment.

I should like however, to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the facts about the Colorado River and the procedure for harnessing its water which is proposed in the bill (S. 500) recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This is a matter which is far more important than mere dry statistics. This is a matter of homes, a matter of construction, a matter of increasing population, a matter of providing opportunities for men to raise their families and to build communities by conserving the waters of a vast river basin in an area which has been throughout most of the life of the Nation almost completely desert.

At this moment, according to the announcement which was made on yesterday, the President of the United States

is preparing a message which will come to the two Houses of Congress with respect to some of the point 4 programs to be carried out in other nations of the world in order to promote economic improvement and peace among the peoples of the world.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of the greatest of these programs initiated under the Foreign Operations Administration is the program for the River Jordan. I refer to it, Mr. President, because the area which will be irrigated when the $80 million plant has been fully constructed, when the dam has been built and the waters are being distributed, consists of arid land, such as is found in some areas of the United States. That arid land in a far-off country will receive the water of the River Jordan which for centuries has been wasted into the sea, with consequent disastrous effects upon the population of ancient Palestine and the surrounding areas. Water will go to Lebanon; water will go to Israel; water will go to the Transjordan area. This reclamation project authorized by the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, is in conformity with policies which, unlike those having the aspects of war, consisting of equipping of armies, and the making of atomic bombs, have to do with building for the future peace of the world.

The Department of the Interior has loaned 87 different experts of the Bureau of Reclamation to foreign countries with which to construct irrigation works. The countries include India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Formosa, and Australia. Many of those areas are dry and even desert land.

Fortunately for those countries, there are no theorists there who are devoted to the belief that it is better to preserve the ancient ruins of centuries gone than it is to use the scientific capacity of modern man to build modern engineering works in order to conserve and use the water which has been wasted for thousands of years.

Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that the Senate today has the great pleasure of having as auditors in the Chamber some members of the German Bundestag. Inasmuch as they, like the Members of the Senate, especially the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, are vitally interested in taking steps designed to promote peace and culture among mankind, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of permitting him to introduce these gentlemen. I hope that the time to be taken for this greeting will not be charged to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be used for this purpose be not charged to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take the time to introduce these gentlemen individually; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very short biographical sketch of each of them, in order that Senators may know something about each of the gentlemen who are honoring us with their presence today.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Richard Jaeger, Christian Social Union, vice president of the Bundestag, chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born February 16, 1913, in Munich. Studied law at Munich, Berlin, and Bonn, and was admitted to the bar in 1940. Entered the Bavarian government as an official of the ministry of culture in 1947 and became Lord Mayor Eichstaett in 1949. He was elected to the Bundestag on August 14, 1949, and has been vice president since September 7, 1953.

Mr. Fritz Erler, Social Democratic Party, vice chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born in Berlin on July 14, 1913. Active in Berlin city government until 1938. Later director of a chemical plant and an editorial contributor to a law journal.

Became a member of the Socialist Youth Movement in 1928 and was a member of the Socialist underground during entire Nazi period. He was arrested in 1938 and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment the following year. After the war he was county manager (landrat) in Biberach (a position he later held in his adopted hometown of Tuttlingen) and became an official of one of the German provincial governments in 1947. At the same time he became a member of the provincial legislature. He was elected to the Bundestag in August 1949 and has been one of its delegates to the Council of Europe since 1953.

Mr. Hasso von Manteuffel, Free Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Potsdam. Became a professional officer in 1916 and participated in both World Wars. In World War II he was commander in chief of an armored army and severely wounded on several occasions. Since 1948 he has been active as export manager for a German metallurgical firm. He joined the Free Democratic Party in 1949, where he became chairman of its security committee. He became a Member of the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Ernst Paul, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Bohemia. He was an early functionary of the Socialist Youth Movement. He worked in the Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia until 1938 when he fled to Sweden in the light of a threatened arrest. Since 1945 he has been editor in chief of the Wuerttemberger Abendzeitung. He was elected to the Bundestag in August 1949 and is an alternate delegate to the Council of Europe.

Mr. Fritz Berendsen, Christian Democratic Party, born in 1904. Officer and businessman. 1923 to 1936 officer, commander of the 2d Cavalry East Prussia War Academy, Berlin. Member of general staff 1938 to 1945 when he reached the rank of colonel. Became a member of a commercial firm Duisburg after his release as prisoner of war. He entered the city council of that city in November 1952 and became chairman of his party's group in the city council in March 1953. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Fritz Eschmann, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1909, he was a locksmith in his early years. From 1932 to 1936 he attended police school and became a police official. He was an officer in the German Army from 1936 to 1945. From 1951 to 1952, he was a county manager (landrat) in Bavaria and was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Dr. Georg Kliesing, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1911. Dr. Kliesing has been a teacher at high schools. He studied at the University of Bonn, where he made his doctorate in modern history in 1932. He served in the German Army as an officer from 1939 to 1945 and spent the years from 1945 to 1949 in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of war. In 1950 he returned to his teaching profession. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Johann Peter Josten, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1915. Mr. Josten is a master carpenter, a field in which he has been active since 1929, with the exception of a short period of army service. He became a member of the Catholic Youth Movement in 1929 and after the end of World War II was one of the local founders of the Christian Democratic Party. He was elected to the Rhineland—Palatinate provincial legislature in 1947 and became floor leader for his party in that legislature the same year. Since September 1951, he has been chairman of the Christian Democratic Union's Youth Movement in his state. He was elected to the Bundestag in 1953.

Mr. Josef Stingl, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1919. He attended the University for Political Affairs in Berlin and became a member of a Berlin commercial firm. He was a member of the German Army from 1939 to 1945 and became a member of the executive committee of the Christian Democratic Union in Berlin after World War II. He has been a member of the Bundestag since September 1953.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate is favored, from time to time, with visits by guests representing legislative bodies of the different countries of the world. We are always happy to see them, to receive them, and to have them stay a while with us in the Senate.

I take great pleasure in presenting to the Senate nine distinguished members of the German Bundestag. I shall ask them to stand and to receive the greetings of the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I hope that as many Senators as may find it possible to do so will take the time to greet and speak to the members of the Bundestag, and to make them feel welcome.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, in order that the greeting suggested by the Senator from Alabama may take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT in the chair).

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct,

operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to make clear to the Members of the Senate what the proposed works in the upper Colorado storage basin and particularly the so-called Echo Park Dam will do, I have had brought to the floor of the Senate some pictures depicting the scene before and after the event to show, as I think I can show conclusively, that there will be do damage or danger to the scenery of this area and no injury to wildlife, but only a scientific and engineering triumph which will make useful the water which has been pouring down the Colorado River system for years beyond the memory of man.

I shall ask Mr. Wilson, of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to bring me two of the photographs. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, many of the Members of the Senate are at luncheon, so I speak, as in increasing degrees, due the pressure of congressional business, we must all speak these days, to empty seats.

ECHO PARK IS NOT A NATIONAL PARK

I have before me, Mr. President, photographs of the Echo Dam site, before construction and after construction. Here can be seen the scenery as it now exists, and as those who wish to strike Echo Dam from this project wish it to remain. Here is shown the same canyon with the dam as it will look when constructed. Nothing is taken from the beauty of the scene. The dam is planned to be 502 feet high. It stands in a canyon which is probably 3,000 feet deep. Can anyone who has ever visited this area say with any truth and justice that the building of that dam will ruin this scenery? Let it be remembered that Echo Park is a local name. It is not and never was a national park.

The dam was sketched on the photograph of this canyon by draftsmen, with engineering accuracy. It represents the situation as it will exist.

I now point to two photographs of Steamboat Rock and the Yampa River junction.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has asked me for specific information about this question, and point out to him Steamboat Rock as it now stands. I point out to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who will speak on this question a little later, when he presents his amendment to strike out the provision for Echo Park Dam, that shown here is the beautiful Steamboat Rock. I point out Steamboat Rock, after the dam is built and the water has been stored. Again, I point out the gateway of the Lodore. I point out the scenery today, and the scenery as it will be after the dam has been constructed. Here again no natural beauty is being destroyed.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no person with an open mind should be misled by the arguments of the conservationists of the canyons of Manhattan Island. Those canyons were manmade. Nobody objected to the engineering triumphs by which the skyscrapers that make those canyons were built, and yet from offices in those skyscrapers are pouring out editorials and propaganda by men who never visited this area, and who would like to condemn the upper Colorado Basin to be forever a graveyard of the dinosaurs.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will pardon the language, how many dam developments are there to be in this project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it will depend upon what future Committees on Appropriations may do.

Mr. WILEY. My question is not facetious. It is based on the idea that the desire is to hold the water back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All the dams are subject to the compact between the States. There will be 6 storage reservoirs of which 5 will develop power.

Mr. President, I should now like to call attention to the map which stands at the rear of the Chamber.

It is important to remember that the Colorado River compact was written in 1920, by the authority of Congress. Congress passed the law because at that time Congress was persuaded by the Representatives of the West in Congress and by Herbert Hoover—not then President, of course—that the water which had been pouring down the Colorado River Basin for millions of years should finally be harnessed and put to use. So the area was divided by compact among the affected States into two sections, the lower basin and the upper basin, which was approved later by Congress. It was provided that the States of the upper basin, which included Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, a part of New Mexico, and a part of Arizona, should, every year, deliver to the lower basin 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, or 75 million acre-feet in the 10-year period.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. My question was based upon the thought that if a great deal of the scenic beauty, or however it may be described, should be obliterated by construction of the project, where is the next lower dam? If it is water that is desired, where is the next lower dam, and how would that affect the water supply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has based his question on the premise that the scenic beauty would be obliterated.

Mr. WILEY. No; I meant that it is said by some that it would be. I ask, where is the next lower dam? The proponents of the measure are after water.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are after water, and the desire is to begin to use the water on the upper reaches of the stream, not with the purpose of keeping it from California, but to prevent it from going uselessly into the sea; but in order to accomplish that purpose, it is necessary to build storage reservoirs lower in the river. There is proposed, therefore, the great Glen Canyon storage project, shown here at the bottom of the map. That is a project for storing water. I point to Echo Park and Flaming Gorge near the top of the map. These are storage and power reservoirs. Then there are numerous participating projects throughout the upper basin.

What I wish the Members of the Senate to understand is that whatever may happen, we must and shall deliver 75 million acre-feet every 10 years to the lower basin. The lower basin has already used about 6 million acre-feet of the amount which was allotted to it. We in the upper basin have not yet begun to build large projects like the Hoover Dam. Our use at the upper basin if the bill should be enacted into law, would amount to about 4½ mililon acre-feet, as I understand. In other words, if the projects were all constructed, we would be able to use only about two-thirds of the water which is ours under the Colorado River compact. We are under the obligation, which is in no wise impaired by any provision of the pending bill, to deliver 75 million acre-feet for the use of the lower basin in every 10-year period.

This is a flowing stream, Mr. President. Every day water goes to waste and will continue to go to waste until we begin to build these works. We are trying to harness these wasting waters in the upper basin so that they will benefit the whole valley of the Colorado.

I can understand, of course, that some of the people of California may be fearful that they may lose something. They will not. Some of them may be guided by the false or unworthy thought that if the construction of the dams in the upper basin can be stopped, since the water must continually flow down hill, that water may be put to use in the lower basin, and claims could be asserted sometime in the future which would make it difficult for the upper-basin States to use the water allotted to them in the compact.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I have been looking at the map, off and on, for the past 2 or 3 days, and I am somewhat puzzled by it. There are a great many sites for the application of water on the left-hand side of the map, and some on the right-hand side. So far as I can judge, the application of the water to the upper basin does not seem to be related to those dams.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont asked that question. The Senator has raised the engineering question of how water is exchanged. What we are proposing to do is to store the water from the very moment the proposed dams are built. When the dams are constructed—and that will be done in such a manner as not to deprive the lower basin of any flow—it will be possible to use upstream the daily run of the river for the projects in the upper basin until it is necessary to release the water to fill the storage

basins lower down or to transmit water to the lower basin.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me see whether I correctly understand the situation. Is it true that in order to use the water on the other streams of the Colorado watershed it is necessary to provide water from the dams on the Green River and the Yampa River, to replace water which will be used at the other spots? Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. So that is the project, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the project which will store the water which otherwise would be wasted, water which California cannot use, water which the lower basin cannot use, water which Mexico cannot use—because Mexico also has an interest—and water which otherwise will, therefore, flow into the sea. By means of this project we shall stop that waste; and by stopping it in the storage basins we shall make it possible to use upstream the water which will be flowing down the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year, until we are required to pass on that water, to fill this dam.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, without building those dams, or their equivalent, under the agreement, it will not be possible to carry on the irrigation projects on the east side of the watershed, will it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite correct. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that the present Governor of Colorado, who was for many years a distinguished and very much admired Member of the Senate—I refer to Gov. Edwin Johnson, of Colorado—came before the committee to plead the cause of some of the areas in Colorado, among them the city of Denver. Unless this project is built, unless this water is stored, unless it is held back, the city of Denver will not have the water. In that event, the State of Wyoming and its citizens also will simply have to sit on the banks of the stream, twiddling their thumbs, watching the water flow by their doors. They will not be able to use it. That is what the conservationists would have us do.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see that certain Wyoming projects are involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see on the map the city of Green River.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont sees the city of Green River. It will be one of the beneficiaries of this project.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have seen it many times.

I think I am reaching a clear understanding of the theory of the proposal. I am still disturbed that the first development lies in the river bottom or the canyon bottom at the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what priority the engineers will give to the construction. Nothing at all in the bill would give Echo Park the first priority.

Mr. FLANDERS. There would seem to be more storage in the Glen Canyon Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is, but the Echo Dam site is ideally suited to storage without evaporation.

Mr. FLANDERS. And there would seem to be even as much or more storage in the upstream Yampa site, and there would seem to be as much storage in the Flaming Gorge site. Yet, somehow, the emphasis—by what means I do not know—seems to be laid on the construction of the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation is simple. Opponents of this reservoir have diligently cultivated the false impression that this is a national park. It is not a national park. The Echo Park is a local name and not a Federal name. Opponents acknowledge that the Echo Park Dam will not disturb the original Dinosaur National Monument. All this has been set forth, but unfortunately the burdens of the Senate are so great that Senators are detained in committee rooms and are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Wyoming and I are here; that answers that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; we are here.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We shall explain the proposal to ourselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by Senators who ask me questions may be charged to the time available to them, and not to the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, other Senators will have an opportunity to comment, by way of objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, other Senators will have 30 minutes, under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I further correctly understand that the time required for the questions which now are being asked by other Senators will be charged to the time available to the opponents?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, which amendment is under consideration at this moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may state the parliamentary situation, without having the time so required charged to the time available to me for discussion of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senate for giving that consent.

Will the Senator from Vermont please repeat his question?

Mr. FLANDERS. The question is, What amendment is now under consideration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, yesterday afternoon, at a time when only a handful of Senators were upon the floor, it was agreed that there would be a limit upon the time available today for debate, and that each Senator could speak for half an hour on each amendment; and thereafter, after the amendments had been disposed of, 2 hours would be available for debate on the bill, with the time to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

There being no amendment before the Senate, in order to secure time in which to address the Senate on this subject, I had to offer an amendment; and I offered an amendment to repeal the Fallbrook Act, which was enacted at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. But I wish to assure him that the amendment was a pro forma one, for the Fallbrook Act is killing itself so rapidly that the Californians are now beginning to realize it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; if the time so required is not charged to the time available to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. With that understanding, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the able Senator from Wyoming give credit to the junior Senator from California for not raising the question of germaneness in connection with the pro forma amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming; but at the same time I wish to suggest that he might have chosen a somewhat different subject-matter for his pro forma amendment, because when he began to mention the name "Santa Marguerita," which I recognize is to many persons, a term of opprobrium, he gave me a little paroxysm of fear. [Laughter.] I hope that if he has a second pro forma amendment to offer, he will consider some other area of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me confess to the Senator from California that I felt sure that if I mentioned Fallbrook or the Santa Marguerita River, the telegraph wires and telephone wires would carry the story to California, and might result in more of the Senator's constituents favoring this bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now return to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I allowed, in putting myself in opposition to a pro forma amendment of which I have no comprehension——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont does not have to. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to allow my time on the other side of the pro forma amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to be expended in asking these questions, if that is parliamentarily permissible.

May I inquire who is in control of the time on the other side of the pro forma amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senators to whom that authority was given are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair take time out for a moment and have the agreement read, and then we can start over. The clerk will read the agreement.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some one designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, as I heard the order read——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield any time to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am trying to arrange matters so that the Senator from Wyoming will not have to yield his own time. That is my purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was my request, I will say to the Senator. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, the Senator may have whatever time he desires to use assigned to the opposition to my pro forma amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I heard the unanimous-consent agreement read, it seemed to be that my request should be made of the majority leader, who is not present. He not being present, or represented, my request is made to the acting minority leader [Mr. PAYNE], who is present. I request of the acting minority leader that I be assigned 5 minutes, in the course of which I shall question the author of the pro forma amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has no time at this juncture.

Mr. FLANDERS. Who has the time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I am the acting majority leader, although on the minority side of the Chamber, I understood the Senator from Vermont to address his query to the genial Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] who is occupying the seat of the minority leader. He was endeavoring to find some Senator who was in opposition to the amendment. I find no one, I will say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], unless he rises and gives his colleague some time.

Mr. KUCHEL. To the contrary——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the explanation of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] been completed, so that the time now is under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it has.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not know where that leaves us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 5 minutes left of his 30 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, has the other amendment, which was under consideration, been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have offered the new amendment in order that I might have additional time. The Senator from Vermont may take a part of my time to ask me the question he wished to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that a pro forma amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, I still had 3 minutes to go on the first amendment. In order to meet the technical objection of the Parliamentarian, I withdraw the first amendment. I hope the Senator from California will rise.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator what I was about to do——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the last word of section 1 be stricken.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator speaking in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will yield to me, I want him to know that I was about to inquire whether I could obtain the 30 minutes which would have been available had the Senator's amendment been germane, so that I might make a gift to him of the 30 minutes, in order that he might have an hour. I enjoy listening to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very gracious, and I acknowledge receipt of the ghostly gift which was thought of but never tendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move to amend the first section by striking out the last word.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not in order under the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move to strike out the authorization of the Juniper Reservoir. That is a substantial amendment to the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOW WATER IS EXCHANGED (BY STORAGE)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont desires to ask an important question about the exchange of water, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I think I have now clear in my mind the practical means by which water is provided for these specific irrigation projects by means of conserving water in a stream which does not supply them, but which does supply the necessary number of acre-feet—or whatever measure is used—to the lower basin, in that way permitting the withdrawal of more water from the other Colorado tributaries for local use. Apparently that is the theory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the theory.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the means. That is clear in my mind. What is not clear in my mind, and about which I wish to interrogate the Senator from Wyoming, is the reason for concentrating so heavily on the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Both the proponents and the opponents of the bill are directing their fire to this one site. I can understand the feeling of the opponents of the bill, because it is a natural feeling with me also. I believe that the bottom land in some of the western mountain regions affords some of the most beautiful scenery in our country. I have seen many of such places. I have seen them even on such an ill-named stream as the Dirty Devil River in southern Utah. So I understand why people like to visit them and like to camp on them and would regret to see them flooded under 500 feet of water. I understand their point of view.

From the opponents I should like to inquire—to put the question into the vernacular—why pick on the Echo Park Dam? Why not make the first development, at least, at some other site?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has raised the question. It is a subject which was referred to the engineers. They are the best engineers in the Government. A long time ago, before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson, there were reclamation withdrawals and power withdrawals in this area. They are represented on a map which the Senator from Utah brought to the Chamber. That map shows the site of the Echo Dam. It is at the confluence of the Green River and the Yampa River. Because it is at that confluence, it has ideal qualities for a dam and for the storage of water.

The problem before the engineers was that of storing enough water to provide for the amount of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. The Glen Canyon Dam and the Echo Park Dam and the Flaming Gorge Dam were deemed to be the most feasible and most economical sites for the storage of the water. That is stating the problem as simply and as clearly as I can state it.

The expert engineers since early in this century have called it an ideal site for a dam. Again I say the site is a park only because local inhabitants have called it a park, as they call every open spot in the mountains.

However, it should also be stated that the Antiquities Act, under which Woodrow Wilson withdrew the Dinosaur Quarry, provided that for the purpose of preserving the historical and scientific landmarks in that area the least possible land area should be withdrawn. He withdrew 80 acres. That area is marked on the map which the Senator from Utah brought into the Chamber. It would not be flooded. Not one inch of stored water would reach it.

However, in 1938, long after the withdrawals on the Yampa, Green, and Colorado Rivers had been made for reclamation and for power purposes, the National Park Service sought to withdraw the beds of these rivers. They did not come to Congress. Only Congress can create a national park. They sought to attain their object by Executive order under the Antiquities Act. There was a long controversy in the bureaus about the Executive order, and when it was finally written the Executive order contained language which was intended to preserve the power rights and other existing rights.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with respect to this subject. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, why Echo Park has been made the center of attention and why it is being emphasized, I would say the reasons are very simple. The first reason is that the upper basin area must have water. The second reason is that it is important to hold the water when it comes down from the mountains at a time when we cannot use it, until we can use it. Therefore, we must have storage facilities. Storage is second in importance only to the water itself.

It so happens that Glen Canyon is the largest possible site for storing water. Twenty-six million acre-feet of water can be stored there. Echo Park is the next one in importance from the standpoint of storage. Looking at it on the map, it would seem that there is more land there.

Actually, Echo Park would have deep storage. There is less evaporation there. It is strategically located with respect to the distribution of power. It is also in the center of other reservoirs, such as Flaming Gorge and Juniper. It is necessary to have at least one reservoir which can be used to meet the peak load and to release it. Echo Park is in the center of the group. It has been, from the very first investigations of the Colorado River, considered to be one of the best sites for power and water development. That is the reason why it is second in importance to Glen Canyon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many dams will there be?

Mr. WATKINS. If I may answer that question, at first there are six. Eventually there will be nine, which will have power possibilities.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is meant by power possibilities?

Mr. WATKINS. First, they will be used for water storage, and, second, for power development.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How much will the power repay?

Mr. WATKINS. All the costs of the power, together with interest. It will also help to repay the cost allocated to irrigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How long will it take to amortize the cost of the water, as well as of the power, and all other costs chargeable to the project?

Mr. WATKINS. Fifty years, under the plan now proposed; 50 years, plus a 10-year development period for the irrigation end of it, with participating projects. But the projects will be paid out. Farmers will pay out all they can pay, and the power will "pick up the check" for the irrigation allotment. But the cost will be paid in 50 years. Industrial water and irrigation water will be paid for in 50 years, with an additional period of 10 years which is now permitted under existing law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are operating under a time limitation, it becomes very difficult to answer any questions in detail.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the majority leader yield me some time in opposition to the motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield the floor in a moment. I think there are as many Senators present as we can gather here today until the time for voting comes. The Senator will have time in which to speak.

DEMAND FOR HOMESTEADS

Mr. President, I refer Senators to the report of the committee for the detailed information with respect to the dams. But what I wish to emphasize is that we are dealing with a problem which arises from the demands of the people of the United States, from veterans of two wars, and from those who wish to settle upon the land. The Bureau of Reclamation has presently before it approximately 90,000 applications from all parts of the United States for settlement on 1,838 units which the Bureau of Reclamation is now in position to offer for settlement. There will have to be a drawing for every one of those units. There are 90,231 persons from all over the country who are seeking opportunity to settle upon the lands. There is fear that the dam, which the pictures show is only 502 feet high, will destroy scenic values created by the floods of a thousand years, and opposition has been raised all over the United States to the construction of these works.

I pointed out that under the program of trying to rehabilitate the peoples of the world and to bring about peace we have loaned to countries of the Middle East 87 of our reclamation engineers who are working upon the deserts which were created in those areas where warring armies destroyed ancient waterworks and people were driven from their homes which subsequently were covered by the sands swept in by wind. So we have a clear record of the demand of the people for projects of this kind.

In the area of these projects, Mr. President, there are minerals of all kinds, including uranium, coal, and oil and gas shale which can be developed. The first Army officer, a lieutenant, sent up the Colorado River to investigate it, on an exploratory trip financed by the War Department, reported to Washington that in his opinion no man ever would be able to make his way up the river. But the trip was made. The Hoover Dam was built. The Imperial Valley and other places in the area have already prospered and new sources of profit and income have been created. Give us the dams we are now requesting, and the water which is now going to waste can be used where it originates. It will result in the starting of new businesses, the establishment of homes, and the building of schools and churches. Why should we be condemned to the desert created by the waters which men before our time were unable to harness for the public good?

So, Mr. President, I hope the pending bill as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be passed.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendments I have offered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, and 66 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there are two amendments at the desk which I desire to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, beginning with the word "Sec. 2.", it is proposed to strike out the committee amendment, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when this proposed legislation was originally introduced it provided for the construction of 2 storage units and 13 so-called participating units. As it comes to the floor of the Senate by reason of the adoption in the Senate committee of a whole series of amendments, 6 storage units are provided for and 33 participating units are likewise provided for.

Again and again, during the debate on this measure, I have endeavored to point out to the Senate that one after another the projects which are now included in the bill have been found to be feasible by nobody. The amendment which I have offered deals with a section which provides, or purports to provide, for a declaration of intent to authorize more unnamed projects in the future. Let me read the section on congressional intent as it originally appeared in the bill:

SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law.

In the committee, I attempted to argue that one Congress could not bind a subsequent Congress; that it was meaningless for the 84th Congress to attempt to sit in judgment on what the 85th Congress, or any succeeding Congress, might do; and that to that extent the section dealing with legislative intent was irrelevant, was meaningless, and ought to be deleted in its entirety.

The committee did not see fit to eliminate the section, but it did see fit to rewrite it. I now wish to read the present section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The report of the committee, on page 13, contains the following paragraph:

The committee recognizes that it may be found desirable to authorize additional storage in the upper reaches of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Grand Junction, Colo., and of additional participating projects in the several upper division States (see sec. 2 of the bill); but it recommends deferment of any commitment by the Congress thereto, due to the fact that engineering reports are not complete.

It seems to me that no one will stand on the floor of the Senate and defend section 2 on the basis of an attempt, constitutionally, to bind future Congresses. That would be an indefensible position.

Section 2 attempts to say, by some type of moral suasion, that the bill, ballooned up, as it is, to include presently 33 projects which are called participating projects, and 6 projects which are called storage units, is only a start. Some start, Mr. President.

Again, it seems to me that before any legislation of this nature is passed, there should be, first, a full and exhaustive study made by the Department of the Interior with respect to feasibility on every proposed project. That is the burden of my argument.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason why some of the projects are not included. It was the intention of the committee, in my opinion, that the projects should be studied by the Department of the Interior or by any other department which was concerned with making the final recommendation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I may tell my good friend from New Mexico that of the 33 participating projects, the great majority have not been found by the Department of the Interior to be feasible, but they are still included in the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as New Mexico is concerned, I cannot see any reason why the project for the Anima-La Plata, a tributary of the San Juan, which eventually flows into the Colorado, should not be a recipient of the benefit of legislation which will take care of the upper basin States.

Is it the intention that merely because it may be desired by some to prevent the construction of certain projects in the future, even if they are reported as being feasible, the water shall go to the lower basin States or to the Republic of Mexico? Would that be doing justice, in the eyes of the Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me say very frankly to my friend from New Mexico that it seems to me the bill, by a whole series of amendments, has become almost a Christmas tree, if I may say so, and that this section is an attempt to indicate that more projects, in the future, will be approved for the upper basin.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from California that I like the expression "Christmas tree." I have been a Member of the Senate for a long time. I remember when the Central Valley, in California, Friant Dam, in California, and Shasta Dam, in California, were characterized as Christmas trees. But I did not think they were Christmas trees; I thought those developments were for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement; certainly. I do not desire to make any statements which are critical or caustic. I tell the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I do not wish to indulge in that kind of language.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment.

Mr. President, that is the burden of my argument. There ought not to be provision for any additional projects. Such a provision serves no useful purpose. It constitutes, indeed, a red flag which I should think some of the proponents of the bill would like to be rid of.

On that basis I offer the amendment and ask that it be adopted.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from California indicated that on more than a majority of the participating projects sought to be authorized by the bill no report had been made as to feasibility, and no report from an engineering standpoint. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 5 of the bill, beginning at the top of line 1, there is contained an exception, which reads:

Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects

shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress.

My question is, The Senator understands that provision is in the bill; does he not?

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed I do.

Mr. WATKINS. And that it means that every one of the projects which I have mentioned cannot be authorized, and no construction can be started on them, until they have been further considered by the Congress. It means that nothing can be done until final reports are made as to feasibility, and all the engineering details have been gone into carefully. No work can be done until Congress acts again on these same projects. In other words, those projects are not being authorized by the bill. It is true that they have been decided upon as projects which in time may again be brought before the Congress, when the engineering reports have been made and other necessary work which is necessary has been accomplished. So we are not actually seeking to authorize these particular projects by the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. What useful purpose can be served by including the projects in the proposed legislation?

Mr. WATKINS. One useful purpose will be to concentrate the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation on what will have to be done if these projects are to be approved. At several sessions I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project, largely on the theory that there might be available a report from the Department of the Interior. I knew the bill would not pass, but I also knew that by having the bill introduced we would keep the Bureau of Reclamation busy on the subject, because there would be something for it to aim at. In that way the Bureau of Reclamation would know that eventually, if the reports were finally made saying the projects were feasible, and if there was a favorable cost-ratio basis, the projects would then be before Congress. That was one of the principal objectives we had in mind in including the projects in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. At least that is a novel treatment of the process of legislative authorization of projects.

Again, to comment on the suggested amendment which I have offered and which I have asked the Senate to consider, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that no legal purpose is served by the inclusion of section 2 in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Probably no legal purpose is served, but a policy is established by having the section in the bill. The provision sets forth that we do not intend in the future to exclude the projects from possible benefit under the program.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator from California that there is a distinct legal purpose and a very practical purpose served. The provision puts the Bureau of Reclamation on notice that as to certain future projects which it may have to consider it should get its reports and other papers ready and do its own preliminary work. How else can an agency be alerted to such contemplated projects unless they are included in proposed legislation? Let me ask the Senator what harm there is in putting the provision in the bill. Why does he want it stricken out?

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me endeavor to answer both questions which the Senator from Colorado has raised. I think he knows the respect in which I hold him both as a Senator and as a lawyer. I think the Senator knows the basis on which I have endeavored to raise the very serious questions which have occurred to citizens of my State who are responsible for continuing the water supply of my State.

On the basis of what I endeavored to discuss the day before yesterday, with respect to the Colorado River compact, the differences in interpretation of the compact by the State which I in part represent and the State which the distinguished Senator from Colorado in part represents, I tried to point out that there was a hazard with respect to the continuance of the flow of the waters of the Colorado River to which my State feels she is entitled. A part of the hazard, a part of the fear, comes from the prodigious number of subjects which are encompassed in the bill. Then there is added a section which purports to be a declaration of intent to add more projects in the days to come. I suggest to the Senator that the provision would serve no legal purpose. To that extent it is needless. It constitutes a red flag that should not be in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The supply for future possible participating areas will come from water which has been allocated, by the 1922 and the upper basin compacts, to the upper basin States. So the upper basin States have, under the language of the law, provisions carrying legal intendments. The language has the effect of doing those things which are necessary to deal with the distribution and consumption of water, so as to get the water which has been allocated. If the bill mentions certain projects, its only purpose is to alert the Bureau of Reclamation that it must consider those proposals and make reports on them. What harm can the provision do to the upper and the lower basins? The provision has a beneficial purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator agree with me that the language of the provision is surplusage from a legal standpoint?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I do not think it is surplusage from a legal standpoint. I think it serves notice on the agency which is charged with the administration of the proposed act to be prepared to submit reports and to get ready for the future.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not a fact that this Congress cannot bind any future Congress?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. That is true of every provision in the bill that goes beyond this immediate Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that the point just made by the Senator from Colorado has some justification from experience in his own State. After all, the State of Colorado contributes more than 70 percent of the water of the Colorado River. By the compact it is entitled to 52 percent of the water allocated to the upper basin States. Under the projects listed in the bill, Colorado will get only a small fraction of the water, maybe as little as 15 percent. Colorado has a right to look forward to future utilization of the waters allocated by the compact.

We tried hard to meet the objections raised by the Senator from California. I did appreciate the point he raised. He made the point that this Congress could not bind any future Congress. He is making the point that we are trying to say that certain things should be done in the future. Because of the point made by the Senator from California, and because of the very fair and friendly way in which the point was raised, we went to the trouble of rewriting the whole section so as not to bind any future Congress. But we permitted the Senator from Colorado to go home and say, "I did not settle for the small amount of water now being given to Colorado."

We who are in the upper basin States recognize that our claims to the water come merely because of our geographical position, and not because of the water we contribute to the stream. My State receives a substantial percentage of the water—11 percent or so. Yet all we contribute is the water of the San Juan River, which is a tributary of the Colorado. I do not wish to commit myself, in case the Senator from Colorado and I get into an argument subsequently. But nearly every drop of water in the Colorado River rises in his great State, and the San Juan River flows across a corner of my State, giving New Mexico an opportunity to use it.

I say frankly to my friend, the Senator from California, that I supported this provision because I wanted the Senator from Colorado to believe that we felt that his State had rights in the matter, and that when the time came we wanted to see that his State received its rights. I say to the Senator from California that I recognize his position; but we went as far as we could go in meeting a valid objection he raised, at the same time recognizing the rights of the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for stating his

position, as well as that of the other members of the committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to labor this amendment; and so I intend to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, unless the distinguished Senator from Colorado wishes to ask a question at this time. If so, I now yield to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, it has already been pointed out that before any of the future participating areas can be recognized they must meet all sorts of tests, must cross all sorts of hurdles, and must be submitted to the other States for approval. If every project should become authorized we would still be within the water allocation made to the upper basin States.

I repeat what the Senator has said: Colorado contributes over 70 percent of the water of the stream. I say, not in a contemptuous sense, but as a matter of fact, that the State of California does not contribute a single drop of the water. I do not know exactly what importance that fact has, but it has something to do with the emphasis with which we explain these matters.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Colorado suggest that any of the States through which that magnificent stream runs contribute any water to it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply say that the State of California, which contributes the most complaint, contributes the least water; that is what I am saying.

I repeat that if there is constructed every participating project which possibly is thought of—every project which challenges the Bureau of Reclamation to produce facts and figures, in order to show its feasibility—if all of them are found feasible, if Congress approves their construction, and if all of them are constructed we shall still be using less water than the amount allocated to Colorado under the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not dispute that point, either. But I am pointing out that people who have lived and made their living in my State since the 1870's have been able to use the waters of the river which came from Colorado; and over the years the population of that area has grown, and the demands have increased. So, Mr. President, when on legal questions of interpretation the people of Colorado take one position, and the people I in part represent take another, is it any wonder that I have tried to reach a fair conclusion by saying, "Hold this up until the Supreme Court decides the controversy." That is what I have been urging throughout the hearings in committee and here in the Senate. But, again, that is a little far afield from the pending amendment.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions to be asked of me, I desire to yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California be so kind as to yield again to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, Mr. President; I yield once more to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish for a moment to deny to the people of the State of California any of the water they have been using in the past.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that is the position of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish to deny them the use of any of the water to which they have a legal right at present. However, I am as anxious to deny to them water which belongs to the upper basin States as the Senator from California is anxious to have the upper basin States prohibited from using water which he thinks belongs to the people of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat that I do not want my State to get either a drop less or a drop more of the water than the amount to which she is legally entitled.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further? It will take me only a minute.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If every point now before the Supreme Court of the United States is resolved adversely to our section, we in the upper basin still will have sufficient allocation of the water to be able to meet the needs of the various projects which are contemplated or authorized or given any status at all in the pending bill. If every issue under the present litigation is resolved against us, there will still be enough water in the apportionment to the upper basin to make it possible to meet the needs of all the projects which are covered by this bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be glad to yield, although I do not wish to be guilty of delaying the procedure. I have another amendment to submit, and, first, I wish to have the pending amendment disposed of.

However, I now yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, instead of asking a question, I shall speak in my own time, in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and I ask the Senate to adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 30 minutes under his control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to answer the argument submitted by my good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

We in New Mexico are interested in some of the water which has its source within Colorado.

At the beginning, I wish to say that I am 100 percent in favor of the enactment of Senate bill 500; but I am particularly interested in the water New Mexico should have, even though the amount be small.

I agree with the Senator from California that what California is entitled to, she should receive. But I do not want California or any other State to get one drop of water to which we in New Mexico are entitled and which we can use.

As I have said, I am 100 percent in favor of Senate bill 500, which provides for authorization of the Colorado River storage project, namely, dams known as Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho. Certain limitations on Curecanti and Juniper are provided in the bill. I feel that the Navaho Dam should be included so that the State of New Mexico can start deriving the benefit of the water to which it is entitled under the Upper Colorado River Compact. This dam is needed in order to regulate water for beneficial consumptive use. Until that is done, what the Senator from California has said is true, namely, the water will be going down the river, and California will get the use of the water.

There are also included a number of participating projects on which the water would be put to beneficial use. Construction of these participating projects would not be undertaken until the Secretary of Interior had reexamined to determine the economic justification of the projects, and had certified to the Congress that the benefits of such projects would exceed their cost.

Is there anything wrong with that? All the provision in question says is that if and when the Secretary of the Interior, be he a Democrat or a Republican, finds that those projects are feasible, they shall be included within the purview of the law we are now considering.

The bill also provides, with respect to the Navaho and San Juan projects in New Mexico, that in addition to the review by the Secretary of the Interior these projects must be submitted in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944. The only project which is included for complete authorization in New Mexico, therefore, is Navaho Dam, while the Small Hammond project and the Small Pine River extension would be authorized, subject to reexamination for justification. The Navaho and San Juan projects are included for the purpose of assuring that they may participate in the financial returns from the power revenues resulting from the large power dams.

An additional project of considerable importance to the northern part of New Mexico is the Animas-LaPlata project, which is not included in the bill because reports are not available from the Department of the Interior. But the water is there, within our sphere.

There are many Indians residing in the San Juan Basin. We all feel sorry for them when we have a little cold weather, or when a snowstorm comes; but when we try to do something in Congress for them, we are told California needs the water. The trouble with California, I will say to the minority leader, is that if we shed a tear in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, or Utah, Califor-

nia thinks it belongs to her. California wants all the water which belong to the upper Basin States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say for the RECORD that the Senator's statement is simply not correct. The State of California does not want any water to which it is not legally entitled under the terms of the compact. We recognize the fact that the upper Basin States are entitled to 7½ million acre-feet above Lee Ferry. We believe we are entitled to the same amount below Lee Ferry, divided among the lower Basin States. There is also a certain division of the surplus over that amount.

As my colleague pointed out, we do not want a single drop of water to which we are not legally entitled under the compact. We do not want to deprive the upper basin States of a single drop of water to which they are entitled. I submit that it is a gross libel and slander on the people of California to say that they are seeking to gain that which properly belongs to the upper-basin States. I have not injected myself into this discussion up to this moment, but I could not let the statement of the Senator from New Mexico go unchallenged.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is the way the Senator feels, why is he against the proposed legislation, which seeks to carry out the purposes of that compact?

The bill has as its ultimate purpose the carrying out of the compact to which the Senator from California refers. If the Senator feels as he has expressed himself, he should be for the bill and take his chances that the right thing will be done. Under the compact California will get its share, the other States will get their share, and we poor people in New Mexico will get our just share.

Let me say something else to the Senator from California, and see if he wishes to deny it. The junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] stated that the people of California have been using the water from the river since 1872. I can point, on the map, to the town of Blanco, in San Juan County, N. Mex., where water was used 50 years before that time. California wants that water too.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that, had the Senators from all the States, the upper and lower basin States, been as alert to the interests of the entire Colorado River Basin, both upper and lower, when the Mexican Treaty was before the Senate, both the upper and lower basin States would not have been in quite the serious difficulty in which they now are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will say to the Senator from California, on the question of alertness, that if at that time the Senators from New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming had been alert, when the original compact was made, we would not have been in the present difficulty. That was the original trouble. The irony of the situation is that the original compact was made at Santa Fe, N. Mex. However, neither Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, nor New Mexico stood up against California. The only State which stood up against California at that time was the State of Arizona, and because she did, she was able to protect rights to which she was entitled.

There are many white people in northern New Mexico who are barely eking out an existence by subsistence farming. Supplemental water in that area will improve their means of livelihood. With the additional water supply to irrigated land which can be obtained through the upper Colorado River development program, the pressure on grazing lands can be reduced, and the destruction of those lands prevented. New Mexico has had an increase in population in recent years, and the cities and towns are finding it difficult to obtain adequate municipal and domestic water supplies. Many fine people from California are now in that particular area looking for gas, oil, uranium, and other minerals which the area furnishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we in New Mexico feel that in order to progress, the proposed projects must be completed, which will enable us to increase our usable water supply. In terms of water quantities, the amount is not great, as measured by the supplies of other States in the Union. We are thinking of using all possible water from our allotment of about 838,000 acre-feet. Actually the amount which would be used by the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects would be in the neighborhood of 600,000 acre-feet annually, and the benefits would be very great.

So far as our water is concerned, we feel as Daniel Webster felt in the famous Dartmouth College case. New Mexico is small, but we love her.

The projects to which I am referring in this area are the San Juan-Chama, the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects, the Animas-La Plata, and the Navaho.

On the San Juan River, at approximately the place I now indicate on the map, is the town of Blanco, which has existed for more than 100 years. An overflow of people from the fine State represented in part by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] came there as early as 1872 and settled in that valley. They are using only 18 per cent of the water they are entitled to use. Why? Because the lower basin States never would allow a project to be built; and so long as the project was not built in that area, or in the area of the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the water ran down the river.

We all know the law relating to the waters of the West. Usage results in the accrual of rights. One of these days it will be said that we can use that water, even if California is legally and morally right, because we have been using it for so many years, and they have not. Even Mexico may raise the same question. Even Mexico may acquire some accrued rights unless we take some action.

In the interest of humanity and in the interest of protecting the rights of every State in the Union, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from California will be rejected, and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to yield myself 1 minute. Then I shall yield back the remainder of the time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, when the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was speaking, he raised a question about the amount of water which was to be used. I thought the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had pointed out very clearly that if all of the comprehensive storage projects, including the participating projects in the upper Colorado Basin were built, it would not result in the use of more than two-thirds of the water allocated under the 1922 compact to the upper basin States. That fact should be made abundantly clear, so that there will be no doubt whatever as to the situation that exists.

If we strike section 2 from the bill, it will have the effect of leaving the impression that Congress intends the opposite to what the bill reported by the committee intends, namely, that Congress does not intend to have the Bureau of Reclamation go ahead with its preparation of the necessary data and engineering studies. It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire time only to say that the position of the committee must be one of opposition to the pending amendment.

Again I say that we took the suggestion of the junior Senator from California and adopted it so far as we could and tried to make out of it the most we could. However, we did feel that we had to protect the position of States like Colorado. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I, too, yield back the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 14, beginning with the word "available", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. When the Hoover Dam legislation was adopted, Congress provided that revenues after repayment, should be utilized for the entire Colorado River Basin. There is nothing unfair about that. When the Parker Dam legislation was adopted by Congress and when the Davis Dam legislation was adopted by Congress, it was provided in each case that the revenues, after repayment, should be placed in the Treasury of the United States. There is nothing wrong about that.

The bill before the Senate provides that the revenues, after repayment of the Colorado River storage project costs, shall be utilized exclusively for the benefit of the upper basin. There we have a distinction made which to me is unfortunate.

In the three pieces of legislation to which I have referred, revenues after repayment were not sequestered for one State or for only half of the Colorado River Basin. Provision was made that the revenues be utilized for the benefit of all the States in the basin. In the case of the Parker and Davis Dams, it was provided that the revenues be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

My only desire, therefore, is to have my friends, the authors of this bill, consider adopting the same type of yardstick in this proposed legislation that was adopted in the others.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from California brought this up in the committee, and his statement was as fair there as it is here, but it is difficult to study all the other legislation proposed and to decide in a few minutes what should be done with it. As I understand the Senator's statement, he is trying to equalize the situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does he not propose to strike out the word "upper", have the amendment sent to the House, and in that way try to deal with it before final action is taken?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would have to consult with the ranking minority member of the committee, but I assume that he would not be averse to some such amendment as that, with some clear understanding that the idea is to amend the Parker Dam Act and the Boulder Canyon Act, and then try to bring them into conformity.

If the Senator from Colorado is agreeable to that, and the Senator from California is agreeable to striking the word "upper," I realize that he has a valid point. It is not fair to take the revenues from Boulder Dam and apply them all up and down the basin, and take the revenues from the other dams and apply them only to the upper States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from California have recognized what I, too, think is a basic lack of reciprocity between the upper basin States and the lower basin States so far as handling the revenues to which reference is made are concerned.

I think it would be unfair for the upper basin States, getting revenue from Boulder Dam, to keep all their own revenues. I believe they should be separated. I believe the lower basin States should be allowed to keep their own revenues and we will keep our revenues.

What is the best way to do that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be agreeable, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, to take the amendment to conference with the understanding that we will try to work it out, provided the Senator from California limits it to striking the word "upper."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be so changed; and I would accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that he will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think the attitude taken by the distinguished Senators from New Mexico and Colorado, as well as by my colleague from California, is very sound. As I understand, what they are seeking to do is by amendment to get the matter into conference, so that the question of handling the funds may be determined on an equitable basis. If the funds derived from the Hoover Dam, the Davis Dam, and the other dams in the lower basin now go to the entire basin account, then all other funds should be allocated in the same way. If they are to be handled on an upper basin-lower basin basis, possibly that would be the right solution. But I agree that, under the circumstances, we should either have the policy established that they all go to the entire basin account, or there should be an equitable adjustment so that the funds from the lower basin would go to the lower basin account and that the funds from the upper basin should go to the upper basin account. But we should not use one yardstick for the lower basin and another yardstick for the upper basin.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think what we are talking about specifically is what to do with the revenues from Boulder Canyon, because that is the only project in the lower basin which, as I understand, makes a special allocation of all its revenues to the whole basin. Therefore, I should like to be very sure that the RECORD states exactly what we have in mind. I think it is entirely clear that we are asking that the revenues from the upper basin be made available to the upper basin projects and the funds from Boulder Canyon be dedicated to the lower basin. If that is the case, I support an amendment of that kind. I wish to make it very clear, however, that when the bill goes to conference we shall not lose the point, because it is a very important matter to the upper basin States. It is a most important matter, and there should come back from conference something along the line we have indicated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to yield this point, either. I realize that the Senator from California has put his finger on a question which should be considered. It is in that spirit that I suggested that the amendment be taken to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The matter will be in conference in the form in which we have discussed it. I do not wish to yield something which is now in the bill for a conjecture that something like it may come back from conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say to the Senator that I do not know who the conferees will be. I do not know whether the House will pass the bill. All I can pledge is my best effort to see that it will be presented in conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This is a very important matter to the upper basin States, for the reason that there are many projects in the bill which, at best, will not come into being for many, many years to come, and it is recognized that the proceeds from power in the upper basin States have to contribute to these projects. What I am trying to arrive at, in my own mind, is how we can be certain that there will be brought back from conference a bill which will contain terms such as those which have been discussed.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from California will yield to me again, I should like to point out to him that the people of the lower basin States are as anxious to modify it as we are, because Hoover Dam will be paid off in approximately 30 years, whereas some of the others will be paid off in 80 years. If by some strange working of fate the bill should not come back from conference, then I think the Secretary of the Interior would promptly suggest a bill dealing specifically with the subject.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield, first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I rise to ask a question of both the Senator from California and the Senator from New Mexico. When this matter was discussed in committee it was my understanding that the proposal was made that the Boulder Canyon Project Act could be amended so as to be in con-

formity with the provisions of this bill. The question I should like to ask is this: If we adopt the suggestion made by the junior Senator from New Mexico will that open the door so that in conference we can amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act and put the same provisions into it for the lower basin States as this bill has for the upper basin States?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall first say, so that there will be no question in the minds of any Senators as to my position on the matter, that I shall oppose the bill. I am going to ask the Senate to reject it. I hope the Senate may take that position.

Meanwhile, however, I do not think I am inconsistent in suggesting on the floor, as I did in committee, some amendments which I offer in good faith and which I believe to be reasonable. I welcome the acceptance by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] of a theory that all these projects should be treated equally with respect to revenues after repayment of construction costs.

I should be quite agreeable in this instance to the recommendation which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico, in which the Senator from Colorado joins, to have the matter taken to conference, if there shall be a conference, and to endeavor in conference to bring into accord the present distinctions in treatment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from California that the difficulty was that when an attempt was made to draft a simple amendment, it was found that it was not quite so easy to do. When we tried to adapt the Boulder Canyon Act, that was not so difficult. All that was necessary to be done was to insert the word "Lower" before the words "Colorado River Basin." But it was necessary to deal, as well, with Davis Dam and Parker Dam, and that involved some commitments. It looked like a very difficult situation to handle.

I thought it would be wise to ask the counsel of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to study the problem and to submit language which would deal with the whole matter properly.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I am entirely in accord with the theory which is sought to be adopted for both the upper and lower basins.

The question which has arisen in my mind is, Will the situation be confused more by this amendment, making the revenues available to both the upper and lower basins, rather than by opening the door whereby an amendment to the Boulder Canyon Act, including Parker and Davis Dams, could be adopted at a later date? If the Senator can give assurance that we will not get into a worse position, rather than a better position, I shall certainly agree to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot give an absolute assurance. All I can give is assurance that we shall do the best we can.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment relates directly to the matter of income from the project after all payments to the United States for the cost of construction have been made.

I did not understand the language the Senator had offered. Has he a copy of the amendment, so that I can compare it with the language of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have modified my amendment, at the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, so as to strike out the word "upper."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withdraw the preceding part of his amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the amendment would be on page 10, line 12, as follows:

> After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that the provision as the Senator from California would amend it?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is.

Mr. WATKINS. All that is done is to strike out the word "upper." Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I desired to have the record clear about that. In accordance with the parliamentary situation, it is necessary to take some action on the amendment. It cannot be left to some future arrangement. The provision must be amended now; it cannot be amended later.

I have no objection to the theory, if this is the best way to handle the matter. I agree that the money which is derived from the lower basin projects should be used in the lower basin; and that the money which is received from upper basin projects should be used in the upper basin. I do not think there should be any commingling of funds. We in the upper basin will have our developments under way when the lower basin has accomplished most of its developments. So there should be a complete separation of the funds.

I do not object to the amendment as it is drawn. If some other wording is necessary, it can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from California.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated J. 61286 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "Echo Park."

On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out ", Navajo and Echo Park" and insert in lieu thereof "and Navajo."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering en bloc the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On these amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second, according to the result of the last call of the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How many Senators did the Chair count?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a sufficient second for the request for the yeas and nays will require the approval of 18 Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the amendment at great length today, because yesterday both sides of this issue had considerable—I might say ample—time to discuss the merits of the question.

Briefly, the amendment provides only that the Echo Park feature of the proposed upper Colorado River project shall be deleted. In the upper Colorado project there are 39 separate units, including 6 proposed storage dams. My amendment would eliminate authorization for one of the storage dams, that at Echo Park.

The reason for the amendment is simple. The Echo Park Dam would flood a substantial portion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

For nearly half a century it has been the basic policy of this Government that the national park system shall be free of commercial development, whether by the United States Government or by private corporations. That policy has been adhered to without deviation. If the Echo Park project is authorized, that policy will have been breached.

There are now pending in various parts of the country no fewer than 16 requests that commercial activity be authorized in various national parks or monuments. The lumbermen want to log some of the great pine and spruce

rain forests in Olympic National Park. Some persons desire to construct dams in the Glacier View region of Glacier National Park. Some persons want to divert portions of the Great Yellowstone Lake for irrigation.

If the basic principles governing our national park system are violated at the Echo Park site, these other groups will have equally compelling reasons to seek diversion of water from Yellowstone, to construct a dam in Glacier Park, or to engage in the logging and cutting of forests in Olympic National Park.

The Government cannot say to one group, "You can breach national park system doctrine in the Dinosaur National Monument," but to another group, "You have to obey that doctrine in Olympic National Park or Yellowstone National Park."

The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], capable and brilliant as he always is, pointed out this morning, with the aid of photographs, that the inundation of Dinosaur Monument might actually enhance its beauty. I do not think there is in this country a single national park or monument whose scenery or grandeur would be enhanced by having it converted into a lake or reservoir.

Furthermore, let me say it is a basic policy of the national park system that the area in a park shall be unimpaired. Let me also say that such an area is not going to be unimpaired if it is flooded out.

Whether a great reservoir would make a place more beautiful or not might be open to debate. I do not happen to think that a reservoir would add to the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument any more than it added to the beauty of Hetch Hetchy in California, which was the subject of much controversy in the days of Governor Pinchot and John Muir and other great conservationists and naturalists.

It is possible that some persons might think that the beauty of a place is enhanced when four-lane highways, reservoirs, and golf courses are constructed. We might even eliminate the squirrels on those golf courses. But there are others who believe that there are areas—and they are comparatively small in size and number—that ought to be kept as nearly as possible as nature formed them before the white man came to this country and exploited so much of it.

I think that is the basic issue at Echo Park.

Before I conclude this brief opening portion of my argument, I wish to point out there has been a great deal of discussion about the legal question involved. In 1938, when the President of the United States proclaimed the Dinosaur National Monument, he referred only to a distant site, not Echo Park, but to the so-called Browns Park Reservoir, in the reservation, about which there has been so much discussion.

Mr. President, the basic issue at stake is not a legal one; it is one of conservation. Surely there is no doubt of the fact that the Congress of the United States has the right and the authority to change policy regarding a national park or a national monument. But, Mr. President, the people of this country for years to come will never forgive this Congress if it permits, for the first time in history, the breaching of the boundaries of our park system with this sort of commercial development.

In conclusion, I wish to say, that I am a supporter of the upper Colorado storage project. The distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who made such a profound and convincing argument for the project, knows well that I am a supporter of the project. There are among the conservation groups, for whom I have the privilege to speak today, however incapable or unworthy I am of being their spokesman, some who wanted me to oppose the entire project. I declined to do that, because I believe that the intermountain West needs water, needs power, and needs this general kind of development.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should merely like to state that those of us who are highly interested in the bill appreciate very much the fact that while the Senator from Oregon has opposed a portion of the bill, he has stated, very forthrightly, his general position in support of the development of reclamation projects in the West. I did not want the opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very kind remarks.

Mr. President, I am merely asking that one of the six storage reservoirs be deleted from the authorization contemplated by the bill. I ask that the bill, if it should pass and go to the House of Representatives be so amended as to eliminate the Echo Park authorization, and then perhaps, either in the House, or in the House committee, or in the conference committee, some alternative site can be provided which will furnish equal storage, or nearly as much storage, but which will not breach established policy or invade either a national park or national monument.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is advised that he has used 8 minutes of the time allotted to him, and has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is necessary in this discussion to get back to fundamentals. To have any kind of reclamation project, there must first be water, and in the intermountain area, where snow falls on high mountains and melts and runs down steep canyons for long distances until finally the waters flow into the ocean, it is necessary to have storage facilities to hold the water until it is needed.

I have gone over this matter before, but it cannot be emphasized too strongly in this debate. I should like to point out that the map which stands at the rear of the chamber is a general picturization of the area where are to be located the various dams which we claim are necessary to store the water which belongs to us under the Colorado compact, and which also would make it possible for us to fulfill the commitments to the lower basin States under the 1922 Colorado River compact.

I was asked this question a while ago by a Member of the Senate: Why do we need these big dams? Glen Canyon is the number one storage dam for water. We have to store water because, as I have pointed out, we have to supply the lower basin States with water for consumptive use, according to the compact; and it is necessary for us to take water from the tributaries of the Colorado—from the Green, the Yampa, and the other streams of the upper basin—so that we can have water for the use of our towns and for industries, because the snow which falls in the wintertime melts in the spring, and it is necessary to have these storage dams or reservoirs, to keep the water from flowing to the sea and being lost forever.

The No. 1 storage dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the Glen Canyon Dam. The No. 2 dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the one at the Echo Park site. It has been recognized as being one of the best locations for the storage of water and the development of power; that has been recognized from the earliest days, from the time of the making of the first studies by the Army engineers and others. For many years a continuous study of the entire area has been made. The Echo Park reservoir is second in efficiency because it has room for a large quantity of water; and it is a deep canyon, where evaporation does not occur at the rate at which it does in shallow reservoirs. Echo Park is not only beneficial from those points of view, but it is also strategically located, so that when the second use of the reservoir is made—that is to say, the production of power—it is located in such a way that the power can go into one of the great power markets on the eastern slope of the Colorado, and also to the power markets on the western slope. It is not quite so close to Salt Lake City as it is to Denver; but it is located in such way that it will take care of the Salt Lake City situation, as well.

In the operation of this project it will be necessary to have the other dams constructed—namely, the Flaming Gorge, which is shown by the cross-hatched area indicated on the map in pink; and the Cross Mountain, now known as the Juniper project, which I now point to on the map, just east of Echo Park; also the Split Mountain, which is just below Echo Park. Echo Park will help make all the other reservoirs become much more efficient. Echo Park will be used to supply the peak demands for power. It has a large volume of water which can be turned on immediately, to respond to the heavy demands when the power load is at its peak. For that reason, it will help the other projects and make the whole arrangement much more feasible than it otherwise would be.

The program contemplates the construction of transmission lines from Glen Canyon to Echo Park; and, of course, there will be transmission lines

to the marketing centers, where the power will be marketed.

As I have stated, the first requirement in our area is water. Power is worthless to us unless we have water. Of course, we could develop power by means of the use of coal, although at greater expense—approximately 7 or 7½ mills—and perhaps in the future we could develop power from uranium, although no one knows what that prospect amounts to. At any rate, such power will not be cheaper than the self-renewable source of hydroelectric energy. The principal point is that there is no substitute for water.

So, Mr. President, by means of this project, we shall accomplish two purposes. First, we shall be able to develop the necessary water; and, second, from the same program we shall be able to develop power at no extra cost to the people of the upper Basin States or to the people of the United States, who will loan us the money, to be repaid over a period of 50 years, for each of the projects.

I have made this explanation several times to the Senate, but on previous occasions a smaller number of Senators were present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me? I should like to ask a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. In the event the provision for the Echo Park site is eliminated from the bill, will not it place in doubt the development of the irrigation projects in Wyoming, at the points marked on the map—at LaBarge, at Seedskadee, and at Lyman—for the reason that it will be extremely difficult, except in years when there is an abundance of rainfall, to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry?

Mr. WATKINS. Not only will it be extremely difficult to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry, but it will be difficult to fulfill the commitments for the central Utah project.

It is also contemplated that in the comprehensive program, water may be pumped directly from Echo Park, to take the place of other water which will be taken in the Uinta Mountains, in Utah, in connection with the Utah program.

At this time, Mr. President, I should like to discuss other phases of the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have received a great many letters from residents of my State who are very much concerned because they fear that the enactment of this bill will result in destroying one of the great national monuments of the country, which includes deposits of dinosaur bones, coming from centuries ago. I have been told by the Senator from Utah and by other Senators that the dinosaur relics are below the Echo Park site, and that the Echo Park site really was not a part of the original national monument which was established for the purpose of protecting the deposits of dinosaur bones. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from New Jersey is entirely correct. I shall now indicate on another map just how that is.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I have received many letters to the effect that if I vote for this bill, I shall be voting for the destruction of one of the great natural wonders of the world. I believe it is not clear to the public that, in the first place, this site is not a national park, but is a national monument, and originally comprised only 80 acres, although now it includes approximately 200,000 acres, and that the part we wish to preserve as a monument will be entirely outside the area to be inundated by this reservoir, so far as concerns covering with water the area in which these relics are located.

Mr. WATKINS. As regards the location of the dinosaur bones, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam will not in any sense of the word inundate any of the area where the Dinosaur Monument was originally created.

Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is to be found a pamphlet, entitled "The Colorado River News." It has been published by the citizens of the upper basin States. The pamphlet includes a map which is outlined in red.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Utah has expired. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is under control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire how much more time the Senator from Utah wishes to have.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall need to have at least 15 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already had 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator from Utah to say that he desired to have an additional 15 minutes, and I have yielded that much additional time to him. Does he desire to have more time?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I shall need more time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much more time does the Senator from Utah think he will need?

Mr. WATKINS. I may need 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah all the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has yielded to the Senator from Utah, the remaining time, namely, 20 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to examine the folder to which I have referred, including the map which gives the key. First, let us see where the original national monument was. By examining the lower lefthand corner, Senators will find that the area of the original Monument was 80 acres. It is supposed to be shown in white on the map, although it has been somewhat smeared in the course of printing; but it is a little tract with an arrow pointing to it. That was the original Dinosaur Monument, created in 1915 by President Woodrow Wilson; that was done under the Antiquities Act, under which the dinosaur bones discovered in this area have been protected. Many of the bones have been excavated, but some still remain there.

In 1938, the Monument was expanded by a proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to include more than 200,000 acres. The Monument was thus increased in size some 2,500 times, without any additional evidence of any kind that there were in the additional area more prehistoric bones or other antiquities to be taken care of.

I am not quarreling with that, because I think it was a good idea to go through with the program they had in mind at that time. My only objection is that they are trying to get away from the program which was announced in those early times.

It will be noted that the area in black covers all the area in dispute here with respect to Echo Park. The river bottom and the sides of the canyon had all been reserved in prior withdrawals, a long time before 1938, when President Roosevelt issued his Dinosaur proclamation. Those withdrawals are now in full force and effect. I submitted the documents in my speech of March 28, when I gave a complete documentation of the various steps which were taken in the creation of this monument and in its expansion, and also the interpretations made by competent officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States.

So all this area in black, which takes in the entire river area, is a reserved area. There was a reclamation withdrawal in the North, called Browns Park. That is at the top of the map, looking north. That is not in dispute. Even the conservationists admit that that was actually reserved. But what they overlooked for a long time was the fact that all the other area had been reserved, and that the reservations were still valid, legal, subsisting reservations. I submitted the documents at that time. It required an hour and a half to go through that speech, and I know I shall not be able to crowd that presentation into 30 minutes at this time, so I shall not attempt to do so.

I point out, however, that the people of the State of Colorado and the people of the State of Utah are vitally interested in this question, and they were at the time. They were not asleep. They were not allowing the expansion of the monument to take place without finding out what was going to happen, and the program which was intended.

In 1936, some time before the proclamation of President Roosevelt was actually entered, the late Senator King, of Utah, who was a Member of the Senate for many years, wrote a letter to the Department of the Interior in which he said:

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of a letter under date of January 22 from Gov.

Henry H. Blood, of Utah, in which attention is called to a matter of great importance to the State. He refers to studies which have been made of lands along the Colorado and Green Rivers in Utah with a view to their possible development as national monuments or national parks, and he suggests that these areas possess latent possibilities as sites for reservoir development, irrigation and other purposes; also that there are mineral resources which are susceptible of development. The Governor states that unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc., and the right to locate and develop mineral resources might be denied to the State or to individuals.

I shall be glad if this matter may receive your attention. Certainly the State ought not to be deprived of the benefits which may result in the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River for power or irrigation purposes nor the right to the mineral wealth within the area referred to and locked up within areas within the boundaries of monuments which may be established, or public parks which may be created.

I am advising the Governor that I have brought this matter to your attention and stated to him that as soon as I heard from you I would further advise him.

I shall be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. KING.

So the people of the area were vitally interested in this question. They were told, when the proposal for the expansoin of the original Dinosaur Monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres was advanced, that they would have the right to build reservoirs and develop the reclamation possibilities. They were told that such rights would be preserved. They were also given assurance that they would be permitted to continue grazing in the area. It takes in a great deal of territory. They were led to believe that that question had already been taken care of.

I will say, to the credit of President Rooseevelt, Secretary Ickes, and Mr. Demaray, the acting director of the National Park Service at that time, that in my opinion they carried out, to the letter, a sort of gentlemen's agreement which was entered into with respect to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres.

Mr. Demaray wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission on August 9, 1934, on this subject. In that letter he said:

Gentlemen, we are studying the possibility of setting aside certain lands in northwestern Colorado as a national monument. The area considered is within the watershed shown on the map marked exhibit H (a), which accompanied an application of January 30, 1932, of the Utah Power & Light Co., for a preliminary permit, and which is on file in the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau. The proposed monument would be affected by the Echo Park Dam site and the Blue Canyon Dam site, as indicated on the enclosed map of the proposed monument.

With that letter he enclosed a map.

Continuing to read from Mr. Demaray's letter:

Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is of course an existing right.

I wish Senators to keep in mind that language:

I continue to read from the letter of Mr. Demaray:

However, we feel that we should call this to your attention. If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration.

I read the concluding paragraph:

If you have any data or reports on this area, we would appreciate very much receiving copies.

Very truly yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Director.

In reply to that letter, Mr. McNinch, the head of the Federal Power Commission said:

This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In another portion of the letter he said:

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power posibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1,500,000 to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme.

He had been asked if he could cancel out the power withdrawals.

The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I now come to President Roosevelt's proclamation. I have just quoted language from Mr. Demaray, and his reference to existing rights.

The proclamation is dated July 14, 1938. This was carrying out the understanding among Mr. McNinch, of the Federal Power Commission, Senator King, Governor Blood, and the people in the Uintah Basin area. Incidentally, that is where I resided for many years. I know that area very well. The people there had the understanding that they were fully protected. The people of western Colorado had the same understanding, because meetings had been held with them by park representatives, who told the story, and told what it was hoped to accomplish.

Let us examine the language of the proclamation, which was signed July 14, 1938, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah:

Whereas certain public lands contiguous to the Dinosaur National Monument established by proclamation of October 4, 1915—

That is the Wilson proclamation on the 80 acres—

have situated thereon various objects of historic and scientific interest; and

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the said Dinosaur National Monument;

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906 (ch. 3060, 34 Stat. 225 U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument: * * * aggregating 203,885 acres.

The Acting Director, Mr. Demaray, himself said that all existing rights would be protected and would be subject to existing reservations. Of course a water-power withdrawal is an existing right.

In a letter written by the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission he lists 10 power withdrawals in addition to the Browns Park withdrawal. I shall not read all of the letter. It was included in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on the 28th of March, and the RECORD is available to the Members of the Senate.

Along with that letter the Chairman enclosed a map. I have had that map blown up to show the situation. It shows the location of the lands in question.

I point to the map to indicate the location of the original site of the 80 acres mentioned in the Woodrow Wilson proclamation of 1915, when the Dinosaur National Monument was created. The blue sections of the map, of course, indicate the river. I point to the Green River, a tributary of the Colorado, and also to the Yampa River.

The area marked in orange shows the area that was withdrawn in this power withdrawal. There would seem to be some overlapping, but practically the entire area was withdrawn prior to 1924.

In the letter he makes the statement that the status is the same as it was in 1938, and that the existing rights are still in good standing. That statement is contained in the letter to which I have referred.

That is the situation, Mr. President. We feel a little bit put out by our good friends, the conservationists, who contend, in effect, that we are trying to

invade the parks. Incidentally, I am just as good a conversationalist as they are—did I say "conversationalist"? If I did, that is a rather good description of them. They are not only good in conversation, but also in correspondence, I might say. They have the mistaken notion that we would invade their territory. The fact is that the people in the area resent the invasion by them of the water withdrawal area and the power withdrawal area. We believe those reservations should be respected. They were made pursuant to an order, and they are still there.

Mr. Demaray wanted to get them out of the way. Mr. Ickes wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission and asked if it were possible to have them excluded. The Federal Power Commission stood its ground and said these places were too important for power and water development purposes, and therefore it refused.

President Roosevelt, in his proclamation, refers to the valid existing rights, and then describes the lands in Colorado and Utah, by providing:

Do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

When he reserved the lands from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, he excluded homesteading and that sort of thing.

Without reading the whole proclamation, particularly the portions dealing with the description, I come to the following:

The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the temporary withdrawal for classification and for other purposes made by Executive Order No. 5684 of August 12, 1931, and the Executive order of April 17, 1926, and the Executive order of September 8, 1933, creating Water Reserves No. 107 and No. 152.

They are not involved at all in this matter.

I continue with the Roosevelt proclamation:

The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916—

The proclamation cites the statute—

except that this reservation—

That is, the reservation reserving all this area as a monument—

shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project.

There is a specific reference to the language used by Mr. McNinch in his letter when he said he had no objection, if the operations of the Federal Water Power Act would be permitted to be carried on.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I have only 2 or 3 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission support the view of Mr. McNinch?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; he does. I received a letter from the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in which he said these lands were all in the withdrawal status and were in good standing at the present time, and valid.

Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to discuss, in the few minutes left to me, all the matters that ought to be called to the attention of the Senate. If Senators will read the speech I made on the subject they will find a clarification of all those points.

The Roosevelt proclamation was issued in 1938. A year later, Mr. Margold, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior at the time of the issuance of the Roosevelt proclamation, was called upon to interpret the power of the President to create a national monument subject to other uses. Mr. Margold held that the President did have the right to create a national monument. The question came up with respect to a monument in the Boise area, namely, the Boise National Forest. There, too, power and water withdrawals had been made.

The question was whether the President could issue a proclamation establishing a monument subservient to the dominant use by the water program. He held the President could do so. This is a specific opinion in point.

He was asked the additional question whether the Federal Power Commission had the power to issue licenses. He said it did not.

The conservationists have taken that statement to mean that that gave the President the power to cancel out everything, because the commission did not have any power to issue licenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from Utah is permitted to speak for an additional 5 minutes, will the proponents of the amendment be granted an additional 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate agrees to such a request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of additional time be allowed, and that the time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, be equally divided between the opponents and proponents.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an appointment to speak in New York this evening. We are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. I should like to vote on this measure. Therefore I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

The time on the other side is under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it would be a tragedy if a power dam were constructed in the magnificent Dinosaur National Monument at Echo Park. We must not despoil this wonderful handiwork of nature.

After listening this afternoon to the debate on the pending amendment, which I hope will carry, I should like to refer to the witnesses who appeared before our committee urging that the committee delete Echo Park as one of the storage unit dam sites.

It will be recalled that the bill in its original form called for the construction of but two storage units. They have now been increased to six. Among those who appeared to urge the committee to delete Echo Park were many representatives of the great conservation organizations of the country. One of the organizations that appeared through a representative was the Izaak Walton League of America, whose reputation for sound conservation principles is known in all the States of the Union. It was vigorously opposed to the Echo Park Dam site. Opposition was registered also by the Sierra Club and the National Parks Association, and many other conservation groups across the country.

A distinguished American who bears a distinguished name, Ulysses S. Grant III, testified at length against the proposed desecration of that magnificent beauty which is one of the joys of all the people of this country.

I am going to read a paragraph from this morning's New York Times' editorial.

Says the New York Times:

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 1 further minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I read, Mr. President:

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the national park system, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowing filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO PARK DAM

With the speed that bears evidence of political maneuvering the Senate has suddenly taken up the administration's billion-dollar upper Colorado Basin storage and power project containing authorization for the bitterly controversial Echo Park Dam. It is difficult to believe the Senate can be cajoled into voting for a measure that could pave the way for the destruction of the National Park System.

The entire upper Colorado scheme itself should be subjected to severe analysis and questioning. The plan involves construction over the next half century or so of a number of water storage, power, and irrigation projects in eastern Utah, western Colorado, and neighboring areas. The first phase of it is to cost over a billion dollars, with sums of untold magnitude yet to come. Quite apart from the governmental propensity for underestimating costs, the entire economic basis for this scheme has been cogently attacked as unsound. It has been shown by such authorities as former Governor Miller of Wyoming that power to be produced at the Echo Park site, for instance, will cost $883 a kilowatt, while power produced by steam-electric plants in the same area costs less than $170 a kilowatt. The potentialities of cheap atomic power development have, of course, not yet been scratched. So far as the irrigation aspects are concerned, the estimated costs range from a few hundred dollars to a thousand or two per acre. There are far cheaper ways to increase our agricultural surpluses, if we insist on doing so.

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the National Park System, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowly filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not wish time to be granted to me under false pretenses. I am still not quite clear in my own mind. I wish to ask some questions. I am predisposed to the amendment which the Senator from Oregon has offered.

Let me say, first, that I feel convinced as to the rights involved in the matter. I am convinced that the proponents of the dam have rights. I am not at all disposed to grant that this region is going to be beautified by the projects for which the bill provides. Lake Mead, which is situated near a large town, has a sandy bathing beach. This region is not so accessible, and the beauty of the canyon will be diminished when the stored water covers the lower part of it and there remains what is between the water level and the top. So far as its beauty is concerned I do not get any thrill from the photographs showing what the canyon will be like when the water level is raised. That canyon floor is beautiful. I happen to be a lover of canyon floors. I raise the question in my own mind as to how many conservationists or other persons will visit it. Two a month? One hundred a month? Two thousand in a year? I do not know. But I do not look with pleasure and satisfaction on seeing that floor inundated.

It is being advertised. This debate advertises that canyon floor and those steep walls, Steamboat Rock, and the other natural features.

In looking over the storage units, it would appear from a hasty and unprofessional examination that of the various storage reservoirs indicated, 1 or 2 more might replace, certainly in order of priority, the Glen Canyon Dam. It is a matter of regret that the arguments, pro and con, have been focused on that dam. I should like to see the Glen Canyon site left as it is and then find out whether many people in the United States really want to visit it and see it. If they do not, let us build a dam there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes remain.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on some of the arguments made to justify the Echo Park proposal.

To begin with, I think it is quite significant that in the proclamation of President Roosevelt in 1938 the only reservoir site referred to is Brown's Park, which is on the extreme northern end of the monument. It is vastly different from the proposed Echo Park reservoir, both as to size and through its impact on the scenery of the monument.

I should like to say, with reference to the inquiry concerning the dinosaur bones, that there is no issue as to the bones, and the distinguished Senator from Utah knows that to be so. President Wilson set aside an area of 80 acres in 1915, to take care of dinosaur relics. This project has no relation to dinosaur bones. That was merely a name. The question now is based on scenery, grandeur, and outdoor majesty. That is what is threatened by this proposed project—no more, no less.

No mention whatever was made of Solicitor Margold's opinion rendered shortly after the monument was expanded to its present size. He said:

Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Federal Power Commission by specific provision in the National Monument proclamation would be ineffective, since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character.

If the argument is valid that filling up this magnificent canyon—which is now in its natural state—with a reservoir will enhance its scenic beauty, then every single river canyon in every national park or national monument in this country is imperiled by being filled up with water. If this argument is valid, then why not build dams in Glacier National Park? The issue is quite as valid at Glacier Park so far as anything enhancing scenic beauty is concerned. Why not decide that a reservoir would add to the wonders of Glacier Park? The theory is the same.

The distinguished Senator from Utah made some mention of grazing, because grazing is allowed in the monument. In practically every national park, grazing is permitted because of the grandfather rights which inhere in the people who had ranches there before boundaries were created. In this respect I might mention Grand Teton, Bryce Canyon, Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, and Grand Canyon National Monument. In all those places grazing has continued. But that is no argument for the Echo Park Dam.

Those rights had to be extended, because the people had been on the land prior to the establishment of the monument or the park. Their rights continued so long as they or those directly associated with them should live.

Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the population of the country increases and as the real income per capita increases, there will be, of course, an even more rapid increase in the demand for recreation. Already our national parks are overused and overrun. It is vitally necessary to build up new places to which people may go to be revived in spirit and recharged with energy. The question is, What kind of recreational areas are needed? There can, of course, be lakes—and I may say that I think Lake Mead behind Boulder Dam was an addition to the recreational facilities of that region.

But certainly there should be also wild places and deep canyons where man may acquire some humility and see how little he is in comparison with the great works of nature, and so that his mind may go back into the enormous stretches of time which have gone into the making of the earth and the development of life on the earth. That is an experience which we all need and particularly city people.

It would be a very tepid United States if all the streams were dammed and if everything were reduced to a series of placid lakes. At times we should feel that nature is tough, that nature is awe-inspiring.

That is why I think we should maintain the Dinosaur National Monument, rather than dam it and create another lake.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall not take all the 9 minutes.

The basic issue in the amendment resolves itself into a single question: Does Congress and in this particular instance the Senate, wish to authorize the construction of a commercial power and irrigation project within the borders of a national park or monument? This has never taken place in the entire history

of the National Park System since its establishment.

If this amendment shall be defeated today, I presume that the Senate will then proceed to take that step. I believe it will be a backward step. I believe it will be a backward step for recreation, for scenic and esthetic values, and for other similar areas throughout the Nation.

As I said yesterday, there exist in other places in the United States—in the Olympia peninsula, in Glacier National Park, in Yellowstone Park—similar pressures by persons who want to cut trees, who want to divert lakes, or who want to dam rivers, to have this sort of commercial development, either by the Federal Government or by private industry, take place within a national park or a national monument.

In this respect, I completely agree with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], even though he knows we are not entirely in agreement upon the project as a whole—he opposes it; I support it—that there should be some inviolate areas in the United States where the basic word of our national park system continues to prevail—and that word is unimpaired. If the Dinosaur National Monument is flooded, it will no longer be unimpaired. That is clearly evident.

I conceive the basic issue today to be the integrity of our national monument system. A national monument is a basic part of the national park system. It is true that a national monument is established only by Presidential proclamation or Executive order, whereas a national park is established by act of Congress. Nevertheless, many of the present national parks once were national monuments. So a threat to a national monument is, in every sense of the word, a threat to the entire national park system. That is what my Echo Park amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 or 3 minutes of his remaining time, so that we may complete a discussion we started yesterday?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think there was ample time for the discussion yesterday. I yielded sufficiently then.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short statement I have prepared on the Neuberger amendments be printed in the RECORD just prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

As I have indicated, this upper Colorado River bill includes in its present form one project that I most earnestly oppose, along with millions of other American citizens throughout our Nation. We all have heard of it again and again—Echo Park—for conservationists from all over the country have protested this with almost unprecedented determination. Last summer the Speaker of the House himself in a statement said that the whole upper Colorado project had died in the 83d Congress because there were so many protests against the Echo Park Dam. And we in the Senate have heard the protests echoing in our Halls in this 84th Congress also.

Why these protests against this one dam—the Echo Park Dam?

There is one simple answer. It would be an invasion of our National Park System, and, Mr. President, the American people intend to see that the National Park System is not invaded but rather that it is held sacred for themselves and their children and their children's children.

Thirty-nine years ago next August the President of the United States approved an act (39 Stat. 535) whereby the Congress established a National Park Service, and provided for the orderly and effective administration and protection of the national parks and monuments. In that act the Congress also carefully defined the "fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations."

I am using the exact words of the act, which goes on to say that this "purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." For four decades the people of the United States have respected this policy and today they are more deeply determined than ever before that the National Park System shall be so handled in our own day that these areas cannot only be enjoyed by their increasing millions of visitors but also that they shall be left unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

During all these four decades there has not been a single successful challenge of this policy. Year after year has strengthened it and endeared it to the American people.

No wonder the people have so violently and so persistently protested against the Echo Park Dam. For this dam would be deep in the heart of one of the truly superb areas in this National Park System. Unimpaired? The Echo Park Dam would so seriously impair the Dinosaur National Monument in which it would be located that never again could this area serve the great and unique purposes for which it is now so deeply cherished.

Do the gentlemen who advocate or condone this desecration of the Dinosaur National Monument think that I exaggerate? Let me then, try to present to you a brief description of the marvelous canyons with which we are here concerned. Then let me try to give you some idea of what the proposed dam would do to this area. And I am sure Senators will agree that this dam is indeed a threatened impairment of a superbly great unit in our National Park System.

But, first of all, I should like to make it plain that I am opposing the Echo Park Dam for what it will do and not for what it will not do. Proponents of this dam would have you believe otherwise. They want you to think that the Echo Park Dam is opposed because it would flood dinosaur bones, and then they eagerly point out that it will not inundate any of these great skeletons. Mr. President, I know that the great dinosaur quarry in this monument is many miles down the river from Echo Park. I know full well that the dinosaur quarry is high in the hills above the river it overlooks. I know that these interesting bones are high and dry and safe from the Echo Park Dam. But, Mr. President, I know also that the Echo Park Dam will create a reservoir through mile after mile of marvelously beautiful canyons for which the monument was deliberately enlarged from its 80-acre quarry to its present size of 209,744 acres so that it could preserve these canyons. That is the reason conservationists oppose it.

Let me try to convey to you some idea of what these canyons are like. I regret that I have never seen them with my own eyes. Indeed, I am among the many Americans who, never having seen them, all the more earnestly support their protection. In the meantime we see such areas through the eyes of others. Our National Park Service describes for us each of the areas within the system it guards and interprets. I have here the folder which it publishes on the Dinosaur National Monument—a folder which carries the name of the Secretary of the Interior and is surely reliable. Here again we read:

"The National Park System, of which Dinosaur National Monument is a unit, is dedicated to the conservation of America's scenic, scientific, and historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

This leaflet admires the Dinosaur National Monument because it "contains a vast wilderness almost untouched by the works of man." And well we may cherish a few such areas in our great country where the wilderness can still live on in its natural splendor. Let me continue with this description of the Dinosaur National Monument.

"Its principal scenic features are formed by the Green and Yama Rivers, which flow through deep, narrow canyons with precipitous, strangely carved, delicately tinted sandstone cliffs. * * * Between high vertical walls of tilted strata that represent millions of years of geologic processes, the Green River, largest tributary of the Colorado River, flows on its turbulent way toward its junction with the Colorado."

These canyons, which the Department of the Interior in this folder describes as "spectacular" and "awe-inspiring"—these canyons this Department's Bureau of Reclamation calls a great "storage vessel" and wants to use as a site for reservoirs that would inundate these turbulent wild rivers and replace their unspoiled scenic splendor with one of the works of man.

Through the eyes of one of the conservation leaders who has testified at the hearings on this bill I get a further impression of the grandeur of these scenic wild canyons. Again and again, he says, he has tried to convey to his friends some of the grandeur of this area, and he says he has come closest to it by thinking first of the Washington Monument.

Think of the Washington Monument. Think of its nobleness. Then, and I am paraphrasing a part of the statement by the Wilderness Society's secretary that appears in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine the respect and admiration which you feel as you place yourself before its 555-foot thrust into the sky. Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred and fifty feet yet higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand

against time and the elements. That is Steamboat Rock.

Think too of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock. That is the Green River. It has come through the Canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa. These waters have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

The testimony continues:

"Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

"Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's Canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

"Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

"Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—your Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain — inundating those whirlpool rapids.

"Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters of that impertinent dam below you. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high."

What great impairment this proposed Echo Park Dam would be in this superb part of our national park system. As the witness, who himself had been there, went on to say:

"Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around unnumbered bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir."

We thus can gain some idea even at this great distance of the magnificence of these canyons. We can see why they properly belong in our National Park System. And we can see why a dam almost as high as the Washington Monument would most assuredly impair and desecrate this great area. Truly, "it would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world."

How greatly the American people will benefit from the preservation of these canyons is only beginning to be realized. At the Senate hearings from which I have quoted another conservation leader told of the great experiences that are being enjoyed by vacationists traveling in rubber boats down the turbulent rivers of these deep canyons, savoring their splendor and feeling the grandeur of their wildness. Read of it, and I am sure you will be impressed with the great and appropriate use being made of this priceless scenic treasure of the American people.

This Dinosaur National Monument should be preserved as the unit of the National Park System which it now is and should remain.

Let me make plain, however, I do by no means wish to deny to the people of this region the full economic use of the waters that flow through these canyons. I am the rather convinced that reservoirs can be provided to the maximum extent needed or desired or possible without invading this national park area. I am impressed with the great choice of an alternative program that would respect the sanctity of this area. And I am convinced that these alternates should be much more fully studied than apparently they have been.

Let me refer to just one of several alternatives. This one would be an increase by some 35 feet or so in the height of another dam already in the program—the Glen Canyon Dam. It is indeed, along with the Cross Mountain Dam, the only dam that is expected to produce power at a cost less than it can be sold for. The Department of the Interior itself posed this heightening of the dam at Glen Canyon as a possible alternative to constructing the Echo Park invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument. But the Reclamation planners threw out this possibility—for just one reason, they said—added evaporation losses.

I can well understand the importance of saving every possible acre-foot of water, and I can well understand the force of an argument that claims that an alternate proposal will lose an extra 165,000 acre-feet of water. That was the claim with reference to this alternative. But when I see this claim—under the scrutiny of critics concerned with preservation of the national parks—reduced first to 77,000 acre-feet and then finally brought down to only 25,000 acre-feet, I say let us by no means sanction an invasion of our national park system on the basis of such recommendations as these.

Our people, in the increasing stresses and strains of our modern life, need the resources of scenic wilderness, and those who follow us will need them more. It is a thirst all its own. Truly the people of America need the best possible development of their water resources. But let us not needlessly sacrifice any great need of the American people. Let us be absolutely sure that we are proceeding on a program that will be sound from all points of view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Accordingly, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—30

Barkley	Gore	McNamara
Byrd	Green	Neely
Case, N. J.	Hennings	Neuberger
Clements	Humphrey	Pastore
Cotton	Ives	Potter
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Duff	Kefauver	Russell
Ervin	Knowland	Smathers
Frear	Kuchel	Thurmond
Fulbright	Lehman	Williams

NAYS—52

Aiken	Ellender	McCarthy
Allott	Flanders	McClellan
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barrett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bender	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Payne
Bible	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jackson	Scott
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Kerr	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Long	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Watkins
Daniel	Malone	Young
Dworshak	Mansfield	
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Dirksen	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley
Kennedy	Purtell	

So Mr. NEUBERGER's amendments were rejected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the so-called Neuberger amendments were rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 2 hours are available for debate on the bill itself; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and the time is to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and it is to be under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of Senators on either side of the aisle as to what Senators may desire to speak at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very short statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the Senator from California desire to have?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no desire to speak for more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. Do any other Senators on this side of the aisle desire to have time?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I voted for the Neuberger amendments because as far back as I can remember, I have been a very vigorous proponent of conservation policies, both in my own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation.

However, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill itself. I shall so vote despite the fact that the bill will have no immediate benefit to the people of my State. I shall vote for the bill in accordance with my long-held philosophy that what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every part and every section of the Nation.

I am convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need greatly increased cheap power, publicly developed. I am also convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need more reclaimed and irrigated land on which to grow the food which an ever-increasing population will require. We shall no longer be able to indulge in the doubtful luxury of cutting back our agricultural acreage and reducing agricultural production. Instead, we shall be crying for more food, and we shall be doing so within a shorter time than many people now contemplate.

I hope that my thesis that "what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every section of the Nation," will be generally followed by the Members of the Congress of the United States. If we have failed to follow that philosophy or if hereafter we fail to follow it, I believe that all progress on a national scale will stop.

If we, in Congress, vote for appropriations only because they help benefit our own particular States, we shall be entering the field of provincial or parochial legislation; than which nothing would be more dangerous to the interests of or to the advancement of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, we who live in New York State have a great power potential in the Niagara River, which can produce power for New York State and for the adjacent States as cheaply as any power development in the entire continent. The development of cheap power from the Niagara River will be of great benefit, not only to New York State, but to the entire Nation; and it will cost the Nation and the taxpayers of the United States nothing, because the project will be self-financed by the State itself.

Just as I shall vote for the pending bill because I believe so strongly that it is greatly in the national interest, so I hope and believe that my colleagues will vote for other projects which are in the broad interest of the entire Nation, not solely in the local interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with my friend, the Senator from New York, that what is good for the Nation is good for each section of the Nation. It is because I believe that this project is not good for the Nation that I oppose it; and I ask that my colleagues consider very briefly the great disadvantages which are connected with it.

In the first place, Mr. President, although I have supported public power developments in the Tennessee Valley and on the Columbia, and although I am supporting them on the Snake, and although I would support such development on the Niagara, the area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River, only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River, only one-third the flow of the Tennessee River, and only one-half the flow of the Snake River.

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost at most dams on the Columbia River.

The cost of generating power at the most favorable damsite covered by the pending bill, namely, Glen Canyon, will be from 4¼ to 4¾ mills per kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power at Echo Park will be close to 6 mills; and the cost of generating power at the damsite further up the river will be more than 6 mills.

In comparison, the generating costs for the multiple-use dams on the TVA average 1.1 mills; on the Columbia, about 1 mill including indirect costs, and at Hells Canyon, the estimate is only 2½ mills, directly.

Mr. President, if we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public-power project, we would pick out this one. It is extraordinary, to me, that an administration which refuses to establish power projects on the Columbia River, and is opposed to the big dam at Hells Canyon, and turns a cold shoulder at the proposal to construct a project on the Niagara and which calls public power "creeping socialism," is nevertheless picking out this project, where, in my judgment, even the power project will not pay out. So much for the power features.

What about the irrigation features, Mr. President? The appropriation for power is proposed to be $650 million. I doubt that this sum will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

The irrigation features are to cost approximately $915 million, but this amount does not include interest; and for 10 years, no retirement on principal will be made, and no interest will be paid; and then, for 50 years more, while the principal is supposed to be retired, no interest will be paid on the money allocated for irrigation.

So for 60 years, plus the construction period, however long that may be, no interest will be paid, but the taxpayer will have to pay interest upon the bonds which will be floated to finance the project, or he will give up purchasing power out of taxes. So if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than $1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than $2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to $3 billion or more.

What will be the irrigation cost per acre under these features? Yesterday I placed in the RECORD tables which will be found on pages 4637 and 4642, showing that the average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be $952 an acre, on the basis that 3 acres of supplemental land can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. If we include interest, the cost per acre will be $2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be $3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country, land in the central belt of Illinois, which I have the honor in part to represent, is not worth more than $600 or $700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than $2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately $4,000 an acre.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from California yield me more time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes, as were the early projects in Arizona and California. They are not projects as those are at which the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of live stock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

Who, then, will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues.

If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program. It is about the worst program I have ever seen during the time I have been a Member of the United States Senate. It would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. It would probably create huge dams behind which there would be some idle reservoirs, because the water is being overpledged. It would destroy the recreational features of Echo Park. To my mind it is not justified on any basis whatsoever, and I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. President, if it is in order, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not repeat the arguments which have been made. I think the time may come when this proposal will be justified. My principal objection at the present time is on the ground of timing.

As to the power aspect, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already discussed the cost of the power features of the bill. I do not think there is any dispute about the high costs of power production in this program.

As to the flood-control project, it is of no great importance, because flood control is not a major problem, nor is it a principal objective of this program.

As for the production of food, it seems to me that the argument which has been made by the proponents of this bill is again untimely. I would assume, as a wild guess, that perhaps when our population reaches 300 million or 350 million, there may develop a sufficient pressure upon the food-growing capacity of the country to warrant bringing in submarginal lands by irrigation methods under such a program as that proposed here. I have no doubt that in time conditions will arise under which such a program as this will be justified, but I certainly think it is not justified at the present time, when our real problem is the disposal of surpluses rather than the production of additional food.

When we are spending large sums of money and racking our brains for methods to dispose of unwanted surpluses, and taking out of production large agricultural acreage far greater than the area of land which would be brought in here, it seems to me rather ridiculous to enter into a program of this magnitude on the theory that we need the production for food.

As I say, I have no doubt that in time that need will arise, and in time this program will be justified on the basis of economics. However, it seems to me that it is entirely out of order at the present time, and that there are many other programs which are far more pressing than this one and far more justifiable on many counts, either for the production of power or for the conservation of water for purposes of industrial or municipal use.

I say again that I believe that in due time, when the population in this area has grown to a sufficient extent—and it is growing at the present time—there will arise a sufficient demand for water for municipal and industrial use to make a much better case than is presently made.

Finally, there is certainly no great pressure for employment in this area. If this proposal were before us during a period of great unemployment, and this program were being offered as a program which would serve to some extent the purposes I have mentioned, and in addition, relieve unemployment, that would be an argument in favor of the program.

On the contrary, in our country generally there are greater signs at the moment of a tendency toward inflation than toward deflation. So I think there is no argument whatever to justify bringing forward this proposal at this time.

In conclusion, I feel that I must vote against this program because it is improvident, extravagant, and unjustifiable under present conditions, recognizing that, in due time, it is probable that the development of this country will justify a program of this kind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my junior colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I very much regret that I am compelled to oppose this bill. However, the fact is that this bill is bad legislation. It is bad because it bypasses the precedents established by the Congress. It is bad because it is premature. I wish very briefly to demonstrate why I make these statements.

First of all, I wish specifically to point out to my brethren in the Senate that this is not a bill sponsored by the administration. The administration made a comparatively modest recommendation. That recommendation was in favor of two storage units, so-called, and a dozen participating projects, so-called, whereas the bill before us provides for 6 great storage units and 33 participating units.

Let me read from the report of the Department of the Army, printed in the committee report accompanying the bill when it was reported to the Senate:

> Comments on 4 of the major units (Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, and Curecanti) in the comprehensive plan covered by S. 500 and on the participating projects are not practicable from an engineering and economic standpoint without an up-to-date engineering and economic report. However, with respect to the two remaining units (Echo Park and Glen Canyon), the Department of the Army has reviewed a report of the Department of the Interior and has advised that Department that these two storage projects appear to be justified.

The Department of the Army does not endorse the legislation as it comes before the Senate. I wish particularly to add that when the Senate committee saw fit to increase the number of participating projects from 12 to 33, it placed in the legislation new proposed participating projects which in no event have received the test of feasibility from the Department of the Interior or any other agency of government.

It is said by the proponents of the bill that in regard to these projects they will be required to come back to Congress a second time.

That is a novel approach. That is not the pattern which has been laid down in the Senate in years gone by. The logical question that occurs to anyone is why should there be this initial and indirect attempt to approve projects upon which at this moment there has been no determination with respect to feasibility?

The States in the Colorado River Basin many years ago entered into an agreement or compact. That compact apportioned the waters of the Colorado River. There are various interpretations given to it by the States which approved it. Indeed, at this moment the sovereign State of Arizona is plaintiff in a law suit in the Supreme Court of the United States in which the State of California is defendant. The very questions which are at issue concern themselves with how the Colorado River compact shall be interpreted.

The United States Government has intervened in that suit, and a motion has been made to join as parties to the action the other States which signed the Colorado River compact. The bill before us rests on the compact. Until the Supreme Court decides what it means, until the legal dispute among the States is finally settled, how can this proposed Colorado project be administered properly?

It seems to me that here is an instance where prematurity is the very essence of the legislation before us. Those who seek to have the legislation adopted interpret the compact in one way, as I endeavored to explain on Monday, and those from the State which I in part represent interpret it in a different way.

I suggest that until the States involved know what the rights and liabilities are under the compact we should not pass legislation of this prodigious size, as we are being asked to do. Many issues are involved here, Mr. President. The debate here on the floor has touched

upon legal questions, economic questions, and policy questions. All of them are important. I look across the aisle and I see the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I congratulate him for the comments he made concerning the bill from the standpoint of economic feasibility.

We should refuse to pass S. 500 at this time. Here is a bill calling for the expenditure of $1½ billion with a built-in guaranty that more will be spent later. It will not settle a dispute. It will multiply the dispute. And in the process, it tosses away the long-time precedents of the Congress. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I had prepared a speech on the bill, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to deliver it at this time. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I have made a careful study of the question whether authorization of the Colorado River storage project should include the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects located in the canyon unit, added to Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential proclamation in 1938. My study has considered the following main questions:

1. Whether the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain power and storage projects would create a bad precedent by violating the general principle that national parks and monuments should be immune from such developments?

2. Whether the alternative projects, proposed in the main by General U. S. Grant III, on behalf of the National Park Association, etc., are acceptable as substitutes for Echo Park and Split Mountain projects in connection with the legitimate use of the upper basin on a sound multipurpose basis?

3. Whether any other alternatives should be considered in an effort to find a compromise solution which would preserve the most important scenic and other features of the canyon section of the monument, while at the same time preserving the legitimate interests of the upper States in water and power?

4. Whether the project, as proposed to Congress by the Department of the Interior, represents the best multipurpose plan for developing the upper Colorado Basin in accord with the general principles of division of water, set forth in the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948?

BRIEF ANSWERS

In very brief, my answers to the four questions are as follows:

1. I think there is no question but that the Presidential proclamation of 1938, adding the Green and Yampa Canyon area to Dinosaur Monument, was intended to safeguard the future opportunity to develop the storage and power values of the various sites, and was further intended to assure the people of the region, as well as the Federal Power Commission, that the enlargement of the monument would offer no new obstacle to such development. Actually, the principle itself is not a blanket exclusion of developments involving water storage, irrigation, and power from national parks and monuments, but a reservation to Congress of the decision where such uses of park or monument lands are proposed.

2. I do not think that the proposed alternatives are acceptable as substitutes for the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects.

3. An attempt to determine whether a compromise approach, designed to modify the Bureau plan in such a way as to preserve the most important features of the canyon unit of the monument without serious impairment of the Colorado River storage project, could be found produced a negative answer.

4. I think that the project as proposed to Congress is a sound embodiment of the principle of multipurpose river-basin development to provide water storage and hydroelectric power, as well as a considerable protection of lower-basin projects against encroachment of sediment. I concur, however, with the Federal Power Commission comment that somewhat larger power installations than proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation will be warranted.

In reaching these conclusions I have not ignored the very great importance of affording as many people as possible opportunity for the kind of recreation which comes from association with the untouched wilderness in all its forms of beauty and historical interest. In all my association with river-basin programs I have tried to bring about planning which would recognize these as well as the other more material values as worthy of equal consideration. My effort has been to harmonize all possible uses of the resources of a basin in a multipurpose plan.

In this particular case, I have come to the conclusion that (a) the people of the upper basin States are entitled to the best use of their water resources for purposes of economic development; (b) they were assured that this would not be blocked by expansion of Dinosaur Monument to include some of the best water storage and power sites in the upper basin; (c) the entire basin is replete with scenery and records of geological history; and (d) without minimizing the extent to which the natural beauties will be altered by the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects, the conclusion is warranted that there will remain an expanded opportunity for the people of the country to enjoy outstanding recreational values of a wilderness, scenic, and prehistoric record character.

I shall now turn to some more specific observation supporting my general appraisal of this project.

ECHO PARK WOULD MEAN NO VIOLATION OF PRINCIPLE

The 1938 addition of about 200,000 acres, including the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites, to the 80-acre Dinosaur National Monument, was accomplished by a Presidential proclamation which deliberately and effectively reserved the opportunity to use those sites, or any other sites, for power development.

The Federal Power Act, as amended in 1935, by definition, excluded national parks and monuments from the operation of the act. The President's proclamation said that the designation of this additional Green and Yampa Canyon area as part of Dinosaur National Monument "shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act as amended."

What the opponents of the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites overlook is the fact that the act's definition of the public lands which are open to the operation of the Federal Power Act is not a part of the operation of the act but a restriction of the field within which it operates. The Presidential proclamation was accurately directed at limiting the designation of these public lands as monument lands to the extent that the result would be to prevent development of their power resources. In other words, the proclamation said that reservation of these lands for monument purposes was not complete to the extent that it would preclude operation of the Federal Power Act within their boundaries.

The whole background of the "except" clause in the 1938 proclamation makes this clear.

The House committee 1954 hearings show that in 1934 the Acting Director of the National Park Service wrote the Federal Power Commission stating that the contemplated proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument "would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is, of course, an existing right." The latter stated further: "If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (hearings, p. 727).

Chairman McNinch of the Commission replied emphasizing the magnitude of the power resources involved. He referred to the Utah Power & Light Co. application, estimating the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site at 130,000 horsepower and pointed out that this estimate, as well as the estimate of the Woolley United States Geological Survey report on the Green River, would justify installations of about 300,000 horsepower. He continued:

"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower of installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the great part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any plan for development of these streams.

"Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time will elapse before the power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to creation of the monument if the proclamation contains specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted" (p. 728).

From this 1934 letter, antidating the expansion of Dinosaur Monument, it becomes very clear that there is no ground for the charges of General Grant and his associates that the whole purpose of those supporting the Echo Park project is to undermine the national park principle.

In November 1935, Secretary of the Interior Ickes again took the matter up with the Federal Power Commission, calling attention to the fact that the Utah Power & Light Co. had voluntarily withdrawn its application for a preliminary permit for a power site reservation along the Yampa and Green Rivers. He said: "This suggests that the power resources of the section may not be as important as originally believed," and continued: "I shall appreciate receiving your opinion as to the possibility of releasing the power withdrawals that exist in the area. By such action the proposed monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (p. 731).

Chairman McNinch, in a reply of January 9, 1936, said the Utah Power & Light withdrawal of its application "was not based on any reduced appraisal but was taken because the Commission was unwilling to carry the application any longer in suspended status, and the growth of the company's power market did not justify the construction of any

of the plants within the comparatively brief period which would have been allowed under the Power Act after the issuance of the permit." He continued: "Nothing has occurred to change the status of the Power Commission withdrawal, or power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721, and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93, which are also involved."

Chairman McNinch quotes the paragraph from his previous letter to the Director of the Park Service beginning "Regardless," quoted above, and added:

"Since receipt of your letter this whole subject has been given further study but no information has been developed to change the views of the Commission as expressed in the above quotation" (pp. 731–732).

Clearly, it was to meet the Federal Power Commission's estimate of the importance of this portion of the basin as a power resource that the President's proclamation contained the limitation: "except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended." In other words, the judgment of the Government's principal power agency was accepted, that the value of the resources involved for hydroelectric power development was too great to permit an unconditional setting aside of the area as a monument outside the operation of the Federal Power Act.

And it should be recalled that this exchange of letters occurred after the 1935 amendment to the Federal Power Act definitely excluding national monuments from its operation. Under the proclamation the land set aside was not a national monument for the purposes of the Federal Power Act.

Certainly it was not the intention of the President, or his advisers, to mislead the people of the upper Colorado States or the Federal Power Commission. In this connection a portion of the statement of Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, in the House committee 1954 hearings is significant. He referred to contemporary representations by the late Senator King and the late Governor Blood, both of Utah, expressing concern about the expansion of Dinosaur National Monument to include the upper Green and Yampa River canyons. He quoted Governor Blood as stating that "unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to, the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc." He continued:

"In response to these representations, even the then Acting Director of the National Park Service, Mr. A. E. Demeray, assured Senator King by letter in May of 1938 that the reclamation and power reservations were being incorporated in the President's 1938 order designed to protect the water power developments within the monument." (House 1954 hearings, p. 230).

One other fact should be noted. As embodied in the successive amendments to the Federal Power Act which have been the focus of discussion, the principle is simply that developments for power involving national park or monument resources shall not be undertaken solely on the decision of an administrative agency. The decision, in such instances, is reserved to Congress itself. And Congress has acted to leave the door open for the utilization of national park lands for reclamation purposes in the case of both Grand Canyon and Glacier National Parks. Apparently a major objective of the Federal Power Act amendments was to prevent an administrative agency from allowing private exploration of park resources.

This interpretation conforms with the provision of the Glacier National Park Act of May 11, 1910, "that the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project" (House 1954 hearings, p. 595).

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES ARE INADEQUATE

In dealing with possible alternatives to individual projects in a Federal agency program for multipurpose development of a river basin, it must be taken into account that the entire comprehensive program is, in a real sense, a single integrated project with its individual site developments hydraulically, as well as economically, integrated to produce the greatest values from the basin's water resources.

This means that it is necessary to look at more than the contrasting storage capacities, evaporation rates, energy production at site, or even initial costs of the alternative projects, to determine their comparative effects on the total basin project. Provision for storage is located not only in terms of its contribution to power development at the site and downstream but also in terms of the control of flows contributed by various tributaries, etc., where storage of high flows will have to be carried over many years.

A review of various presentations of alternatives to Echo Park and Split Mountain suggests that there has not been sufficient weight given to this consideration. There has not been ample consideration in terms of the economic feasibility of the entire undertaking. Specifically, I find the following among the rather serious inadequacies in efforts to recombine Bureau of Reclamation figures to produce and justify alternatives:

1. Minimization of the significance of the additional evaporation losses due to the lower reservoir elevations and greater surface areas of his alternatives. No river basin planner can dismiss 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet, representing not only additional land brought under cultivation and additional industrial water supply, but also additional kilowatt-hours at the reservoir site and below. Water is valuable, particularly in the arid States.

2. Opponents did not use comparable figures in presenting Bureau of Reclamation project figures to develop comparisons between proposed alternatives and the Echo Park-Split Mountain combination. In specific instances there were used figures for cost and energy output which, because representing different periods in the planning or operation of the projects, are not comparable.

3. Alternatives would not treat the Colorado River storage project as a whole, including all the objectives and especially the importance of release and routing of stored water in terms of the schedules for long-range requirements of cyclical storage as well as the development of maximum supplies of economical power from the combination. Thus, in offering the combination of the Cross Mountain and Gray Canyon units as the initial development, in place of the Echo Park unit, there was presented the full energy production figures for the Bureau's Gray Canyon unit, although about one-third of its energy capacity is due to the stream flow regulation provided by the Echo Park unit which he eliminates.[1]

[1] In the Bureau's program the Gray Canyon unit is scheduled to come into production with the following active storage behind it: Echo Park, 5,460,000 acre-feet; Flaming Gorge, 2,950,000 acre-feet; and Cross Mountain, 4,200,000 acre-feet. This total of 12,610,000 acre-feet would be about three times the storage in Cross Mountain unit alone, as used in Grant's alternative initial project. Furthermore, the Cross Mountain unit would control only the Yampa average flow of 1,617 cubic feet per second, whereas the Echo Park unit would control both Yampa and upper Green flows, totaling about 4,100 cubic feet per second.

4. In minimizing the need for about 48 million acre-feet of total storage, there is a failure to take account of the multiple purposes to be served by the combination of reservoirs in the Colorado River storage project. These include not only provision for cyclical storage to enable upper States to make full use of their allotted consumptive use of water but also dead storage to make possible economically feasible power development and sediment storage to prolong the life of such downstream units as the already constructed Hoover (Boulder Canyon) development and the projected Bridge Canyon power development. An additional 200 years life for the Hoover Dam unit is not to be easily dismissed.

5. Little, if any, attention was given in proposed alternatives to the problems of project timing associated both with the orderly filling of reservoirs and the overall economics of developing a feasible program for enabling the people of the intermountain States to use their share of Colorado River water for constructive regional development. And no one should minimize the difficulties which face those responsible for enabling the upper basin States to use their share of the water.

In this connection it may be noted that California thinks of the Glen Canyon project, to which there is no real opposition, as benefiting primarily the lower basin, in terms of both sediment control and power. California wants the 800,000 kilowatts of power transmitted downstream to be picked up by the Los Angeles transmission lines at Hoover Dam, rather than upstream to combine with Echo Park and other upper basin power to support economic development in the Mountain States.

It is my conclusion that substitution of proposed alternatives would significantly reduce the water for consumptive uses and the hydroelectric power available to the upper basin States. I also conclude that it would jeopardize economic feasibility of the entire program.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO ECHO PARK QUESTIONABLE

In connection with the work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee, agencies of the Department of the Interior under the direction of Leland Olds (1951–53) worked out alternatives to certain Corps of Engineers proposed power projects in the Kennebec and St. John Rivers in Maine. These were designed to accomplish substantially the conservation storage and power objectives, while avoiding interference with important wilderness recreation opportunities in the Bigelow Mountain and Allagash River areas. The alternatives consisted in the main in shifting the location of storage and power developments in such a way as to protect and even enhance the wilderness and semiwilderness opportunities without eliminating storage of the flows of specific tributaries or utilization of important power resources.

With the relatively limited basic data available I had tested the possibility of such compromise solutions in the general area associated with the canyon section of the Dinosaur National Monument. Specifically, this compromise approach, if feasible, would not have eliminated development within portions of the monument but would have preserved to a very considerable extent the Echo Park and the Green River and lower Yampa Canyons immediately above it, including Steamboat Rock, unoccupied by dams or reservoir pools.

In other words, the alternatives would not be sought on other streams or in lower reaches of the Green River, but in the same general portion of the basin as the proposed Echo Park unit.

Specifically, I had explored the possibility of moving the Flaming Gorge Dam still farther downstream, while maintaining the same maximum reservoir elevation, or alter-

natively, of adding a Lodore Canyon unit. Coupled with this would be an experimental moving of the proposed Cross Mountain Dam somewhat farther downstream, to gain head and storage. Another experiment involved consideration of the possible combination of the Gray Canyon and Desolation units into a single project. In general, it was assumed that the Split Mountain site would be developed for power as part of the alternative combination.

After working with the available geological maps and checking with the Bureau of Reclamation to determine whether additional data was available, the conclusion was that in terms of one or another obstacle, including the spreading of storage over wide areas, excessive evaporation, foundation conditions, costs, etc., the probabilities were against such alternatives proving out even if the data in the Bureau's Salt Lake City office were obtainable.

There is another obstacle to finding a substitute for the Echo Park unit. It is contained in the upper Colorado Basin compact, which recognizes the right of the State of Utah to take 500,000 acre-feet a year of Yampa River water for its central Utah irrigation project. This provision is a safeguard against the possibility that full use of the irrigation water—to which Wyoming is entitled—may result in return flows which introduce enough alkaline salts into the Green River so that dilution with the mountain water of the Yampa will be required. So far as studies have been able to determine, the Echo Park Reservoir is necessary to enable Utah to exercise this right under the compact.

In general, this serves to emphasize the extreme complexity of the task of working out a feasible program for such a basin where many of the forces of nature seem adverse to full utilization of the resources. It is a gigantic task of bringing nature into cooperation with man's several major purposes.

It is my general conclusion that the Bureau of Reclamation engineers have made a sincere effort to investigate all possible alternatives to use of the storage and power resources within the expanded national monument.

A SOUND MULTIPURPOSE PROGRAM

The main issue as to whether the Colorado storage project represents sound multipurpose planning involves chiefly the question whether the losses in scenic, geological history, and other recreational and cultural benefits, through construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain units, will outweigh the particular storage and power benefits associated with those projects.

In attempting to find the answer to this question I have come to the conclusion that the prospective losses in cultural and recreational values have been considerably exaggerated by those fighting for the inviolability of a principle, which was deliberately made subject to power development at the time when Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit.

I think that the soundest discussion of the question is found in a Report of Progress, dated May 13, 1943, submitted to the Director of the National Park Service by Frederick Law Olmstead concerning the Dinosaur National Monument region (pp. 733–735, House 1954 hearings). This was part of a Survey of Recreation Resources of Colorado River Basin approved by the Secretary of the Interior in January 1941 to contribute to the general formulation of a comprehensive plan of utilization of the waters of the entire Colorado River system. The Secretary appointed Olmstead, distinguished landscape architect, with wide experience in regional and site planning, as consultant for the survey.

The Olmstead report records certain problems and tentative conclusions in regard to the Dinosaur National Monument, as developed to date by unfinished investigations by George F. Ingalls, Olmstead, and others, "in relation to plans now in process of development by the Bureau of Reclamation for water-control projects on and near the Monument."

Olmstead's report recognizes that "reservoir construction as contemplated by the Bureau would submerge a number of sites, geologic formations, and wildlife habitats, and would alter the character of the landscape by substitution of still water for flowing streams, and by reducing the visible height of the canyon walls." It says that "the latter effect would be most disastrous at and near Pats Hole, where the extraordinary feature of Steamboat Rock would be submerged to more than half its height, and in the inner canyon of the Yampa for some miles upstream well beyond Harding Hole. The report continues:

"Nevertheless, the canyon unit would still have scenic and recreational values of notable importance and of nationwide interest. I venture to cite a very few examples,

"The canyon of Lodore, in general roughly V-shaped in section, is so deep that raising of the water in its bottom by 100 to 500 feet or thereabouts would hardly diminish its great impressiveness to a perceptible degree. Its rapids and low waterfalls now visibly continuing the process of erosion which cut all these canyons in the uplifting mountain mass as it rose athwart the rivers that once meandered across an ancient peneplain—would be changed to a fiordlike lake. Such an artificial change would not be justified in a national monument administered to preserve notable features of nature for enjoyment of mankind as nearly as possible in their natural condition; but it cannot be denied that if the area is deliberately made a 'multiple-use' area, for power developments plus any recreational values compatible therewith, a great many more people can and will derive pleasure and inspiration of a high order from traversing the canyon of Lodore in boats on a fiordlike lake than would even be able to see it all in a more perfectly natural state by shooting its dangerous rapids in boats or by following the 25 miles or more of narrow trail that might with difficulty be contrived to traverse it without much scarring of natural conditions. The upstream portions of the meandering narrow inner canyon of the Yampa, incised into the 'bench' in many places to a depth of about a thousand feet with almost vertical walls, would appear much as at present seen from above. One of the most impressive and geologically illuminating features of the entire area would remain at the eastern end of the monument, wholly unaffected by the damming. It is where the high, bare sandstone escarpment of the unfolded strata has so obviously been sawn through, on the axis of an anticline, by the river; which there quietly flows from a broad flood plain into the dark deep canyon it has cut in the slowly rising rock. The notable outlooks from many places on the rim of the upper plateau south of the rivers, especially on and near Harpers Corner—some very beautiful, all interesting geologically or otherwise—would in most cases remain substantially unchanged in appearance (unless transmission lines, as yet not definitely planned, should be so located as to impair one or more of them seriously."

Olmstead's report summed up his chief considered impressions and opinions in regard to the scenic and recreational values of the canyon unit in two paragraphs, the second of which seems of great importance as indicating what sound multipurpose planning for this portion of the basin calls for. He said:

"1. It is without doubt sufficiently notable and distinctive and good of its kind, from a national standpoint, to justify in the absence of very strong special reasons to the contrary, retaining it as a national monument, administering it as such, and in due course of time expending a considerable amount of Federal taxpayers' money to make certain parts of it conveniently accessible by road and to provide simple conveniences for visitors and for its operation.

"2. It is not so unique and precious for such purposes (in the sense that Zion National Park is, for example), and the scenic, recreational, and related values which it would have if so administered would not be so largely sacrificed by the introduction of the waterpower developments contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation as to give very strong grounds for opposing those economic developments if and when it becomes clearly evident that the installation of some or all of those waterpower developments would produce economic values of social importance largely and certainly in excess of the economic cost of producing them. Under those conditions it would be reasonable for the Park Service to approve changing the legal status of the unit from that of a national monument to that of a 'multiple-use area' devoted to the storage and regulations of water and production of waterpower and also (to the full extent compatible with the reasonably efficient performance of that function) to conserving and utilizing the potentially great scenic, recreational, and related values of the area."

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead.

Water is essential to their welfare.

There will be plenty of gorgeous scenery and recreational opportunities available for the boys and girls throughout the country, including the very area where this project will be developed.

I prefer to look into the future and see happy faces of boys and girls benefited economically, recreationally, and spiritually by the water potential of this project, rather than to look into deep canyons, untouched by human hands and undeveloped for the happiness and welfare of our people as a whole.

However, it does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore I shall vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say in addition is that I wish to compliment and commend my colleague from the State of Oregon for the exceedingly able argument and case he presented in support of his position on the amendment he offered.

My colleagues know very well that if I felt the merit of the argument was on his side of the case I would certainly lean over backward and vote with him on that issue.

However, I gave a very careful study to the bill and all of its ramifications, and I came to the conclusion that the legal argument did not support my colleague's amendment. I felt that the law of the case, so to speak, was in favor of the Echo Park project. Therefore, I

voted for the project, and I shall vote for the bill.

I wish only to read the conclusion of the speech that I prepared and had inserted in the RECORD:

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead. Water is essential to their welfare.

It does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it is agreeable to the able minority leader, I should like to yield myself 5 minutes and then yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall have to inquire whether there are any further requests for time in opposition.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the Senator from New Mexico will yield himself 5 minutes and yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remainder of the time controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], under the present control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is yielded back, except 5 minutes, which the Senator from New Mexico has yielded to himself. The Senator from California yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I recognize that there is some point to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the effect that we have agricultural surpluses on hand. He tried further to point out that these agricultural surpluses might be difficult to handle, especially in view of what may develop as a result of the passage of this bill.

I point out that the central Utah project will not be in full operation for 26 years, and that in a matter of only 7 years we expect to reach a balance between the present production of agricultural products and the consumption that will be required by the country at that time.

The Navaho project in my State will not be completed and in full operation for 27 years. We are not dealing with a present emergency. We are dealing with a situation that may arise in this land.

I think we should build our agricultural program so that we can take care of the agricultural needs of the Nation when the time arrives. At the present time there are many threatening conditions. In the New York Times of yesterday morning there was a statement saying that dust and winds have afflicted Colorado areas, that fields and ranches are barren, crops of wheat ruined, that Kansas is also affected, and that grass roots are in danger.

As the able Senator from Utah pointed out yesterday, this does not happen under irrigation, and we should try our best to tie down by crops land which has been blowing and causing great trouble.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible to reproduce the picture carried in the newspaper, calling attention to the fact that the wind takes its toll. It is stated that the wheat crop northwest of Lamar, Colo., has been badly damaged by drought and by blowing. We seek to make it possible to tie down the land.

I received in the mail within the past 48 hours a copy of a publication entitled "Land and Water," published by the Friends of the Land, a conservation movement. The publication comes to me because I am a member of the group called the Friends of the Land. I have tried to render service to those who are interested in conservation. The publication points out that our water use is growing faster than is our population. It points out that the requirements for water have been increased from 4 to 6 times in the past 50 years, whereas our water supply has been increased only twice. It also points out that as the years go by, the problem of water will become increasingly acute.

Here are the conservation people asking us to save the water of this country. What does the Colorado River project do? It builds at Glen Canyon a great dam. Not 1 drop of that water will irrigate 1 foot of land in the upper river valley. It will be held there to take care of other obligations. That water is precious. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in appearing before a subcommittee on the saline water bill yesterday, brought with him an article entitled "Water." He pointed out that water was becoming increasingly scarce and that this country must not be prodigal with its water; that it must conserve every drop. This project seeks to take the water of the great Colorado River and save it.

Oh, Mr. President, to be sure, power rates in the great Tennessee Valley Authority will be lower than those in the area of these projects. To be sure, they will be lower in the Columbia River Basin. About all we can make out of that is that when God formed the convolutions in the topography of this country He put the Colorado River in the wrong place. But that is not our fault. We have to take it where it is and make use of it. If power costs 5 or 6 mills as against the part of the country which is favored with only a 1-mill rate, that is not the fault of the hardy pioneers who have tried to make something out of the Mountain States. As the years go by we shall see more and more need to be careful of our supply of hydroelectric power.

There was a debate several years ago concerning the natural-gas bill, and it was pointed out during the debate that the State of New Mexico had the lowest natural-gas rate in the Union. The rate was 1.9 cents per thousand feet of gas shipped out of the State. That was the actual fact.

Within the past few months a contract has been signed providing for the movement of natural gas into the Salt Lake area at a rate of 13 cents to start and 18 cents when it is finished. Yes, prices go up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kilgore	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Symington
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Magnuson	Young
Ellender	Malone	
Ervin	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Accordingly I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave

of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Ellender	Malone
Allott	George	Mansfield
Anderson	Goldwater	Martin, Pa.
Barkley	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hennings	Millikin
Beall	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bender	Holland	Morse
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Jackson	Payne
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kerr	Sparkman
Clements	Kilgore	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Watkins
Daniel	Lehman	Young
Dworshak	Long	
Eastland	Magnuson	

NAYS—23

Byrd	Gore	Potter
Case, N. J.	Green	Robertson
Cotton	Ives	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Frear	Neely	Williams
Fulbright	Pastore	

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Kennedy	Purtell
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley

So the bill (S. 500) was passed.

FUNDS FOR EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 92) providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOYALTY DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 140, Senate Joint Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day. That day will be celebrated in the 48 States in accordance with proclamations issued by the governors of the respective States.

Similar resolutions have been sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars before the State legislatures; and a representative of that organization appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary this year in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 58.

Last year the Committee on the Judiciary approved a similar resolution, but too late for timely action by the Senate.

The House has already passed an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 184. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the consideration of House Joint Resolution 184 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. It is identical with the Senate resolution which is on the desks of Senators and which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas whether the adoption of the resolution would result in a conflict. Many years ago I sponsored and secured the passage of a resolution creating May 1 as Child Welfare Day. Until now there has been annually a proclamation of the President setting that date aside as Child Welfare Day. Will there be any conflict between that designation and the one sponsored by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I know of no conflict. According to the evidence received by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee this year and last year, no conflict was suggested to the committee at those times.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be no conflict in having the same day devoted to two different purposes?

Mr. DANIEL. I know of none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

The Chair hears none; and the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 184.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 1st day of May 1955, is hereby designated as Loyalty Day and is set aside as a special day for the reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States of America and for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom; and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day, in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 58 is indefinitely postponed.

PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2225, the feeder airline bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. I understand the Senate bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We are now taking up the House bill, which is not identical. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is going to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that was my intention. I should like to state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] held hearings on the bill. The only difference between the House and the Senate bills is the proviso in the Senate bill which leaves authority in the Civil Aeronautics Board to take care of certain airlines, such as spur lines, which might not be economically feasible. With such a proviso, the Department of Commerce and the officials in the Transportation Division are in wholehearted agreement with the bill. I

thought we could take the bill to conference and then work out the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute Senate bill 651, as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding the following:

"(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the enactment of this paragraph shall show that, from January 1, 1953, to the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant has been during the period since its last certification inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this section and the date of its application: *Provided*, That the Board in issuing the certicate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, before it is passed?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question before the bill is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a unanimous vote. All the bill proposes to do is to offer aid to a group of what are called feeder airlines, small airlines in the United States, some 14 or 15 in number, which have become an important and integral part of our airline system, have established themselves in giving service to small areas, and feed into the big trunklines.

Those feeder airlines have been operating for a number of years under what is called temporary certificates, in some cases running for as short a time as 2, 2½, or 3 years. Obviously, since they have only temporary licenses to operate their airlines, their economic structure is not so stable as it should be. Questions of financing have kept the smaller airlines from buying new equipment, because they were not sure their certificates would be renewed.

All the bill proposes to do is authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to give the small airlines, which are permanently established as part of our air system, permanent certificates, so that they may find themselves in a more stable economic situation, and may be able to obtain more modern equipment.

I might say that aiding these feeder airlines is important to all sections of the country. Because of their financial situation, they have been forced to fly with equipment which is not suitable for feeder line operation. It is hoped that by granting permanent certificates to them, the airlines will be enabled to purchase more suitable aircraft. Most of them have been using DC–3's.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] heard the testimony. I am sure he can answer any questions Senators may desire to ask him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the bill is passed would we not be permanentizing what started out as local service experiments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They were not experiments. There were some airlines conducted on an experimental basis which dropped out of the picture; but those covered by the bill are now established feeder airlines. They operate in all sections of the country. They furnish service to the smaller communities, and feed into the main trunk lines. The feeder airlines were constantly making application to the Civil Aeronautics Board to be given permanent status, because of the deficits resulting from the type of operation they were compelled to adopt.

I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he would care to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say the feeder lines would have no status in the way of permanentizing without governmental approval that they do not now have under their temporary certificates. If the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to have a hearing and to cancel the permanent certificates, it has that right to do so under section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Both the feeder and trunk lines are thus given permanent certification, but that section provides that at any time, for cause, the Civil Aeronautics Board can amend or modify or cancel the certification to fly these routes for which they are permanently certificated.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the bill place the burden of proof or evidence on the airlines, or does it place any restriction on freedom of action on the part of the Board?

Mr. MONRONEY. The provision gives the Board general freedom of action, in that 50 percent of intermediate points between terminals can be adjusted or canceled any time the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to do so if they do not generate sufficient traffic.

The principal complaint, and the only complaint, really, that was registered by the Civil Aeronautics Board was the permanentizing of the route structure. While it was well satisfied with the terminal points, it felt some of the intermediate points might not justify enough traffic or airmail service to warrant continued permanent service there.

In order to get away from requiring these lines with permanent certification, after formal hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board and on application, to discontinue service we provide, in an amendment, that the Civil Aeronautics Board, on its own initiative, can change not more than 50 percent of the intermediate points in any of these feeder airline systems if they fail to produce sufficient traffic. I feel it reasonably meets the objection of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or at least it meets what the Board was driving at.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have been wanting to see the time when we could stop the subsidy to airlines, both feeder lines and trunk lines. Does not this measure permanently obligate us to pay a large annual subsidy to the feeder lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. It commits us to no more than what we are doing today in the case of the trunk lines; and I think we shall see the subsidy requirements reduced once these lines are able to effect the economies which permanent subsidization will give them. In that event they will have better planes, which they can operate more cheaply, which will carry larger payloads, planes which are designed for the feeder type of service, instead of using obsolete DC–3's. They will achieve further economies in operation by being able to keep their employees permanently, instead of having them ready to leave, in order to accept employment on the permanently certificated trunk lines, where steady jobs are now available. I believe we shall save the feeder lines $100,000 on each certification, by virtue of the fact that they will not be forced to go through unnecessary hearings every 2 or 3 years, in order to get a new lease on life, so to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. One hundred thousand dollars would not go very far toward paying the subsidy to these lines.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the subsidy last year amounted to approximately $24 million. There are some 14 car-

riers. So $100,000 represents a substantial part of the subsidy.

Mr. GORE. How many passengers were carried, for which we paid the subsidy of $24 million?

Mr. MONRONEY. More than 2½ million passengers were carried last year. The load has been growing each year. This year the load is increasing by 20 percent or more.

In addition to carrying 2½ million passengers last year, the smaller lines transported more than 1¼ million ton-miles of airmail, more than 1 million ton-miles of express, and more than 1 million ton-miles of freight—in the calendar year 1954. That is evidence that they are growing. In 1950 they carried less than 1 million passengers.

Let me say to my good and dear friend from Tennessee that the hearing rather conclusively showed that today these feeder lines are in almost as good condition, subsidywise, as the condition in which the trunk lines, as we know them today, were when they were certificated permanently under the Civil Aeronautics Act and the grandfather clause, in 1938.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. According to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, when those figures are translated into the number of passengers, they mean that during the last year the taxpayers of the United States have been called upon to pay approximately $10 for every passenger who traveled on the lines, whether on a long trip or on a short trip—and most of the trips are very short.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator from Tennessee is completely ignoring, I believe, the fact that the airlines carried 1¼ million ton-miles of airmail. Certainly the growing airmail service, for which the Government has received payment in the neighborhood of $9 million in postage, is not to be ignored.

Let me say further to the Senator that much of the subsidy of which he is speaking comes back to the Government, because the local airlines collect Federal excise taxes on transportation in the amount of $3 million, which could not be collected if they were not flying those loads. The $9 million the Government receives in revenue on airmail could not otherwise be obtained. The annual payroll of $30 million is taxable, both on payroll taxes and on income taxes, in the case of the many mechanics and air crews who serve these lines.

I believe we certainly must realize that if we in the United States intend to limit commercial aviation to only the highly populous cities, we shall relegate ourselves backward, out of the air age, instead of forward. A trunk line on a railroad could not be prosperous had not the branch lines been established; and certainly many of the railroad lines—and I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee will agree with me—were built with a vastly greater amount of subsidy, in the form of public lands, than the cost of this service to the feeders.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the financing of these lines. Is it not true that until these feeder lines have something definite, until they know whether they are going to get permanent certificates, they cannot have access to the ordinary channels of sound financing, as modern airlines?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct. It was testified that their cost of financing is a great deal higher because no equity capital is willing to be invested in them, when they have hanging over them a death sentence of a year or two, as is true in the case of a 1-year or 2-year certificate.

Mr. STENNIS. Exactly.

Furthermore, has not this air service become an essential part of the economy of the small towns and small cities these lines serve? Moreover, as illustrated by the continuous flow of air traffic from north Mississippi into Memphis, Tennessee, is not it true that the feeder lines are feeding more and more wealth and income into the larger areas served by the larger airlines?

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to my distinguished colleague and friend from Mississippi that we heard testimony from a large rug concern, which not too recently has located a large plant in the State of Mississippi; and one of the major factors leading to the location of that plant in Mississippi was the fact that it had feeder air-line service by means of which the company could reach from its headquarters in New York City to that small town in Mississippi, by making connections through a feeder line operating from Memphis, and thus the company was able in a few hours to have distribution of patterns, orders, and personal visits for executive supervision.

Mr. STENNIS. And without the service from the small towns and small cities to the major population centers which are served by the major airlines, the small towns and small cities will not have a chance to compete on a modern basis, and will not have a chance to grow. Is that not true?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Let me say that 442 cities in 42 States are served by these feeder airlines, and 264 cities are served exclusively by feeder lines.

Are we going to limit air service only to New York City, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Miami, and the other large cities; and are we going to force the people, who live in the small and thriving communities, to live in a horse-and-buggy age?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield once more to me, let me say that we who serve on the Appropriations Committee, on the Armed Services Committee, and on other committees are concerned with dispersal; but this feeder airline service is doing much more than can be done by anything else I know of really to bring about the dispersal of small industries and to keep the population from centering further and further in the large, over-populated areas.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Mississippi very much for his contribution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The pending bill will give the feeder lines an opportunity to develop passenger traffic, will it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed it will; and there will be more permanence due to the fact that the service will not be here today and gone tomorrow, and will not depend on willingness of the CAB to renew a temporary certificate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could point out to the Senator instance after instance I know of, of cities, towns, and communities having been denied air service simply because the local airline had only a temporary certificate and because, as a result, the cost of giving service on the temporary certificate, in terms of the cost of construction of the station and the cost of providing equipment, was so far beyond the ability of the airline to pay, in view of the temporary basis.

Thereby we lose the service to the community on the one hand, and we also lose the possibility of developing greater service in terms of trunk lines. I think this bill is long overdue. As I gather, under the terms of the bill, if the Civil Aeronautics Board finds that the lines between the main terminal points are uneconomic, if there are too many stations for the traffic, the freight load, or the express load, after hearings certain stops can be dropped. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The entire certificate can be dropped after hearings, if the Board chooses to do so. But we attempt to allow a certain amount of flexibility without hearings. We give flexibility to the route structure, so that, without hearings, 50 percent of the intermediate points, as they are converted, can be dropped within a reasonable period of time if they fail to use the air service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us assume, however, that the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to cancel a particular stop in the feeder-line service. What right does the community affected have to go to the Board and appeal its case? Representatives of communities are constantly writing to me in cases in which an airline, operating under a temporary certificate, is about to curtail service simply because of its present economic position. Often the mayor of the community, the city council, and the chamber of commerce will say, "If you give us 3 years or 5 years, or enough time to develop traffic, we will make this a paying proposition." Does such a community, under the terms of the bill, have an opportunity to appear before the Civil Aeronautics Board and be heard?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed it has. But there is a special case when the line is completely uneconomic. Fifty percent of the intermediate points are subject to being changed without the formal hearing provided for in section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that the Civil Aeronautics Board is to have unquestioned authority to cancel out up to 50 percent of the stops without even an opportunity on the part of the local people to be heard or to appeal and present their case?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Board has unquestioned authority today to cancel out the entire route structure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no protection against that. In order to try to satisfy the complaint of the Civil Aeronautics Board that making these certificates permanent would copper-rivet, in an uneconomic and hopeless manner, a great number of stops, the committee, I think, reached a very happy compromise in saying that 50 percent of the stops must be permanent. The others will be on a use-it-or-lose-it basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a better statement of what I feel is equitable and fair.

Is it correct to say that the rights which the local communities now possess, in terms of their representations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, would in no way be abrogated or weakened by the bill before us?

Mr. MONRONEY. They are increased manifold. That was the safeguard we wrote into the bill, so that there could be some flexibility of route structure, and so that the operators need not be uncertain, as they are today, as to whether or not their licenses will be renewed the next time they come up for certification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the committee for bringing this legislation before us. I think it will do great good for the aviation industry of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say that the report of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Small Business Committee I commend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for the leadership they have given the Senate with respect to the pending bill.

I see our good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Chamber. He is the chairman of the Small Business Committee. He knows that the Small Business Committee has worked in this field for a considerable time.

I particularly wish to emphasize, speaking to the Senator from Oklahoma, that this bill will have an extremely beneficial effect on the feeder lines from the standpoint of commercial psychology within their communities. It will have an effect, for example, on their credit standing. It will give the business communities and the various feeder localities greater confidence in the perpetuation of these lines.

I particularly desire to stress the need for these feeder lines in the more sparsely populated areas of the United States. I find that it is easy, in highly populated areas which are served by other airlines, for people to overlook the importance of the feeder lines in less thickly populated areas—for example, in my section of the country. The feeder lines perform a valuable economic service to the people in the small towns in very remote areas—in our arid areas, our mountain areas, and our rural areas. I think this bill is of great importance, and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his contribution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said. I wish to add my commendation of the able Senator from Oklahoma and of the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and all other members of the committee, for reporting this bill. It was needed. I have followed with interest the development of the feeder system. I remember when the first hearing was held, and the first routes were authorized on a try-out basis. One of them operated in my State. I knew the management. I have flown on many, many of the feeder routes. They are certainly a very important and essential part of our transportation system.

I should like to make one further observation. As the Senator from Oregon has said, the Small Business Committee, during the entire life of the present committee, has been greatly interested in air transportation in the United States, and particularly its impact upon the small independent businesses engaged in air transportation. This is a part of the picture.

There are other phases of the problem. When I say that, I do not mean solely the so-called irregular carriers, but there are other carriers—freight carriers, and various other segments of the air transportation industry—which have not been given proper consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and, in my opinion, never will receive such consideration, unless this committee does a job in that field such as it has done in this particular instance.

There are many so-called irregular carriers. I hold no brief for a single one of them. I think they ought to observe reasonable regulations, but it is my opinion that at times the Civil Aeronautics Board has not been reasonable in the regulations it sought to impose upon those carriers.

Every time I go to the airport to take a plane and see the crowds milling around, and note the large numbers of persons in a "standby" position, waiting and hoping to get on a plane, I am impressed with the fact that our air transportation is not keeping pace with the growing demands day by day. There are possibilities, potentialities, in all the various phases of air transportation, which ought to be given serious consideration, both by the Civil Aeronautics Board and by the committee.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and other members of the committee for what they have done. At the same time, I urge them not to stop at this point, because one of the fastest growing things in this country is the demand for air transport of all kinds. I think we shall need to stay on top of this problem if we are to provide the American people with what they ought to have.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to commend my able friend for his excellent explanation and exposition of the bill. He seems to have satisfactorily answered all questions. However, I should like to ask one further question. Does he envision the time when the subsidy program can be substantially diminished, if not ended?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to my distinguished friend that I certainly can envision such a time, because the curve of subsidy payment is downward today. It is not downward on the total amount involved, but on the subsidy per passenger mile.

In 1950 we were paying for a very great portion of the operation. That is when it began as an experiment. Today we are paying a very small amount, although the airlines are flying many more passenger miles. In other words traffic, mail, and freight loads have grown as the route structures have grown.

This is little business, and little business is growing. These men are hustling for business. I wonder whether Senators know that 2 out of every 3 of these passengers carried by feeder lines were either coming or going farther distances via a trunk-line airline. Of the 2½-million passengers who originated on these feeder lines, 2 out of every 3 went farther on the trunk-lines, which, of course, have now worked out of a need for substantial subsidies.

When we consider the fact that nearly $50 million is being spent for overseas subsidies, the $24 million involved is not too great a price to pay for needed services to our local communities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I had prepared and intended to read to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I introduced the local service certificate bill, S. 651, to strengthen our system of national civil air transportation. In providing for permanent certification of local service airlines, the bill will make air transportation available to many local communities on a permanent basis. For the last 10 years the Nation's scheduled feeder airlines have been operating under temporary certificates of public convenience and necessity even though most authorities were agreed the Civil Aeronautics Board, under the Civil Aeronautics Act, had the power and authority to certificate permanently these local service airlines.

The testimony which was developed during the hearings on S. 651 by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the able leadership of Senator MONRONEY, demonstrated both the right of the local service airlines to permanent certificates and the benefits which would result to the country from their receipt of permanent certificates.

In the last Congress the House of Representatives unanimously passed H. R. 8898

and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously and favorably reported out that bill with amendments. Because the report was made late in the season, the Senate failed to take action before adjournment. This week, April 19, 1955, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 2225, a bill similar to S. 651.

The 13 local service airlines, each serving its respective region, furnish scheduled passenger, mail and cargo service to 47 million Americans in 42 States and to nearly 400 cities, of which they furnish the only scheduled air service to about 220. Their importance to the economy of the great Western States is attested to by the unanimous action of the Western States Council. The council, representing the executives of the chambers of commerce of the 11 Western States, in annual session at Fresno, Calif., on March 22, 1955, endorsed the principle of S. 651 and urged all its Members in Congress to support the legislation. I offer a copy of the resolution for the RECORD.

These airlines are aggressive, small businesses with a proved record of steadily increased air service and a constant reduction in Federal subsidy per unit of service rendered. In calendar year 1954 2½ million Americans traveled on the feeder airlines. They traveled either between small towns on the local airline system or they commuted between a small town and a large metropolitan area, or they flew to a metropolitan airport where they connected with a truck airline for further transportation. In each event the unity and the commerce of the United States was promoted by the flight and our national system of air transportation was developed proportionately.

The rapid rate of progress of the local service airlines is eloquent testimony of the national need for this type of air service. In 1954 the local service airlines showed about a 20 percent improvement over 1953 in number of passengers, number of revenue passenger miles and mail ton miles. So far in 1955 the industry average shows about a one-third improvement over 1954.

This progress has been achieved in spite of the great handicap of temporary certification. Although the so-called "local service experiment" has been in process for 10 years, most of the carriers have operated under certificates which gave them only 3 or 4 years of life at any one time. The expense of renewing these temporary certificates has been considerable—estimated upward of $100,000 for each renewal proceeding—and every one of these airlines has had at least one renewal. Two of them have had two renewals and four are now in the process of attaining their second renewals.

The temporary nature of their certificates has made it extremely difficult for the feeder airlines to run stable and economical personnel programs. The inducement of planning a career with an employer that has three years or less to live before it must undertake an expensive legal proceeding to justify a further extension of its existence is obviously difficult. Its difficulty is at the root of a personnel turnover rate in the local service airline industry twice that in the trunk airline industry. High training and personnel replacement costs have thus been inevitable.

The difficulties of financing an airline enterprise that has only a temporary lease on life are also obvious. The local service airlines have paid the penalties of abnormally high interest rates and have generally found it impossible to secure any long term financing, or indeed any financing that runs beyond the expiration date of their certificates. This legislation would remove that obstacle to financing and leave each airline strictly on its own financial merit in securing further backing.

Up to now the local airlines have been necessarily required to make short term arrangements for hangars, navigational equipment, maintenance facilities and other operating equipment with all the financial penalties inevitable in short term arrangement. This legislation will permit the economies that go with long term arrangements.

States and municipalities have been understandably reluctant to invest large sums of money in aeronautical facilities when they realize that the airlines furnishing them their service have only temporary certificates. This legislation will not only reassure States and municipalities which have heretofore invested money in aeronautical facilities that their investments have not been speculative, but it will induce those States and municipalities to plan new or expanded facilities which will further generate improved service to the public.

Heretofore aircraft manufacturers have been reluctant to design an aircraft specifically tailored to the particular requirements of local airline service. The ever present possibility that the customers for such an airplane would be out of existence by the time it was ready to fly has understandably curtailed the enthusiasm of the airplane manufacturers, but this legislation will at least remove that danger from their planning so that they may undertake the design of a new suitable aircraft with confidence that customers will be available to buy it if it proves successful.

This bill provides that a feeder airline, in order to qualify for a permanent certificate, must show that it was a carrier furnishing passenger, property, and mail service from January 1, 1953 to the date of its application for a permanent certificate. This provision, however, does not mean that routes, segments, or points being served on January 1, 1953 are the only ones eligible for permanent certification. On the contrary, the route patterns and the segments and points to be permanently certificates are those for which the individual carrier applies and which it is serving between the date that this bill becomes law and the date that the carrier files its application.

I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to the proviso at the end of the bill. This proviso is an addition to the bill which was reported to the Senate last year and is not found in the bill passed by the House this week (H. R. 2225). The purpose of the proviso is to furnish all the flexibility necessary to the Board to guarantee that there will be no freezing of hopelessly uneconomical route patterns or segments or points. In order to make this guarantee the Civil Aeronautics Board will be authorized by the proviso to certificate temporarily up to one-half of the intermediate points named in the permanent certificate of the individual carrier if the Board finds that those points have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires their permanent certification at the time that the certificate of the individual carrier is issued. During recent renewal proceedings some additional intermediate points have been added. Some of these, we are told, have not yet developed sufficient commercial traffic to show the point is a real asset to the carrier or that the carrier's service is a substantial benefit to the intermediate city itself.

This proviso is not, however, an escape valve by which the Board is meant to duck the objective of the legislation. Since the Board has already certificated each of the local service airlines at least twice and is presumably familiar with their pattern of operations, the Congress can be confident that the proviso will not delay the implementation of the legislation and it can be further confident that the 13 local service airlines will all have their permanent certificates by the end of the calendar year 1955. I certainly expect the Board to proceed, and the Congress may expect it to proceed, on a schedule that will make that date a liberal one.

This bill is specifically for the benefit of local-service airlines. It is not meant to include within its purview trunk airlines which happen to be operating local service type routes. In a few cases the Civil Aeronautics Board has awarded typical local service type routes to the trunk airlines. The policy of the Congress has been and the intent of this legislation is to establish strong, permanent, local service type carriers. It is not our intent by this legislation to approve of the past or future award of permanent certificates of local-service routes to trunkline carriers.

Permanent certification of these airlines does not mean permanent subsidy payments. On the contrary, this permanent certification will be the biggest single step taken so far toward reducing subsidies. The economies inherent in operating on a permanent, rather than temporary, basis will help accelerate the rate of reduction of subsidy per unit of service rendered along the favorable curve on which the local service airline industry has been driving it ever since its birth as an industry.

Likewise, there need be no fear that possession of a permanent certificate entitles the possessor as a matter of law to expect that every segment of his route should be permanently subsidized. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 provides in section 406 (b) for the payment of "need" mail pay to enable the air carrier in question "under honest, economical, and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense."

This provision is the one under which the Board determines whether a particular route or segment should be subsidized. If the Board should find, after adequate experience in actual operation, that a particular route or segment is so weak that it does not contribute to the development of air transportation as provided in section 406 (b), under the act the Board must cut off subsidy for that particular route or segment. In that event the carrier could either operate the route at his own expense or, with the permission of the Board, suspend or abandon his operation there.

In 1938 the Congress gave grandfather rights to the domestic trunk airlines by enacting the Civil Aeronautics Act. That legislation has been the foundation for the development of the world's finest system of civil air transportation and for the development and manufacture of the world's finest civil air transports. I am confident that the passage of S. 651 will similarly serve both as a foundation for the development of local air service beyond the capacity of our imaginations presently to envisage and also as a foundation for the development of local service type aircraft that will likewise lead the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a resolution adopted by the Western States Council, an association of chamber of commerce executives of 11 Western States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN STATES COUNCIL IN ANNUAL SESSION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MARCH 22, 1955

PERMANANT CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Be it resolved, That the conference of the Western States Council, meeting in annual session in San Francisco, hereby unanimously

endorses the principle of permanent certification legislation in Congress for the local service air carriers of the United States and hereby urges its entire membership to actively support such endorsement by vigorously seeking the unqualified support of their appropriate congressional delegations for Senate bill 651 and House bill 2225 (84th Cong.), or their equivalent.

The principle of permanent certification of local service air carriers is endorsed for these and other reasons:

A. Such action is directly related to the public interest.

B. The Nation, and especially the Western States, have a need for improved transportation and communications facilities.

C. Individual communities and areas should not have to stand the expense and effort of showing need for service over and over again.

D. Carriers and their backers are entitled to investment security.

E. Better service would be the result of an assured future.

(The Western States Council is an association of chamber of commerce executives of the 11 Western States banded together for the mutual exchange of helpful information that will develop the West.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appropriate place in the RECORD some remarks which I have prepared concerning Senate bill 651.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE ON S. 651, PERMANENT LOCAL SERVICE CARRIER CERTIFICATION BILL

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma who put in long hours conducting hearings into this important bill in his capacity as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I should like to address myself to S. 651 for several minutes. I believe this bill points up important aspects of the progress of air transportation in this country. Some years ago when feeder airlines trudged the hard row of developing air service over areas not served by the larger trunklines, these feeders served as pioneers in this industry.

Today this country is served by 14 local service carriers operating under temporary certificates. They face the time and expense of going before the Civil Aeronautics Board to carry on protracted proceedings to insure the continuance of their operations. It seems to me that any feeder airline which has met the good business and experience test is deserving of permanent certification.

It cannot be disputed that the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting temporary certificates to local service carriers believed that the progress of the Nation required the extension of the benefits of air transportation to a greater and greater segment of this country. Certainly, the main difference between feeder service and the trunkline service lies in the number of persons using such service and not in the character or the need of the people themselves for such service.

I would venture the opinion that today the vast majority of people traveling by airplane expect the same service whether they are traveling in a trunkline carrier or in a local service carrier. However, the local service carrier does not have the business potential of the trunks which serve the big metropolitan areas.

As a westerner, I can truly appreciate the desirability of air transportation when great distances must be covered. In the areas of the West where feeder airlines serve a most important purpose of interconnections with trunk lines, the necessity of local service carriers cannot be overestimated.

The State of Nevada itself brought into existence in 1945 one of the country's most successful local service carriers, Bonanza Airlines. Today, this airline has daily flights into 17 cities in Nevada, Arizona, and California. Its growth has been a healthy one shown by an increase from 908,000 revenue miles in 1950 to 17,400,000 revenue passenger-miles in 1954. The contribution this airline and its president, Edmund Converse, have made to the march of progress in Nevada business life has indeed been outstanding.

This airline holds a most important place in the transportation industry of the three States it serves. Certainly, if its business progress has been healthy, it is deserving of permanent certification so that its continued growth can be built on a more solid foundation.

The local service airline industry has proved its value to the Nation. It is here to stay. Any industry which provides good air transportation to 444 cities is one that the American public deserves to keep.

The progress of air transportation cannot be halted and it seems to me that it behooves the Congress to lend a helping hand by authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent operating certificates to this important segment of the American civil-aviation industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appropriate place in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to Senate bill 651.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held 2 days of hearings on S. 651 and in the course of those hearings I believe that all the arguments for and against the principle of S. 651 were forcefully and clearly presented to the subcommittee. There is no doubt in the minds of the members of the subcommittee, Mr. President, as evidenced by their unanimous vote in favor of S. 651, and as confirmed by the unanimous vote of the full committee in favor of that bill, that S. 651 will be a major step forward in strengthening the system of civil air transportation in the United States.

The 13 local-service airlines have been in business for periods varying from 5½ to 10 years. This is a short life as transportation industries go, but their record of progress during that short life has been phenomenal. The local-service industry was conceived right after World War II as an experiment to test whether the American people would support scheduled air transportation of passengers, mail, and cargo to, from, and between the small and intermediate size cities of the United States, and the steady and rapid rate of increase of utilization of facilities of the local service carriers has eloquently proved that the experiment has been as successful as it was foresighted.

The fact that 2½ million Americans rode in local-service airplanes in calendar year 1954 is itself a dramatic argument in support of the public acceptance of this system of transportation. The fact that 2 out of every 3 of these passengers was either coming from or going to a trunk airline has proved the wisdom of the feeder concept and has earned the strong support of the trunk airlines for the local carriers. The fact that these small airlines transported over a million and a quarter ton-miles of airmail and over a million ton-miles of express, and another million ton-miles of freight in calendar year 1954 is further evidence of the acceptance of this element of the air-transport industry. There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that local airline service is here to stay, and that the support of the public will increase the extent of the service which the feeder airlines render to the public.

The growth of local airline service and the degree of its public acceptance is evident in the fact that in 1950 they carried fewer than 1 million passengers as compared to 2½ million last year. Likewise, in 1950 their commercial revenues were approximately $10 million whereas last year they were nearly $28 million. The air mail ton-miles have increased from approximately one-half million in 1950 to 1¼ million in 1954 and air express and air freight have approximately doubled in the same period. At the same time 1955 gives every indication of being by far the best year in the local-service airline industry. Just as 1954 reflected in general a 20 percent improvement in the local-service airline picture over 1953, so 1955 to date evidences about a one-third improvement over 1954.

This public acceptance has another happy byproduct in that it has reduced substantially the amount of Federal subsidy per unit of service rendered. This is a young industry and will undoubtedly need the sympathetic assistance of the Congress for a few more years in the matter of subsidies, but whereas mail pay per aircraft-mile in 1948 was twice the amount of commercial revenues of the local-service industry, commercial revenues caught up with mail pay in 1951, passed mail pay in 1953, and today are substantially ahead of mail pay as the principal source of revenue to the local service industry.

In the State which I in part represent the local-service airlines serve 15 cities and 9 of these cities get their air service exclusively from a local-service carrier. These 9 cities have an average population of 18,000. obviously no trunk airline would be interested in serving towns of this size and yet I believe that my constituents should not be penalized in the matter of air transportation just because they have chosen to spend their lives in the small towns which are the backbone of American strength.

While the services of the local airlines have been greatly increased in quality and quantity in the past few years, the gross subsidy bill has been approximately stable for the fiscal years 1954, 1955, and projected for 1956 at about $25 million. Even if this figure could be considered a net expenditure to the Government, I would submit that it was a small price tag for this country to place on scheduled air service to the 444 cities in 42 States served by the feeder airlines, 264 of those cities exclusively by those airlines. This $25 million is really not a subsidy to the local-service airlines as such but is actually a subsidy to the 47 million American citizens who live in the 42 States served by the local carriers.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that this figure is not in any sense a net expenditure to the Federal Government for a major part of it is returned to the Government in the form of revenue. The local service airlines collect Federal excise taxes on transportation on the order of $3 million. They pay oil and gasoline taxes on the order of $1 million. They provide an annual payroll of nearly $30 million subject to Federal income taxes and on which the employers pay payroll taxes of over $600,000, a figure matched by the social security taxes paid by the employees. They generate mail revenues to the Federal Government of nearly $9 million. Thus, some $14 million, plus the unknown amount of the Federal income taxes paid by their employees, is returned to the Federal Treasury by the local service airlines and may properly be considered in diminution of the gross subsidy bill.

Likewise, the subcommittee was greatly impressed by the defense potential of the feeder airlines. These small companies have 160 aircraft in service and they employ about 430 flight crews. Likewise, they have about 1,000 mechanics and approximately 1,000 other skilled personnel, as well as maintenance and operating bases, all in a state of readiness and immediate availability to face any defense emergency. This is certainly a multi-million-dollar asset to the national defense and one which would be considerably more expensive to maintain in its state of readiness and availability if it were supported by the Government exclusively as a defense asset rather than principally by the commercial customers who use it.

I would like to stress two specific points with respect to the bill itself. One is that it is the intention of the subcommittee that the routes being operated by the local service carriers whether by the terms of their temporary certificates or by exemption, as of the date that this law becomes effective are the ones that are to be permanently certificated—not the routes they were operating on January 1, 1953. The other point is that the committee intended this bill to be for the benefit of the local carriers as such and not for the benefit of trunk airlines that happen at the moment to be operating local service type routes. The committee intends to support the policy of having local service type routes operated by local service type carriers, and this legislation is not intended to permanentize any trunk carrier in their current temporary operation of feeder routes.

Many advantages will flow to the system of national air transportation from this legislation. The temporary certification and recertification proceedings which have been the rule heretofore have cost the local service airlines from 50 to 100 thousand dollars each time a line had to go through the proceedings. The subcommittee heard repeated testimony showing that the cost of a temporary recertification was equal to the amount of many months, if not more than a whole year, of the advertising budget of some of the local carriers. It is the subcommittee's feeling that the money heretofore spent on temporary certification proceedings could much better be spent on the development and improvement of the services rendered by the feeder airlines. Likewise, the expense to States and municipalities and the inconvenience to them has been comparable to that of the feeder airlines themselves. The economy of avoiding such proceedings in the future will be welcome to States and municipalities, and those local governments will be further fortified in the knowledge that their past investments in aviation facilities have been foresighted rather than merely speculative. Likewise, they will be encouraged to make future expenditures so that the quality of local air service will be improved and its scope broadened.

The temporary status of the local service carriers has in the past discouraged financial sources from investing in the feeder airlines and has likewise discouraged aircraft manufacturers from designing an aircraft tailored to the requirements of local service. A business that has a life expectancy of 3 years can neither be considered a very promising investment nor a valued customer. This legislation will remove at least a major psychological difficulty that has faced investors and aircraft manufacturers because it will assure them that the airline in question can make long-range plans for the future.

Likewise, the economies inherent in long-term arrangements for hangars, navigational equipment and maintenance facilities will be available to the local service carriers on terms comparable to those available to the trunks. Heretofore the penalties inherent to short-term leases have contributed to increasing the operating expenses of the local carriers, and we may expect an improvement in that regard.

In 1938 the Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act permanently certificated the trunk airlines of the United States. On the basis of their permanency and of the public demand for their services, those airlines have expanded into the greatest system of national air transportation in the world. Aviation has progressed since 1938 to the point where we can consider local air service in the same practical fashion as we then considered trunk air service. I confidently predict that on the basis of S. 651 the local service airlines of the United States will enjoy a growth and prosperity and will render a continued public service comparable to the experience of the trunk airlines.

Our local service airlines are an integral part of the Nation's air transport network. I cannot conceive of an air transport system without them any more than I can conceive of a railroad system made up only of transcontinental lines or a highway system made up only of through super highways. I believe that local air service is just as surely here to stay as the small and intermediate-size city of the United States is here to stay, and I further believe that the Congress should pass S. 651 so as to make permanent the status of our system of local air transportation so that the carriers themselves may get on with their job and increase the quality and value of their services to the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read, "An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

CONSTRUCTION OF A MODERN OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 206, S. 1722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In granting money to be paid for earned subsidies, may I ask if all the money is to be paid to domestic air carriers now operating within the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. I should explain that the Senate estimated that it would cost $15,200,000 to pay all the carriers, both the carriers operating within the United States and those operating internationally. The House appropriated only $5 million. The best figure we could arrive at, which would take care of the carriers in the United States only, was $11,200,000. We were able to raise the House figure to $8,900,000. In other words, we increased the House figure by $3,900,000. The House committee in its report states:

> The funds appropriated under this head are to be used to pay subsidy claims due for local-service carriers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Those are the carriers within the United States, not strictly the feeder lines we have been talking about in connection with the bill the Senate passed a few minutes ago. In other words, these are trunk lines as well as feeder lines within the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The reason for that is stated in the House Committee report on the bill:

> The committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decision, if properly adhered to, will result in a substantial reduction in the amount of subsidy, and that the amount allowed by the committee will be sufficient to make payments during the remainder of the fiscal year to domestic lines and international carriers who are not affected by the Supreme Court offset decision.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4903, which was read as follows:

> IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
> *April 20, 1955.*
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66 to the bill (H. R. 4903) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $258,000 named in said amendment insert: "$200,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $21,000 named in said amendment insert: "$15,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $125,000 named in said amendment insert: "$100,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, and 23.

Amendment No. 18 provides $200,000 for expenses of the general supply fund under the General Services Administration. The Senate amendment provided $258,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $200,000.

Amendment No. 19 provides an appropriation of $15,000 for the Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission. The Senate amendment provided $21,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $15,000.

Amendment No. 23 provides an appropriation of $100,000 for Indian health activities. The Senate amendment provided $125,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR MUTUAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 144)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that there is at the desk a message from the President of the United States which has been read in the House earlier today. I ask that it be laid before the Senate and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For the President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished majority leader may have made an announcement earlier in the day with reference to a call of the calendar. Is it correct that there will be a call of the calendar next Monday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. Our plan is, Mr. President, to have the Senate meet tomorrow for a short routine session, and then recess or adjourn until next Monday and have a calendar call on Monday. If the Committee on Appropriations has reported the Agricultural appropriation bill in time to have it considered, we expect to take it up on either Tuesday or Wednesday. We are hopeful that we shall have another appropriation bill during the week, which will be followed by the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act.

There is a resolution which we expect will be reported from the Banking and Currency Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and if it is reported, we expect to take it up also. I think it will be noncontroversial.

JOHN DAY DAM PLANNING FUNDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most valuable power sites in the country is that at John Day on the Columbia River. The present budget calls for only $500,000 in appropriations to make possible the plans and engineering for this vital structure. My distinguished colleague, Senator MORSE, and I are working with the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase this sum to $1,500,000, if it can humanly be done.

John Day Dam would provide low-cost hydroelectricity at approximately 2.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, as contrasted with the 6-mill power which the administration is pushing so aggressively in the upper Colorado Basin.

I urge that the funds for the planning and eventually erection of John Day Dam be increased by the Congress, because the administration's budget is not ample in this respect.

A cogent editorial from the Oregonian of Portland, for April 14, 1955, serves to illuminate the need for John Day planning funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN DAY PLANNING FUNDS

One item on which the Democratic and Republican Members of Congress from the Northwest can and must joint forces is an appropriation for planning funds for John Day Dam. This dam, the next logical structure in the Columbia Basin timetable, has been authorized by Congress. Whether it shall be built by the Federal Government alone or by the Government in combination financing with local utilities, immediate funds for planning are essential.

The Inland Empire Waterways Association is urging appropriation of at least $750,000 for first-year planning. Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregan, have announced they will work for $1,500,000.

"Under an accelerated planning schedule, the Corps of Army Engineers could effectively use up to $1,500,000 during the first year," writes Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the waterways association. "The additional amount of planning funds would reduce preconstruction planning time to 16 to 18 months at a total cost of $2,500,000 as compared to 24 months and a cost of about $2 million."

Since it will require almost 6 years to get the first generating units on the line after start of construction, and from 8 to 9 years to complete the power installation, obviously the sooner the planning can be done the better. The Northwest, by all reliable estimates, will be seriously short of power before John Day can be completed, even with accelerated planning and earliest construction.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Resolution 33 providing for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Viet-Nam.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Wayne M. Sweetland, Salome.
Floy M. Martin, Thatcher.

ARKANSAS

Calvin O. Stevens, Biscoe.
James S. Rollins, Cotter.
Alfred T. Smith, Hindsville.
William C. Baker, Lowell.
William E. Hodge, Jr., Mineral Springs.
Arvle H. West, Mountainburg.
Icy M. Wood, Pangburn.

CALIFORNIA

Josephine D. Blocking, Clayton.
Arthur H. Morgenstern, Hermosa Beach.
Katie B. Smith, Oro Grande.
Lester P. Frost, Placerville.
John J. Shanahan, St. Mary's College.
Thurston C. Jordan, Skyforest.
Louis K. Fies, Tulelake.
Gladys E. Beard, Veterans' Home.

FLORIDA

Bonita R. Swann, Wauchula.

INDIANA

Reuben Leon Ridenour, Angola.
Ruth L. Wilson, Hartsville.
Lester J. Britton, Hillsdale.
Rex E. Daugherty, Merom.
Arthur Heiny, Noblesville.

IOWA

Robert E. Lathrum, St. Charles.
Homer I. Stearns, Sutherland.

KANSAS

Paul H. Turnbull, Bushton.
Henry Clay Davis, Colby.
John J. Keener, Rush Center.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ray D. Adams, Great Barrington.

MINNESOTA

Clair N. Lund, Byron.
James E. Avenson, Cohasset.
Albert H. Temanson, Grand Meadow.
George M. Freking, Heron Lake.
Lester W. Kamholz, Morgan.
Edmond L. Farrell, Slayton.
Walter A. Lienke, Windom.

MISSISSIPPI

James K. Baker, Jr., Aberdeen.
Melvin G. Nesbit, Ecru.
Charles D. Davis, Northcarrollton.
James D. Burch, Pattison.
Lowrey T. Martin, Smithdale.
Dan Reece Monroe, Taylorsville.

MISSOURI

Gene D. Callison, Barnett.
George W. Lowrance, Golden City.
Cyrenius J. Jones, Jonesburg.
William H. Adams, Memphis.

NEBRASKA

Virgil W. Benson, Upland.
Raymond E. Paulson, Wakefield.

NEW JERSEY

Marian T. Killoran, Almonesson.
Francis C. Monks, Harvey Cedars.

NEW MEXICO

Byron C. Withers, Fort Sumner.

OHIO

Keith W. Lowery, Buckeye Lake.
Homer E. Charleston, Byesville.
Richard H. Mikesell, Cadiz.
David H. Reynolds, Cedarville.
Jean Ray Swihart, Eldorado.
Jack Richard Turner, Forest.
Helen M. Hall, Fredericksburg.
Clarence E. Felker, Gibsonburg.
Earl G. Golliver, Grover Hill.
Olive G. Spangler, Harrisburg.
Walter Thomas Woolard, Hebron.
Wayne F. Grosse, Hiram.
Adolph F. Raab, Lancaster.
Verne A. Miner, Lodi.
Robert H. Shafer, McComb.
Billy A. Calendine, McConnelsville.
Stanley L. Hartman, Medina.
Veryl D. Rodocker, Mount Eaton.
Dale A. Parker, North Bloomfield.
Harold E. Zornes, South Webster.
Barras George Birkbeck, Wadsworth.
Ben S. Daniels, Willoughby.
Marjorie A. Sine, Zanesfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

Donald C. Reese, Berwick.
Stanley A. Dubos, Chestnut Ridge.
Edna D. Lennon, Churchville.
Edward R. Quinn, Clifton Heights.
Blair E. Goodlin, Clymer.
Clair W. Wood, Conneautville.
Glenn P. Whelan, Croydon.
Karl W. Schempp, Jr., Donora.
Norman L. Bender, Dry Run.
Dorothy G. Fritz, Garrett.
Fred M. Ganoe, Heilwood.
Angelo P. Cellini, Midland.
Neil J. O'Brien, Renovo.
Gerald E. Ray, Rouseville.
Arthur B. Coulter, Saltsburg.
John P. Withers, Jr., West Elizabeth.
Arthur V. Gridley, Westfield.

RHODE ISLAND

Charles J. Butler, Westerly.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John T. Mabry, Abbeville.
Herbert G. McGraw, Clemson.
James R. Chitty, Jr., Olar.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Glen L. Engwall, Vermillion.

UTAH

Douglas R. Jensen, Redmond.

VERMONT

John H. Northrop, Enosburg Falls.

VIRGINIA

Roger D. Clark, Alexandria.
Sylvia M. Goad, Dugspur.
Paul P. Jones, Fancy Gap.
John H. Brown, Holland.
Mary M. Blaydes, Spotsylvania.

WASHINGTON

Daun Ringer, Bridgeport.
Gilbert E. Manuel, College Place.
Loring E. Bundy, Edwall.
Willis E. Goodwin, Houghton.
Samuel E. Edwards, Ritzville.
George A. Morrison, Vashon.
Bertha L. Mills, Vaughn.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lawrence E. Crow, Cameron.
Ivan E. Stewart, Ceredo.
Harold A. Buchanan, Gilbert.
Hayden K. Wolfe, Glen Rogers.
Frances L. Spencer, Hastings.
Robert Bruce Cooke, Iaeger.
Vernon Squires, Newburg.
Margaret G. Billings, Thorpe.

WISCONSIN

Sister M. Lenora Stein, Sinsinawa.
Minard F. Gaulke, Wisconsin Rapids.

WYOMING

Charles F. Hessenthaler, Byron.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Floyd C. Hammond to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, in the State of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. W. Warren Filkin, Jr., professor of Christian education, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bow before Thee humbly today in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. We thank Thee for blessings innumerable that we take for granted, so unaware that they come from Thy bountiful store.

We pray for the President of the United States, and for the Speaker, and those who labor faithfully with him today in the affairs of state. Give us the blessing of Thy presence today. Give insight to know Thy will and courage and grace to do it.

We pray for peace. May there be a great turning toward the Prince of Peace in America and throughout the world. Bless these men and bless this Nation, and help us each one to live more and more for the honor and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, for we pray in His blessed name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 426)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, 13, 17, 25, 27, 60 and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65, 67 and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$95,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, $7,500,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT"

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64 and 66.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $650,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Research Service," instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $7,000,000 additional for "School-lunch program."

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $8,900,000 for "Payments to air carriers, Civil Aeronautics Board," instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this head are to be used to pay subsidy claims due for local service carriers.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $50,000,000 for "Operating-differential subsidies, maritime activities," instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8: Provides a limitation of $225,000 on the amount that may be advanced to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities" from "Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)," as proposed by the House instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $95,000,000 for "Federal-aid highways" instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $3,500,000 for "Forest highways" instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $875,000 for "Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)", instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $230,000 for "Operating expenses, Canal Zone Government", as proposed by the House instead of $338,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Foreign Operations

Amendment No. 15: Provides, by transfer, $6,500,000 for "Contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance" instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Increases limitation on administrative expenses for the Export-Import Bank of Washington to $1,125,000 instead of $1,110,000 as proposed by the House and $1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Independent offices

Amendment No. 17: Deletes item of $12,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration proposed by the Senate. The conferees gave serious consideration to this item, but deferred action to permit the House to give consideration to the program in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, 1956.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $7,500,000 for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees" instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 21: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Increases authorization to $80,020,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" instead of $79,400,000 as proposed by the House and $80,640,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes item for Office of the Secretary proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 26: Provides $750,000 additional for "Salaries and expenses" to be derived by transfer, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate. These funds are for home leave only.

Amendment No. 27: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to make available not to exceed $75,000 from "Contributions to international organizations" for the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Amendment No. 28: Provides transfer of $100,000 to "International contingencies" instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

The Judiciary

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $13,300 for "Salaries and expenses, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $900,000 for "Salaries of Judges," instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $914,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 32: Corrects title.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $85,000 for the Bureau of Accounts as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 35–37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $63,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $650,300 for "Department of Public Health" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $152,900 for "Department of Public Welfare" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $28,008 for "Settlement of Claims and Suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XII

Legislative branch

Amendments Nos. 47–51: Make provision for Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 54–59: Make provision for Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Eliminates amendment to Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Eliminates item for House of Representatives, Salaries, Officers and Employees, Office of the Clerk, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $21,139 for fiscal year 1954 and $38,972 for fiscal year 1955 for "Capitol Police Board" as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,420 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 65: Eliminates language as proposed by Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIII

Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments

Amendment No. 67: Inserts document number.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $9,504,219 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,269,842 as proposed by the House.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report is the unanimous report of both the House and Senate conferees.

There are a number of technical amendments which under the rules must be submitted for separate vote but the committee of conference reports with a unanimous recommendation.

The three remaining amendments are submitted with modifications agreed on in conference which will be submitted to both the House and the other body in identical form.

It is a very satisfactory report in that it is $53,196,843 below the budget estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has gone to conference and is now back for our consideration. The other body placed increases in the bill totaling in the neighborhood of $98 million. We finally had to agree to an increase of $41,618,000 of the $98 million. Frankly, considering everything, I think the House conferees did as well as could be done in working the bill out. We have not included in this bill any more money than was absolutely necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc the amendments which are reported in technical disagreement and on which the House managers will move to recede and concur, as follows: 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 2, insert: *"Provided further,* That said funds may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), for such funds as have been allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture for payments for the specific purposes authorized herein."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 7, insert:

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

"Claims, Federal Airport Act

"For an additional amount for 'Claims, Federal Airport Act,' to remain available until expended as follows: Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., not to exceed $110,854; to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of amounts heretofore appropriated for 'Claims, Federal Airport Act'."

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 1, insert:

"Repair of reserve fleet facilities

"For expenses of repair and installation of mooring facilities and restoration of cathodic installations at reserve fleet locations, $970,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 12, insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $400,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for Reserve Fleet expenses is increased from '$6,460,000' to '$6,860,000'."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 7, line 3, strike out all of line 3 down to and including line 11, and insert:

"INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

"Claims

"For an additional amount for 'Claims,' $4,320,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Military personnel, Navy,' fiscal year 1955.

"Retired pay

"For an additional amount for 'Retired pay,' $8,000,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Military personnel, Navy,' fiscal year 1955.

"For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the respective amounts stated:

" 'Claims,' Department of Defense, $4,320,000;

" 'Retired pay,' Department of Defense, $22,000,000;

" 'Military personnel, Army,' $150,000,000;

" 'Military personnel, Air Force,' $110,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this head to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation only during the fiscal year 1955 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 15, line 10, insert:

"Assistance to States, general

"The limitation under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from '$2,400,000' to '$2,418,000'."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 22, line 2, insert:

"Operating expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses,' $1,100,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Acquisition, construction, and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 22, line 6, insert:

"Retired pay

"For an additional amount for 'Retired pay,' $584,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Acquisition, construction, and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 22, line 10, insert:

"Reserve training

"For an additional amount for 'Reserve training,' $46,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Acuisition, construction and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 23, line 3, insert:

"OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL

"The limitation of $10,000 for the settlement of claims not in excess of $250 each in accordance with the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, is increased to $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 23, line 10, insert:

"Metropolitan police

"The appropriation for 'Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention),' contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for payment at basic salary rates for services performed from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, by members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department in excess of their regular tour of duty (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing service within such period)."

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 24, line 14, insert:

"JUDGMENTS

"For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Cong.), $10,587, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment."

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 25, line 1, insert:

"AUDITED CLAIMS

"For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Cong.), $155,095, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest on audited claims for refunds at not exceeding 4 percent per annum as provided by law (act of July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 546, sec. 14d)."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 26, line 18, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $3,905, to be available, effective April 1, 1955, for the compensation of 1 director of photography, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $5,100, and 1 laboratory technician, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $4,020."

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 27, line 1, insert:

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $140: *Provided,* That effective April 1, 1955, the basic rate of compensation of

the chief cabinetmaker shall be $3,540 in lieu of $3,200."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 29, line 8, insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings,' $16,000, of which $12,500 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Capitol Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination, including related architectural treatment."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 30, line 1, insert:

"Senate Office Building

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Building,' $53,000, of which $10,000 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Senate Office Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 32, line 7, insert:

"CHAPTER XII A

"ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

"SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary equipment, such necessary connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such necessary access facilities over or under public streets, such other appurtenant or necessary facilities, such changes in the present House Office Buildings and mechanical and other changes necessitated thereby, and such changes in or additions to the present subway systems, as may be approved by such Commission.

"SEC. 1202. (a) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purposes of section 1201 of this chapter or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any street, avenue, road, highway, alley, or part thereof, acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the House Office Building Commission. Square numbered 636 in the District of Columbia (which is now part of the new House of Representatives Office Building site) shall be available for the purposes of this chapter. Any real property owned by the United States and located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol without reimbursement or transfer of funds. At such time or times as may be fixed by order of the House Office Building Commission, (1) any real property acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter shall become part of the United States Capitol Grounds and subject to the act entitled 'An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes,' approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a–193m, 212a, and 212b), and (2) the building and all facilities constructed pursuant to section 1201 of this chapter shall become subject to such act approved July 31, 1946, and to the provisions of law relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building contained in the act approved May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175).

"(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled 'An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States,' approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–644).

"(c) When any real property has been acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

"SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this chapter there is hereby appropriated $5 million, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by the House Office Building Commission to be required for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of such Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

"SEC. 1204. This chapter may be cited as the 'Additional House Office Building Act of 1955'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18 page 10, line 15, insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Expenses, general supply fund

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general suply fund,' $258,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Defense public works, community facilities'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$258,000" named in said amendment insert "$200,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19, page 11, line 1, insert:

"Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission

"For necessary expenses of the Commission in preparing, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 620), a comprehensive plan for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, and transportation and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence for members serving without compensation, $21,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$21,000" named in said amendment insert "$15,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 15, line 15, insert:

"Indian health activities

"For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $125,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Retired pay of commissioned officers,' fiscal year 1955."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$125,000" named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON, and by unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the votes on the various amendments in disagreement was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 144)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress authorize, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the program for mutual security outlined in this message. The program reflects the greatly improved conditions in Europe and provides for the critical

needs of Asia. It encourages private overseas investment and private enterprise abroad, fosters an increase in cooperative effort, emphasizes loans rather than grants wherever possible. I consider the program an indispensable part of a realistic and enlightened national policy.

The fixed, unwavering objective of that policy is a just, prosperous, enduring peace. On this fundamental position we base our broad approach toward our world trade, our military alliances, our exchange of information and of persons, our partnership with free nations through the mutual security program. This partnership is rooted in the facts of economic and defense interdependence and also in the understanding and respect of each partner for the cultural and national aspirations of the other.

The recommendations in this message are an essential complement to the foreign economic program outlined in my message of January 10, 1955. That program is designed to develop the economic strength and the security of the free world through healthy trade expansion among the free nations and through an increased flow of investment capital particularly to underdeveloped areas. The lessening of barriers to trade in the free world is a vital component for the successful implementation of our national policy for security and peace.

We must recognize, however, that certain free world countries, because of the aftermath of war and its continuing threat or because of less developed economies, require assistance which will help them achieve stable national health and essential defensive strength. The mutual security program is designed to deal with these specific problems in the national interest and in the cause of peace. The program stands on its demonstrated worth.

Its cumulative success is especially evident in Western Europe today. The free nations there have attained new levels of production, larger volumes of trade, expanded employment, and rising standards of living. They have established strong defense forces which, although deficient in some respects, now constitute a significant deterrent to aggression and add substantially to the free world's defensive power. Their own national efforts and their cooperation with each other are the prime reasons for their success. However, the United States mutual security program and its predecessor, the European recovery program, deserve an important portion of the credit.

The program I now recommend to you for fiscal year 1956 proposes no economic aid for the original Marshall plan countries in Western Europe. These nations are capable of meeting current defense goals without such support. Deliveries of arms from previous appropriations will continue under constant review to insure that the latest weapon developments and strategic thinking are taken into account. Our initial contribution toward the arming of German forces is already funded by previous congressional action.

In Spain and Yugoslavia, which were not in the Marshall plan, defense programs can be successful only with further strengthening of their economic base. New appropriations are needed to continue our cooperation with them. Likewise the special circumstances of the city of Berlin require continued support for that outpost of freedom.

But the immediate threats to world security and stability are now centered in Asia. The preponderance of funds requested of the Congress will be used to meet the threat there. Within the vast arc of free Asia, which extends from the Republic of Korea and Japan to the Middle East, 770 million people, one-third of the world's population, reside. Most of them are citizens of newly independent states. Some have been engaged in recent war against the Communists. All are threatened. Capital is very scarce. Technical and administrative skill is limited. Within the area, however, abundant resources and fertile lands are ready for development.

Now is the time for accelerated development of the nations along the arc. The major responsibility must necessarily lie with the countries themselves. At best, foreign capital as well as foreign aid can only launch or stimulate the process of creating dynamic economies. In this light, the United States has the capacity, the desire, the concern to take the lead in friendly help for free Asia.

For example, we can assist in providing and mobilizing capital for useful and constructive development. We can encourage our successful private industry to join with the people of free Asia in building their private industry and facilitate the way. We can consult and advise on the means by which a free nation builds upon the initiative of independent farmers to achieve a steady advance toward better standards of living, in contrast to the mounting failures of collectivist agriculture.

It is clear that most of the nations of free Asia prefer to quicken their cooperative march toward these objectives through the Colombo plan consultative group which was established in 1950 to promote mutual economic development. We welcome this initiative. As a member of the group, we shall continue to work in strengthening its cooperative efforts.

The varied nature of national situations requires that our cooperation be essentially bilateral. Some of the nations are members of the Manila Pact and their treaty obligations give rise to special economic problems. Most are members of the Colombo plan. Most, except for Japan, have very little industrial capacity.

The requested authorization includes substantial funds to further our mutual objectives in this area. Of these funds I suggest that we can achieve the maximum return if $200 million is set aside for the establishment of a President's fund for Asian economic development, with broad rules enacted by Congress for its use through loans and grants, and with adequate latitude to meet changing circumstances and to take advantage of constructive opportunities.

To help assure the most effective use of these funds, this appropriation should be available for use over a period of years. Wisdom and economy in their use cannot be achieved through speed. A small, firm, annual commitment out of this $200 million may prove in many instances to be the most fruitful method.

Because of the continuing threat of aggression and subversion in Asia, a large part of the amounts requested for military assistance and direct forces support is to build and maintain the defensive forces of our allies there. This includes the substantial costs of maintaining and improving the defenses of the Nationalist Government of China in Formosa and provides for military equipment and supplies for Korea.

The newly achieved stability in Iran has decreased the Communist threat and has opened the way to the use of oil resources. These eventually will bring revenues to the nation for the further development of the land and the opening of new opportunities for its people. Pending resumption of sufficient revenues from oil, however, limited defense and economic support must be provided.

In the Near East, our stalwart North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, Greece and Turkey, are both making significant progress. But neither of them can alone support the substantial armed forces which they maintain for their own defense and for the NATO force goals in that area. Their initiative in promoting security arrangements in the Balkans, and Turkey's vigorous efforts for Middle East defense, reinforce the need for continued support of their efforts. Iraq's action in joining with Turkey in a defensive security arrangement is another favorable development.

The continuing tension between the Arab States and Israel handicaps the peoples of all Near East nations. We should continue to work with the governments and peoples on both sides to improve their economic status and accelerate their progress toward lasting peace between them. Our cooperation is beginning to bring results, particularly in the development of water resources. Such developments in the Palestine area can go far to remove present causes of tension.

In the vast continent of Africa the long-range effect of our cooperation is extremely significant. This continent and its resources, the progress of its people and their relationship to the free world are of growing importance. Requested appropriations for this area are needed in the effort to promote welfare and growth for the peoples of Africa.

In Latin America, I recommend intensification of our technical cooperation program. In this area more than a decade ago, technical cooperation was first undertaken in a systematic manner. The programs have proved their high value in many of our sister republics. No international programs have ever had such widespread welcome and support. Indispensable to the economic development of many free nations, they also reflect the deep humanitarian spirit of the American people.

Technical cooperation programs have contributed effectively to the efforts of the other American Republics to strengthen and expand their national economies. These efforts have likewise been aided by our very large inter-American trade, substantial private investment, more extensive lending by the Export-Import Bank, and credits by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As a result, Latin America has achieved a remarkable rate of economic development. In addition to the technical cooperation programs for Latin America, I recommend a continuation of our modest contribution to the Organization of American States and further economic support to meet the critical situations in Guatemala and Bolivia.

Our programs of national action are not in any manner a substitute for United Nations action in similar fields. Every instance of effective measures taken through the United Nations on a human problem improves the ultimate prospect of peace in the world. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the United Nations technical assistance program, in which 60 governments participate and which is carried out by the United Nations and its specialized agencies be supported in a continuing and adequate manner. The United Nations Children's Fund has carried out an especially appealing and significant work. We have done our full share to make this work possible. We should continue to do so.

Persons who have escaped from totalitarian oppression, often at great peril, and refugees uprooted by war and disaster deserve further support in 1956 through programs administered by the United States, the United Nations, and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

One of the unique, least expensive, and most fruitful aspects of the mutual security program is the participation, largely in humanitarian projects, of 47 voluntary organizations representing many millions of our citizens. These organizations do an exceptionally effective work in helping the escapees and refugees become self-supporting. They distribute large quantities of food on a people-to-people basis. But certain costs for transporting food, and for supplies beyond their own voluntary resources, are needed and should be provided.

In total, for fiscal year 1956, I recommend that the Congress approve funds totaling $3,530,000,000 for the mutual security program, as proposed in the budget message. Of this amount, $712,500,000 is for economic programs, including $172 million for a continuation of technical cooperation programs; $175,500,000 for special programs; $165 million for development assistance; $200 million for the special President's fund; $100 million is for a worldwide contingency fund. I request $1,000,300,000 million for defense support, which serves both economic and defense purposes by supplementing the efforts of countries, particularly in Asia, carrying out defensive measures beyond their current financial capacity; $1,717,200,000 is for military assistance and direct forces support. Included in this amount is $500 million to cover expected losses to present military-assistance programs by operation of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

The Foreign Operations Administration has proved to be an effective and efficient instrument for conducting the Mutual Security Program. An able and devoted group of men and women have successfully conducted the program under direct line authority from the President.

The Congress provided in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 for the termination of the Foreign Operations Administration by June 30 of this year. As I indicated in my letter to the Secretary of State of April 15, I shall issue an Executive order effective June 30, 1955, transferring the affairs of the Foreign Operations Administration to the Department of State, except for certain military aspects which will be transferred to the Department of Defense.

This transfer to permanent Departments of the Government will reflect the significance of this program as an integral part of our foreign policy. In the implementation of the program, the facilities of all agencies of the executive branch will be used where appropriate, and to the maximum possible extent on a contract basis. However, it is essential that responsibility for the nonmilitary operations continue unified; to fragment this responsibility among several agencies would seriously detract from their effectiveness. The reorganization will continue the role of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in carrying out cooperative programs for the advancement of the well-being of the peoples in the other American Republics.

The continuity of operations and the adjustments of internal relationships within the Department of State after June 30, 1955, will require a period of transition. I recommend that the Mutual Security Act of 1955 include broad authority to revise the organization during a period of 6 months following June 30, 1955.

The International Cooperation Administration will be a new semiautonomous unit within the Department of State. Its Director will report directly to the Secretary of State and will, on the Secretary's behalf, give supervision and direction to the mutual-security operations performed within the Department of State.

This responsibility will require that the International Cooperation Administration have the capacity to make and carry out operating decisions within broad policy guides established by the Secretary of State. It will likewise require that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration have his own complement of supporting staff and program personnel, both in Washington and in the field. It will be his responsibility to assure that appropriate policy guidelines are secured from the Secretary of State, and within those guidelines he will issue the necessary instructions to the field to carry out its policy.

Based on the experience of the past 2 years, 3 out of every 4 dollars appropriated for the entire mutual security program will be immediately spent within the United States for commodities, services, machinery, and other items. Insofar as feasible and consistent with the effective meeting of our goals overseas, the commodities will include food, cotton, coal, and other goods for which our capacity or surplus supply most readily matches requirements. Approximately $350 million of agricultural products are expected to be used in the fiscal year 1955. This includes a significant export of major surplus crops. Shipments under the mutual security program will be in addition to but coordinated with sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

The other 25 percent of the dollars will be spent overseas in a manner that will add directly to the accomplishments of the mutual security program. For example, the offshore procurement contracts assist in establishing a defense production base in key points in the free world. In addition, these expenditures will indirectly add to the power of other nations subsequently to purchase with these dollars other needed goods from the United States.

I recommend continuance of the authority in the present Mutual Security Act to meet unexpected events by transfer of funds, appropriated for one geographic area or purpose, to another geographic area or purpose. Experience in recent years has demonstrated that flexible authority is highly desirable to move with dispatch to meet new circumstances, to overcome new dangers, or to capitalize upon favorable developments.

New procedures approved by the Congress last year now make possible maximum integration of domestic procurement of military equipment for our own and allied forces, increased flexibility in the flow of military equipment to our allies and greatly simplified procurement and accounting arrangements. Under the new procedures, the military departments procure most of the equipment for this program as a part of their regular procurement operations, with military assistance funds reserved to repay the services at the time the equipment is delivered. Under present law, military assistance funds which are reserved remain available for obligation and expenditure until June 30, 1957. To further improve the present arrangements, I recommend that current and proposed military assistance funds be made available until expended, as is now provided in the case of most Department of Defense appropriations for procurement.

In conclusion, I wish again to emphasize the essential role of the mutual security program. The program for the arc of free Asia has had a thorough review by all the departments of the Government concerned, and it has been recommended to me by the Council on Foreign Economic Policy and the National Security Council after extensive study.

We are making renewed and intensified efforts to develop a successful basic policy on the question of disarmament and we will persist in this effort. But

until success is assured beyond doubt, the best prospects of peace and the grim essentials of security together demand the continuance of both our national and mutual defense programs.

The other free nations need the United States, and we need them, if all are to be secure. Here is a clear case of interwoven self-interest. The necessary expenditures to equip and maintain United States Armed Forces of air and land and sea at strategic points beyond our borders are never called aid. The necessary expenditures to enable other free nations associated with us to equip and maintain vital armed forces at these same strategic points beyond our borders should not be considered as aid. These, in fact, are defense alliance expenditures clearly safeguarding in the most desirable manner, and at times in the only possible way, the security of the United States and of other free nations.

Our economy cannot be strong and continue to expand without the development of healthy economic conditions in other free nations, and without a continuous expansion of international trade. Neither can we be secure in our freedom unless, elsewhere in the world, we help to build the conditions under which freedom can flourish by destroying the conditions under which totalitarianism grows—poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease. Nor can we hope for enduring peace until the spiritual aspirations of mankind for liberty and opportunity and growth are recognized as prior to and paramount to the material appetites which communism exploits.

Apart from any obstacles created by the Communists, this is a long-term process. Patience, resourcefulness and dedication are required as well as the creative application of knowledge, skill and material resources to the solution of fundamental human problems, ancient in their origin. In that spirit, the mutual security program is designed for the benefit of all free nations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1955.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR OWN NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, aid to bolster the economy of a foreign country and to assist business, big and little, in a foreign country are worthy of consideration. The President's request will receive careful consideration, I know, by Congress. However, I believe that Congress should put its foot down on any further aid to bolster the economy of a foreign nation until we have made available at least $1 billion a year in the United States for water and soil conservation, flood control, hydroelectric dams, navigation, and the development of other natural resources. We have a backlog of 300 projects already approved by the Corps of Engineers that could be commenced right away.

The World Bank is cooking up another international RFC for foreigners and foreign countries. It does not seem to concern our representatives in this bank that they are proposing to give in foreign assistance with United States credit valuable aid that is not available to the citizens of the United States.

POLIO VACCINE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of appearing unfair to stockholders of a very great and important American industry, I should like to ask our pharmaceutical companies to join in the spirit which made development of the Salk polio vaccine possible. This they can do by rejecting all profits from the sale of the vaccine until it is no longer in critically short supply and can be placed on the market on a competitive basis.

I realize that the six commercial firms now producing polio vaccine have already made a great contribution to humanity by vast investments in an experiment whose practicability did not become established until last week. Without their faith in Dr. Salk and their willingness to make enormous capital outlays in a product that was yet to be proved, mass production of the vaccine might not have become a reality for many months hence. I salute these drug manufacturers for their foresight and courage.

In addition to these invaluable contributions, however, perhaps it would be possible for these companies to forego profit on the vaccine at least until the end of this year so that no semblance of financial gain can in any way be attached to the development and introduction of the Salk polio vaccine. Studies which led to the successful discovery of the vaccine were made possible through the contributions of a generous public. Dr. Salk himself has rejected monetary remuneration. President Eisenhower has announced that complete information on the polio preventive will be made available on a gratis basis to every nation desiring it. To complete the picture, manufacturers of the vaccine need only to renounce any profit motive so long as demand remains so far out of supply's reach.

Last week, the Wall Street Journal quoted two pharmaceutical companies with the prediction that sales of the vaccine would have a marked effect on earnings. A spokesman for one concern said that his company had a large investment in the vaccine and expects a sizable return. I believe that most of us found this statement somewhat disturbing; it could be counteracted with an announcement to the effect that there will be no profit realized on polio vaccine, at least for the time being.

According to the Washington Sunday Star, the manufacturers of the vaccine have announced a commercial price of $6 for a quantity sufficient to take care of the three injections recommended by Dr. Salk, with a special rate to the medical profession of $4.20 for the series. Assuming that the latter rate is within range of the actual production cost, the differential would stand as the base of a huge profit as millions of the Nation's children are treated with the vaccine. If manufacturers were to reject this profit and explain that the vaccine is being produced at cost as another contribution to America's campaign for better health, I believe that the public would respond by giving even more generously to the fight against cancer and other crippling and killing diseases.

Let me say in conclusion that I believe such a move should be entirely voluntary on the part of pharmaceutical concerns. There have been suggestions that distribution of the vaccine be handled exclusively by the Government. I cannot concur with this view. The Government did not develop the vaccine, and bureaucrats are not the proper ones to oversee its production, distribution, or supply. Dr. Salk's discovery was made possible through public contribution, and a voluntary refusal of profit by the manufacturers is all that is necessary to round out the story of this glorious medical miracle.

THE DESTRUCTION OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to the Hungarian people and their many American descendants, I want to take this opportunity to engage the attention of the House.

Europe in 1848 was a continent in ferment. The pillars of the old order, founded upon autocracy and despotism, were shaken by the powerful forces of liberalism and nationalism. These forces, earlier fostered by the American and French revolutions, found renewed expression at this time in Eastern and Western Euprope. Hungary was a storm center of the conflict.

In Hungary, the forces of freedom were led by Louis Kossuth. A man dedicated to the ideals of democracy, Kossuth momentarily broke the shackles that bound his country, and together with his compatriots proclaimed the independence of Hungary on March 15, 1848.

Hungarian independence had thus become a reality. At long last the people of Hungary were free, but not for long.

Fate had ruled otherwise. Imperial Russia, the most formidable autocracy in Eastern Europe, intervened to put an end to Hungarian democracy.

A curious parallel to the Hungarian experience in 1848 was the experience she had following World War II; for again Russia, still the most formidable autocracy in the world, intervened, imposing a severe occupation which ultimately created the conditions that resulted in the loss of Hungarian freedom. Upon Hungary the Soviets imposed a new type of tyranny which enveloped the entire national life of the Hungarian people. No longer were the Hungarians politically free. No longer was their society to be a society acting in the rich historic traditions of Hungary. No longer was there to be intellectual freedom. No longer was there to be religious freedom. Thus, in Hungary we behold a nation in bondage.

All America laments the destruction of Hungarian independence, just as she laments the destruction of independence throughout all Eastern Europe. For us and all the free world Hungary has become a symbol of two things: It has become a symbol of Soviet tyranny. For we have seen in Hungary Soviet Communist oppression at its harshest. Secondly, Hungary has become a symbol of man's desire to be free. For all mankind there is in Hungary an example of a type of heroism, courage, and forbearance that inspires emulation. Hungary is today a nation in bondage, but it is a nation determined to live again and in that hope all the free world abundantly shares.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Powell
Blatnik	Eberharter	Reed, Ill.
Blitch	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Herlong	Roberts
Canfield	Holt	Scott
Carlyle	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Cooley	Kilday	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	
	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 211) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill, except that it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to offer any of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California, Mr. Moss, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the very controversial bill on the pay of postal employees. I am taking this time to speak on the rule because it is a somewhat unusual rule, and I think the Members of the House would like to understand quite clearly what the rule does.

I would like to give you an explanation of the rule and what the issues involved are. I do not know how other Members, who are not members of the committee, have felt about this whole situation, but I am frank to say I have been very much confused. I think that this rule we are presenting to you pinpoints the issues involved between those who want the Murray bill and those who want a more liberal bill.

I had thought there was a great deal of controversy about the subject of reclassification, to begin with. I found in the discussion before the Committee on Rules on yesterday that reclassification apparently is not as much of an issue as has been discussed, because it was stated positively by both factions that under this reclassification provision, which runs throughout this bill, the Postmaster General could not demote anybody; that he could not reduce the pay of anybody; that he could not do anybody any harm. The only thing is that he can promote. He cannot demote. So far as the appearances before the Committee on Rules were concerned, that was not disputed. So apparently there is not very much merit in the discussions we have heard about reclassification. What those who oppose the Murray bill wanted and what they are asking for and all that they have asked for was an opportunity to vote on three amendments which they have proposed. You will find those three amendments, which will be offered by Mr. Moss, set out at length at page 4721 of the RECORD of yesterday. I want to discuss those briefly with you. Before doing so, I would like to make this statement:

Everybody seems to agree that the postal employees as a whole should receive an increase. The dispute is about how much the increase shall be. That same question came up last year, and the dispute about more increase resulted in the postal employees receiving no increase. I do not think anybody wants to see that happen again this year.

The differences in these amendments, as I see them, are comparatively small. If this bill had been passed last year the postal employees would have received more money by now than they would lose by the little differences that exist between them.

It has been said pretty generally, but of course nobody can speak for the President of the United States, and certainly I would be the last person who would undertake to speak for him, but it is generally thought and believed that if this increase goes above the increase recommended by the committee bill there will be a veto, and that if there is a veto it will be sustained. I think the question, when you brush aside all the discussion and argument, resolves itself to this one thing: Whether you would rather give them the moderate increase provided in the committee bill or take a chance of a repetition of what happened last year in which the whole of the postal employees will be deprived of any increase. That is just about what it is going to come down to.

Let me explain to you these amendments. This is an unusual rule, but it is what both sides were willing to have apparently, that is, that this should be a closed rule with the right of the minority, represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] to offer three amendments which would be in order for a vote by the House. These three amendments are printed on page 4721 of the RECORD.

The amendments are these:

No. 1 provides that the Postmaster General shall make a report to the Congress the first of next year on his actions under this bill. Nobody objects to that; I think the committee would be willing to concede it.

No. 2: That this pay increase shall date as of March 1; in other words, it makes it retroactive to March 1. I do not think there is a great deal of discussion or controversy about that because of the fact that for over a year this matter has been pending with everybody believing that the postal employees are entitled to a moderate increase. That would not be too expensive; it would cost $10 million a month until the

bill becomes effective, but it seems to me that in fairness there should be no objection to letting this increase date retroactively to March 1. So that brings us to amendment No. 3, which is really the important issue in controversy.

It has been generally stated that the President will accept a pay bill which has a 7.6 percent increase. If the Moss amendment is adopted the raise will be increased to 8.3 percent. That difference may be the straw that breaks the camel's back so far as the veto is concerned, and the question that this House must consider is whether your interest in the postal employees is such that you would rather take the increase recommended by the committee or take the chance of no increase by reason of a Presidential veto. That is, frankly, the situation as I see it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time, if the gentleman please.

While that is the percentage of increase, it applies only to a limited group of personnel. There is a classification known as No. 5 in the schedule set up by the committee, and the Moss amendment will increase the pay for schedule No. 5 which consists of postal clerks, postal carriers, and the motor-vehicle operators. That is just about all there is to the situation. So I think you can pinpoint the controversy that will arise today in this bill on whether you shall grant to this class of employees the additional compensation which they ask which will bring the general increase of pay up to 8.3 percent. That is about all there is in controversy, as far as I can see.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say whether the chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee asked for an open rule or for a closed rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They were willing to consent to this type of rule.

Mr. GROSS. They were willing to consent to this type of rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. To the type of rule that is presented.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say how much time will be permitted for debate upon the amendments that will be offered under this rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is a matter under the rules of the House. General debate is 2 hours, as provided in the resolution.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the ranking minority member of the committee agreed to the type of rule that is being brought up today?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I said I did not think they objected to it. Did the gentleman object to it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly. We asked for an open rule. The chairman of our committee and I asked for an open rule on this bill. I went to the House floor after making the request to look after legislation in which I was interested. This matter transpired after I left the committee room.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry I was mistaken about that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is my belief at the time of discussion before the Rules Committee that we agreed to 2 of the 3 Moss amendments. We were only $40 out of the way on agreement to the third amendment. I felt quite sure that the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Kansas were in agreement while we were discussing that before the committee, before coming to a final decision.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thought so. We were trying to get the warring factions together.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Do I understand that under this rule, if adopted, the membership will not have an opportunity to vote for a 10-percent raise, the increase provided by the Senate bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; they will not.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I do not believe that the question was clearly understood. What we would like to know is, when the amendments are offered, will they be subject to discussion under the 5-minute rule or will they be limited to one speech for and against?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I imagine that the House will be lenient about that.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me say to the gentleman that from a strictly parliamentary standpoint there would only be 10 minutes, 5 on one side and 5 on the other. Whether you can get unanimous consent or not I do not know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such times as I might require.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise the question, if this rule is adopted, and when the amendments are presented, whether or not the amendments will be open to discussion under the 5-minute rule or we will be limited to one 5-minute speech for and one 5-minute speech against the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules, there will be one 5-minutes for and one 5-minutes against. No pro forma amendments will be in order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as always, the able chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has presented the rule in a most logical manner. He has explained the provisions of the rule and he has also spoken with reference to the three amendments that will be offered. Therefore, there will be no necessity for me going into that particular matter. However, I want to make a few brief observations and I make them with the knowledge that in my 22 or 23 years as a Member of this House I have supported every bill that has been presented for the benefit of the postal workers. I believe I am correct in saying that since 1945 the postal workers of this country have received a 92-percent increase in salary. In addition, they have received many other benefits. As I say, I have always supported the increase, but now, Mr. Speaker, I expect to support the findings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Servce. Since that committee, from a nonpartisan standpoint, Republicans and Democrats alike, has come in and by a vote of 17 to 6 reported this bill, it behooves every Member of this Congress, whichever side of the aisle he is on, to support the committee. We have a legislative responsibility. After a committee holds extensive hearings and has a rule reported allowing only 1 Member, the gentleman from California, to offer 3 amendments which affects 59 changes, I say that it is incumbent upon us to support the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

With regard to the rule, I may say that we did have an unusual situation in the Committee on Rules. During the many years that I have served on the Committee on Rules, I cannot recollect one instance when the chairman of a legislative committee and the ranking minority member of that same committee have come before the Committee on Rules asking for an open rule which was denied. Whereupon the Committee on Rules then gave 1 member of the minority group, just 1 member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 1 Member of this great body consisting of 435 Members, the privilege of offering amendments. This is the first time to my knowledge when the Committee on Rules has turned to one individual and said, "No one else, just you, solely, alone, are the only one that can offer amendments in this instance." So, I say that was a most unusual thing. I know that when we have considered bills under suspension of the rules, many Members have said that was an unusual procedure. But to me this is far more than unusual. If the time comes when only 1 Member and 1 Member solely can offer 3 amendments while the other 434 Members are denied that privilege, I say that certainly is not proper legislative procedure.

As the able gentleman from Virginia has stated, every Member here without exception is for a reasonable amount of increase. What is a reasonable amount? Hw can we gage it? This bill provides for a 7.6 percent increase for all postal workers. According to the best information that came before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as well as the Committee on Rules, the cost of living has risen only 3.4 percent since the last postal raise back in 1951. I have had letters within this last year from postal organizations saying that we gave the military men, the ones that have done the fighting and will do the fighting when the time comes, an increase of only 6.7 percent to meet the higher cost of living.

We also gave the old people a raise of 5 percent. So when it comes to the question of what is a reasonable amount of increase, when we gave the military only 6.7 percent and the old people 5 percent, and we are offering here 7.6 percent, how can any Member argue against that and say that it is not a reasonable amount?

We have heard much about a Presidential veto. We heard that last year and we have heard it again this year. Some who have not, perhaps, read the Constitution as recently as I have, may fail to realize that the Constitution provides the right of veto to the President. That is his responsibility. Our forefathers put that in the Constitution for a purpose. The right of the President to veto is as much the law as any other part of the Constitution. We must abide by it. If I were President of the United States and felt in my own conscience that Congress had done wrong in passing a certain bill, I should not hesitate 1 minute to veto that bill. I think that is what was in the minds of Thomas Jefferson and Madison and the others who wrote the Constitution.

We have heard something about a compromise. When this bill was first mentioned, I think Members will agree that the administration was for a 5 percent increase. Certain others were for 7 percent or 8 percent or 10 percent. A 10 percent increase was provided in the Senate. But up until that time it was a question whether it would be 5 percent or 7 percent.

It is my understanding that the administration has accepted what I say is a fair compromise, which raised the percentage from 5 percent to 7.6 percent. I do not see why anyone should consider that that was not a fair compromise.

I should like to say further that I feel we should quit fooling around. Last year, because of the bickering that was indulged in, the postal workers did not receive a deserved and a rightful increase, did not receive what they were entitled to receive. It would have amounted to about $200. They have lost that $200. They will never receive it.

We have before us today a bill which, if it is vetoed by the President, I believe the veto will be sustained. We know that the key vote in the Senate was 52 to 41. So that the postal workers, after having lost two or three hundred dollars last year as a result of indecision and as a result of some trying to get them a little more, may lose three or four hundred dollars this time. All caused by a few insisting that some, not all postal employees, receive but an additional sixteenths of 1 percent increase.

There is one other thing I might add, that out of 503,000 postal workers, the proposed amendment affects only a little more than 300,000. The proposed amendment that is causing all the trouble does not affect the rural carriers, and several other postal organizations. It does not affect 200,000 postal workers. Still they will suffer if we do not pass an increase in salary bill this session.

It is said that some of these increases are too high for certain positions. We know that in business those who have responsible jobs get higher pay and larger raises.

We know that if people in the classified part of the Government service show outstanding ability they go up in grade and receive a raise. We know that the men who go into the Army and advance in rank get higher rates of pay than the privates and the corporals. We know that right here in Congress when we raise the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Doorkeeper or the Sergeant at Arms we give them, because of their extra responsibilities and extra duties, more of a raise than we give the pages and the guards. Recognition of ability and outstanding achievements has made our Nation great and will keep our Nation great.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, let us forget about the small differences. Let us pass this bill in order that all of the 503,000 postal workers may receive additional pay immediately. As far as I am concerned individually, I am willing to accept the amendment in the report making the salary increase retroactive to March 1. If it has any bearing on the case, I am willing personally to accept the March 1 deadline, so that these workers can get a 7.6-percent raise starting March 1. Otherwise, it is possible that through lengthy conferences between the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, by reason of a possible veto, that again this year the postal workers will again be denied a deserved reasonable increase to which all agree they are entitled, because a certain number insist on an additional increase of $1 or $2 per month.

Therefore, I respectfully urge that today this body pass the bill before us that was recommended by a nonpartisan vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, that will give every man and woman in the postal service an average of 7.6-percent raise in salary and other benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I first wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and the former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], for the great interest they have always taken in postal employees. The responsibility they have is tremendous, and I am sure all of the postal employees in the country recognize that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke and voted against a gag rule when this bill first came up on March 21. This bill affects more than 500,000 postal employees. A great many of these employees are opposed to the bill in its present form and would like the opportunity to present proper amendments. If we are to legislate for all postal employees, and I believe that to be our duty, then we cannot deny the right of any group of employees to submit their case to the Congress.

I know everybody here is trying to do the right thing. In my opinion, the right thing is to discuss this bill under an open rule. This way no set of employees will feel they have been discriminated against.

I firmly believe that in matters of this sort we must not yield to pressure, we must not yield to insults, we must not yield to threats of veto, but rather be guided by our consciences. My conscience would not permit me to sleep if I voted for this closed rule knowing that approximately 200,000 postal clerks had the feeling that they had been left out in the cold.

I also feel that we can still get a 10-percent increase as passed by the Senate, and that this in reality is what all postal employees want and are entitled to.

So I urge upon all Members to be fair to all the employees. When you vote against this gag rule, you are favoring all of them and not discriminating against any single group. I believe then the case can be properly presented to the people, and I believe the people will credit you for having done a good day's work.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman's idea is to vote down the rule and then have the Rules Committee bring in a rule which would permit us to vote on an amendment providing for a 10-percent increase?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is exactly right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachuetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear as if there was little need of either bitter feeling or political controversy in the consideration of this bill. We are confronted with an unusual situation. Practically everybody recognizes the need of the postal workers for an increase in salary to compensate them for increased cost of living and to keep them moving forward with the rest of labor.

We are divided because of two bills presented, and we are asked to determine which shall be passed.

First, we have the committee bill; a bill overwhelmingly supported in the committee after weeks of careful study. It provides an estimated general increase of 7.6 percent, and it endeavors to bring about a reclassification which is said to be an improvement.

Then we have a second proposal, submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. His bill, it is estimated, would bring about an average increase of 8.2 percent. It would make changes in the classification which are controversial. This bill is without any formal committee endorsement.

In reaching our determination as to which proposal to accept, we must take into consideration what we think will insure the postal workers getting what the majority believes they should have—an increase in pay.

President Eisenhower has let it be known that he favors the committee bill; the one which calls for 7.6 percent. His views are so well known and expressed so clearly in the letter to Chairman MURRAY and in his talks with me that I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the Moss bill will bring about a presidential veto.

This puts it squarely up to us. Do we want to give the postal workers an increase in pay or do we want to fool them by passing a bill which cannot become a law? No one, I am sure, believes the measure would become a law over a veto.

There is, of course, as one might expect, serious disagreement as to the right decision between the several labor groups. There are five major labor organizations in the postal field. Three groups have decided it is best to take the committee bill and secure the increased pay. Two other groups are classified as being in the opposition, although many of their members have privately said they would prefer to pass the bill which has approval of the administration.

Certainly there need be no reason for playing politics with the measure. At best, it would be doubtful politics.

The chairman of the committee is TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee. He is a Democrat and through the years has been a stalwart champion of the Democratic Party. He and his committee are for the bill they have reported because they believe in it. They believe the committee bill represents the best possible compromise of what has been a perplexing problem. And they believe it is good judgment to support a measure they know can win the approval of the administration, which shares in the responsibility of the problem.

Therefore, my colleagues, I oppose the Moss amendment and favor the bill brought out by the committee. Its passage will give the postal workers a substantial increase in wages at an early date, and I believe we owe it to them to do this.

In conclusion, may I say our responsibility is not only to the postal workers but we have a responsibility as well to hundreds of thousands of Government workers in the classified service who are weekly losing increased pay while we quarrel over this particular bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Several Members have asked me about this rule. As I understand it, there was minority opposition on the committee. The minority position is found substantially in what are referred to as the Moss amendments. Is it not true that the rule we are now being asked to adopt, and which I shall certainly vote for, gives the House a clear choice between those two positions; first, the bill as reported by an overwhelming majority of the committee; and, second, the position taken by the minority members of the committee in respect to the proposals that they seek to have adopted as against the original bill?

Mr. MARTIN. There is no question but that the rule gives an optional choice between the two questions in dispute.

Mr. HALLECK. So that, as far as this rule is concerned, its adoption permits a choice by Members of the House as between the majority position of the committee and the minority position of the committee?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he would not be averse to the enactment of retroactive features on the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I said that the adoption of the 7.6 bill would not bring any personal objection from me in dating the bill back to March 1. I know there are many who do object, but I do not.

Mr. HESELTON. But if we pass the 7.6, the gentleman would feel justified in making it retroactive to March 1?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that would be objectionable.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman; certainly.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman has adverted to the possibility of a veto by the President. Are we not an independent body, and shall we be men or mice? Should we be cowered by the threat of a Presidential veto, or should we vote on the merits of the legislation?

Mr. MARTIN. I would say to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that I never knew a person to ever lose anything by taking advantage of all information that he could secure.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Surely.

Mr. KLEIN. In the colloquy just a moment ago with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the gentleman pointed out two conditions that we have if this rule is adopted.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. KLEIN. Am I correct in saying that those of us who feel that the postal employees should have a straight 10-percent increase, similar to Senate bill 1, would not have any opportunity under this rule to offer such an amendment?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not also a fact that if this rule is adopted in its present form we will not have an opportunity to vote on whether or not the reclassification provisions of this bill should be stricken from the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman knows that motion would not be in order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is obvious to all of us that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House will find themselves in one camp or the other; that is, for the committee bill or for the additional recommendations of the minority of the committee.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Knowing the great respect and admiration the membership of this House has for the gentleman from Massachusetts, his judgment, and his thinking, he is, I gather, definitely of the opinion that anything other than a 7.6-percent increase may meet with a veto by the President. Is that right?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not make that statement unless I believed it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. It is also true, then, that a 10-percent amendment cannot be voted on, and that no amendment other than the Moss amendments can be offered under the present rule.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are the jury; we should act accordingly. As far as we are concerned the only difference is that instead of representing our own respective viewpoints we represent those of the people back home.

We have before us three alternatives: To support the rule and the three amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] which have been explained previously; to vote down the rule which would bring in an open rule which might permit amendments for 10, 15, or even 20 percent increase; or to bring back the original Murray bill which gives a 5 to 58 percent increase to postal employees or average of 6.5 percent. Let us make up our minds.

This puts us in a very involved position to support the rule and support the three amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California, the very amendments the minority agreed upon of the committee. What we would like is what we intended originally to get, at least a 10 percent increase. We would also like to put in other amendments, but due to the parliamentary situation under which the bill will be considered only three amendments will be in order. We know that by going further than that we get into great difficulty. The 10 percent increase provided in Senate bill No. 1 is threatened with a veto, and we know we have not sufficient votes to override the veto. We also know that the reason the bill was vetoed last year was because it did not contain a reclassification provision. Basically there are still some inequities in the reclassification bill we have reported out. We have eliminated

many of them, but not sufficient in the thinking of many of the people affected, especially the clerks.

I would like to see the present bill adopted with a 10 percent increase at least, but under the parliamentary situation we will not be able to accomplish that.

I would like to clear up a few points that have been mentioned. The original bill, the Murray bill, called for an increase of from 5 percent to 58 percent. The bill made in order by the rule provides a 6.9 percent increase for the majority of the employees, and 7.6 percent for the overall which the committee reported out. Do not be misled because portion of the bill goes as high as 58 percent.

The Department estimates that increases in the bill as reported by the committee will cost in the neighborhood of $153 million. The Moss amendment increase in the first, second, and fifth grades will add an additional $12 million, making the total cost $165 million.

The big difficulty here today is this pressure from the Department upon the respective Members of Congress to hold this bill down. The Department is more interested in saving dollars at the expense of the employees than giving them a justified pay increase.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Rules Committee said, this is indeed an unusual rule. It is unusual in that it grants to one individual, the gentleman from California, a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the right to offer amendments; at the same time, it denies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] the right to offer the provisions of the Senate bill which provides for a 10 percent increase. The same thing would apply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

It is unusual in another respect. Some weeks ago I had occasion to appear before the Rules Committee on H. R. No. 1 and made an impassioned plea to the Rules Committee to grant me a modified rule that would allow me to offer 5 amendments to the proposal to renew our Trade Agreements Act. I was given to understand that was too much favor to grant to a single Member. Yet, we find the committee coming in here with the same kind of rule I asked for and was denied less than a month ago. It is indeed an unusual situation.

It is generally understood on the floor of this House that I am opposed to gag rules and to closed rules. It will be a pleasure for me, if there is opportunity to do so, to vote against this rule, because I am convinced that there is no piece of legislation so controversial that it cannot be brought to the floor of the House and the Members allowed without discrimination in favor of some Members to work their will on that legislation. I will be perfectly willing to accept whatever their decision is, but I do not think we should be denied the opportunity to offer any kind of amendment we desire.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the bill before us. It is highly prejudicial to those in the upper as against those in the lower echelons in the postal service. The hewers of stone and the bearers of water—that is those who do the hard work in the postal service are discriminated against. Under the facade of reclassification, there are huge salary increases. In some instances, the increases range as high as 50 percent or more, especially to supervisors and postmasters. In contrast, the rank and file—using words in common parlance—are given the dirty end of the stick. Their increases are meager. There are at least 15 positions or classifications in which immediate increases of 10 to 34 percent have been allotted. As we stated in the minority report:

There are only 7 positions for which the increases average less than 7 percent. In these latter positions are the regular city carriers and clerks—the very warp and woof of the basic fabric of our postal service—motor vehicle operators, automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers. These carriers, clerks and motor vehicle operators will average only a 6.9-percent increase, and many thousands of them will get barely over 6 percent. Automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers will get well under the average for all employees. Thousands of rural carriers will receive only 6 percent. The remainder of the officers and employees will average 8.1-percent increases.

I cannot conscientiously vote for a bill of this type with such disproportionate, unfair, and inadequate increases. The Senate passed the bill for a 10-percent overall increase and with no provisions for reclassification. The bill must be drastically amended. We, today, on the Floor of the House, hear tell that if we pass such an amended bill, it would be vetoed by the President. Well, my answer to that threat is that we should be as independent in our legislative functions as the President is in his executive functions. If he vetoes the bill, that is his responsibility, not ours. We should not be cowed by a threatened veto. We are men and not mice and I think we should act like men and not crawl supinely before such a threat. Furthermore, I think our leadership is missing the boat. Here is an issue which we should seize and do all and sundry to indicate by word and deed that we are for a decent living wage scale for postal employees. Let us make the issue clear cut. We are for the proper increases. Let the administration oppose them. Such opposition is full of political dynamite which should burst in Republican faces.

I am told I should vote for the rule because a half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. The bill doesn't even provide for one-tenth of a loaf. I would stultify myself if I voted for the rule, making in order, a bill which I violently oppose.

This obnoxious bill contains provisions for reclassification of postal-field-service positions. It gives the broadest grant of administrative authority to the Postmaster General—a politically minded Postmaster General. His free-booting methods will make mincemeat of civil-service rules and regulations and laws. He will ride roughshod over seniority rights in order to fill as many positions as possible with deserving Republicans. It is true that mandatorily under one of the proposed Moss amendments he shall report his activities vis-a-vis reclassification within 6 months to the Congress. But what good will such a report be? The political dirty work will have been done. Congress will be confronted with a fait accompli. All we could do would be to protest in the event of injustices or impartialities, but our protests would be as effectual as trying to stem the tides with a groan. To my mind, one of the most inequitable provisions is just this reclassification provision, especially in the hands of an antilabor bureaucrat like the present Postmaster General. The whole business is a travesty. Furthermore, the rule before us is a gag rule. This so-called deliberative body is supposed to dispose of 3 important amendments with only 10 minutes debate for each amendment—5 minutes for each side. If one contemplates that the salaries of the postal employees depends upon such debate, then one realizes how inadequate is the time for deliberation. Just think of it—10 minutes is to be given for debate on salary increases as provided for in one of the so-called Moss amendments which would increase the average rate from 6.8 percent to 8.275 percent.

Assuredly, the productivity of the employee should have some effect upon the salary, but no monetary recognition is given to postal employees for the greatly increased productivity that they have achieved in recent years. All the administration thinks of is the budget. Certainly, workers' productivity should be just as much a factor in salary determination as budget goals. No real consideration is given to the increases and fluctuations in living costs. The cost of food, clothing, and shelter has mounted in geometrical progression—not so salary increases. The minority report states as follows:

From 1946 on, the workload per man-year, based on pounds of mail handled, moved irregularly upward. The workload per man-year, based on the number of pieces handled, which is probably a more accurate measure, moved consistently upward.

The overall picture, comparing 1938 to 1952, has been one of increased employment, increased volume, and increased productivity. From 1938 to 1952, employment increased 59 percent, while volume in pieces went up 92 percent. The great increase in volume handled over employment, meant that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938.

The report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, showed a 6.04-percent increase in mail volume over 1951 and only a 1.3-percent increase in hours of employment. This report also showed that over the previous 5 years' volume had increased by 33 percent and weight had increased by 29 percent, but that hours of employment had increased by only 9 percent.

This increase of more than 20 percent in productivity was not created by machines, as often is the case in private industry, but, by reason of the extraordinary nature of per-

sonal services required to move the mails, is almost wholly attributable to greater efforts by the postal employees.

The salaries of the postal employees have not kept up with the salaries of private industry. For example, 15 years ago, the earnings of postal clerks and carriers were on a par with employees of General Motors Corp. In 1953, however, the General Motors Corp. employees averaged $92.27 a week, or an 8.4 percent increase over 1952. Postal employees got an average of $78.27 per week for 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Many comparisons could be made between salaries of postal employees and salaries of large corporate entities and the disparity between the wages paid would be clearly manifest.

It requires no recitation to show that the purchasing power of the dollar and the purchasing power of the postal worker's dollar has declined significantly during and after the World War II period, but the bill takes little heed of this consideration of declining purchasing power. No indeed. The administration is only worried about fiscal budgetary objectives. Making the salary of the postal employees sufficiently large so as to permit the worker to live in dignity and decency is, apparently, of little concern to the administration. Throughout the hearings, we could hear the thumping of only one theme—that was the need to balance the budget. We heard, for example, nothing of the vast costs involved in the granting of huge mailing privileges to large publishing outfits like Life, Time, Fortune, Saturday Evening Post, Collier's, Look, Newsweek, and so forth. Maybe if these publishing houses would actually pay in dollars and cents what they should pay for the postal services rendered them, the Government might be on the way toward balancing the postal budget. But no—the Postmaster General in this administration would not dare ask these publishers for higher rates. They contribute very handsomely to the Republican campaign chest. The administration says that the little fellow should sweat it out. Let the postal employee bear the burden.

My point of view is as follows:

First. I vote against the rule.

Second. If the rule passes, I vote for the Moss amendments.

Third. If the Moss amendments prevail, I shall vote for the bill although I would prefer to be given the privilege of offering an average 10-percent increase—something I cannot do under this semiclosed rule. One of the Moss amendments would provide for an average increase of 8.2 percent. I will take that as the best to be gained under the circumstances.

Fourth. If the Moss amendments do not prevail, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is again true that the Rules Committee has deliberately in its deliberations decided that the greatest deliberative body in the world cannot deliberate on legislation. I want to confine my remarks strictly to the rule. As has been pointed out, this rule is not only unusual in the fact that three amendments only can be introduced which amendments have been carefully outlined in specific language, but we are not even able to debate those amendments more than 5 minutes on a side.

I may say that apart from any of the considerations regarding the total amount of salary that shall be paid in any of the steps or at any of the levels, there are many features of this bill which should be subject to amendment.

I might enumerate that the provisions dealing with promotions in this bill are not satisfactory or entirely clear. The provisions dealing with the anniversary dates as to when the employee shall fit in the various schedules are not very satisfactory. The matter regarding the classification of certain of the clerks in level 3 certainly ought to be debated and given full consideration. So, we could go on with many features of this long, involved bill and make a clear point that there should be amendments and debate on the floor of this House.

Let us recognize further that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate, in fact, the entire Senate committee and the entire membership of the Senate, have had no opportunity whatsoever to study and debate the very involved and complex features of the Classification Act. We are going to be meeting with them—I wrongly use the pronoun "we" because I fully expect to be carefully excluded from the conference despite my ranking on the Post Office Committee—when those conferees meet we are going to have the situation where 1 of the 2 bodies is going to have had no legislative experience or consideration dealing with classification. So, if there are things in this bill which are bad, things which ought to be corrected, there is going to be no chance for the conferees to correct them. Consequently, regardless of the merits of the various amounts of money proposed in this controversy, I believe that we have here an example of too much restriction on the membership of this great deliberative body, and I believe that this rule ought to be defeated and we ought to have a chance to deliberate a little bit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to some of the practical aspects of this situation. I am a member of the committee, and I am one of those who signed the minority report, and I am one of those who wanted an open rule, but I am here a little longer now and I am getting a little wiser, if not thinner, as time goes on. Every member of the committee who signed the minority report wanted a 10 percent raise, but during the course of the proceedings it became quite clear to the distinguished chairman, for whom we have the highest regard, and who was most fair throughout this entire proceeding, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that if we become too generous in our aspirations to please those who are asking for money, we might not get anything. So we thought that we could accomplish something. All of us could have had our favorite amendments, but we felt that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] who studied it most thoroughly and was most familiar with it, had a solution that we could agree to. Now, we were concerned with the practical proposition that if we were to play politics with this thing and say, "Sure, pass 10 percent and let the President veto it," the warnings given us were honest ones. However, we could take 8.2 and not have the straw which broke the camel's back. Even with this proposition, we are risking the fate of these people. Now, all of the various labor groups knew that this compromise was in the making, and one of them later broke from it. While I want to be as generous as anyone else—and coming from Jersey City, I can play politics as well as anybody else—I do not want these men to go home and say, "If those smart guys in the House pass a 10 percent raise, sure, the President will veto it." Maybe he will be blamed, and maybe he will not. That is why I joined with the Moss amendment, and I say that with great respect to the minority members, because I appreciate their viewpoint, but we are a little more daring than they are. We think the President will not veto an 8.2 percent raise when he is willing to grant 7.6, and we are willing to take our chance. But, to you Members who are proposing the 10 percent raise only, I say this: That is your right and your privilege, but who will suffer? It will be the women and the children of these employees who will suffer. That is why I stand here today doing something I do not want to do; but the rules of this House permit this procedure, and I believe that the rules of this House were born and distilled out of experience, and there must be good reason for them.

Early in this session I got into an argument with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and I twitted him, because he had given us words of wisdom on the subject. I found out that I should have listened to him. However, I am not at all ashamed to say that I have learned something from him and I speak in support of the rule, to let him know that. So that those of the Members who want to be generous with other people's money may go right ahead and vote the rule down. But it is interesting to note that those who want to be generous and those who want to be parsimonious are on the same side. There is something funny in that picture. Somebody is playing politics. I will not say who. But I am perfectly willing to go along with this measure because I am thinking that it is about time that we put money into the pockets of these people instead of arguments into their heads.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules. But when he made the statement in opening debate that this was a rather unusual rule, in my opinion he was making one of the understatements of the year. This is an unbelievable rule. If this rule is

adopted, we shall be setting a precedent that Members of the House prepare amendments, go to the Committee on Rules, ask that they be screened and approved by the Committee on Rules before they can be introduced. This rule is discriminatory. This rule is more unfair and more discriminatory than a suspension of the rules or a closed rule, because under either of these procedures all Members would be on the same basis for none could offer amendments to the bill.

This provides that one Member and one Member only may introduce amendments, or that some other Member who may gain preferential recognition may offer the amendments which this one Member has proposed. And the pending amendments cannot be amended.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule without regard to any other provisions of the bill, because we would set a dangerous precedent if we adopt the proposed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. The point has been raised that there will be only 10 minutes of debate on this very controversial amendment on the pay question, which is to be found at page 82 of the bill. I should like to state frankly that I did not notice that. I believe that we should provide time for pro forma amendments, to any amendment that is offered. It was not my purpose to restrict the debate in this way. This was not called to my attention until this morning.

After consultation with the minority I ask unanimous consent that debate under the 5-minute rule on the amendment which will be offered at page 82 of the bill relating to the pay schedule, be extended for 30 additional minutes, which will provide 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean that we will have the usual 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against, on the other two amendments that may be offered?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. SADLAK. The significance of the gentleman't request that the rule as originally introduced would provide only 5 minutes of debate on each amendment to each side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As to the other two amendments, that is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that the time for debate on the amendment which the gentleman identified be extended 30 minutes?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, who will have control of the time under that procedure?

The SPEAKER. It will be up to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to recognize Members under the 5-minute rule.

Mr .MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I think we can have assurance that both sides will be equally recognized in the 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume everybody will be fair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] on the courageous remarks they made on the floor today. I thoroughly agree with the remarks both of them made. I agree with them in that I personally would like to see a 10-percent increase for postal employees. However, we are faced with a very practical situation. For responsible legislators to fail to recognize a practical situation would result only in harm to the employees of the Post Office Department, as I project my mind ahead.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has been very frank. He knows there will be a veto on the 10-percent increase, and so does everybody else. He knows, and so does everybody else, that a 10-percent bill presented to the President would undoubtedly be vetoed, and that such a veto would be sustained.

Then where would the postal employees be? Let us project our minds ahead a few weeks and see where they would be. The chances are that no better bill than the bill that came out of the committee would go through the Congress. That would mean a 6.91-percent increase for the regular clerks and carriers instead of an 8.2-percent increase if the Moss amendment is adopted.

The situation is a very practical one. Whether or not the President will sign a bill along the lines of the House measure, if that is the one that goes to him, is something that I cannot say. But I will say that if a bill along that line goes to the President he would have extreme difficulty in vetoing it, and if he did veto it, we would have an excellent opportunity of passing it over his veto in both branches of the Congress.

Therefore those of us who want to have a really effective pay raise bill put through, and through as quickly as possible, are faced with the problem of not what we would like to do ourselves but from a practical viewpoint what is the best thing we can do.

As a result of the failure to suspend the rules, the amendment making the effective date March 1 will be put into the bill. If the suspension had not been defeated, that amendment would not have been put into the bill, because the bill would have gone to conference with the Senate bill setting no date and the House bill setting no date, and the conferees would have had no discretion. That question would not have been in conference, and whatever increase went through and finally became law would be prospective instead of retroactive to March 1.

Furthermore, we have to realize when we are voting for the rule and voting for the Moss amendments, and passing the bill, that the bill will go to conference. In the conference, there will be the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. There is a wide latitude for the House and Senate conferees to work out some of the differences that will exist. So in voting for the rule and for the bill today, as I see it, and in voting for the Moss amendments without sacrificing any of our views, but viewing it from a practical angle, those of us who want to see a really effective pay raise bill go through as quickly as possible, are doing the best we can under the circumstances. Because if a 10-percent raise goes through and it is vetoed, and the veto is sustained, they will not get any more than is contained in the present bill, and there is a chance that they will get less. So in view of the situation, my colleagues, those of us who want to see a really effective bill go through, ought to vote for the rule and for the Moss amendments. If I were against the Moss amendments, and I would want the 10-percent raise to go through, I know it would be vetoed, and I know that the veto would be sustained. But there is no guaranty that there will be a veto of the bill that goes through, which is along the lines of the Moss amendments, and if it is vetoed, we have an excellent chance of passing it over the veto, whereas, our commonsense tells us that a 10-percent bill cannot pass over the veto of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the Moss amendments will be adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the minority have an opportunity under any circumstances to recommit this bill with instructions to include the bill, S. 1?

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is in order under the pending rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 269, noes 17.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were ayes 259, noes 32.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Comittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4644, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 1 hour; and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide an increase in the compensation of postal employees and, at the same time, bring about correction of serious inequities in the salary schedule by the adoption of an improved method of classifying postal employees for salary purposes.

Under this bill, all postal employees will receive a minimum increase of 6 percent on their basic salaries and will then be fitted into a salary schedule providing for a pay scale establishing a more realistic relationship between their salaries, their duties, and responsibilities. The adjustment to the new salary schedule will result in a payroll increase of approximately 1.6 percent.

On January 11, 1955, the President of the United States forwarded to the Congress a special message concerning the rates of pay of postal employees. He recommended that postal employees be given a 5-percent increase in their basic salary and that the increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the compensation for postal field-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed. Legislation in conformance with this recommendation of the President was submitted by the Postmaster General and introduced as H. R. 2987.

The committee held extensive hearings—15 sessions—on this subject, and testimony was received relating to the need for an increase in postal salaries as well as the various features of the Postmaster General's reclassification plan. Representatives of the employee groups, including those affected by the amendment to be offered today, testified to the need for a reclassification of positions in the postal service. I refer you to pages 157, 178, 185, 190, 192, 195, 240, and 244 of the printed hearings.

Following these hearings the committee recommended its own bill, H. R. 4644, which is now before the House. This new bill adopts substantially the reclassification features of the bill recommended by the Postmaster General. However, it contains 21 basic changes representing the views of the committee based upon testimony received. This bill contains the safeguards and other favorable conditions requested by the employees, including a guaranty against reduction in salary, and provision for other benefits. I will now give you the basic changes that we made in the present bill from the first bill introduced.

First, the bill sent down by the Postmaster General provided for a 5 percent minimum increase. The bill here before you provides for a 6 percent minimum increase.

Second, the committee bill before you today provides for a new salary level to be known as No. 5, for clerks, carriers, and motor vehicle operators, raising the amount of salary increase for carriers and motor vehicle operators and for window clerks and distribution clerks about $65 over the Postmaster General's bill or in a total amount of over $20 million.

This bill also allows for an increase of shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this legislation, whereas the Postmaster General's bill provided that it should take effect 6 months after enactment

This bill also allows for an increase of 50 percent in the travel of postal transportation employees. Railway mail clerks or postal transportation clerks are raised from $6 to $9 a day.

This new bill removes over 100 grants of power and authority to the Postmaster General.

It provides appeal rights to all employees to the Civil Service Commission which the first bill did not.

It removes from the first bill the blanket repealer which would have repealed all existing postal laws.

It also has an express provision against downgrading of any employee in the service. It also provides higher pay for temporary higher level work which was not included in the first bill.

It further provides that employees may be detailed or assigned between the field service and the departmental service only with the employee's consent.

It also provides that the employment of persons now outside the postal service shall be limited to professional and scientific positions and to positions in the district and regional offices.

It continues the present law requiring compensatory time for Saturday or Sunday work except in the month of December.

It provides also that there shall be 1 substitute for every 5 regular employees.

It limits assistant postmasterships to one in each office.

It provides credit authorization for time served toward automatic increments of increase.

It further takes care of senior clerks by providing that senior clerks must be favored over junior clerks for promotion.

It continues the longevity rights and protects the anniversary dates of the employees in consideration of their longevity steps.

This legislation adopts substantially the reclassification features of the bill recommended by the Postmaster General. However, it contains several major changes representing the views of the committee based upon testimony received. This bill contains the safeguards and other favorable provisions requested by employees including a guaranty against reduction in salary, appropriate provision for appeals, and other benefits.

APPEALS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The bill provides that an aggrieved employee may appeal to the United States Civil Service Commission any administrative action taken or decisions made with respect to, first, the ranking of positions not described as "key positions" in the proper salary level, and, second, the placing of an employee in a "key position" on the basis of and in accordance with the description of the duties and responsibilities of such position. The appeal will be for the purpose of determining whether his position has been properly allocated. The decision of the Civil Service Commission is made mandatory on the Postmaster General.

NO DOWNGRADING OR REDUCTION IN SALARY OF PRESENT EMPLOYEES AND SUBSTITUTES

The bill contains prohibitions against downgrading of individuals and assures employees they will continue to receive their present salary plus the 6 percent added during the process of conversion to the salary schedules contained in the bill.

It also provides that nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of the postal field service schedule, the rural carrier schedule, or fourth-class office schedule to an amount less than his basic compensation immediately prior to adjustment to such schedules—present rate plus 6 percent. It would not preclude reduction due to voluntary acceptance of a lower level position in lieu of separation from the service, or due to a change in salary level required because of a subsequent reduction in mail volume or receipts of a post office or because of the adjustment of a rural route.

HIGHER LEVEL FOR CARRIERS AND CLERKS

The committee bill also contains an additional salary level added between levels 4 and 5 of the postal-field-service schedule proposed by the Postmaster General. In this level will be placed motor-vehicle operators, city carriers, distribution clerks, and window clerks. This provision is the only change in the salary schedules contained in the committee bill when compared with H. R. 2987. This change will result in an additional increase in payroll costs of $20,144,900 which will go to motor-vehicle operators, city carriers, distribution clerks, and window clerks. This will increase the starting rate for clerks and carriers from $3,270 at present to $3,640, an increase of $370 or 11.3 percent. The maximum rate will go from the present of $4,070 to $4,360. In addition, many of the clerks and carriers at the top are eligible for the additional longevity grades of $100 each at 13, 18, and 25 years' service, making a top rate of $4,660.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR SUBSTITUTES

The bill will provide longevity for substitutes for the first time. In some post offices, and this will be particularly important now that the number of automatic steps have been reduced in the case of the large clerk-carrier group from 9 to 7, many substitutes have been

at the top of their automatic steps and not eligible for longevity promotions until they become regulars. This bill will permit substitutes to receive longevity pay on the same basis as regular employees, that is, at the end of 13, 18, and 25 years of service.

LARGER ANNUAL INCREASES

Under the provisions of the bill, movement of each clerk and carrier to the top steps of his salary level will be accelerated. This is done by reducing the number of steps from 9 to 7 and increasing the amount of each step.

AUTOMATIC STEP INCREASES FOR POSTMASTERS AND SUPERVISORS

Under present law, postmasters and supervisors are paid single per annum rates, whereas the rank and file employees are given annual automatic increases. The postal field service, rural carriers, and fourth-class office schedules in H. R. 4644—designated as PFS, RCS, and FOS schedules, respectively—provide that all employees, including postmasters and supervisors, shall be placed in a seven-step level, except for PFS–20 and PFS–21 employees, for whom seven-step levels are precluded by the present $14,800 maximum. This opportunity for salary increases as skills and responsibilities increase is an important incentive factor and should apply to all employees.

SALARY INCREASE ON PROMOTIONS GUARANTEED

The bill provides that when an employee is promoted to a higher salary level in the PFS schedule, he shall receive as a minimum increase the amount of difference between the first step of the salary level from which promoted and the first step of the next higher salary level. Thus, an employee who assumes more responsible duties receives a substantial increase in pay rather than a token increase or no increase at all, which is commonly the case under Public Law 134.

GREATER PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

There will be greater opportunity for promotion. The establishment of 21 salary levels in the PFS schedule in H. R. 4644 will permit the classification of many positions at salary levels above, as well as between, the rates established in Public Law 134. Under that law, the Post Office Department has been able to pay employees only on the basis of job titles and the pay rates established in the law for those titles. The number of certain supervisory titles which an office might have also was prescribed.

Thus, for example, an employee serving as a substitute for a superintendent of mails who is on extended sick leave may not be compensated for the added responsibility because the title and salary structure of Public Law 134 does not permit it. This bill will permit proper salary payments in such cases.

There are many positions, both supervisory and nonsupervisory, whose duties and responsibilities warrant a pay differential which is not provided in present law. Under H. R. 4644 the greater responsibilities of these positions can now be reflected in greater compensation. The effect is that upon enactment of the legislation the incumbents of these positions will receive pay adjustments which are tantamount to promotions. As vacancies occur there will be these additional higher paying positions to which others can be promoted.

The inclusion of regional and district office positions in the same salary schedule with other postal field service positions will make possible the establishment of orderly promotion lines from other positions in the postal field service to positions in the regional and district offices.

RESTRICTIONS ON APPOINTMENTS FROM OUTSIDE THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

The provisions of section 501 of H. R. 4644 limit the authority of the Postmaster General to appoint to a salary rate higher than the entrance rate. It is limited to the appointment of persons who have been employed in a civilian capacity in other branches of the Government and to positions in the district or regional offices or to professional or scientific positions.

BIWEEKLY PAY PERIOD

In place of the present semimonthly pay period, the pay period for postal employees under H. R. 4644 will be biweekly providing 26 paydays per year and thereby granting an extra day's pay in the year for these employees. Another advantage in the biweekly pay period is that it permits standardization of the payday so that it will occur on the same day of each alternate week throughout the year.

RATIO OF SUBSTITUTES TO REGULARS

The authorization of 1 classified substitute for each 5 regular employees—rather than the 1 for 6 ratio now in effect—will permit the conversion to career tenure of several thousand employees who cannot presently be converted from indefinite or temporary tenure.

RURAL CARRIER SUBSTITUTES

The bill also provides a new method for computing the per diem rate of rural carrier substitutes, using a 312 days' basis instead of a 360 days' basis. The change in the pay period will permit the compensation of substitute rural carriers on the same basis as the regular carriers.

SUNDAY AND HOLIDAY WORK

Representatives of the clerks and carriers organizations objected to authorizing postmasters to pay time and a half for service performed on Sundays and holidays throughout the year as recommended by the Postmaster General. They recommended that it be restricted as at present to Sundays and holidays in the month of December with compensatory time allowed in the months other than December. The committee has included an appropriate provision covering this in the bill.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZED TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

The bill also increases the authorized travel allowance of postal transportation clerks from the present rate of $6 per day to $9 per day.

NEED FOR RECLASSIFICATION IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Congressional committees, as well as the task force of the Hoover Commission, have repeatedly directed the attention of the Congress to the need for a more realistic appraisal of salaries in the postal field service. They have pointed out that the present postal salary system completely ignores the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and makes no provision for recognition of substantial differences in the difficulty of the work to be performed, the degree of responsibility to be exercised, the scope and variety of tasks involved, and the conditions of performance.

USE OF KEY POSITIONS

H. R. 4644 contains descriptions of 50 representative positions which are occupied by over 90 percent of the postal field service employees other than those paid under the FOS and RCS schedules. Each key position is assigned in the bill to its proper salary level.

These key positions serve two purposes:

First. They determine the specific salary levels for the great majority of postal employees by direct congressional action;

Second. They serve as benchmarks for the Post Office Department in determining the appropriate salary levels for the positions occupied by the remaining employees, who constitute less than 10 percent of the total force.

To illustrate the effect on employees occupying key positions: The Department will identify the position of an employee as falling within the description of 1 of the 50 key positions. The salary level of the employee then becomes the salary level set forth in the law for that key position. The basic salary of the employee will be converted to the proper step of that salary level in accordance with the conversion rules of sections 304 and 306.

The process of determining the proper salary level for employees in positions other than the key positions is set forth in section 201 of the bill. It consists of, first, comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position occupied by an employee with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the key positions described in section 203; and, second, ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

Determinations made or actions taken in both of the above illustrations are appealable to the Civil Service Commission, whose decisions are mandatory on the Postmaster General.

NEED FOR A REVISION OF THE SALARY SCHEDULES

Employees in the postal field service are now paid upon salary schedules set forth in Public Law 134 of the 79th Congress. This law has been amended almost 200 times in order to meet situations that have occurred requiring adjustments in the salaries and in the relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal field service. Public Law 134 in itself represented a great advance in the pay system of the postal field service. It was the first major revision of postal employees' salaries since 1926—nearly 20 years.

During the committee hearings of this Congress on postal pay and classification nearly every employee representative commended the action of the Congress in its initiation and approval of Public Law 134. Since the passage of Public Law 134, which gave all employees on the rolls an increase in salary, salary increases have been based upon a need for keeping pace with the increase in the cost of living. Since Public Law 134 was effective July 31, 1945, there has been a general increase in the level of postal employees' salaries which has raised the average salary for postal employees from $2,049 in 1945—just prior to Public Law 134—to the present average annual salary of $3,928. In 1945, after the enactment of Public Law 134, the average annual salary of postal field service employees was $2,267. At present it is $3,928—this represents a 91.7 percent increase since 1945. After the enactment of this bill, H. R. 4644, it is estimated that the average annual salary for postal field service employees will be $4,243. This represents an average increase since 1945 of over $2,000 per employee, or 96.6 percent. During this same period the increase in the cost of living was 48.7 percent.

As another illustration, a postal clerk or carrier who entered the service prior to January 1946 would have entered at $1,700 a year and would not be in the top automatic grade drawing a salary of $4,070. Under the bill his salary will become $4,360 a year, or a total increase of 156.5 percent.

It is interesting to note, also, that on July 1, 1951, the effective date of the last salary increase, the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 110.9; in January 1955 the index was 114.3. This represents an increase of only 3.4 points, or 3.07 percent. H. R. 4644 grants a minimum salary increase of 6 percent to every employee.

Some groups of employees have, since 1945, received larger increases than other employees. This is occasioned, in part, by the manner in which salary increases for postal employees have been brought about. For example, some employees have received advantage by the elimination of the first two grades by Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress. The entrance grades for clerks and carriers, as set by Public Law 134, was $1,700. Intervening increases, together with the proposed increase in this bill, will bring the entrance grade for clerks and carriers to $3,640, an increase of 114.1 percent.

In summary, this bill will provide a minimum 6-percent increase for all postal employees and a new salary schedule which is designed to place the wages for postal-field-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

The Post Office Department estimates the cost of this bill at $160,382,000 annually.

Your committee labored long, hard, and faithfully on this legislation, and we endeavored to bring out the best possible bill, a fair, a just, and an equitable bill. This present bill was approved by the committee by a vote of 17 to 6.

We are confident that after this bill is once enacted, the postal employees as a whole will be thoroughly satisfied with this legislation.

It is true at the present time that the postal groups are divided into several camps, some supporting the pending bill (H. R. 4644) without amendment, some supporting the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], while others, including the organizations of city clerks, are opposed to both the bill and the Moss amendments.

This bill is supported by the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. I have here and insert at this point a letter addressed to me by the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association under date of April 4, 1955.

The letter referred to follows:

NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The rural letter carriers of the Nation are becoming increasingly concerned over the present postal pay controversy. This letter is to urge your support of H. R. 4644 as a compromise solution. We are particularly alarmed over the possibility that legislation may be enacted which would exceed the limitation announced as acceptable by the White House; thereby resulting in a veto and thus delay a deserved raise for an indefinite period and/or conceivably preclude the enactment of pay legislation in this session of Congress.

On behalf of the 36,000 members of this organization, I express profound gratitude for your sincere interest in and support of our efforts to obtain a much-needed salary increase. Speaking for rural carriers, I can assure you that they are reasonable and expect nothing more than fair and honorable treatment as loyal employees. The delay in enactment of pay legislation is a travesty on justice and, knowing full well that further delay will have a devastating effect on morale, we earnestly and in good conscience seek speedy enactment of salary increase provisions provided for in S. 1489 and H. R. 4644.

It is reliably reported—and we believe—that the President would approve this legislation. To fail to act, in consideration of the fact that each day of delay is depriving postal employees of the Nation of $500,000—or approximately $1 per day per employee—is indeed nothing more than denial of an increase which is truly deserved and sorely needed for the economic well-being of postal personnel.

We appreciate and respect the difference of opinion in the Congress. The freedom and diversification of thought thus represented is truly the safeguard of our freedom, our Government, and our way of life. Likewise, this cornerstone of democracy in action has been the refuge and board of appeal for postal employees to seek corrective action on conditions of employment. We know that the Congress has never failed to heed the problems of employees, or act in a constructive manner to improve the terms, conditions, and benefits of employment, including a fair pay scale for the work performed. We highly commend the Congress as a body for the faith they have kept with the postal employee.

We feel that you will agree that the welfare of the employee is more important than a complete meeting of minds on the amount of increase that is proper, justifiable and deserved. Sincerely feeling that this will also be your personal thought, we respectfully urge your every effort to speed enactment of the 7.6 percent pay proposal.

This association has acted independently in arriving at the conclusion that this compromise is a must if we are to accomplish our mutual endeavors of putting needed pay in the pockets of postal people. Our position in respect to this legislation parallels that of four other postal organizations: National Association of Postmasters, National League of Postmasters, National Association of Postal Supervisors and National Association of Special Delivery Messengers. These four organizations together with ourselves represent approximately 125,000 of the 500,000 postal employees.

We feel that H. R. 4644, the 7.6 percent pay proposal reported out by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee after adoption of 21 amendments to the original bill, and now before you, represents a compromise on the part of both the employee organizations and the Post Office Department; and that this proposal reflects a midpoint meeting ground which, in our opinion, is definitely compromise from the original positions of employee organizations and the Department.

In view of this, and in consideration of the urgency of action, we most earnestly and respectfully urge that you exercise your important influence and support this compromise solution which is possible by passage of H. R. 4644.

Most sincerely yours,
WARREN B. BLEDSOE,
President.

We have also an endorsement of H. R. 4644 from the National Association of Postal Supervisors. Their letter, signed by Mr. M. C. Nave, president, is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
Jackson, Tenn.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The confused situation which has arisen concerning the pending postal pay legislation has become a matter of serious concern to the 21,000 postal supervisors in post offices throughout the Nation, and the purpose of this letter is to briefly analyze and clarify conflicting views on a just and equitable solution. This association sincerely believes that H. R. 4644, presently on the House Calendar, would treat all employees fairly and justly.

In his message to Congress on January 11, 1955, the President recommended legislation to provide a 5-percent general pay raise, with reclassification to adjust long-standing inequities. On January 25, Chairman MURRAY, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced H. R. 2987 based on those principles, the estimated cost of which was $129 million. Following extensive hearings, the committee made more than 50 liberalizations and changes in the salary and reclassification provisions of the bill to meet desires expressed by all employee groups and it was reintroduced as H. R. 4644, with an increased cost of $32 million, all of which would go to employees in the 5 lower salary levels, predominantly to the clerks and carriers in level 5.

As now before the House, H. R. 4644 is definitely a compromise between the original administration proposal and the expressed desires of all employee groups. The reclassification provisions of the bill have been generally agreed to by all employee groups, but those groups who would be in level 5 are still urging a further increase above the 7.6-percent average now in the bill to 8.3 percent, which would further raise the cost by more than $15 million, all of which would go to only 2 of the 9 major groups of employees.

Reliable administration sources have assured that any further increase in cost above the 7.6 percent now provided in H. R. 4644 would invite a certain veto, and rather than action which could result in no pay raise this year, we earnestly urge your support of H. R. 4644 as a reasonable and proper compromise.

This association has consistently supported this measure since its presentation to Congress last January and joins with the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postmasters, the National League of Postmasters, and the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, with a combined total membership of 125,000 of the 500,000 postal employees in mutual support of H. R. 4644.

Sincerely yours,

M. C. NAVE,
President, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

I also have a letter from the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, signed by Mr. George L. Warfel, president, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an appeal for your support of the postal pay-classification bill H. R. 4644, without amendment. The bill as it now stands is a compromise bill drawn up by the committee and embodies 21 major liberalizing amendments to the bill as originally introduced.

The Department's recommendation to the Congress sought to eliminate many existing inequities. One of these objectives was to upgrade the position of special delivery messenger to that of city carrier level as merited by the duties and responsibilities of the job. Therefore, both positions were placed in salary level 4 of the original bill, which action was publicly endorsed by the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. One of the compromises worked out in the committee was the creation of a new salary level 5, ranging from $50 to $80 per annum higher than level 4, then because of off-the-record objection by the city carriers to the upgrading of special delivery messengers to city carrier level the committee, as a means of arriving at the compromise, left special delivery messengers in level 4 while city carriers, clerks, and motor-vehicle drivers were placed in level 5.

Our membership is greatly concerned over the present legislative situation. Although justice demands that special delivery messengers be placed in the same pay level as city carriers, yet we are apprehensive that further amendments to H. R. 4644 might result in either 1 of 2 things: (1) No pay increase this year, or (2) eventual enactment of less desirable legislation than would be provided by H. R. 4644.

For the reasons above stated we are in complete agreement with the position taken by the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the National League of Postmasters, and the National Association of Postmasters, and join them in earnestly soliciting your support of H. R. 4644 in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. WARFEL,
President.

A letter from the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, dated April 2, 1955, urges the adoption of H. R. 4644, and their letter, signed by Mr. Raymond V. McNamara, president, is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 2, 1955.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM 34,000 POSTMASTERS

The 34,000 members of the National Association of Postmasters are deeply disturbed because they are convinced that failure by Congress to pass H. R. 4644 will result in no pay raise this year for the deserving postal employees of the country.

H. R. 4644 represents an intelligent compromise. It contains 21 provisions which were placed in the bill at the request of the postal organizations. It will give postal employees $30 million more than was provided by the original Murray bill. All of this additional money will go to the rank-and-file employees, predominantly clerks and carriers.

In view of the fact that every day of delay is costing the postal employees of the country $600,000—or more than $1 a day per employee—we feel that it is very harmful to the interests of the postal service to haggle over a fraction of 1 percent, particularly since any further addition to the 7.6 percent pay bill will almost certainly result in Presidential disapproval and further delay.

The National Association of Postmasters in taking this stand parallels the thinking and the action of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers, the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, and the National League of Postmasters. These 5 organizations, representing almost 30 percent of the entire working force of the Nation's post offices, make up a significant cross-section of all postal employees. We are united in the belief that H. R. 4644 is the best possible bill that can be passed at this time to benefit every segment of the postal employee force.

It is our understanding that all but one of the postal organizations opposing H. R. 4644 have agreed to a salary increase within one-half of 1 percent of the increase provided in that bill. This area of disagreement, which is also the margin between probable Presidential approval and probable Presidential disapproval, seems to us far too small to justify the unconscionable delay that has been generated by the resistance of a few objectors.

Your support of H. R. 4644 in its present form, without amendment, will be greatly appreciated by the postmasters of the Nation.

Yours respectfully.

RAYMOND V. MCNAMARA,
President.

The National League of Postmasters of the United States, representing more than 26,000 members, requests support of H. R. 4644. Their letter, signed by Mr. C. B. Gravitt, Jr., secretary-representative, is as follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF POSTMASTERS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The National League of Postmasters, representing more than 26,000 members, unanimously requests your support of the postal classification bill, H. R. 4644. We are greatly concerned over the confusion and the unnecessary delay in granting a pay raise to the faithful, loyal, and hard-working postal employees. We are losing more than $500,000 in raises for every working day that passage of H. R. 4644 is delayed.

This bill, which was reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a bipartisan majority of 17 to 6, represents a compromise between the original recommendations of the President and other proposals which were made to the Congress and would result in an average increase of 7.6 percent for all postal employees. The President has made it clear that a larger raise or a raise without elimination of inequities is not acceptable.

The Congress has enacted a 6.7-percent raise for the military. We believe that H. R. 4644 with an average raise of 7.6 percent is the best compromise that can be made at this time for postal employees.

The National League of Postmasters joins with the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the National Association of Postmasters, and the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, in mutual support of H. R. 4644, and respectfully asks that you use your influence to expedite its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. GRAVITT, Jr.,
Secretary-Representative.

Mr. Chairman, I have done the best I can about this legislation. I am the oldest Member in point of service on the old Post Office Committee and the new Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. When I became a Member of this distinguished body in 1943, I was assigned to the old Post Office Committee. I guess I was assigned there because I had enjoyed some experience in the postal service. For nine years I was associated with the Post Office Department in Washington under Postmaster Generals James A. Farley and Frank C. Walker. During my sojourn in the Post Office Department I learned something about the postal laws and about postal needs.

I realized at that time that there was an urgent need for a reclassification of the entire postal structure. So in 1943 when I became a Member I began urging the chairman of the committee, who was then the Honorable Thomas G. Burch, who later went to the Senate, and who has now passed away, to give time and attention to drafting a sound salary reclassification structure for the postal service.

The late chairman, Mr. Burch, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and I were on a special committee to draft Public Law 134 which was passed in 1945. This was the first reclassification bill the postal service ever had and it gave the postal employees their first increase in salary since 1923.

At that time some of the employees did not like the measure, but later all of them favored it and now refer to it as the bill of rights for the postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I have always had the interest of the postal employees at heart. I do not believe any member of the committee during my service at least has sponsored more beneficial or more helpful legislation on behalf of postal employees than I have. I try to go along with them as long as they are fair and reasonable. Of course, sometimes their demands become unreasonable, and then I cannot agree with them, but I can assure you that I have done my best to

bring out a bill that I expect will be approved by the President if it is not further amended and the cost increased.

The bill sent down here by the Postmaster General would have cost $129 million. Your committee bill will cost $160 million, $31 million more than the President recommended.

I am sure all of you who were here when we tried to pass this bill under suspension of the rules heard me read my letter to the President, sending copy of my bill, H. R. 4644, and his reply.

The following is my letter to the President and his reply:

MARCH 17, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted for your information and reference is a copy of our committee report on H. R. 4644, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. This report has just been received from the printer.

I am sure that you are aware that within the next few days this legislation will be considered by the House and Senate. Our committee has recommended favorably H. R. 4644 which would provide a minimum of a 6-percent increase for postal employees and a proper reclassification of positions very similar to those recommended by the Postmaster General and in line with your message of January 11.

The pay provisions, of course, are somewhat higher than you recommended but appear to the committee, after careful consideration, to be reasonable. There are many Members of the House, I am sure, who would prefer to give an even higher salary increase. At the same time, I do not believe they would want to amend the committee bill to the point that it might be disapproved with the result that there would be no salary increase for postal employees.

Because I am aware of your deep and continuing interest in this legislation, I thought you might like to have this information as to its current status.

Respectfully yours,

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1955.

The Honorable TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your letter respecting H. R. 4644, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, and am interested to learn of your committee's action on this important legislation.

My special message to Congress on January 11 emphasized the need for fair adjustments in postal pay and long overdue reclassifications of postal positions. To accomplish these purposes, I recommended an increase of 5 percent in the compensation of postal employees and also a reclassification of postal positions and compensation adjustments to bring about proper wage relationships among new classifications. The combined increases of pay adjustments and reclassification amount to an overall 6½ percent salary increase in the postal service. These modifications, in my judgment, would be equitable to all postal employees.

I am gratified by the committee's action on reclassification. As to the compensation of postal employees, I note that your committee has approved an increase higher than I recommended. This gives me concern not only because of the fiscal impact of such increases, but also because of the close relationship between this legislation and legislation now pending in the Congress affecting the compensation of other Federal employees.

Of course, in the consideration of such legislation as this there can be reasonable differences of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. Although I shall carefully consider this factor when the time comes for me to act on this legislation, in fairness to you and your colleagues I must make it clear that any additional increases in postal salaries above your committee's action would give me the gravest apprehension.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I take it from the President's letter, of course, that if we increase the cost through this bill by any amendments then undoubtedly and unquestionably the President will send this bill back with his disapproval. I do not believe either the House or the Senate will override the President's veto. I feel certain if we cannot get this bill approved without amendment then we cannot get it approved by the President.

Now, later on I wish to discuss the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California. I have no objection to the amendment requiring the Postmaster General to file a report. That is amendment No. 1. I have no objection to amendment No. 3 which would make the pay increase effective retroactive to March 1st instead of the first payday after the enactment of this legislation, provided the second amendment which distorts and destroys the proper balance and relationship of positions in the salary reclassification schedule is not adopted, and I want to discuss that amendment later on in the debate as I think it will wreck and ruin the salary schedule set forth in the bill. I hope the Members will vote down amendment No. 2 to be offered by the gentleman from California, because it will throw out of balance and out of kilter the proper relationship between the 21 schedules. I would regret to vote against my own bill but I would be compelled to do so out of self-respect for my own honest convictions and judgment if this obnoxious amendment is approved or made a part of my bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today a piece of legislation that affects the livelihoods of half a million people, employees of the postal service, fine, splendid citizens for whom we all have the highest respect. I have always had high regard for them, and I trust they have the same respect for me. On some occasions we do differ. I have always supported legislation on their behalf that was fair and reasonable. I am today supporting legislation that I believe to be fair and which I hope will become law.

Let me say at the outset that the legislation we are bringing before you today has had the careful consideration of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I know of no committee that works harder and more diligently with respect to legislation that comes before it than this committee of which I have the honor of being a member.

I would like to address myself briefly, to the rule under which you brought this legislation to the floor of the House. I have been here for quite a number of years now. I took my share of the lambasting a few weeks ago, because we brought a similar bill to the floor of the House under what is known as suspension of the rules. It was proper procedure. It came in order on a suspension day. There was no special privilege about it. Some Members said it was a gag rule. All we asked you to do was to vote for or against the bill. If you liked it, all right; if you did not, all right. The big complaint was there was no chance to amend it. Members said there should be an open rule and a chance for anyone to amend where and when it was in order.

During the years I have been a Member of this body, I have never witnessed the adoption of a rule quite like this one. The Rules Committee has said the House will be permitted to consider only three amendments proposed by one Member of this body. Yes, some other Member may submit one or more of them. But we are restricted to consider three amendments that one Member has proposed. Remember they are not committee amendments. So one man holds in his hand the proposals we are to consider.

There has been discussion about 10 percent across the board. Or 15 percent. You cannot do that under this rule. This Member did not include that in this request.

I admit the Member who has been authorized to offer amendments, is a strong man. He is my good friend. He is studious. He attends committee meetings regularly. But look what you have done in the adoption of this rule. You have said that none of the other 434 Members of this body may even offer an amendment, if he wants to do so. Where are those who have 10-percent proposals? They are out and that is all there is to that. It would have been much fairer to permit no amendments than to follow this procedure. This may be described as a sort of gag rule and favoritism put together.

Until a little while ago the Committee on Rules told us we could have only 10 minutes of debate on any one of the amendments. One involves the expenditure of $10 million. Now, I understand 30 minutes will be permitted to discuss this amendment.

It is at least rather interesting. We are making history, I think, so far as procedure is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be very glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Let me say that I have highest respect for the gentleman. He is truly one of the great Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is generally a prelude to the gentleman's jumping on me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not do that for the world. I have just said the gentleman is a great man. He is sincere. My criticism is in respect to the

action of the Rules Committee of which he is the honored chairman.

The House approved the rule, so the gentleman is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to say that the feeling is entirely mutual. I have great respect for the gentleman. But I know the gentleman does not want to be misunderstood, does not want to make a misstatement. As a matter of fact, the rule merely identifies the proposed amendment as the Moss amendment; but it provides that any Member of the House may offer any one of those three amendments which are identified in that way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the procedure the only amendments that may be considered are those already submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Either he or anybody else. The gentleman will find that in the rule. It is not restricted to any one Member. Whoever gets the floor first may offer the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it must be the amendment that has been proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], which he has printed in the RECORD. So, it does not make any real difference. In other words, the amendment must be one of those that the gentleman from California has proposed and only these.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So there is not much difference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wanted to make that little correction. I have enough faults and enough of the criticisms made of me are justifiable that when I get the opportunity to correct the gentleman, I like to do so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And I want the gentleman to do so, too.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should be glad to yield briefly to a member of that great Committee on Rules. I do not differ with the right of the committee to do as they see fit. But I do disagree with what the committee has done, in taking this action because I think it is wrong. I want to say that I did appear before the Committee on Rules and asked for an open rule, as did the distinguished chairman of our committee. But we were overruled. We understand that the committee has the right to overrule us. That is the committee's power and authority.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield briefly to me at this point?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately, I was not present when this matter came up. Personally, frankly, while I supported the rule, I should have preferred an open rule, because I thought that was possibly the best procedure. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question. Did the gentleman object to this type of rule when he appeared before the committee? I was not there, so I am asking the gentleman just for the information.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The answer, briefly, is this. The chairman of our committee and I appeared before the committee. We presented our views. We said we thought we ought to have an open rule, and made request for an open rule. Our chairman explained the bill quite carefully. We both requested a rule that is nearly always granted in cases. It was my view that since the House was unwilling to accept the legislation under suspension, we should go before the Rules Committee and ask for the usual rule. When we were through presenting the matter, the chairman of the Rules Committee asked how much time should be allotted for debate. As I recall the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] suggested 2 or 3 hours.

Mr. SMITH, chairman of your committee, asked if anyone else would like to be heard. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] asked to be heard. I believe he said he was appearing on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] who could not be present. He read, or rather had a member of the staff, read some proposed changes in the measure. Nothing was said in my presence about a restricted rule. The House was in session. I went to the House floor. I was informed your committee met in the afternoon and agreed to this rule. I was not invited to the afternoon meeting of the Committee on Rules. I did not expect to be invited. I was surprised at the action taken.

Mr. COLMER. As I said, I was away that day, unfortunately. But what I was asking the gentleman was whether he had knowledge that that type of rule was pending or was being advocated, and whether or not he protested it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman mean after the committee decided on it?

Mr. COLMER. I mean before the committee acted on it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not go back. I came down to the floor of the House because the House was in session and I had a bill pending and had to come down and look after it. I am informed your committee recessed until some time in the afternoon and took action in the afternoon meeting. I was not invited to the afternoon meeting. I am not complaining about that. I was quite surprised of the action taken. If any one knows of precedent for this kind of action, I would like to have someone cite it to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is important and far-reaching legislation. It has been carefully prepared. It is the result of a considerable amount of study on the part of our committee. It is a major revision of Public Law 134 that has been greatly applauded by the Members of this House, postal employees, and people across the country.

The last Congress had 24 sessions dealing with the question of pay and other benefits for postal employees. During this Congress our committee held 15 long sessions on this proposed legislation.

Members may be interested to know that before this bill was finally submitted the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and I as minority member, conferred with representatives of the postal employees with regard to it. We made several changes, as the chairman has told you, because of their suggestions. The bill is a fair approach. It provides a minimum increase of 6 percent and an adjustment and realinement of the pay structure which adds an additional 1.6 percent.

The bill in my judgment is the best that can be worked out in the consideration of the interests of the Government and of keeping salaries and salary increases within reasonable bounds.

Let me say this to you. You have heard and talked about a 10 percent proposal.

The facts are that no member of our committee proposed that we consider the recommendation of a so-called 10 percent bill, even though such bills were pending before our committee. Yes, there was, as I remember it, and I went over the testimony for a 10 percent across-the-board increase, but no one proposed a vote on any of those 10 percent bills.

The original bills did provide a minimum of 5 percent in base salaries. I suggested a minimum of 6 percent. It was approved with little objection, if any at all.

Let me suggest again, that these three amendments you are going to consider in a while were not considered by our committee as they are now proposed. They are not exactly as they were proposed before our committee, and there was plenty of time to propose them at that time.

A great deal has been stated to the effect that the Postmaster General is likely to manipulate and move individuals around in their positions. That is entirely incorrect. Ninety percent of them are classified right under this bill and only with respect to 10 percent or less, if the Postmaster General wanted to, could he do any reclassification, because the duties of 90 percent of them are written here in the bill itself.

This legislation has been carefully prepared and is the result of a considerable amount of study on the part of our committee. This legislation has been studied as far back as the 80th Congress. It is really a major revision of Public Law 134, that has been greatly applauded by Members of this House at various times. This legislation has been grossly misinterpreted. During the hearings all members of the committee agreed there must be reclassification. That, of course, includes those who have submitted minority views. This measure includes a tremendous amount of work, effort, and research. It is really a committee bill.

The last Congress held 24 sessions dealing with the question of pay and other benefits for postal employees. During this Congress, our committee held 15 sessions on this proposed legislation. Members may be interested to know that before this bill was finally submitted, the chairman of this committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and I, as ranking minority leader, conferred with representatives of postal employees. These were representatives who had already testified before our committee. We included a number of their suggestions in this proposal.

This bill is a fair approach. It provides for a minimum increase of 6 percent and an adjustment and realinement

in the pay structure which adds an additional 1.6 percent. This bill, in my judgment, is the best that can be worked out in consideration of the interest of the Government and in keeping salaries and salary increases within reasonable bounds.

Complaints and suggestions are bound to develop when you deal with personnel problems affecting more than 500,000 employees. I challenge anyone to deal with matters affecting more than half a million individuals and not have some dissent. I want to emphasize that if there is going to be an increase in postal salaries, it must be accomplished by a salary plan. It should be equally clear that the plan included in this legislation has been pushed to a breaking point. Our committee has complied with practically all of the criticisms that were leveled against this legislation by representatives of postal organizations.

Basically, this bill provides a minimum of 6 percent salary increase, and, at the same time, will bring about a reclassification of postal employees' salaries through the establishment of a new salary plan for the postal field service.

Under the bill, 90 percent of the employees are covered by positions specifically defined in the bill and are assigned to appropriate salary levels. Only 10 percent will be assigned by the Postmaster General, and these must be assigned in accordance with strict standards and subject to an appeal to the Civil Service Commission by the employee concerned. This meets the criticism leveled against this measure that the Postmaster General has power to push these people around in their jobs.

The descriptions of duties, responsibilities, and relationships of 50 positions, covering more than 90 percent of the postal employees, and the establishment of salary levels, are made a matter of law by section 203 of the bill.

The detailed procedure for the establishment of salary levels for the remaining less than 10 percent are made a matter of law by section 201.

Section 202 authorizes the employee to appeal to the Civil Service Commission any action taken by the Post Office Department in the assignment of a job to a key position or to a salary level. It also makes the decisions of the Civil Service Commission mandatory on the Postmaster General.

It has been erroneously stated the salary of employees can be reduced merely by assignment to lower levels. I ask you to look at section 204 which allows the assignment of employees to other duties, but provides (a) that the salary of no employee be reduced as a result of such action, and (b) that assignment of an employee to higher duties for more than 30 days in a calendar year shall be paid for at the higher rate of pay.

The minority report would have you believe that the Postmaster General can make unlimited appointments to supervisory positions from outside the postal field. Section 501 limits this authority to appointment of persons who have been civilian employees in any branch of the Government and to positions in the regional and district offices and positions in the professional and scientific fields.

They also claim that this legislation permits the appointment of an unlimited number of substitutes. This is not correct. The committee recognized that there was some desirability of eliminating the regular-substitute ratio in the interest of flexibility of administration. Section 606 (c) takes care of that.

Some of those who criticize this legislation would have you believe that this proposal would allow the Post Office Department to downgrade all positions. The fact is that H. R. 4644 establishes by law the grade and salary of over 90 percent of the positions and provides a mandatory procedure for establishing the salary level of all others.

It has been suggested that great increases go for higher paid workers. This statement would be true if you are going to ignore the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and responsibility. The ranking of positions and salary levels as set forth in title II and III of the bill, H. R. 4644, recognizes this principle. There are some 1,100 employees in positions such as assistant postmasters, superintendents of mails, superintendent of transportation, and a few others who for some 10 years have been grossly underpaid. For instance, the postmaster at New York is paid $13,770 while the assistant postmaster is paid $8,470. This is a difference of $5,300 between the postmaster and his first deputy. The provisions of H. R. 4644 will bring these salary rates into more reasonable alinement and will, for the first time, recognize the duties and responsibilities of the assistant postmaster.

The committee also recognized that the clerks and carriers in post offices in the first and second class have greater responsibilities than reflected in the salary level proposal by the administration. A new salary level 5—section 301—which provides higher salaries for these groups of employees was approved by the committee. The additional cost resulting from the insertion of this new level is estimated at over $20 million.

Those who criticize the bill say that the proposed effective dates delay increases for 6 months. The fact is this bill establishes the first pay period after the date of enactment as the effective date of both the 6 percent minimum pay increase and that resulting from reclassification. The bill allows a maximum of 180 days in which to effect the assignment of all positions to salary levels. Once the assignment is made, the employee will receive a retroactive payment for the amount of this gross increase as of the first pay period after date of enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the starting rate for clerks and carriers. The present starting rate of clerks and carriers is $3,270 a year. This bill increases that amount $370, which makes a total of $3,740. Clerks and carriers comprise about 60 percent of employees in Government. The average increase for clerks and carriers is 8.2 percent and not 6.2 percent as claimed by the minority. The minority neglected to include premium pay for overtime and night work which really brings the increase to 8.2 percent.

This bill provides too that clerks and carriers reach a top salary in 7 years instead of 9 years.

The question now is whether the bill is right. If it is right, you will vote for it. If you do not think it is right, then you will vote against it. I think it is fair. I am anxious to get a bill through the House and through the other body that will become law. In my view this bill is the one most likely to become law and I think that when the postal people really know what the measure contains, they will not only favor it, but will support it. I would like to say that I have at all times supported legislation that I thought was fair and beneficial to postal employees. This bill is fair. It is right. It ought to pass.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First I want to commend the gentleman and likewise the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, on the very fine work they have done on this very difficult proposition. It is quite obvious that you understand the subject and that all the way through you have tried to be fair and are being fair. May I ask the gentleman this question. Is it not true that this measure, as reported by the committee, represents a very substantial compromise in the way of increased expenditure of the taxpayers' money as against the administration proposal originally sent up here?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly, that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And is it not true the amendments and changes which have been made have added $30 million annually to the cost that will follow the enactment of this legislation as against the original proposal of the administration?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct. There were 21 amendments added to the bill and many changes made in the bill after it was first introduced. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, a new, clean bill is before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious to do the thing that is fair and right for the rank and file, yes, all postal people of this country. They are doing a great service. They are good men and women. They are patriotic in every respect. I do not think the action some of you propose in supporting the controversial amendment before us today, it will be for the best interests of all postal employees. As I said before, I want to do the right thing. I know you do.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair that the Members of the House should be informed of the compelling reasons why I am opposed to H. R. 4644, the postal pay legislation, as reported by the Post Office Civil Service Committee, and supporting the 8.2 percent increase.

In my judgment—and I think it is amply supported by the record—our postal employees have clearly established a right to at least a 10 percent increase in their present salaries. I introduced a bill which would have provided such a richly deserved increase of 10 percent. I still think that it would be only right and proper. However, at the same time I recognize that there are other factors which have been injected into consideration of postal pay legislation and which undoubtedly will require a settlement of some lower figure. I just want to make it clear that my principles remain unchanged, but I am willing in a spirit of compromise to try to reach a reasonable settlement. That is why I support the 8.2 percent increase. I would like to see the House adopt the Senate bill of 10-percent increase.

Year after year I have seen our postal employees forced to come before our committee and literally beg for fair pay standards. Year after year I have seen them go away with half a loaf or—as in the case last year—nothing at all. Yet, year after year they have striven to report to Congress the facts with respect to their problems and their work. I think it is a sad commentary that once more this House is being asked to consider a bill which provides pay adjustments far below that which is justified for these postal employees. The Senate passed a straight 10 percent increase for postal and classified workers with no reclassification. I prefer this.

As I said, notwithstanding this I have been willing to accept and support a reasonable compromise. I have been willing to meet those who disagree with my view on a reasonable compromise. That is why I signed the minority report on this legislation in favor of an 8.2-percent increase. The proposal in the minority report, while still less than I believe warranted, will go a long way to answering the problems of postal employees beyond what is provided in the reported bill.

This bill is discriminatory among classes of employees and should be amended. It provides an average increase of less than 7 percent for over 200,000 regular city carriers and clerks. For some supervisory employees or postmasters the immediate increase can run as high as 40 percent or more, with maximum possible increases for this preferred group ranging as high as 74 percent. This is a manifest travesty on justice.

Nor is this bill any compromise at all. The administration recommended a 5-percent immediate increase, plus 1½ percent extra as the cost of reclassification. This bill will provide only a 6-percent increase. Anything more represents the cost of reclassification desired by the Post Office Department. It is almost wholly a one-way compromise—with the employees yielding.

Speaking of the clerks and carriers, they are placed under this bill, into a salary level which is barely above the next lower salary level, and is far below the next highest salary level. This is a serious distortion which should be corrected. Moreover, the increase in this level recommended in the minority report—ranging from $40 to $70 a year for the various steps—would provide a more adequate compensation for the actual duties of these clerks and carriers and would cost—according to the Department's own estimate—$10 million additional.

The record of increased productivity of postal employees is one of the finest accomplishments in Government in recent years. It is one in which both management and workers take pride. This is another reason for not being niggardly in adjusting salaries of these employees.

Increases in salaries and wages of comparable workers in private industry have far surpassed increases for postal workers since World War II. A comparison of postal salaries with national income and with the average of all postal incomes is even more unfavorable to the postal workers. Millions of employees in other lines of work who but a few years ago were in the same bracket as postal employees now have moved on upward, far above. The postal employee finds himself relegated to a status at or near the lowest major income level.

These are some of the reasons why I oppose H. R. 4644 as reported, and urge approval of the 8.2 percent increase recommended in the minority report on this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make perfectly clear one rather important fact. The amendments which I propose offering at the conclusion of the debate represent not the individual effort of one member of the committee, but the combined thinking and efforts of all the members who signed the minority report. When I offer them, I offer them on their behalf, and they have shared equally in the efforts to bring about their enactment here by the House.

I think it well to tell you exactly what we propose by these amendments. The first one to be offered will give to the Congress the right to take a very careful and searching look at the classification actions taken by the Postmaster General under the rather broad grants of authority which will be made by the passage of this legislation. I am not going to tell you that this is wholly as good a bill as the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking minority Member would have you believe, and neither am I going to tell you that it is as bad or as vicious as others might lead you to believe. It is a bill which, if properly and sympathetically administered, could be very beneficial. But without proper administration, and without a sincere effort for fairness, it can become a very vicious bill—one which will be highly destructive of the morale of the postal workers. It is deficient in many respects. There is not a sufficient number of benchmark positions as provided in the classification of supervisory and clerical workers. There is substantial grounds for fear on the part of many employees, but I, for one, am convinced that we cannot legislate solely against fear. If the things they anticipate finally take place, then most assuredly this Congress next January should take steps to enact remedial legislation to prevent abuses which are clearly possible under this legislation. That is why the amendment proposes to require a most detailed report from the Postmaster General to the committees of the House and the Senate.

The second amendment, and the one around which the greatest controversy arises, is very simple. It provides in level one for a $20 increase for each person working in that level. In level two we provide a meager increase for those workers by increasing the step rate by $5 a step. The total cost for those two levels is approximately $168,000, but they are dollars which go into the pockets of the poorest paid people in our Government, and I think they are entitled to that extra measure of consideration.

The highly controversial group is level five. You have been told that it affects just one group. One group, yes, where about 60 percent of the total working force of the Post Office Department is employed; one group which, under the bill H. R. 4644, would receive an average increase of approximately 6.7 percent. While those who still support the committee bill as written are trying to say it is 7.6, it is not, and will not be unless my amendment is adopted, because under that amendment we do raise employees, clerks, and carriers, to a figure between 7.6 and 8.25, depending upon their length of service and the level into which they will be fitted upon conversion when this present factor is brought into play. In other words, it provides a degree of equality of treatment for about 60 percent of the employees, to give them the minimum level of the bill, as opposed to the 40-percent group who receive all the way from 15 to as high as 58 percent, under this legislation. If we simply measure the additional cost, I believe the Department's figures are $10 million, although the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Rees] said it was $11 million, but in order not to underestimate, I say the cost will be approximately $12 million. It will bring the cost of payroll up to 8.278 percent—almost 8.3 percent. But that additional cost, that additional $12 million, goes into the pockets of people who need it now and need it most desperately. It only brings them to an average of the overall cost of the bill.

Now let us concern ourselves with the charge that I propose to take away from somebody in this bill, through a change in the levels 14 through 20——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making, although, as he understands, I am not in complete agreement. The gentleman has spoken of the people in the lower grades who need help most. Is it not fair to say that in recent years we have had these across-the-board increases of $400, and in the 80th Congress $450? Is it not fair to say that the people in the lower grades proportionately profit much more by these across-the-board raises than the people in the higher grades?

Mr. MOSS. I would say that the history of the legislation would indicate that that is the truth. The fact, however, that the Department itself came before the committee this year and advocated an additional increase indicates they felt that these people did not get too much.

I am convinced that we are trying to work under a too-low scale for our Federal workers, not only in the Post Office Department but in the classified service as well. We have an effective maximum of $14,800 and from that we go on down and have 20 or 21 levels. It cannot properly reflect responsibility, and sometime we should realistically set the higher salaries. They most certainly are entitled to what they would receive under my amendment and even if we gave them 10 percent we would not by giving them more than they are entitled to have.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. When the pay bill was considered in 1951 the Postmaster General, at that time Mr. Donaldson, and the head of the Civil Service Commission Mr. Ramspeck, testified before our committee that a 21 percent increase was justifiable. They got less than 10 percent in 1951. Since then the cost of living has gone up. If the gentleman from Indiana would like to check a little, I have before me here a statement released a few days ago, on Monday, showing the cost of living and how it has gone up. In it are included these words: "With no net drop in food."

I wish to emphasize that point.

Mr. MOSS. I wish to thank the gentleman for that information. I would like now to get to the money I am proposing to take away in this revised salary schedule. I have been accused, and I notice today in the Washington Post and Times Herald that there is some reflection there that certain people in the administration feel that perhaps my amendments would bring about distortion and certain inconsistencies.

The only reason I am proposing the bill with the step increases for levels 14 through 20 is to assure consistency. In the classified schedule employees we have a maximum step increase of $250. Under this bill as reported by the committee it was proposed to go up as high as $400. I believe that we should give more uniformity in the Federal service both as it relates to postal salaries and classified salaries if we were to increase executive salaries, and I think we should. Let us do it properly and let us maintain a consistent policy for all Federal workers. That is all in the world my amendment proposes to do in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Could the gentleman from Tennessee let me have 2 more minutes?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOSS. I want to explain in this 1 minute the final amendment, that of retroactivity. It will make retroactive a 6-percent increase, which is the conversion factor for consideration in this new schedule, make it retroactive to March 1. I picked the date March 1 because we had delayed, I believe, unnecessarily in bringing this bill to the floor, and I felt it was not the fault of the individual postal worker. That also was the date on which our salaries were increased and the date on which the judiciary received an increase. I think it is a very fair proposition, and I am pleased that the chairman has indicated that he agrees with that amendment.

I sincerely hope we adopt these three amendments. We will have a better bill. It will then go to conference and represent the minimum fair consensus of this body.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it is already abundantly clear that the members of this committee, and I believe also all Members of the House, are most anxious to bring out a bill that will give equitable and proper pay raises to our postal employees. We are all agreed on that. The only questions now are as to amount.

This bill is being brought out here, it seems to me, under a rather remarkably strange rule. It is a rule that in my years of service in the Congress I have never seen brought in before, and I have yet to find anyone who ever has. It may not be a closed rule, it certainly is a personalized rule, to say the least.

Of the three amendments that are to be offered, I think two are not very controversial, in fact, I would say they were not controversial at all. For that reason, I am only going to address myself to the second amendment. I am not aware of how these amendments are to be presented, whether they are to be presented in the order, 1, 2, and 3, but I am taking this as the second amendment, the one which would raise the salary schedules.

I have said on the floor of this House before, and I repeat, I do not believe that anybody can go into a classification bill on the floor of this House and try to correct it without throwing a monkey wrench into the whole business. To my way of thinking it is exactly as though we were to take a valuable antique clock and allow a child to try to make it go. It just cannot be done. Classification is a very technical matter. The minute you touch one piece in the mechanism you throw the whole thing out of gear. For that reason I would like to suggest that we accept the bill as written, especially the classification feature, that we try to make it work, and that, then, at the end of a little while, probably, as the gentleman from California has well pointed out, by next January, we can come back and reconsider this legislation.

Regardless of what we do here today, we are not going to write the final word on classification or salary legislation. Some people who have been here a shorter time may believe these things can be done once and for all. But fortunately our form of government does not work that way and we come back year after year, amending old laws, improving them, we hope, but, at any rate, changing them.

The proposal to limit step increases in the top levels to $250 would compress the schedule at the top for no valid reason. Initially, it would create additional cases where the savings clause would be effective and for many new appointees it would result in their working for several years before attaining the earnings which present employees now receive for the same work. In other words, that completely destroys the theory of equal pay for equal work. The proponents of this limitation appear to have overlooked two facts, one that H. R. 4644 represents a reduction in the starting rates for many positions in the higher levels and, two, that step increases above level 10 will not be automatic beyond step 4.

I am told that the reason for this limitation in salary schedules is to bring it into conformity with that of the Classification Act of 1949. It seems strange that the proponents of this amendment would in this case recognize the Classification Act, yet in the changes they propose in levels 1, 2, and 5 they entirely ignore any relationship which these positions may have to similar positions in the Classification Act. I do not believe that the $50,000 which will be saved by this amendment is worth the dislocation of the schedules, hardships, and administrative difficulties which it will cause.

Mr. Chairman, another consideration is that while our committee labored long, hard, and may I say very patiently on this legislation, these three amendments were never at any time proposed in the committee. We made many concessions and many compromises. When we established a new level 5, we felt that we had gone a long way and that without dislocating the Classification Act we had a pretty good bill. Now we have a complete change in a great many other classifications under this amendment. We have not studied it. We have not heard testimony on it, and it seems to me that after 4 months of work this committee has brought out as good a bill as it can and one that most certainly should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, when I go home, I always visit with my postal employees. I talk to them. I tell them what I believe and what I think, frankly and openly. We do not always agree, but we always come away from those interviews, I am happy to tell you, with mutual respect and trust. Of course, the employees want more money, and I do not blame them. They want a lot more money. They will not be satisfied with 8.3 percent, and do not let anybody tell you that they will. They want at least 10 percent. Under this rule, they cannot get it. Therefore, let us give them the best bill we know how to give them, and that is the bill that has been worked out in this committee, a highly technical bill, a very difficult bill for various Members on the floor who have never seen it before to understand.

May I also say that those of us who worked on this bill deplore the fact that so few Members have read the report. The report gives you the answers to a

great many things in this bill that you cannot possibly understand in any other way.

Now, under this proposed amendment, it is likewise said that a few people will get less money. Well, actually, 47,926 employees will get less money, and I think that is quite a goodly number. There are about 54 different changes in classification which will automatically take effect under this amendment which will also help to dislocate the whole bill.

It has also been said that it seems strange the President should remain adamant for 7.5 percent. I have asked my postal employees what they consider the difference is, the compromise between 5 percent and 10 percent, and they immediately reply 7.5. Of course it is a compromise. Of course this bill is not perfection, but it is a good bill, and most of you will be here next January, no doubt, to improve it some more. Finally, after we are all dead and gone, there may be a perfect classification postal pay raise bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I will reluctantly support the amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] to this bill. I would much prefer to vote for a 10-percent raise, the amount set forth in the Senate bill, but I am realistic enough to know that that would be an empty gesture, because we are told on good authority that the President will veto a 10-percent raise and that we cannot pass that 10-percent raise over his veto. I think the 8-percent raise is inadequate. We are again lagging in paying our faithful postal workers. They are entitled to 10 percent, and they should have it. But I am going to be realistic and support the Moss amendments and urge you to do likewise.

Let me call your attention to the fact that quite recently in this House we passed a pay-raise bill for the uniformed services costing over $750 million a year.

It was passed by a vote of approximately 400 to 1. It had the stanch support of the President of the United States. It was a good bill. It was a bill long overdue. Out of his long experience in the armed services, he knew the problems of those services intimately, and he threw his weight behind that bill. I am certain, had the President of the United States had the same experience in the civil functions of the Government, he would understand the problems of the civil employees of the Government as he does those of the armed services. He would not take the adamant stand that it is reported to us by the leadership he has taken on this bill. I have great respect for him, but I am sorry that part of his long service in the Government was not spent away from the military services.

There is no question but that a 10-percent pay raise is justified for postal employees. As usual, we never quite catch up with the cost of living as far as these people are concerned. Being unable to get 10 percent, I shall settle for the next highest percentage that I feel can be gotten, and I shall leave the responsibility of the final approval of this measure to the President. I am sure that 8.2 percent, while inadequate, while not filling the gap, will at least help these faithful postal workers over the dark period ahead.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the maximum possible increase obtainable for the postal employees. We have been deliberating this problem for almost a year and a half now. During the past year and a half we have had serious disagreement, bitter debate, jockeying for political position, charges and countercharges. We have had attempts on the part of some groups to set themselves up as special friends of the postal employees and other groups have been referred to as not as good friends of the postal employees. I think we must admit here today that we are all friends of the postal employees and that all of us want to do everything we can to increase their income and their standard of living as much as possible.

I think there is practically unanimous agreement that an increase in their income is justified in order to compensate them for the increase in the cost of living. But, as I said before, we have been deliberating this problem for a year and a half. We have had a difficult time agreeing upon the exact amount of the increase and how it should be distributed among the various grades. We have arrived at a bill that is a compromise. We have heard that many times today. Certainly, in any compromise there has got to be a sacrifice on the part of all groups, or it is not a compromise. This bill is not completely satisfactory to me. I should like at least a 10-percent increase, and I think we will have to have an average of at least a 10-percent increase in order to meet the increase in the cost of living of the past 10 or 15 years.

We have coming up here today an amendment to increase the salaries of some of the employees, by raising the bill to an overall increase of 8.3 percent. That is going to be a very difficult vote for some of the Members to cast. On the surface it looks rather simple. On the one hand we have an increase of approximately 7.6 percent and on the other hand an increase of approximately 8.3 percent. If that were all there was to it, it would be quite obvious that the overwhelming majority would vote for the increase of 8.3 percent. It would be the politically smart thing to vote for the maximum increase that is before you.

However, as you look further into it, it is not quite that simple. First of all, I am convinced that a vote for the 8.3 increase will not result in getting any increase into the pockets of the employees we are trying to help. We heard several statements made today, or rather, everybody has admitted that a 10-percent increase does not stand a chance of being enacted into law. We have heard from authoritative sources that a 10-percent increase will be vetoed. We have from the same authoritative sources heard that an 8.3-percent increase will be vetoed. So if you are not offering an amendment for 10 percent because you are afraid it will be vetoed and the veto will be sustained, then for the same reason you should not offer an increase of 8.3 percent.

One reason I am going to oppose it is that I am confident this increase will not reach the pockets of the employees we want it to reach. That is where I want the increase to go, not just to be on record as having voted for an 8.3 increase.

Furthermore, if we increase all postal employees by 8.3 percent we jeopardize the increase for 1,200,000 classified employees. All we have heard about the last year and a half was the 500,000 postal employees, yet we have 1,200,000 classified employees that are affected by all this controversy. We do not hear any dickering back and forth fighting for a higher increase for them. The only thing we have heard is a general agreement that they would be entitled to 6 percent. During the past 10 or 15 years the classified employees have received a 14 percent less increase than the postal employees. That has been admitted by all who have looked into the question. The reason is that the postal employees are distributed all throughout the country, and the Members of Congress are familiar with their problems. Also, they have more political influence by being distributed throughout the country.

I think in all fairness we must grant the same increase for the classified employees that we are trying to get for the postal employees. I feel that if we adopt this 8.3 amendment today we are jeopardizing the chances of getting a further increase for the classified employees. I hope and plead with you here today that you will support my efforts to obtain at least a 7.5 increase for the classified employees as enthusiastically as you are trying to increase this 7.6 bill for the postal employees.

Another reason why we should oppose the amendment is that it is an improper amendment. If the amendment provided for an increase across the board, as the 7.6 bill does, or if it went up to at least 10 percent so we could justify the gamble of running into a veto and overriding the veto, I would be willing to support it. However, as the gentlewoman from New York stated, this does throw the whole bill completely out of kilter. Regardless of what the gentleman from California stated, we are taking from one group and giving it to another. We are jeopardizing the overall program to give $1.12 a week to one group of employees. We are actually pulling the people down that are in the upper grade as well as those right in Grade 5.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] stated the other day in answer to remarks of mine, to the effect that I felt the Republican Party has followed the principles of Jefferson throughout the years more than the Democratic Party, that if Abraham Lincoln were living today he would be a Democrat. One of the many remarks of wisdom uttered by Abraham Lincoln was that he believed in equal opportunity for all, not limited opportunity for some. He believed in every individual having the right and the opportunity to rise as far

and as high as he could, but not to pull the other fellow down in getting there.

I believe that if Lincoln were here today he would try to help all of the employees as much as possible and provide for them equal opportunity. But he would certainly vote against pulling some of the employees down for the gain of a few others.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that I favor the maximum pay raise possible for our postal employees. In view of the limited rule under which the House is considering the bill, however, this body will not even have an opportunity to vote on a 10 percent increase. Therefore I hope each and every Member of the House will support the amendments that will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] in which all Members who signed the minority report concur.

These amendments are very similar to those offered previously in committee but which were voted down. I say this notwithstanding a statement to the contrary made by another member of the committee.

Three weeks ago this body voted against considering the postal pay-raise bill under suspension of rules. The best way now to make that vote count is to support the three amendments which will be offered later today.

In my opinion, voting for these amendments is the only means this body has of justifying to the postal worker the long wait he has had for his pay raise. By so doing we will make it possible for the bill to go to the conference committee from which I hope a fair bill will emerge.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the House Members would have the privilege of voting on a 10 percent pay boost. I am convinced the postal worker not only needs but deserves such a raise. The Senate evidently thought so, too.

We House Members, however, have been denied the opportunity to vote on a 10 percent increase, and instead we are to be allowed to vote only on the three Moss amendments. I do not see how any Member who has the welfare of the postal employee and his family at heart can do less than vote for these amendments.

The amendments are reasonable. They make small but significant improvements. They will not add enormously to the cost of the bill, but they will add greatly to the comfort and self-respect of the postal employees and their families.

One of the amendments will make the postal pay raise retroactive to March 1. This means the postal employee and his family will not be penalized because H. R. 4644 was held up while some of us have been fighting for a better deal for him. In fact the retroactive feature will make an additional $20 million available to the 503,000 postal workers for the months of March and April of this year.

Another amendment directs the Postmaster General to make a comprehensive report to the Congress next January on what he has done under the bill's reclassification features. I am sure the Postmaster General would be happy to do this—even without a request.

The third, and most important, increases the average pay raise from 7.6 percent to 8.2 percent, and squeezes out some of the inequities in the bill between grade levels. This means an extra 10 to 12 million dollars each year to the more than 320,000 postal clerks, carriers and motor vehicle operators—the very core of the nonsupervisory postal workers.

If this amendment is not adopted, the bill will give raises of over 50 percent to some of the field officials and raises of barely 6 percent to many of the postal workers at the bottom of the pay scale. The officials well deserve their raise; they have long been underpaid. But after all, a sack of potatoes or a quart of milk costs the same whether it is bought by a postal supervisor's wife or the wife of the post officer janitor. And a few more pennies in the janitor's pay envelope might mean the difference between having some of the necessities of life of going without them.

Adopting this amendment to give rank and file postal workers just a little better deal will help repay them for the fact that they were deprived of their pay raise last year by a Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, I have been firmly in favor of at least a 10 percent pay raise for postal workers down through the weeks this bill has been under consideration by the House Post Office Committee and by the House itself. The cost of living is sky-high. I do not see how those with slim pocketbooks are making ends meet. A postal worker in the lower pay brackets, who is trying to raise a family, cannot possibly maintain the standard of living that we Americans so proudly boast we have in this country.

I was most disappointed when it developed during House committee hearings that the administration would not support a 10-percent pay raise. I joined with some of the other members of the committee to try to perfect a bill that the President would not veto, but we found ourselves up against a this-is-it attitude that was very disheartening. Just as it takes two to make an argument, it takes two to make a compromise. The administration was unwilling to yield even a yard. It was partly as a protest against the administration's unyielding attitude that the minority report was drawn up and signed.

When the attempt was made to bring this above-and-beyond-compromise bill up under suspension of rules, preventing the House from either debating it or amending it, I voted against the move, as did the vast majority of the Members of this body. I think we were all agreed that consideration under suspension of rules was not only discourteous but unjust and unfair to the almost half a million Americans whose economic future was at stake.

I regret that an open rule was not granted on this bill. Those of us who went before the Rules Committee earlier this week made it clear that we considered an open rule the only satisfactory way to handle this bill. The rule permitting the three amendments was offered as a second-best method, and certainly preferable to a completely closed rule. I shall always be sorry that the House was not given an opportunity to vote, under an open rule, on an amendment to give the postal employees a 10-percent raise. I think it would have been passed.

Mr. Chairman, I know this administration wants to cut Government expenses. So do I. But I do not believe denying postal employees and their families a decent standard of living is the way we should start to economize.

I am confident that my colleagues will join today to amend this bill, and give the postal employees a little better deal than would have been possible had we not fought this battle to a finish.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there has been plenty of evidence, I believe, to all of us that a substantial pay increase for postal and Federal workers is justified. If we just look at the increased productivity of the Nation, we will find it is advancing much faster than the purchasing power of our Federal employees. Federal pay has not kept pace with rising living standards or increased productivity. Naturally, all postal employees as well as other Federal employees want more money. But, I can assure you money is not the only thing involved in this question today. Ever since this legislation has been before our committee, I have opposed the reclassification provision. During the debate today on the rule, little mention was made of the question of reclassification, and yet I feel that this is a crucial issue so far as the opponents of this bill are concerned. In my opinion, this is not a good reclassification bill. You cannot set proper reclassifications in the postal service unless first you determine what is a proper minimum and what is a proper maximum for salaries. When that is done, then it is possible to work out the proper rates in between. That has not been done. I believe this bill gives entirely too much authority to the Postmaster General. Let me say this is not a partisan matter so far as I am concerned.

It is true no matter who the Postmaster General may be or what political label he may carry. There are some very good reasons for the post-office clerks to be concerned because they are the ones who would be hurt most if the powers granted under this bill were used for shortsighted political purposes and advantages or to punish those postal employees who dared to hold an honest opinion which is in conflict with the thinking of those who head the Post Office Department. There seems to be plenty of ground for such fears because of some of the incidents that have already happened. I believe it is necessary to have proper discipline in the postal service and, as a matter of fact, wherever people may be employed, but I do not think there is anything good that can come out of something like this if the result is going to be discrimination and punishment under the guise of inefficiency. It could have a disastrous

effect on the morale, and result in the weakening of the civil service and merit system. In all fairness, I want to say that substantial improvements have been made since this bill was first introduced. Improvements were made in the committee with the adoption of a meritorious amendment by Congressman Moss which sets up better procedures for the handling of grievances. I believe the Moss amendment which will be before you for your consideration today when the bill is read for amendment, and which asks for a comprehensive report by the Postmaster General on next January 1, with reference to the action he takes to make effective the job classification provisions of this bill, would be another improvement. I believe there are loopholes which would permit grave injustices. That is why I think we should accept this Moss amendment when it is offered. My first preference in connection with this legislation is S. 1 because it does not contain the reclassification provisions.

Some of us have been very suspicious as to the real objective behind the reclassification desires of the Post Office Department. In accepting it, even with some of the improvements which were made, indicates the willingness to compromise by those of us who took a minority stand in the committee. There will be an opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit, and under certain conditions we do have a chance to vote on S. 1, which will give a 10-percent increase and also eliminate the reclassification provision.

If the compromise suggested by the Moss amendments is not accepted it is my intention to vote to recommit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, we are today dealing with the welfare of a great group of men and women who are representative of the Federal Government and who daily come in contact with the citizens of our country. The postman or the rural carrier is the first representative of Government to the schoolboy. In our rural areas the postmaster at the village office is often the only agent of the Government that the people see from year to year. They pay their taxes and they hear wonderful things about slum clearance and public housing and Federal legislation, but to them the Government is exemplified by the post office, and I am sure it is a refreshing thing today that we are bringing up this important subject.

The bill before us today is really of twofold importance.

First, it undertakes to do a job that has been long needed, that of classification of employees of the postal service. The enactment of this part of the bill will do much to improve the efficiency of our Post Office Department. It will tend more nearly to assure the principle of equal pay for equal work, a principle which has long found favor with employment in industry and in Government employment.

I should like to point out that the reclassification feature, with the appropriate pay schedule for each category, has been enunciated in H. R. 4644, after many months of deliberation and study by experts in the field. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee then approached the subject from the legislative viewpoint, and after several weeks of intensive study suggested several refinements, some of which were, after consultation with authorities, found to be unworkable and were discarded. Others were able to be dovetailed into the framework of the legislation, and were included in the bill as it comes before this body. This legislation is now presented as a matter not of perfect legislation, but of one which is the product of thought and study by a department of Government and by a committee of this House. Alterations to it would tend to disregard and destroy the balance and the delicate quality of the classification mechanism. We here, as a deliberative group, are called upon to determine policy. Shall there be classification or not? We, the 435 of us, cannot hope to write the formula for that classification. The result would be unworkable confusion, and a vast majority of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service realized that as they approved this legislation, while at the same time they regretted that it was not possible to make specific changes which would have permitted even greater benefits to certain groups of individuals.

This bill should receive the unanimous support of everyone, if for no other reason than the important goal we attain in enacting the reclassification feature.

But as representatives of the people, we are interested too in the welfare of our postal employees, of granting them an appropriate increase in wages. It has been several years since the postal workers have received an increase, while their neighbors in private industry have, many of them, been benefited by a boost now and then. Thus we have the second reason for the enactment of this legislation. It would indeed be wonderful, and we would obtain the undying gratitude of the postal workers everywhere if we could greatly increase their salaries, many times over what they are presently receiving. I am sure each of them would welcome it and would put the increase to good use. But that is not possible. There are three reasons why the pay scale of this bill has been determined at the present figure.

First, it is a figure which I feel the taxpayers will willingly agree to pay. Remember, they are paying the bill.

Second, being a realistic pay increase it would be in keeping with the conduct of the postal establishment. Do you suppose for 1 minute the Postmaster General would have objected to a greater increase if it had been to the best interests of the Department?

Third, it is in line with the cost of living index and comparable wages in private industry.

But in addition to the logical dollars and cents argument for this bill there is one very real and compelling argument for the increase here enunciated: The committee wanted to present legislation which it felt would meet the approval of this House. It would have been an insult to your intelligence to have come to this body with an increase too extravagant or too small, for this House has the honor of representing not only the people of the United States for their best interest but also the Post Office Department and all of its employees. The facts are before you in the testimony before the committee and the report of the committee. They are the same facts which were available to the Post Office Department and to the Chief Executive and upon which they have based their opinions.

This body as a group of legislators will weigh the testimony and will enact legislation which will grant a pay raise and grant it now to these deserving employees. While we deliberate they lose a dollar a day. If the Members of this group feel within their hearts that the postal workers should have a greater increase let them not forget that their first duty is to obtain for them an increase which the facts show them clearly entitled to and to which we will all agree. This is not the last opportunity to enact postal-pay legislation; there will be other bills in other years. Let us give them the benefits they can surely get and get now.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks to an understanding that has been presented to the House with regard to Moss amendment No. 2 on the theory that the adoption of this amendment would bring an increase in pay to approximately 303,000 employees at the expense of, as I understood it, 47,000 other employees; and that would come about by the compression to $250 in the retention of that differential within grade step pay raises of the supervisory personnel at levels 14 to 20.

I respectfully submit that in the Post Office Department salary plan schedules and statistical comparisons of 1955 the estimate by the department of the total number of employees in Grades 14 through 20 is 412, and the number affected would be 397.

I further submit that in the matter submitted by the Post Office Department on January 31, 1955, showing the estimated number of employees in each salary level from 14 through 20, they estimate 960 employees would be affected by this uniform within grade step increase of $250 as provided under the Moss amendment. The people most affected are represented by the National Association of Postal Supervisors. According to a statement released by this association in April of this year 425 supervisors would be affected in levels 14 through 20 at an annual cost of approximately $68,000.

I submit that there is no rank discrimination in affording an increase to 256,000 employees as against the possible reduction to 425 or $47,000.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I was most interested in the remarks during the debate on the rule of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If I interpreted his remarks correctly, the gentleman from Massachusetts made it quite clear that by recognizing the possibility of a Presidential veto we as legislators were not deserting our responsibility. I think he clearly pointed out that to do so was merely a realistic recognition of the political facts of life. The President has not threatened a veto. I do not think the word "threat" has been properly used here. The President has merely indicated that he will exercise his obligation under the Constitution, and I emphasize the word "obligation," to veto a bill that he does not approve. We are in no way restrained from voting a bill in excess of 7.6 percent; however, I do agree with the majority leader that to be practical we should consider what the President is likely to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that the top bill which will secure Presidential approval is the committee bill before you, providing for a raise of 7.6 percent, and I am equally certain that the necessary two-thirds vote to override a veto cannot be mustered. Where will this leave the postal workers? Right down the same old blind alley they have been down before with no pay raise at all. Oh, yes; another bill can be presented, and it can be passed, but in the meantime, what happens to 1,200,000 classified employees? If I were a civil-service worker, I would be getting pretty sick and tired of sitting back for some postal union leaders to play politics with postal-pay bills while I got nothing. If the 8.2 position prevails today, and if it is vetoed, if the veto is not overridden, I call upon everyone of you who support it to join with me and others in immediately demanding that a classified pay raise bill be passed at this time so that we can do away with this silly age-old principle, this unwritten law, that 1,200,000 classified workers must await the outcome of what happens to 500,000.

I will admit that there are undoubtedly some areas in the United States where a pay raise in excess of the amount provided in this bill is justified. I think probably our own State of California is such a place. But postal workers have long ago banded themselves together to seek united action through their representatives. I heartily approve of such action, and I commend them for having taken it. But this leadership has consistently opposed the principle of setting salaries in accordance with the cost of living in the various areas of the United States.

When you demand the same treatment for the country as a whole, you require the finding of an average need, and you reward those with a lesser need at the expense of those with greater need. Whenever you try to apply one rule to different problems, you invariably run into that sort of a situation. There are areas in the United States where postal salaries are very attractive, and they are very adequate. In other areas I admit they are not. But the President must view this as a national problem. He is not representing one congressional district, just as the postal union leaders are not representing one post office. They are representing the Nation as a whole, and they must solve the problem by finding an average.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the average which will be approved is 7.6 percent. I submit that if you pass a bill providing more, you will delay this much-needed pay raise. Furthermore, you will require 1,200,000 classified employees of the Government to await the raise which they also deserve, and which they are denied by the action of persons over whom they have no control.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss in the brief time that I have two points. First, it has been declared here this afternoon that we will be depriving the postal employees of any pay raise if we refuse to go along with the assertion that 7.6 is the maximum which the President will approve. I think it should be pointed out, and especially to the Democratic Members of the House, that it is perhaps time that we made very clear that if this veto is forthcoming, all of us will have to stand up and be counted as to whether or not we will deprive the postal employees by our votes of the 8.2 which is suggested by the Moss amendment. If the veto should be forthcoming, I for one would be very glad to see the issue clearly drawn for the few dollars that are involved. To say that the postal employees are not entitled to that raise is, I think, absolutely unrealistic, and I shall vote for the Moss amendment because 8.2 is the minimum, not the maximum, to which they are entitled.

I think, secondly, that we should pay very careful attention to the report of the committee, which on page 13 describes the administration features of this bill. It cannot be said, I think, that there is anything niggardly in the powers which have been given to the Postmaster General, and in view of the importance to all of the people of our country of the postal service, I for one would have liked to have seen an amendment here which would have required that any findings which he might make in regard to reclassification should be submitted to the Congress for approval prior to their going into effect. The Moss amendment says that a report will be required of the Postmaster General in order that the Congress can know and understand what he has already done. That is better than nothing. So I hope that as a result of the conference this Congress will adopt a bill that includes the increased pay scales provided by the Moss amendment, and the retroactive amendment, and especially a much more strict control of the Postmaster General's classification powers. If a Presidential veto should result we can then do our legislative duty and override it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat a figure I have given before, with clarification. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, mentioned that the increase in the cost of living has been 3.8 percent since the last pay increase. That figure might be correct or wrong, I do not know, but let us assume it is 3.8. The previous increase of roughly 10 percent should have been 21 percent, leaving a balance of 11 percent, and adding 3.8 and 11 percent is 14.8, or roughly 15 percent increase that the postal employees should be getting today. So, if the amendment of the gentleman from California prevails, the postal employees are only getting approximately one-half of what they should be receiving.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON].

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some interest to the discussion of what appears to be a very difficult problem, and there may be something lacking in my understanding, because it seems to me the problem is more simple than it has been represented. I serve on the committee and I heard the testimony and I heard the discussions. In addition to that, having for many years been in the field of job analysis, I was interested to inquire as to how these schedules and these rates were determined and as to what methods and criteria were used to arrive at the schedules that were before us. It seems to me that H. R. 4644 does very well, much better than I could do, even with the many years of experience I have had as an individual in determining a like finding on the same problem. It is primarily for the purpose of increasing the rates of basic salary which it does, and eliminating certain salary inequities, which it undoubtedly does. I assume there were inequities. There always will be inequities in wage scales and schedules. But as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] so eloquently said, this does not make a final determination. If inequities develop, there will be opportunity to change them. But certainly, if the competent people who spent months studying this matter, if the committee which gave over a period of weeks hours at a time to a study of this matter comes up with the bill that is before you, which is a complete wage schedule, there is no hope of improving it by arbitrarily making changes and adjustments, however well intended they may be, to give more money to certain people.

I do not think that my responsibility here is just to disburse money from the Federal Treasury. I think I am charged with a greater responsibility, as other Members are, to represent the employer, the Federal Government, to determine fair and adequate compensation for the service that employees perform. So I do not subscribe too much to the thought that the final determination should be made on what will furnish Federal employees or any employees money sufficient for the standard of living that they might desire or for the number of dependents they might acquire; but the basis for the compensation should be that it is adequate and fair for the service rendered, not alone for those presently employed, but for those who will continue to be added to the payroll and

who, we hope, will become more proficient and will be promoted.

What this amendment that is proposed will do is to tear apart a carefully prepared schedule and add, as I understand it, about $10 or $12 million to the proposed pay of certain employees, some 240,000 of them, and in making this adjustment arbitrarily to take away from others about $3,600,000, from people who probably are of more value to the Service than these people who are in the lesser responsible positions; give them less pay than the studies and analyses determine they should have.

In addition to that there are 21 classifications carefully drawn up from study and 138 rates and an arbitrary amendment is suggested—and this is with no disparagement of the competence and abilities of my colleagues, that would put in 59 rate changes in 138 rates of pay.

I call attention to the fact that it is a very serious thing when we represent the Government in determinations which the employer makes as to fair compensation for Government employees for the service they render, on the basis merely of argument and presentation and out of our generous attitude toward these people to destroy a wage scale. It was a hodgepodge to begin with. If anyone does not think so, let him study what you had. This bill certainly improves it. But then to come here today and change 59 of these 138 rates arbitrarily and add $12 million onto certain rates to certain people and take away from 48,000 others $3 million of pay and say that that is a better bill, does not make sense to me.

I think the amendment should be voted down. I will certainly vote against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I am under no misapprehension in coming here to say a few words. I know anything I may have to say will probably not change a vote that is cast in this House today. However, there are a few things that I think might well be said in order that in casting your votes you may bear them in mind and know of the truth at the time you do cast your votes.

It is still my opinion that the decision to be made here today is whether we are going to vote a pay raise bill for the postal employees or vote a bill that will be vetoed. I think that is the question and the whole question here.

We have been told the President has promised to veto a bill that is greater than 7.6 percent. I did not consider what he said to be a threat. I actually think it was a promise, and there is a distinction between the two. I do not know why we should not be happy to have the knowledge of the President's position in this matter and to know that he had the courage to state his position.

The people from whom the complaints have come that the President stated his position are probably the same people who complained last year that the President did not advise us he was going to veto the pay raise bill that was passed last year. I think they are the same people. I wondered today as the vote was taken on the rule where all of those people went who on March 21 were screaming about a gag rule when this bill came up under suspension on that day.

After the House action on that day the chairman of our committee, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, together with the ranking minority member, appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for an open rule so that the House could take whatever action it wanted to. If we are going to pass a bill that will be vetoed, let's pass a good one. You would be surprised to know the names of the people who did appear before the Committee on Rules and asked for this closed rule, the gag we have here, and insisted upon it.

To pass on from that, we know there have been lots of views on the kind of bill that ought to be passed. I have with me some communications that go from one extreme to the other on this matter, in order that you may know all the different ways people have in mind that this legislation ought to be passed. Most of them are cut off from having any chance of their position being presented here on the floor of the House.

There is one organization that represents probably 25 percent of the employees. They say they do not want this bill passed either with, or without the Moss amendments. They say, "We want you to vote against a closed rule." I am sure all of you got a similar telegram. I did vote against the closed rule. There is another one from another organization which says, "We do want you to vote for a closed rule because we think that we would like to have the Moss amendments." Yet others, want the bill as written.

Then here is a group of letters I received from Brooklyn, N. Y. I will read just part of one of them. It says:

I am a postal employee and I know that at present all postal employees are highly overpaid.

That is what he says—"overpaid."

The letter continues:

And I was disgusted when the Senate Post Office Committee passed out S. 1. The employees have had four raises already in the last 7 years.

There are several of those, and I will only read one of them. These next letters remind me of an immigrant farmer who had come to the United States and who had decided to become a citizen. He appeared before a magistrate for his naturalization papers. The offical asked him, "Do you like this country?" "Oh, sure," said the applicant. And then the question, "Does our government suit you in every way?" With some hesitation the immigrant said, "Well, pretty much, but I would like only to see it a little more rain."

Now we are getting in that position here. "Oh, yes, I want a pay raise, but, of course, I would like to see a little bit more."

Here is a letter I received from a Post Office employee down at Natalia, Tex., and that is not in my district. The letter says:

We have been hoping for more than a year that something would be done about a pay increase for the postal employees, but it looks like the matter is becoming more and more complicated. I personally would rather have a dollar in my pocket now—

And, of course, this means a dollar a day—

than the remote possibility of $1.15 some months later, and so I ask you and the other members of your committee to vote out this bill, H. R. 4644.

And then he goes on and states:

Personally, I would like to have more money, but I do not think more money would get by the White House so let us take the 7.6 percent increase and let it go at that. We have already lost more than enough to make up the difference. So it simply looks foolish to wrangle any longer.

And he quotes:

"A bird in the hand is worth more than two in the bush."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. May I ask what State that letter came from? That has some good sense in it.

Mr. DOWDY. That is from the State of Texas, of course.

Here is one from my district:

I am writing you in regard to the postal pay bill. I would appreciate any consideration you would give this matter. We postal clerks would prefer even a 6-percent increase plus classification than to have a bill enacted which would not be signed by the President. Please consider H. R. 4644.

So you see there are all these different ideas of what should be done. They do not want the bill at all—they want more—they want a little bit more—and they want what is here.

Here is another one from Texas. I am reading you several from Texas. This letter is from all of the employees at a post office. It is right near my district. The fact of the matter is some of the rural carriers come into my district. It says:

We clerks and city and rural carriers at the Cleveland (Tex.) post office urge your support of H. R. 4644 which we feel is a compromise solution of the various bills now before the Congress. We feel that if certain legislation granting a larger increase in pay is enacted, it seems certain to die by Presidential veto leaving us without a pay raise for the remainder of this session of Congress. In view of this, we most respectfully urge you to exercise your important influence in support of the compromise solution which is possible by the passage of H. R. 4644.

Of course, as have other Members of the Congress, I have received a number of letters from various employees, some saying they did not want reclassification in any form and that they preferred no salary raise at all if it had any reclassification.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us just how much authority the Congress is surrendering to the Postmaster General in this reclassification section.

Mr. DOWDY. In this bill that has been presented here by the committee, it is my opinion that the Postmaster

General has less authority than he has under the present law.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like very much to vote for this bill, but I do not intend every year to continue to surrender all the authority that we have in the Congress to some Government department.

Mr. DOWDY. It is my opinion, he has less under this bill than he has under the present law.

With reference to this matter of limiting any possible amendments, I think, as I have stated, that if we were going to bring this bill before the House after the action taken on it before, it should have come in under an open rule. If I were permitted to write the bill myself, this 4644 would be different; since other people and circumstances had to be considered, I believe this to be the best bill we can expect to enact. Therefore, I have supported the committee action, even though acting alone, I would do otherwise. I feel the employees would prefer a pay raise over a vetoed bill. There are a great many amendments that could be offered. There are organizations representing 25 percent of the postal employees who say they do not want a raise if it has reclassification in it. It may be, if a bill is passed with reclassification, someone may wish to amend it so that no part of them would be affected by the bill; that none of its provisions would affect them unless in writing, the individuals gave notice that they wanted to come under the provisions of the bill. I think most of them would say in writing that they wanted to come under the provisions of the bill, but I think they should be given an opportunity to elect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. There is one thing to bear in mind—that this matter is going to a conference. Do you not think it best for us to pass a bill that we know will be signed, so that a pay raise can be enacted? For one dollar a week for just a part of the employees, should we take a chance on a veto? I am trying to be practical and sensible and realistic in what I am saying and in my action. The Senate passed a bill which amounts to a 12-percent increase. It cannot be approved. It will be vetoed. We will have a bill from the House that can be enacted; and if the conferees find improvements can be made and the bill still be enacted, they will certainly make the amendments.

There are some things that have been said about the proposed amendments, and that is that all of the reductions in salary would be in the higher levels. I do not think the truth has been made clear to you on that. They say they are increasing the pay rates about 8.3 percent. The significant part of that is that less than half of the employees are getting that raise. Over 50,000 employees are losing an aggregate of more than $3,600,000 per year, and over a period of 4 years that would be $16 million you are penalizing a part of the employees. And that is not in the higher brackets. Listen carefully. Forty-eight thousand of them were in level 5. The clerks, carriers, and motor-vehicle operators that are now in grade 3 will receive $80 a year less under the Moss amendment than under the present bill. Those in grade 4 will receive $75 a year less than under H. R. 4644. Those in grade 5 would receive $70 a year less. Why penalize those people in order to pay some others, in the same group, doing the same work, more money?

So let it not be said that the money they are cutting is coming from the top grades, because over $3,600,000 is coming from men in the lower steps in grade 5.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more that could be said on this bill. As I said in the beginning, these are just a few things that I wanted to call to the attention of the membership to be considered in passing upon the whole proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas for his graciousness in yielding me this time to speak out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I have just introduced a bill of profound importance in connection with the American merchant marine and I should like to make a brief explanation of its purpose.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there are some 16 shipping companies operating in the foreign commerce of the United States whose expenses of operation are subsidized directly by the Federal Treasury. Generally speaking, the subsidy represents the difference between the cost of operating a ship under the American flag and the cost of operating under a competitive foreign flag. The great bulk of this difference, which now has risen to over $100 million annually, represents wage costs.

Back in 1936, when the act was passed, the wages of American seamen were substandard and the living conditions aboard ship were almost intolerable; so the Congress included in the act a provision directing the Maritime Commission to establish minimum wages, manning scales and working conditions for all vessels covered by operating subsidy contracts. Over the past 20 years, times have changed so that today there are indications on all sides that the high cost of operation under the American flag is driving the American merchant marine right off the seas. The coastal and intercoastal trades are gone; the few remaining nonsubsidized lines are on their last legs; the only segments of the industry that can survive are those whose operations are subsidized either by the Federal Treasury or by profits from other phases of the company's business, such as oil, lumber, fruit, or steel.

The bill which I have introduced would direct the Maritime Administrator to fix maximum as well as minimum wages, manning scales and working conditions for all subsidized vessels. These maximums would, of course, establish the limits beyond which obligations of the companies would not become obligations of the Government under the subsidy contracts. However, the parties would be left free to work out wage agreements under the collective bargaining process. Any increases in wages, manning scales or working conditions over and above established maximums would be absorbed in subsidy payments only if approved by the Maritime Administration after appropriate hearings.

I know there will be those who will point to this bill as antilabor. There will be those also who will condemn this bill as invading the parity concept of the 1936 act. To each of these groups I say, "If this bill is not the proper approach to the problem, come in and tell us why. But, do not come in unless you are prepared to offer some constructive alternative." I am sick and tired of those who are always ready to criticize but fail to see that unless something drastic is done—and done now—we will have no American merchant marine and all American seamen will be "on the beach" as they call it.

In conclusion, let me say that while I have indicated to the members of the Merchant Marine Committee that I might introduce this bill, I did not ask their approval of it. Hence, the proposal has been introduced by me as an individual Member of this body. And, my sole concern and purpose is to save our fourth arm of defense, the American merchant marine, from being completely amputated. I have the greatest hope and optimism, however, that carefully planned surgery can restore our patient to good health and enable him to keep pace with the advances in American business and commerce.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any time this afternoon on the pending bill because I realize that the pros and cons have been discussed many, many times prior and I am not naive enough to believe that any remarks I may make will influence anybody one way or the other on this legislation. However, I do want to say that the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service on both sides of the aisle have studied this matter thoroughly and have gone into it conscientiously. All those who are concerned have had an opportunity to express themselves in every way.

The administration presented a 5-percent bill and many Members introduced 10-percent bills. I know of no better compromise between 5 percent and 10 percent than about 7.5 percent. I realize when we are discussing 7.5 percent or 7.6 percent, we are talking of an overall amount applied to the present salaries paid by the Post Office Department. I realize that some go somewhat higher and some go somewhat lower. But that is essential in a reclassification act.

When we are dealing with reclassification, we are dealing with something here that has been a realized necessity for many years and this has been brought out in the history of the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House and Senate. So we are just taking action on something that should have been done a long time ago.

Much study has been brought into this matter. We have had a great deal of pressure brought to bear on the Members of the House from the postal unions and from all angles. Let me say that as a Member of the House of Representatives, I fully realize the responsibility that the representatives of the postal unions have in trying to do the very best they can for the people that they represent. They would be derelict in their duty if they did not. They ought to be pushing for a 10-percent increase right down the line. But we have a responsibility, too, Mr. Chairman, a responsibility to see, first, that the employees of the Federal Government, whether they be postal, military, or civil-service employees, receive a fair and just wage and, secondly, we have a responsibility to the constituency which we serve, a responsibility to the people of my district, for instance, that I will not abdicate to anybody.

I want to say—and I do not lay this to any particular group—that some of the actions that have been brought to bear upon Members of Congress and some of the slanderous things, shall we say, that have been said, written to us and so forth, would have been better off if not done at all. I do not think I can lay those particular things that have happened to one individual or group. But let me give you an example. I certainly bear no malice to no one. I received a postcard today, postmarked Washington, D. C. So it does not concern me very much. It states:

Labor eliminated Ferguson in Michigan. A Congressman should be no trouble. Special interests may have more money, but the people have the votes. If you can't recognize needs, replacement with one who will is in order. Re pay raise 10 percent.

The individual did not have the nerve to sign that card. I do not think that is a reasonable nor a good approach to the problem. It certainly does not impress me at all.

I think one of the things that this points up is simply this: There ought to be a more fair, a more equitable, an easier way for the employees and the Department to settle these wage disputes. A commission of some kind to handle this matter would do a far better job and it would relieve a lot of people, including the employees' representatives and the Members of Congress, from going into some of these problems and be subjected to all kinds of pressure from all sides.

Now, I just had to get that off my chest, because I believe it is important. You all know what I am talking about. You all have been subjected to it. I want to say this. I do not think these things have been inspired by the leadership of the postal workers. I believe it has been done by individuals themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this in the few minutes I have remaining, that I think this is a fair bill, and I will tell you why. If we compare the salaries that have been provided in this bill—and I do not know of anyone who would not like to pay a little greater salary; we all would; that is quite natural and quite human—but, if we compare them with the salaries being paid for like positions in industry in our given districts, taking into consideration fringe benefits, sick leave, vacation pay, holidays, and all of these other things, they will compare and compare favorably, and I think that is a responsibility that we have to be sure that they do compare favorably.

Now, there is one other matter that I think is going to come up, and it is important to every citizen of the United States. We have a matter, I believe, which is going to come before this body which is of equal importance to the operation to the Post Office Department—and that is the matter of postal rates. I wonder where everybody is going to be when they call the roll, whether they are going to raise the 3-cent stamp to 4 cents. I tell you I am for it, and I will tell you why. I am for it simply because I realize that with $160 million added to this bill on top of the post-office deficit, it is going to over half a billion dollars, and that is about $3 for every man, woman, and child living in the United States that they are subsidizing the users of the mail, and when 75 percent of the first-class mail is used by business other than individuals themselves, I think it is time we do something about rates to relieve the general taxpayers from this unrealistic postal deficit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I was extremely hopeful that the Rules Committee would report the postal pay increase bill to the floor of the House under an open rule. However, they have, in their wisdom, reported the bill to the floor permitting only 3 amendments and naming the amendments.

I certainly desire to vote for a substantial salary increase for the postal employees. However, I do not intend to surrender the few remaining powers left in the Congress of the United States to the Postmaster General or any other Government department. The Congress, during the past 15 years, has continuously surrendered its powers to the executive department to the extent that now it is impossible to even have a House committee take serious consideration of a bill without first securing the consent of one of the executive departments and, on numerous occasions, the consent of the Budget Bureau.

I certainly do not consider we have a representative form of government when Members of Congress, who are selected to represent the people of their respective districts in the Congress of the United States, cannot vote for the type of legislation they desire without first securing permission of the executive department.

I cannot understand why Congress could not vote the postal employees a salary increase without granting the Postmaster General additional authority which, if abused, could completely wreck the postal service.

I think if Congess wants the Post Office Department employees reclassified, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee should make recommendations and spell out the people whom they desire to secure promotions and the type of positions they desire to have created in the Post Office Department.

I regret very much that it is going to be extremely difficult for me to vote for the pending bill as long as it includes the section pertaining to reclassification which, in my opinion, gives the Postmaster General complete jurisdiction over the postal service without making it necessary to consult Congress on any proposal.

I hope that I am wrong in my interpretation of this section of the bill. However, from all the information I have been able to secure on this proposed legislation, we, Members of Congress, would, if this section were included in the bill, no longer be able to take care of the wishes of our constituents by calling on the Post Office Department to make certain transfers and appointments within the postal service in our respective districts. I would find it extremely difficult to explain to my constituents why we surrendered this jurisdiction to some other Government agency and must, if the present bill is enacted into law, go to the Post Office Department with our hats in our hands and on bended knees to plead for any little assistance for our constituents.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is no tremendous surprise to arrive in Washington as a freshman Congresswoman and find nearly every day's office mail containing from 1 to 100 letters from postal and other Federal workers earnestly written and conscientiously phrasing an appeal for an appropriate salary increase. This should surprise none of us, for it is evident, that for the most part, the history of Government wage legislation is one of shabby treatment of Federal employees. Too often Congress and the executive branch of our Government have considered Federal salaries as a largess—rather than a justifiably earned income.

In all cases, and especially so in the instance of the postal worker, whose devotion to duty, whose dependability and integrity have become a matter of superb record, the ratio between income deserved and income accorded has been and continues to be representative of a considerable sacrifice for themselves and their families. A further graceless financial condition in which the postal worker finds himself is seen in the ratio between his actual income and the cost of living.

During the greater part of the last two decades, postal employees and other Government workers have been denied the income which enables them to meet increased prices. They have been the stepchildren of our American economy. For example, in 1952, their income was a mere 4 percent above actual living costs.

In 1953, the difference decreased to 1 percent.

These facts and others equally important are well known to them and to us. And it is well known that the postal service is facing a situation which can lead only to extreme difficulty in procurement of high caliber personnel. In fact, such a situation is now in existence in many areas, resulting all too often in the necessity to secure personnel who are inadequate. This means added cost of operation, added burdens on efficiency.

It is obvious why we must act promptly to raise adequately the incomes of these workers—reasons which find their bases on both moral and economic grounds. Accordingly, I have consistently urged that a salary increase of at least 10 percent be provided by this Congress for the postal employees. It has been and continues to be my firm opinion that such an increase is entirely justifiable.

Nevertheless, such an increase, however justifiable, appears to be unsuited to the atmosphere created by this administration. The shadow of veto suggests the starkness of no increase at all. This then—all else having failed—is the time for compromise, to accept the amendments allowable, to recognize the great need for as substantial an increase as possible and to abide by that amount.

Therefore, I will vote in favor of the Moss amendments and an increase of 8.2 percent for our postal workers. It will be a reluctant vote, for it is suggestive of a continuing shabby treatment of our Federal employees. It will be reluctant because the half-a-loaf concept should have no place in an economy which is bound to expand as this great Nation seeks constantly to raise its standards of living.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the hearings on H. R. 4644 and testified that, in my opinion, a 10-percent increase for postal employees was the irreducible minimum that Congress should pass. However, the committee has seen fit to bring to the floor of the House, a bill providing approximately 7.6-average increase in the pay of postal employees. We have been assured by the Republican leadership that a 10-percent increase would receive a Presidential veto, and in view of the fact that the President vetoed a 5-percent increase last year, that warning is probably well founded.

The Senate has been more liberal and if this House passes the present measure, it will go to conference and something will be worked out, no doubt, on the order of a compromise.

I am going to vote for the three amendments that will be offered by the gentleman from California, and shall vote for the bill on final passage, because I believe that the postal employees would rather have an increse of 7.6 percent to 8.2 percent, rather than to run the chance of a Presidential veto that we might not be able to muster enough votes to override. I am supporting this bill, not because I am satisfied with it; not because I think it is sufficient, but because I believe, under the circumstances, as they exist today, it is all we can hope to accomplish.

Postal employees needed a pay raise last year, but even a paltry 5-percent increase met with a Presidential veto at that time. I do not know what has brought about the President's change of heart, but I am accepting the assurance of the Republican leadership, that the President will not veto this pay raise—if passed. I only hope our confidence is not being misplaced.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I take the balance of the time to discuss briefly amendment No. 2 which will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. When he presents the amendment, I want him to answer this question. Is it not true that there will be 47,926 employees who will lose under his amendment? In other words, are there not 17,399 clerks and carriers today in grade 3 who will lose $80 under your amendment as compared to H. R. 4644? Is it not true also that 13,524 in grade 4 will lose $75 as compared to H. R. 4644? Also, is it not correct that in grade 5, 16,503 will lose $70 as compared to H. R. 4644?

Yes. What you are doing by this amendment is taking away from these lower grade employees and giving to the employees in the higher grades. Yes, you give the top increase to those in grade 9. How many are in grade 9? 131,651. How much increase do you give them over H. R. 4644? $70. How much do you give those in grade 8? $65. Those clerks and carriers already receive the top in grade 9 and most of them already have the $300 representing 3 longevity grades.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California is approved, while I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, I predict with all confidence that the President will veto this bill, and I for one am going to vote to sustain it. If this amendment is adopted, then I cannot in good conscience support H. R. 4644 with this unfair, unjust, discriminatory and inequitable amendment being made a part of the bill.

Do you want to follow the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and approve his amendment and wreck this bill, distort the entire salary structure, throw it out of balance and out of kilter, and then get a veto? If so, go ahead and do it. But if you want a good, sound bill, you will vote for H. R. 4644, without the Moss amendment that distorts these schedules. The Moss amendment to the salary schedule would transform my bill, which is a good bill, a fair and a just bill, into an unjust, unfair, discriminatory, inequitable bill. I, for one, appeal to you to stand by the majority of the committee and vote down the Moss amendment when it is offered.

I want to say this. This is no administration bill. This is no Democratic bill. This is no Republican bill. This is not a partisan bill. This bill represents the considered opinion and judgment of the great majority of our committee and I hope you will stay with the committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, today we have under consideration in the House H. R. 4644, the postal pay bill; and at this time I would like to make my position known on two vital points, which seem to be very controversial.

First, I was very disappointed to learn that my bill, H. R. 2094, granting a 10-percent pay increase to our postal employees was not favorably considered by the committee. When I introduced this bill in the House I was hopeful it would receive the proper consideration since our efforts last year to pass a suitable pay increase for these employees failed. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that this is little compensation in return for the loyalty and efficient service our postal organization has rendered the citizens of the country. Even when it was learned that the President would veto any measure granting a 10 percent increase, I had hopes that a compromise would be reached whereby a fair and just bill would be brought to the floor for amendment. However, under the gag rule, it appears those of us in favor of this increase will have no opportunity to make such recommendations to the Congress.

Secondly, I wish to state herewith that I am opposed to any type of reclassification, but again, because of the modified closed rule granted by the Rules Committee, we Members who take this stand find our hands tied and are unable to offer more liberalized amendments.

During all my years in Congress I have continuously worked to raise the living standards of our deserving postal employees. I am still in favor of a 10 percent across-the-board raise without reclassification and only wish I could be given the opportunity to offer the appropriate amendments.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said that it would be a good political vote to go for the amendment of 8.2 percent with the knowledge that the President would veto that amount. I am more interested in trying to see that these employees get a raise this session than to try to make any political vote.

I told the first committee that came to my office some weeks ago that, in my opinion, if they did not get the 7.6 percent raise at this time, the Congress would not override the President's veto and that there was a good chance that, as last year, they would get nothing. I have told the same thing to every postal worker who has talked to me since then.

I am going to vote against the amendment and therefore for a certain 7.6 percent increase at this session.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against this rule because I believe that an open rule in this case would be of greater value to the average postal employee.

If the rule had been defeated we would then have been in a position to offer, as an amendment, S. 1, recently passed by the Senate. This provides for a 10-percent increase which, I believe, our postal employees warrant. It also would give us the opportunity to delete the reclassification feature of this bill, to which almost all of them object.

I am not too concerned with the threats here made that if that bill were enacted it would be vetoed by the President. I am not convinced, nor can anyone be, that this eventuality would take place; but even if it did, it is my firm and considered opinion that both this and the other body would override the veto.

At any rate, regardless of whatever action the Executive might take, it is our responsibility to pass legislation that we feel is fair and equitable and should become law.

I shall vote for the Moss amendments with the hope that when this bill goes to conference the Senate bill may be substituted for it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to indicate my support of the Moss amendments to the bill before this body.

I am not content with the basic proposal to provide a 7.6 percent increase or with the Moss amendment to provide an 8.2 percent increase. Neither percentage increase is adequate to provide our postal workers a fair and equitable standard of living. I will support the Moss amendment because it seems to be the maximum that can be voted out in this session.

The President is within his rights in announcing what kind of legislation he will veto—but, if he vetoes a bill which provides a .6 percent increase over his own recommendation, he must take full responsibility for his own arbitrary conduct in that respect.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, postal employees and other Government employees deserve a salary increase. The case does not rest on the answer to the question of whether or not their real wages today are as high as they were in the past; and does not rest on the answer to the question of whether or not their income is higher than that of some groups whose income was once below that of the postal worker, or nearly equal to the income of some groups whose income was formerly higher than that of postal workers.

The report which George Fry & Associate, Inc., prepared for the Post Office Department last year, shows generally that, with the exception of the wartime period, the average weekly earnings of clerks and letter carriers exceeded the income of production workers. The impression left by this comparison is that the salary of postal workers is therefore adequate. It should be noted, however, that in determining the weekly earnings of production workers, earnings of both full- and part-time, skilled and unskilled workers in manufacturing industries were included. Although the explanation of the chart does not contain the information, I assume that overtime pay of postal employees was also included in establishing the statistical basis for the charts. It should be noted, too, that the industrial workers, throughout the period covered in these charts up to 1941 or 1942 were working under the depressing influence of heavy unemployment. Their position has improved in terms of real wages very definitely in the period between 1939 and 1953. Using the 1947–1949 dollar as a base, the real weekly earnings of production workers show an increase of 55 percent. This was a 55 percent increase in purchasing power or in the standard of living of production workers. During the same period, the real weekly earnings of letter carriers and clerks increased only 1 percent. In other words, there has been virtually no improvement in the standard of living of postal clerks and letter carriers since 1939. The condition of nonsupervisory postal employees is about the same.

There has been no appreciable decline in the cost of living within the last few years. The fact that the increase which was voted by the Congress last year was denied by the President's veto makes all the more imperative early action by the Congress on an increase in salaries for Government employees.

There can be little satisfaction to the Government worker in the knowledge that his position in terms of real income is relatively better than that of others who have suffered a serious loss in real income in recent years. Nor can he take much satisfaction from the fact that other underpaid groups, such as the teachers, have not yet achieved equality. One cannot eliminate injustice by making it universal.

The Congress has the responsibility of protecting the integrity of Government service and of maintaining and improving the standards of Government employment. The Government employee has a right to just compensation for the services which he gives to the Government and to the country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that three amendments will be offered to the pending bill providing for an increase of salary for postal workers. Two of the amendments are not too controversial. The third amendment, however, has become exceedingly controversial, and in my opinion unduly so. This latter amendment relates to the percentage of increase in the salary schedule.

The committee has reported a bill that provides an average increase of 7.6 percent. The so-called Moss amendment provides for an 8.2-percent increase. The latter would increase the cost of the bill by $12 to $14 million. The total cost of the bill with the amendment would be $170 million as against $158 million provided in the pending bill.

It seems inconceivable to me that so much fuss could be created over an expenditure of $12 million. When we consider the vast sums being appropriated by the Congress this small $12 million becomes so insignificant that it becomes unbelievable that so much controversy could be raised. For instance, today, the President presented to the Congress a message that calls for $3½ billion for economic assistance in foreign countries, mostly in the Far East, and yet when it comes to a mere $12 million for worthy postal workers to enable them to meet the high cost of living we are faced with an opposition based on the threat that the President would veto any bill that carried any such increase above the present bill. It is difficult for me to believe that the President would be so unreasonable. But, in any event I have a responsibility now, and after careful consideration I am convinced that the postal workers are entitled to this increase and I shall accordingly so vote. If the President should in the fulfillment of his responsibility veto the bill then I am willing to face that situation if and when it arises. I repeat that I will be surprised and certainly disappointed if the President should take such adverse action.

Furthermore, we must bear in mind that the Senate has already passed a bill that would increase the salaries of the postal workers by 10 percent. I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity to support such an increase in the House. I believe it was justifiable. We should not be cheap in dealing with our own Government workers. They work for us. They serve us well and faithfully. To those who are so fearful of increasing our expenditure in this matter by $12 million, I say that before this session of Congress is ended that amount and the entire $170 million, the overall cost of this increase can be saved from appropriations yet to be made for enterprises that have far less merit than this increase for postal workers. I shall support the amendment with my vote.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, over the years, I have consistently supported all legislation favorably affecting the hours, wages, and general welfare of the loyal employees in the field service, Post Office Department. From the very first day of the current congressional session I have made known my position regarding the dire need for an immediate upward wage adjustment for the more than one-half million postal workers nationwide.

On previous occasions I have stated my views concerning the need for passage of a pay increase measure which would provide a minimum of at least 10 percent for these faithful employees. That is still my position and I am greatly concerned over the action taken on Monday of this week by the Rules Committee, which provides a limited rule and prevents further amendments other than those stipulated in the House of Representatives.

I am ever mindful of the fact that the only possible way to secure this long-overdue, much-needed legislation is to pass H. R. 4644 with amendments and send it to a conference between the Senate and House of Representatives. I make that statement knowing that S. 1, the 10 percent measure which provides a minimum of $430 for each employee, passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority on March 25.

It now appears quite certain that the most expeditious approach for salary increase legislation for postal workers is to support amendments to H. R. 4644 in order that the legislation may be expe-

dited and that the postal workers receive this much-needed additional money without further delay. I am, therefore, in favor of these amendments to H. R. 4644 and passage of the bill. I do so with great reluctance because the monetary allocations for certain field service postal employees are inadequate in H. R. 4644.

Nevertheless, my action constitutes the only method by which an even greater amount than that provided in H. R. 4644 can be obtained, namely through a Senate-House conference. I hope that the conferees will authorize upward wage adjustments in keeping with present-day realities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to prolong the consideration of this measure by an extended expression of my support of the pay increase that has been proposed. I am for the increase proposed in the pending measure and feel that our postal workers have been most patient and that a cost-of-living pay increase for them is deserved and long overdue.

We have, to a large extent, taken care of the need for cost-of-living increases for other categories of Government personnel by previous legislation. We have passed legislation to make the armed service more attractive by means of increased compensation and pay—the incentive pay increase bill. It is now time that the rural carriers, postmasters, and other postal workers come in for their deserved and delayed pay increase.

The schedule worked out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is in the main—and here I wish to pay tribute to the hard work and detailed study and consideration which Chairman MURRAY and the members of the committee have given this legislation. We should be grateful to them. I am supporting the bill as fair and equitable and shall vote for the perfecting amendments to provide for some additional category increase and also to make the pay increases retroactive to March 1 just past.

I merely want to state my position of support of this measure and of the proposed increases. There are no more loyal, hard-working, faithful employees in our Federal Government than our postal workers and they are deserving of the consideration authorized in this measure and the amendments proposed. I urge the committee to take action to give them this deserved recognition for their service, efficiency and their need and pass this measure without further delay.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, in expressing my unalterable opposition to the bill before us. It is highly prejudicial in favor of those in the upper as against those in the lower echelons in the postal service. Those who do the hard work in the postal service are discriminated against. Under the facade of reclassification, there are huge salary increases. In some instances, the increases range as high as 50 percent or more, especially to supervisors and postmasters. In contrast, the rank and file—to use the vernacular—are given a very raw deal. Their increases are meager. There are at least 15 positions or classifications in which immediate increases of 10 to 34 percent have been allotted. As was stated in the minority report:

> There are only 7 positions for which the increases average less than 7 percent. In these latter positions are the regular city carriers and clerks—the very warp and woof of the basic fabric of our postal service—motor vehicle operators, automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers. These carriers, clerks, and motor vehicle operators will average only a 6.9 percent increase, and many thousands of them will get barely over 6 percent. Automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers will get well under the average for all employees. Thousands of rural carriers will receive only 6 percent. The remainder of the officers and employees will average 8.1 percent increases.

I cannot conscientiously vote for a bill of this type with such disproportionate, unfair, and inadequate increases. The Senate passed the bill for a 10 percent overall increase and with no provisions for reclassification. We here today, on the floor of the House, hear tell that if we pass such a bill, it would be vetoed by the President. Well, my answer to that threat is that we should be as independent in our legislative functions as the President is in his executive functions. If he vetoes the bill, that is his responsibility, not ours. We should not be cowed by a threatened veto. We are men and not mice and I think we should act like men and not crawl supinely before such a threat. Furthermore, I think our leadership is missing the boat. Here is an issue which we should seize and do all in our power to indicate by word and deed that we are for a decent living wage scale for postal employees. Let us make the issue clear cut. We are for the proper, the just, increases. Let the administration oppose. The opposition is full of political dynamite which should burst in Republican faces.

I am told I should vote for the rule because a half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. The bill does not even provide for one-tenth of a loaf. I would stultify myself if I voted for the rule making in order a bill which I violently oppose.

This obnoxious bill contains provisions for reclassification of postal field service positions. It gives the broadest grant of administrative authority to the Postmaster General—a politically minded Postmaster General. His freebooting methods will make mincemeat of civil-service rules and regulations and laws. He will ride roughshod over seniority rights in order to fill as many positions as possible with "deserving Republicans." It is true that mandatorily under a proposed amendment he shall report his activities vis-a-vis reclassification within 6 months to Congress. But what good will such a report be? The political dirty work will have been done. Congress will be confronted with a fait accompli. All we could do would be to protest in the event of injustices or impartialities, but our protests would be as effectual as trying to stem the tides with a groan. To my mind, one of the most inequitable provisions is just this reclassification provision, especially in the hands of an anti-labor bureaucrat like the present Postmaster General. The whole business is a travesty. Furthermore, this rule before us is a gag rule. This so-called deliberative body is supposed to dispose of 3 important amendments with only 10 minutes debate for each amendment, 5 minutes for each side. If one contemplates that the salaries of the postal employees depends upon such debate, then one realizes how inadequate is the time for deliberation. Just think of it, 10 minutes is to be given for debate on salary increases as provided for in the so-called Moss amendment which would increase the average rate from 6.8 percent to 8.275 percent.

Assuredly, the productivity of the employee should have some effect upon the salary, but no monetary recognition is given on this score to postal employees, for the greatly increased productivity that they have achieved in recent years. All the administration thinks of is the budget. Certainly workers' productivity should be just as much a factor in salary determination as budget goals. No real consideration is given to the increases and fluctuations in living costs. The cost of food, clothing, and shelter has mounted in geometrical progression—not so salary increases. The minority report states as follows:

> "From 1946 on, the workload per man-year, based on pounds of mail handled, moved irregularly upward. The workload per man-year, based on the number of pieces handled, which is probably a more accurate measure, moved consistently upward.
>
> "The overall picture, comparing 1938 to 1952, has been one of increased employment, increased volume, and increased productivity. From 1938 to 1952, employment increased 59 percent, while volume in pieces went up 92 percent. The great increase in volume handled over employment, meant that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938."
>
> The report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, showed a 6.04-percent increase in mail volume over 1951 and only a 1.3-percent increase in hours of employment. This report also showed that over the previous 5 years volume had increased by 33 percent and weight had increased by 29 percent, but that hours of employment had increased by only 9 percent.
>
> This increase of more than 20 percent in productivity was not created by machines, as often is the case in private industry, but, by reason of the extraordinary nature of personal services required to move the mails, is almost wholly attributable to greater efforts by the postal employees.

The salaries of the postal employees have not kept up with the salaries of private industry. For example, 15 years ago, the earnings of postal clerks and carriers were on a par with employees of General Motors Corp. In 1953, however, the General Motors Corp. employees averaged $92.27 a week, or an 8.4-percent increase over 1952. Postal employees got an average of $78.27 per week for 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Many comparisons could be made between salaries of postal employees and salaries of large corporate entities and the disparity between the wages paid would be clearly manifest.

It requires no recitation of authorities to show that the purchasing power of the dollar and the purchasing power of the postal worker's dollar has declined significantly during and after the World War II period, but the bill before us takes little heed of this consideration of

the declining purchasing power. The administration is worried about fiscal objectives. Making the salary of the postal employees sufficiently large so as to permit the worker to live in dignity and decency is, apparently, of little concern to the administration. Throughout the hearings, we could hear the thumping of only one theme—that was the need to balance the budget. We hear nothing of the vast costs involved in the granting of huge mailing privileges to the large publishing outfits like Life, Time, Fortune, Saturday Evening Post, Colliers, Look, Newsweek, and so forth. Maybe if these publishing houses would actually pay in dollars and cents what they should pay for the postal services rendered, then the Government might be in a position to balance the postal budget. But no—the Postmaster General in this administration would not dare ask these publishers for money. They contribute very handsomely to the Republican campaign chest. The administration says that the little fellow should sweat it out. Let the postal employee bear the burden.

My point of view is as follows:

First. I vote against the rule.

Second. If the rule passes, I vote for the Moss amendments.

Third. If the Moss amendments prevail, I shall vote for the bill although I would prefer to be given the privilege of offering an average 10-percent increase—something I cannot do under this semi-closed rule. One of the Moss amendments would provide for an average increase of 8.2 percent. I will take that as the best to be gained under the circumstances.

Fourth. If the Moss amendments do not prevail, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, it was my sincere hope that an opportunity would be given us today to vote for the passage of a 10-percent wage increase for our faithful post-office employees.

In my opinion the employees have made a strong economic case for at least a 10-percent increase and they are entitled to that minimum consideration.

The employees have demonstrated that a minimum of 10 percent is the only amount that would bring their purchasing power almost in line with present-day economic realities. It is most unfortunate that Members of the House who believe as I do that a 10-percent wage increase is both realistic and fair will be denied the opportunity of voting for that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I support the bill before us today. I realize that a considerable number of hours have been spent by the committee handling this bill in bringing it before us, as I also appreciate the sincerity of the minority members of the committee who have suggested perfecting amendments to the bill. I had hoped they would be able to extend the benefits in the bill and regret that they have been obliged to stop short of what I believe would be a fair bill.

There are some features of this legislation, particularly those sections dealing with the reclassification of postal employees, that I think deserve considerably more study before we are asked to consider the legislation. If it were my prerogative, I would suggest that salary and reclassification be separated and considered as two distinct entities. Despite my own opinion in the matter, it appears as if this will be the only opportunity for the moment to adjust postal wages and while I had hoped that a higher increase would be voted upon today, nevertheless I am constrained to vote for the present bill in the hope that some measure of justice will be given postal employees before this session of Congress adjourns.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is with great reluctance and a heavy heart that I go along with this bill, knowing as I do that it does not contain enough money by way of an increase, and at the same time provides for reclassification proposals which I think should be given further study before being placed into law. I will support the bill simply because it appears this will be the only opportunity to act on this vitally important legislation. In so doing, I would urge my colleagues to go along with the bill with the hope that it can be improved in conference with the other body.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the rule on H. R. 4644, the postal pay raise bill, has been adopted, the House is now proceeding to consideration of this legislation.

Although I do not believe that the rule under which this bill has been brought to the floor is an entirely satisfactory one, it is evidently the best one we can get at this time. Rather than delay any longer this much-needed and well-deserved adjustment of salary for our postal employees, it is felt that action should be taken on the bill, and on the three amendments proposed by the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

These amendments would, first, increase salaries by an average of 8.2 percent, rather than the 7.6 percent figure carried in the bill; second, make the retroactive date of all increases March 1, 1955, rather than the nearest pay period at the time of final enactment as now specified in the bill; and, third, call for the submission of a report to the Congress by January 15, 1956, from the Postmaster General on the operation of the reclassification program.

While these amendments are an improvement over the bill as it now stands, and although they will have my support on the floor, I firmly believe that the committee has sidestepped its responsibility in not reporting to the floor for consideration the bill which has passed the Senate—S. 1—and which provides for a 10-percent increase in postal workers' salaries. This 10-percent increase is little enough, and certainly will not go far in offsetting the increasing cost of living which has haunted the postal employees for years.

In the 83d Congress, because I believed that such an increase was absolutely justified, I had introduced legislation calling for an $800 per annum increase in the salaries of postal employees. No action was taken on that bill, and legislation providing for a much smaller increase was vetoed by the President.

This year, along with a number of other Members, I had introduced a bill which would provide for a 10-percent increase in the salaries of these employees, and had been hopeful that the committee would act favorably on this legislation. Unfortunately the majority of the committee has seen fit to report out a bill which does not provide the adequate increase in the compensation of our postal workers to which they are entitled.

In addition, the closed rule under which this bill is being considered limits the amendments to the three I have previously mentioned. This, in effect, prevents the Members of the House from enacting legislation similar to that already passed by the Senate.

Needless to say I am disappointed and regretful that we have not been given an opportunity to vote on S. 1 or similar legislation. However, I trust that this pending bill will in some small way compensate our postal workers for their long and devoted service to the public. Perhaps at a later date some further adjustment can be accomplished.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have long advocated, and as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have supported a pay increase for postal employees.

It is because I want postal workers to have a pay increase that I will vote today against amendments which will make the amount such that a Presidential veto will be visited upon this legislation.

President Eisenhower has long since warned that he will veto a pay increase bill above the schedules set forth in the committee bill. I can only assume that the President means what he says, and I am convinced that a veto will not be overridden.

I cannot, therefore, vote on final passage for a bill that provides for an increase of more than approximately 7.6 percent, for I want postal workers to have an increase and not merely promises of an increase.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep feeling of regret at the circumstances under which I am forced to take the floor today and address the House on H. R. 4644 and the rule under which it has been brought before us. I have this sense of regret because of the division which has arisen among postal employee organizations over the terms and conditions of their pay raise legislation. Here is another situation where a split in the ranks of labor could very well defeat their own best chances of getting a major part of what they set out to get originally and together. I know from experience that if labor groups do not hold their ranks solid and compromise their differences between themselves, they almost invariably achieve far less than they had hoped for or than they had a right to expect. That is the kind of a situation we have watched develop within the past few weeks, and with which we are confronted here today.

The division among the postal employee groups has been seized on by the administration and the Postmaster General, and has been worked on to the limit to the disadvantage of the post office workers and to the advantage of the administration point of view on the

question of how much of a raise shall be voted and what the terms of reclassification proposals shall be. The division has also placed the friends of the employees in an almost impossible position as far as working for their best interests is concerned. This split gives the administration and the President something to seize on to excuse a possible veto of whatever legislation now emerges by claiming that postal employees themselves oppose it—at least a part of them. The split also divides those Members of the House who have fought in the interests of the post office workers and endangers the chances of their working successfully together on the floor and in conference to obtain the most generous possible terms in the final bill.

In the face of the present situation, it has become parliamentarily impossible to get any direct action on the floor of the House on a 10-percent increase proposal. The chairman of the committee has stated that he would not bring such a proposal to the floor. Three separate polls taken among the Members of the House have indicated that even if a bill were brought to the floor under an open rule, an amendment calling for a 10-percent increase would lack a few votes of the necessary majority for its adoption. Any further delay at this point, such as would be occasioned by rejecting the present rule, would perhaps wind up with the one result the postal employees do not want—no pay raise at all for at least another year.

Under these circumstances each individual Member must assess the situation as he sees fit. As one of the leaders of the long fight for an increase of at least 10 percent and against the distateful reclassification proposals, unhappy as I am about it I have concluded that I must support the proposed rule. By passing this bill and with the addition of the amendments sponsored by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Moss] we can go to conference and still have some chance of bringing it more into line with the legislation already passed by the other body. That is, we can work for a greater percentage increase and a further cutting down of the harmful possibilities of the reclassification provisions. For my money, that is the best gamble available to support the interests of the majority of postal employees at this time and that is the one I am prepared to take.

I want to make it clear that I take this position with a great deal of reluctance. Unfortunately, we who have fought the hardest for a decent pay bill are now left with little choice. My support for this rule certainly does not mean that I no longer recognize the injustices which post office employees and their families have suffered over the years as a result of pay raises always coming too little and too late. However, I am convinced that any other action will result in this raise coming another year too late, with the probability that any raise voted at that time would still be too little.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my conviction of what is the just and proper thing to do in the matter of pay adjustments for the postal workers remains unchanged. There should be an increase of not less than 10 percent, and there should be no reclassification.

Letters that have poured into my office testify to a condition inexcusable and that is destroying both morale and efficiency. Something drastic and immediate must be done by this Congress or it is inevitable that we will lose the great and outstanding service that long has been a tradition of the post office.

I have been stunned by the reports that have reached me of the discharge of senior employees of the Post Office Department, on the flimsy pretext that they have slowed down. These employees who are being discharged or demoted to lesser services are the ones who, during many years of hard and faithful work, have built the fine reputation that the postal service has enjoyed.

If it is the thought of this administration that it can build a false reputation for efficiency and economy by sending in the wrecking crews to throw these experienced workers into the wastebasket, the price will be paid by the loss of the American people of the finest postal service that the people of any nation have ever enjoyed. I think there should be a congressional investigation.

I appreciate that in private business the so-called efficiency experts have set a formula that anyone past 35 years of age should not be hired on the theory that industry spends so very much money in educating an employee that it cannot get the money back if one starting in employment is past 35. It is a formula of destruction. If pursued another decade or two, then all the average American citizen can do is to buy a revolver when he is 35 in order to have it ready to end what has become an economically useless life when he is 40. I protest with all the indignation in me against the application of this formula to a department of the Government of the United States.

As I understand it, the purpose of advocating reclassification is to make it easier for the Postmaster General to put into immediate and drastic application this abominable formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time to call stops. For my part, I would stay here day and night in continuous session of this Congress to fight it out for an increase of at least 10-percent for every postal employee and for no reclassification. I am not intimidated by the threat of a Presidential veto. I think that I know pretty well the American people. The American people believe in doing the right and the just thing by everyone, and the American people have been served too faithfully and well by the postal workers to leave any doubt as to their reaction in the event of such a veto.

Unfortunately, we are not given the opportunity of voting for S. 1. We are offered our choice between a very inadequate bill and a bill which is much better, which provides a larger increase in pay, which calls for a report from the Postmaster General to the Congress and which has a retroactive provision putting the increased pay into effect as of March 1. Under the circumstances, I am supporting this bill as much the better of the two. I am supporting the Moss amendment No. 2, despite the fact that it has been intimated that even its compromise figure will result in a veto of the bill by the President. I anticipate that there will be no such veto. If, however, such a veto should be forthcoming, I predict with full confidence that the manhood and the independence and the sense of decency of the Congress will override the veto by a tremendous majority.

Mr. Chairman, while I am most unhappy that I have not been given the opportunity to vote for a 10-percent increase with no reclassification, I nevertheless compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and his loyal colleagues in the minority group of the committee on doing an outstanding job. But for their great service and the tireless efforts of the great leaders of the postal employees' organizations, a bill distasteful to most of us would have resulted. The adoption of the Moss amendments will mark a triumph of right over wrong. It will be a great victory in a long fight, marked by the ever-present threat of a Presidential veto, and in the 83d Congress stopped in its tracks by a veto, to get a better increase for the postal workers than the one that was sought to be forced upon us.

LONG OVERDUE PAY RAISE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this is so much like one of those old movies on television. You watch it, being pretty certain you have never seen it before, but nevertheless everything in it looks and sounds so familiar. So it is with this merry-go-round over postal pay raises.

Last year, after almost fantastic delays and maneuvers to block it, we passed a postal pay raise measure which was certainly not the best one in the world but which did, at least, have the merit of providing some increase to help meet the increased cost of living. It was the first such raise since 1951. As we all know, it was vetoed on what I think were very untenable grounds.

Now the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House has gone all through the issue all over again and finally we again have the opportunity to vote on pay increases for the postal workers of this country. The committee bill, however, is not nearly adequate.

I am deeply disappointed that the parliamentary situation on this bill is such that we cannot under the rules of the House vote for the 10-percent increase already passed by the Senate. The best we can do under the rule on this measure is to support the Moss amendments, and I, of course, will certainly support them. We can then hope that the conferees will compromise on a bill better than this one.

It is distressing, Mr. Chairman, to have to explain to our postal people—whose need for a pay raise is not disputed by anyone—that we were blocked here on the 10-percent proposal by the terms of the rule. This makes us sound rather ineffectual. I do not like to appear to be placed in that situation, and I know many Members share my feeling.

But I am not so reckless as to want to take responsibility for jeopardizing any

increase whatsoever for the postal employees. The combination of circumstances here—that is, the ultimatum from the White House to veto any 10-percent bill; the unity among the members of the President's party in the House in agreeing to stand by the committee figure and oppose even the 8.2-percent Moss amendment, let alone a 10-percent raise; and the definite and flat acknowledgement by our leaders in the House, who, we know, are equally anxious to see the 10-percent raise go through, that defeat of the rule would in all likelihood keep any postal pay legislation from becoming law in this session—this combination of circumstances, Mr. Chairman, leaves us little choice.

Thus it is not a case of ineffectualness but of practical reality in taking a step which will not do more harm than good. I know my constituents recognize that the important thing is to get through a bill which can in fact become law and which can thereby help our postal workers and their families meet the often-crushing burdens of today's living costs on their modest pay scales.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have an opportunity to vote on legislation which will increase the salaries of postal workers. I believe them to be one of the most loyal and devoted group of Government employees, and there is no doubt that they deserve an increase in compensation, particularly in these days of high living costs.

I know something of the difficulties which postal employees in my own congressional district have experienced and I know also of the excellent services which they have given over the years. I had hoped that an increase of 10 percent would be granted to them and I publicly indicated that I would favor such a raise. I am sorry that the legislation does not provide this degree of increase and that there was no opportunity of voting for it. I do, however, believe that the amendments as introduced by the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, are the next best answer to the problem, and I am voting for them in the hope that the 8.2-percent increase they provide for will be adjusted in conference when the Senate bill is also considered.

I would like to add that I subscribe fully to the well-expressed remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, out of a sense of simple justice I am impelled to urge prompt passage of this bill, H. R. 4644, designed to extend a reasonable cost of living pay adjustment to our postal employees.

We all know that whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past several years, persons with fixed incomes suffer the most. Some workers can obtain raises to offset at least a portion of the increased cost of living, but those whose incomes are stationary or whose salaries are set by law have serious trouble trying to keep up with rising prices and maintain their family on a decent living scale.

Such is the current predicament of our Federal employees. Their salaries are set by law, and it takes action by the Congress to raise their compensation. An important consideration in this connection is that while Federal employees may organize, they are not allowed to strike; and, to have the record present the truth on this subject, let us remind ourselves that they have never shown any disposition to strike. They have been content to rely upon a sense of fair play on the part of Congress and the general public.

May I also remind you that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them adequate salary compensation.

It is only ordinary commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to reasonably meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, during the 83d and the present Congress, I introduced legislation providing a substantial pay increase for postal employees. I have consistently supported a pay raise of at least 10 percent for all Federal employees.

I would therefore like to state my reasons for voting against the inadequate pay raise and reclassification bill reported out by the Murray committee and against the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

I believe that the amount provided in this bill as amended, is insufficient, inadequate, and unfair to postal workers. I feel that these faithful public servants are entitled to an increase of at least 10 percent and I regret very much that the Members of the House have not been permitted to vote for that increase as provided in S. 1 when that bill passed the Senate.

Because of my strong feelings in this matter, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the small increase provided by the House version of this legislation as presented to us today. Further, it is my conviction that post office employees should not be forced to accept a reclassification plan they do not want.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak today in behalf of the postal workers of the United States for the benefit of whom the legislation we are considering has been introduced.

It is my firm conviction that a postal pay increase is long overdue. As the cost of living has gone up, salaries of postal workers have remained comparatively static. The net effect has been that as the standard of living of other work groups has been raised, that of the employees of the Post Office Department has dropped to a level not in keeping with the American way of life. Indeed, many families of postal workers in my district would find it impossible to subsist were it not for the fact that the wives in the households are working, too. In many cases postal employees hold outside jobs, in addition to their regular full-time postal duties, in order to maintain a living family wage. Such conditions are a breeding ground for disharmony in the home as well as for juvenile delinquency. Surely, we have a duty to do our utmost to alleviate this situation, and it lies within our power to do it.

I am sorry that the bill reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not contain provisions for a 10-percent salary increase. However, I feel that an equitable and satisfactory adjustment between the Senate bill and this bill will come out of committee. Having waited so many years for a pay raise, the postal workers must not be disappointed again.

Let me call to mind here and now that the postal employees serve us, one and all. We help ourselves when we help them. We are assuring ourselves of more efficient mail service by making every effort to see that this legislation becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955, by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. These amendments are not subject to amendment.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] desire at this time to offer any of the amendments that were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as indicated?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 1, as printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 81, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 205 (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are asigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.).

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day,

and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. This report shall be printed as a House document after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment and accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a technical amendment to the amendment be approved. It has been suggested by the legislative counsel. It merely strikes the last seven words in the last line of the last paragraph of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to modify the amendment as indicated in the gentleman's statement?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 82, strike out the entire postal field service schedule occurring after line 2, and before line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which has provoked the most controversy. Before proceeding with a detailed explanation of it, I should like to deal with some rather amazing charges which have been made in the first instance by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and by the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

It has been charged that under these amendments 47,000 persons would receive a lesser amount than they would under the committee bill. Temporarily that is partly true, but every one of those 47,000 persons except 425 supervisory employees will ultimately under my amendments receive more money than under the committee bill and, in addition, 253,000 employees will receive an immediate amount in excess of that which is set forth in the committee bill.

What are we proposing here?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. What does the gentleman mean, that they will temporarily take a loss?

Mr. MOSS. Because their ultimate increase under my amendment is more under every single step of every single level from 1 to and including 13.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman know it will take 4, 5, or 6 years for all of them to receive that increase?

Mr. MOSS. I believe it will take approximately 3 years at a maximum. Most of them would overcome the difficulty after the first year, but 253,000 people will receive an immediate amount in excess of the amount provided in the bill itself.

We are proposing here at an increased cost of $12 millions to bring approximately 60 percent of the total working force of the postal field service up to the average of the bill which was originally reported by the committee, to correct a gross inequity, to accord fair treatment to people, and it will not result in any distortion of the schedule, as was intimated by the chairman. There is more distortion in the relationship between salary levels 4, 5, and 6 as contained in the bill reported by the committee than there is in the amendment I am offering you at this time.

It restores a proper relationship between the various levels proposed in the legislation.

We have heard about the amount of increases these people have received, and I think we should give some thought to them. If we take the average increase since 1926 for the postal workers, it is approximately 97 percent. The increase in the cost of living is approximately 98 percent. The increase in the incomes of people employed in industry for the same period is over 275 percent. We are not proposing anything here which is at all a shocking amount. It is the bare minimum necessary to deal decently with these people. It gives no consideration to the increased productivity of every person employed in the postal-field establishment. Those of you who have noticed the recent full page advertisements by the General Motors Corp., with reference to their employee relations, know that within the period from 1950 to the present time just for the factor of increased productivity, they have given their employees an increase averaging 22 cents per hour. I think it is time we stopped being kidded or being threatened. You are not going to get a veto necessarily. I know of no one here on this floor on either side of the aisle who can, in all sincerity, arise at this moment and say that the President of the United States has assured him that if the Moss amendments are adopted, he will definitely veto the bill. There has been no such assurance given. Certainly, there is an intimation that a veto might be expected. However, a veto might be expected regardless of what you do, because the other body has adopted a bill far different from this bill. Then there remains the conference procedure which must be gone through before this legislation can become law. I would like to see the House of Representatives send to that conference, a bill which is at least fair to every person employed in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is most obnoxious. It absolutely destroys the proper balance and relationship of the salary schedules. The gentleman from California does not seem to think I know what I am talking about when I talk about the distortion of the salary schedules by his proposed amendment. Well, the present salary classification law—Public Law 134—was written by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the late chairman of the committee, Mr. Burch, and myself. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] if that is not true. I have studied the postal service system and its operations much longer than the gentleman from California. I have been on the committee over 12 years. He has been on it a little over 2 years. I was with the Post Office Department for 9 years, and I think I know a little about postal salaries and postal job reclassification. I am willing to predict without reservation that if this unfair, discriminatory, inequitable Moss amendment is adopted, unquestionably, the President is going to veto this bill. It is up to you whether or not you want to take this chance and have the bill vetoed by the adoption of this amendment. My opinion is that this Congress will not override the veto of the President. It is up to you whether or not you are going to follow your committee. This bill was approved by your committee by a vote of 17 to 6. The committee gave long and careful attention to the bill. We worked out a good bill. We spent 3 years on this salary schedule and reclassification and yet the gentleman from California comes here and offers 59 specific changes in this reclassification schedule. I tell you that this amendment offered by the gentleman from California will absolutely throw out of balance and out of kilter the salary reclassification schedules. Not only that but the cost of the amendment is around $12 million. The principle involved is that the schedules proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] will absolutely throw the schedules out of balance and you will be doing an injustice to 47,629 employees when you reduce by $70 and $80 the amounts they will receive under the Moss amendment, as compared to what they will receive under the committee bill.

As I said before, the Moss amendment is in the interest of the long-time clerks and city carriers who are today in grades 7 and 8 and 9. These carriers and clerks in these grades get much more pay today than the carriers in grades 3, 4, and 5, yet under the Moss amendment you penalize the city carriers and clerks in grades 3, 4, and 5 by reducing their salaries and give to the carriers and clerks in grades 7, 8, and 9 from $60 to

$70 increase. In addition, most of these carriers and clerks in grade 9 are getting longevity pay of $300. It is a question whether or not you want a bill sent to the White House that will be approved by the President or whether you want to adopt the Moss amendment and then have the bill vetoed, and then have the veto sustained. Then the postal employees will have no salary legislation at all. You may want to take that gamble, but as for me, I am going to stand by this bill without amendment, and I hope the Members in their clear judgment will support the great majority of our committee and vote down this amendment. If you approve the amendment, then it makes my own bill so bad that I cannot conscientiously vote for it upon final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to provide an 8.3 percent average salary increase to postal employees, in my opinion, is a very reasonable compromise.

In my opinion, a good case was made before our committee for a 10 percent increase, using statistics relating to the increased productivity of postal workers in recent years, the cost of living increases since the last postal pay increase, and comparable pay raises which have gone to workers employed by private industry. And certainly postal and Federal pay has not kept pace with the Nation's ability to produce. I am quite certain that this administration would have a great many less headaches over surpluses if they would take a more liberal attitude toward placing more purchasing power in the hands of the people, particularly where the need is most urgent.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I would like to point out to the committee that nine members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service signed the minority report on this bill, in which this amendment is included, and that with this amendment this bill is acceptable as a compromise to a vast majority of the postal workers of this country. Without this amendment it is acceptable to hardly any or very few of the postal workers of America. I urge you to pass this important amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to say in reply to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], that I do not think it matters much how long you may happen to be a member of any committee. That does not change your basic thinking and philosophy. I see a basic difference here on which there can be an honest difference of opinion. I say that with all due respect to our chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee. But we all realize that the legislative process is complicated, and we have to give and take. The administration's position has been an unyielding and stubborn refusal to commit itself to more than a 7.6 percent pay raise. The threat or promise, or whatever you call it, of another veto has always hung over our deliberations. This, I believe, is an unfortunate and unwarranted pressure by the executive branch. However, we in the Congress must not surrender our prerogatives and our duty to legislate in what we are convinced is the best interests of our postal employees and of the Nation as a whole. We should not be intimidated or swayed by guaranties of approval of certain legislation if specific provisions are written into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was with great reluctance that I made the decision to compromise on this issue by agreeing to support the 8.3 percent increase, and particularly because of the questionable reclassification provision. If any of these amendments are voted down, I intend, if I have the opportunity, to offer a motion to recommit the bill.

This amendment does much to eliminate the unfair discriminations in pay which were contained in the administration bill. It is a fair compromise openly arrived at after due study and consideration of the factors involved, and I therefore urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support it without reservation, because I am convinced it is the best possible raise which can be enacted at this time; and I think it can be enacted despite what has been said about the threat or promise of a Presidential veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. MOSS], who distinguished me as the "gentleman from New York." I hope I will always conduct myself as one.

I rise in opposition to this amendment because, as I have said before and as I am prepared to repeat, I think it completely distorts the classification features of this bill over which this committee had labored for a very long time.

Secondly, I think if any amendment were to be offered it would have been far better, if I may use the vernacular and perhaps speak as a gentleman, to have gone the whole hog and gone after 10 percent. I have no recollection that the gentleman from California or any other member of the committee ever offered such an amendment.

The present amendment, first of all, distorts the carefully prepared salary schedule established by a 17 to 6 vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by giving additional increases to certain groups of employees and taking away part of the proposed increases from others.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California would increase the raise for the highest-paid clerks and letter carriers by about $70 a year and reduce the raise provided by H. R. 4644 for approximately 40,000 clerks and letter carriers by $70 to $80.

The amendment would arbitrarily reduce the raises proposed for assistant postmasters and superintendents of mails in many large offices, and would result in some postmaster positions being paid a lesser salary than provided by the present law.

This amendment would add another $11 million to the annual cost of H. R. 4644, and would give this money to the same group of employees who already have received through amendments in committee to the original bill an additional $20 million over and above the amount originally proposed.

The Moss amendment would destroy the traditional relationship as continued by H. R. 4644 of the salaries of city letter carriers with the salaries of rural letter carriers, thus seriously discriminating against the rural carriers.

The Moss amendment would increase the pay of post office janitors far above the salaries for janitors in other Federal buildings as provided by bills under consideration by the Congress to raise the salaries of these employees.

In other words, this amendment, though undoubtedly well meant and though undoubtedly trying to give the employees what they desire and what we all want them to have, is not well conceived, is not well prepared, and does not show sufficient experience in the matter. The chairman of the committee did well to bring out his many years of service, not only on this committee, but also as a member of the Post Office Department. Certainly he had the experience and the knowledge; certainly he must be, from personal knowledge, sympathetic to the problems of the postal people. There are many other members on this committee who have also been here a long time, who have worked year in and year out on this problem.

For these reasons I urge this committee to give careful consideration to the bill as it was written in committee, to realize that this amendment was not submitted to the committee, also to realize that the one question that seems to have come up at that time was whether we should have a 10 percent pay raise or the pay raise as written in this bill. After careful consideration, after going over all of these figures, it became abundantly clear, after 3 months of hearings, this this bill was the best we could get.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, some 13 years ago I was assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. I have served on various committees of the House during the past 13 years. Recently, the great Committee on Ways and Means asked me to go back on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. So I am here in the capacity of a member of the committee, although the junior member of that committee.

As I listened to the debate today I found it quite confusing in the attempt to explain the number of grades, levels of pay and so forth that have been announced and I have tried to clear my own thoughts down to what this actually means. I think this is important.

If we compare the wages of the post office employees today, their purchasing power, not the number of dollars but the purchasing power, with 1939, we find that a salary of $2,026.50 purchasing power in 1939 that that same man is working for $1,863 today under the terms of the committee bill. In other words, he is receiving $163 less in purchasing power after 26 years in a career job in the United States Government.

What does the committee amendment of 7.6 percent increase mean in a week to the average employee in increased wages dollarwise? It means an increase of $5.60. What does the Moss amendment mean? It means 80 cents to $1.20 more a week. It means 16 cents to 20 cents a day more than the committee bill. We are now getting down to the point where the wife of a post-office employee goes to the grocery store to buy a quart of skimmed milk and she will get under the Moss amendment from 16 to 24 cents a day more. She can buy 1 quart of milk for her children with the increase under the Moss amendment.

Does anyone in this House want to tell me that the President of the United States will veto this bill because the Moss amendment will give to the wife of that postal employee the right to buy one quart of milk a day more than under the committee bill?

If the President should veto this bill because of the Moss amendment, I state that his veto would be known as the quart-of-milk-a-day veto. I do not think the President will veto it.

Now, let me bring another point to your attention. In 1945 a Congressman's pay was $10,000 a year. We recently had a pay raise which brings out total pay raise since 1945 up to an additional sum of $12,500. That is 125-percent increase since 1945 up until the present time. What have we done in the same period of time for the post office employees? Beginning in 1945, and passing six bills increasing their wages, we have increased their wages 92 percent. You have advanced your own salary 125 percent. You are advancing the post office employees 7.6 percent, which would bring the total up to 100-percent increase over the past 9 years for the postal employees. In other words, even with the Moss amendment, which gives six-tenths of 1 percent pay increase in rates, you still only give to the post office employees 100.06-percent increase in the last 9 years, but you have given yourself 125-percent increase. I voted for the increase, because I thought the job was worth it, and I still do not think it brought up the purchasing power of a Congressman to what it was 25 years ago under a $10,000 salary. It is still less than it was then according to the purchasing power of the dollar and what we have left after taxes. I ask the Members of this body to be just as fair and considerate to the post office employees as they were in considering their own salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that notwithstanding the President's position in respect to this legislation, the bill is a good, well-balanced piece of legislation. The original bill should be supported on its merits. It is the result of careful consideration of a committee which has gone into this matter thoroughly. It is the best judgment of that committee. These proposals you are considering at the present time, let me repeat, were not considered by the committee but just brought to our attention only yesterday. Considerable has been said on the floor of the House about 10 percent and things of that kind. I ask you, where were those Members when we held our executive sessions? Not one member of our committee, not one member on either side, got up there and said, "We want you to consider a 10-percent across-the-board increase." None of them; none at all. Then those same members go before the committee day before yesterday. Did they ask for an open rule? No, they asked for what they call a restricted rule. Just amendments they wanted to offer. No chance to examine them. Not even submitted to our committee. Did the gentleman from Louisiana ask for an open rule? Not that I have heard about.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. These were my exact words before the Committee on Rules yesterday. I said:

> I will follow my distinguished chairman of the committee and distinguished ranking member and ask for an open rule, but——

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, but.

Mr. MORRISON—

> but if the committee in its wisdom brings in or decides to bring in a closed rule, I suggest that these three amendments be allowed.

I asked for an open rule just like the gentleman did.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman told the committee he was representing his colleague, which he had a right to do. I am just saying he did not get up and insist on an open rule. In any event only a few minutes ago he voted for the rule just adopted.

I say the 10-percent proposal was not even considered.

Now, this bill as written is right. But look at the changes you propose to make in legislation that you have been talking about all day. Yes, we expect to be back next year considering this problem, but nevertheless here are 48,922 people who work for our Government who are not going to feel too good about what you are doing if you approve this amendment. There are 59 different places where you are changing schedules in this bill.

Letters have been referred to. We all received letters. Rightly so. I, as you do, encourage people to write me. People should express their views even more than they do. Because someone mentioned letters he received I am going to read a part of a letter I received from the president of the National Rural Carriers Organization. He says his organization joins with the National Association of Postmasters, League of Postmasters, National Association of Supervisors, Association of Special Delivery Messengers, and others, in support of the bill as reported to you by our committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I suggested heretofore, the bill as now written represents about 3 years of work and study by our committee, together with the Postmaster General, postal employee organizations, engineering firms, and others who testified before our committee.

A complicated salary schedule such as is contained in this bill and governing the pay of over a half million employees cannot be tampered with or it will no longer preserve a proper relationship between positions.

Let me give you one example of what happens when you alter a part of a salary structure in order to provide a pay raise for a select group of employees. This, I am sure, is the principle behind the Moss amendments. Under the bill all employees will receive a minimum of a 6-percent increase on top of their present salaries, and they will then be fitted into the within-step rate of their level that is next highest to that figure—that is, to their present salary plus 6 percent. Let me give you one example to illustrate what will happen under the Moss proposals compared to the present bill. Let us take a clerk or carrier who is presently in automatic grade 4 of Public Law 134. His present salary is $3,570 a year. Adding 6 percent, it would be $3,874.

Under the provisions of the bill as it presently stands, he would be placed in step 3 of level 5 at a salary of $3,880. Under the proposal of Mr. Moss he would be placed in step 2 of level 5 at a salary of $3,805, or his immediate increase is $75 less under the Moss proposal than he would receive under the present bill.

The cost of this amendment is approximately $11 million. What we have not been told is that a group of employees will receive more than the additional $11 million because 48,000 employees will get less money than they receive under this bill. In fact they will be in effect contributing about $3½ million to others already being paid more than they get. It should be observed this amendment will change the schedule by placing revisions in levels 1, 2, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. Mr. Moss has made 59 specific rate changes. All of them could have the same disastrous effect of the one I have pointed out. And I might add the illustration I have just given is not the worst of these examples.

Let us see now what is happening. One of the reasons for reclassification is to provide equal pay for equal work. What we are doing under Mr. Moss' proposals is that we are taking money away from employees who are lower down in the present pay scale and giving it to the top-grade employees because that is where the biggest increase occurs under Mr. Moss' proposals. These top-grade employees are already drawing up to $1,100 more than some other employees doing exactly the same type of job. In the example I have given you, we are taking $75 from the man who is making $700 less than the top-grade clerk doing the same job in order to give the higher paid man a $70 raise.

As I have said, this is the product of 3 years' study and more by our committee. Really, it was the study which began in the 80th Congress nearly 8 years ago. I believe that this illustration I have given you effectively demonstrates that no one individual can just pick up and completely revamp a complicated schedule like this without throwing it completely out of kilter.

I would like to make one additional point. If we are going to have a reclassification of postal employees' salaries, and I think most of the membership of this body believe it necessary, we cannot give everybody the same dollar increase. We do, however, guarantee a minimum increase of 6 percent on their present basic salary for every postal employee.

Some groups of employees naturally will receive a lower salary increase than others under the job classification features of the bill. Those employees who will receive the smallest increase are, in general, the employees who are now receiving a higher rate of pay than any other employees doing a similar type of work in the Government or in private industry. Conversely, those who will receive the higher increase are the employees who, through the years, have been grossly underpaid for the duties they performed and the responsibilities they held.

One of the groups receiving a little better break under this bill is the supervisers. The provision of the bill which gives them an apparent advantage is one which puts them for the first time in a pay pattern giving within-grade step promotions. This is the same thing which clerks and carriers have had since 1945. In fact, in 1945, clerks and carriers were given 11 automatic promotion steps. They were subsequently reduced to 9. Under this bill, there will be 7 automatic step increases for all clerks, carriers, postmasters and supervisors.

In addition to the flat across-the-board pay increases with minimums and ceilings which have been granted to postal employees since 1945, and which everyone recognizes has distorted the pay schedule, the fact that letter carriers and clerks had automatic step increases while supervisors had only a single grade permitted clerks to catch up to their supervisors' salary and in some cases surpass them.

I was impressed during the hearings with the many compliments given the chairman of our committee, along with the late Senator Burch and our colleague, Congressman NOAH MASON, by representatives of the postal employee groups. These three gentlemen, in 1945, developed the present pay and classification plan which was an admittedly long step in the improvement of postal employees' salary and classification. I am told that at the time that law was passed there was also a great deal of criticism on the part of employee groups feeling that they did not get as much as their members expected to get out of the bill.

I would like to predict that this bill if enacted into law will be as highly thought of and considered as great a step forward as was Public Law 134 after the employees have had time to experience the benefits it will provide in the way of better opportunities for promotion and the satisfaction of being well paid for a job well done rather than on the length of time on the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

To close the debate, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, addressing myself to the necessity for the Moss amendment No. 2, which is presently under consideration, I should like to say that, with all respect, I do not have much sympathy for the crocodile tears of the speaker who preceded me concerning the rule under which we are operating. Because I remember, not too long ago, he wanted one that was worse than this one. So let us address ourselves to a consideration of the merits of the amendment and decide whether or not we want to vote for it as it stands.

H. R. 4644, in level 5, which represents the big group of employees with whom we are mainly concerned, starts at $3,640 and winds up at $4,360. There are in that group approximately 303,000 employees. The Moss amendment would add to that salary raise, at the beginning step $40, and in the final step $70.

Why is that? When you take the total increase and boil it down to how much more a man is going to get per hour, it amounts to 2 cents per hour, 15 cents per day, or 77 cents per week. Why does that become important? Please allow me to show you why it does.

On page 82 of the bill you will find this tremendous distortion which exists in the bill, on which the committee worked very carefully. But unfortunately, in an effort to reach a compromise in the last days of the committee hearings, the present schedule was put into the bill as a compromise, and after it was adopted it was determined that the following very obvious distortions took place, which were highly detrimental and injurious.

The whole theory of reclassification is based on getting more money for more work and putting people in the proper levels as compared with each other, in respect to the duties which they perform. That makes good sense, does it not? It does until we examine carefully the pay schedule that is in the bill. Then what do we find? We find in level 5—and, mind you, under the original bill all of these employees were put in level 4. Then the committee decided and determined that that was an improper level, that they were out of the proper classification and that they should be at a higher level. They put them in level 5. What did that do with their pay? Here is what it did. If you went from level 4 to level 5, as an employee, you would get only $50 more, but if you went from level 5 to level 6, you would get $240 more. If that is consistent with the purposes of reclassification, I will eat the bill page by page.

Look at the difference between salary level No. 1 and salary level No. 2: $210. You are creating an incentive for the employee between level No. 2 and level No. 3 of $250; and between 3 and 4 of $260. Everything is fine and rosy for the employee. He is going to become a supervisor or a postmaster—until he gets to level 5. The next jump is $50. Between 5 and 6 it is $240, and between 6 and 7 it is $310. If that is not distortion in the present pay schedule I have never seen it in my entire life.

Let us take this next one, which is a distortion in the present pay schedule, and look at it from another angle, and here the Moss amendment should be adopted regardless of politics, partisan or otherwise. Look at this chart. This is the present bill. This is the way it stacks up right now. You find supervisory employees receiving a minimum salary increase of 12.3 percent, a maximum of 27.7 percent. You will find clerks and carriers, 303,000 of them under the present bill, receiving 6.91 percent. That is regulars only. You find all other employees receiving a 8.25 percent increase.

The Moss amendment does one single thing. It gives all nonsupervisory employees in the same average percent salary increase. It does not discriminate. It is not costly. Everybody admits that point. It is a question of principle. We respectfully submit that the principle in favor of the Moss amendment is more sound; there is less distortion, there is more equality; there is more fairness under the adoption of the Moss amendment than there is in retaining the present pay schedule under H. R. 4644, and I say this with due apology to all of the Members who worked so hard and to the chairman of the committee, who certainly was fair in every respect, in trying to present a proper bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to close debate in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Before the chart was carried out, I noticed on it that the regular clerks and carriers were credited with a 6.9 percent raise. I think it has been conveniently forgotten that 20 percent of the postal field service, 120,000 substitutes and temporaries, were not included on that chart. If they were, the average raise would have been 7.2 percent.

Mr. HALLECK. At that point, and with particular reference to that chart, I think this point should be made, and everybody ought to be fair enough to understand it. In recent years we have had what we call across-the-board raises of $400 and $450. Obviously everyone recognized that this profits in greater proportion the men in the lower grades as against the higher grades. That is what is meant by the reclassification, to bring some sort of equalization in pay to the more responsible positions. So, certainly, this proposal of the committee should not be attacked on that ground.

I am for this bill and against this amendment for two reasons: First, because the committee has brought in a good bill, that is fair and equitable; and second, there is no question about it in

my mind that it is the only bill that can become law.

Reference was made to the fact that even if we go this far, the 8.2 is risky. It is more than risky, because if you stop to consider, this is the fact: Already this bill recognizes a tremendous amount of compromise from the original administration proposal. I know something about it because I worked very diligently trying to bring about an arrangement by which we could get fair treatment for the postal employees and have a bill which would be passed. So the original 5 percent was raised to 6 percent. Other adjustments also were made. A total of $30 million has been added to the cost of the bill by the action of the committee as against the original administration proposal. Now let us take another look at it. I realize it is always easy to want to be openhanded. I have had people working for me and I would like to pay them more, but the question is how much can I afford. That is one of the things involved here. The total cost of the committee bill was $160 million a year. You may say, "Well, to add $12 million more—how does that make it bad?" I just want to say to you the committee bill has gone about as far as we can go. It has gone as far as we can go. Not only will we add on more expense every year, but in addition it will wreck the whole reclassification proposal, which is most important.

Bear in mind another thing. We ought to be responsible in respect to affairs of government. The Post Office Department is operating at a deficit right now of $400 million a year. You are going to add another $160 million a year in expenditures. How many of you who want to raise that amount are ready to stand up here and vote for a rate increase to balance it out? What you are doing is saddling the taxpayers of the country with additional burdens.

I say this bill is fair. Since 1945, the increases for the postal employees have totaled 96 percent and in that time the cost of living has increased only 48 percent. The gentleman from California referred to the increases in our own salaries. I have received some rather critical letters and communications. They said, "Well, you voted yourself 50 percent and now you will not give us 10 percent." But they overlook the fact that since our salary was set at $15,000 a year, we increased it 50 percent while in that time the postal employees have received a 60-percent increase in their pay and here is an additional 7.6 percent. This bill is fair treatment for them. If the average pay for the postal employee is $2 an hour, and that is about what it is, then this 7.6-percent rate is equivalent to 15 cents an hour increase in their pay. Is that not comparable to what you have heard has been done generally in industry in that time? If you go back to 1951, when the last pay adjustment was had for the postal employees, the cost of living has increased 3.8 percent and here is proposed a 7.6-percent increase in their pay.

Finally, as I say, we have a responsibility and I think we ought to meet it. I do not think we ought to touch off another inflationary wage spiral and price inflation. Reference has been made to the increased cost of living. We all know how that has affected us. Fortunately, in recent years the cost of living has balanced out. I do not want to be responsible for starting that inflationary action all over again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. Moss and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 174.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 89, strike out lines 4 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which will make the salary increase proposed in this legislation retroactive to March 1 of this year. This is a proposal which essentially boils down to a matter of personal opinion and your own feeling as to whether or not we deal more fairly with these people by making the effective increase retroactive or whether they should continue to wait for the salary increase proposed in the legislation until it becomes effective.

I would like to point out it is not the fault of the people who work in the Post Office Department that it has taken so long to finally get this bill to the floor where the Members of the House could work their will. The bill could have come to the floor a long time ago, I think it should have, but there has been delay and unless this amendment is adopted we are going to unnecessarily and unjustly penalize the people who have a full entitlement to every dime we propose to vote under this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. It boils down to just this: Simple justice for the workers in the post office.

Mr. MOSS. I think that is very well put. It certainly is simple justice.

Mr. DINGELL. If they are entitled to an increase they are entitled to this retroactive provision.

Mr. MOSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman. We have already granted increases to two large groups of Federal personnel and their increases are now effective. I urge that you give this most careful consideration and grant it in justice to these people who are entitled to this measure of relief from the Congress.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I agree to the amendment. It will be carried forward in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there are some very minor technical changes for the purpose of clarification that have been suggested by the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moss asks unanimous consent that in the first paragraph of the language of this amendment now adopted by the House the phrase "or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended," be stricken out, and that on page 110, line 6, of H. R. 4644, after the phrase "as amended,", the following matter be inserted: "or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have not had a chance even to consider these proposed amendments, I will have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 211, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, known as the Moss amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 82, strike out the entire postal field-service schedule occurring after line 2 and before line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment, on which a separate vote was demanded.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 189, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—224

Abernethy	Boyle	Davis, Ga.
Addonizio	Bray	Davis, Tenn.
Albert	Brooks, La.	Dawson, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks, Tex.	Deane
Andrews	Brown, Ga.	Delaney
Anfuso	Buchanan	Dempsey
Ashley	Buckley	Denton
Ashmore	Burdick	Diggs
Aspinall	Burleson	Dingell
Bailey	Burnside	Dodd
Baldwin	Byrd	Donohue
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Donovan
Bass, Tenn.	Cannon	Dorn, N. Y.
Bell	Carnahan	Dorn, S. C.
Bennett, Fla.	Celler	Doyle
Bennett, Mich.	Chelf	Edmondson
Boggs	Christopher	Elliott
Boland	Chudoff	Engle
Bolling	Clark	Evins
Bowler	Colmer	Fallon
Boykin	Cooper	Fascell
	Davidson	Feighan
Fernandez	Lane	Rains
Fine	Lanham	Reuss
Fisher	Lankford	Rhodes, Pa.
Flood	Lesinski	Richards
Flynt	Long	Riley
Fogarty	McCarthy	Rivers
Forand	McCormack	Robsion, Ky.
Forrester	McDonough	Rodino
Frazier	McDowell	Rogers, Colo.
Friedel	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
Fulton	Macdonald	Rogers, Mass.
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Rogers, Tex.
Gary	Mack, Ill.	Rooney
Gathings	Madden	Roosevelt
Gordon	Magnuson	Rutherford
Granahan	Mahon	Sadlak
Grant	Marshall	Seely-Brown
Gray	Matthews	Selden
Green, Oreg.	Merrow	Sheehan
Green, Pa.	Metcalf	Shelley
Gregory	Miller, Calif.	Sheppard
Griffiths	Miller, N. Y.	Sieminski
Hagen	Mills	Sikes
Haley	Mollohan	Sisk
Hardy	Morano	Smith, Miss.
Harris	Morgan	Spence
Hays, Ark.	Morrison	Staggers
Hays, Ohio	Moss	Steed
Hayworth	Moulder	Sullivan
Hébert	Multer	Teague, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Ill.	Thomas
Holifield	Natcher	Thompson, N. J.
Holtzman	Norrell	Thompson, Tex.
Huddleston	O'Brien, Ill.	Thornberry
Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tollefson
Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.	Trimble
Jarman	O'Konski	Tumulty
Jennings	O'Neill	Udall
Johnson, Wis.	Passman	Vanik
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Vinson
Jones, Mo.	Patterson	Watts
Karsten	Pelly	Whitten
Kee	Perkins	Wickersham
Kelley, Pa.	Pfost	Wier
Kelly, N. Y.	Philbin	Williams, Miss.
Keogh	Pilcher	Williams, N. J.
Kilgore	Poage	Willis
King, Calif.	Polk	Winstead
Kirwan	Preston	Wolverton
Klein	Price	Wright
Kluczynski	Priest	Yates
Knutson	Quigley	Zablocki
Landrum	Rabaut	Zelenko

NAYS—189

Abbitt	Curtis, Mo.	Jensen
Adair	Dague	Johansen
Alexander	Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.
Alger	Dawson, Utah	Jonas
Allen, Ill.	Derounian	Jones, N. C.
Andresen, August H.	Devereux	Judd
Arends	Dies	Kean
Auchincloss	Dixon	Kearns
Avery	Dolliver	Keating
Ayres	Dondero	Kilburn
Baker	Dowdy	King, Pa.
Barden	Durham	Knox
Bass, N. H.	Ellsworth	Krueger
Bates	Fenton	Laird
Baumhart	Fino	Latham
Beamer	Fjare	LeCompte
Becker	Ford	Lipscomb
Belcher	Fountain	Lovre
Bentley	Frelinghuysen	McConnell
Berry	Gamble	McGregor
Betts	Gavin	McIntire
Bolton, Frances P.	Gentry	McVey
Bonner	George	Mack, Wash.
Bosch	Gross	Mailliard
Bow	Gubser	Martin
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn	Mason
Brownson	Hale	Meader
Broyhill	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Budge	Hand	Miller, Nebr.
Bush	Harden	Minshall
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Mumma
Carrigg	Harrison, Va.	Murray, Tenn.
Cederberg	Harvey	Nelson
Chase	Henderson	Nicholson
Chatham	Heselton	Norblad
Chenoweth	Hess	O'Hara, Minn.
Chiperfield	Hiestand	Osmers
Church	Hill	Ostertag
Clevenger	Hillings	Phillips
Cole	Hinshaw	Pillion
Coon	Hoeven	Poff
Corbett	Hoffman, Mich.	Prouty
Coudert	Holmes	Radwan
Cramer	Hope	Ray
Cretella	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Crumpacker	Hosmer	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Hyde	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Riehlman
	James	Robeson, Va.
	Jenkins	St. George
Saylor	Springer	Vursell
Schenck	Taber	Wainwright
Scherer	Talle	Weaver
Schwengel	Taylor	Westland
Scrivner	Teague, Calif.	Wharton
Scudder	Thompson, Mich.	Widnall
Short	Thomson, Wyo.	Wigglesworth
Shuford	Tuck	Williams, N. Y.
Siler	Utt	Wilson, Calif.
Simpson, Ill.	Van Pelt	Wilson, Ind.
Simpson, Pa.	Van Zandt	Withrow
Smith, Kans.	Velde	Wolcott
Smith, Va.	Vorys	Young
Smith, Wis.		Younger

NOT VOTING—21

Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Reed, Ill.
Blatnik	Eberharter	Reed, N. Y.
Blitch	Herlong	Roberts
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Scott
Canfield	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Carlyle	Kilday	Walter
Cooley	McCulloch	
	Powell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. Holt against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 287, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—125

Alger	Bolton, Frances P.	Coon
Allen, Ill.	Bosch	Coudert
Andresen, August H.	Bow	Cramer
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Crumpacker
Avery	Brownson	Cunningham
Ayres	Broyhill	Curtis, Mo.
Baker	Budge	Davis, Wis.
Bates	Byrnes, Wis.	Dawson, Utah
Becker	Cederberg	Derounian
Bentley	Chase	Devereux
Berry	Chenoweth	Dixon
Betts	Clevenger	Dolliver
	Cole	Dondero
		Fino

Fjare
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
George
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Kean
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McDowell
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
Mack, Wash.
Martin
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Murray, Tenn.
Phillips
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scrivner
Scudder
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wolcott
Young
Younger

NAYS—287

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Cretella
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—22

Allen, Calif.
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolton, Oliver P.
Canfield
Carlyle
Cooley
Davis, Ga.
Dollinger
Eberharter
Herlong
Holt
Kearney
Kilday
McCulloch
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Roberts
Scott
Thompson, La.
Walter

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Holt for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 85, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—324

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dodd
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Schenck
Schwengel
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—85

Alger
Allen, Ill.
Arends
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Bates
Becker
Bentley
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Chase
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Coudert
Cramer
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Derounian
Devereux
Dondero
Fino
Fjare
Ford
Gamble
George
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Heselton
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hyde
Jackson
Johansen
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Krueger
Laird
McGregor
Mack, Wash.
Martin
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Phillips
Poff
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
St. George
Saylor
Scherer
Scrivner
Siler
Simpson, Pa.

Smith, Kans.	Utt	Wigglesworth
Taber	Van Pelt	Williams, N. Y.
Teague, Calif.	Vorys	Wilson, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.	Vursell	Wolcott
Thomson, Wyo.	Wainwright	Younger
	Weaver	

NOT VOTING—25

Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Powell
Blatnik	Eberharter	Reed, Ill.
Blitch	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Roberts
Canfield	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Carlyle	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Cederberg	Kilday	Walter
Cooley	McCulloch	Wier
	Mason	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Mason.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 4644 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 4644 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. R. 4644.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. COON asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made with reference to Dr. Jonas E. Salk during the consideration of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill may appear in the RECORD following the conclusion of the legislative business today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a news item appearing in the press on Monday, of a meeting that President Eisenhower is going to have with Dr. Jonas Salk on Friday, and the statement in the news item that Mr. Hagerty said the President was hopeful that the new award would be the first by the Congress, and in time for the Friday appointment in Washington for the developer of polio vaccine, Speaker RAYBURN and I conferred and we decided that if President Eisenhower desired legislative action to be taken between now and Friday, we would cooperate in every way possible. We decided that a resolution would be introduced today in the House, to be taken up by unanimous consent.

On conferring with administrative assistants in the White House with a view to getting something official from the President, or the White House, to the effect that such an emergency bill for Dr. Salk was desired, I was informed that there was an unintentional misconstruction placed by the press on what Mr. Hagerty said; that President Eisenhower did not expect legislative authority for the issuance of a special medal would be passed between now and Friday; that a bill was being drafted in the executive branch to carry out the President's recommendation, and that a bill following his recommendation in his message on the state of the Union in this respect will be transmitted to the Congress in the very near future so that appropriate consideration and action by the proper committees might be taken.

The intention was to convey the distinct impression that when such legislation was passed that Dr. Salk would be the first who would be given consideration for recognition for this honor.

The Democratic leadership in the House, and I know the Democratic leadership in the Senate, as well as the Republican leadership in both branches would gladly cooperate with the President to have legislation passed which would enable the conferring of the medal on Dr. Salk next Friday, if desired and requested by the President.

However, as a result of my talk with the administrative assistants in the White House, this is not expected, and it is desired that when the bill is received in the Congress it will take the regular legislative course.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 5687, an identical bill to S. 1697 which was introduced in the Senate by my Michigan colleague, Senator PAT MCNAMARA. The title reads:

To express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life.

The keyword in this title is the word "appreciation"; appreciation for patience and tireless efforts put forth by this man as he ventured upon an uncharted path of human suffering. His road was not at all times an untrammeled vista which promised riches for a successful journey. The motivating impulse was that of the true scientist who has burned the Hippocratic oath indelibly upon his being; for nothing less than unselfish dedication could have brought forth this gift to all humanity.

In reading the newspaper accounts that accompanied the momentous announcement on April 13 one small caption arrested my attention among the massive scientific accounts of Dr. Salk's discovery. I should like to read it. The caption said: "Dr. Salk's only reward is his accomplishment." It further read:

Dr. Jonas E. Salk got a standing ovation by 400 scientists and reporters today when he reported on his successful polio vaccine.

Dr. Salk developed the vaccine under a grant from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis to the University of Pittsburgh, where he is on the faculty.

The vaccine is an unpatened product, so Dr. Salk's only reward is the satisfaction of his accomplishment.

Undoubtedly Dr. Salk will be the worthy recipient of many laudatory awards that will memoralize his Gargantuan efforts in arresting this scourge of humanity; no one could appraise the value that Dr. Salk will attach to these nonmaterial manifestations of his colleagues and fellow men. His place among the great men of his chosen profession is well established for all time. But I, along with my colleague, feel that our appreciation should be carried one step further as expressed in our companion bill.

Therefore, I recommend to the Members of this House favorable consideration of this token of national esteem to a most worthy member of our country's medical profession.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yesterday introduced a bill providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement to be awarded to Dr. Jonas Salk for his outstanding work in developing a vaccine against the dread

disease of polio. It is entirely appropriate that Dr. Salk should be the first recipient of such a medal. His contribution to society is tremendous and one which will affect millions of people who otherwise might have suffered the terror of an attack of infantile paralysis. This is undoubtedly the greatest step forward in medical research that has taken place in recent years, and ranks in importance with the discoveries of a vaccination against smallpox and the antibiotics.

It is significant to note that the announcement of the effectiveness of Dr. Salk's vaccine against infantile paralysis came on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who himself had been a victim of this disease and who was the first to mobilize the battle against it. This is a fitting tribute to a man who worked so courageously to prevent others from being afflicted in such a terrible way.

We of Pittsburgh are particularly proud that the University of Pittsburgh was the scene at which the tests were conducted by Dr. Salk and his colleagues. During recent years Pittsburgh has become one of the great medical centers of the country, and I am gratified that this outstanding discovery should have taken place there, adding to the prominence of the work in medical research being done in that city.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to provide for this medal for Dr. Salk, whose sacrifice and work will mean so much to humanity.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any and all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks during the next 5 legislative days on the postal pay increase bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I hope President Eisenhower will not attempt to thwart the overwhelming will of Congress by vetoing a fair pay increase for postal employees.

The 8.2-percent increase voted by the House is less than adequate, but under the circumstances, was the best could be had. I have favored and still favor a 10-percent raise and am hopeful that the final conference agreement will be closer to 10 percent as voted by the Senate, than the 8.2 percent voted by the House. Either figure is small enough when measured by increased costs of living which have sharply reduced the purchasing power of postal workers.

We would be inconsistent, indeed, if we did not insist on making the increase retroactive to March 1. After all, the 50-percent salary boost Congress has voted for itself was made effective as of March 1. An additional safeguard provided in the House bill will prevent abuse of the reclassification program by requiring the Postmaster General to report his actions to Congress. If these reports indicate that the reclassification procedure is being abused, or being used for partisan political purposes, Congress will have an opportunity to change the program.

THE STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION COMMITTEE OF MISSOURI

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the dictatorial abuse of power and authority of the State Agricultural Stabilization Committee of Missouri is well known by the farmers of Missouri. This condition has become so deplorable that the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri passed the following resolution to investigate the State ASC committee:

House Memorial 1

Whereas it has been stated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the policy of the present administration to administer our agricultural stabilization and conservation programs with the farmers themselves being given a voice in the supervision and control of such programs; and

Whereas the State agricultural stabilization committee, presided over by Murray C. Colbert as chairman, has discharged 3 elected committeemen, suspended 4 elected committeemen, and forced 1 elected committeeman to resign in Texas County, Mo., with just the broad charge of certain irregularities without any specification of what particular irregularities; and

Whereas at a hearing held by the State committee in February of 1954 on the proposed discharge of certain elected committeemen in Texas County, Mo., one William Young McCaskill, a qualified dealer under the emergency drought feed program and also a special correspondent for a metropolitan newspaper of this State, was denied access as a member of the press to such hearing by Murray C. Colbert after the said Murray C. Colbert was requested by the committeemen of the local ASC committee to hold a public hearing; and

Whereas William Young McCaskill was suspended on February 3, 1955, for alleged irregularities in drought feed certificates and on April 6, 1955, was reinstated after an investigation of the alleged irregularities by the Commodity and Investigation Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service and on April 7, 1955, the said Murray C. Colbert again suspended William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. alleging that William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. had made an agreement to circumvent the first suspension; and

Whereas it has been charged that the State ASC committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert is not operating the ASC committee on an impartial basis free from personalities and pressures; and

Whereas numerous counties in the State of Missouri have experienced similar wholesale dismissals and suspensions since Mr. Colbert assumed the office of State ASC chairman; and

Whereas the farmers of Texas County and the State of Missouri are greatly disturbed by the aforementioned actions of the State ASC committee which is definitely hindering the successful operations of such ASC program; and

Whereas a suspension of a dealer under the emergency drought feed program practically destroys the business of such suspended dealer and does great damage to the reputation of such dealer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Missouri, That the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to investigate the activities of the State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri and the suspension of the said William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers for the purpose of bringing the true state of facts to light and of ascertaining whether the declared policy of the present administration of giving the farmers themselves a voice in the administration of the ASC program is being carried out in Missouri; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Committee on Agriculture of this Congress will also investigate the partisan and dictatorial methods being practiced by the ASC against and contrary to law and the interests of the farmers.

PATRIOTS' DAY IN MASSACHUSETTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 19th of April, was Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. This is the day when the people of Massachusetts, particularly the townspeople of Lexington, Concord, Acton, Bedford, and surrounding communities give thanks to God and our forefathers for the first stand made for liberty and freedom.

On this day, the 19th of April, 180 years ago, Paul Revere made his historic ride shouting his notice the British were coming, to every Middlesex village and farm. "To arms!" was the cry on that day so long ago and the village patriots assembled in Lexington and Concord to make their stand for freedom. When they returned the British fire their shots were heard around the world and the beautiful peaceful towns of Lexington and Concord and their courageous patriots carved into the history of mankind one of its finest pages. Here liberty was born. Here freedom was born. Here our great American Nation was born. It can be said this was our finest hour and it can be truthfully said, "Never have so many owed so much to so few," for this was the beginning of freedom, freedom that is as certain as the light of sun, to reach all peoples everywhere in the world.

These hallowed communities, these historic towns, are in my Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District. It is for me such a deep and great honor to represent them in the Congress. Every time I pass the statue of the Minute Man and every time I pass Concord Bridge and the Lexington Green, my heartbeat quickens and my blood rushes with pride, my soul is thrilled and my thoughts are humble in being so close to the great deed that was accomplished here. Every American should visit Concord and Lexington and feel the thrill of the incidents that brought about our liberty and freedom.

Yesterday at the celebration of the 180th anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord, the Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, made a great and ringing address. I wish every American could read it and give it thought. In my remarks here I include his exceptionally fine address. General White is a very superior officer with a great war record and worthy of standing on Lexington Green, 180 years after Captain Parker fired the first shot for freedom. General White's address follows:

It is a moving experience to participate in your celebration of Patriot's Day. I believe that every American—at least once in his life—should come to Lexington on the 19th of April. Here he could be reassured that the spirit which has made America great is still unwavering.

One hundred and eighty years ago this morning, your beautiful town was a small community of peaceful and peace-loving people. All at once this quiet village moved into history's spotlight. Men like Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and Captain Parker spontaneously made it clear that however much the New Englander loved peace, he loved liberty more.

You have a proud heritage, well described by Daniel Webster when he said:

"I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her and judge for yourself. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston and Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill, and there they will remain forever."

In the 125 years since Daniel Webster said this, events have proved that he was right. Time has a way of changing many things, but you and your forbears have preserved much of your historic past, both in landmarks and in spirit.

Within our view, for instance, still stands the house of Jonathan Harrington, bridegroom of only a few months, who gave his life one memorable morning, for an ideal. This ideal has since become the balance wheel of our civilization.

Evidence of your unchanging spirit is this thrilling ceremony that we join in today.

Although time has not succeeded in dampening your spirit of independence, it has wrought a world of other changes.

Although we are here to honor the men of 1775, the occasional sound of a plane overhead serves to remind us that this year of 1955 is a year in the air age. Althought we call it the air age, it is but a part of a great period of technological progress. During the lifetimes of many of us here today there has been more scientific achievement than was made during hundreds of preceding years.

Scientific progress has given us many advantages, but it has also served to enlarge and complicate the same old problems that have always beset mankind.

Our main problem today is similar to the one our ancestors faced in 1775. We love our freedom, and we want to keep it. However, it is being menaced by forces which would make us slaves.

In that respect it is the same old problem. However, the threat to our freedom is more frightening now. The forces which menace our freedom are that of a strong and terrible aggressor. They are the forces of communism, the forces of the Soviet Union and her Communist satellites.

In the Revolutionary days, aggressor forces on a distant continent would not have been cause for great alarm. In fact, Thomas Paine said:

"Not a place on earth might be so happy as America. Her situation is so remote from all the wrangling world, and she has nothing to do but trade with them."

In 1776 this was a reasonable idea, but the progress of which I spoke has erased that concept forever. In this air age, Russia is closer to the United States than New York was to Boston during the Revolutionary days.

Other comparisons between today and yesterday are interesting. On the morning of April 19, 1775, it took the British soldiers about 4 hours to march from Boston out to Lexington.

Just a little over 1 month ago, a number of United States Air Force jet planes traveled from California to New York in considerably less than 4 hours.

Even more meaningful to us here today, if a Communist bomber took off from northern Russia about the time we got out of bed this morning, it could be over this Boston area just about now.

Thus we are no longer remote from all the wrangling world. In this air age we find ourselves right in the middle of this wrangling world. An aggressor can threaten us with the greatest danger we have ever faced.

Again, compare our present situation with the one this area faced 180 years ago.

In 1775, the British left Lexington after the initial encounter and went on to Concord to destroy the patriot arsenal there. They took some 5 hours to do so. Consider that several hundred men needed so much time to destroy one relatively small arsenal. Admittedly, it is unfair for me to use this as an example of their inefficiency. It is well known that the good New England rum was responsible for slowing the British down.

Let us subtract the rum factor and give them credit for having been able to do this job in 1 hour on a drier day. Even so—compare that capability with today's.

Today one man could drop a bomb in the Boston area which could spread destruction out as far as Lexington. The destruction would take seconds, not hours.

This is an awesome thought, but it is one that cannot be ignored at this gathering of patriots. It is your duty, as it was the duty of your courageous ancestors, to clearly understand the nature of the threat to American freedom. Unless we understand the danger, we cannot counter it. Unless we counter the danger, our freedom is lost. Ceremonies like this would become meaningless.

Today, the problem of defending our liberty is as serious to us as it was to the Minutemen in 1775. However, we can no longer depend upon an untrained militia gathered together in a few hours.

Today's Minutemen must be able to react in minutes and with today's weapons. If enemy bombers were to head this way, our warning systems would allow our air defenders only minutes to take off, climb high in the sky, and destroy the intruder.

At the same time, from here and overseas, our long-range bombers must be able to be off the ground and on their way before the enemy could even complete his attack. Likewise, our Army and Navy must be able to instantly move against any attacker.

Besides these full-time defenders, we need many others standing by, ready to serve their country when needed. These are the Reserves of our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I know personally how highly specialized and exacting are the requirements that our Air Force Reserves must meet. Flying our modern airplanes requires a high degree of skill and continual training to keep proficient.

Flying and maintaining airplanes is not like riding a bicycle. They say that once a man learns to ride a bicycle he never forgets. If the same were true of flying, we could teach many to fly and then call upon them only in emergencies.

However, if a man is going to fly in combat he must fly all the time. Every pilot knows how dangerous it would be to let his flying get rusty—dangerous not only to him, but to those with him and below him. For this reason our Air National Guard and our Air Force Reserve men must train constantly.

Perhaps these men are the greatest patriots of our time. They are on their civilian jobs a regular 5- or 6-day workweek. To keep their skills high, they must sacrifice their weekends to training. They, like you and I, would prefer to spend their weekends with their families, in their gardens, at picnics, and in church.

They realize, however, that our need for air age minutemen is great, and so they continue to prepare themselves for a conflict which we hope will never come. They know that our preparedness is the best guaranty that this conflict will not come.

Near here, at the Bedford Hanscom Air Force Base, some of the activities I have mentioned are being carried out. In a few months our interceptors of the Air Defense Command will be constantly poised on the end of the runway there. They will be doing part of the job that other Air Defense pilots are now doing at Stewart, Otis, and Westover Air Force Bases. At all these bases pilots of fast jet planes are ready—24 hours a day—for any emergency.

At other locations are the lonely radar sites. At these sites, our men maintain constant and watchful vigil. They are the ones upon whom we depend for the vital warning and control of our air defense.

Believe me, this system is not untested. Word from the radar sites is often flashed to the pilots. They jump into their fighters and are in the air in 2 or 3 minutes. Right after they take off, they do not know where the target is, or what it is. It may be the real thing. While they are climbing, the ground controller will tell them what direction to go and how high to fly. Soon the pilot's own radar in his plane will spot the target and he will move in close to it.

In each case, up until now, the target has turned out to be one of our airplanes or a commercial airliner which has been lost or blown off course. The interceptor pilot radios this information back to the ground controller, and then, guided by the ground controller, the pilot returns to his base and lands.

Thus our air defense is actually functioning night and day, good weather and bad. When a pilot returns he is tired, but he always is happy that he was able to intercept the unkown airplane before it got to a critical target area.

The requirements of air defense mean that our pilots work at odd and inconvenient hours. The alert shack in which they wait for that important call is usually crude and

uncomfortable. Many of them are married, but it is impossible for them to lead a normal family life.

I think that all patriotic Americans are deeply indebted to these men. In all the history of man, the knowledge that someone was looking out for him and his family has been a great source of comfort. Back in 1775, the people of Boston were comforted by the call of the town crier. When they heard him, they knew that all was well.

Today, people near air defense bases get similar reassurance from the sound of your Air Force jets as they climb into the sky to make sure that all is still well above us.

Also at Bedford Hascom Air Force Base the Air Force Reserve is training. The Bedford wing is making grand progress. In case of any national emergency our Reserves will be a skilled, trained backup to our regular forces.

The laboratories at Bedford, as you well know, are some of the finest in America. The work being done there will eventually result in better defense for us all.

All over America, our air bases are parts of the community in which they are located and which they protect. The air base at Bedford is certainly a part of this community. Like the patriots of Lexington in 1775, you play a valuable part in the modern day defense of our liberty. One of the ways you do this is in support of the defense we are required to have today.

Your celebration here today is visible and heartwarming evidence that our love of freedom here in America is as strong as ever. As liberty was menaced in the days of the men we honor, it is menaced in our own time but now the menace is on a global scale.

We recognize that if we wait until the evil that menaces our liberty is at our doorstep, it would be too late. In this air age, we must stop the march of communism far from our shores. The farther from our shores we stop it, the better chances are that we can do it without a war.

In these days, courage backed up by firmness and great strength give us our best chance for a lasting peace.

Daniel Webster recognized this in 1830. He said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard it and defend it."

We must remember those words as we honor the gallant few who first sounded the trumpets of liberty at Lexington. They passed on the torch of freedom to us and it is the duty of the patriots of today to keep that flame bright.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for 10 days, on account of official business—having been appointed as a member of the Committee To Investigate the Immigration and Refugee Program.

Mr. REED of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until May 10, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. CHATHAM regarding Pan-American Day.

Mr. DEMPSEY and include an article dealing with postal matters.

Mr. LESINSKI in two separate instances.

Mr. ALGER in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. GRANT.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

711. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

712. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

713. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

714. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

715. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

716. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

717. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the request of the corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

718. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 427. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 428. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5694. A bill to provide revenue from an excise tax uniformly applied to end products of manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5695. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5696. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 5697. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5698. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5699. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5700. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 5701. A bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, which authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide for exemptions in the case of certain classes of securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5702. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit certain employed persons to be paid annuities under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quit-claim deed to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., any right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to certain land in such city; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 5704. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 5705. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5706. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5707. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 5708. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5709. A bill providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, and authorizing its award initially to Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5710. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5711. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934 (Public Law 435, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5712. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5713. A bill relating to the status of certain organizations as tax-exempt organizations under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 5714. A bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5715. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5716. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5717. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5718. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 63 Stat. 917) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 5719. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide that arthritis, psychoses, or multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5720. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5721. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5722. A bill to provide for payment of pension to the widow of any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 5723. A bill providing for the designation of United States Highway No. 101 as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5724. A bill to establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, to establish a Federal Advisory Commission to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation, to provide awards of merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5725. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of women officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve on the same basis as male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5726. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 5727. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5728. A bill to provide that certain retired members of the uniformed services shall be paid certain travel and transportation expenses incurred in establishing a home within 1 year after their retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5729. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to authorize loans to be made by the Small Business Administration to development credit corporations or industrial foundations located in areas having a substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5730. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5731. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5732. A bill to repeal section 412 (e) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5733. A bill to add section 246 (f) and amend section 412 (b) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5734. A bill to amend section 301 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5735. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5736. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 5737. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5738. A bill to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers Training Corps programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5739. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5740. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 5741. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to provide for regulation of the amount of radio and television program time which may be devoted to advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5742. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5743. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5744. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5745. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5746. A bill to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5747. A bill to amend section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to allow a deduction under Federal estate tax laws for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests for public, charitable, or religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction under Federal estate tax laws for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, or religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5749. A bill to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5750. A bill to provide special acreage allotments in areas of general crop failure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5751. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5752. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5753. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5755. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5756. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5757. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5758. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5759. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study supplies of petroleum on the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 213. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a study and investigation into the feasibility of establishing additional manufacturing enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations in this State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of house memorial No. 7 of the Alaska Legislature, pertaining to title XII of the Social Security Act, as amended, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5760. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5761. A bill for the relief of Annemarie Moeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgina Calvano (nee Bootz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 5763. A bill for the relief of Toyoji (Suzuki) Whipple; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5764. A bill for the relief of Joseph Beidel (also known as Joseph Beidel Wiedmayer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Basilio Rus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5766. A bill for the relief of George K. Toskos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Lum Shee Seid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Gregory Andrew Bohosiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5770. A bill for the relief of Italo Liccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5771. A bill for the relief of Elpidio Dosado, Aurelia Dosado, Deanna Dosado, Elpidio Dosado, Jr., and Ambrosio Dosado; to to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Mininni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5773. A bill for the relief of Jacques Marius Poletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5774. A bill for the relief of Charles Grant John Giles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5775. A bill for the relief of Hesna Hun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 5776. A bill for the relief of Winston W. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5777. A bill for the relief of Nickolas Bodner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 5778. A bill for the relief of June Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 5779. A bill for the relief of Miguel Saenz-Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 5780. A bill for the relief of Peter Wei Ting Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5781. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Boffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5782. A bill for the relief of Father Evencio Moreno Villar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5783. A bill for the relief of Father Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5784. A bill for the relief of Copalkrishna (Gopalkrishna) U. Bhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone Commemoration Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, September of this year has been designated as John Marshall Bicentennial Month by the action of the 82d Congress, and extensive ceremonies will commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall.

Chief Justice Marshall firmly implanted the precepts of judicial review in our constitutional system. History records this commentary of 1833 which has become a lasting tribute and memorial to his great wisdom and genius:

> Your expositions of constitutional law enjoy a rare and extraordinary authority. They constitute a monument of fame far beyond the ordinary memorials of political and military glory. They are destined to enlighten, instruct, and convince future generations and can scarcely perish but with the memory of the Constitution itself.

In this setting, and as a member of the John Marshall Bicentennial Commission, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, delivered at the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT MARSHALL-WYTHE-BLACKSTONE COMMEMORATION CEREMONIES, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., SEPTEMBER 25, 1954

It is our pleasure today to honor great men of another day, men who have contributed much to our national life and to the civilization of which it is a part. We speak of them, of course, in gratitude, but we have another reason, even more personal to present-day Americans and in keeping with the necessities of our time. We meet here to strengthen our own convictions concerning government and law; to fortify our belief in a government of laws and not of men. We seek rededication to the cause of justice, between individuals, between citizens and their sovereign, and between the nations of the world. We reach for perfect justice, but we do not expect to grasp it, because history, both profane and divine, teaches us that as long as time and human nature exist there will be issues to decide, causes to adjust. We learn from Holy Writ that even the angels quarreled and that Satan and his angels were banished to darkness for their wrongs. We know that the path of justice in every time and place has been rough, tortuous, and uphill. No nation has yet reached the summit. Exact justice has not been achieved. No mortal has embodied all its principles. We recognize, however, that civilizations of the past have advanced it; nations in all ages have made contributions to it, and individuals have either evolved or formulated or synthesized principles of justice in a way that has challenged the admiration and emulation of people in many lands—people who are interested in that kind of government which is premised upon freedom and the dignity of the individual. We honor those nations for their accomplishments and revere the memories of such individuals for their contributions.

As Americans, we are proud of our system of government and our standards of justice, although we claim neither originality nor perfection for them. We, too, have had our great men who have made contributions to the sum total of human knowledge in the field of justice. We do not deify them. Like the sages of other countries, they were people, subject to all the limitations of human beings. As a nation, we make no pretense except to a passion for justice based upon the dignity and rights of the individual. We stake everything we have on our belief that only through this kind of justice can there be order and contentment within nations and peace between countries of the world. We believe this kind of justice is the rightful heritage of every human being and that it is his right and duty to achieve it.

For three and a half centuries Americans, using the experience and wisdom of older countries from which we or our forebears came, have endeavored to develop in this section of the world a system of government and a body of law that will accord justice to everyone. We have made mistakes—many of them. People have at times succeeded in using our system for selfish and even oppressive ends. We have often been required to wipe some things from the slate and start again. At times we have been close to failure but we have never failed in our climb toward the pinnacle of true justice. And we are climbing today to meet the test of Thomas Jefferson that "The most sacred of the duties of a government is to do equal and impartial justice to all its citizens."

We do not assume that justice is indigenous only to our soil or in our own people. Waves of passion, prejudice and even hatreds have on occasions swept over us and almost engulfed us, as they have the people of other lands. In our efforts to guard against these things, we have called upon the wisdom of the ages. We have accepted unblushingly the contribution of those intellects of other nations and ages who, in accordance with the circumstances under which they lived, have placed foundation stones in the temple of justice.

Our own symbol of justice, the home of the Supreme Court of the United States, honors great nations of lawgivers. It is of Grecian architecture of the Corinthian order so loved by the Romans and used by them in a countless number of their public buildings. In the courtroom itself, we give public recognition to the lawgivers of all ages. On the frieze of one wall are the figures of ancients who made their contribution before the birth of Christ: Menes, Hammurabi, Moses, Solomon, Lycurgus, Solon, Draco, Confucius, and Octavian; and on the opposite wall the figures of those who came after Him: Justinian, Mohammed, Charlemagne, King John, St. Louis, Grotius, Blackstone, Marshall, and Napoleon. The most significant to us, of course, are the figures of those who expounded the two systems that are the most alike of any because premised on the affinity of lineage, language, concept, and emulation, the British and American. They stand side by side, William Blackstone and John Marshall. These men were contemporaries although not known personally to each other. The one had not been out of England; the other lived almost his entire life within a few miles of his beloved Virginia.

While Blackstone was writing his commentaries on the law of England, Marshall was studying the great events of history upon which the rights of Englishmen were predicated in order to establish here a comparable system of justice. At that time, he and his compatriots were concerned not so much with a better system of justice than the English system as they were with having the same rights as Englishmen. A few years later he fought with Washington at Monmouth, Brandywine, and Valley Forge to establish here a Nation for that purpose. Blackstone expounded the law of England as it had developed by tradition, charter, statutes, and judicial interpretation for a thousand years. Marshall expounded our Constitution, a document of 5,000 words, only a dozen years old, but which had been designed to establish for all times a more perfect Union of States that had but recently achieved their independence. That Constitution was an experiment in the science of government. Many people believed it to be a dangerous experiment. Many feared it and believed it would become another instrument of oppression. It was approved by the States only by the narrowest of margins. No one was certain if or how it would stand the test of time. One of the signers of the Constitution said, "Constitutions are not the same on paper as in real life." It fell to the lot of John Marshall to translate our Constitution from paper into real life, to enable it to meet the problems of a new, poor, war-tired, and divided country. To say that it took wisdom, foresight, patience, and courage to do this task is trite. But it is nonetheless true, and he did it for 34 years during the most formative and politically turbulent period of our national history, leaving at his death a greater imprint on our legal institutions than any American to this day has ever made. We honor him today at the beginning of the 200th year since his birth in testimony of the lasting and universal veneration in which his work is held.

It is appropriate that this recognition should be given him in his beloved Virginia where he lived all his life and in whose service he offered his life for the new Nation he envisioned, in whose legislature he labored for the Constitutional Convention, where he worked for ratification of the Constitution, and which State he represented in the Congress. It is also fitting that this ceremony should be held at beautiful and historic College of William and Mary where he received his only formal education under the benign tutelage of George Wythe, then occupying the first chair of law in this country. John Marshall was not an orthodox student. Born in the wilderness, he learned from his parents and from an occasional tutor, but largely from the life of his time and from the great men of Virginia in the causes for which men struggled in those days. What men he encountered in his native State—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, Mason, Monroe, and a host of others immortal in United States history. Whether these men agreed in politics or not, they all had great minds, were passionately devoted to their own political philosophy and each sharpened the minds of the others either through friendly intercourse or political contention. Marshall was the beneficiary of these associations as much as any American of those days, whether it stemmed from the adoration he had for his beloved chief, George Washington, or from his almost lifelong political strife with his kinsman, Thomas Jefferson.

We are most fortunate that we can have with us on this occasion Dr. Goodhart, master of University College, Oxford, where English law was first taught and where Sir William Blackstone taught and wrote his commentaries. And how greatly we are honored by having with us on this occasion the Lord Chief Justice of England whose historic position makes him the guardian of the rights of all Englishmen as those rights have come down to them from Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the Acts of Parliament. It gives us a sense of comradeship in a very troubled world.

John Marshall has rightly been called the "expounder of the Constitution." It was new to the point of being without precedent when he became Chief Justice January 6, 1801. The Nation was poor as a result of years of warfare. Means of communication between the States were sadly lacking; there was no national economy; our standing among the nations of the world was deplorable; the States were divided in interests and politics; men held passionate views concerning the relationships between the three branches of Government and between the Federal and State governments. The leaders were men of powerful intellect and passionate convictions. There were those who would center most power in the Federal Government. There were those who would leave practically all power in the States. It was Marshall's mission in life to pursue a course somewhere between those two extreme positions through the construction of the new Constitution in a myriad of cases that arose during his 34 years as Chief Justice. He had spent a horrible winter at Valley Forge with Washington, and the weakness of the Government under the Articles of Confederation had seared his soul. He believed in a strong, central government—Federal supremacy in all matters within the domain of the Federal Government. He believed the Constitution should be construed liberally to accomplish that end, and he confirmed the power of Congress to do so in these historic words:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

He believed that if we were to remain a nation we must have a national economy, and that any strong economy must be based upon the scrupulous performance of contracts, and the orderly regulation by the central government of commerce among the States and with other nations. He realized that if we were to command the respect of the world, we must meticulously fulfill our international obligations and honor the treaties we make. All of these desired results he achieved through decision after decision until they became embedded in our law.

But perhaps the greatest contribution he made to our system of jurisprudence was the establishment of an independent judiciary through the principle of judicial review. In a case instituted the first year of his incumbency, he rooted this fundamental principle in American constitutional law as our original contribution to the science of law.

This and many other of his decisions aroused a storm of protest as being beyond the words and intent of the Constitution, but for 34 years in accordance with his belief, stone by stone, he built the foundation of our constitutional structure, and he constructed it sufficiently strong to support everything we have since built upon it. In those 34 years of his incumbency, he wrote 519 of the 1,106 opinions handed down by his Court.

He did not go with the tide of public opinion or the course of politics. Often his opinions were contrary to both, but he continued to build, patiently, logically, courageously. His sense of duty is epitomized at the time of the trial of Aaron Burr, which he conducted fearlessly in spite of the intense feeling of the public and the national administration against the defendant. In the conduct of that case, as a circuit justice, he said:

"That this court dares not usurp power is most true. That this court dares not shrink from its duty is not less true. No man is desirous of becoming the peculiar subject of calumny. No man, might he let the bitter cup pass from him without self-reproach, would drain it to the bottom."

And he did his duty in that case, unpopular though it was.

He lived with this conviction, throughout his long career. When his work was done and he passed away in Philadelphia on July 6, 1835, in the 80th year of his life and the 35th of his Chief Justiceship, he was acclaimed by friend and foe alike as a man of virtue and great accomplishment.

His long-time friend and illustrious associate, Joseph Story, said of him:

"Chief Justice Marshall was the growth of a century. Providence grants such men to the human family only on great occasions to accomplish its own great end. Such men are found only when our need is the greatest. His proudest epitaph may be written in a line—'Here lies the expounder of the Constitution.'"

The people of Philadelphia accorded him a hero's farewell, and as his body was borne along the streets to the dock for transmittal to his beloved Virginia, the Liberty Bell tolled from the belfry of Independence Hall. Then a strange thing happened. A great cleft appeared in the side of the bell, and like Marshall's voice, it too became still forever. It was taken down and placed in the Hall. It remains there today for all to see—the symbol of our liberty—while the memory of John Marshall abides with all of us as that of "the great Chief Justice," and "the expounder of our Constitution."

Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening last I was privileged to deliver a talk to the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Hall, New York City. The talk was entitled "Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE EXILES OF FREEDOM

(Remarks of Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, before the Second International Congress of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Building for International Peace, New York City, April 17, 1955)

Scarcely 2 weeks ago announcement was made by a Lithuanian newspaper in Chicago of the death of Canon Antanas Petraitis, a Christian martyr to the communistic terror. It was 14 years ago, serving as pastor in the Lithuanian community of Erzvilkas, that he was arrested by the robot agents of the dictator at the Kremlin and subjected to unspeakable tortures designed to crush his will and destroy his soul. He was one of the few survivors of the death march to the Cherven Forest, where thousands were shot down because they were deemed dangerous to the plans of the dictatorship because they preferred death to the loss of liberty.

I pay my tribute tonight to this noble priest, and to all others of the Baltic peoples who were the first victims of the vast plan of Soviet Russia to conquer the world. These men and women, who had the spiritual capacity to resist inhuman torture rather than surrender the freedom with which they were endowed by their Creator, have given us and all the people of the world the example that must be followed before liberty can triumph over force. They are not forgotten by the exiles who have escaped from Central Europe and who have gathered here to keep alive the basic concept of individual freedom which all Christendom has cherished for 20 centuries.

With humility and a deep sense of my own inability to pronounce a fitting epitaph for those who have already made or are still to make the sacrifice of their lives in this struggle, I have accepted the invitation to speak here tonight and shall try to outline some of the facts which it seems to me we must never forget if civilization is to survive this, its most terrible crisis. Note I do not say if religion is to survive, because of that I have no doubt. The soul of man cannot be liquidated by the tortures of the tyrant because it is the breath of God. Men were made free by their Creator. This knowledge has sustained the people of Europe and the people of all countries to which the message of Christendom has gone. It will sustain them now but we must all know that the triumph of the spiritual over the evils of materialism can be permanently won only by those who are willing to sacrifice the temporary material values of life in order to preserve the eternal values bestowed by God Himself upon every human soul.

The struggle in which we are involved is the conflict between the spiritual and the materialistic. The human race, through all written history, has made frequent compromise with the evil of materialism, and has endured wars in the hope that they would speedily pass away, that peace would be restored, and that mankind would once again return to the pursuit of spiritual and cultural objectives. But compromise has failed. The Napoleonic Wars ended at Waterloo in 1815. Not until 55 years later did the Franco-Prussian War begin. Only 44 years of peace intervened before World War I broke out and, after 4 years of the most terrible military slaughter in all the previous history of mankind, all the peoples of the world cherished the hope that with the foundation of the League of Nations peace among men had at last been attained, but only 21 years elapsed before the Second World War was launched in 1939. With vastly improved engines of destruction, with mounting casualties, with war raging on land, on sea, in the air above, and in the deep oceans underneath, the capacity of man to destroy himself reached its zenith. When the shooting stopped, once again men cried peace, but there is no peace. The few treaties which have been written and the termination of the shooting have not yet revealed how war may be abolished and justice among men and nations attained. In the 140 years which have elapsed since the capture of Napoleon, the intervals of peace between wars have been growing steadily shorter, and no answer has yet appeared to the question every man asks in his heart: How can permanent peace be attained?

There was a time when wars were fought by only a portion of the population and under rules that save the open city from

destruction, when women and children were spared. These were days when poets would have us believe that knighthood was in flower. There was chivalry, there was tolerance during the small wars fought during the Christian era, but we live in a time when such rules of warfare have utterly disappeared. This century has seen the development of planned total war in which not only the men in uniform are involved in conflict but when the unarmed civilian population has no protection from ruthless attack. In the war against Japan, this Nation dropped the atom bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was the ultimate in force. It stopped the fighting but it did not bring peace.

It should be plain to us, therefore, why even the greatest of military leaders tell us that war is outmoded. It was Napoleon, when his days of battle and conquest were over, who confessed as he looked back upon his life that he was amazed at "the impotence of force to organize anything." Even the most successful of modern military leaders see the futility of force as Napoleon did. "There are only two powers in the world," he said, "the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit." Napoleon died, an impersonation of the failure of force, but wars continued.

In our generation another great military leader who in World War II led the forces of the Allies in Asia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, came to the same conclusion. I was in the House of Representatives on the 19th of April 1951, when he spoke to the Congress of the United States about war. He was the commander of all the forces of the Allies in Asia when, on September 2, 1945, on the battleship *Missouri* he accepted the surrender of Japan. All the memories of his experience in two World Wars were fresh in his mind when he spoke to the Congress. I give you his testimony:

"I know war as few other men now living know it," he told us, "and nothing today is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes."

"Useless," he said it was, having in mind the capture of the Philippines by Japan while he was the commander, having in mind his return and his recapture of the Philippines, having in mind the dropping of the bombs and the surrender of Japan. He then quoted from his utterance made on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* when Japan surrendered.

"Military alliances," he said, "balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war." He was explaining why World War I had failed to bring peace to the world and why, when the Second World War occurred, we felt compelled to enter it and use all the inventions and weapons that science had achieved. He had seen at first hand what total war means and so he quoted from that speech on the battleship *Missouri*, giving us a message which we can forget only at the peril of losing the great western civilization which is the world's heritage from Christianity.

"The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative," he said, meaning, of course, the use of the most destructive weapons the human mind can conceive. Some other alternative than force, he was telling the world, has to be found, saying:

"We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door."

It is not necessary to depend solely upon the opinions of the great generals of the world. I could recite here how Alexander of Greece, when he had no more worlds to conquer, tried to turn to thoughts of peace. I could tell the story of the Christian concepts of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant and Gen. Robert E. Lee when the great trial of the Civil War came to an end in this country. But I shall be content to give you the facts which show that force defeats itself.

Even the dictators eventually kill one another off. Of Lenin's inner circle, only he and Stalin survived to die natural deaths. The others were liquidated. A dozen ministers were purged. High officials in the Communist Party central organization, more than half of the Communists who wrote the Soviet Constitution, military leader after military leader, all of them experts in torture, ruthless and faithless, were themselves the victims of the dictatorial system they were trying to enforce upon the world. It is a system which cannot last because it is a system without faith. It believes in neither God nor man, and because of this lack of spiritual faith it consumes its own adherents.

What then is the alternative to which MacArthur said man must turn? What is the method by which in this century the spirit will conquer the sword, as Napoleon predicted? Perhaps it is too simple to be understood. Surely no one knows better than the descendants of the people of Western Europe the great spiritual triumphs which marked the civilization of Christendom. All the terror and slavery of paganism were unable to crush the spirit and the will of the people who had the faith to believe in and the courage to live by the principle of the Christian religion that God lives and calls to those who will to be free.

Society, any society, is an organism which reflects the spirit of the individuals who constitute it. The relationship between God and man is the relationship between God and every man. When into any society there enters the materialism of paganism, that society inevitably falls to lower standards of character and morality. We have lived in a time in which too many individuals have set aside the concepts of religious faith and have worshiped before the image of the Golden Calf. That is the symbol of materialism. But it is not the symbol of the millions of the people who have received and accepted the heritage of Christendom.

The men and women who founded this country, the United States of America, were men and women of deep religious faith. That was why they wrote into the Declaration of Independence the plain and specific recognition of the fact that man has certain unalienable rights which were given to him by the Creator.

The men and women of the Baltic States and of Europe also have cherished the same faith. It was this deep conviction that enabled them to stand unyielding before the faithless and cowardly minions of the Communist dictators and endure the most inhuman torture rather than sacrifice that share of divinity which they had received from the Creator.

The conflict between the spiritual ideology and the ideology of materialism which now threatens the world with a third global conflict is essentially a moral struggle for the independence of the souls of men. It is not at all a struggle for wealth and power. It is a struggle to preserve the basic concepts of tolerance among men, mutual recognition of the dignity of the human individual faith, hope, and charity, the virtues recognized by all Christians and the Fatherhood of God.

This, if I understand the motives and purposes of the exiles of freedom, is the faith you hold. It is the faith for which you have sacrificed and your relatives and friends have suffered and died. It is the faith which binds you together in this organization, an organization which makes a link between the people of America and the people who live behind the Iron Curtain and along its fringes as well. It provides a means by which as individuals we can all carry the message of Christendom to all other individuals with whom we come in contact. No people want war, but wars come. Perhaps it is because leadership has been inadequate to the task of creating the organization that is capable of preserving peace, or individuals, faltering in their faith, have been willing for selfish and temporary gain to make a little genuflection to the Golden Calf.

You and your associates possess the moral fiber which every individual of every nation desiring to be free should possess. Moral fiber can be disseminated throughout the world by the example every believer in the spiritual motivation of mankind can give to those with whom he comes in contact.

The individual who, in this crisis of civilization, falls below the standards of faith in the spiritual concepts of Christendom weakens by that failure the moral fiber of every nation which really loves and wants freedom. Every such individual impairs the capacity of his nation to participate in the struggle of the free world against the evil forces of totalitarian dictatorship that have been released against it, but he who adheres to the spiritual concept of Christian civilization adds to the strength of freemen everywhere.

The character and morality which are cherished in our daily lives, in home life, in business and professional life, the faith we cherish in the bond between man and God, these and these only are the means by which the spirit shall eventually triumph over force.

Organized as you have organized them, men and women living by the faith that is in them can build a barrier of spirit that Communist force can never overcome.

Remarks of Senator Goldwater at Commissioning of U. S. S. "Hassayampa"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] honored the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by his presence at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Hassayampa*, which is named for a river in the State of Arizona. He delivered a very interesting and able address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U. S. S. "HASSAYAMPA," PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 19, 1955

As we gather here this afternoon in sight of one of the landmarks of American history to commission this new ship, you might well wonder about the name that has been chosen. Surely to most of you here as to most people east of the Rockies the name Hassayampa brings nothing quickly to mind except that it is unusual and somewhat hard to spell. There is even serious question in my mind if many of you have ever heard it used before in conversation or have seen it printed in a story or on a map. Consequently, I approach my pleasant assignment this afternoon with mixed feelings—one, that my remarks might be educational to most of you, but, even more dominant, the feeling of humility, in that this name, Hassayampa, is one that every Arizonian knows and of whose history is deeply and rightfully proud.

Hassayampa is the name carried by one of Arizona's few but famous rivers. We are a dry State when measured by the standards of rainfall and moisture; ours is not a State of vast water resources, ours is primarily a desert area. Even our forests, and they are vast and among the largest in the world, are classed as desert forests because there are not many bubbling streams marking their soft carpets nor does one find moss and fern, usually associated with such growths of trees. Natural lakes are few but those we have sparkle with the exuberance of diamonds among the dark green of the pines. It is easy, then, for one to imagine the enthusiasm we Arizonians have for our lakes and for our rivers and, recognizing that, you can imagine how proud we out there were made when it was announced that this fine new ship was to carry the name of *Hassayampa.*

I said that this was a river. Yes, but not just another river. It is a special one, for within its banks flows the water that we need so greatly for our lands, and along its banks has occurred much of the history of this great State.

It is a lonesone river. Its birthplace is in a small canyon high up on the northern slopes of Mount Union, a peak rising over 7,000 feet into Arizona's glorious blue sky. It is fed by springs and by the melting snows of winter and by the sometimes gentle and sometimes violent rains of the summer months. Up high in those mountains, as it flows over rocks and soft sands, it tells a murmuring tale that has lulled me to sleep many a night as I have camped by its side. It tells of the men who first came to its headwaters to mine gold. It tells of the now ghost town of Senator where men gathered as they sought the yellow richness which the Hassayampa carried from ancient rocks. It breathes the wonderful story of nearby Prescott which was the first capital of our State, where our laws were written, where our early government was hewn out of argument and debate by solid American men who saw in this new country a place where their families could be reared in the American tradition. It whispers the stories of men made rich and men made poor and men who were strong and ruthless and men who were strong and peaceful. It is a wonderful story to hear and many and many a time my memory carries me back to the days of youth and to the upper Hassayampa and its bed lined with the pines whose tips touch the sky and go into the heavens to seek God.

But this is not all of this river; it is a lonesome river I have said, but it is also an ambitious one, for it would not die in those peaks, but sought the arid lands below where its waters could do more for men than just provide the carrier for gold. So it left those peaks for the greenness of the lower mountain valleys where the cattle would come to drink of its waters, down past the settlement of Waggoner it went, and then, leaving the cool and vast valleys it ventured out onto the desert floor of southern Arizona where it soon wore its own roadway of sand and rock. Here developed a battle with the sun as to whether or not this stream would carry its load above the earth or whether it would have to go to the coolness and the sureness of traveling beneath its sandy bed. The sun often wins out and for many miles of its travels across the desert one cannot see water but one knows, as generations of desert dwellers have known, that a scooping out of the sand will bring into that bowl cool and abundant water for drinking. In fact, one of the meanings of this famed word has been ascribed to the Indian meaning "water that is hidden." As one crosses this stream at Wickenburg on Highway 60, if one is a stranger, one might wonder why a bridge here at all for here the water is hidden. It is hiding from the ever-present suction of the sun who seeks its cool waters for its own empty daylight skies, but this stream, which is empty, can fill quickly. As the great thunderheads of summer fill their black bellies with the moisture stolen from a thousand lakes and vast oceans and meager streams, and finally disgorge themselves over the homeland of the Hassayampa and its smaller tributaries, this usually docile stream fills to the banks with raging and often damaging water, roaring and tearing its way down its mountainous course, carrying tree and rock before it, out onto the vast desert and past Wickenburg to lose itself finally in the dryness of its lower bed as the sky gives no more.

Wickenburg. This is the one settlement of any size on the banks of this lonely stream, but it is one of the West's most fabulous places. Its history goes back to the beginning of the West and to the swaddling days of our Territory. Just a few months after Arizona became a Territory of the United States, Henry Wickenburg, in 1863, discovered a vast cache of gold that the earth was tenaciously holding in her grasp. The resulting mine became known as the Vulture, and from it man took millions of dollars worth of gold. The mine needed a mill, and the waters of the Hassayampa provided the water to run it. It also furnished the growing town of Wickenburg, named after the obscure miner, with water for its population. The town grew fast, and by 1866 was large enough to have been considered as a site for the Territorial capital. Nearby, other mines were established, the Congress, the Constellation, and the Mack Morris, and all of them added to the new stature of the town of Wickenburg. It was a robust town, peopled by men and women of the hearty nature of our early pioneers. They were happy in this new town, and as the gold started to be exhausted, they did not wish to leave the banks of their friendly river, but sought, instead, new ways to perpetuate their community's prosperity and growth. The railroad came, and with it Wickenburg became a cattle-shipping point. The ranches grew, and so did the town, but then came modern man and his way of life, and the oldness of our western towns began to disappear before the chrome and gilt of newness, but not this place where the West had so long been a part of the daily lives of its people. Here the West stayed, and today it is the guest-ranch capital of the world, a city seen daily by thousands, a city where one finds all the newness of this age, but sees and senses always the true and real spirit of the West. Here, the high-heeled boot is not just part of a uniform, but it joins the large hat and the open shirt in their adornment of people whose "hello" is meaningful and whose "good day" comes from the heart long before it gets out of the mouth. Here it is warm in the winter and warm in the summer, but over all this warmth of nature is felt the warmth of people who, above all else, want to remain just people. Theirs is no desire for tall smokestacks, or the rat-tat-tat of the rivet gun, or the hustle that goes with the change they would rather not have. They know that as long as man lives he will have a desire for peace and quiet and the calm reassurance of real friends. They know that this place on the banks of the river whose name this ship proudly carries can be that Shangri-la, can be a port where men can always come who come in the spirit of the West, seeking happy relations with neighbors who want the same. Wickenburg is the old with just enough of the new thrown in to make life comfortable according to our modern standards. It is the new, with an abundance of the old thrown in so that we can remember the faith and the hope and the spirit which made our West great. And the lonesome Hassayampa flows past it, sometimes under the sand and sometimes over the sand, as it goes on to its eventual union with the Gila River many miles below where the desert has given way to man's conquering march of reclamation.

That is the river whose name you will carry, but the tale cannot end there for the name itself has special significance in the minds of Arizonians. Many tales have come down through the years about the potent characteristics of the waters of the Hassayampa. We aren't quite agreed as to which fable is correct and history has not given us much help, either, in her constant tests. One version of it has it that he who drinks above the trail is ever truthful, while he who drinks below is lost to truth. In fact, some of my fellow Arizonians say that to call a man a Hassayamp is to call him a liar, but as I said, history has not been faithful to that and I have seen many truthful men whose life's liquid came from that stream and I have seen many of the other category who never quaffed its waters. Then there is the little poem of Orick Jackson's that denies a man the right to drink downstream or upstream as his choice for future veracity.

"You've heard about the wondrous stream
they call the Hassayamp.
They say it turns a truthful guy into a
lying scamp.

"And if you quaff its waters once, it's sure
to prove your bane,
You'll never forsake the blasted stream, or
tell the truth again."

This afternoon, as we face this most pleasant task, I have related to you a bit of the history and charm of this river, Hassayampa. I told you that the Indians called it hidden water, but they also construe its ageless name to mean beautiful water and that is the name I want to recall as we dedicate this ship to the useful purposes it will pursue. This bottle of water has been sent here by the people of Wickenburg. I hope it retains a prominent and perpetual spot in the wardroom so that those who sail this ship might be ever mindful of the pride we Arizonians have in that name, and be mindful too of the new pride which we will carry in our hearts as this ship cleaves the oceans of the world. Thus, the waters of the Hassayampa will go around the globe, seeking everywhere an answer to the question that has always been asked about the veracity of those who partook, for you see that answer has never come forth, since only honest men and women, dedicated to the perpetuation of our American way of life have lived along its course. What happened to those who partook and wandered on we do not know, but we do know that through truthfulness, honesty, and devotion to our fine cause our State has grown to great stature and her people to great respect. It is my wish, and I but reflect the wishes of the people of Arizona, that the course of this ship be ever honest, ever true, and that the close association with this great name will bring true at least a line of that poem I read. "You'll never forsake the blasted stream," and I assure you that neither it, nor the State I represent, will ever forsake you.

Proposed Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week former President Harry S. Truman made a statement before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations studying possible

revision of the United Nations Charter. It was a clear, forceful, and very thought-provoking statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Truman on the U. N."

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

Senator GEORGE, members of the committee, Senators, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to testify before you today. I am grateful to Senator GEORGE for his invitation.

I understand that the subject you have under consideration is the amending of the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Nations is now almost 10 years old. This has been a rough and stormy decade for an organization dedicated to the cause of world peace. Since the Charter was signed in San Francisco, an international situation has developed which in many ways is far more serious, far more dangerous, than the international rivalries which produced World War I and World War II. The present international situation is worse than the one which wrecked the League of Nations and rendered it ineffective. Nevertheless, one of the most significant things about the world situation today is that the United Nations still exists. It is still a functioning body with a powerful influence. In spite of dissatisfactions and dissensions, none of the great powers has withdrawn. Whatever its weakness and difficulties, the United Nations is a power to be reckoned with, and no aggressor can afford to ignore it.

This, in and of itself, is a great achievement. The mere existence of the United Nations after a period of such terrible international tension, is an important and hopeful fact. It demonstrates the tremendous underlying desire of all peoples for international peace.

I will go even further than this. I believe that if we had not had the United Nations, the events of these last 10 years would again have plunged the world into unlimited international warfare. The fact that we have not had such a war is attributable in considerable measure to the existence of the United Nations.

In my judgment, the United Nations is an indispensable force for peace in the world today.

It is true, of course, that the present status of the United Nations does not correspond to the high hopes which were held for it when it was first created. Nevertheless, those of us who helped to set up the United Nations knew that it would have a long and difficult task. We did not go overboard on the assumption that once the charter was signed, world peace was assured forever.

I remember very well the circumstances under which the United Nations was created. The first question that was asked me after I took the oath of office as President at 7:09 p. m. on April 12, 1945, was whether I wanted the San Francisco Conference to open as planned on April 25. I answered at once that nothing should interfere with that conference. It was my firm conviction on that night just 10 years ago that the establishment of the United Nations was absolutely essential to the maintenance of world peace, and I knew that the great majority of the American people felt the same way. I recall my surprise that there should be doubt in anyone's mind about holding the San Francisco meeting to draft the United Nations Charter on schedule.

I soon found out that the eagerness we felt in the United States for the success of the San Francisco Conference was not felt universally. Representatives of the Soviet Union had participated in the preliminary meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, and Stalin had pledged the support of his country to the United Nations at Yalta.

But the victory in Europe now seemed certain, and the Soviet leaders seemed to feel that they could turn their backs on their promises. They implied that the United Nations was not so important after all, and that Foreign Minister Molotov would not attend the San Francisco meeting. This looked to me like a double-barreled challenge: First, would we accept without protest the breaking of an understanding that the Foreign Ministers of the principal powers would attend, and more important, could we permit the Soviets to torpedo the Conference by openly showing a lack of interest?

Just because the end of the war in Europe was in sight I had no intention of ignoring agreements that had been made during the heat of combat. The United Nations idea was too important for the future of mankind to be treated in an on-and-off fashion. I informed Premier Stalin that it was imperative for Foreign Minister Molotov to attend. The Soviet leaders reconsidered, and a few days later I had a rather frank meeting with Mr. Molotov in my office on his way to join the San Francisco Conference.

I explained to him at that time the unshakeable desire of our people for an organization that could effectively solve political problems before they broke into conflict, and that could assist governments to improve the well-being of peoples throughout the world. I expressed these same thoughts in equally vigorous terms to Premier Stalin at Potsdam a few weeks later. Stalin was, I believe, extremely impressed with the overwhelming vote of 89 to 2 by which the United States Senate approved the charter on July 28. He, and many others, apparently had felt that the United States would lose interest in the rest of the world as soon as the fighting was over and would repeat the mistakes made after the First World War.

Speaking as a private citizen, I am very proud that the support for the United Nations, declared so vigorously by the Senate that day in 1945, has been stanchly maintained by both Houses of the Congress ever since then.

We knew at the time the United Nations was created that we were having difficulties with the Soviet leaders and that our difficulties might increase. We were determined, nevertheless, to go ahead with the creation of the United Nations and to get the Soviet Union into it, committed to the principles of international peace which are expressed in the charter. Without such a commitment on their part we believed that the United Nations would not be successful. Looking back now, I think this was the correct course. We were striving to prevent the East-West split which has now become known as the "cold war." We were striving to set up an organization which would bridge the split. Of course, no charter, no constitution can wipe out a power conflict. We must not blame the United Nations for all the bad things that have happened outside the United Nations and in violation of its principles. Soviet membership in the United Nations has been an advantage to the cause of peace, because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviet's conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to see that the Soviets have violated the basic ideals of mankind.

When the charter was created at San Francisco, we did not believe that it was perfect. We were surprised that a charter could be agreed upon at all by so many different nations and peoples. In my address to the closing session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco I said:

"That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder."

I also said:

"This charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into any fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments, but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war."

And at that time we clearly left the door open for improvement.

I am sure the charter is susceptible of improvement. That is true of all documents written by human hands. But we ought not to underestimate the difficulties and dangers involved in trying to get improvements at this time. And we ought to be extremely careful not to lose what we already have in the United Nations, because what we have now is very essential to world peace.

We should consider that the circumstances were more favorable to getting agreement out of 50 different nations in 1945 than they are now. Difficult as it was then, and imperfect as the result may have been, it was far easier to set up the United Nations in 1945 than it would be to set it up today.

This was the world situation in June 1945: We were still fighting a world war. We had finished the war in Europe, but a long, bloody struggle appeared to be ahead in the Pacific and in Asia. We did not know how long it would take or how many casualties it would cost. We were just finishing the battle for Okinawa. The great army which the Japanese had on the Continent of Asia was still untouched. The Japanese Air Force, Navy, and land forces were being concentrated for the defense of the Japanese islands. Weakened though they were by our successes in the Pacific, they were still capable of a fanatical defense of their homeland. Secretary Stimson informed me that it could cost 1 million American casualties to take Japan.

All around the world nations were prostrate and exhausted from 4 years of conflict. In this atmosphere of suffering, uncertainty, and continued fighting, the people yearned for peace. Statesmen were under pressure from their peoples to make concessions that would bring peace to the world. Peace and an end to suffering were the universal cry, even on the part of the Russians, whose losses had been among the worst suffered by any nation.

These were the circumstances in which the charter was drawn up and signed. I do not have to point out that it would be much harder to get similar agreements from national leaders in 1955 than it was in 1945. And I respectfully suggest that this is something you should always have in mind when you consider amending the charter today.

We signed the charter at San Francisco with a clear realization that the charter itself was not enough to guarantee world peace. As I said in addressing the closing session of the United Nations Conference, we had created a great instrument for peace and security, but we must now use it.

During the intervening years, we have used the charter, and we have found in it not only defects and inadequacies, but unsuspected resources. We have discovered some virtues which we did not know it possessed.

In spite of the obstruction of the Soviet Union and its satellites, we have had the united will and the firm determination of a great number of nations to make the charter work. And their will for peace has been so strong that they have used the charter in ways not foreseen at San Francisco. For example, let us take the history of the Security Council. On this organ of the United Na-

tions most of the job of keeping the peace was intended to rest. However, the frequent use of the Soviet veto rendered the Security Council virtually powerless to meet any serious international difficulty. Consequently, in 1950, a good deal of the burden of keeping the peace was shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly. This was done without an amendment of the charter but by the so-called "Uniting for Peace" resolution. Under that resolution, the General Assembly undertook to make recommendations for maintaining the peace where the Security Council was paralyzed by the veto.

This was an important change.

The fact that the General Assembly under the charter cannot require action by the member states but can only recommend action, is not so important as it seems. In any critical situation where a nation may be called on to use its armed forces or to apply sanctions, there must be assent. Few nations are going to go into that sort of a situation unless they feel they ought to do it. And a recommendation of the 60 nations, constituting the General Assembly, may be more effective as an expression of world conscience than the command of 11 nations on the Security Council.

I am not saying that the charter would not work better if it were possible for the Security Council to perform the functions that were envisioned for it, but I am saying that the veto power has not made the United Nations powerless to keep the peace.

I do not wish, at this time, to get into the technical problems of amending the charter. I believe that we should think about them. I believe that we should study them. If the majority of the nations desire a review conference, I do not think we should oppose it. I only believe that we should approach it with caution and with full realization that it may be impossible to get any worthwhile changes under present circumstances. If we go into such a conference with inflexible demands for particular changes, we can be sure that we will encounter strong Communist opposition, and there may be strong differences of opinion among the free nations, and the net result of such a clash may be concentration by the peoples of the world on the defects rather than on the virtues of the charter and a weakening of the United Nations just when strength is most needed. This could do very great damage so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations is concerned.

I do, however, think we should practice vigorously the idea expressed at the signing of the charter in 1945—the idea that we must use the United Nations to make it work. Wherever we can, we should use it. And we should use it now by bringing before the General Assembly the current threats to world peace.

Aside from questions of aggression and armed conflict, there is another wide area in which we should use the United Nations to the utmost—that is the area of social and economic betterment and progress.

An outstanding feature of the charter is the emphasis it puts upon international cooperation to promote higher living standards, full employment, and economic and social progress. One of the most important parts of the United Nations is the Economic and Social Council. This council has the responsibility for promoting international cooperation in the economic and social field, and for coordinating the work of the other international agencies specializing in particular fields of work, such as health, agriculture, and communications.

One of the reasons for the world crisis we are living through is the tremendous upheaval—in social and economic terms—among the peoples of the poorer or less developed parts of the world. Most of these peoples have lived for centuries very close to the margin of existence, with little hope for progress or improvement this side of the grave. In the last hundred years two tremendous things have happened to them. Contact with the highly developed nations has shown them that other peoples can overcome poverty and misery—that progress and improvement are human possibilities. The growth of population, however, has tended to make them even worse off than they have been. Added to these factors, the spread of Western political ideas has given them an irresistible desire to be free and self-governing. The upheaval resulting from these changes has remade the face of Asia in our lifetime, and it is now changing the face of Africa.

We want to see these peoples advance and prosper. For many decades now, through our humanitarian institutions, we have extended a helping hand to the peoples of the less developed countries.

Today, we should realize that no force on earth can restore the old pattern in Asia and Africa. We cannot put the rising flood of human aspirations back into the ancient channels.

We can, however, help it to achieve its goals. And that will be to the advantage of the United States as well as to mankind as a whole.

This was what I had in mind when I proposed a program of assisting underdeveloped areas as the fourth point in my inaugural address in 1949. And this same concept of assistance on the path of progress underlies the economic and social activities of the United Nations.

In the years since 1945, nothing has happened to make economic development and technical assistance less important. Indeed, I think they are more important to world peace now than they were then. We should be doing more in the economic and social area than we are doing. We should stand, in the minds of other peoples, for the concept of orderly and rapid social and economic progress.

In this field, we have the answer to communism. In know-how, in the raising of living standards, in economic development, we can beat the Communists from the start. There is no atomic stalemate, no military standoff in this part of the struggle against communism. We ought to sustain a really significant program of aid in the economic development of Asia and Africa and Latin America. While we must, of course, continue our military programs for our defense and the defense of the free world, a vigorous program of economic development may, in the long run, prove to be more decisive.

In this effort the United Nations, with its economic and social organs and the specialized agencies, can be a great help. Providing technical and economic aid through international agencies offers difficulties in administration and often presents irritating problems. But an international agency sometimes can do things that direct United States aid cannot. The Soviets, in their propaganda, are trying to discredit our aid programs as an imperialist plot. But that kind of propaganda cannot be raised against the United Nations. Very often the governments of the underdeveloped areas are highly sensitive, and will accept U. N. help when they would reject United States aid. The question of who gets the credit is much less important than the need of the underdeveloped nations to get ahead, and to relieve the terrible social pressures that are pushing them toward revolution or communism.

We should, therefore, encourage the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in their economic and social activities, and support them fully. Wherever they can reach the poor and the suffering better than the United States Government can, we should encourage them to do so. I hope we will not cut the United Nations technical assistance program this year.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I urge you to continue to give your strong support to the United Nations. It is helping to build up international understanding and friendship among people by the nations working together on economic and social problems. It serves as a conscience for mankind. More than once it has kept the peace where a serious outbreak threatened—as it did in Iran and in Indonesia. And in the fateful summer of 1950, when the aggressor broke the peace of the world in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge. For the first time in history, an international organization organized effective collective resistance to armed aggression. This is the great lesson of Korea.

I'm sure the United Nations can be improved upon. If we continue to give it our firm support, I'm sure it will be improved upon. But let us be everlastingly careful not to throw away the good and great instrument we already have in a search for something better.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

TRUMAN ON THE U. N.

Former President Truman talked with restraint and good sense about the role of the United Nations in the present world situation and about the problem of revising the U. N. Charter. He took note of the many weaknesses and imperfections in the charter and expressed the wish that the United Nations could be a much stronger instrument than it is for putting down aggression and maintaining peace. But this did not blur his appreciation of what the U. N., with its limited powers, has been able to accomplish.

The complaint most often heard against the United Nations is that it has been rendered powerless by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. Consequently, there is much demand for abolition of the big-power veto. Mr. Truman was realistic in saying that the U. N. would never have come into being without the veto. Neither Russia nor the United States would have accepted a charter without the reserve power the veto provision gives. It follows that talk of abolishing the veto is so much wasted breath. Mr. Truman pointed out that it would be more difficult to secure agreement on the charter today than it was in 1945. We do not think there is a chance that the Senate would agree to an amendment that would permit the Security Council to order military action against an aggressor without specific acquiescence of this Government.

However, the veto ought to be eliminated in regard to the admission of new members, and that should not be impossible of attainment. Also, numerous improvements in the U. N. can be made by strengthening the capacity of the General Assembly to act against threats of aggression when the Security Council is moribund, as at present. The fact that the Assembly has to act through recommendations and consent of a majority of its members is not an insurmountable handicap, as the experience in Korea proved. If there is a will among the law-abiding nations to act against aggression, they can do so through the Assembly under the uniting for peace resolution. This line of development within the U. N. ought to have every encouragement.

While moving toward improvements of this sort, Mr. Truman cautions us "not to throw away the good and great instrument we have in search for something better." This is sound advice. And the best means of upholding and strengthening the United Nations is to make it a positive force for peace and to invoke its powers as effectively as possible whenever there is a threat of coercion by armed force.

The Postmaster General's Disregard for the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, because the Members of this honorable body are today considering H. R. 4644, a measure which gives the Postmaster General unusually broad authority to reclassify Post Office Department employees, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the House certain circumstances that cause me a considerable amount of misgiving in supporting such legislation. Despite the recent vehement protests by the Postmaster General before congressional committees that political considerations do not enter into his administration of personnel matters and his assertion that there is less politics in the postal service today than at any other time in history, I find it most difficult to reconcile his statements with the facts I am presenting to you. They convince me the Postmaster General has utterly disregarded the law.

If ever political consideration and connivance have entered into the appointment of a postmaster—or rather the failure to appoint one—the record with regard to Portales, N. Mex., stands out as a shameful example.

The postmaster at Portales retired on April 30, 1953. An acting postmaster was named and an open competitive examination was called, with the closing date set for August 11. On December 18, 1953, a register of three eligibles, all with 10 percent disabled veterans' preference, was sent by the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department. After a delay of 6 months, during which the Postmaster General made no appointment, the examination was reopened on June 16, 1954, at the request, according to civil-service records, of six applicants who claimed to be disabled veterans. Three of them took the reopened test. Three others failed to prove eligibility as disabled veterans. Two of the three who took the test were held ineligible for lack of required experience. The other, who had not taken the first examination, flunked the reopened test.

On October 5, 1954, the identical register of eligibles that had been sent to the Post Office Department on December 18, 1953, was sent again by the Civil Service Commission. Again no appointment was made by the Postmaster General, although all of the eligibles were disabled veterans, with passing marks of 87.5 up to 97.25 percent, and, further, notwithstanding the requirement of law that there be no delay in postmaster appointment.

On January 24, 1955, nearly 4 months after the second register was in the Postmaster General's hands and more than 13 months after he had received the identical first register, no appointive action had been taken by him. Strangely enough, neither the officials in the Post Office Department nor in Civil Service would tell why the second long delay, although frequent reguests were made by my office for an explanation. The answer came, however, in the form of a telegram from the man who had flunked the first reopened test, requesting a second reopening, so the register of eligibles was sent back to Civil Service on January 26, 1955.

The man who flunked the first reopened test again failed to make the required grade in the second reopened examination with the result that the original list of eligibles, carrying the names of the same three disabled veterans, has been returned again to the Post Office Department by the Civil Service Commission. Yet no action has been taken because, as was explained to me by the Post Office officials, "we are waiting for recommendation from the Republican National Committeeman in New Mexico." They have been waiting for 1½ years. The Portales post office has had no duly appointed postmaster for 2 years. The people of Portales have been denied the service that can be rendered only by an administrative authority which has permanency of tenure. Officials of veterans' organizations in New Mexico have protested strongly about this discrimination against three disabled veterans who are entitled to preference under our law.

Not only has the Postmaster General given his sanction to this gross violation of the Veterans' Preference Act but he has ignored the mandate of Congress as contained in the law concerning appointment of postmasters, which states that they shall be appointed without undue delay.

The Postmaster General cannot plead ignorance of this willful disregard for the law and the rights of these disabled veterans because I discussed the Portales situation with him 3 months ago. At that time he said he would conduct an inquiry into the matter and advise me. To date I have not heard further from him. I can only assume that by his silence he is seeking to cover up his willful maladministration. If it is to be his continued policy to play politics at the expense of disabled veterans and of proper administration of post offices under his direction why does he not come out openly and say so?

Not only should we safeguard the provisions of H. R. 4644 with regard to classification of employees by a proper amendment to require the Postmaster General to give the Congress detailed reports of the actions he takes, but I believe we should go further and authorize a thorough investigation by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of such apparent law violations as are indicated in the situation at Portales.

It is evident that the Postmaster General feels that he is above the law, that he has dictatorial authority over his Department. He has indicated that by his take it or leave it attitude in appearing before congressional committees with regard to this legislation, particularly in respect to the pay increase of postal employees. Therefore I feel that it behooves us to see to it that the Congress retains sufficient control over the administration of the Post Office Department to prevent further disregard for its mandate as expressed in the law. The rights which we have provided for veterans, particularly the disabled, should be fully safeguarded. It is manifestly our duty to see that they are.

Prof. Norman Neal: Fighting Badger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call attention to a situation that existed in our Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor for some time, which resulted in a waste of American taxpayers' money and unfair dealing with some of our friends abroad. At the same time, I would like to pay public tribute to an intrepid professor of agronomy at the University of Wisconsin who battled bureaucracy, refused to be strangled by Government redtape, and almost single-handedly brought about a correction of the unsatisfactory situation previously existing.

That man is Prof. Norman P. Neal, of Madison, Wis. It has been my pleasure to work with him and help him in a small way in this task. Others who have assisted have included Dean Rudolph K. Froker, of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture, as a member of the Commodity Credit Corporation advisory committee, and Raymond H. Lang, head of the nationally known seed company in Madison, Wis. But the rest of us have sort of run interference for Professor Neal; he carried the ball over the goal line.

For some years Wisconsin has pioneered in the development of hybrid seed corn and its varieties have won international recognition. Wisconsin experiment stations have cooperated with a number of our friendly European nations since 1947 in efforts to help them establish satisfactory corn stocks.

In the past few years, the University of Wisconsin exported to Italy parental foundation inbred and single cross seed valued in excess of $25,000 to facilitate production of hybrid seed of Wisconsin varieties in that country. Notable progress has been registered.

In addition to Italy, Wisconsin has furnished a very substantial volume of both breeding stocks and parental foundation seed stocks to The Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal and Greece.

In 1954, I received complaints that through American funds supplied by FOA, another European country was importing Wisconsin hybrid seed corn under very questionable circumstances. The corn was not raised in Wisconsin, was not certified as being Wisconsin hybird seed corn, and was being purchased for a little over $2 a bushel, whereas true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was selling for $9 to $12 per bushel.

Agriculture officials in our State notified me that in their opinion there was not sufficient true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn raised outside Wisconsin to supply a 64,000 bushel order. They pointed out that one bidder offered to supply 600 bushels of a certain Wisconsin variety whereas only 26 acres of that variety had been raised in all of Wisconsin.

"It was reported that one of the suppliers from outside Wisconsin who furnished seed for export actually sold a mixture of all of his reject seed from all varieties," Professor Neal wrote me. "I am firm in the conviction that if the United States Government is financing the purchase of hybrid seed corn for export, it should do so only on the basis for seed that complies in respect to varietal purity. If such seed is not worth planting in this country, it is not worth planting elsewhere. It not only is an injustice to the farmers of the importing country, but also is a shameful squandering of American taxpayers' money, as well as a travesty of the American sense of fair play and America's equity in world affairs."

From my investigations in Washington, I learned that seed corn FOA was sending to Europe in 1953 and 1954 was inspected only to determine if it would germinate, if it had been treated for disease, and was free of weeds. The only assurance FOA had that the European country was receiving its requested Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was the supplier's statement that it corresponded to Wisconsin types.

The amazing thing about all this to me was the attitude generally expressed by FOA officials: "What is the difference, as long as no one is kicking about it?" One Washington official sought to dismiss the matter with the statement that "the supplier is happy, the buyer is not complaining, and the only people making any complaint are you folks in Wisconsin."

Eventually, however, complaints began to be heard, reports from FOA inspections in Europe were not so favorable, and the European buyers began to demand that they get what they requested, even though the money was coming from Uncle Sam.

"Because of the significant role that Wisconsin hybrids have played in the past, and now play in European corn culture, we feel keenly the existence of practices that, in our judgment, prejudice not only the reputation of Wisconsin corn hybrids, but even more importantly, the prime objectives that are basic to the very existence and purposes of the Foreign Operations Administration," Professor Neal wrote me last year.

This year, there is a different story to tell. European nations in their specifications have been requiring official certification, tagging and sealing of the seeds. In consequence, a substantial portion of the seed order has been filled in Wisconsin, and the buyers may be certain that they are getting Wisconsin hybrid seed, and not feed corn corresponding to Wisconsin types. Wisconsin growers assure me they are sending only first class seeds to their farmer friends in Europe. There seems no question that better crops will follow, and our friends abroad will have a better opinion of Uncle Sam's agriculture as a result, thanks to Professor Norman Neal of the University of Wisconsin.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of February 17, 1955, this Nation lost a distinguished and intrepid soldier, statesman, and diplomat. I lost a dear and valued friend with whom I had the honor of serving in Congress from 1938 to 1949.

Pete Jarman left behind a record of accomplishment which time and age shall never dull, which shall always remain prominently in the memory of those who knew and loved him.

Pete served as a lieutenant in the First World War in France with distinction and honor. He fought courageously for the honor and ideals of his country, and until his death he sustained a deep and active interest in military affairs, ever mindful of the continuing need of a strong United States in the face of alien threats to its security. From 1924 to 1940, he served as division inspector of the 31st Infantry Division, and in 1927 was elected commander of the Alabama Department of the American Legion.

This great American came to Washington in 1937 as a Member of the 75th Congress. Immediately he distinguished himself as a statesman of peerless courage and sagacious foresight, as a faithful representative of the interests of his people in the Sixth Alabama Congressional District. As his colleague I had the privilege on numerous occasions of observing and admiring his tireless and conscientious endeavor in the interests of his district, State, and country.

In 1949 Pete was named United States Ambassador to Australia. As a friend and former colleague who was personally acquainted with his ability and convictions, I regarded this appointment as one of significant wisdom and foresight. And most assuredly my confidence and expectations were never blunted. I doubt that the United States has ever before enjoyed the position and prestige in Australia as that manifested during Pete's ambassadorship.

From various and sundry sources, the appraisal of Peter's attainments as Ambassador to Australia was the same—outstanding. In this connection, I was told by Dr. Bob Jones, founder of the Bob Jones University in Greenville, S. C., that on one of his evangelistic trips to Australia he was profoundly impressed everywhere he went in that country by the reception of Government officials and people in all walks of life to Pete's representation of the United States. Dr. Jones was very high in his praise of Pete's achievements in this foreign land.

Yet Pete left behind more than the memory of his warm friendship and dedicated service to his country. Pete left behind a person who was always at his side in spirit and faith and inspiration. The union of Pete and Miss Beryl Bricken, lovely daughter of the late Honorable Charles Bricken, presiding judge of the Alabama Court of Appeals, was as formidable as their equally shared ideals and aspirations. Pete and Beryl constituted a partnership that never deviated from their individually elected roles as public servants and ministers of the American way of life.

Soldier, statesman, and diplomat, Pete Jarman was laid to rest in the Arlington National Cemetery with military honors. As the last reverberations of the volleys fired at his graveside spent themselves in the far-reaches of that hallowed ground, I am sure that those in attendance felt that Pete had come to rest among friends. He is now with the other soldiers and great Americans who have given their very best for their country.

Japanese Rice Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, for standing firm against the dictates of our State Department in the matter of the Japanese rice negotiations. I am informed that at a meeting of the Council on Foreign and Economic Policy yesterday the views of Mr. Benson prevailed and under these negotiations some 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice will be released to the Government of Japan under the provisions of Public Law 480.

These objections in the past on the part of the Department of State have created grave apprehension in the ranks of agriculture. There have been rumors that the Department of State has concluded agreements with certain Asian nations pledging that we would not seek markets in southeast Asia and that we will subvert the intent of the Congress of the United States when we enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, known as Public Law 480.

The specific action of the State Department in opposing sales of rice under Public Law 480 in the southeast Asia markets gives credence to these rumors, The views of the Department of State in this instance would deprive our American rice industry of a market that contains one-half of the world's population and constitutes the greatest rice market of all time.

If the State Department can make such agreements and the Congress does not protest and take action to curb the Department's power, we may see other agreements made depriving us of the

opportunities and privileges of selling our goods in world markets.

Mr. Speaker, even with the release to the Japanese Government of this 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice, there will still be a total supply of 15 million hundredweight available for export. We cannot deny this rice to world markets—especially the great southeastern Asian market, where rice has been the staple for centuries. We cannot limit our trading activities at the will and demand of the Secretary of State. For such an action would destroy our American rice industry.

Such an action in one commodity can lead only to similar actions on other commodities—and we would soon see the destruction of our agricultural economy—and with it, the collapse of our Nation's strength.

If the Department of State succeeds in keeping our rice out of far-eastern markets, it may just as well put on a campaign against export of cotton, tobacco, and wheat in various parts of the globe.

A few days ago a great outcry was raised because the Secretary of State fired one man. This action on the part of the State Department has the effect of depriving untold thousands of families in the United States of their jobs—because just as surely as this policy of the State Department is permitted to prevail then we will see the end of the American rice industry as we see it today. We have already suffered drastic cutbacks in rice acreage across the Nation—and this action on the part of Mr. Dulles and his nonagricultural experts in the Department of State would make it necessary to further reduce rice acreages by a large percentage in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed appeasement throughout the time that I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. I do not believe in appeasement. Nor do I favor this policy of the Department of State, which is, in my humble opinion, nothing more than economic appeasement.

Reciprocal trade, a bulwark of our American foreign policy, cannot be a fact if our Department of State, in the secrecy of negotiations, gives away our export markets and exerts veto powers over actions of other branches of our Federal Government seeking to implement Public Law 480.

Back in September the President issued an Executive order stating it to be the policy of the United States to dispose of our surplus agricultural commodities on a competitive world market. Yet, for some reason, the Department of State, while recognizing this order, seeks to restrain agreements under Public Law 480 and speaks belittingly of "subsidized sales."

Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced in the House H. R. 5568 which would pin down the intent of the Congress in reference to Public Law 480 and would prevent the Secretary of State from exerting such veto powers. I favor this bill and I urge the Congress to take speedy action in adopting this bill to protect our agricultural families and to keep open the channels of world trade.

I wish to commend again the firmness of our Secretary of Agriculture. He has done a valiant work to save markets for our agricultural commodities. I trust that he will continue to stand firm, and I do hope that next week when the Dodge committee meets again that they will heed the intent of the Congress and refuse to permit the Secretary of State to give away our export markets and disrupt our domestic agriculture.

H. R. 5115

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] recently introduced H. R. 5115, to prohibit the disposal by contract or Executive order of work traditionally performed by civilian components of the Department of Defense unless it can be proven that the disposal is economically sound and that it will not endanger our national security.

This measure interested me, Mr. Speaker, because I have received protests in connection with the curtailment of certain types of activities performed by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in the legislative district I have the privilege of representing. I am sure other Members of Congress have had similar protests.

On receiving these protests I made appropriate inquiries and was advised it was the policy of the Department of Defense to foster free competitive enterprise and to avoid the use of Government-owned and operated commercial and industrial type facilities. I was further advised that pursuant to this policy, the Navy had issued directives providing for study of such activities in our naval shipyards.

The criteria to be used in eliminating any Government operation I was informed would be on the following basis:

The necessity for meeting the military demand at all times without delay, particularly where abnormal or fluctuating military demand makes private sources or operation impractical to the extent that the current or mobilization need cannot be met.

The absence of private facilities of sufficient capacity located within a reasonable distance from the point of demand.

The need for maintaining facilities for the training of personnel (for operation in a zone of action or advance base or overseas operations where commercial facilities will not be available) where an organized training program for the type of skills involved, specifically requires the use of the facility in question.

The danger of compromising information which would aid potential or known enemies, or which would otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States, where adequate provision can be made only through Government operation.

Any other criterion demonstrating a particular Government operation to be in the public interest.

In compliance with these directives, and based upon the criteria set forth therein, the laundry services at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been discontinued, box and crate manufacture has been curtailed, and the office machine repair shop will be closed, effective June 15, 1955. In addition, studies are presently being undertaken to determine the desirability of continuing the acetylene, oxygen and nitrogen plants, the automotive repair shop, the tree and garden nurseries, and the photographic equipment and chronometer repair facilities.

The Navy assured me that implementation of the above-mentioned policy is being carried out with due regard to the importance of maintaining our naval shipyards in a condition of readiness to accomplish their appointed tasks both now and in the event of a future national emergency.

The Navy further assured me that when services or the manufacturing of items required at Puget Sound are curtailed in the shipyard, these items and services will be contracted for with local private firms when practicable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out one glaring omission in the criteria which I just recited as having been given me by the Navy, which is covered by H. R. 5115; namely, the transfer of work to a private contractor would have to be economically sound. Efficiency and economy require the integration of many operations. Some of these may be such that individually they could be performed by private contractors outside of Government property, but it seems to me, if you are going to follow the Navy's criteria, the net result could greatly increase cost and reduce efficiency. Take automobile repair as a case in point. In a Government garage work can be performed when cars are not in use. This cuts down on the total number of automobiles required; also, by upkeep and preventive attention, the overall repair cost is greatly reduced.

I do not want to appear in the position of opposing competitive free enterprise. After all, I have supported elimination of costly barge lines and other Government operations directly competitive with private enterprise and costing the taxpayers vast sums of money. But I think Congress should watch our purse strings and be sure the Department of Defense is not going off on an ideological spree. I hope the Armed Services Committee will take a careful look at this whole matter.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of another Pan-American Day I again want to assure our friends south of us in this hemisphere that we are

bound by ties more solid, more sincere, and more understanding than ever before. We form a great bloc of free nations under God, and with God's help we will go forward together for better lives and all those things that mean peace and prosperity under a Christian system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my personal tribute to Rev. Joseph F. Thorning for his unceasing work to further cement our relations with our southern neighbors. He is always in the forefront of every movement that tends toward closer cooperation, and how fortunate we are to have such a man giving of his time and talents to this most worthy cause.

The Anniversary of Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year in 1942 a battle was raging in the Philippines. In both American and Philippine history the defense of Bataan will long be remembered, not only as a chapter in the story of man's struggle against tyranny but as a crowning testimonial to the historic friendship between Americans and Filipinos. Today the government and citizens of the Philippines are meeting the challenges which confront their independent republic with that same courage demonstrated on the battlefield at Bataan.

We in the United States are prone to look upon the Philippines somewhat as a father looks upon a son who has grown into manhood. While recognizing the maturity and independence of the Philippines, we retain those bonds of amity which have their foundation in a tradition of close association of our peoples. We take pride in the fearless energy with which President Ramon Magsaysay and his government act in the welfare of the new republic.

In our relations since Philippine independence was proclaimed in 1946 there has been evident a spirit of cooperation both in achieving the domestic aims of the Philippine Government and in jointly supporting the aims of the free world in Asia.

In the forefront of the problems with which the new Republic has been confronted have been those relating to the Philippine economy. There has been the need for rehabilitation and reconstruction in the wake of the damage inflicted by the war. There have been a myriad of economic and financial problems which are closely related to independence itself and to the withdrawal of the United States. There have been problems related to the general economic development of the Philippines including the expansion of light industry. Perhaps at the very heart of these complexities has been the haunting question of the ultimate effect of independence upon Philippine trade, a trade based upon the export of Philippine sugar, hemp, hardwood, and other products to the United States on a preferential tariff basis.

The United States did not leave the Philippines to cope alone with these economic problems. Since independence it has offered its economic assistance. Among other measures taken, it has been considered in the best interest of the two countries that a tariff not be imposed on imports from the Philippines. We have recognized that both countries benefit directly from this trade and, in the larger view, that the building of a strong Philippines is in the interest of the United States and the free world.

In addition to its economic development, the Philippine Republic since independence has made great gains in the development of its political institutions and in further enhancing the public welfare. A Communist-inspired rebellion has been dissipated by the combined use of force and such constructive measures as homestead grants and land reforms. The firm alinement of the Philippines with the countries of the free world is reflected in the initiative taken in the development of the Manila Pact for the collective defense of Southeast Asia and in the Pacific Charter.

The people of the Philippine Islands are building a democracy in the Pacific. They are facing their present difficulties with vigor and courage—the same qualities they manifested in such a conspicuous manner 13 years ago in the defense of Bataan.

Price Support and the Wisconsin Dairyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each week there arrives in my office, as in the offices of other legislators, a great variety of daily and weekly newspapers from my State.

One such newspaper is the Sharon Reporter, published weekly in Walworth County, Wis.

On the front page of its most recent issue, it carried the grim story of an aroused meeting of grassroots dairy farmers who had, in my judgment, very rightly assembled to protest the inadequate return which our farmers are getting for milk. Some 400 to 500 farmers crowded the local grange hall to talk over their problems and to try to get some action upon them.

The farmers pointed out that in the last 3 years their milk returns have dropped $1.50 per hundredweight, and that right now Wisconsin dairymen are receiving only approximately $3.25 per hundredweight, which is less than 7 cents a quart. That is certainly a meager return for the farmer's labor—7 days a week, 52 weeks a year—and for his heavy investment in cattle, machinery, and buildings.

These facts point up problems which I, for one, have raised on the Senate floor time and time again, and which I have reviewed in detail with the Department of Agriculture and other Federal authorities.

I congratulate the farmers of the Sharon area for taking steps to secure justice for the great dairy segment of our economy, and I pledge my own continued efforts toward that objective.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial which was carried in the April 14 issue of the Sharon Reporter which described this grassroots meeting. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER IS UNHAPPY ABOUT HIS PRICE FOR MILK

The price being paid the farmer in the Chicago milkshed for his milk is the most important matter in his mind at this time. One must admit as much, after witnessing the assembly at Grange Hall last Tuesday night.

To bring 420 farmers out to an 8 p. m. meeting, after they had worked in the fields all the day, is a Herculean feat. But the "protesting farmers" announcement of a meeting to discuss the matter on a real grassroots level did just that.

It took county sheriff's deputies to handle the traffic; there were cars parked almost a mile on either side of the hall. One farmer told us, "I parked my car a mile away, walked to the hall, then couldn't get in." The writer had trouble edging his way through the packed hall to a position where he could get within camera range.

"Keep farm organizations out of this," Mike Dorocke, who did much of the speaking said. "We aren't here for the purpose of battling them. We want, instead, to do what we can as producers to get a more equitable share of what the consumer pays for fresh milk in the Chicago market area."

There was ample opportunity for all to be heard. At times it was hard to hear, and a tap of the gavel from the chairman was necessary to maintain order. But this was the real "grassroots"—these were not polished organizers who had called this meeting to order.

W. T. Carlson of Walworth presented a letter from Colorado's Department of Agriculture to prove that dairymen in the Loveland-Greeley-Longmont area get only $1.42 for grade-A milk—and their farms are worth $200 to $400 per acre. "Things could even get that bad," he said.

There was a definite majority of those present who believe the lawmakers in Washington can help to improve the local milk price situation. Of course some spoke openly in opposition of "going to Washington for help," but the assembly returned to the majority desire to do just that.

So they distributed mimeographed letters. These are to be signed by producers and members of their family and mailed to their Senators and Congressmen. "We want no handouts, but demand a decent livelihood," they say in part. "We will fight through the ballot box for our rights and justice."

If nothing more were to come of the meeting, the very fact that 420 turned out should stir all those concerned with dairying to the point of doing whatever is humanly possible to get the milk producer his fair share of the retail price.

But more may come soon from this meeting. There was a committee of producers formed—farmers from Sharon, Elkhorn, Clinton, Delavan, Harvard, Capron, and Alden. This committee will determine to keep the ball rolling—to carry the fight for a fairer share of the consumer's milk dollar along, until they feel the results of their fight in the milk checks.

Pan-American Day and Hemispheric Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1890, was a historic day, for it marks the inauguration of what we know today as the Pan American Union. On Pan-American Day, as indeed on every other day in the year, the American Republics can be proud of the conception of pan-Americanism. Under it we demonstrate to the world that different cultural traditions can join in common cooperation, that 21 sovereign nations can respect each other's rights.

If pan-Americanism has been a success, this has been due in no small measure to the work over the years of the Pan American Union.

The pan-American idea derived its inspiration from the vision of Simon Bolivar, the Liberator, and from our own statesman, Henry Clay. Active American participation dates from 1890, when the first International Conference of American States was held here at Washington, under the able leadership of Secretary of State Blaine. As a result of that conference an International Union of American Republics was created, represented by a Commercial Bureau located in Washington. The name, Commercial Bureau, reflects the purposes of this early organization. It was not a political union; rather its purpose was the promotion of friendship and good relations among the republics of the American Continent, through the fostering of trade. In 1902 the Commercial Bureau was renamed the International Bureau of American Republics, and the scope of its activities was broadened. Finally, in 1910 the name of the Bureau was changed to the Pan American Union, which came in time to be the popular name for the broader Union of American Republics, of which the Pan American Union was but the agent.

As the popular embodiment of pan-Americanism, the Pan American Union was a most useful center of information on all topics of concern to the nations and peoples of this hemisphere. It provided import and export data, and general commercial information. It stimulated the exchange of students and professors, and promoted closer cultural relations among the member republics. While perhaps undramatic, these activities have contributed materially to the growth of hemispheric solidarity.

In 1948, the Union of American Republics was reorganized at the Bogotá Conference into the Organization of American States. The Pan American Union was designated as the central, permanent organ of the new organization. In this capacity it serves as the general secretariat for the Organization, and is thus of crucial significance to the efficient functioning of the Organization as a whole. Inasmuch as the United States bases its policy in this hemisphere on cooperation through the Organization of American States, the Pan American Union is of great significance for our policy as well. The mutual interests of all American states are bound up in its program and its operations.

Today the Pan American Union still serves as a center for the exchange of information and as the means by which individuals and private groups can become most directly apprised of the activities of the Organization of American States. It carries on the work assigned to it by the decisions of the various conferences and conventions of American Republics. Finally, and perhaps, of greatest importance today, is its work, together with other organs of the Organization of American States, in sponsoring programs of technical cooperation.

It is in such basic and vital activities as these that the Pan American Union is continuing today, as in the past, to serve the highest interests of world peace and progress.

A Bill To Amend Section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses.

This bill is a companion measure to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM PURTELL, of Connecticut.

The purpose of this bill is to permit nonprofit economic development corporations in depressed areas to charge stepped-up rent for a period of the first 5 years adequate to pay off borrowed money and interest, and permit the renting corporation to deduct such stepped-up rent in the determination of taxable income during those 5 years.

This measure will be of great assistance to depressed areas in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England. It will bring new industry into our community and will ultimately provide employment and generally stimulate our economy.

The bill which I have introduced reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of trade or business expenses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of a lease of property (A) which is owned by an organization described in section 501 (c) (4) (relating to civic leagues or organizations for promotion of social welfare) which is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a), and (B) which is subject to a mortgage or other lien securing indebtedness incurred in the acquisition or improvement of such property, such rentals or other payments may, during the term of such mortgage or other similar lien (if such term is not less than 5 years and ends on or prior to the date of termination of the lease as fixed therein), be in annual amounts sufficient to discharge such indebtedness at the end of such term, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective wtih respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Mental Hospital Facilities in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska to treat the mentally ill in the Territory is imperative. The population of Alaska has boomed, with nearly 180,000 people reported in our northern Territory.

At the present time Alaska mental patients are transported thousands of miles from their homes to a privately operated hospital in Portland, Oreg. At the same time mental patients are forced to undergo confinement, frequently in outmoded territorial jails, while awaiting transportation to Portland. Commitment procedures are archaic and outmoded.

To meet the important need for mental facilities in Alaska, I have introduced Senate bills 1027 and 1028. Congresswoman EDITH S. GREEN has introduced identical bills in the House of Representatives.

I am very pleased to learn of the reported general support Secretary of the Interior McKay has given these bills, and I am especially pleased by the support afforded my bills in the city of Portland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Oregon Journal for April 12, 1955, which supports the immediate need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska and for urgent overhauling of outmoded commitment procedures.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA NEEDS OWN MENTAL HOSPITAL

In general, we support Senator NEUBERGER'S two bills (S. 1027 and S. 1028) to provide mental hospital facilities for Alaska in Alaska and for modernizing Alaska's obsolete commitment and treatment laws. And so does his stanch political foe, Secretary of the Interior McKay.

Since 1904 mentally ill patients from Alaska have been sent to Morningside Hospital in Portland, a privately owned and operated facility, for care and treatment. And while this hospital has an excellent reputation, it is generally conceded that Alaska has long since reached the point where it is entitled to its own mental hospital facilities.

It also is conceded by health authorities in the Territory and in the States, including the director of Morningside, that Alaska's commitment procedures are "archaic and extremely inhumane."

Thus these bills, sponsored in the House by Representative GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, attack both these problems simultaneously.

One of the problems, naturally, is that of cost, for both the construction of mental hospital facilities for outpatient and inpatient treatment, and for modernizing Alaskan commitment procedures.

But Secretary McKay suggests an answer: Annual Federal grants on a declining scale for the interim period; expenditure of $6,500,000 over a 10-year period for construction of facilities, and transfer to the Territory of 500,000 acres of public lands, including mineral rights, from which Territorial mental hospital costs could be paid. Senator NEUBERGER's hospital-construction bill merely provides for the appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." S. 1028 also suggests that Alaska eventually should assume responsibility for its own mental hospital program.

Based on our own observation of the handling and care of Alaska's mentally ill patients, some such program is imperative. The ordeal disturbed patients have been forced to go through while awaiting transfer to Portland—including incarceration in cramped and obsolete Territorial jails like ordinary criminals—is harrowing indeed.

That is one procedure S. 1028 would prohibit. Section 14 provides that persons ordered hospitalized in Alaska may be held in a local hospital or foster home or other suitable facility pending commitment, "but he shall not, except because of and during an extreme emergency, be detained in a nonmedical facility used for the detention of persons charged with or convicted of penal offenses."

In his speech before the Portland City Club the other day, Senator NEUBERGER predicted that if Secretary McKay would support his bills they would pass. Now that McKay appears to have done so, the chances of approval are at least good.

It's about time.

A Tribute to the Late William S. Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa, former Congressman from Iowa's Second District. As a constituent of his for 6 years, I came to know and respect the fine example of leadership my Congressman upheld in the Halls of Congress.

Iowa and the Nation suffered a great loss in the death, on Sunday a week ago, of William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa. Davenport and Scott County will always remember with gratitude the faithful services rendered by Representative Jacobsen, for 6 years, from 1937 through 1942. Scott County during that period was included in the old Second District of Iowa, and William S. Jacobsen gave wholehearted and capable service to all his constituents, following the splendid example set by his father, Bernhard Martin Jacobsen, who had represented the same district from 1931 to his sudden death in 1936. These were Democrats, both with the large and with the small "d." In national affairs, and in local affairs, they held to the tradition of rising above party interests, in the spirit of the noble saying of Rutherford Hayes: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

The Jacobsen family stands for one of the proudest traditions of Americanism—the tradition of the immigrant boy who made good, who served his neighborhood as a storekeeper, his city as a banker and postmaster, and his country as legislator. Bernhard Martin Jacobsen came to this country from Germany as a boy of 14, ignorant of our language, accompanying his immigrant parents. He worked in a sawmill, then in a brickyard, then in a general store, learning English from his fellow workers, then resuming his education as his earnings freed him to devote some time to studies. It is an inspiring story and is good to think that this great tradition established by Bernhard Jacobsen was most worthily carried on by his son William, and that others of this fine Jacobsen family survive to carry on the tradition of patriotism and friendly service. The Jacobsen Building, in Clinton, stands as a monument to the accomplishments of the family, and their motto, "Keep right on smiling," is enshrined in the name of the Jacobsen radio station, KROS–AM and KROS–FM, which, up to now, has been operated by William Jacobsen with his younger brother, Marvin J. Jacobsen.

William Jacobsen has left behind him two sons, Bernhard J. Jacobsen and Maenard W. Jacobsen, who are carrying on the tradition of this outstanding family, a fine example of the contribution of German immigration to the development of Iowa and America.

Discharge Petition on Bill H. R. 501 to Revise McCarran-Walter Imigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have today signed a discharge petition to bring out my bill, H. R. 501, to revise and amend the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I urge all my colleagues who favor a liberalization of our immigration laws to sign this petition as soon as possible so we can get some action in the matter.

The recent dismissal of Edward J. Corsi as special assistant on immigration problems points up again the fact that the McCarran-Walter Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 are unworkable and should either be replaced or drastically revised.

During his brief incumbency in office at the State Department Mr. Corsi tried to make our immigration laws work in a humane way. The opponents of liberal immigration in the Department of State and outside the Department stopped him by slandering his unquestioned loyalty and smearing his record of patriotic service to this country. In so doing, they affronted large groups of Americans all over the country who are interested in a decent immigration law decently administered.

The Corsi affair goes beyond partisan politics. It effects millions of people who placed high hopes in Mr. Corsi's efforts to help liberalize our immigration policy and make it more humane. Now these hopes have been largely shattered because of the unwarranted and shameless treatment Mr. Corsi received at the hands of the Secretary of State.

On April 9, when it became known that Mr. Corsi was being dismissed from the State Department, I dispatched the following telegram to Secretary Dulles:

> Was shocked to read that Mr. Corsi, with many years of distinguished public service in New York, was summarily dismissed from his national post. I am not satisfied that his appointment was for only 90 days, nor that security was at all involved with his dismissal. Mr. Corsi's loyalty was never under question before although he held the highest administrative office in New York State by appointment of former Governor Dewey. If, as it is claimed, Mr. Corsi's dismissal was the result of his liberal interpretation of our immigration laws, then the basic principles of our Constitution and laws have been violated. This thing goes beyond partisan politics, and since another Congressman has been accused of causing the dismissal, I demand a complete explanation in order that I may make known all the facts to the Congress and the American people.
>
> Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New York State, whether Democrat or Republican, are incensed and aroused over the State Department's disgraceful action. They see it not only as an act of bad leadership and poor advice, but also that it stems from a lack of ethics in Government and from opinionated men in high positions of power. The whole situation is particularly puzzling when we are assured that the problem of security was not involved in Mr. Corsi's dismissal, and that only a short 3 months ago Mr. Dulles referred to Corsi as his old friend and the man best qualified to handle the job as his special assistant on immigration problems.

What has happened since then? How is it possible that within such a short period of time Mr. Corsi should be dealt with so outrageously and fired from his job in such humiliating manner by the very same people who lauded him to the skies? The people of New York are entitled to an explanation of this whole sordid affair. They are not satisfied

with the explanations given thus far by Mr. Dulles, or Mr. Scott McLeod or other State Department officials.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1955, entitled "Department of Confusion," which clearly explains the state of confusion over this matter in the Department of State. The editorial is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF CONFUSION

Secretary Dulles and the State Department appear somewhat less than satisfied with any one of the reasons they have offered for the dismissal of Edward J. Corsi. Accordingly they now offer a selection, as follows:

1. Mr. Corsi's post was temporary, and has been abolished.

2. Mr. Corsi had completed his assignment.

3. The 90-day period for security clearance had expired and the Secretary therefore lacked authority to keep Mr. Corsi on any longer.

4. Mr. Corsi was unqualified for the job.

5. Mr. Corsi did not want to take on administrative responsibilities.

6. Mr. Corsi wanted to take on too many administrative responsibilities, trying to become actual administrator of the Refugee Act.

Some of these protestations, like 5 and 6, contradict each other, and the others are contradicted by other statements from the State Department itself.

Mr. Corsi's assignment was, in the Secretary's own words, "to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953." Obviously that is no 90-day task; it is the work of a year, 2 years, or longer. Far from having completed his assignment, Mr. Corsi had not completed the preliminaries to beginning it. His security report, by Mr. Dulles' own later admission, had come in before he was dismissed, but the Secretary said there was not enough time remaining to evaluate it.

In this connection, the Department said Secretary Dulles' offer of another assignment to Mr. Corsi should clearly put to rest any implication that his change of assignment involved any question of security. Secretary Dulles himself, however, pointed out that the post from which Mr. Corsi had been removed was "a sensitive one," a remark which had the effect of putting the implication into active motion again.

Mr. Corsi's qualifications for the job were vouched for by Secretary Dulles when the appointment was made January 10. Referring to the appointee as my dear friend, the Secretary called him "the best qualified man in the United States to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953."

The explanations given for Mr. Corsi's dismissal are almost childish in their implausibility. Edward Corsi was United States Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner under President Hoover, and New York State Industrial Commissioner under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. His professional life has been spent in public administration. Secretary Dulles' assertion that Mr. Corsi "indicated to me that he was not interested in and not qualified for administrative work" is therefore amazing, to say the very least. It is lamentable that the person to whom this statement was attributed should have felt it necessary to accuse the Secretary of State of falsehoods.

As of now it seems clear that Secretary Dulles dismissed Mr. Corsi because Representative WALTER of Pennsylvania had accused him of having associated with some Communist-front organizations 20-odd years ago. Mr. WALTER is co-author of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Mr. Corsi says Secretary Dulles "told me he was dismissing me because he had to maintain good relations with Congress" and "it would endanger bills with reference to the refugee program if I stayed."

So once again Secretary Dulles has demonstrated, as in the case of John Paton Davies, that if his appointees are attacked they cannot expect him to stand by them, but can only look forward to being thrown to the wolves. What this will do to morale—which Mr. Corsi says is one of the stiffest problems in administration of refugee relief—should be plain. Its effect on the response of capable men to appeals to serve the Government—at their own risk—should also be plain.

The only possible consequences are deterioration of the quality of the men and women who can be attracted to important posts, and demoralization among those who do accept.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me add that there are implications in this entire affair which may prove damaging not only to the present administration or to a particular party or some individual. I am worried over the damaging effect this scandal may cause abroad and its repercussions there when it is fully realized that the refugee relief program is nothing more than a hoax and a fraud, and that it is administered in such a way as to keep refugees out of this country instead of facilitating their entry. The honor and prestige of our country is involved here.

To prove my assertion, I want to place in the RECORD a United Press story from Rome, Italians Charge Corsi Case Bias, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald last Friday, April 15, 1955. Following is the United Press dispatch:

ITALIANS CHARGE CORSI CASE BIAS

ROME, April 14.—The independent right-wing newspaper, Il Tempo, today said the custer of Edward Corsi as adviser to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on refugee problems involved racial and religious discrimination.

"Every hope of increased Italian migration to the United States has vanished," as a result of Dulles' action, it said.

Corsi's removal "has caused great surprise and some bitterness in Italy," the newspaper commented.

It charged that a powerful influence has been brought to bear recently to prevent the nonquota emigration of 200,000 persons, recommended by President Eisenhower.

"This was done by well-known racial circles favoring Nordic and Protestant immigration from southern Europe," Il Tempo said.

"When one practices an open policy of racial and religious discrimination, it is hard to talk of democracy in relations with other countries. And when such a policy so openly hurts Italians, after the visit of our government leaders (Premier Mario Scelba and Foreign Minister Gaetano Martino), to the United States, it is hard to talk about deep friendship.

Mr. Speaker, both the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act have come under serious attack lately. The Corsi incident is just a demonstration of public indignation against these two acts. The McCarran-Walter law has been called discriminatory and un-American. The refugee relief measure has been called a fraud and a phony by Congressman WALTER.

For the sake of America's greatness, its international prestige, and its position of moral leadership among the nations of the world, I urge this Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act at the earliest possible date, and to make it so workable and fair that no special immigration legislation will be needed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1955, the first day of the current session of Congress, I introduced an omnibus immigration bill, H. R. 501, to revise and rewrite the McCarran-Walter Act. The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, but no action has as yet been taken by that committee on my bill. In view of the fact that more than 3 months have elapsed since I introduced my bill, I have asked the Clerk of the House for a discharge petition and have placed that petition on the Speaker's desk.

I want to appeal to all my colleagues to sign this petition so that we can bring this bill out on the floor for early action and a complete revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I had the privilege of delivering at the annual businessmen's day to the students of the school of business administration at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex., on April 26, 1955, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS THE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING PHILOSOPHY

Mr. Chairman, students of the SMU School of Business Administration, faculty, and alumni, it is a real pleasure to be present with you today. Since your kind invitation was extended me, I have realized how much I have in common with those who are going out into business on their own.

First, I think of my college days when, like yourselves, I was greatly concerned over my future and what career or business endeavor to embark upon. In my case the answer came one night at dinner in a friend's New York apartment, when for the first time I saw a picture show broadcast over the air—television. From the moment of this strange introduction, I knew this was to be my field of business. So it was that after graduation, I plunged into the merchandising and distribution end of this fascinating new industry which, in 1940, was in its marketing infancy.

Another comparison is my situation today when, as you know, I am in an entirely new field of endeavor. I have just plunged into this tremendous task much as will many of our young business people starting out on their own. In the case of a Congressman and the young businessman, both must shift for themselves. The Congressman learns on arriving in Washington and thereafter that while his colleagues are sympathetic, they would never volunteer help but only answer

questions, because they know, as I even now know, that part of the job of being a Congressman is learning to make the adjustments and being left alone to make the adjustments, since each Congressman is an individual coming from a particular district and the strength of our system is built upon the differences which each Congressman represents. Through the adjustment and the struggle, there comes of course a corresponding satisfaction when challenging and new tasks are met and overcome. I appreciate the system in Washington as I have come to learn it.

In much the same way a newcomer to business enters his new endeavor, somewhat alone, where his character and ability are developed through the challenges which are presented. He is a free agent. This is possible because we have free enterprise. We believe in this country in this growth of human personality and character within the framework of a master plan which only the Almighty knows.

My own personal convictions have been tested, as have those of others here present, through those first business endeavors which I was privileged to participate in before the Great War. Then in the war these convictions were further tested, and others came to light that had been lying dormant and were what I now recognize as innate spiritual and religious beliefs. Now, in Congress, my convictions are still tested almost daily, as at this moment in speaking to you, because I am in a position, as a Congressman, where the fundamental ethical, moral and spiritual beliefs, as a yardstick, must continually be applied in making decisions concerning the big issues that face us today.

Through all of the trials and struggles, I have found no reason to change my basic belief in the principles which I was taught going through school. I believe in human freedom, and that means economic freedom. I have come to understand why our forefathers and my forebears believed as they did in free enterprise, competition, the open market place, to establish demand-supply and price, as contrasted with the foreign planned economies and isms they left behind when they left the old country.

So it was that when thinking of talking to you today, the titles that sprung to mind were: "Free Enterprise, the American Way," "Government and Free Enterprise," "Let's Put Business Principles Into Government, and Take Government Out of Business," "The Government in Your Business Future"—but no matter what the title they all started and ended with free enterprise, because within the framework of the definition of free enterprise, as we Americans have traditionally defined it, is found the individual worth and dignity of the man or woman, our spiritual beliefs, the best system for economic growth, the "merit system," individual incentive and initiative. In short, the sum total of American beliefs. To me free enterprise and Americanism are one.

My title finally became "Free Enterprise versus the Something-for-nothing Philosophy." The something-for-nothing philosophy is based on the erroneous belief that government can do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. Forgotten is the fact that ours is a Government of, by and for the people. Through the declared emergencies of a depression and two wars has arisen a Federal bureaucracy of such scope that few, if any, know all the present services offered by Government—many unnecessary to the people. This philosophy spawned on regulations and controls of our economy, through planned deficit financing which resulted in spiraling inflation and cost of living. States rights have been usurped by Federal domination, until the State-Federal proportion of operation and tax income has changed from 75–25 percent to 25–75 percent.

In this something-for-nothing philosophy is found the belief the Federal Government can manufacture, finance, merchandise, market, and compete in every way with private industry, that it can do so without paying tax on its operation which is passed on to private businessmen to pay, who must also pay their own taxes. Simultaneously, the Government often blames free enterprise business which staggers under the Government-imposed regulation and heavy tax, saying that free enterprise is faulty. It is of interest to note that at this moment the Government is still the Nation's biggest electric power producer, the biggest power consumer, the biggest banker, the biggest employer, the biggest insurance company, biggest landlord, biggest tenant, and biggest publisher. In fact, Uncle Sam owns more wheat than the wheat farmers, more grass land than the cattle men, and more trucks than General Motors. Our national debt is $278 billion and we have a hidden debt of $250 billion, an overall tax rate of 30 cents on the dollar.

In the something-for-nothing philosophy, there is the belief that wealth can be redistributed to the point of confiscation by a heavy progressive income tax. This money can be placed in the hands of the low-bracket purchaser who then can stimulate business by buying. This is called the percolate up theory by some. It overlooks the fact that production is necessary or there'll be no goods to buy—and production needs money for plant and equipment to produce, to expand, and to create more jobs.

The advocates of the something-for-nothing philosophy are intentionally or unintentionally disloyal Americans. Some are avowed Socialists. These are the most dangerous because as Americans considering themselves patriotic devoted citizens they are undermining the country's economic strength as a friend—not an avowed enemy such as the Communist we have come to recognize as antithetical to all we believe—and who is dedicated to the overthrow of our country. We recognize communism as an enemy, yet communism is economically a socialistic form of government, and there is the great danger. Too many of our well-meaning socialistic friends of the last 2 decades are playing right into communistic hands. The godless materialism of this philosophy must not be for this great country of ours. As idealists we Americans acquiesce to the goals that social measures propose. It is easy to succumb to the belief first, that government can do it, and second, that we can pay the cost, not only for our own people, but the world. Too often lost in the shuffle is the free-enterprise system that must pay the cost of our grandiose schemes.

The present administration is struggling valiantly to satisfy the increased citizens' demands of its government and at the same time build our economic strength by freeing our business to operate with minimum government intervention or control—of this I approve—but I would counsel this or any administration to always remember an earlier American adage "that government is best that governs least." Our forefathers believed this and they built the free-enterprise system into the world's greatest productive system.

This system was based on freedom—to think, act, and do as an individual—in business as well as government. They recognized that our freedoms were so interrelated that the loss of one meant the loss of all. Therefore economic freedom was fostered in the free-enterprise system. Everyone had a stake in it. They knew and we should remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Further, there was no caste system. Unlike many foreign countries, an American was not forced to stay in the same level that he was born into. A man was recognized for whatever he made of himself. The great accomplishments in the production of American industry is testimonial to the many free men and women who dedicated their efforts to business within the free-enterprise system. These are our traditions—our heritage. We must carry them on.

In the United States there is still no limit to your goal. Each of us can become what we are capable of achieving. Surely, we have proven too that what a mind is capable of thinking, a man can do; witness the new duct-fan helicopter, the modern flying carpet. Since 1900 the world has produced airplanes, radio, television, and countless other scientific discoveries. We all know we have just scratched the surface in new inventions and ideas, that untold worlds may open up ahead of us. New ideas and opportunities need only to be thought of and recognized.

The United States has a magnificent future. The Southwest area of the United States may very well have an even more brilliant future than the national average. Its population and industries are growing.

And you have freedom of choice. You can look around and decide—stay put or move along as new horizons open, and let me assure you from my personal experience that there will be countless vistas unrolling before you, challenging you to new effort—if you stay alert.

In your business ventures you are not likely to forget the part that government plays in our lives, and I hope you will not neglect your duties as a citizen. Using myself as an example in the establishment of my corporation and two small individually owned companies in real estate, I often worked 7 days and some nights. My participation in government suffered. Actually, I deprived myself of the right of participating—a right and privilege all Americans should treasure and enjoy. One day I realized with a shock that many of the bureaucratic policies of our Federal Government and our loss of many States rights were contrary to my beliefs. So here I am.

Many other business people are guilty of leaving the charting of their country's course to others. They are so enmeshed in their personal worries they will not take time to vote, much less in political work. Because of this the very men who could inform our people most of the value of our free-enterprise system do not speak out and the result has been the lack of emphasis on the greatness of traditional American enterprise. It is my hope, therefore, that you will always keep an active interest and participation in your government at the local level. Otherwise, you are leaving the decisions to others whose views may not embody your own.

The weakness of our system, as Plato pointed out centuries ago, is the lack of an informed electorate, or apathy on the part of the people. Businessmen in our country by their neglect of citizen participation in governmental affairs have failed to protect free enterprise by influencing legislation.

Businessmen realize through hard-earned experience that private enterprise and Government cannot compete in business. Businessmen operating on a profit system know that deficit financing is an impossibility, and any system based on it is unsound and should be corrected. Businessmen, having learned these lessons, permit their Government in many instances to make mistakes which their experience and judgment could have prevented if they had been taking a part in the direction of their Government.

My final thought then would be some conclusions I reach in forecasting the trend our Government would take if more business people participated in it. I believe the program would be accelerated in getting the Government out of business. I believe that businessmen in our Government would throw their weight behind balancing the

budget, reducing the national debt, reducing taxes, thereby stimulating incentive, further investment, and creating more jobs. They would reduce the gigantic intended redistribution of wealth the Socialists and Communists are so pleased to see us engage in. There would be further incentive for those talented individuals whose property in the form of earnings is almost entirely confiscated in the upper bracket, and whose responsible positions create more jobs by this stimulated effort. The so-called little man who bears taxation's heaviest burden numerically would be given greater relief in his taxes, made possible by reducing the cost of Government. This reduction would be made possible through decentralization and return to the States of many of the Federal activities. The businessman might insist, I believe, that the Government operate within its income. In fact, the businessman might insist upon a constitutional amendment controlling the Government's ability to tax, borrow, and spend, thereby assuring a sound economy by whoever the elected officials were. Businessmen in Government would continue to remove the Federal Government from areas of operation which do not pertain to government.

It is my heartfelt belief that the future greatness of our country is interwoven with the perpetuation, strengthening, and success of our free-enterprise system. It must be kept free. I believe that people with business experience must join together to continue to remind the American people of the advantages that we enjoy, the high level of production and prosperity, the great economic, moral, and spiritual strength resulting from our beliefs. These are the things, I believe, which business people should remember and practice. I hope that all of you will take your part in the good faith to preserve the free-enterprise system.

I have enjoyed this opportunity of being with you and sharing a few thoughts. I wish you all the very best of everything in whatever you undertake. May you be successful and happy, and in return for the blessing of living and working in this great Nation take an active part in its guidance. Thank you.

Red China and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in early February I was interviewed by Mr. Don Larrabee, the Washington correspondent for the New Bedford Standard-Times. Under unanimous consent I present his article, which appeared in the February 4 issue of the Standard-Times, to be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

PHILBIN WARNS AGAINST SEATING RED CHINA IN U. N., URGES ALL TO BE ALERT TO BANDITRY

WASHINGTON, February 4.—To reward Red China with admission into the United Nations would be a "monstrous travesty upon justice," Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, declared today in an interview.

The Clinton, Mass., Congressman, expressing grave concern over Communist tactics both here and abroad, also blasted the notion that the free world can live in so-called peaceful coexistence with international gangsterism.

"I am greatly concerned about growing Communist strength and every American must be so concerned," PHILBIN told the Standard-Times. "World communism will adopt the tactics it deems necessary to secure world conquest and world control. That is its aim. It will go as far as it can. It will do what it thinks it can get away with.

"When the time is ripe," he added, "and the military timetable permits and its chances for victory seem bright, it will not hesitate to strike along a broad front."

One of the real obstacles to halting the Communist world menace, PHILBIN asserted, is the "indifference and unconcern of many Americans about the affairs of representative government at every level." Not only should Americans be shaken out of their lethargy, but also, he said, the United Nations must inaugurate "cooperative measures" to thwart Communist aggression and check dangerous subversive activities in many parts of the world.

"We have a right to expect the United Nations, if its membership still subscribes to the purposes of the Charter of maintaining the peace and defending human freedom, to move decisively and speedily against Communist malefactors.

"Many people see in recent events the beginning of a move designed to bring Red China into the United Nations. Nothing would be better calculated to shatter confidence of the American people in that body. The idea of permitting a bandit nation, which has secured power and dominion over a great * * * ancient, but helpless people through conspiracy, subterfuge and force * * * to be rewarded for its iniquities by admission into the United Nations would be a monstrous travesty upon justice," said PHILBIN, who is starting his seventh term in the House from the Third Massachusetts District.

The Congressman, a member of the Armed Services Committee, warned the Communist movement has made steady advances in remote areas of Asia, in Africa and South America and in Europe. He said communism will pursue the tactics of infiltration and penetration, playing everywhere on discontent aroused by antiquated colonial systems or capitalizing on social injustices.

Citing Korea as an example of Communist aggressive action, he mentioned Indochina, Burma and the Malayan states as good examples of subversion.

"But the thing for us to remember is that the Communists have their own answer for every situation. They act boldly and do not hesitate to set up a conspiracy anywhere that suits their purpose. This kind of treachery and deceit requires continuous vigilance and a tough-minded attitude on our part. It cannot be dealt with by bleeding hearts or patience-loving, dilatory Fabians urging delay.

"The Fabian approach of trying to wait the situation out is fraught with real peril because every day the Soviet is building greater military strength," PHILBIN asserted.

Turning to the question of Communist activity in this country, the Clinton Congressman made this unequivocal statement: "There is hardly a scientific secret which has not been filched from us through espionage agents and traitors in the innermost, top-secret archives of this Government."

He compared communism in this country to an iceberg—"four-fifths of it is under water." The number of card-carrying Communists is relatively not great, but the "poison of Communist ideas has been spread widely throughout the land."

CLEVER ATTACK MADE

"Pro-Communist and Socialistic-minded people can be found in most segments of American life. Clever and insidious attacks are constantly made upon basic religious, social, economic and political institutions.

"A constant flow of propaganda is directed against the American people at every level, embracing everything from straight Marxism to eccentric notions about the universe.

"All this," said PHILBIN, "is designed to promote hysteria and uncertainty and to undermine the confidence of the people in representative government, in our economic system, in our religious beliefs, our moral ideals, family loyalties, and business structure. The objective is to break America's faith in itself, its principles, its life and its destiny."

He denounced as outrageous the shooting down of American planes on peaceful missions in the Far East, adding: "These incidents of Communist insult and provocation are absolutely intolerable and as completely unconscionable—as well as illegal and inhumane—as the continued imprisonment of American flyers in Red China on trumped-up spy charges."

STRONG ACTION ESSENTIAL

The unanimity of the House vote on the Formosa defense resolution (there were only 3 dissenting votes) was pointed to by PHILBIN as the "first real declaration of determination to face up courageously" to the Communist menace since the end of the Korean war.

This kind of strong, decisive policy and affirmative action is essential, he said, not only to protect Americans but also to maintain our prestige in the Orient.

The Congressman frequently referred to "apathy, indifference, and unconcern" on the part of many Americans over governmental affairs and called it "one of the most disturbing developments of our time." He insisted the Nation must revive the "spirit of patriotism and loyalty and revitalize the commonsense, industry, and enthusiasm of the individual."

PHILBIN has warned about the Communist menace in the past. Records show he was one of the first Members of Congress to point up the spread of world communism during World War II. In his first major speech in Congress early in 1943, PHILBIN predicted the possible realinement of alliances in the post-war period.

While he sees "unfavorable, disturbing spots everywhere," PHILBIN also points to signs that people are becoming more aroused to the dangers, and more aware of the "sham, falsehood, deceit and iniquity of communism."

"The United States," he said, "must not fail to let it be known that she will use her strength if necessary, to protect her way of life. Once that idea penetrates the Communist mind," he added, "there will be no further aggression and then, perhaps, we can take the lead in world councils to establish universal disarmament and control of nuclear substances. This will be no primrose path," said PHILBIN.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement

which I had the privilege of making before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 4560 and related bills to amend the Natural Gas Act which would remove Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, as follows:

My name is BRUCE ALGER. I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, Dallas County. I was elected last year, running on a platform advocating free competition in the marketplace and less Federal control of our economy—a platform quite similar to that of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This action of the electorate made me the first Republican elected to Congress from Texas in a regular election in many years. It also indicated to me that the people of my district likewise realize the vital importance of a return to the free-enterprise principles that made our country great.

My interest in the legislative efforts to correct the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case is more than a desire to correct an injustice to one of the large industries of my State. It is a determination to overcome a new and dangerous philosophy announced in the Supreme Court's decision.

Why should natural gas, the product of an intensely competitive and high-risk industry, be singled out as the only commodity so produced to be brought under Federal price-fixing while in the hands of the producer?

If a bureau in Washington can fix the price of gas, can it not just as easily fix the price of other products?

If natural gas is singled out for Federal price-fixing today, might it not be oil or cattle or cotton or dairy products—or all of them—tomorrow?

If there is any doubt that natural gas is a commodity produced by a highly competitive industry—far removed from the utility status—let us take a look at some of the facts about the demand-supply-price picture. They will show not only that the industry is competitive, but also that the consumer of natural gas inevitably receives his greatest protection from competitive activity.

First, there is a great and growing demand. Natural-gas customers have tripled and natural gas delivered to residential consumers has quadrupled since 1938. Consumption of natural gas has just about tripled since World War II. Today almost 25 million gas customers are residential users. The American Gas Association estimates that an additional 1.2 million users will be added each year in 1955 and 1956 if supplies are available. Countless other potential customers are anxious to see their communities served by natural gas.

Obviously, the efficiency and cleanliness of this fuel contributed to its popularity. Obviously, also, its reasonable prices have been considered among its advantages to the constantly growing gas consuming public.

Competition between producers of gas—as well as between them and other fuels—has been evidenced by the refusal of prices of natural gas to react to inflationary conditions as sharply as have the prices of other fuels. Natural gas is one of the few items in the family budget for which price has remained comparatively stable.

Based on 1935–39 averages for 50 representative cities compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, natural gas in 1953 had an index of 99.6, or just under average prices for the 1935–39 period. Contrast this with 233.4 for anthracite coal, 212.9 for bituminous coal, and 205.5 for No. 2 fuel oil. Contrast this also with the 191.3 overall cost-of-living index for 1953.

If the tremendous demand is not matched by a similar rise in supply, the price of natural gas naturally will tend to rise. But this increase will be even larger if the producers' prices are regulated. Supply is the great consideration, and price-fixing regulations will have a tendency to reduce, rather than increase, the search for new supplies. They also will tend to divert more of the supply from the interstate market into the intrastate, which even now represents half of the total marketed production. Intrastate sales were not made subject to Federal control by the Phillips decision.

With the tremendous expansion of the market made possible by the many large interstate lines built since World War II, the ratio of new supply to net production has diminished rapidly. In the first 5 years after the war new gas supply was proved up at an average of almost 3 trillion cubic feet for each trillion produced. Then the ratio dropped to 2 million for each trillion produced. During the past year, new supply barely exceeded actual production.

Which represents the greater need—to fix prices with a hope of keeping costs to consumers down, as long as the present supply lasts; or to rely on time-tested free competition to encourage wider search for greater reserves to supply the present consuming public and the millions who hope to join today's fortunate consumers?

Developments of recent years clearly show that all reserves possible are essential to meet future needs. Roughly speaking, we have 21 years of supply at the current rate of withdrawal, but that rate of withdrawal may continue to grow.

Certainly an adequate price is essential to prevent waste of casinghead gas, which is produced with oil. Prices for natural gas must be at least enough to pay for the expense of conservation measures. Adequate price also is essential to promote production from wells whose primary product is gas. Leading geologists are convinced that we have not reached the limit in our discoveries of oil and gas. However, the incentive provided will determine to what extent we are able to make additional discoveries.

Because of joint costs and the infinite number of variables, it is impossible to determine a regulated price based on a cost formula, such as would be necessary if gas producing is considered a utility. Gas must be allowed to seek its true price level through free competition with competitive fuels, or it will be found necessary to regulate the prices of these fuels, also, and thus establish a Federal bureau control over all of our energy resources.

If reserves are to keep pace with demand, every producer—not just a few big companies—must have price incentive to search for and produce more gas. The minor or independent producer is the typical wildcatter. He finds the big majority of new fields, and we cannot meet our needs without him. He needs incentive.

There are thousands of these independents in action today. All told, about 8,100 producers of natural gas operate in the country, counting only those who report to the various State agencies. The picture some would paint of a monopoly industry controlled by a few large companies is far from true. Of all the extractive industries, bituminous coal is the only one in which leading companies produce as small a portion of the total as in the natural gas industry. Compared with manufacturers of all kinds, natural gas is less concentrated in the hands of a few companies than 382 out of the total of 452 studied.

The picture of gas production is: First 4 companies, 17 percent; first 8, 28; first 20, 46; first 50, 66; and first 100, 78. There also is a gradual gradation from one size to the next in order, a condition ideal for competitive behavior. Seekers of monopoly can look elsewhere.

The ease of entry into production of natural gas is a sure sign of the absence of monopoly. Natural gas companies even seek additional competitors, frequently looking for partners because of limitation of funds when they spend so much on exploration, title clearance, and leasing.

Competition definitely is present when the producer or gatherer meets the interstate pipeline or transmission company at the bargaining table. The pipeline companies are not so numerous as the producers, but between them they have an interconnecting network of lines covering the large producing areas of the Southwest. With one exception, the various large lines all are connected either directly or indirectly with most of the producing areas of the Southwest. Thus they have widely scattered supply sources to which they can turn if one source prices itself out of the market. Neither the seller nor the buyer has the other "over the barrel."

These active competitive conditions which prevail are pointed up by the price behavior of natural gas. Prices have shown great flexibility and continually have lagged behind the rising cost of living.

Indicating their responsiveness to competitive conditions, prices paid under contracts executed in 1952–53 ranged from 21 to 29 cents per thousand cubic feet in the Appalachian region; from 7 to 18 cents in Panhandle-Hugoton; from 4 to 13 cents in East Texas-North Louisiana; and from 3 to 16 cents in Louisiana-Texas Gulf Coast.

The increased rates paid by consumers today are not due primarily to higher field prices, but to generally higher prices of everything that enters into the distribution, transmission, and production of gas. These include sharp rises in the cost of steel, labor, taxes and many other expenses. Only about a tenth of the total cost to the residential consumer is represented by the price received by the producer for natural gas at the wellhead.

Under free competition, the natural gas producing industry has met every test of service to the consumer. What sound reason is there for fixing the wellhead price that a producer may get for his gas?

Regulating only the "larger producers" is no answer to the problem. Who is the "larger producer"? What if royalty owners, owners of divided interests, small producers feeding into a single gatherer or natural gasoline plant, and others demand payment in kind and insist on separate sales?

Price-fixing is not in the long range interest of the consumer. Putting gas production on a utility status would bring staggering problems and costs, with no benefits and very probably some definite losses.

Consider the staff necessary and the expenses involved if the Federal Power Commision must review 30,000 separate sales transactions, with thousands more each year. Consider the insurmountable difficulties in trying to determine prices on a cost basis. What about loss of incentive to producers? Futility compounded.

No five men can solve all of the problems that have been solved by millions of individual decisions from day to day. The vast machinery for regulating prices would be only one of many costs, both tangible and intangible. The consumer will pay the price, both in taxes and in increased charges for the gas itself.

Regulation in the form of price-fixing is not the answer. The consumer's greatest protection is competitive activity. His true interest lies with a continuing supply. He deserves the benefits of competition.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for this world of beauty in the midst of which we walk, and that new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove. We are grateful for the gifts of human love and friendship, for sacred memories, and for every radiant hope that inspires us on our pilgrim way.

In Thy presence our arrogance is rebuked and our pride of opinion is mocked as we confess that we but grope in the darkness and that our sight is dim, our knowledge is partial, our judgments fallible; for at best we see but as through a glass darkly. Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth wherever it may lead, to be done with all falsehood, and to cast aside all pretense. Save us from any compromise with principle and from the expediency which warps the soul. Help us always to see the best that glimmers through the worst. Kindle our minds with the apprehension of Thy purpose. Steel our wills to do Thy will and to serve the present age, our calling to fulfill. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 20, 1955, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Monday at noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I call the attention of the distinguished minority leader to this request—that the Committee on Appropriations have authority to file a report on the agricultural appropriation bill while the Senate is not in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was just 119 years ago today that one of the truly decisive battles in American history was fought.

The scene was the camp of General Santa Anna, pitched at the junction of the San Jacinto River and Buffalo Bayou. The issue at stake was the freedom and independence of one of the largest territories on the North American Continent.

In my native Texas, San Jacinto will always remain one of the most memorable anniversaries on the calendar. It is the eternal symbol of the great, basic truth that men of determination and men of courage can and will be free.

But San Jacinto is more than a Texas holiday. It is an anniversary of profound significance to Americans everywhere.

The immediate result of San Jacinto was freedom for the newborn Republic of Texas. But the men who fought at San Jacinto were Americans, and the Republic was only one step to statehood.

Looking back on the history of that stirring period, the odds against the Texans who fought under Gen. Sam Houston appear to have been incredible.

Mr. President, I take great pride in calling the attention of the Senate at this time to the fact that one of the descendants of Gen. Sam Houston, the charming wife of the able junior Senator from Texas, PRICE DANIEL, now sits in the front row of the Senators family gallery.

The Texas Army was reeling under an unbroken string of defeats, beginning at the Alamo, where such giants as Davy Crockett, James Bowie, and William Barrett Travis had met their death.

The trail that led to San Jacinto was strewn with martyrs to freedom—men who fell at San Patricio, Agua Dulce, Goliad, Refugio, and Victoria. The retreat across the Brazos had spread panic throughout the territory.

Gen. Sam Houston could muster no more than 800 men on the historic morning of victory. Santa Anna's battle-hardened forces had been augmented only the day before by 400 experienced soldiers under General Cos. The Texans were outnumbered at least 2 to 1.

To Santa Anna, the campaign was over. He was conducting what he considered purely "mopup" operations that would weld the chains of tyranny firmly around the Texans. His confidence was so complete that he actually was taking his siesta on the afternoon that the battle began.

His slumbers were rudely interrupted by the charge of the Texans singing "Won't You Come to the Bower?" and shouting the battle cry—"Remember the Alamo. Remember Goliad."

The fighting was short, sharp, and decisive. In a matter of minutes, practically the entire Mexican Army was killed, wounded, or captured. One of the first prisoners was Santa Anna himself, the self-styled Napoleon of the West.

Independence, although not formally recognized by the enemy, was a fact.

The San Jacinto battleground is maintained today as a State park. It ranks with the Alamo as a monument to the great men of the past.

But in a larger sense, San Jacinto and the Alamo are hallowed shrines of freedom. They are sacred names that will forever inspire men who cherish liberty and who hold dear the ideals and the institutions of our land.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The people of America are indebted to the majority leader for calling to the attention of the Senate and of the people of our country the greatness of Sam Houston. Sam Houston was one of the greatest soldiers this Nation ever produced. He was an inspired leader. In addition, he was a statesman. He was a Member of this body. He was a governor of two States, and the president of a republic. The account of his life is one of the great stories in American history, and I think that this body and other legislative bodies of America should frequently call the attention of our people to the great exploits of which he was a part. They show how America was made. In order to retain the liberties which men like Sam Houston attained for us, each generation must recapture and fight for them.

I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for calling to our attention that it was 119 years ago today when one of the great exploits in our history took place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my warm friend from Pennsylvania for the observation he has made. I certainly subscribe to everything he has said. No nation can be concerned with its future that is not worthy of its past. I appreciate what the able Senator has said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to identify myself with the eloquent remarks of the majority leader and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. We all appreciate being reminded of the great exploits of heroes in our Nation's history. I am happy to join in the statements which have been made on the occasion of this anniversary.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF COLORADO LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the

Legislature of the State of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 6

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling construction of the highway known as the Navaho Trail

Whereas there is no direct improved highway connecting the Grand Canyon area and the southwestern portion of Colorado; and

Whereas such a connection would mean an additional transcontinental highway; and

Whereas the construction of such a highway would be of inestimable value to the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war, and be a welcome addition to the few existing transcontinental highways through the Rocky Mountain area; and

Whereas such a highway would open up vast territories known to contain valuable sources of uranium, and prove a great boon to the Navaho Indians who are engaged primarily in agriculture and animal husbandry; and

Whereas there is situated in the southwestern portion of Colorado the Mesa Verde National Park and the Four-Corners area, and in the southern portion of Utah there is situated Monument Valley, Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Monument, natural bridges, natural monuments and other highly scenic attractions; and

Whereas such proposed highway would not only join together these scenic attractions and national parks for the first time, but, in addition, would connect them with the Grand Canyon National Park and the Hoover Dam; and

Whereas the construction of such a proposed highway from a point on United States Highway No. 160 in southwestern Colorado to connect with United States Highway No. 89, will make all these scenic attractions and natural beauties readily accessible to the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to coordinate plans and enact legislation to designate a Federal highway to connect United States Highway No. 160 in southwestern Colorado with United States Highway No. 89 in northern Arizona, and to appropriate such funds for the construction and maintenance of this highway as will render the same modern and sufficient in every respect; and to provide such by-roads as may be necessary to render more accessible Mesa Verde National Park, Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Monument, Monument Valley, Grand Canyon National Park and Hoover Dam. That said highway should be officially known as the Navaho Trail; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial shall be duly transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.

DAVID A. HAMIL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
LEE MATTIES,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
STEPHEN H. MCNICHOLS,
President of the Senate.
MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT TIN SMELTERS AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.—REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency acting jointly, pursuant to Senate Resolution 254, 83d Congress, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 215) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, pursuant to the provisions and authority of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, as amended, the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., shall be continued in operation until June 30, 1956, and so long thereafter as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States; and, in connection with such study and investigation, the Federal Facilities Corporation or any other designee of the President, is requested to show the plant and facilities to any interested persons and to provide them with all necessary and appropriate information within the limits of security considerations upon which to base appraisals and to formulate proposals to the Government for the future operation of the smelter by the Government or under private lease or ownership arrangements.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to report to the Congress prior to March 31, 1956, the findings of this study and his recommendations with respect to the future operation of the tin smelter.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels from 2 cents to 3 cents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1772. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1773. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1774. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; and

S. 1775. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1776. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia, and the construction thereon of additional facilities for the United States Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1777. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers by railroad to carry a disabled individual requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INCREASED TAX ON CERTAIN MOTOR FUELS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels from 2 cents to 3 cents.

Mr. President, let me say that, in my opinion, we need an adequate interstate highway system, but I believe it should be on more of a pay-as-you-go basis, rather than on a basis which would require the payment of enormous sums of money in interest, in order to provide for this development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels from 2 cents to 3 cents, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ESTABLISHING UNIFORM QUALIFICATIONS FOR JURORS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts. This bill is endorsed and recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States and Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the aims and purposes of this proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1774) to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The summary presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

The purpose of this proposed legislation appears in a statement by Judge Harry E. Watkins, chairman of the Committee on the Operation of the Jury System, on a similar bill, S. 961 of the 83d Congress, which is summarized as follows:

The committee of which Judge Watkins was chairman recommended to the Judicial

Conference of the United States legislation which would provide uniform qualifications for jurors serving in the Federal courts and would qualify women to serve on such juries. The present law provides that if a juror is qualified or exempt under State law, he is qualified or exempt as a juror in the Federal courts.

Questionnaires were sent out to judges and clerks of State and Federal courts to ascertain in what manner they were selecting jurors, and the bill, S. 961 of the 83d Congress, was the result of these studies.

The recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States that this bill be enacted has been repeatedly renewed by the Conference and the endorsement of this legislation is still the attitude and recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States. It is the view of the Judicial Conference that it is desirable to abolish the many outmoded and unnecessary exemptions and disqualifications which still exist in the laws of a number of States, and to make available for jury service in the Federal courts all persons who are capable of satisfactorily performing this important duty. Women as well as men should be qualified to sit on juries of all Federal courts. They are now qualified for jury service in all but about 9 or 10 States. The principal objection seems to be that it would permit women to serve on juries. However, as noted, the States in which women are not qualified for jury service are very much in the minority. In addition, a great many States arbitrarily exclude persons who ought to be included in jury service. Many of these State statutes are antiquated, and there is a great variance in their provisions.

It is the view of the committee of which Judge Watkins was chairman and the subsequent view of the Judicial Conference of the United States that uniform qualifications for jurors, including the qualification of women to serve, should be the pattern for jury service, at least insofar as juries connected with the Federal courts of the United States are concerned.

JURY COMMISSION FOR EACH UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes. This bill is endorsed and recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the aims and purposes of this proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1775) to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The summary presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

The purpose of this proposed legislation is explained in a letter from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, dated June 9, 1954, to the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, on a similar bill, S. 959 of the 83d Congress. S. 959 passed the Senate in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, in June 1954. The bill had the endorsement of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the American Bar Association. A summary of the letter from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is as follows:

The bill in its principal features is a measure which the Judicial Conference of the United States has been advocating for more than 10 years, beginning with action taken at its annual meeting in September of 1943.

In 1941 the Chief Justice of the United States, upon authorization of the Judicial Conference, appointed a committee of district judges to consider and report upon the methods of jury selection in the Federal courts.

In essence, the legislation provides for the appointment by each district court of the United States of one or more citizens as jury commissioners. In order to make the jury commissioners reasonably accessible to the different parts of large districts, it permits a district court to appoint for the district more than one commissioner with, however, a limitation that except in the District of Columbia each commissioner, when there is more than one for the district, shall be designated to serve in a particular part of the district.

The bill further provides, in contemplating that the usual compensation of a jury commission shall be a sum for each day or fraction of a day on which he is engaged in the performance of his official duties, that if the judge of the district considers that it would be in the interest of the efficient operation of the jury system to have one or more of the jury commissioners devote full time to the duties of his office, such judge may, with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, designate one or more commissioners so to act, who shall receive as compensation a salary to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference of the United States. Such compensation shall correspond to provisions of the Classification Act for positions in the executive branch with comparable responsibilities.

The bill further provides that, with the approval of the chief judge of the district, the jury commission is empowered to designate deputy clerks and other employees in the office of the clerk to assist them in the details involved in the selection of jurors.

The bill makes it the duty of the jury commission, under the direction of the district judge, to arrange for the drawing of the names of persons selected for jury service as grand or petit jurors and provides for the method by which their names shall be drawn.

The bill further provides that the persons selected by the jury commissions shall be, in their opinion, "intelligent, honest, fair-minded, of good reputation, and capable of rendering satisfactory service." Also, the bill provides for a separate section on this matter specifically designed for the District of Columbia.

The substantive part of the bill, if enacted, will constitute a complete revision of section 1864 of title 28 of the United States Code, which it amends.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT IN COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to establish a Subcommittee on Disarmament in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I do so in the bipartisan spirit of cooperating with the President of the United States in his recent effort to help crystallize and develop our Nation's objective of achieving a realistic international disarmament program.

The American people have long been concerned over the fact that the peoples of the earth are spending vast amounts of human and material resources to create weapons of mass destruction. It is our national policy to seek the achievement of a reliable system by which steps will be taken to stop this march to death by limiting, reducing, and eventually eliminating the international armaments race.

With that objective in mind, the President of the United States recently established a position of Cabinet rank with the responsibility for developing a program to help make our objective a reality and to help establish the basic policy of our Nation with respect to disarmament. In announcing the creation of a new post of Presidential Assistant for Disarmament, the President stated that when it became "desirable or appropriate under our constitutional processes, concurrences will be secured from the Congress prior to specific action or pronouncement of policy." In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the President's statement printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. With this background it is, in my judgment, essential that the Senate be prepared to cooperate fully with the President in the development of a basic policy with respect to disarmament. The establishment of a subcommittee would help prepare us to carry out that responsibility.

The resolution which I submit to the Senate would establish a subcommittee of 10 members, 8 of whom would be chosen equally from both parties by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and 2 of whom, 1 from each party, would be designated by the President of the Senate from Members not on the committee. The subcommittee would have the authority to direct its attention to the following matters:

First. Efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armaments of all types;

Second. Disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments, as well as by private groups and individuals;

Third. Methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad;

Fourth. The relationship of armaments to the state of the world economy;

Fifth. The relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament;

Sixth. The dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and

Seventh. Methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

The resolution provides that the results of the subcommittee study should

be made available to the Senate no later than March 31, 1956.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1955]

STATEMENT ON STASSEN

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Following is the text of President Eisenhower's statement announcing creation of a new post of Presidential Assistant for Disarmament:

"The massive resources required for modern armaments, the huge diversion of materials and of energy, the heavy burdens of taxation, the demands for years of service of vast numbers of men, the unprecedented destructive power of new weapons, and the international tensions which powerful armaments aggravate have been of deep concern to me for many years.

"At the same time the tragic consequences of unilateral disarmament, the reckless moves of Hitler when the United States was weak, the Korean aggression when our armed strength had been rapidly diminished, and the vast extent of the armament now centered around the opposing ideology of communism have been equally apparent to me.

"The recent session of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations has again resulted in no progress and no clear crystallization of thinking on this subject. It has an inseparable relationship to our constant objective of peace.

"I have, therefore, established a position as Special Assistant to the President with responsibility of developing, on behalf of the President and the State Department, the broad studies, investigations, and conclusions which, when concurred in by the National Security Council and approved by the President, will become basic policy toward the question of disarmament. The position will be of Cabinet rank. When indicated as desirable or appropriate under our constitutional processes, concurrences will be secured from the Congress prior to specific action or pronouncement of policy.

"I have appointed Harold Stassen as a Special Assistant for discharge of this responsibility. He will be expected to take into account the full implications of new weapons in the possession of other nations as well as the United States, to consider future probabilities of armaments, and to weigh the views of the military, the civilians, and the officials of our Government and of other governments.

"For the time being, and for the presentation of the mutual security program to the Congress, he will also continue to discharge his responsibility as Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, but he will begin this new task promptly upon this appointment."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 93), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the American people and the Congress have long been concerned that the peoples of the earth are plunged into vast armament expenditures which divert much of their effort into the creation of means of mass destruction; and

Whereas they have sought the achievement of a reliable system by which steps might be taken to limit and reduce the size of military forces and to insure the control of weapons of mass destruction; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recently established a position of Cabinet rank with responsibility for developing broad studies, investigations, and recommendations regarding the basic policy of this nation with respect to disarmament; and

Whereas the President indicated that when "desirable or appropriate under our constitutional processes, concurrences will be secured from the Congress prior to specific action or pronouncement of policy" in this field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations (hereinafter referred to as the committee), to consist of eight members chosen equally from both parties by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (in conjunction with two other Senators, not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and not of the same political party, designated by the President of the Senate), is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of proposals looking toward disarmament and the control of weapons of mass destruction.

SEC. 2. The said committee shall, without limiting the scope of the study hereby authorized, direct its attention to the following matters:

1. Efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armaments of all types;

2. Disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments as well as by private groups and individuals;

3. Methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad;

4. The relationship of armaments to the state of the world economy;

5. The relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament;

6. The dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and

7. Methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Foreign Relations shall transmit to the Senate not later than March 31, 1956, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as may be found desirable.

SEC. 4. In the conduct of this study, full use shall be made of studies, reports, and plans prepared by executive agencies concerned with this problem and such agencies are requested to give the committee the assistance it may require.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through March 31, 1956, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems desirable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at a luncheon of the Pennsylvania Chapter, Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century, meeting in Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1955.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF REYNIER J. WORTENDYKE, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey, to fill a new position, to file with the committee in writing on or before Thursday, April 28, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SUNDRY BILLS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 16, S. 150, S. 381, S. 382, S. 383, S. 1500, and any other bills which may be before the committee relating to the Small Business Administration. These hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 4, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building, and will probably continue on Thursday, May 5, 1955, in the same room.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone NAtional 8–3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this morning I had the great privilege of attending a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, was the witness. Mr. Hoover presented to us, in an informal way, some observations on the United Nations Charter and on suggested changes in the charter. In connection with his remarks he submitted to us a statement he prepared a year ago, at the request of the Foreign Relations Committee. The statement is entitled "An Appraisal of the Changes in the Charter of the United Nations."

After the meeting we held this morning one of my colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], suggested to me—and I heartily agreed with him—that the wisdom of Mr. Hoover's memorandum was so effective upon us that it should be published in full in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so as to be available in connection with the discussions of appropriate changes or nonchanges in the Charter of the United Nations.

I desire to emphasize that Mr. Hoover took a strong position in favor of continuance of the United Nations as an effective entity.

I now ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE CHANGES IN THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has before it the revision of the United

Nations Charter. The charter provides that revision may be proposed at the 1955 meeting.

I have prepared this appraisal at the urgent request of the committee.

I wish it to be clear that this is not a discussion or appraisal of the foreign or defense policies of the United States except as they are merely incidental to a discussion of the situation within the United Nations Organization itself and the problems of amending its charter.

RETAIN THE UNITED NATIONS

At the outset I may state that I believe the world should retain the United Nations Organization. It has not, however, fulfilled expectations. After 10 years of its service, we have not only had no peace, but a continuing cold war and increasing dissension in the world. The world needs a change of direction before the charter can be amended to fully meet the hopes of hundreds of millions of people over the earth.

PARALLEL EXPERIENCES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Any diagnosis of the problems of the United Nations can benefit from an appraisal of the forces which affected the League of Nations after World War I and the reappearance of these forces affecting the United Nations.

SIMILARITY OF STRUCTURE

The structure of the United Nations followed closely that of the League of Nations. Both organizations provided a council and an assembly. Their councils were similar in permanent membership of the great victorious powers. The requirement of unanimous vote of the League Council had about the same effect as the veto in the United Nations Security Council.

There are some differences in the relative authority and procedures of the councils and assemblies of the two organizations but in practical working they are about the same.

SIMILARITY OF PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

The major idea of both organizations—the League of Nations and the United Nations—was to substitute worldwide and united "collective action" to maintain the peace in place of balances of power, special military alliances and age-old power diplomacy. Maintenance of peace was to be accomplished in two different ways:

The first was collective action to settle disputes by pacific means.

The second was collective action to stop a military aggressor in his tracks by force.

Both the League and the United Nations were authorized to use a variety of pacific actions to solve conflicts among nations. They included advancement of international law, and disarmament. They included investigation of disputes, conciliation, negotiation, and arbitration of conflicts and in failure of these measures to report on the facts and who is to blame. Added to these is a World Court to decide matters of international law. I shall refer to this group of activities as "pacific action."

Both organizations, in failure of pacific action, were authorized to use force to stop military aggression. The League's provision for force actions embraced economic sanctions and contemplated military action. The United Nations' force actions likewise embraced economic sanctions but spelled out a more definite military procedure and organization.

SIMILARITY OF THEIR DIFFICULTIES

Many of the difficulties which beset the League are obviously now besetting the United Nations. Some of them are:

1. The world came out of both World War I and World War II with the illusion that the military cooperation which won victory would continue as unified action to make, organize, and keep the peace. After both wars age-old dislikes, fears, and grievances, the different racial, economic, and political interests and objectives of nations quickly dissolved this unity.

2. Both the League and the United Nations were the product of an idealism which did not contemplate the destructive effect upon peace or upon the organizations by totalitarian governments. Such governments are by nature militaristic and aggressive and, therefore, are poor material upon which to build international law and morals.

After the First World War, at least in part due to their fears of Communist infiltration and conspiracies from Moscow, 14 nations in Europe turned to Fascist totalitarianism, which corroded the whole League concept.

And the Communist totalitarian governments of today are resolute on conspiring to overthrow other governments onto the Communist-Marxist-Leninist line and even to do it by military aggression. They show no more cooperation toward building peace than did the Fascist governments after World War I.

3. The dominant influence of the major powers and their differences of national interests in the League rendered it impotent to prevent aggression by a major power. This same difficulty confronts the United Nations.

4. Both the League and the United Nations have found it impossible to make much progress at disarmament and, as a result, the peacetime military forces in the world rose to unparalleled levels both before World War II and are again rising today.

5. The result of these difficulties and differences of interest in the League led the peace-loving nations to negotiate the solution of critical situations outside of the League. The same thing is taking place outside of the United Nations today.

6. Soon after World War I, the special action by many nations to assure their defense led them into a maze of over 10 overlapping military alliances or allied groups embracing two-thirds of the world's population. These actions taken outside of the League brought about a return again to the balance of power and the ancient power diplomacy concepts. The world thus divided into armed camps devitalized the whole collective security concept of the League.

You may observe some analogies in the present situation through the rise again of a maze of defense alliances or military groups.

Today they include the militant Communist group of some 36 races. Most of the other alliances originate in defense measures against the aggressive dangers from this Communist group. They include the North Atlantic Treaty Defense Organization of 14 nations; the defense organization of American States ratified by 17 nations; the partially overlapping European Defense Community of 6 nations now awaiting signature; the mutual defense pact between the United States and Japan; likewise with Korea; the United States, Australian, New Zealand Defense Pact; the United States-Pakistan Defense Pact; and the United States defense pact with Turkey. There are other proposed defense alliances not yet completed. Another alliance, that is the Arab League, stands apart from the others. In total they embrace today about three-quarters of the world's population.

The United Nations Charter authorizes regional groups of nations for defense or other purposes. Whether these provisions are intended to embrace nations who are not members of the United Nations is not clear. Some of these alliances do include nonmember nations. Without discussing the effect of these alliances on the concept of collective action by the world as a whole, it is clear that the Communists are forcing the world into armed camps for defense against them. All of which certainly weakens the strength of the United Nations own ability to bring peace.

7. The attempt to implement its decisions by force through economic sanctions was the rock which ultimately wrecked the League. The final occasion was when the League attempted those sanctions on Italy for aggression in Ethiopia. The differences of national interests and other disunities caused this action to fail miserably.

I think you can find some analogies to this League experience today. Due to the Communist attitude and in the lack of unity among the other powers in the United Nations we have not fully accomplished the initial purposes for which the United Nations applied economic and military action in Korea. That initial purpose was to secure an independent and united North and South Korea. The lack of unity in the Korean case expressed itself in Communist opposition together with a lack of full unity and differences of strategy in the non-Communist members. This resulted in loading the United States with an undue proportion of the burden. We were compelled to provide 90 percent of the military force, the costs and the loss of life. The final result was a compromise of the initial purpose.

The United Nations (mostly the United States) did save South Korea from the aggressor, where the League failed in Ethiopia. But the differences of interest which developed in the Korean case have weakened the prospect of the United Nations itself taking such action again at least in the immediate future.

SIMILARITY OF STRENGTH

Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have demonstrated notable strength and success in their pacific actions of investigation and report, conciliation, negotiation, arbitration, and judicial decision of disputes which might have led them to war. These successes were principally among the secondary powers and were due to moral leadership and mobilized public opinion. Both organizations contributed to scientific, economic, philanthropic, public health, and international law advancement.

So far as I know, unity on these actions has been maintained in the United Nations except in one case.

DIRECTION OF CHANGES IN THE CHARTER

In view of the attitude and the purpose of the Communist nations and the difference of interests between non-Communist nations, it does not, at the present time, seem possible to make such changes in the Charter as would remedy the seven difficulties I have enumerated above. The world must await a great change in the whole Communist attitude.

Pending that time, the United Nations can build toward more unity in the field of pacific action to settle disputes, especially among secondary nations; in the promotion of scientific research; exchange of knowledge; public health; philanthropy; and such contributions to general prosperity as are possible.

The United Nations can continue to serve in these fields and, in so doing, is also making a contribution to the badly needed building of cooperation among nations outside the Communist complex.

Before the United Nations was concluded, I suggested several secondary ideas which I believed at that time would aid in preserving peace. But in view of the Communist attitudes and division of interest among other nations there would seem little likelihood of adoption of many or any of them at this time.

(a) I suggested a sort of bill of rights for nations including some of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter of August 1941 which had been whittled away at Teheran, and Yalta. They included no annexations, no territorial changes without consent of the people concerned, the right of peoples to choose freely their own form of government, equality in trade and freedom of the seas. This was not done in any effective form.

(b) To strengthen this I proposed a clear provision for freedom of nations from interference in their internal affairs either by the United Nations or its subsidiaries. There is a provision which states such interference by the United Nations is not authorized, but it is not positive nor inclusive of the whole problem.

(c) Another suggestion was that machinery be provided for the revision of onerous treaties, as the emotional situation after all world wars produce intolerable treaties, which in themselves sow dragon's teeth. This machinery was not accepted. Some indefinite words were adopted instead.

(d) A further suggestion was that there should be precise definition of aggression, and that definition to include such things as fifth columns, or foreign-organized conspiracies against other governments as being aggression. The Soviet Government itself at one time submitted a definition of aggression to the League of Nations which was very comprehensive, except it did not include the category of fifth-column activities. But not even the partial definition by the Soviet was adopted.

Secretary Dulles has called attention to some further revisions which include:

(e) There should be a revision of the charter by which all independent nations may have membership. The Soviet veto has excluded 14 such nations.

(f) No nation should have the right to veto pacific settlements among nations.

(g) He suggested that thought should be given to the fact that various specialized agencies set up by the Charter of the United Nations are not under proper control of the Council or Assembly. They mostly act independently and they are a constant source of trouble.

I would add to the Secretary of State's last suggestion one further:

(h) That all treaties suggested by their subsidiary economic, social, and other organizations for submission to nations should be subject to revision and approval by the Security Council before their submission to individual nations.

HERBERT HOOVER.

FORMOSA AND THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, the noted author and columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, has been writing an extremely interesting series of articles discussing the very dangerous situation with which we are confronted in Formosa and the offshore islands.

This morning, in the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers, Mr. Lippmann contributed another highly interesting and thoughtful article entitled "Disentanglement." The article is so important and so clear in its presentation of our danger and of the desperate situation into which we have allowed ourselves to be maneuvered—matters which are of vital interest not only to the Members of Congress, but to all the American people—that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, 1955]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

DISENTANGLEMENT

Last Monday the Chinese Ambassador, Dr. Wellington Koo, delivered a long and interesting speech on the attitude of his government in Formosa. They will reject, indeed they will resist, any proposal which calls for their withdrawal from the offshore islands. There was much passion in the speech. For while Dr. Koo observed the diplomatic niceties and pretended that he was talking about "the well-meaning pacifists of the free world" who are "the sponsors of fanciful formulas," he was quite plainly thinking about Mr. Adlai Stevenson's speech of the week before, and he was talking at, or over the head of, Mr. Dulles.

The formulas, of which many have been talked about in the capitals of the world and in the corridors of the U. N., are all of them, I believe, variations on two basic themes. The first collection of formulas are designed to strike a balance with Peiping in which the offshore islands, plus perhaps other considerations such as the U. N. seat, are to be given to Peiping in return for a cease-fire; Peiping for its part would be agreeing not to use lethal weapons to "liberate" Formosa, and would be assenting to a military coexistence with Chiang's regime. I think it is correct to say that this was the general idea in Washington when the Formosa resolution was being offered to Congress.

Dr. Koo is right, it seems to me, in calling these formulas "fanciful," and indeed in speaking of them as an attempt to appease the Communists. But it is hard to believe that Dr. Koo is really worrying about formulas which have become so unreal and so fanciful. For they have been rejected not only by his own government in Formosa, but even more emphatically by the government in Peiping. What must really be worrying him is the second line of negotiations, which he did not however refer to expressly. This is the attempt to negotiate not with the Chinese Communists but among the allies. Here the bargain would be an allied guaranty of Formosa in return for a disengagement from the offshore islands.

A formula of this sort might help the President and Mr. Dulles to disentangle themselves in Congress. But if it were a serious and candid international agreement, it would have to be a guaranty against the military conquest of Formosa in return for an American guaranty not to give military support to the return of Chiang to the mainland, and to treat his regime as provisional until there is a settlement by international agreement of the status of Formosa.

The declaration in Dr. Koo's speech that the Nationalist troops will remain, if necessary alone, on the offshore islands is directed primarily at these discussions among the allies. Dr. Koo is saying that if Mr. Dulles were to strike such a bargain with Sir Anthony Eden, the Generalissimo would still refuse to leave the offshore islands. And—this is said by implication—if the Generalissimo refuses to leave the islands, then the President's horrid predicament will remain.

For the Nationalist troops are reported to be about a third of Chiang's army. As used to be said of the French troops which were locked up in Dien Bien Phu, they are like a goat tethered in the jungle as bait for the tiger. The President is being cast for the role of the hunter with the big gun who has promised his friends to sacrifice the goat because he will not shoot the tiger.

The moral of all this is, I submit, that it is an illusion to regard the offshore islands as assets in bargaining either with the Communists or with our allies. The truth upon which American policy ought to be based is that the offshore islands are liabilities. They are strategical and political liabilities. Our problem is not how to sell them but how—with honor—to liquidate these liabilities without a tragedy.

Contrary to a widespread opinion, the security of Formosa is not enhanced, it is on the contrary jeopardized, by Chiang's stand in the offshore islands. They are related to the security of Formosa only because they greatly increase the insecurity of Formosa.

For if a general war with mainland China were to break out—and if it were to be fought with atomic weapons in the Carney style—how could Formosa be defended? Suppose, as is more likely than not, that the Red Chinese have received from the Soviet Union, or have been promised, some nuclear weapons of their own. Only the most headstrong in their recklessness will deny that what is so possible is also probable. Formosa is a most vulnerable target to atomic bombing. Being a small island without space behind it, Formosa is infinitely more vulnerable to atomic destruction than is mainland China with its vast space and its vast depth and its enormous population.

And what are we to suppose that Japan would do in such a war? Is it reasonable to imagine that Japan would and could permit the United States to use her territory as a base in an atomic war against the ally of the Soviet Union—which has an air force and a stockpile of nuclear weapons, and is 2 hours flying time from Japan?

It would be well for Dr. Koo and his American friends to stop pretending that only "well-meaning pacifists" or "badly meaning appeasers" are in favor of disentangling the United States, and if possible Chiang as well, from the military trap in the offshore islands. The issues involved are debatable, to be sure, and the working out of the ways and means to disentangle the commitment calls for deliberation and debate. But the issues cannot be disposed of by contemptuous adjectives, like "well-meaning" and by tainted epithets like "pacifist" and "appeaser."

This is a very serious business, involving the vital interests of the United States throughout the world. Those who hold the view that these offshore islands are a liability and a dangerous entanglement include military leaders and statesmen here and abroad who need fear no comparison with Admiral Radford, Admiral Carney, General Van Fleet, or Senator Knowland—be the comparison on the ground of their professional competence, their political experience and wisdom, or their record of resistance to tyranny.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS AND THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, President Eisenhower submitted his mutual security recommendations for the 1956 fiscal year. These recommendations will, of course, receive the detailed evaluation of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees, and thereafter that of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

One of the aspects of the foreign aid program which I trust will be carefully brought to the attention of the American public will be the important interrelationship between that program and the stimulation of production and economic well-being in our own country.

Many persons do not realize the very considerable amount of economic current generated in our own land by the overseas mutual security program.

We as a nation do not, of course, enter into the foreign aid program for the basic purpose of contributing to our own economy. Rather our aim is the strengthening of the free world and the combating of the Communist tide. But it is very clear that there is a healthy and helpful byproduct of our aid in the

form of a constructive economic stimulus to our own economy.

I send to the desk a memorandum with regard to the background of the worthwhile impact of foreign aid on my own State. I have previously commented on the Senate floor on this phase, drawing upon Library of Congress material, and pointing out that Wisconsin, like other States, has been greatly benefited by the foreign aid program.

While detailed economic statistics of the State-by-State impact are not available, certain helpful observations are, I believe, made therein; and I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Foreign assistance not only helps foreign countries to develop their economies, but it aids the agriculture and industry of our country. In 1953 the volume of agricultural exports was equivalent to 33 million acres, or 9.5 percent of the harvested acreage. The value of agricultural exports is equal to about one-eighth of total cash income.

Our merchandise exports constitute about 9 percent of the value of movable goods produced in this country. In 1954 they amounted to about 4.2 percent of gross national product when military aid is included; if that item is excluded the percentage is 3.5. In 1952 the Departments of Agriculture and Labor gave the following totals of employments attributable to exports:

Nonagricultural employees	2,150,000
Agricultural workers	976,000

To Wisconsin, foreign aid is extremely important. In 1954 agricultural imports for the Nation rose 7 percent over 1953. Although agricultural exports gained in importance in 1954 over 1953, we are becoming less dependent on Western Europe as a source of agricultural income. In prewar years Western Europe took more than 60 percent of United States farm exports. By 1953 Western Europe was taking only 44 percent of United States farm exports. Dairy products, in which Wisconsin is the chief State, continued their drop in export volume in 1954 although there was a slight increase over 1953. Exports of condensed milk declined from 17,979,000 pounds to 1,412,000 pounds. Dairy products exported are a small share of United States production. In 1953 butter production was 1,646,000,000 pounds, exports only 306,000 pounds. Cheese production was 1,298,000,000 pounds, exports 6 million pounds. Nonfat dry-milk production was 1,200,000,000 pounds, while exports were 98 million pounds.

Wisconsin's chief port, Milwaukee, is important for the manufacture of heavy items which are well established in export markets. Such items as earth moving machinery, hoists, cranes, tractors, machine tools, pipes, refrigerating machinery, and so forth, are characteristic products. These are among the main items which have been provided under the European foreign aid program. There is continuing need for such equipment in the Asian program. There is also a market for our lighter durable goods products, although such items are not so directly dependent upon aid programs for foreign markets.

The importance of the foreign aid program to the trade of Wisconsin is attested by a careful student of the port of Milwaukee as follows:

"Boosted by foreign aid program, exports from Milwaukee have increased considerably since the war. Milwaukee has become the largest exporter on the Great Lakes for heavy machinery and agricultural equipment. * * * Dairy products and other foodstuffs have also been exported from Milwaukee in considerable quantities." [1]

Mr. Hamming tells of the importance of aid as follows:

"Because of the uncertainty of foreign aid programs, it is difficult to predict what the future of the overseas trade will be. Already in 1951 a decided reduction in the export trade took place." [2]

There are no statistics available which give exact figures covering exports of goods produced in Wisconsin. There is, however, impressive factual evidence that exports play an important part in the industrial and agricultural policy of the State.

Following are general statistics of manufacturing for Wisconsin and United States exports for the year 1952:

Manufacturing industries	Production workers	Wages and salaries	Value added by manufacture	Value of domestic exports at port or border point of export
		Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
Food and kindred products	47,376	$156,389	$530,734	$602,941
Textile mill products	7,812	21,469	50,420	386,689
Lumber and products (except furniture)	19,132	47,390	86,010	54,567
Furniture and fixtures	10,533	37,222	78,118	
Paper and allied products	26,054	98,113	265,227	134,279
Chemicals and allied products	3,922	13,331	77,212	572,592
Leather and leather products	15,648	46,651	87,712	23,271
Primary metal industries	22,107	92,778	187,250	592,329
Fabricated metal products	27,873	107,729	262,639	182,758
Machinery (except electrical)	72,232	317,291	757,947	1,925,756
Electrical machinery	27,491	105,613	300,300	385,874
Transportation equipment	30,678	123,024	237,742	702,024
Instruments and related products	4,095	14,981	31,439	122,123
Miscellaneous manufactures	9,439	32,159	91,402	
Total	358,211	1,339,640	3,320,663	

Sources: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Annual Survey of Manufactures: 1952. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1953, p. 58; and 1952 Manufacturers' Shipments and Domestic Exports of Selected Products.

The preceding table gives only a rough indication of the relationship of value added by manufacture and value of domestic exports. The column for the value of domestic exports is taken from a table covering about $6.6 billion, or about 73 percent of the approximately $9 billion of total domestic exports of manufactured products for which data are distributed by product. No attempt has been made to sum the column because of items which did not fit readily into the classifications as given in the Census of Manufactures Data. The first three columns refer to the State of Wisconsin, the fourth to the United States. It is readily evident that the relationship between the items in columns 3 and 4 is tenuous at best because of the relative inadequacy of detailed statistics.

The dependence of Wisconsin on foreign aid will continue to decline as the emphasis shifts from agricultural and consumer goods to defense items. We hope, however, that Wisconsin will receive its proportionate share in orders for military items. There has been much shifting away from the United States for farm-products needs, especially some of those, i. e., dairy products and corn, which are most important to Wisconsin.

Expansion of the program of foreign aid to Asia should prove to be a boon to our capital equipment industries. In the present declining state of foreign aid to Europe and before the Asian trade gets under way, Wisconsin seems destined to face increasing difficulties in exporting both agricultural and industrial products, but a program of aid to Asia large enough to solve that area's economic problems should provide many fine markets for Wisconsin's agriculture and industry.

THE ARCHITECTURAL GENIUS, FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a statement regarding Wisconsin's and all America's great architectural genius, Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Throughout the world, one of the most famous professional leaders which our country has produced and contributed to mankind is that of the universally acknowledged architectural genius, Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright.

We, of Wisconsin, are proud that for many years we have enjoyed in our State one of his great architectural training centers, Taliesen.

In a recent article in the Milwaukee Journal, Mr. Wright summed up his plans for the ultimate incorporation of Taliesen in "a college of architecture and the humanities to be administered by the State of Wisconsin."

It is most appropriate that we of Wisconsin who have been privileged for many years to enjoy his works and his training activity pay appropriate and lasting homage to this great citizen—this great developer of organic architecture—upon whom honors have been bestowed all over the civilized world.

All too often, unfortunately, a prophet may not be honored in his own country, but in the Badger State, in Arizona, and throughout America as a whole, I trust that we will always do justice by those who have done so proudly by us and for us, as in the instance of Frank Lloyd Wright.

MADISON PROJECT

In the latest issue of the rotogravure section of the Sunday Milwaukee Journal was a picture of the auditorium and civic center project which will be constructed at Madison as virtually a monument to Mr. Wright's genius. This downtown project near the State capitol and extending out

[1] Edward Hamming. The Port of Milwaukee. The University of Chicago. Department of Geography. Research Paper No. 26, Chicago, December 1952, p. 126.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

over Lake Monona will cost at least $4 million under a city bond issue authorized at the Madison election.

INTERVIEWS WITH MR. WRIGHT

Now, as regards Frank Lloyd Wright, personally, the interviews which he has granted have been relatively few in number, but they are always full of exceedingly memorable observations.

There follow now excerpts from an interview which had been published back on July 24, 1953, between Mr. Wright and Mr. Hugh Downs, of the National Broadcasting Co., as recorded in a television film shown on station WTMJ-TV.

Thereafter are excerpts from a significant interview conducted with Mr. Wright by Mr. I. Monty Radlovic, editor of the noted Diplomat magazine, published here in our Nation's Capital. This interview was recorded in 2 parts in the March and April 1955 issues of the Diplomat.

I believe that Mr. Wright's observations will be of deep interest to my colleagues and I include them now.

The people of the United States are proud of the great leaders in all fields of endeavor whom we have contributed to modern civilization.

High among that group will always be the name of this giant of world architecture, Frank Lloyd Wright.

We wish him many more years of good health and fruitful activity.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 24, 1953]

CONVERSATION WITH FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT—THE EMINENT ARCHITECT AT 84 SUMMARIZES HIS HONEST ARROGANCE PHILOSOPHY, DEPLORES TREND TOWARD IMITATION RATHER THAN ORIGINALITY AND STATES THE CASE FOR ORGANIC ARCHITECTURE

Mr. DOWNS. We'd like to get as clear a picture as possible, Mr. Wright, of the essence of your thinking about American architecture in American life.

How did you get started as an architect?

Mr. WRIGHT. We were poor, we had no money to send me to an architectural school—and at Madison, our home, the University of Wisconsin had an engineering school, and a very kind dean, Professor Conover, gave me a stipend to work for him. If I had stayed 3 months longer I would have been given a degree as an engineer, but I was anxious to be an architect. So I started.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you say that any of Louis Henri Sullivan's ideas in architecture influenced you in the early years when you worked in his office?

Mr. WRIGHT. Naturally. They were influencing nearly everybody in the country. He was the real radical of his day. And his thought gave us the skyscraper. You see, when buildings first began to be tall, architects didn't know how to make them tall. They would put a 1-, 2-, or 3-story building on top of another until they had enough. I remember the master came in when I was still with the firm of Adler & Sullivan in 1890, and threw something on my table—the plan of the Wainwright Building in St. Louis. He said, "Wright, this thing is tall. What's the matter with a tall building?" And there it was, tall. After that the skyscraper began to flourish, and I think all the skyscrapers you see today were the result of Louis Sullivan's initiative.

Mr. DOWNS. Most people who are at all acquainted with your work know that your work is organic and intimately bound up with the lives of people. When did this idea first begin to take shape in your work?

Mr. WRIGHT. Out here on the western prairies of Chicago came the first expression in humane terms of what we call now organic architecture.

Mr. DOWNS. You use the word organic. Is that any different from modern architecture, in your opinion?

Mr. WRIGHT. Very different, because modern architecture is merely something which may be built today, but organic architecture is an architecture from within outward, in which entity is the ideal. Organic means, in the philosophic sense, entity, where the whole is to the part as the part is to the whole, and where the nature of the materials, the purpose, the entire performance becomes a necessity, and out of that comes what situation you can give to the building as a creative artist.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, now, with that in mind, what do you try to put into a house when you design one?

Mr. WRIGHT. First of all, we consider the family it is designed for. And we try to put into that house a sense of unity, of the altogether that makes it a part of the site. If the architect's effort is successful you can't imagine that house anywhere else than right where it is. It is a part of its environment, and it graces its environment, rather than disgraces it.

Mr. DOWNS. Tell us about your own home, Mr. Wright. Taliesin.

Mr. WRIGHT Well, Taliesin was built in 1911, and was a kind of refuge at the time. I was getting a worm's eye view of society, and needed to get into the country, and my mother had prepared this site for me and asked me to take it. The countryside is southern Wisconsin, with low hills, protruding rock ledges, wooded site. The site determined the features and character of the house. Taliesin really is a stone house and it is a house of the north. I loved the icicles that came on the eaves. In the winter the snow would sweep up over it and it would look like a hill itself. It was built to belong to the region.

Mr. DOWNS. Where did the name "Taliesin" come from, Mr. Wright?

Mr. WRIGHT. My people were Welsh, my mother's people were Welsh immigrants, my old grandfather was a hatter and a preacher. Taliesin means shining brow and Taliesin is built like a brow on the edge of the hill—not on top of the hill—because I believe you should never build on top of anything directly. If you build on top of the hill, you lose the hill. If you build one side of the top, you have the hill and the eminence that you desire.

Mr. DOWNS. What is the difference between organic architecture and conventional architecture?

Mr. WRIGHT. You mean structurally, I imagine.

Mr. DOWNS. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. The old post and beam construction is a kind of superimposition. If builders wanted partitions, they would cut, and they would butt and slash and if they wanted tension, they had to rivet something to something and make a connection. It might give way. Well, organic architecture brought the principle together so that you could pull on the structure. It had tensile strength owing to steel, and owing to steel it could have great spaces. And the great spaces could be protected with glass. The Greeks never had any such facility. If they had had steel and glass, we wouldn't have to do any thinking today—we'd be copying. But something had to be done with these new materials. Because of that principle of tenuity, we could use the cantilever, and into structure came this element of continuity. You see one thing merging into another rather than this cut, butt, and slash. This same element of strength brought the Tokyo Imperial hotel intact through the earthquake. That is the principle of tenuity and of flexibility of earth, instead of rigidity, which could be broken.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you recount for us some of the things which are fundamentally your own innovations in architecture?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, first of all came this new sense of space, as a reality of the building. Then came the countenance of that space which is more or less what I termed streamlined. That word "streamlined" got into the language about that time through my effort.

Then there was the open plan. Instead of a building being a series of boxes and closets it became more and more open—with more and more sense of space. The outside came in more and more and the inside went out more. That went along until we had practically a new floor plan, and it has been referred to always as the open plan.

Then, of course, there were structural implications which we hinted at a little while ago of a building that had tenuity instead of a building without any, which could fall apart. These houses built upon this plan are good for 300 years, I should think. And in that structural dispensation, a great many features arose. The most important one was gravity heat, where the heat is in the floor, underneath the slab and in a broken stone bed. With a thick rug on the floor, you have a reservoir of heat underneath you. You can open the windows and still be comfortable. The children play on a nice warm surface. If you sit warm and your feet are warm, you are warm.

The corner window is something we should mention in connection with innovation. The corner window is indicative of an idea conceived early in my work that the box was a Fascist symbol, and the architecture of freedom and democracy needed something besides the box, so I started out to destroy the box as a building. Well, the corner window came in. The light came in where it had never come before, vision went out, and you had screens instead of walls. Here the walls vanished as walls and the box vanished as a box, and the corner window went around the world, but the idea of the thing never followed it, and it became merely a window instead of the release of an entire sense of structure.

Mr. DOWNS. I've heard indirect lighting attributed to you.

Mr. WRIGHT. I did the first so-called indirect lighting very, very early. I guess it was about 50 years ago.

Mr. DOWNS. You have recently built a new church (at Madison, Wis.) and it is not typical of most churches in our experience. Could you tell us why?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, there you see the Unitarianism of my forefathers found expression in a building by one of the offspring. The Unitarians believe in the unity of all things. I tried to build a building here that expressed that sense of unity. The plan is triangular. The roof is triangular, and out of this you get this expression of reverence without the steeple. The building itself, covering all, says what the steeple used to say, but says it with greater reverence, I think.

Mr. DOWNS. Over the years, Mr. Wright, the American press and sections of your own profession have not always treated you kindly. I just wonder if you have any comment about this.

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, I don't see any reason why they should have treated me kindly. I was entirely contrary to everything they believed in and if I was right, they were wrong—why should they treat me kindly?

But it is still true that the greatest appreciation of what we have done comes from European countries and the Orient rather than from our own country. It has always been the idea of our people that culture came from abroad. It did. They didn't want to hear of its developing in the tall grass of the western prairies. That was not exciting. So when it had gone abroad and had been

understood and appreciated abroad, and the Europeans had come over here with it, they could sell it to the American people. Americans would take it from them, though they didn't like to take it from me.

* * * * *

Mr. DOWNS. Do you feel that American architecture has progressed generally over—well—the last several years?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I'm afraid it has not. I think that the effects have been sought and multiplied and the "why" of the effect, the real cause of the center of the thing, seems to have languished. If they once mastered the inner principle, infinite variety would result. No one would have to copy anybody else. My great disappointment is that instead of emulation, what I see is a wave of imitation.

Mr. DOWNS. In your long life of practical and artistic endeavor, what do you consider as your most satisfactory achievement?

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, my dear boy—the next building I build.

[From Diplomat]

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT LOOKS AT THE WORLD—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH I. MONTE RADLOVIC, EDITOR OF THE DIPLOMAT

Question. Mr. Wright, do you think Government should assume more responsibility in the field of architecture?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I think the Government is totally unqualified to take a hand in culture. All the Government can do is to police the situation, keep the elements that destroy us standing off, and keep those elements that are competent going. Where is that Government?

Culture, so far as Government is concerned, never was a matter that would be legitimate in its hands. With kings, perhaps. The Louis' could be great patrons of the arts; they had an environment and an atmosphere of their own, characteristic of them. But now we, the people, free, with this ideal of freedom under our vests, tugging away at our life situation—what is there for us?

* * * * *

Question. Do you think the individual should take more responsibility to protect himself against politics?

Mr. WRIGHT. We can't afford in this country to take only a passing interest in politics; we have to get into politics, and we have to get in with all our might, too, and help decide the fate of this Nation. Government is a policeman. We can't live and have our being today without the police. Policemen are essential to the situation, or else everyone would lose everything he had to everybody else. That goes all down the line and ramifies into other things. This moneymaking race, this mad rat race in the direction of money has to have regulation; it must be policed. Now, it is an evil. We don't want to turn our future over to that evil. We don't want to allow that future of ours and of our children to be determined by that factor in our lives.

So why turn over to Government anything except what Government is necessary for, as a policeman? Thomas Jefferson said it in terms as clear as could be stated. The men who devised for us the marvelous, ingenious, and effective instrument called our Constitution, were fully aware of this. But since then it has been tinkered with and changed and fussed with, until now almost everything we had as a defense and as a protection has disappeared by way of amendment; what the forefathers really did has been virtually emasculated, practically destroyed. Absolutely we must take a definite, intelligent interest in politics.

* * * * *

Question. Do you recommend the ballot toward this end?

Mr. WRIGHT. The ballot is inevitable and natural to our system of government; our ballots should mean something, but our voice and our actions behind the ballot should, meantime, be more effective than the ballot, should qualify the ballot.

* * * * *

Question. Do you believe that architecture is a medium through which we can strive for world peace?

Mr. WRIGHT. Why, of course. Any medium is, that is social in its bearings and its effects, and architecture is primarily so. It is a great agency for peace and concordance among nations, because the principles that would make a great city today, will make one all over the world, not only in America. And what is lacking today, I think—why we have so many wars perpetually (we are all paying for war, even when there is none)—is a coherent idea of what is natural. If we had a natural house, we would have a natural state of mind, the whole thing would be natural; in the sense that civilization is natural, war is unnatural. So to begin with, the natural house would eventuate in a natural peace; if we got it over. And to get it over, we would have to have peace. Who can think of houses, or buildings, or a life, where there is continual war? It is unthinkable. So, if you get it in one little end of the skein, you can unravel it the whole way. As a natural consequence of a natural house you would have a natural order. And, as a consequence of a natural order, you would have a natural peace. And you would have more beautiful lives, more beautiful ways of living life. You would have everything in the direction of improvement instead of everything going the other way.

But the state of architecture at the present time is depressing. And when architecture drops out of a civilization—when it is at a low ebb, and depressed—the very key to that civilization has been lost. And there is no way either of opening it or shutting it. Of course, this is an architect speaking. An architect should know what he is for; he should know what he is talking about. But he should be aware of his opportunities as well as his responsibilities; and they are very great. He is the keyman in a civilization.

ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR OF UNOBJECTED-TO BILLS ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the calendar is called on Monday, the Senate proceed to consider the unobjected-to bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARD TO ROY H. GLOVER OF ORDER OF MERIT BY THE PRESIDENT OF CHILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 6, 1955, President Carlos Ibañez, of the Republic of Chile, in a colorful ceremony awarded to Mr. Roy H. Glover, vice president and general counsel of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., the decoration carrying the rank of Knight Commander, in the Order of Merit of Bernardo O'Higgins, one of the highest decorations in the Republic and one which has been awarded to very few foreigners. As everyone knows, Bernardo O'Higgins was the George Washington of Chile; and that son of Irish-Spanish parents had a great deal to do with freeing Chile from Spain and creating the independent nation which exists today.

The history of Chile is one of great distinction, since the end of the colonial period and the establishment of the Republic. Chile is important to this country also because Chile possesses 35 percent of the world's reserves of copper. We know that at the present time copper is an extremely important commodity, and a commodity in short supply.

The principal American company operating in Chile is the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., and the principal official of that company carrying on negotiations with the Republic of Chile is Mr. Roy H. Glover, a friend of mine for many years, a man who has great understanding, tolerance, and merit, and whom the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I are happy to call friend.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article from El Mercurio, of Santiago, Chile, dated April 7, 1955, entitled "His Excellency Decorates Anaconda Mining Co. Vice President."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS EXCELLENCY DECORATES ANACONDA MINING CO. VICE PRESIDENT—THE CEREMONY TOOK PLACE AT THE RED ROOM OF THE MINT

In a ceremony which took place yesterday at 5 p. m., the vice president of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., Mr. Roy Glover, was honored by the Government for his constant and effective activities on behalf of Chile, which he has carried out over long years of continuous ties with our main source of wealth.

The badge of honor as Knight Commander of the Bernardo O'Higgins Order of Merit was laid upon him by the President of the Republic, who expressed his satisfaction upon conferring the decoration to so outstanding a North American citizen.

Mr. Glover acknowledged the honor and expressed his confidence in this country's future which, in his opinion, will prosper with the joint efforts of the Chileans and foreigners.

Present at the ceremony were Mrs. Garciela Letelier de Ibañez, Mrs. Glover, the Minister

of Foreign Affairs, the Secretary of Economics, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Mining, and Interior, the United States Ambassador, Mr. Willard L. Beaulac, the vice president of the Anaconda Mining Co. in Chile, Sr. Rodolfo Michels, and other company officials and chancellery functionaries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Distinction Conferred Upon Mr. Roy Glover," published in La Nacion, of Santiago, Chile, on April 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTINCTION CONFERRED UPON MR. ROY GLOVER

At 5 p. m. yesterday in the Red Room of the Mint, our Government honored Mr. Roy Glover, vice president and counselor of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., conferring upon him the rank of knight commander in the Bernardo O'Higgins Order of Merit.

The new member of the ancient order arrived at the Mint Palace accompanied by the United States Ambassador His Excellency Mr. Willard Beaulac and other high officials of the American Embassy. They were received in the Red Room by the Most Excellent President of the Republic and Mrs. Ibañez, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Ministers of Economics, Agriculture, Mining, and the Navy's Commander in Chief, Rear Adm. Francisco O'Ryan, and the Secretary of the Interior, Senor German Sanhueza. Upon conferring the honor to Mr. Glover, the Chief Executive praised his merits, pointing out Mr. Glover's friendship and admiration for our country, which make him worthy of the distinction bestowed upon him by the Chilean Government.

A moment later the Chief Executive and Mrs. Ibañez entertained Mr. and Mrs. Glover with cocktails at the Mint Palace, attending also Ambassador Beaulac, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and other personalities who had been present at the ceremony.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Mr. Roy Glover, a Friend of Chile," published in the nationwide magazine and newspaper Zig-Zag, of Santiago, Chile, dated April 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ROY GLOVER: A FRIEND OF CHILE

Tall, well-mannered, somewhat youthful looking in spite of his years—such is the impression conveyed by Mr. Roy Glover, vice president and general counselor for the Anaconda and subsidiary companies. He holds these positions since 1951, having visited Chile six times during the past 3 years. It would not be an exaggeration to state that so distinguished a businessman is in love with our country. The simplicity of his manners, the goodwill he shows toward the press, do not betray, I might say, the head of numerous banks such as the National City Bank, the First National St. Paul Bank of Minnesota, and the Metals Bank & Trust Co., nor the adviser to, among other societies, the Montana & Power Co. and the American Brass. All of these responsibilities are held today by this quiet and shrewd former law student of the University of Oregon in the State of Oregon. Having practiced law for a few years, Mr. Glover moved to the State of Montana, where he worked as chief attorney for the company in which today he enjoys so eminent as well as deserved position. His affection toward Chile has—happily for us—allowed him to act in his country as an ambassador from ours. For 2 years now he has been one of the personalities who have most earnestly fought in Washington to enforce the laws suspending importation duties on Chilean copper. Recently he showed outstanding activity at the New Orleans Economic Conference. There he wished once more to demonstrate his interest and love for Chile, and hence no effort seemed enough to him.

Few foreigners, like him, deserve gratefulness from the Chilean people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Roy H. Glover Receives the Order of Merit From President of Chile," published in the Butte (Mont.) Standard of April 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROY H. GLOVER RECEIVES THE ORDER OF MERIT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF CHILE

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—In a solemn ceremony at 6 o'clock Wednesday in the Presidential Hall of Ceremonies, Roy H. Glover, vice president and general counsel of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., was personally decorated by President Carlos Ibañez, of the Republic, with the Order of Merit, one of the highest honors bestowed by the Chilean Government and one which has been awarded to but few foreigners.

President Ibañez in a brief address remarked upon the qualifications of Mr. Glover to merit this high honor. Mr. Glover replied in a brief address.

Members of the cabinet, the United States Ambassador, and counsellor and heads of departments of the Anaconda companies in Chile attended the ceremony. Mrs. Glover aid Mrs. Ibañez were among those present. The ceremony was followed by a tea party with the president as host.

The Order of Merit is awarded for valuable services to Chile. Mr. Glover has contributed much to the economy of the country in connection with Chile's copper industry.

Mr. and Mrs. Glover maintain their home at 915 W. Galena in Butte. During the past several years he has been in Chile numerous times in the interest of the copper program.

After serving as western general counsel of the Anaconda company Mr. Glover, one of Montana's most distinguished lawyers, became vice president and general counsel of the company on October 12, 1951. He is also a director of the Anaconda Co.

He is a native of Goldendale, Wash., where he received his early education. He also attended school in Portland and graduated in law from the University of Oregon. He practiced law in Portland in 1916 after graduation. After overseas service during World War I, Mr. Glover was admitted to the Montana bar in 1918. He practiced in Great Falls from 1918 to 1943, when he joined the Anaconda company's legal staff in Butte. He became western general counsel of the Anaconda company in 1945. In his early career as a lawyer he was a member of the firm of Weir, Clift, Glover, and Bennett, with offices in Great Falls and Helena, the firm becoming counsel for the Great Northern Railway in Montana. In Great Falls he was a member of the law firm of Cooper, Stephenson, and Glover from 1936 to 1943, that firm transacting the legal business of the Anaconda company in northern Montana.

Mr. Glover is a director of numerous corporations. Among them are the First Bank Stock Corp., of Minneapolis, the Montana Power Co., the Metals Bank and Trust Co., of Butte, the First National Bank of Great Falls, and the Heisey Co., of Great Falls.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Glover has had a long and distinguished career in the Western section of the United States. He is a lawyer of great distinction, and of late years he has been interested primarily in the relations between his company and the Chilean Government. He has accomplished a great deal toward preventing exportation of copper to the Iron Curtain countries and the Soviet Union. He has done all that he could to see that copper, which the Chileans must export, is exported to the free world for use in that area.

It is important also that some of the copper be brought to this country to keep our fabricating plants going and to keep our prosperity alive.

I repeat, Mr. President, that there is an extreme shortage of copper in this country, and that the one place we can usually depend upon to make up the shortage is the Republic of Chile. In recognizing the merits of Roy H. Glover, it is my belief that the Chilean Government has recognized a man of outstanding ability, a great American, and one who is interested in the development of Chile, as well as the development of the interests of the United States as a whole.

It is a privilege for my esteemed senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and me to join in this tribute to Roy Glover. Modest, efficient, diplomatic, and understanding he well deserves the honor accorded him by Chile and the thanks of the United States for his outstanding work in solidifying Chilean-American relations and friendship.

OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, humbly and penitently we are coming unto Thee in the fellowship of prayer, beseeching Thee that, in the work of this day, we may be

blessed with clear judgment and wise decision.

May our minds and hearts always be sensitive and responsive to the guidance of Thy spirit and be inspired with a radiant vision of the conquering power of truth and righteousness.

Sustain us in all our struggles to preserve and perpetuate those blessings of freedom and democracy which our forefathers found so hard to win and which we are now finding so difficult to hold.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all who are engaged in the business of statecraft may be courageous in spirit and strong in faith as they strive to lead and lift humanity out of the lowlands of darkness and despair into the loftier altitude of amity and peace.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, as members, respectively, of the Boards of Visitors to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 18, 19, and 23 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–12.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–13.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5478) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1936 this body enacted legislation permitting blind people to operate concessions in Federal buildings. One of the sponsors of legislation, the Honorable Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, and a good friend of mine, has been able to look back, with a great deal of pleasure, on the benefits the blind have derived from this piece of legislation. Last year alone, more than 1,600 blind people earned over $4 million from working in this program.

It has come to my attention that the blind operators are expressing their appreciation to Mr. Randolph and Members of this body who voted for the legislation, by means of a testimonial banquet which they are sponsoring on April 29 and at which Mr. Jennings Randolph will be the honored guest.

It is a privilege to be asked by the blind to extend to the Members of the House of Representatives who served and worked with Mr. Randolph the invitation to join in this celebration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to hear my friend's remarks, particularly in relation to Jennings Randolph, who was one of the greatest Members to have ever served in this body and one of the ablest Members of this body. He made marked contributions in many fields of progress, and particularly in the field to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred. I am so happy to hear these remarks and to pay my special tribute to Jennings Randolph.

Mr. KELLEY of Pensylvania. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts express his opinion about this. The benefits derived by this piece of legislation have been of inestimable value to the blind people in this field.

ANTITRUST HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 9, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary will begin about 3 weeks of hearings on the antitrust problems discussed in the report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. Our subcommittee plans to get at facts hitherto not disclosed concerning the issues, problems, deliberations, and findings involved. The views are being solicited of Members of Congress, small business, farmer, labor, consumer, and professional groups.

We warmly welcome your assistance and would deeply appreciate receiving the benefit of your views and experience on the many complicated antitrust problems discussed in the Attorney General's report. Our subcommittee cordially invites all who may so desire both in the House and the Senate to appear and testify at such time as may be convenient during the period from May 9 to May 27 to help us in our work.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H. R. 4876, have until 12 o'clock tonight in which to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, you will recall my reference recently to the mythical decision of Mr. Justice Radish in the case against the Board of Inland Commissioners. I should like this morning

to read the first paragraph of an editorial which appeared in the London Economist of March 19, 1955:

At this season the Chancellor of the Exchequer is the target for many representations by interested parties for taxation relief. This year, however, one has been made which deserves particular consideration. Two weeks ago a deputation from the general council of the bar, the Law Society and the Institute of Chartered Accountants asked Mr. Butler to take steps to implement the recommendations of the Millard Tucker committee in respect of retirement benefits for self-employed persons. The report appeared a year ago—too late, perhaps, for consideration in what was, in any case, a standstill budget; but if Mr. Butler is considering tax concessions this year it is much to be hoped that he will think about the plight of the professions. As things are, taxation falls with unfair severity upon that section of the community which lives by fees rather than by salaries or wages; especially on those members of the free professions who conduct private practices.

Mr. Speaker, ipse dixit.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of one of the truly decisive events of history—a true story of heroism so unbelievably great that it beggars the tallest tale a Texan has ever told.

On the 21st day of April 1836 a hastily assembled and only partially trained civilian contingent of fewer than 800 volunteers thoroughly routed and utterly put to flight the flower and elite of a huge military empire led by a self-confessed military genius, one of the most ruthless dictators in the history of mankind.

Rarely has a military engagement been so fatefully significant. Because of that triumph at San Jacinto and the events which followed it, the United States was to stretch across the broad expanse of the continent to the Pacific Ocean, adding a million square miles to its domain and making certain the indivisible destiny of this Nation of freemen.

It is worthy of our observance today, not alone because of its historic consequence, but because it imparts a lesson as timely as tomorrow's headline.

The early Texans, lured by the promise of a new frontier and the pledged faith of a written constitution, had come to establish peaceful colonies. Yet the pledge of civil liberty and representative government was cynically betrayed by the Mexican dictator, Santa Anna, who called himself the Napoleon of the West.

So great was their devotion to liberty that the Texans, though they were only a handful, met in a crude, unfinished building and formally declared their independence. So uncompromising was their hostility to enslavement that the entire complement of 182 men defending the Alamo under Travis against a siege by perhaps 3,000 troops openly rejected surrender and knowingly elected to die on their feet rather than live on their knees—a dramatic choice without parallel in the history of heroism.

So complete was the duplicity of their oppressor that under a flag of truce he had lured the Texans into an open meadow at Goliad and callously slaughtered them in a withering crossfire.

It was against this backdrop that Sam Houston's little band, the last ragged remaining remnant of the army of the infant Republic of Texas, crossed Buffalo Bayou into the San Jacinto prairie over which was to hang heavy the smell of death.

General Houston paused before entering the battleground and spoke briefly and simply to his followers:

If there are any here who shrink from the issue, they need not cross the bayou. Some must perish, but victory is as certain as God reigns. Trust in the God of the just and fear not.

They crossed. Houston ordered the bridge behind them burned to seal off escape, and the unequal contest against the vaunted supremacy of the Mexican dictator's legions began. The odds seemed insuperable.

But the God of the just was worthy of their trust. The signal results of that direct onslaught reveal the presence of something more than human will. Against the Texas casualties of 8 dead and 27 wounded, the elite corps of the Mexican Army lost 630 killed and 730 prisoners. Santa Anna was among the captured.

The legacy of San Jacinto is enough to strike terror to the heart of any would-be world conqueror. It is the story of the invincible spirit of free men when finally aroused to righteous rage by the inevitable excesses of despotism.

For San Jacinto does not belong to Texans alone. Present on that day were men from 14 States and the Territory of Arkansas. Its history is so inextricably interwoven into the fabric of American society that its inspiration belongs to all Americans and to all men everywhere who cherish freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RANCHO LOS AMIGOS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of this great legislative body have all been observing with great pleasure and pride the recent glorious news of the release of the Salk polio vaccine for the protection and preservation of the lives of stricken American children. I am sure that all of us feel that the content of this historic medical discovery will be made available to all American children alike according to their needs and regardless of their economic status or the color of their skin, their race, or creed.

I feel it is appropriate therefore, for me to say that some 3 years ago when the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County was planning a $2 million expenditure at Rancho Los Amigos in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, my congressional district, they deliberately planned it under the advice of men of medical science and vision who advised them that at some time in the not too distant future they would be able to use that $2 million specialized polio unit and specialized polio facilities at Rancho Los Amigos for purposes other than just the specialized care of polio victims. So this morning I am pleased to inform you I have been advised by a distinguished man of medicine; to-wit, Dr. Affeldt, chief physician, respiratory center for poliomyelitis, Rancho Los Amigos, Hondo, Calif., that as a result of use of the Salk polio vaccine in Los Angeles County they are already planning on a substantial reduction in the number of polio cases.

I know we are all proud of the achievement of men of medicine in connection with this vaccine, and especially we give our greetings to Dr. Salk. So I am very happy to know that the magnificent structure and facilities therein which were so carefully and considerately planned and constructed by the board of supervisors in Los Angeles County will in due course now be released to the so necessary use and purpose of rehabilitation and of hospitalization and care of American citizens, none of whom, or substantially none of whom will be housed and cared for there because they have suffered the great tragedy in being stricken with polio. I compliment them on their foresight and wish to say it has always been a great pleasure and inspiration for Mrs. Doyle and I and my professional staff in the great 23d district to visit the Rancho Los Amigos and its specialized polio units and to observe the great care with which these American children and adults so stricken were being provided for.

The story behind the polio vaccine goes back a long way. In that story it is shown that the impetus given by former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a polio victim himself, to the drive against polio was the turning point in the battle.

Back in 1927 President Roosevelt founded the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation. From that he developed the idea of the National Foundation for

Infantile Paralysis which will stand forever as a living monument to him.

Through gifts of dimes and dollars by the American people the National Foundation has made available for the fight against polio a total of more than $250 million during the 17 years of its existence. Of that amount $22,400,000 has been allocated to the support of scientific research of which $18,200,000 has been devoted entirely to virus research and $4,200,000 to research into the prevention and treatment of after effects of polio.

Another $23,200,000 has been spent for professional education of scientists and medical experts and $9,600,000 has been used in medical care grants. In addition during this 17-year period, $203,600,000 has been used by the National Foundation to provide financial assistance to the victims of polio who need help. This aid has been made possible by 3,100 chapters of the National Foundation covering every county in the United States.

To my mind, this story back of the polio vaccine and very much of the progress that has been made in combating this disease is the story of a heritage bequeathed to mankind by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. From the seed germinated in his great American mind has grown the cooperative effort in which 85 percent of the American people have cordially participated to win this victory. American money plus American medical science has done it.

In the light of the attention and proper recognition of Dr. Salk and his associates are already having, and will no doubt continue to receive in large quantity and numbers, my humble words of thankfulness to Dr. Salk and to his associates will not amount comparatively to much. But on behalf of myself and my associates and all the people of Los Angeles County, and especially of the great 23d District wherein this magnifient polio hospital at Rancho Los Amigos unit is located, I desire to express my sincere thanks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week, the Army Subcommittee on Appropriations, composed of myself, Mr. RILEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MILLER of Maryland may be excused from attendance at House sessions because of absence on official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 214, Rept. No. 429) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE CLAYTON ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 215, Rept. No. 430) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FISCAL YEAR 1956 NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 199 which will make in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4393, to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 199 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4393 would authorize the construction or conversion of the specific vessels which the Department of Defense has presented as the proposed naval shipbuilding program for 1956. The report on this bill points out that there is sufficient unobligated tonnage to make authorizing legislation unnecessary but the Committee on Armed Services feels that it should be part of the constitutional responsibility of Congress to review the shipbuilding and conversion program of the Navy so that the Congress may be aware of what ships are proposed for construction and conversion.

H. R. 4393 would provide for the construction of 34 new ships, 24 of which would be the combatant types and 14,000 tons of landing craft, and for the conversion and modernization of 28 vessels.

It is estimated that the cost of construction of the 34 new ships and 14,000 tons of landing craft would be $1,149,372,000 while the modernization of the 28 vessels would cost $202,115,000 plus $33,540,000 for material procurements and preproduction plans. The total net cost of the program will be $1,317 million, and the report indicates that this money is included in the President's budget and that the program is now being considered by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the ideas set forth in this bill. I think it is important that the Congress have a clear idea of just what is being done to constantly improve our defenses against the attack of an enemy nation. We all agree that our defenses must be maintained at a sufficiently high level so as to make it extremely foolhardy for any other power to attack us. This conversion and building program will help our Navy to maintain and improve its position so that it can render the most effective service in the event of an emergency. Since the rule is an open one and therefore permits amendments on the floor I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 199 which will make possible the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4393.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has ably and clearly explained the purport of this rule and the bill. There is little I could add. Certainly we must meet our current re-

sponsibility in this field of naval construction modernization. This bill, after careful consideration by the Committee on Armed Services, does just that.

I know of no serious objection to it. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MENTAL HEALTH STUDY ACT OF 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 198.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 256, providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 198 which will make in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 256, providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 198 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that House Joint Resolution 256 was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without opposition. Specifically the joint resolution would authorize the Surgeon General upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council to make grants for the carrying out of a coordinated program of research and study of all aspects of the resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill. These grants would be made to nongovernmental organizations made up of representatives of leading national medical and other professional associations active in the field of mental health.

Under this joint resolution authorization would be given to appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $250,000 and the sum of $500,000 for each of the next 2 succeeding fiscal years. The research program would have to be completed within 3 years from the starting date and annual reports would have to be filed by the grantees with Congress, the Surgeon General, and the governors of the States.

This joint resolution would not preclude the acceptance by these private organizations of additional financial support from private or other public sources.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of the Members of the House are fully aware of the fact that there is urgent need for action in this field of proper diagnosis and treatment and preventive treatment in the field of mental health.

The report on House Joint Resolution 256 pointed out that 6 percent of our total population have serious mental disorders and that 1 out of every 12 Americans born today will spend some part of his or her life in a mental hospital. This is a most serious national problem and one that deserves the serious consideration of the Congress. Since House Joint Resolution 256 would be considered under an open rule—that is, amendments could be offered from the floor—I can think of no reason why the rule, House Resolution 198, should not be adopted.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill has been explained very well, and I join with my colleague in urging the adoption of this rule. I know of no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Am I correct in saying that this resolution, House Joint Resolution 256, was recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as part of the administration program?

Mr. BOLLING. That was the understanding.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]

Allen, Calif.	Edmondson	Miller, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Harvey	Miller, N. Y.
Bailey	Hays, Ohio	Mollohan
Blatnik	Hébert	Morrison
Blitch	Henderson	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Herlong	Phillips
Brooks, La.	Hinshaw	Powell
Burnside	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Canfield	Holifield	Quigley
Carlyle	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Cooley	Jackson	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kearney	Roberts
Cramer	Kearns	Rutherford
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Sieminski
Diggs	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Lovre	Thomson, Wyo.
Dollinger	McCulloch	Walter
Eberharter	Mailliard	Winstead
	Merrow	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Three hundred and sixty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FISCAL YEAR 1956 NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4393, with Mr. Moss in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for 1 hour.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4393 is the fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program for the Navy. Although the ships in the program will take various lengths of time to construct, the program will be completed 4 years from now.

I think it will have much more meaning for you if I describe briefly the status and condition of our Navy as it exists today—and the shipbuilding program that is now going on.

First, our Navy today. We have 1,100 ships of all kinds in commission today, and we have slightly over 1,300 ships in mothballs. The personnel strength of the Navy today is 665,000 men. We have over 16,000 airplanes in the Navy.

Of the 1,100 ships in commission, 407 are combatant ships, which includes battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The aircraft carriers in this number are 26.

Now, that is the picture of our existing Navy.

There are being built today in the United States, at some 80-odd private and naval shipyards, 105 naval vessels. There are 13 more which are authorized, but on which construction has not yet started. In addition, there are being constructed today some one thousand one hundred landing and other small craft.

Of the 105 plus 13 vessels either under construction or to be placed under construction in the near future, 35 are classified as major combatant ships. Four of them are *Forrestal* class carriers, 11 are destroyers, and 11 are escort vessels. Nine submarines are underway, or will be very shortly, including 4 nuclear powered submarines. The *Nautilus* is one of these four.

As I said, these ships are being built in 80-odd shipyards throughout the United States. Some in Maine, some in New York, some in Michigan, Seattle, San Francisco, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

All of these ships will cost about $2,300,000,000. Appropriations to cover all of this construction have already been made and the funds are available.

Now, that is the Navy as it is, and as it will be when these ships are constructed, not counting, of course, the ships in this bill.

The budget which the President recently submitted to the Congress contains an item of $1,317,000,000 for shipbuilding by the Navy.

That is this bill. It authorizes 34 new ships, of which 24 are combatant types. It also authorizes 14,000 tons of landing craft. The remainder of the bill provides for the conversion and modernization of 28 vessels. This is the building program that is provided for in H. R. 4393.

The cost of the 34 new ships and the 14,000 tons of landing craft is $1,150,000,000. The cost of modernizing the 28 vessels is slightly under $202 million. The advance material procurement and preproduction plans add about $33,500,000 to the cost. This all adds up to $1,317,000,000. As I have previously stated, it is in the President's budget, and is now being considered by the Appropriations Committee.

The Appropriations Committee is now considering that budget including the shipbuilding item which I have mentioned. I hope the committee will see fit to recommend enactment of this shipbuilding fund for the building of ships by the Navy.

There is a rule of the House of Representatives which provides that appropriations may be made only for those projects which have been previously authorized by law.

It is necessary, therefore, that the tonnage for ships which are to be funded this year shall have been previously authorized.

It is true, however, at the present time that all tonnage which the Navy wishes to construct with money requested this year has been previously authorized by law.

In the case of combatant ships there are over 1,300,000 authorized tons as yet unobligated and unfunded.

In the case of ships other than those of the combatant categories there is less surplus tonnage on the books but there is ample tonnage to cover everything requested in the current budget.

The authority for the construction of combatant ships is contained in the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934 and its amendments.

There is, therefore, no need for an authorizing act this year insofar as mere tonnage is concerned.

However, it is the province, the duty, and the responsibility of the Congress to choose the weapons which shall be provided for our armed services, and not to leave the choice of such weapons entirely in the hands of the Department of Defense.

It is appropriate that the Congress express its desire in the matter and that the executive branch of the Government take the money appropriated by Congress and provide with it the precise weapons specified by Congress.

I felt, however, and the committee agreed with me, that we have an obligation to find out how our Navy stands today and what it plans for the future. How else are we going to know this, unless we bring to the floor a bill setting out in detail exactly what the Navy plans to build? The committee has its responsibility, and the House shares this responsibility.

Of course, the Appropriations Committee would get to see what the Navy proposes during its hearings on the Navy's shipbuilding appropriation. But when the appropriations bill came on the floor there would not be one bit of evidence on the face of the bill itself as to what ships were going to be built. There would just be some general language and a lump sum appropriation for construction and conversion. This would be meaningless so far as advising the House as to what the Navy's plans are.

Now, this is not criticism of the Appropriations Committee; and I want that clearly understood. The Appropriations Committee does a magnificent job in its detailed consideration of all of the many requests that come before it. Indeed, it is a job I do not envy them. But it is the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee to look at and study the kind of armed forces or naval forces that we are going to have for our defense.

So here we have a bill for which the tonnage has been previously authorized, but which is absolutely necessary as a means of conveying to the House and the country where we stand with respect to our Navy. It gives every Member an opportunity to voice his opinion as to whether the Navy is headed, in his opinion, in the right direction. It helps the Appropriations Committee to know whether they are headed in the right direction. It gives them guidance and support in the conclusions which they must reach; the kind of guidance and support that the Armed Services Committee needs and welcomes from the House. In addition, this authorization will assist the Appropriations Committee in earmarking funds for the various items of construction and conversion.

Such is the purpose of this bill.

If the Congress did not manifest its will in this matter, the Department of Defense would be legally free to take all funds appropriated for shipbuilding and to construct only one type of ship with that money.

The Congress must exercise an affirmative control of the expenditures. The Congress must give to the Department of Defense a bill of particulars from which the Department of Defense may not depart.

I should like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that the bill H. R. 4393 affirmatively states that authority exists to construct this tonnage and that the tonnage for the ships specified in this bill shall be charged against tonnages already existing and authorized by law.

The bill contains a list of new ships to be built and a list of existing ships to be modernized or converted. These lists constitute a necessary and well-balanced program of naval shipbuilding and conversion.

The program was designed with the full knowledge that the Soviet Union has become a major maritime power. The Soviets have at the present time the second largest Navy in the world. Ours is the largest. No longer is our stanch ally, Great Britain, supreme upon the sea.

I believe that there is little dispute as to the value of most of these vessels projects. I am aware, however, that some question the wisdom of building the 60,000-ton carrier.

The Navy regards the carrier as the most important item on the list of vessels to be constructed. Before discussing the merits of the carrier, however, I would like to say a few words regarding another very important weapon included in this bill; namely, the atomic propelled submarine.

The Navy has completed one of these ships and although it would be inappropriate for reasons of security to describe in detail the characteristics of this vessel, I should like to take this opportunity of informing the House that the atomic submarine has not only met all expectations but has in many ways exceeded them. However, the ultimate in atomic propulsion has not been reached. There is much to learn. There is too much yet to be learned in this field for us to abandon the more conventional methods of propulsion now.

I feel, that at this juncture, in our national history we are witnessing a transition as important to our military life and to our economic life, as was the transition from sail to steam.

We are now upon the threshold of a replacement of the power of the steam engine, the turbine and the diesel engine, by the power of the atom.

We must exercise great care not to embrace too rapidly these devices which are new, have great potential value, but which are not yet completely tested.

We must be careful, on the other hand, not to be too slow to adopt advantages which science has brought to us; not to abandon advantages which may be ours if we are bold enough to seize them.

It will be noted that the program contained in this bill includes some conventional submarines as well as those to be propelled by the atom. This is a wise course. It is a necessary course until the atom has been developed further.

Mr. Chairman, I am sometimes puzzled by the opposition which we sometimes encounter to the aircraft carrier as a weapon for our national defense.

It is said that the aircraft carrier is expensive. This is true. So are all weapons. So is war itself. War is wasteful; its sinews are expensive; but success in war is cheap at any price.

I suggest that the carrier and the accessories which must go with it are no more expensive than other complex weapons and weapons systems.

For the carrier, this may be said in its favor, it does not require construction upon foreign soil. It is not susceptible to capture by the enemy and when its usefulness has expired in any particular conflict it is available to be brought home for storage and use in future wars. Our carriers do not become a part of the real estate of any foreign power.

Efforts have been made to compare the dollar cost of carriers with the dollar cost of airfields upon the land. This is a fruitless effort. They are different weapons. They do different things for us. We must have them both regardless of comparative cost.

It is said that the carrier is vulnerable; that it can be destroyed by an atomic bomb or perhaps by lesser weapons. These things may be true, of course; if an atomic bomb falls close enough it can destroy anything which man has ever made. An atomic bomb can destroy cities. An atomic bomb can destroy airfields and if an atomic bomb strikes a carrier or falls close to a carrier it will certainly destroy that carrier.

But vulnerability is no reason for abandoning a valuable weapon. We have not ceased to build cities because they may be destroyed nor shall we do so.

We have not ceased to build airfields or tanks or any other weapon because it may be destroyed nor shall we do so.

It would perhaps be the most improvident act in our long and glorious military history if we were to abandon now the aircraft carrier because it is vulnerable to enemy attack.

It would be nothing short of criminal for us to abandon this tremendous advantage we now have over our potential enemy, bearing in mind that the Soviet Union has no aircraft carriers insofar as we know. In our carrier supremacy we enjoy a particular advantage. We must not surrender it.

I often think, how different our national life at this moment would be, if conditions were reversed and the Soviet Union was the possessor of some 35 operative carriers and we had none at all. Our whole national life would be changed. Our thinking would be different. Our fears would be magnified many times. And I expect we would now be devoting our energies and our money to the arduous task of moving our industries and cities away from our coastal areas. We would be burrowing like moles in an attempt to protect our way of life and our industries by placing them underground out of harm's way.

Before leaving the question of vulnerability, I have another observation to make.

I am confident that the speed and mobility of a carrier task force makes it difficult to find and difficult to hit. Enemy aircraft, wishing to attack a carrier, cannot start out in the morning and know where the target is to be found. Before the attack can be launched a flight of scouts must first have located and reported the position, course, and speed of the carrier. The job of the scouts will not be easy or free from danger for the carrier can see and destroy the scout using its own planes for that purpose.

And another thought with respect to the carriers ability to avoid harm.

Much is being said now of the deadly effect of fallout from the hydrogen bomb. The carrier with its mobility enjoys a great advantage in its ability to avoid fallout.

Should our enemy be induced to expend his bombs upon carrier task forces which may to a degree at least avoid the effect and the after effect of the bomb, it might relieve our cities which cannot escape the bombs disaster of a part at least of the punishment they might otherwise sustain.

I often wonder at the philosophy of those who oppose the aircraft carrier as a weapon when our military history, our recent military history, has demonstrated the value of the aircraft carrier as a weapon.

During World War II, the Japanese Empire on one occasion entered into a campaign designed to consummate in the invasion of the west coast of the United States. The first step in the Japanese plan was the capture and invasion of the Hawaiian Islands. This was to be a steppingstone to an encroachment upon our mainland.

This attempt was made, and was defeated in the Battle of Midway, and in that battle it was only the planes from the decks of our carriers that made contact with the enemy, that attacked the enemy, that destroyed the enemy, and turned him back defeated. This was completely a carrier battle and a carrier victory.

At about the same time the Japanese were executing a plan to proceed southward to the Dutch East Indies and New Guinea and invade and occupy the continent of Australia.

The Japanese had proceeded and established themselves in New Guinea just north of Australia, but another carrier task force lay between New Guinea and Australia, and it was necessary to the Japanese plan that this carrier task force be eliminated.

Our Navy in the Pacific was at a low ebb at this time. Few carriers were available to us.

The Japanese proceeded by sea with carriers against Australia. They were met by our forces, the striking power of which lay in our carriers. The battle known as the Coral Sea was fought and the Japanese never reached Australia.

Later in the war when the fortunes of our forces had commenced to change we started north through the islands of the Pacific, through the Philippines in a thrust aimed at the heart of the Japanese Empire.

A crucial point in this advance was reached when our forces landed at Leyte Gulf in the Philippines. It is at this point that the Japanese made their maximum effort in turning back the American advance.

Once again carrier advantage made its value felt. Only small type carriers were available to our forces against the Japanese advance. They were used to good effect and Japanese surface forces which had no benefit of air cover were forced to leave the Leyte Gulf and to permit the landing of American forces to proceed unmolested.

I am amazed at those who doubt the value of the naval aircraft carrier, when I recall that today, at this very moment in our rather precarious position, it is actually the aircraft carrier that is holding our arms together.

It is the aircraft carrier which at this very moment is making the might of America felt in the western Pacific.

It is only a few months ago that our carrier task forces were deployed at such magnificent effect around the Peninsula of Korea and it was only a few weeks ago that our aircraft carriers covered without the loss of a single life the evacuation from the Tachen Islands.

Today, at this very moment, it is American carriers in the Straits of Formosa which are preserving a degree of stabilization in the Far East.

We have at all times now in the Mediterranean at least one aircraft carrier of the United States Navy. This carrier is there in an effort to preserve the peace and stability of Europe and is an emissary of good will from the United States.

Our leaders in the executive branch greatly desire the presence of these carriers. We do not know, of course, how much they have contributed to maintaining the peace of the world in a troublesome time. We can never know such things. We would probably be surprised if we were able to know. In any case our carriers in the Mediterranean are a continuing and a great stabilizing factor in maintaining peace.

To those who are skeptical of the carriers' value, to those who regard the carrier as expensive or vulnerable, I offer the following statistics:

In World War II the Navy operated a total of 110 carriers, large and small, fast and relatively slow. These carriers spent a combined total of 940 months—over 78 years—in combat areas. They operated by day and by night in all kinds of weather. They were exposed to all manner of attack in restricted European waters as well as in the vast Pacific.

Of those 110 carriers, only 11 were lost, and of the fast cariers of the *Essex* class not one was ever sunk. This is an average loss of 1 carrier to every 85 months of combat operations.

We lost 1 carrier as a result of attack by enemy carrier aircraft, 3 as a result of kamikaze attack, 3 as a result of

enemy submarine attack, 3 as a result of combined attack by enemy carrier aircraft and submarines, and 1 as a result of enemy naval gunfire. No carriers were lost as a result of land based aircraft attack, and, I repeat, no large carrier of the *Essex* class was sunk.

In one period of 13 days off the coast of Japan during World War II, our carriers were attacked by 141 kamikazes, the most deadly of all guided missiles—guided by human brains, eyes and hands. All of the attacking kamikazes were shot down.

In those same 13 days, our carrier aircraft knocked out, on Japanese land bases, over 2,000 enemy aircraft before they could get into the air.

The average fast carrier task group of World War II had a concentration of over 1,600 guns to use in its own defense. When translated into firepower, that means over 6,000 bullets per second or just under 200 tons of steel per minute.

This fire power is in addition to the speed and movement which also protects carriers and other waterborne forces.

But let us not think of the carrier in terms of its ability to defend itself from attack. Let us think of it as a powerful striking power able to project the military might of America to far places over the seas.

Hence let me list very briefly some of the capabilities of modern carriers of the type which this bill would prescribe.

It is a weapons system which has an ability to deliver nuclear weapons in considerable quantity. It can, of course, deliver other weapons of more conventional type as well.

It has the power to deliver such weapons against the very bases from which the enemy might challenge our control of the sea. I am thinking of such things as enemy submarine pens on its coasts or enemy bases of other types on which the enemy might operate its ships and its aircraft against our forces.

The aircraft carrier is a weapon which when employed has the ability to disperse a part of our national power upon the sea, where it is able to move about and reduce the likelihood of its own destruction because it does not remain long in any one place.

The aircraft carrier is effective against those targets which must be hit with precision if they are to be destroyed.

The aircraft carrier is particularly well adapted in the "brush fire" type of warfare such as Korea and more likely the Tachen Island group, while retaining at the same time a power to join effectively in making an all-out nuclear attack.

The aircraft carrier has the power readily to shift its pressure from target to target as the source of the threat against us is shifted. It may do this without constructing any bases and without creating the danger that bases which we build may fall into enemy hands.

The aircraft carrier operates upon the high seas, thus no base need be built for its launching or its support. No permission of a foreign power need be sought or obtained prior to its use. And, even more importantly, when a war is finished and the carrier's work is at end it may be brought home where it will "live to fight another day."

Continual improvement and development in carrier design is necessary. Conversion of old ships will work to a certain extent. Beyond a certain point we may not go.

The increase in size and power of modern aircraft has brought us to the point where we may no longer fulfill our national need by modernization or conversion of our old ships.

We have got to move forward or we will lose our supremacy upon the seas.

If we do not build these modern ships at the rate of approximately 1 each year we will, by 1965, have only 4 underage aircraft carriers in the entire fleet.

Naval aviation is an important part of our national airpower. The carrier proposed by this bill is an important contribution to naval airpower. In his message to the Congress on the state of the Union the President has indicated that our national airpower must be enhanced.

It is not the Navy Department alone which recommends the construction of this carrier. The original proposal comes from the President of the United States. It is a part of his budget. He is a military man of the highest attainments and of the greatest experience. In his budget he has requested this ship. He is joined in this by the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of the Navy, and by many advisors to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have included carriers in the force levels for the Navy—in fact the force levels for the Navy for the coming fiscal year are to include one more aircraft carrier and one more air group than this year, although the Navy has undergone some cutbacks in other activities.

In a letter to me dated March 8, 1955, Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, I quote:

> It is the responsibility of the military departments to provide and maintain the forces and equipment required by the operating force levels as approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense. It is also a service responsibility to determine the timing of procurement of new or replacement items of major equipment required to keep the operating forces adequately modern and effective.

That ends the quotation from Admiral Radford's letter.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, in considering this same subject, said in a letter dated February 15, 1955, to the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, I quote:

> In the numerous discussions which take place in the formulation of our military program and the budget, such items (referring to weapons such as the carrier) are discussed at length with both civilian and military heads of the services. As a result of such discussions the carrier of the *Forrestal* class which is included in the budget for 1956 is considered necessary, and of high priority.

The quotation ends.

The officials who recommend this carrier are those who are charged by the Constitution and by our statutes with the defense of this country. They are the people who have a responsibility to the Congress of the United States. It is their recommendation to us. It is a recommendation which we may ignore, only at our peril and at the peril of the safety of our homeland.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I think the gentleman is to be complimented and the Navy Department is to be complimented for coming back to the Congress for authorization reiterating the intention of the Congress to appropriate money for maintaining the Navy in a modern condition. My purpose in rising at this time is to inquire if this practice which is being followed today of coming back for specific authorization for appropriation, even thought there is in existence on the books authorization for appropriations for ship construction, is to be a precedent and is to be followed in the future. I hope the gentleman's answer will be "Yes."

Mr. VINSON. I want to say that the precedent was already established when we authorized specifically some years ago one of these carriers to be constructed. I want to say that as long as the Committee on Armed Services is of the same opinion that it is today, I feel confident that this will be followed notwithstanding the fact it would be clearly in order without any appropriation bill brought in here and without doing what we are doing here today.

Mr. COLE. Then we can understand that although technically this authorization was granted 20 years ago and although technically it remains on the books, actually the Congress will have an opportunity from time to time as the years go along to specifically authorize ships?

Mr. VINSON. I certainly trust that will be the policy of future Congresses. Authorizations of this kind must be charged against the unobligated tonnage that the Committee on Naval Affairs wrote on the books 20 years ago.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am afraid I do not understand. If the Government now has sufficient congressional authority to build all the ships that are in this bill, then are we merely doing a vain thing, or are we going to reduce the previous authorization by the amount of the specific authorization here?

Mr. VINSON. In reply to the gentleman's first question, we are not doing a vain thing.

Mr. VORYS. Why not?

Mr. VINSON. All right. Just listen to me one second, and I will show you. Now let us get right down to it.

It is the province, the duty, the responsibility of Congress to choose the weapons which shall be provided for our armed services and not leave the choice of such weapons entirely in the hands of the Department of Defense.

It is appropriate that the Congress express its desire in these matters and that the executive branch of the Govern-

ment take the money appropriated by Congress and provide with it the precise weapons specified by Congress. That is what we have done.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say first that I approve the method. I think it is well for Congress to be advised as we proceed. But the question occurs to me that if we already have authority for this, and the Committee on Appropriations could appropriate the money required, what would be the effect if the House should take adverse action on this bill?

Mr. VINSON. That is a very pertinent question. I would say that it would be a guide to the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, technically speaking, the appropriation bill could carry each one of these items even if this bill is rejected. But does not the gentleman know and do not I know that if this bill is rejected then the Committee on Appropriations would not bring in these items in its bill because it would say that the House has already rejected them.

Mr. COLMER. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, while the Appropriations Committee would have the authority to go ahead, this is bringing it up to date and giving congressional approval to the specific types of modernized war vessels.

Mr. VINSON. That is it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has said categorically that if the bill before us, H. R. 4393, were defeated by the House, the Appropriations Committee would then not present to the House the shipbuilding program of the Department of Defense for the forthcoming year.

Mr. VINSON. Certainly I would not wish to make such a categorical statement. A better way to put it would be to say that it would be guidance to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MAHON. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, I would like to say that what the House does on this bill, in my judgment, would have no influence on the action of the Appropriations Committee. If this bill is defeated or approved, it will in no way influence the Appropriations Committee. I should say my own personal opinion would not be influenced.

Mr. VINSON. Nevertheless, if this committee and the House today reject this bill, does not everybody know that even though you have the legal right to do so, and you do bring in appropriations for this program, why, then, the House would hardly reverse itself on the appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. The House knows that whether this bill is or is not approved the shipbuilding program will not necessarily be greatly influenced because there is enough authorization for six programs the size of this program. If this is rejected, there is plenty of authorization left.

Mr. VINSON. Therefore, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee can find no fault with the Congress' specifically earmarking this authorization, because it is in accordance with what the committee has the authority to do without it.

Mr. MAHON. The committee has already had about 5,000 pages of hearings on the military budget for this year. The shipbuilding program will be spelled out in the greatest detail in the report and in the hearings. There is no likelihood that any Member of Congress will be lacking in information as to what the shipbuilding program is regardless of what happens to this pending bill.

Mr. VINSON. This bill gives every Member of Congress an opportunity to reject, as far as the vote is concerned, any one of these particular items. It brings into the open, by a bill, just what character of ships the Navy proposes to build.

Mr. MAHON. The appropriation bill which will be forthcoming in May will give every Member a chance to reject, if he desires, the shipbuilding program because the program will be outlined and amendments will be in order. If anyone wants to strike the supercarrier or the atomic submarines or any other kind of vessel from the shipbuilding program he will have that opportunity.

May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if it is not true that this would just tend to give a double authorization to the program? I am not complaining about a double authorization—but is not that what we are doing? We are more or less shadowboxing.

Mr. VINSON. No; we are not shadowboxing. I want the country to understand that when the committee authorizes, even though it is on the statute books, some expenditure of a billion dollars, which is clearly itemized, it is not shadowboxing. Now, I am grateful to the gentleman for his assurance that he can see no harm in this method we are pursuing.

Mr. MAHON. I believe I read in the press that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services was going to conduct these hearings and, perhaps, bring out this bill in an effort to convince the Committee on Appropriations that the Committee on Appropriations should include funds for the fifth supercarrier; and is this not really an effort to pressure us—I would not say through the blackjack method—but is it not more or less an effort to put the screws on the Committee on Appropriations and demand that they approve a certain shipbuilding program which has been presented to the committee?

Mr. VINSON. I disagree entirely with any such line of reasoning. I might, if I wanted to do so, point out where such would have been proper, in view of some statements that were in the paper to the effect that certain distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations did not look with favor upon a carrier. But we did not even proceed on that basis. We proceeded on this basis: Congress has the right to know all the facts by just such a measure as this, notwithstanding the fact that 20 years ago we passed the authorization for these ships—as I say, they have a right to decide whether they want these ships. It is not going to hurt anything to put it in an authorization bill, and, too, the great committee of which our learned friend is chairman is going to scrutinize it, and he is not going to be disturbed by any pressure. Nobody is going to try to pressure him. We just want to write it in an authorization bill that the House, after having an opportunity to vote it up or down, has concluded we need certain types of ships.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the gentleman has said that if we do not follow this procedure of a double authorization, and a particularization of these ships, that we will be more or less derelict in our duty.

Mr. VINSON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. MAHON. If we would be derelict in our duty not to pass this bill this year, were we not derelict last year when we did not pass a similar bill to authorize a shipbuilding program which we approved last year through appropriations and in all previous years, with one exception that I can recall? This is a new departure, as I see it.

Mr. VINSON. Let us make it a new departure, if that is what it is. It is time to make a new departure, especially when we can do it in this way, and in a helpful way. The gentleman from Texas, and his subcommittee and the Committee on Armed Services all have the same objective: Strengthening the defense of our country. Let us not quibble about this thing. We have a bill here and it is not going to hurt your committee. Your committee has complete jurisdiction over what appropriations it will recommend, whether the House rejects this bill or not. But, I want to say again, if the House rejects this, in all probability the House will not reverse its position next month and it will probably adhere to what the Congress will do here today. So if the gentleman is in favor of a shipbuilding program without any specific authorization, let us go ahead and put this on the statute books as far as the authorization is concerned. The gentleman, after he has carefully investigated, as he always does, each one of these items, and if he reaches the decision that this one or that one ought to be left out, let us then vote whether to leave it out. But no harm will be done by this bill today.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman agree that this, perhaps, is a sort of tweedledee and tweedledum argument, and will he not agree that had it not been for the fact that a member on the Committee on Appropriations, and not the present speaker, had allegedly expressed some opposition to this fifth supercarrier before any one of the four supercarriers heretofore appropriated for had been tried out at sea—had it not been for that, is it not true that the gentleman never would have brought this bill before the House?

Mr. VINSON. No, I differ with the gentleman. I believe Congress should know exactly what is going on.

Mr. MAHON. Did the gentleman believe that last year?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I believed that.

Mr. MAHON. Why did not the gentleman bring forth a bill last year authorizing the shipbuilding program, which we appropriated for last year?

Mr. VINSON. We were so busy last year that we did not get around to it. We are not quite as busy this year. We want the House and we want the country to know that we think we should have these ships.

We know that the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to appropriate for these ships, but no harm is being done in specifically earmarking these ships.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. On that subject a little further, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] did not mean to say that the Committee on Appropriations would not pay any attention to this action. I am sure that is not what the gentleman intended. I am sure the gentleman from Texas and his committee would give considerable weight to the action of the House in reaffirming its position. I know the gentleman from Texas does not want to take unto his committee that amount of responsibility and authority, that he would not give any weight to the action of the House. I wanted to give the gentleman an opportunity to amplify that statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to amplify the statement. I do not know what the Committee on Appropriations would do, but I myself would pay little attention to how the House voted on this bill, because I would assume that Members would know the facts, that this is unnecessary action; that a vote against this bill would in no way indicate opposition to any ship that is particularized in this bill; that Members could well vote against this bill and be for this or a greater shipbuilding program.

Mr. VINSON. All I am interested in is to get the ships for our defense, and I think we are following a constructive method if we take both roads, authorization and appropriation.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia for bringing in this authorization. I think it is the proper thing to do. When you passed that authorization for that amount of tons, back in 1934, we knew nothing about atomic missiles and atomic submarines.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. I think probably the thing we did was to authorize too much tonnage back in 1934.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I trust that when the transcript comes back the gentleman will read it carefully, because I do not think he meant to say what he did say, because I got the inference that if this bill is not passed the Committee on Appropriations would not do anything about shipbuilding.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no. Guidance is what I mean and guidance is what we all need.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I felt quite sure that it was not what you meant. The gentleman knows the members of this committee, and he knows they are just as zealous in doing their duty as are the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is why I was surprised at the inference which the gentleman left.

Mr. VINSON. That is certainly not what I intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman has been stating throughout his presentation that this is simply an authorization. I do not so read it, because the language which you have in the bill itself says that "the President is hereby authorized," and then you add the words "and directed." Now that is a mandate. It is a straitjacket.

Mr. VINSON. If that word disturbs the gentleman, as far as I am concerned we can strike that out.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That will save me offering an amendment.

Mr. VINSON. At the proper time I will ask that the gentleman from Kansas be recognized to move to strike it out.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE. I would like to point out a further reason why this legislation is necessary, and that is that the bulk of this authorization on the books stems from the Vinson-Trammell Act passed in 1934 or 1932, which authorized the appropriation of funds to replace existing vessels in the tonnages of various categories. At that time, it must be remembered, the principal tonnage was in the category of battleships.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COLE. There was little provision for any aircraft carriers. So we are not so certain of the categories, and by following this procedure we modernize the tonnage category.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MORANO. One more question: Assuming the bill were defeated and the Appropriations Committee came in here with an item for certain types of vessels we could not change types.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes, you could; you could vote it in, but I think this is the best way to do it.

Mr. MORANO. But could we change from one type to another?

Mr. VINSON. The appropriation item would be for a lump sum, and in the hearings and their report they would specify the number of carriers, submarines, destroyers, and so forth, to be built.

If the House today rejects this bill and the Appropriations Committee comes in with such an item I am going to support it because I think I know what they are going to put in; nevertheless, there can be no harm in pinpointing and letting the gentleman and every Member of Congress know exactly what kind of ships are going to be built.

Mr. MORANO. But, for example, if we wanted to go to atomic submarines could that change be made if the matter were handled by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. Briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. This bill is nothing more than an annual review of the shipbuilding program of the Department of the Navy. We are trying to bring to the attention of the House the program contemplated by the Navy, something every Member is entitled to know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is any part of the shipbuilding program made necessary because of the ships we have given away?

Mr. VINSON. No, no. They cannot be given away without Congress voting on it. No combatant ship in the Navy can be given away except by act of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that none of the ships used in Indochina, for instance, were given away?

Mr. VINSON. No combatant ship can be given away without Congress authorizing it.

Mr. GROSS. How about landing craft?

Mr. VINSON. It may be that certain little auxiliaries of that type were given away, but no ship of any importance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested because I introduced the amendment for the latest carrier. It did not carry in the House but was inserted in the Senate and when it came back to the House the Members agreed to it.

At the time Members of Congress were not here on the floor; as a matter of fact, some of them left the room. They told me afterward that had they known that the National Defense Committee, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Navy Department and others had wanted the carrier so much they would have voted for it.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is fine that the gentleman and committee have brought this to the floor—and very necessary. I understand the situation, because I went through the fight

for that carrier, talked to many persons here on the floor, in the Senate, and the consensus was that had the Members of the House known how much people wanted that carrier and how necessary it was to our national defense they would have voted for the appropriation in the first instance. The gentleman from Connecticut made a fine speech for it.

Mr. VINSON. I have said to the Committee and I repeat it again, Mr. Chairman, that of course the Committee on Appropriations has ample authority to provide in a lump-sum appropriation for all of these ships after they have had a hearing. It does not hurt anything at all for you, without having to examine the voluminous hearings, to pass on a bird's-eye picture written out in the bill as to what constitutes the consideration before the Appropriations Committee. That is all this is. You can reject it if you want to, and the Appropriations Committee would have ample authority to bring it in and the House then could pass on it. But I want to say that if you reject this bill and the Appropriations Committee brings in a bill which includes these ships, I am going to support the Appropriations Committee because I think the country needs this program.

Now let us talk about two things. I want first to talk about these nuclear submarines.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Perhaps this is not the place to discuss it, but since a lot of information has been brought out for all the world to read, I am curious as to what the gentleman's idea might be as to the effectiveness of the atom submarine against an enemy carrier?

Mr. VINSON. I am not in a position to answer that this afternoon.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does the gentleman feel, as the result of the work which is being done in the construction of the *Nautilus* that we are in an era where the importance of the submarine is going to be even greater than it has been in the past?

Mr. VINSON. I think that the importance has increased considerably. We want to go forward just as rapidly as possible, but we do not want to jump until we work all the bugs out and know that we are on the right road. I think we are on the right track. At the same time, I think it would be the better part of wisdom to construct some nuclear power vessels and continue in that research and also construct some conventional types.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman also concede that those who have been close to this are perhaps the best fitted to proceed to iron out more of the bugs that might exist?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I share the gentleman's interest in having appropriate carriers for aviation, and I think the remarks the gentleman is making are very good. This bill provides that we are going to name the fifth carrier *United States Congress*. If you named it "Eightieth Congress" or "Seventy-fourth Congress" or "Eighty-fourth Congress," some Congress in the past, it would look a little more sensible, but you usually name them after previous ships or deceased heroes.

Mr. VINSON. Now, wait 1 minute. Do not take time up on that. All right. Strike it out. It does not make any difference to the Committee on Armed Services. We want ships, not names. But, we thought there could be no more glorious name given to any ship than to say it bore the name of the greatest deliberative body in the world, the Congress of the United States. But, we will strike it out if you desire.

Mr. MAHON. Some of our ships in the event of war will go down to the bottom of the sea. We do not want the United States Congress to go down.

Mr. VINSON. I am surprised at that statement from the gentleman from Texas, a man that should be versed in nautical matters, military matters, and air matters. Six ships, with a glorious past in the Navy, have borne the name The *Congress*. All right. Strike it out. I do not yield any more.

Mr. MORANO. How about the *Constitution?*

Mr. VINSON. That is right. Now let us talk about this.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust this House will overwhelmingly approve this bill. It gives you the information which is in the President's budget. It gives you the information which will be in the report, no doubt, of the Appropriations Committee; at least I hope so. Anyhow, it lets you know that the Armed Services Committee thinks that you are fully entitled through a bill of this kind to know each any every type of ship the Navy proposes to build. That is the whole purpose of the bill, to let the House know all about this ship construction.

I trust the bill will be unanimously approved. I think the facts, beyond a shadow of a doubt, warrant completely the continuation of the building of airplane carriers. We have four today on the ways, and we propose continuing that construction. If you do not build them now, within 10 years, by 1965, we will have only 4 that are not overage.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. In connection with the question that has been raised with respect to the authority of the administration to turn over any naval vessels to foreign countries, I should like to read this into the RECORD and then ask the gentleman if this is still the law as far as he knows.

In 1951 Congress passed an act which, in section 4, provided as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or the provisions of any other law, no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy Register as provided by section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296), as amended, or any interest of the United States in any such vessel, shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of unless authorized hereafter by the Congress.

Is that still the law?

Mr. VINSON. That is the law today.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. But cannot they decommission those ships and then give them away?

Mr. VINSON. No; they cannot do that. There is a regular procedure for striking ships from the naval register which protects us in that respect.

Mr. CHELF. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. VINSON. They will not be given away unless the gentleman from Kentucky has an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. CHELF. That is fine. We thank the great chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, at first blush it might appear to any ordinary person of reasonable intelligence that this legislation is superfluous, unnecessary, and perhaps useless, but I think if you will study the problem a little further you will realize that it is not vain legislation or mere repetition but that it is an authorization, even though adequate tonnage to carry out everything in this bill has previously been voted.

What this bill does more than anything else is to bring to the attention of the American Congress and the American people what is actually going on in our Defense Department with particular reference to the Navy. Certainly a bill that carries an expenditure of $1,317,000,000 is of sufficient importance, I think, to let the American people know just what kind of Navy, what kind of Army, what kind of Air Force they are getting; because after all, it is Congress that is charged with the responsibility and duty of raising and maintaining armies and navies.

I do not want to be critical of the Committee on Appropriations, but what committee of this House is the proper legislative committee to consider the things that affect our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, if it is not the Committee on Armed Services?

I would not want to see a subcommittee on appropriations usurp and take over the functions of the Committee on Armed Services any more than I would like to see another subcommittee on appropriations overrule or go against the considered judgment and report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Or still another subcommittee on appropriations to defy the proper legislative committee on public works, judiciary, or any other standing legislative committee of this House. I

can assure Members of the House that the Committee on Armed Services is not trying to highjack or blackjack anybody. All we are doing here this afternoon is to honestly and openly accept our responsibilities and discharge our duty. That should settle that matter once and for all. I am getting a little tired of seeing a few men on a subcommittee of whatever branch of our public life it might affect override or defy or nullify the long consideration and the reasoned judgment and logical conclusion reached by any standing legislative committee of this House, and I would like to say to the Members here today that this particular bill was considered and reported unanimously by members of the Committee on Armed Services after we had listened to both the civilian and the military representatives in both the Department of Defense and particularly, the Department of the Navy, all of whom likewise approve this legislation.

Why should you not know the status of the different branches of your armed services in this rapidly changing world when the techniques and methods of warfare change overnight; and when it is not only the right but the duty of the Congress, which raises armies and navies and maintains them, to have some voice in the guidance of the kind of a military establishment we should have.

The basic, hardest striking force in our modern Navy is the aircraft carrier. The primitive man started out by fighting with stones and sticks, and then with slingshots and bows and arrows, and then with a muzzle-loading rifle after the invention of firearms and the discovery of gun powder. In every successive war, we have improved those weapons—not only the ordinary rifle but the machine-gun and the rocket and the bazooka until the battleship was the backbone of our Navy. But the battleship has become obsolete, as we all know. Today, it is the aircraft carrier that is the highly mobile, hard-hitting, effective weapon—not only in the Navy, but, I think, in all of our defense establishments.

The history of the aircraft carrier in World War II and in Korea, and more recently in the evacuation of the Tachens offers indisputable and irrefutable argument for its continued development and employment. Our distinguished chairman has already pointed out the many conflicts and battles and the magnificent victories won in the big pond in the far Pacific in World War II, and if it had not been for these task forces under Bull Halsey and Mark "Pete" Mitscher and John McCain, where in the world would we have been in that war?

Then in the Korean conflict, in that dark December month of 1950, what would have happened in the evacuation of Hamhung and Hungnam when the Chinese Reds struck in North Korea, if we had not had the umbrella of naval and marine aircraft from our carriers to bring out the Seventh Infantry, and the First Marine Divisions? We would have suffered the greatest and most ignominious defeat in all history had it not been for our naval power and particularly the aircraft carriers that made that marvelous feat possible.

Only a few weeks ago the evacuation of the Tachen Islands is one of the brightest pages in our history, that offered protection while we brought out both the military and civilian personnel and all the military equipment worth saving, without having to fire a shot. Why? Because that Seventh Fleet out there, and four aircraft carriers that we had, like a dart pointed at the heart of the enemy, who knew in advance of the vicious and overwhelming retaliation he would suffer if he dared attack.

The history of the development of aircraft carriers is fascinating. The old *Essex* type that evolved from the old T–2 type of carrier, approximately 27,000-ton carrier, designed to carry 100 planes, was valuable in the early days of World War II, but because of the increased weight and speed of aircraft we had to strengthen the hulls of the *Essex* carrier type of ship, increasing its weight from 27,000 to approximately 36,000 tons, with slanted or canted decks, carrying the same number of ships but larger and faster aircraft.

Then the *Midway* type was developed before the war ended, a type of carrier of approximately 45,000 tons, with increased striking power, but because of the rapid advancement made in this scientific age of technological development, even those ships of the *Essex* and *Midway* type became obsolete, or obsolescent to say the least, until we developed the most modern type of carrier, the *Forrestal* type, of about 60,000 tons, to carry approximately the same number of ships, 100. But that will have strengthened decks and stronger elevators and a heavier thrust with more powerful catapults and stronger arresting power, in order that the modern ship, fighter, and bomber, flying at terrific speed, carrying the most up-to-date and the most destructive nuclear weapons, can land on carriers of the *Forrestal* type.

Do not let us lose sight of the fact that in this bill we have provided for many, many different kinds and classes of ships, nuclear-driven submarines, cruisers, picket-ships, destroyers, and minelayers and minesweepers, missile-shooting craft, and along with many other ships an additional super or modern aircraft carrier named the U. S. S. *Congress*.

Why do we want an additional supercarrier or modern carrier started today? Because it takes 4 years to build one.

I was down at the christening of the *Forrestal* at Newport News, last December I think it was, and I am going back next month to inspect in detail that ship. Two hundred million dollars is a lot of money, but it takes a lot of money to manufacture an A-bomb, an H-bomb aircraft, and supporting aircraft to deliver it. But anyone who was at the christening of that *Forrestal* and heard the splendid speeches delivered on that occasion by a half dozen men, will realize the terrific punch and power that that ship carries, and today it is capable not only of great offense but of great defense—antiaircraft artillery, intercepting jet fighters with depth bombs, with radar and electronic equipment.

Although it is expensive, whenever an aircraft carrier and supporting task force is in waters near the enemy it is going to keep the enemy nailed down at home, trying to find this fast moving, hard-striking force. I would much rather have a good task force of modern up-to-date carriers, expensive though they are, in distant waters keeping the enemy planes nailed down at home than to have those planes free to fly to America. Bear this in mind that in World War II not one single aircraft carrier was destroyed by an enemy ground-based plane, not one. We will always know where enemy ground-based planes are, where the airfields are located; it will be there today, it will be there tomorrow, and next week; it cannot be moved about. The element of surprise is taken away. But these supercarriers of increased speed with supporting ships, cruisers, destroyers, and mine detectors can be here today and several hundred miles away by tomorrow morning. The enemy, I repeat, would be compelled to keep his forces pretty close to home to prevent an attack or to hunt out the enemy in distant waters rather than being free to attack us on our own shores.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I just want to remind the distinguished former chairman of this committee that not a large carrier of the *Essex* type or of 15 or 20 thousand tons, even that class, was sunk in World War II. It was the smaller or escort type of carriers that were sunk in World War II.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman. There is one other thing that has not been mentioned, I think, even by our distinguished chairman who comprehensively and very clearly, I believe, covered the entire field: Certainly the point should be emphasized whether he mentioned it or not in his discourse, that it is necessary for us to maintain a strong, healthy shipbuilding industry in this country with a broad mobilization base so that in case of another global conflict—God forbid it should ever come—but if it should come then our shipyards whether at Quincy, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Newport News, down the Atlantic coast in the Gulf, or out on the Pacific coast in the great Puget Sound area, San Francisco, and other places, they should maintain the facilities and the skilled personnel and manpower, not only in our armed services but also in our American industry; because, let me say, Mr. Chairman, the men who work in shipyards and factories are just as essential to victory as is the soldier, the men who man those weapons on the field of battle. Your battlefield can never be stronger than your homefront, and you can never have military might without having economic strength to back it up and support it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. With the line of thought that is running through the gentleman's mind, may I call his attention to the fact that under the law one-

half of these ships are required to be built in industrial yards and one-half in Government yards.

Mr. SHORT. That is the point I was just going to make, because it is more or less on a 50–50 basis with private industrial yards in one half and Government yards in the other half. They are going to be built; and we are not going to give them away, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As to ship construction, I understand from page 7 of the report that it also is a continuing indication of the committee and of the Navy Department that a proper proportion of this work shall be constructed on the west coast.

Mr. SHORT. It certainly is and it should be. Let me say to the gentleman most of the members of our committee are most sympathetic to that, because these supercarriers are so big you cannot send them through the Panama Canal. Why should we not build, maintain and support shipyards on the west coast as well as the east coast? In fact, I think the first thousand years of the Christian millennium was fought on the Mediterranean, the next thousand years on the Atlantic, and perhaps the next thousand years will be on the Pacific, the big pond. That is the reason we should be careful not to concentrate our efforts and spend all our money in Europe but should pay a little attention to the back door of America because sometimes thieves enter the back door.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think this is a good time to thank the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and to give them the thanks of 62 boys from my district, boys who will fight for us in the future. They send their thanks to the Congress for passing legislation which will protect them in their work and save their lives.

Mr. SHORT. I am always grateful for compliments, particularly when they come from such sweet, lovely persons as the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the question raised by a gentleman a moment ago as to construction on the west coast, I want to call his attention to the fact that under the act of May 17, 1938, the President has the authority to construct on the west coast and the Committee on Armed Services is on record in hoping that a live construction program will take place, because at Hunter's Point, at Bremerton, at Astoria, and at other private yards there are ample facilities for construction on the west coast.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. GAVIN. I sincerely hope that the Department of the Navy will not forget the Philadelphia and Baltimore naval yards.

Mr. SHORT. We cannot and will not forget them. I now yield 5 minutes to my good friend and hard working member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4393 is a bill which sets forth the Navy shipbuilding program for fiscal 1955. This is, I hope, the first of a series of such bills to accomplish an annual review of the Navy shipbuilding program. I believe that it is one of the most important functions of the Congress to authorize the specific numbers and types of ships which the Navy is to have. In the past we have been content to prescribe overall tonnage authorization, such as those provided in the Vinson-Trammell Act. Such an overall tonnage authorization is desirable to set a ceiling on the Navy and to indicate the proportionate distribution of the various types of naval vessels. However, in planning from year to year for the construction or conversion of naval vessels, the Department of Defense, and specifically the Department of the Navy, should be required to come before the Congress and present an accurate picture of the current requirements of the Navy. Within the framework of the overall tonnage authorization, the availability of funds from previous appropriations acts, the proposed budget, and the acute needs of the service and the shipbuilding industry, the Congress will be able intelligently to set forth a recommended program of shipbuilding for the forthcoming fiscal year. By enacting such a measure, based on recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee, the Congress will indicate specifically what it has determined is required for national defense and for the maintenance of defense industries. Unless we have a forum of this sort our determination of the size of the shipbuilding and other armaments programs will be based almost entirely upon budgetary and fiscal considerations. In times of grave international danger we must base our military programs on actual need for weapons and installations rather than on arbitrary determinations of how to split the budgeted melon between services. This bill should be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, there are always two sides to every important question. I realize the position I am in, getting up here and disagreeing in part with what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] have said, two men whom I admire very much. I have been accused of a lot of things, but I have never been accused of cowardice in any situation that I have ever been in. I would be derelict in my duty if I stood silent on this measure.

As far as one of the comments made by the gentleman from Missouri, I would suggest that there is no committee or subcommittee of this House, whether it is the Committee on Appropriations, or any other committee, that has ever overridden any committee unless the House has supported them in their position.

I just wish the Russian legislature would hold a session like this so the entire world would know what they were going to build in the way of naval ships. It is ill-advised to bring all of these details out in public as we have done here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a remark that the Navy ought to come in and disclose their program. Well, the Navy does that very thing. Every time they want to get a single, solitary dollar they go into complete detail before the Committee on Appropriations, and the hearings then are much more detailed than has been presented to us today.

The gentleman from Georgia made one very true statement. He stated that with the coming of the atomic submarine we have made a transition in naval warfare. I agree with him emphatically, and that is one of the reasons why we should go a little slower in sinking all of our dollars in supercarriers. I remember when the first supercarrier was suggested. It was to be a huge, flush-deck carrier, because the Navy said they had to be able to carry bombers, big bombers, with the huge conventional bombs, but it was not long, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia, until they changed positions absolutely and said they could not use flush-deck carriers. With the coming of the A-bomb, compressed as it is, we can carry them in fighter-bombers, as the gentleman knows, and you do not need a superduper heavy carrier if the original reason given us was true. Four are already authorized. Let us build them. Let us see what they will do under varying conditions, recognizing that if anything happens in the Pacific, it will take 15 to 16 days to go around the Horn before they will be of any avail.

Of course, the carrier is vulnerable. You say the carrier can be here today and some place else tomorrow. We have wasted billions of dollars on our Air Force if we for one minute think that our Air Force would not consider a carrier the No. 1 target and know where it was every minute of the day and night. We have wasted more billions of dollars if our radar-equipped planes cannot keep right on top of that carrier as it goes around the ocean. A carrier will stand out like a sore thumb and our Air Force can put them out of commission.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman think that New York, Chicago, and Detroit are pretty good targets?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes. They are targets.

Mr. SHORT. And worth more than any carrier or task force; and they know where they are.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Surely; but I will say to my dear friend that we have wasted billions of dollars if what we have in the Strategic Air Force and the Air Defense Command will not do the job they are supposed to do, and defend those targets.

Mr. SHORT. You might as well say that we need not have 18 divisions in our Army.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not say anything like that.

Mr. SHORT. If the enemy has 18 bombs, any division can be destroyed by an atomic bomb.

Mr. SCRIVNER. From what has been said here today, I wondered whether some people remembered that we have an Army and an Air Force.

Mr. SHORT. The members of the armed services are very cognizant of the fact that we have all three and that we will always need them. And we are trying to keep them in proper balance.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Are carriers vulnerable? Certainly they are. Two-thirds of the carrier task force is there for the protection of the carrier. And we are not told how much it is going to cost to get all of your auxiliary vessels and all of your naval bases and everything else.

My view is—and this is personal only—that we can get far more adequate defense by spending more money for some other defense items besides the carrier, the supercarrier. We have or are building four of them. Let us see what they will do first.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was absolutely right when he said nothing would happen if this bill did not pass. It is a futile, empty thing. The 1.3 million tons of naval tonnage are already provided for. We are tilting at windmills, authorizing what has long ago been authorized.

I think the gentleman from Texas hit on the truth when he said that he felt perhaps the big reason for this bill being on the floor today was that the Armed Services Committee was trying to shake a big stick over the Committee on Appropriations and force us to bring in funds for the supercarrier. These gentlemen on the Armed Forces Committee are not worried about these other listed auxiliary vessels. The Navy is going to get practically every dime they have asked for in ship construction in the upcoming appropriations bill. By this action the Armed Services Committee is attempting to usurp the authority of the Appropriations Committee or, at least, tie our hand. In the bill as it was originally presented, the committee has been taking unto itself the power of the Commander in Chief, of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the Naval Chief of Operations when it uses language that "You are directed to do this." That is a straitjacket. They cannot exercise any flexibility whatsoever, hamstrung by such language. If such language had been in effect some time ago when they received appropriations for the conventional submarines, and then wanted to construct an atomic powered submarine, they could not have done it without coming back here and getting another bill passed, thereby losing valuable time. I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the words "and directed." That will modify it a great deal and make it more palatable.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that the language "authorized and directed" is the usual language. But the point raised by the gentleman is a good one, and I am willing to take out the word "directed."

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman. This bill proposes to name the new carrier, U. S. S. *Congress*. I thought, when I read that, of some of the names that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] mentioned. I remember Nimitz, Halsey, and Mitscher, and all of those other fine men who have commanded our carrier task forces. If there is to be another carrier built, a fifth supercarrier, I hope it carries the name of one of those great naval heroes.

There are many other points that could be brought up here, but there is a lack of time. As I said before, with the building of the atomic submarine, we must realize that we are in a period of transition. I think the Committee on Armed Services might well spend some time, since they have so much time, as has been indicated, to go into a complete hearing on these rapidly changing conditions. Let us talk not so much about the Navy evaluation of the super-carrier, but let us see what some of our topflight Air Force men say about them. I know that if they are half as smart and half as good as they are supposed to be, they would consider an enemy carrier—and the only enemy we are talking about now is Russia; we might as well say so out in the open—that any carrier would be their No. 1 target. I feel quite sure that with what we have furnished them, they would be able to put that carrier out of business before it got very many miles from home. The committee should also study how vulnerable such carriers are to attack by atomic submarines.

I do not think the Russian is 10 feet tall. I do not think the Russian is invulnerable. I do not think he can conquer the entire world. We have a better Air Force than they have and a bigger Air Force. We have a much larger Navy, except in submarines, than they have. We have not the largest Army, not as large as Russia's by far, but it is a better Army than they have. It is better equipped and better manned. We have more individual ability in each man, from the lowest member of the squad on up to the highest commander. This is because they have been trained as Americans to use their brains, to use their initiative, to exercise judgment. These courageous men have done it in every war we have ever fought.

As I have said, there are two sides to this question. It is not open and shut. We have the four large *Forrestal*-type carriers authorized. None of them has yet been out in the ocean and none of them has been tried under conditions simulating combat. Whether they will do what the Navy thinks they will do or not I do not know. They should be thoroughly tested before we get more. But in addition to what each one of these cost, $200 million each, you must consider the future cost of the planes and all the other equipment that goes with it, you have to go into the number of supporting vessels that must accompany each one of these carrier task forces. It runs into almost astronomical figures.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I am not going to find any disagreement because the gentleman does not see as I do with reference to the carriers. It is his right and privilege to look at it from that angle. But I am disturbed by one statement the gentleman made. The gentleman said we should not have all this out in the public. I interpret from that that he is worried because we are writing a bill here saying what types of ships we are going to build.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Actually it does disturb me some. I am disturbed every time we have any appropriation bills here for the military as to the amount of information we as Representatives in this constitutional Republic must bring out in the open. It appalls me every time I have to do it. We tell the world too much.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman wants to get some information about the national defense, he should read what I have here in my hand.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I expect I have read it.

Mr. VINSON. After glancing at it, I am deeply disturbed about the information that is sent to the staff of the Senate committee. It was prepared in the Pentagon. Yet here is my learned friend from Kansas cautioning us to be careful because we say that here are 32 vessels of different types.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Perhaps I have seen the very document the gentleman has in his hand. I am disturbed, too. We tell everybody too many things.

Mr. VINSON. What have we told in here except what we say to the Congress?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If you tell the Congress it will go in the newspapers, over the world by radio, and broadcast on TV. That makes this information available not only to Congress and the American public but also to every Russian reporter here in this country, including the Tass reporter that sits in on every Presidential press conference and can sit in the Press Gallery up there as we discuss military appropriations.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee handling this money, mean to convey the idea that the Congress should not know what the money is being spent for? Here we are trying to put the country on notice.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I wish we could do what was done a long, long time ago, that is, go into executive session here on the floor and tell the Members of Congress and not tell it to the entire world. I would sleep much better at night if we could do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The pamphlet to which the gentleman from Georgia refers and which I have in my hand states,

"National Defense Under the Republican Administration Today and Tomorrow." It is a pamphlet that is amazing. It violates everything that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles do not want done.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have seen it. I have seen others put out from year to year. The Secretary of Defense puts out a report, the Secretary of the Navy puts out a report, the Secretary of the Army puts out a report, and the Secretary of the Air Force puts out a report—all of those things, plus some other technical documents that are put out and publicized. I wish they were not put out, including this, although it merely repeats information repeatedly made public.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not approve of this pamphlet, does he?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would rather that this and other pamphlets and reports had not been presented.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds merely to inform the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who does not need to be informed because he knows, that this information has been divulged under every administration. There is a great deal of information which I would like to keep secret.

Mr. McCORMACK. But not this information.

Mr. SHORT. Well, similar information.

Mr. McCORMACK. But not in a compilation like this.

Mr. SHORT. In reports, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. But this is not a report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H. R. 4393 which provides for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels and for other purposes.

In plain words, this bill authorizes the 1956 Navy shipbuilding and conversion program.

In supporting this bill I should like to add my comments to those of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], by pointing out that it is becoming clearer every day that the prospect of atomic warfare has not served to diminish the importance of the Navy and seapower.

We know that the possibility of perfecting any sort of defense against future missiles of the improved V–2 type is very slight.

There is only one solution to the problem posed by these missiles, that is to destroy the bases from which they might be launched.

In other words, within the reasonably foreseeable future, our best defense will be a strong offense directed primarily at the bases and sources of enemy striking forces.

Unless we strike the first blow, a position against which we seem firmly committed, our national security lies only in convincing an enemy that even if he strikes the first blow, he cannot prevent an overwhelming and possibly fatal counterattack against his airpower and other nuclear weapons potentials.

In order to retain a strong potential for striking an overwhelming counterblow in case we are attacked, it is necessary for us to have a system of bases which are not vulnerable to being entirely destroyed in an enemy's initial attack.

Our potential enemies must never reach the position where they are convinced that an overwhelming initial attack will destroy our retaliatory potential.

The security of our base system is one of the major concerns in national defense planning.

In order to compensate for the short range of our present aircraft and missiles, we have placed advance bases on foreign soil all over the globe.

Many of these bases are extremely vulnerable, and in some cases we cannot be assured that they will be available to us because of problems of sovereignty.

An adequate defense for these bases is also very difficult to achieve.

They are the most obvious and exposed targets for surprise attacks by short-range enemy weapons.

Their locations are well known and they cannot be moved.

We have in being, however, a base which is free from the infirmities of the fixed land base; this is the mobile base afforded by our carrier task forces.

Such sea bases can be readily decentralized and scattered; their location cannot be predicted by the enemy.

Furthermore long-range guided missiles cannot be used effectively against such targets.

The nation which possesses such sea bases has a very great advantage over a nation whose offensive and retaliatory potential is based entirely on fixed bases.

In the future the mobile sea base will not be limited to carrier task forces.

We are developing seaplanes of sufficient speed and range to compete with land-based aircraft and which will be able to land and take off from any comparatively smooth body of water.

Mobile bases for the operation of such aircraft will consist of mobile tenders, either surface ships or submarines.

Such developments will give the Nation which has control of the sea a tremendous advantage in its ability to muster a retaliatory potential almost anywhere on the face of the globe; and yet this potential will be so mobile, that an enemy will not know from day to day just exactly where it will be based.

The indispensable prerequisite to continued control of the sea, is continued development of carrier aviation.

This is the weapon system which enables us to concentrate the great power which is necessary to overwhelm the enemy in the ocean area where his offensive sea bases will be located.

Our force must be kept constantly modern through the development of new aircraft, new weapons, and new ships.

It must be progressively improved, first, to retain the ability to deal devastating blows against the enemy's striking power; second, to be self-sustaining for periods sufficient to render overwhelming injury to the enemy, so that even if our shore bases are destroyed we can still continue to attack the enemy's vitals; and third, even though it is invulnerable to long range pilotless missiles, it must possess on overwhelming potential to destroy humanly guided weapons.

With the advent of nuclear propulsion for submarines, and the probability that it will soon be used for propulsion of major ship types, it is not too difficult to visualize the composition of the task force of the future.

Such a force will consist mainly of large aircraft carriers and multipurpose escorts capable of launching defensive guided missiles against enemy aircraft and guided missiles.

The escorts will also be equipped with devices for submarine detection and destruction including escort-based helicopters.

Such a force would be almost entirely self-sufficient for long periods of time, requiring resupply of only ammunition and provisions at relatively long intervals.

The striking power of such a force would be many times that of the World War II aircraft carrier task force, with but a small fraction of the ships being necessary.

Such a force will be widely dispersed over an ocean area as large as the State of Maine.

No single weapon will be able to do damage to more than one ship.

Nuclear powered submarines would operate in the vanguard of such a force serving as scouts, missile carriers, and radar pickets.

This task force would be able to control an area of 60,000 square miles.

An enemy vessel or aircraft which approached that area would have small possibility of survival.

Of course such a sea base is not absolutely invulnerable against every form of attack.

The unpleasant fact of nuclear war is today that everything is vulnerable, particularly airfields.

I believe that the mobile sea base has a far greater chance of survival than the fixed land base.

It possesses many inherent advantages.

First, it enjoys unobstructed radar vision.

Second, the location of the sea base cannot be predicted.

Its location will not be secret but it will be difficult at any particular time to determine the exact location of any particular unit of the force.

In addition the carrier forces defense system will serve to limit the possibility of extensive enemy reconnaissance.

Third, the offensive potential of the sea base will be used to stop enemy attacks at their source—the enemy's bases—using the overwhelming concentration of airpower which will be available to the task force.

We will always know the location of their fixed bases while the enemy can only guess at the whereabouts of our task force vessels.

This is the future picture of the Navy to which our shipbuilding and conversion program is directed.

We are making significant progress in every ship type envisioned for the task force of the future.

At the same time through modernization we are retaining and developing the potential of the conventional ships, aircraft, and weapons which we have in being today to give the most defense for our dollar.

We are also preserving the skills and facilities which we will need to expand our shipbuilding program if and when it again becomes important to build naval vessels in large numbers.

We want to retain and improve the Navy's capability to engage in the type of warfare recently experienced in Korea and other areas of the Far East.

At the same time we must look ahead and develop ships and weapons which will assure us command of the sea for as long as that command retains its importance for national security.

In conclusion, I hope H. R. 4393 will have the unanimous support of the committee so that the peoples of the world will understand that the United States is constantly maintaining a modern and powerful naval arm of its national defense.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H. R. 4393, a bill to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

I would like to join in what the gentleman preceding me has said—that this bill gives notice to the world that this country is going to maintain itself in a strong posture of defense against any eventuality, and that is the only thing that is going to preserve and protect the type of democracy under which we live and of which we are so proud.

I want to address myself to the section of the report on the bill pertaining to the construction of these ships, appearing on page 7, which reads as follows:

> Although the bill does not so provide, it is obviously in the interest of the country that shipyards, Government and private, throughout the United States, be afforded opportunity to construct and convert the vessels in this program. A healthy, vigorous, and easily mobilized shipbuilding industry is an essential element of our national defense. The rapid expansion which would be necessary in the event of war or an emergency would heavily tax all of the shipyards in the United States. Clearly, then, the lack of readily expandible shipyard facilities throughout the country would constitute a serious impediment to our defense effort. This is a mere reiteration, of course, of what has been in the past our national policy in this respect, since, for example, existing law (act of May 17, 1938) makes provision for the construction of ships on the west coast, where the President deems such to be necessary in order to maintain facilities needed in our national defense. Distribution between private and Government shipyards is also already provided for in the law by the requirement that private and Government shipyards be used alternatively for the construction of combatant-type ships. The committee has received the assurance of the officials in the Department of the Navy that there will be appropriate distribution of this construction program in accordance with the foregoing.

Shipping is the fourth arm of our national defense. Modern war is a matter of a system of logistics carefully worked out and one that must not fail to function. We are losing the shipbuilding trade in this country because of the lack of an adequate program for shipbuilding. If we are to maintain the know-how we must distribute the shipbuilding authorized in this bill throughout the several coasts of the United States in order that the necessary skills may not be lost and the basic facilities, shipyards, and so forth, be maintained.

May I point out that in the Pacific area we are particularly deficient in shipbuilding at this time, yet if an all-out war comes—which none wants—the place where we will use these floating airfields or giant carriers, is going to be in the Pacific. The heartland of Europe is surrounded by a complex of air bases that extend from Norway through Europe and around North Africa to Turkey and Iran, but in the Pacific there are no available land locations for such bases, and the war of attrition—God forbid that it ever come—that would follow will have to be supported from these mobile bases operating in the Pacific.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] asked if we were going to have to send these carriers around the Horn the way we did the old battleship *Oregon* in the days of the Spanish American War. It is not only a question of getting them there, it is also a question of maintaining them once we get them there. So, I submit to you that one of these carriers should be built on the west coast, and I hope the Navy Department takes cognizance of the fact so that we will have the facilities there to maintain them and the know-how to keep them floating once they are there.

May I point out that the law presently, as referred to by the distinguished chairman of this committee, does recognize this in section 498 (j) of the act of May 17, 1938, from which I quote the following:

> The Department of the Navy shall construct upon the Pacific coast of the United States such vessels as the President may determine to be necessary in order to maintain shipyard facilities upon the Pacific coast to meet the requirements of national security.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to join my distinguished colleague from my native State of California in support of the policy of building some of these ships on the Pacific Coast. I think the gentleman from Alameda County, Calif., will remember that a few weeks ago in my questioning of the Secretary of the Navy when he was before our Armed Services Committee he stated that they recognized there was a 6-percent differential in favor of the Pacific Coast. I asked him why it was not being used and he said they were looking into it. So I wish to compliment the gentleman and join in his appropriate remarks, and to specify that from the Canadian border on the north to the Mexican border on the south there are a fair number of ready and able private shipyards as well as Navy shipyards, all of which would be blessed and made strong in our national defense if any reasonable number of these ships were constructed on the Pacific coast. And, of course, my native State of California would logically be the recipient of some of this necessary construction.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to say to my very good and able friend from California that I admire the alacrity and the alertness of the gentleman not alone in the committee but in the House for calling our attention to the shipbuilding industry on the west coast.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to know that my friend from Pennsylvania feels that way. I am certain that we also need a strong heavy industry, the greater part of which is located in his State, to maintain this country and support our military establishment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am certain that the gentleman from California, however, would not like to disrupt the shipbuilding industry on the East Coast.

Mr. MILLER of California. I assure the gentleman I have no such intention. It is necessary to maintain the know-how of those facilities, as I said, on all coasts of the United States. I know the gentleman addressing me realizes the necessity for having facilities on the Pacific coast because he knows the Pacific better than anyone else.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, a very serious and careful study has been made by the Armed Services Committee as to the wisdom of building certain modern combat vessels including another 60,000-ton aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class. After listening to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the former committee chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and others who have heard the extensive testimony of civilian and military witnesses from the Department of Defense, I am sure the House will support this legislation with few if any dissenting votes. I could not add to the forceful arguments so eloquently emphasized heretofore if I tried—I would simply be repeating and doing that without the background and

recognized authority of the previous speakers. I do, however, take this means of expressing my gratification that both the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] have pointed out that west coast shipyards should be utilized and their skilled team of workers maintained by equal participation in the naval construction program. I know that the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton in my district has a record for economy and efficiency unsurpassed by any yard in any area of the Nation. As constituted this establishment gives more defense for the taxpayers' dollar, and since it is located in a community with only one industry, if it is not kept busy our skilled workers will move away. So it is important and in the national interest to utilize this yard. And I may say this situation has been recognized by the Bureau of Ships, and a remarkably stable workload maintained. I say this in praise of the Navy and the way it has handled repair and overhaul as well as conversion and modernization. The same should be true of new construction. Now I don't presume to direct where the Navy should build each ship, nor should the Congress dictate such details, but when we know it is in the Pacific Ocean, in Indochina and in Formosa where our Navy may be forced into action, it is only logical that west coast shipyards and their skilled manpower should be fully maintained.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the conversion program of the Navy as set forth in this bill. As you all know most of the vessels which the Navy now has were built during World War II. This means that each type of vessel built during this period would ordinarily tend to become obsolete at about the same time. Of course, many of the ships built in World War II are now in the mothball fleets. The hulls and machinery of these vessels, in general, are in a good state of preservation as a result of the Navy's farsighted mothball techniques. We can keep the hulls and machinery from degenerating to a great extent, but the ships continue to grow less useful because the weapons and equipment as well as the basic design features become outdated. The ships cannot economically or militarily compete with more modern designs.

To avoid having all of these ships become obsolescent at the same time, the Navy has converted, on a selective basis, many of the ships which could be economically modernized. For example, a certain number of submarines have been converted to the guppy type. These ships are not in every respect as modern, comfortable, and combatworthy as the new fleet types which have been built from the keel up in recent years, but they can serve economically and perform similar missions to the new fleet submarines. The other unconverted submarines left over from World War II can still be utilized for limited purposes but they are already becoming obsolescent. We have about reached the point where the extent of conversion necessary, new equipment to be procured and prospective added life for the mothballed subs, makes it economically unfeasible to convert them, as compared with building new ones. The same thing can be said to a large degree of our destroyers and certain other types. However, the Navy is continuing its program of conversion for certain other valuable ships.

Six *Essex*-type carriers in the program will receive what is regarded as the ultimate conversion for that class. One heavy cruiser will receive new antiaircraft batteries. A light cruiser and a destroyer will receive phototype conversions which will enable them to handle guided missiles which are becoming available for service use. Twelve radar pickets will be converted from escort—DE—vessels, in addition to four ocean radar station ships, to provide for early warning installations offshore. A seaplane tender is being modified to enable it to handle our new large seaplanes which are coming into production. In addition, two cable-laying and repair ships are being converted from existing ships because this is economically feasible in lieu of constructing new vessels for this purpose.

Keeping the fleet modern, for some years to come will continue to require the conversion and modernization of some of our large inventory of World War II ships. I believe that the Navy is striking a proper balance between new construction and conversions. It is a balance which will give us the greatest naval power in the long run with the least expenditure of funds—the most Navy for the least money—while still preserving intact the large mobilization base which we will need in case of war.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote "present" on this legislation should there be a rollcall today.

I do this for the reason that the hearings on this bill were entirely inadequate and brief. No opportunity was given for any of the other branches of the military services to express their views nor did the Joint Chiefs ever consider these proposals. The supercarrier and attendant ships under the purview of this bill will cost almost a half billion dollars and all viewpoints should have been obtained.

Navy officials were the only ones to testify. The views of others, whether pro or con were not invited.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration—H. R. 4393—is of prime importance to our Nation. It is important, first, because it strengthens our naval power; and, second, provides work for our shipyards, both Government and private. The bill is entitled to have the support of the Congress from either and both standpoints.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction or conversion of specific vessels which the Department of Defense has presented as the proposed naval shipbuilding program for 1956. The program has the approval of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy. The estimated cost for construction of the 34 new ships and 14,000 tons of landing craft is $1,149,372,000; the estimated cost of modernization of 28 vessels is $202,115,000; advance material procurement and preproduction plans will add $33,540,000 to these costs. Thus, the total net cost of the program will be $1,317,000,000. Provision for all of this has been made in the President's budget. While the various ships provided for in the program will take various lengths of time to complete, the total program will be completed in approximately 4 years, thus giving 4 years of work to our shipbuilders in the shipyards throughout the country.

The basic purpose of this and each annual shipbuilding program is to maintain the strength of our Navy and thereby promote our national security. It is necessary for us to constantly keep in mind the growing strength of unfriendly powers. The Soviet's submarine strength is estimated at 350. This is naturally a cause for serious concern upon our part and it would be inexcusable for us not to take protective means of defense. The Soviets are not only building submarines but also surface combat ships. Cruisers and destroyers we are told have been built by them in large numbers. All of this is reason for serious concern upon our part. We must provide against it or otherwise be derelict in providing for our national security.

Various other considerations also justify this shipbuilding program. Among these there are none more important than the necessity to maintain an adequate shipbuilding industry. Failure to keep our shipbuilders employed in building ships means that they necessarily must look elsewhere for employment. When this occurs these trained workers are lost to the industry. Consequently, when an emergency arises that creates a necessity to build ships, such as World War I, World War II, and Korea, we are without an experienced shipbuilding organization. This could create a serious condition. Thus, we must guard against any such contingency and keep an efficient working force always ready to meet any emergency that may arise. In all of the emergencies I have mentioned we found ourselves in the position of having an inadequate naval force and an insufficient shipbuilding industry. Fortunately we were able to meet the emergency before it was too late because we had the help of allies who carried on while we were getting ready. Can we always count on such outside help while we are getting ready? We should learn from our past experience that it is best to be ready when the emergency strikes.

Our naval building program should be based upon an annual building program. This would provide continuity of employment and tend to keep our shipworkers busy. In the past our national policy seems to have been one of feast or famine. It is a mistaken policy. It not only causes unemployment in the present, but, a great additional expense and loss of precious time to meet an emergency when it arises.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the pending bill. I trust that the membership of the House will recognize its importance and give the bill unanimous support.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support wholeheartedly this bill. I attended the hearings and heard all of the testimony. While there was some doubt in my mind as to the real strength of a carrier against attack by jet planes carrying nuclear weapons, which they will undoubtedly have, I do intend, as I stated, to support this measure. The Navy's presentation convinces me that I should.

Mr. Chairman, the transition to nuclear power has been a greater transition than was that from sailboats to steam, because with nuclear power, it must be remembered, the world could actually commit suicide.

In 1946 the gentleman from Missouri, five other members of our committee, and myself, made a trip to the Far East. We flew over the only two cities in the world that had been struck by an atomic bomb and we experienced a very somber, sad feeling for some time after we observed the terrible destruction wrought by these two small bombs. The destructive power now is infinitely more powerful and devastating.

Mr. Chairman, I am alarmed at some of the statements that are made by Defense Department witnesses and others at the Committee on Armed Services hearings. About a year or so ago when witnesses appeared before our committee they discussed the development of the defense posture of the United States, stating that if and when war comes we should be in a position to win it. Now they do not use that phraseology. They say that when the war comes we want to be in a position to strike back at our enemy and strike back hard.

We are in an armaments race—everyone knows that—and the history of the world indicates that almost every armament race has exploded into a war. With all the seriousness I can command, I tell you that I do not believe the world can withstand an atomic war. All of our industrial civilization, in my opinion, could be destroyed in about 10 days should an atomic war come. We must find a way to avoid such a catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, aircraft carriers are remarkable vessels. They have moving airbases on their decks. But, frankly, I can see that they are rather vulnerable to planes from other aircraft carriers or to airbased planes and here is the reason I make that statement. Radar can pick out an object such as a carrier very readily. A carrier travels at a certain number of knots per hour, while the airplane seeking to destroy that carrier can travel many times that distance in the same time. Also it can make its getaway at tremendous speeds. You cannot tell me that that kind of airplane cannot with its radar pick out a target like a carrier moving along in the ocean. However, the carrier has terrific striking power. As the chairman of our committee mentioned, 1,600 machineguns can pump lead in all directions and at any object that may come within range, and that is what I think constitutes the greatness of the carrier as a defensive weapon against attack. But, remember this, when we have a carrier, we have a group of vessels of all kinds, and they offer some insulation for the carrier, if attack comes by sea or through the air. This conglomeration of vessels, with one large one in the middle, could prove to be a target that would be very, very vulnerable.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can find some way along peaceful lines—that is, the atoms-for-peace movement—or we might explore the possibility of a meeting of the parliamentarians of the various free countries, to see if we cannot have a civilian program to parallel our military program where the free peoples of the world can act together. They may perhaps unify their efforts and they may bring about changes and corrections in our tense situation which may lessen present-day stresses. The international army in Europe was very clumsy in its operations for a long time. We are gradually developing quicker and better ways of handling that force. It may soon be able to move directly and

Surely we nations who are free conflict should come.

We must remember that the free peoples of the world are the most ingenious, including the development of weapons. In the past 250 years the free peoples have developed over 92 percent of the world's patented products. Freedom and versatility go together.

Surely we nations who are free countries and who belong to NATO should be able to find a way to act jointly. Some of us have urged the President to request the free countries in NATO to call a meeting of their parlimentarians to explore the possibility of developing a way to move jointly in the direction of peace; the reduction of armaments; the outlawing of nuclear weapons; realistic inspections by independent representatives to see that the agreements are honored. Even the Soviets do not want to commit national suicide, which could happen in an atomic war. We must develop our power to organize for peace just as we have developed our power to make war successfully.

It has been my privilege to travel to practically every single place in the whole world where we have military assistance groups. I started out in 1950 and with my colleagues I have been in every single continent. Do you realize what we are doing? We are developing and training countries in warfare that never participated in war before. The theory is that of trying to get them to protect themselves, and thereby act as a buffer for our protection. These countries are grateful; they are working hard at the job, but it makes me shudder to think that we are training people in the business of killing and maiming who never experienced that before. I feel that this situation cries out for some kind of a collateral civilian effort that would try to weld the free countries together.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would be indeed vain if I even assumed that I could add anything to what has been said here by the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who, out of his allocated 3 score and 10 years, has given to his Nation over 2 score and 2 years in trying to make this Nation the most secure nation on earth militarily and in every department of our military. The former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], has given to this country over 1 score of his years of life to making this Nation secure. The Army and the Navy, as they are constituted today, realize the need for a balanced defense effort.

Now, I will have you understand that it was the thinking of another Secretary of Defense who had the mentality of the lone foot soldier, whom we cannot ever forget, but we want to get away from the time when our boys must plod and plod and plod through the muck and mire of foot-soldier warfare or foot-soldier mentality.

Here we are today with the great gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, realizing the need to bring your Navy up to the point where it will continue to be the greatest Navy on the face of the earth. There is no question in the minds of any other nation on the face of the globe as to whose navy is the greatest navy on the face of the earth. It is your Navy. There is a question whose is the greatest army; there is a question whose is the superior air force. But remember you this. There is no question whose is the greatest navy. It is yours and yours and yours.

I am not here today to preside over the liquidation of the Navy, and I do not believe you are. I will have you understand that we did not meet behind closed doors. All of this information, I respectfully call to the attention of my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] was given when we had our hearings with the doors open.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is just one of the things I think we should not do in a case like this, because you make known to the entire world just exactly what you are going to do.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not like it, either, sometimes. We do not meet behind closed doors. We let anybody come who wants to testify before us.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman yield again briefly?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We, that is, the Appropriations Committee, do not hide behind closed doors. We do hold hearings behind closed doors because it is best that the security of this Nation be preserved by not making known all of our military secrets.

Mr. RIVERS. I was talking about our committee. We do not hide behind closed doors. I am not talking about anybody else's committee.

I should like to say this. Had we proceeded with the *Forrestal*, had it not been cut back, we would have saved $125 million and the experimentation which is so necessary, would have found out what a new ship will do and known it long ago.

The purpose here is to bring your Navy up to the most modern point where nobody on the face of the earth will ever catch your Navy. More sorties were flown in Korea by your Navy than by any other branch of the service. I will have you understand that this Navy in every single, solitary compartment, category, or capacity is superior to any navy on the face of the globe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend; I have just got to yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. There was not any other navy in that police action.

Mr. RIVERS. And if it were left to the gentleman and to me, there never will be any other.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. RIVERS. And we are not going to give it away, are we? I will tell you something else, just to show you how we want to balance our forces. We have been striving, working day in and day out, to bring our Air Force up to 143 groups or 137 groups or whatever the figure is and in this new public works bill that is going to come to our committee in the next week, we are going to strive, on the urgent request of the Secretary of Defense, to bring the remainder of these bases up to par, to house our planes, our new planes which are coming off the production line.

There is another thing about these carriers. The distinguished former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] told you about the new carriers and what is needed for them. Did you know that in the older type carrier they had a 17-foot clearance in the hangar deck? In these new carriers we have to have a 26-foot clearance. Why is that? Because of the new planes. I want you to know that the new planes that we are going to put on our new carriers weigh as much as the World War II B–17. That is the kind of plane that is going to go into these new carriers. We are bringing them up to date. And how much room do they need? They need over 25 feet of clearance so that they can take advantage of the improved height of the tail to take care of the drag on the new jet planes that are going to be used.

I do not believe that you want to see your Navy second class. Having a second-class navy is like coming out second in a poker game. Let me tell you this: This is no child's play, this game we are in. Let us keep our chips first, and bring them home with a first-class Navy in the first-class American way.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and directed to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, the following modern naval vessels:

One aircraft carrier of about 60,000 tons, to be named U. S. S. *Congress*.

Six destroyer leaders, each of about 3,900 tons.

Seven destroyers, each of about 2,900 tons.

Two nuclear-powered submarines, each of about 2,300 tons.

One nuclear-powered radar picket submarine of about 4,600 tons.

Four submarines, each of about 1,700 tons.

One guided-missile submarine of about 2,900 tons.

Landing craft not to exceed 14,000 tons.

Two inshore minesweepers, each of about 120 tons.

Two escort vessels, each of about 1,400 tons.

Two ammunition ships, each of about 7,500 tons.

One general stores issue ship of about 7,500 tons.

Five patrol vessels, each of about 60 tons.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "United States ship *Congress*" and insert "U. S. S. *Congress*."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM for the committee amendment: Page 1, line 7, after "named", strike out "U. S. S. *Congress*" and insert "U. S. S. *Kitty Hawk*."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this measure. Of course, there is this controversy at the present time not only here on the floor of the House but throughout the country in regard to carriers and their use. I personally have been here long enough not to try to become a strategist when it comes to the type of weapon we select to fight our wars, so I leave my decision to the judgment of those who have had more experience in the field of battle than I. Therefore I have tried to take no chances on the security of my country by trying to decide what is the best type of weapon to use. There are good arguments on both sides of that, of course.

However, I did not rise primarily to discuss that matter. I think the committee has been wise in trying to designate these items before the Members of the House so that we would know definitely what we have in the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is plain. It is self-explanatory. The State of North Carolina and the members of the congressional delegation, together with the governors, for the last 25 years or more have made presentations to the proper officials in an attempt to get some vessel named after this most historic spot in America. As we all know, it is the birthplace of aviation. It is the place where the Wright brothers made their first flight some 50 years ago.

This year there was celebrated the 50th anniversary of that historic occasion. The Wright brothers, as we all know, have contributed much to the defense and security of this country by those first test flights on that historic site. Although it is recognized throughout the country as being a very historic spot, we have recently appealed to the Navy to name the last carrier, which was recently named the *Independence* a few days ago, after a vessel which was in existence many, many years ago. I think it is time that this Congress should recognize the fact that, after all, we do have historic spots in our country, and we feel that we should have consideration, when, after all, we are primarily responsible for the supplying of funds to put these ships into operation.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, these are my reasons for advancing the name *Kitty Hawk* for this aircraft carrier:

From the standpoint of historical interest, it is appropriate that an aircraft carrier symbolic of the far-reaching force of United States airpower be identified with the historical site at which the air age was launched. Kitty Hawk, N. C., bears distinction as the site of the first successful flight of a power-driven heavier-than-air machine by the Wright brothers on December 17, 1903. Since that date the name "Kitty Hawk" has been identified by the American public with the air age and with airpower.

The words "Kitty Hawk" not only has a sound historical basis for being appropriate as the name of an aircraft carrier, but the name has a euphonic and auditory appeal.

It may be that under the present nomenclature policy of the United States Navy the use of the name "Kitty Hawk" for a large aircraft carrier would not be permissible, since the name is not that of a famous former warship, or a battle, operation, or engagement. Smaller-type carriers are named after islands, bays, and sounds, or battles in World War II. Moreover, it is recognized that under present Navy policy the names for historical places for aviation are given to aircraft auxiliary vessels, and that one such vessel has been named the *Kitty Hawk*.

Notwithstanding the general customs governing the naming of aircraft carriers, the great historical significance of Kitty Hawk, together with the public association of the name with airpower, suggests that "Kitty Hawk" would be a highly appropriate name for an aircraft carrier.

Moreover, there have been departures from the general practice in naming carriers. Examples are "Shangri-la" and "Forrestal." Since the general practice in naming aircraft carriers is not a rigid one, "Kitty Hawk," for reasons already mentioned, would be a very suitable name for such a vessel.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say. I am appealing to the House, if they see fit, to adopt my amendment. I know that my State, and I know that other States of the country, which, of course, have participated with us, such as the great State of Ohio, and the Members of Congress from that State as well as the Members of the other body representing that State have always cooperated with us in trying to secure the naming of one of the carriers for that historic spot.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Did the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, offer this amendment in committee?

Mr. DURHAM. I did not. I did not happen to be present when the bill was reported out. I was conducting a hearing in my other committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to see that my friend has not been reading Pravda lately because the Russians claim that they have been building these things long before Kitty Hawk, along with baseball and everything else.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman knows full well that that is probably propaganda, but I think we have missed the point somewhat in trying to carry out some of our own propaganda with reference to historic spots in this country, and that is one reason I am asking this Congress today to go along with me and adopt the substitute amendment naming this carrier, the U. S. S. *Kitty Hawk*. I cannot think of any better name for it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Would it not really be better to leave the matter of the naming of this vessel to a later time? It does not seem quite becoming that the Congress should name this vessel after itself. Ships come and go and at times ships are sunk and lost in battle. We do not want the U. S. S. *Congress* to be sunk. Why should we name it after ourselves? Why should we not leave it open and why does not the gentleman amend his amendment so that that may be done.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman is fully aware of the fact that I have always gone along with the policy in existence, but since a name is in this bill, I am offering the House a name for this new carrier, which I believe to be of prestige to our great Navy, one that every American can be proud of, and I appeal to the House to adopt my substitute amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I include the following address of Hon. Lindsay Warren:

[From proceedings at the exercises held at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1928, in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the first flight of an airplane by Wilbur and Orville Wright]

ADDRESS OF HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Orville Wright, delegates attending the International Civil Aeronautics Conference, and ladies and gentlemen: Standing on soil already sacred in the life of the Nation we come here today to see the world pay universal acclaim to the inventive genius of man. Over 300 years ago, just 3 miles distant, the first of the English set their feet, built their dwellings, sowed their crops, and performed their religious devotions in the Western World. Upon this soil landed the first English women who crossed the ocean to find homes upon the newly discovered continent, and here was born and christened the first English child who saw the light of day in the new world. Here the customs, laws, and language of England were first transplanted and struck their roots in the soil.

It was this dauntless spirit of adventure and achievement that prompted Sir Walter Raleigh to extend the domain of civilization—this indefinable spirit which has inspired man to greater achievement through the ages. The story of the pioneer has largely constituted the history of the world.

Over 300 years later the same pioneering spirit again selected North Carolina for its greatest triumph, and the world's most important conquest began on this spot. For centuries the mind of man had been fascinated and diverted to overcome what was supposed to be contrary to every law of nature, and for ages men experimented and planned, to be accompanied only by failure.

And then came the Wrights. It was by no mere accident that Kitty Hawk was selected as the scene for an experiment that later astounded the world. Nor was it their desire for privacy that made Wilbur and Orville Wright come to this spot on the narrow banks of North Carolina, which hold back the Atlantic from its inland sounds. They did not think that the public would manifest enough interest to disturb them. Kitty Hawk was chosen because the United States Weather Bureau had advised them that it was in this locality that the winds were the strongest and steadiest, and therefore more propitious for their plans. They came to what was then a little isolated village of fishermen, whose life had been a continuous combat with an unrelenting sea. They found here what has been said to be the purest Anglo-Saxon blood on the American Continent—God-fearing, noble men and women, who, together with the crew of the United States Coast Guard Station at Kill Devil Hills, composed the population of this outskirt on the eastern frontier of America.

The scant publicity appearing in the press of the Nation termed it a fool's errand. They suffered the same aspersions and derisions as have all others who blazed trails. They became forgotten men—cranks seeking to obtain the impossible. For 3 years they conducted their glider experiments and after a thousand such flights they had actually succeeded in staying in the air for a minute in a glider. Their courage and faith were superb. They knew that the history of their race had been full of failure, but that each failure had marked a surer and firmer advance of civilization. The world might scoff, but the Wrights knew, as well as men can know anything in the future, that the machine they had so patiently constructed would fly, for the formula had been verified. They achieved their results neither by luck nor the process of elimination, but by scientific inquiry and study. And so, by a toss of a coin, it fell to the lot of our distinguished guest to usher in a new era that has revolutionized transportation and has redounded to the happiness and progress of the human race.

Twenty-five years ago from this morning, with a 27-mile-an-hour wind against it, his machine rose from the ground and went a distance of 120 feet in a flight lasting 12 seconds. And here it was that for the first time in history a machine carrying a man raised itself by its own power into the air in full flight, went ahead without reduction of speed, and landed at a point as high as that from which it started. Here this epoch in the history of the world had its genesis. Here stand the cradle of aviation.

As those who first came to these shores lived in the great age of discovery, so today we live in the age of invention. Distance has been annihilated by the marvelous radio. The world has been united by the locomotive and automobile. The perfection of the printing press has spread knowledge to every class. The humblest man today has available for his comfort and his education facilities that the mightiest king of a former century never dreamed possible. When the gas engine was hurled into the air by Wilbur and Orville Wright, the last citadel of man's earthy kingdom was brought into subjection, and it is the sober judgment of students of human history that nothing can compare in creative worth to this accomplishment.

When we stop and visualize that just a quarter of a century ago one of the greatest newspapers in America wired its correspondent to "stop sending fake stuff, for nobody believes these wildcat yarns about men flying in an airplane," the supremacy of man in the air is almost unbelievable. With this humble origin as a setting we have seen the Atlantic spanned, the globe circled, and the North Pole flown over. We have seen the airplane become an indispensable necessity in the commercial and business life of the world and a vital factor in national defense. What would appear to be a stretch of the wildest imagination could only conjure up the immediate future.

To the honored guest of this splendid gathering I would say that it has not been the privilege of many who have made history to be the recipient of such an ovation as this. There has rarely been accorded to a man in the flesh the plaudits of his fellow citizens such as within a week have been given to you and your lamented brother. A grateful and appreciative Nation, fortified by her friends and neighbors of the universe, come to pay you a tribute of admiration and regard that has only few parallels in history. With the modesty that has ever characterized you, you have seen those who would detract from your achievement succumb in the light of analysis. You stand not only before the world as a discoverer but as one whose brain perfected to its present state what was first conceived in it.

This memorial authorized by the Congress of the United States, started here today, is merely to place in imperishable granite the recording of another milestone of man's work. Its plans have been sought from the most distinguished architects of the Nation. It is contemplated that there shall be a lofty tower containing a light to guide those who travel by air and sea. The second unit calls for a new coast guard station on yonder beach, to which will be attached a tablet in bronze to depict what transpired here. How fitting it is that the Coast Guard, that noble service for humanity, which contributed its assistance in this feat, should be recognized in its perpetuation. Next year a bridge will span this sound to make it in easy access to the Nation, and I believe that I can safely state that North Carolina, recognizing its obligation, will construct a paved road to this historic spot.

We are dedicating here today a national shrine. There will be gathered here the intimate associations that made it possible. Here the air was conquered and here belong the implements of conquest. To this spot in centuries to come will journey those who would pay reverent tribute. Today the homage of the world is given here. Tomorrow it will become the pilgrimage and the mecca of those whose happiness have been enhanced.

This memorial standing here facing a mighty ocean will proclaim the sentiments of a grateful Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer an amendment at page 2, line 24, which is the same amendment as on page 1, line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SCRIVNER:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", strike out the words "and directed."

On page 2, line 24, after the word "authorized", strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that the only possible way of preventing war now or in the future is a defense setup in this country which no aggressor nation could defeat.

There is no question which causes me more concern than the question of what is adequate national defense. An adequate national defense must be a balanced defense between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. No one service is the answer to adequate defense.

I was very much in favor of the first supercarrier, but I am not in favor of this bill today. I am for a continuing program of research and experiment on big and better ships, planes, guns, and every other form of weapon for defense. But, certainly, we should not go into a $5 to $10 billion spending program until we know for sure what we want.

If my information is correct, the *Forrestal* has not been in operation a sufficient length of time for the Navy to be sure that they want or need 10 more such carriers. I predict that by the time this program is completed, this Armed Services Committee and the Defense Department will regret that they did not go a little slower and possibly use this money at this time in other places. Certainly we cannot and should not attempt to create an army to meet the only countries who are a threat to us today on a man-to-man basis.

But as I see the story today, the Army has commitments around the world and certainly should not be reduced. The growing importance of tactical atomic weapons and the continuing likelihood of limited warfare for an indefinite period in the future adds up to the fact that our country should, and must, maintain a relatively large mobile army.

General Ridgway has stated that the Army should not be reduced. I have not talked to General Ridgway personally on this problem and I do not know his reasoning, but I have read every word that I could find in the papers as to what he has said and I am convinced that he is greatly disturbed over the reduction in the Army. In my opinion, he has shown great restraint and patience as a member of the President's defense team. But the American people are entitled to the benefit of his reasoning as far as the manpower of the Army is concerned. The President should either allow or order General Ridgway to tell his reasoning on this problem.

No one is all-knowing and regardless of the military greatness of our President, the people of the United States should be allowed to know the manpower reasoning of General Ridgway and the Army.

In closing, if we are so limited in the money available for defense that we cannot at least maintain the Army at its present strength, we should surely not embark on this program at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read in its entirety, and open to amendment at any portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. The vessels listed in section 1 of this act have been previously authorized by law and shall be charged against previously authorized and unobligated tonnage.

SEC. 3. The President is further authorized and directed to convert from existing vessels of the United States, the following modern naval vessels:

Two aircraft carriers, each of about 36,000 tons.

Four aircraft carriers, each of about 35,000 tons.

One heavy cruiser of about 15,000 tons.

One guided-missile light cruiser of about 12,000 tons.

One guided-missile destroyer of about 2,800 tons.

Twelve radar picket escort vessels, each of about 1,400 tons.

Two cable repairing and laying ships, each of about 4,100 tons.

One seaplane tender of about 13,000 tons.

Four ocean radar station ships, each of about 3,600 tons.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of the foregoing vessels.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "The vessels listed in section 1 of this act have", and insert "Tonnage adequate to construct the vessels listed in section 1 of this act has."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment, page 2, line 21, after the word "and", insert "the vessels listed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is no doubt but that the carrier provision in this bill will be carried. I would like to read to the House a part of a speech made by Admiral Russell, in which he describes the activities of his command in the evacuation of the Tachen Islands. That was fairly recent and very successful and extremely important psychologically to America and also to other countries.

He said:

I first received news that we were to be ready to assist in the evacuation of the Tachen Islands while in Yokosuka, Japan, where my flagship, the aircraft carrier *Wasp*, was undergoing 2 weeks of essential maintenance. Our orders to steam south as soon as possible required that all repair jobs, machinery overhaul, etc., had to be stopped and the ship prepared for sea at half time in the maintenance period. We put to sea, landed aboard our air group which had been exercising at a local airfield, and steamed south. Two days later we joined Admiral Ring and the three other carriers which had come north from the Manila area. We formed two groups, each comprised of two carriers and screening destroyers. Immediately we set about the business of drilling for the operations which would be required of us. These, as you can imagine, were rather vigorous. We were to keep a continuous fighter cover airborne both day and night over the evacuation force in the Tachen Islands, and we were to provide fighter cover over the transports as far south as the point where Sabrejets of our own Air Force, plus the planes of the Chinese Nationalists, operating from Formosa, could take over. Fighter cover, although of the greatest importance, was but one of our aerial tasks. We kept airborne in the objective area during the hours of daylight, strong patrols of attack planes and fighter bombers who were "on call" for an immediate strike at any time the Chinese Communists' artillery might have commenced fire. We provided also an antisubmarine and antimotor torpedo-boat patrol of low-flying airplanes in the objective area. Additionally, of course, we provided fighter cover and antisubmarine cover for our own force.

The Members of the House know how extremely successful that evacuation was. You remember that I introduced an amendment for the most recent of the *Forrestal*-type carrier, and it would have been passed immediately if the House had realized at once how vital the Navy considered it, and how vital the Committee on Armed Services also considered it. As you know, the Senate accepted it and it later passed the House. My interest in the carrier is well known. My interest in all naval establishments is well known. My interest in all military defense is also well known. I have in my own district the Bedford Airfield and Research Center, the Watertown Arsenal, and Fort Devens, a great historic Army post.

So you can realize that I am interested in all phases of our national defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember well the gentlewoman's fight. I joined with her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remember it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentlewoman agrees with me that if this carrier is ever appropriated for, the Navy Department will send it to the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. at Quincy to be built.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have every confidence that will be done. We should have had the last carrier. They do magnificent work there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts typifies the unification of the armed services. She has some Army stations in her area, she is pleading for the Navy, and I know she is interested in the Air Force.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished and able gentleman. I certainly am for very strong national defense, and I want to thank all the Members who have fought so valiantly and effectively for it.

The speech made by Rear Admiral Russell at Los Angeles on March 1, 1955, is as follows:

FLEET AVIATION AND SOME RECENT EXPERIENCES IN FORMOSAN WATERS

(Rear Adm. V. S. Russell's talk before World Affairs Council in Los Angeles, March 1, 1955)

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to speak here today. I thank the World Affairs Council, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Navy League, and the Propeller Club for the opportunity to make a few remarks on the subject of naval aviation, to tell you of some recent activities of the 7th Fleet, and to explain the part naval aviation played in those activities.

Perhaps I should first clarify my position among the visitors: I have just been ordered ashore after a tour of duty in the 7th Fleet as the commander of an Aircraft Carrier Division. The last operation in which I participated was the evacuation of the Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands. My job ashore will be that of the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics which, I am sure, will not be without some problems and headaches. Since I have not commenced it, however, I should like to direct your attention away from my forthcoming job in order to explain how naval aviation functions in the Fleet.

I should like to begin by expressing what, to me, is a self-evident truth but which is sometimes misunderstood by some of our citizens—that aviation is an integral, inseparable, and indispensable part of the operating forces of the Navy. In the tasks apportioned among the members of the national defense team of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Navy's mission is to control the seas. In fulfilling this mission there are countless jobs which the Navy must perform in which aircraft play the essential role.

SEALIFT ESSENTIAL TO SUPPORT OVERSEAS AIRLIFT

Occasionally things happen which bring strikingly to one's attention the importance of the Navy's mission. Flying back from Japan to California the other day my interest both as a seafaring man and an aviator led me to review with the plane commander the amount of fuel we carried—what reserve for adverse winds, for proceeding to an alternate field, for holding over our terminal airport, etc. In discussing amounts of fuel a fact was brought to my attention which bears on control of the sea. It was this—a transport plane flying an average load of passengers or freight round trip from California to Tokyo requires fuel at Hawaii, Midway, and Tokyo, which in weight is roughly four times the load the airplane carries. That is, for 1 ton of passengers or freight airlifted to Japan and 1 ton brought back, 4 tons of aviation fuel is shipped by tanker overseas. My figure of 4 is derived from a very rough calculation—I believe the figure is as high as 7 for some planes. Here, then, is a striking example of what control of the sea means—a control which we almost take for granted. The American overseas airlift depends upon control of the seas for its supply of aviation fuel and support of airbases.

Among the countless jobs in which aircraft play the essential role in the Navy is one about which we hear little because it lacks the glamour of the offense. I speak of the air defense of ships at sea. In the face of stiff enemy opposition, the very life of ships at sea may depend upon a closely knit, expertly controlled fighter defense. This is one of the missions of our aircraft carriers.

INTEGRAL AVIATION REQUIRED FOR SURVIVAL OF SHIPS AT SEA

To make a point one usually cites the horrible example. Mine is from World War II. The utter folly of advancing "naked" of fighting cover into an area of enemy air opposition was typified by an event of the third day of the war with Japan. The British ships *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* steamed northeast out of Singapore to see what might be done about stopping the Japanese amphibious advance into Malaya. These two proud ships moved from their base without any firm plan for air cover. Sighted twice by Japanese submarines, searched for by Jap patrol planes from bases around Saigon the night before, those ships were finally located by air-search at 1100 on December 10 and attacked at about 1130 by 88 Japanese twin-engined Naval attack aircraft (Betty's) 27 of which carried bombs, 61 torpedoes. With a loss of but 4 planes, these 88 aircraft made 1 bomb and 10 torpedo hits on the *Prince of Wales* and 2 bomb and 12 torpedo hits on *Repulse*. *Repulse* sank at 1230; *Prince of Wales* about a half hour later. One Japanese attack plane, which remained to observe results, considered itself lucky to escape from about 10 Buffalo fighters dispatched from Singapore but which arrived at the scene after the mortal damage was done.

This example is from history late in the year 1941; however the lesson still holds in 1955. Antiaircraft artillery has made considerable progress, the employment of guided missiles in air defense is just around the corner, yet the major burden of air defense will be borne by fighter aircraft for some time to come. The modern interceptor is a very high performance jet fighter. Its high performance comes from the use of a turbojet powerplant, which by its nature consumes rapidly large quantities of fuel; and from the fact that the total quantity of fuel carried by the interceptor is held by a reasonable minimum so that fuel weight will not too adversely affect fighting performance. Both factors make the interceptor a comparatively short range, short endurance vehicle. This means that airfields must be in proximity to the area defended. At sea the fighter airfield is the aircraft carrier; its proximity to the area defended is adjustable.

Before leaving my example of air defense at sea, I'd like just to mention that all important ingredient—fighter direction. Fighter-direction, or ground controlled intercept, is a complex affair of radar, radio circuits, and various electronic aids, plus an expert crew skilled in the use of these complexities. Fighter-direction brings fighters into shooting contact with attacking aircraft before the latter reach their targets. In our Navy the capacity for fighter direction exists, not only in the aircraft carriers, but also in cruisers, amphibious command ships, and in certain destroyers and even submarines. The virtue of having fighter-direction capability in many ships was clearly evident off Formosa during the recent evacuation of the Tachens, when carrier based fighters over the objective area were controlled variously by the amphibious command ship, by cruisers or by destroyers; and when the Navy carrier *Princeton* controlled the Formosa based Air Force F–86's which provided cover for the southern part of the transport route.

So much for air defense at sea.

In offense, the power of carrier aviation is better known, and I'll not go into detail. Suffice it to say that with the advent of atomic weapons suitable for employment by tactical aircraft, the offensive power of carrier air took a quantum jump forward.

Our Navy's important antisubmarine forces have air elements of considerable diversity. Landplanes and seaplanes are especially equipped with search and locating devices, and specialized weapons. These planes are manned by skilled crews and fly from airfields and seadromes adjacent to sea areas. Smaller aircraft carriers, with squadrons of carrier type antisubmarine aircraft, perform a similar mission. Here again, the planes have highly developed search and locating devices and the crews are experts in all the facets of submarine warfare. Incidentally helicopters, using their ability to hover, are serving a role of ever increasing importance while flying antisubmarine missions from aircraft carriers. Both patrol and carrier antisubmarine aviation is closely integrated with the work of destroyers and escort vessels in that precise teamwork required for the successful detection and destruction of enemy submarines.

Having made these general remarks, I should like now to shift the scene to the western Pacific.

United States naval forces in the western Pacific are balanced forces designed for the job of controlling the sea at a great distance from our continental bases. An inventory of their composition is of considerable interest.

There is an attack carrier force, usually of 4 carriers, with about 300 embarked aircraft, which embodies the principal offensive power of the 7th Fleet. There is an amphibious group of ships suitable for the transport of troops and their equipment, together with landing craft to put them ashore over ocean beaches. There is a cruiser force, usually of three cruisers for gunfire support of amphibious operations, for surface operations, and for antiaircraft gun support of other forces. There are antisubmarine forces of planes and ships. There is the Formosan patrol of aircraft and destroyers. There are our own submarines, and finally there is a logistic support force which not only supplies the fighting ships with fuel, provisions, and ammunition while underway at sea, but also mans the repair ships and store ships at the various ports used as advanced bases at which extensive maintenance can be performed on our fighting ships.

It is my personal opinion that the evacuation of the Tachen Islands was decided upon by the Chinese Nationalists because of the fact that the Chinese Communists' buildup of air strength in the adjacent fields, those around Shanghai, made the daylight supply of the islands most precarious. We, of the 7th Fleet, were directed to assist the Chinese Nationalists in effecting the evacuation. Here again, in my personal opinion, had the Chinese Nationalists attempted the evacuation with their own resources, the Communists' air superiority would have made it a most costly undertaking.

I first received news that we were to be ready to assist in the evacuation of the Tachen Islands while in Yokosuka, Japan, where my flagship, the aircraft carrier, *Wasp*, was undergoing 2 weeks of essential maintenance. Our orders to steam south, as soon as possible, required that all repair jobs, machinery overhaul, etc., had to be stopped and the ship prepared for sea at half time in the maintenance period. We put to sea, landed aboard our air group, which had been exercising at a local airfield, and steamed south. Two days later, we joined Admiral Ring and the three other carriers, which had come north from the Manila area. We formed 2 groups, each comprised of 2 carriers and screening destroyers. Immediately we set about the business of drilling for the operations which would be required of us. These, as you can imagine, were rather vigorous. We were to keep a continuous fighter cover airborne both day and night, over the evacuation force in the Tachen Islands, and we were to provide fighter cover over the transports as far south as the point where Sabre jets of our own Air Force, plus the planes of the Chinese Na-

tionalists, operating from Formosa, could take over. Fighter cover, although of the greatest importance, was but one of our aerial tasks. We kept airborne in the objective area during the hours of daylight, strong patrols of attack planes and fighter bombers, who were on call for an immediate strike at any time the Chinese Communists artillery might have commenced fire. We provided, also, an antisubmarine and antimotor torpedo boat patrol of low-flying airplanes in the objective area. Additionally, of course, we provided fighter cover and antisubmarine cover for our own force.

No halfway measures were taken in the Tachen affair. The Navy air and surface Formosan patrols were stepped up. The Air Force sent a wing of Sabre jet fighters into Formosa. An ample number of amphibious ships and craft assembled for the evacuation. A cruiser and destroyer gun-fire support team was crusing in the immediate vicinity of the two Tachen islands with guns loaded and trained on the Communist artillery positions. During the daylight hours flights of heavily armed carrier attack planes were circling overhead and speedy jet fighter bombers from the carriers were airborne close at hand, all under the control of the amphibious commander, ready to strike immediately upon his direction. The transport ships were given antisubmarine protection over the entire route from the Tachens to Formosa, by patrol planes and carried-based aircraft.

It became evident in the early days of the operation that, in the face of the strong forces arrayed against them, the Chinese Communists had decided not to interfere. Their artillery, although within range of the evacuation beaches, did not open fire. There were no attacks by surface craft; there was no interference with the evacuation force by Communist aircraft, nor did Communist aircraft contest our control of the air. The Communists did, however, open fire on our planes whenever these came within range of their antiaircraft artillery. Our fighters, flying at 40,000 feet and above, repeatedly reported strings of shell bursts beneath them. In the absence of hostile acts by the Red Chinese, we were required to remain outside the 3-mile limit of Communist territory. This requirement was met through the close radar control of our aircraft by cruisers and the amphibious command ship in the objective area.

My flagship, the *Wasp*, had the dubious honor of having the only plane shot down in the affair. Lieutenant O'Heren, with a crew of 2, in a Douglas attack plane, was leading an element of 2 aircraft, a search and attack team guarding the amphibious forces against submarines and motor torpedo boats. In very difficult weather conditions, namely, a 200-foot ceiling and rain and drizzle which reduced the visibility to 2 miles, O'Heren mistook an enemy island for a friendly one. Discovering his error, he turned away, but not soon enough. The Communists opened fire and scored a shrapnel hit in the engine of O'Heren's plane. With oil streaming from the engine cowl and the oil pressure dropping fast, he ditched his aircraft successfully alongside a Chinese Nationalist minesweeper. The minesweeper transferred pilot and crew to a United States destroyer, which returned them to the *Wasp* within a day.

In my opinion, the Tachen operation was successful for one reason only—because with our help the Chinese Nationalists used the only argument which the imperialist police state Russia and her satellites know—we had adequate military forces present in the objective area to have made any aggressive move on the part of the Reds extremely costly.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because I sincerely feel that this legislation is good legislation. I heard the testimony before the committee. I think that the carrier and other vessels are needed. I do not think these carriers are "supercarriers;" I think that they are modern carriers.

Many naval vessels of our fleet are now overage. There is a need for the new vessels and new types of vessels outlined in this bill. Without such vessels we will be failing to keep abreast of the technological advances which are and should be available to us. This bill will also help us to keep alive our important shipbuilding industry. This is vital to our defense.

This bill provides specifically for the construction of modern carriers. These must be provided in order to give us the advantage of surprise which is necessary in warfare. Our land bases are well-known to the enemy. Our carriers can be moved as they are needed and in a way to confuse the enemy. We must have land bases for our planes and we must also have carriers. We need them both.

I would like to refer to some remarks that were made on the floor earlier in the day with regard to the relative strength of the various branches of the Armed Forces and as to whether or not they were recommended by the Department of Defense. As I understand it, the cut which was made in the Army was not recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is my personal conviction that the cuts which were made in the Army were entirely too deep and that our national defense is today very lacking with regard to the present and projected strength of our Army. I heartily condemn that blow at the Army and at our national security. I think it can be corrected, but it should not be corrected at the expense of these carriers. These carriers are needed and are recommended not only by the Navy but also by the Department of Defense. I hope the Members unanimously support this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the adoption of the Scrivner amendment, I can vote for this resolution as a progress report on the state of our naval building plans. In its present form it is not binding on Congress or the President. Before the Schrivner amendment was adopted this resolution directed the President to construct the vessels listed.

Ordinarily, in a hassle between a legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee, I am inclined to side with the legislative committee. I think it is sound lawmaking to keep the policy-making function separate from the money-spending function. In this case, however, it is admitted that this tonnage was authorized years ago, and that the ships described could be built without our passing this purported authorization. It is also stated that the intent was not to direct or force the President to build these ships, and therefore there was no objection to the Scrivner amendment. In view of all this I fail to see any purpose in the resolution in its present form other than to call the attention of the House to the present plans for our Navy. This purpose is laudable. It might have been accomplished in a less confusing way.

Questions have been asked about the transfer of naval vessels to our allies. This is done by special acts of Congress. For instance, I saw two destroyers of the Benson class when I was in Formosa last December which were part of the Chinese Nationalist Navy, and had already been in battle near Quemoy. They were loaned to the Chinese under the authority of Public Law 188 of the 83d Congress, which provides in part:

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding section 4 of the act of March 10, 1951, or any other provision of law, the President is authorized to lend or otherwise make available to any friendly foreign nation in the far eastern area, with or without reimbursement, and on such terms and under such conditions as the President may deem appropriate, such naval vessels not larger than the destroyer type and not to exceed 25 in number, and such assorted minor miscellaneous craft, naval services, training, technical advice, facilities, and equipment, as he may deem proper. No vessels shall be made available under this section unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines such transfer to be in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as to the future of the 60,000-ton supercarrier already named the *Kitty Hawk*, I would not want to pit my judgment against the Navy Department and the Armed Forces Committee and vote against authorizing it, but I hope we will go slow about its construction until we know more about the performance of the first four, and can study further the possibilities of jet-driven seaplanes. I am an old naval aviator, having been No. 73, and I still have pride and confidence in that arm of our service. I am worried, however, about these supercarriers. I am no expert, but I have carefully studied the brief hearings before the Armed Services Committee on this subject, and I am appalled at the admitted vulnerability of these monsters. It seems to me an insufficient answer to point out the vulnerability of other ships, of cities, and factories. We have never before in the atomic age deliberately built a weapon that was in itself such a large and costly target. We have been seeking dispersion of targets, knowing that concentration invites attack. In a supercarrier, we are concentrating $200 million into one ship and then preparing to spend additional enormous amounts in other ships to protect that ship.

I have been greatly impressed by the possibilities in seaplanes like the Martin P6M–1 *Seamaster*. According to published accounts, it will have a speed of 600 miles per hour, a payload of 30,000 pounds, a cruising altitude of 40,000 feet, and can take off and land wherever there is 15 feet depth of water, and waves are less than 6 feet high, in less space than normally required for landings and takeoffs of comparable-sized land planes. That means that instead of costly 10,000-foot runways, this plane will be able to make a runway out of five-sixths of the earth's surface, the open sea, rivers, lakes. One well-placed bomb, not necessarily a large one, would make either

the deck of a carrier or the runway of a land base unusable for a period that might be vital. This would not happen with water-based aircraft. Igor Sikorsky, pioneer helicopter inventor, has pointed out the structural differences in the landing gear for a land-based plane and the boat hull for a flying boat, showing that the proportionate weight increases as the land plane becomes larger and decreases as seaplanes become larger, especially in the class of 100-ton aircraft. He summed it up by saying:

In larger sizes, the flying boat appears to be definitely superior with respect to its general efficiency and all-around performance characteristics.

We could build a great flotilla of superflying boats for $200 million. They could go anywhere. They have been out of style for a long time, largely because we were not trying to make them big enough to take full advantage of their characteristics. We had better investigate and develop their possibilities before we tie up too much of our money in supercarriers.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. Moss, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 199, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 373, nays 3, answered "present" 7, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—373

Abbitt	Bailey	Bolling
Abernethy	Baker	Bolton,
Adair	Baldwin	Frances P.
Addonizio	Barden	Bonner
Albert	Barrett	Bosch
Alexander	Bass, N. H.	Bow
Alger	Bass, Tenn.	Boykin
Andersen,	Bates	Boyle
H. Carl	Baumhart	Bray
Andresen,	Beamer	Brooks, Tex.
August H.	Becker	Brown, Ga.
Andrews	Belcher	Brown, Ohio
Anfuso	Bell	Broyhill
Arends	Bennett, Fla.	Buchanan
Ashley	Bennett, Mich.	Buckley
Ashmore	Bentley	Budge
Aspinall	Berry	Burdick
Auchincloss	Betts	Burleson
Avery	Boggs	Bush
Ayres	Boland	Byrd
Byrne, Pa.	Hiestand	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hill	Polk
Cannon	Hillings	Preston
Carnahan	Hoeven	Price
Carrigg	Holifield	Priest
Cederberg	Holmes	Prouty
Celler	Holtzman	Quigley
Chase	Hope	Rabaut
Chatham	Horan	Radwan
Chelf	Hosmer	Rains
Chenoweth	Huddleston	Ray
Chiperfield	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Christopher	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Chudoff	Ikard	Reuss
Church	James	Rhodes, Ariz.
Clark	Jenkins	Rhodes, Pa.
Clevenger	Jennings	Richards
Cole	Jensen	Riehlman
Colmer	Johansen	Riley
Coon	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Cooper	Johnson, Wis.	Robeson, Va.
Corbett	Jonas	Robsion, Ky.
Cramer	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Cretella	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Cunningham	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis, Mass.	Judd	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.	Karsten	Rogers, Tex.
Dague	Kean	Rooney
Davidson	Kearns	Roosevelt
Dawson, Utah	Keating	Sadlak
Deane	Kee	St. George
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Dempsey	Keogh	Schenck
Denton	Kilburn	Scherer
Derounian	Kilgore	Schwengel
Devereux	King, Calif.	Scott
Dies	K'ein	Scudder
Diggs	Kluczynski	Seely-Brown
Dingell	Knox	Selden
Dixon	Knutson	Sheehan
Dodd	Krueger	Short
Dolliver	Laird	Shuford
Dondero	Landrum	Sikes
Donohue	Lane	Siler
Donovan	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Dorn, N. Y.	Lankford	Simpson, Pa.
Dorn, S. C.	Latham	Sisk
Dowdy	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Doyle	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Durham	Lipscomb	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Long	Smith, Wis.
Ellsworth	Lovre	Spence
Engle	McCarthy	Springer
Evins	McConnell	Steed
Fallon	McCormack	Sullivan
Fascell	McGregor	Taber
Feighan	McIntire	Talle
Fenton	McMillan	Taylor
Fernandez	McVey	Teague, Calif.
Fine	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Fino	Machrowicz	Thomas
Fisher	Mack, Ill.	Thompson,
Fjare	Mack, Wash.	Mich.
Flood	Madden	Thompson, N. J.
Flynt	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex.
Fogarty	Mahon	Thornberry
Forand	Mailliard	Tollefson
Ford	Mason	Trimble
Forrester	Matthews	Tuck
Fountain	Meader	Tumulty
Frazier	Metcalf	Udall
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Friedel	Miller, Nebr.	Vanik
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Gamble	Mills	Van Zandt
Garmatz	Minshall	Velde
Gary	Mollohan	Vinson
Gathings	Morano	Vorys
Gavin	Morgan	Vursell
Gentry	Moss	Wainwright
George	Multer	Watts
Gordon	Mumma	Weaver
Grant	Murray, Ill.	Westland
Gray	Murray, Tenn.	Wharton
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Whitten
Green, Pa.	Nelson	Wickersham
Gregory	Nicholson	Widnall
Griffiths	Norrell	Wier
Gross	O'Brien, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Gubser	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Gwinn	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. J.
Hagen	O'Hara, Minn.	Williams, N. Y.
Hale	O'Konski	Willis
Haley	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Halleck	Osmers	Wilson, Ind.
Hand	Ostertag	Winstead
Harden	Passman	Withrow
Hardy	Patman	Wolcott
Harris	Patterson	Wolverton
Harrison, Va.	Pelly	Wright
Harvey	Perkins	Yates
Hays, Ark.	Pfost	Young
Hayworth	Philbin	Younger
Hébert	Phillips	Zablocki
Heselton	Pilion	Zelenko
Hess	Poage	

NAYS—3

Davis, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Brownson	Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad
Crumpacker	King, Pa.	Scrivner
Hinshaw		

NOT VOTING—51

Allen, Calif.	Edmondson	Miller, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Granahan	Morrison
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Moulder
Blitch	Henderson	Pilcher
Bolton,	Herlong	Powell
Oliver P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Bowler	Holt	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks, La.	Jackson	Roberts
Burnside	Jarman	Rutherford
Canfield	Kearney	Shelley
Carlyle	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Cooley	Kilday	Sieminski
Coudert	Kirwan	Staggers
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Dawson, Ill.	McDowell	Walter
Dollinger	Martin	
Eberharter	Merrow	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Thomson of Wyoming.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at that point just before the vote on the amendment to name the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* an address by Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, made at the 25th anniversary of the first flight by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CAPITOL RESTAURANT FACILITIES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 218) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, pursuant to rule XI, 9 (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, and House Resolution 692, 83d Congress, supplemented by House Resolution 125, 84th Congress, in order to increase and improve the restaurant facilities in the Capitol Building for Members and employees of Congress, the Committee on House Administration recommends that the Architect of the Capitol be authorized to take necessary steps to extend and complete the east central front of the Capitol as recommended in S. 1170, 75th Congress, passed by the Senate on March 23, 1937, and in accordance with a chart prepared by the Architect of the Capitol and submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations in the 83d Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the chairman of the committee care to explain to the House this resolution, especially the fact that it does not provide any money but just a recommendation?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, this is a question which has been more or less with us since the year 1863 coming on up to the year 1902. In 1937 the other body approved a measure which would complete the east facade of the Capitol. Only last year the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and the Appropriations Subcommittee, had considerable discussion in hearings regarding the completion of the Capitol. In the latter part of August at the last session of Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] introduced a resolution asking the Committee on House Administration to investigate the restaurant facilities and to provide better accommodation for the Members of the House and their visitors. A committee was appointed to do that, a subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration headed by the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. His subcommittee looked into this matter and came to the conclusion that there was really no answer to the situation regarding restaurant facilities for the House of Representatives other than to carry out the original plan for completing the Capitol, and that is what we recommend in this resolution to the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that it is very evident that something needs to be done and needs to be done badly. The facilities are not adequate.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman also contemplates offering a resolution, I believe, that will help out in the cafeteria situation.

Mr. BURLESON. That is true. It is in a separate resolution.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I ask if these plans contemplate additional office space in the Capitol Building?

Mr. BURLESON. This resolution merely recommends that dining facilities be included in the completion of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING FOOD SERVICE FACILITIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 219) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to rule XI, 9 (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, and House Resolution 692, 83d Congress, supplemented by House Resolution 125, 84th Congress, in order to increase and improve the food service facilities for Members and employees of the House of Representatives, the Committee on House Administration recommends that the House Office Building Commission authorize (a) the removal of the beauty shop from its present location in the New House Office Building and relocate it in a portion of the space now occupied by the barber shop in the Old House Office Building, and (b) the room now occupied by the Superintendent of the House Office Building near the west ground floor entrance to the New House Office Building be vacated, and the combined space be allocated to the House cafeteria.

SEC. 2. Any necessary expense incurred in carrying out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the House Office Building Commission and approved by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 3. The Committee on House Administration further recommends that the work involved in increasing and providing additional space for the House cafeteria be postponed until the recess following the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENTAL HEALTH STUDY ACT OF 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 256 providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 256, with Mr. O'NEILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution is brought to the House today by unanimous vote of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is, in my opinion, one of the most important resolutions that the House will consider during the present session of the Congress.

A few nights ago I was listening to an Ed Murrow program dealing with the announcement made about the Salk vaccine and I heard one of the most distinguished doctors of the Nation say on that program that in his opinion, during the next 5 years the most important medical advances in the Nation will be in the field of mental health. I turned to my wife at the time and said: "I am very happy that House Joint Resolution 256 has been reported by my committee in view of the statement just made by this distinguished man of medicine."

Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us today has somewhat of a background, but during this late hour I shall take but very little time in discussing it.

You may recall that the House in 1946 passed the Mental Health Act setting up the Mental Health Institute and providing for some grants-in-aid to various institutions for carrying on research into the causes, the diagnosis, and the treatment of mental illnesses. Following the passage of that act there was a tremendous growth of sentiment throughout all of the 48 States on the question of mental health. That resulted not only in additional appropriations at the State level, at the local level, for clinics, but it resulted in the organization in many counties and many States of private associations devoted to the problems in the field

of mental health. That growth has been very outstanding during the last few years.

At the last conference of governors of all of the 48 States the question of mental health was given a top priority. At the conference of southern governors last year it was given top priority. At a conference last fall of Midwestern governors again it was made one of their top problems. So, I can say, I think literally, that the 48 States of the Union are fired today with enthusiasm to come to grips with the great problems in the field of mental health and to do something about them. I think the record of the governors conferences will bear that statement out.

The time has come, I believe, when we need a realistic nationwide review and reappraisal of the resources, the methods, and the practices in diagnosing, treating, rehabilitating the mentally ill not only in hospitals but rehabilitating them in their homes and returning them to the community for useful service and in such a way that they can fit into the community life without any stigma being attached to the fact that they have been for a time in a mental hospital. I believe that time has come now. I think if we do not at this time move into this field to do what I think is necessary to be done, we may lose a great deal of the progress we have made and we may have 48 separate States running off in that many different directions without a coordinated program in a most important field.

Dr. Francis J. Braceland, one of the great psychiatrists in the country today and a member of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Medical Services, stated before our committee not so long ago that the question of mental health, in his opinion, was the No. 1 health problem of the country today. I think that is easily borne out if we look at a few statistics, one of which is that on every day in every calendar year there are 750,000 people occupying beds in mental hospitals. Forty-seven percent of all of the hospital beds in the Nation are occupied today by mental patients. Dr. Braceland told our committee just a few weeks ago that on the basis of the trend today 1 out of every 12 children born in the future will spend some time in a mental hospital.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to burden the Committee of the Whole at this late hour with a lot of statistics. The resolution before the House today simply provides that the Surgeon General, with the approval of the National Advisory Council on Mental Health—that council having been set up, as you know, under the act of 1946—may make grants to nongovernmental agencies over a 3-year period for carrying out a complete study and reappraisal of all of the methods and techniques used in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illnesses and tying together in a single package, for the information of the Congress and for the information of the governors of the 48 States and everybody interested, just what we have done to date, just where we stand in this important field, just what our future course might be.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation of $250,000 for the first fiscal year and $500,000 each for the 2 succeeding fiscal years, a total of $1,250,000. Now, that may not be sufficient to do this job, but the resolution authorizes that private funds may be accepted for this purpose, and there are a number of foundations, we feel certain, who will contribute private funds to help carry out this study in order that we may know here and that we may know everywhere just where we stand. There is a tremendous shortage of trained psychiatrists for our State mental hospitals. The southern governors' conference meeting last year came up with a figure; they said that they needed more than 4,000 trained psychiatrists for State institutions in the 16 States comprising that conference, and that only 272 will be graduated and ready for service in that area during the next 3 years. That is a serious problem. Other areas of the country are similarly affected, although perhaps not to quite the extent of that particular area.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution, in my opinion, will result in the greatest possible good for our Nation. It will bring to the Congress information that we greatly need at this time. I said in 1946, in presenting the Mental Health Act to this House, that, in my opinion, one of the greatest benefits to flow therefrom would be the impetus that it would give to the local and State governments to take hold of this problem at their levels. I think that has been accomplished. The program under the Mental Health Act has been a rather modest one from the standpoint of appropriations that have been made, and yet everywhere across the country impetus has been given and the States and local communities are moving into the picture.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. I should like to predicate my query by saying that I want to associate myself with the gentleman in this matter and to say that certainly I hope the committee will adopt this very important resolution.

Is it not true that by the expenditure of these funds we could very well save the Federal Government a tremendous amount of money because it is hoped to develop from these studies the knowledge that perhaps the system of custodial care, which is so expensive and to which we have seemed to have a tendency to submit patients to, might be eliminated?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is quite right. May I say that it is my belief that as a result of this 3-year study, we may be able to save millions of dollars in connection with our mental hospitals for veterans. That is one big item as everyone here knows. It is my belief that this 3-year study, financed by an expenditure of $1¼ million may save millions in the future in connection with the treatment of mental patients in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not also true that we could save the entire population of the United States a considerable amount of wealth, perhaps not measured in dollars, but in human life as a result of this study, by changing the thinking of a great many people in medicine itself and among the lay population, with the idea that a great many psychiatric cases, particularly those related to sex offenses, can be cured, as pointed out by the very fine study made in the State of New York which was the first to require compulsory psychiatric examinations, commitment, and cure, and who in their studies determined that a great many of these cases were curable and could be safely returned?

Mr. PRIEST. I think the gentleman is correct. This is a broad field. There are so many aspects of it that could be discussed. It is a subject on which I have thought a great deal during the years. One of the aspects of the treatment of mental patients today which needs a great deal more study, and one on which information needs to be disseminated and trained personnel developed, revolves around the question of new drugs. Dr. Winfred Overholser testified that they are being used now at St. Elizabeths Hospital. But, at many places across the country they do not have personnel sufficiently acquainted with those new drugs to use them in State hospitals. They are accomplishing some wonderful results.

I hope this resolution, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on which no witness appeared to object, will be approved unanimously by the House today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that I heartily endorse everything that has been said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. PRIEST. He has had a long and continuing interest in this field of health, and now he is leading us in the committee and in the House to a consideration of a very important segment of the entire problem.

If anyone has any doubt as to the need for this legislation I suggest that he read the preamble to this joint resolution, which sets out the reasons for this proposed grant for the coordinated study of mental health. Again, I suggest that any such person who is interested as to the reasons for this legislation read the report of the committee beginning on page 3, the paragraphs headed "Present State of Mental Illnesses." A perusal of those two things will demonstrate, I think, without any doubt that here is a field where research and study is needed.

This was well pointed out both in the report and in the hearings by several of the witnesses, particularly Dr. Bartemeier, who was the head of the Council on Mental Health of the American Medical Association. His title is past president of the International Psychiatric Association. He also has been associated with the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Dr. Bartemeier said in part in his testimony:

> Particularly in the field of mental illness, we have mistakenly sought solutions to our problems by the construction and mainte-

nance, at tremendous public cost, of institutions for custodial care of the mentally ill. In many instances these institutions are nothing more than mental pesthouses where patients are confined indefinitely with slight hope of cure.

That approach has been used almost from time immemorial in this country. Indeed, we have taken some steps in that direction in the Congress because we have authorized matching funds for the improvement of mental hospitals. Much of the money for treatment of mentally afflicted veterans has been spent in this way.

But that is not the complete answer to this problem. We must have more research, more knowledge, more means of curing these baffling and difficult diseases that afflict the human mind.

We may think there is no hope in that field. But a short generation ago there was no hope for a person who was afflicted with a severe case of lobar pneumonia. That no longer is true. Just a few years ago there was virtually no hope for a person afflicted with polio but, as the chairman has just said, the Salk vaccine we believe has gone a long way toward preventing crippling disease.

Two generations ago one of the greatest killers we had was tuberculosis. It used to be called consumption. But now that has been pretty well brought under control and the incidence of the disease in the continental United States has receded. The same could be said of venereal disease. Controls have been found.

So if this Congress and the people of the United States will give attention and devote some energy to the correlation of research in the field of mental health, I do not believe the difficulty is insuperable or that the problem is insoluble.

So that is what this resolution proposes today, to authorize $250,000 the first year, $500,000 the second year, $500,000 the third year so that the Surgeon General through the appropriate instrumentalities of this country can coordinate research and can find out the answers to some of these problems all to the end that on a broad front we may have a scientific attack upon mental diseases.

As has been pointed out previously this not only means a great saving in money—and it could well amount to many millions of dollars in savings ultimately—but it means a great relief from the distress and the horrible results of sickness of the mind. Some of you, and perhaps all of us, have seen some of the results of a disabling mental disease. There is nothing more shocking, more startling, or more pitiful than a person whose family and whose entire life is destroyed by an aberration of the mind. Such an affliction affects not only the victim, but often his entire family as well.

So not only will we be saving a great deal of money ultimately by this, but we will be saving heartaches and reducing human misery. We will be adding to the community life. We will be saving families. We will be doing humanitarian service in trying to resolve these baffling and little understood diseases that afflict the minds of human beings.

Let us pass this resolution unanimously.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate this great committee on bringing out a measure such as we have before us at the present time. I think today we can look back to just last week and see what we really accomplished by an attack on diseases such as exist today. This is another milestone in what this committee has brought out in the way of legislation for the past many years for the improvement of the public health of this country. I congratulate this committee on making this measure available to us and to the country. I believe it will do immeasurable good in carrying out and conducting a program which in the end will enable us to lick this dread disease which today is one of the worst problems we have in America.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, House Joint Resolution 256. I do not see how there can be any opposition to a resolution of this character. I observe that it is preceded by 14 "Whereas" clauses, and if it were necessary, I am sure, that 100 more "Whereas" clauses could readily be inserted because the reasons for legislation of this kind are so abundant.

I have always been impressed whenever I enter a veterans' facility with the percentage of so-called NP cases. I understand that the same situation exists in civilian hospitals, and that 47 percent of our hospital facilities are occupied with mental patients.

I have a vivid recollection also of service in our State legislature in the twenties. Across the river from our statehouse in Augusta, Maine, was an institution formerly known as the insane asylum. Anybody who went into the insane asylum was there forever. The idea was not so much to cure the ailing people as to protect the public by interning them. The asylum was about as much prison as it was asylum. Even in those days there was a prevalent idea that everybody in the world was perfectly sane except for a handful of people who were insane. That idea has now, I believe, been entirely dispelled. It is now generally recognized that mental ailments of every degree of severity are now very prevalent. Possibly under the tensions of modern life they are increasing. No one has a right to believe that he is immune from mental ailments any more than he has a right to believe himself immune from physical ailments.

We have all been reading with intense interest in these last few days of the great discovery by Dr. Salk of this serum which promises to put an end to that heart-rending disease, infantile paralysis. If you read the material on page 4 of the committee's report you will get some idea of what has already been done in the way of combating various mental diseases. And while it is pretty clear that we shall never have a single serum to cure all the ailments of the mind, the possibilities of drugs and curative techniques are endless.

I welcome this piece of legislation. It comes from our committee with a unanimous report, and I believe it one of the most promising pieces of legislation to come from our committee, modest, of course, but still offering us a great deal of hope for progress.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I shall require to make one explanation which I have been asked about and which I intended to make.

This is not a research bill, from the standpoint of technical laboratory and clinical research. It in no way interferes with the research program under the regular Mental Health Act that is being carried on at the Mental Health Institute. This is research into our resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, training, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill. But it could not contemplate a clinical or laboratory research with only a million and a quarter dollars available over a 3-year period. I wanted to make that clear, because there has been some misunderstanding as to whether this survey conflicted with the program of the Mental Health Institute. It does not. It is not a research bill, insofar as clinical or laboratory research is concerned.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. The purpose of the bill is to provide grants for research to various institutions?

Mr. PRIEST. That comes under the regular mental health program. The funds which could be available under House Joint Resolution 256 are for a nationwide study of our methods and practices of treating the mentally ill. It is to provide that all this information may be tied all into one package.

Mr. FASCELL. Correlated?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it going to be used for the treatment of certain patients?

Mr. PRIEST. No; not under this resolution. It is only a million and a quarter dollars for a 3-year nationwide survey and reappraisal of all the research, all of the treatment, the diagnostic methods that are being used in State hospital clinics, veterans hospitals, and elsewhere. This is neither a clinical research program nor a treatment program. It could not be such with that small an appropriation, I am sure the gentlewoman will recognize.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was wondering whether it was going to be divided up, so much for each State.

Mr. PRIEST. There is no division like that. The Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to enter into agreements with one or more nongovernmental groups who must agree to undertake a complete survey of the problem and report back.

It is not a grant-in-aid program that is divided up geographically or otherwise.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a wonderful thing, because there are so many persons today who have someone in their family who is not perfectly normal. It is a wonderful thing you are doing.

Mr. PRIEST. Too many times they are afraid to say something about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is a wonderful thing you are doing.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG].

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Chairman, sometime ago when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was holding its public hearings on House Joint Resolution 256, the first witness to appear before our committee was the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. In the course of her testimony she brought forth some startling information to the effect that if some steps were not taken immediately to improve the mental health conditions in this country, the time was not far distant when one out of every 12 children born in the United States would at some time or other during their lives become inmates of mental institutions.

I believe that this has presented to our committee and to the House generally a definite challenge in that we must take action here and now to alleviate the conditions that have come to exist in this country in the care and treatment of those unfortunate enough to be mentally diseased. The fact that 1 out of 12 children will become afflicted with this dreaded scourge is not much of a legacy for us to leave posterity and I believe that we should here and now resolve not only to be legislators and pass pending legislation, but that we should go a step further and become salesmen for a mental health study program, which, to my mind, is a crying need of the day. We should also resolve to become educators for I know of no group who is in closer touch with the people generally than are our Members of this House, and we should begin at once to educate and teach the rank and file that there is no stigma attached to the person who finds himself mentally disturbed.

One of the greatest detriments in the care of the mentally diseased is the fact that so many of our people try to keep to themselves until it is too late the need of their loved ones for hospitalization in mental institutions. This fact has often been brought home when the parents of young men and women, who became mentally afflicted by reason of their connection with the Armed Services, happen to be inmates of State mental hospitals. The parents continually ask that these young men and women be transferred to some of our Veteran Administration facilities even though they realize that in many instances the mental treatment at our State hospitals is better than the treatment at a general Veterans' Hospital. It is simply a case of trying to get around the fact that the young person is an inmate of mental institution.

We may say to ourselves just how will this mental health study act effect us and for what reason should we be willing to appropriate Federal funds where perhaps some State organization could do the work just as well. In answer to this question we might say that we owe it to our children to see that the menace or threat of mental disease be removed from them.

I am sure that by the passage of this act, we can eventually save the Government millions of dollars and restore thousands of people, who are now mentally distressed, back to society.

We have seen the tremendous advances that have been made in the treatment of physical diseases by the discovery of certain drugs and only this week have we come to see what we hope is the permanent cure for poliomyelitis. Looking ahead a little, I am optimistic enough to believe that within our day we shall see science make advances equally as great in the treatment of mental disorders and what a great satisfaction there will be to those of us who have the opportunity today to take a prominent part in the advancement of this program, for when the day is done and we ask ourselves what contribution we have made toward the good of our fellow man, we will always have the answer to that age-old question which perhaps to some of us has become rather trite in its repetition, but which still holds a great meaning. When that little voice of conscience asks us, "Am I my brother's keeper?" our action here today will permit us to say, "Yes, I am my brother's keeper."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the resolution which has been described so clearly by the gentleman from Tennessee, and to commend him for the excellent work which he has done.

The need for a coordinated program of research and study of all the various resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill is self-evident, in view of the considerable number of people suffering from mental disorders.

The mental-health problem in our country today is one of the most urgent we face and one we are sorely unprepared to meet. Approximately 9 million Americans already have serious mental disorders, and 750,000 mentally ill are now being hospitalized on any given day. The mentally ill consume 47 percent of the Nation's hospital beds. These figures are astounding, but even more so is the estimate that 1 out of every 12 Americans born today will spend a part of his life in a mental hospital.

The expense involved in treating and caring for the mentally ill is in many instances staggering. Ninety-eight percent of the beds occupied by mental patients are tax supported. The direct annual cost of mental illness to the taxpayers, including pensions to mentally ill veterans, is over $1 billion; this figure is increasing at the rate of $100 million a year. The Federal Government spends $628 million annually, exclusive of construction costs, on the care and treatment of the mentally ill; the State governments spend approximately half a billion dollars annually for this purpose.

At the first of this year over 57,000 mentally ill veterans were in Veterans' Administration hospitals and over 16,500 were awaiting admission. By 1960 it is estimated that there will be 112,000 psychotic veterans in need of hospitalization.

The resources available for administering to the mentally ill are shockingly deficient. The need for full-time staffs in State mental institutions throughout the country is far in excess of their present number. Presently the number of psychiatrists account for only 50 percent of those actually needed; the number of graduate nurses, 24 percent; the number of psychiatric social workers, 23 percent; and that for attendants, 74 percent.

Scientific developments have produced a number of wonderful drugs in recent years which have aided in combating mental illnesses. Treatments such as electric-shock therapy also have made appreciable advances in this field. Psychosurgery has made great strides, as have the applied concentrated treatments which the mentally ill can receive. In spite of all these gains, there is a pressing need for still greater progress to combat mental illness, one of the most dreaded types of disease.

The passage of House Joint Resolution 256 will authorize the research and study to be made within 3 years from the date it is authorized. It will provide some Federal financial support to organizations concerned with mental health which are trying to find a solution to the problem of mental illness through a nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the entire approach to the problem of mental health.

Such a program should provide for the better utilization of our resources and for such improvements and new developments as will effectively reduce the incidence or duration of mental illnesses. This study should provide also guidance to the States, local communities, and private groups which are engaged in combating mental-health problems.

I feel that the study provided for by this resolution will be of inestimable value to our national health. Therefore, I urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 256.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this resolution. I want to call a matter to the attention of the House for the membership may have lost the significance of it: When the bill for the Institute of Health was before the House the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] got included in that bill $750,000 in addition to the Budget request to investigate and develop a program for retarded children, those people about whom the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has just spoken. I think there is an awaken-

ing all over America about the problem. There are many more of those children in America than we dream of, because, as she said, the parents sometimes think it is some sort of disgrace and they do nothing about those children who could be helped wonderfully in the proper sort of school and with the proper training.

I hope that this special committee or commission that is to be set up under this resolution will take into consideration that problem which is part of the entire problem of mental health in America.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not impose upon the Members at this late hour of the day if it were not for three particular things I would like to say.

In the first place I would like pay a very sincere tribute to the chairman of our committee and the ranking member of our committee, both of whom for many years have been interested in and actively advocating constructive, farsighted legislation in the field of health. I know that this particular bill, as the chairman of the committee said during the course of his remarks, constitutes one of the major pieces of legislation we will enact at this session.

Second, I want to point out for the RECORD, so there will not be any misapprehension, and I do not think anybody has referred to it, that the American Medical Association was represented before us through witnesses who heartily endorsed this particular legislation, so there is no controversy on it from that point of view.

Thirdly, I want to read a brief excerpt from the report which struck me as I heard it as one of the most encouraging things that could be said in regard to handling this terrible problem of mental health. Dr. Daniel Blain, medical director of the American Psychiatric Association, said:

> The despair that consigned the mentally ill to simple custody for life in mental institutions is rapidly being displaced by the realization that mental illness is not hopeless and that the great majority of the mentally ill can be treated and returned to the community in a relatively short period of time.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Another most auspicious change in people's thinking lies in the general trend toward deemphasizing the conventional mental hospital as an almost exclusive tool for dealing with mental illness. This has been in no small measure due to the wisdom of the Congress in encouraging the development of community clinic services under the National Mental Health Act and through the Veterans' Administration. Increasingly, the mental hospital is thought of as merely part of a network of community services, all of them designed to forestall or prevent hospitalization if possible, and to shorten it if not.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am particularly glad that the gentleman mentioned the services performed by the chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member of the committee. I have been a member of this committee for many years and it is impossible to imagine two men with greater zeal on these health problems than our chairman and our former chairman. Their efforts have been tireless and ceaseless and at all times intelligent and constructive.

Mr. HESELTON. I thoroughly subscribe to what the gentleman has said and I express the hope that at long last we will find that this action which has been initiated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] will be called by their proper names.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate Congressman PRIEST and this committee for bringing out this legislation and to say that I have had occasion to see the necessity for it. People in the Jacksonville, Fla., area have brought to my attention certain horrible types of crimes which have become more on the increase in late years. I took this matter up with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its criminologists and have been advised by them that the thing that is most needed is a coordination of study of the mental causes for these various crimes. I am happy to add my voice to this legislation because it seems to be exactly the type of legislation to bring about coordination of research in the United States in connection with these various troubles and to correct them at their sources.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, even though it may be repetitious I wish to add my words of praise to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. During the period of years it has been my privilege to be associated with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have found that he has always taken a very intense interest in all that pertains to the health of the people of this Nation. During that time he has made a very considerable contribution that should be very gratifying to him as in reflection he thinks of those measures in which he has had such an important part. To be associated with him in the work of that committee, and particularly with reference to the health needs of the Nation, is a privilege that not only myself as the ranking Republican member joins but also every member of the committee joins.

This measure which he has sponsored and which comes to us today is an extremely forward-looking one. It has the endorsement of every organization that I have knowledge of. There was not a dissenting voice among the many who appeared as witnesses at the hearings which were conducted by our committee. Naturally, this legislation had the unanimous support of the committee. It was a privilege on the part of the membership to participate in legislation of this character which we know, as the result of the hearings that we have held, is not only necessary at this time but will also prove helpful in the cause of health in the future.

During the last few years there seems to have been an awakening on the part of our people with respect to the responsibility of the Government for the health of our people. This includes not only a Federal obligation or responsibility but also State and local. Much of the legislation which it has been the privilege of our committee to present to this House has taken into consideration the necessity for cooperation between Federal, State, municipal, and private agencies. We have felt that by the wise way in which the committee has considered the legislation which has been reported to the House and which has received House approval, that a great deal has been done and the beneficient effects of it will become more apparent in the years that are ahead, than can be immediately understood or appreciated. It is my desire, together with the chairman of the committee, to give the best that is in us to provide adequate public-health legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more legislation that will come from our committee for the consideration of the House in connection with public health subjects. There is much more to be done. This is a starter and an indication of what the House can expect during this session of the Congress under the leadership of our chairman who is so intensely interested in matters of public health.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in everything that my friend from New Jersey has said about the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. I know of no one I have served with whom I have a higher regard for than my friend from Tennessee, as was evidenced by the fact that I appointed him Democratic whip, and he would have continued as such if he so desired, but the arduous duties as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce required his constant attention.

I know also that the gentleman from Tennessee feels the same way as I do with reference to my dear friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. The people of the country are very fortunate in having two such distinguished gentlemen as Members of this House both on the same committee, one, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], in this Congress, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], chairman in the last Congress and now the ranking Republican Member. Both of you gentlemen have worked hard in the best interests of our country in the field of health and in all other fields, and so have all the other members of your great committee. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House is truly a great committee and has been for many, many years. During my entire service in this body there have always been great legislators on that

committee. I know that the committee appreciates the great medical profession in the United States, the men and women who are devoting their entire lives to medical research, working in various fields, trying to make their contributions for the betterment of mankind and for all humanity. Witness the illustration only the other day of Dr. Salk and those associated with him in giving to mankind that great beneficent result that they achieved and for which we are so deeply indebted to them.

So, I am pleased, as majority leader of the House, to commend the two distinguished gentlemen and all the members of the committee and also to pay special tribute to those great minds, the great men and women of our medical profession, who are devoting their entire lives for the betterment of mankind.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. They are deeply appreciated by me.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to associate myself with my very good friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, in commending the committee for a very courageous and I think a very helpful step; and out of this effort I am sure much good will come.

Mr. WOLVERTON. In conclusion, may I bring to your attention certain basic facts that have come to our attention during the conduct of our health hearings in the last session of Congress, and, that have been further developed in this session of Congress.

At the present time there are 750,000 mentally ill and retarded patients in our mental institutions. Nearly one-half of the hospital beds now in use are occupied by mental patients. The direct economic cost of mental illness to the taxpayers of the Nation, including pensions to veterans with psychiatric disabilities, is over $1 billion a year and has been increasing at a rate of $100 million a year.

When we are faced with facts such as I have just mentioned, it is easy to realize that the great distress suffered by millions of our people anxiously and justifiably concerned about the welfare, treatment, and prospects of mentally disturbed relatives is incalculable and one of the most urgent concerns of our people.

How to meet the problem of caring for our mental patients has been the subject of deep and serious consideration by medical groups, welfare organizations, and agencies of Government. Each is striving to find ways and means of alleviating the conditions that now prevail.

In this connection it is to be noted that there seems to be no overall integrated body of knowledge concerning all aspects of the present status or our resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill, although only through the development of such a body of knowledge can the people of the United States ascertain the true nature of this staggering problem and develop more effective plans to meet it.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a means of meeting the necessity that now exists for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis, study, and research into the problems of mental illness both from the standpoint of prevention and cure. To carry on this worthwhile program the Federal Government is authorized to appropriate the sum of $250,000 to be used for grants to help initiate the research and study for the first year, and the sum of $500,000 for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

This resolution is of prime importance to the welfare of our Nation and its people. It deserves the unanimous support of all who are interested in promoting the welfare of our fellow man.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those who have already spoken may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks in the RECORD; and that other Members who have not had the opportunity to speak because of the limitations of time likewise may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD, during general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, please permit me to associate myself with the splendid remarks of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on House Joint Resolution 256. This kind of legislation has long been needed and deserves unanimous support of Congress and of the Nation.

The problems of mental health are worldwide in scope and intelligent procedures and methods cannot be evolved on the scattered efforts of the many institutions throughout America which are seeking to help in this great problem.

With the development of new drugs and new techniques, there is real hope for substantial success.

While we must maintain our national strength in the world by maintaining powerful military forces in the air and on the land and on sea, we must not neglect our obligation to help all peoples in the world against our common enemies—disease and ill health. We can promote democracy in a greater way when we show the world that our prime interest is the physical well-being, moral well-being and social good of the people who inhabit this same planet.

While this legislation cannot solve the problem of mental illness, it will undoubtedly go a long way toward consolidating the research and the development of processes and methods of treatment and care. In the name of all humanity, it is my hope that our action today may in some way contribute to a better handling of this important world problem.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through its Subcommittee on Health and Science, held extensive hearings on this legislation. We heard a number of distinguished witnesses, all of whom supported this bill. Among those witnesses were:

Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General.

Dr. Robert H. Felix, Director, National Institute of Mental Health.

Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs.

Mr. Mike Gorman, Executive Director, National Mental Health Committee.

Dr. Daniel Blain, medical director, American Psychiatric Association.

Dr. Harvey J. Tompkins, Director, Psychiatry and Neurology Service, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration.

Dr. Leo H. Bartemeier, chairman, council on medical health, American Medical Association.

Dr. George S. Stevenson, national and international consultant, National Association for Mental Health.

Dr. Francis J. Braceland, chief psychiatrist, Institute of Living, Hartford, Conn., and member of the Task Force on Federal Medical Services of the Hoover Commission.

Dr. Filmore H. Sanford, executive secretary, American Psychological Association.

I was a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Science which heard all of the testimony on this bill.

The evidence showed that the country is badly in need of a comprehensive nationwide review and reappraisal of the methods and practices currently used in diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill. This includes those patients within as well as outside of institutions.

Insofar as this committee knows, this will be the first overall review in this country of this entire matter. It is hoped that recommendations which should be forthcoming, when put into effect, will result in a reduction in the incidence and duration of mental illness. This should result in a lessening of economic losses and human suffering.

I think it is most important that the House understand the present state of mental illnesses in the United States. A few of the following facts demonstrate why the mental-health problem is in many respects the most urgent of the health problems we face today:

First, 9 million Americans, or 6 percent of our total population, have serious mental disorders.

Second, 750,000 mentally ill Americans are now being hospitalized on any given day.

Third, 47 percent of the Nation's hospital beds are occupied by mental patients. Ninety-eight percent of these beds are tax supported.

Fourth, 1 out of every 12 Americans born today will spend part of his life in a mental hospital.

Fifth, 48 States carry a tax burden of one-half billion dollars in caring for mental illnesses. In the State of New York, for example, the mental health budget for the current year amounts to $158 million or 35 percent of New York State's operating budget.

Sixth, the Federal Government spends $628 million annually on the care and treatment of mentally ill veterans alone.

There is a tremendous picture of unmet needs in the field of mental health. An even more serious gap, however, exists between our knowledge with regard to diagnosis and treatment of mental illnesses and our applications of available knowledge.

Dr. Leo H. Bartemeier, chairman of the council on mental health of the American Medical Association, testified before our subcommittee, as follows:

In solving health problems, stress is too often placed on the provision of physical facilities for diagnosis and treatment. We lose sight of the fact that hospital buildings do not cure patients. The successful management of illnesses whether physical or mental comes only from the application of the order and science of medicine by a physician skilled in modern methods.

Patchwork, stopgap programs for the care of the mentally ill, are keeping us on a treadmill and actually do little to reduce and prevent mental illness. Particularly in the field of mental illnesses we have mistakenly sought solutions to our problems by the construction and maintenance of institutions for custodial care of the mental ill. Within comparatively recent times the concept of treatment for the physically ill has fallen to the assault of intensified medical research, and the wide applications of new and healing techniques to diseases long thought to be incurable has been substituted.

SUMMARY

In the light of these matters, an objective, thorough, and nationwide study of the kind described appears critically needed. Your committee seeks to support such a study and thereby is trying to accomplish the following objectives:

First. To give some Federal financial support to organizations concerned with mental health. These organizations have decided that our best hope lies in a nationwide analysis and evaluation of our entire approach to the problems of mental health. Other financial support of this commendable undertaking will come from other private and public—State and local—sources.

Second. To give support to the principle that direction of such a program of research and study should be shared among the various groups, public and voluntary, who are concerned with mental health.

Third. To use this study to guide the increasing efforts of States, local communities, and private groups, in coping with mental health problems.

Your committee feels that the survey and study is worth while. The Federal share of the funds which are required for this study is less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the money spent annually by the Federal Government for pensions and treatment of mentally ill veterans. We believe that any improvement resulting from this study in the treatment and rehabilitation of the mentally ill will repay the Federal Government because of possible reduction in expenditures for those mentally ill veterans for whom the Government has assumed a direct financial responsibility.

May I say to the Members of the House that this bill was well heard. The bill was gone over in detail before the committee. Numerous amendments were made to the bill in order to make it more effective.

For 4 years I was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. The treatment of mentally ill veterans arose in many hearings before that committee. The amount of money we are spending on that one item in the veterans' budget is astounding. I believe we have a chance by this bill to make real contribution to the cause of curing mentally ill persons.

Some Members have asked, Why should the Federal Government undertake this survey? I think that is a good question. I wish the Members could have heard the evidence of the variation in the treatment of mentally ill in the States throughout the country. It would become immediately apparent to you from the evidence we heard that an overall tying together is the thing badly needed at this time. There is nobody, either private or public, which is set up with sufficient authority and funds to make an overall survey which would include the entire country. This survey will bring out the various types of treatment as they exist in all of the 48 States. We hope, ultimately, that all of the States could become more uniform in adopting the best techniques for the treatment of mental illness. That is the real job to be done by those who undertake this survey.

I believe this bill does have real merit and that it should be adopted today.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here today in favor of this very splendid legislation, and to pay particular tribute to the chairman of the committee and to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

For some time I have been interested in the problem of mental health. I am the author of a bill in my State, now a law, which established child guidance clinics in the 21 counties of that State.

We learned the other day, with the possibility of the ultimate conquest of polio, that the very persons who made that magnificent discovery look upon the field of mental health as their next objective.

I think it is particularly appropriate that we should pass this legislation today under the very fine leadership of the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to express my very deep appreciation to the majority leader of the House, to the ranking minority member of my committee, to other committee members, and to other Members of the House, for the very kind things they have had to say; and to say at the same time that it has been a great privilege through the years to work with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], particularly on health matters. He has had his heart in it very much. We have worked very closely together. I have appreciated more than I will ever be able to let him know his great cooperative spirit in bringing about legislation in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

Whereas some 750,000 mentally ill and retarded patients are now being hospitalized on any given day; and

Whereas 47 percent of the hospital beds in the Nation are occupied by mental patients; and

Whereas the direct economic cost of mental illness to the taxpayers of the Nation, including pensions to veterans with psychiatric disabilities, is over $1 billion a year and has been increasing at a rate of $100 million a year; and

Whereas the emotional impact and distress suffered by millions of our people anxiously and justifiably concerned about the welfare, treatment, and prospects of mentally afflicted relatives is incalculable and is one of the most urgent concerns of our people; and

Whereas the governors of the several States, through national and regional governors conferences and through the publications of the Council of State Governments, have shown great initiative in their cooperative attempts to develop better methods of meeting the challenge of mental illness in their States; and

Whereas there is strong justification for believing that this constantly growing burden may well be due primarily to an outmoded reliance on simple custodial care in mental hospitals as the chief method of dealing with mental illness; and

Whereas there is strong reason to believe that lack of early intensive treatment facilities has created such a backlog of mentally deteriorated patients that it has become virtually impossible for the States to meet the need for mental-hospital facilities; and

Whereas there is strong reason to believe that one of the greatest impediments to more rapid progress in the field of mental health is a definite shortage of professional personnel in all categories; and

Whereas there seems to be a discouraging lag between the discovery of new knowledge and skills in treating mental illness and their widespread application, as is evidenced by the fact that whereas only about one-third of newly admitted mental patients are discharged from State hospitals in the course of a year, in a few outstanding institutions the recovery rate is 75 percent or more; and

Whereas experience with certain community out-patient clinics and rehabilitation centers would seem to indicate that many mental patients could be better treated on an out-patient basis at much lower cost than by a hospital; and

Whereas there is strong reason to believe that a substantial proportion of public mental hospital facilities are being utilized for the care of elderly persons who could be better cared for and receive better treatment in modified facilities at lower cost; and

Whereas there is reason to believe that many emotionally disturbed children are being placed in mental hospitals, which have no proper facilities to administer to their needs; and

Whereas mental illness is frequently a component of such nationwide problems as alcoholism, drug addiction, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, school failures, absenteeism, and job maladjustment in industry, suicide, and similar problems; and

Whereas there seems to be no overall integrated body of knowledge concerning all aspects of the present status of our resources,

methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill, although only through the development of such a body of knowledge can the people of the United States ascertain the true nature of this staggering problem and develop more effective plans to meet it: Therefore be it

Enacted, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Mental Health Study Act of 1955."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that there exists a critical need for such an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness and of the resources, methods, and practices currently utilized in diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill, both within and outside of institutions, as may lead to the development of comprehensive and realistic recommendations for such better utilization of those resources or such improvements on and new developments in methods of diagnosis, treatment, care, and rehabilitation as give promise of resulting in a marked reduction in the incidence or duration of mental illness and, in consequence, a lessening of the appalling emotional and financial drain on the families of those afflicted or on the economic resources of the States and of the Nation.

(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote mental health and to help solve the complex and the interrelated problems posed by mental illness by encouraging the undertaking of nongovernmental, multi-disciplinary research into the reevaluation of all aspects of our resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill, including research aimed at the prevention of mental illness. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to implement that policy.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH STUDY

SEC. 3. Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 303 the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS IN MENTAL HEALTH

"SEC. 304. (a) (1) The Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to make grants for the carrying out of a program of research into and study of our resources, methods, and practices for diagnosing, treating, caring for, and rehabilitating the mentally ill, such program to be on a scale commensurate with the problem.

"(2) Such grants may be made to one or more organizations, but only on condition that the organization will undertake and conduct, or if more than one organization is to receive such grants, only on condition that such organizations have agreed among themselves to undertake and conduct, a coordinated program of research into and study of all aspects of the resources, methods, and practices referred to in paragraph (1).

"(3) As used in paragraph (2), the term 'organization' means a nongovernmental agency, organization, or commission, composed of representatives of leading national medical and other professional associations, organizations, or agencies active in the field of mental health.

"(b) For such purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $250,000 to be used for a grant or grants to help initiate the research and study provided for in this section; and the sum of $500,000 for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years for the making of such grants as may be needed to carry the research and study to completion. The terms of any such grant shall provide that the research and study shall be completed not later than 3 years from the date it is inaugurated; that the grantee shall file annual reports with the Congress, the Surgeon General, and the Governors of the several States, among others that the grantee may select; and that the final report shall be similarly filed.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall in any way affect the availability of amounts otherwise appropriated for work in the field of mental health; nor be construed to interfere with or diminish the more limited and specific programs of research and study being carried on through or under the auspices of the National Institute of Mental Health.

"(d) Any grantee agency, organization, or commission is authorized to accept additional financial support from private or other public sources to assist in carrying on the project authorized by this section."

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to be offered, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having assumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 256) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO CORRECT ENACTING CLAUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the enacting clause in conformity with the statutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROPAGANDA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. T. P. Pike, Assistant Secretary for Defense, issued what he calls an "instruction" which is to put into effect a new Department of Defense policy on subcontracting to small business. The purpose of this "instruction," according to Mr. Pike's press release, is to extend the Department's small-business policy "to the area of subcontracting."

A careful reading of Mr. Pike's "instruction" will show that it is indeed what is claimed for it. It extends to subcontracting the same policy which the Department has been pursuing in placing its prime contracts. But the trouble with this policy is that it is merely an elaborate and costly pretense, and I see no point in extending it anywhere. The only purpose it could serve is in making empty propaganda and in diverting attention from the fact that the Department is flaunting the policy already established by law, which is that small business shall have a fair proportion of the prime contracts. Small business is already receiving a fair proportion of Department of Defense propaganda in lieu of Department of Defense contracts. More such propaganda will merely cause small firms to go to a great deal of trouble and expense in seeking defense business before they finally go away emptyhanded and disillusioned.

PHRASES THAT SOUND GOOD BUT NO GOOD

While the Department's new instruction is elaborate and filled with fine phrases, all fully qualified, it boils down to this: The Department will write into certain of the prime contracts it awards in the future a clause requiring the contractor to subcontract to small business concerns the maximum amount that the contractor finds to be consistent with the efficient performance of his contract. Such a clause as this, which leaves it up to the contractor to make a finding, if he cares to do so, of the amount of subcontracting which would be consistent with the efficient performance of his contract, is precisely like telling the contractor to eat prunes for breakfast whenever he thinks about prunes and decides they would be good for his health.

The "instruction" also announces that at a later time certain prime contractors will be invited to make reports on the amount of their subcontracting to small business. This invitation will, moreover, be something in the nature of a command performance. Mr. Pike's "instruction" carries the ominous warning that his selected companies who fail to report will be listed on the record of the military department as "Not reporting," What a penalty.

I hope that the definitions and auditing procedures decided upon for these reports will be framed with at least equal precision and clarity of determination, and that those chosen companies which

decide to report will not be merely the few with good records for subcontracting to small business. We would all appreciate being spared any additional bombardment with meaningless or misleading statistics.

CONGRESS MAKES POLICY, NOT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A main point which should not be lost from sight is that the Department of Defense has no business making policy toward small business. The policy on this subject is the policy of Congress which is already established in the law—Public Law 163, 83d Congress. The policy here clearly stated is that all of the procurement agencies of the executive branch of the Government shall conduct their procurement programs to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for Government be placed with small-business enterprises. This clearly means that the executive agencies are to make a fair proportion of their purchases from small business. It clearly does not mean that small business is to get, in Mr. Pike's words, "a fair share of defense business," only when Mr. Pike counts in the secondhand business which his contractors may pass along to small business. If the Department of Defense were meeting the obligation imposed upon it by law, there would be no excuse for delving into subcontracting, either with pretenses or with procedures having some teeth in them. The Department of Defense is not meeting this obligation. It refuses even to meet its obligation for determining what a fair proportion is.

On the several occasions when Congress has declared our national policy on this subject it has deliberately refrained from prescribing an exact definition of "fair proportion," leaving to the executive agencies the task of working out reasonable measures. To do otherwise would remove the flexibility which the military has always insisted that it must have to meet national emergencies, and it would result in a somewhat complex law. Any intelligent definition must, for example, take account of the difference between industries. Our declared objective of maintaining a competitive system of business is obviously not met by contracting procedures which assume that if the small-business sector of a metalworking industry is wiped out, the results will be offset by awarding contracts to the small-business sector of the textile industries.

A FEW GIANT CORPORATIONS FAVORED

As long as the Department of Defense continues spending fifteen to twenty billion dollars a year with business firms, its impact upon the business structure of the country will continue to be a grave problem. These expenditures represent an important part of the total manufacturing in the United States, and a decisive part of total production in the metalworking industries. The Department's tendency to concentrate these industries into a few giant corporations must be checked. It is becoming increasingly obvious, however, that this cannot be done by merely begging and urging this Department to comply with the policy of the law. This Department is placing substantially all of its contracts by negotiation, awarding less than 15 percent on the basis of advertised competitive bids. The fact that the prices to be paid for items the military buys plays little part in the placing of these contracts is attested to by the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been recovered from contractors each year during the years when the renegotiation law was in effect. We no doubt have a military which can accomplish the impossible in the realm of military operations. It seems able to do almost anything, except award contracts to small business. It is now unmistakable that if what remains of the competitive system is to be saved, Congress must either write into the law hard and fast rules for defense procurement or place the procurement functions in an independent agency selected and chosen for the purpose of carrying out our national policies.

EDWARD CORSI

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection on the part of the Members having special orders at this time, the gentleman will be recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable developments in recent weeks has been the firing of Edward Corsi from his job, whatever it was, in the State Department. When this gentleman was appointed, Secretary Dulles called him the one man "best suited" to aid in the implementation of the refugee immigration program established under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Now he has been dismissed from his post and has been called everything from a security risk to a liar.

Whatever the merits of the controversy as it has developed thus far, one thing is quite clear. Scott McLeod is not suited to administer this program either by temperment or by training. As Mr. Corsi pointed out at the hearings on these matters yesterday, Mr. McLeod is essentially a policeman. He has been trained as a policeman and he thinks like a policeman. His interest is in security matters. When he was given charge of the refugee program he proceeded to appoint other policemen to positions of authority in its administration.

Thus the emphasis in administration of the program has been essentially changed from what was intended when the act was passed. The act is in the class of emergency legislation, designed to meet an immediate and pressing need. It was essentially humanitarian in outlook and purpose, even though it has been hedged about with various qualifications and safety provisions. However, Mr. McLeod's approach has been negative. It seems obvious in light of the facts that have already come out in this investigation that both the administrator and his assistants were not interested in seeing refugees with pressing problems admitted but rather in seeing that anyone who applied for admission was kept out if there was any slight stain on his record which might be regarded in an unfavorable security light.

It is most certainly not my intention to imply in any degree that security is not important, nor that refugees applying for admission should not be given a security check. Obviously these matters must be included in the administration of the whole program. But they should not and must not become the whole purpose of the act. When this occurs this Nation is in a worse position in the eyes of others than if we had not passed the law in the first place. Then we can justly be accused of hypocrisy when we state our desire to relieve the distress of the unfortunate people of other lands by allowing their admission to the United States, but actually put so many barriers in their path that admission becomes very nearly impossible.

This is, of course, exactly the position in which the Nation has been placed by Mr. McLeod and his associates. Though the Refugee Relief Act made provision for the admission of 209,000 refugees, only 30,000 visas have been issued and fewer than 1,100 persons have actually entered the United States. In the face of the magnitude of the problem, 209,000 admissions would barely scratch the surface. How far short of the need must the 1,100 actually admitted fall? How hypocritical must the United States seem to those desirous of admission?

In the light of these facts and figures, it seems clear that even if Mr. McLeod has not deliberately sabotaged the act, he and his staff have failed to administer it in such fashion as to achieve its purposes. The solution to this problem would seem to be the severance of Mr. McLeod's connection with the program and the appointment of someone who would have the interests of both the United States and the refugees in mind when he sets up the procedures to be followed in implementation of the act. I would suggest that Secretary Dulles give this matter his most serious consideration.

In view of the fact that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 appoints the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs as the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, I am joining with the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, in introducing his bill, to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 as amended, in order to give the Secretary the authority to accomplish the step suggested above.

AMENDING THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 5701, to repeal section 3 (b)

of the Securities Act of 1933. This section authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to exempt by rule or regulation certain classes of securities from the registration provisions of this act, where the aggregate amount offered to the public does not exceed $300,000. I introduce this legislation because I am convinced that offerings made pursuant to this exemption do not provide prospective investors with full and adequate disclosure of information necessary to arrive at an informed judgment with respect to the securities being offered. Certainly, the disclosures made in the case of exempt securities are far less complete than the disclosures required by the Securities Act in the case of registered securities.

Furthermore, investors in exempt securities are not getting the same degree of protection against false and misleading statements which the act provides for other investors in registered securities. Investors in exempt securities do not have the protection of section 11 of the act, which gives the investor in a registered security the right to sue, in case the registration statement or prospectus is found to be false and misleading, every person who signed the registration statement, the directors of the issuing company, its accountants, engineers, appraisers, attorneys, underwriters, and so forth. The Securities and Exchange Commission once described the importance of section 11 in the following language:

> This latter sanction against practically all persons concerned in the distribution of a security is one of the most important of implements in carrying out the policy of the act, since it results in a concerted effort on the part of all concerned to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of the securities offered.

The above quotation comes from the Commission's 10th annual report to the Congress, page 20.

I can see no reason at all why investors in securities issued pursuant to section 3 (b) of the 1933 act should have any lesser protection than investors in securities which do not qualify under this exemption and must be registered. Why should not an investor who has, say, $1,000 to invest be entitled to the same degree of protection, whether he buys a security that qualifies under this exemption or whether he buys a registered security?

The number of filings under the section 3 (b) exemption now are at the rate of 1,200 to 1,300 a year, and represent offerings of approximately $250 million a year. During the 9-year period July 1, 1945 through June 30, 1954, the aggregate amount of the proposed offerings was $1,758,000,000.

Until 1953, under the SEC rules issued pursuant to section 3 (b), known as regulation A, the issuer of an exempt security was merely required to file a letter of notification 5 days in advance of the offering, stating his intention to issue the securities, and giving a few details with respect to the issuer, its officers and directors and promoters, the number of securities proposed to be offered, the offering price, when the securities were to be sold, and the purposes for which the net proceeds were to be used. No offering literature of any kind was required under the Commission's regulation A. However, if the issuer did use such literature, copies had to be filed with the Commission's regional office, where it received hasty examination. There were no uniform standards with respect to such literature.

During the 82d Congress, a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee made a study of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I was a member of that subcommittee. One of the things we inquired into was the effectiveness of regulation A in protecting investors in exempt securities. In this connection, Mr. Baldwin B. Bane, then director of the Division of Corporation Finance of the Commission, made the following significant statement:

> I think that the possibility of perpetrating fraud upon the investor is much greater under regulation A filings than it is under full registration, and the extent to which you broaden that exemption field, you naturally broaden the possibility of the investor not obtaining the protection that Congress felt he should obtain with which I agree, in the form of adequate and accurate information about the thing he is asked to buy. He certainly does not obtain that in connection with an offering under regulation A.
>
> To that extent, he is offered much less protection. Therefore, there is much more opportunity for fraud, except as you follow it up through enforcement. There is more opportunity for him to act without this protection and there is much less opportunity for the investor to obtain the information under regulation A that he should have as provided for registered securities. * * * That is a result of what I have seen of these filings, coming up through the years; it is not guesswork, no, sir. (Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 2d sess., on Powers, Duties, and Functions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, pt. I, p. 444.)

Early in 1953, the Securities and Exchange Commission revised its regulation A, requiring the issuer to provide an offering circular containing certain prescribed information about the issuer and the security being offered. But the information required in an offering circular does not at all compare with the detailed information required in a registration statement and prospectus for registered issues.

One of the principal concerns I have with respect to this exemption is the large use which is being made of it by uranium mining companies. Beginning with May of 1954, a large increase took place in filings under regulation A of uranium issues. In the 12 months preceding this month, fewer than 10 issues were filed during any one month, and the aggregate amount during the month was less than $2 million. In May of 1954, 16 issues were filled with an aggregate dollar amount of $3,510,000. In subsequent months, the number of filings fluctuated, but were in excess of the May total. In October of 1954, the last month for which I have data, 43 issues were filed having an aggregate dollar value of $8,179,000.

These uranium stocks, selling at 5 or 10 cents a share, are being foisted upon the public without disclosing to them fully and adequately what they are buying and without giving them the full protection under the Securities Act. This same statement also applies to all other securities issued under the section 3 (b) exemption. My bill would rectify this unjust situation and would provide all investors with equal protection under the law.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PRODUCTS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement prepared on the activities of the Small Business Administration. In preparing this statement I have consulted officials of the Small Business Administration. While the major functions of the agency and its accomplishments are described, I believe Members of this body and other readers of the RECORD will be especially interested in a new SBA program, which provides assistance to owners of small manufacturing firms and other businesses in keeping abreast of production and marketing techniques through product development, finding new products and processes, and improving old products. Although this program has been underway but a few months it has received much commendation and hundreds of firms have benefited.

The Small Business Administration is the first peacetime independent Government agency created for the sole purpose of advising, counseling, assisting, and protecting small-business concerns and enterprises. SBA assistance is, therefore, not limited to defense contractors—as was aid to small business by predecessor war-emergency agencies.

In expressing the policy of Congress with regard to American small business, the Small Business Act of 1953, which created the agency, takes note that private enterprise and free competition are the keys to the American economic system.

It is fair to say that the cornerstone of free private enterprise rests in the willingness of the individual or the small business to accept the responsibilities that go along with a free economy. Likewise, to seek within his own resources for the solutions to his problems.

All would agree that no Government agency should be expected to keep each and every small firm in business.

The privilege of an individual in a free economy to begin a business, even a poorly conceived venture, carries an equal privilege and right to go out of that business freely when the owner so desires.

In setting up the Small Business Administration, Congress believed that there are some respects in which the individual small-business firm is unable to compete with larger firms because it is small.

To assist the small-business concern overcome the aforementioned problems and to provide for the needs of the individual small-business man, the Small

Business Administration has three principal functions:

One is to provide financial counseling and assistance.

The second is to help small business to obtain a fair share of Government contracts.

The third is to help individual small-business concerns to keep abreast of production and marketing techniques through management, technical, and production aid and counseling.

In most instances, a large firm is in a better position to get information on contracts from the Government than a small firm. A large firm can afford to spend more money to hire costly administrative and technical experts. It can spend more of its funds on research. And, it is easier for it to expand through issuing securities for equity capital. It is usually in a better position to borrow money on a long-term or intermediate basis.

One of the programs of Small Business Administration which offers unusual opportunities for the small manufacturer is its counsel and assistance in product development. The purpose of the program is to help individual small businesses keep up to date in product and process improvement, production techniques, and marketing developments.

Research and development on new products and processes represent insurance of future profits of a business, and are essential to its continued successful operation. The management of many business concerns say their firms would be out of business in a few years if they discontinued their research and product development programs.

Proof of that is what industry and Government are willing to spend. The expenditures on organized research in industry in the past 8 years have been twice as large as the total for all previous years in our history before 1946. In all that time industry spent roughly $4½ billion on research. In the past 8 years it has spent $9½ billion on research. Additionally, the Government has spent nearly $11 billion on research projects in that time. This also was twice as much as was spent by the Government in the preceding 175 years.

To show the tremendous rate of growth since we entered World War II, consider this: In 1941, Government and business, together, spent less than $1 billion on research. In 1953, they spent about $4 billion. By 1959, it is estimated that research expenditures will come to $5½ billion.

Expenditures by large business organizations are increasing each year for research and development. It has been reported that Westinghouse spends almost 6 percent of its sales dollar on it; American Cyanamid, 5.3 percent. There are numerous other examples.

The Small Business Administration is not the only Government agency that collects technical data that would be of great service to businessmen, if utilized. The Atomic Energy Commission is one. The Department of Agriculture is another. The Department of Commerce has accumulated information over the years from other Government agencies and industrial sources—particularly information on markets.

Both the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce have information on Government-owned inventions which are available to the businessman on a use-free basis or for a small royalty. The Department of Defense is constantly turning up products which have civilian application.

The Small Business Administration can help the small-business man gain access to foreign patents for license here, also on American products needed in foreign countries. They have arrangements to work with the Foreign Operations Administration in this connection—if the solution to the problem of the individual small-business concern lies in the development of products for foreign markets, or in obtaining foreign products for home markets.

As I see it, what the Small Business Administration seeks to provide to the individual small-business owner is access to research and development information, and they are aiding the small-business owner to use his and other available know-how to put this technical information to practical use in developing and improving their products. There is a vast storehouse of such information to tap if you know where to go or whom to ask. This product information has been gathered not only by Government, but also by colleges, by foundations and research organizations, and by other private sources.

Many individual small firms do not have the research facilities or financial resources with which to conduct research that would enable them to keep abreast of current developments in production and marketing techniques, obviously placing the small concern in an unfavorable competitive position. It is this large segment of the country's small-business community that this program is particularly designed to assist. A small-business man has a problem: how to make something; how to eliminate a costly process; where to find a substitute; where to sell a byproduct or waste; or how to determine the market for a product. A small-business owner usually is busily occupied with multitudinous duties in the operation of his plant. The service rendered by the agency helps him find answers to technical problems, if at all possible, and offers him counsel on the practical and profitable application of this information, thus providing him an opportunity to keep abreast of current technological developments in his field. This is particularly true when the information is furnished in connection with specific inquiries or individual product problems.

Through the Products Assistance Division of the Small Business Administration, avenues and means have been developed to help him. He can go to the SBA regional office or the branch office that serves his area, or he can write. He should state his problem. In due course, the information and basic data are brought together in usable form—and, through the field offices, placed in his hands.

The Small Business Administration does not and will not make decisions for the small-business owner seeking aid. That is left up to the business owner. They will give him the necessary facts, they will counsel with him on how those facts can be used to develop his idea, and upon which he can base a decision. On several occasions the individual small-business owner has reached a decision not to enter into the business activity that he was investigating.

The small business on the alert for product ideas and new products, and the owner of an invention or product or process he wants to market, will find that the Small Business Administration can put him in communication with a manufacturer or person that may be interested in making the product.

One interesting aspect of this program that has impressed me is that the Small Business Administration is encouraging and is receiving cooperation and voluntary assistance from some of the larger concerns, from trade associations, research institutions and laboratories, and Government agencies in the very effective activities of the agency that provides aid to small firms.

We have all witnessed the effective assistance that the State and National Extension Service and county farm agents have rendered to farmers. This is the first time, so far as I can recall, that America's small-business owners have had a program, comparable in principle to the American farmer's program, that fits the individual needs of small business; a program made available to them through a one-stop center in the area served by a Small Business Administration field office.

In general, the Small Business Administration, in carrying out this product-development program, serves as a catalytic agent between people with ideas looking for manufacturers and people with plants looking for ideas; assist in finding solutions to their day-to-day problems which will enable them to keep abreast of product research and development and production and marketing techniques.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the program which the gentleman mentions dovetail in with the Department of Commerce program that has been carried on for a number of years?

Mr. HARVEY. It is my understanding that they are coordinated and that they are not duplicated.

Mr. PATMAN. But it is the same type of work that the Department of Commerce has been carrying on?

Mr. HARVEY. I think probably not. It is my understanding, at least, that they are not identical.

JOHN DAY DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, two great problems of the Pacific Northwest are the need of the region for more electric

power and the pressing need for eliminating the remaining bottlenecks to the full and economic use of the main stream of the Columbia River for navigation. To help correct this situation, I am today introducing a bill which will hasten the construction of the multipurpose John Day project on the Columbia River between the sister States of Oregon and Washington.

John Day Dam is a navigation, flood-control, and irrigation project. It will produce 1,105,000 kilowatts of power. It is a vital part of the comprehensive plan of development for the Columbia River and its tributaries.

The importance of the John Day project from the standpoint of navigation is that it will eliminate the last remaining bottleneck in that stretch of the river from its mouth to a point 328 miles upstream at Pasco, Wash. The present turbulent rapids at John Day constitute a serious barrier to the effective use of the river as an artery of commerce. With a dam and navigation locks at that point, and upon completion of the dam now building at The Dalles, it will be possible to have slack-water navigation throughout the entire section of the river, with great benefit to the people of the region.

The John Day Dam is an authorized Federal project. It completes a series of Federal navigation dams already built or under construction on this stretch of the Columbia River. I propose that its existing authorization as a Federal enterprise be preserved, but so amended as to provide for cooperative financing between the United States and local interests.

Under provisions of the bill being introduced, the United States will follow its established policy in connection with similar projects everywhere else in the country, of assuming the costs of navigation, flood control and other so-called nonreimbursable benefits. The bill in this respect is exactly the same as any other legislation covering Federal multipurpose projects.

But the costs of these items, in the case of the John Day project, are relatively small. The power portion of the project—accounting for almost 90 percent of the total cost—is to be financed by local interests. This is in accord with the desire of this Congress to achieve strictest economy in its appropriations and to conserve Federal tax dollars for purposes of the highest priority.

However—and I want to make this point absolutely clear—under my proposal, the John Day project will be a Federal project in all respects. It will be designed, constructed, and operated by the United States Army Engineer Corps. At all times the project will be wholly owned by the United States, and will remain so perpetually. There should be no confusion on this point. This is a simple, straightforward, businesslike proposal between the Federal Government and local power distributors serving the people of the Pacific Northwest, an arrangement designed to promote the earliest possible construction of a multi-million-dollar Federal project so that a critical power need can be alleviated, yet without a burdensome outlay of money from the Federal Treasury.

John Day Dam will cost an estimated $310 million. The bill would require local interests contracting to market the power output to advance the portion allocable to power. This amount is estimated to be $273 million.

This bill further provides that if, after substantial engineering is done, the estimated total cost of the project is more than $310 million, the local interests must agree to advance all of that excess amount before contracts for power can be executed.

The remaining cost of the dam, presently estimated to be $37 million, representing the cost of nonreimbursable facilities such as navigation, would be appropriated for by the Government. In effect, my bill simply provides for an advance sale of power, rather than waiting until the generators are installed and humming before disposing of it in installments over a period of years.

In the case of prior Federal projects the Government has first borrowed money from the taxpayer, built a dam, and then sold the power output for money enough to pay back over a long period of years the amount of money invested in the power facilities.

In the case of the John Day project, under provisions of the bill being introduced, the Government does its selling of the power output first, collecting sufficient payments in advance to meet all the cost of the dam's power facilities, and then—after the money is on the barrelhead—proceeding to build a project.

I have no concern whatsoever regarding the feasibility of financing the project in the manner outlined. I have been assured by a number of responsible local interests that sufficient money will be available to guarantee immediate construction of the project as soon as this bill is approved by the Congress and signed by the President. Moreover, I can assure this House that the proposed method of financing is such as to attract capital at favorable interest rates which will keep power costs low.

The bill provides that any type of local interest engaged in the distribution of electricity to the general public—whether a State agency, municipality, PUD, REA, or private electric company—may cooperate with the Government in helping to finance the project and may share the power output. The expressions of interest received from these local groups leaves no doubt in my mind that this project will go rapidly forward once it is authorized by Congress.

This project is so vital to the Pacific Northwest that I earnestly hope we may consider the proposal strictly on its merits. We need power in our region, and there is no other way to get it than by building new powerplants. There is a strong feeling of unity on this subject among our citizens, who are sincerely interested in developing the full potential of our region. They are becoming impatient with those who would obstruct our progress by making power a political issue. Most of our people feel they have been getting more verbosity than voltage, and they want to see us get on with the job.

It is high time, I believe, that the many areas of agreement in this matter are set down in the record.

First of all, there is agreement on our need for more electric power. We are a fast growing region. We must have an expanding energy base to support our growth, and because we do not have the inexpensive supplies of coal, oil, and other fuels which other parts of the country rely upon for energy production, but do have hydroelectric resources in abundance, we naturally will rely primarily on damming our streams for power production just as long as we have sites remaining which can be economically developed.

We are agreed also in the Pacific Northwest, on the basis of authoritative estimates by all agencies, both public and private, engaged in the business of producing or marketing electric power, that more than 600,000 kilowatts of new capacity must be developed every single year in order to keep pace with the region's anticipated growth. It would take a project somewhat larger than a Bonneville Dam to produce that much power.

We are agreed that a major new project should be started—this year if possible—in order to prevent an actual shortage of power in the early 1960's.

We are agreed that on a vast river system such as the Columbia and its tributaries, we should follow a comprehensive plan of development that will bring about the most economic integration of each unit of the plan with all others, so that the full potential of benefit for all purposes can be realized.

We are agreed that such a plan of comprehensive and integrated development, where substantial problems of navigation, flood control, and other nonreimbursable benefits are involved, requires the cooperation and participation of the Federal Government.

We are agreed, furthermore, that there is truth in the proverb that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

And finally, we in the Pacific Northwest, like other citizens and taxpayers all over the country, are agreed that economy in Government is a desirable objective, that the rising burden of the national debt is a cause of concern.

The bill I have introduced today is in full accord with all of these areas of agreement. It is in harmony with the memorial passed by the Oregon State Legislature only a few weeks ago, urging the importance of an immediate start on construction of the John Day project, either as a federally financed project or under enabling legislation which would permit local agencies to advance funds to the Government to aid and expedite the development.

I hope every Member of this House studies this bill with more than ordinary care. I am confident you will agree that it is a sound piece of legislation which will continue an important program of Federal development and, at the same time, will meet the need of economy in appropriations. This bill merits early study and enactment in this session. It incorporates the ideas of the Government departments responsible for plan-

ning and administering developments of this kind, of State officials and agencies, and other local interests public and private. These groups are realistic in their judgment that today's conditions make it mandatory that new answers be found and new methods be used in the field of financing Federal projects if we are to keep abreast of the Northwest's power needs.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a comprehensive, section-by-section analysis of this bill.

JOHN DAY PROJECT H. R. 5789

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

General statement

The proposed multipurpose John Day project on the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington has been under investigation and discussion for more than 30 years. Five years ago the Congress authorized the project for Federal construction by the Corps of Engineers. Investigations and authorizations unfortunately do not mean dams. Money, public or private, is needed to make an authorized project a reality. The demands for defense at a time when the free world is fighting for its life, make the possibility of an immediate, adequate Federal appropriation for a multimillion-dollar project most remote. All units of government, Federal, State, and municipal, are approaching their respective capacities to provide funds for schools, roads, public health, and other basic governmental services. If the John Day project is to become a reality a way must be found to finance its power features other than by Federal appropriations. Otherwise we may be faced by further years of discussion, investigation, and delay. H. R. 5789 meets the problem and provides the answer. Local interests in the States of Oregon and Washington need the power and energy of this project—and they are willing to put up the funds to build it.

Recognizing the willingness of local interests to finance the project, the bill provides the mechanics under which such local interests in the States of Oregon and Washington, both public and private, can join with the United States to make the John Day project a reality. The overall cost of the project is estimated at $310 million, of which it is estimated $273 million will be allocated to power. (The $273 million, or such higher estimate as may be made by the Chief of Engineers, plus interest during construction, is the amount the local interests must pay to the United States.) The difference—$37 million—is the amount estimated as being allocable to navigation, flood control, and other Federal purposes. The people of Oregon and Washington will get the power and energy. The bill says to them that if you will, through those local agencies which have the responsibility of serving you, put up the money for the power features of the project, the United States will pay for the navigation and flood-control features.

While the local interest in these two States will pay for more than three-fourths of the cost of the project, the project will be built, owned, and operated by the United States and will become a part of the comprehensive plan for development of the entire Columbia River Basin in accordance with the Army engineers' 308 report. In return for putting up the money to build the power features of the project the local interests will receive only what they would receive if the Federal Government built the entire project with money from the Federal Treasury—that is, power contracts. Not only would local interests put up the money to build the power features of the project, they would under contracts provided for in the bill, pay the cost of its maintenance, replacements to power facilities, and operation.

Background

The presently proposed John Day project was first formally investigated by the United States under authority of the River and Harbor Act approved March 3, 1925. That act, among other things, directed the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission to submit to Congress an estimate of the cost of making "such examinations, surveys, or other investigations as, in their opinion may be required of navigable streams of the United States, and their tributaries, whereon power developments appear feasible and practicable, with a view to the formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation."

The Corps of Engineers in compliance with the act of 1925 submitted a report to Congress in which it recommended certain streams for investigation, the kind of investigation that it believed should be made, and the probable cost thereof. This report was printed as House Document No. 308, 69th Congress, 1st session (1926). In the River and Harbor Act approved January 21, 1927, the Congress directed that surveys be made in accordance with House Document No. 308. One of the principal streams investigated pursuant to the act of 1927 has been the Columbia River and the John Day site has always been among those sites recommended for development. The 308 report and the immediately succeeding reports recognized that the principal Federal interest in that part of the Columbia extending from tidewater near the present Bonneville Dam to the mouth of the Snake River, a distance of about 180 miles, was that of making the stream fully navigable from its mouth near Astoria, Oreg., to the mouth of the Snake River near Pasco, Wash.

All reports have consistently recognized that full development of navigation, irrigation, flood control and waterpower on the Columbia and its tributaries required that each project whether privately or publicly built should take into account its effect on each other project, existing or proposed. Some persons, either through a lack of information or understanding or with the deliberate purpose of confusing and frustrating the early development of the Columbia, have charged that comprehensive development can be accomplished only in those cases where the United States pays the entire cost of the development. Such statements ignore the laws of the United States and the policies developed thereunder by such agencies as the Federal Power Commission and the Corps of Engineers. The 308 report itself and the investigations and surveys made after the principal recommendations of that report were enacted into law had, so far as waterpower development is concerned, as its principal purpose the establishment of factual data and standards based thereon to guide the Federal Power Commission in granting licenses to local interests, both public and private, for the construction of waterpower projects on navigable streams.

Under the laws of the United States the same standards with respect to comprehensive development and integrated operation would have to be met whether the John Day project is constructed under license from the Federal Power Commission, as will be the procedure in respect of the Priest Rapids project for which the Grant County Public Utility District has received a preliminary permit, or whether it is constructed, owned and operated by the United States as proposed in the John Day bill. The full Federal ownership principle incorporated in the present bill recognizes the precedent of full Federal ownership of other dams in the middle section of the Columbia—Bonneville, the Dalles, and McNary Dams—and for that reason only, departs from the conventional pattern of construction, where local interests provide the money, under license from the Federal Power Commission.

Necessity for the project

There is no disagreement as to the need for additional kilowatts in the Pacific Northwest. It is undisputed that, by conservative estimates, and after giving effect to all projects now under construction by both public and private interests, the region will, commencing in 1960, need from 500,000 to 600,000 additional kilowatts per year merely to meet the normal growth of the region. Local interests are going ahead with plans for power projects on sites available to them. The John Day site, however, having been authorized for a Federal project, is not available for licensing under the provisions of the Federal Power Act for development by local interests. Thus the Federal Government must either appropriate $310 million to finance the project or adopt the plan proposed in this bill. It can be argued that the United States can't afford $310 million, but it cannot be argued that a failure to bring this resource into service and to use the waters at the site of the John Day project when the means are at hand would constitute reckless waste of a vital national asset which could otherwise be used to turn the generators to provide electric power for farms and homes and industries. The project would have an initial installed capacity of 1,105,000 kilowatts and in combination with projects being planned for construction and ownership solely by local interests, will go a long way toward preventing a regional power shortage.

SECTION 1. Construction, ownership, and operation by the United States:

Under this section the John Day project is required to be built by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army. Title to all of the facilities of the entire project, irrespective of the payments by local interests, is at all times to be and remain in the United States Government; and the project will after completion be operated by the United States. The cost of operation and maintenance allocated to power will, under the act, be paid for by the purchasers of power. The section incorporates and adopts, with minor modifications, the plan for the construction of the project contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, printed as House Document No. 531, 81st Congress. The minor modifications are (1) the project is recognized as essentially a navigation project so far as a proper constitutional Federal interest is concerned rather than as a flood-control project, and (2) a pool elevation of not to exceed 265 rather than 295 feet is adopted for the protection of various communities upstream from the project.

An installation of 1,105,000 kilowatts of generating capacity comprised of 13 generating units of 85,000 kilowatts each is fixed as the minimum initial power and energy capacity. A construction cost of $310 million is estimated on the basis of experience gained in the construction of McNary Dam and the Dalles Dam, both on the middle section of the Columbia—John Day would be 25 miles upstream from the Dalles Dam and 75 miles downstream from McNary Dam. The essential features of the John Day Dam would track those of these two other dams—one recently completed and the other under construction. The total cost of McNary is now estimated at $287 million; and the total cost of the Dalles Dam is now estimated at $300 million. The $310 million figure is in excess of the cost of either of the companion dams. Accordingly, $310 million is believed to be a conservative estimate, especially in view of the economies in construction that

could probably be effected by having substantially all of the funds necessary to construct the project at the time work is commenced rather than having to slow down construction because of delays in appropriating funds, as is usually the case where full Federal payment is involved.

Under this section full control of design, construction, and integration of operation with other works on the Columbia and its tributaries would be at all times under the control of the United States. The provisions of this section should eliminate any controversy as to whether the proposed project will fit into the comprehensive plan for the development of the region's water resources—the section adopts and requires the comprehensive plan to be followed in its construction and leaves the ownership in the United States and operation to the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 2. Assistance of local interests in financing: This section recognizes the need for action in getting the John Day project under way and declares that the interests of navigation, irrigation, flood control, and power production can be assisted and expedited through the payment of funds by local interests toward the construction of the project. Very importantly this section recognizes the paramount interest of farm and homeowners as individuals and not as members of a group and requires that contracts entered into under the act for the distribution of power from the project provide for the widest possible distribution to domestic and rural consumers, irrespective of what agency serves them. Thus there is to be no discrimination against a homeowner or the operator of a farm merely because the home or farm is located in an area served by one type of entity as distinguished from another—the important thing is who is served—not by whom he is served.

SEC. 3. Local interest: This section defines the term "local interest" to mean States or agencies of States; peoples' utility districts, public utility districts, municipalities operating electric distribution systems, rural electric cooperatives, private electric utility companies or entities acting for or on behalf of one or more of them. Thus any agency, public or private, authorized to engage in the distribution of electric energy is invited to share in the development of the John Day project by agreeing to make payments to the Secretary of the Army in aid of its construction.

SEC. 4. Applications for participations:

In general this section provides that the bipartisan, quasi-judicial, Federal Power Commission shall receive and act upon applications from local interests for a share in the cost of construction and a share of the power and energy to be generated at the John Day project. Standards are provided to guide the Commission in making allocations of power in the event more participation is applied for by responsible local interests than can be met from the resources of the project. Basically, if an applicant meets the requirement of financial responsibility, as determined by the Commission, it will receive a share of power proportionate to the payment toward the cost of the project allocated to power which it assumes.

Subsection (a) of section 4 provides that within 6 months from the date of the approval of the act any qualified local interest may make application to the Commission for participation in the John Day project. Six months is believed adequate for each local interest that may be affected to determine if it desires to participate in the project and to perfect its plans for such participation. A longer period would delay early commencement of the project and a shorter period might not give some local interests time within which to act.

Subsection (b) of section 4 outlines the basic data which an application to the Commission must contain and gives the Commission authority to require additional data to act upon such application in accordance with the standards contained in subsection (c) of section 4.

Subsection (c) provides that if applications are received within 6 months from the date of the bill's enactment for participation in the cost of construction of the project allocated to power (now estimated at $273 million) equal to or in excess of $273 million, or such greater estimate as may be made under section 5 (a), the Commission shall proceed to allocate the financial participation in the cost of the project allocated to power, and the energy to be generated therefrom among the applicants. Allocations of power are to be proportionate to financial participation. In making such allocations the Commission is to be guided by considerations of sound financing and early initiation and construction of the project. In addition, the Commission must test each application against these standards:

1. The present and future availability to the applicant of power and energy from other comparable sources;

2. The intent of Congress that the electric power and energy from the project shall have the widest distribution to domestic and rural consumers, with proper regard for the needs and requirements of the applicants in the area to accomplish such purpose; and

3. That there be an equitable division of the power and energy from the project, giving consideration to existing resources and the use thereof by each applicant.

By subsection (d) the Commission is required to notify each applicant of the allocations so made and applicants are given 60 days within which to accept or reject the allocations. When the allocations are accepted, they are certified to the Secretary of the Army and to the Secretary of the Interior as the basis for the contracts provided for in sections 5 and 6.

Subsection (e) provides for an allocation of financial participation and share in power and energy from the project among remaining qualified applicants in the event of failure of acceptance of an allocation by one or more qualified applicants or in event of failure to execute contracts for financial participation and power after the acceptance of an allocation.

SEC. 5. Contracts with Secretary of the Army for payment of moneys to the United States by participating local interests:

Under section 4 the local interests wishing to participate have been afforded 6 months within which to file applications for such participation. The Commission satisfies itself as to each applicant's financial responsibility and the feasibility of its program for financing its proposed share of the cost of the project allocated to power. The Secretary of the Army would, upon certification of the results reached by the Commission, be prepared to enter into contracts for the payment by such local interests of funds in aid of construction of the project.

The aggregate of such payments is fixed at $273 million or such other amount of the total cost of the project estimated to be allocated to power as provided in subsection (a) of section 5, as referred to below. The $273 million figure represents 88 percent of the estimated total cost of the project. This figure—like the total estimate of $310 million—was arrived at on the basis of the percentage allocated to power at McNary Dam and the Dalles Dam. While it is believed unlikely that the cost allocated to power will exceed $273 million provision is made for any increase in such estimated cost.

Under subsection (a) of section 5, the Chief of Engineers would, prior to the execution of contracts for the payment of funds, and after having made adequate foundation explorations and a completed general basis for design, estimate the total cost of the project on the basis of then current price levels. The bill contemplates that the contracts for the advancement of funds would provide $273 million as the amount to be advanced; but the $273 million may be increased by any amount in excess thereof which the Chief of Engineers, under section 5 (a), estimates as the part of the total cost allocable to power. The $273 million would be subject to a further increase in such amount as the Chief of Engineers estimates the total cost of the project to be in excess of $310 million.

In addition to providing for the payment of $273 million, or such additional amount as may be fixed after the estimates referred to in the preceding paragraph, the contracts between the Secretary of the Army and local interests must contain the following additional basic provisions: (1) The construction, maintenance, and operation under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the John Day project as a part of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River as herein authorized; (2) the scheduling of the payment and application of such funds and of Federal funds for maintaining an economical rate of construction of such project; and (3) the procedure and formula for the project cost allocation as predetermined by the Corps of Engineers in collaboration with the Federal Power Commission.

The Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into such other contracts as he finds necessary or convenient for the construction of the project in an expeditious and economical manner and the contracts provided for in section 5 are made "contractual obligations of the United States Government." This latter provision makes the obligations of the United States rank equally with those assumed by the local interests.

SEC. 6. Contracts for power with the Secretary of the Interior:

Up to this point in the legislative plan local interests have qualified for participation by applying to the Federal Power Commission and receiving an allocation of financial participation and a related quantity of power and energy; contracts have then been made with the Secretary of the Army for the payment of funds and for the construction, ownership, and operation of the project by the United States. Contracts would simultaneously be made with the Secretary of the Interior, under section 6, for power and energy from the project. These contracts would provide (1) for the receipt by the local interests for a period of 50 years of the power and energy, from the project; (2) the payment, in addition to the $273 million (or such additional amount as may be estimated as allocable to power) of each local interest's proportionate share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the normal replacement to the facilities of the project, and of other costs allocated to power; (3) any costs of transmission of power as may, by mutual agreement, be transmitted over Federal transmission facilities; (4) any lawful net charge for upstream and downstream power benefits as determined by the Federal Power Commission; and (5) contain a proviso that if local interests paid moneys in excess of the amounts allocated to power, such overpayments would be credited against the foregoing costs.

The contracts for the sale and purchase of power are required to contain provisions dealing with any final cost allocated to the power features of the project in excess of $273 million, or any additional amounts as estimated under section 5 (a). If there should be any such excess the local interests are to be so notified after which they will have 90 days within which to agree to pay any such excess to the United States. If at the end of such 90-day period the local interests do not pay any such excess, the United States may either retain and dispose of the power and energy output represented by such excess, or it may require the local interests

to pay the excess, with interest, over the life of the power contracts in substantially equal monthly installments.

Subsection (b) of section 6 deals with the possibility that during the terms of the contracts for the purchase and sale of power it may be found desirable to increase the project's installed generating capacity. In general this subsection provides that local interests may agree to pay for the cost of any additional generating installations and be allocated power and energy proportionate to their share of the cost of the additional facilities. As in the case of the initial installation, any additional facilities would be owned and operated by the United States. If the local interests do not pay for the cost of any such additional generation, such facilities would be installed by the United States and the power and energy resulting thereof disposed as if the act had not been enacted.

SEC. 7. Assignments: The Secretary of the Interior may assign the power contracts to any other agency or instrumentality of the United States. Local interests could assign the contracts only to each other or to a trustee in connection with the financing of their participation; and provision is made for assignment by the trustee in event of default by local interests in their obligations to the trustee.

SEC. 8. Authorization of appropriations: This section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

SEC. 9. Time limitations: The contracts for the payment of funds by local interests and for the sale of power to them must be entered into within 2 years from the date of the bill's enactment; or within 1 year after completion of the engineering planning of the project by the Corps of Engineers; or within 1 year after the issuance of the certificates by the Federal Power Commission whichever is later. After the expiration of such time the project may be constructed by the United States without reference to assistance by local interests. As is customary in a river and harbor project, planning money advanced by local interests will be dealt with as provided in the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1197, ch. 467, sec. 11).

Mr. CONN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a comprehensive section by section analysis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LEST WE FORGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, I have been closely concerned with the economic, political, and collective security conditions prevailing in that important region.

As we all know, more than one-half of humanity lives in that area. Further, far-reaching economic, political, and social developments are presently taking place in that region—developments which may seriously affect the future course of events insofar as our Nation, and the other free nations of the world, are concerned.

For these, and other equally important reasons, I believe that it is in our own interest to pay close attention to what is happening in the Pacific and in the Far East.

Today I should like to speak for a few moments about the Philippines—that young democratic Republic whose immediate past history has been so closely connected with our own for over half a century.

The Philippines is one of our most dependable allies in that area of the world where the international situation is presently so very delicate. They are islands of freedom in the region in which neutralism and communism have had a great impact during recent years. The Philippines have made wonderful progress in combating communism, principally by demonstrating that the democratic system can provide a higher standard of living to the working class than communism. This she has been able to do notwithstanding the still unsatisfactory condition of her economy as a result of her loyalty to the cause of freedom in the last war.

The Philippines is the showcase of democracy in Asia. If the Filipinos succeed in proving to the working classes of their people and the great masses of the people of Asia that under the democratic system they are able to establish, and to maintain, a higher standard of living than the people of the Communist and Neutralist countries, the free world will have won a propaganda battle that will be more effective than divisions of soldiers or billions in handouts.

In this connection I should like to recall that on April 11 the President of the United States in a message to Congress stressed the need for intensifying our cooperation with the free nations of southeast Asia in their efforts to achieve economic development and a rising standard of living. I quote from his message:

> The motivation behind this cooperation is twofold: Our fixed belief in the worth and dignity of the human individual whatever his race or flag may be, and our dedication to the principle that the fruits of national growth must be widely shared in every society.
>
> As a people we insist that the dignity of the individual and his manifold rights require for their preservation a constantly expanding economic base. We are convinced that our continued economic, cultural, and spiritual progress are furthered by similar progress everywhere. * * *
>
> We seek to evolve a consistent and stable economic policy which will assist free nations in their efforts to achieve a sound growth for their economies.

Let us look at the Philippines today in relation to the frame of reference outlined in the President's message.

The Philippines have paid most dearly in lives and property during the last war for their loyalty to the cause of freedom. The islands were ravaged during the war, and their major industries and economic assets were almost totally destroyed.

Even today, the Philippines have not yet entirely recovered from the destruction of World War II. This country that always had a favorable balance of trade with us and with the world before the war, has piled up a tremendous trade deficit during the years of her reconstruction and rehabilitation.

For instance, during the 8-year period before Pearl Harbor, the Philippines had a favorable balance of trade of $170 million, while in the 8-year period after the liberation of the Philippines the country had a total negative balance of $1,257,000,000. She is still plagued by inflation and unemployment, and has had to adopt strict currency and import controls. These conditions prevail, even though the Philippines has made tremendous strides toward full recovery.

From my observations made during study missions to the Pacific and the Far East, it appears that the Philippines is determined to do everything possible to improve the stability of its economy, and to raise the standard of living of its people. Continued growth and expansion of the Philippine industries could further the attainment of those goals much more effectively, it would appear to me, than any outside aid or assistance.

As we all know, the sugar industry is one of the major props under the Philippine economy. The Philippines has been one of our suppliers of sugar for many years. It seems that, under the present circumstances, this basic Philippine industry could aid greatly in helping to solve that country's problem of trade deficits, inflation, and unemployment.

Under our domestic laws, our purchases of sugar from foreign countries, such as the Philippines, have been limited to certain quotas—either absolute quotas expressed in terms of tons, or quotas based on a percentage share of our sugar market. Prior to the enactment of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946, that country had been allotted a share of 15.41 percent of the United States sugar market. In 1946, sugar imports from the Philippines were limited to a duty-free quota of 977,000 tons. The earlier percentage quota would be more liberal under current circumstances than the absolute quota, and it is my understanding that the Philippines are deeply interested in the restoration of that 15.41-percent share of the United States sugar market.

I believe it should be noted at this point that from the time we entered the war in 1941, the Philippines was able to fill its quota in our sugar market only last year; so that for a period of 13 years the Philippine sugar industry, which has been considered by many as the backbone of the Philippine economy, was unable to take advantage of its share in our sugar market.

It may have been only fair to make some provision enabling the Philippine sugar industry to make up for the losses it sustained. Such consideration may have been warranted because the inability of the Philippines to take advantage of her share in our sugar market was due to the destruction of her sugar industry during the war. No steps were taken in this direction. Now, however, the Philippine Republic has to an extent recovered from the ravages of the war, and is concerned about maintaining an adequate market for her sugar in the United States. Her interest in the restoration of her 15.41 percent share of the United States sugar market should be

carefully considered within the framework of the facts which I have just outlined.

The second consideration which should be borne in mind is that the Philippines has always had close economic ties with our country. The Philippines is the ninth best market for American exports. Seventy to eighty percent of their imports come from us. In 1953 we sold her $351.2 million of our products. The dollars which our people spend in purchasing Philippine sugar and other products come right back to us in the form of purchases of American products which the Philippines so badly need for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

From the information available, the Philippines is the first or second best foreign market for a large number of American products, among them cotton manufactures, cigarettes, dairy products, wheat flour, galvanized steel sheets, rubber and manufactures, fertilizer materials, toilet preparations, soaps, educational textbooks, and dozens of other products. She also is a big buyer of iron and steel products, mineral oil, automobiles and parts, electrical machinery, paper, chemicals and drugs, leather and manufactures thereof, silk and rayon manufactures, fruits, and other products.

The strengthening of our trade ties with the Philippines would be advantageous to both countries. In particular, it would aid the Philippines in strengthening her economy and in enabling her to provide a better standard of living for her people. This, of course, could have far-reaching effects on the entire situation in the Pacific and in the Far East. I mentioned this fact earlier, pointing out that the Philippines is the showcase of democracy in that area, and that the other countries of that region are closely watching the Philippines and what happens there.

I believe that these considerations ought to be borne in mind when the Sugar Act of 1948 will be revised.

There is just one more thing that I would like to mention. When we approved the Philippine Trade Act of 1939, known as the Tydings-Kocialkowski Act, we had practically written off the Philippines as a part of the world with which we should maintain very close ties. The terms of reference given to our delegation to the Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs were to terminate preferential trade relations between the United States and the Philippines at the earliest practicable date consistent with affording the Philippines a reasonable opportunity to adjust its national economy.

Isolationism was then at its height in our country. World War II has changed that. It is now felt on both sides that close political, military, and other relations must be maintained for our mutual advantage. Under our Mutual Defense Pact with them, we have established important military, naval, and aerial bases in their country, and under our trade agreement with them our investments are guaranteed the same protection and privileges as those of their own nationals.

These are vital facts and should be borne in mind by all of us. We are presently maintaining close relations with the Philippines, and this is working to our mutual advantage. I believe that the maintenance of satisfactory trade relations with that country would be beneficial to both sides. To maintain such relations we ought to assure fair treatment of Philippine sugar and other products in our market. This will help them probably more than any grants or handouts.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and for other purposes, to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 25

During consideration of the naval ship-construction bill,

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to obtain the floor at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. At the request of the minority leader, who is temporarily out of the Chamber, I rise to ask if the distinguished majority leader will inform the membership about the program for the coming week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to.

We have one more bill to follow the one under consideration. It is noncontroversial, so I am informed, and will probably not take long. There are two resolutions from the Committee on House Administration that will be disposed of very quickly because they have been cleared with the leadership and reported out of committee unanimously. They are the usual resolutions coming out of that committee.

Monday: There is no legislation pending.

Tuesday: We will call up H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Antitrust Act; and H. R. 5645 relating to the construction of an office building for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Wednesday: H. R. 2107, the Reserve Forces bill, which I think authorizes the construction of armories throughout the United States.

Thursday and Friday: If a rule is reported out it is expected to call up H. R. 12, the agriculture price-support bill. I am setting that for Thursday, conditioned upon a rule being reported out.

Then there is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced. I realize that my colleagues must depend on me for guidance in these matters so they may know what to expect, and I do my best to keep them informed of the situation. There might be, of course, something called up by unanimous consent, but as the Members realize, such matters are very carefully screened.

I might say also that if there is any rollcall on bills that may come up on Tuesday or Wednesday the leadership on both sides have agreed that the rollcalls will be put over until Thursday. This does not mean quorum calls.

Quite a group of Members are going out to Las Vegas where another test will take place; but, as I say, if any rollcall is demanded on a bill on Tuesday or Wednesday the leadership have agreed that the rollcall will go over until Thursday.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There will be an unveiling of a portrait on Thursday afternoon of our beloved Speaker. I wonder if the vote could be put over until the following week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentlewoman has reminded me of that. If we are considering the agricultural bill, certainly the leadership on this side will cooperate in every way and effectively for the unveiling of the portrait to which the gentlewoman refers, a great event to take place for a great man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT and to include some articles.

Mr. RAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and to include an editorial.

Mr. KNOX and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. DODD and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mrs. HARDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYWORTH and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for April 21, 1955, 1 day, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. WALTER, from April 18 to May 11, on account of official business, attending Intergovernmental Commission for European Migration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

720. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

721. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes'," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

722. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

723. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 13 of title 17, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5645, a bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4954, a bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 218. Resolution to improve food-service facilities in the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 219. Resolution to improve food-service facilities in the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report by the General Accounting Office on leave practices in post offices; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report by the General Accounting Office on financial management of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5785. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 5786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of motor vehicles, a lien for Federal taxes shall not be valid as against a mortgagee, pledgee, or purchaser who has no notice or knowledge of the existence of such lien; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5787. A bill to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 5788. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of women officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve on the same basis as male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 5789. A bill to provide for cooperation in financing and prosecuting early development of the John Day project on the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., for navigation, irrigation, flood control, and power production; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5790. A bill to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5791. A bill to approve Act 178 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1951, relating to the University of Hawaii and the powers of the board of regents thereof, and to amend section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 5792. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 5793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on television tubes shall not apply where such tubes are sold for use in the manufacture or production of nontaxable component parts of television sets or for export; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5794. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, an amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 5795. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at Yamhill River, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 5796. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5797. A bill to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5798. A bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5799. A bill to amend the act of August 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 681, ch. 665, sec. 1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 5800. A bill to provide special acreage allotments in areas of general crop failure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5801. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to eliminate all restrictions upon the right of a widow to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 5802. A bill to modify the project for intracoastal waterway in the vicinity of

Algiers at New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5803. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 5804. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 5805. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5806. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 5807. A bill to require that certain commercial retail establishments in the District of Columbia shall be closed to the public on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 21 to 27, 1955, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DODD:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution expressing the gratitude of Congress and the American people for the achievements of Dr. John F. Enders and others regarding the discovery for a way to halt poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 216. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study the Children's Receiving Home at Laurel, Md.; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 217. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study the Metropolitan Police Department, the Park Police, the Traffic Bureau, and the Corporation Counsel's Office; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. Res. 220. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of consumer problems in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 221. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of increasing automation upon the American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committee in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 5808. A bill for the relief of Judith Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5809. A bill for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5810. A bill for the relief of Lee Chow Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5811. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Shinbashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5812. A bill for the relief of Jiichiro Yonemoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Co. of Louisiana, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nur Sami de Wejbe and Maria Sofia Wejbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Antonio LaSala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 5816. A bill for the relief of Kaare Moe Johnsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

205. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petitions of Seaborn P. Collins, national commander, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., opposing the exchange of atomic information or agreements with the Soviet Union and any agreement to ban the use of nuclear weapons; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

206. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 20 residents of Marshall County, Iowa, favoring passage of H. R. 4629 to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

207. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of Lowell, Mass., concerning the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

208. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to transmitting a copy of resolution item No. 125, C. C. P., April 5, 1955, which is in relation to exemption of independent producers of natural gas from regulations by the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

209. Also, petition of Frank A. Hourihan, Chicago, Ill., relative to a redress of grievances, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, pertaining to No. 11,346, *Frank A. Hourihan of Chicago, Illinois, appellant,* v. *National Labor Relations Board, Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the Board and/or the General Counsel of the Board, appellees;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Fight Against Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has had reason to rejoice in recent days at the announcement that a vaccine has proven effective in checking the ravages of poliomyelitis. The discovery marked a victory for scientific teamwork, supported by the will and the money of the American people. It is an accomplishment that has been welcomed generously by the people of all nations who have learned of it. Polio has never let frontiers or boundaries stand in its way.

The fight against polio was a long and an expensive one. It could never have been carried on without the cooperation of the people and the organizations who sought the funds, the administrators who encouraged the research projects, and the scientists and their assistants who worked long and patient hours in the laboratories. To Dr. Jonas E. Salk, who rightfully deserves the credit for the final achievement, must go the thanks of every parent. Let the thanks go also to his team of associates in the University of Pittsburgh, drawn from as far away as Australia and Germany, for the research that made this discovery possible.

They would, I am sure, be the first to concede that their final discoveries would not have been possible without the research and guideposts that were left for them by hundreds who worked on other phases of this problem. The discovery of three distinct types of polio virus, in an experiment that cost $1,370,000, and was carried on in four major universities for 3 solid years, and the discovery that the virus circulates in the blood stream before the onset of the disease are examples of the knowledge that had to be learned.

It is a source of particular pride to me and to the people of my district that the first major scientific breakthrough in the battle against polio was made by a distinguished Harvard scientist whose parents still live in West Hartford, and whose ancestral roots are deep in Connecticut soil. I refer, of course, to Dr. John F. Enders.

It was Dr. Enders and two associates, Drs. Thomas H. Weller and Frederick C. Robbins, who proved in 1949 that the polio virus could be grown in human and

ape tissues in sufficient numbers to produce a vaccine. Their discovery made it possible to produce a safe vaccine that does not carry the risk of brain damage.

For their work, they received the Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology in 1954. Two other awards also came the way of Dr. Enders—the Albert Lasker Award of the American Public Health Association in October 1954 and the Passano Foundation Award in June 1953 for distinguished medical research, the latter an award of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Enders is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John O. Enders, of 17 Highland Street, West Hartford. He is the brother of Ostrom Enders, of Avon, president of the Hartford National Bank & Trust Co., the fifth oldest national bank in the United States.

Dr. Enders was born in west Hartford on February 10, 1897. He was graduated from Yale in 1920, after service as a Marine flier in World War I. He received a master of arts from Harvard in 1922 and a doctor of philosophy in bacteriology and immunology in 1930. A former president of the American Association of Immunologists, and editor of the Journal of Immunology, he is associate professor of bacteriology and immunology at Harvard and director of the research division of infectious diseases at Children's Medical Center, Boston.

I feel it proper that the Congress should take note of these contributions to the drive against polio, and I therefore introduce the following resolution:

Whereas the Congress has learned of the success of American medical science in developing a safe vaccine to use against polio; and

Whereas it is recognized that into the final discovery went years of work, countless observations, and the painstaking efforts of thousands of people; and

Whereas the first successful breakthrough in the fight to conquer polio came as a result of the discoveries of Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins at Harvard Medical School in 1949 of a way to grow the virus in human and ape tissues in sufficient numbers to produce a vaccine: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress and the American people hereby express their gratitude and appreciation for the achievements of Dr. John F. Enders, Dr. Thomas H. Weller, and Dr. Frederick C. Robbins in making the final discovery of a way to halt poliomyelitis possible.

Dedication to an Immigrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today mourns the loss of one of its outstanding citizens, Dr. Albert Einstein, whose tremendous contributions to the world and to this Nation have literally changed the course of this century in which we live.

Many honors have been showered upon Dr. Einstein during the course of his life and many more will be dedicated to his memory. But I can think of no greater tribute which this Congress could pay to him, and certainly none that would be more fitting, than that the House reexamine the immigration laws of our country in order that future Dr. Einsteins, whether potential or recognized, shall not be barred from our shores because of our preoccupation with unworthy fears, mistrust, and discrimination against the stranger who knocks at our gates.

Surely no finer monument could be erected to the great heart and great mind of Dr. Einstein than for this House to put life and meaning into the Refugee Relief Act. Need I remind any Member of the House that this act was passed by the 83d Congress for the humanitarian purpose of admitting to this country 214,000 of those who seek escape from tyranny and oppression, from hardship and suffering in their mother lands to reach America, where liberty was cradled and independence nurtured. Yet today this legislation stands a bar instead of a door to freedom.

In memory of Dr. Einstein then let us engrave upon our hearts as well as upon stone those famous words of the poet, Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Postmaster at Maysville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an affidavit dated March 23, 1955, by Hon. D. Bernard Coughlin, attorney at law, Maysville, Ky., to supplement his affidavit of December 29, 1954, which appears in the March 1, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, concerning the charges against the postmaster at Maysville, Ky.:

AFFIDAVIT IN BEHALF OF NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., ON HIS APPEAL UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED—NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., APPELLANT, *v.* ADDITIONAL BRIEF FOR APPELLANT, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C.:

To further supplement my affidavit of December 29, 1954, concerning the alleged political conspiracy of William B. Mathews and the Republican Committee to remove Newell M. Hargett as postmaster at Maysville, Ky., and replace him by said William B. Mathews, I wish to state that said William B. Mathews has been contacting the members of the Republican committee in Mason County, Ky., for their endorsement and support to assist him to get the postmastership at the Maysville post office although the present incumbent's appeal is pending before you and same is a part of the political conspiracy involved and proved in this case.

_____.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this March 23, 1955.

_____,
Notary Public, Mason County, Ky.
My commission expires April 4, 1958.

Measure of a True Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of humility I rise to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, a true patriot. The measure of a person's devotion to ideals can be put to no greater test than when that person will submit his wife and family to the possible scorn of his neighbors and friends. Mr. Ray C. Moorhead, of Cashion, Ariz., was asked by the FBI in 1947 to join the Communist Party. For 8 years he underwent the many trials and tribulations that go with being a known Communist. Last week Mr. Moorhead testified in the Government's behalf in its case against 5 men and 2 women accused of advocating the violent overthrow of the Federal Government. Mr. Moorhead is a dairy farmer and the father of 4 children. Since testifying, he may be in more danger than when he actually was working with the Reds, but his comment to this has been, "When the FBI asked me to work for them, they gave me 3 days to talk it over with my wife. She told me communism was against God and I decided that I owed it to my country and to Him. After all, somebody has to do the job." I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial written in the Phoenix Gazette on Saturday, April 16, 1955, entitled "Measure of a True Patriot." I am sure that every American is grateful to Roy C. Moorhead for his sacrifice for his country.

MEASURE OF A TRUE PATRIOT

The 8-year ordeal of Ray Moorhead, a Cashion farmer who served the FBI as an unpaid anti-Communist undercover agent, is not new. Many Americans have endured the loss of friends, community distrust, and mental anguish that such assignments bring. One of them, Herbert Philbrick, described the impact of these hazards on a typical American family in his book, I Led Three Lives.

Thus Ray Moorhead is not the first loyal American to endure the ordeal in the service of his country, and he will not be the last. But he is the first known Arizonian to engage in the risky job of catching Communist subversives by pretending to join with them in activities aimed at the overthrow of our democratic form of government. Unlike Philbrick and others whose undercover activities were carried on in large cities, Moorhead performed his valuable work in small farming communities west and south of Phoenix.

Where everybody knows his neighbors by their first names, it takes rare courage to pose as an active Communist for 8 long years. It means cold glances from former friends that say more than words. It means hardship for self and family. It means a man's children must be permitted to believe that their father is disloyal. It means embarrassment, worry, and tensions for a wife who knows the secret but cannot tell.

All these things and more are the price Ray Moorhead has paid to serve his country while protecting it from its enemies. That, we submit, is the measure of a true patriot.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered on yesterday afternoon to the Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply grateful for the high honor and the privilege of addressing this most distinguished group.

You represent all that is best in loyalty and patriotism. You believe in 100 percent Americanism.

You keep alive the traditions and the spirit of those whose courage, sacrifice, and love of liberty built the greatness of our country.

You serve America by your example of devotion to the principles upon which our Republic was established.

You defend America by your watchful, steadfast, and vigorous support of our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

The early settlers of the American Colonies differed in their form of worship and their ideals of government. But they had one firm belief on which they could all agree—that freedom of the individual is God's greatest gift to mankind—more precious than life itself.

The development of the United States, from an uncharted, savage wilderness, to the greatest Nation in all history, was founded upon that priceless element of our national strength—freedom of the individual.

Yes, my fellow Americans, freedom of the individual, sustained by faith in God, made possible our marvelous industrial development, our great transportation systems, and our rich agricultural production.

It expanded the employment of our workers and encouraged the establishment of many thousands of large and small businesses.

It built our great cities and beautiful towns. It gave us our great colleges and universities, our centers of art and music, our splendid churches of every denomination.

It gave America the highest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual level ever attained by any nation in the world.

We can point with pride to all that has been achieved in the comparatively short span of years since the first settlers reached our shores. But we must never forget that we did not gain the proud position we occupy today without struggle, hardship, toil, and sacrifice.

All that we have is ours to enjoy because heroes and patriots in every generation were willing to shed their blood and give their lives in defense of their God-given freedom.

The troubled times in which we live call upon every one of us to take up the cause they so nobly served. The dangers we face today call for renewed dedication to our country and our flag. They call for deeper devotion to the ideals of liberty and independence, for new strength and courage in defense of freedom.

America faces a desperate challenge.

It is a challenge hurled by the forces of evil that would destroy our system of free government and would wipe out the principles of individual freedom.

Let us consider briefly the situation confronting the United States today.

The course of history has placed upon the American people the responsibility for peace and progress in the world.

The United States stands as the one strong barrier against the Communist conspiracy to dominate and enslave the entire world.

The jet-propelled plane, the atomic weapons, and the hydrogen bomb have changed the whole picture of offensive and defensive war. They have revolutionized the whole concept of military science. They give tragic emphasis to the fundamental truth that the world must live in peace or bring about its own destruction.

We know, however, that enduring peace cannot be achieved by force alone. It can be realized through truth, honor, justice, and devotion to high moral and spiritual standards.

But until these ideals are accepted by the whole world, including the Communists, we must face facts that connot be ignored.

To save the world from the total disaster of war, America must be strong—not in arms alone—but strong in the spirit of our forefathers, strong in patriotism, ready and willing to do our full duty in peace and in war.

Unfortunately there are too many misguided Americans who do not understand and do not appreciate the real meaning of America.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our security and our progress.

Good citizenship is the basis of patriotism. That is why I am constantly urging every individual to take a more active, intelligent, patriotic part in government.

We will not attain our full strength as a Nation until every American has a clear understanding of his individual responsibility for the future of the United States.

I think it is the duty of every American to make his voice heard on the question of loyalty.

There is no room under the American flag for those who would tear down our free institutions or undermine our system of government.

We must teach young and old that America means freedom under God, while communism means slavery under the iron rule of godless tyrants.

We must tell over and over again the glorious story of our country's rise to greatness among the nations of the earth.

We must tell and retell the story of our sturdy, courageous pioneers and the heroic exploits of those who extended our frontiers over the mountains and across the western plains.

We must point with pride to the patriots and statesmen who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor that "these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states."

I make this appeal to you because you are qualified by patriotic service for leadership in civic responsibility.

Let us go forward once more, armed and equipped, to fight for our country.

Let us take our places in the front line of the battle to keep America free, strong, prosperous, and at peace.

Michigan State University Mission to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to inform the Congress that Michigan State University, my former employer and a great educational institution, is undertaking an important and dramatic step in the fight against world communism. The political science department of Michigan State has just concluded a contract with the Foreign Operations Administration of the United States Government to conduct a technical-assistance mission to the troubled state of Vietnam. This practical approach to problems of government is in keeping with the great down-to-earth tradition of our land-grant colleges. It is unique, however, in that it undertakes to apply our educational and technical skills on an international scale.

The main objective of the Michigan State mission to Vietnam is to help stabilize the Government and the economy of that country by training native Vietnamese in the skills of modern public administration. Experts are being sent to help train the workers in this new democracy in the fields of public administration, police work, government finance, and field administration. Later, Vietnamese will be brought to the United States for further training in each of these fields.

Michigan State is undertaking this project with clear motives. Believing that democracy can only flourish when the machinery of government is effective, honest, and technically proficient, the members of the mission are dedicated to their task of helping build a sound governmental structure.

With the withdrawal of the French and the refusal of the United States to engage in colonial control of this brave but threatened country, the hopes of keeping the country from falling to the Communists would seem slim indeed. But if we act quickly to help the Vietnamese people in their efforts to make democracy work, Vietnam can still be saved. Small islands off the coast of China are of little importance, indeed, relative to this country which stands between the Chinese Communists and the rich lands of Burma, Thailand, and Malaya.

Prof. Wesley Fishel deserves great credit for developing this technical-assistance program for Vietnam. Mr. Fishel has spent the last several months working with the Premier of Vietnam—Ngo Din Diem. His knowlelge of Vietnam, his sympathy for its people, and

his determination that free government shall flourish in Vietnam have made the project a reality. Prof. Edward Weidner has also worked tirelessly to bring the know-how of American public administration to this troubled spot in the Far East. We wish them and their colleagues Godspeed in their endeavors.

The Late Walter White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we learned of the death of a true American, Walter White. As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he played a leading role in the endeavor to have the principles of the Constitution of the United States adhered to on all levels of American life. To have full recognition of the dignity of all men was his chief objective.

Born with fair skin, blue eyes, and Caucasian features in 1893 in Atlanta's Darktown, he chose to remain proudly a member of the Negro race. At the age of 13, when he witnessed his first mobbing of a Negro in the streets of Atlanta, he started to fight racial segregation and discrimination. Walter White was indeed one of the great national leaders of American Negroes, and his name now lives with those other great Americans of his race, with Booker T. Washington, and George Washington Carver.

As secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People from 1929 until his death, Mr. White fought against lynchings and led the fight for a Federal antilynching bill. A lecturer, author of books and magazine articles, stalwart investigator of lynchings, mediator and consultant on various National and United Nations committees, he was ever vigilant, stoutly militant, and showed no hesitancy in bucking public opinion when he thought he was right.

During his lifetime, 3,017 men and women were lynched in the United States, but for the 4 years prior to his death, there had been not a single lynching in this country. Racial bias and discrimination in labor, industry, and in the arts, was on the wane, and desegregation in education was being effected. Thus it was that in the final days of his life he saw the definite trend toward the fruition of his objective, the full recognition of the dignity of all men. In closing, I want to add the tribute of Marjory Jackson, a member of my staff:

Hard the battle
Day had just begun
Fierce the fight
In heat of noontime sun
Peace with twilight
Brought the victory won.
Rest from labors now
Most valiant and illustrious son.

H. R. 5659

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5659 to provide a refund on gasoline used or resold for the operation of motorized equipment for agricultural purposes.

I am cognizant of the fact that Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax in 1932 for general revenue purposes. However, I am convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that the Federal gasoline tax should be levied and earmarked for highway purposes, thereby imposing a tax upon all motor vehicles propelled upon public highways to pay the tax levied by the respective State and the Federal Government.

My home State of Michigan has a constitutional provision which provides that all moneys collected from the tax on motor fuel consumed by motor vehicles using public highways shall be dedicated and used exclusively for highway purposes and the tax on gasoline consumed for all other purposes shall be refunded to the user. I believe this method to be basically sound and in the best interest of the general public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe you are aware of the debate on the floor of the House a year ago when the Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. It was brought out numerous times that the full amount of money derived from the gasoline tax should be appropriated for highway construction, beside the fact that the tax levied on gasoline used for other purposes than highway construction is highly discriminatory. I am convinced that the American farmer is willing to pay his fair share of the cost of building highways, and this should be developed only by the use of the highways and not through a medium of a flat tax on gasoline for purposes other than highway use. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduce H. R. 5659 to provide for the exemption of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes from the Federal gasoline tax. I request that the Committee on Ways and Means, who is handling this legislation, give fair and impartial consideration to the bill I have introduced.

Snagged Refugee Relief Program Needs "Shot in the Arm"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Corsi controversy, I have received hundreds of protests from constituents of Italian origin urging my intercession with the President to speed up the refugee relief program in order that their relatives and loved ones may be permitted to join them in America.

This "entire mess," as it has been called, merely serves again to expose the ineptitude and inability of the Republican administration in matters of human welfare.

Approximately 340,000 persons entered the United States under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act administered humanely and expeditiously under the Democratic administration of President Truman. This in itself proves that our party, as always, has the interests of the little people at heart and again shows that the Republican Party still stands behind big business.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert herewith my letter to President Eisenhower wherein I urged him to appoint an independent agency to handle this program in order to bring it to a successful conclusion by December 31, 1956:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from the many Americans of Italian origin residing in my congressional district protesting the dismissal of Mr. Edward J. Corsi as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Problems.

I think we would find ourselves in agreement that we should not lose sight of the main point, which is the efficient and effective operation of this program.

The records of your office will show that on three occasions since its inauguration I warned against delays and procedural snarls in the administration of this program designed by Congress to aid the refugees and to bring the relatives of Italian citizens to the United States for permanent residence.

As you yourself said when signing the law on August 7, 1953, this legislation was conceived as "a significant humanitarian act and an important contribution toward greater understanding and cooperation among the free nations of the world."

The latest official semiannual report made by the Administrator to you and the Congress, under date of February 8, said only 17,000 visas had been issued to the first of this year—toward the program goal of 209,000.

The report is significantly silent as to the number of persons who had actually been admitted to the United States under this program 16 months after you signed the bill. That figure is about 800.

Thus, the rate of admission was approximately 50 a month. If the same rate continues it would take 4,180 months, or 340 years, to complete the program. Under the law no visas are to be issued under the act after December 31, 1956.

The Administrator's report itself admits the average time for processing a single case up to the issuance of a visa is 126 working days—61 of which are used for investigative purposes. Explanations for this are wordy and illustrated by elaborate charts and statistical tables.

In this matter we are not dealing with statistics, but with human beings to whom we are presumably extending a helping hand; human beings who have been uprooted from their homes, whose lives were wrecked on the tides of war or conquest by subversion.

What can be done about it?

The Congress can and should revise the law to make its terms more liberal from the standpoint of technical procedural requirements. Although I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which handles immigration legislation, I am exerting every effort upon my colleagues to make a thorough investigation of this program and to enact appropriate legislation to remedy the situation as it exists today.

Secondly, a responsibility rests upon you as President to immediately remove from the Department of State to another independent agency under you the authority to make the investigations and reports of the applicants for admission.

This you have the power to do under the act which provides no visas shall be issued except after a thorough investigation and by such investigative agency as the President may designate.

By Executive order dated September 16, 1953, you designated the authority to the Department of State, which authority in turn was delegated to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Mr. President, in all fairness to the citizens of the United States who are in the process of gaining admission to our country for their relatives and friends under the Refugee Relief Act, may I respectfully request that the authority to administer this program be taken out of the hands of the Department of State and delegated to another agency?

To prove that we are sincere in our wish to have the peoples of the world come to America to live, I appeal to you to use your authority to speed up this program and permit the admission of the remaining 209,000 immigrants before the act expires on December 31, 1956.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, M. C.

Duck-Stamp Funds for Acquisition of Waterfowl Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter I have received from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, and to one of the resolutions adopted by the delegates to the 19th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation at Montreal, Canada, on March 11 to 13.

Last year, Congressman LEE METCALF and I spoke out very vehemently against the cut in the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. I voted for the amendment introduced by Congressman METCALF to restore the funds for the waterfowl program. The amendment did not pass and the reduction in funds meant that the Fish and Wildlife Service could not expand the program of acquiring new wildlife refuges, but would have to spend the moneys received from the sale of duck stamps for maintaining the refuge, research, enforcement of waterfowl regulations, printing of the duck stamps, and other administrative costs. Since Congress intended that the extra dollar assessed for the purchase of duck stamps by conservationists be used for the acquisition of wildlife refuges, I and other conservation-minded Congressmen felt that the Department of the Interior should use the additional money for this purpose.

Therefore, on January 13 of this year, I introduced H. R. 2142, one of the bills to which Mr. Callison refers in his letter of April 14. Mr. Callison's letter reads as follows:

APRIL 14, 1955.

The Honorable LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LESTER: We appreciate your continued interest in the proposed legislation to guarantee that a fair share of the duck stamp money will be used for acquisition of waterfowl areas as originally intended.

Bills similar to your H. R. 2142, earmarking 40 percent of the receipts for acquisition, have been introduced in the House by the following: H. R. 37, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE (California); H. R. 597, CLIFTON YOUNG (Nevada); H. R. 4448, JOHN E. MOSS (California); and H. R. 5140, HENRY S. REUSS (Wisconsin).

Anything you can do to secure action on this important legislation will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

Resolution No. 2 adopted at the 19th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation is as follows:

DUCK STAMP FUNDS FOR ACQUISITION OF WATERFOWL AREAS

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior has estimated some 4 million additional acres of lands suitable for waterfowl management and refuge purposes is urgently needed to complete the Federal refuge system and to assure the perpetuation of continental waterfowl resources; and

Whereas the acquisition of desirable wetlands for this purpose is lagging and the resource is gravely endangered by drainage and by other destructive factors; and

Whereas the receipts under the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act have been used largely for maintenance and operation expenses rather than for land acquisition as originally intended: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Wildlife Federation in convention at Montreal, March 11–13, 1955, That the Members of Congress be urged to enact H. R. 37 or similar legislation to earmark at least 40 percent of the duck stamp receipts for acquisition of waterfowl areas; be it further

Resolved, That the Federation study the advisability of increasing the migratory bird hunting license (duck stamp) fee as the only practical means of securing adequate funds to complete the minimum and essential acquisition of suitable waterfowl areas.

Ship Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the costs of ship construction subsidies and ship operating subsidies payable with respect to American-flag ships in our merchant marine have been mounting so rapidly as to cause widespread concern. That concern relates both to the basis for determining the payments and the amounts of the payments.

It is generally conceded, and I firmly believe, that we must have a strong, privately owned and operated merchant marine under the American flag. Apparently, that result cannot be secured without the payment of subsidies. It is high time that we reviewed all phases of that problem and I am, therefore, glad that Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, has introduced a bill which will require that committee to make such a study.

Boone County Pays Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week it was my privilege, along with many of my Hoosier colleagues, to attend a breakfast here sponsored by the REMC's of Indiana. A special feature of the breakfast, in addition to the appearance of Vice President NIXON, was the presentation to the Rural Electrification Administration of a check in final payment of United States Government loans to Boone County (Ind.) REMC.

The presentation, made to Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of REA, represented the final payment by the Boone County REMC of Federal loans totaling $772,926 over a period of 20 years.

This was, in my mind, somewhat of an historic occasion. Next month, we will observe the 20th year of operation of the Rural Electrification Administration. The question automatically presents itself: Has REA been worthwhile?

The Boone County experience convinces me that the answer must be a definite "Yes."

The Boone County REMC obtained its original loan from REA on November 4, 1935, in the amount of $567,926. Subsequently, additional loans were approved, totaling an additional $160,000. These loans have now been repaid in full. Interest charges totaling $182,937.14 also have been paid, so the Federal investment has been a profitable one. Meanwhile, the Boone County REMC has provided electrical service for a total of 3,528 individuals and firms, mainly rural. Source of the supply of power has been, I might point out, private rather than public and the REMC has found it both possible and profitable to maintain this relationship with private suppliers.

The Boone County experience, it seems to me, provides solid evidence of the soundness of the rural electrification program in this Nation. And certainly

it proves, too, that the management of the Boone County REMC has been both provident and successful in its operation.

It is my privilege and pleasure at this time to call the attention of the Members of this House to two brief speeches by officials of the Boone County REMC, Mr. Paul Morton, board president, and Mr. H. E. Antle, manager. The speeches follow:

ADDRESS BY PAUL MORTON

The Boone County REMC directors and manager are here today for a somewhat unique reason. It is unique in the fact that we came to Washington not to ask for some definite consideration. I think you, as Members of the Congress, will agree that the lack of such is within itself at least a little unusual. We are here, though, to voluntarily give something to one of the departments of the Government—a check. This check is a payment that we are making without the least reluctance on our part, which is also somewhat unique. It is the final payment on the loan granted for our electric distribution system.

It is certainly not my purpose to bore you with a long list of events, dealing with the history of our cooperative, but would like to give a few highlights of the development. The original allotment was made July 22, 1935, in the amount of $567,926. This was to build 567 miles of line and serve 2,200 consumers. Since that time there were 5 other loans of $25,000, $54,000, $25,000, $32,000, and $24,000, respectively. That brought the total advance from REA to $727,926. Besides the advance from REA the members have invested from margins $508,292 back into the system. That makes a total of $1,236,218 that has been used in building the plant. At the present time there is a total of 770.74 miles of primary line serving 3,528 consumers. The first line was energized on May 22, 1936.

We are extremely pleased with the financial condition of the cooperative. Besides making the final payment of the loan, we have other investments as follows:

Invested in Government bonds to match the meter deposits made by the members	$34,621.00
Invested in Government bonds and Treasury certificates or almost one-fifth of the depreciation reserve	104,060.00
In bank deposits which is sufficient for normal operation of system	35,507.52

We have an ample and attractive home office and all of our mobile and other equipment is in excellent condition. There is a definite reason why this has all been possible. The average service bill in February 1955 was $12.32 for 508.9 kilowatt-hours, compared with $2.68 for 43.5 kilowatt-hours in January 1938. That is an increase of almost 1,200 percent.

Admittedly Boone County, Ind., has had some advantages which to some degree have helped in the marked accomplishment. It is a rich agricultural county. Density and power utilization are high. The major part of the construction was completed before the war while costs were lower. Climatic conditions are favorable for high consumption of electricity. Also, the rural people of Indiana are cooperatively minded. But I feel I would be lax if I didn't mention at least one thing that this cooperative has proved. First: Any appropriation you as Members of Congress see fit to make for rural electrification and any loan that REA chooses to make to rural people, under proper management, and capable supervision, should stand a good chance to be repaid. The Boone County REMC is definitely rural and almost strictly agricultural. The December billing included:

Farms	3,105
Nonfarms	207
Churches and schools (all rural)	33
Power users	2
Small commercial users (mostly agricultural)	70

About 90 percent of the $38,209 collected that month came from rural agricultural sources.

The second rather pertinent remark I would like to make—this loan has been repaid altogether on private power. In Indiana we do have reasonably favorable wholesale sources of electric power from private companies. I know, this has been considered impossible by some within our own ranks, but it seems that we have proved convincingly that rural electric cooperative does not have to have certain advantages offered by public power.

Not all problems are solved when a cooperative is out of debt. There come certain demands from the membership, such as: When are you going to reduce rates? And what recognition do I have of the portion of my service bill that has been used to retire debt or build the capital structure of the organization? As I said before, Indiana is not without some cooperative experience and we have some striking examples of how a good cooperative should be built and operated. We would like to build a sound businesslike utility—owned and operated by the farmers of Boone County, Ind. To do this we feel that there are a few principles we should follow:

1. Maintain plant in same top condition that it is now in and continue to offer best possible service.

2. Do all financing of future expansion with local (preferably members' capital).

3. Maintain sufficient reserves in form of cash or bonds to meet unanticipated emergency.

4. Be very cautious about, and probably avoid, any drastic rate lowering policy.

5. Recognize capital that members have invested, probably to the extent of paying interest on the same.

Again, being somewhat unique, we would like to first thank you as Members of Congress for making an appropriation establishing REA, which has in turn made it possible for us to own and operate a rural electric distribution system. We have always enjoyed our association with REA, and only because we farmers have been taught that it is thrifty and sound business to pay off the mortgage, that we are happy to be able to sever legal relationships.

ADDRESS BY H. E. ANTLE

In reality this occasion has more significance than the mere assembly by a group of people representing our Government and the Indiana Rural Electric Systems. It is quite fitting and proper that we meet today. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration became a reality and by Executive order was permitted to make loans up to 20 years to responsible agencies for the purpose of constructing rural electric systems for rural American farm folks. At that time less than 1 of every 10 of America's farmers had electric service. A few days from now REA will celebrate its 20th birthday. The presentation of Boone County's final payment here today is a fitting tribute to the foresight of the folks connected with our Government and to our farm folks who shouldered the responsibility of seeing that this agreement was carried out, that the farm folks received electric service and that the loan was paid during its agreed time. Frequently we believe it desirable for all of us to take stock, to examine the promises that we have made to one another, to the farm folks, to the Congress who made the money available for the construction of the system, and to the administrative personnel who have administered the program. A short review shows today that the Boone system has met all of its obligations; that is, every farm family in Boone County who wished electric service has it today, and those same farm folks have contributed a sufficient amount by the use of electricity and their payment of reasonable electric service bills to enable the system to complete its obligation to the Rural Electrification Administration and to pay the final loan in its entirety.

It is our sincere thought that today is just the start of a series of systems on which the Rural Electrification Administration and the Congress have entrusted money on a loan basis to become self-liquidating and to begin repaying their obligations in full to our Government.

If I could be permitted to make two or three comments with respect to the Hoover Commission and its report on the Rural Electrification Administration, and more particularly to page 64 of this report. The report says, "The additional demand for capital by the REA cooperatives have been met wholly from additional REA loans." This is not a true statement. The total investments in the Boone system as of December 31, 1954 amounted to $1,236,218.49. The total demands for all time as loans by the REA amounted to $726,967. The mere subtraction of these two figures shows that our system consumers have invested $509,251.49. It certainly is evident that the additional demands for capital have not been met wholly from additional REA loans. Farther down on this same page we note a statement, "It is obvious that loans are not in fact, self-liquidating, when substantial subsidies remain in effect permanently." The check that has been presented today, together with the figures shown above of the amount invested by our own consumers certainly is evidence that this statement bears a further checking. We have no quarrel to pick with any Government commissions or agencies, in fact we have total respect for all. However we do believe that today, evidence has been shown that the report as submitted to our Congress should be reviewed very carefully before acceptance by the folks who will have to examine and accept or reject this recommendation.

American Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio has, for a number of years been putting on an annual essay contest among the young boys and girls of each of the congressional districts of Ohio. The prize offered has been a free trip to Washington and other eastern points with all expenses paid, and under the guidance of high American Legion State officials and high officials of the ladies auxiliary of the American Legion of Ohio.

One of the leaders of the American Legion who has been prominent in putting on these contests has been Mr. Peter DeWeese. His success has been so consistent that he is assigned this task annually.

The Members of the House of Representatives and the Senator from Ohio have, from the beginning of these contests, been giving a luncheon in honor of the essay winners here in Washington in the Capitol Building, and this luncheon for 1955 was given today. The State commander of the American Legion and the State legion auxiliary representatives were present, and most of the Members of Congress and Senators from Ohio were present. Each of the winners was introduced and given a chance to speak. Each of them in his or her speech showed his or her appreciation of what the Legion and the Members of Congress have done for them. And every Senator and Congressman spoke feelingly about the program of the American Legion, and of the ability and fine purpose shown by the winners, all of whom were present.

One of the prize winners was Miss Anna Belle Lanning, of Murray City, Ohio, which is a fine historical town located in the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which is one of the finest congressional districts in the country, and which is the congressional district which I have had the honor to represent for 30 years.

The American Legion is to be congratulated upon the fine subject which was selected to be the subject about which the essays should be written. The subject was The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today. No more fitting subject could have been selected in these trying times. The young lady from my congressional district surely discussed this timely and important subject most effectively; her essay is logical and shows that she has a brilliant mind, and has a proper spirit. I am glad to have her fine essay printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that it will be read by the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also hope that this brilliant young lady may be able to continue her education, and thereby be able to take her place in the world as a brilliant woman and as a woman of spiritual guidance and influence. Her prize-winning essay is as follows:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

Our free way of life was developed by men and women of deep religious faith. America has always been conscious of the need for religion. The founders of our Republic were sincere and profound men, men who looked to God for guidance. Today our religion and democracy are so strong that they can never be conquered by direct and open attack. They can succumb only to indifference and neglect.

Fortunately for America and for the world, there seems to be developing a spiritual awakening that has been growing in the hearts of men.

Every citizen of every political and religious faith must feel a sense of security in realizing that our distinguished President understands the importance of prayer and faith in God. Mr. Eisenhower recently made the statement, "Only a people strong in Godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves free and others free."

There is nothing strange about the word "spiritual" today. It's on every tongue, in every newspaper column, and in the title contents of some book on almost every bookshelf. There isn't a phase of life where it doesn't apply.

Effectualness is a noun too little used. What evidence we have so far of the effectualness of spiritual guidance in the world today are sufficient to make the free people of the world very thankful for the spiritual guidance they have received down through the years from men and women who were devout Christians.

Increasing interest in religion becomes more evident as time goes by. For example, at the top of the nonfiction best seller list for most of the year of 1953 was a religious book, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's the Power of Positive Thinking. The revised standard version Bible, published in 1952, had sold more than 2,500,000 copies by the end of its second year. Even the old half-forgotten custom of grace before meals was undergoing a revival. The American Legion and the undenominational Laymen's National Committee conducted campaigns to get Americans to say grace. They sent prayer cards with three graces—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—to thousands of restaurants and eating places where they were displayed on menus or tables. In Los Angeles paper napkins were printed on which were written some old-fashioned prayers for parents to give their children to learn.

While commenting on the progress of religion and spiritual guidance in the world today, we must always be alert to the one most dangerous threat to our spiritual freedom—communism. The best way to keep godless communism out of the world is to have a strong, active Christianity everywhere. Christian citizenship is a rock of Gibraltar that will withstand all outside and inside attacks by communism.

The first and the best place for spiritual guidance to begin is in the home. The Scriptures tell us, and I quote, "Bring up a child in the way it should go, and when it is old it shall not depart from this way." It is the duty of every parent to give their children spiritual guidance from the time they are able to understand the meaning of Christianity in order to protect them from the ungodliness in the world today.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, 'mid all the traffic of life's busy ways at the beginning of another week of challenge and of toil, we turn unfilled to Thee. From the framing of laws and the forming of policies holding in their reach the woe or weal of the Commonwealth and of the nations of the earth, we would pause amidst all the shattering events and tempestuous emotions of our times at an inner sanctuary where the world's angry voices die and Thou alone art real.

In facing those who have sworn to destroy our liberties and to enslave the world with fetters for the body and the mind, may we be ever jealous for a just peace; but, while we are harmless as doves, we would at the same time be wise as serpents lest we ourselves be the unwitting agents for betraying and destroying the free heritage of the generations following. May we follow the gleam of the highest and best we know, as it leads o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent till the evening comes and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 25, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Clyde A. Coggins to be postmaster at Nipton, Calif., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4393 (received from the House today, April 25, 1955). A bill to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5106 (received from the House on April 19, 1955). A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to

authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; and

H. J. Res. 256 (received from the House today, April 25, 1955). Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 21, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on April 21, 1955, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 21, 1955,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 21, 1955, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 216) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS DETAILED AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that for the quarter ended March 31, 1955, there was an aggregate of 2,650 Air Force officers in the executive element assigned or detailed to permanent duty at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FOOD AND CLOTHING IN THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on food and clothing in the Government, dated April 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CHINESE EMERGENCY AID PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Chinese emergency aid program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report on the educational exchange operations, by the Department of State, for the calendar year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ATLANTIC AREA COMMAND, EAST COAST AND CARIBBEAN OPERATIONS, MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Atlantic Area Command, East Coast and Caribbean Operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISPOSITION OF SHORTPAID (POSTAGE DUE) MAIL MATTER AND DEAD LETTERS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling and disposition of shortpaid (postage due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the House joint resolution proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States

"Whereas by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, it is proposed to designate and adopt the rose as the national flower of the United States; and

"Whereas the finest qualities cherished by mankind are reflected in the beauty of the rose, which has been the unofficial flower of the State of New York and appears to be the overwhelming choice of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to adopt, with all convenient speed, House Joint Resolution No. 102 or its companion resolution in the United States Senate, which provides that the flower, commonly known as the rose be designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States, and that the President declare such fact by proclamation, and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly,

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk.

"In senate April 2, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States, including the State of Rhode Island, have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purposes of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"'Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Rhode Island to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is the considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Rhode Island the power to restore the proper balance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Court of New Hampshire urges the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 5255 entitled, 'A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire marine memorial' as the first memorial in the United States in honor of men and women who lost their lives at sea in all wars, which is to be erected at Hampton Beach, N. H., now pending in the United States House of Representatives, as introduced by Representative CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of New Hampshire in the Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

"Passed April 12, 1955.

"Attest:

"ENOCH D. FULLER,
"Secretary of State."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

"Whereas the recent dismissal of a high official from the State Department of the United States has created throughout the country varied expressions of dissatisfaction in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make a complete and thorough investigation relative to the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the State Department of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the presiding officer of both branches of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff

"Whereas the bicycle industry represents one of the major industries in several of the small cities and towns of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas many bicycles are being made and brought into the United States from several foreign countries and the rates of pay in these countries for the fabrication of materials and the building of the bicycles is greatly less than the prevailing rates in the United States, therefore making it impossible for the manufacturer in this country to compete in this business; and

"Whereas the United States Tariff Commission has submitted a recommendation to the President of the United States which would greatly help this industry to survive; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby strongly urges the President to accept these recommendations and to take such action which will result in these recommendations being put into effect at once; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and the commission now studying the subject of tariffs."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans, the same as death pensions granted to surviving World War I widows and orphans

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World War I who had 90 days or more of active military service in the Armed Forces of the United States or who were discharged for disability incurred in active military service in less than 90 days, we believe the same legislation should be passed giving the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to surviving widows and orphans of World War I due to the fact that the surviving widows of World War II and the Korean conflict deceased veterans have young children and are very much in need of assistance in caring for their families: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact necessary legislation granting to the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to the surviving widows and orphans of World War I deceased veterans; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution properly authenticated to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress of the United States, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotments for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

"Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas the allotment of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers cannot operate their farms successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

"Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to provide a premium on milling grades of hard spring wheat and to allocate as a minimum to any operator who has raised 100 acres or more of hard wheat during the past 5 years, an acreage equal to the maximum acreage of such operator, but in no event should such allocation if under 100 acres ever be reduced; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution O

"Concurrent resolution opposing repeal of long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long- and short-haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the charging of a higher rate for a short haul than for a longer haul, the shorter being included within the longer, is now forbidden on North Dakota intrastate traffic in section 49-0409 of the North Dakota Revised Code of 1943; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from North Dakota, particularly on grain, lignite, and other commodities, to the detriment of producers, shippers, and consumers of the State of North Dakota; that it would encourage discriminations in rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the

United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a study and investigation into the feasibility of establishing additional manufacturing enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations in this State

"Whereas the establishment of a jewel-bearing plant adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation has provided much needed job opportunities for Indians residing in the area and has brought into productivity a formerly unutilized labor force and has thereby been an aid to the general economy of the area and to the wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas the employment records of the jewel-bearing plant located adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation show that absenteeism and turnover among Indian employees are lower than the national average for similar industries; and

"Whereas the locating of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations is a positive act of providing social and economic opportunities for rehabilitation of and self-help for Indians; and

"Whereas the establishment of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations has proved to be beneficial to the Indians residing on and near such reservations, to the State of North Dakota and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact proper legislation to provide for a thorough investigation and affirmative encouragement for such self-rehabilitating projects which will result in the elimination of dependency and the establishment of a substantial self-supporting status for Indian people; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Director of Defense Mobilization, and to each of the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and to enact new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas by the treaty of annexation of 1897 ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii on September 9, 1897, the Republic of Hawaii did cede to, and by the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898, the United States did accept, the title to the public lands and other public property of the Republic of Hawaii upon terms and provisions retaining for the people of Hawaii the beneficial ownership thereof but providing for the free use and occupancy of such property by the United States for its civil, military, or naval purposes; and

"Whereas in the case of Puerto Rico the United States, with some exceptions, returned to the people the title to the public domain shortly after its acquisition thereof and did not retain a right of free use, as shown by the acts of April 12, 1900 (31 Stat. 77), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 77); and

"Whereas Texas, the only other area which has come under the American flag by the voluntary action of its people, did not cede to the United States its public lands or any right of free use of lands, except the existing public works (5 Stat. 797); and

"Whereas in the case of Hawaii for a period of more than 50 years the United States has been making free withdrawals from the Hawaiian public domain for Federal uses and purposes, and has, by the Hawaiian Organic Act, prohibited the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from altering, amending, or repealing the Hawaiian land laws without the consent of the Congress; and

"Whereas at this time the legal title to the remaining public lands and other public property should be returned to the beneficial owners, the people of Hawaii, and that the legislature should be authorized to enact laws governing the same without the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Congress; and

"Whereas other lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii are subject to the provisions of section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SEC. 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact a bill substantially as follows:

"'A bill transferring to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and enacting new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii

"'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"'SECTION 1. That the United States hereby grants to the Territory of Hawaii the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii, title to which is in the United States, upon the taking effect of this act, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided, however*, That as to any such lands or other property heretofore set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside upon the taking effect of this act, the United States shall retain title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be, subject, however, to the power of the President to restore such lands or other property to the Territory of Hawaii in the manner heretofore provided by section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C. 511), in which event title to such property shall vest in the Territory of Hawaii: *Provided further*, That when any such public property so taken for the uses and purposes of the United States, instead of being used for public purposes is by the United States leased, rented, or granted upon revocable permits to private parties, the rentals or consideration shall be covered into the treasury of the Territory of Hawaii.

"'As used in this section, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the Joint Resolution of Annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded.

"'SEC. 2. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the Congress, and in no other manner.

"'SEC. 3. The legislature of the Territory is hereby authorized to transfer, or provide for the transfer of the lands, title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii pursuant to existing law or vested in the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of this act, to any city, county, or other political subdivision thereof, or to any public corporate body constituted by law.

"'SEC. 4. The legislative power of the Territory over the lands owned by or under the control of the Territory and its political subdivisions shall be exercised only by general laws, except in respect to transfers to or for the use of the Territory, a political subdivision, or any department or agency thereof.

"'SEC. 5. The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29), shall be applicable to the Territory of Hawaii, and the said Territory shall have the same rights as do the States thereunder.

"'SEC. 6. All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property vested in the Territory of Hawaii, or reserving (except as provided in sec. 2) the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 7. Section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act as heretofore amended (48 U. S. C. 663–677b) shall, until and unless otherwise provided by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, remain in effect as a law of said Territory, subject to amendment or repeal by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii without any requirement that the consent of the Congress be obtained in order to make effective such amendment or repeal.

"'SEC. 8. Except as otherwise provided by this act, section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 9. This act shall take effect on its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 18th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relating to harbor improvements, island of Hawaii

"Whereas a harbor at Kawaihae, Hawaii, is a vital need of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has approved the project proposed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 311, 81st Congress, 1st session; and

"Whereas the 10-year commerce forecast for Kawaihae, made 5 years ago, would already be exceeded; and

"Whereas the existing pier facility near Kawaihae, which is capable of handling cargo only to interisland barges, is in very bad structural condition, causing hazardous conditions; and

"Whereas large tonnages of raw sugar are now lightered to deep-sea vessels at the

nearby anchorage of Mahukona at great cost; and

"Whereas the total benefit to commerce would be more than $500,000 annually; and

"Whereas responsible private interests will jointly cooperate to finance, install, and operate bulk sugar storage and handling facilities; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, by its legislature, has authorized the issuance of $1 million in Board of Harbor Commissioners revenue bonds for construction of the initial port facilities; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii are greatly dependent upon ocean commerce, to a far greater extent than any State of the Union; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has received no major Federal harbor improvement in nearly 20 years: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to include in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a harbor at Kawaihae, Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Tulsa, Okla., Chamber of Commerce, relating to the construction of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Maui, Wailuku, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to an annual session of the Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of John M. Keough and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Hemstead Council, Knights of Columbus, Hemstead, and the Lasalle Council, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Republicans Unlimited, Hermosa Beach, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway 2 to the national interstate highway system

"Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that 'There shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico'; and

"Whereas the act further provided that 'The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States,' and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the National system of interstate highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and several other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's highways 9 from New York to Montreal and highway 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

"Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of United States Highway 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a 2-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way; and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

"Whereas while this is a petition from the State of Minnesota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to, and adjacent to United States Highway 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of United States Highway 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of Minnesota and in the other States served by United States Highway 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), Do most earnestly and respectfully request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

"K. S. POLVANG,
"President of the Senate.
"ALFRED F. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 30th day of March in the year of our Lord 1955.

"H. Y. SEAVY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 12th day of April in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 19, 1955.

"ORVILLE O. FURMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States to support measures to insure the continued operation of the American marine hospital system for seamen

"Whereas the nature and type of work performed by the seamen on the American merchant marine operating on the high seas as well as on the Great Lakes is such that it is imperative that adequate hospital facilities be provided for them; and

"Whereas large numbers of residents of the State of Minnesota are beneficially employed as seamen on the Great Lakes and on the high sea; and

"Whereas steps have been taken which if carried out would lead to the destruction of the hospital system built up over many years for seamen: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to insure the continued operation of the hospital system for the American seamen; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and to each

Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"KARL ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives, the 10th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate, the 30th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 5, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas only about one-third of the State of Oregon has been adequately mapped topographically; and

"Whereas topographic maps are essential for proper planning of engineering, hydropower, geological, property tax assessment, and highway investigations; and

"Whereas the State Mapping Advisory Committee has petitioned the United States Geological Survey to step up topographic mapping in the State according to a priority system, as illustrated on a map submitted with the petition: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in regular session assembled, hereby does memorialize the Congress of the United States in order to urge that appropriate action be taken to obtain favorable consideration of the petition in the interest of the State's expanding economy and national defense; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate March 25, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house April 5, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL ATOMIC ENERGY POLICY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the Senate floor I have previously commented on the importance of making available the miracles of peacetime atomic energy to the Nation's great rural electrification system.

I present the text of a resolution which was adopted at the 19th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative in Madison along this same line.

It is 1 of 9 resolutions which had been adopted by some 400 delegates who met to consider a variety of issues facing the Nation's REA system.

It is my intention in the not too distant future to comment further on the significance of nuclear energy to the Nation's farm and rural people, and preceding these comments, I send to the desk now the text of the WEC resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, preceded by the text of the letter to me from Mr. W. V. Thomas, general manager of the cooperative, and that it be thereafter referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Madison, Wis., April 22, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER P. WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Enclosed are copies of 9 resolutions adopted by more than 400 delegates from Wisconsin's 30 rural electric cooperatives who assembled March 30–31 for the 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative in Madison.

I want to particularly call your attention to resolution No. 13—on monopoly.

The WEC meeting this year attracted the largest delegate attendance in our history. The sessions were marked by an enthusiasm heretofore unparalleled. It was personally gratifying for me to see the determination exhibited by both speakers and delegates for a continuing strong REA program, and for a program of concerted action to strengthen their local organizations.

The 9 enclosed resolutions deal with actual or prospective Federal legislation or policy. I was instructed to forward these resolutions to your attention and respectfully urge your fullest consideration of them. It is our sincere hope that your ultimate position on these matters will conform to the stand adopted by these delegates with what I assure you was unexcelled unanimity.

May I take advantage of this opportunity to thank you in behalf of our officers, delegates, and guests for the very warm greeting you sent us at the meeting.

We wish to thank you for past courtesies and support extended our organizations and to express warmest personal good wishes.

Cooperatively yours,
W. V. THOMAS, *General Manager.*

RESOLUTION NO. 7—ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas nuclear fuels promise to provide a means of leveling off traditionally high generating costs in Wisconsin and particularly isolated rural areas of this State; and

Whereas experiments in development of nuclear energy for production of electric power is now considered entirely feasible and promises within a very short time to be competitive costwise with other types of fuel; and

Whereas the people of this Nation have already spent over $13 billion of public funds for development of atomic energy; and

Whereas the United States is engaged in a race with the Soviet Union in the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy as well as military uses and that the one way will be as important as the other in the years ahead: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the delegates at this 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperatives urge the establishment of a Federal atomic energy policy which will insure the rapid development of low-cost power from a program of action which will include participation by public, cooperative, and private power agencies, and that the same protection of the public welfare long established in another field of public resources, that of waterpower, be extended to this new source of energy; now, be it therefore further

Resolved, That we urge that the Rural Electrification Administration add to its staff a sufficient number of nuclear physics specialists as consultants to work in close cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission in order that they might work toward earliest possible practical adaptation of nuclear energy to the generating facilities of electric cooperatives in Wisconsin and elsewhere; now, be it further

Resolved, That we urge the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to add one or more special consultants on nuclear energy in order that our national association may be assured the closest possible liaison with both AEC and REA in this field.

RELEASE OF WATER FOR NAVIGATIONAL PURPOSES, GARRISON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from the Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc., Minot, N. Dak., signed by Ralph Bartel, general manager, enclosing a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that organization, relating to the release of water for navigational purposes at Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL POWER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.,
Minot, N. Dak., March 26, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached is a resolution passed by a joint meeting of the board of directors of Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., and Central in regard to release of water for navigational purposes at Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

At the present time the precipitation in the Missouri Basin is below normal and the starting of Garrison powerhouse may be postponed because of insufficient water. It is hoped that the Corps of Engineers will use discretion in releasing water for navigational purposes this spring and summer.

Central and Minnkota serve 18 distribution cooperatives in North Dakota and Minnesota, who in turn serve some over 65,000 farm families with their electrical requirements.

Yours truly,

RALPH BARTEL,
General Manager.

JOINT MEETING OF DIRECTORS OF MINNKOTA POWER COOPERATIVE, INC., NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. AND CENTRAL POWER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

EXCERPT OF MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF DIRECTORS HELD FEBRUARY 25, 1955

There was a general discussion on the question of the policy of the Corps of Engineers in releasing water at Garrison for navigational purposes and its effect on hydrogeneration. It was the opinion of the group that the water was more urgently needed for the generation of electric power in view of the fact that there is a threat of serious power shortage in the upper Missouri area and, in taking into consideration the small amount of freight traffic on the lower river. After a thorough discussion on this matter, on motion by Mr. Weltin, of Central, seconded by Mr. Marsden, of Minnkota, and unanimously carried, it was

"Resolved, That in the allocation of water for power generation use and for release for

nagivational purposes in the lower Missouri River, that the Corps of Engineers be respectfully requested to give prime consideration to the fact that there will be a critical power shortage in the area served by Garrison Dam because of a current water shortage in the drainage basin which is the source of water supply to this dam, and that it is the sense of this meeting that the requirements for power ought to receive first consideration over requirements for releasing water for navigational purposes, and that water should not be released for navigational purposes at the expense of necessary generation in this area."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE McKENZIE COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the McKenzie County, N. Dak., Farmers Union, relating to wheat acreage, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE DELEGATES OF THE MCKENZIE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED AT CARTWRIGHT, N. DAK., THE 16TH DAY OF OCTOBER 1954

NO. 1

Whereas the reduction of the 90-percent base of parity to a flexible base as low as 82½ percent, and the drastic cut in acreage allotment will reduce the income of the family-type farmer to such an extent that they cannot possibly pay running expenses, and support a family on the farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates of this convention, That we urge Congress to take immediate action to fix a base of 100 acres of wheat to be exempt from any allotment—this to apply to all farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That allotments over the 100-acre base be on a graduated base cut, increasing as the total acreage increases.

NO. 2

Whereas Congress has seen fit to remove a definite base for many farm products and passed in its place a flexible scale of support, thereby establishing an uncertain market; and

Whereas this has caused the market on grain, livestock and dairy products to drop far below parity; and

Whereas agriculture is, and always has been, in America the basic industry whereupon all prosperity depends: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that when Congress meets, immediate steps be taken to guarantee 100 percent of parity on all agricultural products, including livestock and dairy products.

NO. 3

Whereas there is a constant propaganda carried on by those who wish to exploit our national resources for private profits to create distrust in the ability of our Government to handle its business; and

Whereas their assumed fear of Government monopoly and creeping socialism is used only to avert the attention of the real danger—that of control of our Government by powerful corporations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we resent any such propaganda, as a democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people, whose duty it is to provide for the general welfare of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That we recognize that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that we can only lose democracy in America if we fail to avail ourselves of our rights and duties by not keeping ourselves informed on State and National issues and by not going to the polls on election day and casting an intelligent vote.

NO. 4

Whereas there is again to be introduced in Congress a bill (H. R. 2967) for universal military training, a system that has destroyed every nation that has spent its substance in building and maintaining huge armies; and

Whereas if such a bill becomes a law we will definitely become a military nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are definitely opposed to compulsory military training in time of peace.

NO. 5

Whereas this continuous cold war raging in the world today can never bring world peace but only create more hatred between nations; and

Whereas unless some means can be found to end the cold war it will eventually result in a third world war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government to take immediate steps, through diplomatic channels, to work out a plan for coexistence with nations whose ideologies differ from ours.

NO. 6

Whereas we in the farmers union recognize that organized labor has proved to be our good friends and supporters; and

Whereas only by joining our forces can either of us hope to get just laws passed by Congress for our own protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we pledge our support to the American laborers in their struggle to maintain a wage scale sufficiently high to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,
ROY JOHNSON, *President.*
WILLIAM NELSEN,
ERNEST SONDROL,
OLAF ERICKSON, *Secretary.*

CLOSING OF CERTAIN NORTH DAKOTA VETERANS' HOSPITALS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Post No. 4172, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hillsboro, N. Dak., relating to the closing of veterans' hospitals at Minot, and Fargo, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1955.

To: Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
From: Members of VFW Post, 4172, Hillsboro, N. Dak.
Subject: Closure of North Dakota Veterans' Hospitals.

Whereas the Hoover Commission, in a report issued on February 27, 1955 has recommended the closing of Veterans' Administration Hospitals at Minot, D. Dak., and Fargo, N. Dak., along with 17 other VA hospitals; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo and Minot hospitals would create a great and unnecessary hardship on the veterans served by those institutions; and

Whereas the veterans of North Dakota and adjacent area served by those hospitals are as much entitled to VA hospitalization at a point reasonably close to their homes as are veterans residing in more populous areas; and

Whereas the closing of the Minot and Fargo hospitals would require veterans of North Dakota to go either to Minneapolis, Minn.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; or Fort Harrison, Mont., for needed treatment, which points are most inaccessible to North Dakota points, with the exception of Minneapolis, and all of which would require travel of at least 250 miles in practically all cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Post 4172, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at Hillsboro, N. Dak., in duly convened regular meeting, does hereby urge upon each of the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, to use every means at their disposal to prevent this unwarranted discrimination against North Dakota veterans, and to do their utmost to maintain the operations of the Fargo and Minot VA Hospitals.

Attest:

CLARENCE R. BAKKERM,
Commander.
ARTHUR S. MAGNUSON,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTIONS OF LA MESA (CALIF.) REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the La Mesa (Calif.) Republican Club, relating to the treatymaking power, and the repudiation of the Yalta agreement.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF LA MESA REPUBLICAN CLUB, LA MESA, CALIF.

Whereas early in 1945 at Potsdam, Germany, after World War II had been won against Germany, President Harry S. Truman entered into an agreement with the representatives of Great Britain and Russia under which German territory and the city of Berlin were divided into zones of occupation with the city of Berlin completely surrounded by Russian-held territory; and

Whereas the subjects and the terms of that secret agreement have never been revealed by the United States Government nor submitted to the Senate as is required of all treaties under article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution, as follows: "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"; and

Whereas at Teheran, at Casablanca, at Cairo, and upon many other occasions the recent Presidents of the United States have assumed the power to enter into agreements with other nations without submitting those agreements to, nor asking the advice of, the Senate, and have kept many of such agreements secret from the American people to this day; and

Whereas the American people have a constitutional right to know the subjects and terms of treaties involving the Nation and the people and neither the President nor his executive subordinates have ever been granted powers to secretly bind the people of this Nation without the advice and consent of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the La Mesa Republican Club in meeting this 1st day of April 1955, That the President reveal at once the full and unchanged terms of the Potsdam agreement and other Presidential agreements involving the welfare of this Nation, and that the Bricker amendment to the United States Constitution be enacted promptly preventing the assumption of powers to execute secret agreements by the President; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Republican Central Committee of California and to such other organizations and individuals as is deemed advisable.

MAMIE K. ALLEN,
President.
CECILE MCCLELLAN,
Secretary.

Whereas in February 1945 the Yalta Agreement was entered intio by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; by Winston Churchill, Premier of Great Britain; and by Generalissimo Joseph Stalin, Premier of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas that agreement was secretly made without the knowledge or consent of the United States Senate, nor of the Congress, nor of the people of the United States, contrary to article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which read as follows: "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"; and

Whereas that secret agreement has never been submitted to the United States Senate for ratification and has therefore never become a valid treaty binding upon the people of the United States, and, in fact, has only become officially and partially known to our Congress and our people 10 years later, in March 1955; and

Whereas by that agreement the aforesaid heads of government consented to Russian domination of many territories, properties, and rights of the Republics of China and Korea and territories of the Japanese Empire and of several nations of Eastern Europe, without their knowledge or consent, thereby aiding in the enslavement of 600 million people by the Communist tyrants—all of which is abhorrent to the Christian ideals of our American Republic and has resulted in the Korean war and the present prospects of war in Asia; and

Whereas the terms of that secret agreement have been flagrantly violated by the Soviet Government, thereby releasing the other parties thereto from any vestige of obligation in an invalid and uncompleted treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the La Mesa Republican Club in meeting this 1st day of April 1955, That the Senate and House of Representatives, by joint resolution, repudiate the said Yalta Agreement, declare it null and void, and publish to the whole world the determination of the United States to take every step possible toward restoration of the liberties of those millions enslaved by Soviet treachery; and be it further

Resolved, That we join with Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND in his advocacy of an unyielding opposition to any further Communist aggression in the Far East, and that the Republics of China and of South Korea be aided in the prevention of such further Communist aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That the Bricker amendment to the United States Constitution be promptly passed by the Senate and House of Representatives and the State legislatures, preventing the assumption of such powers by the Executive, as was attempted at Yalta; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Republican central committee of California and to such other organizations and individuals as is deemed advisable.

MAMIE H. ALLEN, *President.*
CECILE MCCLELLAN, *Secretary.*

INCENTIVES FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION OF DURUM WHEAT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by county presidents of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, at Jamestown, N. Dak., relating to incentives for additional production of durum wheat.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON DURUM INCENTIVES

We, the county presidents of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, meeting together in Jamestown, N. Dak., March 31, 1955, wish to go on record against the principle, presently advocated by some, offering nonrecourse loans—loans which do not have to be repaid—and offering disproportionately high levels of parity supports to commodities in order to build up supplies. We believe such actions to be against the best interests of sound price support programs. We refer specifically to the current efforts being made to secure additional durum production in North Dakota through such incentive actions.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF MINOT (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minot, N. Dak., Farmers Union Local, favoring 109-percent parity prices for farmers.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Berry bill (H. R. 3654) is another blow below the belt aimed at farmers by this administration. We vigorously condemn the passage of this bill; and

Whereas in the case of perishables such as cattle, hogs, eggs, potatoes, and so forth, we recommend that Congress declare producers to be entitled 100 percent of parity. That they be permitted to produce and market perishables for whatever price consumers demand permits, and that the Federal Government make up by means of compensatory payments any difference between 100 percent of parity and price received. Such legislation would benefit not only farmers but would be to the economic best interest of the entire Nation by helping to achieve full employment and prosperous economic growth of the entire Nation; and

Whereas we demand that farmers be given the same deal as Dixon-Yates contract, a 25-year contract guaranteeing the farmer 109 percent of parity.

Passed unanimously this 15th day of March 1955, by the Minot Farmers Union Local.

HENRY HILLINS, *President.*
LEITH, N. DAK.

REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS PRICES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., endorsing the mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills purporting to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the matter of regulation of natural gas prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE PASSAGE BY CONGRESS OF H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we endorse the formation of a mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills purporting to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the matter of regulation of natural gas prices. Further, that we endorse participation by the mayor of the city of Minneapolis in such committee program. Further, that Mayor Eric G. Hoyer be requested to immediately contact the mayors of Minnesota communities now served with natural gas with a view to securing their active opposition to the above-mentioned legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the League of Minnesota Municipalities be requested to immediately contact Minnesota communities, including those expecting future service of natural gas, to undertake active opposition to the foregoing legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to transmit forthwith copies of this resolution to Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia, Pa., Clarence Ludwig, secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, Charles Rhyne, general counsel of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and to each Member of the House and Senate in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed April 7, 1955.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved April 7, 1955.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

OPPOSITION TO CHANGES IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the East Central Electric Association of Braham, Minn., opposing the changes in the Rural Electrification Administration recommended by the Hoover Commission Task Force Report.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the task force of the Hoover Commission in their report has recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be eliminated as a direct Government

agency, and that the REA Cooperatives obtain private financing; and

Whereas this report has created an impression by implication that a 5-year moratorium period at the beginning of the loan term gives less than a 2-percent return on the loans to the Government; and

Whereas the REA program through financing of loans for the construction of rural electric lines has in no way been subsidized by the Government, but are all on a self-liquidating basis; and

Whereas the statement by the Hoover Commission report of a 5-year moratorium on loans is not a true statement, but is actually a deferred interest item added to the principal of the loan; and

Whereas the Government has made a profit on REA loans made to REA Associations; and

Whereas the REA would be required to obtain financing from private sources which would result in an interest rate of from 4 percent to 5 percent, in place of 2 percent now in effect; therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the East Central Electric Association, assembled at their annual meeting this 19th day of March 1955, That we go on record to memorialize Congress and the President to continue the REA Act in its present form; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all the Members in Congress from Minnesota, Senators THYE and HUMPHREY.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS AT MINOT AND FARGO, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by Post, No. 5252, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pelican Rapids, Minn., stating their opposition to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to close the Veterans' Administration Hospitals at Minot and Fargo, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Hoover Commission, in a report issued on February 27, 1955, has recommended the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals at Minot, N. Dak., and Fargo, N. Dak., along with 17 other VA hospitals; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo and Minot hospitals would create a great and unnecessary hardship on the veterans served by those institutions; and

Whereas the veterans of the ninth district and adjoining counties served by the Fargo hospital are as much entitled to VA hospitalization at a point reasonably close to their homes as are veterans residing in more populous areas; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo veterans' hospital would require veterans of the ninth district and adjoining counties to go either to Minneapolis, Minn.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; or Fort Harrison, Mont., for needed treatment, which points are most inaccessible to northwest Minnesota points, with the exception of Minneapolis, and Minneapolis is over 400 miles from most northwest points: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Post, No. 5252, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at Pelican Rapids, Minn., in duly convened regular meeting on April 5, 1955, does hereby urge upon each of the Senators and Representatives from Minnesota to use every means at their disposal to prevent this unwarranted discrimination against Minnesota ninth district veterans, and to do their utmost to maintain the operations of the Fargo, N. Dak., veterans' hospital.

Attest:

Jay S. Hauger, Commander; Carl A. Kantrud, Adjutant; Gilman Risset; Donald Erickson; Melfu I. Salter; Donald Monson; Rex R. Crews; Alvin Brenden; Ralph Ballard; Leonard Hays; James O. Peterson; Earl Gobel; Andrew Christensen; Alf P. Anderson; Harry Siggerud; Orphie L. Holt; Arthur Rust; Orval Jensen; L. E. Christopherson; Orville Kind; Ole Brodalin; Arthur Trosvik.

WITHDRAWAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON COMPLETION OF GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Jamestown requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet, and thereby assure the greatest potential benefits of the project.

This is very important, not only for the good citizens of North Dakota, but since a substantial portion of the State of Minnesota is in the Missouri River Basin, I have particular interest in this project and in its public power resources.

Similar resolutions have been received from the following groups interested in maximum benefit from the operation of Garrison Dam: Minot (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce; City Council of Maddock, N. Dak.; City Council of Wahpeton, N. Dak.; Board of Ransom County Commissioners, North Dakota; City Council of Esmond, N. Dak.; Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Hillsboro (N. Dak.) Civic and Commerce Association; Fessenden (N. Dak.) Civic and Commerce Association; Wells County (N. Dak.) Farmers' Union; Minnewaukan (N. Dak.) Commercial Club; Benson County VFW Post, No. 4251, Esmond, N. Dak.; Anamoose Civic Club, Anamoose, N. Dak.; South Cottonwood Farmers' Union Local, No. 48; Sheyenne Valley Rod and Gun Club, Warwick, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Richland County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Eddy County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, LaMoure County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Ward County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Pierce County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Mountrail County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Bottineau County, N. Dak.; County Commissioners, Benson County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Cass County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Wells County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Traill County, N. Dak.; City Council of Rugby, N. Dak.; City Council of Harvey, N. Dak.; City Council of Casselton, N. Dak.; City Commission of Devils Lake, N. Dak.; City Commission of New Rockford, N. Dak.; City Council of Bottineau, N. Dak.; City Council of Carrington, N. Dak.; City Council of Streeter, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Mandan, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.; City Council, McClusky, N. Dak.; City Council, Cooperstown, N. Dak.; City Council, Minot, N. Dak.; City Commission, Hillsboro, N. Dak.; City Council, Lakota, N. Dak.; City Council, Anamoose, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Turtle Lake, N. Dak.; City Council, Oakes, N. Dak.

Mr. President, I am bringing the attention of the Senate to these resolutions because they supplement the resolutions I have received from my own State of Minnesota. The western part of Minnesota has a great stake in the extra power reserves that would only be available with the high-level dam and I support the resolutions for the 1,850-foot pool back of the Garrison Dam.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas through the combined efforts of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, and other interested agencies, it has been determined that the maximum operating pool level for the Garrison Reservoir should be established at 1,850 feet for greatest efficiency and to assure the greatest potential benefits of the project; and

Whereas approximately 300,000 people living in the James River and Sheyenne River Valleys of North Dakota and additional 200,000 along the James River in South Dakota would receive the greatest benefits from the maximum operating level of the Garrison Reservoir; and

Whereas the people in the James and Sheyenne River Valleys future water supply is contingent on the operation of the Garrison Reservoir it is therefore resolved that we ask the Congress of the United States to see that no restrictive phrases should be retained in the bill covering appropriations for the Garrison Reservoir: Be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations and chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Works; to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Works, and chairman, Public Works Appropriations; and to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Attest:

W. F. SHARP, *Mayor,*
O. L. OCHONAN,
City Auditor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1763. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 217).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 222).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 14. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas (Rept. No. 218); and

S. 148. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa (Rept. No. 219).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 653. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 220); and

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 221).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 223).

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 224).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1271. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 227); and

S. 1272 A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 228).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness (Rept. No. 225);

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week (Rept. No. 226).

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 229)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is my privilege to submit to the Senate the favorable report, with amendments, of the Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 8, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives caused by disaster, whenever such vacancies total more than half of the authorized membership of the House.

In submitting this report, it seems to me that this joint resolution is a timely recognition of an existing gap in the constitutional provisions providing for representative government. This is no criticism of the Founding Fathers, for they could not have been expected to anticipate the technological advances in warfare whereby whole cities, including the seat of Government of the United States, may be destroyed.

While all of us believe in and support, the provisions of the Constitution which make the Congress responsive to the electorate, nevertheless, in our day and time we must realize that it is possible for a large part of the membership of the House of Representatives to be destroyed, thereby rendering that body incapable of exercising its constitutional functions. Of course, the Senate might likewise lose a large proportion of its membership in an atomic attack. But the Constitution provides a mechanism whereby governors may appoint persons to serve as Senators until the people can fill the vacancies by elections, so that the Senate could be reconstituted within a short period of time. But governors have no such authority, under our Constitution, insofar as Members of the House of Representatives are concerned. It seems to me that it would be a reprehensible omission if the Congress did not take as much cognizance of its own ability to function in time of disaster as it does of the other aspects of the problem created by the development and perfection of atomic weapons. During those fateful days, no State or district should be compelled to be inactive while representatives of the remaining districts consider and enact legislation vitally affecting their lives.

Mr. President, I submit the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 8, and express my fervent hope that the Senate will consider the resolution at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution and ask that it be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to Constitutional Rights, the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON ARMY SIGNAL CORPS—SUBVERSION AND ESPIONAGE (S. REPT. NO. 230)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage," prepared by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which was ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 231)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the annual report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. Robert Alexis McClure, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States;

John J. Murphy for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of captain;

William C. Fisher and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. John William Harmony and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy.

Mr. BYRD. In addition to the above reports, I report a group of 1,333 routine nominations in the Army in the grade of captain and below, and 670 nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps in the grade of captain and below. Since these names have already appeared in the RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Shih Lu Chang and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert C. McFaddan, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana, vice Julius J. Wichser, resigned.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; and

S. 1779. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1780. A bill to require that a State home for disabled veterans must make at least 50 percent of the beds in such home available for domiciliary care in order to qualify for Federal assistance under the act of August 27, 1888; and

S. 1781. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1782. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 1783. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1784. A bill for the relief of Max Schaffner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Gennaro DeLucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1786. A bill to permit the States to tax wine and distilled spirits purchased on, or for delivery into, military reservations and other Federal areas, unless purchased for use or resale by the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1787. A bill for the relief of Edith Kalwies; and

S. 1788. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth M. de Mik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1789. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels; and

S. 1791. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1792. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1793. A bill for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1794. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to redefine the term "refugee," to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 1795. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1796. A bill for the relief of Martha Fries Moskal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1797. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1799. A bill to amend section 203 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1800. A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1801. A bill for the relief of Milan Kovacevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1802. A bill to extend the Small Business Act of 1953 for 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO CREDIT FOR CERTAIN INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS PAID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1778) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Higher education has become a necessity, not a luxury, in America today.

The nature of our society has become so complex that we can no longer afford to have an under-educated people. We need technicians in all fields of endeavor. What is more, we need people trained in the humanities—people whose horizons have been broadened to understand the world in which we really live today.

We of America prize ourselves on our educational system—the finest in the world.

The fact of the matter is, however, that there are great numbers of promising American youngsters who do not get the benefit of higher education. Of those young Americans in college and studying for higher degrees, very considerable numbers of them experience real difficulties trying to make ends meet during their years of education.

There are innumerable parents in America today who have to sacrifice a good deal in order to put their youngsters through college, even though many of the youngsters earn part of their way by after-hour vocations.

I believe that the United States Government, as a part of its tax policy, should encourage, not discourage education.

I believe that it should give a break to people who want to improve themselves by getting higher education. It should give a break to parents of youngsters who want to see their children get the benefit of the world of learning.

It is for this purpose that I am offering this bill today. It is comparable to numerous other bills already introduced in the House of Representatives.

Its key phrase is that "there shall be allowed to an individual as a credit against (his over-all taxes) an amount equal to 30 percent of the aggregate amount paid during the taxable year by such individual to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees * * *"

The amendment would go into effect to cover tuition paid after December 31 of last year; that is, it would include 1955 payments.

This is but one of numerous changes in the Nation's tax laws which I feel are necessary in order to liberalize the tax program

and provide a square deal for those who are overly burdened by it.

It is useless for us to talk about a shortage of engineers, a shortage of doctors, and of other professionals; it is useless for us to talk about our competitive race for technical superiority against the Soviet Union unless we simultaneously take active steps to promote higher education in our land.

This suggestion today, in the form of the bill which I am introducing, is but one phase of meeting the overall problem of modern education.

I shall offer from time to time other proposals which I hope will receive the sympathetic consideration of the Congress.

INCLUSION OF LAWYERS UNDER OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a long time I have been deeply interested in expanding the coverage of the Nation's old-age and survivors insurance system.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the coverage of the act to one particularly vital group on the American scene. I refer to the members of the American bar. This bill will offer them the right of optional coverage for a 2-year period.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, which I have prepared on this subject, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point to be followed thereafter by typical expressions from bar associations from my State recommending coverage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and related matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1779) to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement and related matters, presented by Mr. WILEY, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Nation's social security system has proved itself.

It has become a part and parcel of the American free enterprise system serving to help sustain it from economic shocks of loss of income, serving to ease the problem of insecurity in elderly years.

Congress acting in accordance with President Eisenhower's wise suggestion has added more groups under OASI coverage.

Only a relatively few groups now remain outside the system, and this is largely at their own request.

Of late, however, there are more and more indications that many groups which have heretofore desired to be outside the system, now desire coverage under it.

The American bar is one such group.

MY CONSULTATION WITH WISCONSIN BAR

I have personally inquired of the position of the Wisconsin Bar Association, of county bar groups and individual attorneys at law. I find more and more county bar associations and more and more individual lawyers indicate to me that the overwhelming proportion of their numbers want to be included.

A very sizable number however, do not want compulsory coverage.

Under the circumstances, I believe that optional coverage should be granted, since optional coverage is apparently generally preferred.

But what of the Federal Government's attitude toward optional coverage?

The traditional problem in connection with optional coverage is that it has raised significant administrative problems, but, more important, serious financial problems from the standpoint of the trust fund.

Older individuals—soon to retire—tend to want to come in under the social security system and to draw considerable benefits therefrom on the basis of relatively few premiums paid in. On the other hand, younger individuals prefer not to be included now, since they will be paying in for many, many years before drawing benefits, ordinarily.

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES VOLUNTARY, WANTS MANDATORY COVERAGE

Therefore, the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have opposed optional coverage, preferring that coverage be on a mandatory basis for young practitioners and old alike.

I believe, however, that optional coverage as in the instance of clergymen, is both feasible and desirable.

That is why I am offering a voluntary coverage bill today.

A provision has been included in my bill to require individuals to decide upon their personal inclusion within 2 years. This is an essential requirement in order to ease and simplify the very considerable bookkeeping and cost problem of the Social Security Administration.

This means, in effect, that a young man coming out of law school and passing the bar examination, would have 2 years in which to make up his mind whether or not he wanted to be included. So would an older practitioner.

While the 2-year limitation for the decision one way or the other may appear rather strict, in point of fact, it is the very minimum. The Social Security Administration feels this minimum is essential as a safeguard to it in the problem of administering the complex program efficiently.

The Administration, I may say, remains opposed to optional coverage at all. But at least, this 2-year requirement will go part of the way in order to meet the Administration's objection.

THIS BILL PROVIDES BASIS FOR FURTHER REVIEW

This bill today is not by any means offered as the last word on the subject. I hope instead that it will help stimulate the Congress and the people toward a careful review of this whole problem of coverage.

As an attorney-at-law myself for over 30 years, I know that few groups play so crucial a role in our free-enterprise economy as do American lawyers.

I FAVOR TAX ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SAVINGS FOR OLD AGE

Included in the new consideration which I am suggesting today, should be the question as to how, under the tax laws, we can promptly and more equitably encourage individuals to save up for their own retirement income in later years.

This problem is particularly applicable in the case of attorneys, doctors, dentists and other professionals. Most of them try to build up nest eggs for their later years, but find themselves so heavily taxed in their productive years as to be unable to build up sufficient income.

MANY LAWYERS ALREADY INCLUDED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Insofar as attorneys are concerned, I should like to point out that already, a great many lawyers are covered under the personal security systems. Attorneys working for the Government are included in the Governmen't civil service retirement system; attorneys working for large corporations are covered under the OASI; attorneys with careers in the Armed Forces are covered under military retirement plans.

From an actual or other standpoint, I do not see any fundamental reason why, from the intrinsic nature of the legal profession, attorneys in practice for themselves should remain excluded, provided they want to come in.

I hope, therefore, that this optional coverage will be rapidly considered, and I hope that more and more members of the American bar will crystallize their thinking as to their precise wishes in this matter.

THANKS TO BADGER BAR

I want to thank the Wisconsin Bar Association for its expressions to me on this subject and to thank all of the many other bar groups and individuals for their helpful comments.

Many responded to an inquiry as to lawyers' own preferences which I had placed in my weekly newsletter to Wisconsin. These responses to the newsletter inquiry were virtually 100 percent in praise of my effort to bring the problem to the fore.

There follow now excerpts from a letter which I had requested from a legislative attorney of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, describing application of my new bill.

Then come the grassroot expressions from Badger bar groups.

EXCERPTS FROM HEALTH DEPARTMENT LETTER

The Department letter incidentally reiterated that the Department does not favor voluntary coverage.

Nevertheless, the Department advised by way of background to my bill for voluntary coverage:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Before enacting the social-security amendments of 1954 the Congress gave careful consideration to President Eisenhower's proposal that old-age and survivors insurance coverage be extended to self-employed lawyers and other self-employed professional groups not covered by the program. Conflicting viewpoints in regard to the coverage of certain of these self-employed professional groups, including lawyers, were presented to the Congress. In some cases the Congress apparently was not certain that a majority of the members of particular groups wanted to be covered. These groups, and among them self-employed lawyers, therefore, continue to be specifically excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare believes that, generally speaking, the need of lawyers for old-age and survivors insurance protection is comparable to that of many self-employed persons and wage earners who are now covered under the program.

* * * * *

You also expressed a desire to have some indication of the amount of coverage required for self-employed lawyers, now at or near age 65, to be eligible for old-age insurance benefits. To be eligible for such benefits, an individual must be fully insured. He is, generally, fully insured if he has not less than one quarter of coverage for each two of the calendar quarters elapsing after 1950 (if he was then 21 or over) and prior to the quarter in which he attains age 65 (or dies). He must, however, have a minimum of six quarters of coverage. The maximum required is 40 quarters of coverage.

A self-employed individual is credited with 4 quarters of coverage for each year in which he has net income from such self-employment equal to $400 or more. If he has less than $400 of such income, he earns no quarters of coverage from it.

In order to avoid a serious handicap to the groups newly covered under the amendments to the Social Security Act enacted last year, an alternative method of securing fully insured status was provided. Under this method, an individual is insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and prior to July 1, 1956, or, if later, the quarter in which he became 65 (or died) are quarters of coverage.

Under these rules, the following are some examples of the number of quarters of coverage required to be eligible for retirement benefits:

Number of quarters of coverage to be insured

Attains age 65 on or before:

June 30, 1954	6
June 30, 1955	[1] 8
June 30, 1957	[2] 12
June 30, 1959	[3] 16

[1] Or, under the alternative method, 6 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 and before July 1, 1956.

[2] Or, under the alternative method, 9 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 and before April 1, 1957.

[3] The alternative provision is no longer beneficial since it would require more than 16 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 in this and all cases of attainment of age 65 at a later date.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS FROM UNITED STATES BAR GROUP

RICE, RICE & RICE,
SPARTA, WIS., *January 17, 1955.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a member of the house of governors of the Wisconsin Bar Association, I have polled all the members of the Monroe County Bar Association on the question of social security for lawyers, and I find that 14 members are for it and 1 is against it.

Yours truly,

Z. S. RICE.

FUGINA, KOSTNER, QUINN & WARD,
Arcadia, Wis., January 5, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I understand that a bill will be introduced in Congress to extend social security coverage for lawyers. Members of the Tri-County Bar Association, to which we belong, are heartily in favor of this, and I hope you will do all in your power to secure its passage. As it stands today, the elimination of lawyers from coverage is very unfair. With best wishes to you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE E. FUGINA.

SAUK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
February 15, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have polled the members of our bar association to determine their views upon social security coverage for attorneys.

Of the 24 members responding out of a total membership of 30, 6 reported in favor of compulsory coverage for attorneys while 18 were opposed. Of these 18, 16 approved optional social security coverage for attorneys.

We trust that you will take this expression of opinion as well as those of the other associations throughout the State into account at such time as the Congress considers this matter.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. KARCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LA CROSSE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
La Crosse, Wis., February 7, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The La Crosse County Bar Association was polled in the month of January 1955 as to whether the members would be in favor of attorneys being included under the social security system.

The following results were obtained: Of 65 members polled 44 were in favor of such inclusion and 21 were opposed to such inclusion. Stated in percentages 68 percent of the members polled were in favor of being included under social security while 32 percent were opposed.

Very truly yours,

G. M. SNODGRASS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MANITOWOC, WIS., *November 23, 1954*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: By unanimous vote of the members in attendance at a meeting of the Manitowoc Bar Association Wednesday, November 17, 1954, the secretary was instructed to inform the United States Senators from Wisconsin and all of the Congressmen from Wisconsin that the association was in favor of having attorneys included under the Social Security Act.

The Secretary was also instructed to inform the secretary of the State Bar Association and the office of the American Bar Association of this action.

Very truly yours,

DONALD J. BERO,
Secretary, Manitowoc County Bar Assoc.

WAUPACA, WIS., *January 5, 1955.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In December 1954, at a meeting of the Waupaca County Bar Association and at numerous meetings prior thereto, the Waupaca County Bar Association have adopted resolutions favoring the extension of the benefits of social security to lawyers.

I certainly hope that you will use your good efforts to have the benefits of social security extended to the lawyers at this session of Congress.

I also want to take this opportunity to inform you that I, along with a lot of others in this State feel that you are doing an outstanding job as Senator from the State of Wisconsin, and I believe I voice the sentiment of the thinking people of this State.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL MCHENRY.

WAUSAU, WIS., *February 16, 1955*

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to congratulate you on the good work you are doing down there in Congress and hope you will continue to do so.

With all the spending of public money outside of the United States it has occurred to me that it might not be amiss for Congress to amend the old-age assistance law and provide assistance to all persons over 65 years of age. For your information, the Marathon County Bar Association passed a resolution at the last meeting urging old-age asistance for lawyers and the resolution provided it should be compulsory. There was no dissenting vote.

Personally I think it is a good law and I think it should apply to the lawyers, doctors, and any others who have been left out as well as those who are now being taken care of, and I feel justly sure that you agree with me.

On behalf of the bar association of Marathon County may I urge you to use your influence to amend the law to so provide old-age asistance to the lawyers of the country.

Wishing you the best of success.

Yours very truly,

LUKE F. BURNS.

KENOSHA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Kenosha, Wis., February 21, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: A recent poll of the members of this organization indicates that the major sentiment is opposed to compulsory social security for lawyers.

It would further appear that some type of voluntary plan would be the most acceptable to this group.

We urge that you give our position consideration at such time as any legislation of this nature is introduced in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. MALLOY, *Secretary.*

DISTRIBUTION OF SALK INFANTILE-PARALYSIS VACCINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that on yesterday the Washington Star published an article stating that it might be 4 or 5 weeks before there would be distribution of the vaccine to combat poliomyelitis, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile-paralysis vaccine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1781) authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile-paralysis vaccine, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN GARRISON DAM, N. DAK., AND SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam, in North Dakota, and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving the river for navigation between such points. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement I have prepared, entitled "Missouri River, Proposed Preliminary Survey To Determine Whether Navigation May Be Extended Between Sioux City, Iowa, and Garrison Dam, N. Dak." I may add that the St. Lawrence Seaway does not help the farmers of the Midwest as much as it would if navigation on the Missouri River could be extended all the way to Garrison Dam, which would result in the saving of millions upon millions of dollars in freight charges paid by the farmers, businessmen, and laboring men of the Northwest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1782) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the

Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army shall cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

MISSOURI RIVER—PROPOSED PRELIMINARY SURVEY TO DETERMINE WHETHER NAVIGATION MAY BE EXTENDED BETWEEN SIOUX CITY, IOWA, AND GARRISON DAM, N. DAK.

Rivers are the mothers of civilization. Through the pages of history flow the great stream names of the world: Tigris-Euphrates, Nile, Danube, Volga, Yangtze, Po, Rhine—rivers fabulous and lore laden.

But it is not of those rivers in faraway lands that I intend to speak today—but of a stream in North America that has channeled the lives of men—that has conditioned the thinking, the economy, the ways of life of a State and a Nation, the Missouri, also called by persons living along its banks The Big Muddy.

The watersheds of the Missouri and the Mississippi enfold all the creeks and rivers so important to our soil, wildlife, transportation, and well-being.

The waterway formed by the Mississippi River from its mouth to its confluence with the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Louis and thence up the Missouri River to its headwaters is the longest river in the world—and the Missouri River is by a considerable margin the longer of the two rivers which form this waterway. Over 2,460 miles in length, the Missouri River originates on the slopes of the Continental Divide in Yellowstone National Park and southwestern Montana and it winds a tortured course to the north, south, and east. On the way, it drains all or a part of 10 States and flows through 7 of them. The natural basin of the Missouri River covers 516,000 square miles or 17.3 percent of the entire continental United States.

At the turn of the 19th century, the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains was primitive land which had successively been the property of the Spanish and French Governments. In the year 1803, ownership of the vast region known as Louisiana Territory was transferred once again, this time to the United States. Our Government regarded the acquisition of the area now known as the Missouri River Basin, which formed a part of the Louisiana Territory, as secondary in importance to the control of the trade outlet at the mouth of the Mississippi River.

In 1764 St. Louis was established as a fur depot and for many years commerce on the Missouri, moving in canoes, pirogues, bullboats, mackinaws, and keelboats were tied to the fur trade. It was not until 1804–06 when Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark of the Corps of Engineers made their memorable exploration that the real importance of the Missouri River Basin was discovered. The Missouri River, together with its 30 major tributaries played an important part in the development of the basin. As a natural trafficway, it provided the only conveyance for many commodities, and supplied a profitable living for rivermen who plied their craft upstream as far as Fort Benton, Mont., in spite of frequent Indian attacks, treacherous currents, floating debris, and many other hazards.

With the coming of the railroad, however, traffic on the Missouri declined. In the year 1884, the Federal Government established the Missouri River Commission and endowed it with responsibility for improvement work in the interest of navigation on the Missouri River. After extensive experimentation and study, the Commission initiated regulation work adapted to the characteristics of the Missouri River.

In 1902 the improvement work was assigned to the Corps of Engineers and this organization has been responsible for all projects concerning the Missouri ever since; but it was not until 1927, 25 years later, that any consideration was given to navigation projects on this great river.

During the years 1929 to 1934, comprehensive studies were made by the Corps of Engineers of the principal river basins in the Missouri River watershed. These studies, prepared under the provisions of House Document 308, 69th Congress, formed a basis for later, more detailed investigation and planning. Construction of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir was authorized in 1933 and in the Rivers and Harbors Acts of August 30, 1935, and May 18, 1938, Congress approved construction of the dam and appurtenant works and a suitable powerplant for the production of hydroelectric power, for the purpose of improving navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth, and for other purposes incidental thereto.

In the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1946, Congress took cognizance of the fact that destructive floods constitute a menace to the National welfare and the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of navigable waters or their tributaries, for flood-control purposes, if the benefits accruing exceed the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of people are adversely affected.

The history of the Missouri River Basin development program is in a sense the history of the settlement of the West, of the pioneer farmers and their government, who, through good years and bad, through flood and drought, developed a system of agriculture dictated by the climatic adversities of that region.

The Missouri River is the last major stream of the Mississippi system to be improved and it has been harnessed step by step and made to work for man. Today this river is no longer the untamed, rampaging dangerous and unpredictable stream it used to be. It has been brought under control so that now navigation on this great river is possible to within 128 river miles south of Sioux City. But this is not enough. Not nearly enough when you consider that the area of the Missouri River basin comprises 17 percent of the entire continental United States and that 10 million people live there. The potentialities of this great region of our country are practically unknown.

This is the region we must look to in the future. With the discovery of petroleum in the Williston basin, large reserves of lignite in North Dakota, large reserves of low-grade manganese in South Dakota, huge quantities of yet untapped mineral resources in the upper basin, all of which commodities will eventually be brought into commercial use—think of the savings if this freight could have been transported by water rather than by rail.

According to a detailed survey made by the Corps of Engineers, even today, without taking into account any of these minerals, approximately 4 million tons of freight were available which could have been transported economically by water if navigation had been possible.

As a concrete example, let me give you a few statistics to prove how water traffic has increased from 1950 to 1953:

	Tons
1950	1,609,304
1951	2,201,011
1952	2,853,562
1953	2,942,483

The principal items of freight traffic reported for the year 1953 were as follows:

	Tons
Waterway improvement material	1,852,392
Sand, rock, gravel	330,710
Crushed limestone	203,243
Motor fuel	41,556
Steel products	39,605
Wheat	23,289
Molasses	14,583

Of course the reason for this increase in water traffic must be obvious to anyone—water transportation is cheaper. In the Wall Street Journal of February 8, 1955, under an article entitled "Rivermen Hail the 'Fencing in' of Mighty Missouri; They See Thirtyfold Tonnage Boost in Next 10 Years," it is alleged that wheat moving by barge from Omaha to St. Louis goes for $2.25 per ton, whereas the rail rate is $8.40; that steel from St. Louis to Kansas City is shipped by barge for $2.58 per ton, but by rail at $11.96. Now the Missouri River Basin is admitted to be the greatest grain growing area in the world—just think what this saving in the cost of transportation would mean to the farmers.

The extension of navigation on the Missouri may be justified on yet another ground—that the railroad companies are discriminatory in their rates and are not equipped to handle the freight during peak seasons. In some harvest seasons, there develops a boxcar shortage which results in grain spoilage. Barges on the river would provide extra capacity for such peak shipping seasons.

And so I ask you, What are we going to do about it? Are we going to sit here and let these farmers continue to be robbed? Let the railroads say what they will or will not ship and when they will ship it?

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind but what these wheat growers living along the banks of this great river are entirely at the mercy of the railroads. If the farmer does not agree to pay this exorbitant rate, the railroad won't ship his crop and even if he does agree, the railroad can't ship it if there isn't space.

Well, the answer to what we should do is a very simple one.

Let us authorize the United States Army Engineers to make a further survey to determine the feasibility of the extension of navigation between Sioux City and Garrison, N. Dak.—this one stretch is our most immediate need. If navigation is established between these two points, these small farmers will have a fighting chance against the railroads. The day that barges can go all the way up this river to Garrison, N. Dak., then we will see rail rates drop—then we will see plenty of shipping space made available to everybody who wants it.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, competition and fair play are synonymous.

Now, Mr. President, I would consider myself most remiss if I did not pay tribute to the Corps of United States Army Engineers. I think these men have done a splendid job. To them the Missouri is a challenge—yes—but no mystery; they have learned from long experience how to cope with this most unpredictable of our streams. And what they have done on the Mississippi and the Ohio, they can do on the Missouri—make it

navigable for the benefit and for the economy of all the people living in that region.

Mr. President, I have given this project a great deal of thought; I have held consultations with the United States Army Engineers—and while these men do not give curbstone opinions, they did not intimate to me that there were insurmountable obstacles to navigation between Sioux City and Garrison, N. Dak.; neither did I get the impression that they considered this unsound economically.

So let us turn to the United States Army Engineers once again, authorizing them to make this survey to determine whether or not navigation may be extended, so that this great area may be fully developed and all its inhabitants may enjoy low-cost water transportation.

INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury explaining the purpose of the legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1789) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 31, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this proposal is to induce a necessary orderly flow of promotion in the officer ranks of the Coast Guard by providing effective means for achieving a reasonable degree of continuing forced attrition of officers in the grades of rear admiral and captain. Existing statutes are inadequate to accomplish this purpose.

A system of forced attrition as proposed is necessary to provide an essential flow of promotion in officer grades in the Coast Guard. In the absence of remedial legislation the prospect is for stagnation in the higher grades and resultant progressive stagnation in the lower grades. Lack of timely promotions will adversely affect the initiative and morale of officers in lower grades. Moreover, the essential flow of young, able, and vigorous officers into top management positions will be retarded. In turn, the efficiency of the Coast Guard will suffer.

Briefly, the proposal provides that rear admirals with 7 years service in that grade or 35 years total commissioned service will be involuntarily retired. For captains, a continuing system of selection is provided whereby captains with at least 8 years service in that grade and 30 years total commissioned service would be considered for further retention on active duty by annual boards. Seventy-five percent of the eligible captains would be retained annually; the remaining 25 percent would be involuntarily retired. There are provisions for retaining on active duty a required number of needed officers in each grade who would otherwise be retired. The Commandant, Assistant Commandant, and Engineer-in-Chief would be exempt from the proposal while serving in those statutory positions. A memorandum is attached explaining in more detail the need for and nature of this proposal.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD," FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This proposed legislation is designed to induce a necessary orderly flow of promotion in the officer ranks of the Coast Guard by providing an effective means for achieving a reasonable degree of continuing forced attrition in the top grades of captain and rear admiral. Before presenting a sectional analysis of the proposal, it is desirable to first demonstrate the need for the legislation in terms of the retirement and promotion situation potential without it.

At the present time there are 15 admirals in the Coast Guard (14 rear admirals and one vice admiral—the Commandant). Of these 15 admirals, 3 are serving in statutory appointments as Commandant, Assistant Commandant, and Engineer in Chief, respectively. For purposes of this discussion a base figure of 15 admirals is used throughout.

A study was recently made of the retirement expectancies of the admirals presently on duty and the promotion outlook for captains in relation thereto. This study was based on the assumption that all present admirals would remain on active duty until reaching the statutory retirement age of 62. In terms of this study, the situation to be reasonably expected in the future unless relief is afforded in the form of the proposed legislation is briefly described as follows:

The last of the 15 admirals now on duty would retire for age in 1967. During the 13-year period 1955–67 the average attrition rate of those officers would be about 1.2 per year.

Presently, the average age of all admirals is about 55; in 1961 this would have increased to about 57; by 1967 the average age would be about 59.

Presently, the average admiral has about 32 years of total commissioned service; in 1961 this would have increased to about 35; by 1967 the average total service would be about 38.

Until recently, the average captain selected for flag rank has been promoted to the grade of rear admiral in about his 30th year of total service at about age 52; in 1961 the typical captain possessing excellent qualifications for the higher grade could not expect promotion until about his 34th year of service at about age 56; by 1967 a similar well-qualified captain could not anticipate promotion to the grade of rear admiral until about his 36th year of service at about age 58; this latter officer could then expect only about 4 years' service or less as an admiral before being forced out by age-62 retirement.

While this forecast is based on the rather extreme expectancy of age-62 retirement alone, it is not believed that attrition from other causes would alter the picture to any significant degree. Thus the outlook is for progressive stagnation in the grade of rear admiral and a resultant growing stagnation in the lower grades.

The proposed legislation will provide the relief needed. Once the forced attrition principle of the proposal becomes fully operative the following comparative results should obtain:

The rate of attrition of admirals should increase to about three per year.

The average age of all admirals on active duty would remain fairly constant at about 54½ years.

At any given time, the average admiral on active duty would have about 32½ years total service.

The typical captain with excellent qualifications for the higher grade could expect promotion in about his 30th year of service at about age 52; he could expect to serve in the grade of rear admiral for at least 5 years.

For purposes of a similar study for captains, a base figure of 150 is used, representing the approximate number of captains presently on active duty. First, if the extreme case is taken that all present captains will remain on active duty until reaching the statutory requirement age of 62, the following will briefly demonstrate the expected retirement and promotion situation relative to that grade if remedial legislation is not obtained:

By 1959 there will be as many captains with over 30 years total service as there will be captains with less than 30 years service.

By 1963, and continuing thereafter, all 150 captains in the Coast Guard will have over 30 years service.

In 1963 and thereafter the typical qualified commander could not expect to be promoted to captain until he was in about his 32d year of total service at about age 54.

Since the extreme situation is assumed in the foregoing analysis—that all captains will remain on active duty until age 62—the conclusions will probably be subject to some adjustments in actual practice. However, even assuming that the attrition rate for captains is five per year from all causes (as reasonably confirmed by recent experience in the matter), the forecast is that by 1961 there will be as many captains with over 30 years service as there will be captains of less than 30 years service. By 1966 and afterward there will be a constant ratio of about 130 captains with over 30 years service to about 20 captains with less than 30 years service.

It can be seen that the outlook without remedial legislation is very unfavorable because stagnation in the grade of captain will result in proportional stagnation in the lower grades. The orderly flow of promotion to higher ranks will be retarded. Discontent, lack of incentive, reduced initiative, and poor morale will follow. There will be an inadequate flow of young able officers into top management posts.

The proposed legislation will provide the means of materially correcting this situation. Once the forced attrition principle becomes fully operative the future situation will develop as follows:

Beginning about 1963 there would be a constant ratio of about 30 captains with over 30 years' service to about 120 captains with less than 30 years' service—a very desirable balance between the experience of maturity and the drive of the more youthful.

Almost immediately the flow of promotion would assume required orderly proportions, so that the average qualified commander could reasonably expect promotion to the grade of captain in about his 25th year of commissioned service, at about the age of 47.

Section 247 of the proposed legislation provides for the involuntary retirement of any rear admiral on June 30 of the fiscal year in which he completes either 7 years' service as a permanent rear admiral or a total of 35 years' active commissioned service. No

board action would be required to effect the retirement.

Section 247 also contains a provision that the Commandant, with the approval of the Secretary, may retain on active duty from year to year any rear admiral who would otherwise be retired. This provision is required to permit the retention of any such officer when the retention is necessary in the public interest.

Section 247 would not apply to any officer serving in a statutory appointment as Commandant, Assistant Commandant, or Engineer in Chief. However, an officer who has completed his duty in a statutory appointment and resumed his place on the regular list of rear admirals would come under the involuntary retirement provision; all time served in those appointments would be included in any computation under that provision.

While the same general principle of forced attrition would apply to officers in the grade of captain, circumstances require the application of a somewhat different concept of forced retirement for that grade. Retirement would not be automatic. Rather, section 248 of the proposal provides a basic method for retaining on the active list as "best fitted" a prescribed percentage of those captains who during any fiscal year complete both 8 or more years' service in the grade of captain and 30 or more years' commissioned service, including appropriate constructive service. The captains to be retained would be selected by an annual board consisting of five or more rear admirals, whose function it would be to select as "best fitted" for retention on the active list 75 percent of those captains who have previously completed or who will complete both of the service requirements during the fiscal year in which the board convenes. The 25 percent not selected for retention would be retired on June 30 of that fiscal year. However, here, too, there is a provision for retention on the active list, in the public interest, of captains among the 25 percent who would otherwise be retired. An officer so retained would not again be eligible for consideration for retention by any subsequent annual board. He would be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which last retained under this authority.

The Congress in recent years has provided each of the other armed forces with legislation designed to meet the same general problem that now faces the Coast Guard.

The results to be expected from this proposed legislation would closely parallel the results now being obtained by the Navy through operation of its selection and promotion laws.

MORE LIBERAL PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES IN COMPUTING NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury explaining the provisions of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1790) to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

APRIL 1, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels."

The purpose of the draft bill is to amend the admeasurement laws to authorize a more liberal deduction from gross tonnage for propelling machinery space on vessels having relatively small engine rooms. Existing law, by restricting sharply the deduction for propelling machinery space on vessels having relatively small engine rooms as opposed to that allowed in the case of vessels with larger engine rooms, tends to penalize efficient design of engine rooms and to restrict freedom of design leading to increased seaworthiness and safety. The draft bill is designed to remove that impediment.

There are enclosed a memorandum which sets forth in more detail the provisions of the proposed legislation and a comparative print showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill. It will be appreciated if you will lay the proposed bill, the accompanying memorandum, and the comparative print before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House.

A draft of a bill containing a similar proposal was submitted to you by this Department in a letter of January 11, 1954, and was introduced in the 83d Congress, second session, as S. 2814. That bill passed the Senate on April 19, 1954, but no action was taken in the House of Representatives on that bill or on the companion bill H. R. 7791, before the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING A DRAFT BILL ENTITLED "TO AMEND SECTION 4153 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE MORE LIBERAL PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES IN COMPUTING THE NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS"

For some time it has been the view of the Treasury Department and other interested agencies of this Government that there is great need for a revision of our present system of determining the gross and net tonnages of vessels, since the present method tends to restrict freedom of design leading to increased seaworthiness and safety. To devise a new system which will be simple, easily administered, and will not restrict freedom of design, and yet which will be acceptable to the principal maritime nations of the world, will require considerable time and study.

One of the troublesome matters in the existing system of admeasurment at the present time is the basis upon which the deduction for propelling machinery is determined in computing net tonnage. The maximum deduction of 32 percent of the gross tonnage is allowable only if the tonnage of the propelling machinery space, including light and air space, is more than 13 percent of the gross tonnage of a screw-propelled vessel or more than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of a vessel propelled by paddle wheels. In any case in which the tonnage of that space is not more than 13 percent of the gross tonnage of a screw-propelled vessel the allowance for propelling machinery space is only 1¾ times the tonnage of that space, while if the tonnage of that space is not more than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of a vessel propelled by paddle wheels, the allowance is only 1½ times the tonnage of that space. The result has been to penalize efficient design of engine rooms in the latter cases.

Notwithstanding the fact that our ultimate goal is a new and better system of admeasurment acceptable to all maritime nations, it is the view of the Treasury Department that, as an interim measure pending attainment of that goal, action should be taken to alleviate the present situation.

The proposed bill is designed to accomplish that purpose by liberalizing the allowance for propelling machinery spaces in the latter cases, while allowing the owner of a vessel, the construction of which was begun on or before the date of enactment of the bill and thus presumably designed to take maximum advantage of the present formula, to determine for himself whether that allowance is to be computed under the present system or the new.

Under date of June 7, 1954, the Secretary of State transmitted to this Department a copy of a note from the British Embassy informing this Government that an amendment to the existing laws of Great Britain on the tonnage measurement of shipping had been enacted and approved March 9, 1954, effective July 1, 1954. The British Ambassador further stated that the proposed amendment had been agreed to in principle by all of the 26 countries with which the Government of the United Kingdom had agreements for the reciprocal recognition of tonnage certificates except Italy, with which country Her Majesty's Government were still in correspondence, and the Soviet Union, which had not indicated its attitude to that date. The governments which have ratified the Convention for Uniform Tonnage Measurement of Ships, signed at Oslo, Norway, on June 10, 1947, namely, the Governments of Norway, Iceland, The Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden, have amended the convention and their laws to incorporate a similar proposal. In view of the universal agreement in principle and the action or proposed action of the other principal maritime nations, it is important that the proposal receive favorable consideration at an early date.

LIGHTS REQUIRED TO BE CARRIED BY MOTORBOATS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats.

Legislation of this character has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury. I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary explaining the purpose of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1791) to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 7, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bil, "To amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats."

The proposed new paragraph (e) of section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, would require any motorboat propelled by both sail and machinery to carry the lights required for a motorboat propelled by machinery only. Paragraph (c) of section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 46 U. S. C. 525b(c), now requires that a motorboat propelled by sail and machinery carry the same lights as a motorboat propelled by sail only. Collisions have occurred involving motorboats complying with the present rule. In the interest of safety the rule should be changed to that proposed. The rule for a motorboat under such circumstances would then be similar to the corresponding rule of other systems of Rules for Preventing Collisions. See sections 62, 144 (c) (iv), 242, and 302 of title 44, United States Code. Paragraph (c) of section 3 has been redrafted to retain unchanged the requirements for lights to be carried by motorboats when propelled by sail alone.

The proposed new paragraph (f) of section 3 would authorize any motorboat to carry the lights required by the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1948 (otherwise known as the International Rules of the Road, in lieu of the lights required by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940. Under existing law a motorboat operating both on the high seas and on waters subject to the Motorboat Act is required to carry the lights required, respectively, by the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1948, and section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940. The construction cost of such a boat is increased by the installation of two systems of lights. Moreover, the changeover from one system of lights to the other when crossing the line of demarcation is a troublesome burden. If the operator of a motorboat neglects to change lights and is involved in a collision, he has the burden of proving that the statutory fault of carrying improper lights could not have caused the collision. It is the considered opinion of the Coast Guard that a motorboat can, with safety, carry the lights required by either the International Rules or the act of April 25, 1940, when operating on waters subject to the latter act.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE OBLIGATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for many years, group life insurance has been available to Federal employees through various beneficial associations. The Government did not pay any part of the premiums or otherwise participate in these programs. However, in the minds of the employees, there was a semblance of Government sponsorship. Agency names were a part of the association's titles; agency officials held office in the associations, and association business was conducted by Government personnel in Government quarters.

While policies in these associations were strictly private agreements, to which the Government was not a party, a plan was nevertheless included in the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 for the purpose of enabling these nonprofit associations to arrange for the Federal Group Insurance Fund to assume the life insurance of its members who were retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service.

Congress was advised by the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Department that the plans set forth in section 10 of the act were practical and workable with regard to assumption by the Federal Group Insurance Fund of the policies held by retired and separated Federal employees with the various beneficial associations.

Mr. President, it has developed that the advice given Congress by the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Department was not correct, and that section 10 of the act is not workable, and will not accomplish the purpose in mind.

Secondly, Congress was advised by these agencies that there was no reason to protect the association insurance of active Federal employees, who were eligible under the new program, because they could obtain replacement insurance in a larger amount and at a lesser rate under the Federal program. Here again the Congress received bad advice. The argument that active employees would lose nothing completely overlooked the following facts:

First. The reducing feature in the amount of insurance an employee can retain after age 65 under the Government-sponsored plan reduces the insurance of a lower salaried employee below the amount he would receive under his nonreducing association policy.

Second. Should the active employee lose his Government employment, he would then have not only lost his association insurance, but also his Government insurance, since the latter ceases upon termination of employment.

Mr. President, there is little wonder that under these circumstances many present and former employees are confused and worried regarding their group life-insurance policies in the various beneficial associations. Because of my understanding of their present predicament, I wish to give them a word of advice and assurance. First, I caution them against allowing their policies to lapse. They should, by all means, keep their policies in force by making their premium payments as they fall due. Second, I want these employees to know that I have introduced legislation to correct this situation; and finally, that the legislation will be acted upon by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as promptly as possible.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 10 the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, setting forth reasons why section 10 of the act should be amended, and explaining what the proposed amendment will accomplish, be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1792) to amend section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 should be amended because:

(a) It requires the nonprofit associations of Federal employees to transfer to and deposit in the Government insurance fund all assets of their life insurance funds as a condition to assuming life insurance agreements for only those members who are retired or otherwise separated from the Government service.

(b) It requires compliance within 1 year after August 17, 1954, the date of the approval of the act.

(c) Assuming that the associations could comply with section 10, it would require the cancellation of insurance protection for all members who are actively employed by the Government, notwithstanding the fact that such members have for many years paid dues in order to provide insurance benefits for their dependents (many for more than 25 years). Also, it would require the forfeiture of their entire interest in the assets of the associations.

(d) The present act requires reduction in insurance at the rate of 2 percent per month after employees attain the age of 65 until the original amount of their insurance is reduced to 25 percent.

(e) It is apparent that no thought was given to the rights of all members to share in the assets of these associations.

(f) Under the law a majority of the members of an association cannot dispose of all of the assets of the association contrary to the wishes of the minority. (*Hill et al* v. *Bland, et al.*, 10 Fed (2d) 623, decided by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia 1925. Writ of certorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States.)

(g) As interpreted by the Civil Service Commission, this section requires the unanimous consent of all members of any association to transfer and deliver its assets to the Government fund. The impossibility of obtaining such unanimous consent is readily seen from the fact that a number of the asssociations have large memberships, many of whom reside in different parts of the United States and its possessions. Communications to the members of nine associations, representing a large number of active Federal employees, as well as those retired or otherwise separated from Federal service, have failed to elicit replies from a very substantial minority. Unanimity of opinion exists among counsel that judicial proceedings to determine the rights of the membership in the assets would require the naming of all members of the associations as parties, the issuance of process and publication

against thousands of individual members, and extensive legal services before the case could be presented to the court for adjudication, all of which would involve the expenditure of large sums, with the possibility of long delays and protracted appeals, making it virtually impossible to comply with the time limitations set forth in section 10. The Civil Service Commission recognizes that the larger associations composed of thousands of members may have difficulty in obtaining unanimous consent as required by its interpretation of section 10, and this is an understatement of the problem as it actually exists.

For these reasons, as a practical matter, section 10 is impossible of performance by any association which has a substantial number of members.

The proposed amendment will:

1. Remove the inequities created by section 10.

2. Remove the necessity of a judicial determination of matters arising under section 10.

3. Permit all members, whether presently employed, retired, or separated from Federal service, to continue their insurance at present dues rates, and thereby provide more adequately for their dependents.

4. Authorize the Civil Service Commission to arrange with nonprofit associations for the assumption of their insurance obligations.

5. Permit the associations to continue in business until such time as their assets, after payment of expenses, have been applied toward the liquidation of insurance obligations.

6. Terminate the right of such associations to provide or obtain any additional insurance for their members after the approval of the proposed amendment.

7. Provide that the operation and management of each association shall be subject to the supervision of the Commission under rules and regulations adopted by it, without any expense whatsoever to the Government.

8. It will not require the Government to make any contribution for many years, as the reserve funds of the associations, together with monthly dues, will be ample to pay insurance claims for a long period of time. Any contribution by the Federal Government would be negligible if at the time the Government takes over the obligations of the association it merges the operation with the Government Insurance Fund.

PURCHASE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit State and local governments to purchase Federal surplus property. This proposal has been endorsed by the representatives of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of County Officials, the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, in addition to the American Municipal Association.

Under existing law, property declared to be surplus by one Federal agency is first made available by purchase by any other Federal agency at a schedule of rates fixed by the General Services Administration. Any property not so purchased is then screened for disposal as donable surplus for educational and health agencies. The remaining property is then offered for sale under the terms of the Federal Service Act of 1949.

The bill would not interfere at all with the first two steps mentioned above. It provides, however, that after it has been screened for health and education purposes the remaining surplus property will be made available to States and local agencies at the same scale of prices that such property is made available to other Government bodies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1799) to amend section 203 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY CONGRESS FOR SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SALK POLIO VACCINE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas, in 1949, Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins of Harvard University discovered a method of growing poliomyelitis virus in nonnervous tissue kept alive in flasks and test tubes; and

Whereas the said Drs. Enders, Weller, and Robbins were awarded the 1954 Nobel prize in medicine and physiology in recognition for such discovery; and

Whereas such discovery led to work by other investigators, resulting in present-day methods for mass producing the poliomyelitis virus needed for the manufacture of vaccine; and

Whereas such discovery made possible the recent development of a successful vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to the said Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins, in behalf of the people of the United States, its gratitude and appreciation for their great contribution to the development of a successful vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DELEGATION TO ATTEND THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas a Parliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in Paris in July 1955; and

Whereas among other items it is planned to discuss at the Conference the question of future cooperation by the NATO members, including their parliamentary bodies; and

Whereas the Congress has taken a leading part in the formation of the Organization and in its support through the enactment of measures to strengthen its capacity to defend the North Atlantic area against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the Conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization; and

Whereas such a conference can contribute to the strength of the North Atlantic area in the maintenance of peace and security and the mutual interests of its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members meeting in conference in Paris in July 1955, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the House, the Senate, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas a parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in Paris in July 1955; and

Whereas among other items it is planned to discuss at the conference the question of future cooperation by the NATO members, including their parliamentary bodies; and

Whereas the Congress has taken a leading part in the formation of the Organization and in its support through the enactment of measures to strengthen its capacity to defend the North Atlantic area against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization; and

Whereas such a conference can contribute to the strength of the North Atlantic area in the maintenance of peace and security and the mutual interests of its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members meeting in conference in Paris in July 1955, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed

for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the House, the Senate, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I have just submitted authorizes United States participation in a parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which will meet in Paris in July of this year.

Joining in submitting the resolution are the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The resolution is exactly similar to one already introduced in the House by Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This would be the first time that legislators of NATO would meet in joint session to consider problems that mutually affect their countries. The proposal originated with Norway, and has now been approved by Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Iceland. Only the United States and Portugal have not yet accepted, and it is of extreme importance that we do so. It is probable that Western Germany, now that it has been added to NATO will be invited.

The resolution provides for a delegation of 14 Congressional Members, half from the House and half from the Senate, to be appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President.

The State Department has indicated that it favors the proposed action, and has expressed the view that it could contribute materially to the strength of the Atlantic alliance.

When Communist bodies are bending every effort to create divisions within the Atlantic Alliance, when there are frequent irritations and misunderstandings, we cannot over-emphasize the importance of the elected representatives of the people of all these nations sitting down together and discussing their common problems.

This is not only the best way to achieve mutual understanding among legislators, but also the best way to make NATO live in the minds of the people of all our nations.

I hope the resolution will be passed at an early date, as it is urgently necessary that this Nation leave no stone unturned to strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY EFFECT OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS—REPRINTING OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, April 20, 1955, when announcing the cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) favoring United States participation in a scientific commission within the United Nations to study certain effects of nuclear explosions, I included the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on the list, as is shown in the text of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20 on page 4782.

The name of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors when it was printed. The Senator from Montana indicated an early interest in the resolution for a United Nations study of the effects of atomic radiation. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which is only a one-page resolution, be immediately reprinted with Senator MURRAY's name included as a cosponsor.

The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has requested that he also be included as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22. I ask unanimous consent that Senator SPARKMAN be included as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 when it is reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COAST GUARD CONTRACT PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS, DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE, REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on March 30, 1955, there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary H. R. 3885, a bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts.

At a meeting of the full committee on April 25, I was authorized to ask unanimous consent to have the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of this bill and that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, in view of the fact that that committee handled identical legislation in the 83d Congress.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3885, and that the bill and the letter of January 26, 1955, from the Secretary of the Treasury, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 1644, A BILL TO PRESCRIBE POLICY AND PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 12, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1644, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 681 BY INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as chairman of a task force of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that public hearings will be held on S. 681 to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion. These hearings will begin on Friday, April 29, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 135, of the Senate Office Building and will continue on Tuesday, May 3.

All persons desiring to testify on this bill are urged to communicate as soon as possible with Mr. Richard Arens, associate counsel of the subcommittee, who is preparing the schedule of witnesses. The address of the subcommittee is Room 135A, Senate Office Building, and the telephone number is Republic 7-7500, extension 3306.

All witnesses are requested to file 24 hours in advance of their appearance several typewritten copies of their statement and to confine their oral presentation to a summary of about 15 minutes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN STEPHENS WOOD, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John Stephens Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Sub-

versive Activities Control Board, for a term of 3 years expiring March 4, 1958, vice Watson B. Miller, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

CONVENTIONS WITH ITALIAN REPUBLIC ON DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand there are certain treaties with the Republic of Italy involving double taxation, now at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaties and that they be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive C, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955, and Executive D, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's messages, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's messages will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's messages are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit Executive C, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Convention with Italy, signed March 30, 1955, relating to taxes on income.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit Executive D, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Convention with Italy, signed March 30, 1955, relating to taxes on estates and inheritances.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

Address entitled "The Romance of Roads," delivered by Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 23, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator MCCARTHY at a testimonial dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, at New York City, on April 20, 1955.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., on the ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, on March 27, 1955.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "Dillard Wins Praise as United States 'Ambassador'," written by Jack Clowser, and published in the Cleveland Press of February 16, 1955.

FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Saturday night the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], delivered a foreign-policy address which should have far-reaching effects.

With his usual clarity of vision, the Senator from Georgia explored the major problems that lie before the United States and the free world. He issued a challenge for bold and courageous thinking on the vital issues of war and peace.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this statement will receive the careful consideration of every policymaking official of our Government. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATOR GEORGE'S ADDRESS TO EDITORS ON FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

I was sitting here thinking of the enormous power that you editors of this country have—a great power for good or evil, and I was impressed with the fact that, being Democrats and Republicans, you don't always agree with yourselves. There is enough disagreement always to make for the safety and security of this country.

I am very glad you are here in Washington and yet I am not quite sure why you are here. Maybe it's because Washington is not running a race with any other city in the Union. Maybe it might be appropriate to call it the "windy city" and why you have come here to be bored by speeches of a public man who would be glad to go to you in any part of this country is a bit beyond me.

When I first came to the city, there was an old gentleman in the Senate for whom I had very great respect—John Sharp Williams. He hurried me into the cloakroom one day and quoted to me from some philosopher, the exact name of whom I don't remember, but anyhow, his quotation ran like this:

He said—and he was speaking to his son: "I want you to go to all parts of the world. Especially I want you to visit all the capitals of the world and see what little wisdom the world is actually run with."

I thought it was something a little sacrilegious. I couldn't quite understand it, but in the course of years I could begin, dimly at least, to see what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who had studied at home and abroad, stated to me.

AMERICAN ATTITUDE TRACED

Now, I suppose you want me to talk to you a little bit about foreign affairs. Since Mrs. George is here, I am under strict admonition not to talk very long about anything. I am quite sure you will appreciate that.

From the beginning, of course, we have had relations with other peoples, but prior to World War I our foreign relations were hardly known to the masses of the great American people.

These relations and the relations growing out of them occupied the attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and a small group of men in the United States Senate, and intellectuals—men and women throughout the Union.

Even after the outbreak of World War II we said: "Aren't we separated from all that clash and all that confusion by 3,000 miles of ocean and do we not live under other political institutions, and are we not dominated by other social and economic ideas?"

Well, we very soon found the answer. The ranchers and cotton growers and manufacturers soon found their markets declining and all but disappearing. And in every accounting and banking house in this Nation, business, temporarily at least, came almost to a standstill. For the first time, Americans in all walks of life began to realize that every important public act committed on the other side of the globe directly affected the welfare and well-being of the American people.

At that time and prior to that time and from the beginning, we had the policy of what you and I know as isolationism. We were protected by two great oceans. The British Navy was the unquestioned mistress of the seas, and behind that navy and those two oceans, we enjoyed an immunity seldom found to a young and struggling people, for a long, long time.

World War I came and ended, but we did not reserve the power unity which enabled us to win that war. It fell apart. We were conscious, of course, of how slightly our interests were affected by international affairs, but the unity which enabled us to win that war fell apart.

MISTAKES OF WAR CITED

At the end of the Second World War, the power unity was again dissolved and almost dissolved because the American people, true to their traditions, true to their innermost longings, wanted to get back home and wanted to get the boys back home and wanted to settle back into a normal life.

That war, of course, was marked by certain mistakes. All wars are, in point of policy or strategy, and we made some mistakes.

I think it may now be said, since the Yalta papers have been published, that we made a great mistake in insisting upon the complete destruction of the great producing nation in Europe—Germany.

Then, after Japan came in and before the end of the war, we again insisted upon its destruction—the complete, utter destruction

of a great producing nation. Thus we insisted on the destruction of the greatest producers in the world, outside of ourselves, unmindful of the fact that at the moment we were creating economic and political vacuums.

We were right, I think, in insisting upon the utter destruction of Hitler militarism as it had been developed in Germany and as it had lived in Japan.

At any rate we did, and at any rate, these two great powers were destroyed. We made a peace treaty with Japan and Japan is now slowly coming back. We made but recently a treaty with West Germany under which sovereignty is restored to West Germany. But more than that, she is entitled to come into NATO. She will come into NATO on May 5, according to present schedules.

Both Germany and Japan are moving back industrially and commercially, especially West Germany, and I do not believe any of us can understand what is going on in Europe and what has gone on there for several months without a realization of what Germany's return to the sisterhood of states in that area of the world means.

Many of the actions taken by our Soviet friends undoubtedly are predicated upon the entry of Germany into NATO; upon the rearming under restrictions of West Germany.

The coming back of West Germany will not be immediate, but ultimately it will mean the organization of all Western Europe and the retreat of the Soviets back to their ancient boundaries, with possibly the exception of one satellite which cannot be defended by Western Europe. Ultimately and at no great distant date, with the return to strength of Japan, there will commence again the age-old struggle—for northern Korea and the rich area of Manchuria. That struggle will be between what we now call the Chinese People's Republic and Japan.

GREAT SIGNIFICANT FACTS

Moscow is 6,000 miles away from that battlefront, and that battleground, and so two great significant facts have come to pass. They are: The peace treaty with Japan and her entry into world affairs; the peace treaty with Western Germany and her entry again into world affairs.

These are two important facts, I believe Justice Holmes once said that a single package of human history is better than a whole volume of logic.

At any rate, many men and women in this audience tonight will see the day when our Russian friends will go back to their ancient borders and boundaries and when again there will be reestablished a power group in the Far East that will give some stability to that area.

Although you may disagree with me, I would be less than frank if I did not say to you that in my considered judgment, whatever it is worth, the great hope for stability in the Far East is somehow, sometime the revival, and I will not say consolidation, but the solidification of the efforts of Japan and India, the latter the most populous country outside of the Chinese People's Republic, in all of Asia.

I know that you would say that oil and water can't mix and sometimes we are all a bit worried with Mr. Nehru. Sometimes he takes some 20 courses, and yet he stands very definitely for something in the Far East. Also, very definitely, when there is a great commercial power, which again can live and thrive in Japan, and with Japan reaching out for markets, both for her fabricated goods, and particularly for her raw materials, there will begin to be order in the Far East.

I am not speaking to you about tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I am simply saying to you what in the course of human events must be the pattern which we will see again both in Western Europe and in the Far East.

We made the supreme mistake perhaps, at the end of World War II, in assuming that because we had fought side by side with our Russian friends to win that war and because we had come to know them, that they must be on the whole, people with aims and purposes and aspirations much or very similar to our very own.

Perhaps we were not justified in reaching that easy conclusion, but we did reach it. We acted upon it, and that is past history. There is no need to discuss it here.

We, of course, know that Russia is still actuated with the old Russian imperialism, plus the communistic ideologies of the 1917 revolution. Capitalism or the capitalistic system could, of course, not be tolerated and outside capitalism could not be tolerated because it is in the way of Communist expansion.

Now, what is the state of the world tonight? Some interesting things have been going on.

In Austria, a treaty has now been hurried to a conclusion and the four powers are invited to witness this ratification, and its signing.

That could mean but one thing. A study of Russian budgets ought to show us that it can mean but one thing and that is that Russia is tremendously concerned with the rearming of West Germany and the taking of her place in the NATO group.

A little while ago we were very much disturbed because the Colombo group had called a conference down in Indonesia. The nervousness in some high places in Washington stems from the fact that we said we would have no friends in that conference and that resolutions would come out of that conference solidiying the yellow and black races against the white man everywhere. So there was nervousness here.

Then we began to speak in more optimistic language about that conference and only last Saturday I was rash enough, perhaps unwisely, to say that I thought the heads of state should have something to say about that conference; that at least we should have an understanding of what that conference meant and what its real objective was, and that I believed there would be some friends of the western powers there.

You have heard the speeches that were made within the past week. You have noted the utterances they have made, and while perhaps those speeches do not represent the rank and file of the Asiatic states represented there, they nevertheless do represent the thinking of some of their leaders. And then, just last night and this morning you read that Chou En-lai had said he had no purpose to go to war with the people of the United States; that he was not, at least, planning such a war, and indicated that he was willing to sit down and talk with us.

Now I have been thinking, myself, for many weeks, for many months, that after a period of great wars, and particularly of great revolutions—fairly shaking the foundations of the old civilizations—that a people into whose hands leadership has been thrust, or to which leadership had come, must be able to make some adjustments to meet the changing conditions of the world.

You may recall that not too long ago I said that I believed the time was rapidly approaching when the heads of government of the four great powers could sit down and talk about the problems of Europe and the tensions in Europe; the tensions indeed, which shadow all civilization with some degree of a prophecy of doom.

Day by day the conviction that grew—at least to my way of thinking—is that we should have the conference first with our friends, with those nations who have been uniformly friendly to us, and with those nations in the southeast of Asia—those in the security organization who are our friends.

Why?

Because I think it important that we know precisely their thinking on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what readjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say that we are willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world.

LAW CASE RECALLED

As a young lawyer, I had a very important case, I thought, and I went to see an old gentleman who was involved in that litigation, but largely as a witness, and I said, "I have come to talk to you about this matter." He said, "I can't talk to you young man. You are on the other side."

I said, "Of course, I am on the other side, but I want to talk to you. I can't learn anything or do anything unless I can talk to the men who are on the other side of this problem."

I then said something which I have always regretted when he again reminded me he was on the other side and couldn't talk, and which I attributed to my youth and inexperience. I said, "Why won't you tell me; are you afraid that you will tell me the truth or that you will tell me a lie?"

I have always regretted that because I had a profound respect for the old gentleman and through the years I have always regretted it.

I am coming now to this point: I do not know, and I doubt if anyone can know, what degree of sincerity is in the mind and heart of Chou En-lai, but I do think the things he saw and witnessed down in Indonesia since the last Sabbath has opened his mind, and when he says that he is willing to talk, then I will unhesitatingly say that this Nation should be big enough and great enough through its highest officials to talk to him.

It is time that we were relieving the tensions of this world, if we can, and that when we know what our friends think and say, what position they have, in what conclusions they concur in about the trouble spot in the Far East. We should not be unmindful of that concurring judgment and opinion of our friends.

Indeed, I do not think that any nation can be unmindful of the opinion and judgment of its friends.

I am not talking about what the President should do or should not do with reference to his position now or hereafter in the Formosa area.

From the beginning I have said and taken one position, and I believe it is right, and I still believe it is right, and that decision is with the President himself.

AN UNSWERVING CONVICTION

In that conviction I have not wavered and will not waver. But I have also expressed the belief, and I believe it profoundly, that when and if a fateful decision must be made by the President as to whether or not he will defend any island or islands in the area of Formosa, that he will get all the information that he can from his Joint Chiefs, from his military leaders, from every agency of information that is available to him. And if I do not mistake the man, he will then go into his closet and face to face with his Maker, he will make his own decision.

I say now that out of a world conference there can come good in Europe, and a conference with our friends will be helpful to us. I say that we ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese People's Republic or their leaders, because we certainly owe a high obligation to all mankind everywhere. Out of that conference might come not a final solution but a first step which will lead to a second and third step toward the solution of some of the problems of our present time.

I know very well that there are many good friends of the United States who believe that the time has come when we should give more attention to our home affairs and when such aid and assistance we might give to other countries should be very definitely marked in behalf of the essential American interests which we are seeking to serve.

With that general thought, no American can quarrel, but I say to you tonight and I hope that you editors and managing editors will bear in mind that this is no time to say that there will be no further aid or assistance given to those people of the world that are struggling to make themselves strong.

I change my mind as I go along, frequently. I am glad I do because it is probably the only proof that I have that I am in existence.

But I change my mind about economic aid because undoubtedly tonight in many wide areas of this earth, especially in the Asiatic and African countries, point 4, if you please—technical assistance if you wish to be more technical in describing it—is of far greater value and promises more than military aid to people who love peace and who don't want a war.

But this is no time to turn away from our international obligations; whatever those obligations are it is not time for us in the present and congenial state of the world to grow soft in our ability to carry out and execute those programs that we regard as vital.

No foreign policy will receive any respect unless the people who put it forth have the strength and the will to carry it to execution.

NOT TIME TO TURN BACK

In an atomic age, that means strength in being, because the nuclear weapons of this modern age have destroyed the productive capacity of the people on which great reliance could have been placed, but you must have something ready and presently at hand.

So this is not the time for us to turn back in our efforts to continue militarily strong, nor is it the time for us to lose interest in the economic soundness and strength of the whole free world.

How can the free world be strong, militarily and economically unless through the cooperative efforts of all free peoples, ourselves included?

How can we turn back the clock to another day and say that the trade and commerce of the world, especially the free world should again be circumvented and departmentalized to the point almost of the stagnation of that commerce and yet hope all free nations to become economically strong and prosperous?

Upon their prosperity and strength will depend their ability to maintain their own military equipment, their own military strength.

We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation, if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people, because of their devotion to duty, private and public, with a tireless energy to bring it about.

Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

So it came to us. Would we pass it up? Can we pass it up? Future generations would hold us responsible and rightly responsible for failure to grasp the high responsibilities resting upon us.

The road which we are traveling may be long and hard and thorny. Indeed, it is hard and long and thorny. But it is worthwhile, my friends, to travel along the highway that can lead us, and will lead us, if we keep our courage and our faith, finally there—to a world in which the normal things of mankind and of human life may be again enjoyed and appreciated.

I thank you.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say I have read the address of the Senator from Georgia in full, and I think it was an extraordinarily clear, foresighted statement. I agree entirely with the majority leader that the address should be read, studied, and thought about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished acting minority leader.

FOREIGN DAIRY PRODUCTS DO NOT CONFORM TO UNITED STATES HEALTH STANDARDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mr. J. F. Shager, of the Cheese Producers Marketing Association of Monroe, Wis., an important message today raising a very significant issue. It concerns the failure of foreign dairy products to conform to the high and exacting sanitary codes to which our American dairy products must comply.

On many occasions I have pointed out this aspect of the American dairyman's problem in his competition with foreign dairymen.

My own State has always prided itself on its dairy standards as the highest in the Nation. It is small wonder that the dairymen of my State are deeply troubled in having to compete with products from overseas which do not remotely have to bear the costs of complying with similarly high standards.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Shager's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. I hope that it will receive the most sympathetic consideration of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEESE PRODUCERS' MARKETING ASSOCIATION,
Monroe, Wis., April 21, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER L. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to compliment you on your efforts to increase the consumption of fluid milk by the armed services and all dairy products as well. We are behind you in these efforts to give our servicemen stationed in this country all the good food they wish.

However, we are also concerned about dairy products that are produced in foreign countries that are in the trade agreement extension bill. We certainly agree that we must trade with other countries, but when we admit their products we feel that the milk should be produced under the same sanitary requirements that is expected of our dairy farmers. These sanitary codes that we abide by and are administered by the various States or Federal Government should be applicable to all countries that wish to sell their product in our markets. We have these sanitary codes to protect the health of our consumers and their health should not be jeopardized for the sake of political trade agreements and at the expense of the American dairy farmer.

You have always fought for the Wisconsin dairy farmer's economic welfare as well as all American dairymen, but there are times when arguments are presented that leaves little room for rebuttal. We know that those exporting countries of dairy products usually have a lower standard of living and can take less in dollars for their products and still improve their lower standards. Also their monetary exchange is usually to their advantage.

It is unnecessary to ask you to vote in the dairyman's favor, however, I hope you can exert some influence on those Senators that may represent other interests in these trade agreements and unwittingly make the American dairy farmers bear more than their fair share of such a program.

Thanks again for your past support and your continued support in the future.

Sincerely yours,

J. F. SHAGER.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is one of the great anniversaries of history.

Ten years ago today, American and Russian troops joined at the Elbe River and accomplished one of the most important military meetings of all times.

From the standpoint of World War II, the juncture was decisive. It meant a fatal blow to the ambitions of the Nazi dictators, and represented the thrust that shattered the forces of the Axis Powers.

But the importance of the Elbe River meeting went far beyond its military significance. For the first time since the Bolsheviks had seized power, the common people of Russia met Americans as friends, and their reaction was a promise of ultimate deliverance for a world beset by dictators.

Every account of the historic meeting establishes unmistakably the ecstatic nature of the event. Language barriers were no handicaps as American and Russian GI's stretched forth the hand of friendship.

Cigarettes and watches were swapped back and forth as the men who had conquered fascism chattered excitedly to each other in their different languages. The fact that they could not understand the words was beside the point—they understood the feeling, and it was deep and far-reaching.

The Communist dictators immediately realized their problem. The meeting on the Elbe was necessary to win their war; but it had also revealed to their downtrodden people that Americans were friends, and not the demons that were described in the Communist propaganda. As soon as they could, they began to withdraw their soldiers from all contacts with Americans. It was the only way they could maintain among the Russian people the distorted concepts which they had so carefully spread for so many years.

Ten years later, the world has changed drastically. The fine flush of enthusiasm displayed on the Torgau Bridge has evaported under the chilling winds of the cold war.

But one fact has been established for all time to come. It is that the people of the world can solve the problems of peace. They do want to live in concord and friendship, and the day the Iron Curtain is penetrated will mark the end for all time of the Communist dictatorship.

THE DISCHARGE OF EDWARD J. CORSI

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State, in connection with his recent discharge of Mr. Edward J. Corsi. I believe the issues raised by this letter are significant, and I await the Secretary's reply. I also want to commend the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for his leadership in calling hearings of his subcommittee in the Senate Judiciary Committee, so that the facts may be brought to light.

It is a matter of profound regret to me, and one of serious loss to the prestige of our Nation, that our refugee immigration program is stalled virtually in dead center. I commend Mr. Corsi for his energetic efforts to help revitalize that program and bring it to life. It is unfortunate that the administration thought so little of the program that they were constrained to manufacture a pretext in order to prevent Mr. Corsi from carrying out his assignment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES:

I am very much interested in the case of Mr. Edward J. Corsi. It is apparent to me, despite your assurances that Mr. Corsi's "change of assignment" does not involve "any question of security" that this case represents another aberration in the administration of the security program. You will recall that the Senate Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I am acting chairman, has been holding hearings on this whole question of Government security.

I note the statement in the State Department's press release of April 11 that:

"Under the department's administrative regulations it was impossible initially to offer him a position for a longer period than ninety days."

I assume that the administrative regulation in question is section 391.42 of the Department's Regulations and Procedures on administrative operations dealing with security of employees. This provision, as I understand it, bars employment of an individual in any sensitive position in the Department unless a full field investigation has been conducted, but provides as an exception to this:

"That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a period not to exceed 90 days by a person with respect to whom a full field preappointment investigation has not been completed if the Secretary of State finds that such action is necessary in the national interest."

I note also that the ninety-day limitations is unique to the State Department, since section 3 (b) of the Executive Order, upon which your Department's provision is based, uses the phrase "limited period" rather than any specific time limitation.

It seems to me that your interpretation of section 391.42 makes you a prisoner of your own regulations, which you have authority to amend and from which you have authority to grant exceptions. It is not conceivable to me that any sound Government administration would permit a technicality of this kind to deprive the Government of the service of a useful official. It would appear, moreover, that the 90-day period was selected since it affords an opportunity for completion of the required investigation, and that in those cases in which an investigation lasts beyond this period, it would be sensible to extend the period rather than disrupt the lives of the employees concerned who assumed they were obtaining regular and not temporary employment, and who assumed, if they were even aware of the 90-day provision, that investigation would be completed within this period.

I should very much appreciate your furnishing me with the following information, which, I believe, is essential to an understanding of the Corsi case:

1. Was Mr. Corsi's original position classified as "sensitive"?

2. Is the new position which was offered to Mr. Corsi on April 8 classified as "sensitive"?

3. Did the office of security of the Department commence a full field investigation? If so, on what date? Was this investigation completed? If so, on what date?

4. Was the investigation referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation because of the existence of derogatory information relating to matters described in sections 392.2b–g of your regulations, which deal in general with subversive activities or interests, or derogatory information indicating that Mr. Corsi has been subject to coercion, influence or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security?

5. If the investigation was referred to the FBI, for any reason, on what date was the referral? Has the FBI investigation been concluded?

6. Has Mr. Corsi's security investigation presented any unusual or difficult problems which result in a longer time for completion than investigations normally require?

7. Have there been any State Department cases since promulgation of Executive Order 10450 in which an appointee has been permitted to remain on the job for longer than 90 days before his full field investigation has been completed?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday last the New York Times carried a very fine editorial entitled "On Foreign Aid." It is a thoughtful, objective, and highly intelligent discussion of the problems with which we are faced and the opportunities which have come to us through the full use of foreign aid, both military and economic. I believe it is an editorial which should be carefully studied, not only by the Members of the Congress, but by the American people generally.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON FOREIGN AID

President Eisenhower stated the case for our continued assistance to those who can make use of it in the fewest possible words in his message to Congress, when he said:

"The other free nations need the United States, and we need them, if all are to be secure."

In this sense the word "foreign" is misleading. This is United States aid, given in the interest of the United States. We are one of those "all" that need to be secure. We are not "giving." We are investing in our security and in the world in which we wish to live.

The amounts that have been suggested are not large in proportion to our resources. We have frequently, without qualm, expended much larger amounts when we were convinced that there was real necessity. All that was required was this conviction of need.

This is what is required now. We can do the right thing with our resources if we are able to bring them to bear. What we must understand is that the field is ready for our effort. This is not a matter merely for statistics or cost sheets. It is not just a matter of combating communism, worthy as that may be. It is a matter of changing the way in which persons live. We can be secure when they live worthily. We are endangered when they live at the margin. Our help can make the difference in many cases. This is the need.

No people, anywhere in the world, are now "foreign" to us. We may differ in language and customs, in law and behavior, but these differences are minimal. We wish to be and to remain free. And that is as true in Nyasaland as it is in Manhattan. This freedom is threatened, there and here. If we plan and work for its defense we are not engaged in a "foreign" operation. It affects us.

This, moreover, is the real background for the immediate practical benefits that can and will accrue from a farsighted generosity. We have had an excellent example of these latter in the recovery of Western Europe under the Marshall plan. That recovery has been of direct practical benefit to the United States in terms of trade as well as in security. It can be argued that some money was wastefully spent. It cannot be argued that the investment, as a whole, did not get results.

The same thing is potentially true in Asia, where the emphasis is now placed. There is a crying need for our effort and our means. This chance for us is more than for a propaganda gesture to offset some of the things that are being said at Bandung. It is a chance to invest in human welfare and progress in half the human race. There are skills to be exported. There is a need for the simple medical powerplant that fights disease. There is need for better agronomy, better marketing, better use of waste. There is need for more food and better food so that men are not crippled by hunger. There is need for more and better education so that men are not handicapped by the inability to read and to understand what has been written.

We have at our command the resources to change the lives of literally millions of persons and to change them for the better. We cannot afford to let good intention bog down in technicality or partisanship. The President has charted a course that is not merely wise and humane. It is conservative in the face of the need.

A POLICY OF PRUDENT STRENGTH AND PATIENCE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the United States gets through the next few years without getting into a major war, the credit must go in large measure to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He has been standing up against pressures from many sources.

Some people think these are times for "nose-punching." Ike does not. The President knows that one blow can lead to another.

Some people think we should put a ship of the shores of Quemoy and Matsu

nearest the coast of China, and defy the Reds to touch it. Ike does not.

The President does not believe in giving custody of the world's peace to those in Chou En-lai's Red China who take pride in face-saving, or to Chiang-Kai-shek's Nationalists who want to return to the mainland of Asia, even though that would require soldiers from the homes of America, and might embroil the world in atomic conflict.

Some admirals and some generals—but not many—think we should regard war as inevitable, and should strike a "preventive" blow. Ike does not. The President knows that war is war, regardless of whether it is called preventive or defensive.

Some people believe that, basically, the longing for peace is in the hearts of the common people everywhere. The President is on their side.

Therefore, President Eisenhower steadily pursues a policy of prudent strength and patient dealing with the vexing problems which arise from day to day. One by one, he meets them—Korea, Trieste, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Western Germany, Formosa. Not always are the solutions perfect. Not always are they exactly what we would like if we were dictating terms as a conqueror might. But they are "live and let live" solutions which, over the span of years, may work better than one-sided dictation.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to work in the ranks of the party that placed Dwight Eisenhower in the Presidency in these times.

EAST VERSUS WEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there are many magnificent scenic spectacles in this great land of ours, the United States of America. During recent weeks, the Travel Section of the New York Times has sponsored a series of debates, between the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, as to which region, the East or the West, contains the most outdoor grandeur.

Naturally, my preference is for the West. Senator FLANDERS favors the East. The debate has been in the friendly fashion which is characteristic of most people of good will, and I feel privileged to have been asked to participate with so eminent a Member of the Senate as the junior Senator from Vermont. The debate was arranged by Paul J. C. Friedlander, travel editor of the New York Times, which is one of the Nations eminent newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vote for the West," written by me and published in the New York Times of March 20, 1955; an article entitled "War Between East and West," written by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and published in the New York Times of April 17, 1955; and an article entitled "Final Skirmish in the Battle of the Senators," written by me and printed in the New York Times of April 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1955]

VOTE FOR THE WEST—ROVING SENATOR COMPARES THE VIEWS FROM EASTERN AND WESTERN TRAINS

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time in my life, I have been traveling extensively through the eastern portion of the United States. Most of this travel has been by train, some by automobile. It has taken me into most of the States between the Great Lakes and Manhattan Island.

What I have seen, either through the windows of pullman cars or through the windshields of automobiles, has scant resemblance to the magnificent landscapes of the American West, where I was born and raised. Indeed, it is clear that the native easterner who has been touring only in his own segment of the Nation doesn't know what he is missing.

I purposely took the 18-hour Gotham Limited of the Pennsylvania Railroad from Chicago to New York so I could ride over the Allegheny Mountains in broad daylight. I hardly realized when the divide of the range had been crossed. The long train twisted up some bare, eroded ridges in the State of Pennsylvania, and then presently we were back in flat country once more. It was no experience at all, so far as scenery was concerned. I felt let down and disappointed, particularly when measuring the view by western standards of scenery.

SCENIC POINTS

I thought of the Great Northern's Empire Builder, winding through wooded canyons on the boundary of Glacier National Park, with deer and elk dotting the slopes. I remembered the time I pilgrimaged via the Rio Grande system from Denver to Salt Lake City, over the magnificent hump of the Rockies. I recalled with nostalgia the breathtaking corridor of the Columbia River Gorge, where Union Pacific trains follow a water-level route past the glacial spires of Mount Adams and Mount Hood. And I mourned for the forlorn eastern wayfarer, who must content himself with the pygmy knobs of the Alleghenies, which would barely rank as foothills where I come from.

Practically all of America's scenery—particularly that lining railroad tracks and automobile highways—is concentrated within the 11 States which stretch from the Rocky Mountains westward. On a train out West, a pilgrim may start reading with the best of intentions, but the panorama outside the window will soon compel him to put down his book or his magazine.

VARIETY OF SIGHTS

Waterfalls, glaciers, rock pinnacles, foaming rapids—these pass the windows of a western train like pickets on a fence. A blasé traveler may possibly become weary of the plethora of magnificent sights from a train rumbling through Colorado or Idaho. But in the East, the tour promoters must exploit each ravine or gully as if it were the Grand Canyon. The Pennsylvania's horseshoe curve is nice to see, yet it is a pretty tame spectacle, indeed, by comparison with the spiral tunnels of the Canadian Pacific, near Yoho Valley.

The West is a land of cosmic dimensions and this, too, the eastern nomad may find it hard to appreciate. In my own State of Oregon, when I was riding toward Washington to take the oath of office, the Union Pacific's crack streamliner City of Portland hurtled along for 8 hours before it reached the Idaho border. Yet, on the short 4-hour Pennsylvania Railroad run between New York and Washington, I never cease to marvel at the fact that we cross six different geographic sovereignties—the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York.

BIG STATES

To be in six separate sovereignties out West, one would have to take passage on a fast train for the better part of 2 days. Many of the Eastern States are of cubicle size, but virtually all the States of the West are measured by endless horizons. Oregon contains more than twice the land area of the State of New York, yet has only as many residents as the borough of the Bronx. This, too, is a distinguishing factor between American journeys, east and west.

In the East, travelers are sophisticated about such vast cities as Philadelphia and Cleveland. They barely look up from their newspapers or bridge game when the train rolls into the station of one of these metropolises. But, out West, the appearance on the main line of Wenatchee, Wash. (population 14,000) or of Pendleton, Oreg. (population 15,000) is the signal for passengers to get off the train, to promenade on the platform and to buy oranges, souvenir folders, and postage stamps.

VAST DISTANCES

The distances in the Western States require far longer trips than in the East, but I still am puzzled by the greater luxury of western trains for one simple reason. Travel in the East, to this dyed-in-the-wool westerner, at least, is a bore. Looking out the window you see either the backside of factories or a drab and flat countryside. In the West the glories of Mother Nature are at their best.

Yet western trains, despite the stirring spectacle visible from their windows, are more comfortable and attractive than their eastern counterparts. There is more space per passenger; there are more lounge cars and domes; more observation chairs. In addition, the food on western diners is cheaper in price and the menu more varied. On the eastern lines there is nothing like the variety that marks the Southern Pacific bill of fare between Portland and San Francisco, and that of the Great Northern between Seattle and Great Falls.

I must confess a prejudice, having been born and raised in the West. Perhaps I do not take into account the fact that eastern railroads must handle far more people. When Oregon is as populated as New Jersey or Pennsylvania, it may be that our trains will not have quite as much room for lolling and luxury. It could even be that our scenic vistas will be less free and untrammeled than they are today. But this isn't likely to occur during my time.

WAR BETWEEN EAST AND WEST—THE SENATOR FROM VERMONT OFFERS A FEW WORDS TO SET STRAIGHT THE RECORD AND HIS COLLEAGUE FROM OREGON

(By RALPH E. FLANDERS, United States Senator from Vermont)

(On March 20 this section published an article by United States Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, from Oregon, decrying the lack of majestic scenery to be seen from the railroads and highways of the Eastern States as compared to what the Northwest offers its tourists. Defenders of the East, both in and out of public office, reacted with the quick vehemence of a Rocky Mountain brown trout rising to a Presidential dry fly. This page is devoted to some of the more pertinent rebuttals which offer small comfort to Senator NEUBERGER'S constituents. He promises a reply to this symposium in a future issue.)

The article by Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon has led me to hope that a few words from me might bring to him a great deal

more of enjoyment as he travels about our country.

First, I would suggest that he make a point of visiting every State in the Union. I had done that by 1922. As a popular speaker and as a United States Senator, he should have no difficulty in wangling invitations which would enable him to cover the country while he is still young.

It would be my advice, however, that he gradually cure himself of his obsession for vastness which seems to be the primary element in his appreciation of the American scene. I, too, love the vastness of America but would not confine my admiration to that one element. I suppose it is because the West is vast that the transcontinental trains are made so roomy and comfortable. If you have to stay 2 or 3 days in 1 train, the railroad company must treat you well, and I for one am frank to say that they do. The long distance travel of the West, whether in quarters, service, or food, is superior to that offered by our short runs here in the East.

HOMEMADE HAPPINESS

There are long, long, dreary stretches in the West, but there is no need to be discouraged by them. I remember once riding a slow train on the Milwaukee through South Dakota. At a station where we stopped for lunch, I talked with a little 6-year-old girl who was very, very happy. In the rotogravure section of a newspaper she showed me the picture of Helen Wills, the tennis player, with the well-known visor which shaded her eyes. This little girl had made herself a visor out of a piece of cardboard and some string. Hers was a homemade happiness. If one is interested in people, one can find interest in travel even where the scene is not particularly exciting, as is the case in so many parts of the West.

I am saying nothing against South Dakota. The ability and enterprise of the people of that region have made a rich State out of one which had few natural attractions.

Senator NEUBERGER speaks somewhat patronizing of crossing the Allegheny Divide between Cresson and the Horseshoe Curve without noticing when he had done so. Does he find anything spectacular in crossing the Continental Divide between Laramie and Rawlins? We don't find something spectacular everywhere, either in the East or the West.

I am sorry that he did not have a more interesting time from Altoona on. Whether he was headed for Philadelphia or Baltimore, the train winds through some very lovely country. If one is to enjoy the whole of the United States, he should have his mind attuned to pastoral beauties as well as to wild and rugged scenery.

THE PLAIN PEOPLE

If he went through Lancaster County, he should know that he is in one of the richest counties of the United States. He might get a glimpse of the Amish people with their plain dress and characteristic buggies. A part of the charm of that journey has passed away since I first made it many years ago when they still maintained depots at such picturesquely named stations as Highspire and Birdsong; but in any event, it is lovely.

I cannot help wondering if interesting scenery from his own point of view is not very limited indeed. Coming East, does it not cease for him at the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains? Are there not, particularly on the northern routes, hundreds of miles between the Rockies and Sierras or the Coast Range which lack interest for him? Certainly to one of New England birth it is a bit disconcerning to drive along the southern edge of the really magnificient State of Wyoming and find that it takes 2 hours to get a new view. Up where I was born there is a new and charming view at every turn in the road. We do not have vastness; vastness in itself is a wonderful thing, but it is not the only thing.

A fundamental difference between West and East is this: Out West the landscape is wonderful in the large. But don't look at it too closely. It won't stand detailed inspection. Back East the scene is not grand, but you can get as close to it as you wish, down to the least blade of grass, and find it beautiful.

As I understand it, the Senator has an engagement in Vermont very shortly. It would be my hope that he might visit my native State (where "spring lingers indecently in the lap of winter") at a time when the buds have shaken out so that he can see a landscape which is truly a God-made park.

He will find many things of interest about that region. One of them is our timberline, which is as good as any timberline in the West. We have it down lower where you can get to it easily. It runs between 3,800 and 4,000 feet above sea level. It is true that the mountains do not rise above that line into the eternal snows. That is somethings for which we have to go west, but our timberline is as good as anybody's.

There are many fine mountains in the West. I think perhaps my favorite is Mount Shasta, particularly as I used to see it from the old Siskiyou Tunnel route. The train would make a turn around a mountain and you said goodby to Shasta. A few minutes later it was looking at you over the top of that mountain. Again you lost it around the next mountain and again it peered up at you over the top—and so on, as I remember it, for hours.

TWO-HUNDRED-MILE WINDS

We have nothing like that in the East, but I would respectfully call attention to Mount Washington which, with the whole Presidential Range, has a grandeur of its own to the discerning eye. It has more than that. It has the highest recorded wind velocities in the world. If one wants to be sure of experiencing 200-mile-an-hour winds plus, he must come to Mount Washington.

The western folks used to be a little scornful of this and erected a weather station on one of the mountains up back of Denver. Hopefully they kept it manned for 2 or 3 years and then quietly, without fanfare, dismantled it. Mount Washington still holds the record.

In good time I am sure Senator NEUBERGER will shake himself clear of his provincialism and become a good American. The way to do that is to learn to appreciate that which every State in the Union has to offer.

FINAL SKIRMISH IN THE BATTLE OF THE SENATORS—NEUBERGER OF OREGON GIVES GROUND BEFORE VERMONT'S FIGHTING FLANDERS

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Now that I have been properly put in my place by a bipartisan phalanx led by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS (Republican of Vermont) and Gov. Averell Harriman (Democrat of New York) I return to the wars in behalf of the superiority of western scenery over that of the Eastern States.

First, however, I must retreat sufficiently to confess that I never intended to give the impression that all the eastern outdoors is unworthy of having 20/20 vision wasted upon it. If I conveyed any such idea, I herewith apologize. The East has its beauty spots and its great moments. Yet, I still stubbornly claim that western grandeur would win in any fair and unbiased competition.

Probably I had better explain what I mean by West. Perhaps that is the source of some of the tension between me and my fellow officeholders. Senator FLANDERS scolded me for what he called the "dreary" landscape of South Dakota. Let me assure my colleague that I must travel about 1,400 miles eastward from Oregon to get to South Dakota. That is substantially equal to the distance he will have to pilgrimage westward from Vermont to reach the same State. But I am not blaming New England for South Dakota. In fact, South Dakota contains some idyllic dales and glens in the Black Hills which I will pit against Vermont (or even Oregon) any time Senator FLANDERS wants to match panoramas.

WHERE ARE THE DAKOTAS

To me, West describes that portion of the United States stretching from the Divide of the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. East, in my opinion, refers to the landscape between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic's surf. South Dakota fits in neither category. It is Middle West.

Senator FLANDERS extolled the marvels of the East, "down to the least blade of grass." We have lovely grass in the West, too, but we never feel that we have to brag about it. Indeed, it is just about identical with the kind of grass that grows in the East, so nobody in America need rent a roomette or fill a gas tank to look at grass, even that recommended by a United States Senator.

I concede that there are many imposing places tooled by nature in the East—Niagara Falls, the Adirondacks and the Presidential Range, Cape Cod and the Great Smokies, to mention merely a few. Furthermore, I agree with Senator FLANDERS and Governor Harriman that you cannot necessarily compare the gentle beauty of the Catskills with the stark glacial majesty of Mt. Hood or Mt. Rainier.

If there is any single lesson which this foray into scenic rivalry should have taught me, it is that each part of America happens to be marvelous and wonderful to the people who live there. Vermont is gorgeous to a Senator from Vermont, and Oregon is in a class by itself to a Senator from Oregon. And South Dakota surpasses all other States in outdoor attractions, if you are a storekeeper or schoolteacher or auto mechanic residing in South Dakota.

I ought not to have forgotten this from World War II. When our outfit was bivouacked in the wilds of the Yukon, men did not yearn for Bali Bali or the Isle of Capri—they ached to be home, wherever that might be.

GI's from the Bronx talked of the Bronx as though it might be the Swiss Alps and full of wonders. Others described glowingly some remote crossroads village in Georgia or Tennessee. And I recall the homesick corporal from Chicago who, when he heard the order to get down out of our truck because we were at an outpost named Burwash Landing, sighed mournfully: "All I want to hear is some conductor call out, 'Change here for Dearborn station'."

That is the way the scolding letters have been since I wrote my original article running down the scenery of the East. A housewife in New Jersey says I just must see the sunset from her front porch. A truck driver in Richmond insists I ought to ride through the Blue Ridge Mountains on the leather seat beside him. An office employe of the Chesapeake & Ohio thinks I have shirked my duty in not rumbling past wooded hills to White Sulphur Springs aboard a Chesapeake & Ohio passenger train.

A New York City physician demands testily to know which mountain cordillera can rival the man-made spires of Manhattan poking through the mist at dawn. A college co-ed in Ohio writes that the massive Canadian Rockies frightened her, but she considers the gentle knolls of her native State to be "just right."

When a Senator from Vermont joins in singing "for purple mountain majesty, above the fruited plain," there comes into his mind's eye a modest dome surmounted by a cog railway. But a Senator from Oregon,

intoning the same hymn, thinks of a pinnacle of ice and basalt where none except the sturdiest can set crampons.

Since writing my first article on this subject, I have engaged in some laboratory work. I have traveled back and forth across the continent via five different railroads and a Convair plane of the United States Army Air Force, as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I resolved to look out the window with other than insular feelings.

A NEW PERSPECTIVE

I saw the palisades of the Hudson not as a partisan of the Pacific Northwest but with a new detachment. Suddenly I became aware that, while not sharing the proportions of the cliffs stockading the Columbia, these sheer crags have a grandeur all their own. The Delaware is not as picturesque a river as the Salmon or the Rogue, but on the banks of the Delaware our freedom and independence were won, and surely that counts for something, especially in these tense and troubled times.

So I meekly sheath my local pride and promise that never again will I contrast the uplands and rim rock of eastern Oregon with the swales of Central Park. For the last time I have compared the piers of the East River with the lava ramparts towering above the Deschutes. I would pull Senator FLANDERS in a rickshaw from Washington to Montpelier before I again would dare to claim that the cascades of Oregon are twice the height of the Presidential Mountains of Vermont.

Perhaps I can retain some shred of my shattered dignity. Will my critics allow me to boast that the West is lonelier than the East? In 1953, my wife and I camped alone on the Lewis and Clark Trail in Idaho. We never saw another person. I appreciated not only the resourcefulness in the outdoors of my farm-reared spouse, but also I understood what America must have been like during the epochs before the white man came. I doubt if this experience would have been possible in the crowded States of the East.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

Under the previous order, the calendar will now be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate was announced as first in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DONALD HECTOR TAYLOR

The bill (S. 26) for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Donald Hector Taylor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

RICA, LUCY, AND SALOMON BREGER

The bill (S. 29) for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUPE M. GONZALEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lupe M. Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SELMA RIVLIN

The bill (S. 42) for the relief of Selma Rivlin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Selma Rivlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EVANTIYI YORGIYADIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 68) for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Evantiyi", to strike out "Yorgiadis" and insert "Yorgiyadis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evantiyi Yorgiyadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis."

URSULA ELSE BOYSEN

The bill (S. 71) for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Else Boysen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARGARET ISABEL BYERS

The bill (S. 89) for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaret Isabel Byers shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

NEJIBE EL-SOUSSE SLYMAN

The bill (S. 90) for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUZIA COX

The bill (S. 91) for the relief of Luzia Cox was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luzia Cox may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

AHTI JOHANNES RUUSKANEN

The bill (S. 93) for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTHER CORNELIUS, ARTHUR ALEXANDER CORNELIUS, AND FRANK THOMAS CORNELIUS

The bill (S. 94) for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

PETER CHARLES BETHEL (PETER CHARLES PETERS)

The bill (S. 95) for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

XANTHI GEORGES KOMPOROZOU

The bill (S. 99) for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Xanthi Georges Komporozou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 154, Senate bill 99, which was passed a few moment ago, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report, which I think is a very interesting one on this bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 99) for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Xanthi Georges Komporozou. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 44-year-old native and citizen of Greece who last entered the United States as a visitor on July 29, 1950, accompanying her employers, Lt. Col. and Mrs. Joseph McChristian, West Point N. Y. Mrs. McChristian is the daughter of Gen. and Mrs. James A. Van Fleet. She suffered an attack of pulmonary tuberculosis 3 years ago and the beneficiary of the bill has taken charge of the McChristian children.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated June 25, 1954, to the then chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to S. 3150 which was a bill passed by the Senate in the 83d Congress for the relief of the same alien, reads as follows:

JUNE 25, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request of the Department of Justice for a report relative to the bill (S. 3150) for the relief of Xanthi George Komporozou, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the New York, N. Y., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would grant this alien the status of a permanent resident of the United States upon payment of the required visa fee. It also directs that one number be deducted from the appropriate immigration quota.

The beneficiary is chargeable to the quota of Greece.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE XANTHI GEORGES KOMPOROZOU, BENEFICIARY OF S. 3150

Xanthi Georges Komporozou is single, a native and citizen of Greece, and was born on October 3, 1909, at Manolas. Her only entry into the United States was on July 29, 1950, at New York, N. Y., when she was admitted as a visitor, accompanying her employers, Lt. Col. and Mrs. Joseph McChristian, West Point, N. Y. She has received four extensions, the last one to expire on May 27, 1954.

Miss Komporozou has been nursemaid to Lt. Col. and Mrs. McChristian's three children since December 1949. She has cared for the children since Mrs. McChristian's attack of pulmonary tuberculosis 3 years ago, and has been practically a mother to the 3 children. Mrs. McChristian is the daughter of Gen. and Mrs. James A. Van Fleet.

Miss Komporozou has no assets, but little formal education, and has educated herself by having tutors and by self-teaching. Miss Komporozou speaks classical Greek fluently and has taught the McChristian children the Greek language.

She has no relatives in the United States. Her two sisters and a half brother reside in Greece.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in connection with the case:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
April 1, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you know, on March 17 I introduced S. 3150, a bill to grant permanent residence to Xanthi Georges Komoporozou, and this bill is now pending before your committee.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter to me from General Van Fleet, as well as a copy of a letter from the general's daughter to him, both of which are self-explanatory.

This appears to me to be a meritorious case, and I will appreciate anything you may do to secure early consideration of S. 3150.

With kind regards, I remain

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

AUBURNDALE, FLA., *March 15, 1954.*

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPESSARD: I have a great favor to ask of you.

It is to ask you to introduce special legislation which will authorize the retention in this country, and to become an American citizen, of a Greek nurse who has been in my family in this country for nearly 4 years.

The reason for special legislation is the fact that the Greek quota for entry into the United States is small and is oversubscribed for many years to come. I believe her case is outstanding and merits special legislation.

Her name is Miss Xanthi Georges Komporozou, born in Manolada, Greece, October 3, 1910.

Miss Komporozou is presently living with my daughter, Dempsie, wife of Col. Joseph A. McChristian, United States Army, at West Point, N. Y.

Miss Komporozou holds passport No. 5900 issued by the Greek Government in Athens, Greece, June 14, 1950. It is valid until May 9, 1955, but the current visa No. 963210 is valid only until May 27, 1954.

Miss Komporozou's parents are dead. She has no living relatives and no home. She desires to become an American citizen.

I am enclosing a statement concerning Miss Komporozou, submitted by my daughter Dempsie.

Colonel McChristian was raised in Miami Beach and is also a friend of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS.

With warm regards to you and Mary,

Cordially,

JAMES A. VAN FLEET,
General, United States Army (Retired).

WEST POINT, N. Y., *March 10, 1954.*

Gen. JAMES A. VAN FLEET,
United States Army (Retired),
Auburndale, Fla.

DEAR DADDY: Here briefly are the facts, most of which you know already, about Xanthi.

She is Miss Xanthi Georges Komporozou, born in Manolada, Greece, October 3, 1910. She is presently in possession of passport No. 5900, issued by the Greek Government in Athens, June 14, 1950. It is valid until May 9, 1955, but her visa No. 963210 is valid only until May 27, 1954. Her parents are dead and she has no (relatives) and no home. She wants more than anything in this world to become an American citizen. The Greek quota is small and already oversubscribed for years to come.

Her integrity, loyalty, superior ideals—in fact all the qualities which would make her an ideal American citizen—are, of course, the very reasons we found her in the first place. You recall this was just before Christmas, a little over 3 years ago, in Greece, and the Communists had made public threat to assassinate you, and they did get the man near you. You were under constant police guard and we were all scared to death for fear something would happen to you or to your grandchildren. And with your third grandchild due any day we, or rather mother, appealed to the lady-in-waiting to the Queen—Mary Carolou—to find someone who could be trusted completely. Mary Carolou sent us Xanthi Komporozou, who had been in her own home for many years.

When we returned to the States in July 1950, we were able to bring Xanthi with us on a temporary visitor's visa for 6 months. When she was due to return to Greece she was midway in extensive dental work and we were able to extend her visa for another 6 months.

During this time we were transferred from Norfolk, Va., to West Point, N. Y., and on arriving at West Point it was discovered that I had contracted tuberculosis in Greece. I know you well recall that terrible experience.

The same day that I entered Fitzsimons Hospital in Denver, in April 1951, you were suddenly sent to Korea to command the Eighth Army. It seemed pretty glum—in fact, downright unsolvable, since it meant 2 years minimum hospitalization for me and no small amount of anguish about our 3 children.

Any ordinary person would have left in a hurry, but Xanthi quietly put aside her own life and plans and took up all of our burdens. Our case was presented to the immigration officials in New York and they were very kind and agreed to extend her visit.

Two years later I came back from the hospital and you came back from Korea. Then in October 1953 it was discovered that my tuberculosis was not cured and the doctors recommended surgery, which was performed at great expense at Harkness Pavilion, Presbyterian Hospital in New York City.

This time we were fortunate to get a letter from the National Employment Service saying that they could not furnish anyone to take Xanthi's place to care for the children and so her visa was extended until May 1954. But during all these past many months, which by now is almost 4 years, Xanthi Komporozou has become not just irreplaceable, but inseparable from us as a loved member of the family. Not only has she cared for the children completely and nursed them when they were ill, but she has loved them as her own and in truth, could not be much more loved by us all had she been born into the family.

She has taught the children the Greek language and Greek philosophy. She has won the admiration of all who know us at West Point. That she would be a credit to our country goes without saying. Her health is excellent. She is known by many people of prominence. Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America stated from his pulpit that she was an example to all Greeks in this country.

And so I am appealing to you, Daddy, because of Xanthi's loyalty to your family at a dangerous time in Greece and because of her 4 selfless years of devotion since—thus freeing your mind when the country needed you both for Greece and for Korea. I believe all of this deserves rewarding and all who know her feel it justifies special legislation allowing her to remain as a citizen in the United States.

These are the facts concerning Xanthi. You may use this letter as you wish.

With love,

DEMPSIE

(Dempsie Van Fleet McChristian, wife of Col. Joseph A. McChristian.)

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 99) should be enacted.

HERMINE LORENZ

The bill (S. 100) for the relief of Hermine Lorenz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hermine Lorenz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LEON J. DE SZETHOFER AND BLANCHE HRDINOVA DE SZETHOFER

The bill (S. 118) for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

DAVID WEI-DAO LEA AND JULIA AN-FONG WANG LEA

The bill (S. 119) for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

VASILIOS DEMETRIOU KRETSOS AND HIS WIFE CHRYSSA THOMAIDOU KRETSOS

The bill (S. 120) for the relief of Basilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

SULTANA COKA PAVLOVITCH

The bill (S. 121) for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sultana Coka Pavlovitch shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIN VOLEJNICEK

The bill (S. 130) for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonin Volejnicek shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIO RIBEIRO

The bill (S. 162) for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Ribeiro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BORYS NAUMENKO

The bill (S. 192) for the relief of Borys Naumenko was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Borys Naumenko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LOUISE RUSSU SOZANSKI

The bill (S. 193) for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louise Russu Sozanski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

OLIVIA M. ORCIUCH

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of Olivia M. Orciuch, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, Calendar No. 208, House bill 1252, is an identical bill. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 196 is indefinitely postponed.

REV. LORENZO RODRIGUEZ BLANCO, AND REV. ALEJANDRO NEGREDO LAZARO

The bill (S. 234) for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco, and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

ANDREAS GEORGES VLASTOS (ANDREAS GEORGES VLASTO)

The bill (S. 238) for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANDREW WOLFINGER

The bill (S. 283) for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrew Wolfinger shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Theodore Sjerslee, a United States citizen.

MRS. DIANA COHEN AND JACQUELINE PATRICIA COHEN

The bill (S. 320) for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

ANNI MARJATTA MAKELA AND SON, MARKKU PAIVIO MAKELA

The bill (S. 321) for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MALBINA ROUPHAEL DAVID (NEE GEBRAEL)

The bill (S. 322) for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

VITTORIA ALBERGHETTI, DANIELE ALBERGHETTI, ANNA MARIA ALBERGHETTI, CARLA ALBERGHETTI, AND PAOLO ALBERGHETTI

The bill (S. 341) for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ARTHUR SROKA

The bill (S. 353) for the relief of Arthur Sroka was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Arthur Sroka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARIA BERTAGNOLLI PANCHERI

The bill (S. 397) for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUCY PERSONIUS

The bill (S. 439) for the relief of Lucy Personius was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lucy Personius, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Glen C. Personius, citizens of the United States.

GEORGE PANTELAS

The bill (S. 449) for the relief of George Pantelas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of George Pantelas. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said George Pantelas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of the first paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

URHO PAAVO PATOKOSKI AND HIS FAMILY

The bill (S. 473) for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Urho Paavo Patokoski; his wife, Toino Esteri; and their three minor sons, Iimo Matti Juhani, Paavo Esa Antero, and Pekka Jouko Kalevi, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JAMES JI-TSUNG WOO, MARGIE WANCHUNG WOO, DANIEL DU-NING WOO AND ROBERT DU-AN WOO

The bill (S. 570) for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo and Robert Du-An Woo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

MARTIN P. PAVLOV

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martin P. Pavlov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HILDEGARDE HILLER

The bill (S. 587) for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegarde Hiller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALICK BHARK

The bill (S. 604) for the relief of Alick Bhark was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alick Bhark shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS

The bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santiago Hormaechea, Jose Lecanda, Rufino Merino Jimenez, Panagiatis Demitreos Zeras, Fernando Macuaga Madariaga, Manuel Lopez Trabazo, Luis Uriarte Otaolea, and Antonio Yrigoyen Arrachea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, there is no objection to the passage of the bill which has just been passed. I so indicated by not offering an objection. However, I wish to go on record now as stating that if, in the future, bills covering certain types of occupations are announced on the call of the calendar, I shall object.

SANDY MICHAEL JOHN PHILP

The bill (S. 644) Sandy Michael John Philp was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sandy Michael John Philp shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as precribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

ANTONIOS VASILLOS ZARKADIS

The bill (S. 650) for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted

to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROBERT A. BORROMEO

The bill (S. 676) for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Robert A. Borromeo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHRISTOS PAUL ZOLOTAS

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Christos Paul Zolotas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROMANA MICHELINA SERENI

The bill (S. 713) for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Romana Michelina Sereni shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALFIO FERRARA

The bill (S. 714) for the relief of Alfio Ferrara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfio Ferrara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

PIETRO MEDURI

The bill (S. 760) for the relief of Pietro Meduri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Meduri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MOJSZE HILDESHAIM AND ITA HILDESHAIM

The bill (S. 827) for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JACOB GRYNBERG

The bill (S. 867) for the relief of Jacob Grynberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacob Grynberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSE PEREZ GOMEZ—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 892) for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

HENRY DUNCAN

The bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Henry Duncan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Duncan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

EDWARD NAARITS

The bill (S. 1044) for the relief of Edward Naarits was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the time limitation provided for in section 330 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward Naarits shall be deemed to be within the purview of the said section provided his petition for naturalization is filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act.

BLANCA IBARRA AND DOLORES IBARRA

The bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SLAVOLJUB DJUROVIC AND GORAN DJUROVIC

The bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

GUISEPPI CASTROGIOVANNI, HIS WIFE AND CHILD

The bill (S. 1350) for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, and his wife and child shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State

shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIO JACOE

The bill (S. 1367) for the relief of Antonio Jacoe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (9), (17), and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Jacoe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

LISELOTTE WARMBRAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon, and "*Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Liselotte Warmbrand may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNA SCHMID

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 236) for the relief of Johanna Schmid which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johanna Schmid, the fiance of Edmond J. Bolz, Jr., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Johanna Schmid is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Edmond J. Bolz, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Schmid, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Johanna Schmid, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Johanna Schmid as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN ZAFRED URBANIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 407) for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Helen Zafred Urbanic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Urbanic, citizens of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRISKA ANNE KARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 504) for the relief of Priska Anne Kary, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Priska Anne Kary may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION S. QUIRK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Marion S. Quirk, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, in line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon, and "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marion S. Quirk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZEV COHEN (ZEV MACHTANI)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 844) for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CASIMERO RIVERA GUTIERREZ ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 974) for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a comma and "upon payment of the required visa fees.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of Restricted Data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, with a view to making it the unfinished business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 220, H. R. 5239, the agriculture appropriation bill, with the understanding that the bill will not be taken up until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the call of the calendar be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the next bill on the calendar will be stated.

RETIREMENT, CLERICAL ASSISTANTS, AND FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES TO FORMER PRESIDENTS

The bill (S. 1516) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I object, not on the merits of the bill, but because I believe it is a bill that ought to be debated by the Senate. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS — BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The Senate proceeding to consider the bill (S. 1628) to provide relief of farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 3, line 10, after the word "area", to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; in line 12, after the word "be", to strike out "necessary" and insert "advisable"; after line 13, to strike out:

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever he determines that the normal production from the acreage allotment for the principal crop produced on any farm, together with the normal production of other crops grown on such farm, is insufficient to provide a livelihood for the operator of such farm and his family, to increase such acreage allotment to the extent necessary to enable such operator to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to provide such livelihood.

In line 23, to change the subsection letter from "(c)" to "(b)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus causing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economics of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed, or damaged,

the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, may cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I object to the bill, on which the amendments have now been agreed to, because I believe the bill establishes a new policy and is a subject that should be debated. I, therefore, object to its consideration on the call of the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that the majority leader will set a time for the consideration of the bill. It is absolutely necessary that the Senate act upon it as soon as possible. It must be enacted very shortly if it is to do any good at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share the hope expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. The bill should be considered and passed at an early date. It is already rather late for its consideration. I doubt whether it would be beneficial to many areas which were adversely affected by the severe weather conditions which recently occurred. I believe the bill should be brought up promptly, so as to give us an opportunity to go on record with respect to it, and so that we may see how Senators feel about assistance of this kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last week I mentioned to the distinguished minority leader that there were some bills reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which I would propose to take up after the calendar had been called today.

I have conferred with the acting minority leader and with the distinguished Senator who made the objection to its passage on the call of the calendar. If it is agreeable with them, I shall move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill as soon as the call of the calendar shall have been concluded.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I certainly hope that will be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall ask that the bill be taken up as soon as we have disposed of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in national forests was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. BIBLE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests, which went to the foot of the calendar, go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a bill which was recommended by the Department. I had been expecting to oppose the committee amendment. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada will state why he would like to have the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the colleague who is associated with me on the Calendar Committee desires to study this particular bill and has some comments to make concerning it. I was hoping he would be on the floor before we proceeded to the call of the calendar this morning.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I do not wish to deprive any colleague of an opportunity to study a bill the first time it is called on the calendar. I desire to observe, however, that I think the bill has considerable merit, and I believe it is meritorious in the way in which it was introduced. I hope the colleague to whom the distinguished Senator from Nevada has referred will give very careful consideration to the bill as it was originally introduced. I hope the study may lead him to support the bill in its entirety and without the committee amendment striking out a portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Calendar No. 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests, will go over to the next call of the calendar.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN—BILLS PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that objection is made by the minority calendar committee to the present consideration of Calendar No. 212, S. 1372?

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill as drawn provides for an indefinite period, without limitation, for the making of supplementary advances on loans at the time the extended period expires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the minority calendar committee if at the conclusion of the calendar call this bill be considered by the Senate.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that there will be any objection to placing in the bill a time limitation of the kind the Senator from Nebraska has reference to.

Mr. HRUSKA. A 2-year limitation would be agreeable to us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I believe this bill involves a new policy, and therefore I object to the bill being considered at this time. I believe it should be debated on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the Senator if I moved to take it up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. I would have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN OKLAHOMA TO THE CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

The bill (S. 998) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Woodward, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land situated in Woodward County, Okla.:

Beginning at a point 66.0 feet south and 283.0 feet west of the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range 21 west, Indian meridian, and running thence south 273.0 feet, thence west 150.0 feet, thence north 273.0 feet, thence east 150.0 feet to the point of beginning, all lying in the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range 21 west, Indian meridian, and including an area of 0.940 acre more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made subject to (a) the condition that the city of Woodward, Okla., pay into the Treasury of the United States, in return for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such land to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after appraisal of such land, and (b) such other conditions, limitations, or reservations as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF RICE QUOTA MARKETING PROVISIONS

The bill (H. R. 2839) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICE ALLOTMENT HISTORY

The bill (H. R. 4356) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that after the call of the calendar, H. R. 1573 be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and several other Senators are very much interested in this proposed legislation, but we are not in position to debate it today. I gave Senators assurance that if it were objected to today on the call of the calendar it would be taken up at an early date.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if it is to be passed, it will have to be passed within the next few days in order to relieve the situation of the farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from South Carolina that I shall be glad to talk to him about a convenient date when the measure can be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Texas.

OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT TIN SMELTERS AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, pursuant to the provisions and authority of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, as amended, the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., shall be continued in operation until June 30, 1956, and so long thereafter as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States; and, in connection with such study and investigation, the Federal Facilities Corporation, or any other designee of the President, is requested to show the plant and facilities to any interested persons and to provide them with all necessary and appropriate information within the limits of security considerations upon which to base appraisals and to formulate proposals to the Government for the future operation of the smelter by the Government or under private lease or ownership arrangements.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to report to the Congress prior to March 31, 1956, the findings of this study and his recommendations with respect to the future operation of the tin smelter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

I strongly urge passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

This resolution proposes to continue operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., until June 30, 1956, and thereafter as authorized by Congress.

The resolution also requests the executive branch to conduct a study in order to be prepared to present to the Congress recommendations regarding the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States—whether under Government ownership or private ownership.

Unless this resolution is enacted, operation of the tin smelter will end on June 30 of this year. This, I am convinced, would be contrary to our national interests.

The United States is in this position: It is the largest single consumer of tin in the world; it must depend on foreign sources for virtually its entire supply of tin.

There is only one tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere—that is in Texas. There is only one principal source of tin ore in the Western Hemisphere—Bolivia.

These two facts are of great significance, taken in conjunction with each other.

For the sake of our national security; as an aid to maintaining the free economy of the nation of Bolivia; and to lessen the risk of our being subjected to price gouging by those controlling foreign tin supplies, continued operation of the North American tin smelter using South American tin ore is essential.

I urge that the Senate adopt the resolution approved by the Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the regular call of the calendar. The bill passed to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

The bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and and stockmen was announced as next in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make which are not related to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan if he will withhold his remarks. There are only two more bills remaining on the calendar.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 1372 there is in course of preparation language which will permit of the imposition of a time limitation with reference to supplementary loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the first period and insert a comma, and the following: "but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word "two" from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting the word "four" and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: "After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection, but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 210, Senate bill 1628, to provide relief for farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1628) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendments have been agreed to. The bill vests the Secretary of Agriculture with power to proceed in cases of disaster such as are outlined in the bill. There is nothing compulsory on the Secretary. Being wholly a discretionary measure, I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill would provide relief to producers in areas suffering natural disasters by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to allot them additional acreage for the production of commodities subject to production controls. The disaster which gave rise to this bill was the freeze which occurred in many States in late March. Producers, farm workers, and others in these areas will suffer severe hardship if substitute crops cannot be planted. In many cases the planting of substitute crops is prevented by acreage allotments, and this bill would provide a measure of relief in those cases.

The committee amendments, first, make it entirely discretionary with the Secretary as to the amount of relief, if any, to be accorded to any and all producers; and, second, strike out a provision requiring additional allotments to provide all farmers with a livelihood.

The additional acreage allotted under the bill for any crop for any year would be limited to the smaller of first, 500,000 acres or second, 3 percent of the national allotment for such crop.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina if the bill as reported from the committee is agreeable to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All of the amendments have been adopted, and the matter is left discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. It is discretionary, not mandatory. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1628) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus caus-

ing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economies of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed, or damaged, the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, may cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate passed Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210, a bill to provide relief of farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or oher natural causes. I had filed an objection to the bill, but it was inadvertently overlooked. Therefore, Mr. President, at this time I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that the objection of the Senator from Delaware to the bill was overlooked, because the able members of the minority calendar committee objected to consideration of the bill when it was called on the calendar. However, at the conclusion of the calendar call, the majority leader asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210; and it was under that procedure that the bill was passed.

Of course, the Senator from Delaware is perfectly within his rights in submitting the motion to reconsider; but the majority leader hopes that at the conclusion of action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill, it will be agreeable to the authors of Senate bill 1628 and to the distinguished Senator from Delaware to have the Senate proceed to act on his motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. If that is agreeable, I should like to have the RECORD so show at this time, so that Members may be on notice that this question is likely to come up then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is agreeable to me, and I wish to have this understanding, because I understand there is a possibility that the Finance Committee will be in session tomorrow afternoon, in which event, before my motion is taken up, I would wish to be notified. I shall be in the city. If we can be notified in advance, I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Texas in having the motion brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then let the Senate be on notice, first, that the Senator from Texas assumes the responsibility of notifying the Senator from Delaware that consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill will be followed by consideration of his motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed. We hope his motion will be taken up by the Senate late tomorrow afternoon or else on Wednesday, depending on the time the Senate consumes in acting on the agricultural appropriation bill.

If the majority leader had known earlier today that the Senator from Delaware wished to be notified when the Senate proceeded to consider Senate bill 1628, the majority leader would certainly have notified him. But the Senator from Texas knows that the Senator from Delaware does not contend that Senators on this side of the aisle failed to carry out any such agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but I did not understand that the bill was to be considered today.

Except for any other understanding the majority leader may have, I would be willing to have my motion considered this afternoon. But in view of the understanding which has been had, I am willing to have my motion go over until tomorrow, although I do not wish to agree that consideration of the motion will follow the Senate's action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware may be assured that the Senator from Texas will personally notify him before a motion to take up his motion for reconsideration is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I will notify the Senator from Texas, too.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say that when Senate bill 1628 was passed over, during the call of the calendar, as acting majority leader I discussed the bill with both Senators on the minority calendar committee, who approved having the bill brought up later, following the calendar call; and I also discussed the bill with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understood from them that there was no objection to the bill, with the amendments which are now in it. That is the reason I did not object when the majority leader asked for the consideration of the bill following the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from Delaware. I think it is a position which was apparently not known to any Member of the Senate when the bill was being considered.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] stated to the majority leader that the bill had been reported unanimously. The minority calendar committee objected to the consideration and passage of the bill on the call of the calendar. The Senate then proceeded to consider it after the call of the calendar had been concluded. Several Senators spoke on the bill. Every Senator had an opportunity to speak. The distinguished Senator from Delaware was occupied in a very important meeting of the Finance Committee and was not aware that the bill was being considered at that time. He is perfectly within his rights to move to reconsider.

All the majority leader wishes to do is to serve notice on the Senator from Delaware and other Members of the Senate that as soon as the unfinished business, namely, the agricultural appropriations bill, is disposed of, it is proposed to proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Texas will assume the responsibility of personally notifying the Senator from Delaware when that is done.

BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senate now to consider Calendar 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That bill has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has gone over to the next call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider Order 213, H. R. 4647, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of

the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4647) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments on page 1, line 8, to strike out "five per centum" and insert "2 per centum or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment," and in line 11, after the word "for," to strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

On page 2, line 4, after the word "acreage", to insert a comma and "and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950–1954 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945–1949 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 4647

This bill, with the committee amendments, would make several increases in 1955 rice-acreage allotments. First, it would increase each State allotment by 2 percent. Second, it would provide each State, and each of those counties whose base acreage had risen 2 percent since 1950, with a minimum 1955 allotment, equal to its 1950 allotment. Third, it would increase each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve hardship resulting from the sharp reduction in rice acreage required by the 1955 allotment. In an effort to take care of the various hardships which have arisen in the various rice-growing areas the committee has proposed amendments which incorporate the substance of Senate bills 1061 and 882, which provide respectively for the State and county minimum allotments just described. As shown in the committee report the areas which would benefit from these minimum provisions have increased their acreage devoted to rice production since the base period applicable to 1950, but now would receive sharp cuts below their 1950 allotments because of the expansion of rice production in other areas.

In order to avoid unduly increasing the national rice acreage the committee amendments would also reduce to 2 percent the 5 percent general increase in State allotments provided by the bill as it passed the House.

The provision for increasing the State reserve is of particular significance in South Carolina where the two price producers have established a rice mill. These producers have previous production history in Georgia and Texas but not in South Carolina. Unless they can obtain a reasonable 1955 allotment on a new farm basis they may be forced to move their rice mill to Texas. This would cause difficulties for all rice producers served by the mill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a question. Were the amendments to H. R. 4647, Calendar No. 213, unanimously agreed to by the committee; and was the bill with the amendments as reported by the committee the bill which was passed today?

Mr. ELLENDER. The answer to the Senator's question is in the affirmative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as I understand, the amendments were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. There was no opposition to this bill being reported.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the unfinished business now the agricultural appropriation bill, Calendar No. 220, House bill 5239?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has been made the unfinished business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What happened to Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356; Calendar No. 217, S. 153; Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573; and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. By unanimous consent, the bills which have just been passed were called up after having been placed at the foot of the calendar. The minority calendar committee had asked that they go to the foot of the calendar until amendments could be drafted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was detained in the Committee on Foreign Relations and was not aware of the progress which had been made with the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 217, S. 153, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, were called but were passed over. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Were S. 153 and H. R. 1573 placed at the foot of the calendar or were they objected to?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were objected to.

Mr. STENNIS. Since the Senator from Minnesota was not present when those bills were called, I may state that I was the Senator who, through the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], interposed objection to Calendar No. 217, S. 153, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. I shall be glad to discuss that bill with the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Minnesota that Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history, was passed, and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was agreed to.

Calendar No. 217, S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, were passed over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to advise the Senator from Minnesota that I interposed objection to the passage of Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, but that I expect the bill to be considered by the Senate at an early date. The Senate may wish to consider it at this time, but I have objected to its passage on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express the hope that before the end of the day, I may be able to have a personal conference with my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in reference to Calendar No. 217, S. 153 and with my good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to see if action cannot be taken on those bills.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to dash the hopes of such a young and good-looking man as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. But so far I am concerned, I am not prepared to discuss H. R. 1573 today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then it may be necessary to return to a consideration of S. 153, Calendar No. 217.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, has the call of the calendar been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed.

The unfinished business is Calendar No. 220, H. R. 5239, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before Senators begin to make speeches, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been speaking with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who had a very legitimate objection to the passage of the bill on the consent calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Vermont if my under-

standing is correct that he is referring to Calendar No. 211, S. 1079?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. I wish to explain that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted rather hurriedly on the bill and took more out of it than it should have. It is my purpose to restore certain language that should be contained in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that, if he will offer his amendment, the Senate can now take action on it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have an amendment prepared by the committee counsel. The committee amendment struck out, on line 7, after the word "strip", the following: "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The last three lines of the bill should remain as they were originally printed. The Secretary of Agriculture would thus be required to make a finding that such lands were suitable for private ownership. The last three lines read: "when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The bill is intended to apply only to little strips of land isolated from the national forests and which, in effect, are a nuisance to administer. The bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "(1)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand correctly that that is the amendment to the committee amendment which the Senator from Vermont desires to offer?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The bill will then read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell at not less than the appraised value, and under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, lands in the national forests which are isolated parcels or narrow projecting strips, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is offered in the nature of an amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it also strike out the "(2)" in line 7?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, the amendment, as amended, strikes out "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota restate his question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My question is merely this: Does the amendment to the committee amendment strike out the words "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that we may have the question answered properly, the Chair will ask the clerk to restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, in lieu of the amendment as offered by the committee, it is proposed to strike out the following: "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That meets the hope I had expressed when the bill was called on the calendar. I hope the bill as now amended will be passed, because it restores the basic language.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont satisfies the objection which the calendar committee had to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. With this amendment, the bill will really be what the committee intended to present. However, this was the last bill taken up at the committee meeting. We were all in a hurry to finish, and we struck out a little more than we intended to eliminate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the leadership to have the Senate remain in session today as long as it is necessary to permit Senators to make speeches.

Tomorrow it is intended to take up the agricultural appropriation bill, which was reported to the Senate on April 21.

If the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill is ready, it is likely that it will be taken up promptly. However, I desire the Senate to be on notice that since the agricultural appropriation bill was reported on April 21, it is intended to have it taken up shortly after the morning hour tomorrow, and to continue with its consideration until it is disposed of, unless the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill should intervene.

CONSERVATION ACREAGE RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recently agreed to designate a subcommittee and to hold hearings on the Conservation Acreage Reserve Act of 1955, S. 1396, of which I am the sponsor, and which is aimed at getting some of our surplus acreage out of grain production and back into grasslands. Because of the growing recognition of need for some such approach, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this measure in advance of such hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point two letters from Ben C. McCabe, one of Minnesota's most experienced leaders in the grain trade, regarding this problem. One of the letters is to Gabriel Hauge, Administrative Assistant to the President, and the other is to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, each calling attention to the problem I have mentioned and urging action along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. President, I also ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD along with these letters the reply sent to Mr. McCabe in behalf of the Department of Agriculture by Marvin L. McClain, Director of the Department's Grain Division, together with a further letter by Mr. McCabe to Mr. McClain.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1955.

Mr. GABRIEL HAUGE,
Administrative Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAUGE: During the President's first year I had quite a little correspondence with you in reference to the farm program advocated by Secretary Benson. I was quite critical of the Secretary, but I think the thing to do is to let bygones be bygones on that deal and let's look at the present situation.

The change in the farm price support laws has led to a rather chaotic condition in commodity markets reflected in the continual drop in farm commodity prices and consequently farm income while at the same time the prices of the things the farmers buy have held steady or have risen. We, of

course, have not seen the end of this farm squeeze yet.

Under the present law, price supports will continue to decline for the next year or two. I haven't seen anything that would indicate that the Secretary is worried about the situation; but we who live and work out here in the Great Plains area are tremendously worried, not only about the present situation but what probably will develop in the coming months unless the administration takes some prompt constructive steps.

I think it is well to remember that during the world war and later at the time of the Korean crisis, the farmers were asked to produce at a maximum level. Of course, that is when the 90 percent of supports came into the picture, but the need for large crops was met by our increased farm production. Millions of acres of previously unseeded land was plowed up and used in production of agricultural crops. That was a good deal like the opening of Pandora's box. The trouble is now to get these acres back into grassland again.

I think the administration should take prompt action to urge on Congress legislation to accomplish this end.

I want to call your attention to the fact that on February 9 Senator THYE, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated S. 1023 to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities under the authority granted the Secretary under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

On March 10 Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1396 to establish a conservation acreage reserve to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources.

Of course, these two bills don't answer all the needs, but I think they provide the basis for at least a start in meeting this tremendous problem which faces us.

Acreage quotas, I am afraid, will not alone fill the bill except as a stopgap measure. They tend to cut down the acreage the farmers can produce crops on until the farmer has a hard job making a living and is inclined to vote against quotas. In that case we would see an extremely sharp drop in farm commodity prices and, consequently, farm income, and I don't believe that that would happen without a severe repercussion on our whole economy.

However, the acreage controls and marketing quotas have been holding the line, but we have done little or nothing to really meet the situation. A large part of the acreage that was put into production during the war years will have to be taken out of production to a large extent. Either the Federal Government will lead the way in constructive action or else we will have the reduction made through farmers going bankrupt because of low prices.

I would plead that you bring this matter to the attention of the President and his advisers and urge that the administration take prompt action leading to the adoption of measures such as sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY and Senator THYE to meet this present emergency. No time should be lost.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

MARCH 28, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: While I have been a Republican all my life, I was quite critical of your approach to the farm price problem. Certainly the farm price-support law did not solve all the problems by any manner of means. However, it was a vehicle that could have been used to hold up farm income while necessary adjustments were made. Nevertheless, we will have to face the situation as it is today and let bygones be bygones.

It is necessary to remember that during the World War and later at the time of the Korean crisis, our farmers were asked to produce at a maximum level. Millions of acres of land was broken up and seeded to agricultural crops. This was like the opening of Pandora's box. At the end of the emergency it was then necessary to meet the problem of how to get these things back into the box again—in other words, how to get these acres back into grassland again.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas are in this situation more or less a stop-gap solution. They tend to cut down the acreage the farmers can produce crops on until the farmer has a hard job making a living and is inclined to disregard or to vote against marketing quotas. In that case we would see an extremely sharp drop in farm commodity prices and, naturally, farm income would drop too. I don't believe that that would happen without a very sharp repercussion on our whole economy.

I want to call your attention to the fact that on February 9 Senator THYE, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1023 to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities under the authority granted the Secretary under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

On March 10 Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1396 to establish a conservation acreage reserve to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources.

Now these two bills would not, even if they became law, provide all the answers; but certainly they would be needed and very constructive steps in meeting the present critical situation.

Under the present law, price supports will probably continue to decline for the next year or two in a rather serious proportion and then, if our farmers in desperation do not vote for marketing quotas and support prices drop to 50 percent of parity, we could have a real chaotic condition.

I cannot believe you, as Secretary of Agriculture, or the President can be unaware of the dynamite contained in this situation. If we are going to try to meet this approaching problem, I believe it is absolutely necessary that you and the administration come out vigorously for proper steps to head off a calamity. Either the Federal Government will lead the way in constructive action or else we will have the reduction made through farmers going bankrupt because of low prices.

I hope that the administration will take vigorous steps to urge Congress to adopt proper legislation to meet this situation which is critical now, but may become chaotic in the near future unless prompt action is taken. No time should be lost.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BEN C. MCCABE,
The McCabe Co.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. MCCABE: Thank you for your letter of March 28, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which you call attention to the serious price and income problems facing agriculture at this time and suggest that, to meet this situation, consideration be given to programs of soil conservation and acreage retirement.

We agree with your view that acreage allotments and marketing quotas are not the best answers to the problems of readjustment facing agriculture at this time, and that the idea of using economic incentives rather than governmental controls to restore a balance between production and markets should be given serious consideration.

Programs providing for the rental of diverted acres, such as you refer to, have been carried out in the past. In the 1933 through 1935 period, rental payments were made to producers who complied with production adjustment contracts under which the Department of Agriculture specified the uses to which the land could be put. These programs proved to be successful in bringing about desired acreage diversion. In 1933, slightly over 10 million acres were diverted, requiring payments of $277 million; in 1934, about 36 million acres were diverted at a cost of $637 million; and in 1935, about 30 million acres were diverted at a cost of $467 million. The total rental and benefit payments for this 3-year period amounted to $1.4 million, which was equivalent to slightly over 18 percent of the total farm income from the commodities for which the programs were in effect.

While, in the light of the experience with past programs, it would seem that the magnitude of rental payments required to balance present and indicated supplies of wheat, cotton, and other crops with market outlets tends to be underestimated, the costs to the taxpayer of carrying under Government ownership large surplus accumulations of these crops is also not generally appreciated. The alternative of withdrawing excess acreage from production to withholding excess production from the market appears to merit careful study, particularly since such a program could be depended upon to make flexible price supports more effective in adjusting production and consumption to each other.

The problem of diverted acreage is becoming one of the most important issues we must deal with promptly and effectively if we are to prevent extension of rigid acreage and marketing controls to the nonbasic commodities—a course of action which would be difficult to reconcile with our administration's endeavor to permit farmers greater freedom in their operations.

You may be assured that the development of programs designed to deal with this problem, the proposals to which you call our attention will be given most careful study and consideration.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Director, Grain Division.

APRIL 7, 1955.

Mr. MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Director, Grain Division, United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCLAIN: I very much appreciate your letter of April 4 and I am particularly heartened to know that the Department of Agriculture is at this time giving considerable thought toward plans for diversion of land unneeded for production of crops to other uses which, in the main, I expect would be grass, pasture, or summer fallow.

Let me point out first that, in my opinion, the extreme drought in the Southwest is about the only thing that will save our price-support program on wheat this year. If, with the coming of summer, this drought area widens out, it might also rescue the programs on feed grains. But without this calamity, I am afraid we would have been faced with an impossible situation right now. The terrible misfortune of the farmers living in these stricken areas simply gives us a little time to work out a program.

In your letter you particularly comment on rental of diverted acres, such as was carried out in years of the thirties. I don't think we should neglect also consideration of the actual purchasing of surplus acres.

I am in the country grain elevator business. I am fairly well acquainted with the Government purchase of land in McKenzie County in North Dakota south of Williston

and in Prairie County near the town of Terry, Mont. We had elevators at both Terry and at Alexander, N. Dak., which was quite close to the project in McKenzie County. Because of the decrease in the land which would be under cultivation in those areas, we disposed of our elevators. As things turned out, we perhaps would have been better off to have kept our properties, but that is water over the dam.

However, we have other elevators in those areas that have actually benefited from these so-called big pastures. Grain farmers have been able to carry considerable herds of beef cattle. There is no doubt but what this combination has tended to stabilize and improve income.

I don't know how they have worked out from a dollars-and-cents point of view as far as the Government is concerned. I would be very much interested, if you do have the figures.

I believe it is particularly important to consider the purchase of land in the establishment of grazing districts, especially in the marginal territory where perhaps the land never should have been broken up.

Without the calamity in the drought area, I am afraid we would have been in for a very chaotic condition and one that very easily could have led to a sharp decline in our general economic condition. The terrible misfortune of the farmers in the stricken area simply gives us a little more time to attack this problem right at the roots where it must be met.

No time can be lost if we are going to have congressional hearings on legislation and get it passed in this session of Congress. I think it particularly important that such action be taken, not only because I believe it is needed so as to get production nearer in line with demand, but there is considerable evidence of a feeling of despair and helplessness spreading over farm areas. I think the active sponsoring by the administration of legislation to meet this very critical problem would go a long way in changing this farmer attitude.

I hope that the Secretary will use all his influence to prevail upon the administration to take prompt action to sponsor legislation along the lines outlined in my previous letter.

Thanks again for your prompt and enlightening reply.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

LAND REFORM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a moment ago I requested unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article stressing the importance of individual farm ownership and operation, which was published in Harper's magazine for February of this year. Along with the article, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a communication I have received from the Department of State, concerning the United States Government's position on land-reform measures. The communication came to me at the time of the dismissal of Mr. Ladejinsky, and was sent to me as the result of an inquiry I made of the Department of State as to whether our Government had taken a position with reference to land reform in the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world.

I am glad to report that we do have such a policy, although it has been somewhat of a well-kept secret, I may say. Instead, it might well have been expounded in very great detail.

Mr. President, for many weeks I have been concerned with failure of our Government to attach enough significance to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, and to give advance thought to planning a constructive policy for following through with our friends at the Conference.

A week in advance of the Conference, I called public attention to the vital importance of land-reform issues among countries which would be participating in the Conference, and I urged our Government to stop hiding under a bushel basket its support for constructive land-reform efforts throughout the world. I urged our Government to speak out and to make known its interest in the aspirations of people in the countries participating in the Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my press statement on that subject may be published at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER EMPHASIS ON LAND REFORM URGED AS BID TO ASIA, AFRICA

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1955.—On the eve of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, the United States should reiterate and emphasize its interest in and support of land reform measures throughout the world, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, declared yesterday.

"We must move from a defensive to an offensive position in relation to this significant conference," Senator HUMPHREY warned.

"In most of the countries to be represented at this important conference, man's relation to the land represents one of the most pressing social and economic problems.

"Nearly half of the world's people will be represented by countries participating in this conference, from which we are excluded.

"If we expect to keep the great majority of these people on the side of freedom in the world as contrasted to domination by Soviet imperialism, it is imperative that we assure them that we recognize and concur in their own aspirations—that our interest lies in their progress, not in their exploitation.

"Let us not make the mistake of letting the Communists seize on the popular objective of land reform as a propaganda weapon at this conference, the weapon they used so effectively in conquering Red China by taking better advantage than we did of the aspirations of underprivileged people who toil on the soil but fail to share reasonably in the economic rewards from the land.

"Instead, let us stress the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broadest concept, and take the offensive in turning the Communist's propaganda efforts against the Kremlin.

"If spokesmen for the Kremlin dare to offer the bait of more widespread opportunity for land ownership to the land-hungry peasants of Asia and Africa, let us oppenly challenge the Soviet to apply such land reform principles in their own country and extend to Russians the opportunity to own and farm their own land instead of being compelled to accept a collectivized state agricultural pattern," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Senator HUMPHREY called attention to the fact that the State Department had recently reiterated its support for basic land reform policies of our government adopted in 1951, and outlined by the United States delegate to the FAO Conference in Rome as 'the United States concept of agrarian reform as a foundation for world peace.'

"Such policies offer a beacon light of hope to many areas of the world today," Senator HUMPHREY declared. "It is not enough to have such policies and pledges in our archives, however. It is time responsible foreign policy spokesmen of our administration gave new emphasis to these commitments, and brought them out publicly before the forum of world opinion as a vital weapon in the ideological battle for the mind of mankind all over the world."

Senator HUMPHREY urged that support for "realistic land reform measures" be made a major part of the United States "peace offensive," so that "we show we are attuned to the needs and desires of people in other lands now struggling for the very goals of our own Declaration of Independence."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Apparently, Mr. President, that statement did not create too much interest in the areas in this country where it should. However, I want the RECORD to show I was correct in my judgment as to the interest it would create among Asian people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a clipping from a New Delhi, India, newspaper, reporting my statement to the people of India.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Delhi (India) Statesman of April 11, 1955]

U. S. A. URGED TO CLARIFY ATTITUDE TO LAND REFORM

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY said today that the U. S. A. must reemphasize its support of land reform programs throughout the world.

The Senator declared in a statement that the Eisenhower administration's policy should be made crystal clear as the Asian-African conference was opening in Indonesia soon, and the Communists could be expected to turn land reform into a major propaganda weapon there.

"We must move from a defensive to an offensive position in relation to this significant conference," he stated.

He added: "In most of the countries to be represented at this important conference, man's relation to land represents one of the most pressing social and economic problems.

"Nearly half of the world's people will be represented by countries participating in this conference, from which we are excluded.

"If we expect to keep the great majority of these people on the side of freedom in the world as contrasted to domination by Soviet imperialism, it is imperative that we assure them that we recognize and concur in their own aspirations—that our interest lies in their progress not in their exploitation.

PROPAGANDA WEAPON

"Let us not make the mistake of letting the Communists seize on the popular objective of land reform as a propaganda weapon at this conference, the weapon they used so effectively in conquering China by taking better advantage than we did of the aspirations of underprivileged people who toil on the soil but fail to share reasonably in the economic rewards from the land.

"Instead, let us stress the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broadest concept, and take the offensive in turning the Communists' propaganda efforts against the Kremlin.

"If spokesmen for the Kremlin dare to offer the bait of more widespread opportunity for land ownership to the land hungry peasants of Asia and Africa, let us openly challenge Soviet Russia to apply such land reform principles in their own country and extend to Russians the opportunity to own

and farm their own land instead of being compelled to accept a collectivized State agricultural pattern."—Reuter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call attention to this only to emphasize the opportunities I feel our Government is overlooking to bolster the case for democracy by alining ourselves with the natural aspirations of other peoples for the same freedoms and blessings we enjoy.

Instead of taking advantage of such opportunities, however, I regret that our Government's attitude toward the Bandung Conference may be losing us friends, instead of winning friends. I refer to the failure of our Government to send official greetings to the Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a United Press dispatch which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of Monday, April 18, under the heading "Negro United States Lawmaker Assails American Stupidity on Bandung."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO UNITED STATES LAWMAKER ASSAILS AMERICAN STUPIDITY ON BANDUNG—POWELL SAYS IKE SHOULD HAVE SENT PARLEY GREETINGS

BANDUNG, INDONESIA.—Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of New York, charged today that the United States administration was guilty of sheer stupidity in rejecting his suggestion that President Eisenhower send greetings to the Asian-African conference here.

The Negro congressman, here as an unofficial observer and newspaper reporter, said the American omission "was all the more obvious after Moscow radio broadcast greetings to the conference today."

He said, "I think this is a colossal error and sheer stupidity and further indicates that we have no Far Eastern policy and do not understand what is happening here at all."

He exhibited a cable he said he had just received through the United States Embassy from Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State.

The cable read:

"I have been asked to acknowledge your telegram of April 6 to President Eisenhower in which you suggested that he address a message of goodwill to the Asian-African conference.

"While most grateful for the suggestion, we do not believe the relationship of this Government to the Bandung conference would warrant such a message from the President."

POWELL said the State Department had opposed his attendance at the Bandung conference and "tried to buy me off." He said "the deal was that if I stayed away from Bandung they would send me on one or two pair red-carpet missions anywhere I wanted to go."

When he refused, POWELL said, Morton told him, "Very well, but do us a favor and stay away from the American Embassy."

"I finally managed to see American Ambassador Hugh Cummings this morning, and he told me: 'The State Department decided we should stay away from you so that nobody could say we were trying to influence the conference'."

The Congressman said that "this conference has put us right on the spot. Asia and Africa are riding on, whether we want to come along or not. If we abstain from voting on colonial questions in the United Nations any more, our entire relationship in Asia and Africa is in danger."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to concur in and associate myself with Representative POWELL's keen disappointment at our Government's attitude; and, as one Senator, I wish to assure the people of Asian and African countries who want freedom from either Communist imperialism or colonial domination that there is a large body of American citizens who have a sympathetic understanding of their problems and want to work with them toward social and economic progress and preservation of the individual dignity of all mankind.

Mr. President, while the administration seems reluctant to give much emphasis to land reform, I want the RECORD to show that our State Department has reaffirmed the official position on this subject taken by our Government in 1951.

In reply to my questions about whether these policies had been changed, in relation to the Wolf Ladejinsky case, the State Department informed me that the basic land-reform policy had been reviewed on several occasions, but such reviews had not led to any revisions, and today it remains the basic United States Government guidance for all of our agencies and diplomatic missions abroad. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the State Department appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 18, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Serious consideration has been given to your letter of December 23, 1954, expressing your concern about the implications of the Wolf Ladejinsky case as related to our foreign policy. A survey has been made of the significant policy documents relating to the problem of land reform and the summary set forth below, including the enclosed documents, accurately reflects the major policy developments in this field during the past few years.

In your letter you question whether we have * * * "reversed or otherwise backed down from our Government's statement of position in land reform previously sent to our diplomatic envoys throughout the world." * * * It is assumed in this connection that you refer to the land-reform policy developed during 1951 by the Interagency Committee on Land Reform under the chairmanship of the Department of Agriculture. This policy was fully set forth by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, United States Delegate to the Food and Agriculture Conference, in November 1951. A copy of this statement is enclosed.

This basic land-reform policy has been reviewed on several occasions as problems have arisen in connection with meetings of the Food and Agriculture Organization and sessions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. These subsequent considerations of the problem, however, have not led to any revisions of this policy, and it remains today the basic United States Government guidance for all agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Foreign Operations Administration, and our diplomatic missions abroad. From time to time certain parts of the basic guidance have been questioned, particularly as to their applicability to certain issues or problems relating to a single country or area, since a policy of this type cannot necessarily be universally applied. However, there has been no change in the basic policy as stated by Representative HOPE, nor is any basic revision in that policy being undertaken.

During the past 2 years there have been several occasions on which United States policy on land reform has been clearly set forth. In November, 1953 the question was on the agenda of the Food and Agriculture Organization conference in Rome. Our instructions to the United States delegation to that meeting were based upon the 1951 policy statement. At that time, the United States delegation (1) reaffirmed the concept of "reform of agrarian structures" of the FAO sixth conference which in turn had reaffirmed the principles of the ECOSOC resolution of 1951, the comprehensive United Nations statement of principles on this subject; (2) urged the FAO to be less hesitant in its approach to specific program activities to implement this resolution; and (3) recommended that the FAO program should be modified by "stressing positive, practical expert help to countries" and mentioned in particular the importance of seminars, training, and direct technical assistance to specific countries.

The seventeenth session of the Economic and Social Council, beginning March 30, 1954, considered a report by the Secretary General on progress in land reform based on replies of governments to a questionnaire on this subject. The instructions for the United States delegation to that meeting were developed and agreed through the United Nations Economic Committee, and interdepartmental committee chaired by State and including the Department of Agriculture and the Foreign Operations Administration. The United States position again stressed the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broad concept and reflected no basic revision or change from previous policy. This position was restated most recently at the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, where the resolution on land reform was supported by the United States. The General Assembly resolution and the statement by the Alternate United States Representatives, James P. Nash, are also enclosed.

While there has been no reversal of the basic United States policy on land reform over the past few years, it is only fair to state that less emphasis has been placed upon land reform relative to other policies designed to improve conditions in the underdeveloped countries and to combat subversive Communist influences. This has come about as a result of two developments. First, the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization some time ago completed elaboration of the fundamental principles recommended for guidance to countries undertaking land reform programs. The real work to be done in this field now consists largely of technical guidance through such organizations as the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization, rather than continued general discussions and resolutions. Second, other problems relating to assistance to underdeveloped countries across a broad political, military, and economic front have demanded greater current attention.

A full survey of what has been done to implement our land reform policy during the past few years would involve a considerable effort. I would, however, like to call your attention to several developments in this field aside from those actions taken at meetings of international organizations referred to above. No change in the basic land reform policy was made by Mr. Stassen at the time the Foreign Operations Administration was established and the policy developed in 1951 remains as guidance for the operating programs of that agency. The State Department has furthermore repeatedly expressed

its interest in land reforms as one of the means of countering Communist influence in southeast Asia and of furthering conditions conducive to greater economic stability in that area. We have particularly emphasized the importance of land reform in Free Viet-Nam and have supported steps for instituting such measures.

The United States Government has expressed a willingness to assist Latin American countries which undertake sound land reform programs, but it stops short of open advocacy of such programs because of the extreme political sensitivity of the subject. Most of the assistance which the United States can offer in that area is in the form of technical assistance, which is now under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations Administration.

A resolution on agrarian reform was adopted by the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas last spring. In abstaining on the final vote on this resolution, a statement was made clearly indicating that, although the United States favored and supported agrarian reform in its broad and full sense, it could not support the resolution because it was based largely on the narrow concept of land distribution.

The Philippines have an aggressive land reform program under way as the result of legislation which was prepared with the assistance of United States technicians. This program involves the settling of State-owned lands as well as the acquisition of privately owned but underdeveloped lands, with proper compensation, and was a major influence in settling the "Huk" problem.

The Shah of Iran is attempting to start a land tenure adjustment program by the transfer of some of his own lands to the tenants on a longtime payment scheme.

In Italy help was extended during the past several years in passing proper legislation for the acquisition of land not effectively used and distribution by sale on acceptable terms to relatively small farmers who had not previously been able to acquire land.

In Formosa the second and third steps in a land tenure adjustment program are now in operation. The first step was legislation which controlled the share of the crop to be paid by the tenants to a maximum of 37½ percent. This step was in fact similar to legislation in some of the States in the United States. The second step was the distribution of State-owned lands, and the third step is the acquisition of large estates, with proper compensation, and distribution of the land to the land-hungry.

The activities sketched above clearly illustrate the continued interest of our Government in this problem and our efforts to assist other countries to improve their basic economic conditions through adequate land-reform measures. They demonstrate that land tenure adjustments can be carried out in a democratic fashion.

The Department shares your views that well-planned actions in this field are significant and effective methods of combating Communist infiltration and discrediting Communist methods. You may be assured that there is no intention to reverse our policy or to abandon our efforts to encourage sound land-reform programs in the interest of agricultural improvement and economic development. The fact that the Interdepartmental Land Reform Committee has been inactive since the summer of 1953 should in no way be construed as an abandonment of interest in that field. The basic purpose of this Committee was the development of land-reform policy and since no revision of that policy has been requested, there has been no need to reactivate the Committee. Other interdepartmental channels have been used to coordinate the interests of the various agencies on current land-reform problems

I hope this résumé of our policies and actions in the field of land reform, all of which have been developed and coordinated in close cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and other interested agencies, will dispel your concern that there has been any reversal or change in basic United States policy on land reform or the activities in support of that policy.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Repretatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HINSHAW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. PAYNE conferees on the part of the Senate.

POSTAL PAY BILL OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955."

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS, COVERAGE, AND EXEMPTIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this act—

(1) "Department" means the Post Office Department established by section 388 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 361), and the postal field service of the Post Office Department;

(2) "postal field service" includes all operations and organization units of the Department, other than the departmental operations and organization units in the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government, and includes postal inspectors assigned to the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government;

(3) "employee," unless the context otherwise indicates, includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, and all other persons employed in the postal field service, regardless of title, other than persons who provide services for the Department on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

(4) "position" means the duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee, other than duties performed on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

(5) "key position" means an existing position, described in section 203 of this act;

(6) "salary level" means the numerical standing in the Postal Field Service Schedule assigned to a position in the postal field service;

(7) "basic salary" means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and longevity compensation;

(8) "basic compensation" means basic salary plus longevity compensation; and

(9) "persons" has the meaning prescribed for such word in section 1 of title 1 of the United States Code.

COVERAGE

SEC. 102. This act applies to all positions and employees in the postal field service.

TITLE II—RANKING OF POSITIONS

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. (a) The Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service, and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in such service, except that not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office. He shall define the various positions other than the key positions specified in section 203 of this act and the standard positions of postmaster in a fourth-class office and rural carrier. He shall assign each such position to its appropriate salary level in the Postal Field Service Schedule. He shall ascertain the appropriate salary level of a position (1) by comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of key positions described in section 203 of this act, and (2) by ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

(b) In ranking positions, the Postmaster General shall apply the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and give effect to substantial differences in difficulty of the work to be performed, in the degree of responsibility to be exercised, in the scope and variety of tasks involved, and in the conditions of performance.

(c) The Postmaster General's determinations under this section shall be the basis for the payment of compensation and for personnel transactions.

APPEALS

SEC. 202. Any employee, either individually or together with one or more other employees with a similar grievance, may appeal at any time, in person or through his representative specifically designated for that purpose, to the United States Civil Service Commission to review (1) if such employee is in a position other than a key position described in section 203 of this act, any action taken by the Postmaster General under section 201 of this act, in order to determine whether his position has been placed in its appropriate salary level in accordance with such section, and (2) if such employee is in a key position described in section 203 of this act, any administrative action taken or determination made under this act, in connection with such employee, in order to determine whether such employee has been placed correctly in a key position on the basis of and in accordance with the descriptions of key positions and the assignments of such

positions to salary levels specified in section 203 of this act. The Commission shall act upon such appeal at the earliest practicable time, and its decision on such appeal shall be certified forthwith to the Postmaster General who shall take action in acordance with such certificate.

KEY POSITIONS

SEC. 203. Key positions in the postal field service consisting of standard, related tasks commonly performed in that service are described and assigned to salary levels in the Postal Field Service Schedule, as follows:

(1) Position: Janitor—Level 1.

Basic function: Cleans, sweeps, and removes trash from work areas, lobbies, and washrooms.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Sweeps and scrubs floors and stairs, dusts furniture and fixtures, cleans washrooms, and washes windows (except exterior glass in high buildings).

(B) Moves furniture and helps erect equipment and fixtures within offices of the building.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Cleans ice and snow from the sidewalks and driveways, and tends the lawn, shrubbery, and premises of the post office.

(ii) Washes walls and ceilings.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(2) Position: Elevator operator—level 2.

Basic function: Operates a freight or passenger elevator.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Operates elevator.

(B) Cleans cab of elevator and polishes metal fittings.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Pushes handcarts of mail on and off elevator or assists in loading or unloading material carried on elevator.

(ii) Tends the heating plant or performs cleaning duties in the vicinity of the elevator.

Organizational relationships: Reports to an elevator starter or other designated supervisor.

(3) Position: Order filler—level 2.

Basic function: Selects, assembles, and makes ready for shipment items requisitioned by postal field establishments.

Duties and responsibilities:

Is assigned any of the following duties:

(A) Separates sheets of the requisition form, fastens copies to clipboards and places on appropriate conveyor line.

(B) Clarifies writing on carbon copies of requisitions in order to minimize errors in filling requisitions.

(C) Sets up and prepares shipping containers.

(D) Places in cartons on conveyor lines the quantities of items requisitioned from an assigned station, indicating action taken opposite each item.

(E) Fills and labels bulk shipping orders and moves bulk material to dispatch area.

(F) Replenishes from stock items stored in individual stations and keeps stations neat and orderly to facilitate filling of requisitions.

(G) Transports bulk and individual shipments on hand trucks.

(H) Assembles materials for each requisition where conveyor lines converge.

(I) Places cartons on assembly table for coordination and packing.

(J) Checks requisition copies and items to assure that proper action has been taken.

(K) Directs items not requiring packing to dispatch area.

(L) Combines shipments to reduce packing.

(M) Transmits bulk slips and shipping labels to the appropriate person.

(N) Labels bulk and individual packages with printed labels to avoid hand labeling.

(O) Prepares labels by use of appropriate rubber stamps.

(P) Seals cartons with stapling machine or tape.

(Q) Packs supplies for shipment.

(R) Stacks and trucks completed orders.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(4) Position: Clerk. Third-class post office—level 2.

Basic function: Sorts incoming and dispatches outgoing mail for a small number of points of separation and destination; provides a limited number of services at public windows.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Sorts incoming mail for general delivery, lock boxes, and one or more delivery routes.

(B) Postmarks, and prepares mail for dispatch by train or other mail route; closes, locks, and affixes labels to pouches and mail sacks.

(C) Performs services at a public window, such as selling stamps, stamped envelopes, or other routine functions.

(D) As the needs of the service require, may perform other related duties incidental to the operation of the post office.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster.

(5) Position: Guard—Level 3.

Basic function: Makes rounds of the post-office building, and punches clocks at designated stations.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Patrols buildings, punching watchman's clock where furnished, checking door and window locks, noting and reporting fire hazards and other irregularities, such as running water and unclosed doors and windows.

(B) Sounds fire alarm.

(C) Preserves order in corridors and, when necessary, detains persons for interrogation by post-office inspectors or local police.

(D) In addition may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Gives directions to the public in building lobby.

(ii) Raises and lowers the flag.

(iii) Retrieves lost and found articles and delivers them to the appropriate place.

(iv) Obtains names of victims, doctors, police, and witnesses in the event of accident.

(v) Guards property entrances and prevents damage to property by the public.

(vi) Tends the heating plant of the building.

(vii) Operates elevators on a relief basis.

(viii) Does incidental cleaning and laboring work.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a lieutenant of the guard, a building superintendent, or other designated supervisor.

(6) Position: File clerk—Level 3.

Basic function: Sets up and maintains files on one or more subject matters.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Prepares new file folders and maintains existing folders in correct order as prescribed in the established filing system.

(B) Transmits folders or information contained therein to authorized personnel (for example, forwards personnel folders to requesting supervisors, or copies data from folders to satisfy requests).

(C) Opens, sorts, and searches file material, and maintains files in up-to-date condition.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Types from rough draft or plain copy.

(ii) Answers telephones.

(iii) Prepares requisitions for supplies.

(iv) Operates a mimeograph machine.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

(7) Position: Typist—Level 3.

Basic function: Types material such as forms, correspondence, and stencils from rough draft or plain copy; performs general office clerical work.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) In accordance with instructions and information furnished by supervisor, types forms, standard reports, and documents such as invitations to bid, orders, contracts, invoices, personnel actions, and related materials.

(B) Types correspondence and memoranda from rough drafts or general information.

(C) Cuts stencils for instructions, circulars, and other general uses.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Transcribes from a dictating machine.

(ii) Operates a mimeograph machine.

(iii) Files, checks, requisitions, prepares vouchers, and answers the telephone.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

(8) Position: Mail handler—Level 3.

Basic function: Loads, unloads, and moves bulk mail, and performs other duties incidental to the movement and processing of mail.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Unloads mail received by trucks. Separates all mail received by trucks and conveyors for subsequent dispatch to other conveying units, and separates and delivers working mails for delivery to distribution areas.

(B) Places empty sacks or pouches on racks, labels them where labels are prearranged or racks are plainly marked, dumps mail from sacks, cuts ties, faces letter mail, carries mail to distributors for processing, places processed mail into sacks, removes filled sacks and pouches from racks, closes and locks same. Picks up sacks, pouches, and outside pieces, separates outgoing bulk mails for dispatch and loads mail onto trucks.

(C) Handles and sacks empty equipment, inspects empty equipment for mail content, restrings sacks.

(D) Cancels stamps on parcel post, operates canceling machines, carries mail from machine to distribution cases.

(E) Assists in supply and slip rooms and operates addressograph mimeograph, and similar machines.

(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Acts as armed guard for valuable registry shipments and as watchman and guard around post office building.

(ii) Makes simple distribution of parcel post mail requiring no scheme knowledge.

(iii) Operates electric fork-lift trucks.

(iv) Rewraps soiled or broken parcels.

(v) Performs other miscellaneous duties, such as stamping tickets, weighing incoming sacks, cleaning and sweeping in workrooms, offices, and trucks where such work is not performed by regular cleaners.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(9) Position: Garageman—Level 3.

Basic function: Performs a variety of routine services incidental to the proper maintenance of motor vehicles.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lubricates trucks in accordance with lubrication charts and type of truck.

(B) Changes crankcase oil and filter cleaners and cleans case in conformance with instructions and vehicle mileage.

(C) Changes tires and makes necessary repairs.

(D) Washes and steam-cleans trucks.

(E) Assists automotive mechanics.

(F) Fuels and oils trucks.

(G) Cleans garage, garage office, swing room, and washroom, as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

(10) Position: Special delivery messenger—Level 4.

Basic function: Is responsible for delivering, on foot or by vehicle, special delivery

letter mail and parcels to city patrons. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Receives special delivery mail for delivery and signs c. o. d. and registered items at post office before beginning route.

(B) Delivers on foot and by vehicle special deliery mail to patrons; obtains signatures when required; collects amounts and fees on c. o. d.'s; in case of absent patrons, exercises judgment in determining whether to leave mail or leave notice and return mail to post office.

(C) Returns receipts and moneys collected to authorized personnel at post office.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Faces and cancels mail and makes routine distribution of incoming and outgoing mail.

(ii) Delivers and collects mail other than that requiring special delivery handling.

(iii) Loads and unloads or carries bulk mail and parcels.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(11) Position: Motor vehicle operator—Lever 5.

Basic function: Operates a mail truck on a regularly scheduled route to pick up and transport mail in bulk.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Picks up and delivers bulk quantities of mail at stations, branch offices, and terminal points; as required, picks up mail from collection boxes and deposits mail in relay boxes.

(B) Operates truck in conformity with time schedules and rules of safety, and in accordance with instructions regarding the route for which responsible.

(C) Ascertains the condition of the truck prior to leaving and upon returning to the garage; reports all accidents, mechanical defects noted, and mechanical failures while on route.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Drives a tractor and semitrailer on occasion, unloading bagged mail and packages at post offices and picking up mail for delivery to a central point.

(ii) Prepares daily trip reports showing work performed.

(iii) Makes minor mechanical repairs to truck in emergencies while on route.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a superintendent of motor vehicles or other designated supervisor.

(12) Position: City carrier—Level 5.

Basic function: Is responsible for the prompt and efficient delivery and collection of mail on foot or by vehicle under varying conditions in a prescribed area within a city. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with route patrons and others, requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used, and with the geography of the city.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Routes or cases all classes of mail in sequence of delivery along an established route. Rearranges and relabels cases as required by route adjustments and changes in deliveries.

(B) Withdraws mail from the distribution case and prepares it in sequence for efficient delivery by himself or a substitute along an established route. Prepares and separates all classes of mail to be carried by truck to relay boxes along route for subsequent delivery.

(C) Enters change of address orders in change of address book and on appropriate form. Readdresses mail to be forwarded and marks for appropriate handling other mail addressed to route patrons who have moved. Sorts such mail into throw-back case for convenient handling by clerks.

(D) Delivers mail along a prescribed route, on a regular schedule, picking up additional mail from relay boxes. Collects mail from street letter boxes and accepts letters for mailing from patrons. Such service may be rendered on foot or by vehicle and in some instances may consist exclusively of parcel post delivery or collection of mail.

(E) Delivers and collects charges on customs, postage-due, and c. o. d. mail matter. Delivers and obtains receipts for registered and certain insured mail. Receipts for such matter, except insured mail, at the post office before beginning route and accounts for it upon return by payments of the amounts collected and delivery of receipts taken.

(F) Deposits mail collected in the post office upon return from route; faces such mail for stamp cancellation.

(G) Checks, and corrects if necessary, mailing cards presented by advertisers bearing names and addresses of patrons or former patrons of the route.

(H) Furnishes patrons with postal information when requested, and provides change of address cards and other postal forms as requested.

(I) Reports to supervisor all unusual incidents or conditions relating to mail delivery, including condition of street letter boxes and time cards.

(J) Regular city carriers assigned to foot delivery routes are required to become proficient in the casing of mail on at least one other foot delivery route.

(K) Substitute city carriers may be assigned to perform clerical duties and may be required to pass examinations on schemes of city primary distribution.

(L) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Checks hotels and other such establishments to insure that mail for residents undeliverable as addressed is not improperly held.

(ii) Delivers stamps or other paper supplies to contract or classified stations.

(iii) Serves at carriers' delivery window.

(iv) Receives and registers, where practical, all letters and packages of first-class matter properly offered for registration and gives receipt therefor.

(v) Makes delivery on other routes as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster or assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

(13) Position: Distribution clerk—Level 5.

Basic function: Separates mail in a post office, terminal, airmail field, or other postal facility in accordance with established schemes, including incoming or outgoing mail or both.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of incoming mail by delivery point (for example, classified or contract station or branch or other delivery unit, general delivery, lockboxes, rural or star route, or city carrier route) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme established for that office.

(B) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of outgoing mail for dispatch (for example, by city, State, region, train, highway or railway post office, or airmail flight) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme prescribed by the Postal Transportation Service.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Maintains records of mails.

(ii) Examines balances in advance deposit accounts.

(iii) Faces and cancels mail.

(iv) Ties mail and inserts facing slips.

(v) Opens and dumps pouches and sacks.

(vi) Operates cancelling machines.

(vii) Records and bills mail (for example, c. o. d., registered, and so forth) requiring special service.

(viii) Renders service at public windows.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(14) Position: Window clerk—Level 5.

Basic function: Performs a variety of services at a public window of a post office or post office branch or station. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons and others requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) As a regular assignment, performs any of the following duties:

(i) Sells postage stamps, stamped paper, cards, internal revenue stamps, migratory bird stamps, and postal savings stamps and certificates.

(ii) Accepts from and, after proper identification, delivers to patrons parcel post, insured, c. o. d., and registered mail; makes collection of required postage, issues necessary receipts, and issues general delivery mail to patrons.

(iii) Verifies second-, third-, and fourth-class mailings, computing and maintaining on a current basis mailers' credit balances.

(iv) Assigns special delivery and registered mail for delivery.

(v) Checks and sets post office stamp-vending machines, postage meters, and large mailers' stamp permit meters.

(vi) Receives, follows up, and recommends action on patrons' claims and complaints.

(vii) Issues and cashes foreign and domestic money orders and postal savings certificates.

(viii) Rents post office boxes, receives rental payments, conducts reference checks, and completes related forms.

(ix) Provides information to the public concerning postal regulations, mailing restrictions, rates, and other matters involving postal transactions.

(B) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Makes emergency calls on patrons to adjust service complaints.

(ii) Makes emergency carrier relays.

(iii) Assists in alien registration and census matters.

(iv) Separates and distributes mail.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

(15) Position: Automotive mechanic—Level 6.

Basic function: Repairs mail trucks, including the removal and installation of complete motors, clutches, transmissions, and other major component parts.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Diagnoses mechanical and operating difficulties of vehicles, repairing defects, replacing worn or broken parts.

(B) Adjusts and tunes up engines, cleaning fuel pumps, carburetors, and radiators; regulates timing, and makes other necessary adjustments to maintain in proper operating condition trucks that are in service.

(C) Repairs or replaces automotive electrical equipment such as generators, starters, ignition systems, distributors, and wiring; installs and sets new spark plugs.

(D) Conducts road tests of vehicles after repairs, noting performance of engine, clutch, transmission, brakes, and other parts.

(E) Operates standard types of modern garage testing equipment.

(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Removes, disassembles, reassembles, and installs entire engines.

(ii) Overhauls transmission, rear end assemblies, and braking systems.

(iii) Straightens frames and axles, welding broken parts where required.

(iv) Makes road calls to make emergency repairs.

(v) Makes required truck inspections.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

(16) Position: Transfer clerk—Level 6.

Basic function: Arranges for transfer of mail at junction points between trains and other mail units and observes the separation, loading, and unloading of mail by railroad employees to make certain that this is done properly.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the most expeditious transfer of mail from observations of the operation of trains, star route, or mail messenger vehicles, Government-owned vehicles, and platform vehicles.

(B) Examines outgoing and incoming cars to determine maximum utilization of space and proper adherence to railroad safety requirements; reports findings, when necessary, to the district superintendent.

(C) Decides whether outbound cars in full authorizations should be held beyond the first available dispatches in order to obtain fuller loading and maximum utilization of the space paid for, making certain that this will not unduly delay the arrival of the mail at destination.

(D) Studies the routing and loading of mail dispatched from his station in storage cars in order to recommend changes which would bring about economies in line haul and terminal charges and effect earlier arrival. Gives similar attention to incoming mail to assure that dispatching divisions are using best routing and loading methods; reports facts to the district superintendent.

(E) Maintains close liaison with foremen of appropriate incoming and outgoing trains and vehicles to assure prompt receipt and expeditious dispatch of mail.

(F) Keeps informed on local holding orders for each outgoing dispatch and requests that departure of unit within these limitations be withheld when scheduled connections are delayed.

(G) Prepares list of railroad cars (except railway post office cars) in which mail is loaded and maintains record of mail loaded and unloaded in outgoing and incoming trains. Serves notice on railroad company to cancel operation and purchases lesser storage unit in its place when necessary. Prepares official diagram and appropriately labels outgoing cars to indicate destination or next relay point.

(H) Inspects the loading and unloading of storage mail to secure individual piece count of lesser storage units (30 feet and less); estimates volume when more than 30 feet.

(I) Observes and reports to designated supervisor any failure of the railroad company to afford protection for the mail.

(J) Qualifies periodically through examination on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train connections.

(K) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Receipts for, transfers, and delivers registered mail between trains or between train and post office.

(ii) Distributes mail prescribed for distribution in transfer office.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(17) Position: Distribution clerk, R. P. O. or H. P. O.—Level 6.

Basic function: Distributes mail in railway or highway post office prior to departure and while en route.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Determines the fastest or most expeditious dispatch of mail from the standpoint of assignment. In emergencies, such as floods, storms, wrecks, strikes, and missed connections, redistributes the mail so as to reach destination by the most expeditious alternative means, for example, by other railway post office or highway post office, airmail route, or star route.

(B) Distributes mail rapidly into letter case or pouches and sacks.

(C) Hangs pouches and sacks in racks and places labels in holders provided: labels letter cases in accordance with official diagram.

(D) Prepares mail for dispatch, involving labeling and tying of letter mail in packages for distribution in pouches, closing and locking sacks and pouches, and maintenance of proper separations for connections en route.

(E) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Receives and dispatches mail en route.

(ii) Unloads mail and equipment at terminal of run.

(iii) Examines car to ascertain that no mail is left.

(iv) Convoys registered mail to post office and connecting lines.

(F) Qualifies through examination periodically on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train schedules.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman in charge of the railway post office car or highway post office.

(18) Position: Claims clerk, paying office—Level 6.

Basic function: Examines claims for loss or damage of insured or c. o. d. mail matter and determines and approves for payment the amount found to be due under postal regulations.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Receives and reviews prescribed claim papers to ascertain whether:

(i) All necessary items of the appropriate claim form have been properly completed.

(ii) Proof of value has been properly determined.

(iii) Appropriate check has been made of applicable records.

(iv) Other necessary information has been supplied.

(B) Determines whether amount of claim exceeds amount of loss and the proper amount payable is within the limits of the indemnity.

(C) Conducts necessary correspondence in connection with the claim.

(D) Approves amount to be paid, and directs disposition of damaged articles.

(E) Maintains prescribed record of claims.

Organizational relationships: Reports to an assistant postmaster or other designated supervisor.

(19) Position: Postmaster, small third-class office—Level 6.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a small third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window service, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has no employees other than the postmaster and a replacement to serve during his leave; has annual receipts of approximately $1,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Conducts the activities of the office in such manner as to provide prompt and efficient postal service to the patrons of the office.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

(D) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

(E) Prepares and submits estimates of operating allowances as required.

(F) Makes deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills.

(G) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

(H) Maintains files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(20) Position: Claims clerk, common and contract carriers—Level 7.

Basic function: Audits carriers' claims for the transportation of mail to insure their accuracy and correctness of form prior to certifying them for payment.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Checks original or draft of claims submitted by carriers using space procurement data, records of air carrier flights and weight allocations, reports of railroad space utilization, emergency space procured, and other pertinent reports and data submitted by the districts.

(B) Corrects errors in drafts of claims and returns them to the carrier for resubmission in final corrected form.

(C) Expedites the processing of claim by continuous coordination with the carriers to minimize the incidence of error on claims submitted.

(D) Rechecks resubmitted claim prior to certifying them for payment.

(E) Maintain records pertinent to carrier claims such as unscheduled air carrier flights, weight allocations for mail on flights of air carriers, and airline flight schedules.

(F) Accumulates data and prepares periodic and special reports on subjects related to the purchase and use of railroad space, and air carrier weight allocation.

Organizational relationships: Reports to the supervisor in charge of the fiscal section in a Postal Transportation Service division office or other designated supervisor.

(21) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 7.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has one part-time clerical employee; has annual receipts of approximately $4,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises and conducts the activities of the office in order to provide prompt and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations.

(D) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

(E) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

(F) Makes required deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills, and makes salary disbursements.

(G) Prepares and submits annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances as required.

(H) Maintains required office records; prepares and submit necessary reports in the accordance with instructions.

(I) Maintains files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(22) Position: Foreman, mails—Level 8.

Basic function: Supervises a group of employees engaged in carrying out assigned tasks connected with the processing of incoming or outgoing mail.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lays out work for employees; insures attendance to duties and proper performance

of assignments; shifts employees from one assignment to another to meet fluctuations in workload; answers questions respecting work progress.

(B) Trains new employees and provides continuous on-the-job training for all employees under his supervision.

(C) Reports unusual difficulties to a general foreman and suggests solutions. Personally resolves problems of a routine nature.

(D) Keeps required records for such matters as time, mail on hand, and mail processed.

(E) Recommends personnel actions respecting subordinates; maintains morale among the employees in the group; adjusts complaints; supplies leadership necessary to secure maximum interest and effort from men and promotes cooperation and harmony.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a general foreman or other designated superior. Supervises approximately 20 or more employees.

(23) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 8.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has two clerical employees and annual receipts of approximately $6,000, and rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees and is responsible for the administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window services; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mail; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local banks; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks of employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries and schedules of disbursement.

(I) Maintains all files for the office.

Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(24) General foreman: R. P. O.—Level 9.

Basic function.—Directs mail service operations in a railway post office train with two or more authorized cars. Supervises a crew foremen and clerks whose primary function is the distribution and exchange of mails en route.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the proper distribution, exchange, and dispatch of mails regularly assigned for handling in the railway post office cars. Makes decisions concerning the most expeditious dispatch, rerouting and utilization of alternative connections involving irregularly received mail and also in emergency situations.

(B) Directs mail service operations in the railway post office train including:

(i) Rapid distribution of all classes of mail in accordance with official diagrams and via most advantageous routing.

(ii) Handling, recording, and protection of registered mails.

(iii) Makeup and exchange of mail at intermediate and terminal offices.

(iv) Proper utilization of space in each railway post office car with relation to other storage space in train and, except as charged to transfer clerks, for proper handling of all storage mail in train.

(v) Loading and unloading of railway post office cars to assure maximum use of available storage space without additional cost.

(vi) Proper usage of mail equipment and supplies.

(vii) Maintenance of distrbution schemes and schedules of mail routes in corrected condition.

(C) Supervises the activities of foremen and clerks in the cars and reassigns them to various duties as may be required to complete maximum distribution. Instructs clerks on proper practices and procedures and reports failures to meet operating standards to the district superintendent.

(D) Inspects condition of railway post office cars and reports to the railroad company unsatisfactory situations.

(E) Completes trip reports form covering service operations, including particulars of train operation, roster of clerks on duty, mails received, worked and dispatched, and mails not worked; prepares a list of all cars on train in which mail is carried, a record of the mail, and a report of any irregularities in service. Observes and reports to district superintendent any failure of the railroad company to afford protection to the mail.

(F) May personally distribute letter mail for one or more States, and maintain record of pouches received and dispatched.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through one or more subordinate foremen, clerks assigned to the run.

(25) Position: Assistant postmaster, small first-class post office—level 9.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, providing general direction and supervision over mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate employees in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(26) Position: Postmaster, second-class office—level 9.

Basic functions: Is responsible for all operations of a second-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has approximately six employees, annual receipts of approximately $16,000, and has rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises and coordinates the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; is responsible for the administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window service; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mails; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local banks; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries, and schedules of disbursement.

(I) Maintains all files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(27) Position: General foreman, mails—Level 10.

Basic function: Directs foremen in the distribution of all or part of incoming mails, outgoing mails, or both, at a first-class post office.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lays out work for foremen at the beginning of a tour and issues instructions.

(B) Oversees work in progress to prevent accumulation of mail.

(C) Insures that mail is distributed in accordance with established orders and instructions.

(D) Shifts men from one foreman to another to keep mails moving.

(E) Reports difficulties and suggests corrective measures to superior.

(F) Maintains required records.

(G) Assures that adequate on-the-job training is carried out to promote employee proficiency.

(H) Reviews and forwards recommendations of foremen respecting discipline, promotions, or changes in assignments; approves time and leave requests; submits manpower estimates.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent or assistant superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through approximately four foremen, employees as assigned.

(28) Position: Postmaster, small first-class office—Level 10.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and city delivery service consisting of 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(29) Position: Building superintendent—Level 11.

Basic function: Directs the janitorial, maintenance, and operating services of a large post office building and branches and stations covering an aggregate area of approximately 700,000 square feet, including security, heating and ventilating, mechanical and electrical equipment, and elevator services.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Plans and prepares work schedules and supervises the custodial forces in cleaning, heating, guarding, operating, and repairing the post office building and equipment.

(B) Makes frequent inspections to determine maintenance needs of the building and equipment, and to determine the efficiency of the janitorial and maintenance force.

(C) Prepares and answers correspondence relating to custodial service.

(D) Plans and supervises maintenance or alteration work under contract.

(E) Supervises the office force in the preparation of vouchers, requisitions, and reports incidental to custodial service, and in the maintenance of required accounts and records.

(F) Recommends transfers, promotions, and disciplinary measures for custodial personnel.

(G) Inspects mechanical equipment to determine repair needs and adherence to standards of preventive maintenance.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster or other designated superior. Directs, through a general foreman of laborers and a chief engineer, approximately 100 employees, including electricians and other skilled trades.

(30) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 11.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 27 employees, annual receipts of $129,000, and 11 city delivery and rural carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(31) Position: Tour superintendent, incoming or outgoing mails—Level 12.

Basic function: Directs general foremen in the distribution of incoming mails or outgoing mails on a tour at a large first-class post office.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the prompt and complete operation of a tour activity, such as incoming mails, outgoing mails, or all first- and third-class outgoing mails.

(B) Reassigns employees as necessary to meet peak-load demands; provides direction to subordinate foremen, coordinating the portions of work assigned to them.

(C) Answers questions of subordinate foremen regarding operating problems; refers policy questions to his superior with appropriate recommendations.

(D) Reviews requests for personnel actions by subordinate foremen, recommending final action to superior.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower required, consolidating for recommendation to superior.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to an assistant superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through general foremen, employees assigned to the tour.

(32) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 12.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 53 employees, annual receipts of $314,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 25 city and rural delivery routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares numerous reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services including contact stations, vehicular service, mail-messenger service, and vehicular-maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(33) Position: Postal inspector—Level 13.

Basic function: Is responsible in an assigned territory, usually including all classes of post offices, for inspection and investigative programs covering all phases of the postal service. In heavily populated areas may be assigned a majority of the time to selected types of work as determined by the inspector in charge.

Duties and responsibilities, assigned territory.

(A) Inspects post offices and related postal units to insure compliance with postal laws and regulations, protection and proper expenditure of postal revenues and appropriated funds, and evaluates and reports to administrative officials on operational efficiency.

(B) Maintains close working relationship with regional officials and submits to them

factual information and recommendations on conditions and needs of the postal service; acts as counselor to postmasters and other postal officials and employees in explaining instructions, regulations, applicable laws and decisions.

(C) Investigates violations of postal laws, including, but not limited to, armed robbery, mailing of bombs, burglary, theft of mail, embezzlements, obscene literature and pictures, and mail fraud.

(D) Determines the validity and seriousness of charges against postmasters and other officers and employees and makes pertinent recommendations.

(E) Investigates local and area operating problems and recommends corrective action, and within his prescribed jurisdiction, initiates necessary corrective action, including restoration of service immediately in disaster areas caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other catastrophes.

(F) Maintains liaison activities (i) with military installations to insure adequate postal service for the military forces; (ii) with Federal and State civil defense authorities at the area level; (iii) with branches of Federal and State law enforcement agencies.

(G) Ascertains postal needs for post offices and stations, rural and city delivery, changes in schedules, quarters, equipment, manpower, and procedures and reports findings and recommendations to appropriate officials.

Selected cases:

(H) Investigates the loss, theft, destruction, and damage to mail matter through technical analyses of complaints and other specialized procedures.

(I) Investigates money-order forgeries; investigates complaints of use of the mails to defraud and to operate lotteries.

(J) Investigates personal injuries, motor vehicle and other accidents; develops evidence for defense of suits under the so-called Federal Tort Claims Act; recommends out-of-court settlements.

(K) In any criminal investigation, develops evidence, locates witnesses and suspects, apprehends and effects arrests of postal offenders, presents facts to United States attorney, and collaborates as required with Federal and State prosecutors in presentation before United States commissioner, grand jury, and trial court.

(L) Surveys postal service on an area basis to ascertain and recommend ways of improving service and effecting economies.

(M) Makes investigations of a variety of other matters and performs related duties as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Responsible to the inspector-in-charge or the assistant inspector-in-charge of the division. Supervises trainees and other inspectors as assigned.

(34) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 13.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services. This office has approximately 72 employees, annual receipts of $797,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 17 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(35) Position: Station superintendent, large classified station—Level 14.

Basic function: Directs the operations of a large classified station, including the distribution, delivery, and dispatch of mail and all required window services to the public.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Plans and supervises the distribution of incoming and outgoing mails, the delivery service, including special delivery, and the dispatch of outgoing mail.

(B) Supervises services to the public at windows, including sales of stamps and stamped paper, money orders, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, registry and insurance of mail; handling of c. o. d. items; general delivery and box mail.

(C) Supervises city and rural carriers and determines that delivery schedules are maintained; consults in the adjustment and establishment of routes to reflect changes in volume, patronage, or population; and recommends establishment or changes in location of collection boxes.

(D) Directs and maintains required records for personnel of station, verifies and approves timecards for payroll purposes; makes manpower estimates and reports; trains new supervisors and employees in various aspects of station operations.

(E) Requisitions supplies and equipment, stamps, stamped paper, and accountable forms from main post office, reissuing to subordinates as required. Is responsible for entire fixed credit of station and for operation within the allowance granted.

(F) Maintains effective relations with large matters and the public; simplifies handling of mail, and takes appropriate action to meet complaints.

(G) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Supervises the cleaning and custodial maintenance of the station building.

(ii) Makes necessary arrangements for special services such as alien registrations, special census reports, or handling of special purpose mailing.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through subordinate supervisors, approximately one thousand or more employees.

(36) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. The office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, fifty Government-owned vehicle units, one classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(37) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including the direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 180 employees, annual receipts of $1 million, 21 Government-owned vehicle units, 3 classified stations, and 65 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by the departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(38) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on

internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationship with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(39) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, 50 Government-owned vehicle units, 1 classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil-service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(40) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous-audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assigiments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(41) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 700 employees, annual receipts of $4,470,000, 77 Government-owned vehicle units, 8 classified stations and branches, and 200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(42) Position: General superintendent, PTS Division—Level 17.

Basic function: Directs all activities of a division of the Postal Transportation Service of average size and complexity in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, or in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail-handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the Division.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail handling and transportation, schedules, security of mail in transit, and rates.

(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units, such as transfer offices, airmail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers, such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, trucklines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, up to 3,300 employees.

(43) Position: Assistant postmaster, large first-class office—Level 17.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally overseas the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(e) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(44) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 17.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(45) Position: General superintendent, largest PTS division: Level 18.

Basic function: Directs all activities of one of the largest divisions of the Postal Transportation Service in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, as well as in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail-handling and transportation schedules, security of mails in transit, and rates.

(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, air mail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, truck lines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, approximately 3,300 or more employees.

(46) Position: Assistant postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 18.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned motor-vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(47) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 18.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(48) Position: Postmaster, large first-class office—Level 19.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a large first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(49) Position: Postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 20.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of one of the largest first-class post offices, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations and branches. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director.

(50) Position: Regional director—Level 21.

Basic function: Directs the management of all postal activities within the jurisdiction of an assigned region in accordance with basic departmental policies and with functional direction and guidance from Assistant Postmasters General.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Develops and formulates policies and practices for the region within basic policies and instructions of the Postmaster General.

(B) Manages post office operations.

(C) Administers routing, distribution, and transportation of mail within and in transit through the region.

(D) Arranges for the provision of adequate facilities and equipment for all postal functions in the region.

(E) Administers the personnel program of the region, including employment, placement, training, evaluation of positions, employee relations, and other personnel functions.

(F) Authorizes and issues allowances for all expenditures and exercises budgetary controls.

(G) Administers cost reduction programs and provides industrial engineering services to operating segments of the region.

(H) Maintains effective public relations with the general public, large mail users, and with Federal, State, and municipal authorities.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the Deputy Postmaster General. Directs, through subordinate officials, approximately 30,000 to 35,000 employees in some 3,000 offices within the region.

SEC. 204. (a) An employee may be appointed to more than one position and shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for each position, without regard to the provisions of sections 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 58, 69, and 70).

(b) As the needs of the service require, an employee may be assigned from time to time to perform, without change in compensation, duties and responsibilities other than the duties and responsibilities specifically set forth in his position description; however, if any employee is assigned for more than 30 days in any calendar year to duties and responsibilities of a salary level which is higher than the salary level to which his position is assigned, except to perform service in a relief capacity for a supervisor granted compensatory time pursuant to section 603, he shall be paid for the period of his assignment in excess of 30 days a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of section 502.

SEC. 205. (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are assigned, and the reasons for such actions;

(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.).

(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. The report shall be printed as a House document.

TITLE III—BASIC SALARY SCHEDULES

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

SEC. 301. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "PFS." Except as provided in sections 302 and 303 of this act, basic salary shall be paid to all employees in accordance with this schedule.

Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

(b) The basic salary for hourly rate employees shall be computed by dividing the per annum rates prescribed in the Postal Field Service Schedule (1) by 2,080 in the case of hourly rate employees other than substitutes, and (2) by 2,016 in the case of substitute employees.

RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

SEC. 302. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "RCS," for carriers in the rural delivery service, which is based in part on fixed compensation per annum and in part on specified rates per mile per annum. Basic salary shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

Rural carrier schedule

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,538	$1,578	$1,618	$1,658	$1,698	$1,738	$1,778
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	65	67	69	71	73	75
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,538	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

(b) A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the combined length of the two routes.

(c) The Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding 61 miles in length. He may not pay additional compensation to a carrier serving such a route in an amount which would exceed $4,700, when added to the basic salary for the maximum step in the rural carrier schedule for his route. In case any such heavily patronized route is extended in length, the rural carrier assigned to such route at the time of such extension shall not be reduced in pay.

(d) The Postmaster General may pay additional compensation to rural carriers who are required to carry pouch mail to intermediate post offices, or for intersecting loop routes, in all cases where it appears that the carriage of such pouches increases the expense of the equipment required by the carrier or materially increases the amount of labor performed by him. Such compensation shall not exceed the sum of $12 per annum for each mile such carrier is required to carry such pouches.

(e) In addition to the other compensation, rural carriers shall be paid the authorized fee for making special delivery of mail. Such fee shall not be paid when (1) no special delivery service is rendered, (2) delivery is made into a rural mail box, or (3) delivery is made to the addressee or his representative on the rural carrier's route.

FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

SEC. 303. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "FOS," for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. Basic salary shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

Fourth-class office schedule

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,514	$2,598	$2,682	$2,766	$2,850	$2,934	$3,018
$900 to $1,299.99	2,304	2,381	2,458	2,535	2,612	2,689	2,766
$600 to $899.99	1,886	1,949	2,012	2,075	2,138	2,201	2,264
$350 to $599.99	1,467	1,516	1,565	1,614	1,663	1,712	1,761
$250 to $349.99	1,048	1,083	1,118	1,153	1,188	1,223	1,258
$200 to $249.99	838	866	894	922	950	978	1,006
$100 to $199.99	629	650	671	692	713	734	755
Under $100	419	433	447	461	475	489	503

(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in gross receipts at the start of the first pay period after the beginning of each fiscal year. In adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step, the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted gross receipts of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of changes in gross receipts shall be deemed the equivalent of a step-increase under section 401 of this act and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category or class indicated by the receipts of the preceding quarter. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category or class pursuant to this subsection shall remain in such category or class until the start of the first pay period after July 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category or class indicated by the receipts for the preceding calendar year.

(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as such postmaster.

(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods such office is open for business during the fiscal year.

(g) Where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the third class for each of the two consecutive calendar years are less than $1,500, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $1,400, such post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

CONVERSION

SEC. 304. (a) Each employee whose basic salary is paid under the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, or under the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended, and who on or prior to the effective date of this section has earned but has not been credited with a higher automatic salary grade increase under the act of July 6, 1945, or a higher within-grade step-increase under the Classification Act of 1949 for his position shall be given credit for such increase before his basic salary is adjusted under this act.

(b) The basic salary of each employee in effect immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, and the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, shall be adjusted to the basic salary in the schedules in the following manner:

(1) If the basic salary of the employee is equal to any step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(2) If the basic salary of the employee is less than the entrance step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such entrance step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(3) If the basic salary of the employee falls between any two steps established for his position in the appropriate schedule, the higher step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(4) If the basic salary of the employee is greater than the highest step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such basic salary shall be established as the new basic salary of the employee.

ADDITION OF LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 305. (a) When the basic salary of an employee, except an employee whose basic salary immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, is established under section 304 of this act, each longevity step-increase which such employee has earned prior to the effective date of his schedule shall become a part of his basic compensation and shall constitute a longevity step-increase under section 404 of this act.

(b) In the case of an employee whose compensation immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, all creditable service under section 404 shall be counted in order to determine such employee's eligibility for longevity step-increases under such section.

RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death.

TITLE IV—STEP-INCREASES

AUTOMATIC ADVANCEMENT BY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 401. (a) Except as to a substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, each employee whose position is allocated to the Rural Carrier Schedule, the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, or salary level PFS–10 or a lower salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step for his position at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of each 52 calendar weeks of satisfactory service, if no equivalent increase in basic salary from any cause was received during such period of 52 calendar weeks. The

benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces.

(b) Each employee whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–11 or a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be advanced to and including step four of his salary level in the manner provided in subsection (a) of this section. Advancement of such employee to steps higher than step four, exclusive of longevity step-increases, shall be granted by the Postmaster General on the basis of superior performance under regulations issued by him, but no such employee is eligible for more than one step-increase within the time period specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Each substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service, whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, shall be advanced in the manner prescribed for other employees under subsection (a) of this section, but such substitute shall not be advanced beyond step four of salary level PFS–6.

CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR ADVANCEMENT

SEC. 402. Each employee in the postal field service is eligible to earn step-increases in accordance with this act. Except for temporary rural carriers serving in the absence of regular rural carriers on leave without pay or on military leave, credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

ADJUSTMENT OF SERVICE CREDIT

SEC. 403. (a) Subject to subsection (b) of this section and for the purpose of establishing eligibility for step-increases under the provisions of section 401 of this act, each employee whose basic salary is adjusted on the effective date of the schedules in sections 301, 302, and 303 of this act shall begin his waiting period of 52 weeks on the date of such adjustment.

(b) Each employee in the automatic grades immediately prior to such adjustment who had not reached the maximum grade for his position may retain his anniversary date established under the Act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), as amended, for purposes of advancement to the next step for his position, if the amount of the increase which he received by reason of such adjustment to his salary schedule under this Act is less than that part (allocable to the service performed by him since his last automatic increase under such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended) of the amount representing the grade increase which would have been credited to him at the beginning of the quarter following his next anniversary date under such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended.

LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 404. (a) There are established for each employee longevity steps A, B, and C. For each promotion to a longevity step—

(1) each postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall receive an amount equal to 5 per centum of his basic salary, or $100 per annum, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) each employee (other than a postmaster at a post office of the fourth class) shall receive $100 per annum.

In computing the percentage increase under this subsection the amount of the increase shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. A half dollar or one-half cent shall be rounded to the next highest dollar or cent, respectively.

(b) Each employee shall be assigned to—

(1) longevity step A at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 13 years of service;

(2) longevity step B at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 18 years of service; and

(3) longevity step C at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 25 years of service.

(c) (1) There shall be credited, for the purposes of subsection (b)—

(A) all time on the rolls, except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier, in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department;

(B) all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Department of the Treasury continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order Numbered 6166, dated June 10, 1933;

(C) all time on the rolls as a special-delivery messenger at a first-class post office; and

(D) all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office for which payment is made from authorized allowances.

(2) In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b) in the case of an employee whose continuous service in the postal field service or in the departmental service of the Post Office Department shall have been interrupted by service with the Armed Forces or to comply with a transfer during war or national emergency as defined by the United States Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in such service with the Armed Forces or on such transfer shall be credited pro rata for each week of such service. All service specified in this subsection, whether continuous or intermittent, shall be credited on the basis of 1 week for each whole week the employee has been on the rolls, except that credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

(d) Employees on the rolls on the effective date of this section who are entitled to promotion credit for longevity purposes under section 2 of the Act approved May 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 102; 39 U. S. C. 839), shall retain all rights and benefits established or continued under such section to the same extent as though such section had remained in effect.

(e) Increases under this section shall not be deemed equivalent increases within the meaning of section 401.

TITLE V—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 501. The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government to any position in a regional or district office or to any professional or scientific position and may place such person in any step in the salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which such person received from the United States.

PROMOTION

SEC. 502. (a) Any employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid basic salary at the lowest step of such higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic salary by not less than the amount of difference between the entrance step of the salary level from which promoted and the entrance step of the salary level immediately above the salary level from which promoted. If there is no step in the salary level to which the employee is promoted which exceeds his existing basic salary by at least the amount of such difference, such employee shall be paid (1) the maximum step of the salary level to which promoted, or (2) his existing basic salary, whichever is higher.

(b) Regular clerks and carriers in first- and second-class post offices are not eligible for promotion to positions of higher salary levels in their respective offices unless they are in the maximum steps of their respective salary levels. If for any reason such clerks and carriers in such maximum steps are not available those clerks and carriers in the lower steps in such offices shall be eligible for such promotion.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

SEC. 503. Each temporary employee who is hired for a continuous period of 1 year or less for a position under the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid a basic salary at the entrance step for the salary level of the position to which he is appointed.

PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION OF FORMER COMPENSATION

SEC. 504. (a) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or Fourth-Class Office Schedule to an amount less than his basic compensation immediately prior to adjustment to such schedules.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "basic compensation" includes basic compensation under the Classification Act of 1949.

TITLE VI—PAY ADMINISTRATION

PAY PERIODS AND COMPUTATION OF RATES

SEC. 601. (a) Employees in the postal field service shall be paid compensation in 26 installments. Each such installment shall be the compensation for a pay period of 2 weeks.

(b) As basic compensation for a full pay period, an employee, other than an hourly rate employee, shall be paid an amount equal to one twenty-sixth of his annual basic compensation. As basic compensation for a portion of a pay period, such employee shall be paid basic compensation computed in accordance with subsection (d) of this section for the number of days and hours of service for which he has credit.

(c) As basic compensation for the pay period, an hourly rate employee shall be paid an amount equal to the product of his hourly rate of basic compensation and the number of hours of service for which he has credit.

(d) For purposes of computing rates of compensation other than annual rates the following rules shall govern:

(1) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for employees other than substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,080.

(2) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,016.

(3) To compute the daily rate of compensation for postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 312.

(4) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for annual rate employees other than postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the hourly rate of basic compensation shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required.

(e) Except for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave upon the termination of employment, an annual rate employee shall not be paid more than one twenty-sixth of his basic compensation as basic compensation for a pay period.

(f) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(g) When a pay period for employees to whom this act applies begins in one fiscal year and ends in another, the gross amount of the earnings of such employees for such pay period may be regarded as a charge

against the appropriation or allotment current at the end of such pay period.

HOURS OF WORK

SEC. 602. Except as otherwise provided in this act, employees shall not be required to work more than 8 hours a day. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours.

COMPENSATORY TIME, OVERTIME, AND HOLIDAYS

SEC. 603. In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to work more than 8 hours in 1 day, or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. For such service he shall grant employees in the "PFS" schedule compensatory time or pay such employees overtime compensation under the following rules:

(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS–8 shall be paid for all work in excess of 8 hours in 1 day at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

(2) (A) Each employee in or below salary level PFS–8 who performs work on Saturdays or Sundays shall, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the excess time worked within 5 working days, except that, in lieu of such compensatory time, the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize such employee to be paid, for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December, at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

(B) If the work performed by such employees on Saturdays and Sundays is less than 8 hours, such service, in the discretion of the Postmaster General may be carried forward and combined with similar service performed on other Saturdays and Sundays. The employees may be allowed compensatory time for such combined service or any part thereof at any time, except that, whenever at least 8 hours of such service has been accumulated, the employees shall be allowed 8 hours, compensatory time on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday on which the total accumulated service was at least 8 hours.

(3) For time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the act of December 26, 1941 (5 U. S. C., sec. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees generally, each employee in or below salary level PFS–8, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall either be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such time worked within 30 working days, or be paid premium compensation at a rate equal to his hourly basic compensation for the time so worked. For work performed on Christmas Day, premium compensation shall be paid at a rate equal to 150 percent of the employee's hourly basic compensation.

(4) Each employee in or above salary level PFS–9 who performs overtime or holiday work as described in this section, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such overtime or holiday work.

NIGHT WORK

SEC. 604. Employees who perform work between the hours of 6 o'clock p. m. and 6 o'clock a. m. standard or daylight-saving time, depending upon which time is observed where such work is performed, shall be paid extra compensation for each hour of such work at the rate of 10 percent of their hourly basic compensation. The differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which such employees may be entitled.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 605. (a) Sections 602, 603, and 604 of this act do not apply to the heads of regional or district offices and such other employees of the headquarters staff of regional and district offices as the Postmaster General designates, or to postmasters, rural carriers, post-office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, and traveling examiners of equipment and supplies.

(b) Sections 602 and 603 of this act do not apply to substitute employees and to employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty.

(c) Section 602 of this act does not apply to employees in post offices of the third class.

(d) The provisions of section 603 of this act relating to compensatory time and overtime compensation for work on Saturdays and Sundays do not apply to hourly rate regular employees.

SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 606. (a) Subject to subsection (c) of this section, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the conditions under which substitute positions may be established.

(b) Each substitute employee who reports for duty in compliance with an official order shall be employed for not less than 2 hours following the hour at which such employee is ordered to report.

(c) In the case of positions which are the same as or equivalent to the positions enumerated in the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1936, as amended (39 U. S. C., sec. 834), the ratio of classified substitute employees to regular employees shall not be more than 1 classified substitute to 5 regular employees or fraction thereof with respect to each such position, except that in offices having fewer than 5 regular employees there may be 1 substitute clerk and 1 substitute carrier, and 1 substitute in the motor-vehicle service.

EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

SEC. 607. (a) The Postmaster General shall organize the work of employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty into regularly scheduled tours of duty. Such tours of duty shall aggregate an average of not more than 8 hours a day for 252 days a year, including an allowance of 1 hour and 35 minutes for work to be performed on layoff periods. He shall not grant allowances of time for work performed on layoff periods to employees other than employees engaged in the distribution of mail.

(b) Employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty, except substitute employees, who are required to perform work in excess of the scheduled time of their regular tours of duty as established by the Postmaster General shall be paid at the rate of 150 percent of their hourly basic compensation for such overtime work. In arriving at the amount of overtime to be paid at any time during the calendar year, any deficiencies accrued up to that time during the same calendar year shall be offset against any overtime work by the employee.

(c) Substitute employees in the postal transportation service assigned to road duty shall be paid on an hourly basis for actual work performed according to the time value of each trip of such road duty, including an allowance of time for all work required on layoff periods.

(d) In addition to compensation provided under this act, the Postmaster General, under regulations prescribed by him, may pay not more than $9 per day as travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum or by such other method as he deems equitable to regular and substitute employees in the postal transportation service who are assigned to road duty, after the expiration of 10 hours from the time the initial run begins.

(e) Substitute employees in the postal transportation service shall be credited with full time while traveling under orders of the Post Office Department to and from their designated headquarters to take up assignments.

EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS

SEC. 608. (a) In addition to the compensation provided under this act regular and substitute special delivery messengers at first-class post offices shall be paid an automotive equipment maintenance allowance at the rate of 7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof for miles traveled under the direction of the Department in making delivery of special-delivery mail or at the option of the Postmaster General at the rate of 90 cents per hour spent in making delivery of special-delivery mail. Payments for equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

(b) The Postmaster General may provide or hire vehicles under an allowance basis for use in the delivery of special-delivery mail whenever the needs of the postal field service so require.

EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

SEC. 609. (a) In addition to the compensation provided in the rural carrier schedule, each rural carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 9 cents per mile for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled. The Postmaster General may pay such additional equipment maintenance allowance as he determines to be fair and reasonable, not in excess of $3 per day when combined with the equipment maintenance allowance provided by the preceding sentence, to rural carriers entitled to additional compensation under section 302 (c) of this act for serving heavily patronized routes. Payments for such equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

(b) Any employee in the postal field service who is assigned to serve any rural route, and who furnishes the vehicle used in the performance of such service, shall be paid the equipment maintenance allowance provided for the route so served, in addition to his compensation.

ALLOWANCES FOR POSTMASTERS IN FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES

SEC. 610. Postmasters of fourth-class post offices shall be paid as allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment an amount equal to 15 percent of the compensation earned in each pay period, at the same time and in the same manner as their regular compensation.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

CLASSES OF POST OFFICES

SEC. 701. The Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of gross annual postal receipts. He shall place in the first class those post offices at which such receipts are $40,000 or more. He shall place in the second class those post offices at which such receipts are $8,000 or more, but less than $40,000. He shall place in the third class those post offices at which such receipts are $1,500 or more, but less than $8,000. He shall place in the fourth class those offices at which such receipts are less than $1,500.

ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 702. With the consent of the employee, the Postmaster General is authorized to detail any employee, including any employee of the departmental service, between the postal field service and the departmental service to such extent as may be necessary to

develop a more efficient working force and more effectively to perform the work of the Department. Each such detail shall be made for a period of not more than 1 year and may be made without change in compensation of the employee so detailed.

INCREASES IN BASIC COMPENSATION NOT "EQUIVALENT INCREASES"

SEC. 703. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of enactment of this act shall not be considered as an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 701 (a) (A) of the Classification Act of 1949, in the case of employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

SEC. 704. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to adopt applicable provisions of this act for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, as of the respective effective dates of such applicable provisions.

REFERENCES IN OTHER LAWS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC LAW 134, 79TH CONGRESS

SEC. 705. (a) Whenever reference is made in any other law to the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, such reference shall be held and considered to mean this act. Whenever reference is made in any other law to a "grade" of such act of July 6, 1945, such reference shall be held and considered to mean the corresponding basic salary step in any schedule contained in this act.

(b) The application of this act to any position or employee shall not be affected by reason of the enactment of subsection (a).

APPLICABILITY OF ACT TO GUAM

SEC. 706. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

REGULATIONS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

SEC. 707. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND RULES, VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

SEC. 708. This act shall not be construed to modify the application of the Civil Service Act and Rules or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the postal field service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 709. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 710. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(b) Section 601 of this act shall take effect on any Sunday following the date of enactment of this act designated by the Postmaster General but not later than the first Sunday of the first calendar month which begins more than 60 days after such date of enactment.

(c) The remainder of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) (1) The adjustment of the basic salary of each employee to the basic salary established for the position he was occupying on the effective date of this act shall be completed within 180 days after the effective date of section 304 (b).

(2) The applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, shall continue in effect with respect to each such employee until the date on which his basic salary is adjusted under such section 304 (b).

(3) Such adjustment of basic salary of each such employee shall be made effective as of the effective date of section 304 (b) and payments of basic salary on the basis of such adjustment shall be decreased by the amounts of basic salary received by such employee during such period under the applicable provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. LANGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the controversy concerning the failure of the refugee-relief program has been spread over the front pages of the press of the Nation during the past 2 weeks. The dismissal of Mr. Edward Corsi as special assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of immigration problems—a most unfortunate and regrettable development, for which the Secretary of State must yet fully account—has focused national attention on the Refugee Relief Act, and on the administration of that act, as never before since the enactment of the legislation in the summer of 1953.

The Refugee Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee is now investigating the Corsi matter and all its implications. The subcommittee is investigating and reviewing the administration of the refugee relief program. In the course of the subcommittee hearings, there has been frequent reference to the inadequacies of the Refugee Relief Act. There seems to be a debate as to which factor has been chiefly responsible for the paralysis of the refugee program—the unfortunate terms of the law itself, or the unfortunate manner in which the law has been administered. Mr. President, I am willing to give full and equal credit to both factors. The law is very faulty. The administration of the law has been most inadequate.

Today, Mr. President, I shall address myself largely to the shortcomings of the law. Today I am introducing, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a comprehensive set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. These amendments are badly needed. I send this bill of amendments to the desk for appropriate reference. I hope the Judiciary Subcommittee, which is looking into the operations of the refugee program, will give full and sympathetic consideration to these amendments. I hope that legislative hearings will be held upon them. I hope the amendments will be reported out, submitted for a vote, passed by the Senate, and sent to the House.

Some changes in administrative attitude are indeed necessary on the part of the Secretary of State, on the part of the consular officers abroad, and on the part of all those who are dealing with this program, if this program is to be snatched from the jaws of failure and converted into a success. The way this program has gone up to now has cast a pall of shame on the prestige of the United States abroad. It has disappointed hundreds of thousands of people, both here and abroad. What was intended by Congress to be a great undertaking in humanitarianism, has instead become a bureaucratic nightmare, full of hair-splitting interpretations of law, frustrations, disappointments, and heartbreak for refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain and for their friends and relatives in the United States.

Let us recall, Mr. President, that this act was entitled the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The message from President Eisenhower recommending this program described at great length the plight of those who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain—of those who had been driven from their homes by war and disaster. That was the keynote of this program.

In that message, the President said:

> We are all aware of the tragic developments of the past several years which have left countless thousands of individuals homeless refugees in the heart of Europe. In recent months, the number of refugees has been increased by the steady flow of escapees who have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain * * * these refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

When this bill was acted on in the Senate, and when it was signed by the President, noble sentiments were expressed regarding the concern which America felt for the brave men and women who, seeking freedom, had escaped into the free world from slave-labor camps and from the oppressions of tyranny behind the Iron Curtain.

The Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act. On the surface, it was a generous act. But technical amendments adopted in committee—boobytraps—robbed the act of its truly humanitarian aspects, and made it, instead, a prescription for delay, frustration, and heartbreak.

When that bill came up for vote on the floor of the Senate, I cast my vote in favor of it; but at the time I warned that those who held forth high hopes for the effectuation of this program were overly optimistic, and that there would be a rude awakening. I predicted, at the time, that only a small percentage of the refugees and escapees whom we undertook to assist by means of that legislation would ever actually be assisted.

I regret to say that my predictions of July 28, 1953, have sadly come true. In almost 2 years of operation—and there is only a year and one-half left—considerably less than 1,000 actual refugees and escapees have been admitted into the United States. Numerous contradictory figures have been cited; but the volun-

tary agencies representing the various religious faiths, who have been working strenuously to translate this program into reality, insist that according to their records, the number of refugees and escapees who have been admitted to the United States number well under 1,000.

Some thousands of relatives of American citizens and of aliens permanently resident in this country have been admitted under the terms of this refugee program. Almost all of them would have been eligible to enter the United States under the quota provisions of permanent immigration law, although their entry would thereby have been delayed. As it has worked out, this program has not been a refugee relief act, but a relatives' relief act.

Of course, I have no objection whatever to the admission of relatives into this country. I am in favor of that, but I do object to the frustration of the hopes, dreams, and legitimate aspirations of refugees and escapees who have no relatives in the United States. This was one of the main objects of the passage of this legislation. Tragically, that objective has been frustrated.

Mr. President, the amendments I am introducing today would slightly increase the allowable number of aliens who would be admitted into the United States under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act from the present limit of 209,000 to 224,000. The difference of 15,000 is accounted for by a proposed authorization to admit refugees now residing in Spain and North Africa, in addition to those already eligible under paragraph 3 of section 4a of the act, namely, the NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, and the Free Territory of Trieste.

Moreover, Mr. President, it is the general purpose of my amendments to make clear the 224,000 figure is a goal which it is desired to achieve. In other words, a target. It has been the very mistaken impression of those administering the act that Congress, in setting the previous ceiling of 209,000 was merely setting an inflexible upper limit and did not really intend that this number of persons should be admitted into the United States.

Those in charge of the program have taken the position that the fewer admitted the better. My amendments would provide that if any of the authorized numbers to be admitted in the various categories are not, in fact, admitted by December 31, 1956, an equivalent number of visas are to be made available in the categories where applications for admission are in excess of the number authorized to be admitted in those categories.

Another of the provisions in my bill would take the administration of the Refugee Relief Act away from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, where it does not belong, and vest it in a full-time administrator who would operate in the Department of State and who would not be subject to the bureaucratic control of any division chief.

Another of the major changes my bill would accomplish would be authorization of the use of so-called agency assurances, in addition to individual assurances, so that our great voluntary organizations, both religious and nondenominational organizations, may assume responsibility for providing housing and employment for the refugees desiring to come to the United States under the act.

My amendments would eliminate the distinction between so-called refugees and so-called escapees, and establish only one category, to include those who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and those who are refugees from the aftermath of World War II.

My amendments would liberalize the provisions permitting aliens who are now in the United States, in a nonresident status, to apply for adjustment of status to that of permanent residents.

My bill would also eliminate the unworkable requirement for a 2-year security history prior to admission. The present provision is self-defeating, making it almost impossible for escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to enter the United States until they have been for at least 2 years in free territory.

All would-be immigrants, in any category, must pass the security requirement of the McCarran-Walter Act—very severe requirements, indeed. Yet the present refugee law, which is designed to facilitate the admission of refugees and escapees into the United States, establishes additional security barriers which make it almost impossible for recent escapees and refugees to enter the United States under any circumstances.

Finally, Mr. President, I would make the final cut-off date for this program December 31, 1960, instead of the present cut-off date of December 31, 1956.

As I said previously, I firmly believe and I think the American people feel that the authorization to admit 209,000 or 224,000 refugees should be used. Time should certainly be allowed for the completion of the processing of applications and the straightening out of difficulties in individual cases to the full extent of the authorized ceiling of admissions. The cut-off date I have provided in this bill of amendments would permit such a procedure.

Our amendment would also provide, as I have said, that further applications could be received in categories where the authorized number of visas had not been issued by the preliminary termination date for visa issuance, namely, December 31, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that a detailed analysis of my bill, along with a copy of the bill, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The bill (S. 1794) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to redefine the term "refugee," to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN on behalf of himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEFAUVER was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 2 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 400; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) 'Refugee' means any person in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist dominated, who because of persecution, fear of persecution, natural calamity, military operations, or events subsequent to September 1, 1939, is out of his usual place of abode and is unable to return thereto."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of such act is hereby repealed.

(c) Subsection (d) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971a), is amended by striking out "two hundred five thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred twenty thousand."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971b), is amended by—

(1) striking out in paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (13), wherever it appears in such paragraphs, the word "ethnic";

(2) striking out in paragraph (2) the word "escapees" and inserting in lieu thereof: "refugees"; and

(3) striking out all of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Not to exceed 25,000 visas to refugees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey, North Africa, Spain, Sweden, Iran, or the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside. Such visas shall be issued only in the area in which they reside."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "ethnic."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971c (a)), is amended by striking out "ten years of age" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "fourteen years of age."

SEC. 5. Section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971d), is amended by—

(1) striking out in the first sentence "Any alien who establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any alien entering the United States prior to July 1, 1953, who establishes"; and

(2) striking out in the second sentence that portion which reads "except that the quota to which he is chargeable is oversubscribed."

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971e), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Except as provided in section 5 of this act with regard to eligible orphans, no visa shall be issued to any alien under this act unless an assurance, in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, shall first have been given by a citizen or citizens of the United States or by an organization recognized by the Administrator for the purpose of submitting such assurances, that such alien will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such alien and the members of such alien's family who shall accompany such alien and who propose to live with such alien will not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent sons and daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons and stepdaughters and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1,

1953, of such alien shall not be required to have such assurances made in their behalf. The assurances shall be submitted to the Administrator and it shall be the duty of the Administrator to verify the authenticity and bona fides of such assurances. This subsection shall have no applicability to an alien eligible under paragraph (6), (8), or (10) of section 4 (a) of this act, if such alien provides satisfactory evidence that he will not become a public charge."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No alien shall be issued a visa under this act or be admitted into the United States unless he shall present to the consular officer at the time of application for a visa or to the immigration officer at the time of application for admission a valid unexpired passport, or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if any such document is required under the regulations issued by the Administrator."

SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971i), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. Section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971j), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. Section 20 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971q), is amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 20. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no immigrant visa shall be issued under this act after December 31, 1956.

"(b) If any of the special nonquota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this act remain unissued on December 31, 1956, such unissued visas shall be redistributed among those categories in section 4 (a) of this act that have (1) unfilled applications for visas, and (2) no visas remaining available for issue on December 31, 1956. Each such category shall be allotted a percentage of such unissued visas (to the extent necessary to fill applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956) equal to the percentage of the visas authorized under section 3 which is allotted to such category under section 4 (a). Any unissued visas remaining unallotted after the allotment provided by the preceding sentence shall be allotted among those categories which are not allotted sufficient visas under the preceding sentence to fill the applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956, until (1) all such unissued visas have been allotted or (2) all categories have been allotted a number of such unissued visas equal to the number of its applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956. No immigrant visa made available to the categories under section 4 (a) of this act by virtue of this subsection shall be issued after December 31, 1960."

SEC. 10. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971), is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof as follows.

"ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 21. There is hereby established in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall serve under the direction of, and shall be solely responsible to, the Secretary of State and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $17,000 per annum."

The analysis submitted by Mr. LEHMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT AMENDMENTS

1. The term "refugee" is broadened to include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and as a result of present political conditions, fear of persecution, military operations, etc., are unable to return to their natural place of abode. The term "refugee" is made to include escapees from behind the Iron Curtain obviating the necessity for two separate categories which in the present law have contributed to administrative delay and confusion.

2. The responsibility for the administration of the act is vested in an Administrator within the Department of State, but not, as in the present law, in the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. The present Administrator, Mr. Scott McLeod, would have this responsibility taken from him. The new Administrator would be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. He would serve under the direction of the Secretary of State.

3. The overall number of visas available for issuance is increased from 209,000 to 224,000. The 15,000 increase is added to the present 10,000 allotment of visas (sec. 4 (a) (3)) for refugees residing in the NATO countries. New areas included within the purview of the act would be Spain and North Africa.

4. The restrictive and opprobrious term—"ethnic"—is struck from the act.

5. The maximum age for orphans eligible to be admitted under section 5 of the act is increased from 10 to 14.

6. The provision for adjustment of status of aliens presently residing in the United States is broadened and liberalized.

7. The requirement for employment and housing assurances for qualified refugees has been modified to provide that these assurances may be given by individuals or by voluntary agencies recognized by the Department of State for the purpose of giving such assurances. One of the major problems arising under the present assurance requirements is that a specific job and housing facility must be underwritten by a specific individual prior to the time a refugee can be declared eligible for immigration. Authorizing the acceptance of such assurances from duly recognized voluntary agencies would greatly simplify the entire program.

8. The requirement of section 7 (d) of the present act that an alien, before being admitted into the United States must obtain a certificate of readmission into the country from which he departs for the United States is eliminated. It is felt that the requirements of the basic immigration law covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

9. The requirement of subsection (d) of section 11, that a completely documented 2-year history of the alien be submitted as a condition of eligibility is repealed. This provision has resulted in interminable delays in the admission of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. The security requirements of the basic immigration law, as well as the additional requirements of this act, are deemed more than adequate to protect the security interests of the United States.

10. The final termination date of the act is extended from December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1960. Provision is made that after December 31, 1956, those visas which have not been issued in the various categories established in the act shall be reallocated to those categories which have exhausted their visa allocations and in which there is still a demand for visas.

11. Section 12 of the act which establishes a system of priorities for the issuance of visas is repealed. These provisions have proven to be largely unworkable and meaningless in actual practice.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER, GERMANY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, today has a special meaning for all people everywhere. Ten years ago today, almost at this very time, soldiers of the American and Soviet Armies met on the Elbe River in Eastern Germany.

For myself and for 59 other Members of this distinguished body, for 256 Members of the House of Representatives, and for millions of other veterans throughout the country, this anniversary has a very personal meaning.

Mr. President, 10 years ago those of us who had not been knocked out were still participating actively in the bloodiest struggle in history. Our eyes had become accustomed to seeing fellow humans being killed and maimed. The smell of death was with us constantly, and we had seen privation and destruction in the areas where so short a time before had been peaceful farms and villages of those whose land had become the arena for this slaughter.

Is it any wonder that the great event that took place on April 25, 1945, stirs in us a strong emotion? The meeting of American and Soviet GI's that day meant that the war in Europe was about to end—which it did, as we all know, 2 weeks later. And the end of war in Europe meant the end of Nazi tyranny—with its concentration camps, its secret police, its slave-labor factories, its intellectual inquisition, and its contempt for the rights, liberties, and dignity of the individual.

It is well to remember all this when we consider how tragically the hopes of 10 years ago have been betrayed. Let us not forget that the destruction of Nazi tyranny did restore freedom and a better life to half of western Europe and liberate the majority of German people from totalitarian rule. But unfortunately it brought no such benefits to the peoples of the Soviet Union or of eastern and central Europe. Nor did it bring true peace. Instead, the hopes of Elbe Day gave way to the Iron Curtain, the cold war, and the threat of a new world war of unimagined destructiveness.

The end of a war that left the Soviet regime immensely strong but the Soviet peoples still enslaved by totalitarian rule could not bring real peace to the world. For, as General Bradley said the other night in a message broadcast to the Soviet veterans over Radio Liberation, "the only threat to peace is tyranny."

This is the crux of the world problem we face today. With its hollow propaganda about coexistence, the Soviet tyranny would like to cause the world to ignore the fact of tyranny itself, and the fact that Soviet despotism is the source of the threat which hangs over all of us today. How can peace be secure as long as one-third of the human race lives under totalitarian despotism, as long as millions of human beings are tormented in concentration camps, as long as people from the Elbe River to the China Sea are denied the human rights to which all men are entitled?

Until the Soviet peoples themselves—the first victims of Communist tyranny—are free, neither the life nor the liberty of anyone on this earth is really secure.

For this reason, if for no other, we look forward to the day when our Soviet comrades-in-arms in the war against Nazi tyranny, together with all other peoples now living under the Communist yoke, have achieved liberty.

We are heartened by the knowledge that the struggle for liberty has never ended in the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the Soviet veteran yearns for a world of peace and freedom just as earnestly as does the American veteran.

Indeed, here in our own Capital today are emissaries of those unknown millions in the Soviet Union who, each in his own way and in his own heart, struggle toward a world without barriers, and in which the individual is master and the state is the obedient servant. They are Soviet soldiers who, together with thousands of others, have escaped through the Iron Curtain since 1945.

Mr. President, some of us have just returned from the Presidential Room where we participated in a special ceremony to be broadcast to the Soviet peoples by Radio Liberation. It is heartening to know that the citizens of the Soviet Union who yearn for freedom have a voice that speaks to them of a better future. It is the voice of Radio Liberation, which is manned by men and women—technicians, scholars, writers, and artists—who have escaped from Soviet tyranny. With the help of American citizens who believe that a secure peace depends upon liberty, they are now operating nine powerful transmitters and beam the message of hope to their still-enslaved compatriots. We Americans who are proud of our revolutionary tradition in the cause of human liberty can take pride in the fact that Americans are giving their support to such a program.

In recent days, Mr. President, the official organ of the Soviet Government—Izvestia—delivered a violent attack against Radio Liberation and against those Americans who are helping their Soviet friends who dream of freedom. This proves that after nearly 40 years of thought control the Soviet masters have been unable to kill the dream of freedom, and that they still fear it. This proves that after nearly 40 years of iron control by secret police, the masters of the Kremlin have not been able to stifle the urge for personal liberty. This proves that after nearly 40 years of totalitarian rule, the despots of the Soviet Union know that their despotism is still vulnerable to the most powerful ideas in the world—the ideas of freedom, of liberty, of justice, of the brotherhood of man.

Mr. President, I think it is agreed by all Americans that we must do everything humanly possible to avoid an open clash with the Soviet Union, since the consequences of such a war are beyond contemplation. At the same time, we must be strong and firm, and prevent any further Communist aggression, whether by direct conquest or by subversion.

But for the long run, I submit, Mr. President, the world's hope for enduring peace lies in the possibility of freedom for the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union. For when the Soviet peoples are free, and I think not before, the promise of peace which shone so brightly when American and Soviet soldiers met 10 years ago, will be fulfilled.

When that day comes, Mr. President, the sacrifices that were made in World War II—and this has deep meaning for me—will have been fully justified.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] expressed sentiments which are shared, I believe, by the leading veterans' organizations of the country—the Disabled War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the AMVETS, and the American Legion. So I think we can be sure that the ex-GI's who did the fighting against Hitler's tyranny are well aware that until the tyranny in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain is lifted from the unhappy peoples of those lands neither peace nor liberty can be finally secure—either in this country or anywhere else.

We have learned through bitter experience that a regime which maintains itself in power by terrorizing its own people cannot live in real peace with anyone else. Such is the substance of Bolshevik despotism—as it was the substance, 10 years ago, of the Nazi-Fascist tyranny which millions of Soviet soldiers and citizens died to help destroy.

Therefore, on this day, 10 years after Soviet and American soldiers met on the Elbe River, let us remember all who perished in that struggle—whether on the battlefield, or beneath the stones of crumbling cities, or in the incinerators of Nazi concentration camps. And, above all, let us remember this central truth: Whatever form of government may be imposed on them, the plain people of the world yearn for peace and for personal freedom.

The tyranny of the Soviet Communist leaders does not represent the peoples of the Soviet Union any more than the tyranny of Hitler represented the German people. If we have anything for which to reproach ourselves in the long struggle against Hitlerism, it is only this: That we did not seek out, in good time, the decent elements in the German trade unions, the German army, the church and elsewhere, who regarded Hitlerism as a hideous libel on the German spirit and culture. We might have saved countless lives, had we done so.

But there is still time, now, to learn from bitter experience. There is still time to achieve lasting peace—without war. Today, on Elbe Day, let us make it known that we do distinguish clearly between the plain people of the Soviet Union and the reactionary dictatorship.

Let us make no mistake about it: The present Soviet regime is not merely despotic, but—like all despotisms before it—it is thoroughly reactionary. What else can we call a regime which permits no free trade unions, reduces farmers to serfdom on state-controlled farms, employs slave labor on a gigantic scale, allows no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press and no freedom of assembly. What else can we call a regime which has built radio jamming stations extending from East Germany to the Ural Mountains in a desperate effort to prevent the independent words of Soviet soldiers and citizens abroad from reaching the Soviet people over radio liberation? What else can we call a regime which has inflated one man's indictment and analysis of the economic evils of a century ago into a state religion from which there must be no dissent, no heresy?

Clearly the present Soviet Government is both despotic and reactionary. Our Soviet brothers-in-arms in the war against Nazi-Fascism deserve a far better future than such a regime can ever give them. The Russian people are heirs of a great revolutionary tradition—of a century-and-a-half-old struggle for liberty and social justice. They will surely win the human rights for which they have so bravely and so often fought against the cruelest odds.

Let the Soviet armed forces and the citizens know on this Elbe Day that our feelings of fellowship and sympathy for them have not changed at all since the meeting on the Elbe, 10 years ago.

The American people today, as always, remain the friends and allies of every man in every land who fights for the liberties and dignity of the individual. We know that every fighter for liberty, wherever he may be, fights the battle of all mankind. And we know that when the world is rid of tyranny, the peoples of the world—Russians, Americans and all others—will join together in the common war against poverty, ignorance, prejudice, and disease.

SHIPMENT OF SCRAP IRON TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a condition which I think deserves consideration and which has disturbed a good number of the people in my State.

I am informed that large stockpiles of scrap iron are being assembled in various port cities throughout the United States for shipment to foreign countries. It is suspected that this scrap iron is then being transshipped to Red countries behind the Iron Curtain.

I cannot help remembering the days when scrap iron was shipped to Japan, and we Americans had it thrown back at us at Pearl Harbor. Anyone can make a mistake once, but only a fool makes the same mistake twice.

If this scrap iron is going to countries behind the Iron Curtain, then I think the American people should know about it, and I think its shipment should be stopped. We should not tolerate business by a few people who are making a momentary profit with no thought of the future. I am sure our scrap dealers would not want to do business of this sort behind the Iron Curtain. We should investigate this matter thoroughly.

I have discussed this with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and he has agreed with me that if scrap iron is being shipped to foreign countries and then transshipped to Red countries, it should be stopped immediately. He has agreed to take the matter up for investigation by the Armed Services Committee. I believe we should look closely into this matter and protect our people and our servicemen from ever again being fired upon with scrap-iron bullets and scrap-iron guns.

Mr. President, I call this to the attention of the Senate because I feel sure that the Members on both sides of this honorable body never again want to see our people the victims of attack with our own scrap iron as they were in World War II.

THE SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that we are now undertaking to get in touch with the distinguished majority leader in an effort to get further information on the matter the Senator from Delaware has spoken to me about, and in connection with which I believe he now desires to have me yield to him. I shall take only 5 minutes, or less, to speak on another matter. I assure the Senator there will be no delay on the subject he had reference to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on Friday last I wrote a letter to the President of the United States urging that he declare in clear, precise, and unequivocal terms the position of the administration on the so-called Bricker amendment, which was reintroduced early in this session of Congress. I ask the indulgence of the Senate that I may read to the Senate the text of the letter I wrote to the President of the United States. It is as follows:

On April 27 the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, a revival of the so-called Bricker amendment.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senate concerned itself with this proposal for many weeks during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. During extensive committee hearings, your Secretary of State, speaking presumably for the administration, clearly expressed his opposition. Subsequently, you declared yourself on more than one occasion as opposed to any constitutional amendment which would throw out of balance, in any way, the historic separation of powers as between the three branches of our Government and as between the several States and the Federal Government. In a letter to you dated February 5, 1954, and on many occasions in public and on the floor of the Senate, I expressed my wholehearted support for your defense of the Constitution and my emphatic opposition to any weakening of the constitutional powers of the President.

Since our victory last year, events have occurred which have focused attention again upon the powers of the President in the field of foreign relations as Commander in Chief. I refer specifically to the resolution on the defense of Formosa and the adjacent areas which, in response to your request, the Congress adopted last January. At that time, Mr. President, I indicated my deep concern lest the procedure followed on that occasion be misconstrued as a tacit acceptance of the principle you opposed at the time of the debate on the Bricker amendment. Although you made quite clear your position that as President you already had, under the Constitution, the authority you requested in the resolution, the resolution itself failed to recognize that you hold such powers and reflected in this respect a grave misunderstanding of the true nature and extent of the constitutional powers of the Presidency.

Mr. President, the forces who fear and mistrust the Presidency as an institution are again at work. It would appear that the Nation is again about to be subjected to the same shopworn arguments, the same fallacious, ill-considered and, in fact, dangerous propaganda which last year poured forth in such copious quantities from people bent on destroying our basic constitutional structure. Considering the many grave international and domestic issues which demand our immediate attention, the Senate and the Nation can ill afford to become engaged again in weeks upon weeks of debate and controversy over a proposal which was roundly defeated and discredited at the last session of Congress.

I fear, Mr. President, that those who wish to weaken or restrict the historic powers of the Presidency are prepared now to seize upon the Formosa resolution as an indication of your support or acceptance of their position. In short, the adoption of the Formosa resolution has created serious doubt and uncertainty as to your present position with respect to the Bricker amendment.

In this context of events, Mr. President, as one who has fought the battle long and hard for the preservation of the historic constitutional powers of the Presidency, I feel compelled to urge you to declare now in clear, precise and unequivocal terms your unwavering and uncompromising opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 and to any and all substitutes or alternative proposals tending to dilute, distort, or destroy the powers of the Executive.

In this matter, Mr. President, partisan considerations play no part. Members of your own party and of mine have firmly stood their ground against the persistent forces of reaction and fear. We shall continue to do so. At the same time it is imperative that the full authority and prestige of your office and your person be brought to bear against these forces and in unqualified support of those who have struggled and will continue to struggle to preserve intact and unimpaired the historic powers of the Presidency.

I believe, Mr. President, that the national interest will be served at this time by a statement of your position on this issue, and your declaration will be of inestimable value to those of us who propose to continue to fight to preserve the great constitutional powers of the Presidency, to preserve, in fact, the Presidency itself for yourself and your successors, as strong and as vigorous as the founding fathers intended that it be.

The Nation, Mr. President, awaits a clear statement of your position.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read in the newspaper the Senator's letter, and I have listened this morning to his reading of it. Does he draw a distinction between the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the President's authority as Chief Executive in connection with diplomatic and political questions? The Formosa situation, as I see it, is a problem of the Commander in Chief rather than one within the President's diplomatic or political powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, there is a distinction, as the Senator has indicated. I issued a rather lengthy statement. In terms of the problem we are going to be called upon to solve, I think it is unfortunate, that there is apparently a resubmission of the so-called Bricker amendment on the heels of its defeat at the last session of the Congress. I, of course, voted in favor of the Formosa resolution, I may say to my good and distinguished friend from Massachusetts, and I did so for reasons which I think were not related to my personal feelings in the matter.

This morning I learned from the clerk of the Judiciary Committee that Secretary Dulles, who was scheduled to testify before the subcommittee on constitutional amendments in behalf of the Eisenhower administration, has canceled his appearance. I am also told that Secretary Dulles has not indicated to the subcommittee when he will be ready to testify on this resolution.

In view of the failure of Secretary Dulles to present testimony on behalf of the administration at the initial and crucial stages of the hearings on the so-called Bricker amendment, I am requesting the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to cancel the hearings scheduled for Wednesday, and not to schedule any further hearings on the resolution until Secretary Dulles is in a position to present the administration's attitude concerning the proposed constitutional amendment, which so vitally, and in some instances so fatally, would affect the Presidential powers and our country's foreign policy.

As Senators know, the original and, may we say, unadulterated, pristine Bricker amendment was soundly defeated during the last session, but proposed substitutes in lieu of it were, in the last instance, defeated by only 1 vote. The distinguished newspaper columnist, Robert C. Albright, writing in Sunday's Washington Post and Times Herald, indicated that the Bricker amendment and its closely related fellows have apparently less chance this session than during the last session; but only, cautions Mr. Albright, if President Eisenhower makes clear, in forceful terms, a determined opposition.

That the protection of the historic powers of the Presidential office must find most support from the opposition party is a sad commentary on the state of public affairs in this country. It is my prayer that President Eisenhower will become aware of the importance which his views in this matter must of necessity be, and that he will direct his Secretary of State to come forward with adequate testimony in opposition to the amendment, which would subvert the historic doctrine of separation of powers of our Government and, in many respects, seriously weaken and whittle down the great office of the Presidency itself.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN PRIVATE BUSINESS TO BECOME MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the strength of a Nation is measured in terms of its gross national product which consists of combined resources of production and services rendered by its total manpower.

The ability to repel any attempt to destroy us would be determined by the maximum output of our total manpower. This manpower must be shared by the civilian economy with the military forces because each one requires more personnel of high qualifications than is available from supply. Consequently, any philosophy or policy which rejects the principle of sharing the available manpower between civilian and military needs is fallacious. Such a philosophy or policy is apt to lead to serious disagreements among our people.

Civilians should not be barred from participation in Military Reserve forces simply because it is inconvenient to employers. Neither should the reservist be penalized in his efforts to attain greater economic security and advancement because of the fact that part of his time must be given to drills and study.

The very existence of the employers of this Nation depends upon the maintenance of military strength necessary to protect against the seizure of our businesses and our entire country by an outside enemy.

Consequently, I am deeply concerned over the statement in Babson's Washington Forecast of April 18, 1955, which reads as follows:

> Businessmen should expect some complications under the new reserve setup. For example, if a reservist doesn't meet his obligation, penalties imposed upon him could also hurt your business.
>
> Right now, you could avoid difficulties by not hiring reservists. Later, however, all young employees will have military obligations * * * and you'll have to learn how to live with the problem.

The Reserve Officers Association, as well as the United States Chamber of Commerce, has been attempting to educate the business firms of this country that it is not only a patriotic duty but also a case of self preservation to encourage employees to become members of the Reserve Forces.

We are living in an era of uncertainty. We pray constantly that we will not be engaged in another armed conflict. But, should it come, the Communist world will attempt to strike from the air at the great industrial centers of this country. Their hope would be to deal such a blow the United States would be unable to produce the materials of defense necessary for victory.

It is impossible to maintain sufficient forces on active duty to provide maximum security for our Nation. However, if we develop our Reserves as envisioned in the National Reserve Plan to augment the active duty force, we will have sufficient strength to combat the effect of sudden attack.

To achieve our objective, the young men of America must be assured that their service in the Reserve Forces will not hamper or retard advancement in the business world.

The Reserve Officers' Association has been attempting to educate the American public that every young man has an obligation of citizenship to his country. Part of this obligation is to serve in the military either with the active duty force or the Reserve or a combination of the two for a specified number of years. Under present law each individual reaching age 18½ has an 8-year obligation in the Reserves.

We believe business and industry of this Nation must encourage individuals to execute their military obligation by serving in the Reserve Forces. Within a few years these employees will have discharged their obligations except that a certain number will be needed to remain voluntarily in the program.

Consequently, business and industry must take the initiative in encouraging employee participation in the nation's defense forces. Fathers and mothers must encourage their sons to carry out their obligation rather than attempt to seek reasons for deferment.

The American public must be fully educated that every man, woman, and child has a personal and specific obligation of citizenship to the United States and sufficient numbers of people must accept their responsibilities. When this is accomplished, our fears of Communist powers need not be as great. With God's help and guidance our kind of government and our way of life will continue as the hope of mankind.

THE FORMOSAN SITUATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, within the past few weeks the situation in which the United States found itself in respect to threats in the area of the Formosan strife appears to be hardening to such an extent that open warfare seems almost unavoidable. The American people can take note of happenings over the past few days which indicate that the apparent inflexibility of the situation has now given way to an atmosphere in which conciliation and adjustment seem possible. Today it appears not unlikely that the United States can reach a political rather than a military solution to the problems in this area.

Above and beyond all the talk of warlike action on both sides is the fact that the people of this Nation want peace, and honorable peace. The actions of many of the leaders of the Asian and African nations demonstrate that they too want peace. I cannot believe that the people of China, despite the previous position taken by Chou En-lai and other leaders of the Communist government, want war.

I was glad to read the advice of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that we prepare ourselves to sit down with our adversaries and attempt to work out a practical solution. Selfish interests on both sides require that this be done.

I also hope that the administration will carefully consider the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that we now begin active consultation with all our friends and allies as to their positions and wishes regarding a just settlement.

It seems to me that there lies before us the opportunity to adjust differences in the particular matter of Formosa, and as well to open the way to such general settlements as may be necessary for peace in the whole Far Eastern area. This will be a long step toward peace in the world.

THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Time magazine, in its issue of April 18, devotes approximately a column and a half to a discussion of a recent decision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on the basis of an amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act which I sponsored in 1952.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR: ON THE SOUTH SIDE

Few Members of the United States Congress walk both sides of the street as successfully as Arkansas's Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. Often described as a passionate Democrat and a liberal, he is also good at conforming to his constituents, many of whom are far from being liberals. For instance, FULBRIGHT knows how to tip his hat to southern industrialists, who capitalize on cheap labor. Last week, Dr. Full was in eclipse and Mr. Bright had the spotlight.

In 1952 FULBRIGHT pushed through Congress a bill under which the courts could review United States Department of Labor prevailing minimum-wage orders. His purpose was plain. Under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, the Department of Labor had set nationwide minimum wages for manufacturers and suppliers holding $10,000 or more in Government contracts. Since the Labor Department's minimums were affecting the wage scale throughout the textile industry, southern textile men wanted to attack the order in court. After FULBRIGHT put through the amendment, the Southern manufacturers sued to wipe out the national minimum of $1 an hour in cotton, silk, and synthetic textile plants.

Last deek Washington's Federal Judge Alexander Holtzoff (who upheld Harry Truman's seizure of the steel industry in 1952, and was reversed by the United States Supreme Court) ruled on the case. Judge Holtzoff pointed out that the Walsh-Healey Act permits the Department of Labor to set minimum wages by "locality," but said that blanketing the whole United States under that term is a "tortured interpretation."[1] His conclusion: the Labor Department cannot set nationwide minimum wage rates under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Senator FULBRIGHT's good friends the southern industrialists were overjoyed, but his good friends in the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, were not. Said TWU

[1] Commenting on this interpretation, Judge Holtzoff quoted a passage from Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking-Glass: " 'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

" 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

" 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be the master—that's all.' "

Executive Vice President William Pollock, in an appeal for repeal of the Fulbright amendment: "What the court said, in effect, is that it is quite proper for employers in one section of the country to pay less for the same work as long as they can get away with it. Under this kind of reasoning we should also abolish the Federal minimum wage law (under which the minimum is 75 cents an hour). If Judge Holtzoff's philosophy prevails, we shall have taken a long step backward toward the sweatshop and the slums."

Naturally, New England textile manufacturers were lined up with the TWU in this case. Continued lower wages in the South help to hold them under a serious disadvantage. Management and labor outside the textile industry were deeply interested, too. If the Holtzoff ruling is finally upheld by the United States Supreme Court, it can affect pay scales in nearly 50 other industries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Time magazine seems also to have some difficulty in placing me in one of the convenient slots into which editors are wont to divide us all. I regret very much that I have so complicated the lives of the editors of Time. I know it makes the life of an editor extremely difficult if a public official cannot be categorized as a liberal, conservative, radical, or reactionary.

In my own case, Time accuses me of walking both sides of the street successfully, of conforming to my constituents, and of knowing how to tip my hat to southern industrialists.

These Time-style characterizations, as well as their resort to a play on my name, seem to imply that I am a political Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—Dr. Full and Mr. Bright. Time says Mr. Bright took over in this case.

Mr. President, I do not think one needs to be very bright, liberal, conforming, et cetera, to come to the conclusion I, as well as the Congress, arrived at in 1952, when Congress decided that the Secretary of Labor should follow the law, or that his decisions should be subject to judicial review. This is a principle of government, it seems to me, which the editors of Time should be able to understand, if they would devote their attention to it.

Of course, this decision of mine—namely, that the Secretary of Labor should be required to follow the law—was based upon an opinion that he was not, in fact, doing so. The decision of the United States District Court, of which Time takes note, confirms my opinion that, for one thing, locality, a term used in the act, does not mean the entire United States. In other words, the requirement of law that wages of laborers engaged on Government contracts be determined on the basis of those prevailing in the locality in which the materials are to be manufactured, does not mean those prevailing in the whole United States. Or to put it more simply, locality does not mean the whole United States of America.

This most recent decision is the third by a Federal court since my amendment was enacted. In every case, the Federal courts—which I do not suppose Time would care to label as "liberal," "conforming," "bright," or "full," or to characterize as tipping their hats to southern industrialists—have upheld the view I took in sponsoring the amendment.

"Naturally," Time says, "New England textile manufacturers were lined up with the Textile Workers Union in this case," in opposition to the Court's decision. This, I presume, is supposed to put the clincher on my own paradoxical character. How could a "liberal" support such legislation?

Mr. President, I suggest to Time, Inc., and to anyone else, that a "liberal" or a "conservative," or anyone concerned with the proper role of government in the economic development of our Nation, could support this proposition on the same grounds as those on which he might oppose some of the same groups in their efforts to maintain the South and West as colonial areas, for the exploitation of the northeast. This was their practice for many decades, through their control of government and finance, by the use of discriminatory tariffs, interest rates on money, and freight rates. They now seek to maintain it through their control of certain agencies of the Government; and they seem to be extremely aggravated because the courts have held that, in so doing, they must follow the law of the land—that is, that the 48 States of the United States do not constitute a "locality."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Friday, April 15.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. FULBRIGHT AND THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT

One of the most thoroughgoing journalistic hatchet jobs we have seen lately was performed this week by Time magazine on Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

The technique used here, of which we ourselves often have been the victim, is to attribute to the Senator convictions he doesn't have and then accuse him of hypocrisy for not following them. Says Time of Mr. FULBRIGHT:

"Often described as a 'passionate Democrat' and a liberal, he is also good at conforming to his constituents, many of whom are far from liberal. FULBRIGHT knows how to tip his cap to southern industrialists who capitalize on cheap labor. Last week Dr. Full was in eclipse, and Mr. Bright had the spotlight."

Well, the Senator is a Democrat all right, and we think he has earned the title "liberal"—in the old-fashioned sense; that is, as opposed to the doctrinaire usage that Time imputes here. But if anybody has ever described the slow-speaking, professorial Arkansan as "passionate" it must be someone who has never met him or examined his record in the House and Senate. The prime characteristic of Mr. FULBRIGHT's public career has been a sort of intellectual detachment rare in politics, and it has often led him into collision with his party's leaders, as in the notable case of his spectacular feud with Harry S. Truman over the RFC investigations.

The industrialists Time charges the Senator with running errands for in this instance are the southern textile manufacturers, who have recently brought suit to knockout a national dollar-an-hour minimum wage imposed on Government contractors under the Walsh-Healey Act. The action was brought under an amendment to the act sponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT in 1952, and Time implies that all this was carefully rigged on behalf of the Senator's good friends, the southern industrialists.

The great irony in all this is that the textile industry in Arkansas consists of four small mills with a combined political influence roughly equal to that of the Little Rock Audubon Society. The Senator's interest in the Walsh-Healey Act stemmed from the fact that under its arbitrary interpretation by the Labor Department scores of small industries in this underindustrialized State were being frozen out of Federal contracts. His amendment, which was actually a compromise against a drive to repeal the act entirely, simply provided that decisions of the Labor Department, which had been final, could be challenged in the Federal courts.

The Walsh-Healey Act was passed after the old NRA was knocked out by the Supreme Court, and was intended as a stop-gap wage-fixing device to be used until Federal wages and hours legislation could be enacted, as it subsequently was. But during the Korean war the Labor Department began to employ it as a device to raise wages paid by Government contractors well above the minimum level required by law. Moreover, the Department began to interpret the requirement that wages should be determined by "locality" to mean that it could establish standards based on nationwide averages.

The obvious result of this was to squeeze out many small Arkansas fabricators, particularly in the wood products field. To qualify for a Government contract of more than $10,000 they had to raise their wages not to the level their competitors were paying under private contracts, but to the level paid in the wealthy States of great industrial concentration. Senator FULBRIGHT contended that this was an absurd interpretation of the act, and the courts have now agreed in the first test case. "Tortured" was the term used by Judge Alexander Holtzoff in characterizing the Labor Department's practice of interpreting "locality" to mean the whole United States.

It is also worthy of note that the Labor Department was clearly acting in the interests of New England manufacturers who have been trying to use the full leverage of Federal labor laws to fight off the effort of Arkansas and other underdeveloped States to attract industry. There is a tipoff as to what the shouting is really about in the fact, as Time notes, that in the present instance the New England textile industry has joined with the Textile Workers Union in denouncing Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment as "sweatshop legislation."

One consistent pattern in Mr. FULBRIGHT's public career has been the effort to stimulate small business in general, and to protect it against undue pressures from the great national concentrations of industry. The Walsh-Healey amendment was in that pattern. So, in part, was his recent investigation of Wall Street, in the course of which he also earned Time's wrath. It would, it seems to us, require still another "tortured interpretation" to brand this course as either illiberal or un-Democratic.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE HONORABLE KEN ANDERSON, MEMBER OF THE AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in years gone by, many of us have had the privilege of visiting our sister Republic, the Commonwealth of Australia. Under the rules of her Parliament, a member of a legislative body of equal standing has the right to the floor.

I was privileged to be present at a meeting with the Australian Cabinet last fall. I enjoyed very much the hos-

pitality of that great country and the opportunity to visit its legislative assembly halls. I was inspired by the fine work Australia is doing and by her system of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. President, today I am delighted to have the privilege of presenting to the Senate a member of the Australian Parliament, the Honorable Ken Anderson, from Sydney, New South Wales.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes the distinguished Member of the Parliament of Australia. All of us are very glad to have the opportunity to greet him and to have him visit the Senate and our country.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the great importance of the speech which will be made by my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee, a speech which I hope as many Senators as possible will hear, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is now nearing the conclusion of its consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to extend and modify the reciprocal trade agreements program. It is expected that the bill will reach the floor of the Senate within a few days.

In terms of our own economic prosperity and progress, and in terms of the units of nations in the grand alliance of free nations of the world, its importance can not be overemphasized. Our foreign trade policy serves as the cornerstone of all our foreign policy, and its success or failure can mean the difference between prosperity or adversity in our domestic economy, the difference between a prosperous export trade, or falling domestic prices and unmanageable surplus. It can mean the difference between a high level of employment, or unemployment for American workers. It can mean the difference between profit and loss for thousands of American businesses.

It can mean the difference between allied economic solidarity, or stagnation of trade and economic division in the free world.

We can not for a moment afford to underestimate the importance of the decision we make on H. R. 1.

For 2 years now our foreign economic policy has been sick. On two successive Junes, just as it was about to draw its last breath, it has been revived temporarily by 1-year extension of life. Nothing has been done to get at the root of the illness, nothing has been done to breathe into it new life and vitality.

Two years ago when the Eisenhower administration came into office it was faced with the problem of what to do to bolster our sagging world trade and to secure the economic solidarity among nations of the free world which had been achieved at such great cost. Since there was a new team in control of both the administration and the Congress, it was argued—and with some justification—that time was needed to study the situation. The Randall committee, composed of notable cast, was appointed to study and report.

But no positive action on a world trade program was taken. Instead, we marked time for a year by enacting a simple and practically meaningless 1-year extension. During that year we did nothing to enhance our trade position—not one single new trade agreement was made.

But while we marked time the Communist world went into action, making trade overtures to many of our customers in the free world. Those overtures met with considerable success. While we made no new trade agreements, the Russians concluded agreements with 15 of our allies, and the Red Chinese with 13.

Last year, with the Randall Committee study completed, the President sent to the Congress on March 30, recommendations for a trade program. He asked for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act along with some cautious liberalization which he called the "minimum" he considered "essential." I was disappointed that the President did not go further in his recommendations for trade liberalization, but I thought the program he did submit was good as far as it went.

The President's program last year met a storm of opposition from members of his own party in Congress. Eventually he chose to back down on his request rather than face the hostility of members of his party. He said he would settle for another 1-year extension, and despite efforts of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle to save the 3-year program for him, a meaningless—for him and for the country—1-year extension is all that passed. So, for still another year we have marked time without concluding one single trade agreement. For a second year the President was deprived of the minimum weapons he needed to meet and counter the Communist trade offensive. But the Reds continued to move ahead. Since January 1, 1954, nations dominated by the Kremlin have made 30 new trade agreements with nations of the free world, while we, the great United States, have made none.

The faltering of the past intensifies the challenge today.

I think there is none among us who will not agree that the national economy would be enhanced by an increase in our export markets, though not all will agree upon the method to be employed. I am convinced that passage of H. R. 1 is the very minimum step we should take to rejuvenate our declining foreign commerce. H. R. 1 is the least disquieting procedure we can use to maintain the unity among free nations of the world that has been achieved at such great cost. Failure to take this minimum step would signal a return to the protectionist policies which played a significant part in wrecking our economy and the economy of the whole world in the early 1930's. More than that, failure in this small task would seriously damage the grand alliance of free nations that stands with us as a bulwark against the spread of communism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. What my distinguished friend from Tennessee says is true. But is it not a fact that the group who desire to contract the commerce of the United States and to take us back to the days which the distinguished Senator describes is the Republican Party of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I think there are certain Members affiliated with the Republican Party who do hold to that philosophy. However, in view of the vote in the House of Representatives, I cannot deny that some Members of the Democratic Party also seem to embrace that philosophy, at least in part.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator. Let me state that I share the same views on tariffs and foreign trade the Senator from Tennessee entertains. Perhaps I would go even further in removing trade barriers. But, after all, the center of opposition to the reciprocal trade program has been and is the Republican Party.

Mr. GORE. I think the record will speak to that effect rather loudly, if not eloquently. When this question was before the United States Senate last year, nearly all Senators on this side of the aisle voted for the 3-year extension program which the President had requested. Every Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle opposed it. I do not know how Members of either party will vote on the question this year. I hope there will be some improvement in that regard.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The act contains a peril-point provision does it not?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator agree that it is a bad provision?

Mr. GORE. I do not know that I would agree that it is bad. Perhaps it has many inadvisable features. Perhaps there is something that may be said in its favor, too.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who placed that provision in the bill?

Mr. GORE. I do not recall the author.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was placed there by the Republicans, was it not?

Mr. GORE. I am sorry, but I do not recall the vote. I believe it was largely

supported by Members of the Republican Party.

Mr. EASTLAND. In fact, the Republican Party has given only lip service to the program, and that is one of the reasons why the program is in trouble now. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I am having difficulty disagreeing with the able Senator from Mississippi. I am hoping, however, that with the leadership of the President in this field there will be some conversions effected of Members of the Republican Party. I say that because our foreign policy should be bipartisan, and our foreign trade must be the keystone of economic foreign policy. I am very hopeful that with the leadership of the President we can pass in a bipartisan fashion a forward-looking, self-interest-promoting, and free-world-interest-promoting foreign trade program.

Mr. EASTLAND. Am I to understand the Senator to state that if the President really leads and really makes a fight for this program, a good bill will be passed by Congress?

Mr. GORE. I did not say I thought that would happen; I said I hoped it would. The trouble with the President's leadership on this subject is that there is some uncertainty about where he will stand. It is possible that when we arrive at his position he may have changed it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I say that regretfully. I do not mean to be critical in that regard. I appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Mississippi, and I am grateful for his support of a program that is very vital to the welfare, not only of the United States, but to the grand alliance of free nations, which has been built at such great cost.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with the colloquy which my colleague has had with the Senator from Mississippi, while we all hope that this program may have strong bipartisan support in the Senate, so that it may be enacted this year, I believe the RECORD ought to be clear, particularly since the necessity has been shown of the President's taking a very strong position in support of this measure at this session, that in the last session, while no support came from the Republican side of the aisle for the extension which the Senator from Tennessee sought to provide by amendment, only four votes in favor of the extension were lost on the Democratic side of the aisle. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I do not remember the exact vote. I believe the Senator has stated the vote approximately.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also a fact that a substantially larger number of Democrats voted for the measure in the House of Representatives this year than did members of the Republican Party?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. The number was considerably larger.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the junior Senator from Tennessee feel that, although the President supports the measure, if this great program is to be rescued, it will take more vigorous support and backing from the administration than has thus far been evidenced?

Mr. GORE. I do indeed. I may say, also, that in such matters as international trade the role of the President is the dramatization of the national interest. When there is no effective leadership from the President, Senators and Representatives become prey to the special interests of their own constituencies. Each Senator has at least two constituencies which he must consider. The first is the constituency he is honored to represent directly. The second is the national interest, which every Senator must also keep in mind.

Conversely, the President has but one constituency, and that is all the people. Therefore, in such matters, it is the function and, I believe, the duty of the President of the United States to hold ever in the forefront, by effective leadership—not by lip service—the national interest, and thereby encourage and lead Members of Congress to take a broad position, rather than permit them to yield to the demands of interests within their constituencies who may believe or fancy or imagine that they will be damaged by such a program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the Senator has made a very telling point in the statement he has just uttered. I have had the pleasure of reading a part of the Senator's outstanding address. I cannot escape the feeling that if the President of the United States were to take the measure to the people of the United States and present it to them in the same vein the Senator from Tennessee is presenting it to the Senate today, there would be no doubt that this great program, which is so necessary for trade and peace, would be saved. That is the kind of support the Senator is suggesting should be accorded. I hope it will be forthcoming.

Mr. GORE. I have in mind the kind of fight that Woodrow Wilson made for a liberal trade program when he denounced the tariff lobby and called the attention of the American people to the threat that such activities posed to the national interest. I am not talking about lipservice. I am talking about the kind of effective political leadership which should be able to get at least one vote on the other side of the aisle from the President's own political party.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee mentioned the tariff lobby. Does the Senator know that there will be a number of very powerful tariff lobbies at work in opposition to the bill?

Mr. GORE. I do indeed. In the course of my remarks I expect to pay particular attention to the tariff lobby.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Mississippi knows something about such lobbies. Every one of the lobbies is allied with the Republican Party. If the Republican Party really wanted to pass the proposed legislation, it could pass it without change. It is solely a question, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee says, of whether we will serve the national interest, the interest of all Americans, or whether we will listen to the siren song or special privilege. The Republican Party has always listened to the siren song of special privilege and high tariff. We see again those forces at work under the banner of Republicanism.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his contribution. I should like to call attention to the contrast between the fight which the administration made on the tax bill and the lip service which it has given to the reciprocal trade agreement program. I should like to read what former President Woodrow Wilson said about the tariff lobby of his day. That lobby was essentially the same then as it is today.

Behind the clamor against the reciprocal-trade program is one of the best organized, most insidious lobbies Washington has ever had to contend with. It is the high-tariff lobby, and it has been around a long time. It is the same lobby which descends upon Washington every time a trade question comes up for discussion. During President Woodrow Wilson's first term the activities of this lobby became so notorious that President Wilson felt compelled to issue a statement of warning to the country. Because that warning would be applicable today I want to read the Senate what President Wilson had to say:

> I think the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations in the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, and so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead not only the judgment of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby, and to create an appearance of a pressure of opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill.
>
> It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it.

It is unfortunate that President Eisenhower has not emulated President Wilson's warning that the tariff lobby threatens the national interest, for everything President Wilson said about that lobby in his day applies to its activities today. The maximization of the national interest is the proper role of the Presidency. Only by strong, effective Presidential leadership can the tariff lobby now be overcome.

Mr. President, I have read the speech which President Eisenhower made in New York within the hour. In that speech the attention of the American people is in nowise called to the tariff lobby. There is no denunciation of the unfair and misleading tactics employed. Nowhere in the speech do I find that it is calculated to give effective leadership to-

ward the enactment of the program by the Senate. Indeed, Mr. President, the word in the cloakroom is that the administration has agreed to the first breach in the line by accepting the amendments which have already been adopted by the Senate Finance Committee. Not once, before either the House committee or the Senate committee, was there an explanation of the importance and meaning of a provision which would permit tariff reductions to 50 percent of the 1945 rate on items which are not imported into this country at all because of prohibitively and unrealistically high import duties. Not once before either committee was there an explanation of the importance of the provision which would permit such reductions of tariffs on some 617 items which are not imported into this country in more than negligible quantities because of prohibitive tariffs.

Mr. President, is that a fight by the administration for the program presented by the President? Was the speech in New York a fight for that program? I did not so interpret it. It is a fine general statement of policy, but what of the trade agreements?

Mr. President, I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on April 22, entitled "Trade Bill in Danger":

> The first serious inroads on the administration's reciprocal trade extension bill (H. R. 1) have now been made by the Senate Finance Committee, and there may be more to come before the measure is reported to the floor. What will happen when the Senate as a whole starts to debate this bill is anybody's guess.
>
> All of this means that President Eisenhower must exercise every ounce of his vast influence if the bill is to be approved in satisfactory form. Thus far, pressure from the White House has been reported so light as to be unnoticeable.

Mr. President, last fall I went to Geneva as a United States delegate to an international conference on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. While there I had an opportunity to talk to officials of dozens of countries. From these talks I got the impression that the whole free world was waiting to see what direction our international trade policy would take. I am convinced that a return to protectionism by the United States would cause a stampede among other nations to raise their own tariffs and erect any other protectionist barriers they could devise. For that reason alone, though there are many others, it is imperative that the President be given the new authority he asks under H. R. 1, without crippling amendments.

Although the Senate Finance Committee has already adopted crippling amendments, with effective executive leadership further crippling amendments may be defeated and the disturbing features of the amendments already adopted may be mitigated and modified. Some say these amendments are not seriously damaging to the program and that their adoption was necessary in order to save the bill. Others say this is but the first breach in the line. I hope the first interpretation will prove to be correct, but I am apprehensive that the latter will be more than justified.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that the press generally interpreted those amendments to affect principally if not entirely the textile industry. Their effect is more far reaching than that, Mr. President. I consider the more serious aspect of the amendments the one which has been referred to but little in the press, namely, that which denies to the President the power to negotiate reductions to the level provided by existing law in the tariffs on goods which are not imported into this country at all, of which there are 484 items, and commodities which are imported into this country only in negligible quantities, which are 617 in number.

It is in this field, Mr. President, that there might be great opportunity to effectuate two-way trade without the infliction of injury upon industry in the United States. Yes, in this field there is vast opportunity to effectuate two-way trade which would build markets in this country, not only for imports, but for the development of industry within the United States, to meet new market demands.

It is particularly disturbing that this first yielding to a special interest comprises concessions to an industry which enjoys not only more than 99 percent of the American market, but also a thriving export trade, since it sold more than 6 percent of its production abroad in 1954. I am, of course, referring to the textile industry.

I shall treat with this phase of the question in more detail later; but at this point let me express my deep concern about maintaining our export markets. My concern is both national and local in character.

An estimated 200,000 Americans have jobs manufacturing and processing this thriving textile export business, to say nothing of the number of farmers helped by this big outlet for their cotton. In the State of Tennessee alone, if I may be permitted to make direct reference to my own constituency, the jobs of an estimated 5,000 textile workers depended upon this export trade in 1952.

How are we to continue to sell abroad, Mr. President, unless we are willing to buy from abroad? The tariff lobby provides no answer to this crucial question.

To be specific, Mr. President, I wonder what segment of our people is expected to bear the burden of maintaining this big exportation of textile products. The textile lobby has shown its unwillingness to accept any imports whatsoever. So whom, I ask, does the textile lobby expect to bear this burden? What other industry does it expect to accept the requisite amount of import competition to balance our $622 million of textile exports? To this question the textile lobby is as silent as it is loud about some very minor textile imports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that ever since 1860, the textile industry, has demanded that the United States should maintain a high tariff on textiles, and that the original claim was, "If you will only give us protection for a few years and allow the infant industry to develop, it will become so strong that it will be able to stand on its own feet and will not need a tariff"?

Was not the great Henry Clay, who came from the Senator's adjoining State of Kentucky, the man who first advanced that argument?

Mr. GORE. To the last question, the answer is "Yes." To the first question, the answer is that the statement is true of the textile industry, in the history of protectionism for that industry. But it is also true and typical of many other industries as well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true of the iron and steel industry, is it not?

Mr. GORE. Indeed, it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Tennessee think that in 139 years the baby ought to have been able to grow up and stand on its own feet?

Mr. GORE. Not only ought it to have become able to do so, but I shall show in the course of my remarks that it is able to stand on its own feet, and that it is able, successfully, to meet competition not only in the United States, but also abroad.

Why is it that the American textile industry can export $622 million of products in the markets of the world? It is not because the foreign customers like the way we part our hair. It is not because they want to spend their scarce dollars. It is because they like the American product, made with the efficiency and ingenuity of American industry, by American workers, and because the great American textile industry can furnish such products competitively in both price and quality.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to be saying, in effect, that the infant has long since grown up, but has refused to be weaned?

Mr. GORE. Since so many of my constituents are involved in this industry, and since they feel so strongly that their interests would be endangered by the passage of H. R. 1, I rather hesitate to speak in terms of weaning. I must say, however, in all candor, that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, characteristically, has a picturesque and eloquent manner of putting the question.

I recur to the question, What segment of our industry do we expect to bear the burden of maintaining the thriving export trade for the textile industry? Is it the farmers? Is it the chemical industry? Is it the automotive industry? What segment of our industry is it? Again, there is silence.

Can it be that the taxpayers of the United States are to be saddled with this requirement or burden? We cannot continue to export except in 1 of 2 ways: Either by accepting more two-way trade or by continuing to dole out American dollars abroad in subsidy to foreign nations, in order that they may have the money with which to buy American products.

Does the tariff lobby expect our Government to continue to dole out United

States money to foreign countries in order that the foreign customers may have the dollars with which to buy? That, Mr. President, would be aid, not trade. I thought our policy for many months past had been to develop trade, not aid.

We must choose between some method of balancing these exports between trade or aid, on the one hand, or suffer a loss of the markets abroad with consequent loss of jobs, on the other hand. Some may seek to avoid coming to grips with reality by advocating the expansion of our export trade, but opposing the development of import trade. That, however, is but an attempt to escape reality, and is to be compared with the philosophy of the classic demagog who votes for all appropriation bills but against all tax bills.

I realize that it is sometimes difficult for Congress to resolve what appear to be conflicts of interest between local and national welfare. When the people of our respective States think they will be injured by a program, it is difficult to support that program even though the national interest may require it. But the conflict may be more apparent than real. In fact, it may not be real at all. In the long run the sectional interest will, I believe, coincide with the national interest.

As I have said, all the clamor against this program is raised by one of the best organized and most effective lobbies I have ever seen. The lobby is conducting a vicious campaign and thereby producing unwarranted fear among the people of the country, in order to pressure and mislead the judgment of the Congress. It seeks to convince businessmen—and it is succeeding in convincing many businessmen—that if H. R. 1 should pass, they are likely to be bankrupt by competition from imports. It seeks to frighten laboring men and women, and it is succeeding in frightening hundreds of thousands of such workers with the spectre of unemployment caused by the failure of businesses which, it is contended, are unable to meet import competition. The goal of the lobby is to cause the people of each State to become so frightened that they will write to their Senators and urge them to vote against H. R. 1.

My own mail in opposition to H. R. 1 has been heavy. I am confident that the sentiment in Tennessee strongly favors the reciprocal trade program, which was fathered by the great Cordell Hull; and yet, because of the activities of the lobby which has been successful in implanting fear where there is no cause for fear, my mail against this program has been heavy. Most of the letters I have received from constituents are no doubt a genuine reflection of their fear. I do not criticize them for writing; I welcome their letters. But their letters show the results of an unconscionable campaign of misrepresentation that has resulted in generating fear. I resent this kind of campaign of misrepresentation, which has aroused fear unnecessarily, and caused doubt where there is no room for doubt.

In one of the slickest propaganda campaigns I have ever seen a group of willful, selfish men has spread the word that passage of H. R. 1 will bring on widespread business failure and unemployment. To many they have a plausible sounding story about competition from low-wage workers from abroad. For the most part, neither worker nor small-business man can do the research necessary to uncover the misrepresentation in this lobbying campaign. So many have been misled, and they are gripped with fear.

But United States Senators do have facilities to do research. We can determine which of the tariff lobby's claims are true, which are only half true, and which are completely false. We can discover what the whole picture is on any given industry. We do not have to take as gospel only that colored and slanted information which the tariff lobby offers.

Yes, Mr. President, many of the letters we have received reflect genuine fears of our constituents. But those fears are founded for the most part on half-truths and untruths planted by the high-tariff lobby which would betray the national interest for its own selfish ends.

I should like to speak about my own section of the country. Until this year the people of the South have not been as vulnerable to the tariff lobby's propaganda as have residents of other areas. The economy of the South until a few years ago was predominantly agricultural, and we in the South had a great net stake in the export of agricultural commodities. We still have such a stake, as does the whole country, but this year many people and several of our Congressmen have fallen victim to the tariff lobby.

The textile industry, which now employs a great many people in the South, has been one of the chosen instruments of the tariff lobby. It is, of course, a national industry and an important one. It is particularly important in New England and the South. I decided to find out just what the lobby was doing to influence that industry, and to determine what the textile import-export situation is.

I have before me a copy of the tariff lobby's plan for its propaganda campaign to be directed at the textile industry, at its workers, at its management, at businessmen, and at local civic leaders who are directly interested in and dependent upon the prosperity of that industry. After reading that plan I am not at all surprised that my mail from textile workers opposing H. R. 1 is heavy.

Mr. President, this tariff lobby textile campaign plan is a Madison Avenue type of production. It does not miss a single bet. The main theme is that if H. R. 1 passes, the country will be flooded by textiles made by cheap foreign labor, and that as a result our textile mills will fail and our textile workers will be thrown out of jobs. The plan is to persuade each mill manager to write a letter to his employees conveying this idea to them. The lobby even encloses a pattern text of the letter which it suggests be rephrased in the mill manager's own words. It is further suggested that the mill manager send the letter, along with a personal covering note, to leading citizens of his community.

Furthermore, the plan seeks also to persuade mill managers and mill personnel to write letters to the newspapers and try to secure newspaper stories and editorials. Very conveniently, it offers materials from which those letters, editorials, and news stories are to be made up.

I read now from verbatim directions found in the lobby's December 8 campaign bulletin:

> Make special effort during December to furnish your local newspaper with your own statement of the facts of the tariff issue.

Mr. President, I digress from the quotation to say that the lobby conveniently furnishes what it alleges to be facts, but which are in reality not facts. I resume reading from the campaign bulletin:

> Material for such statements can be easily adapted from any one or more of the encosed TIS (Textile Information Service) news stories recently published. This is especially important while your Congressmen are at home.

The lobby even prepared posters for posting on bulletin boards all over the country and has put on a campaign to secure public service radio and television time to exploit its propaganda.

Here, simply stated in the December 8 bulletin, is the purpose of the campaign:

> The objective of this entire campaign will be to work toward a climax reached in a flood of letters and other communications to Members of Congress as the showdown vote on the tariff issue approaches.

To achieve this objective, the lobby is missing no bets. According to its own plan, it has sent out portfolios of speech materials to be used before Rotary clubs, Lion clubs, and so forth. It has prepared special resolutions, which it sends out to the country in the hope of persuading American Legion clubs and Veterans of Foreign Wars clubs to pass them. It has distributed made-up advertising materials for use in newspapers. It has sent out the names of all Senators and Representatives, along with their hometown addresses. The lobby's order of battle even notes special plans for exploitation of letters to some of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, and "similar letters from executives in areas where there is important representation in Congress."

All this is coordinated through a special clearing house set up here in Washington, where all types of plans, reports, actions, and reactions on the campaign are set up in a special file with a general direction. As President Wilson warned, years ago, an untold quantity of money is being spent in order to mislead the people and to affect erroneously the judgment of the United States Congress. In the words of the lobby's bulletin, this clearinghouse is "set up to provide a quick idea of geographic coverage; to show specifically which Members of Congress are being approached and which ones are reacting; which areas may need greater attention or specially planned action."

Since, in the view of the lobby, I have not been reacting properly, I seem to have been made a subject of their specially planned action. Others, too, have been favored with specially planned action, especially those who represent, such as I do, constituencies in which

many people are employed in the textile industry. To textile employees, to small textile-mill owners, to people who are civic leaders in communities having textile industries, as well as to the general public, the lobby has painted the outlook for the textile industry in somber tones indeed.

Some people, as I have said, have been both misled and frightened by the scare-them-to-death tactics of the lobby. I wish to read a portion of a letter I received a few days ago from a good personal and political friend who is now president of the chamber of commerce of one of Tennessee's principal communities:

When you support legislation to lower the prices of foreign-made garments produced with unconscionably low-paid labor, an even greater injury than you may realize may be inflicted upon both working people and business here.

As to the patriotic aspects of free trade in the interest of world peace, we applaud your zeal in supporting these principles, but we feel certain you cannot afford to shut your eyes to the injury that must result to business in this country from the importing of foreign-made goods which sell at such low prices on the retail counter, unbelievably lower than the cost to produce the same clothing in this country.

About a thousand garment workers will be out of work in this county alone and many more thousands here will be adversely affected, if the garment industries of our county are compelled to go out of business because of foreign competition.

And I submit for the record, my reply to this letter which, as I say was addressed to me by a friend:

I have read very carefully your letter of April 12.

First of all, I should like to say that I am aware of the problems faced by the textile industry. I am aware, too, of the fears that have been expressed by representatives of that industry that enactment of a more liberal trade program would imperil the industry and the jobs of people who work in it. It is my considered opinion that these fears are exaggerated. It is true that any action which would permit increased imports would, to some extent, create more intense domestic competition for the industries engaged in producing the particular products affected.

But there is another side of the picture. As you may know, our textile industry exports a large percentage of its production. I have looked into the import-export situation with reference to the various classifications of textile products. I find that in almost all instances the volume of imports constitutes only a small fraction of the volume of exports. So, the textile industry has a large stake in export trade.

I believe sincerely that it will not be possible for us to maintain the existing level of exports, much less increase them, unless we adopt a program which will facilitate the flow of international trade. We cannot expect our foreign purchasers to continue to buy from us in increasing quantity unless we permit them to sell to us. Accordingly, I believe adoption of a liberalized trade program will result in more rather than fewer jobs for American people.

The program envisioned in H. R. 1 is moderate. The existing safeguards for American industry (particularly the so-called peril-point and escape-clause provisions of existing law) are retained intact by the bill. Furthermore, the President has stated that, in administering the program, he will keep fully in mind the problems of particular domestic industries.

I believe this is a question upon which the American people must take the lead. If we falter now, our friends abroad will begin immediately to raise their own tariffs and to erect other barriers to international trade which will make it exceedingly difficult for us to sell.

For these reasons, I believe it is manifestly in the national interest to enact a more liberalized trade program. I intend to support it with all the vigor I possess. I do so with full knowledge of the fears that have been expressed by some but with a sincere conviction that enactment of the program will provide greater security and greater prosperity for all of us.

Mr. President, I respect this friend. He went on to add some personal political advice as a friend. I appreciate that, too; and I have no doubt that his letter represents the real apprehensions of business leaders, as well as of many employees, of that community. But, Mr. President, that apprehension is erroneously based.

I looked up the facts. Far more jobs of employees in that community depend upon exports of this commodity than upon the very meager imports which might perchance compete. Again I express my concern for the jobs of the 200,000 American citizens who are employed in the export trade in textiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the jobs of those who are employed in manufacturing textiles are not the only ones which would be adversely affected? Is not the prosperity of a large section of the South dependent upon the exports of cotton; and if we refuse to admit imports, will not the foreign markets for our raw cotton be largely shut off?

Mr. GORE. There can be but one answer: The foreign markets would then be shut off, not only for our exports of cotton, but for all our other exports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Including tobacco, does the Senator from Tennessee not agree?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so—and also automobiles and many other commodities which are produced in this country. Like water, the international flow of goods seeks its level, seeks a balance. There must be a balance. How are we to achieve it? The textile lobby seems unwilling to have any imports come into the United States. Yet the industry is exporting $622 million worth of goods a year.

Mr. President, I ask: By what process are we to maintain not only the export trade in textiles, but also the export trade in farm commodities and in manufactured commodities? How are we to maintain the jobs of 4 million Americans whose employment is dependent upon the export trade of our Nation? I know that everyone is strongly in favor of exports, but who is willing to accept any imports? Let us find them. Oh, yes; the friends of mine from the South who for the first time have cast protectionist votes are strongly in favor of export trade. They want to open up foreign markets. That seems to be the solution for all our ills. But how meek are they when they are asked to accept a few imports.

Mr. President, let me point out to the senior Senator from Illinois that I have before me a list of 487 commodities which are not imported at all into the United States, because of virtual prohibition, or, at least, effective prohibition, created by tariff rates. I also have before me a list of 617 commodities which are imported into the United States in only negligible quantities. Why is that so? It is because of unrealistic, prohibitive tariff rates. Yet there is an amendment, already approved by the Senate Finance Committee, which denies the President the authority to reduce the tariff rates on those commodities through negotiated agreements.

Mr. President, who are those who are strongly in favor of developing foreign markets? By what process do they propose to develop foreign markets? Do they propose to develop foreign markets by having the United States dole out the money of American taxpayers? Is that the only answer? It is the only answer in the absence of acceptance of two-way trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Unless we are willing to take more imports, is it not true that it will be more and more difficult for the countries of Europe and for Japan to take cotton and tobacco in return?

Mr. GORE. Not only will it be more difficult, but it will become impossible unless we lend or give them the money with which to buy those commodities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What will that do to the cotton-producing areas of western Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia?

Mr. GORE. It would be ruinous to them, just as it would be ruinous to the 4 million Americans whose jobs depend upon America's export trade. In my opinion it would be ruinous also to the grand alliance of free nations which has been built up at such great cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What effect would a restrictive trade policy have on the export of tobacco from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina?

Mr. GORE. Soon the producers of burley tobacco are to vote, in a referendum, upon the acceptance of a further reduction in acreage allotments. Our tobacco farmers are about to vote upon a program which would reduce hundreds of thousands of tobacco farmers to an acreage of one-half of an acre.

In Geneva last year, in an effort to help build up a foreign market for tobacco which is so important to the hill farmers of Tennessee, I undertook to talk with some leaders of the tobacco industry in Europe. They want to buy more, but they have not the money with which to do it. How do we make the money available to them? Either through gift or through trade. There is no other way. Yet, because of unrealistically high tariffs, more than a thousand commodities are imported to no extent at all or in very negligible quantities. The distinguished Finance Committee would deny the President the power to make

any reduction in the tariff rates on those items. Yes; we want to build up foreign trade, but apparently not many are willing to do it in any manner except by saddling the burden upon the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have talked with quite a number of representatives of various lobbies. Of course, there are lobbies in many industries, and there is also the overall lobby.

The other day a certain lobbyist came to see me. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Tennessee a question relative to his approach. He said that while the foreign-trade program was all right for the tobacco growers, and was a fine thing for the automobile industry in Michigan, he did not think much of it for the textile industry. He refused to relate the importance of the automobile industry and the tobacco growers' business, the farm machinery industry, and many other things, to the textile industry. He did not say what those industries mean to the textile industry. I tried to argue with him. I did not have the statistics. I hope the junior Senator from Tennessee will have some. In the first place, a great many textiles go into automobiles. In the second place, if we could not export some automobiles, I wonder what would happen to the textile products purchased by the constituents of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and by the constituents of the junior Senator from Tennessee and myself who grow tobacco. So I think the lobby, in its great effort to prove its point, has been completely overlooking the fact that we must give the people of this Nation employment if they are to be able to buy the textiles manufactured in our mills all over the country.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I wish to compliment him upon the answer he gave to his caller. He could have gone one step further and said that the textile industry itself has a great stake in foreign trade, because last year, when, the lobby says, the United States was literally "flooded" with textile imports, this country exported eight times as much textiles as it imported.

That is why I say I am concerned with the method by which we maintain our export trade. I hope we can find some means of expanding it. I am not willing merely to accept a condition of status quo with respect to American foreign trade. As President Eisenhower said in New York today—and I do not undertake to quote him exactly—the expansion of a healthy, two-way trade means prosperity for this country.

Let me quote from the President's speech:

> Two-way trade, I believe, is a broad avenue by which all men and nations of good will can travel toward a golden era of peace and plenty. Your administration is committed to building it. I personally believe it is for the greater good of all 164 million of our people, and I shall not relax my personal effort toward its achievement.

Mr. President, fine as are these words, we need, and the country needs, a kind of leadership which will persuade at least one member of the President's party in the United States Senate to vote for the program. I applaud the President's words, but I remind him of the leadership which Woodrow Wilson provided for this program, and I contrast the lipservice to this program with the all-out fight of the President against a tax bill which would have given some relief to the hard-pressed many in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the President today used the words which the Senator from Tennessee has quoted. Referring to the enactment of this program, he said that, "I shall not relax my personal effort toward its achievement." Does the Senator think that is good enough to secure the passage of the bill? Is it enough not to relax? The efforts have been approaching close to zero. Is it enough to continue with this low rate of encouragement? Will it not have to be increased very materially.

Mr. GORE. I am wondering if the President relaxed when he agreed to the amendment which would deny him the power he had requested, to reduce to 50 percent of the 1945 rate the tariffs on more than 1,000 items the importation of which is now virtually prohibited. If that is the kind of relaxation we are to have, then I say that the President's leadership is difficult to follow, because we are not sure that he will not turn aside, when we arrive at a crucial point, as he did last year, when, immediately preceding the vote, there was read to the United States Senate a letter from the President backing down on his request for this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee remembers the line of Gilbert and Sullivan in their The Gondoliers, in which the Duke of Plaza-Toro sings:

> He led his regiment from behind—
> He found it less exciting.

Would the Senator from Tennessee say that that is the attitude of the administration so far as the tariff fight is concerned?

Mr. GORE. I believe in the Army it is called a retrograde movement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While the Senator from Tennessee is fighting on the floor of the Senate for the President's program, what are the members of the President's own party doing?

Mr. GORE. They are voting against it in committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to the 4 million people who are affected by our export business. That is the approximate number of employees so affected. As a member of the Committee on Finance and also as a Member of the Senate—as well as from my long experience in the Senate—one of the troubles I find is the fact that no one dramatizes the 4 million people who are affected by our export business, but everyone dramatizes the 100, 150, or 300 people who are involved in our imports.

How can we dramatize, for the benefit of the American people, the effect on the 4 million workers to whom the Senator has referred, instead of merely dramatizing the effect on the few who may be involved in some particular industry or some particular plant? Where does that duty to do that lie? Does it lie here or with the Executive Department, including the President of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe it lies exclusively with the Executive Department. As I said earlier, Members of the Senate have their direct constituency and also the national welfare to consider. Conversely, the President has but one constituency, the national interest. I believe it is the proper role of the Presidency not only to dramatize but to maximize the national interest.

I would not, however, excuse Members of the Senate from undertaking to dramatize—to use the word the able junior Senator from Kentucky has used—the effect on the welfare of the 4 million people whose livelihood depends upon the export trade, merely because the President has not done so.

The junior Senator from Tennessee is undertaking this afternoon on the floor of the Senate to dramatize the welfare of one segment of our industry, the textile industry, in which the jobs of approximately 200,000 persons depend upon export trade. I am trying to bring that point home by pointing out that approximately 5,000 persons in the State of Tennessee have jobs dependent upon textile exports.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to an amendment regarding textiles, which has been agreed to by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. And many other commodities.

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment calms the fears of those engaged in that industry about what may happen to it in the future because of imports from Japan, although at this moment only one-half of one percent of our domestic consumption of textiles is imported. The committee, with the assent of the State Department, which represents the administration, has agreed to an amendment which calms all their fears, so that they are no longer worried. However, there are a great many other commodities with regard to which the State Department and the administration have not agreed so far as an amendment of that character is concerned.

Would the Senator from Tennessee be able to discuss the relative importance of the textile industry, which has been calmed by the amendment already agreed to, with the sanction of the State Department and presumably the President of the United States himself, with other industries, which have equal fears, not only for the future but for the present?

Is the Senator from Tennessee able to discuss the comparative importance of

those industries? I refer particularly to employment and the relative importance to our national defense and our security of the commodities produced by such industries.

Mr. GORE. There is some question about how ably the junior Senator from Tennessee may be able to discuss that subject, but he will try to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator discuss that point.

Mr. GORE. Before doing so, I wish to call attention to the fact that the junior Senator from Kentucky has confirmed the cloakroom rumor to the effect that the administration has agreed to one amendment. I would not wish to catechize the Senator about proceedings within an executive session of his committee, but it is rumored in the cloakroom that the administration has agreed to this damaging amendment, which not only affects textiles but more than a thousand other commodities, and which denies the President the authority to make a 50-percent reduction in the tariff rates on items on which the tariff is now prohibitive.

Mr. BARKLEY. All that was accomplished. There is no need to limit it to cloakroom rumors, because the press has published the fact that the committee has agreed to an amendment, which it did on the recommendation of the State Department, changing the date from July 1 to January 1, 1955, because negotiations are now in progress between this country and Japan, which may be consummated before the 1st of July 1955. The amendment provides that, notwithstanding any agreement by way of a trade proposal between the United States and Japan which might be consummated between now and July 1, the tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1955, shall be the basis upon which any reduction of rates will be accomplished.

That amendment adopted by the committee calms particularly the fears of the textile industry. Therefore, no matter what may happen between now and July 1 the tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1955, must be the basis of any reductions. That amendment was agreed to by the State Department and by the administration.

Mr. GORE. Again I call attention to the contrast between the President's speech in New York and the action of the Eisenhower administration in agreeing to this first serious breach in the line, which favors a few special interests.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield, but I shall wish to come back later and answer the interrogation of the able junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the administration makes this concession on textiles, how can it logically refuse or prevent similar concessions to the oil industry, or to zinc, to lead, to fluorspar, and to a whole variety of other products?

Mr. GORE. The answer to that question involves a part of my answer to the able junior Senator from Kentucky. I do not know. Such amendments are essentially commodity amendments. If it is fair to calm the fears, so to speak, of one industry, why is it not equally fair to calm the fears of the coal industry, of the chemical industry, of marbles, and of clothespins, and all other segments of our economy?

I may say in all candor that I would not seriously quarrel with the junior Senator from Kentucky about that feature of the amendment which eliminates the possibility of placing one industry in double jeopardy, but I do quarrel with the part of the amendment which denies the President the authority, which he has requested, to negotiate tariff reductions to a rate 50 percent of that obtaining in 1945 on more than a thousand other commodities. I shall seek to eliminate it from the bill when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not seen the President's speech or heard what was said, but in view of the Senator's remarks, I am wondering whether the speech delivered today in New York perpetuates the idea and the conviction that in this administration the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing and is seeking perpetually to conceal what the left hand is doing. I am speaking in a blind alley, because I have not read the President's speech and I do not know what he talked about.

Mr. GORE. I have read the speech. I think the result can be accurately described as the Senator has described it. To put it in my own language, it is a repetition of the President's habit of never coming to grips with the practicalities of the issues before the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that many noble sentiments have been expressed in speeches and messages, but those who have been brought here by the administration seek immediately to nullify them, and I am wondering whether this latest emanation from the White House is in consonance with the almost universal practice of the top level that noble sentiments are uttered in messages and in speeches, but, forthwith, those who were brought here by the President seek to nullify every noble sentiment he expresses.

Mr. GORE. Insofar as I see it, it follows the pattern of the President preaching one thing and his administration practicing something else.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my long experience here I cannot remember any time when at any top level the right hand has never known what the left hand was doing. There is only one comparison I can make, and that is the occasion when the hand of Esau got tangled up with the voice of Jacob.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution. I find myself in agreement with him.

Further to answer the Senator, and trying to put the textile industry into proper focus, it has been estimated that the jobs of 200,000 persons are dependent upon the export of textile products. It is estimated that some 4 million Americans are employed in the export trade generally. So it is apparent that the textile industry accounts for approximately one-twentieth of the entire employment in the export trade of the United States. But while the industry is confronted with meager import competition, amounting to less than one-half of 1 percent of the domestic production, the tariff lobby succeeds, I regret to say, in arousing fears and apprehensions in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of our people.

I say, Mr. President, that we must seek not only to maintain, but to expand, our export trade. This is important not only to the one-twentieth of our export workers in the textile industry, but also to the prosperity of all America.

Mr. President, it is because I have examined the facts in some considerable detail that I have not been frightened by the propaganda of the tariff lobby which, as I say, has used the textile industry as its chosen instrument.

I take this occasion to lay before the Senate and the American people some of the facts as I have found them after careful study.

I refer to the textile industry in particular, first, because of my concern in maintaining our export trade in textiles; second, because it has been the chosen instrument of the tariff lobby, and through that instrument the lobby has been most successful in arousing, without foundation, the fears and apprehensions of the people; and, third, because it represents the first yielding by both the administration and the distinguished and able Senate Finance Committee to special interests.

I fear that this example may be followed by further concessions to this group and that group, as was indicated by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This group, that group, and all the groups make up America.

I do not believe the President of the United States would so use the power he requests as seriously to harm any major segment of our society. I think he would use it advisedly.

I wish we would face some of the real facts which refute the propaganda of the tariff lobby.

Let us first face up to one obvious fact, and that is that in recent months the cotton textile industry has gone through a period of adjustment. Production of cotton cloth reached a peak of 10,184,000,000 square yards in 1953 after a moderate dip in 1952. There was a moderate decline in production in 1954. Total production over the past few years has been fairly static. There is no denying that there is increased competition in the cotton-textile industry and that this increased competition has imposed adjustment problems on many mills, particularly on the less efficient and marginal producers.

But if we are to understand the problem adequately and evaluate the implications of H. R. 1 for the cotton textile industry, the question that must be answered is: have imports of competitive cotton textile products caused the difficulties the domestic industry has encountered in recent years? We must also ask ourselves, what is the real stake of the cotton textile industry in foreign trade? Does it have more to gain from

exports than it has to fear from imports? What about H. R. 1? Will enactment of H. R. 1 really imperil the cotton textile industry?

If we examine these questions and look for the answers calmly, factually, and dispassionately, I believe we will arrive at the conclusion that the industry's difficulties are not due to imports; that it has an overwhelming stake in exports as opposed to the danger of imports; and that passage of H. R. 1, with the contribution it can make to the liberalization and expansion of world trade, can bring important net returns to the cotton textile industry.

The industry's difficulties have been primarily domestic in origin. Regional shifts in the producton of cotton textiles have brought with them adjustment problems for the areas from which industry has moved.

Increased competition—domestic, that is—has created adjustment problems for the less efficient producers in all the producing regions. Curtailment in military procurement of textiles has necessitated adjustment to production for civilian requirements. Then, technological changes in the industry have created both increased economies of production and a curtailment of employment. The development of new fibers and their admixture into new types of cloth have created still more problems. Aside from the technical problem that this involves, there are also marketing problems. Perhaps the most important development has been the change in demand for textiles, and the acute competition among the different fibers resulting from the development of synthetic fibers.

From 1950 to 1953 there was a 17 percent decline in the per capita consumption of textiles by the people of the United States. In the case of cotton, this decline was 14 percent. In the case of wool it was 42 percent. A 42 percent decline in the per capita consumption of woolen textiles is, of course, a very formidable and difficult problem. Much of the decline in wool demand is due to a shift in preference on the part of the American consumer to lighter weight fabrics. As a result, from 1947 to 1953, there was a decline in consumption of men's wool suits of 7,000,000 units in the United States. This was not caused by imports. Imports of woolen and worsted cloth have never been more than 6 percent of domestic production, and in 1953 were only 4.5 percent of production.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Tennessee is presenting some interesting figures. I am delighted to have the information.

As I understand, the fibers to which the Senator is referring are fibers such as nylon, orlon, and others—new fibers which have been developed and which have displaced some of the market for cotton and wool.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and also rayon and dacron. Numerous synthetic fibers are now vigorously competing with cotton and wool. I shall cite in a few moments the exact magnitude of the choice of the American people for the various fibers.

Let us look closely at the changing pattern of mill consumption in the United States of the different fibers—cotton, wool, rayon, acetate, and other synthetic fibers. A Department of Agriculture publication entitled "The Cotton Situation," No. CS 157, dated March 1955, has a table on page 20 showing the historical changes in total and per capita mill consumption in the United States in different fibers. Per capita consumption of cotton in 1946 was about 34 pounds. In 1954 it was down to 25 pounds. Despite an increase in population, total mill consumption declined from 4.8 billion pounds in 1946, to 4.1 billion pounds in 1954.

I call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the fact that this decline has occurred within the United States as a result of the preferences of the American consumers, without any relationship whatsoever to imports. Yet the tariff lobby will cite the reduction in employment in the cotton-textile industry as evidence that the United States has been flooded with foreign imports.

It is insinuated that such reduction in employment is the result of foreign imports. That is not so. The textile lobby has deliberately sought to mislead the American people.

Cotton lost in its relative position with respect to the consumption of all fibers. In 1946, consumption of cotton amounted to 74 percent of the consumption of all fibers, but had dropped to 68.5 percent in 1954.

The change in wool was even greater. Per capita consumption declined from 5.2 pounds in 1946 to 2.4 pounds in 1954 and wool's percentage share in the total market fell from 11.3 percent in 1946 to 6.4 percent in 1954, more than 50 percent drop in 8 years.

I now come to a discussion of the question asked by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Correspondingly, the use of synthetic fibers has increased. I neither applaud nor deplore this. I am simply laying before the Senate the facts relating to the textile industry which have been used by the tariff lobby to plant fear in the hearts of millions of our people, and in an effort to misguide, mislead, distort, and thwart the judgment of Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator state the percentage of the cotton textile production represented by imports at this time, and the percentage of American production which is exported? Does the Senator have such figures available?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I shall come to them very quickly. Six percent of our production is exported; less than one-half of 1 percent of our production is imported.

Last year, as I have said earlier, the textile industry exported eight times the amount that was imported. But that is not all of the picture with respect to that particular fact, because the imports were largely of specialty items which, in the main, are not competitive in the American market.

Later I shall cite examples of the imports and show that the bulk of the American textile production is not only able to compete successfully in the United States but is also able to compete successfully in the world markets, where our products face the same import restrictions as do the products of other countries.

Rayon and acetate fibers showed a per capita consumption in 1946 of 6.3 pounds and in 1954 of 7.1 pounds. Its percentage share of total consumption rose from 13.5 percent in 1946 to 19.2 percent in 1954. Most dramatic of all were the changes in such synthetic fibers as nylon, orlon, and dacron, and so forth. In 1946 per capita consumption was 0.4 pounds; in 1954 it was 2.1 pounds. It increased by a multiple of 5 or more in that 8-year period.

Total consumption increased from 54.2 million pounds in 1946 to 342.1 million pounds in 1954. Its percentage share of the total market rose from 0.8 percent in 1946 to 5.7 percent in 1954.

This was not because of imports; it was because of the technological development within the United States—improvements and developments in the production of fibers—and to the preferences shown by a substantial number of American citizens.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. According to the Senator's argument, the textile industry is picking on the wrong culprit. It is not the importers who are responsible for any decline in the textile industry in this country; it is the producers of other lighter materials, of the sorts which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. GORE. The conclusion of the able Senator is inescapable when the facts are read and considered. However, I wish to point out that the cotton textile industry has a great stake in international trade. As I pointed out, the cotton textile industry last year exported eight times as much as was imported. As I have cited several times this afternoon, that situation involves jobs in that industry. I shall cite that fact again, because I am undertaking to dramatize the interests of American workers and American industry in export trade. I point this fact out to the Senator again to illustrate that the cotton textile industry, instead of being harmed by international trade, has a great net stake in that trade, and it should be interested in expanding rather than contracting it. Where is the representative of a textile industry, or a Member of the House or a Senator representing respectively, a district, or a State, as I do, in part, in which there is substantial employment in the textile industry, who would advocate destroying our foreign markets, which would result in reduced employment in that industry?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. What the Senator is saying about the troubles of the textile industry being so much at variance with the facts as related before the committee reminds me of the story of a prizefighter who had an optimistic manager. The manager would try to encourage the boy by telling him that he was doing fine. The fighter was engaged in a match in which he was doing poorly. At the end of one of the rounds he asked his manager, "How am I doing?" The manager replied, "Fine. He hasn't laid a glove on you." The fighter said, "When I go back for the next round, I want you to watch the referee, because someone has been punching the daylights out of me."

Obviously it is competition from other materials which is causing difficulty for the textile processors and industry. I believe the Senator from Tennessee has made a case that imports are not causing the trouble.

Mr. GORE. The figures on decreasing employment and the decline in the cotton-textile industry which were presented to the committee are disturbing, indeed; but I point out to the Senator that throughout American industry there is a tendency for greater production per man-hour. What is the word that I see used so much? It is automation. Workers are fearful of that in the automobile industry, in the appliance industry, and in all manufacturing industries. It is my hope that eventually this trend toward more productivity per man-hour will result in benefit to the American people. I would not attempt to stop automation, but I do regret to see persons temporarily lose their jobs because of it. But there has been increased employment for textile workers as a result of the export trade in textiles to a far greater extent than there has been a decrease in jobs as a result of import competition.

Mr. LONG. So actually, the textile people are about 12 to 1 ahead, if one compares the ratio of exports to imports. If I understood the Senator correctly, the figures he cited show that this Nation exports about 12 times as much, in dollar value, as it imports. I believe the Senator stated that 6 percent of our textile production went into exports, and one-half of 1 percent of textiles used in this country came in as imports.

Mr. GORE. The only reason why I hesitate to confirm what the Senator from Louisiana has stated is that he has translated the percentage into dollar value. I am not sure that when translated into dollar value the same percentage would be arrived at, because of the difference in retail markups and manufacturers' costs. I am not sure how the figure would come out, but it is a substantial sum. I am advised that the percentages refer to square yards of products.

Mr. LONG. A 12 to 1 ratio would be a good offhand guess of the favorable balance of trade in cotton textiles, would it not?

Mr. GORE. I wish to give the figures exactly. Cotton manufactures and semimanufactures accounted for $83.1 million in imports, but the value of comparable exports was $317.3 million.

Imports of synthetic fibers and goods were worth $32 million, but exports of those commodities were worth $217 million.

If in my own business I were to have a customer to whom I sold eight times as much as I bought from him, I would consider him to be a good customer, and I would try to seek ways to keep his patronage, rather than to try to cut him off and refuse to buy the small amount of his own product which would enable him to continue buying from me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not present on the floor throughout the Senator's very interesting and informative speech. I listened to the figures he has given with regard to the relative position of exports and imports of fiber-made goods. I wonder whether the Senator included in those figures the carpet and rug industry of this country, or whether the figures included mainly wearing apparel.

Mr. GORE. The figures I gave were overall figures. I think I shall be able to find the figures with respect to the specific product about which the Senator has inquired. There are certain specialty items as to which there are significant imports.

The overall figures I gave indicate that imports of textiles as a whole are small and relatively negligible. I do not have the exact figures with respect to the particular commodity about which the Senator has inquired, but I shall undertake to obtain that information and have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Steele Winterer, president of the Carpet Institute, Inc., reported to the House Ways and Means Committee that imports of machine-made rugs in 1954 amounted to about 5 percent of production. Imports were worth from $15 million to $20 million, and domestic production was worth about $400 million.

The Census Bureau reported late in 1954 that production of tufted textile products, and woven and knitted cotton rugs reached a new alltime high record in the first half of 1954.

The per capita consumption of all fibers fell from 46 pounds in 1946 to 37.1 pounds in 1954, and total consumption fell from 6.5 billion pounds to 6 billion pounds in the same period. There was thus a decline from 1946 to 1954 in the total mill consumption of fibers of just under half a billion pounds.

These changes in the consumption of fibers by United States mills, and in the composition of fiber consumption, have been domestic changes exclusively. They are not related to imports. They are the major influences which have affected the production of cotton cloth in the United States during the postwar period.

Although production levels have not changed very much, employment has. This is a very interesting phenomenon. For example, between 1951 and 1953, employment in cotton textile mills fell by about 20 percent while production between 1951 and 1953 increased by 200 million square yards. I read recently in Mr. J. A. Livingston's syndicated column, The Business Outlook, of March 6, 1955, that production of textile products as a whole—which included cotton textile products—increased 13 percent from December 1953 to December 1954, but employment declined by 3 percent. Of course, this development has no more been confined to textile industry than it can be blamed on imports. It has occurred in other industries where production techniques have been improved. For example, in the case of oil and petroleum products, production increased 9 percent while employment declined 5 percent. Production of transportation equipment increased 9 percent and employment decreased by 6 percent. As a matter of fact, national industrial production was up 5 percent and employment was down 4 percent during this same period.

Unmistakably, the trend in our economy is toward greater productivity and efficiency in production. It is to be hoped that this trend will create new jobs and that the decline in employment will be of short duration.

Fortunately, there is evidence that the depressed conditions of textiles in 1954 may have been reversed. The cotton situation report of last month points out that "the cotton textile industry was depressed during most of 1954 but rose to higher levels of operation late in 1954 and early in 1955."

One thing is sure: No good can come from falsely attributing this decline in employment to import competition. Over the same period which Mr. Livingston's statistics cover, our total merchandise imports decreased while our merchandise exports increased. Under that set of circumstances could the lobby blame the loss of employment on imports, when during this period imports decreased and exports increased? If anything, the effect of foreign trade on the domestic production and employment situation in 1954 was such that it supported production and employment. In the absence of this net gain in our foreign trade position, the decline in employment would have been greater.

As I said a moment ago, as the trend toward automation grows, we shall perhaps need fewer and fewer workers to produce all our domestic market can consume. If we are to maintain a high level of employment in this country, it is imperative, as the President said in his speech in New York, that we begin to move now to develop markets abroad where we can sell the greater surplus we shall soon be producing. Otherwise, we may have to cope with a most distressing problem of unemployment.

Mr. President, having established, at least in a prima facie fashion, that the influences at work on the cotton textile industry have been primarily, if not exclusively, domestic in nature, let us examine more closely our net stake in foreign trade in cotton textiles. Have imports of cotton textiles exceeded exports, so as to cause a net loss to domestic producers and, by so doing, contributed to the distress of the industry? Or do exports exceed imports, and thereby constitute an important outlet for our domestic production of cotton textiles? What of foreign trade in textiles made

of synthetic fibers? Is that a source of competition or an important market for the domestic industry?

I have already answered those questions, I believe; at least the record speaks quite loudly.

Let me state first, in summary fashion, the overall picture of exports and imports of textile manufactures for 1954.

The bulk of our exports were made up of cotton and synthetic textiles and textiles manufactures. It is to this area of the trade that much of the lobby's propaganda is directed. Imports of cotton and synthetic textiles and textile manufactures totaled only $115.1 million, while comparable exports were valued at $534.8 million, or 460 percent greater.

Cotton semimanufactures and cotton manufactures accounted for $83.1 million in imports, but the value of comparable exports was $317.3 million. Imports of synthetic fibers and manufactures were worth $32 million, but exports of these commodities were worth $217.5 million.

The particular product upon which the textile lobby centers its fire is cotton cloth, sometimes called cotton piecegoods. This category includes the whole wide variety of cotton textiles that are the major products of American textile mills. Here is the situation on cotton cloth. In 1954, we exported 605 million square yards, while our imports were only 73 million square yards. Thus, out of a total domestic production of almost 10 billion square yards of cloth, we exported over 6 percent of our production, whereas imports were the equivalent of less than 1 percent of our production. This is a statistical fact which deserves more attention than it has received. Surely on cotton cloth alone—and let me repeat once more that it is in the area of cotton cloth that so much fear has been excited over imports—our square yard exports are something of the order of 8 times our imports. In fact, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute itself has pointed out that this export business supports some 45 thousand jobs in the cotton textile industry.

The story on foreign trade is even more favorable with respect to cloth made of synthetic fibers. There, fully 7 percent of total production finds its way into export markets, and both production and exports have been growing over time, while imports have been on the decline.

But it is sometimes argued that total figures conceal as much as they reveal. I think that in this case what they may conceal is the fact that imports are even less important competitively than the textile lobby would have us believe, for to a large extent only selected items of cotton textiles come into this country. I have previously called that to the attention of the Senator from New York. They are for the most part either low-grade, low-cost gray goods on the one hand, or the fine cotton products like damask which require a lot of handwork, on the other. The bulk of American production of cotton textiles enjoys no significant import competition.

The fears we hear so much about are fears of competition of imports from Japan. So let us take a close look at the imports of cotton manufactures from Japan. I call this to your attention, Mr. President, because in this effort, this afternoon, I am undertaking to face all the facts, and not to dodge any.

In 1953 these imports totaled $18.7 million in value. This total was made up of four major categories:

First, cotton cloth, of which we imported from Japan 31 million square yards, or 5.2 million dollars' worth;

Second, table damask of which imports were valued in 1953 at $3.8 million;

Third, cotton wearing apparel in the value of $1.4 million; and

Fourth, cotton floor coverings worth $4.7 million, of which we imported about 3½ million square yards.

In 1954, these imports increased. I think we should acknowledge that, but we should also examine it. Total imports of cotton manufacturers from Japan were worth $23.1 million, an increase of $4.3 million over the 1953 levels. In the case of cotton cloth, 1954 imports were $9 million, or 48 million square yards, an increase of 17 million square yards over 1953. Imports of table damask in 1954 were the same as in 1953. Wearing apparel imports increased from $1.7 million to $3.1 million, while imports of floor coverings fell in value to $4 million.

I believe that is a partial answer to the questions asked by the able Senator from New York. The facts show that imports of floor coverings from Japan were less in 1954 than in 1953; and I believe Japan is the principal source of import competition in the case of this particular item. It is important for us to recognize that 1954 was labeled by the cotton textile lobby as a year in which the American market was swamped by a devastating inundation of Japanese cotton textile imports. Frankly, I fail to see by what test it is appropriate to call the increase in imports in 1954 a flood. It amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of our production, let me again remind the Senate.

But let us look behind these figures and see what we can find. As I have said, Mr. President, there was an increase in imports from Japan of cotton textiles in the last quarter of 1954. Most of that increase was in the last quarter.

In fact, almost half of the imports of cotton cloth from Japan came in the last quarter of 1954. Does this show, as the textile lobby would have us believe, a new trend in imports of cotton goods from Japan? I think not. But that is what the lobbyists sought to lead the Senate Finance Committee to think. However, I do not believe that is the case. I am advised that the Japanese economy suffered serious inflation last year. The Japanese Government undertook a policy of deflation by restricting bank credit in order to get Japanese prices back into line. Japanese cotton textile manufacturers, short of cash, sought to liquidate their inventories of finished goods, in order to finance the purchase of the raw cotton which was necessary to keep their production going. The result was the sale of textiles at which might be called distressed prices. At times, it appears that the prices at which these products were sold to United States importers were below the cost of production in Japan. This practice I frown upon. I am advised by responsible persons in the State Department that the practice has now been stopped, and I understand that efforts have been made to insure that it will not recur.

There are two lessons to be learned from this situation. One is that there is need for stability and growth in the Japanese economy. Since that economy is so dependent upon foreign trade, it must follow that a most important avenue of stability and growth for Japan is an expansion of her foreign trade throughout the markets of the free world.

I wish to point out that the negotiations now underway in Geneva involve not only the United States and Japan, but 15 or 18 other nations. What is needed by Japan and by the United States is not two-way trade, but multilateral trade. We furnish Japan a large amount of the raw materials necessary for her industry. In fact, we sell to Japan three times as much as we import from her. What is needed is a reciprocal trade agreement arrangement by which the United States cannot only continue to sell what it now sells, but can sell more raw products to Japan, so that Japan, in turn, may process such products into manufactured items and sell them in Southeast Asia. Then we, in turn, need and can take strategic materials — rubber, tin, manganese, chrome, mica, and other products—from Japan's customers in Southeast Asia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the thesis of the Senator from Tennessee. I think the answer is, as was brought out in the colloquy a few moments ago with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], to build up customers for Japan. But how are we to build up, within any reasonable measurable time, the purchasing power of the Southeast Asiatic countries which can, and should be, customers of Japan?

Mr. GORE. We can build it up if the United States buys, if South America buys, and if Western Europe buys more of the very important products which are indigenous to that area. That is an area with vast resources which we need, and which the people of many other nations need. If they are purchased there, the people of that area will have an enhanced income and purchasing power which they, in turn, can use to purchase from Japan, and which Japan, in turn, can use to purchase more from the United States. That is one way to do it. There are other ways—education, economic development, and so forth. The dynamic process of growth, development, enlightenment, and education will provide increased purchasing power in that important area.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have always felt that Japan—and perhaps India—probably represented the key to what is to happen in the Far East. If we can keep them on the democratic side, we have a chance for our way of life eventually to survive and make progress in the Far East. The ironical thing is that some of those who talk about a strong Japan and the necessity of strengthening Japan, in an effort to see that Japan survives the economic storms and the efforts the Communists are making to infiltrate, are mainly also the ones who are strongly opposed to increasing trade with Japan, without which she cannot possibly survive. Is not that the experience the Senator is finding?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is indeed correct. When we talk of trade with Japan, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, we are discussing a question which is vital to the security of the United States and the free world.

Saturday night I listened to a magnificent address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. In that address he paid eloquent tribute to the Japanese people and predicted for them a return to the responsible and powerful part they have played in the past in world society. I want that part to be played on the side of freedom, on the side of democracy, on the side with which the survival of the United States of America is inexorably involved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator see how we can logically advocate preventing Japan from trading extensively with Communist China and with other Communist nations, and at the same time take positions, as apparently so many members of the Finance Committee have taken, which would still further reduce our trade with that nation?

Mr. GORE. As the Senator knows, Japan is a country of very limited natural resources, great density of population, and consequently stringent economic conditions. For her the choice is rather stark. It is either trade or starve. I agree fully with my senior colleague.

From our import experience in the last quarter of 1954, there is another lesson we must learn, and that is that we really have little to fear from Japan in the way of huge inflows of cotton textiles into the American market. It required depressed prices on sales of cotton cloth to increase Japanese penetration of our market by 17 million square yards in 1954. This 17 million square yards is to be compared with a total domestic production of 10 billion square yards. It represents seventeen one hundredths of 1 percent. Under normal price conditions it is doubtful that Japan could have expanded her sales appreciably in competition with domestic production.

But she could, I believe—and I think she should—be able to increase the export and sale of her commodities among the free nations of the world, to her profit, to their profit, and to the benefit of the United States if the negotiations envisioned by H. R. 1 are successful.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to a speech which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] delivered last Saturday night, I believe, before the National Press Club. I did not have the privilege of listening to that speech. However, among my colleagues in the Senate I have very great regard and respect for the senior Senator from Georgia. The impression which I received from reading the press reports was that he was not wholly satisfied with the provisions of House bill 1 regarding our trade with Japan. As I say, that was the impression which I gained. I may have been mistaken. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee can advise me authoritatively. I received the impression that the Senator from Georgia believed that the authority given to the President to deal with Japan on tariff matters was too broad, and should be limited. As I say, I may be mistaken.

Mr. GORE. I would prefer to have the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia speak for himself in that regard. I am not sure that my understanding of what he said and meant would exactly comport with his own meaning and understanding. If the Senator from New York will pardon me, I should prefer to have the senior Senator from Georgia answer that question himself.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully understand the Senator's position. I suggested that he might hesitate to speak for the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. It is perfectly true that there are individual specialty items where imports have been a significant proportion of domestic production. But the total domestic production of these products is a small part of our entire production of cotton goods. One of these specialty items is velveteens. Total United States production of velveteens was about 3 million square yards in 1954, as compared to the total production of 10 billion square yards of cotton cloth. There were 1,190 looms in the United States producing velveteens and less than 1,000 workers engaged in their production.

Ginghams are another item where imports are supposed to be sizable. There are no separate import data from ginghams but it is understood that these imports increased substantially in 1953–54 from the United Kingdom and Austria. But again, ginghams constitute only a small part of our total national textile production. Last year the production is estimated at only about 57,250,000 yards, less than 1 percent of our 10-billion-yard total cotton textile production.

The lobby tells us there is a critical situation in damasks. Even if there is stiff competition in this speciality line, it does not necessarily follow that the textile industry will be irreparably damaged, for our damask production is only about 15 million square yards a year. Shall the whole foreign economic program of the United States be jeopardized because of a few specialty items?

Would the textile industry refuse to accept the importation of any textile product whatever? If so, I come back to the question I asked earlier in my speech: What other segment of American society shall we expect to bear the burden of accepting import competition to balance our exports of $622 million worth of textiles?

I wish to refer to one other item, namely, the manufacture of shirts. Actually, in the shirt-manufacturing field there is very little competition from imports. Nevertheless, the tariff lobby has succeeded in arousing fear among the employees of shirt factories until they have been writing me by the hundreds. Merchants who depend upon shirt factory employees for trade have likewise been writing me, as have chamber of commerce representatives, shirt factory owners, and plant superintendents.

I have in my hand typical letters from shirt factory employees in my State, and I should like to read a letter that comes from Milan, Tenn.:

> DEAR SIR: Will you please come to our rescue by voting against low tariff laws. People are out of work, many with children to support, because we can't sell our products made here at home. Foreign trade is putting many families on starvation.

I think it is reprehensible for a lobby in Washington, financed with huge self-interest funds, to seek to mislead and to succeed in misleading people, and to throw fear into their hearts. The writer of this letter concludes her appeal with these words:

> Please won't you help us by helping our country get rid of low-tariff laws. Thank you.

The facts show that there is no reason for this lady to be alarmed about her job because of the importation of shirts. Quite to the contrary, her job might well depend upon the exportation of shirts, as is the case with the jobs of many of those who work with her.

What are the facts?

In 1954, United States imports of men's shirts amounted to less than 0.8 of 1 percent of United States production. Imports in 1953 were even less. United States production of men's shirts in 1954 exceeded 19 million dozen. Imports amounted to $915,836, but we exported more than 6 times this amount, $5,881,300 worth.

Compared with total production, however, the imports appear even less consequential—less, as I have said, than 1 percent. Yet the propaganda of the tariff lobby has succeeded in this case, as in others, in arousing fear where there is no cause for fear.

From this one plant I received 143 letters, all written according to the pattern suggested by the tariff lobby.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Tennessee visited Louisiana some years ago, and I was very much honored to have him as my guest for a few hours. I am sure he recalls that during his visit he spoke at a parish fair in southwestern Louisiana, where he addressed a large gathering, and that at that gathering he observed rice growing as far as the eye could see in every direction.

Mr. GORE. And there was a very large gathering of people, too.

Mr. LONG. The people the Senator spoke to on that day were rice farmers. They must sell at least half of their rice to overseas customers. They depend on people overseas who have dollars with which to purchase the rice. I am sure the Senator has visited other areas of our country, such as in the State of Tennessee, where cotton grows as far as the eye can see.

The Senator himself has pointed out in debate on the floor of the Senate that in good years 50 percent of that cotton must be exported to people who need the cotton, so that they may process it into clothing and other products.

The millions of American cotton farmers need cotton customers. They can get them only if the customers are able to earn dollars with which to buy the cotton. Is that not about the situation?

Mr. GORE. That is precisely the situation. Not ony are cotton farmers, rice farmers, tobacco farmers, and wheat farmers interested in export trade, but so are 200,000 textile workers. The same thing is true of 4 million other Americans engaged in industry. A loss of our export trade will result in a contraction of our economy, a lessening of our industrial employment, and a shrinking of markets for our farm products. No one advocates that, of course. However, where are those who are willing to do the things necessary not only to maintain our present export trade but to expand it, which I believe would be healthy, not only for this country, but for the free world as a whole?

I appreciate the contribution of the able junior Senator from Louisiana. I recall with pleasure being in his company upon the occasion to which he has referred. I enjoyed my visit to the great State of Louisiana. My heart was warmed by the esteem and genuine affection in which I found he was held by his fellow citizens.

But I wish to point out to him that the welfare of those people, as is true of the welfare of the United States as a whole and of the free world, is involved in maintaining economic solidarity in the great and grand alliance of free nations which we have built up at such a great cost, and upon which the security of this country so vitally depends.

The Senator referred to the export of cotton. I wish to recall to his attention specific figures. In 1954 the United States exported $125 million worth of cotton to Japan. The total import of cotton textiles to this country, mostly in specialty items which competed but little with American industry, was $23 million worth. Would not the Senator think that when we have a customer who takes $125 million worth of our products, of which we have huge unmanageable surpluses, in return for only $23 million worth of imports, largely noncompetitive, he is a valuable customer?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One point that might escape the eye is that by Japan's taking this cotton from the United States she is able to sell to customers to whom we cannot sell. The Senator from Tennessee is very familiar with the fact that all the nations of the world are seeking dollars, but they cannot get the necessary dollars to pay us for goods they would like to buy from us. In many cases they can trade with Japan because they do not have to have dollars in order to trade with that country.

Mr. GORE. I come back to the fact that there are only two ways by which other nations which do not mint or print dollars can obtain them. One is by trade with the United States, and the other is by grants and gifts from the United States.

Mr. LONG. The thought occurs to me that while I should prefer to have someone overseas buy cotton shirts made in the United States, if it came to deciding whether that person was going to buy a cotton shirt from Japan or from Russia, I should prefer that Japan get the customer in preference to Russia.

Mr. GORE. I see that the Senator and I are viewing the problem very nearly alike. I point out that the Soviet Union has made trade agreements involving the sale of cotton. However, I would not overemphasize the state of the cotton industry is international trade.

I have sought today to pinpoint the textile industry because it has been the chosen instrument of the tariff lobby with which to invade the South with protectionist philosophy, and because it is through this chosen instrument that the tariff lobby has had its most marked success in opposition to the passage of H. R. 1 without crippling amendments.

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator has picked a good example. Speaking as one who, in part, represents a State which has only a very small proportion of the Nation's textile production, I have received literally hundreds of letters from persons who wish to prohibit or prevent any expansion of trade in cotton textiles.

Mr. GORE. Contrary to the Senator's situation, I have the honor of representing, in part, a State which has much textile production. More than 60,000 persons whom I, in part, have the honor of representing are employed directly in the textile industry. The prosperity of many communities in Tennessee is dependent upon the textile industry. Therefore, when I discuss the question I do so with real interest, with genuine interest in the welfare of the industry, and I have undertaken to express my resentment at the misrepresentation of facts relating to that industry.

Mr. President, I point out to the junior Senator from Louisiana that, whereas there are many plants producing textiles in my State, the industry is growing in the State of Louisiana. There are now 15 plants in the State of Louisiana producing textiles.

Despite the spreading alarm, records show that the United States has increased her textile exports and decreased her imports as compared with prewar. With United States production of cotton cloth up by 2 billion square yards in 1953 over 1939, our exports in 1953 took a little over 6 percent of our production as compared with 4 percent in 1939. Imports were about one-half of 1 percent of our production in 1953, only about one-third the percentage of 1939.

So, despite this great cry of alarm, look at the trend. Look at the success with which the American textile industry, through the ingenuity of American workers and American management, has met the competition.

Our exports of cotton yarn were up to 17.2 million pounds in 1953 as compared with 9.9 million pounds in 1938, and our imports of cotton yarn were down to 200,000 pounds in 1953 compared to 1 million pounds in 1938. In the case of rayon piece goods, our position has likewise improved. Production has increased by almost 50 percent since 1938, imports in 1953 were 6 million square yards as compared with 3 million in 1938, and United States exports have risen from 26 million square yards to 216 million square yards in 1953.

These developments are not surprising. The United States textile industry enjoys a very strong competitive position, not only at home but also in foreign markets. How else could it export last year eight times as much cotton cloth as was imported? Even in 1954, when domestic production of cotton cloth fell below 10 billion square yards, exports helped sustain the industry.

In the case of cotton duck and allied fabrics, production in 1954 fell by 300 million square yards below 1953. Exports, however, increased by 1.5 million square yards—exports increased from 3.5 percent of production in 1953 to 4.5 percent in 1954.

As I have said, over 6 percent of our production of cotton-print cloth was exported in 1954.

In the case of denims, production declined from 394 million square yards in 1953 to 380 million square yards in 1954. But exports stayed up and rose, as a percentage of production, from 7.8 percent in 1953 to 9.2 percent in 1954. Meanwhile, imports of denims were insignificant.

Take cotton tapestry, upholstery, and drapery materials. Production in 1954 increased by 20 million square yards and exports increased from 3.8 percent of production in 1953 to 4.1 percent in 1954.

Imports were only a fourth of exports. As I have indicated, total exports of cotton cloth declined somewhat in 1954. But there is evidence that exports are increasing and helping to sustain the recovery in the industry. Our exports in each of the last 3 months of 1954 were actually greater than exports in the corresponding months of 1953.

Let me read some excerpts from a speech delivered by Mr. Matthew J. Cuffe, the president of the Textile Export Association of the United States to the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute at New Orleans on April 23, 1954. The text of his address appeared in the Journal of Commerce for April 26, 1954.

I am certain that everyone is aware of how necessary a prosperous export trade is to the smooth and profitable functioning of our industry. Since the lifting of foreign trade restrictions early in 1947, more than 6 billion yards of American cotton textiles have been shipped overseas. This volume, together with military purchases, supplied that so-called plus business which enabled the industry to operate its equipment at a rate far in excess of the prewar average, to pay the

highest wages in the world, and at the same time furnish steady to overtime employment to a half million workers, and yield highly satisfactory returns to thousands of stockholders.

But even these figures fail to picture accurately the vast extent of our export trade. Customarily, the fluctuations in our foreign trade are measured in terms of countable cotton cloths. These figures do not include many items which cannot be measured in terms of yardage and are listed either in pounds, units or in dollars.

For example, our exports of countable cotton cloth last year amounted to 620.8 million square yards. Incidentally, this total does not include exports to territories and possessions of the United States such as Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska which amounted to almost about 75 million yards. In addition, our industry exported 17,235,000 pounds of cotton yarn, 20,879,497 pounds of remnants, a million and a half cotton blankets, more than 800,000 bedspreads, 228,000 dozen sheets and pillowcases, 370,000 dozen handkerchiefs, close to 4 million pounds of cotton bags, about 12 million yards of assorted drapery fabrics, plushes, pile fabrics, etc. I cite these figures as an examples of the range of the industry's foreign-trade interests. Loss of this business, I think you'll agree, would cause grave repercussions in our domestic merchandising and manufacturing centers.

After discussing the problems of restrictions abroad against our exports of textiles, Mr. Cuffe goes on to say:

I hope that what I have said does not lead anyone here to the belief that there is no room for American textiles in international trade and that the only course open to us is to retreat gracefully and concentrate on our domestic markets.

We in the export trade have consistently maintained that there are tremendous outlets for American goods which are being denied us by artifical and discriminatory trade barriers. We cannot hope to compete on a price basis with the low-count staples of Japan and India. Our mass production methods make it impossible for us to compete with so-called luxury items of Western Europe. But in the so-called middle ground American cotton textile manufacturers are supreme. There are no mills in the world which can produce denim, percales, chambrays, vat-dyed twills and drills, corduroys, sheets, towels and many other items at prices equal to our when quality factors are taken into consideration.

As Mr. Cuffe points out in his speech, it is the continued existence, and in many cases, the aggravation of restrictions abroad on our textile exports, which accounts for the decline in our exports of cotton textiles over the past few years. If these restrictions could be reduced in the future, then our exports would increase because of our strong competitive position. Mr. Cuffe finished his address by saying:

The so-called social transformations resulting from the war have produced so-called middle classes in many countries and these are the people to whom American textiles appeal. Removal of the trade bars directed against us would enable us to cultivate this new and large body of consumers and put our export trade on a solid footing.

This view is seconded by the economic advisor of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Dr. Claudius Murchison, in a study entitled "The Cotton Textile Industry and Foreign Economic Policy" of February 1954. Dr. Murchison feels that there is a great potential market for cotton textiles in the underdeveloped countries. He wrote, at page 19:

The startling paradox of the world cotton-textile situation is that, while a condition of overcapacity and production surplus exists in the major manufacturing countries, a condition of extreme scarcity prevails in the underdeveloped nations where the goods are most needed.

How can we hope to tap these important and expanding markets overseas? How can we hope to effect a reduction in the restrictions against our exports abroad so that we can gain access to overseas markets unless we give the President tools with which to negotiate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee upon the thesis he has so ably defended and advanced this afternoon. I am particularly interested in the quotation of a statement by Dr. Murchison, which the Senator has just read.

I wish to ask if he agrees with me that it raises the point that, after all, the great defense weapon for freedom for many decades to come may not be the economic productive power of the people in backward areas of the world, since their standard of living must be raised if we are to have any hope, at least, for permanent peace on this earth. Does the Senator agree with me on that general thesis?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his generous references to me and for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. MORSE. To take the basic cotton problem involved, when we consider the millions of people in the so-called under-developed areas of the world, and their need for textiles and textile goods, does the Senator agree with me that there is a great potential market which ought to be tapped in disposing of the cotton supply of this country; and that to the extent that that market is tapped, we start to build up the standard of living of those people?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. It is by that process plus the mutuality of trade that prosperity will be increased in this country and in other countries with which we are associated.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator says that, does he agree with me that if we could raise the standard of living of millions of people in, let us say, the next 20 years—and that is not so long a time—by a maximum of only 5 percent, we would thereby create a market availability for American industry which would return to us many times the amount of any investment which might be made under the kind of bill which is now being discussed in the Senate?

Mr. GORE. I not only agree as to the material returns, but I suggest that the returns of friendship, respect, and understanding might be even far more precious.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator's observation. I wanted to express this word of support of the Senator's position by relating it definitely to what I think is a very interesting observation in the Murchison study.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I, in turn, wish to inquire of him if, perchance, he read in the New York Times of today an article from Geneva, reported by a Mr. Hoffman, whom I know and for whom I have high regard, to the effect that there is developing in Europe a strong sentiment for isolating the American dollar in international trade.

Mr. MORSE. I have not read the article, but I would observe that a policy of economic isolationism on the part of Europe would be just as shortsighted as a policy of economic isolationism on the part of the United States, because I think mankind—and I prefer to discuss the problem from the standpoint of the obligations of mankind to future generations—will follow a self destructive policy if it adopts an economic isolationist program in every segment of the world.

I think the greatest and most effective way of fighting the vicious advance of communism and of checking it is by demonstrating the superiority of our system of economic freedom and of the choice of a system whereby the people become the economic masters and not the economic servants of the state. The latter type of system is what exists behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Hoffman reported that the prevailing sentiment, the sentiment of the abler and more progressive thinkers of Europe, was that economic isolationism in Europe would have the disastrous effects which the Senator from Oregon has stated he believes would result, and that such an enlightened sentiment prevailed now. But he stated that if the United States itself, turned toward a policy of economic isolationism, the result might be the growth and the eventual predominance of a sentiment in Europe to isolate the American dollar. Why? Because of the impracticability of trading with a nation which is not only the greatest exporter, but is also the greatest importer, and which refuses to face up to the fact that international trade is a two-way street.

Will we accomplish the desired ends that are of so great importance for the American textile industry by defeating or emasculating H. R. 1? The answer must be an emphatic "No."

One policy that can help to secure for our textile industry its share of overseas markets is that represented by the passage of H. R. 1. I believe this to be true for several reasons: First, an expansion of world trade and an increase in the ability of foreign countries to earn dollars will create favorable conditions abroad which will permit a reduction in trade restrictions which exclude some of our products from some foreign markets. Secondly, through the trade agreements mechanism, and that includes GATT, we can negotiate with other countries for a reduction and elimination of these restrictions. We can bring effective pressure to bear on these countries to eliminate discriminatory practices which penalize our exports.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that passage of H. R. 1 is a symbol of the continuation of our historic policy which was initiated in 1934. It is a symbol of the stability and direction of our economic leadership of the free world. If

this country backslides on this vital policy, she can only expect that other countries will also withdraw. We would have much to lose from that. Already, there are pressures from textile producers in Canada and Latin America—the major export markets for our textiles—to protect their industries from American competition. Mr. President, you can be sure that if we move back to protectionism by defeat of H. R. 1, or by amendments which would cripple it, other countries will follow suit and give in to the demands of their own protectionists. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] envisioned that result, with its catastrophic consequences. The consequences for our whole economy, not only the textile industry, would be disastrous.

Mr. President, I have today emphasized the problems and circumstances of the textile industry as related to international trade, for three reasons, which I have already related, but which I should like to relate again in summary. One reason is my genuine interest in export trade and its effect on the economic system of the United States. The second reason is that it is in this field the propaganda of the tariff lobby has been most blatant and misleading and, at the same time, most effective. The third reason is that this special interest has received the first major concession of the Senate Finance Committee.

However, the textile industry is by no means the sole beneficiary of the amendments tentatively adopted by the Finance Committee. In fact, the protection provided for items and economic segments other than tetxiles, particularly some in which we have no imports, or only negligible imports due to unrealistically high tariffs, is considerably less defensible than the concessions to the textile industry. These I shall discuss later, in more detail, when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, provided this amendment remains in the bill.

I would not have my emphasis on the textile industry today be misunderstood. Other industries and economic groups have joined in this onslaught of high-tariff lobbying. Perhaps I shall have occasion later to discuss the international economic problems and political activities of the chemical, coal, oil, and electrical-equipment industries, and perhaps others. I do not wish this brief reference to indicate any condemnation of these groups. Like the textile industry, each of them has genuine problems with which I am genuinely sympathetic; but I would not have the overall national interest of the United States submerged because of individual problems, and particularly because of misrepresentations with respect to them.

What I should like to emphasize most is the overall problem of economic balance. The United States is the world's leading exporter and its leading importer. Our economic position is so preeminent that what we do affects every member of the grand alliance of free nations.

It is no longer possible, as some persons seem to think, for us to regard international trade as solely a matter of domestic politics.

Fortunately, we are in a position where our own enlightened economic self-interest and world responsibilities converge in a trade policy that will permit an expansion of international commerce.

In closing, I should like to emphasize further, Mr. President, that the United States is not only the world's greatest trading nation, but also the world's greatest creditor nation. Like water, the flow of international economics seeks a level—a balance. The question for the Congress to decide is whether that balance will be achieved through two-way trade, curtailment of United States exports or continued foreign subsidy by United States taxpayers. As for me, I choose trade.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the Senator for a truly magnificent address on this subject.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I have heard many speeches concerning foreign trade. However, I believe the two best speeches made on the subject were both made by the same Senator, the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Any time he wishes me to come to Louisiana to speak, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LONG. The Senator's speech this year on the subject was very fitting, as fine an address as the one which he delivered on the floor of the Senate last year, when he led the fight to try to see to it that we would have a liberal foreign trade program which would give us some hope of winning the battle between communism on the one hand and freedom on the other. We shall certainly welcome his leadership in the fight which will take place on the floor when the bill comes from committee.

I am frank to say, as a member of the committee, I am not happy about some of the amendments which have been adopted. Generally I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. Perhaps we may be able to save the bill from emasculation before it is passed.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. His statement is greatly appreciated and is a source of encouragement to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I desire to join the Senator from Louisiana in congratulating the junior Senator from Tennessee for the able presentation he has made. He has done a great deal of research and has presented a defense of the reciprocal trade program against the viewpoint from which it has been receiving its most severe attack.

In presenting his argument this afternoon the junior Senator from Tennessee has done something that more of us in the Senate need to do. When there is a pressure from a particular group or groups it is not easy to disagree with them. When, for the common good of all the people of the Nation generally, it is essential to disagree with such a group, it is very difficult to take the time to do the necessary research in order to present arguments for the common good. That is what the junior Senator from Tennessee has done this afternoon.

I hope before the reciprocal trade bill comes before the Senate for a vote other Members of the Congress and officials of the executive departments who are charged with responsibility in the matter will do as the junior Senator from Tennessee has done. He has vigorously presented the viewpoint that without a reciprocal trade program our trade could not expand, and that without such a program we would be working under many difficulties in trying to achieve a just and lasting peace.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I am grateful for his generous comments. It is my genuine hope that my effort today, which is the result of much work, will be helpful. At the risk of repetition, I wish to say again what I said to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that the United States Senate does have the facilities for research and for developing the facts, whereas many employees of the textile industry do not have such facilities.

I regret that the President has not provided forceful and effective leadership. But as I said to the Senator from Kentucky, that does not absolve the Members of this body, on which the Constitution has placed specific responsibility.

I thank the Senator; and I hope, with him, that other Senators will join in the discussion, will conduct research, and will dig into the facts, in order that the Senate may arrive at a conclusion which will comport with the national interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I, too, wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee for his very able remarks of this afternoon. Until the Senator from Tennessee took the floor, the enemies of freer trade had had almost full sway, both on the floor of the Senate and in the committee which is considering the bill. The pressures for special favors are heavy, and it is difficult to resist them. We must build up sentiment in favor of the general advantages of freer trade. The Senator from Tennessee has done that admirably, and has performed a public service of the first magnitude. I hope he will go on, from strength to strength, and from victory to victory.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, my gratitude for the generous comments and the sentiments of my distinguished friend, the eminent and able senior Senator from Illinois, is almost unrestrained. With his encouragement, I shall proceed to render to the best of my ability the small contributions of which I may be capable in this great battle.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 64TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 22, 1955

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution have just held their 64th annual convention. It was one of the most successful conventions ever held by that great, patriotic organization.

Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution together with the veterans organizations of this Nation are the natural guardians of our liberty through constitutional government.

The Members of Congress would do well to study the work of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the light of pending legislation to divide the wealth of this country with the nations of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 23 resolutions adopted by the 64th convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

FLAG

Whereas the present Public Law No. 829 is somewhat confusing as to the correct position of the United States flag in relation to the banners of the United Nations, NATO, and other like world organizations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress of the United States to pass a clear and concise law making it unlawful at any time to fly any international flag or banner above or on the same level with the flag of this Nation within the borders of these United States or its possessions; be it further

Resolved, That a penalty for the violation of the sovereignty of the flag of these United States be included in this legislation.

REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Whereas the reciprocal trade-agreements program represents an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of our Government upon the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas as a result of reduction of tariffs under the reciprocal trade-agreements program various industries important to our healthy economy and strong national defense have been injured or forced out of business with consequent injury to and loss of jobs by the American workingman: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) to expire June 12, 1955, and upon its expiration, the Congress should assume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission.

REDEDICATION TO RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

Whereas the heart of atheistic Marxism is the denial of God, and the destruction of all symbols of religious faith; and

Whereas many religious leaders and publications are zealously advocating the sacrificing of the sovereignty of the United States for a world government under the United Nations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, earnestly requests our spiritual leaders to hold steadfastly to the faith of our fathers in the teachings of the Bible and to beware of the pitfalls of world government and the Socialist state.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA

Whereas the Soviet Union has constantly intervened in the affairs of Latin American Republics, and has used certain Central American countries as a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere in a conspiracy to gain domination of all Latin America, thus threatening the very existence of this Nation and the entire free world: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges immediate strengthening of relations between the United States and all Latin American countries, through more technical, economic, and military aid to those countries that are being influenced by Communist propaganda against the United States, and against the capitalist system in the entire world.

RED CHINA

Whereas Red China has violated in many instances the terms of the Korean Armistice; and

Whereas admission of Red China to the United Nations would add to the already dangerous power of the Soviet Union in swaying the votes in the Security Council of the United Nations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its previous stand and strongly oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

ANTARCTICA

Whereas Antarctica, a continent reported to be larger than the United States and Mexico combined, has untapped reservoirs of natural resources, said to be rapidly becoming of important material value; and

Whereas American citizens have discovered more of the South Polar continent than all other nations combined and have done nothing to validate its rightful claims; and

Whereas 7 other countries claim portions of the area, 1 country claiming the entire continent: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress immediately to take the necessary action to further explorations, to produce maps and to make investigation of mineral resources in Antarctica in order to lay the foundation to validate the rightful claims of the United States.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas it is our belief that the pooling of atomic information and resources among the nations constituting the United Nations would have the effect, not alone of investing immeasurable potentials for the destruction of the United States of America by its openly avowed enemies, but could result in the accumulation of unlimited physical energy by an international oligarchy, which through its monopoly, would be enabled to hold all nations of the world in terror and achieve such a tyranny as never before has been witnessed in human history: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the immediate abandonment of all such plans and concentrate attention and effort toward further discovery and application of all available measures for the protection of our Nation against the facilities which our enemies have already acquired, and when they deem it expedient, will unhesitatingly employ.

FOSTER TRUE PATRIOTISM

Whereas the theme of this 64th Continental Congress is "Foster True Patriotism," as stated in the major objectives of our national society, and chapters have used this topic for programs during the year; and

Whereas true patriotism and Americanism are needed during this crucial period more than ever before in the history of our Nation, in order to assure the preservation of our Constitutional Republic as envisioned by its Founding Fathers: Be it

Resolved, That all DAR chapters and members redouble their efforts to foster true patriotism and love of country.

LAWMAKING BY TREATY (BRICKER AMENDMENT)

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America is the greatest document for human liberty in 2,000 years of recorded history and, originally treaties were intended to be agreements between sovereign nations concerned solely with international affairs, and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements have been and are now being drawn which admittedly endanger American rights, make domestic laws, override the Constitution, give congressional powers to the executive branch of the Government, gives States rights to the Federal Government or to an international body, and cut across our Bill of Rights: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the immediate adoption of the Bricker amendment which will provide that no treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect; and no treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States except by valid legislation duly enacted by the elected representatives of the American people.

UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas the United Nations is a group of 60 nations banded together for the sole declared purpose of preserving peace in the world with definite provision that there be no interference in the domestic affairs of any member nation; and

Whereas by the following assaults upon the Constitution of the United States it is now clear that a concealed purpose is to destroy the sovereignty of the United States of America in order to build a world government without the right of secession:

1. By the Fujii case in California, through which the Charter of the United Nations was substituted for the laws of the State of California;

2. In the Steel Seizure case, a Chief Justice of our Supreme Court claimed the right of the President to seize private property under the Charter of the United Nations;

3. The propaganda of the Declaration of Human Rights is used to confuse and conceal the true purpose of the Covenant of Human Rights—which would, if adopted, destroy free speech, free press, free religion and the right to own private property;

4. The Genocide Convention will, if adopted, deprive American citizens of the right to trial by jury and will make them subject to the provisions of a world court;

5. UNESCO is a deliberate plan to create public opinion for world citizenship—it is especially directed to the school children of the Nation and is patterned exactly after the Communist teaching in Soviet Russia; Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, implore the Congress of the United States to declare in unmistakable language the sovereignty of the United States of America, demand that the United Nations confine its activities to being a deliberating body only of sovereign nations and that all interference in the domestic affairs of the United States cease immediately and completely.

STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, renew its request that the Status of Forces Treaty be reviewed as soon as possible by the United States Senate to the end that means be found whereby the historic rights

of Americans serving on foreign soil both in the Armed Forces and in civilian service be reestablished.

FOR A SOLVENT REPUBLIC

Whereas the national debt of the United States exceeds $275 billion, courting inflation and bankruptcy; and

Whereas the recipients of American taxes in foreign aid have exceeded their production and foreign trade as recorded previous to World War II: Be it

Resolved, That all foreign aid be reduced as rapidly as possible and these billions of American tax dollars be applied on the national debt to promote a balanced budget and a financially secure United States.

FOUNDATIONS

Whereas there are approximately 7,000 foundations in the United States of America with resources in excess of $10 billion and an annual income of over $300 million; and

Whereas many foundations are using their tax-exempt funds to subvert our youth by directing American education toward an international viewpoint and disregarding the traditions to which they were dedicated: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request the 84th Congress of the United States of America to conduct an unhampered investigation, the findings of which would expose to the public the foundations which are using their funds in a manner detrimental to American interests.

GREAT SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the underlying law relating to the Great Seal of the United States—the resolution of Congress of June 20, 1782—specifies certain colors for the component parts of the device but not the uniform shades of the colors: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States, the State Department and necessary divisions thereof, the fact that there is no departmental or official control of the shades of color used in the Great Seal of the United States and urge that master color plates of the Great Seal be devised and adopted to serve as an authentic guide so that all copies of the Great Seal shall have uniform shades of color.

YOUTH GUIDANCE

Whereas the report of the FBI informs the public that juvenile delinquency has greatly increased, especially in the lower age brackets, which situation now constitutes a serious and tragic menace both to the child involved and to the security of the Nation: Be it

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution determine to develop in their respective communities an increased and active interest in healthy and well-ordered training in the home and in the school; to emphasize the moral force of the church, to support worthy youth groups which meet the need for recreational activities, and to promote, wherever feasible, juvenile courts for the sympathetic understanding of the problem of the juvenile delinquent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm their adamant stand for control of education by the people through their States and local communities only and oppose Federal aid to education.

AMERICAN HISTORY A REQUIRED SUBJECT

Whereas one of the primary objectives of our National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, is to stress the understanding of American history and civics; and

Whereas the teaching of these subjects in our schools, colleges, and universities should be stressed in order to enable all young people to have a better knowledge of our country and governmental system essential for good citizenship: Be it

Resolved, That each State be urged to pass laws requiring that courses in American history be taught in our elementary, junior and senior high schools, and that at least one course in American history and civics be required for graduation in all colleges and universities, both State supported and privately endowed.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its previous stand on the policy of investigating committees, commend their efforts in exposing subversive activities and earnestly request the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance of the courageous campaign by our duly elected legislators and their staffs.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (M'CARRAN-WALTER ACT)

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414) which became effective on December 24, 1952, is the result of a 4-year study and compilation of the previous rules and regulations for immigration; and

Whereas many countries which claim an overpopulation and demand a refuge for their nationals in these United States have not fulfilled their treaties with the United States by furnishing the stipulated number of members in their Armed Forces; and

Whereas the act has been effective in the denaturalization and deportation of criminals and subversives and is operating in the best interests of the American people; and

Whereas there has been and continues to be, a concerted effort to undermine and destroy the provisions of the law and to present private bills to the Congress admitting great number of aliens: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm approval of Public Law 414 and urge all patriotic Americans to resist weakening amendments or private bills which would destroy the effectuality of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PROTECT AMERICA'S FUTURE THROUGH PATRIOTIC EDUCATION

Whereas the changing of the name Constitution Day to Citizenship Day in the matter of observance of September 17 as the date of the signing of our Constitution minimizes the importance of this all-important document in the minds of the American people and emphasizes the citizenship idea which tends to fall into the "world citizen" plan of propaganda, and in order to preserve, support, and appreciate our Federal Constitution it is essential to understand its provisions and principles: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the United States Congress to restore the designation Constitution Day to the date of September 17 in order that all Americans on this anniversary may rededicate themselves to the basic principles of this great document; and

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in every locality study and publicize the Constitution during its 168th anniversary week of September 17–23, 1955; request their mayors and governors to proclaim Constitution Week; and sponsor chapter, school, and public programs on the Constitution, especially emphasizing the primary purposes of good government as set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution and the freedoms as set forth in its Bill of Rights, so that it may continue to protect us and our posterity in this Nation under God.

FBI

Whereas the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirms its confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, with commendation for its past record; be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appropriate funds adequate to continue and expand its effective services.

COMMENDATION OF FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its heartfelt appreciation to the esteemed former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, for his continued interest in, and activity for, the problems facing the Government and, in particular, the findings contained in his current report as Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER INDIANS

Whereas there is now before the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 401, which calls for the abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, removal of Federal guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian land, within 3 years from the date of the enactment of the act; Be it

Resolved, That the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution commend the Bureau of Indian Affairs for its diligent study of problems relating to American Indians on reservations as wards of the Federal Government, and earnestly solicits the Secretary of the Interior to grant sufficient extension of time for proper training of these dependent people for complete cultural assimilation and integration into mixed community life; and

Resolved, That the State Societies and Chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution within the several States where Indian tribes exist on reservations, be requested to contact the members of their State legislatures for the purpose of urging that State and local governments assume greater responsibility for the economic and civic preparedness of those reservation Indians now woefully unable to earn a living in new surroundings, and for adequate educational opportunities for the Indian youth of these tribes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these resolutions are the work of the shock troops of the Nation. Miss Gertrude S. Caraway has been President of the Daughters of American Resolution for the past 2 years, and she will continue for another year in that office. Mrs. Margaret Patton is chairman of the Daughters of American Revolution national defense committee. Together, these two fine ladies have spearheaded the work of this great patriotic organization.

EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for a 2-year extension of the Small Business Administration. On a later day, I shall discuss the bill. But at this time, as a Member of the Small Business Committee, I am introducing the bill.

I think it particularly apropos to introduce the bill today because of some exceedingly interesting hearings, in connection with military procurement, which a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee has been conducting during the past few days.

I believe it is important that the attention of business in the Nation be called to the testimony we have received in part

from the witnesses before the committee. I refer to the testimony that at present we are really going through a restricting procurement program. Military procurement is not now expanding; instead, it is restricting. That simply means that fewer orders are available for American business, large or small. Therefore, during this period of restriction, it seems to me that the Small Business Administration now has the additional burden of seeing to it that equity is done to small business, because, Mr. President, it is understandable that during a restrictive period there are going to be large business establishments—who, after all, are the prime contractors in the case of most of these contracts—that necessarily will want to hold as much of the business as they can, in order to take care of their own business needs. That is understandable; certainly it is human. Yet those prime contractors, those large business establishments, will be very much dependent upon small business in case the tables are turned—although we hope and pray that that does not occur—with the result that we would then find ourselves in need, because of worsening world conditions, of speeding up military procurement, rather than restricting it.

The testimony this morning, for example, given by an exceedingly able witness from the Air Force Small Business Policy Division, Mr. Waddell, made very clear the importance of our keeping in mind the fact that there is less business now, and that there will be even less business than at present, available to business firms which seek to obtain procurement contracts. I think—and I say this as a sort of advance rebuttal to those who will undoubtedly say, "In view of the fact that procurement is now on a restrictive basis, can we not bring about some administrative saving by getting rid of the Small Business Administration?"—that the argument is all the other way. I think it is even more important, in order to see to it that we do not push out of business those small businesses which we shall need in case world conditions worsen and we must speed up all at once our procurement policy, that we maintain the Small Business Administration as a watch dog, so to speak, of the equities, interests, and rights of American small business.

The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now presides over the Senate, is the chairman of our Senate Small Business Committee. I am sure he will agree that it is important that those of us serving on this very important committee in turn frankly advise American small business that the business simply does not exist in the quantity in which it existed, so far as military procurement is concerned, 2, 3, or 4 years ago. Also, we should say to the American public, "Let us be thankful that that is true." As I shall develop at greater length in a major speech on this subject later, I also believe that an increasing responsibility is placed on the Congress to follow a legislative course of action which will be helpful in expanding our economy, so that, on the civilian front, rather than the military front, there will be the business opportunity which American small business needs in order to give to American small business the opportunities for expansion which it must have if we are to have a healthy economy.

I think that is a somewhat appropriate introduction to the subject matter about which I shall speak in a few minutes this afternoon, because the subject matter I have risen primarily to address myself to goes to the matter of expanding the American economy through a governmental development of the great water resources of our Nation. I do not know of any single item within the civilian economy which offers greater business stimulus to large and small business than the maximum development of the potentials of the streams of America from the standpoint of the development of electric power, the development of the irrigation resources of our country, and the development of all the multiple purpose features of a comprehensive river development program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1802) to extend the Small Business Act of 1953 for 2 years, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HELLS CANYON DAM: FACTS VERSUS FALSE PROPHETS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I have been pleased to cooperate with the Senate leadership in postponing until this late hour the speech I shall now give. I have done so because of the fact that the excellent speech which has been given by the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] had been scheduled for delivery earlier this afternoon. I give my speech at this late hour only because of the fact that it has already been released to the press, and therefore I feel under obligation to deliver the speech today, instead of tomorrow.

"Divide and conquer" was the motto of the Hapsburg empire. It is the strategy of the Idaho Power Co. in its effort to defeat full development of the Hells Canyon site so that the company can maintain its monopoly empire.

On April 7 the Idaho Power Co. enlisted a new recruit, the Governor of Oregon. Until this month, Governor Paul Patterson has been playing the role of reluctant dragon with respect to taking any position whatsoever on the issue of full development of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River against inadequate exploitation of this great resource by the Idaho Power Co.

But on April 7 in Portland, Oreg., all this changed. This was the occasion of the last day of the field hearings on S. 1333, a bill to authorize Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project, which I introduced with 29 cosponsors: Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG.

Governor Patterson had read the multicolored propaganda of the Idaho Power Co. and walked up to the door of the recruiting office several times. Significantly, he did not enter while a candidate for the Governorship of Oregon. Finally, on April 7 he walked through and signed up.

It would be difficult to determine if Governor Patterson has any strong convictions of his own on this or any other important issue affecting the future of Oregon. It is fair to say, in examination of the position he took in Portland on S. 1333, that his convictions, if any, must be stronger than the line of reasoning which he used to justify them.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GOVERNORS WEAR BLINDERS IN PUBLIC

Like the arguments advanced during the field hearings on the Hells Canyon bill by Governors Smylie, of Idaho, and Langlie, of Washington, those of Governor Patterson assume the kind of narrow parochial view which cannot see past State lines and is utterly unrealistic. That approach constitutes a clear and present danger to the State of Oregon and the rest of the States in the Columbia basin if it is allowed to dominate the policies of resource development in this region.

Governor Patterson and the other two musketeers of resistance to the 20th century—Governors Smylie and Langlie—have evidently failed to consult together on either geography or economics as it pertains to their own region. According to their public logic, the Pacific Northwest is not a unified area, unified by its river system, the Columbia. If each is locked against the other, as they advocate, if each greedily competes against the other to grab small advantages, Oregon will be the loser. These insular officials willfully ignore the basic fact that no surveyor's imaginary line can efface, and that rivers do not respect, State boundaries. They flow to the ocean across States, drain areas in many States, and carry with them potential uses which if developed fully and in harmonious relationship, will enhance the economies of all the States which lie within major watersheds like the Columbia River Basin.

THE POWER RESERVATION FOR EASTERN OREGON AND IDAHO

Governor Patterson flies in the face of this elemental fact, and bemoans with loud lamentations the provision of the Hells Canyon bill which would allow 500,000 kilowatts of power attributable to the project to be allocated to the underdeveloped areas in eastern Oregon and Idaho which have never obtained the stimulus of low-cost power because of the obstructionism of the Idaho Power Co.

Again, I point out that Governor Patterson's geography is astoundingly rusty. It is hard to believe, but apparently he is convinced that there is no Oregon east of the Cascades. Or, even more fantastic, perhaps he views that vast area as disaffiliated territory under the informal but effective rulership of the Idaho

Power Co. and the California Pacific Utilities Co.

OREGON'S POWER BENEFITS UNDER S. 1333

The 500,000 kilowatt reservation in my bill, S. 1333, applies to the drainage basin of the Middle Snake River. That includes a substantial part of Oregon, namely, Baker, Malheur, Union, and Wallowa Counties, which comprise 20 percent of the total area of the State of Oregon.

The reservation is what it says—a reservation. It is improbable that eastern Oregon and Idaho will be able to absorb immediately all of that 500,000 kilowatts when Hells Canyon Dam comes on the line. Idaho today does not use that much power. But, as the stimulus of that power does increase consumption, Oregon will receive the benefits of the authorized and as yet unfinanced dams on the lower Snake which high Hells Canyon alone can make feasible. In those terms, Hells Canyon will make possible 2¼ million kilowatts of capacity for the Columbia River system in which Oregon farms, homes, and factories will share.

I have a great deal more confidence than the Governor's testimony would indicate he has in the future economic development of Baker, Malheur, Union, and Wallowa Counties.

In order to assure their prosperity and in order to help develop the economic potentialities of those counties, we need, may I say to the Governor of Oregon, cheap power, not high-cost power from the Idaho Power Co. The people of these Oregon counties must have a choice between the high-cost power of the Idaho Power Co. and the cheap power that can be made available to them if we have the historic foresight to proceed to build a high Hells Canyon Dam at the Hells Canyon Dam site.

In other words, one of the great differences between the Governor and me is my abiding faith in the future economic potentialities of our State. To have those opportunities, we cannot afford to sell out, politically or otherwise, to the Idaho Power Co. The people of our State are entitled to the kind of protection that I am seeking to give them in the high Hells Canyon Dam bill.

I want every member of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, which is playing the private utility game in the Pacific Northwest, to understand my language. I speak to the Portland Chamber of Commerce as well as to the Governor of Oregon today when I say that the opponents of the Hells Canyon Dam are selling out the future interests of Oregon boys and girls in cheap power in the Pacific Northwest.

It is about time, Mr. President, that we lay it on the line in my State. As one who can be counted on to stand up and fight for future generations of Oregon boys and girls to their right to cheap power that can be generated at a high dam at Hells Canyon, I do not intend to be diverted one iota by the multicolored propaganda of the Idaho Power Co.

With respect to the Hells Canyon Dam I wish to say, as I shall present it to the people of the State of Oregon time and time again in the months immediately ahead, that we join now in an issue as to whether the representatives of the people in the State of Oregon will follow a course of action with respect to the development of the Columbia River Basin which will guarantee future generations and citizens of the Pacific Northwest the cheap power to which they are entitled and upon which the whole economic future of the Pacific Northwest depends.

HELLS CANYON BENEFIT TO WESTERN OREGON

The Governor failed to ascertain the fact that Hells Canyon project not only will turn out 686,000 kilowatts of prime power at site, but that Oregon west of the Cascades will benefit from Hells Canyon storage releases which will provide additional power from the eight downstream dams, on the line, under construction and authorized to the amount of 436,000 kilowatts equivalent to more than another Bonneville Dam. Additional downstream power benefits in the Middle Snake have not yet been computed but are substantial.

Let me restate that point. It is important that the people of Oregon understand what we are fighting for west of the Cascades, as well as east of the Cascades. We are fighting for a dam that will provide prime power west of the Cascades in an amount equal to the power that is being provided by Bonneville Dam. I do not propose to become a party to any program that plays into the hands of the Idaho Power Co. and which denies to the people of my State, both east and west of the Cascades, power resources that the high dam at Hells Canyon would provide. I leave such a sellout to the Governor of the State of Oregon.

Does the Governor assume that this additional electric energy made possible by Hells Canyon downstream firming will not go in good part to meet load requirements in areas in Oregon along the lower Columbia? Does he assume that the Idaho power plan, with about one-fourth of Hells Canyon storage, with no system intertie, with power at high cost designed to meet only the needs of the Idaho Power Co.'s service area, except for dump power interchanges, will benefit Oregon? Does he assume that Idaho Power will operate its projects like the Federal Columbia River Power System is operated, with electric energy at about 2 to 2.5 mills, and distributed over the regional transmission grid so that its benefits are spread to the utmost at the lowest possible cost consistent with good business practice?

The Governor's attitude in refusing to accept for Oregon a proper and substantial share of over 400,000 kilowatts of downstream prime power, plus that which will go into eastern Oregon reminds me of the old story of the farmer's colt who was backed up all winter against a haystack and starved to death because he didn't look around.

GOVERNOR PATTERSON IS WRONG ON THE FACTS

While on the subject of power production, I should like to set Governor Patterson right with respect to his statement that the John Day project would generate more energy than Hells Canyon. In terms of prime power, Hells Canyon will produce 1,122,000 kilowatts, at site and downstream. John Day will contribute 713,000 kilowatts to the Federal system.

I can join with the Governor in his feeling that John Day should be built. As a matter of fact, together with my Senate colleague from Oregon, and the Senators from Washington and Montana, I have announced that we will fight for an appropriation of $1.5 million for accelerated preconstruction work on this very necessary project, both to Oregon and to the region.

A John Day partnership bill with a new look has just been introduced by the Republican Congressman from eastern Oregon. It is much longer and more detailed than the bill put in by Senator Cordon and the same Congressman in 1954.

The new bill appears on its face to increase the contribution of the partners, but that is not really the case. The new bill continues the principal shortcomings of the old bill. For example, it is vague on when the partners pay. The old bill specified that the partners would repay the Federal Government $165 million, plus whatever other costs were chargeable to power—it did not say when. That was to be left up to a Government-utility agreement with only a 50-year limit provided. It did specify that interest charges were to be no higher than 2½ percent, which meant that the major partner—Portland General Electric—would save tens of millions of dollars on interest, because it could not issue bonds at such low interest rates. The new bill apparently leaves interest rates up to agreement with the Army engineers and FPC, which in the last 2 years have been allies of the private utilities. That could mean an interest bonanza by agreement rather than statute.

The interest gimmick in the 1954 bill became one of the most frequently discussed subject matters in the political campaign in the State of Oregon in 1954. We pointed out up and down the State that what this little interest gimmick at 2½ percent would mean would be a giveaway of millions of dollars for 50 years to the Portland General Electric Co. That issue drew blood, as the votes in the election showed. It was one of the causative factors.

How do they try to get around that little gimmick? They do not try to get around it by fixing interest rates specifically in the bill high enough so that the people of this country would not be paying more for money they borrow than Portland General Electric Co. would be paying back into the Treasury by way of interest to the United States Government.

They propose to leave the matter of interest to an agreement entered into between the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission on the one hand, and the partner on the other hand. That is not good enough, Mr. President. I will tell the Senate why it is not good enough. It is not good enough because there is no legislative control over the kind of agreement they would be able to get out of the Federal Power Commission on interest rates. The Federal Power Commission under this ad-

ministration has been playing the game of the private utilities. The President appointed as Chairman of the Commission a man who is known to be an opponent of Hells Canyon Dam. He took him right out of the Governor's political entourage in the State of Washington. Governor Langlie is one of the outstanding opponents of high Hells Canyon Dam. That is why I say that here is one representative of the people of the State of Oregon who is not going to go along with the kind of program which is contained in the new bill, whereby, instead of specifying a two-and-a-half-percent interest rate as they did in 1954—which was bad enough—they now say, "We will leave it up to an agreement between the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission on the one hand and the partner on the other."

Mr. President, I wish to say on the floor of the Senate today that my fear is that the people will get taken again if they go along with that kind of a gimmick. I want John Day Dam built; I want it built as fast as we can get it built. I have been fighting for it. Last year I fought for the funds for planning for John Day Dam. We got them through the Senate, but what happened? They were lost in the Senate-House conference. The junior Senator from Oregon and I are going to do everything we can this year to get at least a million and a half dollars for planning and preconstruction work on John Day Dam.

With reference to the new bill which has been introduced, there is a great deal of explaining which must be done about what the bill provides before it can be understood. It seems to me that the new bill is the same old wolf, but they skinned a new sheep for its clothing. I think the people of Oregon will see through it before we get through with our public discussions of both Hells Canyon Dam and John Day Dam.

The governor proposes a phony partnership which would result in another piece being removed from the comprehensive plan, another boost to the regional power rates, and another bonanza to the private power companies at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers. My associates and I, together with the majority of the people of Oregon and Washington, propose Federal development, release of power over the Bonneville grid and at BPA rates, and its operation in conformity with a unified hydraulic and electric power system. In other words, we propose full development, while the governor, using the private power company arguments, proposes inadequate development, high-cost power, and dismemberment of the comprehensive plan.

JOHN DAY IS A SUPPLEMENT NOT AN ALTERNATIVE

The John Day Dam, like high Hells Canyon, is a key unit in the Army engineers main control plan for the Columbia River Basin. It is essential to an integrated, multipurpose system for power, navigation, and flood control.

It is not an alternative to Hells Canyon.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that the escape which the Governor is trying to use by representing to the people of the State of Oregon that he is for the John Day Dam is no escape for him at all, because we need both dams. The John Day Dam is dependent upon high Hells Canyon Dam for the development of its maximum electric potential. Both are needed, and both are so economically advantageous in terms of paying for themselves that they are both sound investments.

It would seem that in Governor Patterson's book of strange logic it is perfectly correct for Oregon to take all the power from John Day, as proposed in the Cordon-Coon partnership bill of last year. But he would deny to Idaho and Oregon on the Snake drainage part of the power from Hells Canyon which is so urgently needed to bring these areas into a better economic life after having been deprived of Federal power except in driblets, since its development began.

I would also assume that Governor Patterson would, if following out the course of his logic to the bitter end, assume that Washington would be happy to provide a sizable block of Priest Rapids power to Oregon if that project is built by the non-Federal public bodies. I would also assume that he would be willing to negotiate a top-level agreement with Governor Langlie to obtain permission to anchor John Day on the Washington side of the river, and that Langlie and other Washingtonians would be favorably disposed to support John Day on this basis, with no power available for themselves.

If the Governor thinks any such arrangement will be worked out, he is sadly mistaken, because the people of the State of Washington know that, after all, they have regional interests and rights in the development of power out of the Columbia and Snake Rivers, and we cannot successfully take a narrow provincial attitude as the Governor has done with respect to high Hells Canyon Dam and not then be held to the same attitude when we come to the development of the John Day Dam. What we need to do is to recognize that this is a regional economic problem. It is not one which can be put into watertight compartments on the basis of State boundaries, because a State boundary cannot hold back the waters of these rivers. They are going to continue to flow across State boundaries, and we should have the vision and statesmanship to develop their economic potential in terms of their regional effects and meaning.

IF STATE LINES GOVERN POWER USE, OREGON WILL LOSE

I would like to ask Governor Patterson: After John Day, what then? Where are the big power producers which Oregon could claim as her own? They lie in Idaho, Washington, and Montana, not in Oregon. In the kind of dog-eat-dog atmosphere which characterizes the three musketeers in the governors' mansions of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, where will this leave Oregon when it searches for more power to keep its economy going and finds itself up against the similarly limited and greedy self-interest of the Republican leaders of Oregon's sister States?

Hells Canyon may have drawn these three musketeers together for the moment, but for the moment only. Right now we hear them declaiming "one for all and all for one." But tomorrow, as it has been in the past, their separate war cries will be "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost."

THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' SONG AND DANCE

The unique manner in which the arguments of the three musketeers cancel themselves out is worthy of some comment. Governor Smylie cried out in loud and pathetic tones that Idaho owned the Snake River, lock, stock, and barrel, and that the interests of present and future reclamation were her primary concern, and would not be sacrificed to benefit the insatiable downstream States.

HELLS CANYON POWER AND IRRIGATION

Governor Patterson, on the other hand, took the position that the use of Hells Canyon revenues from the sale of power to aid future reclamation in Idaho was a threat to power users in Oregon who wanted the product at the lowest possible cost. He also said that this proposal was completely unrealistic because there was no physical connection between Hells Canyon project and the upstream areas which were susceptible to irrigation.

I shall have more to say on the subject of irrigation in another major speech on Hells Canyon which I shall deliver at a later date. But it was rather amusing to hear the Governor, in his testimony before a Senate subcommittee in Portland, express such great concern about the use of Hells Canyon power revenues to help defray the cost, or part of the cost, of the irrigation development.

I wonder what the great liberal Republican, Charles McNary, would have said had he heard the Governor's testimony?

I wonder what the thousands of farmers, making their living on irrigated farms in the State of Oregon, will say once they have read the Governor's testimony.

I wonder what the farmers in the Prineville area will say, farmers who have been fighting for years for the development of an irrigation project on the Crooked River, the development of which will be dependent upon a part payment of the cost of irrigation out of power revenues. If the Governor intends to follow the principle he laid down in the Portland hearing, he will have to follow it consistently. He cannot say to a group of farmers in one State, "I am against using power revenue for the development of irrigation land in this section," and then take a different position in the Crooked River area.

The Governor's testimony on the irrigation point is testimony against the best interests of the farmers of the State of Oregon, whose lands require irrigation water, whose farming activities and very livelihood depend upon the development of those dry lands by seeing to it that water is brought to them.

In his testimony, the Governor expressed the view that he did not think it was consistent with good public policy to be paying part of the cost of the

irrigation development from power revenues. Let him go into the dry land farming areas of Oregon and tell that to the farmers. He will get his answer—and it will not be an answer in support of his position.

In his testimony, the Governor also said that the proposal in regard to reclamation was completely unrealistic, because there was no physical connection between the Hells Canyon project and the upstream areas which were susceptible of irrigation.

The Governor should obtain a little rudimentary education in these matters. Let me call to his attention that there are irrigation features in connection with Hungry Horse project with no physical connection between the two. Let me add that Davis Dam on the Colorado, and Keswick on the Sacramento, are power producers and do not irrigate 1 acre of land, but their power sales help make such an operation possible.

This has been part and parcel of the reclamation program of our Government for many years.

Governor Patterson is slightly confused, but this is a confusing time of year for those who go swimming in cold water out of their depths. At any rate, he should have compared notes with Governor Smylie in order to get their respective stories a little better straightened out.

LOW-COST POWER FOR IRRIGATION PUMPING IN OREGON

Governor Patterson's touching concern for Oregonians consists of opposing high Hells Canyon Dam. The obvious alternatives to the high dam are 1 or 3 Idaho Power Co. small dams in the Hells Canyon. They would be of no benefit to Oregon. They would perpetuate and strengthen the Idaho Power Co.'s monopoly position with its attendant high rates.

In strong contrast, low-cost Hells Canyon power would be of great aid to irrigation pumping in eastern Oregon. As I pointed out in 1953 when introducing the Hells Canyon bill:

Compared with rates charged farmers in Oregon and Washington, Idaho rates—

From the Idaho Power Co.—

are exceedingly high. The farmer's monthly electric bill in Idaho is much higher than that of his neighbor in the two coastal States. What does this mean to the farmer who would like to irrigate new land by pump? The added cost frequently determines whether or not it is possible for the farmer to irrigate * * * to bring new land into production. It's a gross handicap to the State of Idaho, which needs new agricultural land for its sons and daughters.

A comparison of power rates will illustrate the point. For instance, a typical pumping operation, involving irrigation of 100 acres with an average of 3½ acre-feet of water, lifted 100 feet, would cost $709.40 in areas served by the Umatilla Electric Co-op in Oregon, and the Big Bend Electric Co-op, the Benton County REA, the Columbia County REA, and the Okanogan Electric Co-op, all in the State of Washington. They all purchase low-cost power from the Columbia River system.

In contrast to this cost of $709.40, the Idaho Power Co. bill for the same operation would be $867.10 or $155.70 more money which the farmer could be putting in the bank or spending with local businessmen. When the lift is greater, an even larger difference in pumping costs is involved.

Not only is there that great disparity, but 1 of the most amusing oversights in the Governor's testimony before the Senate committee in Portland on April 7 was his failure to tell the people of Oregon the number of kilowatts they will get from the Idaho Power Co. if the 3 small dams are built. There is no guarantee or assurance that they will get a single kilowatt. In fact, the hearings on Hells Canyon over the years have brought out, time and time again, that the Idaho Power Co. is seeking a permit to build the three low-head dams for use in Idaho, not in Oregon.

What is sought to be accomplished by my bill is to guarantee to the people of Idaho and Oregon 500,000 kilowatts to be set aside for the middle Snake River Basin.

POWER REVENUES FOR RECLAMATION

Governor Patterson protests that Hells Canyon revenue should not be used to help defray the costs of irrigation in Idaho, specifically the Mountain Home development.

The Governor was something less than complete in his discussion because Hells Canyon power revenues could be made available to Oregon irrigation developments under the same section of the bill. It provides in part:

The initial works of the projects authorized by section 1 of this act and any additional works or division, including the irrigation features of the Payette unit of the Mountain Homes division, that may be authorized as hereinafter provided, shall be treated as one project for the purpose, among others, of providing for the application of project revenues to the return of reimbursable costs in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. Federal reclamation developments proposed to be constructed in the Central and Upper Snake River Basin may be authorized as works or divisions of these projects, but only if such authorization is specifically provided by an act of Congress.

I ask, Is the Governor opposed to such power revenue aid to irrigation in Oregon for feasible and worthy projects?

Apparently, from his testimony, he is.

There are still thousands of acres which need to be brought under cultivation in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. My colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], performed, I think, a signal service for the farmers of Oregon who are dependent upon irrigation waters when, in the hearings, he specifically asked the Governor of Oregon if his testimony meant, for example, that he likewise, as a matter of policy, would be opposed to the use of power revenues to help defray the cost of irrigation in the Crooked River area in the region of Prineville, Oreg. The Governor's answer was in the affirmative.

I am at a complete loss to understand how the Governor of Oregon thinks that the much-needed reclamation projects in Oregon and the other States of the Pacific Northwest can be developed unless the long-established reclamation policy of the Federal Government shall be continued, whereby part of the power revenues are set aside for reclamation purposes.

The reclamation laws have been a major factor in the growth of the West. Since the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, who provided the inspiration and impetus for large-scale western irrigation, hundreds of thousands of acres have been brought under cultivation in the semiarid regions of the reclamation states.

It is not surprising to find the Governor of Oregon parting company with the philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, Charles McNary, and George Norris. I do not propose to join him in his campaign to preserve and extend the sagebrush domains of the Idaho Power Co.

HELLS CANYON STORAGE WOULD RELIEVE BROWNOUTS

Mr. President, it is strange that the Governor of Oregon should attack Hells Canyon Dam, because it would "be out of place in the logical timetable for Columbia basin development," and that other projects are more urgently needed.

The Governor should look around and remember, too. On March 23, because of low flow on the Columbia, interruptible power deliveries were curtailed 50 percent by the Bonneville Power Administration, and there was the usual flurry and fluster of attempting to get expensive standby steam generation on the line to meet this emergency. Let the Governor also remember the drought of 1952 and ponder. At the time there was great economic loss to the region because the waters of spring had gone to waste and none had been held back upstream to be released when there was need for uninterrupted power production downstream, which upstream storage at Hells Canyon would substantially aid.

Does Governor Patterson assume that much of the feasibility of John Day is not contingent upon upstream storage at Hells Canyon? Is he not aware that Hells Canyon releases will add 56,000 kilowatts of prime power to John Day that he is so anxious to build, or more than 8 percent of its total output? Is he not aware that Hells Canyon storage release will add 24,000 prime kilowatts to the Bonneville project, 50,000 to the Dalles, and 48,000 to McNary? Is he not aware that the four lower Snake dams depend almost entirely for their economic feasibility on Hells Canyon storage, which will add 249,000 prime kilowatts, or about 48 percent, to their output?

Where does he think he is going to get the votes in the Senate of the United States for funds for dams authorized, but yet to be built, when, in round numbers, they are dependent for one-third of their prime power production upon storage at Hells Canyon Dam?

Part of the political propaganda in the Pacific Northwest for the Idaho Power Co. is, "We cannot get the votes in the Congress to build Hells Canyon." Who said so? The Republican politicians.

And I say to the people of the Pacific Northwest, "The answer is at the ballot box."

The greatest handicap we have comes now from Republican representatives in

the Pacific Northwest. We did not have any trouble last year getting authorizations through the Congress of the United States for Cougar and Green Peter Dams as Federal projects. That does not bear out the Republicans' propaganda that Senators from the Middle West and the East will not vote for these great Federal projects, because the Senators from the Middle West and the East recognize the tremendous importance to eastern and middle western industry of an expanding economy in the West.

Mr. President, this is a unit nation now. We are dependent State upon State across this land, and upon the prosperity of each State. No more can we have economic isolationism within the country than we can have it within the world and still have prosperity.

What is the Eisenhower administration saying in regard to these two federally authorized projects, Cougar and Green Peter? "Well, we will recommend funds for them on a partnership basis." And Republican spokesmen are trying to sell a phony partnership scheme to the people of the Pacific Northwest for projects already authorized as Federal projects, and authorized last year as Federal projects. Get rid of the Republicans and give us some Democrats from the Pacific Northwest who will vote us appropriations.

Mr. President, I am not worried about votes from the Middle West and the East. I am worried about votes from the Republicans in the Pacific Northwest, who are primarily the spokesmen of the private utilities, and not of the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Governor if he is unaware that load growths in Oregon are dependent upon the development of these projects as part of the main control and comprehensive plans? Is he willing, then, to trade off an all-Oregon John Day, and nothing more for Oregon, in order to please the power company seconds in his corner who are cheering him on as he shadow boxes with the region's future?

A POSITIVE DAM PROGRAM FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

My own position is clear. I am fighting for John Day as the next new start in the Pacific Northwest. But at the same time I am fighting for Hells Canyon as the next authorization this year and a new start with Federal preconstruction money next year. We have seen what lack of upstream storage has done on 2 grim occasions less than 3 years apart. And neither the people of Oregon, I, nor my associates in the Senate, who have given so generously of their support for Hells Canyon and full development of the Columbia, are going to relax our efforts to carry forward comprehensive harnessing of the Columbia system for all the people, not segmented, inadequate development of jealous States divided by nonstatesmen in office, and by the insidious propaganda of the private power companies which continually add fuel to the fires of provincialism in order to conquer by such destructive divisions.

The Governor of Oregon warned the public that even if the Hells Canyon bill were passed, what assurances would there be that there would be any appropriations for construction? I might ask in return if his phony partnership John Day bill would pass, what assurances of Federal moneys would there be? I can assure the Governor that if he were to lend his support to obtaining Federal appropriations for Hells Canyon, instead of using outlandish reasoning to oppose it, there would be that much more accomplished to assist. I can also assure the Governor that there will be as concerted an effort to proceed rapidly with the construction of Hells Canyon as my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest and I are now making to obtain money to prepare John Day for building.

THE FPC DODGE

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to deal with the final argument, if argument it could be called. by Governor Patterson against the vitally needed Hells Canyon project. It has such a familiar and counterfeit ring of Idaho Power Co. propaganda.

Governor Patterson wishes the Senate of the United States to stand breathless, immobile, and powerless to exercise its constitutional and lawful responsibilities to develop the rivers of the Nation while its own creature, the Federal Power Commission prepares its decision on the 3-dam application of the Idaho Power Co.

This is a modest proposal which resembles the request of a headsman to his victim to hold still so a clean decapitation can be better accomplished. The Federal Power Commission is not an objective administrative agency. It is rigged to give a decision in favor of the Idaho Power Co. plan. But on the basis of its composition, and the eerie chain of reasoning by which the FPC staff counsel recommended issuing the private license after recounting the overall superiority of the high Federal project, there is nothing else to expect.

As a lawyer, if an affidavit of prejudice is available, I do not believe in taking a client before a prejudiced judge. I believe in getting him into another courtroom. This great issue of the people of the country needs to be brought here to the Congress and decided here in the Congress, and not before a Federal Power Commission to which the President of the United States has appointed as Chairman a man whose enmity to a high Hells Canyon Dam is well known.

I do not intend to stand by, Mr. President, and let the proponents leave it up to the Federal Power Commission to get by with that "sleeper."

Mr. President, I wish to say that apparently the Governor of Oregon assumes that in the realm of foreign policy, war and peace, taxation, and other complex matters there is no questioning the ability of the Senate of the United States to proceed in the exercise of its powers of legislation. But any issue which affects the full development of our rivers, and particularly involving legislation which would result in removing once and for all the private power company threat against full use of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River suddenly becomes too complex for the Congress to comprehend or to decide upon with intelligence, according to the Governor of Oregon and the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. President, there is nothing so complex about the comprehensive plan for the development of the maximum potential of the Snake and the Columbia Rivers that the Congress of the United States cannot solve and settle in a very statesman-like manner.

I can only say that Governor Patterson has made his maximum effort in this manner. If his future pronouncements on this important issue bear the same "Reddy Kilowatt" double-talk, mixed with medieval provincialism, as does his statement before the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee in Portland, the people of Oregon would be better served if he returned to his less difficult role of reluctant dragon. The issues of full and comprehensive development are too important to the future of Oregon, the Northwest, and the Nation to be discussed by such prattle as the Governor of Oregon emitted in his testimony before the Senate committee, in Portland, on April 7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks certain communications I have received from various organizations in support of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the telegrams, resolutions, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, A. F. OF L.,
Madison, Wis.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, and 22 other Senators, proposes the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon which would develop the full hydro-electric potential of the site and in addition it would provide water for irrigation, navigation and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the erection of a high dam at Hells Canyon would be far superior to the proposal of building a series of low dams: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters assembled in semi-annual meeting in Madison, Wis., on April 21, 1955, go on record favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333 and the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to the National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 E. Salmon Street, Portland 14, Oreg., to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to Senator WAYNE MORSE, and to the General Office of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America at Indianapolis, Ind.

Executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters: Walter Jensen, president, Madison, Wis.; John V. Mayett, first vice president, Superior, Wis.; Robert H. Strenger, second vice president, Madison, Wis.; Erven Schultz, secretary-treasurer, Neenah, Wis.; George Hoffmann, executive board member, Kenosha, Wis.; William A. Eckart, executive board member, La Crosse, Wis.; Harry Boerschinger, executive board member, Green Bay, Wis.; Edwin F. Kijek, executive board member, Wausau, Wis.; Walter Barnett, Executive Board Member, Eau Claire, Wis.; Henry C. Kreutzfeldt, executive board member, Milwaukee, Wis.; Joe Harrmann, executive board member, Milwaukee, Wis.; Wilburt Hahn, executive board

member, Wausau, Wis.; Albert Forer, executive board member, La Crosse, Wis.; August Trappler, executive board member, West Allis, Wis.; Val Schueller, executive board member, Marshfield, Wis.

Unanimously adopted.

EUGENE, OREG., *April 23, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteenth annual convention of Northwest Public Power Association endorsed Senate bill 1333 by resolution at general business meeting April 21.

Good luck.

CARL NEWCOMB
(For Gus Norwood, executive secretary, NPPA).

HELLS CANYON DAM

OROVILLE GRANGE NO. 985,
Oroville, Wash., April 6, 1955.

Whereas we believe that the construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon is essential to the full development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas estimates of our needs for electric energy for our growing industrial program show that anything less than the fullest possible utilization of our water resources will be inadequate for our needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Oroville Grange, No. 985, That we go on record as favoring Senate bill 1333 and urge the earliest possible enactment of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Hells Canyon Association, to Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of Washington, to our Representative in Congress Hon. WALT HORAN; to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER of Oregon; to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee for Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Washington State Grange; and to Okanogan Co., Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oroville Grange, No. 985, in regular session April 2, 1955.

OSCAR THORNTON, *Master.*
ISABEL THOMSEN, *Secretary.*

WESTLAND GRANGE, No. 827,
Hermiston, Oreg.

Whereas the necessity for building the high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, on the Snake River is very vital at this time; and

Whereas this high dam will provide flood control, storage, and unlimited electric energy, for the Northwest; and

Whereas the shortage of electric power now present, in the Northwest, it is imperative that this high dam be authorized and started: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Westland Grange, No. 827, in regular session this 8th day of April 1955, urges immediate action on S. 1333, and asks this Congress to pass legislation authorizing the start of this high dam in Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress, to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, GRACIE PFOST, and to the executive secretary of the Hells Canyon Association.

W. B. SMITH,
Master.
LILLIAN M. SMITH,
Secretary.

A RESOLUTION ON BILL S. 1333

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN GRANGE, No. 741,
Prineville, Oreg.

Whereas from a careful study of such information as we have been able to gather, both pro and con, concerning the question of the best use of Hells Canyon resources and believe we have arrived at a just conclusion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of Lookout Mountain Grange, No. 741, do hereby go on record as supporting measure S. 1333 as being in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

GEO. J. JEE,
Master.
FRANCES SHOOK,
Secretary.

Whereas there is at this time an effort being made to substitute a plan for multiple low dams for the Government proposed high dam in the Snake River, and the high dam being necessary for the development of the Columbia River to its fullest capacity; and

Whereas for the past several years, since the beginning of this development, we have seen the benefits accruing from the low-cost electricity to the people of the Northwest, particularly to the small-farm operator; and

Whereas under Government control, this increase in the use of electricity has demonstrated the fact that the public utilities have had the major part in the growth of the Northwest and in bringing to us the many advantages of low-cost power; and

Whereas with even the low rates for electricity, the dams are returning to the Government amounts of money annually to insure the repayment in the allotted time all of the cost of the dams; and

Whereas the high dam is a part of the system of development which takes into consideration the multiple use of water for production of electricity and also the great added advantage of flood control, irrigation, and water transportation, as well as recreational facilities; and

Whereas the construction of low-level dams would break the chain of planned development of the rivers, give a smaller amount of development, result in a higher cost of electricity to the present and future users; and

Whereas the entire Northwest area is dependent to a great extent on the furnishing of cheap power to many present and potential manufacturers, as well as the small, independent users of electricity; and

Whereas the past has shown us that the private power interests are more concerned in profit than development, and that they have failed to make the moves necessary to get cheap power to a large number of people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Siletz Valley Grange, No. 558, earnestly urges that every effort be made to see that the orderly and planned development of the Columbia River and its tributaries be carried out for the benefit of all the people, as opposed to a comparative few; and be it further

Resolved, That the full development of this area will be hindered by substituting the low dams for the high one.

This resolution passed by the members of Siletz Valley Grange at the regular meeting, April 4, 1955.

WALTER GAMPEL,
Master.
J. E. BLOOM,
Commissioner.

RESOLUTION 190

Whereas the Central Lincoln People's Utility District has the responsibility of providing electric service to approximately 45,000 people in western Lincoln, Lane, Douglas, and Coos Counties along the Oregon coast; and

Whereas the power demands of the district's service area during the past 10 years have increased more than tenfold and the present demands are expected to triple in the next 10 years; and

Whereas the demands for increased power supplies are general throughout the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the economic development of the Pacific Northwest will inure to the benefit of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the full potential economic development of the District's service area and the Pacific Northwest is dependent upon a continuing, abundant, low-cost power supply; and

Whereas full development of the hydroelectric power potentials of the northwest are a requisite for a continuing adequate power supply in the area; and

Whereas a Federal high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon is essential for full development of the power potentials of the Snake and Columbia Rivers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Central Lincoln People's Utility District, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon, That the district go on record as favoring the construction by the Federal Government of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon as proposed by Senate bill 1333; and be it further

Resolved, That the District's position on Senate bill 1333 be made known to the joint Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Congressional Delegations of the Pacific Northwest States, and other Members of the 84th Congress, 1st session.

Adopted this 29th day of March 1955.

MILLARD MARTIN,
President.

Attest:

JOHN GREENBO,
Secretary.

LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
LOCAL UNION NO. 2785,
The Dalles, Oreg., April 21, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to certify that local No. 2785 of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers of this city as well as those throughout the Northwest heartily endorse the introduction of your Senate bill 1333 for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

We will constantly be with you and your coworkers in your vigilant fight until its construction becomes a reality.

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR V. MEANS,
President.
ELMER J. EDGERTON,
Secretary.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas a proposal to construct a federally financed high dam which would develop the full hydroelectrical potential of the site at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas a high level dam at this site would also provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum of flood control; and

Whereas the public interest would best be served by a high level multipurpose dam and not by a series of low level dams built by private utilities seeking to produce only electricity; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in the United States Senate and Congress by Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719 to accomplish the development of Hells Canyon to the maximum of resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Solano County, Calif., Building and Construction Trades Council endorse Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719; and be it further

Resolved, Copies of the resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators urging their support for a Hells Canyon federally financed high level dam; and be it further

Resolved, Copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

SOLANO COUNTY BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,
LOWELL NELSON.
Business Representative.

Adopted April 18, 1955.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD SHIPWRIGHTS, SHIP JOINERS, AND BOAT BUILDERS, LOCAL UNION, 1184,
Seattle, Wash., April 19, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Shipwrights, Joiners, and Boat Builders, Local 1184, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at their regular meeting on April 15, 1955, unanimously went on record in support of Senate bill 1333, providing for a Federal-built dam at Hells Canyon.

Our membership is fully aware of the necessity of this project, in order that the fullest possible use can be made of the natural resources of the Northwest.

Respectfully,

JOHN B. WIGEN,
Business Representative.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, CARPENTERS LOCAL, NO. 1599,
Redding, Calif.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 proposes to creation of a federally financed high dam which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site. In addition, it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the McKay proposal would turn the site over to a private utility which intends to erect a series of low dams for the production of electricity. These dams would not produce the full hydroelectric potential of the site. The difference in hydroelectric potential of a high dam as compared to a series of low dams would be lost forever and no irrigation for the people below: Therefore be it

Resolved, Carpenters Local Union, 1599, Redding, Calif., goes on record for Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719, and copies of this resolution be sent to our general secretary, Albert Fischer, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 SE. Salmon Street, Portland 14, Oreg.; and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

GLEN HOLLIBAUGH,
President.

L. A. BROWN,
Recording Secretary.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate will, under the order previously entered, stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1955:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1960. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ruben Rodriguez-Antongiorgi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years, vice Harley A. Miller, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal, division No. 2, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years, vice Benjamin B. Mozee, term expired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by me under subsection (b) of section 504, in ranks as follows:

Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Adams, James F., O29968.
Akers, Russell F., Jr., O19243.
Alspaugh, Ralph, O19159.
Armitage, John D., O19014.
Ashworth, Edward T., O19052.
Ayers, Loren A., O18561.
Bailey, William A., O19264.
Bail, William E., O41586.
Bartlett, William G., O19047.
Bastion, Joseph E., Jr., O19162.
Bayne, Robert H., O19[illegible]7.
Beck, Thomas H., O19164.
Beckenbach, Charlie G., O29031.
Bell, James K., O29912.
Bernard, Lyle W., O19195.
Blanchard, Robert M. Jr., O19282.
Blandford, William O., O18990.
Boswell, James O., O19188.
Bowen, Claude L., Jr., O19244.
Boyles, Francis R., O29803.
Bridgewater, F. Clay, O19182.
Brindley, John R., O19087.
Britt, Albert S., Jr., O42237.
Bruno, Angel F., O39632.
Cahill, Edwin M., O19141.
Calhoun, William R., O19256.
Carver, George A., O19122.
Chapman, Ethan A., O19076.
Chapman, George H., Jr., O19064.
Chase, Charles H., O19095.
Chuck, Harry C., O51032.
Clainos, Peter D., O19269.
Clarke, Ernest M., O19183.
Cleveland, John A., Jr., O19136.
Coffin, Edward C., Jr., O51259.
Coleman, Frederick W., 3d, 019216.
Coleman, Hughe D., O39848.
Conway, Theodore J., O19015.
Corum, Dabney R., O19001.
Crawford, Joseph B., O19215.
Cubbison, Donald C., Jr., O19204.
Curren, William F., Jr., O38749.
Cyr, Arthur R., O19119.
Dahlen, Chester A., O19020.
Damon, William F., Jr., O19179.
Daniel, William J., O19019.
Daniels, Leonard P., O29550.
Daniels, Madison A., O51019.
Darnell, Carl, Jr., O19213.
Davidson, William G., Jr., O18862.
Davis, Hawthorne, O51013.
Davis, Hoy D., Jr., O18982.
Decker, Joseph F., O29999.
Degavre, Chester B., O19262.
Doleman, Edgar C., O19131.
Dolph, Cyrus A., 3d, O19170.
Douglas, Robert H., O19212.
Downing, Ellsworth B., O18986.
Downing, Walter A., Jr., O18991.
Due, William F., O19268.
Dunn, Charles G., O18996.
Duvall, Edward, O41921.
Edwards, Morris O., O19041.
Ehlen, Edward S., O19286.
Elder, Frank L., O19203.
Ely, William J., O18974.
Engler, Jean E., O19198.
Essman, Graydon C., O19242.
Evans, Roy T., Jr., O19140.
Evans, Thomas B., O19174.
Ferris, John W., O19097.
Fields, Kenneth E., O18957.
Fleming, William J., O28910.
Fletter, Randolph W., O19148.
Ford, Blair A., O18547.
Frame, Marshall W., O19103.
Franklin, Robert B., O19046.
Freaman, Jay H., O41458.
Frentzel, William Y., O19026.
Fritz, William G., O19069.
Fuqua, Stephen O., Jr., O19109.
Gandia, Amaury M., O19205.
Gee, Samuel E., O19251.
Gibb, Frederick W., O19222.
Gibbs, David P., O19189.
Gilbert, Douglas G., O19202.
Gillon, Paul N., O19048.
Given, William J., O19105.
Gray, David W., O18988.
Green, Duff, Jr., O42239.
Gretser, George R., O19126.
Grimes, Alston, O19252.
Grubbs, William E., O18146.
Hain, Robert W., O19072.
Hall, John R., O51265.
Hallock, Duncan, O18960.
Hanley, James F., O39591.
Harrell, Ben, O19276.
Harris, Benjamin T., O19166.
Harris, William A., O18976.
Harrison, William E., O29991.
Hartel, Frederick O., O19254.
Hazlehurst, Max W., O38723.
Henderson, Morris K., O19230.
Henry, Frank S., O18989.
Herb, Edward G., O18973.
Higgins, Elmer R., O38755.
Honeycutt, John T., O18975.
Hoult, Charles S., O42047.
Humphries, Ferdinand M., O19012.
Huntsberry, Walter A., O19200.
Hurlbut, Oren E., O19077.
Ireland, Thomas R., O51004.
Jensen, Walter A., O19006.
Johnson, Harold K., O19187.
Jones, Beverly DeW., O19081.
Jones, Clyde L., O19074.
Jones, Willie H. H., O39626.
Kaiser, Maurice E., O19165.
Kait, Harry C., O29532.
Kane, Andrew D., O42073.
Kevin, Hugh W., O41583.
Kibler, Edgar H., Jr., O19039.
Klanderman, Russell R., O19099.
Kleitz, Anthony F., O19145.
LaDue, Paul E., O19017.
Landaker, Chester L., O18353.
Lane, John J., O19021.
Lanning, Harley A., O39720.
Lawlor, Robert J., O19036.
Ledbetter, McWesley, O51096.
Leland, Alanson T., O42236.
Leslie, Robert C., O18993.
Letzelter, Cyril J., O19132.
Leydecker, Charles E., O19227.
Lincoln, Lawrence J., O18968.
Lonning, Stanley N., O19281.
Losey, Melvin D., O42235.
Lothrop, Guy C., O18992.
MacArthur, Donald P., O51216.
Macherey, Earl J., O19158.
Maclachlan, Walter L., O50948.
Marquette, William J., O42231.
Maston, Victor E., O19075.
Matheson, John D., O18962.

McCrary, Arthur A., O19037.
McKee, Basye C., O29041.
McMorrow, Francis J., O18995.
McNair, Charles F., O18383.
Merriam, Lauren W., O19002.
Messersmith, Joshua R., O19139.
Meyer, Richard D., O18963.
Meyer, Richard J., O19147.
Middlebrooks, Marvin A., O51440.
Miles, Charles H., Jr., O19151.
Miller, Austin A., O19228.
Miller, Edwin T., O30006.
Millett, Stephen J., O38690.
Minnich, Edgar R., O51197.
Montgomery, Gus H., O29993.
Moore, Leslie S., O51012.
Morrison, Burton O., O41658.
Neely, Robert B., O19114.
Nelson, Russell M., O18674.
Nichols, Wallace J., O30003.
O'Connor, Thomas J., O19125.
Olson, Hardin L., O19110.
O'Malley, Joseph H., O19061.
Otto, Samuel E., O19030.
Park, Richard, Jr., O19080.
Parker, Daniel, O19038.
Parr, Ivan W., Jr., O19255.
Patterson, Charles G., O19073.
Pickett, George E., O42131.
Pittman, Joseph M., O19121.
Plapp, Herbert C., O19059.
Polk, James H., O19028.
Pope, Phillip H., O19115.
Porter, Gwinn U., O19210.
Powell, Charner W., O19284.
Powers, George T., 3d, O19137.
Pritchard, James R., O19248.
Pryor, Ralph H., O29996.
Putnam, William DeM., O29605.
Quinn, William W., O19283.
Raff, Edson D., O19261.
Ratcliffe, Lamar C., O19034.
Remus, Joseph A., O19275.
Reynolds, Royal, Jr., O19238.
Risden, Richard A., O19278.
Ritchie, Walter P., O41646.
Robblee, Paul A., O42198.
Roberson, Gerald L., O19161.
Rogers, Henry H., O29992.
Rothwell, Franklin G., O19176.
Ruggaber, John C., O28943.
Russ, Sam W., O41555.
Ryan, William F., O19142.
Sassé, Francis M., O29807.
Sax, Samuel E., O51267.
Schmelz, Russell W., O29353.
Schull, Edson, O19236.
Scovill, John N., O19267.
Shakel, William C., O39612.
Sharove, Joseph, O42021.
Shepardson, Frank H., O19068.
Shinkle, John G., O18979.
Sibley, Alden K., O18964.
Simkus, Clyde C., O50998.
Skinner, Edwin C., O50985.
Skinner, Ernest B., O39710.
Skinner, James H., O19144.
Smith, Franklin G., O19154.
Smith, Kimball C., O29882.
Solomon, Maddrey A., O19194.
Sparrow, Herbert G., O19003.
Speiser, Robin G., O19104.
St. John, Ralph P., O39706.
Starbird, Alfred D., O18961.
Stephenson, Andrew D., O19201.
Stilwell, Joseph W., Jr., O19117.
Sweeting, Harry W., Jr., O19168.
Tague, Marcus O19090.
Talbot, Ralph, O19226.
Thompson, Robert P., O19098.
Thorlin, John F., O19067.
Trent, Joseph F., O17319.
Tripp, Robert C., O18972.
Tubbs, Harry S., O19056.
Turner, Robert A., O18987.
Tyson, Arthur W., O19120.
Urquhart, Henry C., O39754.
Van Way, George L., O19093.
Versace, Humbert J., O19152.
Wagstaff, David, Jr., O19246.
Wallace, Neil M., O19101.
Walters, Paul R., O19050.
Welling, Alvin C., O18983.
Wetherbie, Harold B., O41823.
Whelihan, William P., O19102.
Whipple, Sherburne Jr. O19130.
White, George W., O19079.
White, Hiram B., O14849.
Wick, Thomas H., O41689.
Wilkin, John L., O39847.
Willette, George, O17289.
Woestenburg, John M., O30004.
Wood, Julian C., O41651.
Zeller, Frank J., O19043.
Zierath, Frederick R., O19211.

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Betzold, Curtis W., O19641.
Wilson, Neil O., O29256.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Aabel, Bernard, O29239.
Barrick, Carrol C., O19330.
Blair, Edgar A., O56803.
Blake, Allen J., O29229.
Cooper, Eugene G., O19614.
Daman, Eli E., O19703.
Hill, Guy C., O29272.
Huff, Rufus D., O29311.
Layer, Harland W., O19643.
Mackin, James H., O29300.
Marchek, Carlyle S., O29290.
Maxwell, Roy D., O29265.
Paige, Ralph E., O31023.
Partin, Everett W., O19699.
Prince, Carl M., O29288.
Sheen, Ernest T., O29268.
Thompson, Dale LeB., O39668.
Weidenkopf, Stanley J., O41771.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified:

To be captain

Hollander, Bennet N., O50693.

To be first lieutenant

Sneeden, Emory M., O68170.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captain

Metcalf, Edward A., III, JAGC, O518681.

To be first lieutenants

Clinton, Everett E., DC, O2270453.
Doyle, Rita F., ANC, N753510.
Horner, James M., MSC, O2044519.
Liberty, Frances M., ANC, N799517.
Malewicz, Wanda, ANC, N752347.
McFarland, Paul H., Jr., DC, O1892073.
Young, Mary G., ANC, N901282.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Burt, Howard, O4024934.
Douglas, William F., O4024555.
Grace, Louis B., O4038147.
Holland, Charles R., O4038155.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hughes, Charles M., O1885621.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hoover, Jerry L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Early, Ralph T.
Golden, Bruce E.
Heinz, Robert F., Jr.
Pia, Louis L., O4028508
Van Straten, James G.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abel, Billy J.
Ackiss, Ernest L., Jr.
Adams, Gilbert S.
Anderson, James J.
Andre, Peter C.
Barber, Richard L.
Basten, Lawrence E.
Bate, Milford C.
Benoski, Joseph, Jr.
Bilyeu, Rolland R.
Blackburn, Paul L.
Boop, Dean A., Jr.
Brutscher, Baldwin L.
Burke, Roderick L.
Bush, Robert C.
Bussey, Charles D.
Butterfield, Dennis O.
Byrne, Edwin J.
Byrnes, Graham F.
Cluxton, Donald E., Jr.
Colleoni, Richard F.
Combs, John W.
Cook, John J., Jr.
Cooley, John R.
Cooper, Cortez A., Jr.
Dahl, Winston A.
Dahmen, Glen W.
Dambrauskas, Vincent
Dankers, William H.
Day, Edward A., Jr.
Dekle, Thomas A.
DeLeo, John B., Jr.
Dorman, James L.
Doyle, William E.
Durkin, Michael J.
Ebbeler, Jack H.
Ferguson, Charles H.
Fladager, Dean A.
Gable, John P.
Gallier, Gary L.
Gilliam, John J.
Goldsberry, Verne W.
Gunter, Gurnie C.
Haar, Franklin R.
Harl, Neil E.
Harris, William I.
Herzog, David E.
Hill, James R.
Hodgson, William E., Jr.
Hoeft, Herbert E.
Hope, Fred H.
Howard, William C.
Hubbard, Charles J.
Hughes, Douglas A.
Huskey, James E.
Jimenez, Adam
Joachimi, Ned A.
Jones, Royce E.
Kaufman, Gerald G.
Kingsbury, Dave R.
Kinnison, Jimmie G.
Korywchak, Frank
Krane, Robert A.
Lamons, Robert E.
Lawson, Warren G.
Londo, Richard J.
Lozar, Alfred J.
Lutz, Joseph C.
Lynch, David F.
Manna, Paul E.
Manning, Robert L.
Marlow, James W.
Marsh, Lemuel E., III
McDonald, Donald F.
McDonald, Thomas F.
McElrath, William T.
McGowan, Garrett E.
McMaster, Ronald R.
McNall, Jack G.
Medley, George W.
Meeker, Don E.
Meissner, Roger F.
Miller, Edward M.
Miller, Louis G.
Miller, Robert A.
Mitchell, James L., Jr.
Morton, Bryan D.
Murphy, Jerry C.
Neal, Jerome B.
Neal, William R., Jr
Openshaw, James A., Jr.
Orr, James M.
Osborne, Walton H., III
Ottinger, Joseph B.
Parker, Eugene W.
Payne, Robert W.
Perry, Earl E.
Pfaff, Robert A.
Pierce, John A.
Piper, Arthur D.
Plugge, Donald W.
Ragan, Robert M.
Ramsey, Roger R.
Raymer, David L.
Redd, Gail R.
Riordan, William T.
Robinson, Bobby L.
Rogero, Ralph S., II
Roster, Nicholas J.
Sage, Robert S.
Scanga, Robert P.
Scott, Douglas W.
Shippers, Ernon L., O4017511.
Smith, Robert G.
Staley, Richard D.
Stevens, Charles T.
Stewart, Charles E., III
Thompson, Douglas F.
Thompson, Frederick A., O4026931.
Ulcak, Ben J.
Underwood, John R.
Van Giesen, Robert E.
Vergot, William D.
Wiggins, Brook C.
Williams, Bruce H.
Wilson, James F.
Yates, Samuel M.
Zenk, Daniel R.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1955, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Donald Arthur Andrews
Billy Adair Arthur
Eugene Richard Auer
Thomas Joseph Auger
William Andrews Auxp
James Edward Barker
Gilbert Rodney Batchman
Vane Quentin Bates, Jr.
Paul Bazilwich, Jr.
Richard James Bean
Richard Douglas Becker
James Patrick Bergen
Ted Eugene Bishop
Ira Woodruff Black, Jr.
Norman Gene Blahuta
Philip Taylor Blanton
Charles Fred Bliss, 3d
Peter Demetrios Booras
Royal Charles Bosshard
William Perry Boyd
James Radcliffe Brokenshire, Jr.
Thomas John Brooks
John Mitchell Brown
Robert Bruce Brown
William Wiley Brown
Karl Avrum Brunstein
Donald Montgomery Buchwald
Alva Bartlett Bundren, Jr.
George Anthony Burkhart, Jr.
William Sylvester Burrus
Ronald Lee Cairns
John Nicholas Calley
Robert Elder Camp
Jack Preston Campbell
Walter Earl Campbell
Richard George Cardillo
Robert Dollar Carpenter
Francis Eugene Ceglowski
William Hanlon Chambers
Billy Junior Chance.
Robert Bruce Chapman
Richard Sales Cheesborough
Gerald George Chikalla
Alfred Anthony Cini
John Bell Clayton, 3d
Alton Hugh Coleman
James Allen Cooper
Lionel Robert Coyle
John William Crancer
Loomis Leslie Crandall
Thomas Tingey Craven
Alden Rudyard Crawford, Jr.
William Totton Cummings
Robert Joseph Cummins
James Theopold Darrah, Jr.
Raymond Edwin Dax
Clarence Albert DeLong
Edgar Ernest DeMaris
Robert Everett Deardorff, Jr.
Jerry Linwood Denman
James Anthony Devereaux
Daniel Wayne Dienst
Richard Wayne Dinwiddie
Kenneth Anthony Dion
Robert Ingomar Doerr, Jr.
Charles Robert Domeck
Neil Louis Dorward
John Paul Doyle, Jr.
James Everman Drummond
John Edward Dryer
Daniel Carlisle Dugan
George Arden Dulk
Roy Saulsbury Dunaway, Jr
Watha James Eddins, Jr.
William Henry Edwards, Jr.
Philip Harrison Enslow, Jr.
Lee Earl Erminger
John Sebree Farrington
John Autrey Feagin, Jr.
Paul Fetko
Peter Nick Fikaris
Herbert Charles Finger
David Dewees Finley
James Elmer Fiscus
James Elliott Fleeger
Norwood Wall Fleming
Arthur Gordon Follett
Richard Alfred Fontaine
Clifford Joseph Fralen
Joseph Powel Franklin
Wallace Greene Franklin, Jr.
Harold Dean Frear
Sheldon Jonathan Freed
Jack Wilson Frost
John Owen Funkhouser
Elisha Lloyd Gallup, Jr.
Harvey Arlen Garn
Forrest Theodore Gay, 3d
Charles Richard Gersitz
John Harry James Giddings
David Drew Gilpatrick
Kenneth Edward Ginter
Jack Goldstein
Richard Neil Gottron
Todd Porter Graham
William Alexander Graham, Jr.
Donald Haines Gransback
Richard Herbert Gray
Frank Upton Greer, 3d
James William Grey
John Charles Griggs
Edward Fox Grubbs, Jr.
Raymond Eric Gunderson
Edward Richey Guthrie
William Edward Haas
William McKell Hadly
Jerome Francis Hagan
Zach Hagedorn, Jr.
John Mark Hamilton, Jr.
Richard Lee Hargrove
Robert Wilson Hasbrouck, Jr
Richard Thurber Hawkins
Moody Echol Hayes
Ralph La Verne Henry
Robert Barrett Henry
Leo Anthony Hergenroeder.
Thomas Wade Herren, Jr.
Donald Constantine Hilbert
Robert Marble Hinrichs
Harold Richard Hoeferkamp
Willard Ames Holbrook
Thomas George Horst
David August Hufnagel
John Plympton Stuart Humphrey
Kenneth Kiyoshi Ikeda
Don Isbell
Robert Arthur Jackson
Paul James Jeffries
Cecil Donald Jellison
John Randolph Jeter, Jr.
Charles Rodney Johnson
Fredrick Graham Johnson
Richard Damon Johnson
Robert Peter Johnson
Stanley Morgan Johnson
Clifford Jones, Jr.
Warren Alexander Jones
Robert Emmett Joseph, Jr.
Irvin George Katenbrink, Jr.
James Hanlin Kinzer, Jr.
Robert Lee LaFrenz
Walter Howard Landers
Kaye Don Lathrop
Paul Thomas Lenio
Gerald Lewis
Theodore Joseph Livesay
Dean Albert Longbottom
John Philip Lovell
Samuel Newlon Lowry, Jr.
William Ernest Lozier
William Campbell Lucas, Jr.
Daniel Dean Ludwig
Bruce Stratton MacDonald
Alexander Ronald Macdonald
Daniel Karl Malone
Rudolph Sargus Malooley
John Ells Martling
Sidney Echols Mason
Clyde Massey, Jr.
John Rhodes Matteson
Stephen Anthony Matuszak
David Franklin Maurer
William Clifford Maus, Jr.
William Stephen May
Preston Brooks Mayson, Jr.
Thomas Weller McCarthy
Robert Rugh McClelland
John Cardinal McCloskey
J. Gordon McCormack
William Lewis McCulla, Jr.
Thomas Patrick McGrevey
Martin Cyril McGuire
Wilmer Lee McIlroy, Jr.
James Albert McIntosh
Leon Ellington McKinney
Carl Herbert McNair, Jr.
Martin Lewis McNamee
David Allen McNerney
Malcolm Vernon Meekison
Henry Watts Meetze
Edward Allen Mendell
Christopher Jesse Miller, Jr.
James Richard Miller
James Richey Conklin Miller
John Walton Miller
Cecil Myron Minich
Dan Moses
Thomas Lawrence Mullan, Jr.
Arthur Edward Muller, Jr.
Gary William Munroe
James Francis Murphy 3d
John Allen Myers
James Wyly Napier 3d
Gordon Raynor Negaard
Robert Winthrop Newton
Sterling Ramsdell Nichols, Jr.
Edward Wesley Nidever
Miguel Nieves, Jr.
William Dale Norvell
Robert Hugh Nourse
Francis Edmund O'Brien
Lee Donne Olvey
Godwin Ordway 3d
Louis Vernon Pace
George Wilson Page
Alton Brooks Parker, Jr.
Paul Francis Parks
William Trest Parks
Russell Levi Parsons
John Franklin Passaflume
Theodore Brooks Patterson
David Wilson Patton
John Cruickshank Pearson
David Lee Pemberton
Rex Van Noy Perkins
William Grayson Peters
Joseph David Pettet
James Julian Pirtle, Jr.
David Wayne Polly
Chester Hilton Pond
Donald Carruthers Poorman
John Henry Pratt
Thomas Allen Price
Hugh Quinn 3d
Rawleigh Hazen Ralls 3d
Allen Dwight Raymond 3d
Donald Emerson Reid
Benjamin Douglas Roberts
Frank Jay Robertson
Willard Luther Robinson
John Vincent Rock, Jr.
John Edward Rudzki, Jr.
Don Philip Rundle
James Herbert Ryan
Walter Joseph Ryan
Henry Lee Sanderson
Franz Peter Schauer
Madison Clinton Schepps, Jr.
John Lawrence Schick
Frank Joseph Schlotter
Robert Curtis Harkin Schmidt
Horace Schow, Jr.
Charles Allen Schuh
John Garnett Senger
Robert Lee Shaffer
Raymond Lowell Shideler
Richard Dean Shimunek
William Frederick Sietman, Jr.
Joseph John Skaff
John Francis Sloan
Donald Eugene Smith
Norman Maynard Smith

Wayne Richard Smith
Paul Richard Smor
Robert Louis Soper, Jr.
Norman Wayne Sparks
Alfred Joseph Spaulding
John Gill Spellman
Leo Robert St. Amour, Jr.
Robert Forrest Stanley
James Walter Staudaher
John Wiley Steakley
Charles Augustus Steinman
Richard Anthony Stemle
Wynne Bennett Stern, Jr.
Charles Hiram Stevens III
Michael Andrew Stevenson
Lawrence Edward Stockett
Howard Francis Stone
Robert Anthony Strati
William Bernard Streett, Jr.
James Ralston Strickland
John Howard Strom
Richard Bradley Struss
Paul James Sullivan, Jr.
Stanley Richard Sydenham
Charles Horace Symonds 2d
Louis T. Tebodo
Billy Montgomery Tennant
William Arthur Terrio
Joseph Norman Thomer
Theodore Eugene Thompson
James Edward Torrence
James Irving Town
Richard Morton Traut
Jack Durward Trawick
Edward Lee Trobaugh
Frank Daniel Troyan
Jon Conrad Vand'n Bosch
Harold John Vandersea
Joseph Fraser Vincent
John Alvin Viney
Roderic Bemis Vitty
Edmund Vulgas
Frank George Walton
Leo Vincent Warner, Jr.
Rodney Lee Waterstrat
Gilbert John Weden
Macon Wesson Wells
William Lloyd Welter, Jr.
Robert Charles Werner
Thomas Cato West
Robert Loyd Wheaton
David Eastwood Wheeler
Howard Clayton Whittaker
Robert Dudley Wiegand
Bruce Abbott Wilburn
William Howard Wilcox
William Carl Wildermuth
John Raymond Wing
William Mervin Wix
Frederick Frank Woerner, Jr.
Graham Wayne Wood
Harry Milton York
David Crawford Young, 2d
Edward John Zaborowski

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William K. Phillips, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commandant, National War College.

Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Paul L. Abernethy, Jr.
Jackie D. Adams
John W. Ailes IV
Donald M. Alderson, Jr.
Thomas L. Aldrich
Donald A. Alecxih
Howard W. Alexander
John C. Allen
Erns M. Anderson
Ray "J" Anderson
Alexander B. Aronis
Glenn N. Arthur, Jr.
James P. Ashford
George T. Atkins, Jr.
Donald J. Aven
William A. Bair
Winfield S. Baird, Jr.
Laurence C. Baldauf, Jr.
James T. Baldwin
John A. Baldwin, Jr.
Charles W. Ballew
Robert MacQ. Ballinger
John M. Bannon
James M. Barrett
Paul D. Batdorf
Glenn D. Bates
Leroy R. Bechelmayr
Joseph E. Bennett
Thomas P. Bennington
Roger G. Betsworth
Herbert K. Biegel
Michael E. Bishop
Gregory D. Black
Robert D. Blaine
Peter S. Blair
James R. Blandford
Russell M. Blythe
John R. Boardman
Edmund B. Bossart, Jr.
Francis T. Boucher
Luke S. Boudreaux III
Donall G. Bourke
Barry V. Bowen
Robert L. Boyd
Leonard A. Bracken, Jr.
John L. Brainerd
Carl T. Braun
Donald R. Briggs
Edward H. Browder
Thomas N. Brown
Victor A. Brown
James H. Brownlow
Harvey W. Burden
Frederick D. Butterfield
Patrick S. Byrne
Anthony C. Cajka
Rex S. Caldwell, Jr.
John R. Camp
Harry F. Campbell, Jr.
Thomas P. Cann
Elisha B. Caraway, Jr.
Verner R. Carlson
James McL. Carr, Jr.
Powell F. Carter, Jr.
Francis L. Castillo
David W. Caswell
Ralph N. Channell
Warren P. Chase
Walter B. Christmas
Angelo G. Cicolani
Carl C. Clement, Jr.
David W. Cockfield
Jonathan S. Coe
Roger L. Coffey
George O. Compton
Richard I. Comstock
Robert L. Conlan
David J. Conley
Walsh J. Conmy
Donald L. Conner
Samuel S. Conoly, Jr.
Robert F. Constans
James McN. Conway
Thomas H. Copeman, Jr.
Dale F. Crosier
Dennis E. Curtis
Gerald T. Dantzler
George W. Davis, Jr.
Thomas A. E. Davis
Albert L. Dawson
Charles R. Dedrickson
Russell C. De Esch
James L. DeGroff
George B. DeLano
Joseph C. DeLashmitt, Jr.
Lawrence S. Del Plato
Daniel C. Dennison
Rodericks S. Dickens, Jr.
Richard H. Dimse
Anthony J. Dopazo
John B. Draves
Edward M. Dower
Loring P. Dresel
Leonard G. Duffy
Joseph J. Dunn
David A. Durgin
Montague R. Duval
James P. Eadie II
Joseph M. Earley, Jr.
Richard D. Echard
Donald E. Eckels
Charles T. Edson
William Elias, Jr.
Robert E. Emery
Thomas R. M. Emery
Robert J. Englert
Billy M. Ervin
Francis J. Farino
Paul W. Fiedler
Harold C. Filbert
Myles E. Fladager
Walter R. Flowers
Edward R. Floyd
Harvey D. Foley
John J. Foran
William R. Forbes
Barton W. Fordham, Jr.
Joseph A. Forest
Robert R. Fountain, Jr.
Henry A. French
S. Pendleton Fullinwider, Jr.
Richard K. Gaines, Jr.
John W. Gallagher
Robert J. Galvin
Clark M. Gammell
John R. Ganey
Geoffrey L. Gardner
Joseph A. Gattuso
Leroy F. Gayle
Charles F. Gerhan, Jr.
Richard L. Gero
Richard B. Gilchrist
Gerald W. Gilstad
Quentin L. Glass
Charles L. Gooding, Jr.
Guy A. B. Grafius
Walter W. Graham III
Edwin H. Grant, Jr.
Jack A. Garrow
Clifford R. Graue
George W. Greene, Jr.
James F. Greene, Jr.
William T. Greenhalgh, Jr.
James M. Grego
James L. Griffin
Laurence H. Grimes, Jr.
Paul B. Grozen
Harold B. Grutchfield, Jr.
Sherred L. Guille
Gordon R. Guimond
James C. Gussett
Charles "R" Hagee
John D. Hague
David G. Hamilton
Frank P. Hamilton
Robert B. Hamilton
Lawrence V. Hansen, Jr.
"J" "E" Harmon
Lee D. Harmony, Jr.
Norman W. Harper
John V. Harter
Neil L. Harvey
Anthony A. Hastoglis
John B. Haynes
Donald C. Heckman
Lawrence L. Heisel
Raymond R. Henderson
Robert W. Hepworth
Kenneth L. Highfill
Raymond W. Hine
Robert M. Hinton
Paul M. Hoff, Jr.
William J. Holland, Jr.
Hartley O. Holte
John J. Hootman
Richard McB. Hughes
Richard L. Hunt
Tom G. Hussmann
Theodore K. Hyman
Robert P. Irons, Jr.
Thomas E. Irvine
Jimmie D. Jackson
Joe T. Jackson, Jr.
Aaron B. Jacobs
Edward F. Jardine, Jr.
Johns P. Jaudon
Paul O. Jessen
George L. Johnson
Lauren A. Johnson
Raymond F. Johnson, Jr.
Roger D. Johnson
Gerald L. Jones
Richard M. Jones
Douglas S. Jordan
Robert G. Judd
Kenneth I. Jurgensen
Donald S. Kaiser
Alfred W. Kavanaugh
Leo P. Keating, Jr.
Delbert V. Keener
Donald W. Kellerman
James P. Kelly, Jr.
William A. Kennington
Thomas G. Kiefaber
Edward A. Kingston
Donald E. Knepper
Frederick H. Koester, Jr.
Demosthenes N. Kolaras
Stanley D. Kolb, Jr.
Jerold D. Kowalsky
Albert J. Kozischek
Joseph J. Kronzer, Jr.
Ronald C. Kucera
William P. Kuhne
Stanley J. Kuplinski
Walter W. Lamb
William F. Lavallee
George E. Lawniczak, Jr.
Samuel W. Layn
Donald H. Lilienthal
John E. Lilly, Jr.
Donald B. Linehan
Charles W. Litzenberg
John F. Long
Stephen D. Lowe
Edward W. Lull
Randall M. Luzader
Allen B. MacDiarmid
Richard N. Mack
Joseph D. Mackenzie
Malcolm MacKinnon III
Joseph Malec, Jr.
Paul R. Manikowski
William H. J. Manthorpe, Jr.
Donald Martin
Donald L. Martin
George H. Martin
George W. Martin
Charles E. Masalin
Walter L. Matthes, Jr.
Mitchell D. Matthews, Jr.
Kenneth R. McCally
William E. McCarron, Jr.
William F. McCauley
Douglas R. McCrimmon
John R. McDonnell
William E. McGinnis
Donal E. McGonegal
Edward B. McHale
Alban T. McIsaac
Alfred S. McLaren
John S. McLaughlin
George J. McMurtry
John E. McNish
Robert T. Meloy
Robert S. Merritt
Edward L. Micjan
Richard J. Mieldazis
Robert M. Mielich
Justin A. Miller, Jr.
Robert N. Miller
Ronald D. Miller
Eric Milnor
Matt C. Mlekush
Thomas H. Moore
William H. Moore IV
John R. Morgan
Burton L. Munger
John J. Murphy
Henry C. Mustin
Robert U. Myers
Richard T. Nelson
Roger E. Nelson, Jr.
Edward C. Newbegin
Robert G. Newbegin IV
Byron B. Newell, Jr.
Charles L. Newman
Henry C. North, Jr.
Keith A. Nyhus
John W. Nyquist
Carl E. Oates
Charles M. O'Brien, Jr.
James M. O'Hara
Philip Oliver, Jr.
Walter E. Olsen
Gary E. Olson
Ross S. Olson
Edward G. Otrupchak
William R. Overdorff
Elton C. Parker, Jr.
John T. Parker, Jr.
Joel D. Patterson
Roy C. Paul
Daniel E. Peckham
Edward M. Peebles
Joseph F. Perez
Fred C. Peterson
Richard A. Peterson
John T. Pierce
Robert B. Pirie, Jr.
Charles M. Plumly
Robert D. Poland
Robert K. Pollak
Thomas B. Potter, Jr.
John H. Powell
William L. Pray
William N. Pugliese
David A. Reedy
Philip M. Reitzel
John W. Renard
William O. K. Rentz
David B. Reynolds
Preston A. Reynolds
William K. Rhodes, Jr.
Keith J. Rice
Robert C. Rice
Hallem B. Rich
John R. Richards
Myron V. Ricketts
James P. Riviere
John W. Roberts
Joel A. Robinson
Robert M. Robinson
Francis C. Rose, Jr.
James C. Rothrock
Kirk W. Rowe
Robert R. Rule
Philip H. Ryan, Jr.
Marvin L. Salomon
Carl H. Sanders, Jr.
Thomas E. Sandmeyer
George S. Sanstol
Wesley L. Saunders, Jr.
Wesley W. Saunders
John F. Schilpp
Frederick B. Schoenberger
Harry C. Schrader, Jr.
Thomas D. Schultz
Walter H. Schulze II
MacGregor G. Scott
Donald C. Shelton
Rolf A. Shepard
Robert E. Sherwood
Dan G. Shields
Thomas Shine, Jr.
Winfield M. Sides, Jr.
Stanley S. Skorupski, Jr.
Marshall T. Slayton
Charles R. Smith
Dickinson M. Smith

Edward G. Smith
John W. Smith
Lewis D. Smith
Robert L. Smith
William D. Smith
Winchester "C" Smith, Jr.
James R. Snow
Gary L. Snyder
Harry E. Spence
Thomas F. Stallman
Paul R. Steffenhagen
David M. Stembel, Jr.
Gordon LeR. Stephens
James R. Stevens
William Stevens
Charles R. Stewart
John E. Stewart
Walter J. Stewart III
Francis G. Stokes
George W. Stott, Jr.
Carl C. Strange, Jr.
John B. Streit
Charles J. Stuart, Jr.
Donald B. Stuart
Harley L. Stuntz III
Donald L. Sturtz
Dennis J. Sullivan, Jr.
Paul E. Sutherland, Jr.
Charles T. Sylvester
William G. A. Sympson, Jr.
John M. Tallman
Charles A. Tarver, Jr.
Carl H. Taylor, Jr.
Patterson C. Taylor
William J. Thearle
John R. Thune
Frederick W. Tindall
Donald G. Todaro
James F. Todd
Robert E. Tollaksen
Albert L. Toney, Jr.
Ernest J. Toupin, Jr.
William K. Tracy
George Tsantes, Jr.
Edmund L. Turner
Lee R. Turner, Jr.
Simon J. Ulcickas, Jr.
Fred S. Underwood
George H. Volk
Seaborn H. Wade, Jr.
Denis E. Waitley
William A. Walden
Eugene R. Walker
Homer N. Wallin, Jr.
Donald W. Walter
Joseph J. Walter
Edward A. Wardwell
Larry E. Ware
Frank B. Warren
Richard P. Warrick
Jerome F. Watson
Raymond A. Ways
John C. Weaver
Hugh L. Webster
Raymond L. Wehrmeister
Robert J. Westberg
Darrel E. Westbrook, Jr.
Bernard A. White
Lawrence S. Wigley
John E. Wild
John E. Wildman
Edward A. Wilkinson, Jr.
Charles H. Will, Jr.
Percy W. Williams, Jr.
John P. Williamson, Jr.
James L. Willis, Jr.
Derek W. Wilson
Gordon B. Wilson
John R. Wilson, Jr.
Carroll H. J. Wittner
Douglas A. Worth
Eric R. A. Woxvold
John M. Yuscavage
Charles J. Zadarozny
Otto A. Zipf
Emil J. Zseleczky

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Elif A. Andersen
Robert A. Barbary
Jack R. Bedenbaugh
Arthur G. Bedford
John A. Begley, Jr.
Arthur F. Braun
Edgar S. Causbie
Davis L. Clark
William G. Collier
Robert W. Davis
Richard W. Ellis
Paul S. Farans
John J. Flynn, Jr.
Laurence W. Frost
Robert F. Gallagher
Richard C. Hensler
James R. Holder
Samuel Jacobson
William E. Jerauld
John M. Jones, Jr.
Richard T. Knock
Donald A. Lovelace
Richard B. McLaughlin
Billy G. McSwain
Ray A. Mara
George W. Mead III
Arthur J. Mehrens, Jr.
Douglas M. Michelsen
David O. Miller
James R. O'Neil
Earl H. Pace
Richard H. Ribbe
Leonard P. Rittenberg
Richard A. Ruth IV.
Stephen R. Ruth
Robert D. Ryder
Carl Shumaker
Casimir E. Sojka
Willard G. Steadman III
Donald G. Straw
James W. Sweeney
Clarence J. Thurston
William E. Turcotte
Carl P. Vogel, Jr.
Robert B. Vollum

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy:

Hyneman M. Andress
Walton J. Grinke
Robert P. Phenix
Stephen W. Reszetar
Ernest H. Smith
Thomas N. Tate

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

John B. Acey
John A. Adams
Joseph E. Armstrong
William R. Ball
Allen W. Brown, Jr.
James J. Chmelik
Richard J. Cisewski
Josiah W. Collins
James G. Cowart, Jr.
John R. Curnutt
John W. DeWitt
David J. Dunn
Cecil A. Edwards, Jr.
Franklin P. Eller, Jr.
Robert L. Fischer
Wilfred S. Fisher
Bobby H. Freeman
Bobby F. Goins
John C. Gonzalez
John T. Gray
Wallace M. Greene III
Billy M. Grimes
Joseph T. Hawkins
Charles A. Henry
John H. Honse III
Michael D. Kandra
John I. Kelly
Donald J. Lange
Thomas J. Lapham
Robert A. LeBrun
Richard G. Little
Bill G. Lowrey
Robert A. Lynch
Carlos K. McAfee
Peter R. Maitland
James E. Masters
Donald R. Miller
John P. Monahan
John A. Morra
John B. Morris
Arthur H. Nussel
Edward R. Perron
James M. Perryman, Jr.
Robert O. Price
Robert E. Rodecker
Roger F. Scott, Jr.
Paul D. Slack
William P. Slattery
Robert D. Stuckey
Frederic LeR. Tolleson
John G. Toner
John T. Tyler
Alfred L. Vail
Calvin G. Weaver
Robert K. Wier
Eric H. Wieler

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold G. Adams
James L. Adams
John L. Adams
Winthrop R. Adkins
William M. Ahlenius
Herbert W. Ahrens, Jr.
Charles P. Ake
Dean C. Allard, Jr.
Neal M. Allen
Bruce T. Alligood, Jr.
Richard R. Allison
Thomas L. Allison, Jr.
Kent S. Allworth
Frederick J. Almgren, Jr.
Harris J. Amhowitz
George Anagnostos
Jon T. Anderson
Paul R. Anderson
Samuel A. Anderson III
George S. Ansell
Charles Antonacos
David W. Armstrong
George R. Armstrong
Donald M. Arveson
Robert H. Aslakson
George P. Atkins
Charles W. Austin
John H. Ayres
Hunter E. Babin
Allen L. Bader
Bruce A. Bailey
John P. Bailey, Jr.
Charles C. Baker
Jon A. Baker
Robert A. Baker
George K. Baldry
Geoffrey H. Ball
Stanley M. Ball
Robert D. Banz
Richard H. Barbe
Gale D. Barbee
James A. Barber, Jr.
Robert F. Bardwell
Charles B. Barfoot
Theodore W. Barger
Karl L. Barkley
Howard W. Barnes
Walter A. Barr
James J. Barrett
Fred H. Barrows III
Marion D. Bartlett
Wayne R. Bartley
Robert D. Bascom
Phillip D. Batton
John R. Batzler
James R. Bauder
John W. Bauerle
Erich E. Baumgartner
Norman T. Beal
Richard N. Bechtel
William H. Becker
Thomas S. Beeler
Charles E. Bell, Jr.
William R. Bell
Frank Belvin
Richard G. Bemis
John E. Bendel
Raymond "D" Bennett
John C. Bergquist
Thomas A. Bickerstaff, Jr.
Donald J. Bilinski
Robert O. Binkley
Edward E. Birkinshaw, Jr.
Robert W. Bjorndahl
Shem K. Blackley, Jr.
James S. Blaising
David D. Blanchard
Alan A. Blatz
John A. Blesch
Gene E. Bloch
Donald W. Blount
Herbert L. Boatwright III
Gill H. Boehringer
Archie M. Bolster
Russell L. Bolton
John J. Bonasia
Homer E. Bonds, Jr.
Edwin J. Bonner
William W. Bonneville
Philip E. Bonz
Joseph Bordogna
David L. Boslaugh
William LeG. Boss, Jr.
George T. Bostic, Jr.
Kirk L. Bosworth
Bruce E. Bothwell
Frederick R. Bott
Byron F. Boudreaux
Norman M. Bouton
Harry S. Boyd
Robert W. Boyd
James R. Bradish
Bedford C. Bradley
Jerald S. Bradshaw
Walter F. Brady, Jr.
Carl F. Bratton, Jr.
John C. Bray, Jr.
Stephen K. Breslauer
David G. Briggs
George W. Brockman III
Richard H. Brodeur
Charles J. Brown
Delbert L. Brown
Glenn C. Brown
James G. Brown
William H. Browning III
Merle W. Brubaker
Philip N. Buchanan
Theodore C. Buckshaw III
Robert C. Bueker
Donald D. Bunker
Robert B. Bunn
William J. Burch
Raymond F. Burke
Richard D. Burke
Donald J. Burkhart
John E. Burroughs
David G. Burton
Donal W. Butterfield
Robert D. Buzzard, Jr.
John C. W. Cadoo, Jr.
John E. Cahoon, Jr.
Walter K. Caldwell
John H. Calhoun, Jr.
Edward F. Cambridge
Jim F. Cameron
Charles N. Campbell
William S. Campbell
John M. Cantey
Oscar B. Carlisle
John W. Carlson
Leland J. Carlson
Frank C. Carlton
Frederick L. Carothers
Donovan V. Carr
Patrick F. Carr
Thomas U. Carr
Robert E. Carter
James F. Cartwright
David C. Carvey
Alan F. Casey
George E. Casey
John A. Casey
William K. Catching, Jr.
Allen W. Cater
Francis Catterson
Raymond L. Chalker
Dan D. Chandler
Edward A. Chapman, Jr.
Albert K. Chevalier
William S. Chilton
Howard E. Christensen
Jack P. Christopher
Fred M. Clark
William C. Clause, Jr.
Gene L. Cliff
James G. Cline
Emsley F. Cobb
Stanley H. Cochran
Michael B. Coffey
Jackson Coffin
Rulon F. Collett
Neuland C. Collier
Charles C. Collins, Jr.
Marcellus T. Coltharp
Kenneth E. Conn
Thomas P. Connally
John J. Connors
Robert A. Conquest
David R. Conrad
Stephen N. Cook
Lynton B. Cooper, Jr.
Don E. Corn
Paul A. Cornett
John J. Costello
James C. Cotting
Robert G. Courter
Donald E. Crabill
Robert C. Craig
Richard W. Crain, Jr.
Tom J. Cress
Jack LaV. Crittenden
Richard L. Croll
Wayne R. Crone
Billy D. Crouch
Alexander S. Cuenin III
Daniel M. Culhane
William A. Culpepper
Edward I. Cunningham
Raymond M. Currie
Charles E. Daley
John D'Aloia, Jr.
John L. Dampman
Jere R. Daniell II
Alan O. Dann
Rodger L. Darbonne
Ronald Darby
Carl F. Davis, Jr.
Charles N. Davis
Frederick G. Davis
Gregory H. Davis, Jr.
James C. Davis, Jr.
Richard H. Davis
Stanley R. Davis
James P. Day
John J. Deady
Marvin E. Deck, Jr.
Severin A. DeDeyn
William A. Deshler
Harry L. Devoe, Jr.
William L. Devries
Carl C. Dietz
Warren C. Dietz
Dan J. DiGiovacchino
Max W. Dixon
Sidney C. Dixon
Jeremy H. Dole
Bruce K. Donaldson
Henry S. Donaldson
James M. Doody, Jr.
Gerald P. Dougherty
John Downes, Jr.
"J" Patrick Doyle
Richard H. Dudley
John P. Duffy
George P. Dunigan
Theodore F. Dutko
George L. Dyer, Jr.
Walter O. Edberg
James V. Edelmon
Thomas H. Edgerton
Henry F. Edwards
Alfred O. Elder
William N. Elder
Charles P. Elliott
John L. Elliott
Robert C. Ellis
Robert L. Ellison
Harold B. Elsasser
Alden H. Elsea
Stanley W. Elwell
Ivan H. Enstrom, Jr.
Richard O. Erhardt
Kenneth J. Erickson
Gerald W. Eriksen
Robert B. Erskine
Jacob V. Eskenazi
Alexander J. Esrey, Jr.
Edwin Ettinger
Samuel D. Evans
James A. Everts
William F. Exley
Willard L. Fadner
Fred E. Falke, Jr.
Allen P. Fancher
Richard H. Faulkner
Edward S. Ferrell
George F. Fickeissen
Edward P. Fillion, Jr.
Hulon P. Fillingane
Walter J. Finke, Jr.
John G. Finley
Charles D. Fisher
George M. Fitting
Robert F. Flacke
James T. Fleming, Jr.
Jerome D. Fleming
Thomas R. Foard
Larry B. Flood
Frederick F. Fordon
Ronald Forehand
John G. Forester, Jr.
James N. Fowler
John D. Fowler
Francis H. Fox
Mylo G. Fox
Fred R. Frank
Joe Frank
Jo W. French
Bruce H. Frisch
James C. Froid
Richard H. Frye
Gary M. Fuller
John W. Fuller
Robert V. Fultyn
James R. Funck
Daniel J. Fuss
Thomas E. Gainor

Joseph E. Galbraith
Robert G. Galli
Barry J. Galt
Barry T. Galvin
William H. Garland
Theodore C. Garrett
Robert W. Garver
Thomas A. Gasser
Richard G. Geer
Scott Gerrish
Robert J. Gibbons
Gerald H. Gilbert
Charles W. Gilgore
Jack W. Gillespie
Jerry T. Gillett
John H. Gilligan, Jr.
Paul L. Giuffre
James G. Givens
Gerald L. Glahn
Burton J. Gleason
Robert W. Goedjen
Robert B. Goetz
Milton LeR. Goff III
George DeW. Goodrich
Rex J. Goodwin
Perry G. Gorham
Donald A. Gottschalk
Bernard B. Gragg, Jr.
James G. Graham
Loren R. Graham
Galt Grant
Roger B. Granum
Stephen D. Green III
Donald L. Greene
Robert C. Greene
Edward P. Griffing
Donald M. Grimes
Glenn W. Groenewold
Charles C. Groff
Richard L. Grogan
Donald L. Gross
Gordon W. Grossman
Aubrey J. Gruber
Byron C. Gwinn II
Robert C. Haavind
Michael C. Hadow
Karl H. Hagenau
Frederick W. Hahn, Jr.
Charles W. Hall
Edward A. Hall
Howard R. Hallet, Jr.
Donald M. Halley, Jr.
Harry D. Hamilton
William O. Hamilton III
Rodney E. Hammond
Frederick D. Hamrick III
Robert P. Hanson
William E. Happersett, Jr.
Thad H. Harden
Arlington R. Harman
Lawrence S. Harnes
Clio A. Harper, Jr.
Donald K. Harris
William A. Harris, Jr.
Richard M. Harvey
George F. Harvie
Jerry R. Haupt
Frederic H. Hawkins
Jan. R. Hawthorne
Hugh A. Hazle
Joseph F. Heaps
James E. Hemphill
Thomas F. Henderson
Jack A. Henry
William R. Henry
Robert R. Henzler
Wesley C. Herbol
Diego E. Hernandez
Herbert F. Herndon
Robert O. Herrmann
James L. Hesburgh
John L. Heuser
John A. Hickey
Joseph F. Higgins, Jr.
Russel "K" Hileman
Emerson W. Hilker
Bruce E. Hill
Henry H. Hillman
William G. Hine
Oscar T. Hines, Jr.
Thomas W. Hirtle
Douglas S. Hobbs
Sidney N. Hockens
Banjamin E. Hoffman
Robert L. Hogg
Lowell J. Holloway
James E. Holmes
George F. Hoober
Gordon W. Hope
Jack E. Hooper
John G. Hordyk
Serge P. Horeff
Douglas G. Hoskins, Jr.
John T. Houk, Jr.
Norris W. Howard
James B. Howe, Jr.
Albert L. Huber
Harry L. Huggins
George D. Humphrey, Jr.
Griffith L. Humphrey
Elmer LeR. Hunt
Herman L. Hunt
John B. Hunt
Charles T. Hunter, Jr.
Robert M. Hunter
William B. Huntley, Jr.
Marc A. Hurt
Willis G. Hyde
Clifford F. Ide
Gary D. Irish
David E. Isselhard
Robert N. Jack
Manly L. Jackson
Tommy H. Jackson
William R. Jackson, Jr.
James H. Jacobsen
Harry R. James III
Thomas A. Jansing
Donald R. Jebens
John E. Jedlicka
David H. Jenner
Fred O. H. Jensen
Harvey J. Jensen
Harvey R. Jewett, Jr.
Bruce Johnson
Bruce D. Johnson
Earl J. Johnson
Linwood E. Johnson
Richard W. Johnson
Tucker I. Johnson, Jr.
William T. Johnson
Gary D. Jones
Roycroft C. Jones, Jr.
Waldo D. Jones II
David L. Jordan
Rudy E. Joyce
William B. Joyce
John A. Judge
Bruce C. Juell
Frederick P. Kaempfer
Richard E. Kameros
Lenni W. Kangas
James H. Karlen
Donald K. Kassel
Marvin S. Katzman
Ralph H. Keeler
Charles M. Kelley
Donald R. Kelley
Lawrence C. Kelly
Dale L. Kemmerer
Wallace C. Kemper, Jr.
Robert J. Kendra
Robert M. P. Kennard, Jr.
Robert P. Kennedy
Robert E. Kenny
James C. Kerbin
Paul R. Kerrigan
Leslie P. Kewley
Roy V. Keyes, Jr.
Richard C. Keyser
Burdell E. Kietzmann
James M. Kilpatrick
Ronald K. Kimmel
James C. Kinard
Fred N. King
Alexander G. Kirby, Jr.
Harvey R. Kirby
Theodore A. Kircher
Clyde K. Kislingbury
Joseph E. Klein
Thomas R. Kloves
Dale R. Klugman
Donald R. Kneepkens
Dwain LaV. Knepper
Robert R. Knepper, Jr.
Stephan H. Knight II
Everett F. Knowles
Richard J. Koch, Jr.
John H. Koslov
Robert L. Kramer
Harold G. Kraus
Henry P. Krienke
Eugene L. Kritter
John L. Krizek
Joseph J. Laferty
Rodney D. Lake
Chapman L. Lam
John P. Lamers
Frederick W. Lander, Jr.
Peter H. Langer
Jay R. Larson
John D. Lauck
Gene P. Laughlin
Clark R. Lawrence
George B. M. Lawrence, Jr.
John M. Leaver, Jr.
Charles E. LeBoeuf
William P. Lee
John P. Lehman
Edward C. Leibig, Jr.
John S. Leighton
John M. Leivestad
Ronald C. Lengyel
Lawrence L. Leonard
James E. Lesh
John H. Letarte
Gerald Levey
Walter G. Lieberman
Austin M. Lindsey
David H. Lively
John V. G. Lockhart
Eugene V. Lofdahl
Donald E. Lotton
John J. Love
Max H. Love
Dana E. Low
Daniel B. Lucas, Jr.
Carl W. Ludvik
Davidson Luehring
Eugene P. Lund
Carl D. Lundin
David A. Lyle
James A. Lyons
Francis A. McCarthy
Robert J. McCarty
Robert C. McClanahan, Jr.
Jack E. McClelland
Kenneth DeW. McCloskey
Mark McCormick
Verl E. McCoy, Jr.
Peter W. McDaniel
Michael P. McDermott, Jr.
Donald A. McGee
Donald E. McGrath
Joseph G. McGrath
James D. McKinney
Richard K. McLeod
Peter C. McMahan
Charles J. McMahon
John J. McMahon
John A. McMinn
Raymond W. McNamee, Jr.
Richard P. McNerney
Robert H. McSweeny
Robert P. McVoy
Richard J. Macaleer
Neil L. MacFarlane
David L. Mack
Henry C. Mack, Jr.
Joseph P. Mack
William E. Madison
Evan W. Madsen
William T. Mahaffey
Peter D. Maher III
Richard D. Maltzman
Mark W. Mandelker
Charles R. Mandly
James D. Mansfield
Paul J. Marbach
Charles R. Marchand
Lloyd P. Marsh
Miles E. Marsh
John Marshall, Jr.
David V. Martin
George J. Martin, Jr.
James A. Martin
James E. Martin
John A. Martin
Richard L. Mathews
Joseph D. Mathewson
Carter C. Mathies
Rudolph Matzner, Jr.
James H. Mauldin
Robert D. May
Peter Mayerson
Stuart B. Meach
David D. Meacham
William J. Mebes
Wade I. Melton
Robert J. Merikangas
Ricardo A. Mestres, Jr.
Bertram L. Metzger, Jr.
John W. Meyer
Cardell E. Miller
Eldon J. Miller
Robert W. Miller
Ronald A. Miller
Vaden T. Miller
Robert T. Milligan
Roy C. Milton
Robert T. Minkoff
George M. Minot
George F. Minser
Charles R. Mohr
Theophilus B. L. Molloy
Robert S. Moore
Thomas W. Morgan
Thomas J. Morris, Jr.
Dexter C. Morrison
John H. Morrison
Robert McK. Morrison
Roy J. Morton, Jr.
Robert E. Mortvedt
John W. Mossbarger
James E. Murphey
Thomas H. Murray, Jr.
Charles M. Murrin
John D. Musa
Joseph E. Myers
Russell Myers, Jr.
James H. Nagel
Ronald E. Narmi
Gary B. Nash
Thomas W. Nedwek
Donald L. Nelson
Lowell B. Nelson
Hugh McK. Newsom
Jesse S. Newsom, Jr.
James H. Newton
Richard L. Nichols
Richard M. Niedbala
John L. Niklaus
Allan K. Norberg
James H. Norman
Stuart E. Norris
James Norton
William D. Noteboom
Winslow B. Oakes
William J. Oberle
John D. O'Brien, Jr.
William O'Brien III
Patrick J. O'Donnell
Chauncey G. Olinger, Jr.
John C. O'Meara
Gordon B. Orbesen
Albert F. Ott
John L. Overbey
Curt L. Owen
William C. Owen
Daniel I. Padberg
Donald E. Palmer
Philip M. Palmer
Thomas W. Parent
Donald H. Parkinson
Frank Parra
Jerry A. Parsons
Donald C. Paulson
Ronald G. Payne
William L. Payne
David M. Paynter
James A. Pearson
Herbert C. Pendergast, Jr.
John J. Pepas
Franklin H. Perry
Phil M. Perry
Francis V. Pesenti
Richard A. Peters
Brock A. Peterson
Kenneth R. Peterson
Gordon L. Petri
Phillip A. Petty
Norman S. Phillips
Kent L. Pickard
Lovett B. Pickren
Joseph L. Pierce, Jr.
William H. Pierce
Robert E. Piper, Jr.
Anthony J. Pitz
Richard K. Plummer
Wayne G. Pizak
Edwin D. Porter
James E. Poth
Eric D. Potter
Maurice T. Pozzi, Jr.
Keith F. Prater
Loren M. Pratt
Gordon R. Prentice
George B. Pressly
John V. Prestia
Alan E. Price
Alan H. Price
Willie B. Pruitt
James L. Purdy
Alfred L. Purrington III
Sylvester A. Puzio
Michael D. Pybas
William J. Quinn
William L. Ragsdale
Robert L. Rain
Richard L. Ralston
Ross Rammelmeyer
Charles F. Ramsey
Donal M. Rand
William E. Ratliff
James E. Rattan
David E. Rawnsley
Kenneth F. Read
John G. Reeder
John N. Rees
Malcolm C. Rees, Jr.
Gerald E. Reid
Philip J. Reilly, Jr.
Thomas L. Reise
Robert V. Rice
Bill "A" Richards
Gordon R. Richards
William G. Richardson
Frederick W. Richter
Huntley N. Ricker
George McK. Rider
George E. Riddell
Ronald E. Ries
Ivers W. Riley, Jr.
Thomas R. Riley, Jr.
Ira "D" Riskin
Todd D. Ritter
Harold S. Roach, Jr.
John L. Robertson
Terrell P. Robinson
Ray W. Rodman
John E. Roe, Jr.
William F. Roemer
Brien B. Rogers
Charles L. Rogers
Thomas F. Rogers
James L. Rollins
Robert W. Rose
Hayden A. Ross-Clunis, Jr.
Mario A. Rossi
Ralph A. Rossi
Harvey Rubin
Leon I. Rue
Lowell H. Ruff, Jr.
Robert D. Rummel
Willard H. Rusk
Edward DeK. Russell, Jr.
Franklin E. Russell
Ernest H. Salter, Jr.
Charles R. Samuelson
Louis F. Sander
William A. Sanders
Gerald L. Sauer
Robert C. Saunders IV
William K. Schafer
David E. Scherer
Edward R. Schickler
John R. Schinabeck
Joseph R. Schlichter
Gilbert A. Schroeder
Albert B. Schultz
Karl E. Schwarz
Austin B. Scott, Jr.
Gary L. Scott
George W. Scott
Ronald D. Scott
Thomas W. Scott
William D. Scott
Chester J. Schuler
Charles E. Seager
James H. Seaton
Kenneth C. Seawright, Jr.
Robert "B" Segal
Richard A. Semmler
Paul J. Sengstock, Jr.
Floyd B. Shacklock
John P. Sheehy
John R. Sherman
Lawrence L. Sherman
John H. Shippee
Richard L. Shoup
John Shulick, Jr.
James W. Shumate
Gilbert K. Sievers
Robert G. Sievert
Erwin Sigrist
Allan J. Silberger
John R. Sill
Larry K. Simmering
Charles V. D. Singer, Jr.
Ray D. Sipes
Melvin J. Sires III
Vincent M. Skrinak
Robert W. Skyles
Harold D. Sleet
Kenneth J. Sliwa
Bernard J. Sloan, Jr.
Charles E. Smith
Charles R. Smith
Douglas A. Smith
Robert W. Smith
Roy J. Smith
Thomas K. Smith
Thomas R. Smith
Dimitry Smorsch
Manuel B. Sousa
Charles M. Southall
Richard J. Spangenberg
George M. Spartalis, Jr.
John F. Speer
Carl W. Spitzer, Jr.
James A. Stackpole

John H. Staehle
Franklin R. Standerfer
Arthur W. Standley, Jr.
Frederick B. Steketee
Edward V. Stephenson
Reay Sterling, Jr.
Frederick R. Stewart, Jr.
Robert N. Stewart
John A. Stichter
James L. Stidham
Walter W. Stoeppelwerth
Bernard J. Stortecky
Peter R. Story
Richard W. Stott
John T. Strain
Ralph N. Straley II
Raymond S. Strangways
William R. Stratton
Thomas L. Strub
Douglas M. Stuart
Newell M. Stultz
John J. Sullivan
Ronald K. Sundfors
William A. Sybers
Donald J. Taggart
Edward B. Talbot
Alex O. Taylor, Jr.
Henry L. Thacker, Jr.
Colin C. Thomas
William I. Thomas
Richard E. Thompson
William Q. Thornburg
George D. Tice, Jr.
William T. Todd II
George F. Towne III
Bernard J. Tracey
Jeffrey W. Traenkle
Donald P. Trepte
Dean E. Troxell II
James R. Tucker
John L. Turnbull III
Laurence L. Turner
Donald M. Ulbrich
George E. Ulrich
Walter G. Updike
Robert E. VanDermay
John E. VanDeWater
Richard W. VanHorn
David B. VanHulsteyn
Richard W. VanPelt
James A. VanValkenburg
Eugene H. Vaughan, Jr.
John M. Vaughan
Anthony J. Venetti
Carl VerSteeg
Robert J. Vogel
Lewis C. Wade
Thomas L. Waddell
Donald L. Waggoner
Gerald D. Wagner
John E. Wahl
Raymond J. Wahlgren
James R. Walker
John A. Walker
John D. Wallace
Kenneth T. Wallenius
Lawrence P. Walsh
William A. Walsh
John T. Walter, Jr.
Thomas G. Warburton
Byron LeR. Warmee
John S. Warner
Harry C. Watts
Horace C. Wauson, Jr.
Wayne R. Weatherhead
Terry M. Weathers
James G. Webster III
Donald P. Wefer
Richard L. Weis
Gerhard F. Wellmann
Alfred H. Wells, Jr.
John E. Wengert
René DuW. Wernicke
Rodney K. Wernicke
Harold O. White
Kohen E. White
Treatwell M. White, Jr.
Charles W. Whitehead
Frank C. Witney
Ralph C. Wiggins, Jr.
Bruce S. Wilkinson
Edmund S. Wilkinson, Jr.
Mark R. Willcott III
Arthur G. Williams
Frederick D. Williams
Gerald G. Williams
Hugh C. Williams
Kenneth M. Williams
Norman T. Williams
Talmage T. Williams, Jr.
Edmund P. Willis
Allen D. Wills
James A. Wilson
John C. Wilson
Peter D. Wilson
Victor L. Wilson
Wayne W. Wilson
Richard N. Winfield
Cleon W. Winslow
Daniel J. Wolkensdorfer
Gerard E. Woodbury
James H. Woodson
Thomas A. Woodward
Theodore H. Wuerfel
Donald G. Wylie
Robert F. Wyvill
Lawrence L. Yost
Richard A. Young
Charles E. Zamzow
Marshall V. Zinner
Robert H. Zuege
Allen D. Zumbrunnen
Richard F. Zwetsch

John F. Carr (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stanley J. Bielobocky
Leonard J. Cullen, Jr.
John D. Cunningham
Merrill S. Garnett
John R. Law
Henry J. Lerian, Jr.
William W. Lippstreu
Frederick G. Pfister
George P. Rejebian
Wister L. Ritchie, Jr.
Sarantis R. Sarantos
Oscar V. Simpson, Jr.
Charles M. Steiner
William B. Stewart, Jr.
Herbert A. Tabor

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

B. Lewis Avera, Jr.
Harry K. Barber
Richard W. Carr
George L. Capwell, Jr.
John D. Crawford
Felix L. DePinto
Alan J. Fohl
Michael V. Gaddis
James R. Green
Charles H. Hayes
Kenneth Keen, Jr.
Patrick G. Kirby
Joseph M. Lorimier III
Paul N. Pappas
Vito M. Solazzo
John P. Tauro
Francis C. Taylor
George A. Thomas, Jr.
Fred J. Vanous
Henry A. Wilde, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James D. Ahearn
Peter D. Binkley
Russell L. Currier
Thomas W. Dye
Bernard T. Eilerts
Charles K. Engle
Thomas G. Felke
Russell H. Gills
Thomas E. Howard
David L. Jeter
George H. Leach
Albert D. Leahy, Jr.
William K. MacNulty, Jr.
Thomas B. Mickley
Harvey P. Pittelko
William T. Read
David Rice
John A. Rogers II
Wade H. Royston, Jr.
Donald E. Sudduth
Henry J. Zoubek

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Bainbridge
George H. Ellison
George G. Evans, Jr.
Don H. Hadden
Edward P. Hand
Robert R. Hull
John E. Hurley, Jr.
Clifford B. Johnson
John R. Kostelecky
Thomas H. O'Leary
Charles A. Pisaturo
Van S. Reed
Harold Schofield
Carl B. Sterzing, Jr.
William R. Thomas
William G. Thursby
Walter N. Yanochik

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Walter Howard Schad, Brewton, Ala., in place of M. C. Leigh, retired.

ARIZONA

Jimmie L. Matheson, Fry, Ariz., in place of V. J. Schrader, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Helen H. Mitchell, College Heights, Ark., in place of Floyd McAlister, transferred.

Teddy E. Miller, McCrory, Ark., in place of I. L. Dunnam, retired.

Isaac H. Roland, Malvern, Ark., in place of J. T. Alderson, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Harry Sorensen, Grover City, Calif., in place of M. H. Wharton, resigned.

John Herman Gengler, Marysville, Calif., in place of T. A. Gianella, retired.

Walter B. Townsend, Universal City, Calif., in place of C. W. Deming, retired.

Rudolph F. Loewe, Visalia, Calif., in place of E. R. Connelly, retired.

FLORIDA

Wayne R. Dickerson, Dade City, Fla., in place of W. V. Gilbert, retired.

B. Maxine O'Neal, Nocatee, Fla., in place of J. D. Carlton, retired.

GEORGIA

Louis J. O'Connell, Augusta, Ga., in place of B. E. Lester, retired.

Ben Dayton Newton, Shady Dale, Ga., in place of J. M. Athon, resigned.

Ruth R. Myers, Smithville, Ga., in place of S. M. Lunsford, removed.

Reginald D. Reynolds, Sumner, Ga., in place of E. L. Ellis, retired.

ILLINOIS

Frank Y. Mueller, Christopher, Ill., in place of D. C. Bacon, resigned.

Patricia Ann Higar, German Valley, Ill., in place of Edith Wieman, retired.

Alfred St. Aubin, Harvey, Ill., in place of F. G. Ring, resigned.

Lucy L. Stone, Hooppole, Ill., in place of W. G. Ellers, resigned.

William G. Needham, Maple Park, Ill., in place of M. H. Cofey, resigned.

Earl S. Wagher, Oneida, Ill., in place of F. L. Thayer, resigned.

INDIANA

Glen D. Bray, Amo, Ind., in place of W. F. Brewer, resigned.

Mark M. Hadley, Coatesville, Ind., in place of A. B. Newman, retired.

Joseph E. Fouts, Greens Fork, Ind., in place of S. E. Reese, deceased.

Helen L. Ort, New Haven, Ind., in place of M. L. Garstka, removed.

Robert L. Spencer, Thorntown, Ind., in place of H. E. Patterson, removed.

IOWA

Mable C. Schuck, West Point, Iowa, in place of M. C. Sallen, deceased.

KANSAS

Lincoln T. Gribben, Havana, Kans., in place of A. M. Whistler, retired.

Milton M. John, Jr., Saint John, Kans., in place of G. E. Bartlett, resigned.

KENTUCKY

James G. Smith, Burlington, Ky., in place of Newton Sullivan, retired.

John C. Hicks, Hindman, Ky., in place of O. M. Sturgill, removed.

LOUISIANA

Walter Y. Kemper, Jr., Berwick, La., in place of H. E. Hebert, retired.

MAINE

James O. Ricker, West Enfield, Maine, in place of A. I. M. Ewing, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Allan C. Williams, Jr., Falmouth Heights, Mass., in place of W. G. Craig, retired.

Walter K. Parker, Lenox, Mass., in place of C. H. McCarthy, retired.

Jessie M. Andrews, Monponsett, Mass., in place of A. J. DeSorcie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Bauer, Athens, Mich., in place of C. W. Holt, retired.

Philip B. Wood, Bangor, Mich., in place of F. W. Kime, resigned.

Owen A. Kern, East Detroit, Mich., in place of F. W. Schroeder, deceased.

Grant D. Maudlin, Royal Oak, Mich., in place of B. S. Trace, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Arnold E. Weflen, Clara City, Minn., in place of L. J. Voight, deceased.

Cecil R. Campbell, Ellendale, Minn., in place of J. B. Neugebauer, retired.

Bernard R. Anderson, Kerkhoven, Minn., in place of H. T. Kennedy, retired.

Donald O. Nelson, Tyler, Minn., in place of M. G. Pedersen, retired.

Donald T. Johnson, Waseca, Minn., in place of D. C. Brown, declined.

MISSISSIPPI

James D. Mills, Jr., Carthage, Miss., in place of J. H. Henderson, resigned.

Thomas A. Elder, Coldwater, Miss., in place of H. L. Callicott, retired.

William Yerger Guilbert, Collins, Miss., in place of G. B. McIntosh, resigned.

Dewey D. Patterson, Tupelo, Miss., in place of E. R. Rankin, deceased.

MONTANA

Adolph Freier, Box Elder, Mont., in place of N. M. Spangelo, retired.

Robert F. Haurigan, Custer, Mont., in place of H. J. Webster, retired.

NEBRASKA

Teddy W. Mundell, Kimball, Nebr., in place of J. J. Cromie, resigned.

Lee Curry, Ponca, Nebr., in place of D. J. Ehle, transferred.

NEVADA

Gretta J. Schenck, Indian Springs, Nev., office established April 16, 1953.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bernerd A. Marcotte, Epping, N. H., in place of J. P. Masse, deceased.

Francis H. Malony, Gilsum, N. H., in place of L. A. Wright, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Sherwood A. MacPherson, Bridgeton, N. J., in place of W. M. MacPherson, retired.

Morton S. Howell, Broadway, N. J., in place of J. S. Howell, retired.

Nicholas J. Caruso, Hoboken, N. J., in place of John Schuemann, Jr., deceased.

Evelyn H. Way, Ocean View, N. J., in place of R. B. Downam, resigned.

NEW YORK

Henry W. Clas, Albany, N. Y., in place of J. P. Hayes, removed.

Lyle W. Palmiter, Alfred Station, N. Y., in place of I. O. Lewis, retired.

Herbert Improte, Centereach, N. Y., in place of A. V. Herron, resigned.

Margaret K. Schneider, Clay, N. Y., in place of C. F. Driscoll, retired.

George A. Albrecht, Long Island City, N. Y., in place of Moses Symington, retired.

James D. Collins, Niagara University, N. Y., in place of W. J. Glavin, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.

Raymond Truett Warlick, Lenoir, N. C., in place of N. H. Gwyn, retired.

John Clyde Garrison, Morganton, N. C., in place of M. B. Kibler, retired.

William B. Early, Old Fort, N. C., in place of F. M. Bradley, retired.

Thomas F. Littlejohn, Ruffin, N. C., in place of S. C. Worsham, retired.

Nancy F. Harris, Wake Forest, N. C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.

Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N. C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.

OHIO

Gladys L. Via, Gratis, Ohio, in place of A. J. Bratton, resigned.

Fred J. Jurisch, Phalanx Station, Ohio, in place of R. A. Clark, transferred.

Blaine Van Tilburg, Rockford, Ohio, in place of G. R. Kinder, retired.

OREGON

John Prentiss, Nehalen, Oreg., in place of L. I. Mead, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

James P. Burgoon, Ashville, Pa., in place of T. J. Murphy, deceased.

John P. Oberholtzer, Mohrsville, Pa., in place of F. C. Swoyer, resigned.

Kermit E. Thomas, Osceola Mills, Pa., in place of J. F. Dugan, retired.

Viola E. Fulmer, Smicksburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dodson, deceased.

Mary E. Reagle, Wheatland, Pa., in place of R. E. Haney, retired.

Edwin A. Barnitz, York, Pa., in place of W. D. Rinehardt, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Junot Franco-Soto, Sabana Grande, P. R., in place of M. A. Franco-Soto, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Spencer R. Elliott, Winnsboro, S. C., in place of P. A. Matthews, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyle Elward, Deadwood, S. Dak., in place of G. C. Kenworthy, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lela Crawley Scroggins, Lupton City, Tenn., in place of Edith Caldwell, retired.

Herman S. Kinchen, Ramer, Tenn., in place of J. E. Barnes, retired.

TEXAS

Jesse A. Armstrong, Angleton, Tex., in place of E. L. Coale, resigned.

Patricia K. Fisher, Greggton, Tex., in place of N. M. Hall, removed.

Anna B. Shults, Portland, Tex., in place of L. H. De Mouche, retired.

Charles E. Paxton, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of M. J. Sweeden, resigned.

R. T. Savage, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.

A. D. Wilson, Westbrook, Tex., in place of M. E. Powell, retired.

UTAH

Gwendelyn F. Gottfredson, Circleville, Utah, in place of Orion Gottfredson, deceased.

VERMONT

William C. Nawrath, Manchester Center, Vt., in place of L. F. Martin, Jr., resigned.

Henry W. Handfield, Poultney, Vt., in place of O. W. McShane, retired.

VIRGINIA

Thornton S. Terry, Axton, Va., in place of R. D. Davis, retired.

Lawrence R. Kipps, Bealeton, Va., in place of J. C. Kehoe, deceased.

Willis E. Crews, Clover, Va., in place of A. C. Turner, Jr., deceased.

Lucinda S. Sims, Ruckersville, Va., in place of Lottie Herndon, retired.

Troy B. Slate, Saltville, Va., in place of J. A. Buchanan, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Jack A. Middle, Mabton, Wash., in place of H. C. Smyth, deceased.

Calvin M. Langfield, Troutlake, Wash., in place of M. M. Aldahl, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Eleanor Hess Lavencheck, Carolina, W. Va., in place of P. M. Satterfield, resigned.

Walter M. Ferrell, Kenova, W. Va., in place of H. S. Lambert, removed.

Helen E. Eagan, Nellis, W. Va., in place of R. K. Eanes, resigned.

Virginia T. Bailey, Page., W. Va., in place of T. F. Settle, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Rhoda A. Burns, Blue Mounds, Wis., in place of H. S. Emerson, removed.

Earl E. Horn, Port Washington, Wis., in place of J. H. Biever, removed.

Darnell W. Kadolph, Weyauwega, Wis., in place of I. J. Rieck, deceased.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 25, 1955:

POSTMASTER

Clyde A. Coggins to be postmaster at Nipton in the State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the inspiration of all that makes life noble and worthwhile, wilt Thou now kindle within our minds a clear vision of Thy divine will, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Strengthen us daily with a deeper sense of those spiritual resources which will enable us to safeguard our heritage of freedom and share it with all mankind.

May we be numbered among those who are not afraid of evil tidings but whose hearts are always strong and steadfast, trusting in the Lord.

Show us how we may hasten the dawning of that glorious day when our hopes and longings for peace on earth and good will among men shall be a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1955, was read and approved.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request, an administration bill which may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955." Senator SPARKMAN has introduced the same bill in the Senate by request.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section analysis and a brief summary of the bill may be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955."

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1955" and inserting "July 1, 1960."

SEC. 3. Section 203 (i) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "the total amount of insurance outstanding at any one time under this proviso not to exceed $100,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 204 (f) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized, with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments for insurance issued on or after July 1, 1955, and, with the consent of the mortgagee or mortgagor, as the case may be, with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments issued prior to such date, to effect the settlement of certificates of claim and refunds to mortgagors at any time after the sale or transfer of title to the property conveyed to the Commissioner under this section and without awaiting the final liquidation of such property for the purpose of determining the net amount to be realized therefrom."

SEC. 5. Said act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking clause 1 of section 207 (c) and inserting:

"(1) not to exceed $12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000, or, if the mortgage is executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of clause (b) (1) of this section, such dollar limit with respect to any one mortgage instrument and with respect to the aggregate amount of such commitments shall be $50,000,000."

(2) by striking clause 1 of section 213 (b) and inserting:

"(1) not to exceed $12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstand-

ing under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000, or, if the mortgage is executed by a mortgagor regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States or agencies thereof, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, such dollar limit with respect to any one mortgage instrument and with respect to the aggregate amount of such commitments shall be $25 million; and."

(3) by striking clause (i) of section 220 (d) (3) (B) and inserting:

"(i) not to exceed $50 million with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $50 million; and."

(4) by striking "$5 million" in sections 213 (c), 221 (d) (3), and 803 (b) (3) and inserting:

"$12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000."

SEC. 6. Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1954" and inserting "July 1, 1955", and by striking "$3,500,000,000" and inserting "$4 billion."

SEC. 7. Clause (a) of the second sentence of section 227 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "under section 221" and inserting "under section 221 if the mortgage meets the requirements of paragraph (3) of subsection (d) thereof."

SEC. 8. Section 604 (f) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized, with the consent of the mortgagee or mortgagor, as the case may be, to effect the settlement of certificates of claim and refunds at any time after the sale or transfer of title to the property conveyed to the Commissioner under this section and without awaiting the final liquidation of such property for the purpose of determining the net amount to be realized therefrom."

SEC. 9. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before such date" and inserting "pursuant to a certification by the Secretary of Defense or his designee made on or before such date and a commitment to insure issued on or before June 30, 1956."

SEC. 10. The second sentence of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking in clause (a) thereof "designate hereunder" and inserting "designate hereunder or (iii) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued pursuant to the preceding clause (ii)."

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 11. (a) Section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "$100 million, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100 million on July 1 in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively: *Provided*, That (subject to the total authorization of not to exceed $500 million)" and inserting "$500 million, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $200 million on July 1 in each of the years 1955 and 1956, respectively: *Provided*, That."

(b) Section 106 (e) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking $35 million" and inserting $70 million."

SEC. 12. The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 344) is hereby amended—

(1) by inserting "urban renewal," after "urban redevelopment," in the title;

(2) by inserting ", and Urban Renewal" after "redevelopment" in the heading of title I;

(3) by inserting "and urban renewal projects" after the term "urban redevelopment projects" in each place where that term appears in title I;

(4) by inserting "urban renewal," after "redevelopment," in the heading of title III;

(5) by inserting "urban renewal," after "urban redevelopment," in sections 301 and 303;

(6) by inserting "or urban renewal" after "urban redevelopment" in section 304;

(7) by inserting "as amended," after "(Public Law 171, 81st Congress)," in sections 101, 301, and 304);

(8) by inserting "as amended," after "Housing Act of 1949," in the clause numbered "(1)" in section 304; and

(9) by inserting ", as amended," after "this act" in sections 101, 301, and 304.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

SEC. 13. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting section 10 (i) and inserting the following:

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Authority may, with respect to low-rent housing initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 1, 1954, for not to exceed 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1 of the years 1955 and 1956, and may enter into such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which (1) the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or (2) there is being carried out a project covered by a Federal aid contract executed, or prior approval granted, by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the governing body of the locality has, by resolution, approved such additional units: *And provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the number of such additional units does not exceed the number of families of low income, eligible for admission to such units, which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator estimates will be displaced within the metropolitan or housing market area of such locality as a result of Federal, State, or local governmental action."

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

SEC. 14. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking section 6 (c) and inserting:

"(c) The original stock subscription for each institution eligible to become a member under section 4 shall be an amount equal to 1 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of the subscriber's home mortgage loans, or such higher percent not exceeding 2 percent as the board shall by regulation prescribe, but not less than $500: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall permit a member to reduce the amount of stock held by it to below 2 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of its home mortgage loans as of the effective date of the housing amendments of 1955, but no such member shall be required to subscribe for additional stock until such time as the amount of stock held by it does not equal that required by such regulation. The board shall from time to time adjust the amount of stock held by each member so that, as nearly as possible, such member shall at all times have invested in the stock of the Federal home loan bank at least an amount calculated in the manner provided in the preceding sentence (but not less than $500). If the board finds that the investment of any member in stock is greater than that required under this section or under regulation of the board, upon application of such member, the bank shall pay such member for each share of stock in excess of the amount so required an amount equal to the par value of such stock, or, at the election of the bank, the whole or any part of the payments which would be so made shall be credited upon any indebtedness of the member to the bank. In either such event, stock equal in par value to the amount of the payment or credit, or both, as the case may be, shall be surrendered and canceled. No share of stock shall be surrendered and canceled if the effect of such surrender and cancellation would be to violate the provisions of section 10 (c) requiring the amount of stock held by such member to equal at least one-twelfth of the outstanding advances to such member."

(2) by striking the first sentence of section 6 (i) and inserting: "Any member other than a Federal savings and loan association may withdraw from membership in a Federal home loan bank 6 months after filing with the board written notice of intention so to do, and the board may, after hearing, remove any member from membership, or deprive any nonmember borrower of the privilege of obtaining further advances, if, in the opinion of the board, such member or nonmember borrower (i) has failed to comply with any provision of this act or regulation of the board made pursuant thereto, (ii) is insolvent: *Provided*, That any member of a bank which is a building and loan association, savings and loan association, cooperative bank or homestead association shall be deemed insolvent if the assets of such member are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts, or (iii) has a management or home-financing policy of a character inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of this act.";

(3) by repealing section 6 (1); and

(4) by striking the period at the end of section 7 (a) and inserting a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the board may by regulation increase the number of elective directors of any Federal home loan bank having a district which includes five or more States to a number not exceeding twice the number of States comprising such district, but such additional elective directors shall be apportioned as nearly as may be practicable in the same manner and order as is provided for the apportionment of elective directors under

subsections (c) and (d) hereof. The term 'States' as used in the preceding proviso shall mean the States of the Union and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 15. The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the proviso at the end of the second paragraph of section 5 (c) and inserting: "*Provided*, That no such loan, unless so insured or guaranteed, shall be made in excess of $2,500."

SEC. 16. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking section 403 (d) and inserting: "(d) Any institution which applies after the effective date of the housing amendments of 1955 for insurance under this title shall pay, in the event its application is approved, an admission fee in such amount as the Corporation shall determine, taking into consideration the total cost of processing all insurance applications."

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 17. Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 702. (a) In order (1) to encourage municipalities and other public agencies to maintain at all times a current and adequate reserve of planned public works the construction of which can rapidly be commenced, particularly when the national or local economic situation makes such action desirable, and (2) to help attain maximum economy and efficiency in the planning and construction of public works, the Administrator is hereby authorized to make advances to public agencies (notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended) to aid in financing the cost of engineering and architectural surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, or other action preliminary to and in preparation for the construction of public works: *Provided*, That the making of advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to assist in financing the construction of any public works so planned: *And provided further*, That advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State shall at no time exceed 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund established pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

"(b) No advance shall be made hereunder with respect to any individual project unless it is planned to be constructed within a reasonable period of time, unless it conforms to an overall State, local, or regional plan approved by a competent State, local, or regional authority, and unless the public agency formally contracts with the Federal Government to complete the plan preparation promptly and to repay such advance or part thereof when due. Subsequent to approval and prior to disbursement of any Federal funds for the purpose of advance planning, the applicant shall establish a separate planning account into which all Federal and applicant funds estimated to be required for plan preparation shall be placed.

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid without interest by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided*, That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable: *And provided further*, That in the event repayment is not made promptly such unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency.

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(e) In order to provide moneys for advances in accordance with this section, the Administrator is hereby authorized to establish a revolving fund which shall comprise all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to this section, together with all repayments and other receipts in connection with advances made under this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such revolving fund, in addition to the amount authorized by this section as originally enacted, the further amounts of $12 million, which may be made available to the revolving fund on or after July 1, 1956; $12 million which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1957; $14 million which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1958; and such additional sums which may be made available from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in undisbursed balances in the revolving fund and in advances outstanding for plans in preparation or for completed plans with respect to projects which, in the determination of the Administrator, can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time."

SEC. 18. Effective upon the date of enactment of this act the basic rate of compensation of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955."

Section 2. Extension of title I home repair and modernization program: This section would extend the FHA title I home repair and modernization program for 5 years to July 1, 1960.

Maintenance of a high level of construction activity, improvement of individual properties in need of modernization or repair, and proper maintenance of the existing housing inventory of the Nation are all affected significantly by the availability of adequate consumer credit for modernization and repair loans. The FHA title I program has contributed significantly toward assuring an adequate supply of such credit.

Availability of insurance protection for this type of credit encourages lenders to make these loans available to borrowers in smaller communities and eligible borrowers in larger communities who might otherwise have difficulty in arranging loans. In this connection, it should be noted that credit for home-repair purposes is not as readily available (without some measure of governmental encouragement) as is consumer credit for automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other consumer durable goods. In these fields, the dealer normally receives credit support from the manufacturer. In the case of home-repair loans, however, manufacturers of paint, lumber, gypsum, nails, and other products are each likely to have a relatively small stake in the repair or improvement job done by the local firm. The manufacturer or wholesale supplier is thus rarely interested in backing up credit for a repair or improvement job, especially when the largest cost item is locally applied labor. In addition, the local automobile dealer, appliance or department store itself normally has a better line of credit than the carpenter, painter, small contractor, or hardware merchant who may supply the services or materials for home repairs or improvements. Finally, it should be noted that an automobile, radio, or refrigerator can be made subject to a chattel mortgage and can be repossessed, while items financed under title I become part of the house and cannot be repossessed. Neither is it practical in the case of a repair loan to go through the expense of obtaining secondary real-property mortgage security. It is for these reasons that home repair or improvement loans, in the absence of title I aids, will be unavailable to many borrowers, or else be available at exorbitant interest rates or fees.

Insurance activity in excess of $60 million monthly under this program since the effective date of the 1954 act amendments reflects the continuing usefulness of the program. Also, the title I program of insurance for modernization and repair loans constitutes an integral part of the urban-renewal program for neighborhood conservation and improvement which was adopted in the Housing Act of 1954.

In order that the lending institutions and dealer organizations may make appropriate plans for participating in both the urban renewal program and other modernization and repair, the title I program would be extended for 5 years as provided in this section. This is equivalent to the most recent previous extension from March 1, 1950, to July 1, 1955.

Section 3. Repeal of separate limitation on insurance authorization for farm-housing mortgages insured under section 203 (i): The Housing Act of 1954 perfected a consolidation of all outstanding mortgage-insurance authorizations (previously provided under sections 8, 203, 217, 603, 610, 701, 803, and 903) into a single authorization provided for under section 217, and eliminated the separate insurance limitation for each of these sections. This consolidation simplified FHA administration of the insurance authorizations and Presidential actions related thereto.

The Housing Act of 1954 created several new mortgage insurance programs which are operated under the single mortgage-insurance authorization, including farm-home mortgage insurance under section 203 (i). However, unlike the other sections, section 203 (i) contained a separate subsidiary authorization limitation of $100 million.

In the interest of reducing the record keeping with respect to the farm housing program and the necessity for recurring estimates of the amounts of outstanding balances on these farm housing mortgages, the separate authorization control of this program should be eliminated and the insurance volume under this program be consolidated for control purposes with other insurance activity under section 203. To accomplish this purpose, the special limitation for section 203 (i) would be replealed.

Section 4. FHA settlement of certificates of claim: This section would enable the FHA to make final settlement of certificates of claim held by mortgagees, and refunds to mortgagors, at any time after the sale or transfer of title by the FHA to sales housing acquired by FHA in cases of defaulted mortgages. The provision would apply to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments for insurance issued on or after July 1, 1955. Also, if the mortgagee or mortgagor consents, the provision would apply to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments issued prior to that date. The section would carry out a recommendation made by the General Accounting Office for the purpose of saving personnel expenditures and other administrative expenses. (Comptroller General's Report on Audit of FHA for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1953. H. Doc. 53, 84th Cong., p. 6.)

Under the provisions of section 204 of the National Housing Act (which relates to sales housing mortgages, but not to rental housing morgages) the mortgagee receives, in case of default on the mortgage, the benefits of FHA insurance in the form of (1) debentures in an amount equal to the "value

of the mortgage" as defined in the act, which does not include the full amount of earned interest and does not ordinarily fully compensate the mortgagee for foreclosure costs and other expenses or advances made by it (debentures are issued in multiples of $50 and provision is made for a cash payment to adjust the difference between the value of the mortgage and the aggregate face value of debentures, not to exceed $50), and (2) a certificate of claim in an amount equal to the difference between the debentures (and cash adjustment) and the amount which the mortgagee would have received if the mortgagor had paid the indebedness in full at the time of the conveyance to the Commissioner.

In each such case the Commissioner acquires the property covered by the mortgage. The certificate of claim, plus an annual increment of 3 percent, becomes payable to the mortgagee only if the net amount realized by the Commissioner from the property exceeds the Commissioner's outlay with respect to the property, including debenture principal and interest and all expenses of the Commissioner in dealing with and disposing of the property. If any excess should remain after payment of the certificate of claim, the Commissioner pays the excess to the mortgagor.

The existing provisions of section 204 do not permit settlement of the certificates of claim and payment of any excess to a mortgagor until final liquidation of the Commissioner's interest in the property, since "the net amount realized" from the property can only be determined after final payment has been made by the purchaser. For example, if a Commissioner-owned property is sold to a purchaser making a 10-percent downpayment and executing a 20-year mortgage for the remainder of the purchase price, settlement of a certificate of claim may not now be made until such mortgage is paid in full, thus requiring the maintenance of records for a period of 20 years before settlement of the certificate of claim can be made.

A study based upon a sampling of homeownership properties acquired and sold by the Commissioner indicates that the proposed amendment would result in a financial benefit to the FHA because the earlier settlements will result in simplified accounting and reduced recordkeeping. The financial savings may become very substantial if there arises a high volume of insurance claims.

Section 5. Revision of mortgage limitations for multifamily projects: This section would revise the present statutory mortgage limitations for multifamily projects. The $5 million limitation for projects with private sponsorship would be changed to $12.5 million, and the mortgage limitation would be applied both to each individual mortgage instrument and to the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments outstanding at any one time under each section of the act with respect to projects in the same housing market area which involve the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control).

In February 1938, section 207 of the National Housing Act was amended to provide that no insured mortgage under that section shall involve a principal obligation in an amount exceeding $5 million. Prior to that time, section 207 permitted a $10 million maximum. Statutory language similar to the 1938 amendment has been used to establish mortgage limits for private housing corporations in each multifamily project program enacted since that date, namely sections 213, 220, 221, 608, 610, 803, and 908.

From 1938 until the summer of 1954, the $5 million limitation was administratively applied as a limitation solely on the amount of a single mortgage instrument. This application extended even to a point of insuring two individual mortgages for a single sponsor for contiguous properties on which the physical improvements were, for operating purposes, essentially a single structure.

Alternative administrative decisions might, under present legislative authority, place a limitation with respect to operations of a single sponsor or groups of interrelated sponsors on either: (1) the aggregate mortgage indebtedness insurable in all insured projects without regard to location, (2) the aggregate mortgages insurable within a single housing market area, or (3) the aggregate mortgages insurable within a single development, that is, housing on contiguous sites, capable of being managed as a single project.

The first alternative would preclude insurance exceeding $5 million on projects with a single sponsor or interrelated group of sponsors even though the projects involved were located in such widely separated locations that no competitive relations within any housing market are in any way affected by the fact that aggregate mortgages exceed $5 million. Such a control would, in effect, be designed to place a limit on the total concurrent benefits which any program of the National Housing Act could make available to any one sponsor.

The second alternative would limit the amount of mortgage insurance for a single sponsor in a housing market area (or metropolitan area) to the $5 million limitation. Such a limitation would be directed toward avoiding any semblance of monopoly of opportunity to serve an existing housing demand within a housing market, which might otherwise occur if simultaneous commitments were approved for several projects in scattered locations within a metropolitan area.

The third alternative would limit the amount of mortgage insurance to $5 million on one or more mortgages if the projects involved were so closely related that they present the appearance of constituting an integrated project or if management as a single project is in fact feasible. This limitation would be designed particularly to preclude such a concentration of newly created rental housing in a limited sector of a housing market that one sponsor or group of related sponsors could either monopolize the opportunity to serve rental housing demand in a single small section or could expose the FHA to an excessive risk of insurance loss because of inadequate marketability in a single section.

The present administrative application of the $5 million limitation by the FHA is that no one sponsor or group of interrelated sponsors shall receive project-mortgage insurance on one or more mortgages exceeding $5 million within a single housing market area so long as the projects securing mortgages are under construction or still attaining initial occupancy. This interpretation aims to minimize (1) monopolization of opportunity at a given time to serve new market demand in that market area and (2) undue risks of market absorption.

In the case of section 220 housing in urban renewal projects, these restrictions are not applied if local government determinations have identified and contracted with a single sponsorship for a larger aggregate of housing and if the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has approved an urban renewal plan for the area which involves a larger aggregate of housing under a single sponsorship. In all projects, the maximum insurable mortgage within the $5 million limitation is determined by FHA analysis of the marketability of the number and quality of rental units proposed for construction. Thus, in smaller communities or in relatively slow-growing areas, individual projects may be limited, as a result of market requirements, to mortgage amounts substantially below the $5 million limitation.

With due recognition of the increase in construction costs since 1938, it is evident that the administrative policy now in effect under sections 207, 213, 221, 803, and 908 limits mortgage insurance for a single sponsor within a single housing market to a substantially smaller amount of rental housing than could have been covered by a single mortgage in 1938, when the $5 million limitation was adopted.

For purpose of clarification, two amendments are incorporated in this section of the bill. First, that the maximum insurable mortgage amount limitation for private housing corporations under substantially the same control be established at $12,500,000 for sections 207, 213, 221, and 803. Second, that the comparable limitation for section 220 be established at $50 million. In the case of each of these sections, the limitation would be applicable to projects insured under the particular section within a housing market area as described above.

The $12,500,000 limitation constitutes an upward adjustment of the $5 million limitation first established in February 1938 in keeping with the intervening increase in construction cost levels as indicated by the E. H. Boeckh, Inc. indexes of construction costs for apartments, hotels, and office buildings (increase of 150 percent from 1937 average to October 1954).

The $50 million limitation proposed for section 220 would establish for private corporations operating in urban renewal projects the same limitation now in effect under section 207 of the National Housing Act for public bodies. Use of a similar limitation appears reasonable in view of the fact that in the urban renewal operations to be insured under section 220, the governing body of the locality is required to prepare and submit the overall plans for specific urban renewal undertakings and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator's approval of such plans is required before FHA mortgage insurance can be made available.

The proposed amendment would make four major changes in, or addition to, the language of the statute. The $5 million limitation would be changed to $12,500,000 (except that for section 220 projects, the limitation would be $50 million); the limitation would be applied not only to a single mortgagor, but also to mortgagors under substantially the same control; the limitation would cover an entire housing market area, not merely an individual housing project; and finally, the limitation would not apply to two or more mortgages even though the sponsors were the same and the structures on contiguous sites, if the mortgages are not simultaneously in the commitment stage (that is, the stage prior to the completion of the project and final endorsement of the mortgage for insurance). In such cases, no additional commitments would be made available until the marketability of such units had been established by the response to the previous project.

Section 6. Increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization: This section would amend section 217 of the National Housing Act (the FHA general mortgage insurance authorization) to authorize FHA mortgage insurance up to the aggregate of outstanding insurance liability and commitments on June 30, 1955 plus $4 billion. The revision of section 217 to base insuring operations after June 30, 1955, on outstanding commitments and insurance in force on that date plus the indicated increase in authorization is intended to show in the current legislation the additional amount of insurance liability which the agency is expected to assume during the ensuing fiscal year. The amount of unused authorization under existing legislation remaining on June 30, 1955 (estimated to be over $600 million) would be merged with the new additional authorization proposed. Thus, the new additional authorization is estimated to be under $3,400,000,000.

Current budget estimates of mortgage insurance operations during the 1956 fiscal year indicate a gross use of insurance authorization totaling $7,397,600,000. After allowance for return of authorization through expiration of commitments, scheduled repayments on outstanding insured mortgages, and complete prepayments of such mortgages, the prospective net use of insurance authorization for mortgage insurance programs during that fiscal year is estimated at $3,998,800,000.

Section 7. Removal of cost certification requirements from section 221, single family homes: As adopted in the Housing Act of 1954, section 227 of the National Housing Act provides for a certification of cost by the mortgagors on all properties with mortgages insured under section 221, including both single-family homes for sale and rental projects. To the extent that construction under section 221 consists of single-family homes built in projects, the difficulties of cost certification substantially outweigh any possible benefits to be derived from the certification.

In such construction, as under section 203, homes produced in subdivision developments by operative builders are completed in succession and are transferred upon sale to an owner-occupant mortgagor. Upon such transfer, the cost to be certified would be the sale price of the property, a figure which is already reported to FHA and used as a basis for determining one of the limitations to the insurable mortgage amount. In this type of case (just as in the case of the construction of a single home for sale) the cost certification procedure serves no additional purpose.

For properties which are not sold upon completion, the builder may have the mortgage endorsed for insurance, with the mortgage amount limited to 85 percent of value, instead of 95 percent of value, thereby tripling the percentage of equity value. Also, on such transactions, total costs allocable to a particular structure may not be subject to final allocation, either because the expenditures may not yet have been completed (such as street surfacing) or the appropriate allocation among all units produced may not yet be establishable because construction operations on other parts of the subdivision are still under way.

Thus, with respect to single-family homes, the cost certification for the owner-occupant duplicates another established procedure, and as to the builder the certification would need to be done on a tentative or estimated basis. Accordingly, this section of the bill would, in effect, provide that under section 221, cost certification requirements shall be restricted to multifamily operations, as is the case in other FHA programs.

Section 8. FHA settlements of certificates of claim—section 603 Housing: This section would add the same provision with respect to section 603 mortgage insurance (covering World War II and post war veterans' emergency housing built for sale) as would be added by section 4 of the bill with respect to other FHA sales housing. This section of the bill would thus enable FHA to expedite final settlement of certificates of claim, and refunds to mortgagors, in connection with sales housing assisted under section 603. Of course, no further mortgage insurance commitments can be made under section 603.

Section 9. Extension of FHA title VIII (Wherry Act) military housing program: Under existing law, title VIII of the National Housing Act, the FHA Wherry Act military housing program, expires June 30, 1955. This section would extend title VIII for only those projects which are certified by the Secretary of Defense prior to June 30, 1955. Also all commitments by FHA to insure those projects must be made during the following year. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense so that existing title VIII operations may be concluded in an orderly manner.

Section 10. Termination of insurance authority under title IX: This section would merely provide a technical amendment to continue title IX insurance for outstanding commitments on July 1, 1955. The Housing Act of 1954 restricted title IX insuring operations to (1) outstanding commitments on July 31, 1954, and (2) projects designated by the President between July 31, 1954, and July 1, 1955. There has been only one Presidential action to authorize title IX operations since July 31, 1954, and there is no information to indicate prospective requests for further Presidential actions.

Accordingly this section would not extend title IX except with respect to any commitments which may possibly yet be issued prior to July 1, 1955, and remain outstanding on that date.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 11 (a). Capital grant authorization: Under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, capital grants in the aggregate amount of $500 million were authorized to carry out the title I slum clearance and urban redevelopment program, and this authorization was made available for the broader urban renewal program under the Housing Act of 1954. Section 11 (a) of the bill would increase that authorization by an additional $200 million to be made available on July 1, 1955, and another $200 million to be made available on July 1, 1956. Also the President would be authorized to increase the authorization at any time or times by an additional $100 million.

By December 31, 1954, a total of $429,852,000 of capital grants had been committed, including a $50 million reserve for possible overruns. It is estimated that by June 30, 1955, the entire $500 million capital grant authorization now in the law will be committed, including a $50 million reserve for overruns. A commitment of capital grant funds for a project is effected when the original allocation of an advance for surveys and plans is made. The commitment consists of the reservation of capital grant funds for such project based upon estimates of the capital grant needs for the project. From time to time, as the planning work progresses, revisions may be made in the capital grant reservation to bring it in line with later estimates. Reservations of capital grant funds do not represent legally binding obligations of the Federal Government to pay such capital grants. Such obligations are created when a contract for capital grant is executed following the completion of the surveys and plans. However, a reservation does indicate that a project approved for planning advances may in the normal course of events be covered by a contract for a capital grant, chargeable to a legislative authorization in effect when planning commences, in substantially the amount reserved. To that extent, therefore, such capital grant funds are earmarked or committed for such project. By June 30, 1955, the entire $500 million authorization will be thus reserved or committed. It is estimated that $194 million will actually be obligated by such date under title I contracts providing for the payment of capital grants.

By the end of fiscal year 1955 additional capital grant authorization will be required for the title I urban renewal program. By December 31, 1955, it is estimated that capital grants in the aggregate amount of $585 million will be committed, of which $60 million will represent a reserve for overruns. By June 30, 1956, a total of $700 million will be committed, of which $70 million will constitute a reserve for overruns. Thereafter, it is anticipated that the commitment of capital grants will increase at a more rapid rate. The broadened scope of the program and the anticipated increase in the number of municipalities that will participate in the new urban renewal program will accelerate capital grant commitments to the point that the balance of the increased capital grant authorization would be fully committed in about 2 additional years.

The need for providing at this time for the entire additional authorization of $500 million in capital grants (to become available as described above) arises out of the type of program involved. Many months of preliminary work are required to develop an urban renewal project. The local community must engage in long-range preparatory activities involving such matters as establishing and maintaining an appropriate urban renewal organization, hiring and training personnel, engaging experts, making surveys, preparing plans, revising capital improvement programs, and providing funds. In order to undertake such time-consuming and expensive activities, local communities need the assurance that capital grant funds are authorized and will be available at the time needed by the communities.

Moreover, the Urban Renewal Administration normally does not make even planning advances for any project unless there is available adequate capital grant authorization to cover the project. This means that without the capital grant authorization the planning of many urban renewal projects cannot be commenced by local communities, nor can the program be carried out at an orderly and efficient pace. The additional authorization is thus essential to enable local communities to commence and carry out necessary preparatory activities and to keep the urban renewal program moving forward to achieve the objectives of the Federal law.

Section 11 (b). Capital grants authorized for any one State: Under section 106 (e) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, not more than 10 percent of the capital grants authorized may be expended in any one State, provided that an additional $35 million (subject always to the limitation on the total authorization) of capital grants may be allocated to local public agencies in States in which more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted by those States has been obligated. By the close of fiscal year 1955, it is expected that this $35 million cushion will be committed. On December 31, 1954, $12,047,000 of the $35 million was committeed. Upon the basis of applications in process and anticipated, it is estimated that by June 30, 1955, the full $35 million will be committed.

The proposed increase in the capital grant authorization would double the maximum amount that could be made available to local public agencies in any one State under section 106 (e). For a period of time this increase in the maximum amount that can be made available in any one State would afford ample margin for meeting the urban renewal needs. But as the urban renewal program gains momentum, it is anticipated that the 10-percent maximum under the increased authorization with the $35 million cushion now provided will not be adequate for local public agencies in several States. Other States may not be able, for various reasons, to avail themselves of the maximum available Federal assistance. It is, therefore, desirable to make appropriate provision in the law to enable local public agencies with extensive urban renewal programs to utilize, within the maximum of an additional $35 million cushion, capital grant funds which other States will not need.

It should be noted that the $70 million amount in section 106 (e) would not be in addition to, but rather would be within, the total capital grant authorization.

Section 12. Urban renewal in Territories: This section is a technical amendment to permit Territories to take full advantage of the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the Housing Act of 1954, making financial assistance available for urban renewal projects. The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 authorized the governments of the Territories to enact laws

which would authorize municipalities or public authorities in those Territories to carry out slum clearance and redevelopment projects which would be eligible for financial aid under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. However, the Housing Act of 1954 added provisions to the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal aid to urban renewal, which includes aid not only for land acquisition and clearance for redevelopment as previously provided, but also aid to help in preventing the spread of slums and blight through the rehabilitation and conservation measures. This section would broaden the authority of the Territories in this respect to cover the broader urban renewal activities.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 13. Continuation of public housing and modification of restrictions: This section would authorize additional public housing for 2 more years at the rate authorized for fiscal year 1955 under the Housing Act of 1954. It would maintain the basic purpose of meeting the relocation needs of families of low income displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or by other governmental action. The section would, however, make necessary and desirable modifications of statutory restrictions which are holding up the provision of housing needed for those families and preventing the use of the authorization intended by the Congress. Accordingly, the section would amend subsection 10 (i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as amended by the Housing Act of 1954) to make the following changes:

1. The authority to enter into new annual contributions contracts for additional public housing would be increased by 70,000 units, in increments of 35,000 becoming available annually beginning July 1, 1955. This conforms to the recommendation of the President in his state of the Union message. The present authorization (for 35,000 units expiring June 30, 1955, under present law) would be extended to June 30, 1956, and each of the new increments of 35,000 units would remain available for 2 years after the first date on which it becomes available. Thus, the 35,000 units becoming available on July 1, 1955, would remain available until the middle of 1957 and the 35,000 units becoming available on July 1, 1956, would remain available until the middle of 1958. This would establish a reasonable deadline for using the authorization without unduly disrupting program operations.

2. As under the existing law, the restrictions in the revised subsection 10 (i) would be made applicable to annual contributions contracts, thus effectively controlling the size of the new program. However, it would be made clear that preliminary loan contracts, under the revised subsection, would not be subject to these restrictions, in order that preliminary planning could start at a date early enough to assure that the low-rent housing will be available when needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by governmental action. This is consistent with the present provisions of subsection 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, which makes definitive contracts for low-rent housing and title I urban renewal projects subject to the approval of a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight, but does not make preliminary or planning loans subject to such approval. The proposed language, however, would permit preliminary loan contracts for only a sufficient number of units to assure that annual contributions contracts could be entered into for the number of units authorized.

3. There would be incorporated in the revised subsection the requirement (presently included in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949) that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator make the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in that section. The new language provides, however, as in the case of FHA mortgage insurance under section 221 of the National Housing Act for housing for displaced families, that the workable program requirement is not applicable in the case of a locality where there is being carried out an urban redevelopment project covered by a Federal contract executed, or prior approval granted, by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954. This is in recognition of the fact that the concept of a workable program is newly created by the Housing Act of 1954 and requires time for development of techniques and procedures; and where a title I project has been approved previously it ought not to wait for approval of a workable program before public housing or section 221 housing can go forward to provide dwellings for the families displaced by the title I project. Existing law permits the undertaking and completion of such title I projects although the community does not have, or will not have, a workable program. There will thus be the same problem of relocating displaced families of low income from those projects as from projects in communities having workable programs, and public housing should not be barred where needed for such families.

4. The present requirement that there must be a title I urban renewal project being carried out in the community is eliminated, since it seems unfair to deny public-housing assistance for displaced families in communities which have workable programs and eliminate slums without Federal aid under title I. This would be parallel to the provision with respect to FHA insurance under section 221 for housing for displaced families which is predicated on the elimination of slums but does not require the carrying out of a title I project as a condition precedent to such insurance.

5. In place of the present requirement of a certification by the local governing body that the project is necessary to assist in meeting the relocation requirements of section 105 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the proposed legislation would require only that the local governing body approve the additional units by resolution. This would carry out the apparent intent of the existing requirement but eliminate language which has raised serious questions of interpretation. The present language would also be inconsistent with the proposed removal of the requirement that there must be a title I project being carried out in the community.

6. The present law requires that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator determine that the additional units will not exceed the total number to be needed for families to be displaced by Federal, State, or local governmental action. The proposed amendment would require, in lieu of this provision, that the House and Home Finance Administrator make a determination that the additional units will not exceed the number of low-income families to be displaced (within the metropolitan or housing market area) by Federal, State, or local governmental action, thus making it clear that the Administrator is not required to take account of vacancies which may occur in existing low-rent housing projects. The proposed legislation would permit new housing to be provided for families to be displaced by all governmental action without affecting occupancy in existing projects, which could then continue to serve other eligible families of low income. Such eligible families include those (1) who leave the slums on their own initiative without being forced out as a result of governmental action, (2) who are displaced by private enterprise which is clearing a slum site on its own initiative, or (3) who are displaced as a result of fire or other catastrophe.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Section 14 (1). Change in amount of required stock subscription by member of Federal Home Loan Bank: The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, enacted in 1932, originally required that each institution eligible for membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank must subscribe to the stock of that bank in an amount equal to at least 1 percent of the aggregate unpaid principal of all the home-mortgage loans held by such institution (but not less than $1,500, which amount was later reduced to $500). That requirement was not changed further until 1950 when a new subsection 6 (1) was added to the act requiring an increase in the amount of stock subscription from 1 to 2 percent for the purpose of acquiring additional funds to enable the Federal home-loan banks to retire all Government stock holdings in these banks. All of the stock held by the Government in these banks has now been retired and there is no longer necessity for the higher stock ownership. Therefore, this section would provide that the Board could determine the amount of required stock subscription, but that in no event could it be less than 1 percent nor more than 2 percent of the aggregate of the member's home-mortgage loans. However, it would be provided that this would not reduce at any time the amount of stock required to be held by a member below the amount required to be held as of the date of enactment of this section.

An additional safeguard which would avoid any substantial reduction in the amount of stock subscriptions arises from the existing requirement in section 10 (c) of the act that at no time shall the aggregate advances by a Federal home-loan bank exceed 12 times the amount of bank stock held by the member institution. Any appreciable increase in demands by a member institution for advances from the bank would, in most cases, necessitate an increase above 2 percent in subscriptions to the bank stock in order to maintain the required 12-to-1 ratio.

Section 14 (2). Termination of bank membership: This section would amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to provide that any member institution may be removed from membership if in the judgment of the Board it is insolvent or the character of such institution's management or its home-financing policy is inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of that act. A member institution (which is a savings and loan or building and loan type) would be deemed insolvent if its assets are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts.

The act currently provides that no institution shall be eligible to become a member of a bank if in the judgment of the Board its financial condition is such that advances may not safely be made to it or if the character of its management and home-financing policy is inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the provisions of the act. There is, however, no provision for removal of a member institution for these grounds once the institution becomes a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

A conservator can be appointed for a Federal savings and loan association on grounds somewhat similar to those just referred to. Also, under the Housing Act of 1954, legislation was enacted which authorizes the termination of insurance of accounts of an insured institution for somewhat similar grounds. However, a State-chartered institution which is a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System but is not insured could not be deprived of further membership, although if such an institution were insured, its insurance could be terminated.

This section would thus merely fill a gap in the statutory authority of the Board to terminate benefits to unsound institutions.

The section also expressly provides that a Federal savings and loan association may not voluntarily withdraw from membership. These institutions are required by law to become members of a Federal home-loan bank. The present law requiring these institutions to be insured does not permit them to voluntarily cancel insurance of accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Section 14 (3): This is a technical amendment.

Section 14 (4). Increase in the number of elected directors in certain Federal home-loan banks: The Federal Home Loan Bank Act presently provides for a board of 12 directors in each Federal home-loan bank. Eight directors are elected to each board by the members of the bank and four are appointed by the Home Loan Bank Board. This section would permit the Board, in any district in which there are more than four States (that is, more than half the number of elected directors), to increase the directorate so that there could be as many as, but not more than, twice as many elective directors as there are States.

Because certain of the Federal home loan bank districts, such as the Greensboro district, with 7 States and the District of Columbia, and the San Francisco district, with 9 States as well as Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, contain so many basic units, proper recognition cannot, in all cases, be afforded. At present the Board in its regulations attempts to provide for each State to be represented on the board of directors of the bank of its district. In the case of the San Francisco district this is, of course, at present impossible and the Board has been compelled to adopt the method of treating two States as if they were one. By regulatory provision, the representatives of these two States have been alternated. Furthermore, the present law so limits the elective directors that fair consideration cannot be effected giving recognition to the relevant financial importance of the institutions in the various States, while recognizing representation for all States. In the San Francisco district, the California members comprise approximately 57 percent of the entire membership and hold approximately 73 percent of the entire outstanding bank stock of the San Francisco bank. The proposed change would permit all States to be represented on the board of directors and permit recognition to be given to the relevant financial importance of the institutions in the various States.

Section 15. Removal of $2,500 limitation on FHA and VA improvement loans by Federals: This section would make a correction in the existing law to remove a $2,500 limitation as applied to the amount of an FHA or VA insured or guaranteed loan made by a Federal savings and loan association.

Prior to the Housing Act of 1954, FHA or VA insured or guaranteed repair loans made by a Federal savings and loan association were not subject to a special dollar limitation. The applicable limitations were thus the ones provided for all lenders in the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. However, in enacting an amendment increasing from $1,500 to $2,500 the maximum amount of an eligible Federal association loan not insured or guaranteed, the Congress also imposed the $2,500 restriction on an insured or guaranteed loan (thus prohibiting a Federal association from making, for example, a $3,000 FHA title I loan for construction of a new structure). This was apparently done inadvertently, and it is important that the statute be corrected.

Section 16. FSLIC admission fee: The present law requires that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation charge (in addition to premiums) lending institutions an admission fee as an initial payment for obtaining insurance coverage. That admission fee must be based upon the reserve fund of FSLIC and must constitute an equitable contribution to that fund. This section of the bill would change that requirement to provide that lending institutions applying for insurance hereafter shall pay an admission fee as determined by FSLIC, taking into consideration the cost of processing the applications. This would carry out the recommendation of the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 371, p. 16, 83d Cong., April 26, 1954) and make the admission fee requirement more consistent with general insurance operations. The statement of the General Accounting Office with respect to this recommendation contains the following:

"We recommend that the National Housing Act be amended to eliminate the existing requirement for the payment of an admission fee based on the reserve fund of F. S. & L. I. C. and to authorize the imposition of a fee on newly insured institutions commensurate with the direct and indirect cost of granting insurance coverage.

"The admission fee charged by FSLIC against newly insured associations is required by law to be based on the reserve fund of FSLIC and to be, in its judgment, an equitable contribution * * *.

"We believe that a newly insured association's contribution to an insurance reserve fund should be confined to payments for services and benefits actually received, i. e., insurance premiums for protection to be received by its investors. Further, a fee based on the ratio of the reserve fund to the total insurance risk (which would satisfy the legal requirement for an equitable contribution) might be so large as to discourage applicants for insurance membership. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does not charge admission fees against newly insured banks, and to our knowledge other similar risk enterprises do not make such charges."

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 17. Reserve of planned public works: This section would amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, which authorized the third public works advance planning program. The proposed amendments would carry out the recommendation contained under the heading "Coordination of public works planning" appearing in section 4 of chapter 3 of the Economic Report of the President, which was transmitted to the Congress on January 20. That report contains the following statement:

"A problem of great interest * * * is the stimulation of public works planning in States and localities. Many smaller communities have projects within their master development plans for which funds are not immediately available to produce preliminary engineering surveys and designs. Assistance to such communities would help them to develop plans for public works ready for initiation, which otherwise would take months to prepare in case of need. Such a reservoir of planned public works should be of considerable magnitude to be effective. The sum of $1.5 million made available by the Congress last year for planning advances—that is, interest-free loans—to States and municipalities was a good beginning but no more than that. It is recommended that the Congress enlarge substantially the appropriation for planning advances, and that a revolving fund be established for this purpose. The need for building a reservoir of ready-to-go projects has been recognized in three separate programs of planning advances, established by the Congress within the past decade. This experience indicates that the need for preparedness, being itself continuous, is not well met by programs of limited duration."

The bill would make the following changes in the present law:

(1) The Housing Administrator would be authorized to establish a revolving fund for the making of planning advances. In addition to the $10 million authorized to be appropriated by section 702 as originally enacted there would be authorized to be appropriated to the fund twelve, twelve, and fourteen million dollars to be made available on or after July 1, 1956, 1957, and 1958 and, in addition, such appropriations from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in outstanding advances (and any undisbursed balances in the fund) for plans of projects which can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time.

(2) Advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State would be limited to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund. Under the present law not more than 5 percent of appropriations may be expended in any one State.

(3) The July 1, 1957 expiration date for the present program would be eliminated, and the new introductory language of the revised section 702 would make it clear that a reservoir rather than a shelf of planned public works is intended.

(4) As under the present law, local public agencies must agree to complete the plan preparation promptly and to repay advances when the construction of the public works is started. Provisions would be added to the law, however, which would require a public agency to repay proportionate amounts of advances when only a portion of the construction of a planned public work is undertaken by the local agency.

The bill would continue provisions in the present law which state that the advances are designed to finance the cost of engineering and architectural surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, or other action preliminary to and in preparation for the construction of State and local public works. By definition, public works excludes housing. The bill retains present provisions of law which make it clear that the making of planning advances in no way commits the Congress to assist in financing the construction of the public works planned.

Section 18. Salary of Community Facilities Commissioner: This section would make the salary of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency the same as that of the heads of its constituent agencies. The Housing Act of 1948 has fixed this compensation at $15,000 per annum.

A new constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, known as the Community Facilities Administration, was established by the Housing Administrator's Reorganization Order No. 1 of December 23, 1954. There was transferred to that administration the office of the Commissioner of Community Facilities, and the title of such office was changed to Community Facilities Commissioner.

The Community Facilities Commissioner is presently receiving $14,800 per year pursuant to Public Law 359, 81st Congress and Public Law 375, 82d Congress. This proposed section would therefore give the necessary statutory authority to increase the compensation of the head of this new constituent unit so that it would be equal to the compensation received by the heads of the constituent agencies and the head of another new constituent unit of the agency, the Urban Renewal Administration. Although the salary increase provided by this section would be very small, it would serve the purpose of providing consistency in the salaries paid the heads of the constituent agencies and units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Urban Renewal Commissioner already receives the same salary as the heads of constituent agencies by virtue of section 106 (a) (1) of the Housing Act of 1949 and the Housing Administrator's Reorganization Order No. 1.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

INCREASE IN FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The FHA general mortgage insurance authorization would be increased to authorize FHA mortgage insurance up to the aggregate of outstanding insurance liability and commitments on June 30, 1955, plus $4 billion. This increase would take care of the estimated amount of housing construction which will be assisted by FHA mortgage insurance during fiscal year 1956.

EXTENSION OF FHA TITLE I HOME REPAIR AND MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The FHA title I home repair and modernization program would be extended for 5 years to July 1, 1960. Under this program the FHA insures lending institutions against loss on home repair and modernization loans. FHA liability is limited to 90 percent of loss on individual loans and to 10 percent of all title I loans held by a lending institution.

REVISION OF FHA MORTGAGE LIMITATIONS FOR MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS

The present statutory limit on the dollar amount of a multifamily housing project mortgage, where the mortgagor is a private corporation, would be increased from $5 million to $12.5 million. This limit would apply to mortgages insured under sections 207 (the major FHA rental housing program), 213 (cooperative housing), 221 (low-cost housing for families displaced in slum-clearance areas and by governmental action), and 803 (military housing) of the National Housing Act. The limitation on FHA mortgages financing multifamily housing in slum clearance or urban renewal areas under section 220 of the National Housing Act would be increased from $5 million to $50 million, where the mortgagor is a private corporation. This conforms to the dollar ceiling now in the law with respect to multifamily housing mortgages where the mortgagor is a public body.

The dollar limit would apply not only to the amount of the mortgage which is insured but would also apply to the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued by FHA to the same mortgagor and outstanding at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area. The effect of this provision would be that no mortgagor could receive from FHA a commitment to insure the mortgage on a proposed multifamily project as long as another project in the area covered by a commitment in the maximum amount to the same mortgagor is still under construction or still attaining initial occupancy. If a corporation seeking an FHA commitment is under the same or substantially the same control as another corporation which has an FHA commitment, the two corporations would be considered to be the same mortgagor for the purpose of this limitation. The limitation would not apply to two or more mortgages, even though the sponsors were the same and the structures on contiguous sites, if the mortgages are beyond the commitment stage.

OTHER FHA AMENDMENTS

The separate authorization of $100 million under section 203 (i) of the National Housing Act for farm-housing mortgages insured under that section would be eliminated. This provision would be removed to reduce record keeping and the insurance volume under this program would be controlled in the same manner that other section 203 sales housing mortgages are controlled under the general FHA mortgage insurance authorization.

Provisions with respect to properties acquired by the FHA under foreclosed mortgages would be amended to enable the FHA to make final settlement of certificates of claim held by mortgagees and refunds to mortgagors at any time after the sale or transfer of title by the FHA to the property acquired. Under the present law such final settlement and refunds cannot be made until the housing which has been sold by FHA has been completely paid for, which may involve as much as 20 years in cases where 20-year mortgages are taken by FHA in payment for the property. The amendment would result in savings through simplified accounting and reduced record keeping.

The present requirement in the National Housing Act for cost certification by the mortgagor on all single-family housing covered by mortgages insured under section 221 of the National Housing Act would be removed. Section 221 housing is low-cost housing for families displaced by slum clearance operations or governmental action.

Title VIII FHA military-housing program (Wherry Act) would be extended for only those projects which are undertaken pursuant to a certification by the Secretary of Defense prior to June 30, 1955, and a commitment to insure issued on or before June 30, 1956.

Title IX FHA defense housing mortgage insurance would be made available for any outstanding commitments on July 1, 1955, to insure under that title. Title IX would otherwise expire on that date.

INCREASE IN CAPITAL GRANT AUTHORIZATION FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

The capital grant authorization in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for Federal assistance to slum clearance and urban renewal would be increased by $200 million to be available after next June 30 and an additional $200 million after June 30, 1956. The President would also be authorized to provide an additional $100 million of authorization. The present law provides that not more than 10 percent of the capital grant authorization may be expended in any 1 State except that an additional $35 million may be allocated to local public agencies in States in which more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted in those States has been obligated. The $35-million limit would be increased by the bill to $70 million.

TERRITORIAL ENABLING ACT AMENDED TO AUTHORIZE URBAN RENEWAL LEGISLATION

Amendments would be made in the Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 to broaden the authority of the governments of the Territories to enact laws for urban renewal activities. Under the 1950 act they were authorized to enact urban redevelopment laws. Since urban renewal activities are broader than urban redevelopment activities authority is needed to enact the broader urban renewal laws.

SEVENTY THOUSAND ADDITIONAL LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED

The Public Housing Administration would be authorized to enter into new contracts for 70,000 additional low-rent public housing units with the authorization becoming available at the rate of 35,000 on July 1, 1955, and 35,000 on July 1, 1956. Each year's authorization would be available for 2 years. That is, the authorization for 35,000 units which would become available on July 1, 1955, would remain available until June 30, 1957, and the 35,000 units authorization becoming available on July 1, 1956, would be available until June 30, 1958. In addition, the authorization in the present law for 35,000 units (provided in the Housing Act of 1954) which expires June 30, 1955, would be continued to June 30, 1956.

MODIFICATIONS IN STATUTORY RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLIC HOUSING

Modifications would also be made in certain statutory restrictions on the provision of low-rent public housing which have been found to be so restrictive as to prevent the provision of the housing by the time it is needed for housing families displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal operations.

Under the present law no new agreement of any kind with respect to public housing can be made with a community except where there is already being carried out a slum clearance and redevelopment or urban renewal project with Federal assistance under the Housing Act of 1949. This requirement would be changed so that preliminary contracts could be entered into for public housing which will permit planning at a stage early enough to assure that the low-rent housing will be available when needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by slum clearance or other governmental action. Further, public housing assistance would be permitted in communities which have workable programs for the prevention and elimination of slums even though they are not undertaking a redevelopment or urban renewal project assisted under the Housing Act of 1949. This would permit assistance in these communities where slum clearance is being accomplished without Federal assistance.

Communities which are carrying out slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs under the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 prior to its amendment by the Housing Act of 1954 would be excepted from the requirement that communities must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums before new public housing contracts can be entered into. The requirement of a workable program would continue to apply to all other communities entering into new contracts.

Under existing law, the local governing body must certify that the public housing project is necessary to assist in meeting requirements for housing families displaced from slum-clearance projects being assisted under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. In place of that requirement, the proposed legislation would require that the local governing body adopt a resolution approving the public housing project.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be required to find that the number of new public housing units to be provided in a community does not exceed the number of families of low income eligible for admission to the housing which he estimates will be displaced within the locality as a result of governmental action. The present law requires that the Administrator determine that the number of new units will not exceed the total number to be needed for displaced families. This change would make it clear that the Administrator is not required to take account of vacancies which may occur in existing low-rent housing projects. This would permit new housing to be provided for displaced families without affecting occupancy in existing projects, which could then continue to serve other eligible low-income families. Such families include those (1) who leave the slums on their own initiative without being forced out as a result of governmental action, (2) who are displaced by private enterprise which is clearing a slum site on its own initiative, or (3) who are displaced as a result of fire or other catastrophe.

STOCK SUBSCRIPTION REQUIREMENTS OF MEMBERS OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS REDUCED

The requirements for stock subscription by members of Federal home loan banks

would be changed to require that the original stock subscription for each lending institution eligible to become a member shall be an amount equal to 1 percent of the aggregate of the subscriber's home mortgage loans, or such higher percent not exceeding 2 percent as the Home Loan Bank Board shall prescribe by regulation, but not less than $500. This would be in place of the present requirement that a member shall acquire and hold stock in an amount equal to at least 2 percent of the aggregate of its home mortgage loans and purchase contracts, but not less than $500. A member would not be permitted to reduce the amount of stock held by it to below 2 percent of the aggregate of its home mortgage loans as of the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1955. However, a member would not be required to subscribe for additional stock until such time as the amount of stock held by it does not equal that required by the regulation of the Home Loan Bank Board. The proposed reduction in stock subscription requirements are a result of the retirement of all Government holdings of stock in the Federal home loan banks so that there is no longer necessity for the higher stock ownership by members of the banks as a means of obtaining funds for such retirement.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK MEMBERSHIP AND ADVANCES

Provisions would be added to the present law to permit the Home Loan Bank Board, after hearing, to terminate membership of a lending institution in a Federal home loan bank, or the making of advances to nonmember borrowers if, in the opinion of the Board, such member or nonmember borrower has a management or home-financing policy of a character inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. The present law merely requires that the Board find failure to comply with provisions of the law or regulations of the Board or insolvency. Provisions would also be added that a member which is a building and loan or savings and loan association, cooperative bank, or homestead association shall be deemed insolvent if the assets of such member are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts. The addition of these provisions will assure that the standards for termination of membership and advances by a Federal home loan bank are the same as the standards of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for termination of insurance of accounts of an institution so that institutions whose insurance has been terminated will not continue as members of a Federal home loan bank and to receive advances.

INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF ELECTED DIRECTORS IN CERTAIN FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

The Home Loan Bank Board would be authorized to increase the number of elective directors of any Federal home loan bank having a district which includes five or more States so that there could be as many as, but not more than, twice as many elective directors as there are States. This would permit representation for each State in a district and permit recognition of the relevant financial importance of institutions in the various States.

REMOVAL OF $2,500 LIMIT ON FHA AND VA IMPROVEMENT LOANS BY FEDERALS

The present law would be amended to permit Federal savings and loan associations to make FHA or VA insured or guaranteed repair loans without regard to the $2,500 limit placed on repair loans made by the associations which are not insured or guaranteed by FHA or VA. The limit on FHA or VA loans would be that provided in the National Housing Act or Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

FSLIC ADMISSION FEE

The admission fee paid to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation by lending institutions applying for insurance of their accounts would be changed to be in an amount determined by FSLIC taking into consideration the cost of processing the applications. Under present law the admission fee must be based upon the reserve fund of FSLIC and must constitute an equitable contribution to that fund. The change has been recommended by the General Accounting Office.

ADVANCES FOR PLANNING PUBLIC WORKS

The July 1, 1957 expiration date for the present advance planning program would be eliminated and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized to establish a revolving fund for the making of planning advances to local agencies for the preparation of a reservoir rather than a shelf of planned public works. In addition to the $10 million authorized to be appropriated by the present law, there would be authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund $12, $12, and $14 million to be made available on or after July 1, 1956, 1957, and 1958 and, in addition, such appropriations from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in outstanding advances (and any undisbursed balances in the fund) for plans of projects which can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time. Advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State would be limited to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund. Under the present law not more than 5 percent of appropriations may be expended in any one State. Provisions would also be added to the present law which would require a public agency to repay proportionate amounts of advances when only a portion of the construction of a planned public work is undertaken by the local agency.

SALARY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMISSIONER

A new provision of law would be enacted to make the salary of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency the same as that of the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing Agency, which under the Housing Act of 1948, is $15,000 per annum. The Community Facilities Commissioner is presently receiving $14,800 per year pursuant to Public Law 359, 81st Congress and Public Law 375, 82d Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES IN ANTARCTICA

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a resolution adopted last week by the Daughters of the American Revolution urging immediate action by the Congress to take steps to validate the claims of the United States in Antarctica.

Minnesota delegates have always been active in this effort and they are to be commended for arousing a national awareness of the great potential of this area.

As the resolution adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the DAR pointed out, American citizens have discovered more of the South Pole continent than all other nations combined and have done nothing to validate its rightful claim.

The society has urged that further exploration be undertaken in order to produce maps and surveys of mineral resources as groundwork for validating the claims of our country. This vast area comprises one-tenth of the earth's land surface and represents one of the last great frontiers.

Following is the text of the original resolution passed by the 60th annual State conference of the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution in March 1955:

ANTARCTICA

Whereas the United States of America has discovered, explored, and claimed more territory in the south polar region than all other nations combined; and

Whereas this region not only is an untapped reservoir of natural resources, but is of extreme strategic value in the interest of our national defense; and

Whereas the United States of America has done nothing to advance the claims so acquired, although seven other countries each claims a portion of Antarctica, and one nation lays claim to all of it:

Resolved, That Congress be urged to pass House Joint Resolution 25 and to take all steps necessary to protect and preserve our claims to Antarctica.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2225) amending section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRIEST, HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, WOLVERTON, and HINSHAW.

JASPER (ARK.) HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our young people are the leaders of the future. It is always inspiring to have them come to see us and allow us to share their enthusiasm and good sense.

From our own district last week, we were happy to have the graduating class of the Jasper High School. Jasper is the county seat of Newton County, Ark., and is a beautiful city nestled in the bosom of the Ozarks, not far from Diamond Cave, one of the scenic wonders of the country. These children are fortunate, indeed, to be able to claim such a lovely locale as their home.

While they were here, they visited the Capitol, saw the Congress in session, made a tour of the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court, visited the Washington Monument, the Bureau of Engraving, the White House, Smithsonian Institution, Mount Vernon, Arlington National Cemetery, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and other points of interest. They were fortunate, too, to see a big-league ball game between the Washington Senators and the Boston Red Sox.

A hand salute to each of these youngsters and their sponsors. They are a credit to their country.

In the group were sponsors Arch Smith, superintendent of the Jasper schools, Mrs. Erma Dee Spears, and Mr. Lewellen, and the following students: Guy Young, Bobby Burdine, Emma Faye Hensley, Dalton Ham, Garner Milam, Lester Waters, P. J. Hensley, Coy Boen, Lawrence Smith, Irene Brasel, Euteva Kilgore, Patty Phillips, Doris Sloan, Anna Thomas, Joan Spencer, Louise Kelley, Nina Robinson, Jerry Lynn Reynolds, Clayton Reynolds, Barbara Jo Twyman, and Wanda Lea Webb.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FOREIGN QUARANTINE DIVISION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H. R. 5798 to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to the compensation of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division. This bill would do two things. First, it would establish overtime provisions for quarantine officers as the same as those for Customs and Immigration Service. Secondly, with some exceptions, it would require that in cases of overtime performed at the request of private shipping company representatives, the requesting party reimburse the United States for the cost.

In the 83d Congress, H. R. 6253, a somewhat similar bill introduced by me, was passed unanimously by both Houses but the President withheld his approval and thus it did not become law. This measure, H. R. 5798, is designed to overcome Executive objections to the other legislation in that it does not spell out overtime rates. It simply recognizes the claim of inspectional employees for equal treatment with other inspectional groups. It deals with a pattern and not a pay structure.

The problem of shipping operators whereby their vessels are required to anchor at quarantine until morning when arriving after 6 p. m. results in costly delays amounting to as much as $5,000 a ship per day. Therefore, shipowners are willing to reimburse the Federal Government for out-of-hours inspection costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will expedite consideration of this legislation. I believe if the House and Senate take favorable action on H. R. 5798 with this changed provision, the previous White House objection would be overcome.

The President, as he stated he would last August, has provided for a study of overtime and premium pay and H. R. 5798 is designed to fit in with any changes in pay structures which might come out of recommendations resulting from this study.

Because of the peculiar circumstances of out-of-regular-hours service in meeting and inspecting ships where arrival times are uncertain and the inconvenience to inspectors is out of proportion to hours worked, liberal overtime rates are traditional and warranted. The study of such overtime rates instituted by the President is bound to recognize these unusual factors, but regardless of the outcome of this study, everyone agrees a quarantine inspector should be treated on the same basis as the customs and immigration inspectors because all three services work under identical conditions.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 4876, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RIGHTS OF STATES TO LEVY AND COLLECT CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the State of Iowa recently adopted the following concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation whch will secure and make certain to the States of the Union the power and right to levy and collect certain taxes:

House Concurrent Resolution 20

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.*, v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and the preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule here complained of; and

Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union of any portion of their power to tax government contractors there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in the balance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 56th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union and the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the law of any State of the Union, except such taxes the direct incidence of which would be upon the United States.

THE HARD-MONEY HIGH-INTEREST POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the hard-money, high-interest policy is starting all over again. If present policies of the Federal Reserve are carried out, it will be much harder than the hard-money policy of 1953, which almost caused the country to suffer from a ruinous depression.

Farm prices are down. They have been going down a long time. There is not much hope of farm prices starting upward again soon under present policies and outlook.

OVER 3 MILLION UNEMPLOYED

Today we not only are suffering from low farm prices but we still have more than 3 million workers unemployed. We have more than 100 distressed areas in the United States, many of them with an unemployment rate of as high as 11 and 12 percent. These are distressing signs in our economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman about that, but I

noticed the latter part of last week about how many hundred thousand was it?—the gentleman perhaps noticed it—we have to take care of. They told those in the northern half of the country to go south, and we would take care of them. Now they say there are not any jobs for them. How long does the gentleman think that can go on?

Mr. PATMAN. Who is the gentleman quoting?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In Friday's Post. I know it is not a very good quote, but that is the source.

Mr. PATMAN. I will read it with a great deal of interest, because I know the gentleman is keeping up with things like that. I appreciate the fact that he has called it to my attention. I will read it.

ADJUST ECONOMY FOR 1956 ELECTION

Mr. Speaker, in a newsletter put out by people who discuss banking, currency, and monetary matters in general, there is a very frank statement contained in the first paragraph of the issue published the last few days concerning this new policy of the Federal Reserve to cause hard money again and high interest rates. I will quote it exactly:

Politically, there is fear that good business will not be sustained until the presidential election in 1956.

In other words, those in charge of our monetary system, the money managers, our money masters, placed in charge by this Congress, have decided they should look at our economy from the standpoint of next year's election. They have decided that this economy cannot continue prosperous throughout this year and next year—1956, too. So it is in their interest to look at it from the strictly political standpoint, that is, it is in their interest, in other words, to cause a recession now and have the economy go down so that commencing a while before the election next year, they may have an expanding economy and be before the people just before the election in a more favorable light. In effect, that is exactly what this says, and that is the kind of talk we are hearing from every corner. And that seems to be the policy of causing hard times now so that the time will be so much better in 1956 and the economy, in particular, will look so much better in 1956, just before the general election. It says further in this newsletter, which is so highly regarded in banking circles:

Steps to dampen the rate of business expansion in order to spread out the duration of good times are naturally under consideration.

Any reader of this letter is impressed with the fact that the people who prepare it for distribution among banking and financial leaders are very close to the money masters, the money managers, and that they know what is going on. Therefore, let me repeat that this writer says that our money masters certainly have under consideration the fact that steps to dampen the rate of business expansion in order to spread out the duration of good times are naturally under consideration.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. What will be the effect of upping the rediscount rates in the various Federal Reserve centers?

Mr. PATMAN. It is more psychological than real, but it has a devastating psychological effect. The banks do not want to go into debt to the Federal Reserve banks any more. They got caught that way one time and they did not like it, and they are not going to go into debt if they can help it. The money masters in fixing this rate and in upping this rate one quarter of one percent is giving notice to all the banks and all the people who deal in credit—"get harder—get harder with money; raise your interest rates because this is your signal that money is going to get harder."

It is strictly psychological, that is, more so than real, but it hurts the little man more than anybody because this wholesale interest rate is reflected immediately in the interest rate that the small man must pay.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. What is the meaning of the upping of the interest rate by Secretary Benson on disaster loans, up to 5 percent?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I think that was terrible. It was wholly unjustified. There was no reason at all. Of course, I would not accuse Secretary Benson of having any intention of making it hard on people already in distress. I would not accuse him of that, but the result is that it makes it much harder on those already in distress, and it was not necessary to do it.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman have any information that about May 1 the FHA, and possibly the VA, may tighten down on all FHA and VA loans, in order to bring back hard money?

Mr. PATMAN. They are already doing it. This upping of the rediscount rate is the signal. Even GI loans are selling as low as 92. They are Government guaranteed, guaranteed by the Government of the United States, and money has already gotten so hard in many sections that that paper can only be sold if they will reduce the price of it down to 92, or a loss of 8 percent on the Government-guaranteed GI loan. It is a disgrace. It should not be permitted. It can be stopped if the Congress wants to take action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join the gentleman in his expression of regret regarding the news that disaster loan interest rates have been raised from 3 to 5 percent in the drought areas. I know of no previous time when the Government has endeavored to make money out of disaster, and out of the distress of human beings, but in this instance the interest rate on these disaster loans has been raised to the highest point of any interest rate that I know of that is being charged on Government loans. Yet that is the policy just put into effect by Secretary Benson. I certainly share the gentleman's feelings about it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an increase of 66⅔ percent to people who are in distress and cannot help it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean the interest rate on loans that have already been made has been increased?

Mr. PATMAN. I was not talking about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are not talking about loans that have been made?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I got that information several months ago. I have been so busy on other matters that I have not mentioned it. But that happened several months ago. Most of those disaster loans bear a 5 percent rate instead of 3 percent. There was no public announcement made of it at the time it was done. I do not know that they deliberately concealed it, but I heard about it in conversation with one of the officials several months ago when I made inquiry about interest rates being increased on other loans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman has been busy. He did a very fine job with me in the Small Business Administration Committee. But does the gentleman mean that disaster loans that have been made—that the interest rate on those loans has been increased?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to intelligently answer the gentleman's question, but I know they have been increased from 3 percent to 5 percent. Whether or not they had the power to go back and rewrite the contracts and increase the interest rate I do not know, but they have increased the interest rate on disaster loans from 3 percent to 5 percent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, let us get that clear.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to get it clear right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. PATMAN. But the point is the disaster-loan interest rates have been increased. It is not a matter of any great concern right now for the purpose of my discussion whether it applies to former loans or not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The new interest rate went into effect January 3, 1955. It has been effective on all loans made since that date.

Mr. PATMAN. There was no public announcement made?

Mr. EDMONDSON. None whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. It was only known publicly a few days ago, although I heard it several months ago when I was making an inquiry about increases in

interest rates. I did not see any announcement of it. So I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that all loans made since January 3 have carried the higher rate.

Mr. RAINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman anticipate that the raising of the rediscount rate will foretell an increase in interest rates generally?

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly does, just like the administration started out to do in January 1953. It charged more interest, and the people who pay interest are compelled to take more and more from their limited budgets and pay it in the form of interest and service charges and have less and less to buy the goods in the form of comforts, necessities, and even luxuries of life.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman arguing that money should be made easier in the sense that interest rates should be lower, and it should be easier to buy on installment or to borrow at a lesser rate of interest?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the terms in the recent past, meaning in the last few years, have been rather reasonable. As to installment purchasing, I am not talking about the commercial rate of interest as much as I am the Government rate of interest. I do not believe the Government rate of interest should be arbitrarily increased, and that is what has been going on. Whenever you arbitrarily increase the Government rate of interest that eventually goes clear across the board. If you raise the rate from 2½ percent to 3 percent that means a one-half percent increase which eventually goes clear across the board, and affects all debt, public and private.

Our national debt today represents a large part, almost one-half of the entire outstanding debt of the Nation. About a year ago the entire outstanding debt was $640 billion; that is public debt, private debt, all debt of all kinds, $640 billion. A 1-percent increase in that debt means $6.4 million a year. That is about $40 per annnum for every man, woman, and child. That makes a heavy burden on the people to pay interest rates. So the trend now makes it harder on the fellow who pays interest rates and make it easier and more profitable to those who are collecting interest; that is exactly the trend; there is no dispute about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands, I think, with the other Members of the House, that we are soon to be confronted with a $3.5 to $4 billion foreign aid bill; and we are told that under the foreign aid bill this year emphasis will be put upon loans to foreign governments. I doubt that the gentleman from Texas believes we are going to lend very much of this money, but if we do, does the gentleman think that foreigners will pay us 5 percent on the $3.5 or $4 billion that will be put out to them?

Mr. PATMAN. If they do it will be a new policy; in fact, I am going to look with a very critical eye on these recommendations and suggestions about additional loans to foreign countries to bolster the economy of a foreign country when we are denying our people the same opportunities here at home.

The Export-Import Bank with a billion-dollar capital furnished by the United States Government can make loans, big and little, all over the world, except in the United States; they can build steel mills in Argentina, and they are; they can build different projects all over the world at a low rate of interest; they can lend money to the big business or little business of foreign governments in foreign countries, but the people in our own country do not have that aid. We have the Small Business Administration created in 1953 which may make a loan up to $150,000, that is all, just $150,000; in other words, enough to let small business compete with other small businesses, but not enough to let them compete with any large business, not a dime. But they will let them have all the money they want in foreign countries! That part is not good, it is not good.

They have discovered a small area in foreign operations including loans which is not covered and they are trying to organize another RFC worldwide in scope, the INF, to cover a small area which is not covered. This INF is being sponsored by the world bank. We will hear more about it soon.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman just referred to the fact that the Export-Import Bank can make loans at a low rate of interest anywhere in the world except the United States—and he is so right about that, tragically right. But the Farmers' Home Administration has the power under the present law to make these loans at 3 percent. Our committee, or at least the Subcommittee on Credit of the Committee on Agriculture, was concerned about this very matter and called Mr. McLeaish, and he appeared before us last week. He went into this very matter and I personally asked him if they did not have the power to make these loans at 3 percent. He said they had. Mr. McLeaish expressed some concern and said that maybe there ought to be some distinction between a loan of a half million dollars and a loan of $1,500, which is their average. I think probably there should be. I asked him if he did not have the power at the present time to make a distinction in the interest rate and he said they had. We asked him why he did not make that distinction and he said he supposed that the Congress wanted him to bring about uniformity in interest rates. Had he wanted to bring about uniformity it seems to me he went about it in a very strange way because the present law provides that the interest rate on these noncritical, on these nondisaster loans that have been made simply to enrich somebody shall be 5 percent, but we leave discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants as to whether he will raise or lower the interest rates on these disaster loans. Two or three years ago when we had the floods in the Missouri Valley, the interest rate was lowered and was fixed at 3 percent for those people who suffered a disaster. Now the interest rate has been raised for the people who have suffered a disaster in the form of a drought, a freeze, or other kinds of disaster. I do not think that the Congress ever intended anything of the kind. The Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration admitted within the last 3 days that he had the power to fix 3 percent had he wanted to but he did not want to.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate these interruptions and I appreciate especially the interruption of the gentleman from Texas because he has made a contribution to what I have to say.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am indeed glad to hear that the gentleman is going to scrutinize the foreign giveaway program this year. We will welcome him to that little fraternity that has carefully scrutinized them for a long time.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be there and the first thing I am going to do, and I hope the gentleman will look upon this favorably, is to insist that before we send anything overseas to bolster up the economy of any country we set aside a billion dollars a year here for soil and water conservation and for flood-control projects, that will help make America stronger. We have gotten down to about $300 million a year on an annual basis on works of that type, which is entirely too low. We ought to have a minimum of at least a billion dollars a year first on projects like that. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will join with us on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I sure will, but after you get all this soil back into production, what are you going to do with the surplus?

Mr. PATMAN. We will not have any trouble if every person who needs the right kind of diet is placed in the position of obtaining the proper food for that diet and using it. We will not have any trouble getting rid of any surplus; in fact, we will not have any surplus at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have always understood, and my studies have convinced me, that one of the most valuable assets any country has is a strong

agriculture. That is dependent upon a good virile topsoil. So it would seem to me that the vitally important thing is to keep that gift that God has given us in good topsoil. I say that coming from a district where we have no farms.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his good statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that we are having an increase in our population in the United States of about 3 million a year?

Mr. PATMAN. Four million last year. The greatest challenge we have is providing the food and fiber for the expanding population 20 years from now. We should commence now, right now. We are not commencing now. We are sending too much abroad to bolster the economy of foreign countries. We should start helping out our own country some in that direction. I am not opposed to the foreign-aid program. It is out of balance now with our own needs. We should not overlook our own country.

MONEY TURNED ON AND OFF

Now, I have a very interesting article that I will put in the RECORD by Miss Sylvia Porter on Your Money's Worth. Miss Porter is outstanding in her field of reporting and writing. It discusses a question that Congress should be vitally concerned about at this time, and that is the money market.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

INTEREST RATE RISE CONTINUES

The cost of borrowing money is now at the highest level since the spring of 1953. What's more, it's a virtual certainty that the price of a loan will go higher before it goes lower.

The trend toward higher interest rates which got under way toward the end of 1954 is continuing. The swing is gathering strength.

The movement is no accident. It is based on fundamental forces which actually are operating in most areas throughout the Western World, and in this country it is part of a deliberate program designed by our top monetary authorities.

The Federal Reserve Board is the key agency in America that controls the supply and cost of money and credit. By certain maneuvers in the basic money markets in New York, it can flood the banking and business streams with money—and thereby force interest rates down and make loans a cinch to get.

This was its policy from mid-1953 to the fall of 1954.

Or by certain other maneuvers in the basic New York markets, the Federal Reserve can cut down on the volume of money banks have available to lend—and thereby force interest rates up, make credit harder to get.

This is its policy now, in mid-April 1955.

The demand for loans today is truly massive. Giant corporations and small-businessmen are asking billions to finance expansion plans, new equipment, rising operations. Homebuilders and buyers all over the land are asking more billions to finance peak construction. Individuals are asking still more billions to finance purchase of cars, appliances, furniture, etc. States and cities are asking even more billions to finance new roads, schools, essential public works. And finally, the Government itself is asking additional billions to pay its immense week-to-week bills.

The Federal Reserve System simply has decided it will not supply all the billions needed or requested.

It has so decided not because it wants to cripple or halt the current upswing. It has so decided because it wants to restrain the boom a bit, keep it from taking off at a speed that could not be maintained and that could lead later to a sickening bust.

The trend is affecting every borrower from the best-known giant down to the young bridegroom asking for a loan for the first time.

The highest credit risk in the world—the Treasury—was paying only about ⅝ percent interest for a 90-day loan in 1954.

Today, it is paying over 1½ percent interest for an identical 90-day loan. This is the basic clue to the cost of money.

There won't be any real money squeeze, any near-panic resembling what we felt in early 1953.

But home-buying and installment terms won't get any easier than now; they well may get tougher in the near future and there are significant signs they already are toughening in some spots. Business loans won't get any cheaper. They could get more expensive soon.

You see in the newspapers that the interest rate had to be raised in order to be in line with other interest rates. Who made the other interest rates? The Federal Reserve System turns our money on and off just like water is turned on and off for an irrigated land area. If we want plenty of money, lots of money, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to provide it. If the Federal Reserve System wants to tighten up, it can tighten up, and that is exactly what they are doing today. You know our money system that the Federal Reserve and the commercial banking system is operating is not new.

GOLDSMITHS

It started back hundreds of years ago when they used to have goldsmiths in the old countries who would keep the gold on deposit for the people. A depositor would deposit so much gold, and the goldsmith would give him a receipt showing that he had that much gold on deposit with him, and he would take that receipt and he would use it and trade it for what he wanted. That was the money in those times. It was soon discovered that the people would leave their gold with the goldsmith and seldom ask for the return of the actual gold, but used the receipt for it instead. They did not need the actual gold. All they needed was the receipt, and they used that as money. So, they decided, well, since the people will not often come back and get the gold, let the goldsmith extend credit equal to 10 times as much as he has in gold and get interest on the loans equal to 10 times the gold. That was all right. It worked for hundreds of years. At one time in Amsterdam, I am told, they even passed a law to assess the death penalty against any person who put out a report that the goldsmith did not have the money to pay those receipts. And, for some unknown reason, they had a run on a goldsmith anyway; he did not have the gold, and they hung the goldsmith. Well, those things happen. The bankers do not have the money in the banks today to pay off in full if they were to have a run. They are not supposed to have the money. They can get it very quickly through the United States Government. Their deposits are guaranteed and there is no risk involved, for a depositor is protected. The banks only have a reserve.

They can do like the goldsmith of old. They can manufacture or create from $6 to $10 for every dollar of reserve, of money, and that is what they should be allowed to do. It helps the country. It helps to expand our economy. I defend it. It is all right. But we should use it for the benefit of the people, not for speculation, for gambling in the stock market. We should not create money for purposes like that, and that is what I object to. This great privilege should be used by a local bank primarily for local people. It should be used to help expand the local community and create prosperity.

This article discusses the creation of the money and how the Federal Reserve can turn it on or turn it off just the way they want to do. It is up to them. There is no such thing as a free money market in United States Government bonds.

SHOULD KEEP BONDS AT PAR

The Federal Reserve causes the bonds to go down, and the Federal Reserve causes the bonds to go up. This Congress should pass a law fixing all Government bonds at par and not let them go below par. They are running them away down right now. In 1953 the bonds were reduced in price; some of them went down to 89 cents on the dollar. Think of it, United States Government bonds down to 89 cents on the dollar. Of course, the big bankers bought up these bonds, and then they went back to 100 and they sold these bonds. They made enormous profits that way. They were windfalls. How much did they make? I do not know. It never has been looked into. Their annual reports disclosed large profits made in this way. And, the bonds are going down again. The people in the know or who have good reasons to believe what is going to happen will buy those bonds at the right time, and when the bonds go up, they will sell them. And, the Congress is permitting that. It is going on every day. It is not right. It is dishonest. It is not treating the people right, and it should be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will take action in the near future to take a step in the direction of stopping such conduct as that.

WEEKLY LETTERS

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the last eight weekly letters prepared by me and sent to the newspapers in the district I have the honor to represent. The subjects discussed in most of the paragraphs concern our current economic situation and related subjects.

[1,131st weekly letter, April 28, 1955]

BANKING

Commercial banking represents an indispensable segment of a dynamic, prosperous economy. The local commercial bank is almost invariably operated by outstanding, public-spirited citizens, who are among the most influential people in the community. Our country would be helpless without a successful and efficient banking system.

It is my opinion that banking should always be privately owned and, in order to

serve the public properly, should be allowed to operate with a good profit. The Congress is charged with the duty, under the Constitution, of creating money and regulating its value. This great privilege has been properly farmed out to banking interests under restrictions and limitations. In order for a local bank to be able to properly serve the community it is allowed to manufacture or create money to the extent of six to ten dollars on every one dollar of reserve. When a loan is made of $100 to a local citizen by a bank $100 is created by the bank to make the loan. When the loan is paid the $100 debt is extinguished and that much money is canceled. This goes on all over the United States every day—creating and canceling money. It is in the public interest that banks be allowed the privilege of manufacturing money for the purpose of using it in the public interest.

In recent years, without authority of law, holding companies secured a strong foothold in the banking business. Even in States where branch banks are not allowed, an outside banking institution purchases a majority of stock in a local bank, places local dummy directors in charge, and operates the bank from a distance to serve the interest of the holding company officials. To my mind, this is repugnant to the true intentions of the private banking system and a violation of the obligations imposed upon the bank by the granting of the charter. These holding companies do not stop at banking; they own theaters, race tracks, liquor stores, investment houses, insurance companies, and all kinds of nonrelated businesses. They have not been allowed to get started in Texas, as our State constitution provides for independent banks without branches.

An effort is now being made through the passage of the Spence bill in the House to restrict banking to its original sphere of activity and require the great privileges given to a local bank to be used in the public interest and for the convenience, particularly, of local people and not be used as a vehicle to satisfy the greed and dictatorial ambitions of a few holding company executives in a distant city.

NATIONAL DEBT

The national debt is large and we should have a definite program for its liquidation by a payment of a certain amount each year.

It is not in the public interest to pay off the public debt too fast. Under our monetary system, our money is based on debt. If all debts were paid, we would not have any money with which to do business.

Our entire debt, including public and private, aggregates over $700 billion. There is no way under normal circumstances to lower the aggregate debt without retarding the progress of our country. Our debts must increase 3 percent to 4 percent each year to provide for a growing economy. Therefore, as the public debt is paid, the private debt must be expanded in order for the Nation to have sufficient money. We cannot escape the conclusion that oftentimes the public debt is in competition with the progress of the Nation. It can be in competition with every local community in the Nation. If we can only have so much debt and no more in order to prevent inflation, debts for the improvement of cities and States or for the expansion of businesses are necessarily restricted by the size of the national debt.

Last year—1954—we could have paid a sizable amount on our national debt by not reducing certain taxes. I voted against the tax reduction bill. The Congress reduced the excise profits taxes on large corporations, which saves the large corporations $2 billion a year. Last year, this $2 billion was paid to the corporations the same as if the taxes had not been repealed. Congress was told that prices would be reduced if the taxes were repealed, but prices were not reduced. The same prices are still paid by the consumer, and the $2 billion, instead of going to the Government and being paid on the national debt, is going to corporations that are not using it to pay dividends but are using it as expansion capital, which amounts to costless capital to them. This not only deprives savers, who are looking for investments, of an opportunity to invest, but places the small-business man, who is required to pay a high rate of interest, in a very hazardous business in competition with the unit of the large concern across the street from him that is getting its capital free in the form of high prices from the consumer.

No one knows how far the monopoly trend will continue. There is no denying the fact that monopoly has the green light in America today. We know that the little man and small business are the backbone of our Nation. Time only will tell how far we can permit them to be crushed without destroying the whole country.

[1,130th weekly letter, April 21, 1955]

PROGRESS IN CONGRESS

Many important bills have come up and others will be considered in the first session of the 84th Congress. The present sessions appear to be about half-way over. The House, which originates all money bills, has passed about half of the 1956 budget's appropriation requirements. Altogether, five of the big departmental bills have been passed by the House and sent to the Senate. In addition to appropriations bills, the House has passed H. R. 1, the reciprocal trade agreements bill, and Extension Act of 1955. The House has also moved to plug several costly tax loopholes that will save the Treasury much revenue. The House has acted on national defense, including granting the President discretion in the defense of Formosa and passing the draft extension bill. Still to be considered are bills relating to farm price supports, school building, the highway-aid bill, health reinsurance, aid to medical education, Armed Forces Reserve, postal and classified Federal employees' pay bills, and a minimum-wage bill. As usual, it appears that the House will be marking time waiting for the Senate to clear up its work prior to adjournment. At the present time, it looks like adjournment may not come before August.

Ways and means must be found for more effectively implementing the full employment pledge that is embodied in the Employment Act. Recent experience has convinced me that opponents of full employment have found ways of circumventing the clear intent of the act. This became clear to me when I tried in vain, during the recent hearings on monetary and debt-management policy, to secure from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve a statement that they regarded the full employment pledge underlying the Employment Act as the primary objective of government economic policy. Despite the fact that section 2 of the act makes this unequivocally plain and the added fact that this was the plain intent of Congress, these two officials of Government refuse to acknowledge that it is so. Moreover, the Federal Reserve Board in a third revised edition of its propaganda booklet on the Federal Reserve System, Its Purposes and Functions, now omits mention of the goal of "contributing to * * * the maintenance of a high level of employment," which did appear in an earlier edition. The new version now includes this aim: "Essentially people are primarily concerned with what the dollars they earn, are indebted for, or need to borrow for them. The ultimate test, in other words, is the purchasing power of the dollar."

If the bankers at the Federal Reserve persist in their policy of building up the purchasing power of the dollar at the expense of jobs, they will stabilize the country into a greater depression than in 1929.

WATER SCARCITY AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Water and soil conservation are going to be increasingly important in the years ahead. Many sections of the country already know how important an adequate water supply is for the land, our major resource. A fellow Texan, Representative GEORGE MAHON, has tried to focus attention on the water problem by introducing a bill to consider the feasibility of transporting surplus waters of the Missouri Basin for utilization in the Southwest where there is a great deficiency of water.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts is seeking nationwide observance of Soil Stewardship Sunday in churches throughout the country on May 15. More of the public should know about the importance of soil conservation, especially in view of the efforts of the opponents of the present national soil conservation program to undermine it.

BANK MERGERS

The current wave of bank mergers and the spread of bank holding companies are creating an unhealthy concentration of financial resources. More and more, locally owned and locally managed banks are being acquired by holding companies. Our independent unit banks are threatened by the growth of large branch banking through mergers and the spread of holding companies. Banking is becoming more and more a monopoly in the hands of a few large banking groups. Financial monopoly and political democracy do not coexist very long.

The growth of monopoly in banking is, in part, a result of the failure to include banks in the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. The reason given at the time was that the Federal Reserve would control it. The Federal Reserve has not been able to do so. The Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on a bill that would curb the growth of bank holding companies. It is expected to have strong support from members, who want to see power, authority, and management of local financial resources retained by the local communities.

The national economy may set a record for producing goods and services in the spring of 1955. Gross national product for the first quarter of 1955 will be close to a $370 billion annual rate equaling or perhaps slightly exceeding the mid-1953 record. In the midst of this prosperity, however, times are getting harder for the farmer. Farm prices are continuing to fall and future markets are weak. While other people may be prospering, the farm recession is getting deeper and deeper. Farmers are not only getting less for their crops, but they are being forced to grow less while their costs are being kept high. Farm income is daily shrinking, but extended recession in farming will affect the other sectors of our economy. The history of the 1920's continued to suffer over a long period of time, other businessmen were affected sooner or later.

[1,129th weekly letter, April 14, 1955]

H. R. 12, REPEAL OF SLIDING-SCALE PRICE SUPPORTS

H. R. 12 is a bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee to repeal the sliding-scale price supports that go into effect this year. Even without sliding price supports, declining farm prices have exerted a disastrous squeeze on farmers. The agricultural parity ratio is now at its lowest point since 1941. Reduced farmers' income is hurting all business and contributing to unemployment. Further cuts in farm incomes as a result of the sliding-scale price supports will not help business and will not reduce unemployment. When H. R. 12 comes up for

action, which is expected soon, I am sure that Members on both sides of the aisle will be considering the harmful drag that falling farm income is having on our economy and will recognize, too, the need to increase the farmers' share of the national income from its present postwar low position.

REAL ESTATE CREDIT CURBS?

Many bankers are alarmed at the so-called easy credit housing boom. Proposals have been made and the Government agencies have been discussing tightening-up terms of VA and FHA underwritten home mortgages. Meanwhile, the annual rate of new housing starts after adjusting for seasonal variations actually has been declining since December, so the discussions may turn out to be academic. However, it is important not to lose sight of a number of facts about credit in housing. A revolution has taken place in the last 20 years in the housing field, which has been a boon to the home builder, the house buyer, and the construction industry. The role of Government credit agencies, such as FHA and VA, has been a major one in the revolution that has brought the mass market and mass production into the housing field. Before 1933 mass production was not possible when a down payment of at least 25 percent of appraised value was required. Interest costs on first mortgages limited to half of the appraised values, at rates from 6 to 8 percent and maturities of no more than 5 years, were extremely high. Families of moderate means were further burdened with a second mortgage. Interest was 8 percent or more. Discounts and commissions came to about 20 percent of the loan. If the mortgage matured when money was tight and the homeowner could not get a renewal, foreclosure would ensue. These are some of the facts that should be remembered by those who inveigh against "easy credit."

I frankly believe that if we are going to have an expanding economy, we have not come anywhere near the potential of our people to absorb more and better housing and the other goods that make for better living.

THE MONOPOLY QUESTION

A new impetus to monopoly growth has been loosed by the recommendations of the Attorney General's Commission To Study the Antitrust Laws. In a 385-page report, this group, operating with White House sanction on funds Congress appropriated to enforce the antitrust laws, recommends greater freedom for the big corporations to undermine the competitive enterprise system and, at the same time, would make cooperatives, farmers, small-business and working people open targets for abuse by the big corporations.

Once before in our history, in the 16 years following the Republican victory of 1896, giant monopolistic trusts manipulated by a small group of men, who constituted the eastern financial community, threatened to reduce the farmer, small-business man and workingman to economic peonage. The ever-increasing concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a small select oligarchy was the overriding issue of the Democratic campaign in 1912. In that campaign, President Woodrow Wilson gave the Democratic Party's answer to the trusts. The people voted for a free and open economic and political system, and repudiated the party and the men who, while paying lipservice to this principle, are always willing to place more and more power in the hands of a few giant corporate managers.

The monopoly issue has already resulted in some of the most intensive debates on economic and financial issues by more Members than has been the case since the early days of 1933. The people have a major stake in the debate. Involved are such things as jobs, prices, credit, interest rates, franchises, competition, and economic and political freedom.

[1,128th weekly letter, April 7, 1955]

THE OUTLOOK IS FOR PEACE

Although events in the Far East may appear to be touch and go insofar as peace or war is concerned, I am hopeful that the next month may see the easing of war pressures in that area. Everything depends upon the action that is taken in regard to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Our policy is being determined by the President, and he gives every indication of pursuing a firm but nonprovocative policy line. I do not believe that the Chinese Communists will want to come into the Asian-African Conference, which opens at Bandung, Indonesia, next month, with the stigma of threatening the peace of the world on them. Therefore, I conclude that after a brief, nervous period, the danger of all-out war in the Far East will begin to recede.

The situation in Europe continues to improve and the war danger is diminishing there also. Of course, nobody can predict what the Soviets will do; but from the way they took up President Eisenhower's comments about the outlook for a meeting of the big powers, they appear to be anxious to talk.

If we can have peace, I am convinced that we will enter a period of prosperity and abundance and a general rise in living standards as the world has never before seen.

MONEY, CREDIT, AND INTEREST RATES

It is expected that consumers will spend about $1 billion more buying on credit this year than in 1954. Of the expected 4 percent increases in retail sales this year, bigger credit sales spurred by more liberal credit terms are expected to be the major factor. Consumer credit outstanding last year came to $30,125 million. Commercial banks, which used to take a cautious attitude toward installment lending, now are eagerly seeking this type of business. As business becomes more and more dependent upon costless capital, the banks are looking for new avenues to support their earnings. A survey of over 200 leading banks shows that consumer credit now accounts for 22 percent of total outstanding loans (United States underwritten home mortgages are another source of consumer lending for banks) and 36 cents out of every dollar of gross income from bank loans is earned on installment credit.

Money and credit are manufactured by the commercial banking system. For every one dollar in reserves that a commercial bank has, it can create six dollars of additional credit, which it can then loan and earn interest upon.

The availability of credit depends upon the policy of the Federal Reserve and especially the Open Market Committee. At present, there is some concern that the Federal Open Market Committee may be permitting credit to tighten and interest rates to go up. Pressure for higher interest rates on VA and FHA home mortgages is building up. Loans in many places are being sold at a discount for the first time this year. Real-estate mortgage debt and consumer credit are being watched very carefully.

The Treasury reports that interest costs on short-term government borrowing are rising. The economic picture at present is considered by the most astute observers as the most difficult to judge in many years. It is imperative that under such conditions nothing drastic should be done to upset the economic applecart.

TAX-BILL CONFUSION

Indications are that it may be necessary to have an exhaustive study of the 1954 tax revision law, in order to correct many technical defects. One of the most embarrassing errors in passing H. R. 8300 last year was that the penalties for certain narcotic violations were left out of the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The Treasury Department discovered the error and brought it to the attention of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee last October. But Congress was not in session then and there was nothing he could do about it. When Congress reconvened this January, quick action was taken to correct this error. However, for a period of 20 days—from January 1–20, 1955—there were no penalties for certain narcotic transactions.

In addition to the mistake made with respect to the omission of the narcotic violations penalties, the Treasury estimates that revenue losses from two sections would only be about $50 million turned out to be billions of dollars too small.

To date, the Treasury Department has already discovered 70 mistakes in the tax law passed last year.

In this highly technical field of tax law, Members are simply not equipped to legislate intelligently without depending upon the advice and aid of the Treasury experts and the committee staff aides. The 1954 tax law covers 1,000 pages and represented over 1,000 changes in the law. It was impossible to have given it the careful study needed in the short time that was permitted prior to its being called up for a vote.

[1,127th weekly letter, March 31, 1955]

TRICKLE-DOWNERS VERSUS DO-GOODERS

There are a group of men around the President led by Secretary Humphrey who know what they want. They are playing the game for keeps. This group belongs to the reactionary school of trickle-downers. They are willing to see the Government spend a lot and confer a great deal of privileges, provided the pouring in starts at the top. They will guarantee that it stays at the top. Then there is a school of liberal trickle-downers. They also follow the formula of providing incentives and tax relief for the well-to-do. Unlike the Humphrey group, they are willing for some of it to seep down and help the little fellows. I think it could be said that the President and his council of economic advisers belong to this latter group. However, it appears that Secretary Humphrey and the bankers in the bottleneck positions are running the show.

Opposed to any kind of trickle-down philosophy are those who want to do good for all the people. The Democratic Party has generally taken this position. We voted for the $20 per capita tax credit, because equity and justice in taxation demanded it. This relief was necessary to redress the extreme favoritism shown to the wealthy taxpayers in the 1954 tax-revision law. I voted for the measure for an additional reason. I feel we need to raise mass purchasing power. This will help the farmer get a fair price in the market for his products. It is needed to help our economy move forward. We have to provide more jobs quickly for workers who are being replaced by the new machines and for the young people who are getting out of school and expect to be able to earn their own way. Even though the tax cut was beaten by the Humphrey trickle-downers, I feel that the lesson in political philosophy will not soon be forgotten by our people.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON GOVERNMENT LENDING

The RFC was organized under Mr. Hoover to carry out his version of the trickle-down theory. Under his direction, RFC bailed out banks, railroads, and insurance companies. Preferred stockholders were very grateful to Mr. Hoover for using the Government's credit to save their investments.

Later, when President Roosevelt expanded the RFC to help provide credit at reasonable interest rates for States, cities, political subdivisions, small business, etc., this did not please Mr. Hoover or his banker friends. When the Republicans temporarily took over

in 1953, they quickly abolished the RFC and handed out the most desirable RFC assets to the private banking groups. Following up the dissolution of the RFC, the trickle-downers want to abolish all the other Government lending and insuring agencies and turn the entire field of financing over to the private bankers. This is what the latest Hoover Commission report on Government lending agencies calls for. If followed out, the recommendations in this report would cripple the REA. It would place the CCC program for price support loans in the hands of the private banks at a higher cost to the farmers. The report seeks to undermine the lending and insuring activities enacted in the past 20 years in such fields as veterans' and agricultural loans. housing and small business credit. Interest rates in all these programs would be subject to the decisions of the New York bankers. In fact, this report by the Hoover Commission carries out the recommendations made 2 years ago by the New York Clearing House Association, composed of the largest New York City banks.

Although the Congress created the Hoover Commission to come up with recommendations for improving the management of the executive department and the various agencies, Mr. Hoover has used it as a vehicle to remake public policy along the lines he thinks it should be. The amount of wasted taxpayers' money on useless reports is a crime. A recent editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald commented that this latest report was just a wasteful exercise that might just as well have not been written.

MONOPOLY IN RUBBER

When the House in July 1953 voted for a bill requiring the Government's synthetic rubber plants to be disposed of in 1 year, I opposed the bill for a number of reasons, including the unknown requirements of the Korean situation. In addition, I was not assured that they would not be sacrificed to the four big companies that own and control 80 percent of the private rubber business in the country.

Recently, I sponsored a resolution before the Congress to stop the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission's plan to sell the Government's synthetic rubber industry to a handful of rubber, oil and chemical companies. There are no safeguards to protect the public nor the small businessman against unfair and destructive practices that will likely occur, since the method of disposal of these plants creates an ironclad rubber monopoly. Under the so-called agreements in the contracts with the proposed purchasers, they are supposed to make available specified amounts of their product to small business. The truth is that this is a meaningless and unenforceable provision. No small fabricator could hold any rubber company to such an agreement, if the company refused to sell him supplies. In the House, 60 percent of the Democrats voted for my resolution, but 100 percent of the Republicans voted against it, causing its defeat. The same situation caused its defeat in the Senate.

[1,126th weekly letter, March 24, 1955]

PAY INCREASE FOR MEN IN UNIFORM

The loss of expensively trained, experienced personnel to private industry when their period of service is completed is an expensive problem confronting the military. By a vote of 399 to 1, the House of Representatives passed the bill known as the Career Incentive Act of 1955, which provides for pay raises designed to induce both enlisted men and officers to stay in the service. It costs anywhere from $3,200 for basic recruits to $275,000 for jet bomber pilots to train a single member of the Armed Forces. In 1953 and 1954 there was a total turnover of 4 million men to maintain a 3.1 million man Armed Force. This gives an idea of the size of costs involved. It is hoped that the House-approved pay raises, which the Senate is expected to pass, will help the services retain their trained experts.

LOCAL UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

I have been deeply disturbed by the high unemployment rate in Texarkana and have been trying to get the administration to do something to ease the situation. I am afraid that the executive branch agencies, who deal with the distressed unemployment area problem, have not shown sufficient vigor in their handling of this serious problem. In spite of the fact that there are 144 such distressed areas throughout the Nation, we do not have a central agency or a national policy to deal with the so-called spot unemployment problem. In the past 2 weeks I have written to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce about the situation in Texarkana. I am receiving replies from these agencies, assuring me of early consideration. I do know that this issue will get a very high priority from the Democratic leadership in both the Senate and House. The burdens of distress are not confined to the local unemployment area. Unemployment and low incomes in these areas reduce the market for goods produced elsewhere and thereby threaten employment and incomes throughout the entire economy.

REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OPPOSE INDIRECT FINANCING

A unanimous report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report signed by all Republican and Democratic Members rebuked the administration for turning to indirect borrowing by so-called authorities for financing public works, such as schools, highways, hospitals, etc., instead of raising the funds by having the Treasury issue the bonds directly. The indirect way is more costly and is less efficient than having the Treasury do the borrowing directly. It also evades statutory debt limit and thereby limits or circumvents congressional authority over the purse strings. It is ironical that a movement to bypass Congress on spending should start in a Republican administration.

ATOMS FOR PEACE

Although the world is walking a very thin line between war and peace these days, plans for the peaceful use of the atom are going ahead. The first university for nuclear engineers has been opened under United States auspices. We will not only offer training to our own young scientists, but we also will help educate young people from other countries. It is all part of the President's "atoms for pease" proposal to the U. N. The conference on this proposal gets under way with public sessions at the U. N., beginning next June.

We shall be able to announce at this conference the delivery of the first commercial supply of electricity from an atomic reactor. Two large eastern utilities—Duquesne Light Co., and Consolidated Edison Co.—operating in Pennsylvania and New York, are planning to produce electric power from atomic reactors. Ten years from now, will petroleum, coal, and gas be replaced?

WHEN SECRETARY HUMPHREY MAKES A MISTAKE IT'S A "BEAUT"

One of the most colorful political figures of the 1930's was the late Fiorello H. La Guardia. He started out as a Republican Congressman and later became mayor of New York City. An official, who had been appointed by Mayor La Guardia, became involved in some wrongdoing. The mayor, who was an outspoken critic of political backsliders, said when asked about this appointee: "When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

It seems that the same thing might be said about some of the fiscal mistakes that our Secretary of the Treasury has been making. The first big mistake he made shortly after coming to Washington involved a billion-dollar issue of 3¼ percent, 30-year bonds. Everyone agrees that the "Humphreys," as these bonds have come to be known, carried much too high an interest rate. Taxpayers will be paying for this "beaut" for 30 years.

Now it appears that the Secretary of the Treasury was caught napping in connection with an important provision of last year's revision of the Internal Revenue Code. This permits business firms to set aside reserves against future expenses and charge it off against the current year's income tax bill. Unless repealed, this provision will cost the Treasury at least $1 billion. It is suspected that there are about 75 hidden sleepers in the tax bill. This one is the biggest windfall and is jokingly called "Humphrey's Blooper" by the Members. The Secretary has already asked the House Ways and Means Committee to eliminate this provision from the tax law. Thus, the Secretary of the Treasury, who has called Members of the Senate "silly" and Members of the House "fiscally irresponsible," has committed two of the biggest fiscal "beauts" in recent Treasury history.

[1,125th weekly letter, March 17, 1955]

AUTOMATION

Automation is a term that you will hear a great deal about in coming months. It is a word that has been coined to describe the introduction of automatic machinery on a grand scale. In theory, technological progress should raise the standard of life for everyone and increase security of employment. This is true when workers and farmers benefit from the fruits of technological progress by no longer having to toil as excessively, and, at the same time, equitably sharing in the increased income that reduced production costs make possible. If farmers and city workers do not equitably share in the distribution of the income gains from the growth of automation, they will not be able to provide a market for greatly increased consumption of all types of products, which the new technological developments could make available for higher standards of living. If job opportunities are held back by recurring recessions due to deficiencies in purchasing power and a failure to promote economic expansion, then automation will merely add to the unemployed, as it displaces workers by reducing labor requirements. This must not be allowed to happen. I believe this problem is so important that Congress should try to see whether it can, through adequate study and hearings, develop a national policy that will insure that the potential benefit of automation to the American standard of living will be fully realized and equitably shared.

FINANCING ROADS

Fiscal experts are not happy about the proposal to set up special financing bodies to issue bonds and earmark taxes to pay for the roadbuilding program. Too much of our national debt is being hidden out of view of the people. It is also costing many times more in interest to finance projects outside the public debt. One disadvantage in the present proposal for roads is that it sets up an unrealistic and inflexible priority for roadbuilding. About 55 cents of every dollar borrowed to finance the interstate highway construction program would be matched by 55 cents in total interest payments, under the Clay proposal.

I wonder why the President doesn't consider raising funds for roadbuilding when, as and if needed, by issuing non-interest-bearing bonds to the Federal Reserve banks. These bonds can be retired whenever there is a surplus and economic conditions warrant a retirement of part of our debt. Billions of dollars in interest will be saved this way.

The money could be used for help to the unemployed or to make up for some of the gap in schools.

DEFICIT IN TAXES VERSUS DEFICIT IN JOBS

The administration is more concerned about a possible deficit in tax collections than they seem to be about the family deficit that results from unemployment. The proposed $20 tax credit per dependent, which the administration is fighting so hard, would not only correct an injustice to the lower income groups who received less than 25 cents of every dollar of tax saving voted last year, but it would help reduce unemployment. Today, there are 144 so-called distressed unemployment areas throughout the country. Texarkana is one of the serious unemployment areas. Not only does the administration not have a national policy for helping these areas, but they oppose tax relief that will lighten the burden of those families whose incomes have been cut because of the depressed conditions in the distressed areas. Since January 1953, the number of jobs in nonfarm establishments has declined by one million. This deficit in jobs has not received as much attention by the administration as the tax and budget deficit, although it is much more important, because there is an unbalanced family budget for everyone of those missing jobs.

THE FARMER UNDER EISENHOWER

Prices received: Prices by farmers for their production have declined each year since the Eisenhower administration assumed office. The decline from January 1953 to January 1954, was 3.3 percent. The decline from January 1954, to January 1955, was much larger, the drop amounting to 5.4 percent.

Realized net-farm income: Farmers' realized net income totaled $12 billion in 1954. This was about $3 billion below the amount farmers could have realized under full employment conditions. It was 10 percent less than farmers actually realized in 1953. It was 15.5 percent below 1952.

Farmers retained only a little over one-third (35 percent) of their gross farm income in 1954, as farm production costs stayed high. Farm property taxes and farm mortgage interest charges accounted for the high level of costs, as they continued to rise while other items of expense dropped a bit. The percentage of gross farm income retained after expenses was the lowest in 22 years.

Farm purchasing power: In 1954, the purchasing power of farmers' realized net income fell by 11 percent from 1953, and was lower than in any previous year since 1940. According to the administration, 1954 was the year of the honest dollar. For the farmer, it was the year of the vanishing dollar.

The farmers' share of national income is now at a postwar low.

[1,124th weekly letter, March 10, 1955]

DEMOCRATS WILL FULFILL TAX-RELIEF PLEDGE

Secretary Humphrey of the Treasury has acknowledged that 75 cents out of every dollar of the $7.4 billion of tax relief voted last year went to big business or individuals earning $5,000 and over. Our party vainly fought for tax relief for the little fellow. In the campaign last fall, we pledged to enact such relief. The action of the House, attaching to the President's tax proposal a $20 per capita tax credit, represents a redemption of the 1954 tax-relief pledge. I feel sure that this tax relief will help to increase the buying power of the lower-income families and thereby increase the demand for goods. This will mean more investment and more jobs will be needed.

GOVERNMENT BONDS DOWN

The prices of Government bonds are going up and down daily because of the crap-shooting that is allowed by the Federal Reserve System. It is very profitable to the larger banks, particularly the New York banks, but such speculation in the Government bond market is harmful to the people and should be stopped, at least to the extent that Government bonds should not be allowed to sink below par. Then any speculation would be above par and it would not be so harmful to the people.

SCHOOL CRISIS

In 1954, we had a record crop of 4 million new babies. It is only a short time until the age when they will be entering nursery and kindergarten. Our schools are already in a critical state. We need many more classrooms and we need them soon. The President's school-financing proposal has been sharply criticized as inadequate to meet the schoolroom shortage. It bears more of the earmarks of concern for sound finance and more long-term, tax-exempt debt paper than for sound education.

ANOTHER INTERNATIONAL RFC?

One proposal made by the President is bound to get a cold reception by Members, who feel we already have too big an international RFC. This is the recommendation that Congress authorize at the proper time a contribution by the United States to the capital of the proposed International Finance Corporation. We already have the Export-Import Bank of Washington, with capital and full authority to do the same job the proposed agency would presumably be doing. I am personally viewing more critically than ever before expenditures abroad by our country. We have many fine projects involving water and soil conservation and flood control that should have priority over foreign aid.

ROAD TO FASCISM

I wonder if we have not been led, unknowingly, down the path to a fork where some Fascist clique could push us off the main highway of democratic government. The other day at the Washington University in St. Louis, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court delivered an address on the Blessings of Liberty. He called the erosion of our traditional liberties a greater threat than the danger of direct attack by an enemy from abroad or willful subversion from within. Our fundamental liberties are embraced in the Constitution and reinforced by the Bill of Rights. In Germany and Italy, people were taught to hate and fear socialism and communism to such an extent that first they gave up some of their fundamental constitutional freedoms and then accepted fascism when it was presented to them as an alternative. When we approve of dictatorship techniques by people, who say they are defending our freedoms, we are undermining our free democracy and opening the way for some Fascist group to present the full-fledged Fascist alternative.

CONGRESS AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Some Members feel the Hoover Commission is encroaching on the Congress. When it was originally set up, the Commission was supposed to suggest ways and means, whereby the efficiency and cost of running the Government could be improved to the benefit of all. Thus far, the Hoover Commission has been conspicuously marked by its apparent failure, insofar as achieving substantial savings are concerned. But it has gone beyond its original purpose and is now in the policy-recommending business. The Hoover Commission is armed with vast powers. It has the subpena power and can hold public hearings. It has changed from its original bipartisan nature to a body that employs former Members of Congress, whose views on policy have been contrary to those held by their former constituents. It has a well-organized national lobby that operates at the local level. Members, who encountered this lobby during the recent election, were not happy about the pressure it exerted. Most important of all, some Members feel that the Hoover group is doing work that is properly the work of Congress; and the feeling is that continued delegations of congressional responsibility may reduce the Congress to a rubber-stamp body.

THE CASE OF CORPORAL KULICH—IS THIS AMERICAN JUSTICE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen, I always have believed—proudly—that justice is one of the greatest benefits of our form of government.

But an uneasy conviction has been growing upon me that our proud system of American justice is being undermined, corroded and taken away by our Federal security system.

I have read published accounts of cases in which an individual's reputation and even his chances of earning a livelihood have been destroyed by vague charges, implying disloyalty, based on what often appears to be the most tenuous evidence, charges which lead to dismissal from Government service under the cloud of being a security risk. As a Congressman, I have received a number of letters from individuals pleading for my help in piercing the dread walls of silence which envelop security proceedings.

The reports I have received have disturbed me greatly for a long time now. But a case in my own State of Washington, just brought to my attention through an appeal for aid, so reeks with injustice that I am moved to inform my colleagues in the House about it.

The appeal is from a reputable attorney of Aberdeen, Wash., Mr. Paul O. Manley, who enclosed a copy of a letter which he had written to President Eisenhower, asking justice for a young man of Aberdeen.

The young man, Walter William Kulich, served 2 years in the Army and was a corporal when he received his honorable discharge a couple of months ago, after which he became a member of the Army Reserve.

Suddenly, out of the blue, he has been advised officially that the Army now possesses charges that his father is a Communist. The youth is bewildered by this charge, knows of nothing to support it, and has his father's word that it is not true.

Yet this young man is given these incredible alternative courses of action:

First. He may appear before a field board of the Army and—in effect—prove his father's innocence of the accusations.

Second. He may agree to an undesirable discharge.

Is this American justice?

I should like to ask: Since when does an American citizen have to prove his innocence? I had thought it was up to the accuser to prove guilt.

I should like to ask: Since when do we condemn a man because of what his father or any other relative or any other person has done? I had thought that in our free land guilt was individual and innocence was individual, and that we did not punish a man or tarnish his

reputation because of what an ancestor might have said or done.

I should like to ask: Since when do we convict a man without advising him of the basis of the accusation? I had thought that our Constitution guaranteed to every person the right to be informed of the nature and the cause of the accusation and to be confronted with the witnesses against him.

I should like to call for a thoroughgoing investigation, not only of this individual case but of the security system which made this case possible. I think such an investigation should be made by the executive branch, but I think it also should be made by the Congress.

I hope that such an investigation will be demanded by the American people.

So that the full story may be known, I am going to read Mr. Manley's letter to the President into the RECORD. I am sure others will be outraged, as I was, by this account.

APRIL 14, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is written to call your attention to a great injustice being done a boy who is now a member of the United States Army Reserve. His name is Walter William Kulich and his residence is Aberdeen, Wash. He was inducted into the United States Army at Fort Lewis, Wash., on January 6, 1953, and received his certificate of honorable separation from the active service on January 6, 1955. He served in the 271st Engineer Battalion, Combat, at Fort Lewis, Wash., and his Army service number is US56123130. He is 22 years of age.

I have a photostatic copy of his separation certificate before me. Its character is listed as honorable and there is nothing therein to indicate that his active service was anything but satisfactory. He attained the grade of corporal prior to being released from active service and transferred to the Army Reserve.

The month following his transfer to the Army Reserve, he received a letter from the Commanding General, 6th Army, through official channels. The basic letter was dated January 20, 1955, and was forwarded from headquarters, Washington Military District, Fort Lawton, Wash., on February 8, 1955. The letter advised him that allegations were on file in the Department of the Army that his father is listed as a Communist Party member and leader, has associated with known Communist Party Members and has attended Communist Party meetings and has affiliated with the Communist Party and is alleged to have received money from Communist sources used to defray the expense of trips made to the United Nations in New York. The letter further stated that under the provisions of special regulations 600–220–1, subject, military personnel security program, dated June 18, 1954, the boy was required to elect in writing to the chief of his military district, one or more of the following choices:

(a) Submit a request within 5 days for a personal appearance hearing before a field board with or without counsel, the appearance to be at his own expense.

(b) In lieu of such appearance to submit a letter of rebuttal together with supporting documents within 15 days of receipt of this letter. However, he was warned that in case he did not elect the personal appearance hearing, subsequent action could result in his separation from the service under other than honorable conditions.

(c) That he could request discharge and agree to accept an undesirable discharge. A mimeographed sample form of consent to accept an undesirable discharge was enclosed for his convenience.

Corporal Kulich consulted me on receipt of these letters and I prepared a letter for him to sign and send to the Washington Military District Headquarters on February 10, 1955. In this letter, Corporal Kulich denied the allegations concerning his father and demanded a personal appearance before a field board for a hearing. Inasmuch as he had no information concerning the dates, places, or other particulars concerning his father's alleged Communist activities, he demanded this information and the names of the witnesses who made the allegations so that he would be in a position to rebut them. This letter was mailed on February 10, 1955, and no answer has yet been received. Several weeks ago, he received a letter from an officer at Fort Lewis, Wash., who stated that he had been assigned to represent Corporal Kulich in connection with the proposed hearing. At my suggestion, Corporal Kulich made the trip to Fort Lewis and conferred with the officer. He was informed that no particulars or names of witnesses could be obtained from the Army and that the only possible procedure would be for him to attend the hearing armed only with character witnesses who had known his father for some time and who could testify that he had never been a Communist. He was informed that it was not up to the Army to prove his father's guilt, but that he, the boy, must prove his father innocent. All this, without knowing any of the particulars of the misconduct with which his father was charged.

Just as an honorable discharge is a certificate of merit, proudly carried by millions of American veterans, an undesirable discharge or one other than honorable is a smear and a mark of shame on the man receiving it. If one holding such a discharge seeks political office, it is a potent weapon in the hands of his opponents. In his efforts to seek profitable employment, it is an almost insurmountable obstacle. It bars him from veterans' benefits and even disqualifies him from membership in the great veterans' organizations. To force a boy to take such a discharge after 2 years of loyal service without a mark on his service record is certainly a cruel injustice. If it is desired to discharge him from the Army for matters which are no fault of his own, the least that common decency would require would be to give him the type of discharge that his own conduct would entitle him to.

I have agreed to represent this young man at any hearing that may be called. However, I feel that any hearing based on the premise that a son can be punished for his father's alleged misconduct and on the theory that it is up to the son to prove his father's innocence rather than for the prosecuting authorities to prove his guilt cannot be relied upon to reach an equitable result. I have not yet been able to procure a copy of the regulations upon which these proceedings are based, but I assume that the Commanding General of the Sixth Army would not be proceeding in this fashion unless there are regulations sustaining his procedure. If there are such regulations, I insist that they are vicious and unfair and are calculated to cause great and irreparable harm to young men who are innocent of any wrongdoing and who are not in any position to threaten the security of the United States. I am calling this to your attention not only for the benefit of Corporal Kulich but to help other young soldiers who are in the same position. Corporal Kulich has a brother, aged 19, who will soon be inducted into the Armed Forces. Unless something is done to remedy the existing regulations, he will be exposed to the same type of undemocratic and unfair treatment as Corporal Kulich is now undergoing.

Corporal Kulich tells me that he believes the allegations concerning his father are false. I have talked to the father and he denies them in toto. No charges have been filed against the father by way of criminal proceedings or otherwise. In view of the fact that we have stringent laws concerning individuals engaging in subversive activities, it seems almost incredible that the authorities are concentrating their energy in efforts to smear the son with an undesirable discharge rather than to attempt to substantiate their charges against the father. In this connection, it is interesting to note that were the father to be charged in a criminal proceeding with subversive activities, he would be entitled under the Constitution to all of the safeguards of the Bill of Rights, including the right to meet his accusers face to face and to be furnished with the particulars of his alleged offenses.

Before writing this letter to you, I have discussed the case with a number of representative people, many of them veterans of the United States armed services. Without exception these people have vigorously condemned any method whereby a boy can be punished for the supposed sins of his father and without even the semblance of a trial after having been apprised of the exact charges against the father. I feel that the only way that the system can be cleaned up is from the top, and I am writing you in your capacity as Commander in Chief. I am also sending copies of this letter, with requests for cooperation, to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of Defense, and two United States Senators from the State of Washington, the Congressman at Large from the State of Washington, and the Congressman from the Third Washington Congressional District in which this boy makes his home.

I respectfully urge you to use the powers of your great office to protect the rights of this young soldier and to see to it that necessary reforms are made in the system which has made his present predicament possible.

Yours very respectfully,

PAUL O. MANLEY.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague from the State of Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I had a similar letter from Mr. Manley, the Aberdeen attorney, on this subject. Mr. Manley is a Republican, a former prosecuting attorney of Grays Harbor County. He is a very reliable man and is regarded as one of the best members of the legal profession in the community. I think the statements he makes concerning this boy must have a great deal of truth in them. Mr. Manley is not the kind of attorney who makes unsubstantiated charges. I agree completely with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that a thorough investigation of this case should be made. Immediately upon receipt of Mr. Manley's letter, which has been read here, I contacted the Defense Establishment, Mr. Wilson's office, and asked for an immediate investigation. I have not had a reply other than that they would investigate the matter up to this time. That request was filed Saturday with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very happy to have this comment from my colleague from the State of Washington, who represents the Third Congressional District in the State of Washington in which Corporal Kulich resides.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. After listening to this case, and I have heard of others like it, is this not an attainder which is being put on this boy because of his father's sins? Is it not an attainder where a person is prosecuted—or persecuted is the proper word in this case—for the sins of another?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it is in the nature of a bill of attainder where one person is punished for the sins of another.

Mr. MILLER of California. If I read my history rightly, one of the things that we founded this country for, one of the things that Jefferson stood for and one of the great contributions that he made to this country was wiping out bills of attainder.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and let us not forget the immortal words of the preamble to the Constitution:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Note that the establishment of justice is given a high priority in this declaration of the purposes of our Constitution.

I hesitate to think what Jefferson and the other framers of that great document would have thought of the case of Corporal Kulich.

I know they would have denounced it as violating in every way the avowed purpose of the Constitution to establish justice.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not think the gentleman from California should use the words "sins of the father" because, so far, this is just an allegation against the father.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am very happy to accept the correction. In this case, it is an attempt, however, to punish the boy for the alleged sins of his father.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct, and they are further, according to the attorney's letter, trying to require that the boy prove his father is not a Communist rather than that the Federal Government prove that the father is a Communist.

Mr. MILLER of California. I know that the gentleman who has the floor, and the other distinguished gentleman, from Washington, hate communism in all its implications as much as any of us, but if things like this just do not play into the hands of the Communists, I would like to know what does. This is the kind of thing that they can go to Bandung and other places with and make the argument that our democracy is a farce and a fraud. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for calling it to the attention of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I certainly think the gentleman is doing a service when he calls the Members' attention to this particular case. I think it all comes down to a matter of guilt by association even if the association happens to be one's father, even if there is not any guilt. The gentleman may have heard of another case in the State of Washington, in my particular district, where there is an employee of the General Services Administration who was suspended without pay 90 days ago because his brother-in-law, an alleged Communist, moved into his home. It seems to me that if gentlemen, like the gentleman from Washington, will interest themselves in cases like this, that we will finally bring about a system where the innocent are protected and will not be held guilty because of an association.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. MACK and Mr. PELLY] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for their comments.

I might comment at this point that one of the most disturbing things about the case of Corporal Kulich, which I am now discussing—perhaps even more disturbing than the fact that an attempt will be made to punish him for something which authorities believe his father did—even more disturbing are the terms under which he must defend that charge. It has been pointed out by his appointed Army counsel that it will not be up to the Army to establish the truth of the charges; that the Army will decline to furnish the details of the basis of the charge or the names of the persons responsible for the accusation. I think we can all appreciate that a boy going before a field board hearing under those conditions, however able his counsel may be, is going to have a very small chance of coming out on top.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the old soldier in the White House will take a personal interest in the young soldier whose unhappy plight I have outlined here today.

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some 9,000 school administrators attended the recent regional convention in Cleveland, Ohio, of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association.

At this meeting the United States Office of Education was charged with being overrun with partisan politics. The New York Times of April 2, 1955, reported that Dr. Jordan L. Larsen, president of the American Association of School Administrators, declared that there was evidence of greater political domination in the Office of Education now than ever before.

This domination is the most unfortunate thing that we have in this country today—

Dr. Larsen said, and continued:

We can no longer rely upon the accuracy or the impartiality of the statistics that we get from the Education Office. Many of us in education no longer have confidence in the education department.

The following resolution was adopted at the convention:

We reaffirm our position that education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics. We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education. Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We therefore urge the Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency.

The Office should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. Such a board should have the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education who would serve as the board's executive officer. This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government.

We pledge our continued support and cooperation to the Commissioner of Education.

I include here news articles from the New York Times and the Cleveland Plain Dealer, dated April 2, 1955, on this great regional convention of school administrators; as well as the text of a letter I have received from the National Education Association giving the resolutions adopted by the NEA and the National Council of Chief State School Officers calling for the establishment of an independent national board and/or office of education in the Federal Government.

Also included is an extremely interesting letter which I have received from Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, setting forth in detail the history of the effort of American educators, educational organizations, and those interested in advancing education in general to establish such an independent office of education.

Dr. Fuller pointed out in an article which appeared in The Nation's Schools in November 1949 entitled a "National Board Would Be the Best Type of Protection Against Federal Control," that—

Federal organization for education has long been notoriously inadequate. Most school people have at one time or another supposed that a Federal Department of Education would be an improvement. In recent years, however, large numbers have become convinced that a cabinet post is neither necessary or desirable. They believe it would put education into partisan politics and probably would lead to a larger Federal educational establishment than we want.

Dr. Fuller goes on to say, in support of an independent Office of Education:

Under a national board, the sober judgment of a group of laymen would be brought

to bear on education programs proposed in the Office of Education. Under such a nonpartisan board of laymen, looking to its professional executive officer to suggest programs for evaluation, amendment and approval, such controls would not exist.

A national board would make educational policies only in the sense that it would approve or disapprove the programs of the Office of Education. The purpose, scope, and content of these programs would be more clearly defined, and the Office would be more efficient professionally than it can be while under the control of political officers. Such efficiency should be recognized by everyone as desirable and is itself insurance against extension of the special aids and splintered educational controls now exercised by noneducational Federal agencies.

The national board would, of course, have no jurisdiction to determine State or local curriculum or other educational policies in any way. The functions of the Office of Education would remain exactly as now defined in the statutes, but they could be performed more economically and effectively.

American experience proves that public education is best governed in local school districts by the lay board of education operating with the professional administrator as its executive officer. Over a period of years, the same pattern has been more successful in the States than has any other, and the trend is clearly toward its increased use. Local boards have not abused their extensive delegated powers. State boards also have exercised their powers appropriately, without abuse of the broad authority which results naturally from the constitutional concept that the government of education is a State function. A national board of laymen, serving without pay and meeting perhaps 6 or 8 days a year, is surely more to be trusted than political officials to guide professional operation of the Federal educational programs within the limited scope of the Federal educational authority.

This excellent article by Dr. Fuller is included here in its entirety, because of its informational value.

With the broad support for an independent Office of Education in mind, I have developed and am introducing today a bill to provide for the establishment of such an office in the Federal Government which will be nonpartisan and free of political control and domination.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 6, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We are enclosing copies of resolutions by educational organizations supporting the establishment of an independent national board and/or office of education.

1. National Education Association (1954 platform, sec. IV)—National Board of Education: "The development of education, whether at the local, State, or National level, should be placed above all temporary and partisan political issues and provided with appropriate administrative arrangements to safeguard the integrity of the educational process. The association urges Congress to create a National Board of Education as an independent agency to administer the United States Office of Education. The members of the national board should be appointed for long overlapping terms by the President with the consent of the Senate.

"The association further recommends that the national board should select a professionally qualified commissioner of education, responsible to the board for the conduct of his office and the performance of his duties, to serve as its executive officer."

2. American Association of School Administrators (1955 resolutions, No. 15)—United States Office of Education: "We reaffirm our position that education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics. We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education. Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We, therefore, urge the Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency.

"The office should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. Such a board should have the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education who would serve as the board's executive officer. This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government.

"We pledge our continued support and cooperation to the Commissioner of Education."

3. Council of Chief State School Officers (continuing resolution):

"The safety and security of our Nation, as well as the perpetuation of the American way of life, is dependent upon the education of the young people in our schools and colleges. Public schools and colleges enroll one-fifth of our entire population and expend billions of dollars annually. The continued development of this system of education is dependent upon lay and professional leadership that will be helpful in improving the work in our schools and colleges. The traditional pattern of such leadership is to place public education under the control of nonpartisan lay local and State boards of education that are responsible for the planning and improvement of public education and the employment of competent professional personnel.

"In harmony with these principles, the National Council of Chief State School Officers believes that the Federal responsibility for education should be discharged through a national board of education composed of laymen. This board should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis for long overlapping terms by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. It should be empowered to select a qualified professional educator as the United States Commissioner of Education to serve as the executive officer of the board and to be responsible to the board for organizing and directing the staff.

"A national board of education has been recommended by such other organizations as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National School Boards Association, the American Association of University Women, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National Education Association of the United States.

"The National Council of Chief State School Officers hereby authorizes a committee appointed by the president of the council to proceed to implement this resolution."

We would also at this time like to express NEA's appreciation of your attendance at the House Education and Labor Committee hearings on school construction, and your interest in the testimony being presented. We are sure you will join other members of the committee in working to report out a good school-construction bill as soon as practicable.

Cordially yours,

J. L. MCCASKILL,
Director, Division of Legislation and Federal Relations.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Conversations with members of your staff have led me to look back to the history of the issue concerning the establishment of an independent agency for education in the Federal Government, with particular attention to the support given to this idea by citizens and education groups through the years.

The first matter of record is a resolution of the National Council of Chief State School Officers at its annual meeting in Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 7–10, 1936, in which a separate and distinct agency was urged. The earliest definitive statement of the proposed structure itself is found in NEA Research Bulletin, volume 22, No. 2, April 1944, page 78. Here is the statement:

"Make the United States Office of Education an independent Federal agency under the general direction and control of a national lay board of education. Have this national board of education appointed by the President, with approval by the Senate, in such a way as to secure a high level of competence and minimize the danger of partisan political influence in the Office of Education activities. Authorize the national board to appoint the United States Commissioner of Education and let it determine, within the framework of Federal law, the basic policies and plans which the Commissioner is to administer as head of the Office of Education."

The Chief State School Officers reaffirmed their 1936 position through the years and decided to frame legislation and have it introduced in 1946. This was done through Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, in 1947, and such legislation has been pending in the Congress ever since. The Chief State School Officers have reconsidered it from time to time and have made changes from one Congress to another, but the basic idea has remained the same.

Resolutions supporting an independent agency for education in the Federal Government have been passed by the National Education Association, by the Educational Policies Commission, by the American Association of School Administrators, by the County and Rural Area School Superintendents, by the Hoover Commission's Task Force Report on Functions and Activities of the National Government, by the National School Boards Association, the American Association of University Women, and others.

It is highly significant that although the campaign to include education in a Department of Health, Education, and Wefare has been conducted by both major political parties, that such organizations as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the County and Rural Areas School Superintendents and the National School Boards Association have never altered their resolutions favoring an independent agency for education.

Educators assisted in the defeat of the Hoover Commission Plan No. 1 in 1949, the Hoover Commission Plan No. 27 in 1950, both of which sought to place education in a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Upon the change of administrations in 1953, a compromise was made by President Eisenhower with the American Medical Association whereby a special assistant was promised to be be assigned to the staff of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. After the American Medical Association had agreed to the new Department on behalf of the health services, educators continued to argue the case. They were finally overruled in conferences in February 1953 and were

offered a National Advisory Committee on Education. This committee has never been established, and the 84th Congress has refused funds for it.

This background makes it perfectly clear that educators generally and citizens most closely connected with education favor an independent agency for education in the Federal Government. The bill which you propose, therefore, is timely and appropriate. I am attaching a few comments on its details on a separate page but they should not be read as critical of the general idea in any respect. For your initiative in introducing the bill we congratulate you and offer our complete support in achieving an independent agency for education in the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR FULLER,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL BOARD WOULD BE THE BEST TYPE OF PROTECTION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL

(By Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers)

Federal organization for education has long been notoriously inadequate. Most school people have at one time or another supposed that a Federal Department of Education would be an improvement. In recent years, however, large numbers have become convinced that a Cabinet post is neither necessary nor desirable. They believe it would put education into partisan politics and probably would lead to a larger Federal educational establishment than we want.

The recent defeat of Reorganization Plan No. 1 by a Senate vote of 60 to 32 narrowly saved the United States Office of Education from absorption into a completely centralized Department of Welfare. Education was the incidental beneficiary of the influence of the medical and dental professions, which had other reasons for wanting to defeat plan No. 1. The place of education in the Federal Government was not seriously considered.

An amended plan No. 1 probably will be presented to Congress in January 1950. The medical and dental professions will have been appeased. Educators must decide whether they will stand quietly by while education becomes an integral part of welfare in the organization of the Federal Government. If it should, we may get similar organization in the States in the near future, and eventually in local schools districts.

AFFIRMATIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

The directors of the National Council of Chief State School Officers have voted that the Federal structure for education is regarded by them as a most crucial issue during the months immediately ahead. They have asked the President to preserve the present autonomy of the United States Office of Education in any new reorganization plan to be submitted to Congress. They will exert every effort to induce Congress to defeat any plan that does not leave at least the existing degree of professional independence in the Federal education agency.

Since the place of the Office of Education in the Federal Government has been made an issue, the time has come for the profession to express itself. Opposition to absorption by welfare is not enough. Neither is maintenance of an unsatisfactory status quo. An affirmative program is necessary to prevent such a development.

General opinion favors a National Board of Education, composed of laymen appointed by the President on a nonpartisan basis.[1]

Senate bill 656, introduced by Senator MORSE at the request of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, provides for 11 members appointed for overlapping terms of 11 years and subject to confirmation by the Senate. The measure deserves the full support of the profession.

A national board of this type would be the best possible protection against Federal control of education. Without such an advisory body, the decisions are now made by political officers who are not professional educators. As it is now, the United States Commissioner of Education may or may not be consulted, and if he is consulted his advice may or may not be heeded. Budgets and programs of the Office of Education are made uncertain by official redtape. The most important policies may be decided for other than educational reasons. Even the Commissioner may never know what the real reasons are, or which officials in the overhead line of authority really made them. Professional frustration is the rule rather than the exception under such conditions. A national board would eliminate this type of bureaucratic control.

Let me illustrate specifically. Whether compulsory health insurance is desirable or not, it is clear that the Office of Education should not campaign for it.[2] Had Reorganization Plan No. 1 succeeded, the Office of Education program could have included education for compulsory health insurance because of direct orders from high political officers or through their use of subtler methods.

In the present situation, the Federal Security Administrator can exercise his authority of direction and supervision in similar ways, with only the slight protection of the specific statutory assignments of functions to the Office of Education and the tradition of partial independence in professional matters as limiting factors. These are inadequate protections against controls by crusading officials with superior authority.

Under a national board, the sober judgment of a group of laymen would be brought to bear on education programs proposed in the Office of Education. Under such a nonpartisan board of laymen, looking to its professional executive officer to suggest programs for evaluation, amendment and approval, such controls would not exist.

NO OTHER JURISDICTION

A national board would make educational policies only in the sense that it would approve or disapprove the programs of the Office of Education. The purpose, scope, and content of these programs would be more clearly defined, and the Office would be more efficient professionally than it can be while under the control of political officers. Such efficiency should be recognized by everyone as desirable and is itself insurance against extension of the special aids and splintered educational controls now exericsed by noneducational Federal agencies.

The national board would, of course, have no jurisdiction to determine State or local curriculum or other educational policies in any way. The functions of the Office of Education would remain exactly as now defined in the statutes, but they could be performed more economically and effectively.

American experience proves that public education is best governed in local school districts by the lay board of education operating with the professional administrator as its executive officer. Over a period of years, the same pattern has been more successful in the States than has any other, and the trend is clearly toward its increased use. Local boards have not abused their extensive delegated powers. State boards also have exercised their powers appropriately, without abuse of the broad authority which results naturally from the constitutional concept that the government of education is a State function. A national board of laymen, serving without pay and meeting perhaps six or eight days a year, is surely more to be trusted than political officials to guide professional operation of the Federal educational programs within the limited scope of the Federal educational authority.

The individual members of the board would have only vague and broadly defined responsibilities to the President as presidential appointees. The board itself would be responsible to the President in the sense that it would deal with the Bureau of the Budget through its executive officer, the commissioner of education. Practically, this means that the commissioner would first present the Office of Education budget to the board. The board would officially adopt it, typically with amendments. The commissioner would next present it directly to the Bureau of the Budget, acting in behalf of the board.

We could be certain no political officer had told him what to say. The commissioner, rather than a hierarchy of noneducational political officers, would state the case for education. As the executive officer of the board he would speak similarly for education in presenting to congressional committees the legislative programs approved by the board. Both the board and its executive officer, obviously, would be subject to Congress in the field of educational policies and to all the limitations imposed by the Bureau of the Budget and Congress in respect to appropriations.

Congress will, no doubt, leave statutory responsibilities for certain Federal educational programs in the education agency of the Federal Government. For instance, it probably would hold the national board responsible for the Federal aspects of administration of vocational education and for the collection and dissemination of statistical information concerning education.

Congress might also assign new responsibilities to the board, such as the Federal aspects of administration of the school-lunch program or the Federal administration of funds granted to the States to be used by them for current school costs or construction.

Consider the history of the United States Office of Education since it was established in 1867. Consider our experience with special Federal educational programs administered and controlled all the way to the pupil by noneducational Federal agencies. Do we know any better or safer way to do these things than the lay board and professional executive system which works best in local and State educational governments?

FEDERAL ORGANIZATION FOR EDUCATION UNDER S. 656, A BILL BY SENATOR WAYNE B. MORSE SPONSORED BE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The President appoints 11 members of the national board of education for overlapping 11-year terms, subject to confirmation by the Senate, and routes to Congress the fiscal recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for the United States Office of Education.

Congress, after receiving the executive budget and holding hearings of its own, ap-

---

[1] Part III, Federal Policy and Organization for Education, pp. 277–378, a section of Task Force Report on Public Welfare (appendix P): Functions and Activities of the National Government in the Field of Welfare, a report with recommendations prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government by the Brookings Institution, January 1949. On sale by U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., $1.25. In the report Dr. Hollis P. Allen explains why he recommends a National Board of Education, just as the National Council of Chief State School Officers, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, and numerous other organizations recommend such a board.

[2] There is no implication that it has; the illustration is entirely hypothetical.

propriates funds to the Board for operation of the United States Office of Education. The Senate confirms appointments to the Board.

The Bureau of the Budget receives budget estimates from the Board, holds hearings and recommends to Congress a budget for the operation of the United States Office of Education.

The National Board of Education (1) exercises general control and supervision of the policies and program of the United States Office of Education, acting through the Commissioner of Education, who is its executive officer; (2) appoints the Commissioner of Education, and (3) appoints other professional personnel on nomination of the Commissioner of Education.

The Commissioner of Education serves as executive officer of the Board and administrative head of the United States Office of Education.

[From the New York Times of April 2, 1955]

EDUCATION OFFICE CALLED POLITICAL—TWO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CHARGE SECRETARY HOBBY JUGGLES BUILDING NEEDS—SEPARATE UNIT IS URGED—MOUNT VERNON SUPERINTENDENT SAYS COMMISSIONER "CAN'T CALL HIS SOUL HIS OWN"

(By Benjamin Fine)

CLEVELAND, April 1.—The United States Office of Education is overrun with partisan politics, two top school officials charged today.

They declared that the Commissioner, Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, was nothing but a figurehead who "can't call his soul his own." They accused Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of conveniently juggling school building figures for political purposes.

The charges were made by Dr. Jordan L. Larsen, president, and Dr. Worth McClure of the American Association of School Administrators. The association, a department of the National Education Association, opens its regional convention tomorrow when 9,000 school executives are scheduled to arrive here.

Dr. Larsen, who is superintendent of schools at Mount Vernon, N. Y., denounced the political interference he said had just about destroyed the effectiveness of the Education Office in Washington.

CRITICS FRAME RESOLUTION

A resolution will be presented to the delegates dealing with the need for independent education departments.

"We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education," the resolution reads. "Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We therefore urge Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency."

The educators were particularly disturbed by the statement of Mrs. Hobby that by 1959–60 the classroom shortage would be 176,000 instead of an estimated 407,000. This figure was challenged by both Dr. Larsen and Dr. McClure.

"Not long ago the United States Education Office announced, after a thorough study," Dr. Larsen said, "that 720,000 classrooms would be needed—350,000 to eliminate obsolete buildings and 370,000 to take care of new enrollments. Later that figure was cut to 600,000 and then still later to 407,000, and now it is down to 176,000.

"This is surely an amazing way to solve our school crisis. If we give Mrs. Hobby a couple more weeks, we may even have a surplus of classrooms."

Dr. Larsen suggested that the Secretary might learn more about the facts of life. He said those in the field who know the educational problems did not have her wishful thinking or her ability to rationalize. He estimated that at least 3,500,000 school children were receiving inadequate education because of poor school facilities.

"At the very least we must say that Mrs. Hobby is confused," he asserted.

DOMINATION BY SECRETARY

Dr. Larsen declared that the Education Office was dominated by her to such an extent that Dr. Brownell could not speak out unless he got her permission. He added that there was evidence now of greater political domination in the Office than ever before.

"This domination is the most unfortunate thing that we have in this country today," Dr. Larsen declared. "It may be true that Mrs. Hobby is a very charming woman, but she knows next to nothing about education.

"We can no longer rely upon the accuracy or the impartiality of the statistics that we get from the Education Office.

"Many of us in education no longer have confidence in the Education Department," he asserted.

Among the educators already here it was generally accepted that the Office of Education and its Commissioner were dominated by Mrs. Hobby. They call the Department the political stepchild of the present administration.

Many sectional meetings are scheduled for the next 5 days. The delegates will consider ways to improve teaching, especially in reading, writing, and arithmetic. They will give attention to the recruitment of capable teachers and to the factors involved in juvenile delinquency.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Saturday, April 2, 1955]

CHARGES POLITICS HITS EDUCATION—SCHOOLMASTERS' CHIEF TALKS OF CONVENTION ISSUE

(By J. A. Wadovick)

Charges of political domination of the United States Office of Education flew thick and fast here yesterday on the eve of a 5-day regional conference of the American Association of School Administrators.

"As presently constituted, there is a complete domination of the Commissioner of Education," asserted Jordan L. Larson, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., president of AASA, in an interview in Hotel Statler. "This political domination is one of the most unfortunate things in our country."

URGES FEDERAL AID

Larson, superintendent of public schools in Mount Vernon, was equally outspoken in underscoring the need for Federal aid to schools.

"We ought to have at least $1 billion in Federal assistance for schoolhouse construction to meet current needs and to catch up with obsolescence," he said.

If Federal aid is available for building, he reasoned, "perhaps there might be left greater local resources for teachers," and schools would be able to meet current expenses.

Larson saw little hope for additional help from local tax funds. Many communities, even if taxed to the legal limit, cannot undertake to build under present costs, he contended.

APPOINTED BOARD PROPOSED

Some 9,500 administrators are expected to be convened here by this morning. The delegates will vote on a resolution stipulating that the Office of Education should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms.

"Such a board should have the authority to appoint the commissioner of education," the resolution says, "who would serve as the board's executive officer.

"This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government."

INDEPENDENT AGENCY IS AIM

The administrators will be asked to reaffirm their position that "education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics."

If the resolution is approved, the administrators of American schools will be on record as favoring the establishment by Congress of the Office of Education as an independent agency.

Larson criticized figures released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the number of schoolrooms currently needed throughout the country. The Department's original estimate of 720,000 was whittled down to 600,000 and finally, according to the latest report just released, to 176,000, he said.

"This figure probably represents wishful thinking," said Larson, commenting on the inference from the office of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department, that no Federal assistance to schools was needed.

The original 720,000-room estimate had been made by her department, he pointed out. The figure was based on a $5 million survey by the Government.

EXHIBITS OPENING

Jordan will preside at 2 this afternoon in public hall at the ceremonial opening of the exhibits, said to be the largest of their kind anywhere, and will open the first general session, a vesper service at 4 p. m. tomorrow. Mark C. Schinnerer, superintendent of Cleveland public schools, will welcome the delegates. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON will speak at a general session at 8:30 tomorrow night.

A number of professional groups are meeting here concurrently with the AASA. The National Association of Educational Secretaries held open house last night in Hotel Cleveland.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) in two instances.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

724. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive

element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government as of the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 1955 (March 31, 1955), pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (Public Law 150, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

725. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on food and clothing in the Government, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

726. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Atlantic Area Command, east coast and Caribbean operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

727. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

728. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling, and disposition of short-paid (postal due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

729. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the Chinese emergency aid program, pursuant to Public Laws 327 and 535, 81st Congress, and Public Law 165, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

730. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $263,475 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H. Doc. 147); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

731. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $827,815,000 for the Department of Defense—military functions, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 145); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

732. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the first semiannual report as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; 50 U. S. C. App. 2001–2016) and section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U. S. C. App. 1621–1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

733. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report on Educational Exchange Operations for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1602. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2679. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3948. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4936. A bill to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 5817. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5818. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 5819. A bill to modify the Waukegan Harbor, Ill., project by eliminating certain requirements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5820. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hulah Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5821. A bill to amend the Federal Records Act of 1950 to improve the microfilming services available to Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5822. A bill to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5823. A bill to modify the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5824. A bill to assist the States in providing for the construction of municipal lakes, ponds, and reservoirs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5825. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions in the classified (competitive) civil service may retire at age 55, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain officers and employees of the Federal Government involuntarily separated from their positions shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE (by request):

H. R. 5827. A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5828. A bill to establish an independent Office of Education in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim Sunday, June 26, 1955, and the fourth Sunday in June of each year thereafter, as a day of prayer for the "Man and Woman in White"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution relative to a definition of the phrase, "Peace-loving state", in the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling construction of the highway known as the Navaho Trail; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging enactment of H. R. 5255, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire Marine Memorial, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to harbor improvements, island of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and to enact new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 5829. A bill for the relief of Fahmi Mickel Mansy and Mrs. Taman Chartouni Mansy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 5830. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Carey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5831. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 5832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Takeda) Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 5833. A bill for the relief of Filomena and Emil Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5834. A bill for the relief of Libero Ridolfi and Mrs. Luigia Belardi Ridolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 5835. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ramiro Liera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

210. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 95 railroad employees of Williamsport, Pa., area urging every Member of Congress to support any bill that contains the following provisions: "To provide retirement at age of 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age, annuities to be based on one or more of one's highest year's earnings. Rail retirement annuities and pensions to be increased by 15 percent"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Local No. 568, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Mason City, Iowa, urging enactment of legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

212. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of legislation giving suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

213. Also, petition of the grand knight, Hempstead Council No. 1241, Knights of Columbus, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, petition of the grand knight, LaSalle Council No. 454, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. Also, petition of the executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate resumption of the construction of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir project and asking the Congress of the United States to reappropriate the necessary funds to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to allow the early completion of the project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

216. Also, petition of the secretary, the Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, Westerly, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the monthly benefit for old-age and survivors' insurance be increased to $100 per month across the board for worthy elderly American citizens who retired under provision of the old-age and survivors' insurance, social-security law previous to 1950 amendment thereof, until the last surviving member thereof has passed on; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

217. Also, petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of either H. R. 4560 or H. R. 3902 in their original form, pertaining to natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

218. Also, petition of the deputy county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to Resolution No. 142, relating to a request to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, to provide for an annual session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Opinion-Poll Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been conducting an opinion poll among citizens of the Third Congressional District of Indiana on eight questions dealing with President Eisenhower's 1955 legislative program and other issues of vital concern to the Nation.

I have been conducting these polls among my constituents annually for the past 4 years with several objectives in view. My primary purpose has been to determine, in broad terms, for my own benefit, the attitudes and opinions of the people of northern Indiana on major legislative issues. These surveys, however, also serve to stimulate public discussion and interest in these issues, which is a healthy thing, and they enable me to present to Congress, as I am now doing, the views of an important segment of the voting population.

Questionnaires were mailed early in March to a substantial cross section of voters in the four urban and rural counties I represent: St. Joseph, South Bend; Elkhart, Elkhart and Goshen; La Porte, La Porte and Michigan City; and Marshall, Plymouth.

Ballots also were printed in several district newspapers and readers were asked to fill them out and send them to me with their answers.

The response this year, as in past years, was well above the average for similar mail polls. Approximately 18,000 questionnaires have been returned to date, and they are still coming in. This compares with a response of approximately 12,000 in 1952, 15,000 in 1953, and 21,000 in 1954.

The results of my 1955 poll, as tabulated by the IBM service bureau, an impartial private concern, are listed below. Within the limitations of any survey of this nature, they reflect the current opinions of a substantial cross section of Indiana voters.

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	82	9	9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	34	61	5
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	44	46	10
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	76	11	13
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	39	46	15
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	70	23	7
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	55	33	12
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	67	26	7

POLL OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

In order to stimulate interest in public affairs among future citizens of my district I again conducted a separate poll among high-school students. More than 3,000 students took part this year, voting on the issues in class under the supervision of instructors after a thorough discussion of the pros-and-cons. Here are the results of the 1955 high-school poll, based on returns from 25 high schools in northern Indiana:

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:			
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	Percent 84	Percent 7	Percent 9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	50	43	7
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	41	39	20
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	73	15	12
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	50	22	28
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	65	22	13
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	34	44	22
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	54	28	18

Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks in the RECORD recently, the recommendations of the Attorney General's committee to study the antitrust laws are receiving wide attention.

Some of the recommendations strike at the very heart of the Robinson-Patman law. My service on the House Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over all monopoly and antitrust legislation, has afforded me an opportunity to keep in close touch with the operations of the Robinson-Patman law, the court decisions interpreting it, and the efforts constantly made to weaken it. This law was passed by Congress in the interest of the small independent businessman. It is intended to give the small man an opportunity to stay in business and it has demonstrated its usefulness over the years.

We frequently hear loose statements to the effect or at least implying that the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, requires the selling of commodities of like grade and quality at the same price, under all circumstances. This is simply not true. The act specifically permits the manufacturer or supplier to sell commodities of like grade and quality to different customers at different prices, where the difference is due to normal discount for cash, quantity buying, freight savings, and other varieties of customary and acceptable business practices. Cash discounts, savings in freight based on quantity buying, differentials which make due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from differing methods or quantities in which commodities are sold to the purchaser—all such advantages have always been available to operators. Such fair business practices were customary prior to the adoption of the Robinson-Patman Act and they have not been changed by that law.

What the act prohibits is purely arbitrary price discrimination, not remotely connected with economic reasons, so that the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to endanger, destroy or prevent competition. Such price discriminations mean that a manufacturer or supplier has two prices, a secret and very low price for a few favored customers such as chain stores, and a so-called public high price for the independent little-business man in the community, such as the corner grocery store, hardware store, drug store, and filling station. It prohibits under-the-counter concessions to the favored few under such guises as excessive free goods, brokerage commissions, rebates, and so on.

One of the favored devices to crush the small-business man was the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. A majority of the Attorney General's committee proposes to amend the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. Beware of this proposal. In that connection, I want to make a part of the RECORD the letter I received from California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., dated April 21, 1955. It tells the story so very clearly that I cannot possibly improve on it, and I commend it to all the friends of the small-business man in Congress. The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA & HAWAIIAN
SUGAR REFINING CORP.,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: I am writing to state this company's strong opposition to the position of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws regarding the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As the law now stands, section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act forbids payment of brokerage to any person who is acting for or is under the control of a buyer. This provision was aimed at an abuse widely practiced before adoption of the act—the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. Such buyers were in the practice of demanding brokerage for these departments in amounts completely unrelated to the value of any services received by the seller. The brokerage was of course nothing but a price concession given color of validity by the brokerage department device.

A majority of the Attorney General's Committee proposes to amend section 2 (c) of the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. In our opinion this seemingly innocent exception would make the section entirely unenforceable. It would make every complaint under the section depend on difficult questions of cost accounting. In practical effect, the section would be a dead letter.

The consequences would be extremely serious, both to sellers and all but the largest buyers. It is only relatively large buyers that are in a position to establish brokerage departments and take advantage of the loophole proposed by the Attorney General's Committee. In our judgment the committee's proposal is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the act, to preserve equality of economic opportunity.

The payment of brokerage to a buyer is a merchandising absurdity. A bona fide broker is the seller's sales representative; his function is to give sales service. In the nature of things a "broker" employed by a buyer cannot and will not do this job. A more honest and descriptive name for a broker acting for a buyer is purchasing agent. His interests are essentially adverse to those of the seller, and no seller would ever voluntarily agree to pay him. This practical inability of such a broker to give any service of value to a seller justifies the present outright prohibition of brokerage in such a case. Any payment to such a broker is in practical effect a payment to a buyer's purchasing department and results in unfair discrimination as between competing buyers.

Please forgive the length of this letter. This company well remembers the brokerage practices that existed before the adoption of section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. They were costly and unfair, and should never be permitted again.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD MACLEAN.

Brotherhood and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., of Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, on March 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD AND DEMOCRACY

(Address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, from Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, Sunday, March 27, 1955, Station WOOK, 1:30 p. m. to 2:30 p. m.)

I deeply appreciate the privilege I have received in your invitation to share in the ninth anniversary broadcast of Americans All. The esteem in which your listening audience holds this program reflects the quality of your leadership and direction, Dr. Todd.

There is, of course, a great service to the public inherent in the enjoyment that a radio broadcast furnishes through its programs in either a sense of pleasure or stimulation of thinking. The greatest service,

however, is that which is performed by a program of this kind which in its essence fulfills the foremost of American principles—those ideals of brotherhood and democracy.

The fostering and upholding of these principles have always been for Americans a civic, moral, and a Christian responsibility. They are the centermost part of our American way of life through which all the parts of the total can be balanced. They hold within themselves the first laws of our land, the first laws of morality and ethical conduct, and the first laws under God.

It has been precisely stated that the democratic idea upon which our Nation was founded and for which Americans have given their lives through two wars and an international conflict, is founded in human nature and comes from God who makes human nature.

The fact that ours is a government of the people, in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised directly or indirectly through a system of representation—presents to the world our esteem of man as a human being whose stature arises from intellectual and creative powers and his practice of right or ethical conduct.

Our profession of faith in such a principle of government also expresses our faith in the brotherhood or kinship of all the people who make up our common family—a kinship that lies in the common pursuit of the objectives of such a form of government—life, liberty, and happiness.

Unless we have brotherhood among all men of our Nation, we cannot have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, because brotherhood implies an equality between all men which makes them capable of self-discipline and thus self-government. Brotherhood also implies an unlimited personal liability for the pursuit of the objectives of democracy for all men—life, the right to equal opportunities for work as embodied in the FEPC bill cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota and guest today, the Honorable WILLIAM F. LANGER, to worship freely and to live sociably with fellow man; liberty, the right to impartial laws by all men may be secured in their equal rights; and the pursuit of happiness, the state of well-being and pleasurable satisfaction arising from personal accomplishments and personal acceptance in the common family.

Brotherhood and the principles of democracy have been the subject of discussion for generations by orators, poets, governmental officials, and religious leaders, but never before has the fate of the world hung more upon the relationship of man within his own sphere of activity and the effects of the relationship as it is intensified and as it reaches out into the outer spheres of the lands of other men. America, the leader of the free world, is faced with its moral and Christian liability for the welfare of fellowmen within and without its sphere. Only so can it give demonstration of its faith in the principles of democracy and brotherhood.

The tensions which are abroad in the world today and give rise to our fears for civilization are evidences of the lack of a strong sense of kinship between and liability for other men—the doubt of one man's belief in the equality and worthiness of others. Events have proved we cannot remove an iota or a dot, from the law of brotherhood and still accomplish democracy. So long as there exists in America men who are without equal rights under the law, men who are without equal opportunty for self expression and development or men who are unprotected, we have not fulfilled our democratic ideals. As it affects the outer world, we can ease tensions by showing others a better way of life or even our faith in such a life.

Men of all the free world and, we are sure from the testimony of those who have escaped the snare, men of the enslaved world look to America—world leader, foremost advocator of democracy—with the prayer that she will demonstrate her faith in the destiny of man.

Sports Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Congress is well aware of my interest in our State Department's international, educational, and cultural exchange program. As a cosponsor of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act, I have been gratified to note from time to time the effectiveness this program has had in winning friends abroad and gaining respect for our country.

While it is generally well known that this program includes an exchange of students, professors, teachers, and research scholars it is not so well known that the program has also been garnering much good will for our country through nonacademic exchange of persons. The interchange of leaders of national prominence between our country and some seventy countries around the world has been a very fruitful interchange in obtaining a better understanding of our life, our attitudes, and our peaceful intentions in today's world. Top level Government officials, mayors, civic leaders, and so forth from other lands have returned home to tell the American story with convincing credibility. The selected American leaders who have gone abroad on this program from as diverse fields as law, labor, management, the arts, and athletics have been equally effective in providing living refutation to Communist lies about our life and our people.

Surprising, to some observers, has been the tremendous success of the goodwill tours of our top athletes who have gone abroad on this program. On February 7, 1955, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable CARL HINSHAW, of California, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of a newspaper article which appeared in the Pasadena Star-News which described the tremendous exploits and friend-winning activities abroad of our great two-time Olympic diving champion, Major Sammy Lee. I have been told of the voluminous reports which have come in from our Foreign Service posts describing the abundant goodwill won for our country by our four great Olympic champions, Sammy Lee, Mal Whitfield, Rob Richards, and Harrison Dillard. Bob Considine, outstanding American sports writer, recently quoted an on-the-spot observer from India as saying that Bob Richards, the Vaulting Vicar, reached and favorably impressed at least 3 million Indians while he was in India on this educational exchange program.

The Cleveland Press on February 16, 1955, carried an article on Harrison Dillard which displays so much admiration for their home-town product and which expresses so well the value of this kind of exchange that I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILLARD WINS PRAISE AS UNITED STATES "AMBASSADOR"

(By Jack Clowser)

For a long time, I've felt it was impossible to be more proud of Harrison Dillard than the day I saw him ascend the victory stand at London and accept his first Olympic victory wreath.

For a close second, perhaps, it was the time his old coach, Eddie Finnigan, and I watched him enter Buckingham Palace—the only member of his race invited to a reception by the British King and Queen. I remember Eddie, his chest swelling with pride, muttering "What a long way to come—a kid from a poor East Side neighborhood, all the way to the Palace."

Now I'm not sure that either was Dillard's finest achievement. After reading letters that have been coming to Mayor Celebrezze and to Hank Greenberg, Harrison's boss, it seems the famous Cleveland track star has just turned in his most praiseworthy performance.

The letters are from the United States State Department, under whose auspices Dillard recently made a 3-month good-will tour of South and Central America. His selection was, in the first place, a high honor indicative of his type of citizenship.

In this global struggle for the minds of men, with democracy arrayed against communism, the State Department sought to impress our pan-American neighbors by sending them a young man who was representative of the highest type of sportsman. A gifted extemporaneous speaker and world-famous athlete, Dillard filled the bill so well that United States Embassies in the countries he visited have been deluging the State Department with praise for his work.

Here are some examples, as cited by the department in letters to Greenberg and the mayor:

From Haiti: "The Department is to be congratulated for its selection of Dillard. His effectiveness is not limited to demonstrations of sports techniques; in addition he represents his country, on all occasions, with poise, intelligence, cordiality, and a genuine interest in his hosts."

From Bolivia: "The story of Dillard's visit can be described by saying that in almost every instance when he was scheduled to make a speech, show a film, or attend a reception indoors, the demand to see him was such that we had to move outside. He was one of the most successful of American leaders who have visited here in years."

From Argentina: "His visit to Buenos Aires was a great success * * * his engaging personality, his modesty and sincerity made a highly favorable impression on all who met him. President Peron himself expressed his satisfaction at Dillard's visit, and his wish that the visit might have been longer."

From Cuba: "Just imagine what it means, in the affirmation of the principles of the good neighbor and democracy, to see this young Negro, of humble background but lifted to the pinnacle of success and admiration by his own efforts, widely honored, as he well deserves. Dillard has rendered Cuba a work worthy of gratitude."

From Panama: "Dillard's visit is considered by this Embassy to have been the most effective short-time exchange of persons project ever experienced in Panama."

In his reply to the State Department, Greenberg wrote, "We are proud of his association with the Cleveland Baseball Club, and delighted to learn that his appearances in Latin America provoked such complimentary responses."

It must give all good Americans a warm glow to know that the skinny little guy at East Tech High has grown up to represent his country, not only as a wonder athlete, but much more important, as an instrument for international good will.

After all, isn't that the logical sequence for the sterling sportsmanship he has unswervingly practiced?

Surplus Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the laws passed by Congress, including the most recent Public Law 480, in substance and essence constitute directives to the Department of Agriculture to find outlets for surplus farm commodities in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices.

I am willing to concede that these directives of necessity present administrative difficulties. On the other hand, many of us in Congress honestly feel that the program outlined by Congress has been pursued by the Secretary of Agriculture with something less than vigor and enthusiasm. This could be due to the fact that because of alleged international considerations the State Department has put a damper on or at least has been cool to the program. But whatever the reason for it the cold fact is that our surplus farm commodities have not moved in the channels of foreign trade, as contemplated and directed by Congress.

Rice is a typical case in point as brought out recently by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Representative E. C. GATHINGS, one of the farmer's best friends in Congress. Following a discussion with Mr. GATHINGS, I addressed the following telegram, dated April 12, 1955, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State:

APRIL 12, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that as conditions to the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan, the State Department is seeking to have Agriculture Department to agree first that in the future no rice will be offered on the world markets at less than current domestic prices and, second, that no rice will be exported into the Southeast Asian markets. The first condition would, in my opinion, be in direct violation of the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 480 and the second would constitute a trade barrier which neither State nor Agriculture can impose. Further, such restrictions would no doubt result in further reduction of domestic rice acreage which has already been cut too deeply. I strongly protest any action of this nature and would appreciate your advising that these or any other similar restrictive conditions have been or will be removed and that program of disposal of rice will be pursued vigorously as contemplated by Congress.

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert in the RECORD the reply of the Department of State, dated April 18, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILLIS: Reference is made to your telegram of April 12 concerning the question of rice sales in Asian markets.

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in Southeast Asia.

Your attention is called to the fact that title I, section 101 of Public Law 480 provides that in negotiating agreements "the President shall (a) take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities."

On September 9, 1954 the President issued an Executive order and a general policy statement for the implementation of Public Law 480, which outlined the basic problems as well as certain of the responsibilities in connection with the administration of this act. Two paragraphs of the policy statement are hereinafter quoted in full.

"Today, the magnitude of the United States' holdings of many commodities is such as to be capable of demoralizing world commodity markets should a policy of reckless selling abroad be pursued. This potential greatly alarms other countries despite the fact that past behavior of the United States has shown no intention of pursuing a harmful policy."

* * * * *

"The United States cannot be satisfied with the position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodites."

The State Department, from the very outset of the problem of surplus agricultural commodities, has been intent upon opening up possible permanent foreign markets for American commodities, and particularly in the areas where consumption may be increased. Our primary concern has been to widen the markets and to create a situation which will permit a continuation of sales abroad on an expanding basis. The Department has been concerned that we do not enter into potential price wars which can only harm the American farmers and defeat the basic foreign policy concept clearly set forth in the introduction of Public Law 480.

A decision to dispose of United States surplus rice stocks in Asian markets under Public Law 480 or at subsidized prices under existing uneasy political conditions in that area is one which should involve consideration of the important questions of foreign policy which are concerned. In particular, disposal in a manner which would have the effect either of depriving Burma and Thailand of their traditional markets or of depressing export prices, or of threatening to do so, may seriously jeopardize the enthusiasm of those countries to resist Communist overtures. Few actions on our part could be more suitable to Communist propaganda which is already pounding into Asian ears the charge that the United States surplus disposal program disregards the economic interests of Asian countries.

The specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration to determine the manner in which our surplus disposal program and our critically important foreign policy interests in Asia can be reconciled.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, I was, of course, very pleased with the second paragraph of the letter, which I repeat:

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in Southeast Asia.

And while the succeeding paragraphs in the letter were perhaps necessarily general, I was nevertheless pleased with the assurance of the last statement to the effect that "the specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration," and so forth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 3 days later, on April 21, 1955, I received the following letter from the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 21, 1955.

Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: We have your telegram of April 12 to Secretary Benson regarding the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan.

The Department of Agriculture has been discussing this transfer thoroughly with the Department of State and other interested parties. We are now in the process of going ahead on negotiations for the transfer.

As you may know, the Department of State is properly interested in making sure that relations with friendly nations are not jeopardized by any transfer of foodstuffs involving substantial subsidy that might interfere with normal marketings by other friendly nations.

However, I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

Assuring you of our desire to pursue every possible avenue to move rice into the export markets, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, evidently the considerations at highest level of the administration referred to by the State Department bore fruit because in the letter of the Department of Agriculture I find this significant sentence:

I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

I sincerely hope the negotiations, when completed, will continue to be satisfactory not only in this case but in connection with the general administration of the directives of Congress.

Anniversary of the Evacuation of Boston by the British

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include with pleasure an excellent and appropriate address made by United States Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, on March 13, 1955, in South Boston, Mass., a part of my congressional district, on the occasion of the patriotic exercises conducted under the auspices of the South Boston Citizens Association in connection with the 179th anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British:

When the patriots looked from Dorchester Heights and saw the British Fleet set sail out of Boston Harbor—that was a great day. I don't suppose the time will ever come in these parts when the evacuation anniversary is not celebrated. I am sure that day will never come so long as there are Americans with Irish blood here—because this was the symbol of the dawn of freedom in this great land. And if there is one thing the Irish prize above all others—above prosperity, above security, it is freedom. In that cause they have bled and died through the centuries.

Of course they knew well enough that the departure of the oppressor did not mean that all their problems were solved. But here was a real start on the road to independence and to a chance to build a land of liberty and plenty.

The climb upward from the days of oppression has been a long one. There have been setbacks. But as time goes on the ideals of the colonial patriots have been increasingly achieved. Even the most reactionary people today would not accept manners and laws and customs that were considered all right in the days of the American Revolution.

Let us not forget that the freedom for which the patriots fought was not achieved in a battle or in a campaign or in the whole War of the Revolution. After the war was won, the only people allowed to vote were male property owners. It was many years before all white men had the right to vote. It was many more years before it was conceded that all men who were not felons should have the right to vote—and this is still not fully accepted in some parts of these United States. It was many years before women were given their political freedom and the right to vote.

Those were the days in which the institution of human slavery was commonly accepted as a proper condition, not only for the black men, but also in effect for the white bondsman.

Those were the days in which the very idea that workingmen might band together to gain their economic ends was looked on as a crime and indeed, as flying in the face of providence.

What I am getting at here today is that the pursuit of liberty and of happiness is a never-ending affair. We climb one hill, we achieve another freedom or another good, and still another unsolved problem of social justice lies ahead.

Some of us close our eyes to the hills ahead. It is more comfortable that way. We can just pretend that they don't exist. Some of us look backward, to the good old days when the jobless workingman had the right to starve but not the right to beg; to the good old days when the suspicion of hard times coming meant wholesale slashing of wages; to the good old days when there was no income tax and it wouldn't have mattered to us much if there had been—because who but the rich had a dollar in those good days?

Well, I for one am not wasting my time on the good old days. It is my idea that we should try for better days, not for a few, but for all the people. It is my idea that the dignity of the individual is a value worth keeping. It is my idea that while this great Nation has done much, we still have seen but a little of the great things that are to come. That is to say, the great things to come if we keep conquering the hills ahead. I mean to make my small contribution to that end.

We are coming close to St. Patrick's Day, and I should like to say just a few words about where that sainted man would have stood had he been here on this day in 1955. I am pretty sure that he would have been looking ahead too. He had to look ahead in his day in Ireland. There he was amid a hundred pagan tribes, trying to bring the faith and education and tolerance of each other to people who must have been pretty hard to convince. He did a fine job for all the people, and we carry him in our hearts for it. It seems to me that we could do worse than get in step with St. Patrick and make this city and this State and this Nation—yes, and this world, a bit better for those who shall come to inherit what we have left.

Atomic Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has given out the information it is now making arrangements with a number of private power companies and, in one case, with a public utility district, for the planning and construction of atomic powerplants. This is good news, not only for our own country, but for the free world.

We have recently learned of the extensive plans of Great Britain in this field. I do not feel that it is necessary to get into a race with our friendly ally in this matter. Neither do I believe that the United States should lag behind in the development of such important peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The concern of the Atomic Energy Commission for the development and improvement of weapons is natural in this age of anxiety, yet atomic energy in its many peacetime uses can be one of the great boons of mankind. I do not think that we can for one moment forget that fact.

The development of efficient and economical atomic powerplants offers much to the world. In countries such as Sweden, Finland, and Austria which are dependent for much of their power production on coal imported from behind the Iron Curtain, atomic powerplants offer an end to an economic stranglehold.

If we succeed, as the Department of the Interior is endeavoring, in finding an economical way to make vast quantities of fresh water from sea water, atomic plants to power-pumping stations can make deserts bloom in many arid lands, and provide food and a better life for millions of people.

Every time mankind has discovered a great new source of power, the ability of the world to sustain a growing population has been advanced. We have made such advances through the use of coal, falling water, oil, and gas. We are standing now at the threshold of what may be mankind's greatest era if we can avoid war and put atomic energy to peaceful uses.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dinner of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROMANCE OF ROADS

(Address by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Saturday evening, April 23, 1955)

One of the most spectacular developments in the United States has been the surprising increase in our population. According to the latest Census Bureau estimates, we are now a Nation of almost 165 million people.

That figure represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the total for the last general census of 1950. Compared with the 1940 census we have had an increase of 25 percent.

Translated into terms of human needs and the American way of life, this population increase has imposed upon us many great problems.

We need more schools to educate the growing army of young people. We need more hospitals. We must build more churches of every denomination. We must have more, better, and safer roads to accommodate the vastly increased volume of motor traffic that crowds upon our inadequate and hazardous highway systems.

I refer to these problems because they offer a challenge of such great importance to the future of our country. They should be the concern of every public-spirited American.

This evening I want to center my remarks on the urgent need for the expansion and modernization of our roads in all parts of the United States. As ranking Republican member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I have given a

great deal of study to the highway legislation now under discussion. I am confident that substantial progress will be made from the standpoint of economic growth, national defense, civil defense, the safety and convenience of the traveling public and the general welfare.

This history of transportation in America is a fascinating story. It is filled with the romance of an expanding empire of freedom and opportunity. It is the story of resolute, courageous men and women who pushed westward over the mountains and plains to open new lands, to clear the forests, and to create new communities that have become great centers of industry and enterprise. From the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard, the development and use of our waterways, highways, railways, pipelines, and air transportation has been one of the most important factors in our material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

In the early days the streams and Indian trails provided the only means of communication and travel. The first roads that connected scattered communities were built to accommodate horse-drawn vehicles in the unhurried pace of that day.

Military necessity was another strong influence in road development. General Braddock's road through the mountain wilderness from Cumberland, over a course now followed by the historic Route 40, and the Forbes Road from Bedford to Ohio Forks, were outstanding examples. They rank with the world's great military operations. The mission of these military campaigns was to secure the "point" where the Allegheny and the Monongahela join to form the Ohio. The prize at stake in this great struggle was the control of a continent. The British finally won after years of hard fighting. Here in the wildnerness, 200 years ago, the future of the New World was decided and the geography of Europe was shaped.

It is not necessary to recount the battles, campaigns, and individual exploits before a western Pennsylvania audience such as this. The thrilling story has been told many times by students of history. It has been brought home to us in song, folk-lore, and on the motion-picture screen.

The westward migration through the Point resulted in the settlement of the plains, the prairies, and the Pacific slope of North America. It brings to mind the great fleet of Conestoga wagons, which had their origin in Pennsylvania, and other covered wagons, ever moving westward. This is an inspiring picture. It is typically American. It embodies the American spirit of self-reliance and individual responsibility. It meant hardship, privation and often death, but it developed the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Yes, my fellow Americans, there is romance in our roads, yet they are today, as always, the basic means of transportation. The other avenues of transportation—waterways, railroads and the air—aid and supplement the roads just as the auxiliary branches of the armed services help the "doughboy" gain and hold his objective.

Turning now to the present and the future, there is widespread agreement that bold, new steps must be taken to correct the deficiencies that have accumulated on our highway system during and since World War II.

The Nation has not kept pace with highway needs. The time has come when obsolete and dangerous roads must be replaced or rebuilt to modern standards of safety and efficiency. Larger, faster, and increased numbers of motor vehicles have added to our problem and will continue to do so. The American people now own 58 million motor vehicles and that figure is expected to rise beyond 81 million in the next 10 years. The number of vehicles using the original Pennsylvania Turnpike has multiplied by 4 in the last 5 years.

For many years roads were built where there was the strongest political pressure. There was no comprehensive plan.

Today we have a program and a plan. It was placed before Congress by President Eisenhower after an exhaustive study by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in cooperation with the Governors' conference. It calls for the expenditure in the next 10-year period of $101 billion.

To reach a better understanding of what that figure means—$101 billion—let me tell you that it is more than the cost of all wars in which we have been engaged, with the exception of World War II.

Under the President's plan, the total cost will be apportioned approximately one-third to the Federal Government and two-thirds to State and local governments.

The Federal Government will assume primary responsibility for developing the National System of Interstate Highways. This is a specially designated network of 37,600 miles connecting 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all the cities over 50,000 population. It will have controlled access and will bypass large centers of population.

The system has been carefully laid out to take care of the military and industrial needs of the country. When completed it will also be one of our greatest cultural and spiritual assets, providing easy and safe highways that will bring our people closer together and provide the means for a better understanding of our great country.

On the other systems, primary, secondary and urban, Federal contributions are to be continued on a matching basis at the rate of about $600 million a year, as provided by the Highway Act of 1954. This, incidentally, was the largest highway program ever authorized by the United States.

I have discussed the proposed program in broad outline, but there are many difficult problems involved. The most serious, of course, is how it is to be financed.

I am sure most of you are aware that I have always been a strong advocate of the pay-as-you-go plan in Government at all levels.

I have always favored the pay-as-you-go plan because it means greater economy. It avoids the danger of burdensome debt and keeps taxes at the lowest possible level.

I would prefer to have the proposed highway program carried out on that basis. But we have been told by qualified experts that even with a substantial tax increase it would take 30 years to do the job that is needed right now—and can be completed in 10 years under the plan proposed by the President.

That plan recommends the creation of a Federal Highway Corporation authorized to issue bonds to finance construction of the interstate system. The bonds will be supported by Federal gasoline tax revenues above the $622½ million now contributed to the States for all road construction other than the interstate system. It is anticipated that the 2-cent gasoline tax now levied by the Federal Government will liquidate the $23 billion in bonds in 30 years while the roads will be completed in 10 years. It will not require an increase in the tax.

There is some opposition to this financing plan. It has been argued that it is not legal to appropriate for such a long period. To my mind this objection is not valid. The same argument could be made against the bonds for the public debt and the payment of pensions because each Congress must make the appropriations.

Others contend that it is not good Government practice to earmark revenues for specific purposes. Against this is the fact that 24 States already have constitutional provisions segregating all gas tax receipts for roadbuilding purposes.

We need the roads. There is no disagreement on that score. We must have them if we are to have an expanding economy. We need them for our industrial, cultural, and spiritual advancement. We need them for national and civilian defense. We need them to reduce the frightful toll of lives taken each year by accidents on our highways. The big decision we must make is how they shall be financed. It's up to the American people to decide, for they must pay the bills.

Personally I feel the President's plan is sound. I do believe, however, that serious consideration should be given to the question of tolls. I believe that the collection of tolls, wherever feasible, on sections of roads, bridges and tunnels, would be advantageous to our country and fair to the traveling public. Or perhaps it might be wise to require the payment of a license fee for vehicles traveling on the interstate system.

In the past the romance of traveling in covered wagons, stage coaches, and packet lines were adventures pictured in the famous prints of Currier & Ives and other artists. The tying together of the Atlantic and the Pacific by steel rails was acclaimed all over the world.

The first plane across the continent was hailed as an event unparalleled in transportation.

The completion of the highway plan now under consideration will be another romantic story in American progress.

It means the mobilization of the best in engineering skill and construction ability; the assembling of material and equipment in quantities never before equalled and all coordinated with American know-how in the American way.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Testimonial Dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Shultz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at a testimonial dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, held in New York City on April 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR MCCARTHY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR RABBI BENJAMIN SCHULTZ, NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 20, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, our meeting tonight is long overdue. The gallant warrior we are honoring has been covering himself with glory for so many years, it's a wonder we have never stopped, until now, to say thanks.

That's the trouble, Ben, with being a solid, unwavering bastion of strength—like the Rock of Gibraltar, people tend to take you for granted. I regret this is not the 10th or 20th time we have gathered to honor you; but I thank God we have always been able to take you for granted.

Someone recently observed that no man is indispensable. As regards some matters, I emphatically agree. But in other fields, I

would be more cautious. How, for example, would the anti-Communist fight have fared over the past decade without Rabbi Schultz? And how should we bear the loss if ever he were to leave his post? Some men in some jobs, let's face it, are indispensable.

What is it that can make a man indispensable in this struggle? Is it the possession of keen insights—an understanding of the fallacies of the Communist doctrine, an appreciation of the moral evil it contains? Or is it practical shrewdness in the day-to-day battles? Is it an ability to joust with the dialecticians at the intellectual level? Or is it stubborness and grit at the street level? Is it unflagging courage? Is it single-mindedness of purpose—an unswerving determination to defeat the enemy absolutely?

Each of these qualities is a scarce commodity; the possession of any one of them makes a man valuable to the anti-Communist cause. But when you find them all in one individual, you have found a rare man, indeed; and you can afford to talk about indispensability. The good Lord put in all the ingredients when he made Ben Schultz.

Ben Schultz' contributions to the anti-Communist cause are innumerable, and many of them have been cited here tonight. We have heard, and we might well hear a great deal more, of his distinguished accomplishments—as an arresting orator, as a skillful writer, as an organizer. But it is in this latter capacity—as the founder and the guiding star of the American Jewish League against communism—that Ben Schultz has performed what is perhaps his most distinguished service.

Ben Schultz, ably seconded by Roy Cohn, Benjamin Gitlow, Frank Chodorov, Judge Irving Kaufman, Eugene Lyons, George Sokolsky, Walter Winchell, Alfred Kohlberg, Ben Mandell, and countless other leaders who share his religious beliefs, has managed to expose the malicious myth that persons of the Jewish faith and Communists have something in common. This wicked falsehood has been ruthlessly exploited by the Communists for their own ends.

The Communists sow this particular seed of discord by two methods: First, they emphasize the religion of traitors or security risks in those instances where it so happens that they are of the Jewish faith. This type of propaganda, as the Communists well know, catalyzes latent prejudices and creates race hatred. Why don't the Communists comment on Alger Hiss' or William Remington's religion? The reason is obvious: There is no profit here, no conspicuous prejudice to exploit, no promise of creating division or suspicion.

The second Communist method of exploiting the race issue is more subtle. Rabbi Schultz shrewdly diagnosed it in an article for the American Mercury last summer. The Communists energetically peddle the line that anticommunism and antisemitism go hand in hand—specifically that all hard anti-Communists are ipso facto antisemitic. This slur is, of course, pure invention; but it commonly results, as Ben Schultz suggests, in 1 of 2 things—both of which give aid and comfort to the Communist. Some non-Jewish Americans are angered by the accusation, and in reaction to it, turn their resentment against Jewish people. Others are intimidated by it, and with an eye to their political fortunes, decline to take an active role in the anti-Communist fight. Either way—whether race dissension is created, or people are frightened off from joining the anti-Communist fight—either way, the Communists win.

Let's make no mistake about this: the Communists are waging a diabolically clever campaign. But its effectiveness has, to a great extent, been blunted by the work of Rabbi Schultz and the American Jewish League against communism. The very existence of this hard-hitting anti-Communist group gives the lie to a vitally important item of Communist propaganda. And I say to you that I frankly doubt there is a single organization in this country that the Communists are more anxious to destroy.

There are two reasons why I am confident that the Communists will not be successful in this. First, Ben Schultz, and his indomitable crew of heroes will not be beaten down by anybody. Second, and perhaps of even greater importance, is the fact that Jewish people are congenital enemies of communism. Those of the Jewish faith are, historically, champions of liberty. They are, traditionally, jealous guardians of the individual's freedom—political, economic, social. These things communism is determined to destroy.

And remember too that persons of the Jewish faith have, by force of circumstances, a vested interest in tolerance. It is not an interest in tolerance of moral evil such as communism embodies. But within the framework of belief in the dignity of the individual they insist on tolerance of diverse political and religious beliefs. This is a position the Communists cannot abide. Jewish people know this—they are keenly aware that in a Communist society it is only the Communist and the Communist dogma that is tolerated.

Far and away the most valuable contribution of Ben Schultz and his organization is that they dramatically symbolize the eternal hostility between Judaism and communism.

It's a personal honor to me, Ben, to be able to join in paying tribute to you. But I don't speak just for myself. I think I speak for all of your debtors—all of the American people. You have served your country well. Thank you, good luck, and Godspeed.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George W. Healy, Jr., editor of the highly respected and influential New Orleans Times-Picayune, has rendered a public service in having reproduced a series of editorials on the subject of the explosively controversial tidelands issue. I hope I will render a service in having these illuminating editorials reproduced here and spread on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune has never faltered in its stalwart support of the individual States in their fight to retain title to that which they lawfully possess. Now that it has been determined by the Congress that the States do have the right of possession to their tidelands, the new issue of just what do the tidelands consist has been raised by those diehards who refuse to accept the decision of the Congress in its full meaning and embrace. While one part of the fight has been won, much remains before a full and complete victory becomes final.

The consistent fight of the New Orleans Times-Picayune has been one of the brightest spots in the unfaltering battle to retain for the individual States that which belongs to them. The position of the New Orleans Times-Picayune in this instance only reflects the position which it has consistently taken whenever the rights of the individual States have been challenged or involved. Its editorials have always spoken out against violation in any form of the fundamental principle that each State of the United States is a sovereign State.

Any comment on the long and hard fight to restore the tidelands to the States would be incomplete without mention and full recognition of the role played in the fight by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana. True, there were many who contributed their full ability to the fight to restore the tidelands. The roll will be long when called but at the head of the list will be the name of Judge Perez.

When others grew faint of heart and others were tempted to compromise, and still others were frustrated to the point of surrender, it was Judge Perez who never even momentarily faltered or hesitated. Even today when there are those who would settle for less than what rightfully belongs to them, Judge Perez stands as the uncompromising foe who of any individual or any group who would take an infinitesimal part of that which rightfully belongs to the individual States.

Fighters like Judge Perez are necessarily positive and determined men. Their objective is the success of their cause and not the niceties and subtleties of the suave compromiser or the clever manipulator. These kind of men and these kind of leaders fight to the death for that in which they believe. So it is with Judge Perez, and better is his State and his Nation for such a fighter. There are those who will disagree with him but there are none who will challenge his courage and his determination nor his resourcefulness in battle. I again salute him.

Here are the series of the New Orleans Times-Picayune editorials to which I have referred:

ALL WANT MINERALS MONEY; FLOW SHOULD BE INCREASED

Three recent developments in the situation affecting revenues received by the State of Louisiana from offshore minerals, it seems to us, merit extended comment.

First of these was the repeated statement by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay that Louisiana's tidelands claim is one based on a 3-league, rather than a 3-mile limit. Although, after prompting, the Secretary said that he had intended to testify before the House Appropriations Committee that the Federal Government claims title to submerged lands beyond a line 3 miles from the Louisiana coast, his actual testimony to the contrary appears to us to have been significant.

The second of the developments was the issuance of a statement by Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana, that the State will go to court relatively soon to sustain Louisiana's boundaries. It is and should be the State's contention, in our opinion, that the Louisiana boundary is 3 leagues, slightly more than 10 miles, beyond the coastline.

Third of the developments was a continuing action by State and city agencies to find ways to spend the money which Louisiana

is receiving from offshore minerals. Most recent of the spending suggestions was a recommendation by city officials of New Orleans that tidelands oil revenues be used to pay part of the cost of a new incinerator here.

For many months this newspaper has contended that first call on money received through the sale of the State's mineral wealth should be conceded to elimination or reduction of the staggering State debt.

To exhaust the mineral resources of Louisiana without reducing the debt of Louisiana, we submit, would be worse than folly.

The joint committee of the Louisiana Legislature which is headed by Senator W. M. Rainach has accepted suggestions that tidelands money be used to retire the public debt, with amendments.

This committee believes that the money should be used three ways: One-third to retire the State debt, one-third to improve the State school system, and one-third to build and maintain highways.

A firm dedication of the minerals revenue to the purposes recommended by this committee, it seems to us, would be wise. Certainly it would prevent dissipation of the windfall which won't last forever to pay inflated current expenses.

In the first quarter of 1955, royalties, bonuses and rentals received by the State from its mineral lands aggregated $33,908,-707. These figures were obtained from the office of Mrs. Ellen Bryan Moore, register of the State land office.

Of this income, slightly more than $14,-800,000 was from offshore minerals and more than $19 million was from inshore royalties, bonuses and rentals.

If the rate of the first quarter is continued throughout 1955, the State's income from its minerals—exclusive of severance taxes—will exceed $130 million.

This income, of course, is tremendous; but in the opinion of students of the situation, Louisiana still is not receiving its just returns from minerals being severed from submerged lands off its shores.

One of these students, Leander H. Perez, is convinced that a positive stand by the State to protect its claim to all lands within its historic boundaries should substantially increase the revenue realized by the State from its minerals.

An elaboration of this thesis will be presented in succeeding editorials in this series.

Does State Get Just Share?

As interpreted by laymen, including President Eisenhower, the Tidelands Act of 1953 was intended to restore to the coastal States their offshore lands whose title was placed in question by a United States Supreme Court decision. This decision held that the Federal Government had "paramount rights" in these lands.

To a large degree, the desired result has been achieved. Enactment of the legislation which had support of the Eisenhower administration opened up development of offshore oil and gas fields which had been halted by the efforts of the Truman administration to take over the tidelands for the Central Government.

In the first quarter of 1955 the State of Louisiana received approximately $15 million as its share of royalties, rentals, and bonuses from offshore mineral leases.

The greater number of these leases, if not all of them, were within 3 miles of the State's coastal line—that is the coastline established by the United States Coast Guard as marking the end of inland waters and the beginning of the open sea.

Despite the language of the Tidelands Act referring to the State's coast, lessees holding mineral leases within this coastline established by the United States Coast Guard paid oil royalties to the Federal Government, instead of to the State on approximately 20 million barrels of petroleum produced under 42 State leases up to December 1954.

Collection of this revenue by the Federal Government, as we see the situation, reflects an attitude in Washington which is not justified by existing or past circumstances.

We believe that the State is entitled to revenues from all lands between its shores and a line 3 leagues beyond its coastline. Certainly, as we understand the situation, Louisiana is entitled to all revenues from lands within its coastline.

The Federal position, it seems to us, is founded on a contention that there is something indefinite or obscure about the phrase "coastline."

Under an act of February 1807, Congress authorized the President to cause a survey to be taken "of the coast of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

This act, obviously, emphasized the difference between "shores" and "coast or coastline."

Under a later act of Congress the United States Coast Guard was authorized to, and did, establish the coastline of Louisiana—as well as of other States. This line is the same line as that redefined under Louisiana law. It extends from Chandeleuer Lighthouse in a curved line following established aids to navigation, including Pass-a-Loutre lighted whistle buoy 4, South Pass lighted whistle buoy 2, Southwest Pass entrance channel lighted whistle buoy, Ship Shoal lighthouse, Calcasieu Pass lighted whistle buoy 1, and Sabine Pass lighted whistle buoy 1.

Some of the revenues going to the Federal Government instead of to the State government are from leases on submerged lands within this well-defined coast line.

When Attorney General Fred S. LeBlanc goes to court to "sustain Louisiana's boundaries," it seems to us he should seek to establish the State's claim to this particular mineral revenue.

Louisiana's Claim to Land 3 Leagues From Coast

Under the Tidelands Act of 1953 "title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters" were "vested in and assigned to" the respective States.

A section of the Tidelands Act provided further that the "seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline." This section provided also, however, States admitted to the Union after its original formation might establish such boundaries but that "nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by the Constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore approved by Congress."

The latter provision apparently was intended particularly for the benefit of Texas, which was a republic before it became a State—under a treaty establishing its boundary 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, beyond its coast line.

This provision appears to us to apply also to Louisiana, giving this State title to submerged lands 3 leagues beyond its coast line.

Reason for this interpretation is the language of the act of Congress of April 8, 1812, under which Louisiana became a State of the Union.

This act of admission established the seaward boundary of the new State at "three leagues of the coast."

That the Congress acknowledged that it could neither take away from nor add to a State's territory was manifested a few days later, on April 14, 1812. On this date the Congress added to Louisiana lands which had been claimed by Spain, which are known today as the Florida parishes, "in case the Legislature of the State of Louisiana shall consent thereto."

The Louisiana Legislature subsequently did "consent to" the Florida parishes being added to the State.

In view of the language of the act which admitted Louisiana as a State and of Congress' acknowledgment that it lacked the power to take from or add to a State's territory, without its consent, it seems to us clear that Louisiana had a boundary more than three miles beyond its coastline "at the time such State became a member of the Union."

During prohibition it was generally understood that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction "beyond the 3-mile limit." This understanding was shaken, of course, by the "I'm Alone" case—in which the rum-running boat I'm Alone was captured far beyond this "3-mile" limit.

Whatever the origin of this popular conception or misconception, it has no support in the language of the 1783 Treaty of Independence, which settled the Revolutionary War and fixed the boundaries of States then bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes.

Probably because the Atlantic coast States had substantial interest in fishing, the boundaries of the original States touching that coast were fixed by the treaty at "20 leagues from shore" into the Atlantic Ocean.

The Continental Congress on August 4, 1779, had instructed the treaty commissioners of the Continental Congress to insist on the 20-league boundary as an ultimatum.

Before Louisiana was admitted as a State, with a boundary three leagues from its coast, the area of the Louisiana territory—as shown by early maps—extended even farther into the Gulf of Mexico, to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

It seems to us that State officials are obligated to maintain Louisiana's right to the submerged lands three leagues beyond its coastline.

Should Resist Bureaucrat Attempts to Fix Boundaries

Several years ago, during the Truman administration, an agent of the United States Department of the Interior prepared a map of the coast showing where the Department believed Louisiana State jurisdiction ended and Federal jurisdiction began.

This newspaper published that map, with the comment that—by strange coincidence—the line drawn by the agent to divide State lands from Federal lands cut across the entrances of bays in which there was no oil production but drove deep into bays and coves where there were producing oil wells.

Judging by dispatches from Washington, there still are employees in the Interior Department who think that they have the power to determine where Louisiana's lands stop and where Federal lands begin.

As a matter of record, the Federal Government had little, if any, interest in the so-called tidelands until oil was discovered in submerged lands off the shores of California and Louisiana.

Also as a matter of record, the Federal Congress never has given to the Department of the Interior the power to establish State boundaries or, for that matter, to fix coastlines. Congress first made the President responsible for establishing coastlines. Later the responsibility was shifted, by law, to the Secretary of the Treasury and then to

the Secretary of Commerce and, finally, in 1946, to the commandant of the Coast Guard.

An attempt was made to legally authorize the Secretary of the Interior to "define and publish lines" marking areas of State jurisdiction, but this authority was taken out of the Tidelands Act of 1953 before its final passage.

Nevertheless, Washington correspondents, including this newspaper's Paul Wooton, have been informed that the Department of the Interior is having its agents make aerial pictures, draw maps, and perform other work to "establish State boundaries." This apparently is being done on the theory that the Department of the Interior has authority to decide what oil belongs to the States and what oil belongs to the Federal Government when petroleum is produced from offshore lands.

This theory, we contend, has no basis in law and should be discarded, in addition, on the basis of practical considerations. The record of the department of the interior in handling Federal oil lands, before the adoption of the Tidelands Act of 1953 and of the companion statute which provided for the department's leasing of mineral lands in the outer continental shelf, was far from brilliant. Federal oil lands were leased for 50 cents per acre when adjoining State and private lands were leased for many dollars per acre.

Just because the Federal department received a surprising $250 million when it opened its first bids for leases on the Outer Continental Shelf—after adopting bidding procedures formerly used only by the States—is no justification for it to follow bureaucratic precedent and try to take in more territory than the law allows.

The only authority which the interior department has to justify its recent actions is an interim agreement reached with Gov. Robert F. Kennon and members of the State mineral board.

This "interim agreement" was reached, dispatches reported, "in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation" on September 28, 1954, to prevent State and Interior Department officials from seeking bids for leases on the same tracts of land.

At that time Governor Kennon said that the State government and the Federal Government should seek some agreement on what is the shoreline of Louisiana. Since the Tidelands Act is concerned with the State's coastline, rather than its shoreline, and since the Coast Guard definitely has established the State's coastline, it is difficult for us to comprehend why officials of either the Federal Government or the State government should be bothering about a shoreline.

The Tidelands Act itself defines coastline as the seaward limit of inland waters. This is the line as defined and established by the Coast Guard and, obviously, is a definite line. In most places the Louisiana shoreline is an indefinite, shifting line—depending on tides, wave wash, accretion and other factors.

The full definition of coastline contained in the Tidelands Act is: "The term 'coastline' means the line of ordinary low water along the portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters."

As we view the situation, there is nothing vague or complicated about this definition.

Since the act of Congress which admitted Louisiana as a State in 1812 fixed its seaward boundary within 3 leagues of coast, since the Coast Guard established the State's coast line, and since the Tidelands Act restored to the States lands within their historic boundaries, there seems to us no justification for discussion of shore lines or other factors which should have no bearing on the matter.

The "interim agreement" reached by the State and Federal officials, we believe, should be discarded in favor of a permanent agreement, in which the Department of the Interior should recognize the realities of both the letter and spirit of the Tidelands Act of 1953.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, in an appearance before the House Appropriations Committee, recently said that 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, applied to Louisiana as well as to Texas—in the determination of off-coast State boundaries.

The printed report of the executive hearing contained the following:

"Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you further about the drilling off the coast of Louisiana. This is, of course, outside the limit of 3½ miles.

"Secretary MCKAY. It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. I was under the impression that the 3 leagues only applied in the case of Texas.

"Secretary MCKAY. It applies both in the case of Texas and Louisiana.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. It applies in both States?

"SECRETARY MCKAY. Yes, sir.

An attorney for the Interior Department immediately expressed belief that Secretary McKay had made a "slip of the tongue." Next day Secretary McKay wrote the committee chairman saying that the Department supports the contention that the Federal Government owns lands "3 geographical miles off the coast of Louisiana."

Secretary McKay, it seems to us, was correct when he said, "It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON."

A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my address delivered over radio station WHK, Cleveland, on April 24, titled "A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio":

During the past week there have been many interesting and indeed important events on the Washington scene. There have been developments in the international field, with which we are very much concerned, because they have a direct bearing on the security and well-being of each and every American.

Last week was highlighted by a dinner honoring SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, which brought together some 3,500 leaders of the Democratic Party from all 48 States. Former President Truman was among the speakers and he gave every evidence that he had lost none of his old fire and persuasiveness as a campaigner. There was an atmosphere which gave every indication that the rank and file membership of the Democratic Party is looking forward to a new and inspired leadership within the ranks of the party. The inspiration of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and Woodrow Wilson was in abundant evidence at this national Democratic dinner and I have every reason to believe that the party will present to the people in 1956 a program based upon the great ideals expressed by Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson. The Democratic Party, by its tradition, has offered the best leadership toward the goal of world peace with freedom and justice for all.

Congress debated the appropriation bill for the United States Information Agency. During the debate, I made one basic criticism. My criticism was that we have failed to fully understand the tremendous power for good inherent in the United States information programs and the relationship they have to the urgent question of peace or war. I believe that most Americans are agreed that the crisis which now grips the world is best described as a struggle for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of all the people of the world. On the one hand, the forces of human freedom of which we are a leading part, seek to show all the people of the world that they can attain their aspirations more quickly and more surely by their association with us. On the other hand, the evil forces of despotism as represented by Communist imperialism, seek to lull mankind into a deep slumber during which time the chains of slavery will be thrown over the entire world. In this struggle, I brought to the attention of the Members of the House that the Russians spent somewhere between $1 billion and $1½ billion a year on their false propaganda programs as compared with $77 million appropriated last year for all our information programs.

As a practical example of the way Russian propaganda works, I pointed out that in 1953 alone, the Russian Communists published over 1 billion propaganda books in 40 different languages which were used to penetrate every nation on the face of the globe. These publications put out in pamphlet and book form, sold for a price of from 5 cents to 50 cents—books which obviously would cost several dollars to reproduce—but which the Russians subsidize in order to promote their propaganda line.

I reminded Members that it did not take Congress long to recognize that there was great power for good or for evil in the new force called nuclear energy, which caused Congress to establish a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make certain that this great force would be kept in the hands of the American people. I, therefore, urged that Congress establish a joint committee on international information programs in order that they might be placed on a level and scope commensurate with their importance to the urgent question of peace or war. There is no doubt in my mind that ideals such as we Americans cherish and their transmission to the multitudes of people throughout the free world, form a weapon in the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Russian slavery, which ideals may, in the end, be more powerful and conclusive than nuclear energy. I intend to push this measure in Congress until there is created such a joint committee, because I believe we have a lot to learn in the field of propaganda if we are to make rapid progress toward our national goal of peace with freedom.

On January 24 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to testify on H. R. 1. H. R. 1 is the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, a bill to extend the trade agreements authority of the President for another 3 years, and among other things, to permit him to negotiate tariff reductions up to 5 percent during that period. At the time this bill was first under consideration there was strong indication on the Washington scene that Harold Stassen, who has just been relieved of his duties in connection with the Foreign Operations Administration, was advocating either the giving or selling of our surplus food stocks to the Russian despots. He was advocating this ill-advised maneuver under the slogan—"Barter Butter for Manganese." From my long-time study of the Russian Communist empire and the struggles of the enslaved people against their rulers, I felt compelled to appear before the House Ways and Means Committee to impress upon them that if we were to give or sell any of our surplus food

stocks to the Russian despots, we would be doing a great disservice to the enslaved people who are struggling to defeat communism and to regain their freedom and independence. I also pointed out that one of the greatest weapons the people have against the despotic regime is that of withholding food from the state which would bring about a crisis within the empire because food shortages bring about grave and sweeping discontent and further opposition. Several days ago Moscow admitted to the world in an editorial appearing in Pravda, leading Communist mouthpiece in Moscow, that the farmers within the Red colonial empire had wrecked the planned agricultural economy and appeared bent upon forcing a crisis within the Communist empire. Pravda revealed that the farmers are withholding more food stocks than they turn over to the state, and that these food stocks are consumed by the farmers, given to their friends, or destroyed. While Pravda called for grave punishment of all the farmers because of their wrecking the production program, by the same token it was forced to admit that the farmers of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Turkestan, and the other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union were engaged in a constant struggle against the tyrants of Moscow, and that they were doing so at grave risk to their own lives. How anyone, including Harold Stassen or others within the Eisenhower administration, could possibly think of selling or giving our surplus food stocks to the Soviet Government in light of these established facts, is beyond me. The Eisenhower administration is supposed to stand up for a program of liberating the captive non-Russian nations from communism, and it had better not be tempted by the lush profits held out by the Russians as a reward for trading or exchanging our surplus foods for their low-grade manganese.

On the international scene, a great deal of attention was focused on the Afro-Asian Conference taking place this week at Bandung, Indonesia. This is the first time in history that the nations of Asia and Africa have ever come together for the purpose of discussing common problems or common aspirations. Before this conference opened, there were some misgivings that this conference could do little more than criticize Western civilization for its past implication in colonialism and imperialism. Much of this apprehension was due to the fact that Chou En-lai, the notorious Chinese Communist conspirator, along with Nehru of India, were among the sponsors of this conference. There was no doubt in any one's mind concerning Chou En-lai and his and his evil deeds of the past, but Premier Nehru has been a big question mark in the minds of statesmen who earnestly seek peace and freedom, because of Nehru's truculence and his unquenchable thirst to become spokesman for a large segment of mankind. These misgivings have, in large measure, been dissipated, because of the courageous and foresighted stand taken by the statesmen of Egypt, Iraq, the Philippines, Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Turkey, Afghanistan, and others. The leading spokesman for the people of Asia and Africa did not hesitate to identify Russian communism as a new type of colonialism—a type of colonialism far more dangerous and more tyrannical than any form of colonialism or imperialism yet visited upon the human race. Many of the great Moslem leaders spoke out with spirit, condemning communism because it denied God in the affairs of man. Still others made it clear that the new and inspiring era of national independence which has finally come to South Asia and Africa must defend itself against the new Russian colonialism—and that to preserve their national independence, these nations must develop common programs of security and economic advancement. In my opinion, the Bandung Conference boomeranged against the Russian despots and isolated the Russian stooge, Chou En-lai. Moreover, it should serve as a practical object lesson for the vacillating Nehru, whom we hope will now give up his precarious fence-sitting of neutralism and join the forces of human freedom and progress.

In my judgment, the Bandung Conference did much to break up the Communist propaganda that there is a wave of the future, namely, that Russian communism will eventually triumph and for that reason, it is smart to aline yourself and your nation with Russian communism. Russian propaganda boasts its great conquests over 800 million people covering one-third of the world's surface. This so-called wave of the future has been stopped by United States aid to Greece and Turkey, its assistance to Iran, our Berlin airlift, and our fight in Korea. The efforts of the Bandung Conference to break up the Communist free ride on the wave of the future may very well have set a new course which will, in the end, upset Moscow's timetable, for enslavement of these newly independent nations.

The House passed a bill to increase salaries of post-office employees. The administration recommended an average salary increase of 7.6 percent. However, an amendment by Congressman Moss, Democrat of California, was adopted, raising the average salary increase of 8.278 percent. The major difference created by the Moss amendment is that before the amendment was adopted the bill carried an average of only 6.7 percent increase for the majority of the employees. The Moss amendment brings the increase up to where all of the employees in the lower grades will receive approximately the same percentage of increase in their annual salaries.

The Senate Labor Subcommittee conducted hearings to increase the minimum hourly wage in interstate commerce which is now a penurious 75 cents. The administration advocates 90 cents per hour. Others more realistic to the needs of workers and heads of families and the increased cost of living advocate $1.25 per hour to which I subscribe.

The House authorized the construction of 24 combatant ships, including a new *Forrestal* type carrier, about 60,000 tons, which will be the fifth of its type. Also authorized were 3 atomic submarines, 10 auxiliary ships, and the conversion and modernizing of 28 ships, some into guided missile ships, the total cost is estimated at $1,317,000,000.

Freedom of Information as Related to the Legislative Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of appearing on a panel of the American Society of Newspaper Editors to discuss the freedom of information as related to the legislative branch of the Government. I was the moderator of the panel.

Participating were William R. Matthews, publisher and editor of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., and V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor of the Tampa Tribune of Tampa, Fla.

Little could be added to the discussion in this area which was not reflected in the papers read by the participants and myself. I believe, however, that the diversified points of view should prove of interest and benefit, especially in these particular times when there is every indication that censorship is the signpost on the road from the Pentagon.

I am presenting the statements by the participants and myself in the order which they were delivered and without comment. Each speaks for itself.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OF LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS ON A DISCUSSION PANEL OF THE RIGHT OF THE PRESS TO KNOW ABOUT LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Members of the panel, I appreciate this opportunity of participating in this discussion. As you know, I have been for many years identified with legislative inquiries. For the last 5 years, consecutively, I have been either chairman or ranking member of an investigating subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. I should like to state to you, therefore, my view of the right of the press to have access to the information obtained in these inquiries.

I stand flatly upon the proposition that the legislative business must be conducted in the open; and for dissemination of information to the public so that, in our democratic system, the weight of an informed public opinon will support and sustain legislative action.

That is a declaration of the principle and a practice which I have followed in Congress. I am supported by the long standing and historical rules of the House of Representatives. The House rules provide that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except when the committee is marking up bills (and that, of course, means actually agreeing on the text of legislation as distinguished from legislating) or for voting (and, of course, that provision is obvious) or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

Thus, the House has by established usage limited executive (or closed) sessions to there three classes of matters.

The House has lately added an additional rule relating to the circumstances under which an executive session may be called, in the first instance, as follows:

"If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall (1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such persons to subpena such additional witnesses."

These rules are almost identical with the rules of our subcommittee.

I have referred to these rules to indicate our tradition in the Congress for open hearings. I support that usage in a democracy for the reason that the objective of any inquiry in the Congress must be the improvement of the legislative process or the need for legislative action, corrective or otherwise.

That purpose can only be served, in my opinion, when the weight of public opinion fortifies the findings of a legislative body. Obviously no such opinion can be formed unless the public has access to information. It is upon the public and to the public that the legislature must look for its support.

Bear in mind that the Congress cannot and is not charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of laws. It has neither the facility nor the continuity to provide

for enforcement. In the case of the House, its tenure is marked by the constitutional limit of a 2-year term. Thus, the House especially must depend, as the whole of the Congress must depend, upon a clear and adequate understanding by the public of its legislative concerns, facts, and recommendations. Anything short of that norm is self-defeating.

However, there are some other very plain constitutional principles involved. While we demand unity for the public good, we respect and intend to protect the right to diversity of thought.

The right to differ within the framework of the law is as American as the soil on which we walk and the flag under which we live. The application of that principle is entitled to a full constitutional protection and must be respected in every forum, be it legislative, executive, or judicial.

The American right to differ is expressed and protected in the principle that a person because of diversity of view, or misfortune, ought not to be intimidated, defamed, or degraded in a public forum against his will. So the whole of it, in my very simple view, gets down not to a question of the right of the public to know, but to the duty of the public to protect all of its citizens, great and small, uniformly and effectively.

On the other hand, I believe we must be sparing, judicious, and conscientious in the application of the rule of secrecy; and that there are times when even this personal privilege must be subordinated when the good to be accomplished outweighs the strictly personal consideration.

For example, an individual having a contract with the Government certainly must expect that everything in relation to the contract is and ought to be a public matter.

If in the process of investigating such a relationship an individual is concerned, certainly the public interest in the enforcement of the laws of the contract between the Government and its citizens or the need for reformation of laws or regulations as disclosed by such ventures is a legitimate subject for public consideration.

Thus stated, in my very simple view, every argument stands for the disclosure of the legislative investigations. Yet I think no one would disagree with what we placed in our rules.

There have been, however, certain practices which, in my view, are to be condemned. I do not believe it is the contribution to the public good to turn a hearing of the Congress into a stage performance with the actors preening themselves before the camera; and with the viewers taking over the conduct of the proceedings. The information elicited at these hearings is for other purposes than entertainment. That type of hearing gets itself into the position where the reproduction of the hearing becomes more important than the subject under inquiry.

In our subcommittee we do not deny any member of the press the right of access to the hearings nor to any member of the pictorial media the right to reproduce what is to be seen at the hearings. On the other hand, it makes a mockery of a legislative process to have a hearing interrupted during its course by the taking of pictures or television cameras or other unseemly interruptions. In my opinion, it serves no legitimate legislative purpose. There are many hours in a day during which actors can perform outside the legislative halls.

Now, a word about release of information in executive sessions. We have provided by rule that no one member and no group of members, only a majority of our subcommittee may release the text of any such information.

Finally, I think I must say in complete candor that the dignity and decorum, the dispatch and the demeanor of persons at a hearing, are in every instance but the length and shadow of the judgment and discretion, the restraint and the capacity of the chairman and the committee conducting the inquiry. No law and few rules can cope with every human quirk. But the healthy and wholesome use of the gavel by the chairman can enforce the rules and can keep hearings within the bounds of propriety, good conduct, and public decency. And that can be done without doing violence either to the principle of open and fair dealings or full and frank discussion.

Mr. Matthews followed me with this statement:

Let me reassure you that I am an ardent worker for freedom of information. For nearly a lifetime I have been battling in its behalf as a fighter on the firing line. Some of the battles I have won; some I have lost. Most of them could have been evaded had I followed an easy-going, disinterested policy. They have cost me money and they have cost me heartaches. As long as I have a breath to breathe I will continue this same vigorous policy.

From this experience I have learned some lessons, some of them painful and some disillusioning. That is why I challenged Russ Wiggins' report a year ago. My experience has taught me that there are limits to where news media can go; limits to what they can demand in the way of freedom of information.

For instance, as a newspaper editor I insist that no news media has a right to invade the privacy of any American home or family life. That goes for the lowliest, and it reaches up to the Roosevelts and the Eisenhowers. I insist there is a right of privacy on personal and family matters that is a precious and indispensable part of the right of freedom.

These limits apply to legislative and administrative processes, from school boards up through Congress. There was a time, when I was a young crusader, that I denounced executive sessions of our city council. When such a demand worked to the advantage of articulate demagogs, while hindering rather than helping good government, I modified my stand.

Reporters of Tucson newspapers sit in on the executive sessions now but they scrupulously refrain from writing any comment on what goes on. We maintain always the fundamental policy that the public is entitled to know what is done at official meetings of any public body.

Legislatures and our Congress are entitled to a varying amount of privacy in the work done by their committees. If committees are to function in a way that will command respect for democratic government, they must be able to do much of their work in privacy.

Important committees, such as the Committee on Appropriations, have an enormous job to do. To insist that the press and the public have a right to sit in on all such meetings ignores the give and take, the compromises that must be made, and the massive amount of detail work that must be done. Members have to be able to think aloud without the fear that some speculative question might make them look ludicrous to the public. They must be able to bargain with their fellow members. Bargains and compromises cannot be made unless much of this speculative thinking goes on. Compromises require all committee members to give in, in order to reach a conclusion. Able and sincere committee members could easily be made to look foolish by making concessions to expedite the work of the committee.

On the other hand, demagogs, of which every legislative body has a surplus, would thrive on seeing their sensational charges, their eloquent pleadings, and their irresponsible chatter, publicized. The committee is one place where they can be shut off. The floor of a legislative body is the place where they have ample opportunity to glorify themselves with their loose talk.

After all, the work of a committee is a necessary administrative procedure designed to formulate what is a proposition, a resolution, for debate upon the floor of the legislative body. With a bicameral legislature the records will show these resolutions are subject to debate and most of them are amended in some form before they become law. From what I have seen of legislative work, democratic government will be harmed, not bettered, by any requirements that all committee meetings be open and the votes of the members recorded. Members may vote one way on a committee in order to facilitate a report, and vote another way on the floor of the legislative body.

The fact is that any mandatory requirements on open meetings can be dodged by unofficial meetings in homes, clubs, hotel rooms, and private offices. No law can prohibit them. This process is used from time to time, even now, by leading members of some committees who want to thrash out their differences by frank discussion.

Much as I insist on this right of privacy of committees, I insist with equal emphasis that it is not an absolute right. There are many times when committee meetings should be open. There are times when responsible parties like the press have the right to appear and to ask questions, to demand reports, in behalf of the public welfare. Those are the times when a newspaper should take the initiative in performing a public duty, instead of begging for some law to prevent what it wants on a platter. Those are the times when editorial judgment has to be used.

As my time grows short, let me sum up:

1. I am a vigorous exponent of freedom of information, but I have learned from long experience that there are limits to what can be demanded. I am unqualifiedly opposed to this doctrine of absolute rights. A tendency of so many of us Americans to think in terms of absolutes is one of our big weaknesses.

2. The limits on freedom of information cannot be defined with a rigid line because situations vary. Editors should be expected to put their abilities, their spirit of fair play and public interest to work. Committees must have privacy to perform their routine work.

3. The decisions and the minutes of all legislative and administrative bodies should be made public or available to responsible parties.

4. Meetings of legislative committees and administrative boards should be open on demand by any responsible party where specific information on questions of high public importance should be made available.

5. Public documents, excluding the errata of informal office memoranda, should be made available to the public, when publication does not impair national security.

6. At this time, when we are doing so much shouting about freedom of information, I cannot help remarking how some of those who have done the loudest shouting boiled over in indignation at the publication of the Yalta papers.

In my opinion, the Potsdam and Cairo documents should be produced. They are historical records. National security is not involved. Unless we are now starting to write our histories so as to protect some and glorify others, the way the totalitarian powers do, these documents should be published. Some of us who took part in these great events of the past generation would like to know, before we die, what really went on.

Is this too hot a question for our own Freedom of Information Committee to handle Or must hot issues be avoided?

I think our committee ought to get busy on it, and so should those responsible for Washington news coverage, instead of waiting for a New York newspaper to crack the barrier.

Mr. Newton closed with the following remarks:

Fifteen minutes, the time allotted me here, is hardly time enough to penetrate the secrecy which enshrouds Federal Government, as any Washington correspondent will tell you today.

During 1953, congressional committees held 3,105 meetings and a survey shows that 1,357, or 44 percent, were secret meetings held behind locked doors with press and public barred.

During 1954, congressional committees held 3,002 meetings and 1,231, or 41 percent, were held behind locked doors.

Few of these secret meetings dealt with defense or security affairs. Instead, they dealt with virtually every matter before Congress. Nearly every one of the Appropriations Committee meetings, in which our public servants decided how to spend the citizen's tax funds, was held in secrecy.

Much of this legislation conceived and congealed behind the locked doors of these secret congressional committee meetings was railroaded through Congress with a minimum of debate and with little opportunity for the restraint of public opinion to be exerted. Actually, some of it did not see the light of public print until it became law.

In my correspondence with Members of the United States Senate over this matter, Senator JENNER, of Indiana, at that time chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, wrote me last April as follows:

"Another reason for the railroading of legislation through Congress is the very large role played in legislation by the bureaucracy of the executive branch. They frequently draft the bills. They write the arguments for the bills. They fill the record of hearings on bills. They have supporting groups which come in and testify to the approved line. Ordinary citizens cannot meet such well-financed, well-organized competition. It may appear as if the sentiment is all in one direction on a bill and Congress hears little or no objection, and so moves quickly to pass it."

Now when you add Senator JENNER's damning statement to the fact that nearly half of all congressional committee meetings are held secretly behind locked doors, you can reach only the conclusion that the ordinary American citizen has very little to say about our legislation. Under such a system, the ordinary American citizen is deprived by his elected representatives of his inherent right to exert constantly the pressure of public opinion upon his free Government. And any student of history soon learns that free government cannot long last in such secrecy.

Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, wrote me that the secret committee meetings were necessary to mark up bills and to prevent the Congressmen from being self-conscious and from dropping into oratory. Yet it is in the same peace and quiet of these secret meetings that amendments are tacked onto the bills and other changes made that the American people should know about at the time and not after the fact, when too often it has been too late.

Senators Holland, of my Florida, Smith of Maine, Payne, Dirksen, Gillette, Welker, Ellender, and Hendrickson expressed great and tender concern over the danger of needlessly ruining the reputations of witnesses and appointees before public meetings of the committees. But what about the case of Harry Dexter White, the Communist spy? His appointment was considered and confirmed in a secret meeting of a Senate committee and then railroaded through Congress. How in the world can the interests of the American people be properly protected unless all the facts are made public at the time and not after the fact, as in the case of White?

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, wrote me that he felt the American people would be more informed if their legislators are allowed to work in the privacy of their own arguments. Isn't this the modern philosophy in Federal Government today, that Government belongs to our public servants, and that the American people are entitled only to that information which our public servants think they should have?

Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, wrote me that the secret meetings were necessary to protect our Congressmen from the bureaucrats and the lobbyists. But what about the protection of the American people from those same bureaucrats and lobbyists? What about giving the people a look at the bureaucrats and lobbyists in action?

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, wrote me that the publicizing of the committee's work prior to final decision, and I use his exact words, "might lead the citizen into actions harmful to himself." In reply, I asked the Senator if he could name just one case in all history where free, open government, under the constant restraint of an alert and informed public, has "led the citizen into actions harmful to himself." On the other hand, any student can dig out of the pages of history thousands of cases wherein the politician, acting behind the locked doors of secret government, really dealt the citizen a knockout punch.

Senator BENNETT, of Utah, wrote that it would be impossible for our Congressmen to reach a compromise in a public committee meeting. This poses an interesting question. Does free American government today consist of nothing more than a secret compromise between two political parties without the restraint of the people's opinion? Isn't this a sad commentary on free government, anyway you look at it?

Later in our correspondence, Senator BENNETT wrote that if the congressional committee meetings were opened to the public, it would force the committees to adjourn to secret meetings in so-called smoke-filled rooms. In reply, I wrote that a group of Congressmen meeting unofficially in a smoke-filled room would have no official power whatsoever. They could not draw a bill; they could not vote on a bill; they could reach no official decision. And if the American people ever tumbled to the fact that our legislation was being cooked up in a smoke-filled room, I am sure that we would have a new set of public servants in Congress after the next election.

Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, suggested that I propose the plan of open meeting to the board of directors of my newspaper and invite the reporters of competitive newspapers to sit in on all meetings of our board of directors. In reply, I reminded the Senator that American citizens, through considerable taxation, are stockholders in their Government and had the right to check on the actions of their public servants just as the stockholders of a newspaper have the right to check on the actions of their board of directors.

Senator IVES, of New York, wrote me that the quiet atmosphere, divorced from the temptation of public expression or political maneuver to gain advantage in the eyes of the public was much more efficient than a public sounding board. In reply, I asked this question: Which is better for the people, the harmony of the secret communistic government in Russia, or the turbulence of free, open democratic government in America? I think the answer to this question also would answer all of the questions involved in the quiet atmosphere of any secret meeting in government. We cannot afford to sacrifice the basic freedom of our country for expediency or because another way is speedier, easier, or more efficient. The world's history shows that once you sacrifice freedom, you regain it only through bloodshed.

Of the 62 Senators with whom I corresponded on this matter, only 25 stated they were for open committee meetings. And only 11 had the courage to state outright that they were opposed to the open meetings. The others hemmed about this qualification or hawed about that reservation. Thirty did not even condescend to answer my original letter.

Now, 25 Senators are not a very high percentage of the free world's greatest legislative body in favor of the free people's inherent right to know about their Government. And it is with great sadness that I tell you, after a number of years struggling with this national problem, that many other people, including some within our profession, think that a little secret government is all right.

Yet we can no more have a little secret government than we can have a little freedom, a little justice, or a little morality. Of course, we do not have absolute freedom, absolute justice, or absolute morality today. Yet our adherence to these great absolute principles, even though we yield a little here or compromise a little there in actual practices, has given the world the greatest free civilization of all time.

And I tell you with great personal conviction that should we ever veer away from our absolute principles of freedom, justice and morality, even though we occasionally compromise them in practice and in deference to human frailties, we will consign the great American experiment to that limbo of fallen civilizations.

So I tell you also, with equal conviction, that we in the newspaper profession are deeply obligated, under the precepts of free government, to fight with all our might for the absolute principle of freedom of information; for it is only through upholding that absolute principle, in the face of human frailties, that a free people can be guaranteed the maximum of information of government, so necessary to retention of freedom.

Speaking of human frailties, I am reminded of a school board in South Georgia, which closed its doors to both press and public last year. In defending the board's action, its chairman announced to the press, and I use his exact words:

"You are crazy if you think we are going to wash our dirty linen in public."

It is a great pity that we do not have such unadulterated honesty in our Federal Government today. There is, for instance, the question of our national security. No editor of the free American press will question the right of the free American Government to withhold that news which would endanger national security and give aid and comfort to the enemy. But every editor will question the right of the Federal politician to abuse this privilege by the withholding of legitimate news in the name of national security but which has nothing to do with national security.

Last May the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee locked its doors and held secret deliberations on the bill for a separate Air Academy. I wrote Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, then the chairman of the committee, about the matter of these locked doors. He replied that this was a classified matter and then he arrogantly demanded to know what right I had even in writing him. Yet as an American citizen who pays taxes, I could not help but wonder what political pressures were being exerted back of those locked doors, first by rival armed services, and second, over the matter of a site for the new academy. And certainly the complete revelation of all the facts and discussions on this important matter would not have given aid and comfort to the enemy.

I could go on for hours and hours citing similar cases wherein our Federal politicians have abused their privileges in the regulations to protect our national security. But

my time is limited and before I close, I would like to dwell for a moment upon what the precedent of secret Government in our Congress has done to the rest of American Government.

Our Congressmen may think a little secret Government in their committees is all right, yet this precedent has so spread in Washington today that we have developed a new philosophy of government. In most of our 2,000 Federal executive agencies and bureaus, Government largely is conducted behind the locked doors of the secret executive session; legitimate facts and records of Government are withheld; and the people are spoon-fed information only in the form of handout releases from Government press agents, which often are propaganda carefully devised to promote and prolong the political life and interests of the officeholder. More and more, our public servants, once elected or appointed, assume that the people's business is their private domain and that any critical voice raised against this philosophy is that of a deadly enemy.

Sixteen months ago President Eisenhower revised President Truman's Executive order giving the right to certain Federal officials to withhold facts of Government in behalf of national security. He eliminated the classification "restricted" but retained the three classifications of "confidential," "secret," and "top secret."

This should have released a mass of information, particularly from the Department of Defense, but it didn't work out this way. On June 1, 1954, a Department of Defense directive created a new classification for official use only, and it set forth the purpose to assure the proper custody, preservation and use of official information which requires protection in the public interest.

The Department of State a short time later adopted this same new classification of for official use only, and then stamped it upon even its press clippings.

But, in view of the precedent of congressional committee secrecy on matters of the people's business not concerned with national security, why shouldn't our other Federal governmental agencies protect the public by barring the people from even looking at the press clippings they save?

Why shouldn't the appointed public servants of the executive branch of our Government lock out the people from their procedures if the elected public servants of the legislative branch can get away with it? Where shall we draw the line on a little secret government?

Furthermore, the congressional precedent of secrecy is spreading to the lower levels of American Government. And, when a Georgia school board and North Carolina legislators rise up and announce that they are going to deliberate their people's business in secrecy just so long as Congress deliberates the American people's business in committee secrecy, then I say in all sincerity that the time has come for our Congressmen to examine their consciences over the matter of freedom of information, or the American people's right to know about their Government.

Thank you.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 25, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Father, whose still, small voice invites us to turn aside from the feverish ways of the world and whose tender love bids us find our strength in Thee: We are conscious as we bow at this altar of Thy grace that if we live a life of prayer Thou art present everywhere. Amid the draining duties of these demanding days, by the spiritual resources that are found in Thee alone may our jaded spirits be refreshed and our souls restored.

Endow and enrich Thy servants in this national body with wisdom and purity of motive in the ministry of public affairs. Make them worthy of the Nation's trust in these days so fraught with destiny.

"We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives,
That freedom shall not die;
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace:
Almighty God on high."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE—POSTAL PAY RAISE BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tomorrow until the evening of May 3, 1955, the reason being that I am going to New Mexico, Arizona, and California on hearings regarding juvenile delinquency among the Navaho, Hopi, and other tribes of Indians, and it is necessary that I be absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago I heard the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] make a request for leave of absence from tomorrow until May 3. I wish to call this request to the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to ask him if he has any plans for calling the committee together to consider the question of a conference on the post office pay raise bill, which has passed both the House and the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas, may I say that it is hoped we will be holding conference meetings.

Mr. CARLSON. If that is the situation, I urge the chairman of the committee to consider the appointment of a Senator to take the place of the Senator from North Dakota, in order that some action may be obtained on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that I shall expedite the matter as much as possible. If the House agrees to go to conference before the time the Senator from North Dakota is due to return, I shall appoint another Senator to take the place of the Senator from North Dakota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ, FORMER SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to announce to the Senate the death on last Sunday at Casper, Wyo., of a former Member of this body, the Honorable H. H. Schwartz, United States Senator from the State of Wyoming during the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses. Prior to his election to this body in 1936 he was a member of the State Senate of the State of Wyoming. Earlier in his career before he began the practice of law he was in public service in the Department of Interior as a member of the field service of the General Land Office. In every office which he ever filled he was a distinguished public servant, a man of public spirit, and one who made friends in every circle to which life called him. His death last Sunday will be noted with great

regret by all who knew him and by all who served with him.

In this body he was a member of several important committees, among them the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Education and Labor, Military Affairs, and Pensions. He was at one time chairman of the latter committee. Diligent in his work and affable in his demeanor, he was an effective legislator.

He also served for several years as a member of the Mediation Board under appointment by the late President Roosevelt.

The date of his funeral has not as yet been made known to me, but it will be held in his hometown, Casper, Wyo., to which he retired after his service in the Senate came to an end.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of Richard S. Abbott and 1,306 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States not printed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY OR IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of Robert D. Harrop and 669 other officers for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps not printed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is now in order.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a joint resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 so as to add United States Highway 2 to the National Interstate Highway System.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway 2 to the national interstate highway system

Whereas the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that "there shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico"; and

Whereas the act further provided that "the routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States," and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

Whereas Philip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Work Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal-Aid Act of 1944, which can be placed on the interstate system; and

Whereas United States Highway 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and several other boundary States; and

Whereas said United States Highway 2 plays an ever increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

Whereas the said United States Highway 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway 9 from New York to Montreal and Highway 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air defense bases, the number of which, and the personnel involved, are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a 2-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way; and

Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

Whereas while this is a petition from the State of Minnesota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expan-

sion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

Whereas this request that the designation of United States Highway 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of Minnesota and in the other States served by United States Highway 2: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled (the senate and house of representatives concurring), Do most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

K. S. PALVANG,
President of the Senate.
ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 30th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 12th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved April 19, 1955.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

PROMOTION OF MARKSMANSHIP—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from H. C. Daniel, secretary of the National Rifle Association of America, a resolution which was adopted at the 84th annual meeting of that distinguished association on April 1, 1955. Its purpose is the recommendation to the Congress of the appropriation of adequate funds for the encouragement and promotion of marksmanship training in our land.

I heartily endorse this resolution and have so stated in previous comments which I have made on the Senate floor.

Marksmanship has proved to be indispensable to our country in times past in periods of crisis, and I hope that we will never be so shortsighted as to forget that fact.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, were constituted by the National Defense Act, as amended, for the express purpose of training citizens of the United States of America in individual marksmanship; and

Whereas experience has demonstrated repeatedly the imperative necessity of having well-trained individual marksmen on the field of battle; and

Whereas, experience has demonstrated also, the necessity of properly indoctrinating our entire citizenry in the fundamentals of marksmanship prior to their entry into the Armed Forces in order to insure that no person shall enter combat without adequate marksmanship training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Rifle Association of America, in annual meeting assembled, respectfully urges and requests the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and all members of Congress to provide funds in that segment of the annual appropriations entitled "Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army" adequate to enable the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice to properly execute, in the future, the directives of the National Defense Act to encourage and promote marksmanship training of every citizen, of whatever age, who may now or hereafter be required to serve in the defense of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of this association to the Secretary of Defense, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Passed and adopted by unanimous vote of the association at its meeting in Washington, D. C., April 1, 1955.

Attest:

H. C. DANIEL,
Secretary.

HELLS CANYON DAM—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a significant resolution which I have received from Walter Jensen, president of the Wisconsin State Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The resolution endorses the proposed federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon—a position widely held in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Senate bill 1333, introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, and 29 other Senators, proposes the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site and in addition it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the erection of a high dam at Hells Canyon would be far superior to the proposal of building a series of low dams: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters assembled in semiannual meeting in Madison, Wis., on April 21, 1955, go on record favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333 and the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to the National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 East Salmon Street, Portland 14, Oreg., to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to Senator WAYNE MORSE, and to the general office of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America at Indianapolis, Ind.

Executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters: Walter Jensen, President, Madison, Wis.; John V. Meyett, First Vice President, Superior, Wis.; Robert H. Strenger, Second Vice President, Madison, Wis.; Erven Schultz, Secretary-Treasurer, Neenah, Wis.; George Hoffman, Executive Board Member, Kenosha, Wis.; William A. Eckart, Executive Board Member, LaCrosse, Wis.; Harry Boerschinger, Executive Board Member, Green Bay, Wis.; Edwin F. Kijek, Executive Board Member, Wausau, Wis.; Walter Barnett, Executive Board Member, Eau Claire, Wis.; Henry C. Kreutzfeldt, Executive Board Member, Milwaukee, Wis.; Joe Herrmann, Executive Board Member, Wilwaukee, Wis.; Wilburt Hahn, Executive Board Member, Wausau, Wis.; Albert Forer, Executive Board Member, LaCrosse, Wis.; August Trappler, Executive Board Member, West Allis, Wis.; Val Schueller, Executive Board Member, Marshfield, Wis.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1803. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1804. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. H. Oddie, Mrs. Marian Oddie, and their minor children, Susan Annabelle Oddie, Catherine Jane Oddie, and Pamela Louise Oddie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1806. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720); to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1807. A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a regular component of a uniformed service;

S. 1808. A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy;

S. 1809. A bill to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes; and

S. 1810. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical

specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1811. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1812. A bill for the relief of Athanase G. Politis;

S. 1813. A bill for the relief of Andreas N. Bartholomeos;

S. 1814. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli; and

S. 1815. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Antoine Gazda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1816. A bill for the relief of Sam A. Reeks, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 1817. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of a breakwater for the protection of the Cleveland, Lakewood, Rocky River, and Bay Village, Ohio, shore of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1818. A bill to limit the amount of land on Federal irrigation projects which may be exchanged under the act of August 13, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1819. A bill to amend section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 1820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction under the Federal estate tax for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, and religious uses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1821. A bill to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1822. A bill for the relief of Dumitru Iordache; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. GORE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1823. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1824. A bill to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties of such communities; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1825. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1826. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1827. A bill for the relief of Adel Kamal; and

S. 1828. A bill for the relief of Robert Naihsin Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1829. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1830. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to lawyers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of Panteles Kerkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1832. A bill establishing a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps to provide for the rehabilitation of youthful delinquents through a program of service in connection with the preservation and protection of the natural resources of the Nation, such program to include general educational, vocational, and military training; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1833. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1834. A bill to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 1835. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REMOVAL OF DOMESTIC TRADE BARRIERS AFFECTING MILK PRODUCTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, virtually ever since my coming to the Senate in 1939, I have been fighting against the little Chinese walls—trade barriers—which have been set up between the 48 States.

It is inconceivable that in this land, which in 1787 was conceived as one great undivided market for all the products of the American people, there should persist the unfortunate tendency to erect totally artificial barriers in the form of arbitrary State laws and regulations against the importation of out-of-State products.

In few instances has more harm been inflicted by such artificial barriers than in connection with the impeding of transportation of midwestern milk to eastern and other markets.

The dairy farmers of Wisconsin, in particular, have been grossly discriminated against in not being able to ship their wholesome products to many areas outside the Badger State.

I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultual Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products.

I may say that I have fought this battle, in particular, to assure the entry of Wisconsin milk into the District of Columbia area. I had urged for many years that Wisconsin milk, which completely complies with the highest health standards of the Nation, should not be frozen out of the District of Columbia area because of spurious so-called "special" health rules applied in the District.

I earnestly hope that this bill, aimed, as it is, against the Chinese walls which bar interstate movement of milk, will be enacted by this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1803) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. (a) The purpose of this section is to remove those barriers to the free movement of milk and milk products in interstate commerce which now exist because of milk marketing agreements and orders issued under this act, and because of various State and local sanitation requirements; and to provide uniform sanitation standards governing milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce.

"(b) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall prescribe uniform sanitation standards governing the production and handling of milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce. As used in this section, the term 'sanitary milk or milk products' mean milk or milk products produced in a State whose chief agricultural officer has certified to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States that milk and milk products produced in such State are produced and handled in compliance with the standards prescribed under this subsection.

"(c) No marketing agreement or order issued under this act shall apply to, or be effective in, any marketing area in which any Federal, State, or local restrictions operate to prevent the free marketing of sanitary milk or milk products shipped into such area in interstate commerce.

"(d) No Federal, State, or local law shall operate to prevent the free marketing, in any area of the United States, of sanitary milk or milk products shipped into such area in interstate commerce."

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a

bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by me, and a section by section analysis of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1805) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year underway, the ensuing fiscal year, and the subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned, or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a 10-year period.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority,

administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

The statement and section-by-section analysis, presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget.

I first introduced a similar bill on February 19, 1950, in the 81st Congress (S. 2898). In 1952, at the beginning of the 82d Congress, I reintroduced the measure with some minor revisions. That bill became known as S. 913. After public hearings and careful consideration, the Senate Committee on Government Operations unanimously reported S. 913 favorably, and on April 8, 1952, following full debate, the Senate on a rollcall vote passed it by 55 to 8.

The bill was again reintroduced in the 83d Congress as S. 833, under the sponsorship of 54 Members of the Senate, and was reported favorably on May 19, 1953, after hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization which approved the bill as reported favorably in the previous Congress, with a further perfecting amendment. S. 833 passed the Senate on May 23, 1953, under unanimous consent, and was referred to the House Committee on Rules, where no further action was taken. The bill I am introducing today is identical to S. 833 as it passed the Senate, except for a few very minor technical differences.

This proposed legislation is designed to remedy serious deficiencies related to appropriation procedures and the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

The swollen cost of operating the Federal Government, with annual budgets ranging between 60 and 70 billions of dollars, and continued annual deficits of billions of dollars that pyramid the already astronomical national debt dictate the compelling necessity of reducing the cost of Government where it is prudent to do so in order to restore sound fiscal policies and balance the national budget.

Presently, the Congress and its Appropriations Committees labor under a tremendous handicap in passing judgment on budget requests for the executive branch of the Government. They have thus far failed to provide and are woefully lacking in adequate facilities with which to procure the factual information that is needed and indispensable to enable them to make sound and judicious determinations with respect to appropriations requested in the budget, and as to amounts that are sufficient and not excessive for the proper functioning of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. It can be removed and this vital deficiency can be remedied. That is the purpose of this bill.

Section 1 of the bill charges the joint committee with the duty "to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government * * *"; "to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget and the justification submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto." That is the heart of the bill.

The bill makes it the duty of the joint committee "to report to the Aprpopriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security." That is the goal the bill seeks to attain.

To enable the joint committee to properly function and render the services and perform he duties prescribed, it would be empowered to employ a professional, technical, and clerical staff and, upon the written authority of the chairman or the vice chairman, the members of the professional and technical staff "shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

The proposed joint committee is also authorized to hold hearings at any time whether the Congress is in session, in recess, or has adjourned, in order to examine into and inform itself on matters relating to the Federal budget, requested appropriations, and the expenditure of public funds. It will then reports its findings to the two Appropriations Committees.

The bill, as introduced, contains the amendment approved by the committee in the 83d Congress, which authorizes the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake special investigations upon the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget. This amendment was designed to conform to a number of suggestions submitted to the committee relative to the desirability of establishing a qualified staff on a permanent and nonpolitical basis to make such investigations and reports as may be required by the joint committee with respect to designated agencies.

In addition, certain provisions of the bill have been further clarified relative to the adoption of rules respecting its organization and procedures, and contains a further subsection requiring the inclusion in the annual budget of the United States of a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, including grants-in-aid programs, under a separate grouping covering a projected period of 10 years.

The need for the services prescribed to be performed by the joint committee for the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress is obvious. The Bureau of the Budget, an arm of the executive branch of the Government, employs between four and five hundred people the year around at an annual cost in excess of $3½ million to prepare and submit the annual budget of the President to the Congress. Every agency and department of Government has its own budget staff and employees separate and apart from the Bureau, the number and cost of which is indeterminable. All of these Federal employees represent the views of the executive branch with reference to appropriations to cover the operating cost of that branch of the Government. When appropriation bills are before the committees of Congress, the hearings conducted are ex parte in nature. Witnesses appearing before the committee are the heads and representatives of the agencies desiring the money to spend. Their purpose is to support and defend the budget requests both as to necessity and amounts.

The Appropriations Committees have not heretofore been equipped with professional and technical staffs charged with the duty or responsibility of thoroughly examining and evaluating proposed expenditures. Neither the Congress nor the taxpayers are represented by witnesses who are prepared and competent to refute with facts and reliable information the claims or the evidence submitted by representatives of the executive branch in support of the budget requests.

Under this procedure it is most difficult, if not impossible, for the Appropriations Committees to screen the requests before them and make fair and judicious decisions with reference to all appropriation items. They only hear one side of the case. A joint committee as proposed, properly staffed and functioning, will be able to present to the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress factual information that will justify the elimination of some items entirely and a reduction in the amounts of many others.

Since this joint committee would, with the powers and duties conferred upon it, constitute an overall watchdog committee over all expenditures in the executive department, the need for a number of existing special watchdog committees in both the House

and Senate over particular appropriations and expenditures would be obviated. This committee would follow up on funds appropriated by the Congress and report on the prudence of their expenditures. On the basis of such reports the Congress would then be able to make more intelligent determinations with respect to subsequent appropriations.

The need for the kind of facility and service this measure would provide has heretofore been recognized and confirmed by both Houses of Congress—by the Senate in the passage of S. 913 during the 82d Congress by a vote of 55 to 8, and by unanimous agreement in the 83d Congress, and by the House of Representatives when its Appropriations Committee in the closing days of the 82d Congress passed a resolution to increase its staff and asked for a $250,000 appropriation to pay the cost of such increase. The Congress further gave its approval by including in the first supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 an item of $500,000, $250,000 to the House and a like amount to the Senate, for increasing the staffs of their respective Appropriations Committees.

The Congress cannot with good grace and conscience continue to ride herd on the agencies and departments of the executive branch for waste, duplication, and extravagance if it is unwilling to set an example by putting its own legislative machinery in order. We cannot justify the hiring of 2 people (or 2 special professional and technical staffs) and the spending of $2 when $1 is sufficient to do the job.

I hope this proposal will receive early consideration.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Section 1 of S. 1805 amends section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as follows:

Subsection (a) creates a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 14 members, to consist of 7 members each from the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations (4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party), who are to be chosen by the designated committees.

Subsection (b) provides for the filling of vacancies on the committee.

Subsection (c) provides that the joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session. During even-numbered years the chairman shall be selected from the House, and the vice chairman from the Senate. During odd-numbered years the order shall be reversed.

Subsection (d) provides that the joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary; and requires approval of a majority of the committee to report a measure or recommendation.

Subsection (e) sets forth the duties of the joint committee, as follows:

1. To inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget, including analytical, investigative, audit and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office and other Federal agencies; to provide the Committees on Appropriations with information necessary for adequate consideration of the items contained in the budget and the justifications in support thereof; to utilize all reports from the executive branch, including the President's messages on the state of the Union and the economic report; to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including estimates from the Treasury Department; to consider essential programs and changing economic conditions; and to report its findings to the Appropriations Committees with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations which are required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

2. To recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate, changes in existing laws which may effect greater efficiency and economy;

3. To make reports and recommendations to standing committees of either House, upon request, or as the joint committee deems necessary or desirable, on matters within the jurisdiction of any such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, relative to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations; and

4. To report to the Committees on Appropriations at the beginning of each session the total estimated costs of all authorized programs and projects including such costs during the current, ensuing, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

Subsection (f) authorizes the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to hold hearings when Congress is in session, recess, or adjournment, to require the attendance of witnesses by subpena or otherwise, to administer oaths, take testimony, and make such expenditures as may be deemed necessary to carry out its functions. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman and shall be served by any person designated by them. Witnesses refusing to testify or failing to produce records are subject to penalty under the provisions of sections 192–194, title II, United States Code.

Subsection (g) authorizes the joint committee to employ and to fix the compensation of a staff director, an associate staff director, and other necessary professional, technical, clerical, and other temporary or permanent employees. The staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party. FBI loyalty and security investigation of all employees are required prior to appointment of any persons.

Subsection (h) provides that the joint committees shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, and subcommittees thereof, during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

Subsection (i) provides that professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon written authority of the chairman or the vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any Federal agency, within or without the District of Columbia, as well as data related to proposed appropriations in the annual budget.

Subsection (j) requires that an additional budget analysis be included in the Federal budget showing all long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, the total estimated cost of each, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior, current, ensuing and subsequent fiscal years. Grant-in-aid programs are to be included in a separate grouping showing the estimated annual cost for a 10-year period for grants of indefinite duration.

Subsection (k) requires that qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget, at the request of the Committees on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, shall attend executive session of the committees to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

Subsection (l) requires the Comptroller General, at the request of the chairman of the joint committee, to make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable the committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the Federal budget and the justifications submitted in support thereof; for this purpose, authority is given to the Comptroller General to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, and to fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Subsection (m) defines the broad coverage of the term "agency" as used in the bill.

Subsection (n) authorizes the requisite appropriation to carry out the purposes of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

Section 2 proposes a new subsection 133 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, requiring that all bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations which are reported from Senate or House committees be accompanied by reports in writing which include an estimate by the department or agency of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislative proposals over the first 5-year period of its operation, or over its period of operation if less than 5 years. Such estimates shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget if the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation. Compilations of all such estimates are to be maintained and printed semiannually by the joint committee.

Section 3 proposes a new subsection 139 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, authorizing the joint committee to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Appropriations Committees, and subcommittees thereof, without affecting their power to conduct separate additional committee hearings, or in any way affecting the independence of committee deliberations and decisions. The new subsection further provides that the chairman of each joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of such hearings, and the vice chairman shall be of the other body.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947.

This bill was submitted to the Senate by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and is being filed at his request.

The bill would authorize the General Accounting Office to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer of loss or deficiency of funds, securities or records if the loss occurred while the officer was acting in the discharge of his official duties or by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate, in cases where the employee has made restitution. The act of August 1, 1947, now permits such relief in cases where repayments have not been made to the fund.

The bill would remove inequities in these types of cases by authorizing the General Accounting Office to reimburse

an officer or agent for payments made by him in restitution of the loss or deficiency in an account, if it occurred without fault or negligence on his part, and such reimbursement is recommended by the head of the department or agency. The bill, if enacted, would eliminate the need for repeatedly submitting to the Congress private bills to correct these inequities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720), introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills relating to the armed services.

Each of these bills is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purpose of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1807. A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1807 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 6, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of legislation, "To further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to remove the inequity which now exists under the provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. Reserve and National Guard enlisted personnel who are called to active duty for training are paid basic allowances for quarters on a basis and at rates different from enlisted personnel on extended active duty. Since enlisted personnel are called to active duty for training for periods of 15 to 193 consecutive days, it is inequitable to deny them the benefits that are provided to active duty personnel undergoing the same type of training.

The Career Compensation Act of 1949 provided that enlisted personnel of grades E–7, E–6, E–5, and E–4 with seven or more years' service shall be entitled to a monthly basic allowance for quarters of $45, if without dependents, and $67.50, if with dependents, and adequate Government quarters were not provided. Personnel in pay grade E–4 with less than 7 years' service and personnel in pay grades E–3, E–2, and E–1 were considered at all times to be without dependents; thus, they could be eligible only for the $45 monthly basic allowance for quarters under any circumstances.

The Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 amended the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and increased the basic allowance for quarters for enlisted personnel on extended active duty. Also, it provided that the basic allowance for quarters for personnel with dependents could be paid to persons in pay grade E–4 with less than 7 years' service and to those in pay grades E–3, E–2, and E–1. The act required that eligible personnel must place in effect allotments of $40, $60, or $80 monthly, depending upon grade, before the basic allowance for quarters would be paid. These amounts must be in addition to the basic allowance for quarters which would be paid, also, by monthly allotment to the dependents.

The Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 specifically stated that: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this act shall not apply to enlisted members on training duty" and that such persons should continue to draw appropriate allowance as prescribed by the Career Compensation Act on the day prior to the effective date of the Dependents Assistance Act.

The act of May 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 79) increased the rates for basic allowances for quarters as provided by the Dependents Assistance Act by 14 percent. There was no increase for Reserve personnel who would draw basic allowances for quarters under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 but not under the Dependents Assistance Act. These Reserve and National Guard personnel on active duty for training currently draw basic allowances for quarters as provided in the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

These laws have created an inequity among enlisted personnel with regard to basic allowances for quarters. Currently, personnel on active duty in pay grades E–1 through E–7 may be entitled to quarters allowances ranging from $51.30 to $96.90 per month, depending on grade and number of dependents. As previously indicated, they must have allotments in effect in order to receive the basic allowance for quarters. However, Reserve enlisted personnel on active duty for training are limited to $67.50 per month for pay grades E–7, E–6, E–5, and E–4 with 7 or more years' service, regardless of the number of dependents. Personnel of lower grades are not entitled to basic allowances for quarters on account of dependents under any circumstances. Within the Air Force, approximately 56 percent of the Reserve airmen strength and 73 percent of the National Guard airmen strength are in these lower grades and it is expected that this percentage will increase.

A strong Reserve Force is of paramount importance to the defense of our country and is receiving increased emphasis. Current policies of the Department of the Air Force permit airmen of all grades with dependents to enlist in a Reserve component. Additionally, personnel released from active duty are required to complete the balance of an eight-year legal responsibility in a Reserve component of the armed forces, during which period the average number of dependents per individual undoubtedly will increase. Reserve and National Guard personnel who participate in active duty training for pay are required to train two weeks each year unless excused upon the basis of personal hardship only. The high participation requirements, together with the years of obligated service, will cause the inequity to affect more personnel and for a longer period of time than in the past. When personnel are called to active duty for training, it is inequitable to deny them the benefits that a counterpart in the Regular service would be eligible to receive during the same period of training. It is particularly desirable to correct this inequity for personnel who are called to active duty for training to attend schools for short or special tours.

The proposed amendment to section 302 (h) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 provides that an enlisted member of a Reserve component called to active duty for training shall not be required to place in effect an allotment of pay. The term "active duty for training" is defined since that term is neither defined nor employed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 at the present time.

The proposed amendment to section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 796) would authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service. The present prohibition of that section would be limited to enlisted members on inactive duty training.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Based upon the present programed strength for fiscal year 1956, it is estimated that the following amounts from appropriations indicated represent the increase in cost between present system and the proposed system:

Department:	*Amount*
Army	$3,758,000
Navy	966,142
Air Force	598,000
Marine Corps	229,000
Total	5,551,142

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1808. A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1808 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 12, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense

for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Department of the Air Force to nominate 40 cadets for the United States Air Force Academy from among members of the Civil Air Patrol.

The law governing the appointment of cadets at the United States Air Force Academy is based upon the law governing the appointment of cadets at the United States Military Academy. In all instances except one, the Army law can be adapted to cover the appointment of cadets at the United States Air Force Academy. The one exception is under the part of the Army law contained in section 1 (b) of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 303), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1092a (b)). It provides for "* * * Forty to be nominated from among honor graduates of the honor military schools and the honor naval schools * * * under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe." This exception arises because the United States Air Force does not have a junior ROTC program nor does it have designated honor schools. It would be undesirable to establish such a program for the Air Force since the returns therefrom would be negligible in comparison to the funds it would be necessary to expend. As a result, another source of these 40 nominations must be provided to fill the authorized strength in cadets for the United States Air Force Academy.

The Air Force has an official auxiliary in the Civil Air Patrol, which can provide a group of highly motivated and intensely interested youth as potential entrants of the United States Air Force Acadmey. The Civil Air Patrol is a volunteer organization chartered by the act of July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 347), as a nonprofit corporation whose objectives and purposes are (1) to provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare, and (2) to provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies.

The Civil Air Patrol proficiency training program consists of drill, aviation education, orientation concerning relationship and objectives of Civil Air Patrol and United States Air Force, flight orientation, encampments at Air Force bases and participation in Civil Air Patrol operational activities. Upon successful completion of a comprehensive examination on aviation subjects and satisfactory attendance at one summer encampment, members are awarded a certificate of proficiency by National Headquarters Civil Air Patrol.

In addition to the direct support provided by Civil Air Patrol to Air Force operations a recent survey revealed that over 20,000 airmen, approximately 2,500 ROTC students and 480 Air Force aviation cadets are former Civil Air Patrol members.

The most desirable entrant into the Air Force Academy is an individual who is indoctrinated in the concepts of air power and the role of the United States Air Force; highly interested in aviation; and motivated primarily by an intense desire to follow a career in military aviation. The graduate of the Civil Air Patrol cadet program has had the benefit of training directed toward meeting these requirements. Another advantage of the proposed legislation is that through motivation, direct encouragement, and additional incentive, the cadet membership of Civil Air Patrol and the number of applicants for the Air Force Academy will be substantially increased. This, in turn, will provide a higher caliber of cadets by making available a greater number from which to make final selection.

This proposed legislation, therefore, will provide a suitable source of appointees for the Air Force Academy. The number to be appointed each year will be limited by section 6 of the Air Force Academy Act until the academy reaches its full strength. Allocation of quotas for nomination will be made annually on the basis of membership within each of the eight regions of the Civil Air Patrol organization, prorated in accordance with the total population.

The proposed legislation does not in any way affect other nominations or appointments which are now provided for by existing law.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no increased cost to the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Acting Secretary.

S. 1809. A bill to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1809 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor who, under the supervision of the commandant of cadets, shall have immediate charge of the physical education of cadets at those Academies.

The establishment of a permanent professorship in physical education will contribute toward attainment of higher standards in this department of instruction at the Academies. As a permanent professor the incumbent can devote his entire career to the field of physical education. Under present conditions at the Military Academy, in view of the temporary nature of his assignment, an officer of the line detailed to the duty of director of physical education must, in addition to keeping himself abreast in the field of physical education, also keep abreast in the field of military science generally in order to fill future assignments in other fields. A similar situation would prevail at the Air Force Academy after it begins operating. Physical education is of more than usual importance at the Academies and requires prestige of a full professor as head of the department. The appointment of a permanent professor of physical education was recommended by the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy (1952) as well as several previous Boards of Visitors, the Compton Board, and three successive superintendents of that Academy.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense as the pay and allowances of a professor are those of a colonel, the usual rank of an officer of the line detailed to this position.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1810. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1810 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to correct inequities existing in the dates of rank in permanent grade of captain of nurses and women medical specialists of the Army and the Air Force. A study of permanent-grade captains has pointed up the fact that a number of nurses and women medical specialists were integrated into the regular components during the 1947–48 integration and accorded permanent grade of captain on the basis of a requirement of 10 years' service. This was because at that time section 107 (a) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act (61 Stat. 44), which became law April 16, 1947, required of Army nurses and women medical specialists for permanent grade of captain completion of the same length of service "now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain." At that time, 10 years' continuous commissioned service were required of promotion-list officers for promotion to permanent grade of captain, by virtue of section 3 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 506), as amended (10 U. S. C. 552a).

This 10-year requirement for promotion to permanent grade of captain, however, was repealed, effective December 31, 1947, by section 507 (d) (2) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which substituted in lieu thereof, in section 509 (b) (10 U. S. C. 559 c (b)), the requirement of completion of 7 years' promotion-list service for permanent grade of captain.

As shown above, section 107 of the original Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 required for permanent grade of captain the same number of years' service now or hereafter required of promotion-list officers to the same grade. Hence, even under the original Army-Navy Nurses Act, which became law prior to the enactment of the Officer Personnel

Act, the change from a 10 to a 7 years' service requirement for permanent grade of captain could be made in integrating Army nurses and women medical specialist officers subsequent to December 31, 1947. This change from 10 to 7 years was made even clearer in section 107 (b) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act (10 U. S. C. 166 f (b)) as amended by section 3 (c) of the act of May 16, 1950 (64 Stat. 161). Section 107 (b) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act as so amended provides that Army nurses and women medical specialist officers may be promoted to permanent grade of captain on completion of 7 years' service. While section 107 of the Nurses Act applies specifically to the Army, it is also applicable to the Air Force by virtue of section 307 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act (10 U. S. C. 1837 (c)).

To summarize, those Army nurses and women medical specialists integrated as permanent captains before the change effected December 31, 1947; by the Officer Personnel Act in the number of years' service required for permanent captains, were obliged to have had at least 10 years' service, actual or constructive, whichever was greater. In contrast, those in the same personnel categories in the Army and Air Force who were integrated as captains after this change effected by the Officer Personnel Act were required to have had at least 7 years' service, actual or constructive, whichever was greater. As a result of this difference in the number of years' service required for permanent grade of captain as between the two integrations, there are nurses and women medical specialists who were integrated during the earlier period who have dates of rank in the permanent grade of captain which are later than the dates of rank of those nurses and women medical specialists who were integrated as permanent captains after the above mentioned change effected by the Officer Personnel Act, although the later individuals, in many instances, are younger and have a shorter period of actual military service.

The nurses and women medical specialists who would be affected by the enactment of this proposed legislation include not only those integrated originally in the grade of captain, but also those who were integrated in the grade of first lieutenant and thereafter were promoted to permanent grade of captain without adjustment in date of rank for the individual's actual or constructive service in excess of 7 years.

The inequity caused by the difference in the number of years' service required for permanent grade of captain of nurses and women medical specialists integrated at different periods into the Regular components is obvious from the foregoing facts.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Air Force on November 18, 1953, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 7277 and S. 2688.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This legislation will not decrease the number of officers allotted to the various grades. Consequently, its enactment will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes.

This bill would authorize and direct the Federal Power Commission to issue a license for the construction and operation of a power project utilizing the Niagara River waters made available for such purpose under the terms of the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950, consistent with the terms of the reservation attached by the United States Senate to this treaty.

The license would be issued to, and the project constructed and operated by, the New York Power Authority, an instrumentality of the State of New York authorized by law to engage in this activity.

This project will cost the Federal Treasury nothing, since the power authority of the State of New York is prepared to issue revenue bonds to finance the project. There is an assured market for these revenue bonds, and there is full legal authority for their issuance.

Under the terms of this bill, Congress would prescribe certain licensing conditions—certain safeguards of the national and consumer interest—which the Federal Power Commission would be required to include in the license to be granted, and which the New York Power Authority would be required to accept, as a condition precedent to the issuance of a license.

These conditions or safeguards are the heart of this bill, constituting, as they do, the sense and meaning of national public-power policy evolved over the past 50 years under both Republican and Democratic administrations in the Nation. They also conform to the public-power policy of the State of New York.

These safeguards of the public interest consist of guaranties that this public power will be used for the benefit of all the people—to bring down power rates throughout the State, and to make this low-cost power, one of the largest blocs of undeveloped hydroelectric power on the North American continent, available, in the first instance, to public bodies and cooperatives.

The power is to be developed and distributed for the primary benefit of rural and domestic consumers of power and secondarily, for the benefit of enterprises operated for profit, such as industries and private utilities.

Further to accomplish this purpose, the New York State Power Authority is required to build, acquire, or to secure the use, through contract, of transmission lines, and to make appropriate wheeling arrangements.

Further in support of the public interest, and in furtherance of the treaty commitments entered into by the United States with Canada under the treaty of 1950, the New York State Authority is required to build a park and a scenic parkway on the American side of the Niagara River, leading to the falls.

I hope, Mr. President, that there will be speedly hearings on this bill before the Public Works Committee. An identical bill is being introduced in the House by Representative IRWIN DAVIDSON, of New York City. Another bill for public development, somewhat different in some of its terms, has been introduced in the House by Chairman BUCKLEY, of the House Public Works Committee.

I look forward to the resolution of the differences between that bill and this one, and to the early enactment of the appropriate legislation.

I do not think that more than perfunctory consideration need be given to still another pending proposal—that for a giveaway of the Niagara power potential to private interests. That bill is opposed by the overwhelming majority of the people of my State, and by all the leading public spokesmen of my State, of both political parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a detailed analysis, may be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1823) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pursuant to the provisions of the reservation of the Senate of the United States in ratifying the treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning uses of the water of the Niagara River signed February 27, 1950, which provides that no project for redevelopment of the United States share of such waters shall be undertaken until it be specifically authorized by act of Congress, a project for the redevelopment of the United States share of such waters for power purposes is hereby authorized, in accordance with existing general laws of the United States and this act. This authorization constitutes compliance with the reservations to said treaty and is consistent therewith.

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal Power Commission is hereby authorized and directed to issue a license to the New York Power Authority for the construction and operation of the project, upon its application therefor and its acceptance of licensing conditions set forth in this section.

(b) The Federal Power Commission shall include among the licensing conditions, in addition to those deemed necessary and required under the terms of the Federal Power Act, the following:

(1) In contracting for the disposition of project power, the licensee (the New York Power Authority) shall (A) give equal preference for the purchase of such power to (i) counties and municipalities, including their agencies or instrumentalities, (ii) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of New York State, (iii) rural electric coopera-

tives not organized or administered for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost; and (iv) the defense agencies of the United States, and (B) make flexible arrangements and contracts for the disposition of project power to utility companies organized and administered for profit, with suitable provisions in such contracts for the withdrawal upon reasonable notice and fair terms of enough power to meet the needs of the foregoing classes of preference customers.

(2) The licensee shall construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, such transmission lines as may be necessary to make the power and energy generated at the project available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to privately owned companies, to the preference customers enumerated in subparagraph (1) (A) of this subsection, and to the neighboring States in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(3) The licensee shall make a reasonable portion of the project power available for use within economic transmission distance in neighboring States and shall cooperate with the appropriate agencies in such States to insure compliance with this requirement. In the event of disagreement between the licensee and the power-marketing agencies of any of such States, the Federal Power Commission may, after public hearings, determine and fix the applicable portion of power to be made available and the terms applicable thereto: *Provided,* That if any such State shall have designated a bargaining agency for the procurement of such power on behalf of such State, the licensee shall deal only with such agency in that State. With respect to the share of the power so allocated, the arrangements made by the licensee for the sale of power to or in such States shall include observance of the preferences numbered (i) and (iii) in subparagraph (1) (A) of this subsection.

(4) Project power shall be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of the people as consumers, and particularly for the benefit of domestic and rural consumers, to whom it shall be made available at the lowest rates reasonably possible and in such manner as to encourage the widest possible use.

(5) In the event project power is sold to any purchaser for resale, contracts for such sale shall include adequate provisions for establishing resale rates, to be approved by the licensee, consistent with paragraph (4) of this subsection.

(6) The licensee, in cooperation with the appropriate agency of the State of New York concerned with the development of parks in such State, shall submit to the Commission an appropriate outline plan for the construction of a scenic drive and park on the American side of the Niagara River, near the Niagara Falls, such outline plan being subject to approval by the Commission. The cost of these scenic and recreational facilities shall be met in such part by the licensee as the Commission may approve.

SEC. 3. The license issued under the terms of this act shall be granted in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Power Commission, but in the event of any conflict, the provisions of this act shall govern in respect of the project herein authorized.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1955."

The analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE NIAGARA BILL

Section 1 takes cognizance of the Senate reservation to the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950, and authorizes a public power project "consistent therewith." The Senate reservation declares it the policy of the United States Government to make the Niagara project subject to congressional enactment "for the public use and benefit."

Section 2 directs the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to the New York Power Authority for the construction and operation of the Niagara project, subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act and to certain other licensing conditions as follows:

1. First preference in access to the project power to be given to counties and municipalities and their instrumentalities; to agencies of the New York State government; to rural electrification co-ops; and to United States defense agencies. Withdrawal clauses to be included in all contracts with private utilities to insure continued availability of power to preference customers.

2. Transmission lines to be built, acquired, or contracted for, to permit the project power to be widely distributed to load centers, and to preference customers, and to neighboring States, by wheeling or other arrangements.

3. A reasonable share of the project power to be made available to neighboring States "within economic transmission distance" of the power site, with the Federal Power Commission acting as referee to settle any disputes that might arise with neighboring States: assurance to be secured from such neighboring States, that preference customers within their borders be given first preference in access to the State's share of the Niagara power.

4. Project power to be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of rural and domestic consumers, at the lowest rates reasonably possible.

5. The New York Power Authority to fix resale rates to insure compliance with the above.

6. A park and scenic drive is to be built on the American side of the Niagara River, to be financed by the power project in such part as the Federal Power Commission may approve.

JURY TRIALS IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for jury trial in condemnation proceedings in the United States district courts.

This bill is identical to S. 30 of the 83d Congress and S. 1958 of the 82d Congress, both of which were reported favorably by the committee and were passed by the Senate. They were not acted upon by the House of Representatives.

On August 1, 1951, rule 71 (A) of the Rules of Civil Procedure relating to condemnation of property became effective. Under this rule as promulgated by the Supreme Court there appeared subsection (h). This subsection is as follows:

(h) Trial: If the action involves the exercise of the power of eminent domain under the law of the United States, any tribunal specially constituted by an act of Congress governing the case for the trial of the issue of just compensation shall be the tribunal for the determination of that issue; but if there is no such specially constituted tribunal any party may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed for answer or within such further time as the court may fix, unless the court in its discretion orders that, because of the character, location, or quantity of the property to be condemned, or for other reasons in the interest of justice, the issue of compensation shall be determined by a commission of three persons appointed by it. If a commission is appointed it shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of rule 53. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of rule 53. Trial of all issues shall otherwise be by the court.

Previous to the promulgation of rule 71 (A) when land was condemned the condemnation proceedings were had under State law and in the vast majority of States, the jury trial was allowed upon the issue of just compensation. Subdivision (h) above referred to now provides for trial by jury on the issue of compensation by the filing of the demand therefor unless the court in its discretion orders that because of the character, location, or quantity of the property to be condemned or for other reasons in the interest of justice, the issue of compensation shall be determined by a commission of three persons appointed by the court.

It can thus be seen that under the discretionary power of the court the plaintiff or defendant in the condemnation proceedings no longer has a right to jury trial on the issue of just compensation but that such a jury trial rests solely within the discretion of the court.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore to the litigants in condemnation proceedings the right to have a jury trial on the issue of just compensation, if they so desire, and restores to the law the practical effect of procedure in condemnation proceedings which existed prior to the promulgation of rule 71 (A) of the Rules of Civil Procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1825) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL YOUTH REHABILITATION CORPS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill establishing a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps to provide for the rehabilitation of youthful delinquents through a program of service in connection with the preservation and protection of the natural resources of the Nation.

This program will include general educational, vocational, and military training.

All over the Nation people are expressing alarm at the continuing problem of juvenile delinquency. Former Senator Hendrickson of New Jersey did a remarkable service as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in the 83d Congress, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] likewise has uncovered much of what we now know about juvenile delinquency. In this proposal I do not seek to detract

in the slightest from what those gentlemen have done. Rather, I seek to build upon the knowledge gained from their investigations, and I propose in this bill the basis for a constructive approach to the problem of reclaiming and rehabilitating some of these youths before their delinquency leads them to become habitual criminals.

We have in America 2 valuable resources, 1 being our natural resources, including historical and archeological sites as well as forests, fish, and wildlife, and the second—of far greater importance—being the youth of our Nation.

I seek through this bill to combine those two resources under a program for the betterment of the Nation as a whole and for the particular rehabilitation of those who because of their delinquency have been incarcerated or put on probation.

Everyone who has visited a national park or camped in the many national forests which blanket the West has seen evidence of what can be done with the directed efforts of the youth of the Nation; for in almost every such park or forest there are found trail building, parking, and look-out construction, firebreak, and other fire-prevention construction, reforestation, soil conservation, and watershed works, all of which were done under the work of a CCC program. Many of those works which were badly needed and which have returned to the Nation untold value in the enjoyment of our parks are now in a state of disrepair because of natural deterioration and erosion. The maintenance and repair of such projects have been above and beyond the ability of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to keep stride.

It is proposed, Mr. President, that any male individual between the ages of 16 and 25 who has been committed to a State or Federal institution correction home or other detention institutions by reason of having been convicted of a crime or misdemeanor by a court of competent jurisdiction and has been placed on parole on condition that he enroll as a member in the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps, or who has been convicted of a crime or misdemeanor by any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction and been given a suspended sentence and placed on probation on the condition that he enroll as a member of this corps and who otherwise meets the conditions of physical and mental health and has not previously been an enrolled member in this corps shall be eligible for enrollment. The corps is to be set up within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with its own director and sufficient personnel to assure that each of these young men receives at least 1 hour per week instruction in the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of citizenship, 9 hours of general educational and vocational instruction, 5 hours of military training, and 25 hours per week of service in the protection, restoration, regeneration, improvement, development, utilization, maintenance, and enjoyment of the natural resources of the Nation.

The bill provides the machinery for cooperative arrangements with States and governmental agencies for the selection and enrollment, discharge of enrollees, together with the necessary machinery for designating quarters, subsistence, and supplies necessary to make the corps function.

These matters need not be detailed here, but the overall pattern of this proposed legislation is to take a direct approach to the question of what can be done to rehabilitate young men who, because of their lack of guidance and training in the past, now find themselves inside our penal institutions, faced only with the future of marking days until they will be released in the same competitive world without training, and schooled in the talk of discontented prisoners.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1832) establishing a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps to provide for the rehabilitation of youthful delinquents through a program of service in connection with the preservation and protection of the natural resources of the Nation, such program to include general educational, vocational, and military training, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Youth Rehabilitation Act."

FINDINGS OF FACT

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that it is in the public interest to further expand existing facilities of the Government for the protection, restoration, regeneration, improvement, development, utilization, maintenance, and enjoyment of the natural resources of lands and waters (including historical or archeological sites) as well as the products thereof (including forests, fish, and wildlife) belonging to, or under the jurisdiction or control of, the United States, its Territories and insular possessions, and the several States;

(2) That the most valuable resource of the United States lies in the youth thereof, and that the future of the United States as a great Nation, and even the very existence of the United States, depends more upon the development and training of its youth than upon the development of any of its other resources; and

(3) that great numbers of the youth of the United States are not receiving the training and preparation necessary to enable them to assume the important and highly responsible role required of citizens under our form of government, and that, as a consequence of such lack of training and preparation, the incidence of crime among the youth of the Nation is greater than ever before and the problem of juvenile delinquency has assumed such alarming proportions that it has become a matter of great national concern.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this act to establish an organization and prepare a program for the rehabilitation of youths in need thereof. Such program shall include not less than 1 hour per week of instruction in the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of citizenship, 9 hours per week of general educational and vocational training, 5 hours per week of military training, and 25 hours per week in service in the protection, restoration, regeneration, improvement, development, utilization, maintenance, and enjoyment of the natural resources of lands and waters (including historical or archeological sites), as well as the products thereof (including forests, fish, and wildlife), belonging to, or under the jurisdiction or control of, the United States, its Territories and insular possessions, and the several States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL YOUTH REHABILITATION CORPS

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps (hereafter referred to as the "Corps") which shall be administered and directed by a Director who shall be appointed by, and under the supervision of, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and whose salary shall be $ per annum.

AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. The Director shall, with the approval of the Secretary, have authority—

(a) to formulate rules and regulations and to establish procedures for the maintenance of discipline among the enrollees of the Corps and, in connection therewith, to provide for the deprivation of privileges, the assignment of extra duties, and the imposition of monetary penalties, by way of deductions from the compensation to which an enrollee is otherwise entitled, for the violation of any such rule or regulation, but the amount of any such penalty for a single violation of any such rule or regulation shall not exceed the amount of compensation to which the enrollee committing such violation would otherwise have been entitled for 1 month;

(b) to appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, the principal subordinates of the corps, and to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations, such other civilian personnel as he deems necessary for the efficient and economical discharge of the functions of the corps, the compensation of all such appointees to be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(c) to enter into agreements and otherwise cooperate with the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and with States and political subdivisions thereof, as well as with private organizations in carrying out the purposes of this act; and

(d) to formulate such other rules and regulations, establish such other procedures, enter into such other contracts and agreements, and generally perform such other functions as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this act.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ENROLLMENT

SEC. 6. (a) Any male individual between 16 and 25 years of age—

(1) (A) who has been committed to a State or Federal prison, detention home, or other correctional institution by reason of having been convicted of a crime or misdemeanor by a court of competent jurisdiction, and has been placed on parole on the condition that he enroll as a member of the corps, or

(B) who has been convicted of a crime or misdemeanor by any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction and has been given a suspended sentence and placed on probation on the condition that he enroll as a member of the corps;

(2) the condition of whose physical and mental health is found by the Director to be such as to enable such individual to undergo the training and preparation prescribed for enrollees of the corps; and

(3) who has not previously enrolled in the corps, shall, upon agreeing to comply with the rules and regulations promulgated by the Director for the government of the members of the corps, be eligible to enroll as a member of the corps.

(b) The terms of any parole or probation referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall—

(1) among any other conditions prescribed by the court or other entity granting such parole or probation, or required by the Director under regulations prescribed by him for such purpose, contain the condition that the individual with respect to whom the parole or probation is granted shall continue in the service of the corps for the period for which he enrolls, and

(2) provide that upon the breach of any condition contained in the terms of the parole or probation, the individual with respect to whom the parole or probation is granted shall forthwith be recommitted, or committed, as the case may be, to a prison, detention home, or other correctional institution of the jurisdiction by which he otherwise would have been confined had he not been granted a parole or placed on probation.

TERM OF ENROLLMENT

(c) Enrollment in the corps shall be for a period of either 1, 2, or 3 years.

DISCHARGE OF ENROLLEES FROM THE CORPS

(d) (1) Any enrollee of the corps who is discharged therefrom by reason of the expiration of his term of enrollment shall (A) be presented with a certificate of discharge which shall contain his name, address, age, and physical description, and a summary of the kind and extent of the vocational, educational, and other training he has received while a member of the corps, (B) be provided with a new suit of civilian clothing, a pair of shoes, and other accessories of wearing apparel, and (C) receive the amount of $100 in cash.

(2) Any enrollee shall be discharged before the expiration of his term of enrollment if the Director finds that he has breached any of the conditions of his parole or probation, as the case may be, or if the Director finds that he is unable or unwilling to maintain the standards of discipline prescribed for members of the corps.

NOTIFICATION TO AUTHORITIES OF BREACH OF PAROLE OR PROBATION BY ENROLLEE

SEC. 7. Upon the desertion from the corps of any enrollee or upon the discharge of any enrollee under paragraph (2) of section (6) (d), the Director shall forthwith notify the proper authorities of the jurisdiction from which such enrollee is on parole or probation that such enrollee has breached the conditions of his parole or probation, as the case may be.

QUARTERS, SUBSISTENCE, ETC., FOR ENROLLEES

SEC. 8. The Director shall provide enrollees of the corps with such quarters, subsistence, uniforms and equipment, medical services, and hospital facilities as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate for their needs.

COMPENSATION OF ENROLLEES

SEC. 9. The compensation of basic enrollees shall be at the rate of $25 per month. The compensation of enrollees who have been designated as leaders (the number of individuals so designated not to exceed 6 percent of the total membership of the corps) shall be at the rate of $35 per month.

SUPPLIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT

SEC. 10. The Director may expend such amounts as he deems necessary for supplies, materials, and equipment for enrollees to be used in connection with their work instruction, recreation, health, and welfare.

LAWS NOT APPLICABLE TO ENROLLEES

SEC. 11. Existing provisions of law with respect to the hours of work, rate of compensation, sick leave, vacation, unemployment compensation, life insurance, and compensation for sickness or injury of Federal employees shall not be applicable to any individual during the period for which he is an enrollee of the corps.

RESERVE OFFICERS TO SERVE IN CORPS

SEC. 12. The President is authorized to order Reserve officers of the Armed Forces of the United States to active duty with the corps under the provisions of section 233 (a) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (providing for the ordering to active duty of Reserve officers with their consent).

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

This bill is identical to a measure which I sponsored in the 83d Congress, namely, S. 1878. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held public hearings on S. 1878 and thereafter it was reported favorably from the committee with amendments, and passed the Senate on April 19, 1954.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries did not hold hearings on S. 1878 until August last year, shortly before adjournment, so that there was not time for final action on the bill.

The bill I now introduce would amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by setting a single standard of valuations for losses under war-risk insurance and requisition transactions. Present law uses different terminology for these two types of losses with resultant confusion and uncertainty. This bill would also provide for a review de novo by the courts in all cases where the valuation set by the Secretary of Commerce would be rejected by the owners or insured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1833) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Retired Officers Association, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Capt. Franz O. Willenbucher, USN, executive vice president and legal counsel of the Retired Officers Association, explaining the purpose of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1834) to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1955.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Retired Officers Association, on behalf of the retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard who had performed more than 40 years of active service and, as a result thereof, were entitled to receive the benefits provided in the act of January 12, 1923, 42 Stat. 1131, prior to its repeal on November 1, 1949, requests the introduction of a bill to extend similar benefits under existing laws to them. A suggested draft is enclosed.

The above-mentioned law was enacted in 1923 to establish, insofar as possible, equitable benefits for commissioned officers of the Coast Guard who had served more than 40 years on active service comparable to officers of the Navy, in view of the much slower promotion in the Coast Guard as compared to promotion in the Navy. The law, granting them this benefit, remained in effect until its repeal as of November 1, 1949.

In view of the great length of active service required, only very few Coast Guard officers qualified for the benefits involved and of those who did qualify approximately only 15 would be benefited by the enactment of this proposed legislation. Of the total number of about 21 officers, originally benefited, some have died and at least 3 of them now receive the higher pay provided under the existing pay laws, they having had additional active service after the 40 years of required service and subsequent to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, October 1, 1949. Consequently, the cost of the enactment of this proposed legislation would be very small indeed.

In view of all of the circumstances, especially the long active service performed by the officers concerned, this proposal is extremely meritorious and our association earnestly urges its introduction and enactment.

Sincerely yours,

F. O. WILLENBUCHER.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1635) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Exchange of correspondence between himself and Representative RALPH W. GWINN, published in the Elizabethton (Tenn.) Star, together with explanation of that newspaper of the correspondence.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NATIONAL BANK BILLS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on S. 1187, S. 1188, S. 1189 and S. 1736 relating to national banks. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m. on Monday, May 2, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT AT ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by the President of the United States yesterday at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Always, I feel it is a special privilege when I can meet with men and women of the newspaper profession. Our newspapers have traditionally been a guarantee that truth will reach every part of our country and all the free peoples of the world. And never was it more important than it is today that the people of the entire world have free access to the truth.

Recently I read a story about one particular segment of the American newspaper community and how it helped spread the truth even beyond the barriers devised against its communication—into the homes of the Communist-dominated lands.

Some 20,000 newspaper boys voluntarily conducted a fund-raising campaign for the Crusade for Freedom. That crusade brings truth to those behind the Iron Curtain, to people who otherwise could not have it. Of course, the boys' campaign is not one of the normal activities of American newspapers—but the incident gives heartening evidence of newspaper people's unflagging interest in the maintenance of freedom and of human hope for peace.

Certainly, I am inspired by the knowledge that boys of this Nation will freely give of their time and their energy—and their hearts—to help bring information of today's world to those whose masters provide them only propaganda.

In this day, every resource of free men must be mustered if we are to remain free; every bit of our wit, our courage, and our dedication must be mobilized if we are to achieve genuine peace. There is no age nor group nor race that cannot somehow help.

Just over 2 years ago I had an opportunity to appear before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I then pledged your Government to an untiring search for a just peace as a fixed and abiding objective. In our search for peace we shall not be bound by slavish adherence to precedent or halted by the lack of it. The spirit of this search influences every action of your administration; it affects every solution to problems of the moment.

It prompted my proposal before the General Assembly of the United Nations that governments make joint contributions of fissionable materials to an International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful research—so that the miraculous inventiveness of man may be consecrated to his fuller life.

It inspired last week's offer of polio information, research facilities and seed virus—so that Dr. Salk's historic accomplishment may free mankind from a physical scourge.

It provides the reason for a plan that, after some weeks of study, I am able now to announce. We have added to the United States program for peaceful uses of atomic energy an atomic-powered merchant ship. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administration are now developing specifications. I shall shortly submit to the Congress a request for the necessary funds, together with a description of the vessel.

The new ship, powered with an atomic reactor, will not require refueling for scores of thousands of miles of operation. Visiting the ports of the world, it will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living. In part, the ship will be an atomic exhibit; carrying to all people practical knowledge of the usefulness of this new science in medicine, agriculture and power production.

In every possible way, in word and deed, we shall strive to bring to all men the truth of our assertion that we seek only a just and lasting peace.

There is no precedent for the nature of the struggle of our time.

Every day, in our newspapers, we are confronted with what is probably the greatest paradox of history.

Out of an instinctive realization of the horror of nuclear war the hunger of virtually every human being on this planet is for tranquil security, for an opportunity to live and let live, for freedom, for peace. And yet, defying this universal hunger, certain dictatorships have engaged in a deliberately conceived drive which periodically creates alarms and fears of war.

In our uneasy postwar world crises are a recurrent international diet; their climaxes come and go. But so they have—in some degree—since the beginning of organized society. By their effect on human action the peril within them is either magnified or diminished.

A crisis may be fatal when, by it, unstable men are stampeded into headlong panic. Then—bereft of commonsense and wise judgment—they hastily resort to armed force in the hope of crushing a threatening foe, although thereby they impoverish the world and may forfeit the hope for enduring peace.

A crisis may likewise be deadly when inert men—unsure of themselves and their cause—are smothered by it in despair. Then, grasping at any straw of appeasement, they sell a thousand tomorrows for the pottage of a brief escape from reality.

But a crisis is also the sharpest goad to the creative energies of men, when they recognize it as a challenge to their every resource, and move to meet it in faith, in thought, in courage. Then, greatly aroused—yet realizing that beyond the immediate danger lie vast horizons—they can act for today in the light of generations still to come.

The American people, 164 million of us, must recognize that the unprecedented crises of these days—packed with danger though they may be—are in fullest truth challenges that can be met and will be met to the lasting good of our country and the world.

Two great objectives are mountain peaks that tower above the foothills of lesser goals. One is global peace based on justice, mutual respect, and cooperative partnership among the nations. The other is an expanding American economy whose benefits, widely shared among all our citizens, will make us even better able to cooperate with other friendly nations in their economic advancement and our common prosperity.

The fundamental hazard to the achievement of both objectives is the implacable enmity of godless communism. That hazard becomes the more fearsome as we are guilty of failure among ourselves; failure to seek out and face facts courageously; failure to make required sacrifices for the common good; failure to look beyond our selfish interests of the moment; failure to seek long-term betterment for all our citizens.

Recognizing the ruthless purposes of international communism, we must assure, above all else, our own national safety. At the same time we must continue to appeal to the sense of logic and decency of all peoples to work with us in the development of some kind of sane agreement for peace.

When a nation speaks alone, however, its appeal may fall on deaf ears. Many nations must combine their voices to penetrate walls of fear and prejudice and ignorance.

A principal objective of our foreign policy, therefore, is the construction of the strongest possible coalition among free nations. The coalition must possess spiritual, intellectual, material strength.

In things spiritual, the common effort must be inspired by fairness and justice, by national pride and self-respect, by the inalienable rights of the individual who—made in the image of his Creator—is endowed with a dignity and destiny immeasurable by the materialistic yardstick of communism.

In things intellectual, the coalition must manifest such commonsense and evident logic that all nations may see in it an opportunity to benefit themselves. Certainly, it must proclaim the right of all men to strive for their own betterment—and it must foster their exercise of that right.

In things material, the friendly partnership must be sinewed by expanding economies within all its member nations, mutually benefiting by a growing trade volume, joined in recognition that their security interdependence is paralleled by their economic interdependence.

By sound economic thinking and action, we Americans can hasten the achievement of both our great goals—peace among the nations; a widely shared prosperity at home.

We have an unmatched production system. But even our economy will not thrive if confined to our own land. So to sustain our own prosperity and economic growth we must strengthen the economic bonds between us and others of the free world. Thus we confront the Communist with a vast and voluntary partnership of vigorous, expanding national economies whose aggregate power and productivity, always increasing, can never be successfully challenged by the Communist world.

The issue is clear cut. Either we foster flourishing trade between the free nations or we weaken the free world and our own economy. Unless trade links them together, our foreign policy will be encased in a sterile vacuum; our domestic economy will shrink within its continental fences. The enlargement of mutually beneficial trade in the free world is an objective to which I am fully dedicated.

Ours is the most dynamic economy yet devised by man, a progress-sharing econ-

omy whose advance benefits every man, woman, and child living within it.

Last year, our gross national product exceeded $357 billion. Twenty years ago few would have believed such an achievement even a remote possibility.

Nevertheless, continuation of current rates of increase will bring us by 1965 to $500 billion or more as our gross national product. This will mean a tremendous advance in the living standards of the American people.

But a $500 billion economy by 1965 can only be achieved within the framework of a healthy and expanding free world economy.

Trade expands markets for the increased output of our mines, our farms and our factories. In return we obtain essential raw materials and needed products of the farms and factories of others. Likewise, the markets provided here for the products of other free world countries enable them to acquire the capital equipment and consumer goods essential to their economic development and higher living standards.

American agriculture sells abroad from one-fourth to one-third of major crops such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco. Without these export markets there can be, under current conditions, no enduring prosperity for the American farmer.

American factories and labor likewise have an important stake in foreign trade. Last year this country sold over $9 billion of industrial products abroad. Over 3 million workers are directly dependent on exports for their jobs. Jungles the world round are being tamed today by American bulldozers; new mines are being opened by our drills and equipment; fields that have been cultivated by hand for centuries are yielding new harvests to our agricultural machines; our automobiles, trucks and buses are found wherever there are roads; and new industries to employ the teeming millions within the underdeveloped nations are being equipped with our machine tools.

The expansion of our foreign trade should proceed in an orderly fashion. Reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers, both here and abroad, must be gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Changes which would result in the threat of serious injury to industry or general reduction in employment would not strengthen the economy of this country or the free world. The trade measures that I have recommended to the Congress were prepared in recognition of these facts.

To abandon our program for the gradual reduction of unjustifiable trade barriers—to vitiate the administration proposals by crippling amendments—would strike a severe blow at the cooperative efforts of the free nations to build up their economic and military defenses. It could result in increasing discrimination against our exports. It could lead to widespread trade restrictions and a sharp contraction in world trade. It could mean a retreat to economic nationalism and isolationism. It would constitute a serious setback to our hopes for global peace.

Two-way trade, I believe, is a broad avenue by which all men and nations of good will can travel toward a golden era of peace and plenty. Your administration is committed to help building it. I personally believe it is for the greater good of all 164 million of our people and I shall not relax my personal effort toward its achievement.

We shall succeed, given the support of all who, unaffrighted by crises, are prepared to act on today's problems while they work for tomorrow's better and happier future. The accomplishment of this goal is worthy of the best efforts of all Americans. Through you and all your associates dedicated to the mission of spreading the truth, a more rapid progress can be made.

As we build a richer material world, we must always remember that there are spiritual truths which endure forever. They are the universal inspiration of all mankind. In them, men of both the free world and the Communist world can find guidance. Do we remember those words of our faith: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them"?

Do we remind ourselves that a similar thread of peaceful and lofty exhortation reveals itself in the words of every one of the historic religious leaders? Their followers today people great nations.

The Far East, the Middle East, the Near East, the West—Asia and Africa and Europe and the American Hemisphere—all alike possess in their heritage the same universal ideal. Why then should we permit pessimism to slow our efforts; despair to darken our spirit?

Can we not convince ourselves and others that in cooperation there is strength?

Cannot you, men of the pen, propagate knowledge of economic truth just as your professional forebears spread the truths that inspired our forefathers to achieve a national independence? For when all people, everywhere, understand that trade is a fertile soil for the growth of a shared prosperity, of all kinds of cooperative strength, and of understanding and tolerance, the fruit thereof will be another historic step on the road to universal peace.

ADDRESSES AT 29TH ANNUAL DINNER OF AMEN CORNER

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last Saturday evening, April 23, in Pittsburgh, Pa., the Amen Corner held its 29th annual dinner in honor of its retiring president, John B. Nicklas, Jr., an outstanding lawyer of that city.

Judge Elder W. Marshall, distinguished Pittsburgh attorney, ably presided as toastmaster. An address was delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] on the subject, Looking Ahead, in which he reviewed the importance of the United States in world affairs.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] made an outstanding address on the position of airpower in our plan of defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered a most interesting and comprehensive address on American Foreign Policy.

I am very sorry that these distinguished Senators did not have prepared addresses, and, therefore, I cannot offer them for the RECORD. The Senator from Arizona will in a few days discuss on the floor of the Senate the important subject of his address, and I hope many Senators may have the opportunity of hearing him.

At the dinner I spoke on the topic the Romance of Roads, and I am informed that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] did me the honor of having it printed in the RECORD of yesterday.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIRS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial and an article which appeared last week in Minneapolis, Minn., newspapers.

The editorial entitled "Progress Report," was published in the Minneapolis Star of Friday, April 22, 1955, and refers to International Trade Fairs, in which I have been much interested for several years, more especially following a visit at Bangkok, Thailand, in December, 1953, on the opening day of an International Trade Fair there.

The Russians had a most impressive building and exhibit. The Japanese Government had an impressive exhibit. The United States had failed to recognize the importance of such international fairs, and our exhibits in general were of such a nature that we would have been much better off, had we not participated.

I reported this to President Eisenhower, upon my return to the United States, suggesting that the United States participate in these international trade fairs with our very best exhibits. Such exhibits would not only show our industrial plant production, but also would display the fine technical instruments for our hospitals and laboratories, and our developments in the field of electronics—radar, television, and radio. Our cultural accomplishments could also be properly portrayed.

Our participation was made possible, first, by the President's recommendation for an appropriation; and, second, by the action of Congress in making funds available to the Department of Commerce and other appropriate agencies for exhibits in some countries; and plans are being developed for future exhibits in other locations, in Djakarta, Damascus, New Delhi, Karachi, Bangkok, Salonika, Izmir, Addis Ababa, Zagreb, and Cairo. There are possibilities that the United States will participate in these fairs in at least 54 countries.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the producers of Cinerama, and the entire industry, for having made available this fine motion picture for international trade fairs in Damascus, Syria, last September and in Bangkok, Thailand, in December of last year, and in planning it for future trade fairs.

Cinerama is a motion picture which permits the people of the world, whether in the Orient, the Middle East, or on the European continent, to have an understandable picture, or view, of the United States, as to its recreational activities and industrial production and the daily routine of living. Our great agricultural areas and our bountiful crops, as displayed in Cinerama, will place America in its true light before the people of foreign countries when shown at these international trade fairs.

Because of all this, I am inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "Cinerama Called Outstanding Contribution to United States Prestige," which was published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, April 20.

Mr. President, I wish to quote from a statement I made last August 2, at the time when the appropriation was approved by the Senate:

When I returned from my trip to the Orient last winter, one of the first things I did was to bring to the attention of President Eisenhower my impression of a visit to a trade fair being conducted at Bangkok in Thailand, where I saw the extensive and well-displayed exhibits of the Soviet Union in a building which dominated the fairgrounds. The automobiles and farm machinery displayed did not in any manner compare with machines and equipment of American manufacturers, and I question whether some would

be serviceable in actual field operations. But they did capture the imagination of the people, and thousands saw this exhibit and passed through the Soviet building.

I ask unanimous consent to have my entire statement of August 2, 1954, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

I wish to commend Business Week magazine for its article of April 16, 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement, editorial, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR THYE URGES EXHIBITS BY UNITED STATES IN WORLD FAIRS

Senator EDWARD J. THYE expressed strong approval of action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill in meeting the request of President Eisenhower for additional funds to permit participation by the United States in international fairs and expositions during the coming year. The President had advised the committee that there will be approximately 75 such international trade fairs and that the administration feels that participation in at least 30 of them would be useful in drawing attention to American products and the benefits of the free-enterprise system. The Senate Committee on Appropriations allowed $5 million for this and related purposes.

"I am convinced that American participation in these international trade fairs is of great importance to this country in its international affairs and I am very much pleased at the action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations of which I am a member. It will enable our Government to help in coordinating American exhibits and make possible a better rounded and more impressive picture of what America has done not only in the field of machine development but also in the field of culture, art, and human relations.

"When I returned from my trip to the Orient last winter one of the first things I did was to bring to the attention of President Eisenhower my impression of a visit to a trade fair being conducted at Bangkok in Thailand where I saw the extensive and well displayed exhibits of the Soviet Union in a building which dominated the fairgrounds. The automobiles and farm machinery displayed did not in any manner compare with machines and equipment of American manufacturers, and I question whether some would be serviceable in actual field operations. But they did capture the imagination of the people and thousands saw this exhibit and passed through the Soviet building.

"I know that the totalitarian government of Russia can simply commandeer the material for such exhibits and is willing to spend thousands to set them up, but I am certain also that American industry and business under the encouragement of our Government could far exceed anything the Soviet Union can do in this field.

"It seems to me that the United States should assume reasonable participation in international fairs both in our fight for markets in the international field and in showing to the people of the world what has been achieved in the United States under our free-enterprise system and our democratic principles of government. I am sure that much good will flow from this effort and I strongly endorse it on the basis of my own observations in the areas where it is so important that America be understood and appreciated by the people."

[From the Minneapolis Star of April 22, 1955]

PROGRESS REPORT

For some time this editorial page has taken a special interest in the promotion of United States participation in trade fairs all over the world. A number of editorials and articles have been printed describing the progress, or lack of same, of this particular kind of American activity abroad.

A gratifying amount of favorable public interest was aroused, and bipartisan political support was forthcoming, too. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY sent a letter to the editor about election time last November promising vigorous support of the idea in the next (present) session of Congress. Senator EDWARD THYE, meanwhile, had stolen the march on both us and HUMPHREY by helping push through Congress an appropriation to finance a trade-fair program to be administered by the Department of Commerce. THYE also was largely responsible for arousing the special presidential interest referred to in the Business Week article reprinted on today's editorial page.

Because we have been concerned about this matter for so long, and because we have had so often to relay discouraging or only faintly optimistic reports to our interested readers, we are especially pleased to be able now to pass along this latest, encouraging news about an important part of American relations with the rest of the world.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 20, 1955]

CINERAMA CALLED OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES PRESTIGE

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican of Minnesota, Tuesday described Cinerama as one of the outstanding features of American efforts to show other peoples a true picture of the American system.

Senator THYE spoke at the Century theater at ceremonies marking Cinerama's first anniversary in Minneapolis.

The moving picture industry has made an outstanding contribution to American prestige through the showing of Cinerama at international trade fairs in the Middle East and Far East, Senator THYE said.

"If we had continued to disregard the importance to this country of exhibiting at these international fairs, we would continue to have lost an opportunity of putting ourselves, our ability, and this Nation's economy on display before millions throughout the world," he said.

"Cinerama is an example of the imaginative and technological capacity of the American people. It has been most effectively used, much to the credit of the industry which developed it and to our country as a whole," Senator THYE said.

Senator THYE called for strengthening and development of trade fairs, student exchange programs and the United States Information Agency as methods that will portray the American Government and people "as they really are."

Cinerama officials accepted more than a dozen service awards and citations from city officials and service organizations.

[From Business Week of April 16, 1955]

BUSINESS LIKES TRADE FAIRS, TOO—INTERNATIONAL SHOWS COMBINE PROPAGANDA AND ENTERPRISE

What started out to be a propaganda offensive against the Russians is turning into something of a find for United States businessmen: That's the trade-fair program of the Department of Commerce. It is sparking United States participation in international trade fairs such as the Fieria Campionaria, which just opened in Milan, Italy.

The international fairs hark back to the Middle Ages, when European traders from far places gathered under the castle walls. Since World War II they have become big operations—with even the Russians throwing in vast exhibits of merchandise and propaganda.

President Eisenhower got worried last summer about the success the Russians were having at the fairs, pushing their line that they were interested in peace products and the United States only in war material.

Out of his interest came a $2¼ million appropriation for the Commerce Department's office of international trade fairs. This money is being used to set up official United States exhibits presenting the American way of life at 25 industrial fairs around the world this year.

The program has already had two spanking propaganda successes—Bangkok, Siam, and recently at Frankfurt, West Germany. An indication of United States success is the fact that the Russians are withdrawing from many of the fairs.

While Commerce has been fighting the propaganda battle, at its urging many United States businessmen have become interested in the program. Here's why:

The fairs provide an excellent opportunity to meet foreign customers. Even in dollar-short countries where United States firms can't expect to boost sales a great deal, some companies feel it's worthwhile to set up so that other United States competition doesn't nose them out.

There's also a good chance to learn just what foreign customers want, to see what European manufacturers are making—especially for sale in markets such as Latin America, where they compete with United States goods.

It's a good place—with commerce's help—to line up foreign distribution. The Deparment maintains a center for exchange of information, where you can list your name, address, and products—and even provides facilities for United States importers wanting to contact foreign manufacturers.

Visiting one of the fairs in Europe—or in Tokyo in May (where the International Chamber of Commerce is meeting), or in Toronto May 30–June 10—is a good excuse for a trip abroad. The fairs usually last 2 weeks and are in metropolitan centers.

There's no guarantee, of course, that you'll do any business. But something must be cooking, for 65 United States firms set up their own exhibits at Milan this year, and some 500 American products are being shown.

Companies represented include manufacturers of everything from cosmetics to heavy machinery. Many visitors, it's true, will be only sightseers (more than 4 million at Milan last year), but large numbers of businessmen attend.

At the Frankfurt fair this year, United States sellers took more than $700,000 worth of orders.

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE POSTS FOR REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on March 29 last the following article appeared in the Fargo, N. Dak., Forum:

CONVENTION POSTS GIVEN THREE FROM NORTH DAKOTA

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.—North Dakota's big three of the Republican Party have been given committee posts for the Republican national convention in San Francisco during the summer of 1956.

The information was contained in a letter from National Chairman Leonard Hall to George Longmire, State Central Committee chairman.

Longmire was appointed to the subcommittee on radio, television and motion pictures. Mrs. F. Peavey Heffelfinger of Minneapolis, Minnesota national committeewoman, is also on this group.

Mrs. J. B. Cooley of Minot, North Dakota national committeewoman, was named to the rules committee, and the national committeeman, Milton Rue of Bismarck, was named to the committee on call.

Announcement of a new committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Charles Weis of New York was contained in the letter from Hall. It is the committee on program and planning, and is designed to streamline the San Francisco meeting.

Once more I call attention to the kind of treatment which States of small population receive at the hands not only of the administration, but of the Republican National Committee, and, I suppose, to a lesser degree perhaps, at the hands of the Democratic National Committee.

In the last election the State of North Dakota was within one decimal point of having the largest per capita vote of any State in the Union; and yet, in the distribution of chairmanships for the next Republican National Convention, North Dakota is not recognized even to the extent of a single committee chairmanship. The chairmanships are handed out, of course, to the Heffelfingers, the Pillsburys, and others who seem to rule the western part of the United States.

I have written a letter of protest to Mr. Leonard Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee. My letter reads as follows:

APRIL 25, 1955.

Hon. LEONARD HALL,
Chairman, Republican National Committe, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: As the senior Republican Senator from North Dakota, I wish to vigorously protest the lack of recognition given to the State of North Dakota, for the Republican National Convention in San Francisco during the summer of 1956.

From the public press of March 29, I note that you wrote to Mr. George Longmire, State central committee chairman for North Dakota, of the following appointments. Mr. Longmire to the subcommittee on radio, television, and motion pictures. Mrs. J. B. Cooley, of Minot, N. Dak., to national committee on rules, and Milton Rue, of Bismarck, to the committee on call.

In view of the fact that the Republican Party in the last election of Mr. Eisenhower, was within one decimal point of having the largest vote of any State in the Union, per capita, I consider this representation to North Dakota to be inadequate entirely. Not a single North Dakotan has been made chairman of a committee. I want to know whether this is the usual custom of just having the States of New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, and other big States get the cream and the gravy while the small States get the skim milk.

The three North Dakotans have worked long hours and arduously and are entitled to more recognition than just being put on the committee. This letter is written in hopes that it may induce you to use your good offices to see that North Dakota, because of the fine record it made for the Republican Party 2 years ago, is not so outrageously ignored.

With just every good wish and hoping you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

As I have repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate, it seems that States of small population get the skim milk, while States with larger population not only are rewarded with appointments in the Cabinet, to the Supreme Court, and to ambassadorships, but even when it comes to a national party convention, they get the chairmanships. When it comes to writing the platforms, the States of larger population usually have the chairmanships, and consequently the States with smaller population do not receive the treatment to which they are entitled.

When a State like North Dakota makes a fine record, such as that State made for the Republican Party in 1952, when more than 71 percent of the people voted for the Republican administration, one would think that such a State, which twice went for Mr. Dewey, and which went for Wendell Willkie, would be recognized. One might think that somehow or other those in control of the Republican Party would give the Republican Party in the State of North Dakota the recognition to which it is entitled in a Republican National Convention.

Let me say to my distinguished friends across the aisle that I hope when the Democrats come to appoint their committees they will not ignore States with small populations. There are some good Democrats in the State of North Dakota, and I sincerely hope that they may have the opportunity to serve as chairmen of one or two of the important commiteees, particularly committees dealing with agricultural problems.

This subject is very close to the hearts of the people of the State of North Dakota. It is true that we finally got one ambassadorship; but time after time I have heard about that ambassadorship from the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] when I have risen to object to some appointment which ignored the State of North Dakota. The world knows that in 63 years of statehood the State of North Dakota was finally recognized by the appointment of an ambassador. I invite attention to the fact that in 107 years the State of Florida has not had one of its citizens in the Cabinet or upon the Supreme Court. Not a single person has been appointed either to the Supreme Court of the United States or to a position in the Cabinet from the States of Arizona, Nevada, South Dakota, North Dakota, Idaho, or Montana.

The only ray of hope I have seen has been the attitude of the distinguished Vice President, who now occupies the chair. Upon an occasion when I invited the attention of the Senate to the fact that seven States had been completely ignored, the distinguished Vice President informed the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that he would use his good offices to see that at some time in the near future the State of Idaho would be recognized in the form of an appointment to an important Ambassadorship.

The people of Idaho have been very much interested in this subject. They have recommended a man by the name of Gibson, whom I have never met, whom I do not know, but who, apparently, is eminently qualified to be appointed an Ambassador. I have not looked at the record lately, but my recollection of the situation a short time ago is that seven men had been appointed from the city of Washington to various Ambassadorships all over the world.

Once more I invite the attention, not only of Senators but of the distinguished Vice President, to the fact that up to the present time the States which I have named have been ignored.

INTEGRATION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the constant struggle to win the affection and support of people throughout the world for our democratic Government went through another acid test at the Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, last week. The striving by spokesmen for competing government ideologies was aimed at winning the hearts and minds of almost one and a half billion people populating the 29 nations which participated in the conference.

As might have been expected, one of the challenges hurled at the Government of the United States was its record in erasing discrimination throughout the 48 States. A Member of the House of Representatives, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, performed a great service in pointing out the real progress that has been made toward a solution of this most difficult problem.

I think it is significant, therefore, that here in the Nation's Capital the largest private employer has successfully ended an employment policy which discriminated against Negroes. I am referring to the successful efforts of the Capital Transit Co. in integrating its work force.

Five members of the Negro race are working side by side with white employees as operators of buses and streetcars.

To many this may seem like a small accomplishment, but to those who know of the long and troublesome history of this case, it is a matter of great satisfaction, which in a small way should contribute significantly to the great effort by this Government to win the respect of the nations of Asia and Africa.

Some Senators may remember that early in 1942, despite an acute shortage in Washington of qualified personnel to man the transportation system, the Capital Transit Co. refused to employ qualified Negroes as operators. The company stated at that time that it could not employ Negroes as platform operators because its white operators would strike.

The company maintained this position even after the Federal FEPC in 1945, following protracted negotiations with the company, issued a directive to it to employ qualified persons to operate the buses and streetcars. The company maintained its position even though there was a continued critical manpower shortage on the ground that its responsibility to the community demanded that it insure continuous and uninterrupted service. The company alleged this could not be maintained if Negroes were hired as operators.

With this background, it is, indeed, heartwarming to know that after a 13-year interval, during which the situation prevailing was a festering sore in the

local community and contributed much ill feeling between various groups of citizens here, the condition has been remedied and it has been done without any of the anticipated difficulties or trouble, for these 5 operators have been at work in this community for more than 2 months performing useful services according to their ability. The operators, who were chosen on the basis of their qualifications and experience, have performed their duties well, and I am assured by the company that henceforth such positions will be filled on the same basis without regard to race or color.

This change did not take place easily but through determined activities by many persons. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower, it took place peacefully. This is the way such progress is made—through conciliation by men of good will taking small steps, one at a time. There were no spectacular attempts at legislation and no resort to name calling, but the end result was progress.

The President's avowed policy of ending all vestiges of segregation and discrimination in the Nation's Capital created the moral and ethical environment for this accomplishment.

The President's Committee on Government Contracts, headed by Vice President NIXON, negotiated with the management of the Capital Transit Co. for a year and a half to bring about a change in employment policy. He was ably assisted by Jacob Seidenberg, executive director of the committee. The District of Columbia's Public Utility Commission, the District of Columbia's Employment Service, and the Washington Urban League contributed capable technical services to bring about this change.

I would indeed be remiss if I did not mention the efforts which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and his associates on the District of Columbia Committee, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] played in developing this new policy. As a result of their hearings held last year, they spelled out suggestions to the parties which assisted in working out a solution to this vexing problem.

But, above all, I think all of us who are interested in making for better community relations and effecting the proper utilization of qualified manpower are indebted to the present management of the company for its enlightened approach to this troublesome issue, and to the cooperative and understanding attitude of division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL, the certified collective bargaining agent of the employee who assisted in resolving this matter. The role of all the participants who worked to bring about an amicable resolution of one of the most troublesome issues in the Nation's Capital is just one more example of democracy at work in the best and highest traditions of America.

THE FORMOSAN SITUATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the eyes of all peace-loving people throughout the world are focused primarily on the Formosan Straits, and the very difficult situation which confronts America and the forces of freedom everywhere in that vital area.

It seems to me that in Formosa we confront either an opportunity for a dramatic victory resulting in enduring peace, or the possibility of a situation which may deteriorate into defeat for freedom and a prelude for a long and costly war.

Probably in no other spot in the world can we afford to be less wrong in our understanding of the facts and in forming our decisions than in Formosa. We need all the independent information and first-hand observations we can obtain, upon which to base wise and effective decisions.

In that connection, and as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers. The articles are written by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, retired, who did such a courageous and effective job in Berlin in 1948, when we were threatened by the Red forces in that area.

It has been wisely said by international observers and authorities in the field of international affairs that the Berlin situation in 1948 is analogous in many ways to the situation confronting us in the Matsus, Quemoy, and Formosa in 1955.

In the hope that people throughout the country may gain some information and inspiration and ideas from the articles written by General Howley, I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 28, 1955]

GENERAL HOWLEY'S TIMELY ANALYSIS—FORMOSA: WILL IT BE WAR OR PEACE?—COMMUNISM IS DETERMINED TO DESTROY AMERICA, HE WARNS

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, who demonstrated remarkable ability and courage in coping with Soviet trickery during the ill-famed Berlin blockade of 1948, has just returned from a frontline observation tour of the latest arena of Red aggression—Formosa and the Far East. Brigadier General Howley minces no words in stating his personal views herewith about the Formosa crisis and what he feels American policy should be in the Far East. This is the first of eight articles by Brigadier General Howley, in which this outspoken expert on Soviet tactics analyzes the chances of war or peace in the Orient. In view of the imminent showdown expected over Formosa and the outlying islands, his analysis of the Far Eastern crisis is especially timely.)

NEW YORK, March 28.—Formosa can be our great opportunity for peace if—

1. We stop deluding ourselves with sweet reasonableness and come face to face with the harsh reality that communism is determined to destroy us and all the good on this earth.

2. We recognize Chiang Kai-shek as a great and willing ally with a trained armed force of more than a half-million men dedicated to destroying the Red Chinese forces and anxiously awaiting the call to action.

Let us use this ready-made Chinese Nationalist force. Let us change our attitude, our thinking, and our planning from defeatist defense to optimistic offense.

An unfettered Nationalist Chinese Army on Formosa, poised to strike the mainland of Red China at any moment, is our best guaranty for peace in the Far East.

This way we can start the destruction of the Communist conspiracy before it can destroy us.

To some this may sound like strong talk. To me, it is realistic reasoning based on fact.

For the last 10 years I have watched the Communist conspiracy in action from a box seat. For the last 6 weeks I have toured the potential battleground of the Far East.

I have been under Red artillery fire with Chiang's defenders of little Quemoy Island, only 2,000 yards from the nearest Communist-held island.

I have watched Chiang's tough troops sweat through maneuvers under live ammunition. And I have talked with nearly all of the leading military men and diplomats in the area.

Everywhere I went on Formosa there was a clamor for more modern American weapons. The chant was: "Just give us a chance to strike at our common Communist enemy, Mao Tse-tung."

I am convinced on the basis of firsthand observation that Chiang Kai-shek is our answer. We should give Chiang the weapons he needs—including our latest tactical atomic weapons—and give them to him now.

Which is better—to start diminishing the power of the Kremlin-contrived Communist empire which threatens our destruction, or to prepare our children for a life of hiding in cellars to escape the nuclear destruction of our civilization?

If we support such stanch anti-Communist allies as Chiang Kai-shek—and do it now—a new American policy of liberation is possible without the wholesale loss of American lives.

Let us look at the East-West balance of power today:

I say now is the opportune time to seize the offensive position in the Far East because our superiority in hydrogen bombs will deter the Soviets from any temptation to drop great bombs on our own cities.

Why didn't the Nazis use gas against us in the last war? Because of our superiority in the use of gas, and our superior preparations to defend ourselves against it.

We discouraged even the fanatical Hitler from using gas—and, in the same way, we can now, through the threat of hydrogen-bomb retaliation, force the Soviets to concentrate their fighting on the battlefields instead of in the homes of men, women, and children far from any fighting front.

With our H-bombs and our known means of delivering them, we can deter the spread of warfare. For the battlefield, we now have our new tactical atomic weapons, and we know the Soviets cannot yet match them.

Mao Tse-tung and his Soviet-backed regime today constitute the greatest immediate aggressive threat to the free world. Our tragic bumbling in Korea has left the Red Chinese arrogant with delusions of power.

Mao himself seems to believe his own press agents. Given time, the Red Chinese will present a dreadful menace to the entire free world.

The time for talk, tough or otherwise, in Asia is past. The time has come when Mao and his troops should know that they will face certain annihilation if they make one more aggressive move toward the Nationalist-held offshore islands or anywhere else in the Far East.

And this time we must not repeat the errors of Korea. Any new Red aggression anywhere should be the signal for us and

our allies, including the Nationalists of Chiang Kai-shek, to mount an attack and never let up until Mao and his Peiping conspiracy have been destroyed.

There can be no moral question involved in any such attack on Mao Tse-tung with any weapon or weapons, be they military, political, or psychological. It is Mao and his henchmen who have seized illegal control of a populous nation.

They are the ones who launched an unprovoked attack against us in Korea and have directly caused the deaths of at least 30,000 Americans and injuries to 170,000 more.

To talk of drawing lines beyond which Mao will not be permitted to advance is pointless. We have drawn more lines than a child with a blackboard. Mao merely erases them pretty much as he pleases.

He has ignored his international agreements, insulted us, threatened us, and is preparing to attack us again. Records submitted to the United Nations by our high command in Korea give documentary proof of at least 8,000 Americans who were not only murdered after surrender, but brutally tortured first.

Right now the only force restraining Mao's Red armies from marching against the British in Hong Kong and on into southeast Asia, or from resuming the war in Korea, is the presence on China's flank of Chiang's Nationalist troops.

Let us convert this restraining force into a real striking threat. Let us train the Nationalist troops. Let us arm them with our latest weapons and aid them in every way possible to make them a real threat against Mao Tse-tung.

At the least, such a Nationalist force will be a restraining influence on the militant, aggressive Red Chinese.

At the most, it could be the decisive factor to turn the tide of war in favor of the forces of democracy in the event Mao starts a new war to the north or south.

Let us build up Chiang's control of the air and sea. Let us sharpen the weapons of his infantry and give him our newest tactical atomic weapons.

There can be no better way to fight communism in the Far East than by helping this army of real Chinese patriots who have dedicated their lives to driving out Mao Tse-tung and the Moscow puppets now enslaving the Chinese people.

In the British colony of Hong Kong, I heard this suggestion repeated in various versions:

"Let us neutralize Formosa—and in order to get Mao Tse-tung to recognize this neutrality, we shall let him have the offshore islands."

To talk of defending Formosa, or to speak of neutralizing the forces of Chiang Kai-shek—on the offshore islands or anywhere else—is unrealistic and short-sighted.

We can no more neutralize the anti-Communist forces of Chiang Kai-shek in the Far East than we can neutralize the anti-Communist forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Europe.

We refused when the Russians wanted us to neutralize Western Germany. We won't do that in Europe because we maintain that a powerful Western Europe is the best guarantee against an attack by the Soviets.

Give Mao the offshore islands? Since when has any concession to communism brought peace or even a respite from the Communist offensive?

Didn't we learn our lesson in 1950 in neutralizing Chiang when we shut off four shipments of arms and war materials to Chiang's Nationalists while the Soviet Union was rushing war materials to the Chinese Communist armies?

We have paid dearly for these mistakes of the past. We must not repeat them.

[From the New York Journal-American of March 29, 1955]

FORMOSA: PEACE OR WAR?—RED PROPAGANDA DRIVE AGAINST CHIANG EXPOSED—HOWLEY ALSO CRITICIZES SELF-STYLED ASIAN EXPERTS

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of eight articles by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former American Military Governor of Berlin, who has just completed a 6-week observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

The things that impress you the most about Formosa are its vitality and singleness of purpose.

The atmosphere bristles with optimism. From one end of the island to the other, I found unanimous determination to destroy Mao Tse-tung's puppet regime and liberate the Chinese homeland.

Yet, just before departing for the Far East, I had read an alarmist article warning that the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa were in danger of collapsing from within.

This article claimed that Formosa was wracked with "internal rot, decay, and subversion"—and did the American people want to support a government and a people under such conditions?

It is heartening that more and better reporters are now using our vast modern communications to focus public attention on the truth about the Asian situation.

NO SIGN OF ROT OR DECAY

It is unfortunate that some reports from this sprawling area still contain what I regard as confusing information and even misinformation.

One of the great tragedies of recent years is that we in America have been deluged with a wealth of misinformation and outright distortions about Chiang Kai-shek, his Nationalist Army, Formosa, and China.

We Americans have been unable to distinguish and identify the misinformation because of our general ignorance of Asia and its people.

I do not pose an an Asian expert—but I feel that my years of training have taught me to distinguish fact from fancy.

I went to the Far East with as much of an open mind toward the cause of Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalists as any man could who hates communism as much as I do.

I went to see for myself whether Chiang and his Nationalists on Formosa are our answer to the reckless Communist designs of Mao Tse-tung and his Moscow-backed aggressors.

I say they are—and let us give them our fullest support.

I also say that 99 percent of all the derogatory information we have heard about Formosa and the Nationalist Government is false.

My personal observation tour was devoted to talks with people in the smallest villages as well as conferences with Generalissimo and Madame Chiang. I talked with Nationalist soldiers and with all of Chiang's Cabinet ministers.

I made a personal visit to the fortifications of embattled Quemoy Island, and I ate Chinese dishes with Chinese chopsticks until I began to think of a knife and fork as crude weapons.

I found absolutely no sign of rot, decay, or subversion on the entire island of Formosa. On the contrary, I found a Chinese Nation reborn—a renaissance of this country of ancient tradition.

Before I left for the Far East, I had heard warnings against pinning our hopes on Chiang Kai-shek and spending money to support his troops because the Nationalists were an old man's army.

I found that the soldiers of Chiang's army average only 28 years in age. The tough, mobile fighting men I saw on maneuvers under live ammunition were not old men—far from it. As for morale, I have never seen better.

I had heard that Formosa could not support its normal population of Taiwanese plus those parasites who had descended on their island from the Chinese mainland.

FOOD SURPLUS IS ADEQUATE

What did I find? Today food imports and exports are balanced. Formosa is rich in food—so rich that it was a prize Japanese possession for 50 years and sent millions of tons of food to Japan. Everything from rice to bananas.

A great band of fertile land stretches 245 miles from north to south along the island's western half. Most of this rich land, combined with the wet semitropical climate, produces three crops a year.

Formosa's food surplus is more than adequate to feed the 7 million who were there when the Japanese departed at the end of World War II, plus the 1,500,000 Chinese (including Nationalist troops) who have arrived from the Chinese mainland since 1949.

I had heard that the natives of Formosa—the Taiwanese—hate Chiang Kai-shek.

I went looking for resentment on Formosa against Chiang and his troops, but found none. Instead I found growing sentiment among the Taiwanese that Chiang has done more for them than the Japanese did in 50 years of occupation.

The Japanese improved railroads, built powerplants and spurred industrial development. But Chiang has given the farmers of this agricultural island ownership of their own land and has improved the general standard of living.

Accompanied by some officers of the Nationalist army, I wandered through various sections of Tainan in Southern Formosa and out to the outskirts. Several times my Chinese companies asked directions of Taiwanese—some well dressed and prosperous, others city urchins. The response was always friendly and cooperative.

CHEERFUL AND DETERMINED

You can't bluff things of this sort. If there is resentment, it shows.

Does decay threaten the destruction of the Nationalists?

From the top of the government to the humblest chen in the fields, Formosa is alive with enthusiasm and vitality. It is inspiring to see everybody working—cheerful and determined. These people are optimistic and confident about the present and the future.

With Chinese and Taiwanese alike, Americans are popular. In my trips around the cities and small towns, I spotted American uniforms here and there—particularly the blue of American airmen.

About midnight one night I watched two of them who obviously had just arrived. Probably with some of the new Sabrejets being supplied to the Nationalists.

"Hey, Chang," yelled one at a man standing in front of a shop. "Where can we get some beer?"

With a motion that indicated drinking, the airman conveyed what his words could not.

When I saw them last, they were being escorted by the shopkeeper three blocks down the street to a cafe where one might obtain a fairly good glass of beer of a reasonable price.

Despite our sudden switches in policy, our unexplained changes in direction, the Chinese on Formosa like Americans and respect them. But at times we mystify them.

For one thing, they cannot understand our fear of death.

One Chinese official—originally a Buddhist but more recently converted to Christianity, said to me:

"You are basing your national policy too much upon fear of death. For a Christian,

the worst thing that can happen is not to die—but to live badly. For the Communist, death should be bad—because for him that is the end of everything."

CHANCE TO HELP KIN ON MAINLAND

What about the Chinese woman? Is she willing to pay the price to make the sacrifices necessary to return to the China homeland—the mainland? Do these women realize that their men and their sons and perhaps some of the daughters will be killed?

I put these questions directly to Madame Chiang one day as she was busy with welfare work for the women and children evacuees arriving from the Tachen Islands.

The attractive wife of the generalissimo answered without hesitation:

"Oh, yes," she said. "We welcome the opportunity to make these sacrifices. It is more than just being willing. We hope for the opportunity. You see, most of our families and friends are on the mainland. This is our way of helping them. This can be our contribution to life."

Other Chinese women grouped around her nodded in agreement.

What, then, have been the sources of this misinformation about Chiang Kai-shek, Formosa and China? Who is responsible?

SAYS UNITED STATES IS MISLED BY SOVIET'S EXPERTS

Part of this misinformation has come from or through some who have been working against the best interests of America, even for Soviet Russia.

We also have been misled by many self-styled experts whose only claim is that they have spent considerable time in the Orient.

I hope that more and more of our thoughtful college graduates will go to Asia and study, as I went to Europe and studied after graduation from New York University in 1925.

Then we shall have more qualified persons able to evaluate information concerning the peoples and cultures of this vast far eastern area.

Had we Americans known more, we would not have been so easily misled.

DECLARED THE ERRORS OF MISINFORMATIONS

We would have recognized the sinister plot of Mao Tse-tung and his Communists and not accepted them merely as benevolent "agrarian reformers."

Gen. George C. Marshall would not have urged inclusion in the postwar Chinese Government of the Communist group which was already dedicated to China's destruction.

We would not have adopted in 1950 a policy of withholding aid from the recognized Chinese Government "until the dust settled"—until the pawns of Soviet communism were able to seize control of a great nation.

These are the tragic errors of inadequate information and misinformation. There is still time to salvage a critical situation if we will only demand the facts and think straight.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 31, 1955]

WAR OR PEACE?—DOUBTS SEIZURE OF FORMOSA—CHINESE REDS COULD NOT CAPTURE ISLAND, GENERAL HOWLEY SAYS

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, Vice Chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourth of eight articles by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former American military Governor in Berlin, who has just returned from an intensive observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

NEW YORK, March 31.—Hardly a day passes without a boast from Radio Peiping that the Chinese Communists are on the verge of liberating the Nationalist bastion of Formosa.

The military truth is that the Reds have about as much chance of seizing Formosa by frontal assault today as they would of capturing Okinawa.

Nor, under existing conditions, is it possible for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to stage a successful invasion of the Red-held mainland.

The big military picture in this delicate area of the Far East is a standoff at the moment, but the situation is far from static.

The immediate question is what will develop out of the little war now swirling around the controversial Nationalist-held offshore islands.

During my recent 6-week observation tour of the Far East, I made a careful study of the relative military strength of Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek, who have been bitter battlefield foes off and on for nearly 30 years.

The statistics all seem to favor Mao, but in my judgment the Red claims of strength are vastly exaggerated.

Mao now claims an army of 2,900,000 men backed by a home guard of about 1,700,000 and security troops numbering about 1 million.

The Communist navy, according to Red claims, consists of nearly 400 vessels. Most of them are small. The biggest are several light, 3,000-ton cruisers and small submarines supplied by Russia.

Mao's new air force claims to have nearly 3,000 planes—about half of them jet fighters. He also is reported to have two divisions of Russian-built light jet bombers.

Arrayed against this lineup, Chiang Kai-shek has a combined force of about 600,000 on the island of Formosa and on the chain of offshore islands fronting the mainland.

His navy's largest vessels are destroyers and he has only 400 combat planes.

The edge—on paper—is all Mao's. But it would be a great mistake to assume that the Reds could take Formosa.

For one thing, the Chinese Communist army is poorly equipped and poorly trained, despite the efforts of several hundred Soviet military advisers. By Western standards, Mao's army is still primitive.

There is also this question: How reliable are Mao's troops? They accept his food, ammunition and orders and are subjected to intensive indoctrination.

But for the most part, these soldiers are not Communists. The most reliable intelligence sources say there is no indication that the vast majority are about to accept the Communist philosophy.

The large number of desertions and wholesale disavowal of communism by Chinese prisoners in Korea led Peiping to conduct a series of sweeping purges throughout its armed forces.

We know that the Chinese army which drove our forces back in Korea was overwhelming in numbers, but poorly trained and equipped.

Had the United Nations troops not been denied the right to fight for victory, there would be no Communist army on the China mainland today.

We know that the Communists are working feverishly to train their troops with Soviet equipment and Russian advisers.

But there is a vast difference between armored divisions on paper and their ability to maneuver tanks, fire modern weapons, maintain sensitive equipment and fight in western style.

Today on Formosa, more than 400 American experts are teaching the forces of Chiang Kai-shek to fight western style—which means to save their own lives while destroying the enemy.

Assuming that we continue to send equipment to the Nationalist troops and that they continue their present training progress, I would say that a year from now the massive forces of Mao Tse-tung would have great difficulty taking Formosa—even if the United States Seventh Fleet did not interfere, even if Mao had ample amphibious craft.

The Formosa Strait is 100 miles wide. What would he use for invasion craft?

If he relied on the oft-mentioned junks, even those with motors, it would take probably 20 hours for the crossing. During this time, the invasion fleet would be at the mercy of Chiang's air and sea forces.

The recent delivery of United States fighter-bombers has given Chiang's air power a new punch.

At the moment, there is little chance that the Reds will be able to assemble an adequate invasion fleet opposite Formosa.

Such a force certainly could not be assembled so long as Nationalist control of the offshore islands denies the Reds the use of coastal shipping lanes from Matsu on the north to Quemoy on the south.

So long as the Nationalists maintain observation posts along this 200-mile chain of islands, they are able to report Red ship movements around the clock. Fighter-bombers from Formosa do the rest—and would do the same to any attempted Red invasion buildup along the China coast opposite Formosa.

For a successful invasion, Mao would need air and sea supremacy, and for Mao to gain control of the air around Formosa, he would need jet aircraft.

The Reds would need jet bases near the China coast opposite Formosa, for jets exhaust their fuel quickly and cannot remain over a target for a long period.

As of now, the Reds have few airfields near Amoy, the oft-mentioned "invasion port" directly across the strait from Formosa.

There is 1 field just outside Amoy and 3 others in the general area, including 1 at Changting, 150 miles northwest of Amoy. But they are too small for jet planes, and are bare of planes at the moment.

Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, who headed the famed "Flying Tigers," told me none of these fields in the Amoy area could easily be converted into jet landing strips.

Chennault should know. The retired war hero, who now operates a civil airline on Formosa, planned and built all these fields during World War II.

At Foochow, 175 miles north of Amoy, the Reds have one field available for limited jet use. The nearest large jet fields are far north at Shanghai—too far for effective invasion support against Formosa.

Could Mao mount an airborne invasion of Formosa? My answer is yes,—if he wants to lose his troops.

Any airborne invasion is effective only as part of a large-scale land or amphibious operation. To drop airborne troops on far-off island, with limited air support and no amphibious followup, would be to invite their annihilation.

We learned this even with such crack British and American airborne troops as were sent against the Germans at Arnheim and Nijmegen in Holland during the last war. The liability of Allied ground forces to establish contact resulted in costly failure of the operation.

Moreover, Mao cannot claim first-class air troops. The Reds are training paratroopers and glider forces, and the Russians are helping. But there are no troops in the Orient today to compare with American and British airborne units.

And even the best airborne troops could not take Formosa, except in coordination with a huge amphibious invasion force.

Unless he is being deluded by his own propagandists, even Mao must admit the physical impossibility of taking Formosa against Chiang's fighting foot soldiers and American control of the sea and air.

All this does not take into account the tremendous logistical problems of such an overwater operation. Even across the comparatively narrow English Channel, the combined force of Britain and the United

States—backed by the greatest industrial output in the world—were only able to land on the coast of France fewer than 1 million soldiers between June 6 and July 2, 1944.

During this same period, the Allies found it necessary to land 1,500,000 tons of supplies—including 171,000 vehicles and hundreds of tons of other equipment—in order to support their troops ashore.

For all of his loud talk and boast, Mao simply cannot successfully invade Formosa, so long as Chiang enjoys the support of American sea and air power over the Formosa Strait.

It is my further view that even without the Americans, Mao will stand little chance of success once American supplies bolster Chiang's sea and air forces.

What about the reverse situation? Can Chiang invade the mainland? My answer is—yes, given sufficient American air and sea support.

The Nationalists are maintaining close contact with the mainland and have strong evidence of great popular support for a carefully-timed liberation move. They also have compiled mounting daily evidence of popular dissatisfaction with the Red regime.

American-trained Gen. Sun Li-jen told me on Formosa that a powerful, well-trained and well-disciplined Nationalist invasion force could win the population from Mao Tse-tung and his Communists in short order.

I believe this is true. I visited Guatemala just before the successful overthrow of the Communist-dominated government of Jacobo Arbenz and saw an outstanding example of how little popular supporting a Communist government enjoys.

Judging from the lavish display of posters and great propaganda outbursts, one would have thought even all of the Mayan Indians supported the Guatemalan Communists.

Yet 3 hired pilots with 3 borrowed airplanes put the finishing touches on the overthrow of the Communist government.

Last year, the Peiping Communists indirectly admitted that there was not enough food for one-third of China's vast population. The Reds have further created popular unrest by their overlapping series of purges, public trials, and executions.

Mao suffered one of his biggest blows when the 14,000 former Communist prisoners in Korea chose to go to Formosa instead of returning to their homeland. They, too, are being trained for the day Chiang chooses to hit the mainland.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of April 1, 1955]

FORMOSA: WAR OR PEACE?—GENERAL LAUDS CHIANG'S ARMY—HOWLEY CALLS NATIONALIST TROOPS LEAN AND TOUGH

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITORS NOTE.—This is the fifth of eight articles by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former American military governor of Berlin, who has just returned from a 6-week observation tour of the world's most potentially dangerous flashpoint, Formosa. He also visited the embattled offshore island of Quemoy.)

NEW YORK, April 1.—I didn't see a single fat sergeant all the time I was on maneuvers with Chiang Kai-shek's new Nationalist army on Formosa.

The men I saw under Red fire on rocky Quemoy Island were broadcasting invitations to the Communists to "come over and commit suicide."

Tough? These Chinese fighting men are lean and leather tough.

They move like Indian scouts. And they are fast learning the secret of western military success: teamwork.

From a vantage point overlooking a broad plain in northern Formosa, I watched one afternoon as some 400 heavily-armed troops moved into action against an imaginary Communist invasion force.

They were less than a quarter of a mile away, and there was only sparse cover. Yet at no time could I spot more than three uniforms. They moved swiftly and silently. There was no noise except the crack of their rifles.

These troops are masters in the art of camouflage. They cover themselves with strips of cloth, dirt and leaves, and attack at full running speed in canvas sneakers.

With the American soldier, there always seems to be the problem of noise from banging mess gear. Not with the Chinese. His messkit consists of two wooden chopsticks. The only metal he carries is his gun and ammunition.

Four hundred of the best instructors in the United States Armed Forces are the faculty for one of the most intensive military training programs I have ever witnessed. It goes on day and night, 7 days a week.

To head this training program, the men in the Pentagon have chosen wisely. They have sent to Formosa a pair of tough-minded, able, former cavalrymen—Maj. Gen. William C. Chase and Maj. Gen. John C. MacDonald.

The 60-year-old General Chase, who has great faith in the fighting potential of the Nationalist troops, heads what is called MAAG, or officially the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group.

He is the fighting general who led the first units of the 1st Cavalry Division into Manila and later into Tokyo during the last war.

The army section, including the troop training program, is under 59-year-old General MacDonald, whom I have admired for years as a former fellow cavalry officer.

In my opinion, there is no better training officer in the world than this much-decorated general. Before commanding the 4th Cavalry Regiment in France and Germany during the last war, General MacDonald had years of experience training troops at Fort Riley, the famed American cavalry school.

For 2 years during the early part of the last war, it was my privilege as a major to serve as General MacDonald's plans and training officer. His training methods are exacting, sound, and effective.

Since returning from my 6-week personal observation tour of the Far East, I have been asked many times just how good are Chiang Kai-shek's soldiers? How effective is our training program with the Nationalist troops?

My answer—based on all available evidence—is that man-for-man Chiang's troops today are superior to Mao Tse-tung's Communists, who are being trained by the Russians.

And having seen the training program in action, I would estimate conservatively that within a year, Chiang's modern army will be more than a match for 4 or 5 times as many "old-style" Communist soldiers.

We do not have to teach Chiang's soldier the art of infiltration. He knows how to get behind the enemy's lines. We do not have to give him courage or loyalty or the will to fight. He has all that.

What we have to teach him is the science of modern warfare—in short, wholesale killing through teamwork and coordination.

Our American instructors are showing the Nationalist soldiers how to advance by rush. They are teaching them to synchronize their platoons, their companies, their regiments. We are teaching them to coordinate everything from air to water to land attack.

Sometimes the progress is slow, but the Chinese GI and his officers are trying hard. They are accepting the modern techniques once they are sold on their effectiveness.

During my visit to embattled Quemoy, the blockade island in Amoy harbor only 2,000 yards from Red artillery, I heard an interesting story from a Chinese sergeant.

He told how the American instructors staged a demonstration to sell Chiang's officers on the principle of establishing fortifications right down on the beaches. The Chinese preferred to follow tradition and perch their defensive positions high up in the hills.

Boats loaded with dummies were placed in the bay to simulate an attacking Red amphibious force. Then from established beach positions, synchonized machine-gun fire tore into the targets at water level.

The Chinese officers were convinced when they saw the fiery tracer display rip through the twilight to mangle the invaders.

"It was enough to scare you," the sergeant confessed. "I wouldn't want to be out there when I saw that pattern of bullets."

About 50,000 Nationalist troops are defending Quemoy at the southern end of Chiang's chain of offshore islands, and about 20,000 are protecting Matsu, 200 miles to the north.

But one never hears the word "defense" mentioned by the Nationalists. The entire round-the-clock training program is keyed to offense—to the day when Chiang will carry out his promise to return to the mainland.

At Kaohsiung naval base in southern Formosa, Nationalist "frogmen" are learning underwater demolition methods. Naval assault units are constantly rehearsing amphibious landing operations.

Chiang's entire armed forces now number about 600,000 men—the bulk of them in the army.

The Nationalist navy is small, with about 40,000 men. The naval forces now include only 7 destroyers, 16 minesweepers, and numerous landing craft and junks capable of carrying troops.

The Nationalist air force also is weak. It has 400 combat planes, including a sizable number of Thunderjets and some F-86 Saberjets. The first 100 Saberjets only recently arrived at an undisclosed Formosan airfield from the Philippines and Okinawa.

I was told that the best of Chiang's pilots are rapidly learning the latest combat techniques in the streaking jets from their American instructors.

Before going to Formosa I had heard that Chiang had an army of old men unworthy of American support. I found that this is not true.

The average age of the soldiers in the Nationalist army is 28 years, which is not old. Our jet flying aces in Korea averaged 28, and the average age of all our fliers there was closer to 33.

From experience, military men have decided they don't want an army much younger than this. Before the First World War, the French had the idea that lads in their late teens made the best fighters. They concentrated on 17- and 18-year-olds, and we know what happened at Sedan when the French were hit by the more mature Germans.

It has been my experience that young men often panic. Older soldiers stand and fight.

The 28-year average for Chiang's army is particularly young considering that most of his soldiers have never ridden in a truck. They have walked all their lives, working hard and building up their resistance.

Physically, a Nationalist soldier is probably the equivalent of an occidental 10 years younger.

This year the Nationalist military leaders were persuaded to adopt the United States military staff system, regarded as the world's best. It has already eliminated a lot of waste motion.

By working day and night, the American instructors have advanced their training program to division level. A Nationalist division is a complete tactical and administrative unit, just as in the American Army.

Division maneuvers, such as I witnessed, are employing all of the tactical techniques

of modern warfare from synchronized artillery fire to musketry.

The entire Nationalist army is now becoming adept at grazing fire, such as was introduced to the defenders of Quemoy. Before the American instructors arrived, the Chinese were using the obsolete plunging fire.

The traditional oriental method called for getting on high ground to shoot down at the enemy. This grew out of the medieval days when soldiers used swords and those on high ground had a great advantage over their climbing attackers.

Plunging fire wastes ammunition. A bullet that misses buries itself in the ground. But grazing fire places gunners on ground level and enables them to rake an attacking enemy for 800 yards.

Bullets fired in this manner can kill the enemy anywhere along the invasion path. It is especially effective in repelling invasion by boat.

Along with the military instruction, Chiang's troops receive intensive political indoctrination.

To us, the system of having political officers right down to platoon level is reminiscent of the Soviet commissar system which was abandoned during Russia's war with Finland.

This amounts to parallel command, and is contrary to the single-responsibility philosophy of American commanders. The United States training officers have been advocating the American system, contending that split responsibility handicaps the training of troops in purely military matters.

Yet the Chinese system seems to have merit for orientals. The orientals know the orientals, and we have seen how effective such indoctrination was with the Red troops which struck us in Korea.

The Nationalist minister for propaganda explained it to me this way:

"Our soldiers come from all parts of China. They speak many different dialects and have many different ideas as to why they are fighting. To make them successful soldiers, one must teach them what they are fighting for.

"We must indoctrinate them and teach them that their one big job is to fight. This can only be done by training a soldier's mind as we train his body."

In all my travels, I have never seen any higher morale than among the Chinese Nationalist troops. It is the same among the civilian population of Formosa.

One of the most inspiring sights of my trip was the flag-lowering at sundown in the provisional Chinese capital city of Taipei.

All traffic stops and people get out of their cars—Chinese and Formosans alike. Soldiers come to attention with smart salutes. The men remove their hats, and all stand at attention until the flag has been lowered.

As I turned away from the public square with its huge statue of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and thinking of what I had heard and read before seeing Formosa firsthand, I could not help wondering:

Were these the "defeated" Chinese Nationalists? Could this be a demonstration of "resentment" against Chiang and his "lost cause"?

[From the Baltimore News-Post of April 2, 1955]

FORMOSA: WAR OR PEACE?—CHIANG PSYCHOLOGY PAYING DIVIDENDS—ISLAND ECONOMY AND PROSPERITY WILL BE BIG FACTOR AT SHOWDOWN

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the sixth of eight articles by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former American Military Governor in Berlin, who has just returned from an intensive observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

NEW YORK, April 2.—It didn't surprise me to learn on my Far Eastern tour that Chiang Kai-shek's name means "Unyielding Rock."

The soft-spoken man in the unadorned Sun Yat-Sen uniform is just that on Formosa today.

As Generalissimo of 600,000 fighting men, he promises that his Nationalist Chinese armed forces will fight, if necessary to the last man, to defend Formosa, the nearby Pescadores and the chain of Nationalist-held blockade islands within whispering distance of the Red Chinese coast.

As President of Free China, he is giving the 8,500,000 inhabitants of Formosa something important to fight for as well as something to fight against.

Chiang and his Nationalist leaders are making Formosa a showcase. They are creating on their lush island fortress a model China as their first step toward their promised return to the mainland.

For the last 5 years on Formosa, the Nationalist Government has been able to show what its ambitious reform plan can accomplish. Even with abnormal defense expenditures, the economy of the island has been strengthened and the standard of living has been raised.

Today the Nationalists are beginning to use this new model China on Formosa as a powerful psychological weapon—a mirror of progress reflecting hope to millions of mainland Chinese.

It occurred to me in talking with him that Chiang's program on Formosa follows the pattern the Western allies established in Berlin during the 4½ postwar years I was American Military Governor.

We Americans, along with the British and French, bolstered Western Berlin's economy and insisted on an honest democratic government. The contrast to the Communist puppet regime and the deprivation in Soviet-occupied Eastern Berlin was a hands-down victory for the West.

While the Peiping Reds have made "purge" the most fearsome word in the mainland Chinese vocabulary, Chiang's new Nationalist Government has made the modernization of Formosa pay handsome dividends on both sides of the Formosan Strait.

The Nationalists now have solid evidence that the reports of their successful Formosa "experiment" are filtering into the most remote mainland villages and hamlets.

This is how they are preparing the mainland population psychologically for a great popular uprising against the Reds the day Chiang and his troops storm back across the mainland beaches.

The Nationalists say their communications system keeps them in constant touch with developments nearly everywhere on the mainland. Their latest estimates place the number of persons liquidated by Mao Tse-tung's regime at 50 million.

The Nationalists also say they are receiving daily evidence that this wholesale slaughter has had tremendous impact in stirring powerful resentment against the Mao Reds.

Marshal Hsi-Shan Yen, onetime Governor of Shansi Province in North Central China and now a senior adviser to Chiang, puts it this way:

"The Chinese people by tradition, custom, and temperament are opposed to the principles of communism. There are many Chinese who oppose the Communist system purely on a local basis, particularly the local administrations which took an active part in purging their relatives and friends.

"Other Chinese oppose the Communists because of their practices on a national scale. They oppose the principle of building roads and developing heavy industry, rather than concentrating on the production of consumer goods.

"But the greatest number who oppose the Communist regime are those who were promised great personal gain, and who now have found the promises unfulfilled."

He cited, for example, the tenant farmers who were promised their own farms and an improved living standard. Instead, they now find that all of their crops must be turned over to local Communist officials.

In return, these farmers receive slips which they must deposit in the local banks. Then they are permitted to buy back a small part of this food for their own use.

But if a farmer want to withdraw the rest of his money (?) he must seek the approval for each withdrawal of the chief Communist banker who decides whether the money is to be used for what the Reds consider a "worthy cause."

This was the report of a man who has fought Communists and communism ever since the first Red party organization appeared in Shanghai in 1920.

Known as "the last of the Chinese warlords," Marshal Yen was commander in chief of the broad northern front, or second military district, during the Japanese war and had Mao's Yenan Communists under his command. On the other end of the front, Chiang Kai-shek commanded the first district from Chungking.

It was a myth, the marshal says, that the Chinese Communists sent their armies against the Japanese.

"They would promise, then make only token fights while they concentrated behind the lines in seizing Japanese equipment and in politically organizing recaptured Chinese territory."

All through World War II, the Reds made careful preparations for the moment they could turn and strike the war-weary Nationalists. At war's end, they did.

There is a statue of 72-year-old Marshal Yen in Taipei, Formosa's biggest city and provisional Nationalist capital. It was erected to honor his resistance against the Communists and at the last 500 Chinese soldiers under his command who died rather than surrender to the Reds.

Chiang himself sees the Nationalist return to the mainland as a two-phase operation. The generalissimo and his advisers are all agreed that their military victory must be accompanied by immediate and sweeping reforms such as those being perfected on the Formosa model.

At the top of the Formosa "showcase" is Chiang's land reform program—complicated, but popular and effective. It has been so popular that more than 40 percent of the former tenant farmers now own their own land.

And with this new incentive, more food is being produced, the living standard has gone up throughout the island and food exports and imports have been balanced.

For the tenant farmer, the purchase of land was simplified. To the former owner, a fair price was paid.

Under Japanese occupation, many tenant farmers delivered more than 55 percent of their crops to the landlords. Chiang's first step was to reduce this to 37.5 percent. The tenant farmer is free to dispose of his share as he chooses. He has a minimum rental agreement of 6 years, with option for renewal.

When Chiang arrived on Formosa in December 1949, he found that more than 20 percent of all arable land was Government-held. This land has now been sold to native farmers at the reasonable price of 2½ times the annual yield, with payments—in commodities rather than cash—stretched over 10 years.

In payment for their land, owners received other sound investments. Seventy percent of their payment was in land bonds, 30 percent in industrial issues. There was no Communist-style expropriation of holdings.

To develop new leaders on Formosa, state agricultural and engineering colleges have been established and modern western methods have been introduced in agriculture, industry and commerce. The government

boasts a sound financial system with effective anti-inflationary measures.

Chiang's reform program also has made way for younger men and for those who have brought back knowledge and skills from studies abroad. I personally was delighted to find that more than 40 graduates of my own New York University now occupy senior positions in the Chinese Government and in the industrial and business life of Formosa.

There are at least that many more with degrees from other leading American Institutions, including Columbia University.

Chiang's own personal chief of staff attended Purdue University and is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute. He is 55-year-old Gen. Sun Li-Jen, who was commander in chief of the Nationalist army from 1950 until his new appointment last year.

Chiang himself is wiry, alert and the picture of determination, despite his 67 years, and his turbulent career of ups and downs in wars, revolutions and political crises.

Attractive, Wellesley-educated Madame Chiang interpreted during some of our talks, but the Generalissimo indicated that he understood much of what I said by repeating softly:

"Ha. Ha. Ha."

This was a bit disconcerting until I learned that it was the Chinese equivalent of our English, "Uh, huh," or "yes, I agree."

These days, as the immediate crises of the Nationalist-held offshore islands approaches, Chiang rises early, eats sparingly, has long consultations with his advisers and devotes as much time as possible to meditation, prayer and reading the philosophers.

His personal philosophy is that true understanding, to be meaningful, must be combined with action. And around this concept he has centered his determination to hold such close-in offshore islands as Quemoy and Matsu while pushing preparations on Formosa for the day of his return to the homeland.

Chiang Kai-shek knows the Communist enemy as few men can. He has been fighting off their attempts to destroy for 30 years.

Chiang is hard-pressed to recall the day when he has had both hands free to devote to government administration and the reforms he is now carrying out so effectively on "Little China." With at least one hand—and frequently both—he always seems to have been forced to fight a war.

In the early 1930's, he fought both the Chinese Communists and the invading Japanese, routing the Reds. Then came the full-scale Japanese war and final victory. But again the Communists struck, and this time Chiang was forced to move his Government to Formosa.

One hundred miles of rough water separate him from the mainland, but he does not regard this as anywhere near the low point of his shifting military and political fortunes.

That came in 1926 after the death of Sun Yat-sen when Chiang refused to accept Soviet domination. At that time, while he was preparing to launch the famed northern expedition which unified China, he could claim the support of only 500 armed men.

[From the New York Journal-American of April 3, 1955]

FATE OF HONG KONG LINKED TO FORMOSA

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the seventh of eight articles by the former American military governor in Berlin, now vice chancellor of New York University, who has just completed a 6-week observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

If we lose Formosa, the British will lose Hong Kong.

The loss of Hong Kong would be a mighty blow. It would give the Communists control of the entire Asian mainland from the 38th parallel in Korea all the way to Hanoi in Indochina. It also would blot out the last western show window and listening post on the China coast.

Yet it is in British Hong Kong these days one hears the most vocal and confused arguments for neutralizing Formosa and forcing Chiang Kai-shek to hand over the offshore islands to the Reds.

Five hundred miles southwest of Formosa is refugee-jammed Hong Kong, an island-and-peninsula crown colony where the British have been conducting business pretty much as usual since 1841, except for that 4-year interruption by the Japanese.

To the British, Hong Kong means business—a valuable market place built around the finest and most beautiful deep-water harbor in the Far East.

They cannot seem to see why politics has to intefere with business at Hong Kong anyway.

Hong Kong is full of contradictions. The British recognize the Peiping Communists as China's legitimate government. At the same time, they are members of SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) whose charter denounces the Reds and their aggressive policies.

ANTI-BRITISH VIEWS CALLED EXTREME

Those in Hong Kong who are openly critical tell you:

1. That the British will go to great lengths in the interests of their world trade.

2. That most any Communist ship can purchase the protection of the British flag for $1 a year.

3. And that the British will be permitted to stay in Hong Kong only so long as they dance to Mao Tse-tung's tune.

I found these criticisms extreme.

It is my view that Hong Kong can be militarily defended, provided the British are able to muster sufficient planes to control the air.

But right now, Hong Kong's chief defense is the threat of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan forces on Mao's flank. Mao doesn't dare attack Hong Kong, launch a major aggression into southeast Asia or resume the fighting in Korea so long as there is a powerful, unfettered nationalist striking force capable of landing right in the middle of his long coastline.

There is no doubt that the British are sincere in their determination to hold Hong Kong—come what may.

The British military commander in Hong Kong, Lt. Gen. Cecil Stanway Sugden, wastes no words. When I asked him about the many statements I had heard that the Communists could take Hong Kong any time they choose, General Sugden scowled:

"Anyone who tries to take Hong Kong will get himself a bloody nose."

HONG KONG TROOPS STAND AT ALERT

You might laugh at this, or it might convince you that the Reds cannot take Hong Kong. In any event, you can bet your last dollar that the British will fight if they have to.

The days of the "Colonel Blimps" are gone. I found a young and spirited British Army in Hong Kong. The guns don't point the wrong way any more, as they did at the start of World War II.

And most of the British fighting men at Hong Kong are manning strong positions out on the peninsula above Kowloon, where they should be, instead of in barracks and social clubs miles from the Red frontier.

Encouraged by Western retreats, Mao Tse-tung is getting bolder by the day. But he must realize that to drive the British out of Hong Kong would require a major operation.

LONDON ATTITUDE ON FORMOSA ERRS

I feel strongly that the British are wrong in their attitude toward Formosa.

They would like to see Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalists just quietly disappear. That would simplify their whole Far Eastern problem and enable them in good conscience to carry on full diplomatic—and commercial—relations with the Communists in Peiping.

Just how can there be effective coordination of major Far Eastern policy between Washington and London when we insist—and rightly—that Chiang represents the legitimate government of China?

Why do the British persist in wooing the Chinese Communists in Peiping?

One answer is that the British insist on doing business wherever they are—in Hong Kong or anywhere else.

There were more than 20 ships in Hong Kong Harbor when I was there. Around each were clustered junks of all sizes and descriptions.

This most important port in the Orient is still dedicated to business—but business is not so good at the moment. The United Nations embargo against sales of arms and strategic materials to Red China has slowed the traffic.

CHINA REDS GET RAIL SHIPMENTS

Peiping wants to sell to obtain Hong Kong dollars which can be deposited in a Hong Kong bank. In turn, the Reds can obtain sterling credit in London, and they can use the sterling in Europe to buy materials for their heavy industries and war preparations.

The Chinese Reds make such purchases particularly in the Eastern European countries. The shipments to China can come by rail through the Soviet Union. Or they can be slipped into Red Chinese ports which are not subject to the Hong Kong checks.

The British at Hong Kong are making a sincere effort to live up to the U. N. embargo against the Chinese Communists. But they feel that the China embargo should not be so severe while the embargoes against the Red satellites in Europe have been relaxed.

BRITISH FLAG FLIES ON COMMUNIST CRAFT

A British official in Hong Kong offered this explanation:

"We don't ask a man the color of his skin or the nature of his political beliefs so long as he doesn't break the law or cause trouble. If he minds his own business, we treat him as we have been treating other businessmen here for the past 100 years."

To get the British flag on a Communist ship, the shipowner must meet stringent requirements. Where the seaworthiness of a ship is involved, the British are just as fussy in Hong Kong as in Liverpool. Every vessel must have a thorough check, particularly the radio communications.

There have been cases just recently where these Communist-owned ships flying the British flag have attempted to run the Nationalist blockade in the Formosan Strait. They are almost always spotted by Nationalist observation posts on offshore islands. Then come the Nationalist gunboats.

In such attacks, the Communist-owned companies get British protection. But it has been noted that the British fighting ships are a bit slower to arrive on the scene in such assistance.

ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO HALT SMUGGLING

The traditional tolerance of British courts makes it virtually impossible to stop smuggling through Hong Kong. Generally the British and Americans cooperate on smuggling controls, although the British have the final word.

British law demands a severe penalty, including up to 3 years in jail, for smuggling. But when a smuggler is caught, he usually escapes with a light sentence—or none at all.

Can the British be persuaded to limit their trade?

At best you can probably get the British to enforce short-term embargoes or blockades. But they do not want to accept export-import restrictions over a long period.

While the United States takes steps to save Formosa and Chiang's potent military force for the non-Communist world, there are suggestions from some British quarters that Mao and Chiang are both bad, and that a new Chinese force is needed.

A third force? Such talk is ridiculous. There have been such suggestions for years, but the truth is that no such creature exists or is likely to.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of April 4, 1955]

FORMOSA: WAR OR PEACE?—CHIANG'S BASTION KEY TO FUTURE—SITUATION TENSE AS TIME RUNS OUT FOR ASIATIC SHOWDOWN

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the final article in a series by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former Military Governor of Berlin, who has just completed a 6-week observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

NEW YORK, April 4.—Time is running out on Quemoy, the little Asian island with the hour-glass shape.

You can feel the air of expectancy as steel-helmeted, camouflaged Chinese Nationalist soldiers sight down their automatic weapons across the 2,000 yards of quiet water to the island next door and the rugged coastline beyond.

Over there are Chinese of another hue—Red. They are the enemy. They keep reminding you with occasional bursts of light artillery fire.

Nationalist foxholes and Communist shells have honeycombed most of the 70 square miles of this ugly, brown clay island at the entrance to Red-held Amoy harbor. Only the air field has escaped. It nestles conveniently behind a range of giant boulders—just where the Red guns can't reach it.

Quemoy is the southern anchor of Chiang Kai-shek's 200-mile chain of islands blockading the Red China coast across the 100-mile strait from Formosa.

It is defended by 50,000 of Chiang's crack Nationalist troops against that oft-threatened Red invasion from the mainland only 5 miles away.

The northern anchor is tiny Matsu and its 7 satellite islands defended by another 20,000 Nationalists. It is against Matsu that the Communists are believed to be preparing their first assault.

Like Iwo-Jima and Tarawa and the other pinpoints that flared from obscurity during World War II, Quemoy and Matsu seem destined to make history.

For it is on these offshore islands flush against the Red coast that the United States must halt its retreat from communism and make a stand.

Here, on the Red Chinese doorstep, the destruction of communism must begin before it can destroy us.

To guard Formosa and the nearby Pescadores is no longer enough. We have announced to the world that Chiang Kai-shek is our friend and ally in our common fight against the Communist menace.

His Nationalist troops on Quemoy and Matsu wear the same Nationalist uniforms as those on Formosa. They, too, are friends and allies.

A 6-week personal observation tour of the Far East has convinced me that this is the turning point in our relations with the rest of the world.

If we Americans now allow Chiang Kai-shek's troops—our allies—to be annihilated on Quemoy and Matsu, we won't have a friend left in Asia. All of Asia, I am convinced, would go Communist.

Until my visit to the Far East, I was not aware of the terrible blow our prestige suffered throughout Asia through our appeasement of the Communist enemy in Korea.

The Korean disaster gave our morale a terrible blow as well. It planted many dangerous seeds of national cynicism.

In the interests of our relations with our allies and our faith in ourselves, we cannot afford another withdrawal. We cannot give respectability again to men with blood on their hands. We cannot endure their insults around another propaganda table.

If we do not now live up to our obligations with the only powerful anti-Communist military forces in Asia, how can we ask other countries to be our trusted allies?

We must say to the Chinese Reds and to their masters in the Kremlin:

"Chiang Kai-shek is our ally. If you strike him you have struck us—on Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa or anywhere else."

Do we have a choice? If we didn't want to help defend Quemoy and Matsu, if we were not ready to oppose the world Communist conspiracy anywhere and everywhere, then we should not have signed a mutual defense pact with Chiang.

We should have pulled off Formosa and withdrawn our Asian defense line to Pearl Harbor, or even San Francisco.

Since my return, I have been asked many times if I agree with the personal views and beliefs of Chiang. This is beside the point.

I do not consider Chiang's personal views to be any of my business. I do not care whether he is a Methodist instead of a Buddhist, or whether he eats with chopsticks instead of knife and fork.

The views and beliefs of Chiang Kai-shek should be judged today only insofar as they affect our foremost and gravest responsibility: To get rid of the military threat that aims to destroy us from the outside and the subversive threat that aims to weaken us from within. That threat is communism.

Let me state it this way:

The basic policy of Soviet communism is our destruction and world conquest. The key to this policy is the threat of force and the actual use of force when a mere threat fails.

The threat of force put the Balkans under Soviet domination. The use of force swept China and half of Indochina into the Red camp.

We know that the force which threatens us comes directly from Moscow. The past 10 years have taught us that the Soviets will use any kind of force—military, economic, psychological * * * anything—to bring our downfall.

We have tried to appease them and get along with them. They have replied with blockades and attacks. Nor is there any sense in kidding ourselves that these people will simply go away—disappear.

Our only course of action is to put an end to the menace created by an enemy that threatens to use force against us. If it were not for the United States and our H-bomb superiority, the Russians would be using force and threats of force against ourselves and more of our allies today.

It is time we stopped getting pushed around. We have every right to determine how we shall live. We must guard that right.

Right now the most powerful threat the Kremlin holds against us is Red China. To my mind, Mao Tse-tung is also the most vulnerable spot in the Red line.

The road to the Communist downfall is through Asia, and the dagger for Mao's heart is Chiang Kai-shek with his 600,000 ready-made Communist-hating troops and a strategic position just off Mao's flank.

If Mao could be given a decisive defeat on Quemoy and Matsu, I feel that the entire Asian picture would change. Mao's unpopular puppet regime would be en route toward collapse.

Help Chiang knock out Mao Tse-tung, and you have won the first round for a friendly China, a friendly Asia.

The Chinese field commanders say that with United States air support, the Nationalists could hold Quemoy and Matsu against any Communist invasion attempt. I regard this view as militarily sound.

Suppose we do support the Nationalists in a battle with the Chinese Reds over the offshore islands? We then come to this question:

What about Russia? Would the Soviets come to the aid of the Chinese Reds and touch off a third world war?

It is my view—based on the best available information—that Moscow is not ready for war. Nor would the Kremlin look favorably at this time on a wholesale destruction contest involving our superior thermonuclear weapons.

There is further evidence that Moscow is not prepared to back Mao in a shooting war, any more than the Red Army did in Korea. The Soviets, we know, work according to a long-range timetable. They are cunning and realistic in their planning. They may even anticipate an occasional reversal.

Nothing we do to Mao would make the Soviets change this long-range plan. Of all the enemies we have ever faced, this one cares the least about what we say or think or even do. The Kremlin has its own special pattern for our destruction and intends to follow it.

What, then, are the practical steps? What should we do?

We must supply encouragement, training, and all available weapons—including our tactical atomic weapons—to our allies who are struggling against Soviet threats and domination. The place to begin is Formosa with a dedicated leader and a powerful fighting force.

The sabrejets we have just delivered to Chiang should be only the beginning. We should provide him with more planes, more ships, more of our top military instructors, more military supplies and equipment.

We should support the organization of volunteer air units, and equip them with our newest planes—just as we fought the Japanese with the famed Flying Tigers before Pearl Harbor.

At the same time, let us once and for all clear up that confused question of recognizing Communist China. Britain and several other countries have extended diplomatic recognition to the Mao Tse-tung regime.

The United States Government is being urged from various quarters to follow suit.

The surest way to settle this matter is to announce to the world the absolute minimum conditions under which we could recognize the Red regime. Those terms should be:

1. That Mao resign as head of the Government.

2. That the Peiping regime agree to free elections throughout China under international supervision.

3. That the Communists free immediately all United States prisoners and that they may pay in full for the thousands of lives and the billions of dollars damage their volunteers cost us in Korea.

4. That the Chinese Reds turn over to international tribunals all war criminals guilty of atrocities and acts against humanity, particularly in Korea.

Mao obviously would not accept such condition. We should accept nothing less.

On the basis of what we know about him and our experience in Korea, how can we even seriously discuss recognizing Mao and his regime? I say we cannot hope to exist side by side with Mao Tse-tung any more than we can hope to coexist with the men in the Kremlin who plot our destruction.

Now is the time to move in Asia while the Russians are beginning to betray their un-

rest in Europe. They are afraid of the consolidation of the anti-Communist forces in Western Europe, particularly of a re-armed West Germany.

Now is the time to hasten the destruction of the Communist regime in China—while it is still too weak and internally rotten to rally support.

I am convinced that the fall of Mao would set the pattern for the collapse of other flimsy Communist regimes—in North Korea, Indochina, the Balkans, and the Baltic.

And that would be a signal to the neutralists of India, Indonesia and Burma—once relieved of the threat in their own backyard—to see communism clearly for the facade it is.

The Communist house of cards can collapse all the way back to the Soviet borders, and even within Russia itself.

This is not just wishful thinking. It is feasible and possible, if we recognize our great opportunity and seize it. But if we permit the Communists to gain equality with us, there will be no peace on earth.

In the event, we may find ourselves confronted with the situation described by a retiring American Ambassador who predicted gloomily:

"We will give up our way of life because we will not be willing to destroy the world and the Soviet Union will be willing to destroy it."

I don't buy that. There is still time for us to win without the world being destroyed.

Formosa can be our great opportunity for peace. But we must stop confusing those who sincerely would be our allies. We must recognize them and help them.

We must, above all, lead with strength and determination—not weakness and vacillation.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 30, 1955]

FORMOSA: WAR OR PEACE?—HOWLEY SCORES POLICY ON ASIA

(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, United States Army, retired, vice chancellor, New York University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third of eight articles by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former American military governor in Berlin, who has just returned from an intensive observation tour of Formosa and the Far East.)

NEW YORK, March 30.—American Far East policy is thoroughly confusing our Chinese friends on Formosa today.

They cannot understand the conflicting interpretations of the mutual defense treaty recently signed by the United States and Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government.

Can there be such a thing as a limited friendship, they ask?

What do the Americans mean when they say they are friends of the Chinese Nationalists and will help them defend Formosa and the nearby Pescadores, but then take a different view on the Nationalist-held islands off the China mainland?

It is difficult to disagree when the average Chinese reasons that the Americans should be allies 10 miles off the China coast, if they are friends and allies 100 miles away.

After a 6-week observation tour of the area, it is my conclusion that Quemoy, Matsu, and the other Nationalist-held islands nestling against the Red-held mainland are our most valuable pieces of real estate in the Far East today.

I say this for three reasons:

1. These islands enable Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists to bottle up Mao Tse-tung's Red regime with a clever blockade along 200 miles of strategic seafront.

2. So long as they remain in Nationalist hands, these offshore islands prevent the Communists from ever attempting an amphibious invasion of Formosa.

3. And they offer ready-made stepping stones for Chiang's eventual counteroffensive to liberate his Chinese homeland.

Chiang Kai-shek is right in his determination to keep these islands—with or without the United States. There is no doubt in my mind that they can be held.

They must be or our entire position in Asia will crumble. It is already tottering.

We already have suffered a great blow to prestige and psychological position by talking Chiang into withdrawing from the Tachens and the other islands at the northern end of his offshore lines.

If Quemoy and Matsu and the other islands of this strategic line are now abandoned, we shall confirm Mao Tse-tung's claim that America is nothing more than a "paper dragon."

It is sad but true that our stock is not very high in Asia today. Our words no longer carry much weight. The Communists and the hundreds of millions who want to be on the winning side see us as a nation of strong talk and little action.

All Asia is speculating on just what the Americans mean when they say they are "allies and friends."

Is it any wonder? The Asians have heard us talk loud and all too long about Korea—and with what result? We have accepted one of the greatest insults ever hurled at any nation.

The Asians have watched us accept Communist-drawn lines in Korea and bury our dead. They have seen us agree finally to a status quo, with no punishment for those who subjected us to such international humiliation.

They have heard loud talk about Indochina, and again, when the Communists moved into action, they have seen us renege.

Now they have just witnessed an American-engineered withdrawal from the northern strategic islands held by the Nationalists on the Communist doorstep.

When you read about Quemoy and Matsu, you must remember that these are only two links in a long chain of islands stretching all the way from the mouth of China's most important river—the Yangtse at Shanghai—down to the British crown colony of Hong Kong.

Most of their names are unknown to us. Some of the islands are mere dots from the air, almost within walking distance of the mainland at low tide.

At the northern end of this chain, Toumen, Yikiangshan and the Tachen Islands could have provided an effective blockade of Red China's most important river and its most important port.

So long as these islands were in Nationalist hands, the Reds faced tremendous shipping problems. Even if trade were reopened with Japan, how could the old heavy commercial flow be reestablished through Shanghai?

Now the big port of Shanghai is free to do business with the world.

It is true that these northern islands could not be held by the Nationalists alone. But they could have been held with United States support—with the aid of the powerful United States 7th Fleet and land-based planes.

We control the air and the sea in the Formosa Strait. Without complete control of these, no island can be taken.

But the northern islands are gone—abandoned to the Reds. The question now centers on the remaining blockade islands, the biggest of which are Quemoy and Matsu.

By holding these islands, the Nationalists still maintain an effective blockade of China's two most important rivers to the south.

The mouth of the Min River is at Foochow, the mouth of the Kiulung at Amoy. Just off Foochow harbor lies Matsu. Just off Amoy is Quemoy.

Quemoy, with its 50,000 Nationalist troops, blocks Amoy's 10,000-ton-ship harbor. What can be said for Quemoy can be said for Matsu at Foochow.

Mao Tse-tung knows that he must get these islands out of his way. They not only constitute a military threat to the mainland, but a heavy economic burden on the Reds.

The China mainland, with its nearly 4 million square miles and its population of 600 million, has only 15,000 miles of railroad. The United States has 226,000 miles.

Despite China's vast territory, larger than the United States, it has almost no modern roads and only 40,000 trucks. By comparison, there are 10 million trucks on the highways of the United States.

To the Reds river and coastal shipping are vital. They must employ water transport if they are to gather strength for future aggression, or if they are to maintain their economy at even a semi-starvation rate.

The Communists are painfully aware of just how much Chiang's island blockade has been hurting.

Amoy often has been mentioned as the likeliest invasion harbor for a Red strike against Formosa. But even this key port has no mainline railroad. It is connected with the interior only by an old highway.

It would not be possible for the Reds to mass troops or invasion craft at Amoy—or anywhere to the north, short of Shanghai—unless they were free to use coastal shipping lanes for a buildup.

A few weeks ago I flew to Quemoy and inspected the fortifications. I had a long talk with the Nationalist commanding general, Liu-Yu Chang. His statements clearly reflected the attitude of the defending troops and the civilian population.

"We will fight for these islands and hold them," he told me. "Even the civil population has taken an oath to stay here and support us. In 1949—the last time the Communists came—17,000 Reds attacked and 17,000 were annihilated."

It is the general opinion—which I support—that Quemoy and the other offshore islands can be held against any Red force—if the Nationalists are given American air support.

Gen. Huang Chih, commander in chief of the Nationalist army, told me that, given United States support, the Nationalists could bury the dreams of Mao Tse-tung on Quemoy, if the Reds ever sought to stage a frontal assault.

Let me put it this way: It is no military secret that amphibious troops are the most highly trained in the world. They are more difficult to develop than ground assault troops.

It is my opinion that if the 250,000 Red troops opposite Quemoy were to attack, they might take the island, as things now stand. But at least half of this force would go to watery graves.

On the other hand, a firm American policy to hold these offshore islands would make it impossible for these Communist troops even to reach Quemoy.

No troops, however well trained, can cross even 2,000 yards of rough water on barn doors, as the Russian hordes crossed the narrow Oder River in Germany.

The place to stop an amphibious operation is before it starts. There are few places in the world today better for using our tactical atomic weapons than on the Red mainland opposite Quemoy.

Here, in this open country, they could be used with devastating effect on purely military targets against an enemy dedicated to our destruction. Here there would be little, if any, danger of injury to civilian populations.

While we confuse our Chinese Nationalist allies with such terms as limited treaty, the Russians are dramatizing themselves on the mainland as the big brother of the Chinese people.

The Soviets see that every slight bit of aid is accompanied by reams of propaganda, though actually they charge Peiping for every item.

While we speak of helping the Nationalists defend Formosa and the Pescadores, the Russians talk boldly and assure the Communist Chinese of unlimited support.

A great propaganda battle is being waged today in this struggle between the legitimate Government of China, that of Chiang Kai-shek, and the illegitimate Government of Mao Tse-tung.

From Quemoy, loudspeakers can be heard on the mainland. And the Reds on the mainland have set up noisemakers to interfere with the messages broadcast from Quemoy.

Fishermen from the mainland meet fishermen from Quemoy and talk as fishermen have done through the ages about conditions at home.

This propaganda battle is all-important to keep alive the liberation hopes of those countless Chinese on the mainland who live for the day the Communist regime will fall.

Untold strength could be given this fight against the Peiping Reds if the United States would announce a sound policy eliminating the confusion and guaranteeing Nationalist control of the offshore islands.

From a military and political viewpoint, the best thing for the future peace of the world might well be a concentrated attack by the forces of Mao Tse-tung against Quemoy—an assault which could be crushed overwhelmingly by Chiang's ground forces with American air support.

Should we abandon Quemoy and Matsu, the way we have the Tachens?

My answer is emphatically no—unless we want to concede final victory in the Far East to Mao Tse-tung and the Communists.

THE GYPSY MOTH CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the gypsy moth control program is a part of the overall Department of Agriculture pest-control program. Appropriations for the Federal share of the gypsy moth program are included in the pending bill, H. R. 5239, the Agricultural and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill for 1956.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on this matter together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Regional Coordinating Committee on Gypsy Moth Control of the Council of State Governments at Boston on February 17, 1955; a brief excerpt from the testimony of Frank A. Soraci, Chairman of the National Plant Board, before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations; and an excerpt from A Report on the Insect and Plant Disease Control Programs of the United States Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement, resolution, excerpt from testimony, and excerpt from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The gypsy moth, which was introduced accidently into this country around 1869, has infested most of New England and parts of New York. Outbreaks have been stamped out in New Jersey and Pennsylvania only after strenuous efforts.

Better known in its caterpillar stage, the gypsy moth feeds on oak, poplar, willow, gray birch, apple, and pear trees. Each year the loss, real and aesthetic, to our defoliated timberlands, national forests, game reserves, and private property runs into the millions.

The gypsy moth has grown progressively worse in the infested areas. The threat that the problem will spread into other areas of the country is ever present.

A Department of Agriculture survey has shown that more than 100-million acres of valuable forest growth east of the Mississippi River are highly susceptible to severe damage if invaded by the gypsy moth. That the gypsy moth or its larvae may be carried into distant areas, infesting those areas, is well illustrated by the case in Lansing, Mich., where an outbreak was discovered last year in a residential section of that city.

Fortunately, a concentrated spraying in Lansing practically exterminated the insect. It is expected that follow-up operations in that area this year will completely eliminate this infestation.

This case in Michigan illustrates a point which I would like to develop. It brings out the fact that such concentrated spraying in infested areas can eliminate gypsy moths. Until the present time, the Federal Government has allocated funds on the basis of preventing the disease from spreading from the infested northeastern areas to noninfested areas. This method does not attack the problem at its roots; it is not only a waste of time, but a waste of money. In the light of current facts the present program is neither the soundest nor the least expensive in the long run.

The only sound approach is to institute an eradication program. It has been estimated that such an eradication program, with State and Federal funds combined, would cost about $25 million spent over a 5-year period. Continuation of the present program at the present level of spending would cost something approaching $15 million in the next 5 years. And this figure does not include the millions of dollars of damage that would be done to timberlands, national forest reserves, recreational areas, and private property. It is almost impossible to measure the damage that is done yearly by this insect, but during a year when infestation is severe, real and aesthetic damage could run between 10 and 20 million dollars. Aside from feeding on trees and destroying much valuable timber that is essential to the country's economic welfare, the ravagings of this insect also increases forest fire hazards by leaving trees rotted and dead. It also destroys private and resort areas by making them so unsightly that they lose their value.

At the present time, on a preventive basis, the Federal Government is allocating only $525,800, while the States in the infested areas have allocated some $2,300,000 to fight the problem internally. As we can see, the Federal allocation is far short of the real financial need if we are to attack the problem realistically. The amount the various States are expending for 1955 is practically the amount they would be expected to share under a 5-year eradication program.

Although less than 2 percent of the United States is in the generally infested area, Federal expenditures to eliminate this nuisance are amply justified on the basis of preventing spread of the gypsy moth to areas not yet infested.

In the interests of long-range economy, the Federal Government should enlist the support of the States concerned in a gypsy moth eradication program rather than continuing the present control program.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GYPSY MOTH CONTROL OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS, BOSTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 17, 1955

Whereas of the 130 million acres of land susceptible to gypsy moth infestation only 30 million acres are in the Northeastern States; and

Whereas the infested States of the Northeast in the current fiscal year are expending approximately $1,350,000 for the control and prevention of spread of the gypsy moth; and

Whereas a special study group appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1950 made an extensive study of the gypsy moth problem and recommended some alternative approaches; and

Whereas the Plant Pest Control Branch of the Agricultural Research Service submitted the alternative of a 7-point program for preventing further spread of the gypsy moth to uninfested areas; and

Whereas the affected States have in large measure assumed their responsibilities under the 7-point program; and

Whereas the funds necessary for the vital portion of the 7-point program which is the responsibility of the Plant Pest Control Branch have not been appropriated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Regional Coordinating Committee on Gypsy Moth Control, That the Congress of the United States be requested to appropriate such funds as may be necessary for the fiscal year 1955–56 to provide an adequate program for gypsy moth control and eradication; and be it further

Resolved, That in the opinion of this committee, an appropriation of less than a million dollars for the fiscal year 1955–56 would in effect be merely a token toward implementing the necessary program in the gypsy moth barrier zone, and that additional funds spent at the rate of approximately $1 per acre in such zone are needed to carry out the Federal Government's responsibility to prevent spread of the gypsy moth into susceptible uninfested areas to the south and west; in addition, we urge that an appropriation be made to provide Federal financial assistance for suppressing the gypsy moth in the areas to the east of the barrier zone which already are infested.

BRIEF EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF FRANK A. SORACI, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL PLANT BOARD, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, APRIL 20, 1955

We would call your attention to serious deficiencies which threaten to cancel out much of the very successful work of past years along the lines of foreign plant quarantines, gypsy moth control, and—for the lack of a better name—emergency outbreaks.

My own State of New Jersey, the Eastern States, and the rest of the 48 States are very much concerned with the spread of the gypsy moth which has occurred in the last 2 years. This insect has, in these 2 years, established beachheads within and beyond a barrier zone, where eradication work has been centered for some 30 years in preventing westward dispersion of the moth. Barrier zone work has had the combined efforts of Federal and State agencies.

A year ago the plant boards asked the Appropriation Committees to consider the appropriation of $860,000 for gypsy moth control. This amount of money would have afforded treatment of at least 300,000 additional acres in the barrier zone. The money was asked for that purpose. The Congress was generous and we were thankful that at least the appropriation was not reduced last year. The budget had carried only $197,200 for this item but the Congress did show its awareness of the need by restoring the program to the 1954 level of $528,800. The same amount is in the bill for 1956. At least $1 million is needed for 1956 and that will allow the treatment of only about one-third of the newly infested lands in the barrier zone. The information here presented on this subject has been developed through the work of the Gypsy Moth Coordinating Committee of the Council of State Governments, which reappraised the needs

for this program, State by State and federally, just 2 months ago. Senator PAYNE, of Maine, presented a statement on this subject for the New England Senators before this committee on May 5, 1954. He outlined the need for $861,000 for last year's program. We have been very grateful for the support given by our representatives and hope that necessary appropriations might be made to allow accomplishment of the objectives of this program. Some 3,000 square miles of new territory on the western border of the infestation need treatment within a short period, if this insect is to be confined to the New England States and New York. It should also be stated that there is agreement at the present time that every consideration should be given to a program that might clean out the insect from the infested States. Federal and State financing of such a program, over a period of years, might now be possible with the new and extremely effective insecticides and equipment.

EXCERPT FROM A REPORT ON THE INSECT AND PLANT DISEASE CONTROL PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, 1952

GYPSY MOTH

Description and history

The gypsy moth is a small, creamy white insect, which was accidentaly introduced into this country in 1869 from southern Europe. The female moth deposits eggs on tree trunks, stones, lumber, or almost any object or debris on the ground. The larvae hatch early in the spring. Federal participation in the control of the gypsy moth began in 1906.

Host

The gypsy moth is a serious pest of forest and shade trees.

Distribution

The gypsy moth is presently confined to New England and eastern New York. As the female moth is unable to fly, natural spread is relatively slow. However, the eggs are deposited on many objects transported by man; thus artificial spread is a constant threat.

Economic importance

Defoliation caused by gypsy moth caterpillars retards growth and weakens the trees. Repeated defoliation injures or kills the trees. If permitted to spread unhampered, the gypsy moth probably would cause serious damage throughout the hardwood area east of the Mississippi River.

Current program

The purpose of the current program is (a) to eradicate the gypsy moth from outlying areas of infestation, (b) to prevent further extension of the generally infested areas which now comprise New England and eastern New York, and (c) to furnish technical assistance to State and local agencies undertaking eradication or suppression of the pest within the generally infested area.

Prevention of spread and control are accomplished by (a) the enforcement of Federal and State quarantines governing the movement of forest products and other commodities likely to carry gypsy moth egg masses to uninfested areas, (b) the application of sprays to eradicate outlying and peripheral infestations, and (c) providing technical assistance to towns or communities within the generally infested area where local eradication is the objective. Systematic surveys are made annually to detect promptly any infestation beyond the quarantine line and to establish limits of areas scheduled for treatment.

Until recent years control methods were costly, but with the development of airplane spraying and more efficient ground equipment, control measures have been greatly improved and the cost of eradication has been reduced to about $1 per acre.

The application of insecticides by airplanes and new-type mist blowers has eliminated the gypsy moth from more than 368,000 acres in eastern Pennsylvania since 1945. Since 1948, spraying has virtually eliminated the gypsy moth from more than 400,000 acres in eastern New York, and 700,000 acres in southeastern Massachusetts. These States have expended large sums in these control operations.

Appraisal

(a) A majority of the experts who appeared before the study group expressed the opinion that with control methods now available, eradication of the gypsy moth is possible and practicable. Some entomologists support the view that while the population can be reduced considerably to avoid great damage, we must learn to live with the insect. Evidence seems to be adequate, however, including the experience in Pennsylvania, that eradication is possible. This raises a question as to the kind of program that should be conducted.

(b) The present program, in the light of current facts, is not the soundest program nor the least expensive from a longtime standpoint. It would necessitate continued expenditures over a long period of time and would allow damage to continue even though substantial sums are being spent on control measures.

(c) The study group recommends that the entire infested area be treated for eradication in a period not to exceed 5 years. It is estimated that on the basis of present costs such a 5-year program would cost approximately $25 million, whereas continuation of the present program would cost nearer $100 million over a period of 50 years. In addition to the lower cost of eradication, continuing losses caused by the moth in the intervening period would be avoided by this plan. The possible limiting factors to this recommendation are funds, insecticides, properly equipped airplanes, available airstrips in the area, and ground work necessary for delineating the areas to be covered. It is estimated that 5 years will be required for proper delineation of the areas. Insecticides, airplanes, and airstrips are or will be available to carry out the project in this time. The provision of adequate funds therefore would make the project possible.

(d) If the 5-year eradication plan is adopted, the costs should be met by about $15 million from State and local sources and about $10 million from the Federal Government. The proportion of Federal and State funds should probably not be the same for all States since some States have a far greater interest in eradication than do others, as well as far greater damage in the infested area.

(e) The development of an areawide plan for carrying out control operations is recommended.

(f) An alternative to the program recommended is to limit Federal participation to surveys, Federal quarantine, and technical assistance in districts organized for control purposes and financed by State or local sources. This would mean continuous Federal and State expenditures and damage from the insects. The possibility of spread to include the entire hardwood area east of the Mississippi River would continue.

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL GUARD—EDITORIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the officers and enlisted men of America's National Guard on their splendid performance in the Operation Minute Man test exercise.

I am pleased to say that Wisconsin's own 32d Division responded highly effectively to the statewide test alert. According to Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, able commander of our 32d, some 9,674 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men reported out of the division's strength of 10,700.

Our National Guard represents, of course, America's alert sentinels of defense and I want to congratulate it on their outstanding achievement throughout the Nation.

I present an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of April 23 on this theme, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARD UNITS PROVE READY FOR DUTY

Pride and reassurance came to citizens here and throughout the United States this week in the swift assembly of National Guard units. The test of preparedness was announced weeks ago, but all that was known was that such a test was contemplated. The response to the test alert gave evidence that the citizen soldiers are ready for duty on extremely short notice, and that any emergency will find them at assigned posts with almost no delay.

The Janesville quartermaster company, with some of its personnel enlisted from nearby communities, established the extraordinary record of a 97-percent mobilization, and with two-thirds of its men on duty within an hour. It is expected that this record will considerably exceed the national average when final figures are available.

Whether or not this is true, the 97-percent response is fine evidence of interest of guardsmen and a tribute to officers in charge.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 5239, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the unfinished business, the agriculture appropriation bill, is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 7, after the word "Stations", to strike out "$37,000,000" and insert "$38,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 8, after the amendment above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not less than $200,000 of this appropriation shall be available to conduct a special study of (1) the effect on farm income and the general economy of the United States of acreage reductions imposed on 1954 and 1955 crops, and (2) the most satisfactory solution to this problem, including the encouragement of sound soil-conservation practices upon land diverted from production under such acreage restrictions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 20, after the word "law", to strike out "$17,750,000" and insert "$18,758,700."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the amendment now before the Senate is the one relating to the agricultural research program of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the amendment relating to agricultural research has been passed over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we may return to the consideration of the amendment relating to the agricultural research program, since the action taken on it occurred rather quickly, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if the amendment covers some of the publications in the field of research, as well as the conduct of the research itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. The item covers certain of the publications; it does not affect all of them. It covers the publications in the field of home economics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it cover home economics?

Mr. RUSSELL. It relates to the field of home economics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if I am correct in my understanding that the Department of Agriculture is now discontinuing research in the field of household equipment and appliances, and also in the field of clothing and textiles? That seems to be indicated by a letter dated February 25, 1955, signed by Mr. B. T. Shaw, addressed to Hazel K. Stiebling, Director of Human Nutrition and Home Economics Research, and published on pages 502 and 503 of the Senate hearings. The letter indicates that those types of research are to be discontinued.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was considerable testimony before the committee as to what the Department official, Mr. Shaw, termed a shift from research in home economics to research in human nutrition. The testimony indicated that the principal emphasis in this field would be on food and nutrition research, but that there would be a severe curtailment of the research in home appliances and, perhaps, in textiles and clothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that this curtailment largely grew out of an attack which General Eisenhower made during his campaign against a bulletin which the Department of Agriculture issued on the subject of how to wash dishes. The general, I am told, at various stops in his campaign, would hold up the bulletin and point out to the assembled groups that he regarded it as a waste of funds to publish bulletins on how to wash dishes better. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid I cannot answer the Senator's question categorically, because it so happened that I did not hear General Eisenhower speak during the presidential campaign. I know that for a long time there have been attacks upon waste in Government incident to the publication of such articles.

I recall that shortly after I became a Member of the Senate a distinguished Senator exhibited a publication by the Government, printed at the expense of the taxpayers, entitled "The Love Life of the Bullfrog." There was considerable amusement at the expense of that publication.

I do not challenge the statement that General Eisenhower used the pamphlet to which the Senator from Illinois refers, but I cannot of my own knowledge affirm or deny it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that the press accounts of the campaign will indicate that the statement is correct.

Under date of February 25, 1925, Mr. B. T. Shaw, administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, directed a letter to Hazel K. Stiebeling, director of human nutrition and home economics research, which contained the following statement:

1. Arrange for the discontinuance of research in the Home Economics Research Branch relating to operating characteristics and performance requirements of commercially produced household equipment and appliances and the preparation of popular and semipopular publications on the selection, care, and use of such goods.

I infer that this directive is the result of the attack which the President made on the dishwashing process. I assume it was discovered that the bulletin was still being produced by the Department of Agriculture, and that it was causing some embarrassment to the administration. Now the embarrassment is to be removed by discontinuing the publication of bulletins on dishwashing.

Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that for the main mass of American farmers, if not for the large contributors to the Republican Party, dishwashing is among the important household activities, and that the saving of the time and labor of housewives is worth while?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, anyone who has any knowledge of the primary importance of cleanliness knows that dishwashing is of vital importance to any well-conducted home. I am glad that I have finally reached the age where I cannot be attached by compulsion to anything like dishwashing. There was a time in my life when there was compulsion on me to dry dishes. In a household which varied in number from 12 to 18, it was quite a chore.

There are two chores as to which I am glad I am no longer under compulsion. One is the taking of castor oil; the other is the drying of dishes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Dishwashing is not an operation which millions of householders enjoy.

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Bachelors may perhaps be exempt from dishwashing, but not benedicts.

So is it not important that housewives should know about dishwashing equipment, even though it may seem to be unimportant to the large contributors to the campaign funds of the Republican Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think that anything which would lighten the burden of dishwashing, or any other work in the kitchen of the American home, where so many of the housewives of the Nation spend the major portion of their waking hours, would be of tremendous importance.

I am not familiar with the specific publication to which the Senator adverts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that housewives should have information about clothing and textiles, so that they can make garments for their families? Is not this particularly important in the case of low-income families?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was considerable testimony in that field. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has advised me that he intends to propose an amendment relating to that function of the Department of Agriculture. It was for that reason that I requested that this amendment be passed over for the time being.

The Senator from Mississippi proposes, at a slightly later time, to offer an amendment which would, to some extent, cause a revision of the program of the Department of Agriculture Research Service. At least, it would make available some funds for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to learn that the Senator from Mississippi intends to offer such an amendment. I am certain the Senator from Georgia is also aware of some of the other activities of the Research Service of the Agriculture Department. For instance I find in the House hearings, part 2, on page 465, a statement by Dr. Shaw that we have been sponsoring research on the orchids of Guatemala. Does the Senator from Georgia believe that sponsoring research on the orchids of Guatemala would be of great aid to the hard-pressed farm housewives of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, if it comes to competition between research on the

orchids of Guatemala and research which would lighten the burdens of the housewife of America, it would be not only political wisdom but also the very natural instinct of every American to favor research which would result in lightening the load on the American housewife.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that an administration which will poke fun at publishing bulletins on kitchen equipment will nevertheless spend money studying the orchids of Guatemala?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure there is provision for a study of the orchids of Guatemala.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, such research has been carried out.

Mr. RUSSELL. If a study is being conducted in that field, I would say I would prefer that work be done in matters which relate to the lightening of the burdens of the housewives of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 465 of the House hearings, part 2, the Senator from Georgia will find a statement that such a project has been sponsored, as well as a project on "flora of Dominica." The word "flora" is a fancy word for "flowers." "Dominica" means an island in the Caribbean, one of the Antilles.

So here we see an administration which is so solicitous of protecting the taxpayers' money that it does not permit research in the field of textiles from which clothing is made, or in the field of dishwashing appliances or household equipment, and yet sponsors research of orchids in Guatemala and flowers in Dominica. Does the Senator believe that fact indicates a certain bias on the part of the administration and a disposition to believe that it is important for the wealthy to wear orchids, but not important for the housewives to have better dishwashing machines?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is not the type of research to be conducted by the Department of Agriculture determined by advisory committees, who make their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture? Entirely aside from any political considerations which the Senator from Illinois seems to indicate, the research of the Department of Agriculture is conducted entirely because of the recommendations of the various committees, and I think they are good committees, appointed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may be, but the stand taken by General Eisenhower, now President, about the study of dishwashing certainly had some effect on the committees and the Department. It will be noticed that by order of the administrator, all research in respect to household equipment, and research having to do with the use of garments and making clothing, was discontinued; but research in the field of orchids was highly desirable. Does it not indicate a rather poor sense of values to say that we should spend money on the study of orchids, but not on research with respect to dishwashers? Is not this one of the manifestations of the so-called trickle-down theory of prosperity—that if the wearers of orchids are enabled to have more beautiful blooms, we will not need to worry about housewives on farms in North Dakota or Illinois or anywhere else in the country who have to wash dishes and make clothes for their children because of the low prices of farm products?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is there not a vast amount of information available to every housewife from producers of electrical equipment, including dishwashers? Housewives can get all the information they want merely by going to the corner store.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is much better to get such information from official sources than from commercial producers.

Mr. President, the Senate is not now considering the bill relating to the Interior Department, but I am told the Interior Department is conducting a research on oysters. For example, it has a project on how to shuck oysters without losing the juice. It will be very interesting to see that publication when it is issued under the auspices of the Department of the Interior, and I hope the administration will be as zealous in protecting the taxpayers from waste of public funds on such matters as they have been zealous in trying to deprive the housewives, and particularly farm housewives, of information on textiles, clothing, and household equipment.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he has studied some of the bulletins of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must confess that my study in that field has been somewhat limited. I have not made any intensive investigation of the bulletins issued by the Department of Agriculture, and I might say that is particularly true of the field of home economics. I have had occasion to look into some of the bulletins which have to do with production of crops and conservation of soil and water, and matters of that kind; but my study in the field of home economics has been rather limited.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Georgia that, as he probably knows, I have been very critical of the failure of the administration to deal with the problems of distressed areas in this country; the distressed areas in the State of Maine, for example, a State so well represented in part, by the present acting minority leader, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] the distressed areas in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, the distressed areas in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, and Alabama, and the drought-ridden areas of the Southwest. I have been very critical of the attitude of the administration and its failure to provide adequate relief for such areas. But the administration has taken one step to help the people, which I think should be mentioned, because I hold in my hand a bulletin issued by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which is entitled "Ways To Cook Rabbit."

I think this bulletin will be of real assistance to the people of the regions I have mentioned. For instance, the bulletin contains a number of recipes for cooking rabbit, and I am sure people living in the areas I have indicated will be greatly aided by the knowledge that they can cook rabbits in the ways set forth.

For instance, there is a recipe for rabbit a-la-king. There are also recipes as follows: Rabbit baked hash; braised rabbit, with gravy; browned rabbit; chop suey rabbit; creamed rabbit; creole rabbit; curried rabbit; rabbit fricassee with vegetables; fried rabbit; and this will particularly appeal to the German-American farmers—rabbit hassenpfeffer. There are also recipes for rabbit in barbecue sauce; rabbit pie; rabbit-ham croquettes; rabbit salad; rabbit salad loaf; rabbit sandwich spread; stewed rabbit; sweet-sour rabbit; and rabbit with dumplings.

Does not the Senator from Georgia feel this is a magnificent effort by the administration to assist in solving the problems of distressed areas, so that when other forms of support disappear, the people in those areas can go forth and catch rabbits and have the aid of this bulletin, which teaches them how to cook rabbit?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope nobody will prevent the publication of this bulletin. I had a friend in Georgia who told me once the way he knew the last Republican administration that was in charge of the Government of the United States had been superseded was that he saw a rabbit run across his field without two men chasing it. I hope the bulletin is not prophetic, and that there will not develop such a situation that we will see two men running after a rabbit in order to catch it so they can take something home to eat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am told that in sections of southern Illinois the number of people chasing rabbits is so greatly in excess of the number of rabbits that this bulletin is not of much help. Perhaps the bureau should issue another bulletin telling people how to catch rabbits or how to raise rabbits so that they may have a sufficient supply of rabbits to cook.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me an appropriate bulletin would be one on how to catch rabbits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does this remind the Senator of the alleged comment by Marie Antoinette, at the time of the French Revolution, when she was told that the populace of Paris could not find bread to eat? She is alleged to have replied, "Then let them eat cake"; or I believe the phrase actually used by her was "brioche"—"Let them eat brioche."

Does the Senator believe that the administration is now saying to the people, "Let them eat rabbit"? or "Let them wear orchids."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield for that purpose, if consent may be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me inquire of the Senator from Illinois, who at one time had his roots grounded in the State of Maine, whether he would clarify his statement relative to the administration's not caring for distress in Maine. Would he care to elaborate on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Maine deny that there is distress in Maine?

Mr. PAYNE. Would the Senator from Illinois state there has never been distress anywhere else in the Nation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, there is distress in many portions of the country, there are many distressed areas.

Mr. PAYNE. Would it perhaps be possible for the Senator from Illinois to pinpoint the distressed area in Maine a little more definitely, and also to clarify his statement about failure on the part of the administration to recognize it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am informed that textile mills are closing in Sanford and Biddeford.

Mr. PAYNE. Is the situation any different now from what it was in 1949 and 1950?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Conditions are not improving and are in fact growing worse.

Furthermore, the woolen mills along the smaller streams are being closed; and there is great distress in Washington County, where the people used to make their living from blueberries and fish. I am informed that the Portland area has moved from class 3 to class 4–A in unemployment.

I am not saying the administration is to blame for what is happening. I simply say that it has failed to take action to help the distressed areas all over the country; and I was commending the administration for at least trying to inform the people how to cook rabbit. I thought that was a very interesting step.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield and permit me to make an observation, let me say that the studies conducted by many of the leading publications relative to the status of the Nation today, financially and otherwise, in connection with its productivity and in connection with the earnings of the people including all segments of the population, disclose that not only is the economy at a very high level today, perhaps higher than any other record has ever shown, but, also, that the forecasts made by various individuals indicate that it will go even higher in 1956.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has referred to blueberries in Washington County. I am sure he knows that the Washington County area, in Maine, produces somewhat in excess of 92 percent, if my information is correct, of all the blueberries consumed in the Nation. I am sure that industry, according to the last report, is in excellent condition, although, of course, it is affected by growing conditions, as is true in the case of every other agricultural commodity or product.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about the potato growers of Aroostook County?

Mr. PAYNE. I may say that, as was stated recently by the newspapers, the potato market has come back very favorably.

Mr. DOUGLAS. After 2 bad years.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, after 2 bad years; but other factors enter into that situation.

I may say that in this administration, great attention has been given to research.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Research in orchids, but not research in dishwashing.

Mr. PAYNE. And the administration has done many other things which have been very helpful to various areas.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. While the Senator from Maine is referring to blueberries, he should not overlook the recent freeze which has had so disastrous an effect upon agricultural conditions in the South.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and I feel very bad about that situation, and I know it has had a severe effect upon agricultural commodity prices. But I believe that the Agricultural Marketing Service, in its studies of marketing methods, has been very helpful to the agricultural industry generally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion unduly; and we have maintained it on such a light note that I do not wish to depress it unduly.

Let me say, in reply to the Senator from Maine, that although production has risen in the past few months, and we are now only a few points under the peak, employment has not made such a satisfactory comeback. The last reports of the Bureau of the Census indicate that in March there were approximately 3¼ million persons completely unemployed, and that, in addition, there were many hundreds of thousands who were on involuntary part-time employment. It would seem that there were the equivalent of 4 million persons unemployed, or approximately 6½ percent of the working force.

I am not indifferent to that situation, particularly since it has continued for aprpoximately 15 months; and I believe that the administration should pay some attention to the distressed areas. I believe that the distressed areas cannot be "swept under the rug" and disregarded. Instead, I believe that a bold program of dealing with distressed areas is at least as necessary as a program to help the undeveloped countries of the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield once more, to permit me to make an additional observation, let me say that I am sure the Senator from Illinois will have to agree that even though all Members of the Senate do not like to see any unemployment exist, the unemployment that has been referred to is no greater than that which occurred in the postwar period, after World War II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we made a very good recovery following World War II.

Mr. PAYNE. After how many months?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We made a very quick recovery; and the recession of 1949 was not of such long duration as was the other recession we had. Now there is a come-back of production; but the point is that there is not a come-back of employment to the same degree; and some attention should be given to that situation.

I do not think that a bulletin on Ways To Cook Rabbit is an adequate way to deal with this issue, although I suppose we should be thankful for all small favors.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of this appropriation bill.

The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has done his usual excellent job in handling the bill. He has dealt very fairly with agricultural appropriations as he always has during the past more than 20 years that he has had charge of this bill, except for 4 years when Republicans were in charge. I think the appropriations provided by this bill are fair to agriculture.

For the fiscal year 1954, the total loan authorizations for the REA, plus carryovers and rescissions of prior-year loans less next year's carryover amounted to $167,104,100.

For the fiscal year 1955, the total of loan authorizations, carryovers, and rescissions less next year's carryover was $165 million.

For the fiscal year 1956, under this bill, there will be $185 million for loan requirements. That compares very favorably with appropriations by the Republican Congress during the past 2 years. In fact, as I recall, in the past 2 years we increased the appropriations for both REA and RTA over those of the previous 2-year period. In addition, very liberal sums have been allowed for contingency loans under the REA program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a table which I hold in my hand showing rural electrification loans for 1954, 1955, and 1956; rural telephone loans during the same years; and certain figures relative to the school-lunch and research programs.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Rural electrification loans

	1954	1955	1956 estimate
Loan authorization	$173, 000, 000	$135, 000, 000	$160, 000, 000
Carryover from prior year	29, 919, 203	46, 996, 190	21, 096, 190
Rescissions of prior-year loans	11, 181, 087	4, 100, 000	4, 000, 000
Amount available for loans	214, 100, 290	186, 096, 190	185, 096, 190
Carryover into subsequent year	−46, 996, 190	−21, 096, 190	−96, 190
Loan requirements	167, 104, 100	165, 000, 000	185, 000, 000

CONTINGENCY OR RESERVE AUTHORIZATION

The 1954 loan authorization includes $38 million utilized out of $45 million provided in the bill.

Thirty-five-million-dollar reserve is provided in addition to $135 million for the regular program, for 1955.

For 1956, $35 million reserve was estimated, with language making available only if allotment formulas are not repealed. House bill provides $100 million reserve in addition to $160 million for the regular program for 1956, without the repeal provision. The Senate approved this amount.

Rural telephone loans

	1954	1955	1956 estimate
Loan authorization	$67,500,000	$75,000,000	$70,000,000
Carryover from prior years	7,092,500	8,158,176	10,158,176
Rescissions of prior-year loans	8,277,676	2,000,000	
Amount available for loans	82,870,176	85,158,176	80,158,176
Carryover into subsequent year	−8,158,176	−10,158,176	−158,176
Loan requirements	74,712,000	75,000,000	80,000,000

(House bill added $5 million, so the authorization in the bill is $75 million, and the program for 1956 will have $85 million available.)

SCHOOL LUNCH

1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 were appropriated at $83,236,197. Budget estimate for 1956 proposed $68 million, the decrease of $15,236,197 being the elimination of local purchases of commodities under section 6, based on increasing commodities under section 32 and section 416 from $79 million to $102 million and having $49,500,000 available in the special milk program. House provided same as previous years, $83,236,197.

RESEARCH

Estimates for 1956 proposed increase from $35,822,000 to $37,684,000. House allowed $37 million. Senate recommends $38 million.

Mr. YOUNG. For the rural telephone program there was available in the fiscal year 1954, under loan authorizations, carryover, and rescissions less next year's carryover, a total of $74,712,000. That was the total amount available for the rural telephone program in the fiscal year 1954. In the fiscal year 1955 there was available $75 million; and for the fiscal year 1956 there was estimated an authorization of $80 million, which the House increased to $85 million, as provided in the bill.

For the school lunch program, we appropriated exactly the same amount for the fiscal years 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 as it is proposed to appropriate under this heading in the bill, that is, $83,236,197.

Under the head of agricultural research the estimate for the fiscal year 1956 was $37,684,000 compared to the 1955 figure of $35,822,000. The House provided $37 million and the Senate committee increased this sum to $38 million. That, I think, represents a very good sum of money for agricultural research.

The Bureau of the Budget estimate for the soil conservation payment program was $175 million. The House increased this to $250 million, and this action was sustained by the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as well as by the full committee.

Mr. President, I think the Agricultural appropriation bill which is now before the Senate is a fair bill, and that it should be approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the third committee amendment, on page 3, line 20.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the question is put on this amendment, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for his kind of references to me. I have had the privilege of serving with him on the subcommittee as the ranking minority member when he was chairman. I am more than delighted to serve with him when I am chairman and he is the ranking minority member. Whatever be our respective positions, we have usually been in agreement in our views as to what was the best thing to be done to serve the interests of the most underprivileged group in America, namely, the farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the third committee amendment, on page 3, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Extension Service," on page 8, line 16, after the word "agents", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Conservation Operations," on page 9, line 7, after the word "employees", to strike out "$58,612,579" and insert "$60,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program Service," on page 12, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$22,500,000" and insert "$23,000,000"; on page 13, line 1, after the word "than", to strike out "$4,020,000" and insert "$4,520,000"; in line 4, after the numerals "1938", to insert "and for the 1956 program an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the amount of funds available for payments under the 1956 program for the State shall be available for transfer to any Federal, State, or local public agency for services of technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, but such use of these funds may be made only on the recommendation of the county committee and approval by the State committee"; and on page 15, line 5, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the 1956 agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and the funds so allotted may be placed in a single account for each State, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Marketing Service—Marketing Research and Service," on page 17, line 20, after the word "estimates", to strike out "$10,981,000" and insert "$11,096,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 11, after the word "States", to strike out "$11,810,000" and insert "$12,010,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Agricultural Service," on page 19, line 16, after the figures "$3,365,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not less than $500,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Commodity Stabilization Service—Agricultural Adjustment Programs," on page 20, line 11, after the word "than", to strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$6,165,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sugar Act Program," on page 20, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,440,000" and insert "$1,617,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration," on page 22, line 11, after the word "amended", to strike out "(16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5)" and insert "(16 U. S. C. 590r–590x–3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses," on page 24, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 7, after the word "amended", to insert "(7 U. S. C. 1005 (b)), and section 10 (c) of the act of August 28, 1937, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the General Counsel," on page 24, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,079,000" and insert "$2,164,000"; and in line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 25, line 3, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$2,116,000" and insert "$2,172,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Corporations—Commodity Credit Corporation—Limitation on Administrative Expenses," on page 27, line 24, after the word "Corporation," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That $2 million of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter"; and on page 28, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That $934,914 of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under heading "Title III—Special Activities—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for Transfer of Wheat to Pakistan," on page 29, line 24, after "(67 Stat. 80)," to strike out "$69,273,881" and insert "$69,385,831."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for Emergency Famine Relief to Friendly Peoples," on page 30, line 14, to strike out "$9,676,628" and insert "$9,545,830."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—General Provisions," on page 34, line 2, after the word "cotton," to insert "or apples."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of the one passed over, which is the first amendment on page 3, line 7, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 7, after the word "Stations:", it is proposed to strike out "$37,000,000" and insert "$38,000,000."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Committee on Appropriations, it is proposed to insert "$38,040,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has discussed this amendment with me. It grows out of concern over the operations of the Research Administration in the field of home economics, other than home nutrition. Reference was made to that subject earlier in the day by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

As I understand, the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi is to provide some additional funds so that it will not be necessary entirely to discontinue research in the field of home appliances and in textiles and clothing.

In view of the very general interest in that field of research throughout the entire United States, I shall be glad to take the Senator's amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment adds a very modest sum to the amount of the appropriation. Transfers of $242,000 were proposed in the budget estimates, and an additional shift of $146,000 is proposed by the Department. The net result would be that only $196,000 would be available for home-economics research, instead of $584,000 previously provided, or a reduction of $388,000.

The table on page 235 of the Senate hearings sets out the allocations of these funds in detail. I shall ask later that this table be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

While there is no comment in the Senate report as to this situation, there is a statement in the House report, on page 12, reading as follows:

> The recent action deemphasizing home-economics research should also be given further consideration by the Department. Testimony from persons engaged in home demonstration work with farm families indicates that some part of the funds provided this bureau should be used on such projects as "household foods consumption" and "family budgets and expenditures," within funds provided in the appropriation for 1956. According to information presented to the committee, six of the bulletins most frequently used by homemakers of the country are on these subjects. The units of the Department engaged in such research appear to be the chief source of bulletins and other material of this type.

The Department proposes to discontinue the following projects now doing such effective work in home economics research: Household food consumption, family budgets and expenditures, household buying, use and care, and housing and household equipment. This proposal is set out in an administrative memorandum dated February 25, 1955 and supplements thereto. I shall ask later that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

In the hearings before our subcommittee, the Director of Agricultural Research ably defended his directive on the basis that booklets and pamphlets published and relied upon for guidance by housewives and homemakers would continue to be available, and be reprinted if demand continued for them. He also stated that private consumer research organizations were able to take over the research and testing of many items. He also brought out that the shifts to nutritional research involved the effects of diet upon the heart, arteries, the liver and kidneys, which may cause breakdowns in the health of middle-aged persons.

Mr. President, I agree fully with the Department as to the need for undertaking research on these important factors and their effects on human living and the prolongation of life. But I cannot agree that they should be undertaken at the expense of research which is equally important to home and farm living.

In offering this amendment, Mr. President, I recommend that the Department establish an advisory committee on home economics research, in order to obtain the advice and counsel of qualified persons who are best able to ascertain the requirements for home economics research, and to what extent it should be undertaken by the Federal Government in order to continue the availability of homemaking publications for the housewives and rural farm families of America. I am confident that if the Secretary of Agriculture will utilize an advisory committee on home economics research, he will receive sound advice and will be in a better position to recommend to the Congress the funds needed to carry out effective research in both home economics and human nutrition. I am informed that to this date the Secretary has not sought the advice of an advisory group on home economics research, although he has full authorization for setting up such advisory groups and he has established some 25 advisory groups to consult and advise with him on many other phases of research.

Mr. President, I recommend that other Members of the Senate support my amendment, in order that the publications on home economics may be continued at the present rate, until the Secretary of Agriculture has sought and secured the advice of an advisory group competent to present to him the needs of homemakers, and that based upon that advice he should then direct changes in the program in order to properly balance these two great branches of research. In the meantime, this small amount of $40,000 could serve to continue the publications that are proposed to be discontinued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from the hearings on the bill, beginning on page 233 and ending on page 238, as marked, containing the tables and other materials to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR,
February 25, 1955.

To: Hazel K. Stiebeling, Director, Human Nutrition and Home Economics Research.
From: B. T. Shaw, Administrator.
Subject: Redirection of research in human nutrition and home economics.

My responsibilities as Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service involve a continuing appraisal and evaluation of our program in order to determine whether our resources are being used for the most press-

ing national problems facing the Department.

After long and careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that in the area of your responsibility we should concentrate increasingly on problems of food and human nutrition. Such research is of obvious importance both to agriculture and to the general public, and the Department has been under steadily increasing pressure to contribute more largely to the solution of national problems in this field. Financial considerations make it impossible to do this and at the same time continue work in all other phrases of home economics research now underway.

In consequence, I am asking you to proceed at once to shift the emphasis in research in human nutrition and home economics so as to strengthen our program in food and nutrition. I suggest that you take the following actions in implementing this request:

1. Arrange for the discontinuance of research in the Home Economics Research Branch relating to operating characteristics and performance requirements of commercially produced household equipment and appliances and the preparation of popular semipopular publications on the selection, care, and use of such goods.

2. Arrange for the discontinuance of research in the Home Economics Research Branch relating to selection, design, construction, maintenance, and house hold reconditioning of clothing and household textile articles, and the preparation of popular and semipopular publications on these subjects.

3. Existing line projects in the areas described in (1) and (2) above should be brought to a conclusion as rapidly as feasible and results summarized. Please inform me of the funds that would be released in the fiscal year 1956 by the discontinuance of these projects, and list the staff that would be qualified for transfer to the Human Nutrition Research Branch.

By administrative action (Administrative Memorandum No. 101.1, supplement No. 29), research in the Home Economics Research Branch relating to food economics and to family economics and management has been transferred to the Human Nutrition Research Branch. This transferred research should be closely integrated with other work of the Branch.

Research to be continued in the Home Economics Research Branch includes work on farm housing and on the properties of fabrics in relation to serviceability for use as clothing and household textiles.

Research to be continued and strengthened in the Human Nutrition Research Branch is on the relative utility and economy of foods for nutrition, and includes investigations into the composition and nutritive value of foods, human food and nutritional requirements, food consumption of individuals and households in relation to nutrition and as affected by economic conditions and other factors, food quality, home food preparation and preservation, and problems of food use in relation to household management.

B. T. SHAW.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM No. 101.1,
SUPPLEMENT No. 29

To: All divisions and branches.
From: B. T. Shaw, Administrator.
Subject: Organizational realinement of research in human nutrition and home economics.

I. PURPOSE

This AM transfers certain of the functions, activities, personnel, property, and funds of the Home Economics Research Branch to the Human Nutrition Research Branch.

The provisions of AM 101.1 IV B 4 (December 28, 1953), AM 101.1, Supplement No. 20 (October 11, 1954), and AM 101.1, Supplement No. 21 (October 11, 1954) are modified in accordance with this AM.

II. EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of this AM are effective as of the close of business February 26, 1955.

III. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

The functions and activities of the Home Economics Research Branch relating to food economics research and family economics and management research are transferred to the Human Nutrition Research Branch.

IV. TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL, PROPERTY, AND FUNDS

Such of the personnel, property, and funds associated with the functions and activities identified in III above as may be authorized by appropriate administrative action are transferred from the Home Economics Research Branch to the Human Nutrition Research Branch. The official headquarters of all personnel affected by this AM remain unchanged.

V. CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

All officers and employees now performing or authorized herein to perform any of the functions affected by this action shall continue to perform such functions and to exercise in connection therewith existing delegations until directed otherwise pursuant to the authority of this AM. All regulations, orders, and similar instruments heretofore issued by any officer of the Department of Agriculture relating to the functions affected by this AM shall continue in full force and effect, unless and until withdrawn or superseded by instruments of like authority.

B. T. SHAW.

United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service—Proposed redirection of research in human nutrition and home economics

	July 1, 1954, program	Transfers reflected in 1956 budget	1956 budget estimates	Additional program shifts proposed	Program as of end of fiscal year 1956
HUMAN NUTRITION RESEARCH					
Food quality and use	$173,000		$173,000	+$27,000	$200,000
Nutrients in food (food analysis)	262,000		262,000	+48,000	310,000
Human requirements	167,000		167,000	+33,000	200,000
Utility of foods for nutrition	602,000		602,000	+108,000	710,000
Diet appraisal	240,000		240,000		240,000
Household food consumption		+$117,000	117,000	+38,000	155,000
Food in relation to household management		+125,000	125,000		125,000
Food management	240,000	+242,000	482,000	+38,000	520,000
Total, human nutrition research	842,000	+242,000	1,084,000	+146,000	1,230,000
HOME ECONOMICS RESEARCH					
Household food consumption	117,000	−117,000			
Family budgets and expenditures	125,000	−125,000			
Economic studies	242,000	−242,000			
Household buying, use, and care	88,000		88,000	−88,000	
Fabric quality	115,000		115,000		115,000
Textiles and clothing	203,000		203,000	−88,000	115,000
Household equipment	58,000		58,000	−58,000	
Housing	81,000		81,000		81,000
Housing and household equipment	139,000		139,000	−58,000	81,000
Total, home economics research	584,000	−242,000	342,000	−146,000	196,000
Total, human nutrition and home economics research	1,426,000		1,426,000		1,426,000

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SERVICE,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR,
February 25, 1955.

THE REDIRECTED PROGRAM IN HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS RESEARCH

The needs of agriculture and the general public for a strengthened program of food and nutrition research has made necessary some changes in the Department's program of research in human nutrition and home economics. This statement describes the redirected program.

Food and nutrition research will continue to include investigations into the composition and nutritive value of food; human nutritional requirements and the body's response to nutrients, foods, and diets when consumed in varying amounts and proportions; levels of food consumption of individuals and households; the nutritive value of customary diets of selected groups; diet in relation to nutritional state; table quality of food; principles and methods for household processing and storage; and the effective and economical use of food and other family resources for higher levels of living.

Some phases of food and nutrition research will be strengthened. These will be nutritional values of food, human nutritional requirements, consumption of food, and food quality and use, as recommended by research advisory committees.

Studies of the economic problems of rural families will continue. This work, associated with research in food and nutrition, recognizes that management of food on the farm is tied to the family's budgeting of money and time for all needs. These studies will provide periodic reports on the situation and outlook for rural family living and information needed in the farm-home unit program of the Extension Service.

Housing research will be continued to make possible the development of improved designs for kitchens and farmhouses that provide for efficiency in household operation, for livability, and for economy of construction. Plans and working drawings for farm housing will be developed in cooperation with other research groups and issued through regional plan services.

Textile research on fabric quality will continue. Laboratory studies will be made of fabrics to determine their chemical and physical properties. Serviceability under

controlled conditions of actual use will be determined for garments and finished articles made from these fabrics. The results of laboratory and serviceability studies will be correlated in order to learn why fabrics behave as they do in wear, and to develop more satisfactory means for predicting their usefulness for specific purposes.

Household equipment research and research on selection, design, construction and maintenance of clothing and household textile articles will be discontinued in an orderly manner before July 1, 1956.

Publications. Results of research will be reported in Government publications and professional and trade journals. Interpretative material and fact sheets will be developed for Extension workers, teachers, and other educational groups.

B. T. SHAW,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR,
March 31, 1955.

REDIRECTED PROGRAM OF RESEARCH IN HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

(Supplement to February 25, 1955, statement)

This statement has been prepared to answer some of the questions recently raised regarding the redirected program in human nutrition and home economics research described last month.

Research on economic problems of rural families, on housing, and on fabric quality as well as on foods and nutrition will be continued. Though the economic studies will be associated with the Human Nutrition Research Branch, they will continue to deal with household management problems that are broader than food and will provide reports on the situation and outlook for rural family living and information needed in the farm-home unit program of the Extension Service.

The transfer of economic studies from one research branch to another was made in the interest of improved management of staff and funds, and does not contemplate any curtailment in level of support. Indeed, the funds for these studies will continue at the same level as in recent years. The "87 percent of the budget" referred to in many inquiries provides for economic and nutritional studies of concern to home economists, and not for food research alone. The remaining 13 percent is earmarked for research on housing and on fabric quality.

Though it is planned to shift funds and qualified staff from some lines of work, specifically from household equipment and some phases of textiles and clothing, to research on foods and nutrition, no reduction below the appropriations of recent years is being proposed in the total effort given to research on home economics. The decision to strengthen food and nutrition research at the expense of certain other lines of work was taken after careful consideration of the needs of agriculture and the general public.

Publications of interest to home economists and homemakers will be prepared on the basis of continuing research. In addition there now are available from the Superintendent of Documents many bulletins and leaflets that were based on the types of research to be discontinued. These include:

G-4. Window curtains—planning and selection; 16 pages, 20 cents.

G-16. Buying sweaters for the family; 16 pages.

G-20. How to tailor a woman's suit; 24 pages.

G-30. Pressure canners— use and care; 6 pages.

G-31. Buying women's coats and suits; 24 pages.

G-39. Mending men's suits; 24 pages.

L251. Child's self-help overall; 4 pages.

L322. Preventing and removing mildew—home methods; 10 pages.

M688. Buying men's suits; 24 pages.

M687. Home freezers—their selection and use; 16 pages, 10 cents.

IS-46. How to choose and use your refrigerator; 15 pages.

F1474. Stain removal from fabrics; 30 pages.

F1837. Cotton shirts for men and boys; 14 pages.

F1894. Coat making at home; 27 pages.

F1927. ABC's of mending; 23 pages.

F1954. Making a dress at home; 24 pages.

F1960. Carpet and rug repair; 16 pages.

F1964. Fitting dresses; 30 pages.

F1968. Pattern alteration; 40 pages.

Most of these are now available in sufficient supply to last for some time. If the supply of a particular bulletin becomes exhausted and there continues to be a strong demand for it, consideration will be given to reprinting it so long as the information is up to date.

Our research program admittedly does not cover work along all lines wanted by home economists. This is due both to the limited funds available for human nutrition and home economics research and to the fact that some subjects are more appropriately studied by private and State agencies than by the Federal Government.

Because of our concern for rural families, we are interested in all phases of home economics research, even though in our circumstances we ourselves are able to undertake research on only some phases. We hope that together the Federal Government and State and private research groups can provide the necessary basis for strong home economics teaching at all educational levels. We want our part of this research to be as useful as possible. We hope that the American Home Economics Association will continue to bring us the viewpoint of home economists through the advisory committee that it has established.

B. T. SHAW,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE—PUBLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND HOMEMAKERS ON CLOTHING, HOUSEHOLD FURNISHINGS, AND EQUIPMENT

The following bulletins and leaflets on selection and care of clothing, household furnishings and equipment, and on clothing construction are based on research to be discontinued. Most of these publications are now available in sufficient supply to last for some time. If the supply of a particular bulletin becomes exhausted and there continues to be a strong demand for it, consideration will be given to reprinting it so long as the information is up to date.

Buying women's coats and suits. G-31.

Buying men's suits. M-688. (Revision being completed.)

Buying sweaters for the family. G-16.

Cotton shirts for men and boys. F-1837. (Revision being completed.)

Window curtains—planning and selection. G-4.

How to tailor a woman's suit. G-20.

Coat making at home. F-1894.

Fitting dresses. F-1964.

Pattern alteration. F-1968.

Mending men's suits. G-39.

Making a dress at home. F-1954.

ABC's of mending. F-1925.

Carpet and rug repair. F-1960.

Child's self-help overall. L-251.

Preventing and removing mildew—home methods. L-322.

Stain removal from fabrics—home methods. F-1474. (Revision being completed.)

Soaps and synthetic detergents for home laundering of cottons. Unnumbered. (Revision being completed.)

Pressure canners—use and care. G-30.

Home freezers—their selection and use. M-687. (Revision completed.)

How to choose and use your refrigerator. IS-56.

Washing machines—selection and use. G-32. (In press.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the advisory committees used so far have been very helpful. All their recommendations cannot be followed, of course, but they certainly constitute a guide to the Director and to the Appropriations Committees. I thank the Senate for approving the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 7, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Mississippi believe, if such an advisory committee is established, that the Department will regard research in dishwashing as important and less a subject for the kind of ridicule to which it was subjected during the campaign of 1952?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Illinois and other Senators that any practical and important matter that touches the daily life of the American housewife certainly has a place in any home economic research program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Mississippi believe that in the future less attention could be paid to such subjects as the orchids of Guatemala and the flowers of the island of Dominica?

Mr. STENNIS. The relative importance of the two subjects is obvious.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi for his leadership in presenting the matter to the Senate. As I understand, under his amendment, the proposed deletion of the home economic research studies and the materials which were made available to home economists through the county extension program, for the benefit of the Nation's housewives, will now be restored, and a stop will not be put to that particular program. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The purpose of my amendment is to restore that work so far as the sums involved will make its restoration possible. The $40 million provided in the amendment is not sufficiently large to cover all the activities, but certainly the amendment does emphasize the importance of the work in the future. I hope it will lead to a reevaluation of the program by the Department of Agriculture.

The chairman of the subcommittee informs me that there is enough money available in the bill to carry on all these programs if election so to do is made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, no limiting language is included in the bill,

in terms of the total sum involved, which would prevent the Department of Agriculture from continuing the home economics program?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to say so, there is nothing in the bill which would prevent the Department of Agriculture tomorrow from revising its entire research program and carrying on the research in home economics as it was done before the restricted program was announced in February of this year. The main virtue of the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, as I see it, is that it emphasizes to the Department of Agriculture that the Senate is of the opinion that this work is of high importance and that the Senate does not want it discontinued.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank that distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for his comment. His statement affords needed clarification. I merely wish to express the point of view I have held on this subject for a long time, namely, that the home economics research has not only been of practical use in terms of the individuals directly concerned with it, but it has been particularly beneficial to industry by enabling it to determine what clothing and what commodities are most useful and desirable in agricultural areas.

For the Department of Agriculture to limit the activities of this program would be literally to cripple a very important section of our whole extension program through the offices of the county agent. I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture, upon reading the RECORD, particularly the explanation of the amendment by the Senator from Mississippi, will appreciate that Congress does not want the program stopped and does not want to have it severely restricted, but, in fact, wants it continued. As I gather the purpose of the amendment, it is to emphasize that very point.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. I thank the Senator for his remarks, and I also thank the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4–25–55–A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$195,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there surely is objection to it. I assume the Senator from Delaware wishes to make a statement on the amendment. If he does not desire to do so, I am perfectly willing to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall make a statement on the amendment. However, several Senators who are interested in the amendment are not in the Chamber, and I stated to them that I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to cut the authorized appropriation for soil conservation payments from $250 million to $195 million. If that were done there would still remain $20 million more than the amount requested by the administration. The reason why I am not arguing about the $20 million at this point is that it is suposed to cover authorizations under section 8e. So we are dealing at this time only with that phase which relates to direct soil-conservation payments.

In the testimony before the House Apropriations Committee and before the Senate Appropriations Committee the Secretary of Agriculture advised those committees that the Department did not need more than $175 million to carry out their program. At a time when there is an enormous deficit, it certainly does not make sense to appropriate to any Federal agency $75 million more than the amount which it actually requests. I think we all agree that government agencies always request enough, but in this instance Congress is actually trying to appropriate more than has been requested and forcing them to spend it.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will accept my amendment. I do not see why it would not be in order. I yield the floor to the Senator at this time in order to hear what comments he has to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Delaware that my comments will not be to the effect of accepting the amendment. I think the amendment should be rejected.

I am somewhat amazed to hear the Senator from Delaware say that the Congress of the United States should abandon its responsibility in the field of soil and water conservation and adopt the ideas of the present Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson. I say that because when Secretary Benson first came into office he wanted to do away with this program. He asked for only $140 million, and the work was to be confined to 11 of the dry States. But Congress said "No," and it appropriated adequate funds to carry on the program as it had been carried on in the past. We disregarded the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that, in effect, this great program of soil and water conservation, which has meant so much to the farmers of the Nation, should be sabotaged.

The appropriation is perhaps as vital today as it has ever been in the history of the soil-conservation program. There is involved the question of diverted acres under the crop-control program. In the case of wheat many millions of acres have been taken out of production; in the case of cotton several million acres have been taken out of production; and the acreage of corn has been reduced by a series of acreage allotments, though, of course, with respect to corn the whole program has not been applied as it has been in the case of wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco.

So, Mr. President, we face the problem of dealing with many millions of acres which, until the control program went into effect, were devoted to the production of wheat, cotton, and other commodities. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what to do with these diverted acres. Of course, farmers who are producing soybeans do not want them devoted to soybeans; farmers who are producing grain do not want them devoted to grain; farmers who are producing flax do not want them devoted to the production of flax.

The soil-conservation program is tremendously important, because under it diverted acres are put into grass and cover crops. It is also important because of the very desperate conditions which exist in the some areas. I am not referring primarily to the damage brought about by the freeze in my own section. I am referring to the dust storms in the West, as a result of which millions of tons of topsoil which for many years produced grazing facilities are now being blown across the entire United States. I visited that area last year, and the dust almost grounded airplanes. A program of the size recommended by the committee is needed to deal with that problem.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this is no time to decrease the assistance which the Federal Government is offering farmers to preserve the most priceles asset of this country, its topsoil. The income of the farmers is continuing to decline. The income of the farmers is being pulled down, down, down, at a time when the income of every other group is going up, up, and up. To destroy even the weak prop soil-conservation payments offered to the farmers would be very unwise.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that a report made a short time ago showed that the farmer owes more money today than he did at the time of the depression?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the interest rate has been raised?

Mr. RUSSELL. Congress enacted the disaster program, and the interest rate fixed was 3 percent. The disaster funds are supposed to go to farmers who have been deprived of all they possessed by some act of nature, and yet the farmer now has to pay 5 percent interest.

That is the kind of relief the farmer gets from the present Department of Agriculture.

For my part, Mr. President, I prefer to follow the experience we have had in the past and to set aside the modest

sum recommended by the committee to deal with the preservation of our soil.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The farmers, laboring men, and small-business men of North Dakota are very vitally interested in the soil conservation program. A poll was recently taken in the Middle West, and the result was overwhelmingly in support of the program. The people of that section look to the Senator from Georgia as the champion not only of the farmers, but of the small-business men.

I am delighted to associate myself with every word the Senator from Georgia has said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I am very grateful for the substantial support he has always given.

Mr. THYE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota; then I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, in opposing the proposed amendment. The amendment would reduce the amount of money which would be available for the program of soil building and soil and water conserving practices.

Last Wednesday I was in Minnesota. Even in that northern region, where intensified and diversified farming is practiced, the wind was strong and the dust was flying to such an extent that the sun could hardly be seen. That was not in the arid areas of Colorado, western Nebraska, or Kansas; it was in the northern region, in Minnesota.

Unless one is familiar with agriculture, he cannot appreciate what has been happening annually to the topsoil because of erosion by water and wind, and other devastating forces of the rich, fertile soil upon which future generations must depend for their livelihood and for their food supply.

I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for vigorously opposing any reduction in this fund. If we fail to protect the topsoil, if we fail in our responsibilities as Members of the Congress of the United States to safeguard the generations to come by providing good, fertile soil for the future farmers to till, we will be depriving those who will follow us of the opportunity to earn a sound livelihood through the production of abundant food and fiber.

The money sought to be appropriated will not constitute a mere expenditure of Federal funds; it will be an investment which will secure for us the certainty of having fertile land to till and on which to produce food and fiber for future generations.

If ever we needed to take a lesson, we need to take one today from the wind-blown area of the western agricultural region of the Nation, where not merely inches of topsoil have been lost, but many, many feet of fertile topsoil, which can never be replaced. Without the appropriation of sufficient funds, a vast fertile area will be threatened with becoming a permanent desert.

I have introduced a bill which proposes, under Government auspices, to take some of that land out of production and place it under grass-type farming, making it suitable for grazing, because we who were born, bred, and reared on farms, and who have knowledge of farming conditions, know what is happening to the good soil. We should be constantly engaged in an effort to give to the Nation the certainty that fertile acres can be tilled in the future. We are fighting for the type of appropriations which will assure a continuance of sound farming practices, both by conserving of topsoil and by properly safeguarding the sod or grass, so that vast areas will not be washed away by the first little rain which might happen to fall.

I again commend the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for his strong resistence of the amendment which is proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I deeply appreciate the personal references made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. In times past he has served as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. No Member of the Senate has a greater awareness of the problems of farmers or a greater desire to solve them than has the Senator from Minnesota. If he could arrange in some way to return to this subcommittee, I can assure him that I, as chairman, would greet him with open arms.

Mr. THYE. While I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I am a member of the full Committee on Appropriations, which gives consideration to the overall appropriations questions; and I am always sitting, it might be said, at the arm of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The senior Senator from Minnesota was once a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. THYE. Yes, I was.

Mr. RUSSELL. If events should make it possible for him to return to that subcommittee, I shall certainly welcome him with open arms.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators who have spoken in praise of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. RUSSELL). Having served on the subcommittee with him, I know at first hand of the excellent work he has been doing. I agree with him that this particular amendment must be opposed because of the deplorable condition in which many farmers throughout the nation find themselves at this time.

I call the attention of the Senate to a colloquy which appears on page 96 of the Senate hearings on the Agriculture appropriations, under the heading "Decline in Farm Income," as follows:

DECLINE IN FARM INCOME

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, did I understand you to give us farm income in 1954 as compared with 1953 in your statement?

Secretary BENSON. Yes. In the early part I think I had a figure showing there had been a decline in the gross income of about 10 percent, Mr. Chairman, and when that is adjusted for changes in inventory, it represents a decline of about 1 percent.

Senator RUSSELL. In 1953 we had a decline as compared with 1952. What has been the gross decline in the farm income as compared with the peak of the Korean war or subsequent thereto?

Secretary BENSON. Dr. Paarlberg could give us those figures.

Dr. PAARLBERG. I have the gross farm income, which in 1951 was $36,944 million and in 1954 was $33,847 million. The realized net income in 1951 was $14,540 million, and in 1954 was $11,984 million.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that the parity index now stands at 86. The parity ratio dropped from 113 in February, 1951, to 86 at the present time, a drop of 27 percent.

Farmers are now caught in a price-cost squeeze which is very severe. Farmers are not sharing fully in the high prices of farm products which the consumer must pay. Nevertheless, they must pay high taxes and high transportation and marketing costs. Furthermore, high labor charges are keeping farm production expenses high. These factors really penalize the farmers.

On page 20 of the current issue of U. S. News & World Report it will be noticed that spending by the American people a year ago amounted to $131,800,000,000. Now the figure is $143,100,000,000. While that has been happening, farm income has been dropping. So the farmers have been caught in a squeeze play.

We must do everything we possibly can to aid the farmers. The amendment which is now before the Senate will take away from the farmers a substantial sum of money. This is something which should not be allowed. It is imperative that funds be provided to protect the soil of our Nation. If that is not done, farming will suffer in the years to come.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be a dereliction of our duty as Senators to curtail or to limit the very important soil-conservation and water-resources program. I shall vigorously oppose the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I was especially intrigued by the comment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the subcommittee, about the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture concerning this particuler item. I believe it was the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who said that the Senate proposed to appropriate in this bill more than had been recommended by the department. I may say that is not a reflection on the Senate, but, to the

contrary, it indicates how wrong the Department of Agriculture is again.

I noticed in this morning's press that the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture is on his way to visit the so-called distressed or disaster areas. He is going into the Dust Bowl. Of course, he got a good start, because it was raining at the National Airport, and he had an umbrella. A newspaper reporter is going to accompany him and report every little activity in which he engages. I say that before the Secretary went he should have explained to the Congress of the United States why there had been an increase in interest rates on disaster loans, and when he did increase them why it was not announced to the public. Why was it kept a very carefully guarded secret? Apparently it came under the security program and was labeled "confidential," "secret," or "top secret." The Secretary will have a difficult time explaining to the farmers who have lost their crops, who find themselves without seed to plant, who have witnessed topsoil blowing away because of winds or dry weather, why there was a need to increase the interest rates on emergency loans to 5 percent, when the established rate for years has been 3 percent.

Mr. President, I wish to inform the Secretary that he is not president of a private bank; he is Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Department of Agriculture. The argument which the Secretary advanced some time ago in reference to the interest rates, namely, that it costs the Government more to borrow money today, or that the hiring of money is more expensive than it was in the past, is fallacious. Even if it were true, whose fault is it? The Government of the United States can set the price for borrowed capital.

I regret that the Secretary of Agriculture set a higher interest rate on loans, which could only add to the burdens of farmers in the distressed areas. Frankly, the Government should be trying to make the loans easier to obtain and reduce the interest rates, rather than increasing interest rates and making the loans more difficult to obtain. I charge the Department with not only being wrong on soil conservation, but on interest rates on emergency loans.

I hope the appropriation of $250 million contained in the bill will be considered as a minimum. It is not extravagant. In terms of the need, it is a minimum and indicates a very prudent judgment on the part of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations.

My own feeling is that if there is to be done what should be done with respect to diverted acreage, more than the amount proposed is needed. We had better be taking care of the soil, not only for the immediate future, but for the long run.

There are Senators who have witnessed in their respective States land which has been eroded by water and wind. They have witnessed land in their States being inundated by floods. They have witnessed poor soil practices which have stolen the fertility of the soil and bled the soil. At long last, the Government of the United States, working with farmers, who do the main job, is doing something about increasing the fertility of the soil.

Of all the times in the world to suggest curtailing soil conservation, this is the worst time, when 14 States are in distress because of wind and water erosion. I cannot think of a more inopportune time to advocate false economy.

There is no doubt the Senate will defeat the amendment and show the American people that there is at least one great resource this Government will take care of, namely, the land.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. In summing up the argument for the amendment, I repeat that it merely proposes to reduce the appropriation by $55 million and thereby reduce it to the figure recommended by the administration.

As to the argument that this is something entirely new, I should like to point out that in previous years all these same arguments against cutting the appropriation have been made. The same arguments used this afternoon were used long before we heard about the drought of recent years. This is not a new program to handle the drought situation.

I think many Senators will agree with me that one of the major reasons why we are having a Dust Bowl in the Midwest is that as a result of the price support program many acres which should not have been put under cultivation were plowed. As a result of the natural grass coverage being removed, the land is now blowing away. Besides, this 90-percent support program was inherited from the previous administration, and the present flexible price support will not go into effect until the 1956 crop year, so let's not blame this drought on the agricultural policies of this administration.

I think many of our agricultural problems including surpluses would be less burdensome had a more realistic support program been put into effect following World War II.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that during World War II every producer of wheat was begged by his Government to increase his production? The alcohol supply processed from wheat was so low and the synthetic rubber needs were so great that the farmer was urged to produce every bushel of wheat which could be produced. That was done because of the needs of national defense. If there were any acres plowed up, it was because of the great need, not only for the production of wheat, but to provide therefrom the alcohol necessary to manufacture synthetic rubber. If anything was responsible for plowing up acres, it was the great need induced by the war effort of the Nation, and not the 90 percent price supports. It is absolutely an insult to our intelligence to try to blame the farmers for plowing up grazing land because of the 90-percent support program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator from Minnesota has said is partly true. It is true that during the war the Government requested the farmers to expand their production, and they responded wonderfully. The 90-percent price-support program was established, with the proviso that the 90 percent was to carry over for 2 years after the end of World War II in order that the farmers would have a stated period in which to readjust their acreage down to the normal level. That was a sound proposal when we needed maximum production. But the war has been over for 10 years, and we are still carrying on the same wartime price-support program. That is the reason why we have acreage controls and the reason why we are having acreage allotments enforced now.

I think the Senator from Minnesota will admit that the 90-percent price-support program has been extended on a piecemeal basis, for 1, 2, or 3 years. It was never intended that it become a permanent fixture in our agricultural policy.

At no point in the historical background of the law can it be said that it was the intent of Congress that when the war emergency was over the 90-percent program should be projected 10 years in a peacetime period.

It is this unwise action by Congress that accounts for the huge surpluses which have accumulated in our warehouses. Then it is these surpluses which account for today's depressed farm prices. Under this policy the farmers have been hurt rather than helped.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. It is hard for me to understand the Senator from Delaware. Certainly he has not read history. In World War I if a farmer did not plow his farm by a certain time, a stranger could come upon that land, under Government regulations, and plow up what the Senator calls submarginal land. Throughout the Middle West hundreds of thousands of acres were plowed up, not by the men who owned the land, but, under the administration of President Wilson, a stranger could plow up the land if the owner did not have it plowed up by a certain date. That was done because of the national defense needs. Of course, some of the land was submarginal; nevertheless, many farmers cultivated it rather than let it go to weeds or remain nonproductive. Not only that, but the farmers who obtained seed loans and feed loans away back in the time of World War I have been paying interest on such loans at a rate of 6 percent, and today, in some cases, the interest amounts to more than the original principal. We have never had the assistance of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey whenever a measure comes up involving the prosperity of the farmer——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield, I should like to remind the Senator from North Dakota that he said New Jersey instead of Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from North Dakota is reasonably close.

Mr. LANGER. The very first speech the Senator from Delaware made was an attack on the farmers of the Northwest

because they wished to get 30 cents a bushel more for their grain than they were getting at that particular time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for remembering my first statement. If I remember correctly at that time he was trying to authorize a retroactive payment of 30 cents a bushel on all the wheat and corn produced in the preceding 5-year period, which would have cost approximately $10 billion. But he proposed no method for paying for it.

Mr. LANGER. There never was any $10 billion proposition; that is utter nonsense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that it was utter nonsense.

I have said that I do not blame the Senator from North Dakota for favoring this proposition here today. I call attention that, based upon the figures for the percentage of the total revenue of the United States Government which comes from the State of North Dakota, if this part of the bill were put into effect in its full force of $214,500,000, it would mean that North Dakota would pay $235,950, whereas the farmers of North Dakota would receive from the Federal Government $4,491,000—or you would receive allocations on the basis of approximately 20 to 1. I can understand your interest.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I say——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota to wait just a minute, please; I have the floor. The Senator from North Dakota will be able to obtain the floor in a minute.

I point out that in the case of several of the other States the matter will work out a little differently.

For instance, if my amendment is rejected the cost to the people of the State of Delaware will be $2,145,000 whereas our farmers will receive only $329,000. Our taxpayers in Delaware will get back $1 for every $7 they send to Washington. That is a poor way to help.

I may say that—contrary to what the Senator from North Dakota thinks—I come from an agricultural area. The county in which I live outranks any county in North Dakota in agricultural production. So I think I can speak for the farmers when I say that our farmers want less Government regulation. They learned long ago that if there is Government aid, there will be Government controls. We wish you would display an equal interest in self-support. Delaware farmers wish to operate their own farms, and at the same time they do not wish to pay the farmers in the West for land which lies idle as well as paying 90 percent supports for what is in production. The eastern farmers and consumers are tired of picking up the check for all your ideas. There is an overproduction of agricultural commodities in the United States, and our farmers believe that the sooner the farmers of the Nation get down to a realistic agricultural program, the better it will be.

I believe that Secretary Benson is doing an admirable job and has a program which will enable the Nation to reach the objective of an improved condition in agriculture generally.

Mr. President, in order that all States may clearly understand exactly how they fare under this program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a breakdown showing the percentage paid by each State, based upon 1951 statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce, and also setting forth the allocations to each State. The total payments by the States, $214,500,000, is based upon what was spent last year for this program. If Senators will study the tabulation and have followed the debate which has been had today, I think they will see which States will have their hands in the Federal Treasury and why there is so much interest in having the appropriation bills as large as possible. This is little more than a grab bag.

In the interest of all the farmers and all the taxpayers of the Nation I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agricultural conservation program, 1955

	Percentage paid by each State based upon 1951 statistics compiled by Department of Commerce showing percentage of total revenue derived from each	State allocations
Alabama	$1,287,000	$5,987,000
Arizona	450,450	1,486,000
Arkansas	557,700	4,661,000
California	15,015,000	5,340,000
Colorado	1,501,500	3,270,000
Connecticut	3,474,900	490,000
Delaware	2,145,000	329,000
Florida	1,994,850	2,470,000
Georgia	2,123,550	6,992,000
Idaho	386,100	1,705,000
Illinois	18,447,000	8,230,000
Indiana	5,148,000	5,320,000
Iowa	1,866,150	8,972,000
Kansas	1,630,200	6,425,000
Kentucky	4,504,500	6,396,000
Louisiana	1,737,450	4,102,000
Maine	536,250	929,000
Maryland	6,006,000	1,287,000
Massachusetts	6,220,500	533,000
Michigan	17,674,800	4,759,000
Minnesota	2,359,500	5,758,000
Mississippi	471,900	6,305,000
Missouri	5,920,200	8,798,000
Montana	386,100	3,601,000
Nebraska	1,415,700	6,085,000
Nevada	193,050	331,000
New Hampshire	364,650	498,000
New Jersey	6,220,500	716,000
New Mexico	343,200	1,822,000
New York	39,253,500	4,667,000
North Carolina	5,362,500	6,191,000
North Dakota	235,950	4,491,000
Ohio	14,006,850	5,584,000
Oklahoma	2,102,100	7,257,000
Oregon	1,522,950	2,157,000
Pennsylvania	16,516,500	4,957,000
Rhode Island	1,008,150	82,000
South Carolina	815,100	3,352,000
South Dakota	278,850	4,677,000
Tennessee	1,522,950	5,202,000
Texas	7,164,300	18,966,000
Utah	471,900	1,293,000
Vermont	193,050	1,047,000
Virginia	3,667,950	4,249,000
Washington	2,402,400	2,340,000
West Virginia	1,051,050	1,560,000
Wisconsin	4,118,400	5,275,000
Wyoming	193,050	2,007,000
Total	214,500,000	

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Then, Mr. President, I wish to say that there is no control over the farmers that the farmers themselves do not vote for; and in making that statement, I point out that it includes the farmers of Delaware.

Will the Senator from Delaware tell us the vote the last time the farmers in Delaware voted on the question of controls?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Our farmers have voted against the 90-percent supports. They have not voted against all support programs; but our farmers do not want any bureaucrat in Washington to tell them how much they can plow and how much they can seed to corn and wheat; neither do they want a fine or penalty to be imposed in case of overproduction.

Several years ago I heard one of the officials of the past administration speak at Georgetown, Del., in behalf of the 90-percent support program. He admitted that the way it would be enforced would be to levy a fine if a farmer produced or planted too much. If a farmer insisted on overproduction, he would be held in contempt of court and could be put into jail. That official said, "Of course, we would not have to put many farmers in jail, before we would put the fear of God into all of them."

I will never support any program operated on the basis of putting a few farmers in jail in order to put the fear of God into all the farmers. That is dictatorship. Instead, we want the American farmers to have freedom of choice and to have the right to operate their own farms. Certainly we want a sound program to avoid a repetition of the depression; I agree fully as to that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Delaware to yield to me, for a question; but he has stated that he has yielded the floor. So I shall speak now in my own time.

Let me say that, as a matter of fact, there is no control over the farmers that the farmers themselves do not vote for. They voted for it by an overwhelming majority; and in making that statement, I include the farmers of Delaware. The last time the vote was taken, the Secretary of Agriculture demanded that there be a two-thirds favorable vote; he thought that two-thirds of the farmers would not be in favor of the program. But even then, two-thirds of the farmers voted for it.

Now we come to the question of the amount to be received by the farmers of North Dakota, as compared with the amount they will pay. The Senator from Delaware has stated that the farmers of North Dakota will pay only $235,950, but that they will receive from the Federal Government allocations of $4,491,000. I ask my friend, the Senator from Delaware, how much the manufacturers of Delaware receive as a subsidy from the Federal Government. While the farmers all over the Nation receive approximately $1 billion, the manufacturers are receiving a subsidy of $8 billion; but I have not heard my distin-

guished friend say anything about that. Instead, he has been perfectly satisfied to let the taxpayers of the United States suffer a $8 billion loss, as a result of the subsidy which is paid to the manufacturers who produce farm machinery and the other export articles which are handled through the Marshall Plan.

But when the poor farmer has a quarter section of land, and votes that he can farm only 33, 34, or 35 acres of it, and confronts the problem of seeing to it that the rest of his land does not blow away, then we find the Senator from Delaware, not talking about the $8 billion subsidy to the manufacturers, but bemoaning the fact that $25 million of this appropriation will be used for soil conservation payments all over the Nation, including payments on submarginal land.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I must leave the Chamber to attend a committee meeting.

At this time I ask unanimous consent—and this matter has been cleared with the minority leadership—that Calendar No. 227, Senate Resolution 94, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I leave to attend a committee meeting, I also wish to request unanimous consent—and this matter has also been cleared with the minority leadership—for the present consideration of Calendar 221, Senate bill 1763, a bill relating to the extension and final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The bill provides for an extension of 30 days.

I understand that this measure is noncontroversial, and I further understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is prepared to present the bill, which has been cleared with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1763) relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1763) relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me, for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the Armed Services Committee's subcommittee which is considering civil defense matters, it has been proposed by Dr. Flemming, of the ODM, that a study by a Hoover-type commission be made of the question of the dispersal of defense industries and similar matters. Many of us thought that, rather than establish another commission, it would save money and would expedite the handling of the matter if the Hoover Commission could be extended for a sufficient length of time to be able to make this very important study.

I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would consider a longer extension, rather than a 30-day extension, in order to give us a chance to take up this matter with the Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am sure it is the will of the present membership of the Hoover Commission, including the Chairman thereof, to bring its work to an end as quickly as possible. The proposed 30-day extension was found necessary. So far the Commission has submitted 7 reports, I believe, of 18 or 19 which are contemplated. The others are in process, and the Commission is very desirous of winding up its affairs.

My own feeling, based upon my experience in serving on the Hoover Commission, and in view of the area which is to be covered by the study the Senator has in mind, is that it would be better to have some other commission or agency make that study. This Commission was established to cover all phases of government. It is entirely too large for the purpose suggested and, as now constituted, it would be too expensive. I think the same results, or even possibly better results, would be obtained by some other commission or agency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think our recommendation should be to extend the life of the Commission for 30 days, and to create another committee to do what the Senator from Tennessee wishes to have done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. While I have great respect for the Hoover Commission, I think it has made mistakes and some bad recommendations. I have one or two of them in mind. One relates to the REA, and the other to the Export-Import Bank. I think the Commission ought to complete its work, and that a new Commission should be established to make the study suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am pretty sure that any commission as large as the Hoover Commission, covering the broad area it has undertaken to cover, would make mistakes, just as any other commission would.

Mr. CAPEHART. It could not help making mistakes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have been opposed to some of its recommendations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the able Senator has been opposed to some of its recommendations. My thought is that it is not always 100-percent correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe it would be wise to extend the life of the Commission for the purpose suggested by the able Senator from Tennessee. Therefore, I ask that the pending bill be passed without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1763) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 142), is hereby amended (1) by striking out "May 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Chairman of the Commission shall have charge of the final liquidation of the affairs of the Commission after June 30, 1955, including the printing of reports, the payment of bills, the transfer of records and documents to the National Archives, and the disposition of furniture and other equipment of the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission shall designate such members of the staff of the Commission as he deems necessary for these purposes. Such liquidation shall be completed within a period of not to exceed 90 days after June 30, 1955, and the funds of the Commission shall remain available for necessary expenses during such period."

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF THE NEWMAN SCHOOL OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it affords me distinct pleasure to announce that there are now present in the gallery of the Senate a group of fine girls and boys who are members of the freshman class of the Newman School, a very prominent and outstanding school of New Orleans. These students are on a tour which is in charge of Mr. Ralph W. Kelley, and they are chaperoned by Mrs. Anne Turpin, Mrs. Charles L. Graves, and Mrs. Carter S. Johnson, all of whom are distinguished citizens of Louisiana.

With the indulgence of the Chair, I should like to ask that the students be permitted to rise and receive the greetings of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a cordial welcome to the students and to those accompanying them.

[The group rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted by applause.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the names of the members of the freshman class of the

Newman School who are participating in the tour.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWMAN SCHOOL FRESHMAN CLASS EDUCATIONAL TOUR, APRIL 23–29

PERSONNEL OF THE TOUR

Ralph W. Kelley, in charge of the tour.

Chaperones: Mrs. Anne Turpin, Mrs. Charles L. Graves, Mrs. Carter F. Johnson.

STUDENTS

Girls: Sandra Altschul, Elaine Blaine, Lynda Carmel, Cecile Costley, Carroll Durrand, Carol Feldman, Judy French, Carolyn Graves, Gayle Houston, Carol Kennedy, Margaret Kettler, Jaye Klotz, Mary Jane Konrad, Joy Levitan, Edith Levy, Jeannine Matranga, Lynn Perschall, Susan Shaffer, Joyce Singerman, Cornelia Sluis, Beth Souchon, Carol Sullivan, Mathile Watsky, Sandy Robin.

Boys: Philip Adams, David Bernstein, John Bick, Jay Buckman, Devereaux Danna, David Eggler, Julian Feibleman, Kenneth Guidry, Alan Jacobs, Charles Johnson, Arthur Kastler, Donald Levy, Jimmie McCarter, George Meyer, William Norman, William Mimeles, Vernon Palmer, John Parker, Marshall Pulitzer, Richard Rosenfeld, Richard Rudman, Harris Stern, Bernard Woolner.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPIATION BILL, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in regard to one item in H. R. 5239, the 1956 Agricultural and Farm Credit Administration bill. I refer specifically to the entomology funds under the Agriculture Research Service. The Department of Agriculture has a fine record through the years in the realm of research and study in almost every phase of our life, home economics, health, pest control, farm economy, electrification, crop research, and numerous other areas.

In my State of Montana, the Agriculture Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department are cooperating in an extremely important program regarding the mosquito and irrigation problem in the Milk River Valley. The first phase of the work is now complete and the two Departments are now ready to go in and effectively combat the mosquito problem. Under the present appropriation requests there are sufficient funds to carry out this program according to the present schedule, but my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana, JAMES MURRAY and I feel that because of its importance, the program should be speeded up and more funds are needed for the 1956 fiscal year.

The Milk River Valley is an area of a severe mosquito problem, the prevalence of encephalitis viruses in almost epidemic proportions has become serious and the area has been faced with a sharp reduction in crop production. The correction of this deplorable situation is important not only to Montana, but to the Nation as a whole. The speedy correction of this situation which has existed more than 40 years will provide the cooperating agencies a program to follow in attacking other mosquito and irrigation problems in other areas of the Nation under similar conditions. This problem is prevalent throughout the country wherever you find old and outmoded irrigation practices. The farmers are eager to be rid of this mosquito infestation so that they can return their lands to full production.

State and local agencies are cooperating in the Milk River project financially and otherwise. The Montana State Legislature and the Montana Reclamation Association have expressed the urgency of these additional funds. In addition, according to information received from officials of Agriculture and HEW, these funds can be justified.

I think that all of us here in the Senate would agree to these additional funds if they had the opportunity to personally study the deplorable situation. Again, I wish to stress that other areas will benefit from the lessons being learned by the cooperating agencies in the Milk River project.

Mr. President, I wish to recommend to the Senate that Agricultural Research Service funds be increased to allow an additional $20,000 for the Milk River mosquito-control program in Montana.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that the following items be printed in the RECORD: Copies of two letters sent to Secretary of Agriculture Benson and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and a brief prepared by Dr. J. H. Pepper, State entomologist and project coordinator.

There being no objection, the letters and brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 25, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agricuture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A few weeks ago I requested, on behalf of myself and other Montana Congressmen, a conference with Public Health officials regarding the mosquito and irrigation problem in the Milk River Valley of Montana. Last Thursday a highly satisfactory conference was held. From it can proceed, I believe, an improvement in the situation along the Milk River, and I am respectfully requesting your cooperation.

Mr. Hammerstrom of the Public Health Service shares the view of other experts that an increase in the appropriations for the Milk River project can certainly be justified. Mr. J. H. Pepper, Montana State entomologist, believes another $15,000 from the Public Health Service ($10,000 is in the current budget) and another $20,000 from Agricultural Research Service ($5,000 is in the current budget) is required. Other Federal, State, and local agencies connected with the Milk River project are also contributing financially and otherwise.

Montana's Governor Hugo Aronson, the State legislature, Paul Working, who is president of the Montana Reclamation Association, and others have impressed upon us of the Montana delegation the urgent need for additional appropriations. I do not think it is necessary to detail here the prevalence of encephalitis viruses, at a rate comparable to the highest epidemic areas, nor the sharp reduction in crop production in the area. I think that all of us who have studied the Milk River problem agree that more funds are urgently needed so that the deplorable situation which has existed for more than 40 years can be speedily corrected, and so that other areas may benefit from the lessons being learned by cooperating agencies in the Milk River project.

I believe there is a possibility of getting additional funds for the project included in the next budget. Senator MANSFIELD and I are going to make every effort to accomplish this when pertinent appropriation bills are considered soon in the Senate. It would be extremely helpful to us if you would submit to us, at your earliest convenience, documentation of the need for an increased appropriation.

I shall look forward to hearing from you, and to our speedy correction of the costly and dangerous situation along the Milk River.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 25, 1955.

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary, Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. HOBBY: You will recall that a few weeks ago I requested on behalf of myself and other Montana Congressmen a conference regarding the mosquito problem in the Milk River Valley of Montana. You graciously arranged for Mr. Richard J. Hammerstrom of the Public Health Service to meet with my and other Montana Congressmen's assistants last Thursday. They had a highly satisfactory conference from which I believe an improvement in the situation along the Milk River can proceed.

Mr. Hammerstrom shares the view of other experts that an increase in the appropriations for the Milk River project can certainly be justified. Mr. J. H. Pepper, Montana State entomologist, believes another $15,000 from the Public Health Service ($10,000 is in the current budget) and another $20,000 from Agricultural Research Service ($5,000 is in the current budget) is required. Other Federal, State and local agencies connected with the Milk River project are also contributing financially and otherwise.

Montana's Governor Hugo Aronson, the State legislature, Paul Working, who is president of the Montana Reclamation Association, and others have impressed upon us of the Montana delegation the urgent need for additional appropriations. I do not think it is necessary to detail here the prevalence of encephalitis viruses, at a rate comparable to the highest epidemic areas, nor the sharp reduction in crop production in the area. I think that all of us who have studied the Milk River problem agree that more funds are urgently needed so that the deplorable situation which has existed for more than 40 years can be speedily corrected, and so that other areas may benefit from the lessons being learned by cooperating agencies in the Milk River project.

I believe there is a possibility of getting additional funds for the project included in the next budget. Senator MANSFIELD and I are going to make every effort to accomplish this when pertinent appropriation bills are considered soon in the Senate. It would be extremely helpful to us if you would submit to us, at your earliest convience, documentation of the need for an increased appropriation.

I shall look forward to hearing from you, and to our speedy correction of the costly and dangerous situation along the Milk River.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

COOPERATIVE MOSQUITO RESEARCH PROJECT, MILK RIVER VALLEY, MONT.

Prepared and submitted by J. H. Pepper, State entomologist and project coordinator, in support of the request being made by the Agricultural Research Service and the United States Public Health Service for funds to carry out this project.

Following the completion of the Milk River irrigation project in 1911, a severe mosquito problem developed which has been continuous and which has affected both the health and the agricultural economy of the people in the area. This situation can be attributed directly to the presence of large suitable mosquito breeding areas that are the result of an irrigation system which was designed without the necessary knowledge of the topography and soils of the area. In addition the lack of knowledge on proper water usage, under the conditions which exist, has resulted in a continuous degeneration of the soils with a consequent decrease in the agricultural production to the point where much of the land is now nonproductive. In reality this is the basic problem since the mosquitoes are produced by the practices which are necessary under the present system. This situation is not unique to the Milk River valley but is typical of most of the early irrigation projects which were designed without a knowledge of the basic characteristics of the area.

The existence of the problem has been realized since the early twenties at which time an experiment station project was initiated to study the causes of mosquito production and possible means of their control. It was found that the mosquito problem was the direct result of irrigation water usage, but the study was abandoned because of the apparent hopelessness of the situation. At that time action along the lines of preventative control seemed prohibitive from the standpoint of mosquito control alone. It was not realized what was happening to the production levels of the land and that the correction of one problem would correct the other.

Following World War II and the introduction and use of new and powerful insecticides, mosquito control campaigns were undertaken in many widely separated geographical areas. Most of these campaigns soon proved to be too costly and ineffective (except for short periods of time) for the average community to continue. As a result the office of the State entomologist was approached by a citizens committee from Milk River area with a request to make studies which might lead to a more economical and practical solution to their mosquito problem. Preliminary studies by personnel of this office showed that the nature and extent of the problem was such that its solution lay beyond the scope of local and State resources. Since in this area there was evidence of the presence of equine encephalitis, a disease of man and animals which is carried by mosquitoes, the United States Public Health Service was requested to join with State personnel in attacking the problem. This resulted in a cooperative project being set up in 1951, involving the United States Public Health Service, the Montana State College Agricultural Experiment Station, the office of the State entomologist, the Montana State Board of Health and a special committee of Milk River Valley residents.

To date in excess of $60,000 has been spent by the above agencies in defining and analyzing the mosquito production developing from such situations as residual irrigation water, overflow from farm distribution system, irrigation waste water, etc. in fields, pastures, bluejoint meadows, etc. (For complete details, see First Progress Report Mosquito Investigations Milk River Irrigation Project, Montana, by U. S. Public Health Service, April 1953). In addition, preliminary studies were made on the incidence of encephalitis viruses. The studies showed that in the Milk River area the prevalence of these viruses was comparable to the highest endemic areas for this disease in the United States. The mosquito species which are present in this area have also been recorded and data obtained on their relative abundance. Likewise studies have been initiated to determine the effect of mosquitoes on milk production and weight gains on livestock.

When it became known that over 90 percent of the mosquitoes were produced as a direct result of the present necessary irrigation practices, and that these same practices were responsible for the ever-decreasing level of agricultural production, the Research Division of the Soil Conservation Service was asked to cooperate in the solution of the problem. In the summer of 1953 they made a preliminary study and recommended that their Service enter the project as a cooperating agency to carry out research on corrective land and water usage. In 1954, $5,000 was assigned to the Soil and Water Conservation Research Branch of the ARS to make a more comprehensive study of the problem and to prepare a detailed research project statement outlining the necessary studies and the budget requirements. This budget is now being presented to Congress for its approval. The budget for work on this project by the United States Public Health Service is likewise being submitted for congressional approval. Their studies are closely correlated with those prepared by the ARS, in fact the studies proposed by each of the above agencies are completely interdependent and crucial in the solution of the overall problem. A detailed statement of the studies to be undertaken, their interrelationship, the need for them and their value will be found in the attached "Research Project Outline." In addition to the studies mentioned in this outline the United States Public Health Service proposes to study the incidence and natural history of the encephalitis viruses and the biology and control of their mosquito vector. The latter studies will be made in relation to irrigation water usage.

The Montana Agricultural Experiment Station will study the field ecology of the principal mosquito species in the Milk River area. Emphasis will be placed on determining the factors and conditions which are responsible for the choice of egg-laying sites and a determination will be made of the minimum conditions necessary for egg hatch and larval survival. These studies will be made in relation to irrigation water usage within the area. The Montana station, in addition, will continue their studies on the effect of mosquitoes on milk production and weight gains on livestock.

The Montana State Board of Health plans to aid the United States Public Health Service in their encephalitis studies by gathering information on the nature, symptoms, etc., of the disease and in the preparation of case histories.

The State Board of Entomology will provide seasonal help to make mosquito collections throughout the State. These collections will be processed by the United States Public Health Laboratory at Hamilton, Mont., for the presence of encephalitis viruses.

The North Montana Experiment Station will act in an advisory capacity on such things as experimental site selections, land usage, soil treatments, and agronomic practices.

The United States Bureau of Reclamation will make available the knowledge which they have accumulated through the years they have operated in this area, as well as to loan or transfer specialized equipment.

The United States Soil Conservation Service will make available part-time help for the project by regular SCS staff members.

The Blaine County mosquito committee is contributing office space for field personnel and will aid in securing experimental sites.

The Montana Extension Service will aid in the dissemination of research data and in securing acceptance of the findings which results from this study.

The State entomologist will act as coordinator of the project and will assist in maintaining close liaison between the residents of the area and the operating agencies.

This Milk River mosquito project in all its ramifications is one of the few studies ever attempted in the comprehensive manner outlined above. Complete agreement between agencies has been reached as to the phases of study to be undertaken by each agency, and the manner in which these studies are to be carried out. It should be obvious that without the contributive studies from each agency being undertaken simultaneously, limited value would be forthcoming from any one study. The solution of a problem of this nature does not lend itself to a piece-meal approach.

Budget summary for fiscal year 1955–56

	Now available	Required	New appropriation requested
ARS	$5,000	$25,000	$20,000
U. S. Public Health Service	10,000	25,000	15,000
Total	15,000	50,000	35,000

Budgets to be expended by contributing agencies other than A. R. S. and United States Public Health Service. These budgets will be obtained and the funds utilized by the agencies listed below. They are not involved in the request being made by the ARS and the United States Public Health Service. Each individual budget is necessary to carry out the agency's particular segment of the problem. These do not involve requests for new additional funds.

Agency	Salaries	Other	Total
Montana Agricultural Experiment Station	$3,475	$2,202	$5,677
Montana State Board of Health	200	750	950
State board of entomology	1,000	500	1,500
North Montana Experiment Station	300	50	350
U. S. Bureau of Reclamation	.....	2,000	2,000
U. S. Soil Conservation Service	1,500	500	2,000
Blaine County Mosquito Committee	.....	750	750
State entomologist	1,500	300	1,800
Total	7,975	7,052	15,027

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise briefly to comment upon some of the remarks made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. There has been a feeling, as indicated by many magazine articles — and I sometimes think promoted by the present Secretary of Agriculture—that the 90-percent price supports are the cause of the present Dust Bowl area in the Western States. Nothing could be further from the truth. During most of the past 12 years, or during most of the period when we have had 90-percent price supports, the price

of wheat has been above the 90-percent level. During much of this time we have had licenses on exports, and by one means or another a ceiling has been placed on the price of wheat. At one time we even gave the farmers a 30-cent-a-bushel bonus if they would bring their wheat in to market.

With respect to the Dust Bowl area, that is cheap land. When we have abundant rainfall, as we have had during the past 10 or 12 years, with the exception of 2 years, wheat can be produced more cheaply in the Dust Bowl area than in any other part of the United States.

One of the principal things wrong with the present price-support program—and we would have that problem whether we had 90 percent price supports or some other level of support—is the fact that the State of Delaware receives the highest price support on wheat of any State in the Union. The State of Delaware delivers about as high a percentage of its wheat production to the Federal Government as does any other State in the Union. The price support on wheat for Delaware is nearly 30 cents a bushel higher than the price support in Kansas, which is the principal wheat-producing State. It is nearly 30 cents a bushel higher than the price support in North Dakota, where durum wheat is produced. At present durum wheat is in short supply and the Government has not a single bushel of it. It is selling for more than $4 a bushel. The wheat produced in Delaware is soft winter wheat, mostly garlicky, and the Government takes a terrific loss on it.

I emphatically deny that the 90-percent price supports have anything to do with the Dust Bowl area of the Midwest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I remind the Senator from North Dakota that the reason there is a differential in the wheat-support program is that there is a freight differential between the East and the West. The farmers voted against the 90-percent support. However, they must certainly abide by the law with respect to acreage controls, and therefore they must get the advantages or disadvantages of the program. That does not mean that they are in favor of it.

But I remind the Senator from North Dakota that we are not voting on the 90-percent support program in the Senate today. What we are voting on is the question of whether we are to give the Department of Agriculture $55 million more than it even wants or more than it says it can intelligently spend. That is the question before us. Do we want economy in Government or is our talk just lipservice? The vote will tell. I repeat that if we are to have any economy in Government and a balancing of the budget, we must do so by reducing appropriations and not by increasing them. The appropriation bill now before us calls for 33⅓ percent more money than was appropriated last year to the same Department. It is time to start rolling back these appropriations if we are ever to have any tax reduction in this country.

Significantly many of those talking loudest for this increased appropriation here today were shedding the most tears recently when the tax reduction proposal was before the Senate.

We cannot have large expenditures and lower taxes. Take your choice, but let us stop talking for both.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I believe that funds for this program are more necessary now than ever before. The trouble with the price-support program today is the fact that we are maintaining higher price supports on feed wheat than on good baking quality wheat. If the Secretary of Agriculture continues that policy, it will destroy the 90 percent price-support program. It would destroy a program based upon 75 percent price support, or even 65 percent price support. Sooner or later the Federal Government must get rid of the vast accumulation of feed wheat which we are unnecessarily accumulating in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that we are in complete agreement that the present price-support program, as it has been administered in the past, is not workable.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say, in addition, that this practice grew up long before Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture. He has the authority to correct the situation, and I hope that he will have the courage to correct it. If he does not correct it, the whole program may well be destroyed.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is quite right in describing the conditions in the dust bowl. In Oklahoma there have been about 18 dust storms.

This land has been broken up at the insistence of the Department of Agriculture for the production of wheat. If the land is to be put back into grass, these payments must be made. It should be remembered that the Government merely helps the farmer grow the grass and retire the land from active cultivation. If we do not vote the amount of money provided in the bill, we will defeat the purpose of the Senator from Delaware. It should also be remembered that for every dollar the Federal Government spends, the farmer must spend a dollar or a dollar and a half.

Mr. YOUNG. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. I may say further that some of the land in North Dakota was broken up, when the Government urged the farmers to produce flax and fixed the price-support price at $6 a bushel. That is what caused some of the poorer land in North Dakota to be broken up, but that land is not blowing away now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained in the Senate Finance Committee on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business in the State.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] the Senator from Kansas, [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business at a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As voting in the negative.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I did not hear how I was recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As having voted in the negative.

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 76, as follows:

YEAS—5

Bush	Frear	Williams
Curtis	Payne	

NAYS—76

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barkley	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bender	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Cotton	Kerr	Smathers
Daniel	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Symington
Eastland	Long	Thurmond
Ellender	Magnuson	Thye
Ervin	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
George	McClellan	Young
Goldwater	McNamara	
Gore	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Carlson	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Flanders	McCarthy
Bennett	Kefauver	Millikin
Bridges	Kennedy	Murray
Byrd	Malone	Welker

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to offer an amendment, but I should like the privilege of asking some questions of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, relating to the subject of loan authorizations for rural electrification. The item appears on page 21 of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to furnish any information available to me with respect to any item in the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Georgia if my impression is corect that one-half of the ordinary and regular and contingency funds for rural electrification is allocated among the States on a formula based on the relative number of farms not served by electricity, and the remaining one-half, plus any carryover or rescission, is subject to a maximum allotment of 10 percent to any 1 State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that I could not understand all of the question propounded by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Georgia if my understanding is correct that one-half of the new, regular, and contingency appropriations for rural electrification are allocated among the States on the basis of a formula which distributes the money according to the relative number of farms not serviced by electricity, while the other half, plus funds from carryover and rescission, are subject to the qualification that no State is to receive more than 10 percent from this part of the appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is the formula for the distribution of the regular appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I mean.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that as the number of farms not serviced by electricity has greatly diminished—and I believe that the number now is less than 10 percent——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that now the needs of the system are primarily not so much for the providing of additional farms with electricity, as for the "beefing" up of the lines, so that they may carry the increased power to each farm, and also, in certain cases, to provide facilities for generation and transmission for the cooperative groups of the REA?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire whether any precedent exists whereby a Senator may vote later, when he has missed a vote because the signal bell system did not work. Has that happened before, and is there any precedent for covering such a situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a situation has occurred heretofore.

Mr. FLANDERS. But is there nothing that can be done about it?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Vermont may be permitted to cast his vote on the Williams amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. At least half a dozen Senators are in a similar situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the courtesy shall be extended to 1 Senator, I think it should be extended to all the members of the Committee on Finance, where, I understand, the signal bells did not ring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which reads, in part, as follows:

> No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

The unanimous-consent request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], is not in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Williams amendment was rejected. I have not voted at all; perhaps I am not eligible to make such a motion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is eligible to make such a motion.

Mr. FLANDERS. I renew my motion to reconsider the vote by which the Williams amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me urge the distinguished Senator from Vermont to state for the RECORD how he would have voted, rather than to move to reconsider the vote. It might take considerable time to have another vote.

I deplore the fact that some of the most stalwart Members of the Senate were not apprised of the fact that a yea-and-nay vote was in progress. They were performing their duties in the Committee on Finance pursuant to the leave of the Senate that that committee might meet during the session of the Senate.

If the vote had been close, I would gladly support the Senator from Vermont. But, in view of the fact that the amendment was overwhelmingly rejected, by a vote of 76 to 5, let me appeal to him not to press his motion to reconsider.

Mr. FLANDERS. I still think it is a serious matter when the signal system does not work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Not only did the signal system fail in the Committee on Finance, but in my office, also, the bell did not ring.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a very serious matter; and if the Senator from Vermont insists on his motion, I shall join with him in his request. But in view of the fact that the vote was not close, I again appeal to him, not to move to reconsider and to avoid another vote on the amendment. Nevertheless, if the Senator insists on his motion, I shall certainly join with him in asking that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, since the vote was not close, I yield to the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia and say that, had the signal system been working, and had I been present in the Chamber, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kindness in permitting the Senate to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the time of the interruption, I was asking the Senator from Georgia if it were not true that with the passage of time——

Mr. RUSSELL. I recall the Senator's question.

There has been a tremendous increase in the consumption of electric current on the farms. It has gone far beyond anything anyone could have envisioned at the time the original system was built.

The lines of the original systems would not have begun to carry the load which the farms were using as farmers found the means by which to apply electric current to their farmwork. That has meant that most of the systems, particularly in the heavily populated rural areas, have been almost completely rebuilt. This has required additional sources of electric current. There is no question that there has been an enormous increase in the need for electricity on the farms, and that need has been met fairly well as it has developed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, therefore, that there should be a consideration of revising the formula by which the funds are distributed?

Mr. RUSSELL. At the present time, the funds are frozen under a formula which was applied to the Nation when practically none of the farms were electrified. Today the formula is sought to be applied to a Nation in which about 90 percent of the farms are electrified. In some States, almost 100 percent of the farms are electrified. As a matter of fact, the remaining 10 percent are very largely in 3 or 4 States.

The present need for money, as the Senator has pointed out, is for the reconstruction of existing systems to supply additional current. That, however, is a matter which is within the purview of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a standing committee of the Senate. I understand that a bill designed to accomplish the very purpose which the Senator from Illinois has in mind has been reported by that committee, and is now on the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association asked for $169 million in the regular appropriation, but for $250 million to $300 million in the contingent fund. The regular appropriation has now largely been met with the appropriation of $160 million; but the contingency appropriation which the association requested, in the amount of $250 million or $300 million, has been reduced to $100 million.

I may say that such a reduction is particularly severe upon, I believe, the State of Colorado and also the State of Illinois. The cooperatives in both States desire to have the authority to erect generating stations and to build heavy transmission lines. The maximum, total funds which will be available under the present formula to the State of Illinois, under the bill as it now stands, are approximately $21 million. In order that the co-ops in Illinois may carry through with the generation and transmission system they want, a total of from $20 million to $30 million may be needed, plus additional millions for "beefing" up the lines. The total needed may very substantially exceed the maximum under the formula.

So my question of the Senator from Georgia is: If the bill revising the formula should not pass, would the Senator from Georgia consider the possibility of reporting an increase in the contingency appropriation later in the year? For we have found the REA co-ops and their national association to be very accurate in forecasting needs.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over a period of 20 years I have always tried to make certain that the agricultural appropriation bill carried adequate funds for the rural-electrification program. Certainly if there is not sufficient money available in the bill, consideration can be given to the situation in a supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill.

However, I understand the bill which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and which is now on the calendar, revises the formula, so I do not anticipate any trouble along the lines which the Senator from Illinois has suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the provisions of the bill be retroactive?

Mr. RUSSELL. This appropriation will take effect beginning July 1, 1955.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So if the formula should be revised prior to July 1, it would apply to the entire appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my construction that it would.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And if it were not passed until after July 1——

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would apply to it on the day it passed, anyway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to give additional assurance to the Senator from Illinois that the bill to which reference has been made is Calendar No. 217, Senate bill 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. That bill would provide ample funds to complete the project the Senator may have had in mind. There are millions and millions of dollars presently available by the formula under which the REA now operates. Those funds would be released along the lines the Senator has suggested. I am hopeful the bill can be passed this week.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say that the bill now pending does not interfere with any applications already made, either.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Mr. Carroll R. Miller, secretary-manager of the Appalachian Apple Service.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTINSBURG, W. VA.,
April 22, 1955.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.:

Western New York Apple Growers Association's board of directors on February 26 unanimously voted to support our action to eliminate price predictions on apples by USDA. New York-New England Apple Institute's officers and directors have asked their key Congressmen on House Agricultural Committee to support this so they are solidly with us. Illinois Fruit Council's secretary favors but has not yet had opportunity to place before his directors; feels they will favor elimination of prophesying. Washington State apple associations have not completed official action but secretary reports their officers and members favorable to elimination of price guessing.

This in addition to twice-taken stand of both Appalachian Apple Service, the Four-State Growers Organization and Virginia State Horticultural Society that we press for elimination of apple price prophesying.

In August 1953 USDA said apple crop to be larger than 1952 and prices accordingly lower. Buyers used this as authoritative. Actually, 1953 crop turned out four-tenths of 1 percent larger than 1952 and price level by USDA's own records was 9.6 percent higher than in 1952. This same has happened several times. Not only injures growers but accurate foretelling of future prices on perishable fruit is demonstrated impossibility which Government should not attempt.

CARROLL R. MILLER,
Secretary-Manager,
Appalachian Apple Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5239) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on each of its amendments to the bill, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARMWORKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion made yesterday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1628) to provide relief for farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday when the bill was passed, it was inadvertently reported that the bill had the unanimous support of the Agriculture Committee. I want to get the record straight. Also, the bill was passed with the impression being given by some that the administration was likewise in favor of the bill. Neither report was correct.

In a letter dated April 11, 1955, Under Secretary True D. Morse, stated that the Department was opposed to the enactment of S. 1628 on the basis that it would not only be unworkable from an administrative standpoint but also extremely expensive.

It was pointed out that the purpose of the bill was to provide either 500,000 acres or 3 percent of the total acreage as an extra allotment to each of the basic commodities. This additional quota is extended as a relief measure to offset the losses caused by the recent drought and freezes suffered by farmers in some of the Southern States.

I am sympathetic as far as the problems of the farmers in those States are concerned, but I think it is the wrong way to pass a relief measure. Besides, the relief in many instances would go to a group of farmers who were not affected at all by the recent freeze and other weather conditions.

If there is to be any relief measure, it should be brought in as such and voted on as such, rather than brought in through the back door by increasing acreage allotments on so-called basic commodities. This is a new way for the Government to underwrite losses sustained by weather, insects, drought, and so forth.

The Department has taken the position that the bill would be impossible to administer and that there would be no way to sit down and figure it out fairly among the different farmers as to the economic effect in their areas resulting from a drought or freeze.

Likewise, if we pass this bill, we would be establishing a precedent whereby the United States Government, without a crop-insurance plan, would, in effect, be insuring farmers, orchardists, and other types of operators against losses by Nature. If we do this for farmers in the South, then where will the demands stop? This is a most unwise procedure.

In my own State last year we had a visit from Hurricane Hazel, and there was a vast amount of damage done on our farms. It would have been just as logical to have come before Congress with a bill which would restore to our farmers the facilities which had been destroyed as it is to come before Congress with this bill to compensate the southern orchardists against loss sustained during the recent freeze. It is true the bill does not provide that the farmers will receive so much money, but it does grant to them extra acreage allotments in a form of relief.

I agree with the Department that it would be difficult for the Secretary to survey the farm areas between now and crop time in order to arrive with any reasonable degree of accuracy at the amounts of acreage which should be allotted to the different farmers. This damage is just an excuse to raise acreage allotments on wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made the point that the bill would be applied to cases which had not been affected by freeze or other disaster.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way I understood the Senator's remark. Section (b) on page 3 of the bill had been stricken out. Did the Senator know the committee had stricken that section out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. With that section stricken out, the bill would apply only to distress caused by freeze, drought, or hail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that. I do not think the Government has any more responsibility in this particular instance than it did in the case of the hurricane which occurred last year or the hurricane which might occur this year. If we are going to give free insurance to everybody you had better stop and count the cost.

This would be establishing a dangerous precedent, one which would result in having the representatives of the various States in future years asking the Government to underwrite a free insurance program against all acts of nature.

We have a crop-insurance program in which the farmers can buy insurance for their crops and be entitled to damages. If now they can get damages without insurance why should anyone pay?

This proposal is something new and something not heretofore provided in the case of damage suffered by farmers in any other area.

Unquestionably this bill should be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter signed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, under date of April 11 objecting to S. 1628.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in response to a telephone request on April 5 from the clerk of your committee asking for the Department's view on S. 1628.

The purpose of S. 1628 is to provide relief to farmers adversely affected by weather or other natural disasters. It authorizes and directs the Department to increase farm acreage allotments of farmers who apply for an increase and whose livelihood is endangered by the destruction or damage by natural hazards of one or more of their important crops. The amount of increase to be granted in such cases is to be that acreage which, together with the other crops produced on the farm, will enable the operator to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. The Department would be limited in the acreage to be used in this manner to the smaller of (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national allotment established for any commodity.

The economic effect of disasters is recognized and the difficulties of the farmers affected are sympatheticlly understood. It is the desire of the Department to alleviate insofar as possible the difficulties caused by disaster. The Department is in complete accord with the laudable purpose of this bill which is to help relieve farm distress wrought by natural disasters. However, we believe the acreage allotment and marketing quota programs are not the proper vehicle for providing such relief. As you are aware, the purpose of these programs is to help keep production in line with effective demand. However, the provisions of this bill are contrary to this purpose.

All of our major crops except peanuts are in surplus supply, and for the first time in many years, acreage allotments are in effect for corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

We oppose S. 1628 for the following reasons:

1. It would be difficult to administer. Disasters of varying intensity occur in many parts of the country almost every year. There are few farmers who could not justifiably claim that they have suffered severe damage from the vicissitudes of weather, disease, and pests at one time or another during the growing season. This could involve us in a continuous review and adjustment of allotments of individual farmers adversely affected. It appears unfair that farmers adversely affected late in the growing season could receive no relief from this source, whereas their neighbors adversely affected at an earlier date, could. Also, it would be difficult, if not impossible to determine how much increase in allotment should be granted to individual producers. How much acreage would be required of any crop to assure a livelihood for the operator and his family, taking into consideration other crops on the farm and the size and economic status of the farm family, would involve the exercise of judgment decisions by our more than 3,000 farmer committees, which neither they nor we could discharge with a fair degree of accuracy or equity as between farmers.

2. The bill would be expensive to administer. As you are aware, our present budget includes $39 million a year to administer acreage allotment and marketing quota programs. The additional work in making necessary adjustments entailed in carrying out the bill would add greatly to the present

expense. The exact amount would be difficult to determine in the absence of experience. In addition to the administrative expense, additional program expense would be involved in supporting the price of the commodities grown on the additional acreage allotted over and above that presently authorized or required.

3. The bill would set a dangerous precedent by using acreage allotment programs for insurance or relief purposes which they are not designed to serve. The bill is completely contrary to recent legislation authorizing additional reductions in burley tobacco acreage allotments to adjust supplies in line with demand. The additional allotments called for by this bill can only serve to further aggravate existing disparities between supplies and market outlets for crops under control. Producers of basic commodities who are making very steep reductions in their acreage in an effort to bring about better balance in production should not be required to shoulder the burden of providing disaster insurance. Disasters are a matter of concern to everyone, and we believe that any relief granted should be through recovery measures in which the general public participates.

Under existing law the Department has authorized the making of emergency loans to eligible farmers who have suffered substantial losses as a result of the recent freeze and are not able to obtain from other established sources the credit needed to continue their normal operations, including the maintenance and care of orchards. Although it is expected that these loans will be repaid as rapidly as possible, consideration is given to the circumstances of the farmers in each area in the determination of terms and security policies relating to the making of these loans.

If the Congress feels that something more than the disaster loans or drought feed programs presently provided by legislation is needed, such relief should be provided outside the acreage allotment and marketing quota program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in order to clear up any misunderstanding that as a result of the committee amendment to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred the Department has changed its position, I shall now read into the RECORD a letter dated April 25, signed by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse. The letter is very brief, and it reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 25, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your inquiry of today regarding S. 1628.

There has been no change in the position of the Department of Agriculture on the bill from that reported to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under date of April 11, 1955.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. President, the technical change made in the bill, while perhaps improving it somewhat, does not eliminate the criticism made by the Secretary of Agriculture; namely, that the bill would be unworkable. The Secretary does not think that either his agency or any other agency could in all fairness administer the bill, even assuming that it had merit.

If we are to have a relief program, it should be enacted as such. If the claim cannot stand on its own feet let it fall. For Congress to underwrite the loss which has been suffered by particular farmers as a result of weather conditions is unfair to all other farmers who shoulder their own responsibilities. For that reason alone, Mr. President, I think the bill should be defeated.

Mr. THURMOND obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that although the bill was introduced in order to take care of the situation resulting from the recent freeze, it will also be found that the bill refers to drought, hail, flood, freeze, frost, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes.

I should also like to call attention to the fact that on page 3, in line 10, after the comma, the word "shall" has been changed to "may." That change leaves the entire matter within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and permits him to determine what he will do and how he will do it. How much trouble it will be will be determined by the activities he undertakes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill was considered with care by the Committe on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill does not involve an insurance policy or an insurance principle at all. All the bill does is to permit, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, the use of certain acreage over and above the allotments, by a particular farmer who is the victim of a disaster. The bill simply will give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to alleviate economic hardship and suffering. The bill does not mean that the Federal Government will pay for it; it does not mean an insurance policy. It means that the farmer, who is under strict quotas and strict allotments, under other legislation, will at least be permitted to earn a living for himself and his family, in case of a disaster which destroys his cash crop.

I want the Senate to know that the administration is attempting to curtail the crop-insurance program. It wants crop insurance when there is no loss. What kind of an insurance policy would that be? The purpose of an insurance policy is to give protection from loss.

Then the Secretary raised to 5 percent the interest rate on disaster loans.

I wish to remind the Secretary of Agriculture, who adversely reports upon this bill, that one of the best recommendations for the bill is his adverse report.

The Secretary of Agriculture has now started on a tour around the country, to see what disaster is occurring in the Nation. That will not alleviate anyone's suffering. People will not have their spirits lifted by the presence of the Secretary of Agriculture, even if he appears before them with a smile on his face and kind words on his lips or pleasant thoughts in his mind. Instead of that, we need action. I do not think the trip he is taking is necessary. I believe everyone knows there has been hardship beyond expression and beyond comprehension in many areas of the country, because of wind erosion, drought, and freeze.

In my section of the country last year, devastation was caused by what are called army worms, which wiped out entire crops, and left our farmers without a nickel of cash income. Let me point out that it took a little work on the part of some Senators to get the Department of Agriculture to agree to provide even some insecticides to be used to stop that infestation.

Mr. President, the pending bill is an unbelievably reasonable proposal. In essence, it will do no more than authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to take action on the basis of his compassion, rather than to make an oral statement. The bill will also permit what I call a little bit of human ingenuity to go to work, so that the farmer may work himself out of the difficulty which Nature has foisted upon him. That is all. The bill permits a farmer to work overtime, so that he can eat. I cannot understand why the Senate should waste time debating such a measure, when thousands and thousands of farmers are suffering economic distress.

There are statements and reports to the effect that this is the greatest year in our economic history. But that is not true in the case of the farmers of Georgia who lost their peach crop, and neither is it true in the case of the Minnesota farmers who lost their wheat crop, or in the case of the Oklahoma farmers who watched their land blow away—the greatest movement of real estate since the 1930's.

Now we are asking that a farmer be permitted to harvest another crop to take the place of one which Nature deprived him of.

Mr. President, it is time that Congress acted, and stopped fiddling, in the case of these basic agricultural problems. Congress should start to produce. The farmers are willing to produce, and I think Congress should be willing to do a little producing, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As evidence that the intent of the bill is to provide insurance against various acts of nature, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the title was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the title of the bill clearly shows, beyond any question, that the purpose of the bill is to grant insurance against the losses which have occurred to farmers as a result of weather, insects, and so forth.

It has been said that the bill will be discretionary insofar as the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned. That is only passing the buck to the Secretary. If Congress wants to pass such a bill we should be willing to accept full responsibility for it. I hope the bill is defeated, and if not defeated, that the President will veto it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as pointed out by the Senator from Delaware, the title of the bill does contain the word "relief"—"to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses," and so forth.

But on page 3 of the bill, how is that provided for? How is it to be brought about? The bill will apply, in the first place, to a very limited number of cases where there has been actual hail or freeze or other natural causes which have brought about injury and loss, but only in cases where the farmer goes forth with his pick and shovel or his plow or his mule, or whatever else he has, and literally digs the crop out of the ground.

This is only a permit to till the soil—usually his own soil—and it must be soil upon which there has been visited some kind of calamity such as has already happened to the farmer during this calendar year. I do not see how the Senator from Delaware could denominate this bill as a relief bill, or one which would hurt the Government or anyone else. It seems to me that the Government, unless it has been robbed of all its humanitarian purposes, should participate in this program and ask that a bill like this, or one providing broader powers, be passed.

I thank the committee for what it has done, but I greatly regret that it struck out paragraph (b) on page 3, which was the only avenue by which there could have been afforded any help or hope to the many thousands of small cotton farmers throughout the area who find themselves in distress because of the unfortunate application of a cotton-acreage allotment law which Congress passed last year, and whose prayer for relief has been echoing in this Chamber during all these months, and has as yet gone unheeded. I am sorry the committee saw fit to strike that paragraph from the bill, but we must bow to its superior judgment. However, we ought to pass this bill without the loss of another hour, so that whatever relief is to be granted—and it will be scant, I am sure—may be granted quickly.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 1 I inserted in the RECORD a statement regarding the terrible crop losses suffered by farmers and orchardists because of a killing freeze more than a month ago. I expressed my views as to the importance of the passage of Senate bill 1628, introduced by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and cosponsored by myself and other Senators.

Let me say to the Senate at this time that I value highly the judgment, the experience, and the ability of the great junior Senator from Georgia. He has been a stalwart on behalf of the farmers of the Nation. I have found him fair, able, and willing to do everything he could within reason to help the farmers. It was a pleasure for me to join him in sponsoring that bill.

Today I wish to express my views further because of the fact that the Agriculture Department, through Under Secretary True D. Morse, has voiced its objections to passage of the bill.

Mr. President, this bill is not designed to carry out a normal function of agricultural administration. On the other hand, the bill is specifically framed for the purpose of meeting an emergency situation. Emergency situations call for emergency methods.

In a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Mr. Morse expressed three principal objections to this bill.

First, he stated that "it would be difficult to administer." I do not disagree with that statement. Perhaps it would be difficult to administer. However, I believe that certain difficulties must be faced and reconciled in view of the disaster which has struck our farmers and orchardists.

The basic crop acreage allotment program is established. There will be no problem of setting up an entirely new program. This bill would merely provide for additional allotments of acreage to offset the destruction of crops by natural disasters. I am convinced that the difficulties of administration are not as important and not as detrimental to the well-being of this Nation as the total loss of crops has been to many of our farmers.

The Agriculture Department has officials scattered all over this country, in the States and counties. I believe there are enough of these people presently employed to administer an emergency addition to the regular programs of the Department. Their troubles would be small compared with the troubles some of our farmers have.

Mr. Morse stated as his second objection that the "bill would be expensive to administer." Some additional expense might be involved. But Mr. Morse did not offer any estimate of the additional cost to which he referred. I cannot see that great administrative expenses should be involved. Certainly, additional time would be necessary to assign individual quotas, but why cannot the employees of the Agriculture Department absorb this work along with their regular duties? I believe them to be willing, patriotic citizens.

Instead of seeking arguments against the performance of this necessary emergency work, the officials of the Agriculture Department should look for ways and means to offer assistance to the farmers now when it is essential.

Nothing is unchangeable. Certainly, the agricultural programs of the Nation must be geared to the contingencies which arise, as well as to the routine affairs of our farm people.

Mr. Morse stated as his third point of objection that "the bill would set a dangerous precedent by using acreage allotment programs for insurance or relief purposes which they are not designed to serve." He also said that "We believe that any relief granted should be through recovery measures in which the general public participates."

He pointed out that emergency loans are available to the farmers. But the truth is that these loans are now harder to obtain than at any time since their establishment. Interest rates have been increased to a level equivalent to the rates charged by private lending agencies.

I do not believe the argument that this bill would set a dangerous precedent is valid. Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be responsible for determining that a disaster existed. He would be required to make such a determination only "to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation."

The Secretary also would be limited in his authority to make additional allocations of acreage for other crops to replace those lost as the result of a natural disaster. The aggregate for any crop year could not exceed 500,000 acres or 3 percent of the national allotment, whichever is smaller.

I shall not cite again the results of the killing freeze which occurred in South Carolina. But I do wish to state that I have consulted with many of the agricultural leaders in my State since the disaster occurred. Their consensus is that the present measures and methods employed by the Agriculture Department are not sufficient to meet the needs of this emergency.

Mr. President, I hope nothing will deter the Senate in its efforts to enact this legislation. I am convinced that adequate safeguards have been written into the bill to allow sufficient discretion on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and to protect against undue disruption of the acreage allotment and surplus disposal programs.

In the past 2 years our people have suffered greatly from droughts. Added to their losses now is the destructive freeze. I hope the Senate will immediately approve this bill and that the House will take similar action. Given this expression of the views of the Congress, I believe the Agriculture Department will find that it can administer this emergency program without undue difficulties or costs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand the bill from reading it, it does not provide any cash payments to any farmer. It does not in the slightest degree subsidize

the farmer. All it does is to say to the distressed farmer, "You have been seriously crippled by natural causes over which you had no control whatsoever—crippled to such an extent that you cannot make a living for yourself and your family. We are going to give you permission to replant, and reap, God willing, in order to obtain the wherewithal to support your family."

There is no subsidy, no grant of funds, no tangible relief provided for in the bill, if I understand it correctly. Am I correct?

Mr. THURMOND. The distinguished Senator from New York is eminently correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall certainly vote for the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that in this country we raise between 150 and 160 different crops?

Mr. THURMOND. One hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty different crops?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; between 150 and 160 different crops, aside from the basic commodities.

Mr. THURMOND. The distinguished Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, if the bill were not passed, the farmers who have suffered a loss of crops because of disaster would be authorized to plant as much of any one of the 150 or 160 other crops they would care to plant, but would be prohibited from planting any one of the crops for which allocations are in effect. That means that the bill would authorize the loser of a particular crop to plant any of the six basic commodities.

At the present time a farmer who has lost his crop may plant cantaloups, flax, barley, or any one of 150 different crops, to replace the crop he has lost. In other words, the bill would authorize the farmer to plant wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, or tobacco. Is that correct?

Mr. THURMOND. The construction placed upon the bill by the distinguished Senator from Vermont is in accord with my understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of the bill is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to allow farmers who have lost their crops—such as the peach crop, for example—to plant corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, cotton, or wheat. Such farmers may now plant all they want to plant of 150 different crops.

I am wondering what the farmers who have had their cotton acreage reduced by 27 percent, for example, and their wheat acreage 33 percent, would think of the proposal. I admit I have not studied it in detail. I wonder whether in helping one farmer we would not be adding to the burden of another farmer, if the bill were passed.

Mr. THURMOND. No; I do not believe that would be the result. The bill merely says to a farmer: "Because you have suffered disaster through a drought or a freeze, or some other act of nature, and have thereby lost your crop, we do not want you to go on the dependency rolls, we do not want your family to go hungry. Therefore the Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion will permit you to plant a certain number of acres in another crop."

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not correct to say that such a farmer may plant potatoes, carrots, cabbages, and any other crop except wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts? In other words, the bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to authorize the farmer to plant any 1 of the 6 basic crops, although a farmer may never have raised so much as 1 acre of any 1 of those crops. Does the bill provide that if he is allowed to raise 10 acres of cotton he will not thereby gain a basic acreage for the growing of cotton?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill does so provide.

Mr. THURMOND. It is an emergency measure. The purpose of the bill is to relieve distress and suffering.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether there is not some suffering already being experienced by the cotton grower who has had his acreage reduced 27 percent. In the case of a farmer who has lost his peach crop through disaster—and I know peach crops have suffered a great disaster throughout the southeastern area—why should he not be expected to plant cantaloups or some other crop, which would be a substitute for his peach crop, instead of adding to his neighbor's burden by planting more cotton or tobacco or peanuts?

Mr. THURMOND. It is possible, of course, that the land in question will not support a cantaloup crop, or is not adapted to other kinds of crop. That is a matter which the Secretary of Agriculture will have to study and work out with each farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the Senator from Vermont knows the picture as well as does any other Senator, and he knows that it is always possible to talk about raising cantaloups, but that marketing them is another story. It is necessary to establish channels of marketing and distribution.

It so happens that although the bill is drawn to apply generally throughout the country, I must confess frankly that it was designed primarily to help the farmers who had their peach orchards completely destroyed by the recent freeze. It was designed to help such growers plant a few acres of cotton. Most of these farmers, of course, know how to produce cotton. In fact, I would say that everyone of them would be able to grow some cotton. If they are permitted to grow some cotton they can help themselves and stay on their land until next year.

The cotton farmer who has lost 20 percent of his acreage is not happy about it. In fact, he is very unhappy about it. However, he is willing to make the sacrifice, and he has made it, because he voted for the control program and marketing quotas, and so forth. At the same time he is not begrudging his neighbor, who has lost everything, including his capital investment, a few acres of cotton.

I doubt whether the bill even if it were enacted, could be very helpful, coming, as it does—and it is very late. In fact, I do not know whether it would have been of much help if it had been enacted immediately after the disaster struck, or that it would have brought about any great increase in the production of a commodity such as cotton, because, as a rule the farmers who are affected by the bill do not have the facilities with which to produce another kind of crop. However, the amount of cotton for example, that could be raised under the bill would be strictly limited, and could not increase the overall production of cotton very greatly.

At the same time it would keep in business several thousand farmers whose lives have been spent on the farms, and who have everything invested in agriculture. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture realizes that the whole program is discretionary and in the hollow of his hand. There is not one mandatory line in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether it would not be a good idea to make it mandatory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to make it mandatory, but the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator from Vermont is one of the luminaries and former chairman and recognized as one of its very important members, saw fit in its wisdom to make the terms of the bill discretionary.

When a man is drowning, he will catch at any straw. This is the only straw floating around, and we are grabbing at it. The committee made the authority discretionary. Of course I should be glad to make it mandatory. Such a provision would be amply justified, in my opinion.

For my part, I do not believe one American farmer would begrudge another, who he knows is in absolute distress, having allotted to him a few acres on which he could plant any crop, as he could do if it were not for acreage controls.

I took great heart when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported this bill, as, of course, I knew that the Senator from Vermont was a member of it. I did not know he was not present at the meeting of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I was present, and I did not object to the bill being reported to the Senate. I am merely asking for information and trying to ascertain what the effect of the bill might be on the producers of other crops, if the Secretary of Agriculture should see fit to exercise his full prerogatives under the proposed legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. If he did do so, in no event could he allot more than 3 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. The question has been raised by some producers of other crops. Therefore I am wondering if the relief provided in the bill might not be given at the expense of the other producers, and add to their burdens. That is why I am seeking information.

Mr. RUSSELL. It cannot add very materially to their burdens. As the Senator knows, as a practical matter, at this stage of the proceedings it cannot prove burdensome to the producer of any commodity.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not the intention of the Senator from South Carolina or the

Senator from Georgia is it, in effect to replace the loss of the whole recent peach crop?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill permits a farmer to maintain his economic unit.

Mr. AIKEN. How will it be determined whom to help and whom not to help? Does the bill take into consideration the financial condition of the farmers involved?

Mr. RUSSELL. It takes into consideration every factor.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether the farmers' help need employment?

Mr. RUSSELL. If I were Secretary I would take that into consideration. Of course, I do not know just what Mr. Benson's views may be; but, if I were Secretary, I would take into consideration everything which affected the economic status of a man who applied for a small allotment of some commodity which was under control.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the determination be made by the county and community committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be my idea of the way in which the law would operate. The Secretary would have to prescribe standards and then the committee in the county would determine whether any person was eligible for a small amount of acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering how the bill, if enacted, could be administered fairly and what the effect would be on the producers of particular crops. Suppose the peach crop had been struck by a hurricane or a hail storm and destroyed just when the peaches were ripe. Would the bill authorize the Secretary to issue permits to plant corn, peanuts, or cotton in the following year?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have to be in the same calendar year. The bill is very limited in its operations and could only apply in extreme cases.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the loss would be greater after the producer had gone to the expense of fertilizing, spraying, and thinning his crop?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 1628) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BASIL O'CONNOR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the world was electrified on April 12, 1955, when the announcement came that an antipolio vaccine, developed by Dr. Jonas Salk, had proved its effectiveness, and that one of the world's most dreaded diseases was within measurable reach of being vanquished.

A thrill pulsed through all mankind. The highly publicized achievements of physical scientists in developing ever more fearful weapons of destruction and devastation were at last given dramatic contrast by this discovery of a new, magic means of saving life, of preserving men, women, and children from the torture and death of poliomyelitis.

This country expressed itself with an outburst of gratitude to Dr. Salk. Prayers were said for him. Offers of reward poured in on him. He will undoubtedly become the first recipient of a new congressional medal of honor—an award conceived by Congress for recognition of outstanding civilian achievement.

Dr. Salk fully merited, and more, the expressions of gratitude directed at him. He accepted his tributes with a becoming modesty and equanimity. He has now returned to his laboratory and to his lifegiving work. He has seemingly survived the test of public adulation.

But while all this has gone on, there is a man whose contributions to this historic achievement have gone largely uncelebrated, but who deserves an equal share of the world's gratitude. This man, more than any other, made possible the Salk vaccine. This man, by unselfish devotion and dedication over a period of two decades, helped pave the way for the conquest of polio. I refer to Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile paralysis.

Basil O'Connor was a friend and law partner of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was the striking down of Franklin D. Roosevelt by poliomyelitis that first enlisted Basil O'Connor in the long struggle against this disease.

He helped to found, and was the first president of, the Warm Springs Foundation, that institution which restored Franklin D. Roosevelt to health, usefulness—and to history. And in 1938, along with Franklin Roosevelt, Basil O'Connor helped to found, and became first president of, the National Foundation for infantile paralysis. He has remained its president, its driving force and major genius, ever since.

The progress that has been made, the hundreds and thoustands of lives that have been saved in the past 17 years, the care that has been provided for thousands and thousands of polio victims—all these are monuments to Basil O'Connor, as well as to the millions of Americans whose contributions through the years made possible the life-giving, life-saving work of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation.

I well remember the first nationwide celebration of Franklin D. Roosevelt's birthday while he was President, and the ones after that, with the income from the birthday balls across the country devoted to the conquest of polio. And then the annual March of Dimes—all for the battle against this crippling disease.

It was Basil O'Connor who conceived and directed these activities, and many others. His was the tireless energy which mobilized the humanitarianism of the American people, on the one side, and the resources of medical science and of the health professions on the other. Polio, once a nameless terror, known in detail only to those afflicted by it and to their loved ones, became, as a result of Basil O'Connor's efforts, a national concern and a national challenge. The concern was expressed, and the challenge was met.

Beginning in 1938, and for the first time, the American people began to think of polio in terms of a national health problem. For the first time, national resources were brought to bear. The huge accumulation of individual problems became one problem—a problem to be solved by the American people, acting in concert to fight a specific disease—a disease which the World Health Organization has called the most ominous of the unsolved mysteries of the last half-century.

Mr. President, the fight which has been waged against the tiny and invisible virus of polio is without parallel in medical history. It has mobilized an unprecedented corps of citizen volunteers; it has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars for research, professional education, and patient care; it has created the most effective partnership of scientist and layman ever rallied against a single disease. For all this, Basil O'Connor merits the first measure of credit.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement made at Ann Arbor, Mich., by Mr. O'Connor himself, upon the occasion of the issuance of the Francis report corroborating the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BASIL O'CONNOR

Throughout the history of our country man has had a chance to belong, to participate, to transcend himself. In no sphere of activity has man had a greater opportunity to fulfill this desire to be a part of the total order than in the field of health—through the independent voluntary health association seeking good for all. This is a sphere with which he is in daily contact, through his family, his neighbors, and his friends. The significance of man's opportunity to participate in those activities that relate to the welfare of the community through organizations such as the National Foundation, indicates clearly that these organizations are serving a purpose that has a much broader scope than just the accomplishment of the specific end for which they were originally conceived. This wider concept of the service rendered by the public voluntary association is, unfortunately, not too widely held.

But public participation, however significant to the individual himself, is also important—if intelligently directed—to the community activity to which man gives his thought and time and effort and money. No organization has demonstrated that as clearly as has the National Foundation. The organization of the National Foundation is unique. It is the first time in history that in the field of health there has ever been such a cooperative and coordinated effort between scientists, doctors, and all others professionally interested in the field of health and—in no sense the least important of all—laymen.

The story of how the National Foundation for 17 years has been able to secure the voluntary services of scientists, doctors, professionals, and laymen, is an amazing one. Equally incredible is the fact that conflict between those on the one hand responsible for the scientific activities of the National Foundation and those on the other hand charged with its administrative duties has been nonexistent. Just as the laymen in the National Foundation would extoll the service of those answerable for its scientific developments during these many years, so would the scientists assert that on more than one occasion the laymen's effort, at proper levels, has been of inestimable value.

Nowhere then, do I think, is the significance of public participation, properly guided, more vividly illustrated than in the

example of the National Foundation. The story of the full value of the contribution made to American life by the National Foundation through such public participation is yet to be written.

It may well be that the methods proven successful in the conquest of paralytic poliomyelitis will usher in a new era in which the partnership of scientists and laymen will profoundly and swiftly alter the course of events in our time.

Such is the significance of public participation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, these are words which illuminate the very core of American democracy. The announcement at Ann Arbor not only marked a milestone in man's search to conquer disease. It also established the validity of an idea—an idea uniquely American. For the victory achieved at Ann Arbor was a victory which the American people themselves willed, sacrificed for, and achieved through the medium of their own National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

With the leadership which Basil O'Connor gave to the National Foundation and the support that came from its annual March of Dimes, the American people became shareholders in the fight against polio. From 1938 on, in dozens of research projects, in hundreds of exchanges of scientific information, in scores of community projects, there developed wholly unprecedented teamwork between the public and the world of medicine.

The sum total of the influence which the National Foundation, under Basil O'Connor's remarkable leadership, has contributed to the wellbeing of men, women, and children, both in this Nation and overseas, is outstandingly impressive.

Since its establishment in 1938, the National Foundation has allocated $22,400,000 in support of scientific research on poliomyelitis. Of this sum, $18,200,000 has been for virus research and $4,200,000 for research into the prevention and treatment of aftereffects.

But these figures do not tell the whole story, $23,200,000 has been spent for professional education to train scientists and medical experts—the largest professional education program of any voluntary agency in the country. In addition, $9,600,000 has been used in medical care grants.

But during this 17-year period, the largest amount, $203,000,000 has been spent for financial assistance to polio patients who needed help, making possible the best available care for all those who could not meet the costs themselves without undue hardship. Such aid is given through the 3,100 chapters of the National Foundation covering every county of the United States.

Of even broader consequence, Mr. President, is the fact that beyond the financial outlay, National Foundation support has meant nationwide, even international, intensification of the effort to control polio. Many people—at universities, in laboratories, in medical schools, hospitals and clinics—have been able to step up their activities, improve their techniques, undertake projects both scientific and clinical that were not possible before the American people created the means for supporting such efforts.

It was at the instigation of Basil O'Connor that the polio fight began to be waged intensively, not alone on a national, but on a world scale. The International Poliomyelitis Congress, of which Mr. O'Connor is president, came into being in 1948, and has held three international conferences at which distinguished scientists from all over the world have reported on their work, sharing knowledge of advances and providing inspiration for future progress.

I should say, at this point, Mr. President, that Basil O'Connor's humanitarianism is not measured only by his work in polio. During the critical years from 1944 to 1949, he was president of the American National Red Cross. During the years of war and postwar rehabilitation, he devoted his major efforts to the work of mercy of the Red Cross. While president, he inaugurated the Red Cross blood program.

In the 28 years that Basil O'Connor has been concerned with getting public support for voluntary health and welfare movements, the phenomenal sum of $1 billion has been raised by organizations under his leadership, and the figure grows each year. At the same time, Mr. O'Connor has never accepted a salary from any of these organizations.

Mr. President, I submit that this Nation owes to Basil O'Connor a debt of gratitude which it can never adequately discharge. For his has been the rare distinction of leadership in a cause which touched the hearts of humanity the world over. For years we had sought to unlock the mysteries of this silent foe which strikes its victims indiscriminately and without warning. For years we had inched our way forward, our meager knowledge reminiscent of Santayana's torch of smoky pine:

That lights the pathway but one step ahead
Across a void of mystery and dread.

Then, suddenly, 2 weeks ago, we were all witness, Mr. President, not to another "step ahead," but to a forward leap.

The energy for that leap was mobilized under the direction of Basil O'Connor. The Nation and the world are grateful. On this occasion, on the floor of the Senate, I pay my personal tribute to this fine and unselfish man. May he be spared for many more years of fruitful work on behalf of his fellow men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business to come before the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND CURE OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 230, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I understand that the concurrent resolution has been cleared with the minority leader for consideration, and that there is no objection to it. I further understand that the concurrent resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from North Dakota is correct.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 was submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] for himself and some thirty other Senators. As the Senator from North Dakota has said, it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its present consideration was agreed to by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader. The report speaks for itself.

So far as the acting minority leader and the acting majority leader know, there is no opposition to the concurrent resolution, and no reason for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the mental health fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental health education; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 1, 1955, and ending May 7, 1955, will be observed as National Mental Health Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join and cooperate in the fight for prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TEX., TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consid-

eration of Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, as I understand, the purpose of the motion of the Senator from Mississippi is to make the bill the unfinished business.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct; the bill will be the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 25), 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be senior surgeon

Shih Lu Chang

To be surgeon

Wilton M. Fisher

To be senior assistant surgeon

Tamarath K. Yolles

To be assistant surgeon

Calvin L. Young

To be scientist director

Louis C. McCabe

To be senior assistant scientist

Thomas E. Anderson

To be assistant scientists

Virgil R. Carlson
Donald S. Blongh
Donald S. Boomer
Philip Roos

PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior assistant sanitarian

James V. Smith

IN THE ARMY

Temporary appointments in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Alexis McClure, O6785, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John William Harmony, O15240, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Benjamin Peter Heiser, O16450, United States Army.

Col. Arthur Hodgkins Bender, O16611, United States Army.

Col. Theodore Trower King, O28889, United States Army.

Col. Harry Oliver Paxson, O16764, United States Army.

Col. James Virgil Thompson, O16826, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537, United States Army.

Col. William Leonard Hardick, O18558, United States Army.

Col. John Frank Ruggles, O18596, United States Army.

Col. James Winfield Coutts, O18875, United States Army.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named person as chaplain, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be captain

John J. Murphy, O966609.

The following-named persons, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captains

William C. Fisher, MC, O979020.
Warren E. Patow, MC, O1920876.
Stanley W. White, MC, O932416.

To be first lieutenants

Wilbur G. Bingham, Jr., MC, O4022519.
Marion M. Carnes, MC.
Peter E. Jackson, MC.

To be second lieutenants

Frank Kellel, Jr., MSC, O2103085.
Lois MacTaggart, WMSC, M2972.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

To be first lieutenants

Gene T. Blakely, O4024526.
Melvin D. Cheitlin, O2273754.
George L. Ford, Jr.
David C. Green, O4038709.
Austin D. Potenza, O2273865.
Raymond Scalettar, AO3000295.
George J. Schonholtz, O2273730.
George W. Wayman, O2063133.
David B. Weinstein, O2273765.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 4, 1955, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenant

William M. Everett, O4009342.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenants

Morris A. Hymes
Donald Jackson, O4042676
Daniel L. Petracek
Daniel J. Rajski
David W. Stein, O4017794
Dale H. Twachtmann
Robert E. Wharrie

The nominations of Richard S. Abbott and 1,306 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 13, 1955, and may be found in full in the proceedings of the Senate for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Richard S. Abbott, which appears on page 4377, and ending with the name of Henry G. Watson, which is shown on page 4382.

IN THE NAVY OR IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Robert D. Harrop and 669 other officers for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 13, 1955, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert D. Harrop, which is shown on page 4382, and ending with the name of John M. Wood, which appears on page 4384.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, may the legislation which is proposed and enacted by the Congress always redound to Thy glory and bring blessedness to our Republic and humanity everywhere.

Grant that our beloved country may have men and women at the helm of the Ship of State who are not steering her by the rush candles of expediency and self-interest but by the eternal stars of lofty idealism.

Show us how we may gain the mastery over our fears and may our hearts be cheered and sustained by the assurance that righteousness shall prevail.

Help us to bring in that day of prediction when men and nations shall yield themselves in glad obedience to the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in the name of the great Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor;

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger;

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez;

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen;

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea;

S. 120. An act for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos;

S. 121. An act for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek;

S. 162. An act for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Borys Naumenko;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski;

S. 234. An act for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid;

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlatsos (Andreas Georges Vlatso);

S. 283. An act for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger;

S. 320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael);

S. 341. An act for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Arthur Sroka;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Lucy Personius;

S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura;

S. 473. An act for the relief of Urho Paavo Potokoski and his family;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Priska Anne Kary;

S. 570. An act for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo;

S. 574. An act for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov;

S. 587. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller;

S. 604. An act for the relief of Alick Bhark;

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders;

S. 644. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp;

S. 650. An act for the relief of Anonios Vasillos Zarkadis;

S. 676. An act for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo;

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas;

S. 713. An act for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk;

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 827. An act for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim;

S. 844. An act for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani);

S. 867. An act for the relief of Jacob Grynberg;

S. 974. An act for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez;

S. 998. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits;

S. 1079. An act to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests;

S. 1180. An act for the relief of Bianca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic;

S. 1350. An act for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child;

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe;

S. 1372. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2225) entitled "An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE WILLIAM T. SHERWOOD

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was very saddened to learn of the passing of Mr. William T. Sherwood last Wednesday. I am sure that my grief is shared by the many thousand present and former employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and by many present and former Members of Congress.

I know of no man who more completely and unselfishly devoted his life to Government service. Mr. Sherwood exemplified a devotion to duty and an integrity which make our career service in the Government so respected. Without such men as Mr. Sherwood, we would indeed find it difficult to make the machinery of Government function.

All of us who knew Mr. Sherwood fully appreciated his sincerity of purpose, his honesty, and his contribution to the successful operation of our tax system. At any time Mr. Sherwood could have left the tax service of the Government and bettered his economic position, but he preferred to stay and serve his Government. This is the true test of a devoted public servant.

Mr. Sherwood spent 45 years in the service of his Government, beginning as a clerk in the city post office in 1903. He was one of a nucleus of career Government men who were recruited in 1920 by then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Hon. Daniel C. Roper, to help formulate and establish our system of tax collection and administration which has now become the Internal Revenue Service.

Few men have contributed as much to this system as Mr. Sherwood. He inculcated a devotion to duty and a high spirit of Government service in all who worked with him. He was a teacher—in fact, almost a father—to thousands of career internal revenue employees throughout the country. Many of these employees later became the most successful tax practitioners in our country, and carried with them the utmost respect and gratitude for Mr. Sherwood.

In his 25 years with what we now know as the Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Sherwood rose through various administrative positions until, at his retire-

ment in 1948, he had reached the highest career position in the Service, that of Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Even after his retirement, Mr. Sherwood continued to devote his time to the problems of the Internal Revenue Service, serving from 1952 until his death as a member of the Advisory Group on Reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which committee I at the present time have the honor of being the chairman.

I knew Mr. Sherwood not only as a highly respected career Government servant but also as a friend. I have never known a man whom I have held in higher esteem and for whom I had greater respect. I, for one, fully appreciated his selfless devotion to the service of his Government. I am sure that I am merely expressing the feelings of his countless friends throughout the country and in the Congress.

I extend to his family my most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I wish to join wholeheartedly in the remarks of my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, with reference to Mr. Sherwood. Anyone who ever met Mr. Sherwood, especially in connection with his work, which was very exacting, found him to be not only a capable and able man but a gentleman in every respect.

HICK TOWN

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "Hick Town." I quote from the editorial:

A story elsewhere in this issue tells of the restrictions in Mr. MCMILLAN'S home city of Florence, S. C. The attempt to reduce the District to the status of the hickiest of hick towns is the more absurd coming at a time when Washington of necessity is considering ways to reduce downtown congestion and speed public transportation.

I think it unfortunate that the phrasing of these sentences might lead the reader to infer that Florence, S. C., is a hick town. I am sure that the Washington Post and Times Herald did not mean to imply that such is the case. The word "hick" is defined in the dictionary as "an awkward, uncouth rustic; a rube; bumpkin." The great city of Florence, S. C., which is the area of my father's ancestral home, certainly does not deserve that definition. In the Eighth District of Florida we consider a community with from 20,000 to 25,000 people as a city. Florence, S. C., certainly falls into that category. My present home in Gainesville, Fla., has between 30,000 and 35,000 people, and all who have been to our beautiful city regard it as a progressive community with all of the advantages of modern-day living. If a city of 25,000 is to be considered a hick town, I wonder what epithet would be applied to the little town where I was reared in Hawthorne, Fla. I think it is a sizable town with even less than 1,000 people. In fact, it is the metropolitan center of the eastern part of Alachua County, and is the largest community between Lochloosa and Cone's Crossing going north and south, and between McMeekin and Grove Park going east and west. One reason for the strength of our American democracy is the strength of her small towns. My district is full of these wonderful communities, and I am trying in every way I can to help them.

If the parking congestion continues to be so serious in this beautiful Capital area, I would like respectfully to recommend to the great House Committee on the District of Columbia that they consider placing some Federal activity which we now have in this area in the Eighth District of Florida. I would respectfully suggest as a starter a subsidiary of the Library of Congress. If we could just have 1,000,000 books housed in a beautiful building, I know of many towns in the Eighth District of Florida that would welcome the opportunity to have this great library, and we not only would promise to relieve the town of traffic congestion, but I believe the fine people of that community would agree not to allow any automobiles at all in the town if we could just enjoy a small portion of the Federal bounty that has been so abundantly lavished in our beautiful Nation's Capital.

The complete editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald follows:

HICK TOWN

The secret of Representative MCMILLAN'S effort to investigate the police department seems to be his perennial pique over District parking restrictions. Because of his congressional status Mr. MCMILLAN personally enjoys immunity from most restrictions except the ban against parking in front of fire hydrants; but apparently this is not enough for a rugged individualist. The South Carolina Representative wants to authorize 24-hour parking on all Washington streets of four lanes or wider—which means practically all important traffic arteries.

Almost every crossroads in America has had to adopt parking restrictions, for the simple reason that there is not enough space to permit motorists to use streets for storage and still facilitate the flow of traffic. A story elsewhere in this issue tells of the restrictions in Mr. MCMILLAN'S home city of Florence, S. C. The attempt to reduce the District to the status of the hickiest of hick towns is the more absurd coming at a time when Washington of necessity is considering ways to reduce downtown congestion and speed public transportation. It might be worth the chaos it would cause to try the proposal for a day, however, if Mr. MCMILLAN would agree to attempt to extricate his own car from the middle of the snarl.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RADWAN. I can say this to the gentleman from Florida, that the town of Hawthorne has certainly produced one good man in the gentleman addressing the House.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am very grateful to the gentleman, and I know the people in my district will know about his compliment.

INCREASING RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, with a House amendment thereto and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, MORRISON, DAVIS of Georgia, REES of Kansas, and CORBETT.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 214 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 214 which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5645, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District

of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

House Resolution 214 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill and would allow 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5645 was reported unanimously from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and would authorize the construction of an office building at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and would authorize the appropriation of the amount of money necessary to build the building.

The Atomic Energy Commission was housed in the Public Health building in 1947 when the total staff of the AEC was about 300 pepole. However, the personnel of the Commission has now risen to 1200 and in addition to presently expanding its program to encompass the field of weapons production it also has, under the provisions of the AEC Act of 1954, the duty of regulating the civilian atomic energy industry. At the present time in addition to using the Public Health Building, the Commission uses two temporary buildings and a warehouse in Georgetown.

According to the report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, the members of the joint committee feel that from an economic and security standpoint it is inadvisable to continue the present physical arrangement of using the four buildings. It is necessary to have the AEC headquarters located at a sufficient distance from the main part of the city to meet the dispersal requirements which are deemed vital for the maximum safety of strategic industries and activities in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 214 would provide for an open rule and thus amendments would be in order. For this reason I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 214 and that the House will then proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman. I think this building is needed and should be constructed. However, for myself, I have been quite disturbed at the continuing concentration of these very vital, critical operations here in Washington or in the close vicinity of Washington. Does the gentleman have any information as to just what is meant by "near"?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My information, which I believe to be accurate, is that they plan to go out not over 30 miles, within a range of 25 to 30 miles of the District.

Mr. HALLECK. My own view is that, so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned, this building might better be far removed from Washington or at least further removed than the distance the gentleman has mentioned, for reasons that certainly do not need too much discussion at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman, of course, understands that this is an office building; there is no manufacturing, or anything of that kind, to be done in it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that, but the building will certainly house the people who have the know-how and the responsibility for the whole atomic energy program.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And they will also have the records there, and so forth.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume that that matter has been considered by the Atomic Energy Commission and also by the Committee on Atomic Energy. They have reached this conclusion and that is what the bill provides.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may consume.

APPOINTMENT AS OBJECTOR ON PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that Mr. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT has been placed upon the list of objectors on the Private Calendar, representing the minority, to take the place of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I feel much as does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] about this bill. I cannot understand, when we have decentralized agencies and departments through the country when, probably, for purposes of efficiency, they would better be in Washington, why we should specifically state in this resolution that the Atomic Energy Commission Building should be constructed in or near the District of Columbia. If we omit that, they could still put up the building here, if they wish to do so. But I cannot conceive why we should state specifically that this building should be constructed here in the District or near the District when we have decentralized other agencies of Government. I think that is a factor that the committee should carefully consider.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is this rule a closed rule, or does it provide for the consideration of amendments? An amendment might be in order along the lines the gentleman suggests.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is an open rule. The bill will be read for amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should be indeed proud and especially commend our colleague, Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., of New York, for the outstanding success he accomplished as a neutral observer at the recent Bandung Conference of 29 Asiatic and African nations.

We now know that Red China leader Chou En-lai and the Kremlin originally intended that this conference of nations would be used to solidify the Communist bloc and propagandize false and misleading lies in order to undermine the prestige of the United States. Immediately upon arriving at Bandung, Congressman POWELL called a press conference and submitted true facts exposing false Communist propaganda regarding the United States position on colonialism, racial issues, and other lies which the Communist leaders wished to effectively use at the Bandung Conference. These facts from Congressman POWELL were transmitted to all delegates and given wide publicity by the newspapers throughout the world.

When the Conference was called into session, representatives of neutral and anti-Communist nations immediately followed through with the theme which Congressman POWELL used in exposing Communist propaganda and lies. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, the Premier of Pakistan, and one of the leaders of Iraq, immediately elaborated on these anti-Communist facts before the Conference and Chou En-lai's strategy was completely thrown off the track for the rest of the conference.

The Bandung Conference was originally intended by the Communist leaders to split the free world on the basis of color and race. Their strategy was completely exposed and the Bandung Conference can go down in history as the

first worldwide moral defeat for the Communist aggressors.

I know the Members of the House of Representatives are indeed proud of the outstanding ability and diplomacy exercised by Congressman POWELL in enlarging the prestige of the United States in Asia by contributing so much to the enlightenment of the people of Asiatic and African nations regarding communistic colonialism and aggression.

The gratitude and thanks of the Congress and the people of the United States should be given to the great work and good accomplishment by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL as an unofficial observer at the Bandung Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror commending Congressman POWELL. I also ask unanimous consent to include an article from this weeks U. S. News & World Report which sets out a press conference-interviews with Congressman POWELL held during the Bandung Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The items referred to are as follows:)

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 26, 1955]

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Not only Harlem but the entire city of New York is proud of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Harlem's popular clergyman and its Congressman.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL went to Bandung as a free-lance journalist. He was there among black, brown, and yellow people, if you like to denominate human beings by their color. He was also among Europeans who expected him, as a Negro, to kick Uncle Sam in the teeth.

They were fooled. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL stood up for the United States with truthfulness and dignity and pride. He represented not only the American Negro but the American people. And the real truth is that we are one.

It was amusing that when the Communists, in their disappointment, discovered that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was no traitor to his country, they wanted to deny that he was a Negro. He was too light colored for them. They tried to give the impression that he was really a white man masquerading as a Negro. He clinched that argument by telling them that his grandfather had been a slave.

Surprisingly, it was the Communists who raised the racial issue, even questioning the validity of POWELL'S claim to be a Negro because his color is light. It shows the utter ignorance of the Communists both as to the Negroes and as to American life. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL set them right, and in setting them right, he performed an outstanding service for his country.

It is a rare occasion when any American has an opportunity to speak up for his country under dramatic and telling circumstances. The challenge came to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL and he met it. We are proud of him.

RED CHINA EXPOSED—NOT DOMINANT IN ASIA—ASIANS RESIST POWER PLAYS OF INDIA AND CHINA—WORRY OVER COMMUNISM, RACIALISM, COLONIALISM

(Interview with ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Negro leader and Congressman from New York)

(From a prominent Negro Congressman comes this eyewitness account of a United States victory over the Communists in Asia. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, went to the African-Asian Conference in Indonesia on his own. He found attempts by the Communists to exploit the plight of Negroes in the United States are missing fire; Red China's influence in the colored nations of the world is vastly overrated; Asian masses resent Chinese. Asian leaders distrust communism as a form of world imperialism. They want peace and they're against threats of force by anybody. In this interview, cabled from the conference city by regional editors of U. S. News & World Report, Mr. POWELL tells how the United States stands in the nonwhite world.)

BANDUNG, INDONESIA.

Question. As an American observer, how do you size up this Conference of the Asian and African Nations, Mr. POWELL?

Answer. The United States has definitely come off better than the fondest hopes of Washington, and particularly the State Department. We had no Far East foreign policy. We had been depending for our foreign policy to a great extent on colonial powers—the Dutch, British. Our information—the information of the American people—about the Far East is woefully scant or distorted.

Question. You mean you didn't agree with those people who expected the United States would get smeared here?

Answer. In the first place, I insisted before I came out here that the Far East was not antiwhite, not anti-American, but anti our foreign policy. I have found this to be completely true. The only antiwhite feeling you find here is indirectly the result of anti-colonialism.

We overestimated the strength of Red China amongst its Asian and African equals. Here at Bandung, China has been exposed to people who are geographically and racially in the same company. It was one thing for the Chinese Reds to have stood on the coast of China with Quemoy 1 mile away and yelled at America 6,000 miles away. It's another thing to sit down at a conference table at Bandung with your neighbors and your racial equals.

Question. Do you think this means the Chinese Communists have suffered a setback here?

Answer. Most definitely. Red China came here posing as the master of Asia. She has now been exposed as just another Asian-African power.

Question. Just how was she exposed?

Answer. I think this is something that the American people should know, and that I was totally ignorant of until I arrived here:

There is a centuries-old antipathy and, in some countries, hatred of their Chinese minority comparable to the anti-Semitism of the pre-Hitler and Hitler period in Europe. These people feel the Chinese have a stranglehold on their economies which was encouraged by colonial powers.

This was proven by the fact that many of the 2.5 million Chinese in Indonesia staged a special demonstration of welcome for Chou En-lai [Premier of Communist China] at Jakarta and Bandung. I saw them greet him with the Red flag and firecrackers. Yet, when he arrived at his headquarters here in Bandung, the street was packed with 15,000 to 20,000 Indonesians.

I stood no more than 10 feet from Chou as he awaited another hero's welcome. But when his red flag went up with all the pomp and ceremony that had been given each delegation, he received no more than 20 or 30 scattered handclaps, mainly from Chinese school children. Premier Nasser, of Egypt, coming to southeast Asia for the first time in his life, received a much greater ovation.

Question. Do you think Chou En-lai, when he arrived, expected to dominate this conference?

Answer. Most definitely. He thought that between himself and Nehru (Premier of India) they would emerge with an anti-United States bloc of eastern powers. He thought the sheer weight of India and China would force neutralists and smaller states to side with them.

Question. Was this conference revolt against Nehru or mainly fear of Chinese Communist power?

Answer. Neither. It was just the unanimous feeling of all these countries who have fought for so many years against the power of colonialism that they would not accept control by any power or combination of powers, regardless of disguises. The delegates here revolted against the phrase "Columbo Powers," and have changed it to "sponsoring nations." These people are antipower in any form—white or black, West or East, Communist or capitalist.

Question. Well, if they are afraid of power blocs, wouldn't you expect resentment among the delegates against the close relationship between Chou and Nehru?

Answer. Precisely. It was the preconference teamwork of Chou and Nehru that was resented, resisted, and challenged apparently successfully—by the other delegates. Even the so-called neutralists—whom I prefer to call the uncommitted—definitely came out against communism as a form of world imperialism.

Question. Then you don't think people in this part of the world see communism as "the wave of the future?"

Answer. Definitely not. For example, I have talked to Indonesian officials who favor freedom for all people, but privately are worried about independence for Malaya where there is already a strong Communist movement. They are afraid an independent Malaya now would be a Communist Malaya and they're against any more of southeast Asia falling into the hands of the Communists.

Question. Isn't that encouraging for America?

Answer. Of course. Actually, in some ways, Chou En-lai stupidly helped our cause.

Question. What do you mean?

Answer. For instance, take what happened toward the end of the opening session. When every single one of the delegates invoked the blessing of their god upon the conference. Chou arose and said, "We Communists are atheists." In the midst of that deeply spiritual atmosphere, Chou played right into our hands with this astounding tactical blunder. It literally shocked many delegates.

Question. Did you find any support here for America's position on the Formosan problem?

Answer. Non-Communist countries didn't want to raise this question at the conference because they didn't want to antagonize anyone, including the United States. But behind the scene, many delegates told me Quemoy and Matsu should go to Red China. All of them definitely are against the use of force by either side—Communist China or the United States—to settle the Formosa problem.

Question. How much support did you find here for Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Chinese?

Answer. Very little.

Question. Did you talk to the delegates about thermonuclear weapons?

Answer. Yes, I did. They had originally placed that question on the agenda and struck it off because they thought it would give Red China an opportunity to sound off against America. However, to a man the delegates I saw were appalled at the mere thought of the United States using thermonuclear weapons. This emphasized to me again that this was a conference for peace.

Question. Did you find much support for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?

Answer. The question of Red China's admission was not considered, by itself. You must remember that more than one-third of the countries represented here do not belong to the United Nations. If the question of Red China's membership in the U. N. had come up by itself it would have been defeated by a vote of 16 to 12. But, if the vote dealt

with the question of admitting all nations—including Red China—you will find most of the nations here supporting it.

Question. Were most of the delegates you talked to for or against continuing restrictions on strategic trade with Red China?

Answer. It so happened that Burma actually moved that these restrictions be lifted but it was opposed by the Philipines and Thailand. Since no motion could be carried without a unanimous vote, that move failed. But, on a simple majority vote, that motion would have carried.

Question. If controversial questions such as Formosa were avoided, why did this Conference devote so much time to Palestine—which certainly is a controversial subject?

Answer. The Arab bloc had the Colombo powers over a barrel from the very beginning. The Colombo powers didn't want the Arab countries to boycott the Conference, and so they were literally forced not to invite Israel. Therefore, when the question was raised by the Arab bloc it had to be dealt with. Nehru tried to pour oil on troubled waters by trying to persuade the Arabs to keep the discussion as calm as possible.

Question. As a Negro, did you feel the Communists were able to exploit the color question for their ends?

Answer. They came fully prepared to do so. They sent in advance a girl from Ceylon to ask loaded questions at all press conferences. At a Union of South Africa press conference she asked, "What aid can you hope for from the United States when it has the same doctrine of segregation toward the Negro as South Africa?"

The Communists wanted to show that the United States was practicing racialism within its own borders—but they failed to achieve their purpose.

Question. Was there any resentment here against you, as an American, attending the Conference as an observer?

Answer. Quite the opposite. I was received here with open arms. Many of the delegates were friends of mine. In fact, I felt I did a lot of good. I was able to stop Communist propaganda concerning the American Negro by holding a press conference. At least, after my press conference the Communist press gave up attempts to smear the United States on the Negro question. I did this simply by telling the truth about the race problem in the United States.

Question. But wasn't racialism as a world problem still a major question at this Conference?

Answer. Yes. The subjects of racialism and colonialism were questions on which all delegates agreed. And here our Nation was definitely hurt. Even our best friends at this Conference, such as the Philippines, stood firm for complete elimination of racialism and colonialism.

Question. You have mentioned several times the question of colonialism. What is the feeling here toward America's attitude on that issue?

Answer. We can no longer underestimate the passionate determination among these people that all men should be free. The delegates here who disagreed bitterly on the question of communism were united on the question of colonialism. They simply cannot understand why the first Nation in the world to defeat colonialism is now siding with colonial powers.

In the United Nations we abstain when the question of independence for North Africa and other colonies comes up. But this does not fool the leaders of the Asian and African nations at this Conference. They regard abstention on colonialism as a vote for it. From this Conference on, the United States, if it continues to abstain on colonial questions, will lose the support of Asia and Africa.

Question. You've talked to many delegates here. On the basis of these talks, what do you think the United States can do to win more friends among the peoples of Asia and Africa?

Answer. Here are obvious things we must do: Quit taking the side of colonialism in the U. N.; clean up the race problem in the United States as rapidly as possible, and get across the tremendous progress we've already made; appoint more Negroes to our foreign diplomatic posts.

President Eisenhower should invite the Colombo powers to a top-level conference on the problems of Asia. This is nothing unusual. It's the historic approach we have taken in formulating our European policy. There is no reason why we cannot do the same in formulating an effective policy in Asia. We must do it now because these people of Asia and Africa are on the march, demanding admission at the front door into the fraternity of modern mankind.

Question. After attending this conference, do you feel more hopeful about the prospect of stopping communism in Asia?

Answer. Most assuredly I do, but not on the basis of what we are doing now. We cannot defeat communism in the Far East with military alliances alone. These people do not want communism. They are hungry for freedom and democracy. Even Nehru, who is friendly with Red China, bitterly fights communism in his own country. To the people here, communism is not the only problem. They need the understanding and help of the United States to solve their ancient problems of poverty and colonialism.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 215, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 215 provides for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 4954 would provide that whenever the United States is injured in its proprietary capacity through violations of the antitrust laws that the United States may institute action to recover actual damages incurred through these violations. Under existing case law it is now held that the United States is not a person to sue under the statute.

The proposed bill would also provide that private treble damage actions for violations of the antitrust laws as now provided in section 4 of the Clayton Act, as well as actual damage suits by the United States, shall be governed by a uniform Federal statute of limitations of 4 years.

H. R. 4954 would also provide that the statute of limitations with respect to private antitrust actions shall be tolled for an additional year after the termination of a Government antitrust proceeding in order to permit the parties to take full advantage of a final Government decree as prima facie evidence of their case and to have sufficient time in which to file suit.

Section 7 of the Sherman Act would be repealed by H. R. 4954, since this section has been superseded by section 4 of the Clayton Act, and finally the bill would provide that the effective date of the measure would be 6 months after the date of its enactment.

H. R. 4954 attempts, Mr. Speaker, to furnish the necessary statutory foundation which the Supreme Court in the Cooper case decision declared essential to a recovery by the Government. The Court declared at that time that "the Government must have statutory authorization before it can sue for treble damages under the Sherman Act." This bill, however, would only grant the Government the right to recover actual damages, since it is felt that if the Government could recover triple damages it would have a disastrous economic effect upon business concerns doing a great proportion of their business with the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is open to amendment on the floor; there are no restrictions in the rule regarding amendments, and for this reason I hope that the House membership will adopt House Resolution 215, which would provide for the consideration of the bill under an open rule and with the very ample time of 2 hours for debate on its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5645, with Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill and not very difficult to explain. I am sure every Member of the House is familiar with the Atomic Energy Commission and the fine work it has done for our national defense and also the fine work it has done on the matter of dispersal. The question of dispersal has been raised here this morning. I do not believe we have any agency of the Government that has followed the dispersal principle more carefully than the Atomic Energy Commission. If one cares to look at where our laboratories are situated, he will find that they are well placed in all parts of this country. They are primarily convenient for the scientific personnel and the colleges. Storage facilities and everything connected with this work is well dispersed.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The bill up for consideration will authorize the Atomic Energy Commission

to acquire a site in or near Washington, D. C., for a principal office building. It will authorize the Commission to prepare or supervise the preparation of plans, specifications, and design of such a building together with necessary auxiliary items such as guard stations, access roads, and garage.

It will authorize the Commission to handle the construction of the building itself.

The total cost of site, engineering, and construction for this building shall not exceed $10 million.

The project will be paid for from funds presently available to the Commission.

The bill, however, also authorizes additional appropriations for the project if rising costs or other necessary circumstances require them.

I should like to briefly state for the information of the House some background on this building: The AEC, when it first set up its offices in 1947, was assigned the Old Public Health Building. At the time this was perfectly adequate to meet the purposes and needs of the Commission. It had a small staff of about 300. Since that time the Commission programs for the defense of the free world have expanded mightily.

To date more than $12 million have been invested in the atomic-energy program and concurrent with this expansion the Commission administrative responsibilities and staff have increased with a Washington headquarters of about 1,200 people. With the adoption by the Congress of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 last year and with the concurrent additional responsibilities for licensing and establishing the procedures under which a new atomic industry will arise, it is estimated that the Commission staff will increase to approximately 1,300 persons by next year.

As of today the Commission's Washington headquarters, which I might point out is required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to be in or near the District of Columbia, is housed in four separate buildings. One is the Public Health Building, 19th Street and Constitution Avenue NW. The other three are temporary buildings spread along Constitution Avenue at 15th Street. The temporary office space which houses two-thirds of the Commission's staff is not well suited to the requirements of an agency like the Commission. The fact that the Commission is spread through four buildings has, in the opinion of the joint committee, two very serious objections. First and foremost, it is undesirable from a security standpoint. In order to transact Commission business classified documents must be moved in large volume among three of the buildings. This greatly increases the risk of compromise of documents. Secondly, the temporary buildings are not well laid out from a security standpoint. Not only is some security risk inevitable in the present setup, but the cost of the guard force is considerably increased since four separate buildings must be guarded, whereas if the force were all in one building, public access to the building could be controlled through one entrance and a better guard force maintained with far less personnel.

The General Services Administration has informed the Commission officially that it does not have any suitable space in the District of Columbia and its suburbs which it can make available to the Commission. The Commission was therefore authorized in the 1955 Appropriations Act to rent 250,000 square feet in the Washington area.

As an alternative to renting space the GSA and the Commission, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, first proposed to have an office building erected under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, on the grounds that this will be less expensive than renting available space.

The alternative of using the lease-purchase method rather than renting was favorably considered by the House Public Works Committee. The Senate Public Works Committee approved the lease-purchase method subject to consultation with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It should be stressed that neither the House nor the Senate Public Works Committees had before them the third alternative, namely, direct Government construction.

In view of the fact that the Senate Public Works Committee sought the guidance of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Joint Committee carefully considered the matter in executive session with the Commission and decided that, in the case of the proposed AEC building, the lease-purchase method was undesirable for the following reasons:

First, the lease-purchase method of constructing public buildings was devised principally for the construction of courthouses and post-office buildings. The country faced the problem of rapidly constructing a large number of new post offices and courthouse buildings in order to make up for construction which was not performed during the war years. The lease-purchase method provides a system for having a large number of these buildings built in the near future while paying for them over a 25-year period.

Second, these buildings would normally be built in the center of a city for one long-term tenant and the builder could be sure that the tenant would be in the building long after the Government took title to the building. In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission building, however, the structure would be located in a spot removed from the center of the city, in fact probably removed from the city itself. The contractor would always have to plan for the eventuality that the Government canceled the lease before the expiration of the 25-year time. The rental payments would have to take this into consideration.

And, third, the Atomic Energy Commission's office building requirements are somewhat different from that of the average general-purpose office building, partly because of its great volume of classified documents and special security requirements.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy came to the conclusion that direct construction by the Atomic Energy Commission would be most advantageous.

TYPE OF BUILDING

The Commission proposes to have a building with a gross floor space of 400,000 square feet and a net, usable floor space of 230,000 square feet erected. The building will be a 3-story reinforced concrete structure, described by the Commission as "functional in concept and devoid of excessive embellishments and extravagant appointments."

In addition to the building, it will be necessary to provide parking space for 500 cars, a water supply system and a sewage disposal system. About 20 acres of land would be required. The location for this structure has not been selected. The Commission desires to locate this building approximately 20 to 30 miles from the center of the city of Washington in order to meet present dispersal criteria. It would also be necessary that the location be west of the north-south line through the center of the city of Washington. As a practical matter this means locating the building on an arc which passes through Frederick, Md., and Leesburg, Warrenton, and Fredericksberg, Va. The building would be located on a main arterial highway so as to be not more than 45 minutes commuting distance from the city of Washington.

The cost of constructing this building, based on 1954 materials and labor figures is estimated at $8.5 million. To protect against the contingency of rising building and labor costs in the next 2 years the joint committee has set a limit of $10 million on this building, since the Commission could not fund for increased costs without additional authorizing legislation were the figure in the bill limited to the 1954 estimate of $8.5 million. The Bureau of the Budget has informed the committee that it will limit the Commission's spending on this building to $8.5 million if the Congress passes the bill to authorize the new office building, unless an increase is justified by a rise in material and labor costs.

The Atomic Energy Commission has expressed satisfaction with the joint committee's recommendation as has the Bureau of the Budget.

COST ANALYSIS

The Commission estimates that it will cost $2.50 per usable square foot to construct its own office building and amortize it on a 40-year basis. On a 25-year basis it is estimated the cost would be $2.57 per usable square foot. This compares most favorably with the lease-purchase cost which would have been $3.47 per usable square foot, according to estimates of the General Services Administration. The GSA and the AEC estimate that the cost of renting a building in downtown Washington with 255,000 square feet of usable space would be $3.54 per usable square foot.

All square-foot costs listed above are on an annual basis.

There is another matter that entered our consideration:

The major products of the AEC, and the prime military reasons for its existence and its present large size, are atomic and hydrogen weapons. It is these very weapons which have required the country to attempt a dispersal policy with

regard to its vital industries. It thus seems to the joint committee most appropriate that the AEC, which is the country's expert on the effects of atomic weapons, should follow the dispersal recommendations for which its staff is largely responsible.

As long as the Commission maintains its headquarters in the District of Columbia it is necessary that it also maintain an emergency headquarters at a point which meets these dispersal criteria. By locating its offices at a point which meets the dispersal criteria the additional expense of an emergency headquarters in the Washington area can be dispensed with.

The precise location of the building will be a decision of the executive department, based upon the technical facts developed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

I urge the passage of the bill.

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR AEC OFFICE SPACE

First. Rental: Rental of building on H Street in District of Columbia which has 255,000 square feet of usable space:

Annual rental payments	$685,000
Other housing costs	215,000
Total	900,000

$\frac{\$900,000}{255,000}$ = $3.54 per square foot of usable space per year.

Second. Lease-purchase method: 232,000 square feet usable space:

Interest at 3¾ percent and amortization	$498,000
Managerial, custodial, heat utilities	268,000
Annual payment on construction overhead	16,000
Maintenance of property	40,000
Real-estate taxes	135,000
Insurance	17,000
Total annual operating cost	974,000
Less value of land and buildings at end of 25-year contract period	169,000
Net annual cost	805,000

$\frac{\$805,000}{232,000}$ = $3.47 per square foot of usable space.

Third. Direct AEC construction:

Using 2½ percent interest rate, 25-year amortization period:

Annual savings on interest	$56,000
Annual savings on insurance	17,000
Annual savings on taxes	135,000
Total annual savings over lease-purchase method	208,000

$806,000 less $208,000 = $597,000.

$\frac{\$597,000}{232,000}$ = $2.75 per square foot of usable space.

Using 2½ percent interest and 40-year amortization period:

Annnal savings on interest and principal	$74,000
Annual savings on taxes	135,000
Annual savings on insurance	17,000
Total	226,000

$805,000 less $226,000 = $579,000 total annual cost.

$\frac{\$579,000}{232,000}$ = $2.50 per square foot of usable space.

AEC CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE

AEC expenditures for plant and equipment:

	Million
Fiscal year 1953	$1,100
Fiscal year 1954	1,100
Fiscal year 1955	900

During this 3-year period AEC estimates that $300 million was spent on construction of community, light laboratory, and administrative type building.

Department of Defense expenditures for construction of all types:

	Million
Fiscal year 1953	$2,000
Fiscal year 1954	1,700
Fiscal year 1955	1,400

The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior construction expenditures:

	Million
Fiscal year 1953	$200
Fiscal year 1954	170
Fiscal year 1955	135

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE. As the gentleman has indicated the original Atomic Energy law required the central office to be in the District of Columbia. When the joint committee last year undertook a general revision of the Atomic Energy Act, at the request of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Strauss, the statutory limitation on the location of the office was extended to beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Mr. Strauss made that request, having in mind the desirability of placing the central office of the Atomic Energy Commission farther away than the District of Columbia itself, but within a reasonable distance, to make it accessible to other sensitive agencies.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this measure should be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I still have not heard any compelling reason for the location of this structure in or near the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DURHAM. I tried to say to the gentleman that this does not involve what one might call the strategic operations, but more or less paperwork and clearinghouse activities.

One reason why we provided that this building should be outside the District of Columbia was the matter of protection of records. We believe we can build a very safe vault.

Mr. GROSS. And does not the gentleman think a safe vault could be built out in the Midwest, for instance?

Mr. DURHAM. Unquestionably a safe vault could be built anywhere; but the gentleman well knows that in the case of a large agency like this there must be a central agency convenient to Government. The need of consultation with the members of the Commission by Members of Congress is necessary; and then in the matter of representatives of the Commission coming to Washington for appropriations and hearings could cost a great deal of money and cause a great deal of inconvience and waste of time. Think what this would be if we moved it somewhere away from the city of Washington at a long distance.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Is not the language of the appropriation bill in conformity with the language in the existing Atomic Energy legislation?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE. And is it not also a fact that this bill in providing for a possible construction within 20 or 30 miles of Washington also is in conformity with the dispersal policy enunciated by the Government?

Mr. DURHAM. It is. I believe that is a recommendation of the Security Council of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not also a fact that the original Atomic Energy Commission legislation has been expanded to say that the structure may be built outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DURHAM. It was; yes.

Mr. PRICE. The existing legislation uses exactly the same language as the bill presented here today: "In or near the District of Columbia."

Mr. GROSS. But that is taken from the original language.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that at the time the original act was passed we had no knowledge of the blast effects of an atomic explosion. The committee, therefore, is concerned about that. That is the reason we have suggested it outside the city of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Now with knowledge of the blast effect of an atom or a hydrogen bomb, we realize that even at 30 miles it is not out of the blast zone. Is not that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. It would be out on the fringe of the blast effect.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that as far as the dispersal angle is concerned this meets the criteria of dispersal.

I would like to point out that the situation here is a little different from that of the ordinary Government agency. The Atomic Energy Commission is compelled by law to keep a standing committee of the House and Senate, a joint committee, currently informed on all phases of its program. The result is that these commissioners and all the top officials of the Atomic Energy Commission spend almost as much time in congressional committee rooms as they do in their own conference rooms in their own building here in Washington. In this respect it is different from most of the Government departments.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Illinois is correct, and the committee is in almost continuous session. The cost at a great distance would be prohibitive.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, apparently the only item of controversy in connection with this proposal is with respect to the location of the office. I might take a moment to repeat what I had earlier said in explaining how it came about that this expression is used in the bill before us: That the central office of the Commission be located "in or near the District of Columbia."

The original Atomic Energy Act required the central office to be in the District of Columbia. Last year the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, being very sensitive to the need for dispersal, requested that the basic law of the Commission be changed so that the central office could be in or near the District of Columbia, leaving it to the discretion or judgment of the Commission or the appropriate committees of the Congress as to what constitutes "near," having in mind the atomic hazards to which this activity might be subjected.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is likewise sensitive to the need for dispersal and feels that if for no other reason than that this agency should set a pattern for other agencies of Government as well as industrial activities, that reason alone justifies the central office being located some reasonable distance from the District of Columbia. As the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, the Atomic Energy Commission, is in constant communication with the joint committee and other committees of Congress and, of course, with other agencies of Government located here in the District or adjacent to the District which are of equal sensitivity. I have in mind the Defense Department, the three service departments, all of which are located practically within the District of Columbia. I have in mind the proposal that the Central Intelligence Agency is about to be located somewhat near the District of Columbia. Of course, that is a very important and sensitive agency.

The House can be assured that the problem of dispersal is one which is of concern to the Commission as well as to the joint committee and what eventually will be determined to be the location will be a location that is at a reasonable distance, having in mind the need for dispersal and the obligations of the Commission to commute between the central office and the Capitol Building as well as other agencies of the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I say that I had the honor of serving for some time on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. If the gentleman from New York who was the chairman of that joint committee tells me that the Atomic Energy Commission has passed on this matter and approved it and that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has considered it and recommend it, I guarantee to anybody that it has been given thorough consideration by competent individuals whose judgment is good enough for me.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman. I should advise the House that there is an understanding between the Commission and the joint committee that before any final decision is made in respect to the exact location of this building, the Commission will apprise the joint committee of that recommendation and come to some agreement in that respect with the joint committee.

The House should also be advised that the matter of an office building was first submitted to the Committee on Public Works of the House with a request that funds for that purpose come from what is called the lease-purchase program for Government buildings. The Committee on Public Works interposed no objection to the Commission using that avenue of approach in acquiring the funds for this office building. The Commission also last year went to the Committee of the Senate on Public Works and obtained from the Senate committee an acquiescence providing the joint committee approved of the construction of the building. The Commission came before the joint committee about a month or 6 weeks ago with its request for approval of an office building. The joint committee felt that because of the peculiar nature of this office building—its type of construction necessarily must be different from the ordinary office building for reasons of security—and because of the amount of money involved, $10 million, it would be better for the Commission to obtain this authority independently of the lease-purchase program. So the joint committee recommended this procedure.

It should be pointed out also that funds for the construction of the building are already available to the Commission. It has sufficient funds in its control now to build it, but because of the fact that the Congress last year required specific authorization hereafter for the appropriation of funds for construction of any plants, buildings or property, the Commission following out the spirit of that recommendation came to the joint committee for specific authority. That is what the pending bill before the House this afternoon does; it is to authorize the appropriation of funds specifically for the construction of this office building to be built by the Commission under its own contract, its own staff, and according to its own peculiar requirements to meet the security considerations.

I would like now to comment on an aspect of this bill which I believe to be of particular importance—that is, security. The AEC now has offices in 3 different buildings. It has in temporary buildings such important divisions as Reactor Development—charged primarily with the responsibility for development of reactors for power and propulsion of naval vessels and aircraft; Raw Materials—responsible for domestic and foreign procurement of ore; Biology and Medicine, Research, Security, and other important divisions. Necessarily there must be a constant shuttling back and forth between the main building and the temporary buildings of key personnel and of records and documents. Many times these documents are carried by the persons who are going to utilize them. Some of them are quite sensitive. With thousands of classified documents flowing between buildings each year, this situation is going to result in the loss or compromise of a sensitive document sooner or later.

Moreover, the security rules of the AEC, as in the case of many other agencies, require that no classified information be discussed on the telephone. Obviously, this means a great deal more of face-to-face contact by key personnel than would otherwise be necessary. For key personnel located in separate buildings, this requires a further and considerable loss of valuable time.

This bill will permit the AEC to construct a modern building with all the latest protective security devices and vaults. At present the Commission must secure its sensitive documents by placing them in hundreds of separate locked file cabinets. In a single office building sensitive files can be placed in centrally located vault type file rooms at a greatly reduced cost and with maximum protection.

As I have pointed out the Commission is now housed in 2 temporary buildings as well as the Old Public Health Building. To guard these old temporaries requires an extremely large guard force. In fact, the AEC shares one of its buildings with another agency. Guards must be placed in all the common corridors in addition to all the doors leading out of the building. Housing the Commission in a single building will of course vastly reduce the necessary guard force.

You have seen, Mr. Chairman, the typical temporary buildings such as the AEC is now using. To make one of them secure is a complicated and expensive operation, and with the best efforts, one can never be sure. I have utmost faith in the security officers of the Atomic Energy Commission, I know they are doing a conscientious job, but there is a limit on the type of security one can have with such facilities as are available.

A modern office building equipped with all the latest protective devices would not only save money by saving executive time and reducing security guard forces but it would give a greater degree of protection to the Nation's vital atomic secrets.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this bill not only for the important and cogent reasons expressed by my distinguished colleague the vice chairman of the joint committee, and our distinguished colleague from New York, but because I believe the building of this new headquarters in accordance with established dispersal criteria will set a splendid example for the whole country.

In these days of hydrogen bombs with utter, devastating destructive capability, we must pay attention to the one simple, yet effective, answer—disperse our industry, our cities, and our important governmental agencies. That the AEC will build its headquarters in accordance with dispersal requirements, for which

incidentally it bears a major responsibility, makes sense to me, and even if reasons of economy, and security, and prudent business did not persuade me to the need for passage of this bill, the overriding need for dispersal would.

Let me amplify my reasons. The threat of atomic attack on this country is still real and this peril may remain for many years. Most of those who have studied the problem are convinced that some measure of additional protection is afforded to this country's vital industry and key Government agencies by relocating them at sites meeting dispersal criteria. Obviously a target high on the list of any nation launching an atomic attack against this country would be the seat of its Government, Washington, D. C. Because of the huge investment in existing plants, any dispersal is going to have to take place over a period of years. I am quite convinced that the relocation of the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters at a site meeting dispersal criteria would set a splendid example for the rest of the Government and private industry. If the agency with as much knowledge of the terrible destructive capability of thermonuclear weapons relocates its headquarters, I am sure others will recognize the need for them to do likewise.

I understand that the agency believes it can meet dispersal criteria and locate its headquarters not more than 20 miles from the Washington monument. By not going a greater distance from Washington the impact on its employees should be considerably lessened.

Moreover, it will minimize the inconvenience the distance which must be traveled in order to conform with other Government agencies. Obviously no relocation such as this can take place without some inconvenience. I am as sure that the agency will take very reasonable precaution to minimize any inconvenience.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Someone a few moments ago, the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from North Carolina, established the effective blast area as 30 miles. Why do you now speak in terms of perhaps locating this structure within the blast area?

Mr. PRICE. I said about 20 miles. I think the assurance we have from the Commission would be within 20 to 30 miles.

Mr. GROSS. The bill contains a provision "a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia." I assume from what the gentleman has said that he would not oppose striking out the language "in or near the District of Columbia."

Mr. PRICE. I would oppose any amendment that would limit the Commission to constructing the building within the District, and I think unless we have "in or near" it would be limited to the District.

Mr. GROSS. Well, how can you be 20 miles from the Washington Monument and still be in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PRICE. It says in or near the District of Columbia. I should say that anywhere within 50 miles could be considered near in this age.

Mr. GROSS. I think "in" means exactly what it says—in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct; "in" would mean that, but it does not say that. It says in or near the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. It says in or near the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So the structure still may be constructed in the District of Columbia, if this bill is passed.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct; it could be, but it is not the intention of the Commission to do that. It is the Commission's request that we liberalize the language so that it can go outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not make them go outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. GROSS. That is the point; let us make them go outside the District of Columbia. Let us get the building out of this blast area.

Mr. PRICE. I do not suppose that they would have any objection to that, because it is their intention to do that.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman would say that he would not oppose an amendment to the bill providing for construction outside the blast area.

Mr. PRICE. I do not see any need for an amendment to the bill, because I know that it is the intention of the Commission to build outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] does not know that is the intention of the Commission.

Mr. PRICE. I can appreciate that, but I think the gentleman from Iowa can take the assurance of the Commission, through the Congressional Joint Committee, that that is the intention of the Commission. I can appreciate the gentleman's concern.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should like to say to our good friend this: Why should we have to take everybody's word for their intention? We have been let down so many, many times, I am sure the gentleman is aware of that, why not put this outside the District of Columbia? We know the District of Columbia is overcrowded.

Mr. PRICE. Of course we do. And that is the reason why I do not see any possibility of the Commission staying within the District of Columbia. They would not have the space to stay here. They are the ones who are requesting that they be allowed to go outside.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not fair to the District, because here is some more property that would be Federal property and, therefore, not taxed. It is not fair to dump all this stuff onto the District. Why should we not put it in the bill that they should go outside?

Mr. PRICE. We are not going to do that. The Commission does not intend to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what the gentleman says, that they do not want to do that, that they do not intend to do that and everybody is agreed. So why not put it into the bill? What is the objection to stating it?

Mr. PRICE. I do not see any necessity of stating it. There probably would not be any objection on my part, but I do not see any necessity for it in this particular case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have been promising the taxpayers a great many things over the years and have not come through on many of them. Why not put it in the bill now?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for a few minutes in hearty support of this bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia, to serve as its principal office. I should like the record to show that there are in my congressional district, which starts right here on the borders of Washington, in Montgomery County, and in western Maryland a number of very, very suitable locations for this building; suitable not only from the standpoint of a location for an office building but desirable from the standpoint of relieving economic distress in areas within a 30-mile radius of Washington. Those areas are losing business that they now have as a result of shutdowns and changes made in industries now located there.

So I should like to commend to the Atomic Energy Commission the serious consideration of that part of Maryland known as Western Maryland for the location of this atomic-energy building.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. COLE. I am not sure whether the gentleman from Maryland is aware of the fact or not, although I think he undoubtedly is, but just on the outside chance that he may not know of it and for the purpose of giving him some comfort and the people he represents some degree of hope, it is a fact that the Commission has had under consideration and still has under consideration locating the office building in the section of Maryland which the gentleman represents.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for that information. I have heard something about that. Of course, on the basis of that information we have high hopes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice the bill carries $10 million. Is that for the survey or the drawing of the plans?

Mr. HYDE. I know nothing about the details of the plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that $10 million for? Is that just for the making of plans or the making of a survey?

Mr. HYDE. I would prefer the gentleman ask that question of someone more qualified to answer it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is satisfied with the bill as it presently stands because there is a good chance that the building will be located in his district. Is that correct?

Mr. HYDE. I would say that is substantially correct, yes.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman will yield, since the question was raised by the gentleman from Michigan, I can assure him that this includes not only the surveying and planning but the completion of the building.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to commend the gentleman for serving his district. I do not have any criticism and I do not think my friend from Iowa has any criticism because the gentleman wants it for his district, because that is natural and commendable.

Mr. HYDE. I deeply appreciate the gentleman's commendation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill to authorize the construction of an office building for the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters. I hope I will be pardoned for pointing out that action on this legislation justifies a position which I took last year in opposing the request of the Atomic Energy Commission for approval of the construction of the headquarters under the lease-purchase system.

The lease-purchase plan was not designed for the construction of buildings so immediately essential to the proper conduct of our national-defense effort. The funds for this building have already been appropriated by the Congress.

If this headquarters building had been built under the lease-purchase arrangement which was proposed by Admiral Strauss in 1954, the cost to the Government would have amounted to several million dollars more. The method being used to authorize construction of the building is by far the simplest and certainly the best one from the viewpoint of the American taxpayer.

The action of the House here today makes it clear hasty action should not be taken on these lease-purchase projects. It is obvious that the administration is realizing that the lease-purchase plan is not the panacea that many originally assumed it would be. Lease purchase should be used only for the construction of essential buildings for which there is no possibility of direct appropriations being provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, line 7, strike out "in or near" and substitute the words "not less than 30 miles from."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make certain that this structure is not going to be erected at a cost of $10 million within the District of Columbia. My amendment simply provides that the structure shall be built not less than 30 miles from the District of Columbia, which would take it beyond the primary-blast area.

The members of the committee themselves have stated on the floor that the primary-blast area of an expected atomic weapon would be 30 miles. There is nothing complex about this amendment at all, Mr. Chairman. It would simply take this structure beyond the primary area.

We talk a lot about civil defense but there is only one effective civil-defense program and that is the widest possible dispersal of prime targets.

Personally, I can see no reason why this Atomic Energy Commission building should not be constructed somewhere in the country much further removed from the National Capital than 30 miles, in view of modern methods of communication, but I am willing to go along with the committee to the extent that this building be constructed beyond the primary-blast area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment. If the threat of atomic warfare is as real as it is purported to be, and if Congress is not merely giving lip service to dispersal of prime targets, then there can be no question of the location of a new, $10 million structure safely distant from the target area of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated in the earlier discussion of the bill, the basic law, the law which the House considered and the Congress passed last August requires that the central office of the Atomic Energy Commission be located in or near the District of Columbia. It is appreciated that the gentleman from Iowa has this concern over the safety of the Atomic Energy Commission and the people who will be employed in this new office building.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, of any agency of Government which is more aware of the hazards of an atomic attack than the Atomic Energy Commission itself. I am not aware of any group in the Congress which is more aware of and alive to the hazards of atomic attack and the need for dispersal than the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It has already been pointed out that it is the joint view of the Commission and the committee that the office building should be located somewhere within a reasonable distance outside the District of Columbia. If we were to adopt the gentleman's amendment, and provide a minimum distance of 30 miles, we must consider the convenience of the 1,200 people who will be required to travel to this office building. To some, 30 miles may not be a great distance for the reason that they may live nearby and, therefore, may be closer to whatever locality is selected as the site for the office building. For other persons presently employed by the Commission who will be required to travel the distance which will be necessary under this proposed amendment in order to arrive at the office building, which the gentleman proposes must be at least 30 miles away, the distance that they may be required to travel might be as much as 30, 40, or 50 miles. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the House, which has had rather generous reliance upon the judgment of the joint committee in other respects will be equally reliant on the joint committee with respect to where this office building is to be located.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is this structure being built for the convenience of the employees or for the protection of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. COLE. Of course, the gentleman well knows that the building is being built to house the employees of the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the Commission itself. I do not know whether the gentleman shares my viewpoint or not, but frankly I am just as concerned about the convenience and safety of the employees of the Commission as I am about the Commission itself.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is more concerned over the convenience and travel of the employees than he is for the safety of this structure and the records and personnel.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman can be assured that the office building will be constructed in such a fashion that the important records of the Commission will be safely housed and protected against any damage.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, because the records will be in vaults. We are not thinking of the records being safe because the records would be safe almost anywhere they are placed, and they will probably be placed in deep vaults. But that is quite a different thing from the protection of the personnel.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman speaks about a change in the basic laws which were passed a year ago. I know of no reason, and I wonder whether the gentleman knows of any reason, why the

Congress should not change basic laws after they are enacted, if it is found desirable to change them.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman misunderstood my statement. I did not argue that this bill does change existing law. I was simply pointing out that this amendment did not change existing law, the provisions of which still remain in the basic act for the central office to be located in or near the District of Columbia. I was simply undertaking to show that this amendment, before us now, is inconsistent with the action which the Congress took last year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be voted down. I think one of the worst things which would happen, in my opinion, and this was discussed quite at length in writing the original law, and also this provision, is that it would create a speculative interest immediately in land values if a 30-mile limitation were placed in the bill. So the committee felt that it would be wise to leave this in the discretion of the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe the House can be assured, and I am sure we are, that this building should be built outside the District of Columbia. I personally do, and I have insisted on that from the beginning. So I see no reason to adopt this amendment to create speculative prices around here. We have got to purchase the property wherever it is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That would be true no matter where you constructed the building, would it not?

Mr. DURHAM. That is possibly true, but it is different in pinpointing 20 or 30 miles and in leaving it more or less wide open.

Mr. GROSS. How many employees will this building house?

Mr. DURHAM. There are about 1,300 at the present time employed.

Mr. GROSS. How many does the gentleman anticipate putting into this building?

Mr. DURHAM. We intend to put them all in the building. Some of them may resign. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. How many would that be?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know, because some are on the north side of Washington and some on the south side.

Mr. GROSS. But it is a minimum of 1,300?

Mr. DURHAM. About 1,300.

Mr. GROSS. If you construct a building out here somewhere, the employees are going to go there to go to work. The gentleman does not mean you are going to establish some segment of it downtown; do you?

Mr. DURHAM. I cannot be sure that everybody is going 30 miles outside of Washington to work. We have not done that before. We are making an attempt to put it outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Have we not built some kind of a sensitive agency a great deal further out here somewhere?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know of one at the present time where 1,300 employees have had to go that distance. All employees necessarily have to have security clearances and it takes quite a long time to secure these clearances and costs a lot of money, so we cannot afford to lose them by going too far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets started?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MASON. On the question of pinpointing the rise in value, when we say "in or near," we have a circumscribed circle that is just about so big, whatever "near" might mean. But when you say "not less than 30 miles," then you have got a much greater area, and there would be less pinpointing in that than there would be in the present language in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Occasionally there comes to my desk a letter inquiring, "Just how crazy can Congress get?"

I would not ask that question, but I will ask, "Just how illogical can we get?" Now here is a building to make a place for these people, in this very sensitive agency. The purpose is to put them in or near Washington. When the gentleman suggests that 50 miles is "near" today, permit the suggestion that over the years I have been hearing that Asia and Africa and other places, all on the other side of the world, were just next door to us, and that we were forced to spend billions to protect ourselves from them because they were so close to us. We might be called on the next moment to defend ourselves from them.

If I remember correctly, there has been more or less talk and some legislation with reference to making Washington secure, because it seemed to be the center of our national defense. Then there was some talk about defense plants being placed on outside of cities where they are now located, scattering them all around, so that no one bomb could get them all at once. Up at the locks in Michigan, at Sault Ste. Marie, we had built a new airport because we had to protect the locks.

I have heard that the President has a hideaway, and they are talking about building another one for the Speaker and the assistant minority leader and for Members of Congress, to get them away from Washington in time of danger so that someone cannot blow us all up at once.

I met with a great deal of criticism one time when someone suggested a few years back, I think it was right after the Puerto Rican shooting, that someone might drob a bomb down here and blow up the Congress. Thoughtlessly I suggested if they did maybe they would get just as a good a Congress if a new Congress was elected. You know some Members here were really indignant about that; that they could not be replaced. My own opinion is that no one is indispensable. Though some are difficult to replace.

There is now before one of the committees of this House the question of moving one of the defense organizations which is over here in Baltimore, moving it to Dayton, Ohio. It was once located at Dayton, then moved to Baltimore, now it is to be sent back to Ohio, so I hear. I do not know, although I am a member of the committee, whether it ought to be moved or whether it should not be moved. But if we are to move these agencies and defense plants away from centers, then why not support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa? Let the Commission put it somewhere—and I do not suppose many of us know where it should be or care where it is to be—but put it away from this very, very vital and already congested center here in Washington. Does not the amendment seem sensible? Does not that seem sound? Or should we build this $10 million building to house these employees and then in a year or two move the agency to some other city? Some say that now we should just abandon the old Capitol here, this historic room, and the whole building itself.

Over across the plaza we built a $12 million building for the Supreme Court. Go over there some day and take a look at it and ask or see if you can learn what it costs just to maintain it for those nine fine young learned gentlemen who administer the law, who not only administer the law, but with reference to segregation some say make the law. If the trend continues some day we will not need Congress at all, just turn everything over to the Executive—a man at the present time in whom we have the greatest confidence and whom we trust—and the Supreme Court, and let it go at that.

Is it not reasonable to suggest that when we build this new building it go out somewhere so that when those bombs come over, if they do—and that is another thing that is difficult to understand; this bombing business seems to be on a one-way road and schedule; one shot or drop will not wipe out the whole Government. For the last 10 or 12 years we have been frightened to death that either the Chinese—I do not know whether they are going to send over a bomb in a paper balloon—either the Chinese or the Russians would just blow us all to kingdom come.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa ought to be, but probably it will not be, adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE) there were—ayes 22, noes 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Chairman of

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, pursuant to House Resolution 214, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER announced that the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill may be postponed until Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is a gentleman's agreement that there would not be a rollcall vote on a substantive matter today; therefore the gentleman from Oklahoma is asking unanimous consent that further proceedings under this bill be passed over until Thursday.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4954, with Mr. HAYS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a rather simple bill. In a word it provides for a uniform statute of limitations with reference to treble damage suits filed by private litigants against violators of the antitrust laws and permits a right of action on the part of the Government in its proprietary capacity by virtue of violations of the antitrust laws.

At the present time, if the United States Government is injured in that proprietary right—and it is injured many times in its procurement activities on account of violations of antitrust laws—it cannot now sue to recover actual damages. It is rather anomalous that a State can sue for such damages, a city or municipality can sue for such damages, a tri-State authority can sue for such damages, a corporation may sue, but by virtue of a decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1941, *U. S.* v. *Cooper* (312 U. S., p. 600), the United States is deemed not a "person" and thus cannot sue. The word "person" is the key word in the statute. Only a "person" presently can sue.

When you contemplate that the United States Government through its procurement agencies buys upwards, shall I say of $6 billion a month of goods and then cannot by virtue of violations or possible violations of the antitrust laws sue for its actual damages when bidders seem to cabal and unite together to defraud the Government, it is time for us to pause. We must remedy that defect.

The Attorney General has asked for this provision and among other things he has stated:

> The United States is the largest single purchaser of goods in this country and may suffer substantial losses from antitrust violations. As shown in the Cooper case, the Government sustained extensive damages as the result of certain bids submitted on motor vehicle tires and tubes. For the half year ending March 31, 1937, 18 companies submitted identical bids on 82 different sizes of tires and tubes. This identical bidding was repeated in the next half year, but with substantially higher prices than for the preceding period. When bids were submitted for the third half year period the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, upon the advice of the Attorney General, rejected the bids and invited new ones. The new bids were the same as those rejected. In the circumstances the Treasury Department negotiated a contract with another supplier for its full requirements.
>
> In its next invitation to submit bids the Government required the bidders to warrant that the prices bid were not the result of an agreement among them. Lower bids followed. A comparison of these bids with the earlier bids showed that the United States had been injured to the extent of $351,158.21 during the 18-month period involved. A treble-damage action against the offending companies was instituted by the Government but was dismissed on the ground that the United States is not a "person" within the treble-damage provision of the statute.

It was thus discovered that the United States Government, as the result of this illegal, illicit combination, was mulcted in the sum of a little over $351,000. Now, there have been many other instances that could be pointed out where the Government suffered. I think surely we must answer the plea of the Attorney General who incidentally has made that plea for quite a number of years that the Government should be permitted to sue for actual damages.

In addition, the bill provides for a uniform statute of limitations. In cases where individuals sue for treble damages in the various United States district courts, there are a variety of State statutes that are applicable. In one State, for example, the statute of limitations is 1 year. In other States the statute has been construed to be as long as 20 years. Thirteen States have a 3-year statute. Four States have a 4-year statute. Three States have a 5-year statute. Sixteen States have a 6-year statute. The average for the whole country is 4.85 years, and I believe in its wisdom the Committee on the Judiciary—incidentally, the report was unanimous—recommended than an average might well be struck and they determined 4 years would be a proper period.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does that 4 years apply to conspiracy cases? Suppose there is a conspiracy, and it is 10 years before the conspiracy is known.

Mr. CELLER. In the case of conspiracy or fraud, the statute only runs from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. From the time of the discovery?

Mr. CELLER. In conspiracy cases and cases of fraud.

Mr. PATMAN. And it is not the object or intention to change that at all?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Now, in some States you have a considerable degree of confusion. The courts differ as to whether an action for treble damages is, for example, an action in tort or an action in contract. If it is an action in tort, the statute of limitations differs from the statute applicable to a case in contract. In some jurisdictions the action for treble damages is deemed injury to the person; in other States it is injury to property; in still other States it is deemed a forfeiture; in some other States it is deemed a penalty. But, a varying number of statutes are involved, and to avoid the difficulty and the confusion that confronts litigants and their counsel as to what statute really applies so that they may know what the statute of limitations really is, we come forward now and we seek to resolve chaos and confusion and say that the statute shall be uniform throughout the country and shall be for a period of 4 years.

To give you an idea of that confusion, let me read to you a brief paragraph from the report:

> In *Northern Kentucky Tel. Co.* v. *Southern Bell T. & T. Co.*, a private suit for triple damages filed in the State of Kentucky which had a 5-year statute of limitations applicable to "an action upon a liability created by statute * * *," the court held that the 1-year statute of limitations governing actions for conspiracy was to be preferred to the 5-year period for statutory liability. In *Reid* v. *Doubleday & Co.*, the problem was whether the applicable period was contained in the statute of limitations pertaining to actions to enforce "a liability created by statute other than a forfeiture or penalty" or that prescribed for actions "upon a statute for a penalty of forfeiture." In this instance, it was held that the 6-year period governing proceedings of the former type rather than the 1-year period for actions of the latter was applicable.

So, in view of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary presents a unanimous front on this bill, and in view

further that we have been endeavoring to get this remedy before this House for quite a number of years, I do indeed hope the bill will pass.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is now under consideration is the culmination of several years of study and hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary of a very important subject. I am particularly gratified to express my support of the bill H. R. 4954, especially so because it contains provisions which I have advocated and sponsored in the form of legislation in this and previous Congresses.

The bill before us is a relatively simple bill containing two major provisions.

The first provides the Government of the United States with the right to recover actual damages which it has suffered because of violations of the antitrust laws.

The second provision establishes a uniform statute of limitations for antitrust damage suits of 4 years.

Section 1 of the bill, which amends the Clayton Act so as to provide the United States with the right to recover actual damages arising out of violations of the antitrust laws, fills a gap in the antitrust laws which has resulted from the Supreme Court decision in the Cooper Corporation case. It was believed, up until that decision, that the existing statute in referring to "any person," included the Government of the United States. However, the Supreme Court ruled otherwise. Thus, we find a rather absurd situation in the law today. Any individual, corporation, State, or municipality can sue to recover treble damages for violations of the antitrust laws. Yet the Government of the United States, which is by far the largest single purchaser of goods and services, cannot sue for damages it may have suffered from antitrust violations.

When one recalls the billions of dollars annually expended by our Government, it is readily apparent that such a loophole in our antitrust laws must be closed immediately. The taxpayers of this country are entitled to the protection of the laws not only as individual purchasers, but also when their Government acts as their purchasing agent. Section 1 of the bill will remedy the situation. It is interesting to note, in passing, that this provision has practically the unanimous approval of everyone.

Since the United States Government is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the antitrust laws, the bill limits the recovery of damages to those actually incurred as distinguished from the individual's right to recover treble damages. There is no need to provide a motive for the Government to enforce its laws as distinguished from the case of private individuals. Moreover, it is indeed possible, in view of the fact that the Government is dealing with many small- and middle-sized business firms, it might easily cause their failure, should they be the perpetrators of antitrust violations against the Government, if the Government should be entitled to recover treble damages.

The Attorney General should be commended for the position which he has taken in recommending this legislation in his letter to the Speaker on January 20, 1955.

The right to recover damages for violations of the antitrust laws is a Federally accorded right. At the present time, these private treble damage cases are governed by the statute of limitations as set forth in the laws of the various States. That condition has caused serious and perplexing problems affecting both plaintiff and defendant.

In such cases, a determination must be made, first, as to what State law applies; then there is the added problem of a conflict of laws to determine whether the law of the forum or the law of the situs of the injury shall be controlling. And then, to add confusion to mystery, there is the problem to determine the appropriate law of the State that should govern the proceeding. When one recalls the varied gamut of the forms of legal action that exists throughout this land, the hodge-podge that results is self-evident.

A study of the problem from the standpoint of individual State statutes and case law indicates statutes running from 1 to 20 years with an average national limitation of approximately 4.85 years. Therefore, the committee, in selecting a period of 4 years, has struck a fair and equitable national average in order to establish uniformity and to obviate the confusion of the past.

In addition to establishing a uniform statute of limitations, the bill strikes at another problem flowing therefrom, namely, the tolling of such a statute. At the present time, the tolling of the statute, with respect to private treble damage suits, exists during the pendency of a suit by the United States. This period is continued by the present bill. However, in order that a person might not be deprived of the benefit of the Government suit because of an abrupt termination of the Government's litigation, the bill provides for extension of the tolling period not only for the duration of the Government suit but also for 1 year thereafter. Thus the injured parties are provided with an adequate time in which to take advantage of the Government's antitrust proceedings.

There is an added precaution also provided for in this bill to prevent undue and lengthy prolongation of stale claims. By requiring a plaintiff to institute his suit either within 4 years from the date of injury or within 1 year after the final decree in a Government case, the plaintiffs will not be afforded time to procrastinate and delay.

In addition, in order to protect existing causes of action which may be affected by the legislation, provision is made that the act shall not take effect until 6 months after the date of enactment. That 6-month period will provide adequate notice to all to look to their rights and take the necessary measures to protect them.

Over the years, the proposal to fix a uniform Federal statute of limitations has been controversial not from the standpoint of the need for such a statute nor from the desirability of establishing one, but the issue has always been the determination of the number of years. I am happy to say, however, that the committee has been informed that most of the interested parties have now agreed that the period of 4 years, as fixed in this bill is satisfactory and fair. Therefore, I urge the favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman agree with the chairman that the 4-year limitation does not commence to apply in a conspiracy case until the conspiracy becomes known?

Mr. KEATING. I would want to have the law on that checked by the counsel for our committee. I have an impression that there have been decisions under the present conspiracy statute, which is not in any way interfered with by this legislation, to the effect that the statute of limitations does not begin to run until discovery of the conspiracy. But I would not want to make a positive assertion to the gentleman on that point without further investigation of the law.

Mr. PATMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that the discovery was made years later?

Mr. KEATING. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee, who may have investigated that precise point.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I have. The statute only said from the time of discovery in that kind of case. The basis for my conclusion in that regard is the cases themselves. There are innumerable cases on that score.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to have that enlightenment.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman yield for one other question related to this discussion?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. About triple damages, I know the committee has been considering for years the question of triple damages. The contention is made it should be left to the judge of the court to determine if the amount should be less than triple damages. Does not the gentleman believe it would be fair, if you are going to leave it to the judge of a court, to permit the judge of a court to assess more than triple damages where the facts so warrant?

Mr. KEATING. That is not in this legislation at all, because the committee has not reported out any bill to make it discretionary instead of mandatory to award treble damages. Under the existing law, treble damages are mandatory in such case, so that the question which the gentleman has raised seems to me to be academic at this point.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but this reference to not having the triple damages refers to that statute and gives the Government actual damages. It is indirectly related to it. I just wanted an expression of opinion from the gentleman as a ranking minority member of that great Committee on the Judiciary as to his belief that if we are going to

relieve the one who is guilty of the burden of triple damages and leave the discretion in the court to say it may be less, would it be fair also to leave it within the discretion of the court to say under certain circumstances where the facts warrant it could even be more than triple damages?

Mr. KEATING. I still contend that the gentleman's inquiry is purely academic at this point and has nothing to do with the legislation before us. As a matter of fact, when that issue was last considered by our committee I opposed the amendment to lodge discretion in the court about imposing treble damages. We are going to have some hearings on that subject, and I want to retain an open mind; but I believe that the gentleman's question should properly be raised in the hearings to be held on that entire subject and in the ensuing debate if the committee should later report favorably a measure to change existing law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the bill H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, and establishing a uniform statute of limitations. I am sure that most of you are well acquainted with the able statements made by the chairman of our committee, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that considered this legislation. It actually has as its objective three real purposes. The first one is to grant to the Government of the United States a right of action for a violation of any antitrust law where the proprietary interest of the United States Government has been damaged. When the original act was passed, it was not contemplated that the United States Government would engage in business to the extent that it has within the last 20 years, with the result that when it did begin to engage in business in the magnitude, as this report shows, of approximately $6 billion a year, they found many instances of what they believed to be collusion. The Justice Department instituted action believing that the United States Government was a person within the meaning of this act. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court of the United States determined that the legislation, as drawn, did not contemplate that the United States Government was a person within the meaning of the act. Therefore, the Committee on the Judiciary has recommended that the Federal Government be given the position of a person so that they may institute suit against individuals and corporations who may have engaged in a conspiracy to violate the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. That is the first objective of this legislation, and it is needless to point out that the Government is entitled to this protection because of the vast amount of purchasing that they have done in the past and will purchase in the future.

The second feature of this bill is to establish a uniform statute of limitation of 4 years. Heretofore, any person damaged, as a result of a conspiracy under a law that created a cause of action was left to the statute of limitation of his respective State. A survey was made by the Committee on the Judiciary of the respective statutes of limitation, and I direct your attention to page 7 of the report wherein is set forth the various States and their respective statutes. It was very difficult, as has previously been pointed, for the attorneys who are interested in this type of an action to ascertain the statute of limitation in each case. With the adoption of the 4-year statute of limitation, you have something that is uniform and something that should have been enacted in previous legislation.

We protect the rights of individuals where the statute of limitation is suspended under the present law. We provide that the individual must institute his action within a period of 1 year after the suspension has ended.

We, in the Committee on the Judiciary, have considered this along with other matters and unanimously recommend this to the House and trust you will adopt it in every particular.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire me to yield time to him now?

Mr. PATMAN. I prefer to take the time under the 5-minute rule by having the amendments I have in mind read for information, and then briefly discuss each one. I shall not insist upon it now. However, I thank the gentleman from New York for offering me time in general debate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to the portions of the measure now before the Committee for consideration which will affect pending litigation. I would direct the attention of the Members to page 2 of the bill, section 4B, lines 8 and 9, where it is specifically provided that—

> No cause of action barred under existing law on the effective date of this act shall be revived by this act.

It is specifically provided that this bill, in its operation, shall be prospective, so that if there is a State in the Union—and there are, of course, many—where you have a 3-year statute of limitation, upon the adoption of this measure by the Congress, it will not be possible for a litigant to go back and revive his action on the basis that there is now a 4-year statute of limitation applicable. An action that has already been barred by the statute of limitations in a State will remain barred and will not in any way be revived by any action that Congress might take in connection with the bill now before us.

I would also invite the attention of the Members to the last section of the bill, on page 3. Section 4 specifically provides:

> That this act shall take effect 6 months after its enactment.

The general purpose behind this particular provision is to take care of those States—and there are many of them—where they have a statute of limitations longer than the 4 years suggested in this bill. A great number of States have a statute of limitations period of 6 years. I know that is the normal statute of limitations applicable in my own State of Pennsylvania.

In those instances the prospective rights of litigants will be affected by this measure. There, a prospective litigant now has 6 years in which to bring his action. If H. R. 4954 is adopted, that period will be reduced by 2 years. Actually, on the basis of the provisions of section 4, it will be reduced by 1½ years, because we give a 6 months' grace period to cushion the adjustment which may have to be made in those States where the statute of limitations will be reduced from 5 years to 4 years or from 6 years to 4 years. But the important point is that this bill will not revive any rights that are already dead by reason of local State statutes of limitation, and it will give a grace period of 6 months to permit prospective litigants to take advantage of the new period of limitation.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to have one point clarified. Would the limitation provided by section 4B apply to any suits that have been instituted or are pending or might be pending prior to the effective date of the act?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Suits that are already started and pending on the effective date of the act would not, in my judgment, be in any way affected by anything contained in this measure. The provisions of this measure to which I have referred are procedural in nature. It is a statute of limitation, and in a State where a suit has already been started, whether under a 3-year period or a 4-year or a 6-year period statute of limitation, that statute of limitation has been tolled, and will in no way be affected by what we do here.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman if I am correct in my understanding. I notice they have a 6-year statute of limitations in Alabama. Assuming there is a suit pending in Alabama the cause of action having accrued four and a half years prior to the effective date of this act, then this limitation provided in section 4 (b) would have no application to that litigation; is that correct?

Mr. QUIGLEY. In the circumstances the gentleman cites, the action has already been begun in the State of Alabama and will not be affected by the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Then am I correct in assuming that this limitation provided by this amendment is strictly a procedural limitation and has nothing to do with substance?

Mr. QUIGLEY. It was the specific purpose of the committee in reporting this bill to in no way affect the substantive rights of individual litigants. It is simply a procedural change and suggested with the thought of setting up a uniform statute of limitations. That is the sole purpose.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of section 4 the following new sections:

"SEC. 4A. Whenever the United States is hereafter injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws it may sue therefor in the United States district court for the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover actual damages by it sustained and the cost of suit.

"SEC. 4B. Any action to enforce any cause of action under sections 4 or 4A shall be forever barred unless commenced within 4 years after the cause of action accrued. No cause of action barred under existing law on the effective date of this act shall be revived by this act."

RESTORE LAW PERMITTING PRIVATE CITIZEN TO SUE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be read for the information of the Committee at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. PATMAN:

After line 4, page 2, add the following language:

"Whenever such suit has been brought, it shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the United States Attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent."

"SEC. 4 B. Whenever any person possesses information tending to prove that the United States hereafter has been injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws, such person may sue therefor, without cost to the United States, in his name upon the relation of the United States of America in the United States District Court in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover for himself and the United States twofold the actual damages sustained by the United States by reason of said injury, together with the costs of the suit, including reasonable attorney's fee, out of which the court shall order paid over to the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to the actual damages sustained by the United States by reason of said injury. Once such suit has been brought, it shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the United States Attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent."

And in line 5, page 2, change the language "SEC. 4 B" to read "SEC. 4 C."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. I assume the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point as read by the reading clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, that part of this proposed amendment requiring the consent in writing of the judge of the court and the United States attorney setting forth their reasons for their consent for the withdrawal or discontinuance of any such suit or cause of action is so obvious as to its logic and soundness as to require no argument in order to secure its acceptance. Once it is alleged by a United States attorney in a complaint filed in a United States district court that the United States has been injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws and a prayer has been made to recover actual damages for that injury, it is too serious a matter to have such allegations of fact withdrawn and discarded without requiring the United States attorney to secure the consent of the judge and to state his reasons for such action.

The logic underlying the other part of the amendment is equally clear. For example, when it occurs that the United States is injured in its business or property by reason of things forbidden in the antitrust laws and information concerning those facts is not known to the Attorney General and his subordinates, section 4 A, of course, cannot become operative. In those instances it would be with no more effect than if it had not been enacted by the Congress. The impact of the futility of such a situation moved the War Department in the wartime administration of President Abraham Lincoln to propose a measure to the Congress providing for any citizen to bring a suit in his own name upon the relation of the United States when he had information that the United States had been injured as a result of any false claims made against the United States and to recover therefor twofold the damages to the United States, out of which the United States was to secure an amount equal to the actual damages it had sustained. It had been discovered that the United States had been unable to cope with situations in which the Government had been injured by reason of false claims having been made against it. Some of those false claims had been based upon orders for arms and munitions for delivery to the Union forces in the field. It was found that in some instances claims were made for deliveries which had not in fact taken place. In some of the instances citizens knew about the falsity of the claims but were not moved to take action to protect the Government. The Department of Justice could not act because it did not know about the falsity of the claims. Therefore, as then proposed, the Congress on March 2, 1863, enacted as a part of title 31, section 232, of the United States Code, a provision for an individual to bring and carry on a suit as well for himself as for the United States when he had information that false claims had been made to the United States Government. For more than 80 years that provision of the law stood guard against covert wrongs to the taxpayers of this Nation. However unfortunately, when we were engaged and absorbed in carrying on a great struggle to win World War II, interests which apparently saw in the Abe Lincoln provision of the law a dangerous basis for a prosecution of them should they make false claims to the Federal Government for furnishing supplies to our country to win the war, expressed their discontent and dislike for the provision put in the law during the Civil War. Therefore, that provision of the law came in for much criticism by those who were reaping the benefits of large contracts from the United States Government. Finally after the Attorney General of the United States had been innocently influenced by some of this criticism, he proposed that the law be amended so that the citizens would not be so free to sue for wrongs perpetrated against the Government, and while the Congress as well as the rest of the country was absorbed in that great struggle it acted on December 23, 1943, to take some of the teeth out of the law which was approved by President Lincoln. The amendment I propose today as section 4 B to H. R. 4954 replaces those teeth in the law insofar as violations of our antitrust laws are concerned.

I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He does not believe that the first part of the amendment is necessary and he has presented to me a very convincing argument to that effect. The other part I still believe should be incorporated in the law. I shall not insist upon it, however. That is the reason I asked that the amendment be read for the information of the committee. I shall not insist upon it at this time, but the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary assured me that it will be considered when it is proper to do so in his committee.

I am sure the gentleman's committee has given very thoughtful and careful consideration to this bill and I do not want to try to amend it hastily without knowing exactly what the effect of it will be. For that reason I shall not insist, in view of the chairman's objection to it, and his assurance that the amendment will be considered before his committee when it is proper to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after the word "accrued" in line 7, page 2, I have an amendment prepared to include the phrase "and became known" so as to make it clear that the cause of action or that limitation would not commence to run against the cause of action until it is discovered, until it became known, and, therefore, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Is it your understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the cause of action will not commence to run, that limitation will not commence to run on the cause of action until after it is discovered, 4, 6, or 10 years hence?

Mr. CELLER. The statute of limitations will start running from the time the action accrues, not from the time of discovery. If you make it time of discovery, then you practically have no

statute of limitations at all. An action could have accrued and the person aggrieved might not have heard of it for 20 years. Under the suggested amendment he would have a right to bring an action after 20 years, after the evidence will have been lost, and the defendant would be put in a rather deplorable situation in that regard. We provide that the 4-year statute shall start to run from the time of the accrual of damages, from the time the wrong was done, not from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. Even in the case of fraud or conspiracy?

Mr. CELLER. No. In the case of fraud or conspiracy the statute of limitation only runs from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the point I wanted to make sure of. You are not attempting to change that particular part of it?

Mr. CELLER. Not at all.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal for inserting the words "and became known" after the word "accrued" in line 7, page 2, is to emphasize and make clear in the law that the period of limitations shall not commence to run until at least covert wrongs have been discovered. We should make certain that in enacting a uniform Federal statute of limitation we will not be acting to limit the damage period to 4 years, even though a monopolistic conspiracy may have lasted for 10 years before the victim even knew of its existence. Perhaps the amendment I propose will not insure fully against such unjust result, but it will serve to improve the provision which has been presented in H. R. 4954 in making certain that the action is not barred until a period of 4 years after the victim learned of the existence of his cause of action.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U. S. C. 16), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) A final judgment or decree heretofore or hereafter rendered in any civil or criminal proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws to the effect that a defendant has violated said laws shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant in any action or proceeding brought by any other party against such defendant under said laws or by the United States under section 4A, as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken or to judgments or decrees entered in actions under section 4A.

"(b) Whenever any civil or criminal proceeding is instituted by the United States to prevent, restrain, or punish violations of any of the antitrust laws, but not including an action under section 4A, the running of the statute of limitations in respect of every private right of action arising under said laws and based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in said proceeding shall be suspended during the pendency thereof and for 1 year thereafter: *Provided, however*, That whenever the running of the statute of limitations in respect of a cause of action arising under section 4 is suspended hereunder, any action to enforce such cause of action shall be forever barred unless commenced either within the period of suspension or within 4 years after the cause of action accrued."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to read for the information of the committee an amendment that I have prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Before the period in line 2, page 3, insert the following language: "except when a finding is made by the tribunal having jurisdiction, and to which the matter is presented, to the effect that the public interest would be promoted by having the section apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before testimony has been taken or to judgments or decrees entered in actions under section 4A."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the principal change proposed in section 2 under the designation of section 5 (a) of H. R. 4954 is to have the provisions of section 5 of the Clayton Act apply to the new section 4 A in the same manner as to the provisions of section 5 of the Clayton Act have heretofore applied to proceedings arising under section 4 of the Clayton Antitrust Act, that is, providing that a final judgment or decree when entered in any civil or criminal proceeding shall be prima facie evidence against the same defendant in any other action or proceeding brought by any other party under Federal antitrust laws and as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estopper between the parties thereto. That provision is limited by a proviso to the effect that it shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken. Now, the effect of my proposed amendment would continue the limitation carried in that proviso except in those instances where the judge should make a specific finding that the public interest would be promoted. In such instances, and only in such instances, would consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony had been taken be usable as prima facie evidence, as now provided for in section 5 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. I am not unmindful of the reasons which have been advanced heretofore against the use of consent judgments entered before the taking of testimony as evidence in subsequent litigation. Today I stand ready to accept those arguments except when the judge makes a specific finding that those arguments do not apply and that in a specific case the public interest would be served and promoted by having a consent judgment or decree which had been entered before testimony had been taken used as evidence in subsequent litigation.

Mr. Chairman, after discussing this amendment with the chairman of the committee and knowing that he wants to make any correction that he believes should be made in the antitrust laws, I am not going to insist on this amendment, with the knowledge and understanding that when it is appropriate to do so on any bill considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, this question will be taken into consideration.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HALF OF ALL BILLS

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Committee on the Judiciary has a very difficult job. It so happens that about half of the bills that are presented to the House of Representatives are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Of course, that comes about by reason of the Reorganization Act of 1946. The Reorganization Act caused the Committee on the Judiciary to take in immigration bills and private bills of other committees and reduced the number of committees from 54 to 18, and since the Committee on Un-American Activities has been made a standing committee of the House, we have 19 committees. And, out of the first 5,805 bills that were presented, 2,825 of them went to the Committee on the Judiciary. Members of the Judiciary Committee introduced 406 of them. Out of a House membership of 435, approximately 375 of them have bills pending before this committee. I realize that having almost half of the bills that are introduced in the House of Representatives this committee has more work to do, several times as much, than any other committee of the House.

H. R. 11

Mr. Chairman, I bring this up because I have been disappointed in the past because we have not received consideration of certain bills. I particularly refer to H. R. 11 that I introduced in the House of Representatives the first day of this session. I wrote the chairman on January 20, 1955, and asked for an early hearing on this bill. An identical bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, in the other body, Senate bill 11, incidentally, and we have not been able to get consideration of that bill in the House. But I feel sure that the chairman will make every effort to give us a hearing on that bill as soon as he can. I would like to have some assurance from the chairman that he will, as quickly as he can, get to it and give us a hearing on H. R. 11.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has pointed out the stupendous task confronting the Committee on the Judiciary with this avalanche of bills. I can assure the gentleman that at an appropriate time we shall be very glad to hear the gentleman on his bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman understands the nature of the bill and the real need for it?

Mr. CELLER. That is the equal opportunity bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The equality of opportunity bill.

Mr. CELLER. I would be very happy, as far as I am personally concerned, to turn over to the gentleman's committee quite a number of those private bills we have. I can tell the gentleman they are just a perfect nuisance to us, and if you want to handle those private bills, I will be glad to give them to you.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not asking for any part of the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but I just wonder

if we have imposed too much of a burden on that committee. I just wonder if we have imposed so much of a burden that we cannot expect the committee to give sufficient consideration to the major bills that are referred to it. I know the gentleman has a very fine staff. It is my privilege to work with his staff. It is our privilege as members of the Committee on Small Business of the House to have our staff work with his staff. They work together shoulder to shoulder. They exchange information. And, I am mighty glad that the members of our staff are working together that way and we are working together, the Committee on Small Business with the Committee on the Judiciary. We are working to the same end to make sure that the people have as near an equality of opportunity in this country as is possible.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 210), is repealed.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect 6 months after its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION ECONOMICS PHONY AS $3 BILL

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the expressed philosophy of the Bureau of Reclamation embraces the contention that reclamation is all things to all men. As it has done year after year in the past, the Bureau has come forward again with a thesis attempting to illustrate the great benefits to be derived by the Nation from a proposed western irrigation project. The subject this time is the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project. It is the Bureau argument that if the doors of the Federal Treasury are opened to the proponents of this fiscal monstrosity, every State of the Union will get some of the loot.

The Bureau undoubtedly employs accomplished hydrologists and construction engineers, but when it comes to economists the Bureau is woefully deficient. The economics of the Bureau of Reclamation are as unsound and as phony as a $3 bill.

If the Congress were to accept the Bureau's affirmations, then it follows that the Federal Government should subsidize all new industrial development in the United States on the ground that the spending of such public money would benefit all States.

The Bureau's thesis is that if General Motors, for instance, desires to build a new plant at Denver, the Federal Government should put up the money for it, because construction materials, equipment and labor would come from many States, and thereby those States would benefit.

The Bureau's policies have been called creeping socialism. I submit that the Bureau's economics would not be tolerated by the most ardent Socialist, and they certainly are not creeping policies. They are advancing with the speed of a jet plane and, if the Congress does not halt them, they will have the taxpayers of the Nation burdened to the point of complete collapse, the national debt will be increased beyond any hope of future reduction, and the national economy will be in a straitjacket.

The Bureau has furnished the House Interior Committee with a statement purporting to show how many dollars each State will get from the building of the upper Colorado River project. This is the largest conglomeration of dams and irrigation ditches ever put together under one title. It contains either 2, 4, or 6 power dams and either 11, 12, or 33 irrigation projects. Nobody seems to know exactly what it contains, how much it will cost, or much else about it.

In its learned paper analyzing the dollar benefits to be derived for each State, however, the Bureau conveniently has omitted mentioning anything about subsidy. This is considerable. In other reports the Bureau has admitted that the project would cost the taxpayers $1,153,000,000 in lost interest. Evidence has been presented to the Congress showing that this subsidy by the Federal Treasury would amount to $4 billion, possibly more.

In its analysis, the Bureau presents a table which is intended to show the amount of money to be spent in each State for materials and equipment for the project.

I have appended to this table the amount of money which the taxpayers of each State will have to pay if the project is built.

The comparisons are somewhat startling.

For instance, the State of New York will receive, according to the Bureau, $77,398,000, but the taxpayers of New York will have to fork out $493,600,000 for the project.

Who does the Bureau of Reclamation think it is kidding?

Here is the table:

State	Amount Bureau says it will receive	Cost to taxpayers
Alabama	$7,025,000	$46,000,000
Arizona	37,036,000	20,400,000
Arkansas	2,145,000	27,200,000
California	125,248,000	372,800,000
Colorado	47,981,000	36,400,000
Connecticut	15,181,000	69,600,000
Delaware	1,429,000	14,800,000
District of Columbia	774,000	
Florida	2,797,000	67,600,000
Georgia	8,157,000	61,200,000
Idaho	5,963,000	13,600,000
Illinois	53,463,000	276,000,000
Indiana	23,815,000	102,400,000
Iowa	5,357,000	62,000,000
Kansas	10,270,000	52,400,000
Kentucky	5,953,000	50,800,000
Louisiana	5,536,000	53,600,000
Maine	3,452,000	18,800,000
Maryland	9,108,000	102,400,000
Massachusetts	26,970,000	127,600,000
Michigan	41,556,000	196,400,000
Minnesota	8,157,000	69,600,000
Mississippi	2,382,000	26,000,000
Missouri	12,980,000	100,000,000
Montana	4,275,000	16,000,000
Nebraska	6,547,000	34,000,000
Nevada	4,667,000	6,800,000
New Hampshire	2,441,000	12,000,000
New Jersey	33,400,000	144,000,000
New Mexico	17,006,000	15,200,000
New York	77,398,000	493,600,000
North Carolina	13,158,000	66,800,000
North Dakota	1,403,000	12,000,000
Ohio	50,844,000	236,000,000
Oklahoma	7,809,000	44,800,000
Oregon	9,847,000	44,000,000
Pennsylvania	55,549,000	277,600,000
Rhode Island	5,240,000	20,800,000
South Carolina	6,370,000	34,400,000
South Dakota	2,056,000	13,200,000
Tennessee	7,681,000	55,600,000
Texas	34,575,000	194,400,000
Utah	61,716,000	16,000,000
Vermont	1,191,000	7,600,000
Virginia	8,395,000	67,600,000
Washington	14,631,000	68,400,000
West Virginia	5,299,000	35,600,000
Wisconsin	18,100,000	88,000,000
Wyoming	10,719,000	8,000,000

All told, the Bureau claims that $923,052,000 will accrue to the 48 States.

The Bureau says nothing about the fact that the taxpayers of the same 48 States will spend $4 billion.

Thus, if the upper Colorado River project is built the States stand to lose a cool $3,076,948,000.

In the depth of the recent great depression, there was little argument against public spending. Pump priming was necessary for the simple reason of sustaining life and to give our battered economy a chance to recuperate.

The Bureau of Reclamation is advocating the upper Colorado River project in the face of the greatest prosperity we have ever known.

When the warehouses and storerooms of the country are bursting with $8 billion worth of surplus food and fiber, the Bureau of Reclamation wants Congress to authorize a gigantic loss to the taxpayers of the Nation so that a desert project can be built to grow more surplus food.

With only a comparatively small amount of unemployment in the country, largely consisting of unskilled and white-collar workers, the Bureau of Reclamation asks Congress for permission to transport thousands of skilled men thousands of miles to build a project that cannot be justified on any sound basis.

Most of the dams and irrigation works in the proposed upper Colorado River project are located in the most remote

sections of the United States. Some of them are in places accessible only to mountain goats or intrepid explorers. Some of them have been seen by only a few persons, most of whom have been Bureau engineers who get a wild gleam in their eyes every time they see an undammed canyon.

Construction of the various, widely separated units of this project would involve, in addition to the transporting of thousands of men from all parts of the Nation, the building of towns, business houses, and perhaps brothels. The workers who would be uprooted from their home communities would also be taken from their families. There would be no schools, no churches, few physicians in these windswept, barren desert towns that would have to be built.

Of course, it is possible the Bureau of Reclamation intends to ask Congress for another subsidy for churches and schools. The Bureau will build anything. All it needs is more taxpayers' money. The zeal and spirit of the Bureau officials are boundless and inborn.

I forgot to mention that the Bureau also would have to build highways, utility plants, fire and police stations, and motels for visitors.

Now, what happens to all this after the dams are built? Let us consider Echo Park Dam. It would stand in one of the most magnificent canyons in the world, in the midst of a land of unsurpassed natural beauty, the Dinosaur National Monument.

A lake longer than a press agent's nightmare will lie behind Echo Park Dam. This is a power dam. Some years will be dry years. The lake level will go up or down each year. The shoreline will be made up of mud, dirty rock walls, smelly reaches, deep cracks. It will be barren of vegetation. The fishing in the lake will be lousy. There will be no algae in the water, no weeds, no beneficial conditions for fish.

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project cite Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, as an example of fine recreation areas made from big dams. They ought to look at Lake Mead today. The only good recreation there is enjoyed by lizards. The beaches are a mile from the beach houses. Boats are several miles inland from water. Fishing is horrible.

What does the Bureau mean by recreation areas? This?

Echo Park today is really a fine recreation area. All that is needed to make it easily accessible are a few roads. God put everything else there for people to enjoy.

Now, what about building the project? Does the Bureau know who will be the successful contractor? Maybe the Bureau has that all figured out.

If the company who gets the major contract is from Arkansas, then the benefits to other States will be vastly different from the table supplied by the Bureau?

This is just one point that makes the Bureau's table worthless.

And what about equipment contracts? If the major equipment contract comes from Chicago, will the Bureau credit it to Illinois?

The ridiculousness of such figuring seems to be obvious.

Let us look at the States that will benefit from this project—Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico.

According to the Bureau, if the project were built, these States would get the following:

Colorado	$47,981,000
Wyoming	10,719,000
Utah	61,716,000
New Mexico	17,006,000
Total	137,422,000

How much would the taxpayers of these States pay for the hidden subsidies of the bill?

This is the answer to that:

Colorado	$36,400,000
Wyoming	8,000,000
Utah	16,000,000
New Mexico	15,200,000
Total	75,600,000

The only 4 States which would get more money than they pay for construction of the project are the 4 States that benefit from it. The other 44 States pay through the nose.

How, then, can the Bureau of Reclamation honestly make the statement that such projects benefit the Nation as a whole?

In the face of this evidence, how can Reclamation Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer tell Congress, as he did in February of this year, "reclamation is good sound business"?

The Federal reclamation projects that are "good sound business" can be counted on 1 hand of a man with 3 fingers.

It is up to Congress to stop this phoney propaganda of the Reclamation Bureau. For more than 50 years now, the Bureau has been able to make Eastern States swallow its line.

If anyone chooses to swallow it—well, this is a free country. But those of us who are fighting for a sound economy, built on national benefits, had better put a stop to this unfair scheme of giving a few mountain and desert areas billions of dollars of public money for projects we do not want or need.

I, for one, want to stop this Treasury raiding.

REVISING OUR ELECTION LAWS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, revising our obsolete laws governing Federal elections is one of the tasks facing this Congress. It is my hope that the House will soon have an opportunity to consider such legislation. This morning I appeared before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate on Rules and Administration to make a statement on behalf of a bill pending before that body which would accomplish the needed modernization. I am informed that hearings will soon be held by a subcommittee of this body on similar bills, and I am presenting my statement here today in order that Members may consider this particular point of view before the matter comes before them.

STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1955 (S. 636) PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION APRIL 26, 1955, BY REPRESENTATIVE STEWART L. UDALL, SECOND DISTRICT, ARIZONA

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before your committee to testify in favor of S. 636. It seems to me that this bill represents the first serious attempt that has been made to draft a realistic statute to effectively control election spending and insure full disclosures by candidates and their supporters of all expenditures.

I have long been interested in seeing our Federal election laws revised, and, therefore, when I studied this carefully prepared legislation last January I introduced an identical bill (H. R. 3139) in the House without any hesitation whatsoever. I understand that hearings will be held on the House side in the near future on election law revision, and it is my hope that this Congress will enact legislation on this important subject.

It is my opinion that nothing has done more to lower politics and politicians in public esteem than our lax election laws which have produced widespread cynicism, and placed men in public life under needless suspicion. As Members of Congress we need a full measure of public confidence, and I strongly believe we cannot afford to further postpone the day when our election procedures command universal respect.

I do not pretend to be an expert on many aspects of this legislation, and I intend to confine my presentation this morning to what I consider to be the most vital parts of this proposed law. As I read your bill, Mr. Chairman, I note it proposes four major changes in the existing law. Three of these proposals (regulation of primary election campaigning; raising of spending limits; and sterner enforcement provisions) have won near-unanimous support. However, the fourth, the real kernel of this bill (sec. 201), which would broaden the law by requiring all campaign committees to report expenses, and would prevent them from operating without written authorization from the candidate himself, has met with some disapproval.

If this law is enacted without section 201, our Corrupt Practices Act would be as meaningless, practically speaking, as it is today. This is the provision which puts teeth in the statute, and without it there would be no purpose in making the other changes. Consequently, this morning I want to stress the necessity for retaining this section, or a substantial equivalent, in this bill.

Under the old statute the very letter of the law invited circumvention and it has not been surprising that the spirit of the law, if it has existed at all, has been likewise the spirit of evasion. All a candidate needed to do in the past was to be discreetly ignorant of what his friends were doing on his behalf.

I was disappointed that the two national chairmen of our political parties did not give stronger support to this provision when they testified before your committee. I was surprised to learn that Chairman Hall stated this type of law would be unworkable, as it is his function to improve the caliber of our political life, and the old special-committee, friend-spending loophole has perhaps done more to bring politics into disrepute than any other current practice. This criticism came unexpectedly, as other countries, notably England, Canada, and Australia,

have found that such laws are workable and readily accomplish the purpose of restricting and equalizing expenditures and promoting full disclosure of election facts.

For example, the Commonwealth Electoral Act of Australia provides:

"Any person incurring or authorizing any electoral expense on behalf of a candidate without the written authority of the candidate shall be guilty of a contravention of this act."

So we see that other nations have had ample experience under this law to warrant the assertion that such a regulatory statute is both realistic and necessary to assure that election facts are fully disclosed.

I seriously hope that Mr. Hall will reconsider his expressed reservations, as the enactment of this law is a nonpartisan task and we need his approval and support.

This principal argument made against section 201 is that it would require reports from all of the 165,000 precincts in the country. In my opinion this is a completely mistaken view of the practical operation of this law. It is hardly that complicated. Let us take my own State of Arizona as an example: we have 12 rural counties, 2 urban counties with cities of over 200,000 population, and a total of 519 precincts. If this provision were enacted into law and both political parties in my State continued their present practices, the only reports that would have to be made to Federal authorities under this bill would be reports by the 14 county committees and the two State central committees. Unless I am mistaken, it is the practice in all except a few of the largest cities for party campaign spending to be centered at and controlled by county committees. If this is true, I cannot believe that the great merits of this provision are outweighed by the inconvenience that would be caused these political workers. We would probably find that once reporting techniques were mastered, this system would work well and practically all county committees would tend to handle contributions and disbursements and precinct workers would have no occasion to file reports.

The argument was made, too, that it would be impossible for a candidate to control the amount spent by various organizations working for the entire ticket. Admittedly, this would present a minor problem, but certainly not one which would render the law unwieldy. This bill, as it is written, is flexible and unquestionably alert party workers could adapt themselves to the new requirements.

The real answer to these objections, however, is that unless the restrictive provisions of section 201 are enacted, the law will not be strengthened in the least. Surely we can ask our politicians to put up with minor inconveniences in order to bring new respect to our electoral process.

There is a good reason to believe that one highly important byproduct of a stricter law would be that the level of our campaigns would be raised by fixing personal responsibility on the candidate himself for the activities of his friends and committees. Many of the excesses, usually in the form of personal attacks engaged in by committees would be eliminated if the candidate had to assume clear moral responsibility for such actions. Only last week the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee heard testimony from the notorious Harvey Matusow that he falsely pictured a Senator as pro-Communist in speeches given in the Senator's home State during the 1952 campaign. He was paid $1,100 by a candidate's committee for these 2 speeches, he said, and it is almost certain that his services would never have been employed had the candidate who benefited from his efforts been required to openly sponsor him and accept responsibility for his statements.

DEBUNKING THE "SHOCKING TRUTH"

There is one other matter which I would like to comment on before your committee today. Last Sunday I read an article in the New York Times, written by a competent and reliable reporter, which stated that passage of the Hennings bill would give the public for the first time what some Members of Congress fear might be the shocking truth about the cost of obtaining political office. This same reporter, reflecting the generally held view, stated further:

"Altogether, candidates for the 84th Congress spent, or had spent in their behalf, $13,654,236, according to the reports.

"Even these figures, however, give only a fraction of the true picture. Informed guessers estimate that the true cost of electing the 83d Congress was somewhere between $100 million and $200 million. The lowest estimate advanced by any informed guesser in this field put the cost at $75 million.

"That even the informed guessers can't get closer than $100 million to the true cost is a tribute to the inadequacy of existing laws."

To me, the appearance of this statement in a conservative newspaper famous for its factual reporting is highly disturbing. The average reader of such a statement cannot avoid conclusions about our political life that are both ugly and untrue. Some of the more obvious of these would be: Most elections are bought; politicians are a tricky lot and their campaigns are usually corrupt; politicians are indebted to large secret contributors and probably sell votes for substantial campaign contributions; it takes big money to succeed in politics, and the average person doesn't stand a chance.

It is my opinion, without qualification, that these informed guessers are all wet and that their calculations, to use Mark Twain's expression, are "greatly exaggerated."

Yet, wrong as they are, such figures and the ugly, erroneous conclusions they suggest enter the public mind because our laws are inadequate and tend to leave the impression that honest men are dishonest. Our laws should reward, instead of punish, the honest, and should bring together in one place all of the pertinent information to achieve this end. Too, they should promote candidate responsibility and, where possible, produce campaigning on the highest moral level.

It is time someone debunked this myth of fantastic spending. During the past few days I have conducted a private canvas of Members of the House in order to determine as best I could the true spending picture. At the risk of being called naive, I want to state that I arrived at the refreshing conclusion that the overwhelming majority of them are conscientious and filed complete or substantially complete reports. In my opinion better than 90 percent of my fellow Congressmen make such substantially complete reports. Under existing Federal law they are not required to file full reports in Washington (or, actually, any reports at all) and many of them file fuller reports at their State capitols, as they are required to do by State law.

After making this cross-section canvas, I concluded that at least 75 percent of the money actually spent is reported either at the State or Federal level. It would be my estimate that the total amount spent to elect the 84th Congress was not $100 million or $200 million, but, in fact, did not exceed $25 million and was probably nearer $20 million.

There are several reasons why these informed guessers are badly mistaken. Let me list a few of them:

1. All of the big-cost items (TV, newspaper advertising, radio, billboards, etc.) by their very nature cannot be concealed;

2. Candidates eye each other closely and any officeseeker can make a good estimate as to the money his opponent has spent;

3. Most important, with few exceptions, politicians are basically honest and would rather risk the unfavorable publicity resulting from disclosure of excessive spending than the more serious disclosures which would destroy their reputations for integrity;

4. Perhaps two-thirds of the Members of the House do not have serious primary opposition;

5. At general election time 20 percent of the House candidates are unopposed, and another 40 percent have such secure margins that they hardly bother to wage a personal campaign that entails substantial expense; and

6. Most strong House incumbents, and candidates having districts with a pronounced Republican or Democratic character, are content to ride the party bandwagon and wage modest campaigns.

Our armchair guessers are misled by one other misapprehension—another false impression easily created in the absence of loophole-proof laws—the idea that money is all important in political campaigns. No one will deny that a certain minimum fund is indispensable, but any good politician knows that willing friends are the big story in politics, and not money. Funds are no substitute for stanch supporters, key party workers, and endorsements from good organizations. The candidate who can command the loyal support of a cross section of his community, or district, for his stand on vital issues, can ward off the challenge of a contender with four times the cash.

A revision of our election laws is long overdue. It would elevate public life and bring new respect to persons in positions of public trust. And, above all, it would give new encouragement to those of us who dare to believe that politics can be a noble calling, a calling where moral principles are the paramount consideration.

DISTRIBUTION OF ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I have received from a prominent pharmacist of my district on the distribution of Dr. Salk's vaccine:

APRIL 24, 1955.

Congressman HUGH SCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to bring to your attention factors in the publicity and distribution of Dr. Salk's vaccine, which I feel should be scrutinized by Congress.

Lack of proper planning, premature promotion, and solicitation of purchases, unfair distribution, contradictory statements, and unnecessary promotion. Continuous misleading publicity, contradictory statements and press releases plus photographs of shipments being made has tended to create doubt in the public's mind as to fair distribution, plus an anxiety as to their ability to secure the product and the cost of the same plus medical service charges.

Manufacturer's representatives in some instances solicited orders from physicians based upon the physician's past acceptance of their respective company's products, rather than impartial distribution. One manufac-

turer is quoting lower prices to the physician than the prices of the other five firms. This manufacturer is offering one vial to each physician as fair distribution. Present method of solicitation and distribution directly to physicians is contrary to all previous practices. Many physicians resent the control and pressure put upon them as the source of supply. This method compels them to become distributors, invest large sums of money for stocks, and their limited quarters to store the perishable vaccine properly. Many physicians would prefer their patients to purchase and provide the vaccine and only inject the same. Therefore may I suggest the following:

1. Have two Members of the House and from the Senate, one from each party, form a committee with Mrs. Oveta C. Hobby, invite the executive administrators of the six manufacturers, of the Polio Foundation, national head of the Red Cross; Dr. Salk and Dr. Francis; John W. Dargavel, executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, and Robert P. Fischelis, secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association. Have them bring in all correspondence, intra-office and sales and advertising, etc. Then find an agreement on what can be done and issue a public statement to reassure the millions of parents.

I do not believe the medical profession has the manpower, nor the facilities to handle this tremendous job in the limited time needed this year. The physician may become so involved and overworked he may be unable to take care of the needy sick. He may be tempted to sacrifice needed medical attention because of heavy demand for polio injections. Therefore, I would suggest the following for the first year of immunization:

2. All municipalities set up emergency stations; city health, Red Cross, Civilian Defense and all hospital clinics; if nccessary, call in medical staffs of the Armed Forces and National Guard.

3. Fee should cover cost only on evidence of inability to pay.

4. Part of supply should be allocated for individual public purchase and supplied through regular pharmaceutical channels at stipulated prices.

The AMA should suggest a fair basic fee of $4 for both injections, provided patient brings own vaccine. The office nurse in many instances will no doubt do the physical injection.

Let us try to do this humane project without a profit-making motive. Let us show the world in practice, we still have humanitarian ideals. No family should be deprived of this vaccine, because of poor planning, or avoidable human error.

Sincerely,

DANIEL COOPERMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD SHOULD APOLOGIZE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 18 years I have been a Member of this body I have made it a point never to dignify one of these newspapers in Washington by answering one of its editorials. But when they mention my home town and call it a hick town, I feel that I should call their hand. I care not what they say about me personally. But in this morning's Post and Times Herald, in one of their editorials, they refer to my home town as a hick town. I think the editor should write to the mayor of my good city and its newspapers and offer an apology.

I know why this came about. It is for the simple reason that I have made an effort during the past few years to improve the parking conditions here in the Nation's Capital so that your constituents and mine can find a place to park when they come to see their Capital. Another item is the fact that I have made some mention of doing some checking to see how the taxpayers' money from my home town and your home town is being spent here in the city of Washington. They have come to the conclusion that we have no reason to investigate, or to learn how this money is being spent. The Federal Government owns just about as much property in my home district as they own here in the city of Washington, but they pay no taxes and do not give us $20 million a year to help operate our State, city, or county government.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 5715.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to postpone the special order for 15 minutes granted him for today until tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MAYBE THE WORLD IS NOT ROUND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am in the unhappy position today of having to admit ignorance, which of course is not very good politics. Generally it goes better with the folks back home, at least at election time, to profess ignorance of politics and at the same time to modestly let it be understood, even if you have to leak the news yourself by inference, that on all other subjects you just happen to be well informed. I hasten to explain this statement is not intended to impugn the motives of any Member of Congress other than my own.

What, Mr. Speaker, would the good people of the First District of the State of Washington, who not only elected me once but returned me to Congress, think of their Representative if he confessed ignorance, or what may be just as bad, if he admitted confusion on a simple subject like geography? However, it looks as though that is the situation.

What may make matters even worse, out in the State of Washington we have always had a fine public-school system. When I was a boy in the fifth or sixth grade I had the advantage of a fine course in elementary geography. Now it seems what I was taught was wrong. Columbus was wrong. We have been under a delusion—the world is not round.

It seems hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that my teachers in the Summit School in Seattle would have misled me on that one point. They were right about other matters. Not even the Socialists nor reactionaries; nor a depression nor prosperity; nor peace nor war; nor anything since has changed the arithmetic of simple economics taught me in my youth. Two plus two is still four. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are the same. So is the history of this great land of freedom and opportunity; it has not changed. But with geography it may be different.

I say this because I distinctly remember my teachers explaining the shape of the earth so that in circumnavigating the surface of the world the farther one traveled north, for example, from the equator, the less the distance between two locations. Thus a ship from Seattle to the Orient making a circular swing northward, taking advantage of the shorter distance, saved about 1,200 miles as against a ship sailing from San Francisco. In terms of time this was a saving of about 48 hours, or in today's values, figuring present operating costs of modern ships, a huge saving in running a ship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, imagine my disillusionment; for it turns out that all these years I have been in error. Only yesterday I was informed by a high official in the Pentagon that the Army operates on a formula that it is 350 miles shorter in winter and 200 miles shorter in summer from San Francisco than from Seattle to Japan. This was a severe shock and the extent of the seasonal variation was, too. I know about expansion and contraction under heat and cold, but the page in my geography book must have been missing on this earthly phenomenon.

The operators of private ships use the northern route winter and summer crossing the Pacific Ocean, and according to their old-fashioned chronometers and calendars this reduces the trip by a couple of days. But not the Military Sea Transportation Service, which appears to follow the modern army system of measuring distance, and possibly, too, may follow a fairly recent California Chamber of Commerce shipping bulletin which authoritatively says the northern

route from Seattle is unusable 95 percent of the time. We have all heard that the world is getting smaller; what some of us did not know was that the world, unlike people who get older, is shrinking at the girth and not at the neck. Not too seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker, I should have been given sixth-grade geopolitics—not geography. You can see that is about the size of it. Because if I was a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, maybe I could have asked Army witnesses a few questions about geography and learned the new system.

The great State of California is fortunate. It has four distinguished Representatives—more members than any other State—on the House Armed Services Committee. They are fine gentlemen and certainly not ignorant, like the gentleman from Washington who still clings to the old-fashioned notion that a GI by air or by sea can get home from the Orient quicker to his loved ones by the northern route.

It is not often that we find the branches of our military service in agreement, but as to the modern science of geography of the Pacific there would seem to be no clash of opinion. It is true that on the east coast the Navy maintains various operational bases besides Norfolk for combat ships. There are so-called home ports from north to south for various types of ships at Boston, Newport, New London, Charleston, and Key West. On the west coast the only such bases are at Long Beach and San Diego. This traditional concentration near the morale building and excellent year-round golf facilities of southern California, I assume, is owing to its location, to its strategic proximity to what I am discovering should be called the nearer to California Far East. While my maps are not up to date and fail to show this, it may be that the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are so remote from Asia they are quite safe and do not need protection.

A while back I seem to recall the military decided we did not need an airlift across the northern route. It was too expensive. The Post Office Department ought to catch up because it pays on a per-mile basis, and since it pays the private airline on the old measurement basis, the Army mail in increasing amounts is designated via Seattle, which by old-fashioned geography, and old-fashioned economics, too, saves the Post Office Department a lot of money.

Of course, money, particularly other people's, is not everything.

That was demonstrated yesterday when the Pentagon announced Operation Gyroscope. This is a rotation movement of troops. The 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team will come back and the 508th will replace it on the island of Kyushu, Japan. C–124 Globemaster troop carriers will make this 12,000-mile round-trip airlift across the Pacific.

This will be an interesting experiment in overseas troop movement, but it will be of particular interest to me to find out from the final study and evaluation, first, why this operation is not planned via the North Pacific; and, second, how much differential in cost, in extra gasoline alone, would the operation entail as between San Francisco and Seattle.

As I say, my old-fashioned geography must be all wrong. Perhaps Operation Gyroscope will straighten out my thinking. Then I can tell my constituents and taxpayers, and they will be happy that the armed services have been right all along—and sorry for me on account of the poor geography taught me in my youth. Maybe the world is not round.

RICE MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate admendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "5 percent" and insert "2 percent or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

Page 2, line 3, after "acreage" insert ", and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950–54 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945–49 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not this bill is intended to give and does give the State of Oklahoma a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or farms on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The gentleman's question is whether that protects Oklahoma?

Mr. ALBERT. The question is whether this bill gives not less than 500 acres to the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct. That is correct in my understanding. That was the understanding of our committee when we held the hearings on it and when we reported the bill out.

Mr. ALBERT. And that is the gentleman's understanding of the language in the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is my understanding. It is the language of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the House version of this bill increased the acreage, which treated every State equally, with some minor exceptions with reference to North Carolina. That has been upset by the Senate, and they have written this language so that certain States will get an undue amount of this new acreage. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I would not say so. The language of the Senate version reestablishes the acreage as it was in 1950, or at least says that no State shall have less than that acreage. Frankly, that was a very moving factor when our committee was considering the original measure, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill as passed by the Senate makes special provision for one and possibly two States, at the disadvantage of the rest of the rice-growing States. I do not want to be obnoxious in this matter, but I am constrained to object to these amendments, and I do object, Mr. Speaker.

PURPLE HEART STAMP

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Boston is signally honored and privileged this year to be the convention city of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The order has chosen Boston because it is one of the oldest and most historic cities of the Nation and will meet there on August 9 through 14 for its annual convention.

As a well-deserved tribute to this outstanding patriotic organization, I have today introduced in the House a bill providing for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of the Order of the Purple Heart with the added provision that the first-day sale be made at Boston the day before the 1955 convention opens.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Rosaire J. Rajotte, of Northbridge, Mass., legislative officer of the Department of Massachusetts, Military Order of the Purple Heart, has furnished me with background material concerning the establishment of the Purple Heart award.

The Badge of Military Merit, designed as the figure of a heart, in purple, was created by George Washington and the first award was made on August 7, 1782. The following is the text of General Washington's order, which established this award:

UNITED STATES ARMY HEADQUARTERS,
Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782.

Orders of the day:

For fatigue tomorrow, the Second Massachusetts Regiment.

Countersign:

YORK LANCASTER.

The general, ever desirous to cherish a virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or bindings. The road to glory in a

patriot army and free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and to be considered a permanent one.

G. WASHINGTON,
Commander in Chief.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, was created an award which honored the heroes of the war for independence. It was in 1932 that attention was again focused on the Purple Heart when General Douglas MacArthur issued orders to reactivate this outstanding decoration for military achievement. This is the text of General MacArthur's order:

THE PURPLE HEART
GENERAL ORDERS NO. 3
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 22, 1932.

Purple Heart: By order of the President of the United States, the Purple Heart, established by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782, during the War of Revolution, is hereby revived out of respect of his memory and military achievements.

By order of the Secretary of War:

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General, Chief of Staff.

While the Post Office Department was not too encouraging when I first took up this proposal, I hope that the stamp in honor of the Military Order of the Purple Heart can be included in the 1955 series of special commemorative stamps. Such a stamp will be a deserving tribute to this organization and the wounded of World War II and the Korean war.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, an award first made by George Washington on August 7, 1782. Such special postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period beginning August 9, 1955, as the Postmaster General may determine, and shall be placed on sale in Boston, Mass., site of the 1955 annual convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 93. An act for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 120. An act for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 121. An act for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 162. An act for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 192. An act for the relief of Borys Naumenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 234. An act for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 236. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlatsos (Andreas Georges Vlatso); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 283. An act for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 321. An act for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 322. An act for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 341. An act for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 353. An act for the relief of Arthur Sroka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 407. An act for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 439. An act for the relief of Lucy Personius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 473. An act for the relief of Urho Paavo Potokoski and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 504. An act for the relief of Priska Anne Kary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 570. An act for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 574. An act for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 587. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

S. 604. An act for the relief of Alick Bhark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 644. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 650. An act for the relief of Anonios Vasillos Zarkadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 676. An act for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 713. An act for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 827. An act for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 844. An act for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 867. An act for the relief of Jacob Grynberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. An act for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1079. An act to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1180—An act for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1350. An act for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1372. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

734. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Martin Kilian, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., will authorize Mr. Kilian to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within the Ohanapecosh Hot Springs area of Mount Rainier National Park during a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 440. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4817. A bill relating to the payment of money orders; with amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4659. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c); with amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3486. A bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4646. A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5715. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 222. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2107, a bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 5836. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, Public Law 638, 81st Congress, relating to the Young American Medal for Bravery and the Young American Medal for Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5837. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5838. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on the Roanoke River Basin, N. C. and Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5840. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 5841. A bill to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 5842. A bill to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5843. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5844. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5845. A bill to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties of such communities; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 5846. A bill to extend and improve the program of assistance under Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5847. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5848. A bill to reduce the interest rate from 5 percent to 3 percent on certain emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5849. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5850. A bill to consolidate and make uniform the laws relating to public assistance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5851. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5852. A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5853. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline which is used to operate or propel farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 5855. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 5856. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the num-

ber of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5857. A bill to provide limited dental care for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 5858. A bill to provide that admissions to entertainment events conducted by certain civic and community membership associations shall be exempt from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5859. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5860. A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 5861. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5862. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution designating the month of June of each year as National Dairy Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the inclusion of United States Highway 101 (from Los Angeles to the Oregon State line) and United States Highway 199 (from Crescent City to the Oregon State line) in the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation giving the States the power to levy and collect nondiscriminatory privilege taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt House Joint Resolution No. 102, proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give a full hearing on the proposed Proctor Dam on the Leon River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 5863. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 5864. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5865. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Kamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5867. A bill for the relief of Anthony Hourzamanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 5868. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 5869. A bill for the relief of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5870. A bill for the relief of Jesajahu Braun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 5871. A bill for the relief of Guy Francone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5872. A bill for the relief of the Orange County Machine Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

219. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of railroad employees of the Williamsport area, urging every Member of Congress to support any bill that contains the following provisions: "To provide retirement at age of 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age, annuities to be based on one or more of one's highest year's earnings. Rail retirement annuities and pensions to be increased by 15 percent," which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Military Job Changes Since 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert a brief analysis and accompanying charts on changes of duties and training requirements of military jobs in the armed services.

In any look at the technological changes in the offensive and defensive methods of maintaining our national security, one is apt to overlook the tremendous revamping necessary to provide a workable scheduling of adequate proficiency levels of service personnel.

To give some guidance in our thinking on this vital problem, which I have discussed at some length with Assistant Secretary of Defense, Carter L. Burgess, the following information will, I believe, prove most helpful:

MILITARY JOBS IN THE ARMED SERVICES—CHANGING DUTIES AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS, 1949–55

A review of the jobs of the enlisted men in the armed services during the past 6 years reveals a series of changes in each service. These job changes have been made in the interest of better manpower management to reflect the changing technology of the armed services. Table I is a list of major job changes since 1949, including new, revised, and deleted jobs. The training time to reach an entrance level of proficiency in these jobs is also shown.

A significant number of new jobs have been created, such as, guided missile propellant explosive specialist, jet mechanic aircraft and atomic weapons nuclear assembly specialist, reflecting the results of technological development in new scientific fields. Some jobs have become obsolete, such as, the signalman in the Navy, due to these same technological improvements. The complexity of many jobs has become sufficiently great so as to require the breakdown of 1 military job in 1949 into 2 or more separate new jobs. For example, in radar maintenance in the Army in 1949 there were 3 specific jobs. Today the Army requires 7 different jobs for this area of work. Major developments in each service are summarized in succeeding paragraphs.

Between 1949 and 1955 the Army's system of classifying military jobs has undergone two major revisions, in 1950 and now in 1955. The general trend has been that jobs are grouped and related to one another on a functional basis. Likewise, substantial changes have been made in school-training requirements due to increased complexity of the specialty and the division of a single job into two or more new jobs. This tends to simplify training and to accelerate productive time on the job. This latter point is especially noticeable in Army with 2-year inductees as compared to the other services with 3- and 4-year enlistments.

Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have made considerable changes in their job classifications since World War II. The changes, as in Army, represent new skill requirements commensurate with technical innovations. For example, a Navy destroyer in 1940 had

fewer than 200 electronic tubes; in 1955, a destroyer has over 5,400 such tubes.

As new weapons and equipment have been acquired by the Air Force, they have had two effects on Air Force military jobs. One has been to add entirely new jobs related to the installation, operation, and maintenance of the new equipment; a second has been to radically alter the content of the jobs originally established in relationship to older, less complex equipment. This modification of existing jobs to meet the needs set by new and improved equipment results in a system in which jobs are not dropped entirely, but often are drastically changed.

Table II indicates for a sample of jobs the comparative length of time, 1949 to 1955, required for a person to qualify in a skill. More time is required today than 6 years ago to train personnel on jobs that have become more complex, as radar repairman or gunner's mate. Some jobs, as aviation ordnanceman, have become sufficiently complex as to be split into new jobs, thereby often reducing the training time for a specific job.

TABLE I.—*Department of Defense changes in military jobs since 1949*

ARMY	Training time (months)
Additions—Job titles:	
Medical records specialist	7
Surface to air missile materiel chief	10
Surface to surface missile materiel chief	10
Surface to air missile fire control chief	15
Surface to surface missile fire control chief	12
Guided missile mechanical specialist	5
Surface to air missile electronic specialist	11
Surface to surface missile electronic materiel specialist	12
Nonelectrical instrument repairman	7
Guided missile materiel crewman	6
Guided missile fire control crewman	6
Atomic weapons electronic assembly specialist	6
Atomic weapons nuclear assembly specialist	7
Fixed station transmitter repairman	10
Fixed station terminal repairman	11
Fixed station receiver repairman	10
Aircraft repair foreman	9
Helicopter maintenance supervisor	10
Cargo helicopter pilot	12
Airplane repairman	9
Soils technician	7
Medical equipment repairman	9
Aircraft powertrain and engine repairman	9
Rotor and propeller repairman	6
Aircraft instrument and electrical systems repairman	9
Target airplane mechanic	6
Helicopter repairman	10
Atomic weapons electrical assembly crewman	5
Fixed station radio attendant	8
Aircraft maintenance crewman	8
Signal parts specialist	6
Guided missile propellant explosive specialist	6
Engineer parts specialist	6
Ordnance parts specialist	5
Transportation parts specialist	4
Quartermaster parts specialist	4
Clinical technician	16
Integrated fire control electronic repairman, M–33	8
Integrated fire control electronic repairman, T–38	8
Chemical parts specialist	6
Integrated fire control electronic repair helper	10
TV equipment repairman	8
TV cameraman	6
Radio relay and carrier operator	6
Guided missile mechanical repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile mechanical repairman, Nike	6

ARMY—continued

	Training time (months)
Additions—Job titles:	
Guided missile doppler system repairman, corporal	6
Guided missile computer repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile radar repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile internal guidance system, repairman, corporal	8
Guided missile launcher control repairman, Nike	6
Guided missile acquisition radar and computer repairman, Nike	8
Guided missile track radar repairman, Nike	9
Guided missile internal guidance system repairman, Nike	7
Light Antiaircraft artillery integrated fire control equipment mechanic	13
Medium or heavy antiaircraft artillery integrated fire control equipment mechanic	13
Field artillery radar mechanic	10
Guided missile electronic repair helper	10
FA radar crewman (field artillery)	8
AAA radar crewman (antiaircraft)	8
Heavy antiaircraft artillery fire control crewman	8
Light antiaircraft artillery fire control crewman	8
Surface-to-air missile electronic assembler	9
Surface-to-surface missile electronic assembler	9
Surface-to-air missile fire control crewman	8
Surface-to-surface missile fire control crewman	8
Light fire control equipment repairman	11
Heavy fire control equipment repairman	11
Doppler repairman (corporal)	11
Computer repairman (corporal)	11
Radar repairman (corporal)	11
Internal guidance repairman (corporal)	12
Acquisition radar repairman (Nike)	12
Track radar repairman (Nike)	12
Internal guidance repairman (Nike)	12
Atomic weapons nuclear assembler	11
Radar repairman	10
Electronic warfare repairman	10
Electronic navigation equipment repairman	13
Civil mechanical engineering assistant [1]	3
Mathematics-statistics assistant [1]	3
Chemical engineering assistant [1]	3
Electric electronics assistant [1]	3
Physical sciences assistant [1]	3
Biological sciences assistant [1]	3
Social sciences assistant [1]	3
Deletions—Job titles:	
Electronic fire control equipment repair supervisor	11
Electronic fire control equipment repairman	9
Medical technician	8
Guided missile assembly chief	10
Guided missile warhead specialist	10
Guided missile propulsion specialist	9
Guided missile mechanical guidance specialist	9
Guided missile electronic guidance specialist	9
Guided missile assembly crewman	7
Single side band radio repairman	7
Fixed station radio repair supervisor	9
Radio teletypewriter repairman	8
Special weapons assembly specialist	8
Special weapons electronics specialist	8

[1] These military jobs are occupied by highly specialized civilian-trained men, all of whom held one or more academic degrees, who are inducted into the Army and who are under the scientific and professional program of the Army.

ARMY—continued

	Training time (months)
Deletions—Job titles:	
Fixed station radio repairman	7
Guided missile repairman	10
Guided missile internal guidance system repairman	11
Guided missile external guidance system repairman	11
Heavy antiaircraft artillery fire control mechanic	12
Guided missile guidance components repairman	10
Guided missile repair helper	7

NAVY

Additions—Job titles:

A. General service

	Training time (months)
Guided missileman	25
Aviation fire control technician	25
Aviation guided missileman	25

B. Emergency for mobilization

Fire control technician (A) (automatic directors)	12
Fire control technicians (M) manual control directors)	10
Fire control technician (U) (underwater)	12
Fire control technician (G) (missile guidance systems)	12
Electronic technician (N) communications)	12
Electronic technician (R) (radarman)	12
Electronic technician (S) (sonarman)	12
Damage controlman (A) (ABC defenseman)	10
Aviation electronic technician A (aircraft equipment)	12
Aviation electronic technician G (ground equipment)	12
Aviation electronic technician O (ordnance)	12
Aviation boatswain's mate A (air ship rigger)	9
Photographer's mate A (aerial cameraman)	12
Torpedoman's mate E (special electric)	12

A. General service

Deletions—Job titles:	
Fire controlman	20
Aviation electronics man	20
Aviation photographer's mate	22

B. Emergency for mobilization

Boatswain's mate K (canvasman)	5
Torpedoman's mate S (special)	12
Torpedoman's mate E (electrical)	8
Fire controlman S (surface weapons)	10
Fire controlman S (underwater)	10
Radioman N (radioman)	12
Radioman E (landline telegrapher)	10
Communications technician A (analytical aide)	12
Communications technician M (maintenance man for Sp. Equmt)	12
Communications technician O (operator for special equipment)	10
Communication technician R (radio specialist)	10
Personnel man S (supervisor Women's Reserve	6
Personnel man R (recruiter)	8
Personnel man W (chaplain assistant)	6
Damage controlman P (painter)	8
Aviation electronics technician A (aircraft equipment)	12
Aviation electronics technician G (ground equipment)	12
Aviation electronics technician O (ordnance)	12
Aviation ordnanceman F (fire controlman)	12

MARINE CORPS	Training time (months)
Additions—Job titles:	
Personnel accounting analyst	6
Lawyer enlisted	7
EAM operator	10
EAM key punch operator	6
EAM accounting operator	16
Enlisted jet pilot	17
Jet mechanic aircraft	11
Reciprocating mechanic aircraft	11
Chief jet mechanic aircraft	23
Helicopter aircraft mechanic	11
Airborne intercept operator	8
Explosion ordnanceman dispatch technician	11
Wire chief	20
Field radio operator	5
Radio telegraph operator	9
Cryptographic equipment repairman	10
Bulk fuel man	7
Legal clerk	6
Engineer equipment mechanic	10
Engineer equipment mechanic foreman	19
Engineer master mechanic	16
Aviation control tower operator	12
Ground control approach operator	13
Ground-control intercept operator	12
Aviation radio technician	14
Aviation radar technician	14
Aviation fire-control technician	14
Ground-control approach technician	12
Air-launched guided-missile electronics technician	16
Radio and TV information man	7
Atomic, biological, and chemical man (defensive measures)	16
Aircraft radio technician	14
Aircraft radar technician	14
Integrated fire-control technician, medium AAA	16
Integrated fire-control technician, light AAA	16
Integrated fire-control technician, guided missile	16
Deletions:	
Airborne intercept operator	6
Jet-power-plant maintenance mechanic	7

AIR FORCE	Training time (months)
Additions—Job titles:	
Airborne electric countermeasures specialist	9
Electric countermeasures repairman	9
Ground electronics countermeasures specialist	12
Guidance systems mechanic	10
Fire-control systems mechanic	12
Weapons-fusing systems specialist	10
Nuclear specialist	9
Aircraft electrical gunner	9
Electronic fuel-control repairman	10
Jet-engine mechanic	9
Inflight-refueling specialist	7
Weapons mechanic	9
Aircraft loadmaster	5
Motion-picture photographer	13
Motion-picture specialist	11
Aircraft-landing-control operator	8
Control-systems mechanic	9
Instrumentation mechanic	10
Photographic-equipment repairman	12
Mechanical accessories and equipment repairman	9
Munitions specialist	8
Air-frame repairman	9
Rescue and survival specialist	6
Survival training and personal-equipment specialist	10

TABLE II.—*Length of time to qualify in a skill*

ARMY	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Wheel vehicle mechanics	9	10
Infantry squad leader	16	18
Radar repairman	16	18
Fire control maintenance (Artillery)	6	10
Petroleum supply	4	6
Communications center specialist	8	7

NAVY	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Quartermaster	15	15
Electronics technician	21	21
Fire control technician	23	23
Torpedoman's mate	12	18
Gunner's mate	12	16
Aviation fire control technician	(*)	25
Aviation ordnanceman F	10	(*)
Air controlman	15	18

(*) In 1949, the job was only a part of the overall duties of an aviation ordnanceman. By 1955, the work has become so complex as to warrant a rating.

AIR FORCE	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Weather forecasting	20	21
Armament systems maintenance	19	22
Aircraft and engine maintenance	22	24
Radio-radar system maintenance	21	23
Metalworking	17	17

MARINE CORPS	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Amphibian tractor mechanic	18	18
Aviation ordnanceman	20	20
Radio technician	12	13
Radar technician	21	23

Public Honor for Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter which I have written to Mr. Mark Wright, president of the San Jose Newspaper Guild of San Jose, Calif. This organization of working newspapermen and newspaperwomen recently honored the public servants of local government in our community by presenting its annual "Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award" to Mr. Francis Tanner, a patrolman on the San Jose police force:

Mr. MARK WRIGHT,
President, San Jose Newspaper Guild,
San Jose Mercury-News,
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: The increasingly complex problems facing our local communities today could never be mastered were it not for the ability, loyalty, and devotion to duty of the men and women who are the civil servants of the public in the administration of our government. It is to the everlasting credit of our free American press that the public is kept informed about the activities of these public servants, and that a close link is maintained between the public and those laboring on its behalf.

Today I should like to express to you and the working members of the San Jose Newspaper Guild my sincere appreciation for presenting your "Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award" for 1955 to a plain patrolman of the San Jose police force. Most of us who keep up on local affairs are familiar with the names and activities of top officials, such as the mayor, the city manager, the chief of police, or the sheriff. Your award to Patrolman Francis Tanner points out admirably that the public is served with equal distinction by policemen, clerks, firemen, meter readers, draftsmen, laborers, technicians, repairmen, and many other categories of men and women. We, as members of the community, have every reason to be proud of them.

In choosing the recipient of this year's award, your organization acted from first-hand knowledge of the merit which alone determined the choice. In doing so, you performed a considerable public service which cannot but benefit the community. May I commend the San Jose Newspaper Guild for doing such an excellent job in fulfilling its mission in our community.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Member of Congress.

A Cowboy Invitation to Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the capital city in my native State of Oklahome has been selected as the future site of the national Cowboy Hall of Fame. Representatives of 17 Western States meeting recently in Denver chose Oklahoma City as the location for this permanent monument to commemorate western heroes of past and present.

Reports indicate that this memorial may become one of the greatest tourist attractions in America. This would be fitting, indeed, since the contributions of the cowboys who conquered America's last frontier were dramatic and great, and their intrepid spirit constitutes a rich national asset. Symbols of these pioneers should be enshrined in a place of honor, while their spirit should be preserved within our hearts.

It is most appropriate that Oklahoma should be chosen as the center for this Cowboy Hall of Fame. The series of spectacular "runs" at the end of last century, which were immortalized in Edna Ferber's Cimarron, and made familiar to every American through the motion picture based on her book, helped to establish the wide renown of Oklahoma's cowboys at an early date in our history.

Further, Oklahoma is well along the way toward becoming the vacation center of America. Figures released 3 weeks ago by the Defense Department show that 4 of the 14 most popular recreational areas within Army engineer projects over the entire Nation are located in Oklahoma.

Lake Texoma, which we share with our neighboring State of Texas—although Oklahoma rivers supply most of the water—continues to lead all others in general public use. Wister Reservoir—located in the congressional district of my esteemed colleague, the majority whip of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]—ranked 10th in the Nation. In my own district in northeastern Oklahoma, Fort Gibson Reservoir ranked 7th nationally, while Tenkiller Reservoir held 13th place.

Let me take this opportunity to extend a cordial invitation to every American to visit my native State. Friendly hands of welcome will greet you when you visit

our lovely lakes and hills, attend our rodeos or Indian pow-wows, tour our oilfields or mines of lead and zinc, or seek out the historical sites which abound in Oklahoma.

As an indication of what we have to offer every guest, let me mention but a few of the points of interest within my own Second District. We have the famous Will Rogers Memorial at Claremore, dedicated to America's Good-Will Ambassador who claimed he was "just an old cowhand with a little luck." We have, near Sallisaw, the log cabin home built by Sequoyah, the Cherokee Indian who was one of the 12 people in the history of the world to invent an alphabet for his people. His was so simple that it could be mastered within 3 days, and is one of the intellectual triumphs of any age. Statues of both these men now stand in the Hall of Fame in our Capitol.

Tourists can visit the reconstructed stockade at Fort Gibson, a military post established in 1824, where Robert E. Lee, Zachary Taylor, Jefferson Davis, and many other famous men served as soldiers in their younger days. Washington Irving visited there, and Sam Houston in 1829 established himself 3 miles northwest at his Wigwam Neosho, where he lived with his Cherokee Indian wife until 1832 when he left for Texas to win eternal fame.

The Union Agency for the Nations of the Five Civilized Tribes was established in Muskogee in 1873, and the affairs of these noted tribes are still administered from this city. On Agency Hill is located the old Union Creek Agency, soon to be the site of one of the Nation's outstanding Indian museums.

The permanent capitol of the Greek Indian Nation still stands in Okmulgee, while in Tahlequah the capitol of the Cherokee Nation now serves as the county courthouse for Cherokee County, and the old Cherokee penitentiary is the present county jail.

Prehistoric Indian mounds, some of them recently excavated under supervision of the Smithsonian Institute, dot the district. The fabled Texas Road and the famed Osage Trace crossed the area. The grave of Stand Watie, last Confederate general to surrender at the end of the Civil War, the lead and zinc mines first unearthed in a legendary Spanish mine dating back to Coronado's time, the Sacred-Fire ceremonies of the Kee-Too-Wahs, and the magnificent dogwood and redbud tours, are merely samples of the thrilling and inspiring sights available to guests of Oklahoma within the Second District alone.

Then we have our roundup clubs and rodeos in almost every town. They have continued the cowboy tradition in its fullest glory. This is clearly shown by the fact that both the all-around champion rodeo cowboy of the United States for 1954, and the runner-up as well, are from my district. Buck Rutherford from Lenapah is national champion, and Jim Shoulders of Henryetta won second place. Shoat Webster, who also hails from Lenapah, is the United States champion steer-roper, while Bennie Combs of Checotah, according to a recent report, is now top bulldogger of the world.

So I invite, and urge with pride, my fellow Americans to vacation in Oklahoma. Its lovely and historic sights will add substantially to your appreciation of the beauty, the vastness, and the inherent greatness of our Nation.

The addition of the national cowboy hall of fame will add another luminous star in the crown of glory that rests upon my native State.

The Yalta Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written in the newspapers and periodicals, stated in radio and television broadcasts, and spoken here about the release of the Yalta papers. There is much half information, false information, and impertinent information about the position of the State Department in this matter.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, made a complete statement on the subject before a committee of the other body on April 19, 1955, and yet confusion still exists in the public mind about what he said. The hearings of congressional committees, though printed, are not easily read by or readily available to the general public. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a somewhat better medium for disseminating public statements of this nature. Accordingly, I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of the statement made by Secretary Dulles on the subject of the release of the Yalta papers:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Let me say at the start that I believe that it was right that the Yalta papers should be made officially public. I believed—and still believe—that the American public, historian and citizen alike, is entitled to all relevant information on this remarkable chapter in world history that could be divulged without jeopardizing the national security. In this respect I share the view expressed by the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who, as Secretary of State, participated in the Yalta Conference. He said, in 1949, that "it is important for the public to know exactly what took place in the Crimea, and, almost equally important, what did not take place." That was said in the preface to his volume "Roosevelt and the Russians," which very fully reproduces his detailed record of the Yalta Conference.

The official United States publication has now taken place. I am glad to review with you the background and the chronology of events in connection with it.

I

The volumes on the Malta and Yalta Conferences were two of a number of volumes in the Foreign Relations series requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its report for fiscal 1954. The request grew out of the supplemental hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on May 15, 1953, which considered a 4-year publication program submitted by the Department of State. This program involved the reduction of the backlog of 26 volumes which had been compiled but not published, along with the publication of a series of volumes on our relations with China during the 1940's and another on the World War II conferences of heads of Government. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report of May 28, 1953, requested the Department of State to "allocate sufficient funds from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, 1954' to provide the necessary personnel and other related expenses essential to start reducing the backlog" of the Foreign Relations volumes, and referred with approval to the 4-year program submitted by the Department.

In the hearings for fiscal 1955 the Senate Appropriations Committee had before it a report from the Department showing the proposed schedule of publication which listed the Malta-Yalta volume as having top priority for publication in the series on World War II conferences.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's report for fiscal 1955 stated:

"The committee reiterates its firm conviction that the historic and documented record of our international relations as compiled in the Foreign Relations volumes should be continued aggressively and in unexpurgated form. Every effort should be made to make these documents available just as soon as security considerations will permit. Accordingly, the Committee is recommending $227,280 for this specific purpose."

The Yalta papers were ready to be sent to the printer early last September. If they had been printed at that time they would have been ready for publication in October. The question of whether to publish in October was put to me while I was in the Far East in September. On my instructions, Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle cabled the Department from Tokyo on September 11, 1954, as follows:

"With respect to date of publication, Secretary believes that it should not be published until after the congressional elections. If the publication could have taken place a month ago, that would have been all right; but to publish only 2 or 3 weeks before elections would, he thinks, damn the entire operation as political, and in the eyes of students discredit it as politically motivated. They would be suspicious that the selection and omission of documents had been politically motivated. He would, therefore, recommend publication sometime about the first of December."

That December date was not met because of unexpected developments. The British Foreign Office, in accordance with customary practice, had already been shown the documents of British origin, and had cleared these, with very minor exceptions, which did not affect our foreign policy. But toward the end of November 1954 the Foreign Office asked to see the entire collection of documents, including those of United States origin.

In view of the understandable British interest in the minutes and related conference papers, the Department sent the entire set of galleys to the Foreign Office for its information. This was done on December 2, 1954.

By early January, no comments had been received. So, on January 10, 1955, I sent a personal message to Foreign Secretary Eden telling him of our desire to proceed with publication without further delay and expressing the hope that he had no objections. On January 13, he replied that he still had some questions which he suggested we could discuss together at Bangkok the following month. He requested delay until then.

In deference to the Foreign Secretary's wishes, I postponed the publication. However, under the pressures of other matters, Sir Anthony Eden and I failed to talk about this at Bangkok.

Accordingly, upon my return from Bangkok I decided that, while awaiting British

approval, a limited number of galleys should be printed and made available on an official basis for departmental use and use by those committees of the Congress who had a special interest in them. On March 10, I cabled Sir Anthony recalling that he had planned to talk to me at Bangkok about the publication of the Yalta papers, but that in the pressure of business we had both overlooked this. I said that, in deference to his views, I was still holding up general publication, but that I did plan to make copies of these documents available to the appropriate congressional committees, for their official use.

On Monday, March 14, at the regular noon briefing of the correspondents who cover the State Department, the State Department spokesman, Mr. Henry Suydam, announced this program. This announcement was premature, in the sense that it was made before Assistant Secretary Morton had had the opportunity to consult with the appropriate members of these committees.

Shortly after lunch on the 14th, I saw news ticker reports which indicated that the chairman generally preferred that their committees not take custody of the papers, but thought it would be better that the State Department make them generally public.

Assistant Secretary Morton confirmed this, and I then asked him to send the following letter to the respective congressional leaders:

"Pursuant to congressional authorization and appropriation concerning special conference volumes the State Department has compiled the papers relating to the Yalta and Malta Conferences of 1945. It is deemed inadvisable at this time to issue these papers in volume for public distribution. Since, however, the papers have actually been compiled and since they may be of interest to your committee members in their official capacity, but not for publication, the Department of State will, if your committee so desires, make a limited number of copies available on a confidential basis."

These letters were written Monday evening, March 14, and delivered by hand on Tuesday morning, March 15.

The Tuesday morning press indicated that the delay in publication was widely ascribed to British objections. So, at 9 a. m. on Tuesday, March 15, I telephoned the British Ambassador. I expressed the view that, in the light of the wide public interest which had, by then, been aroused, it was better for Anglo-American relations to publish at once rather than to allow the impression to gain ground that the United Kingdom had something to hide—which was not the case. The Ambassador indicated his concurrence. I said I would advise Sir Anthony Eden of my views and the Ambassador said he would do the same. He indicated that he felt confident that I would get a quick answer from Sir Anthony. Accordingly, at 10:30 a. m., I sent a message to Sir Anthony saying that I thought it undesirable to perpetuate a situation which created an atmosphere of mystery and concealment, and that, accordingly, unless he felt strongly against it I proposed to publish.

I should, at this point observe that I had already carefully considered the possible impact of publication upon the international situation and particularly upon the pending ratification of the Paris Accords by the German Bundesrat and the French Council. I concluded that that impact would not be unfavorable.

At 10:30 on Tuesday morning, I spoke over the telephone with Senator GEORGE and informed him generally of the position and that I hoped shortly to be able to release the documents generally.

At 11 on Tuesday morning, I had my regular press conference, at which I said:

"The Yalta papers are at the present time in galley-proof form. They are available here in the State Department for consultation on a restrictive basis by Members of the Congress who are on committees that might be concerned with them, and we are still studying the matter of their full publication."

While Assistant Secretary McCardle and I were preparing for my press conference, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, telephoned Assistant Secretary McCardle's office and left the following message for him:

"Tell him while he is with the Secretary that I have had a long talk with GEORGE about the Yalta business and I think I ought to see the Secretary after the press conference if I can."

When my press conference was finished, Assistant Secretary McCardle brought Mr. Reston to my office. Mr. Reston said that his impression of his conversation with Senator GEORGE was that the Senator wished to see the Yalta record made public by the State Department. Mr. Reston urged that it was of the utmost importance that the papers be published as a whole and not in garbled form; that unless the New York Times did this, no one else would, but that this would be very expensive and take time. Therefore, if there was to be any comprehensive publication, they had to have an advance copy since it would involve setting up an enormous printing job.

I said that such matters fell under the jurisdiction of Mr. McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who was a former newspaperman. Thereupon the two left.

I subsequently learned that Mr. McCardle gave a galley proof to Mr. Reston about 8:30 p. m. that evening (Tuesday). This involved an exercise by Mr. McCardle of a discretion that was his. It involved no breach of security. On November 5, I had taken and recorded a decision to publish without deletion on an expedited basis. This constituted authority to declassify under Executive Order 10501. The galley proofs, on March 3, were marked "For Official Use Only," under Mr. McCardle's instructions. This was not a security classification but a purely internal classification which Mr. McCardle himself had imposed and which he had full authority to remove.

At 10:12 a. m. of Wednesday, March 16, the British Ambassador phoned me that his Government agreed to publish and that a confirmation cable from London was on its way to me.

At 12:45 on Wednesday I lunched at the Capitol with Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES. This appointment had been made 5 days before, on March 11. They mentioned that they had heard a rumor that the New York Times was going to publish the Yalta documents on March 17. I expressed surprise, but said that I thought that we would release the documents that afternoon to all news media. When I returned from lunch, I found the confirmation cable from Sir Anthony Eden agreeing that we should now publish.

Also, shortly after I returned from my lunch with Senators BRIDGES and KNOWLAND, Mr. James Hagerty phoned me that he, too, had heard that the New York Times was planning to run the Yalta papers the next morning and I made to him the same reply I made to the Senators, namely, that I planned a prompt general release.

At 3:45 I talked with Assistant Secretary McCardle and asked him to arrange promptly to release the documents generally. This was done and there was a general publication the next morning (Thursday, March 17).

II

The decision to publish the Malta-Yalta records required decision as to just what to publish. As to this I relied primarily upon Dr. George B. Noble, who has served as Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research or of the Historical Division since 1946.

The task was not easy. There were no agreed tripartite minutes. The only records available are those which were made by certain members of the respective delegations. These were done on a national basis and no distinction was recognized between formal and informal conversations.

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, minutes were kept of the meetings not only of the Council of Ten, but for the most part of meetings of the Big Four (France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States). These were circulated among the interested delegations and became substantially "agreed minutes." These minutes, which have been published, contain many casual comments of the nature of those to be found in the records of the Yalta discussions.

Where the participants in a conference do not themselves make any distinction in their remarks, as by asking that certain remarks should be treated as off the record, it is extremely difficult for subsequent historians themselves to make the distinction. Secretary of State Stettinius in his volume did not eliminate all of the so-called chit-chat. The record published by the Department of State was the actual record as compiled by certain of the participants and supplied by them to the Department of State for its records.

The most complete record is that of Mr. Bohlen who acted as interpreter. Early in 1949 he had checked and cleared for accuracy the proofs of Mr. Stettinius' book, and in July 1949, Mr. Bohlen transmitted his own record to the Division of Historical Policy Research.

It will be recalled that the report of the Senate Appropriation Committee for fiscal 1955 called for publication of the "unexpurgated" record. I should, however, say that a very few casual or informal remarks have nevertheless been omitted which might have done harm without adding anything of substance to the record.

In some cases remarks which otherwise might have been omitted by the above test have been included because they had previously been incorporated in authoritative memoirs and given wide publicity. The harm, if any, was done, and omission in the official record would merely have served to raise question as to the validity of the publication.

III

To sum up:

(1) At no time have I had any doubt about the desirability of publishing the story of Yalta. This, indeed, seems to have been the view of three of my predecessors who have held office since the Yalta Conference. I have already quoted Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State at the time, as to how important he judged it for the public to know exactly what took place at Yalta. His successor as Secretary of State, Secretary Byrnes, published in his memoirs his notes on the Yalta Conference. Secretary of State Acheson early in 1949 cleared the publication by former Secretary Stettinius of his extensive record of the conference.

The view that there should be publication was not only an executive judgment, but also explicitly endorsed by the United States Congress which appropriated the funds for prompt and full publication.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for approximately 2 years that publication was in process, and this has seemed to meet with general approval.

(2) The timing was judged opportune, in the light of the general international situation, and I think it has proved opportune. Furthermore, the timing was such as to avoid any approximation to a domestic election period.

(3) When publication was finally agreed upon, there was full publication of the volume which covers the Yalta Conference. I believe that at least two newspapers, within a few hours of the release, carried the full text of about 300,000 words, while others carried very substantial portions. This served the indispensable purpose of assuring that the American people and interested peoples abroad would easily and quickly get the main

story in full and not be dependent upon extracts which might have been selected for partisan purposes or for reasons of pure readibility.

(4) The Yalta papers are now where they belong—in the public domain.

Correspondence Between Senator Kefauver and Representative Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Representative RALPH W. GWINN and myself as it appeared in the Star of Elizabethton, Tenn., on April 3, together with the explanation by the Star of the correspondence.

There being no objection, the correspondence and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA: KEFAUVER VERSUS GWINN

(Back in January the Star, in its morning mail, received one of those extension of remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This particular one caught the editor's eye because of the title: "Twenty Years of Experience With Our First Socialist-Communist Experiment."

(Its author was Representative RALPH W. GWINN of the 27th District of New York.

(Representative GWINN's attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority (the Socialist-Communist experiment) and his uncomplimentary remarks concerning Tennessee drew from this newspaper a column-length editorial which pointed out that TVA's defense becomes Tennesseeans' obligation, since unfair attacks upon the public-power system appear to become direct attacks upon the people of Tennessee themselves, and that the biased and inaccurate estimates of TVA became, willy-nilly, biased and inaccurate estimates of Tennessee and Tenneseeans.

(Representative GWINN received a copy of this editorial and wrote a letter to the Star in reply to it. He mounted a nine-point attack upon TVA which would "summarize the facts as I seem them," he said.

(The Star was interested in the facts as Representative GWINN saw them, but it was also interested in how Representative GWINN's views would appear in the eyes of one of the men who knows TVA intimately and has championed its cause. With this in mind, Representative GWINN's letter was forwarded to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, with the request that the Congressman's points be answered, so that both might be published simultaneously.

(This was done, with the result that the Star's readers, in the exchanges below, may see the major arguments against TVA and the rebuttal to these arguments. Juxtaposed, they make very enlightening reading. Here they are:)

NEW YORK CONGRESSMAN ANSWERS STAR EDITORIAL IN NINE-POINT ATTACK; CHARGES REMARKS MISREPRESENTED

EDITOR, STAR:

One of your subscribers has sent me your editorial printed in the February 6, 1955, edition of the Star entitled "Also at Stake: Our Reputation." It appears the editorial was prompted by my remarks regarding TVA printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1954.

Near the beginning of the editorial is this statement:

"1. There is not a word of truth in what Representative GWINN said or implied." In other parts of the editorial I am represented as "spewing a wildly inaccurate speech," that I used loaded statistics and that in general my remarks were "tripe." These charges would be less serious if all your readers had the benefit of reading my remarks, rather than your interpretation of them.

Men of good faith and good intentions can honestly disagree as to the merits of nationalizing basic industries. But the holding of different opinions gives no license to misrepresent the facts. Surely the people who are sought to be convinced and who must pay the taxes to support such adventures as TVA are entitled to all the facts and the unvarnished truth.

I find it difficult to answer your editorial, for nowhere does it cite my facts and prove them wrong. Mere characterization does not constitute rebuttal. At one point my remarks are completely misrepresented. I did not say that the people of Tennessee are less well off than they were in 1933. Of course, Tennessee has made progress in the last 20 years but she has not progressed as rapidly or as well as her sister States in the South that still rely on the private production of power.

Should you see fit to print this letter as a reply to your editorial let me summarize the facts as I see them for the benefit of your readers:

1. The TVA has permanently flooded 660,000 acres (an area the size of Rhode Island) including rich farmland capable of yielding $27 million worth of farm produce annually. Thus, rather than controlling floods, TVA has permanently flooded more land than the Tennessee River could, left in its natural state.

2. The low-cost power produced by TVA has created such a demand (at least 100,000 homes in Tennessee are heated by electricity) that the supply has never been able to meet it. No other section of the country, supplied by private utilities, has experienced a shortage of power. It is worth mentioning that the private power industry is presently expanding to the tune of $2.5 billion.

3. The TVA is a complete monopoly in its reservation, having forced out all competitors by law. It is subject to no State regulations.

4. Allocation of costs among the various TVA operations have been consistently made on basis favorable to power production.

5. TVA pays no Federal taxes.

6. TVA pays only a small sum in lieu of State taxes which in 1954 amounted to $3,578,668, or about 2.7 percent of its total revenues. On the other hand the Consolidated Edison Company of New York which supplies my district paid $113,447,477 in State and Federal taxes for 1954, or about 24.4 percent of its revenues.

7. Except for a low rate of interest paid on about $65 million worth of bonds which were bought by the United States Treasury, TVA has paid no interest at all on the money it has borrowed or which has been advanced to it. It has been estimated that if TVA repaid the Federal Government for the interest costs alone of Federal moneys spent through TVA, the bills from TVA to its customers would have to be increased over $40 million a year.

8. The taxpayers of the Nation have spent $2 billion in TVA and in recent years congressional advances have averaged in excess of $150 million a year. The 1954 appropriation was $188,546,000.

9. TVA has only made a book repayment of $101.1 million which is $87 million less than the appropriation made in the single year 1954.

Those are the facts. I believe the people are entitled to have them. When they do, I am sure they will come to the proper conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. GWINN.

TENNESSEE SENATOR ANSWERS GWINN'S LETTER TO STAR: CHARGES CONGRESSMAN GREATLY MISREPRESENTED TVA

EDITOR, STAR:

I am glad of the opportunity to present the other side of the TVA case in answer to Representative RALPH GWINN, of New York.

Congressman GWINN's letter of February 14, 1955, to the Elizabethton Star, as well as his speech of April 18, 1954, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, greatly misrepresents the facts about TVA and the Tennessee Valley.

This can be illustrated by his first point in his letter, regarding flood control. In comparing the amount of land inundated in the TVA reservoirs with the land protected from floods, Congressman GWINN simply omits the fact that the TVA system, by holding back water and increasing the effectiveness of the Mississippi levees, helps protect 6 million acres of productive farmland in the Mississippi River Basin from floods. This is 10 times the amount of land inundated in the TVA reservoirs when filled to the brim, not counting the land and cities and towns in the Tennessee Basin which are protected.

In his speech, Mr. GWINN claimed the Army engineers said the Tennessee "would not seriously flood more than once in 500 years," although there would be some spring overflows which would leave a fertile sediment on the land. Actually, as their report shows, the Army engineers said 230 lesser but damaging floods could be expected in 500 years, or about 1 every 2 years. In fact, in 1946, 1947, and 1948 there occurred what would have been without TVA control, the 5th, 6th, and 7th largest floods in the history of the river at Chattanooga. Had it not been for the TVA system, these floods would have deposited a fertile sediment in the homes, stores, and factories of the city, causing $36 million of direct flood damage in 3 years.

In the second point in his letter, Mr. GWINN fails to mention the major reason the power supply situation is tight in the valley region: Namely the large proportion of TVA power going to AEC and to other Federal defense agencies, which are of immense importance to the entire country. Last year TVA's sales to these agencies totaled about 12 billion kilowatt-hours, an amount about equal to that sold to the 150 distributors serving 1,350,000 consumers, and within a couple of years it will reach about 30 billion kilowatt-hours a year. This fact helps explain why TVA appropriations have been large in the past few years. Essentially of course, this point in Mr. GWINN's letter raises the question of whether it is better to have a high demand for power at low, but profitable, rates or to have ample power available at high, exorbitant rates which limit customer use.

In general, Mr. GWINN resorts to some indefensible calculations—the sources of which he does not give—to improperly inflate TVA's power costs. For example, he figures interest not simply on the investment in the powerplant in service but on all the money invested or expended by TVA, for navigation, flood control, fertilizer and munitions research, and so on. Yet surely he must know that the Federal Government has spent many millions of dollars for navigation improvement in his own State of New York—as much or more than in the entire Tennessee Valley—which the people there will neither pay back to the Treasury or pay interest on, through their electric bills or otherwise. When he asserts that TVA allocations of investments

have been consistently made on a basis favorable to power product, he ignores the report of the Federal Power Commission in 1949, made with the assistance of the United States Army engineers, which approved the allocations.

When Mr. GWINN tries to compare TVA's payments in lieu of taxes with the tax payments of private utilities, he ignores the fact that TVA is entirely a wholesaler of power while the private utilities sell power at retail at much higher rates. Actually, when the tax equivalent payments of TVA power distributors are added to the TVA payments, the consumers of TVA power (except for Federal agencies, which properly are exempt) pay about 6 percent of their electric bills for taxes whereas the proportion for surrounding companies for State and local taxes ranges from 4.6 to 11.4 percent. While TVA is not subject to income taxes, it must be remembered that all its earnings belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. GWINN's letter obscures the fact that, far from being "subsidized," TVA rates are a paying proposition. TVA books, kept in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts for all utilities, show that its revenues have been sufficient to cover all the costs of producing and selling power and to leave a margin equal to an average return of 4 percent on the power investment over the past 21 years. This return is about double the cost of money to the Government.

A word might be said of Mr. GWINN's statistics by which he attempts to show Tennessee lagging behind in economic development. These are selected indexes, provided as Mr. GWINN said in his speech, by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Such indexes as gross postal receipts, for example, are questionable as indicators of overall economic progress. Total income is a more reliable index. In the United States between 1933 and 1953, total income increased 485 percent, in the Southeast 642 percent, in the Tennessee Valley region (including parts of 6 other States besides Tennessee) 649 percent, and Tennessee 655 percent. These figures confirm the fact, known to all Tennesseans, that the State is making very satisfactory economic progress and that the TVA program of resource development has been a helpful factor in that progress.

Yours sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Thorsten A. Gustafson, president, New York Conference, Augustana Lutheran Church, offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, Thou who hast welded us into a nation in dark and difficult days: We thank Thee for our country, filled with countless privileges, and imbued with the overwhelming trust of freedom. Given by Thee, power intended for the welfare of all mankind, our national leadership seeks Thy firm guidance along its way.

Thou who hast struggled in the valley of death for justice and peace: Increase our faith in the right and in the triumph of the good. When we complain, kindle anew in us our first love toward Thee. When we place great demands on others and small demands on ourselves, renew Thine image in us. Be Thou the constant help of all those who are deprived of their birthright, the homeless and the defenseless who are sacrificed to the results of misused power.

O Holy Spirit, Lord of Life: We would today take another step toward greatness in Thee. We would assume patiently the responsibility of the free citizen. Silence Thou our unbelief. Uphold us now in the anticipation of that day, when it shall be evident in all the world that Thou hast brought, in us and through us, truth and right to victory.

This we would ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our risen Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 22, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1628. An act to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes;

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness.

AMENDING THE RICE-MARKETING-QUOTA PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1938

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "5 percent" and insert "2 percent or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

Page 2, line 3, after "acreage", insert ", and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950–54 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945–49 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas some questions and make a statement.

The House passed the 5-percent increase with a special provision for South Carolina. What amount of acreage did that add to the national acreage?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but he was present and if he will refer to his record of the hearings I think he will find the answer.

Mr. HAGEN. Does the Senate version add less or more to the national acreage?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. It would add less because of cuts from 5 to 2 percent.

Mr. HAGEN. It gives special relief to about 3 States?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct; however, the overall acreage, if I am correctly informed from the other end of the Capitol, will be considerably less under the current bill.

Mr. HAGEN. The additional acreage given to 3 States is about 37,000 acres?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. May I say that I have communicated, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, with those Members from California who represent the principal rice-growing areas. They have, in turn, communicated with their growers. They do not like this unequal treatment. However, it is getting rather late in the season and the possibility is no increase will be adopted if this one is not agreed to. Although they do not like it, they are willing to go along. By reason of the emergency character of this legislation and the parliamentary situation, California Congressmen are placed in the position of either blocking unfair legislation, dictated by the other body, and foregoing some local benefit or acquiescing and accepting a basically unfair proposition as the price of securing some emergency acres and retaining the goodwill of the representatives of other rice areas. I have put this proposition to other California Congressmen who have checked with their constituents as I have said and in this one instance they are

willing to yield. It is for this reason that I withdraw my objection raised yesterday but I would like to comment further on the questions raised by this development.

The question of raising the 1955 rice acreage allotment was presented to the House Agriculture Committee at an early date and the subcommittee of which I am a member worked assiduously on the problem. After extensive hearings it was determined that some emergency increase in acres was desirable provided all States were given equal treatment. Legislation embodying these principles was passed by the House at a very early date. Thereafter the other body dawdled with the subject and at a late date presents us with a basically different proposition which violates the rights of a great many rice-producing States.

This and similar occurrences are the reasons that I am voting against a restoration of 90 percent of parity on basic crops at this time. Unquestionably this high level of support has a greater tendency to produce surpluses and quotas than a lower level of support. It is my observation, based on sad recent experience, that it is almost a corollary proposition that with respect to any crop under quotas some Representative will conclude that his farmers are entitled to special treatment at the expense of farmers from other areas and he seeks such special treatment with frequent success. These actions make a political proposition out of support programs and justify much of the criticism of support programs which produce surpluses. Representatives of the areas of new, progressive production in the United States will not long tolerate any program which is twisted to the detriment of such production. No one wants to be the victim of a political gouge.

I believe in support programs for farmers. I believe that they are vitally necessary but at the moment I am withholding support for that kind of a support program which is most likely to produce those surpluses which necessitate the political gouge which I have seen applied around here of late.

It is of small value that the House acts equitably if the other body acts inequitably and imposes its will upon us. This rice legislation was passed with no debate in the Senate—with no voices of opposition.

Finally I would like to state that I am somewhat critical of my people with respect to this legislation. Although I am the only Californian on the Agriculture Committee I have received no communication from any farm organization or rice grower on this subject.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not he feels it would be well for this bill to go to conference or does he think it should be brought up here in this manner without due regard to the straight 5-percent increase which the House bill carried?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I am very strongly of the opinion that if we go to conference it will drag out so long it will be too late to plant rice.

Mr. GATHINGS. We do not have unanimity of agreement in the State of Arkansas by virtue of the amendment placed in the bill by the Senate. We like the House bill. Under the House version there was no special treatment accorded any one section of the belt; all were treated alike. Under this bill, in my State, we would get only about 9,000 additional acres. One county would pick up about 5,000 acres under the provision which was written into the legislation by the other body. May I ask the gentleman if he feels it would be better to pass this bill here today or go to conference?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I think it would be better to pass it right now; in other words, accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. GATHINGS. I withhold my objection for the sole reason that I am convinced that any further delay in the passage of a rice bill, even though the legislation provides only a mere pittance of relief, may mean that there will be no rice bill enacted which would add acreage for the 1955 crop year. This measure offers little, very little, assistance. It will, however, supplement the allotment of a host of rice farmers who are faced with glaring and brazen hardships. They need to have their allotments brought up to such a level as to be able to operate their farms on an economical basis. The cutbacks from their previous plantings are so severe that they amount to gross inequities which are unconscionable. Too, I am partly consoled in this matter by the fact that another bill, H. R. 2839, providing for the release and reapportionment of unused rice acreages, has been adopted by the other body without amendment and is now before the President for his signature. I called the White House today to seek to determine when this bill might be signed, and while no action has been taken as yet, I am hopeful that we will receive speedy action. Thus, while the measure now before us provides a mere pittance, additional relief will be provided by the release and reapportionment legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the request to agree to the Senate amendments, because it appears evident that this is the best that we can obtain and objection now might prevent even this little relief being made available to those rice farmers in need of something being passed at this time to ease their situations. I much prefer, however, the language of the House bill and regret that we must accept less than that passed by the House. If we are to receive anything on this subject, it seems that this is the most we can pass.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether it is intended by this bill to give to Oklahoma and whether this bill, in fact, gives to Oklahoma in 1955, a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment to farms in Oklahoma operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or in which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I think it does, without any question. The problem of Oklahoma which the gentleman has just described is one of the reasons why section (4) beginning on page 2, line 18, was written into the original bill. Oklahoma was specifically mentioned in the House report. There is no doubt that the committee, and the House, intended to take care of the State of Oklahoma along with all other States with a like problem.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the increases in acreage in this entire bill are intended to take care of the 1955 emergency only, and should not be included in future history.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my initial impulse has been to object to the acceptance of the Senate amendments to this bill. The Senate amendments follow the procedure of giving special acreage consideration to old rice-growing areas where normal economic developments have resulted in a voluntary decrease in rice acreage.

This may be a humanitarian attitude to adopt in regard to modification of acreage bills, but the Congress has certainly refused to adopt such an attitude in consideration of other acreage legislation, notably that of cotton. The only legislation to increase cotton acreage which has been approved by the Congress has given special concessions to the new growing areas by contrast with the old. When the House Agriculture Committee considered cotton acreage legislation a few months ago, some of the same members of the committee who approved of these Senate amendments actively opposed similar legislation for cotton. If the cotton legislation which the House passed was fair, this bill is decidedly unfair.

This bill will have the effect of increasing rice production at a time when the country is already burdened with a heavy surplus of rice. In view of objections which the Department of Agriculture, speaking for the President, has presented to other acreage increase legislation, the only consistent course that can be followed would be for the President to veto this bill.

I shall not object to this unanimous-consent request because it is possible that a bill to come out of conference might actually provide for an even greater increase in rice acreage. I want

to call the attention of the Congress, however, to the inconsistency of the House Committee on Agriculture on the subject of rice and cotton acreage. I hope more fair treatment will be provided to both the cotton and rice growers in Mississippi in the future.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to passage of H. R. 4647, but I want to point out that as now before the House, it contains provisions I am reluctant to see enacted, and I want to make it clear that, so far as I am concerned, I hope this House will not consider this bill as establishing a precedent for future agricultural legislation.

This bill sets up emergency rice-acreage allotments of 1955. The planting season is now on us and if it is not immediately enacted it will do no good for anyone. That is one reason I am not objecting now. You will recall that this House passed a bill granting a 5-percent rice-acreage increase on an equal basis to all rice-growing States. It treated all growers alike. When the measure reached the Senate it was amended and the measure now before us includes the Senate amendments to the House bill.

Now the bill provides for a 2-percent acreage increase, but provides for added acreage in certain States. While California will receive some benefit from this measure, it is reduced in comparison with that provided by the original bill passed by the House. At the same time, this measure now gives preferential treatment to certain other areas. I appreciate the difficulties faced by rice-growers in certain areas and I want to be fair to them and to assist in solving their problems, but I feel that the principle of preferential treatment for certain States is a dangerous one and I am reluctant to see the Congress appear to embark on a program based upon regional or geographical considerations rather than a program designed to afford equal relief to all farmers who need it, regardless of where their farms are situated.

I sincerely hope this House will accept my view that in working out our farm problems we must act as a Nation on a national basis and not as individual States bickering over regional or local advantages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In this wealthiest of nations where per capita income is the highest in the world, more than one-fourth of the families who live on American farms still have cash incomes of less than $1,000 a year. They neither share fully in our economic and social progress nor contribute as much as they would like and can contribute to the Nation's production of goods and services.

This human problem is inadequately pictured by charts and figures. Curtailed opportunity begets an economic and social chain reaction which creates unjustified disparity in individual reward. Participation diminishes in community, religious, and civic affairs. Enterprise and hope give way to inertia and apathy. Through this process all of us suffer. This problem calls for understanding and for action.

We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people.

Recommendations to achieve this end have been made to me by the Secretary of Agriculture. I transmit them to you, with my general approval, for your consideration.

The Secretary's recommendations for starting the program are based on the accompanying report prepared for him by the Department of Agriculture, entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resouces, a Report on Problems of Low-Income Farmers." This report, more than a year in preparation, emphasizes the long-range nature of the low-income problem in agriculture and will serve to stimulate continuing study and action. Nevertheless, an immediate start is extremely important.

The essential cooperative nature of the undertaking is clear. The recommended program is cooperative as regards individual and group action, as regards private and public agencies, and as regards agencies at local, State, and Federal levels.

The Secretary's 15-point program recognizes that this is not exclusively an agricultural problem but that opportunities for off-farm employment are a part of the solution. Recommendations emphasize the voluntary approach, the importance of working with young people, and the desirability of broadening the program as experience is gained. In all matters, the urgency of the problem is recognized. The proposed program, however, is one of prudence as well as zeal.

A many-sided attack is essential. We need an integrated program in which each part contributes to the whole. Each will be more effective if the others are adopted. Together, they will help toward a solution within the framework of freedom for the individual, respect for his rights as an American citizen, and opportunity to participate more fully in the economic life of our Nation.

Proposals for enabling legislation and the necessary appropriations shortly will be presented to the Congress for consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1955.*

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express my congratulations to the people of Israel today on the seventh anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel.

The creation and development of today's Israel were not easily attained. Her birth was the glorious culmination of strenuous and persistent efforts and the accomplishment of a noble, and sacred task, undertaken under most difficult conditions. Each of these years has been full of historic and momentous events accompanied by hardships and tremendous sacrifices.

Thus, today Israel is a living, growing entity in the Middle East. It is a truly democratic and progressive state with representative governmental institutions. The Israelis are renowned for the industry and ingenuity they have displayed in the building and in the improvement of their country. They have protected their newly won freedom in their ancient homeland with extraordinary vigilance and bravery. With enthusiasm and energy they are doing their utmost to convert the desert of the Negev into a fertile land, and the hills of Galilee into blossoming orchards. By the skillful use of science and the technical abilities of their people, by the erection of hydroelectric power stations, by installing water pipelines, and by the use of chemical fertilizers, the Israelis have turned arid and inhospitable hills and desert plains into cultivable and productive farm lands. In this respect, as in many others, they have worked near miracles.

Today on the celebration of her seventh anniversary Israel stands as a new and encouraging phenomenon in the Middle East. One of her most pressing problems arises from the fact that her exports earn enough foreign exchange to pay for only a part of her imports. To make up the balance Israel is presently dependent upon foreign aid and such things as the sale of bonds.

The response of the Jewish people here in the United States to the financial needs of Israel has always won my deepest admiration. The sacrifices they make to assist their relatives and friends in Israel are often heroic.

As a member of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have in past years

done everything possible to see that Israel was granted sufficient funds to progress with her noble task of creating a new life for the 750,000 refugees who have come to her shore since 1948.

I have derived great personal pleasure over the years in supporting legislation extending aid to the courageous people of this young nation, who despite many difficulties, economic and financial hardships, and political uncertainties, have made gigantic strides in attaining their goal of complete independence. The people of Israel face the future with confidence. I hope they continue in their task with undiminished zeal and boundless zest.

In the celebration of this anniversary I wish them peace, prosperity, and happiness, and express my hope that complete success will reward their valiant efforts in their ancient homeland.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the calling up for final passage today of H. R. 5645, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, notwithstanding that under unanimous-consent request further proceedings on this bill were postponed until Thursday for final passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is now agreeable to those who opposed it temporarily.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make the observation that the agricultural bill with reference to parity will not come up this week?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 5645 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA POWER

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House a bill identical with that introduced in the Senate by the great Senator from New York, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to provide for the public development by the State of New York of electric power at Niagara Falls. The financing of the project will be borne by revenue bonds issued by New York State. Thus, there will be no cost to the Federal Government.

The great benefits which will inure to the public by the early completion of this project are patent. I am sure, therefore, that my colleague from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] the chairman of our Public Works Committee, whose interest in this field is no less than mine, will shortly schedule hearings on this subject.

I include here a short but detailed analysis of the measure which Senator LEHMAN and I have introduced:

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE NIAGARA BILL

Section 1 takes cognizance of the Senate reservation to the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950, and authorizes a public power project consistent therewith. The Senate reservation declares it the policy of the United States Government to make the Niagara project subject to congressional enactment for the public use and benefit.

Section 2 directs the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to the New York Power Authority for the construction and operation of the Niagara project, subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act and to certain other licensing conditions as follows:

1. First preference in access to the project power to be given to counties and municipalities and their instrumentalities; to agencies of the New York State government; to rural electrification co-ops; and to United States defense agencies. Withdrawal clauses to be included in all contracts with private utilities to insure continued availability of power to preference customers.

2. Transmission lines to be built, acquired, or contracted for, to permit the project power to be widely distributed to load centers, and to preference customers, and to neighboring States, by wheeling or other arrangements.

3. A reasonable share of the project power to be made available to neighboring States within economic transmission distance of the power site, with the Federal Power Commission acting as referee to settle any disputes that might arise with neighboring States: assurance to be secured from such neighboring States, that preference customers within their borders be given first preference in access to the State's share of the Niagara power.

4. Project power to be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of rural and domestic consumers, at the lowest rates reasonably possible;

5. The New York Power Authority to fix resale rates to insure compliance with the above.

6. A park and scenic drive is to be built on the American side of the Niagara River, to be financed by the power project in such part as the Federal Power Commission may approve.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. In paying a salute to that young and vigorous state it is nice to note that in the 7 years of its existence, it has taken into its country and integrated into its economy as her own citizens some 750,000 refugees from all parts of the world. In the 70 years prior to its coming into existence there have been some 270 new agricultural settlements established in that area of the world. In the last 7 years there have been 400 new agricultural settlements created in that small area. In the short time since 1951, its annual deficit in the balance of trade has been reduced by $100 million. Its railroad mileage has been doubled, and its highway mileage has been increased 50 percent. With all of this tremendous progress toward peace, it is regrettable that there is still no peace in that area of the world. This day the State of Israel and its people extend their grateful thanks to this country for its leadership and the tremendous help it has given to that small country, not only morally, but materially. Again, the State of Israel and its people look to this country to lead the way to peace in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their re-

marks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, out of the political and economic confusion which swept over Europe and Asia during World War II and the postwar period has come the liberation of a number of peoples. It is unfortunately true that in Eastern Europe a number of countries have lost their freedom and national independence, but in other parts of the world, in Southeast Asia and in the Middle East, many millions of people have gained their freedom and many formerly dependent nations have attained the status of independent sovereign states. Of these peoples who have emerged as independent nations perhaps none has worked more consistently or has sacrificed more for the regaining of their national political independence than have those Jews who longed to return to their ancient homeland in Palestine.

Today the emergence of the State of Israel is one of the most significant phenomena in the whole Middle East. Phenomenal also is the way the foundation of the new state was laid by the persevering and undaunted Jewish leaders despite many political and economic handicaps. The growth of the Jewish population in Palestine gives striking evidence of their achievement. While in the early 1920's there were some 62,000 Jews in Palestine, today there are more than 1,500,000 Jews. Such an achievement of miraculous change by immigration and settlement of refugees in only a relatively few years is a little short of amazing. And this was accomplished in spite of a host of obstacles and almost insurmountable difficulties.

Seven years ago when the independence of Israel was proclaimed it was a smaller and weaker country than it is now. Today, even though the new state is not entirely out of all financial and international difficulties, it is larger, stronger, and its youthful and hard-working citizens face the future with full confidence and boundless energy. We join them in the celebration of the seventh anniversary of their independence and hope that the State of Israel will continue to grow in strength and prosper in peace.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the free State of Israel is 7 years old this month. Out of the depths of despair and oppression into which they had been thrown, the Jewish peoples rose to fulfill a dream of 2,000 years. Since winning its war for independence, Israel has provided a homeland for 750,000 immigrant men, women, and children. They have come from every corner of the world to find safe refuge from war's havoc, from the cruel barbs of anti-Semitism, and from the oppression which had almost become their birthright.

The courageous people of Israel have displayed much of the same vigor, fortitude, and idealism that characterized our own Founding Fathers, and it is not strange that the American people find a real bond of friendship with the people of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, because the fate of Israel and all other democratic states is linked with our own fate, we must continue to lend that kind of support and encouragement which true friendship requires.

At a time when our own State Department describes as "impartial" a policy by which free military assistance is given to Iraq while arms are sold to Israel, it is clear that we must reconsider the values upon which free and independent Israel is founded. And certainly we must change our policies to meet a definition of "impartial" more in keeping with our own honest American standards.

It is important that this young nation in the Middle East be encouraged to look to the United States as a worthy model of freedom, truth, and democracy. Only by being truthful in our own policies can we hope to serve as this model for the Israel which has risen against tremendous odds to be one of the truly democratic countries of the world.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many peoples have struggled and fought for the attainment and preservation of their national political independence. Many have made great sacrifices for the realization of that most desirable of all national ideals—the freedom of the nation to develop and govern itself according to its own traditions and under its own chosen rulers. It is perhaps safe to say that no people has worked more steadfastly, and has pursued that goal for so long, much of the time under discouraging and disheartening circumstances, as have the Jewish people. After nearly 2,000 years they have finally earned the reward for their work and patience in the form of the new State of Israel. Only the Jewish people themselves who have had an active share in the creation of their new country really know what it took to make it a living reality and thus bring about the realization of their centuries-old dream.

Today the State of Israel is not large, and, measured in terms of armed forces and power politics, it is not among the so-called great powers, but it is a new force in the whole Middle East to be reckoned with in international affairs. It is a young, growing, progressive state, and it needs peace to grow stronger and more powerful. On this the seventh anniversary of its birth we wish the Israelis good fortune and success in their venture, and hope that they will find the peace they require for the proper development of their country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, today is the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to that country which has proven itself to be a valiant friend, a bastion of democracy, and a source of hope in the Middle East for many thousands of unjustly oppressed people. The mutual friendship which has existed between the United States and Israel will, I know, continue for many years to be a source of inspiration to the peoples of other countries. It is my sincere hope that Israel, one of the newest of the countries of the free world, will continue to grow in strength and vitality, and I will be happy to join in any movement to encourage, promote, and foster such growth.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my best wishes to the State of Israel upon its seventh birthday.

Since its inception in 1948, the free State of Israel has been closely observed by freemen throughout the world. We have watched the unceasing efforts to establish a stronghold of democracy, of toleration, and of freedom, within the territorial limits of this new state. We have aided and encouraged these efforts, in the hope that the State of Israel would become a beacon of inspiration to freemen everywhere, and a champion of justice, democracy, and peace.

It is our fervent hope that the State of Israel will continue to strive for these worthy objectives. We are especially hopeful that the people and the leaders of Israel will earnestly strive for the establishment of lasting peace in the Near East, which is presently torn by many conflicts. To this end, the State of Israel has our best wishes on this seventh anniversary of its independence.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, historically, the plight of the Jewish people in foreign lands has been a travesty of international justice and compassion. For centuries, they have in many, many instances been disfranchised, pilloried, subjected to the most adverse and inhuman treatment at the hands of implacable dictators and sinister rulers. Seven years ago a new era dawned for many thousands of Jewish people with the founding of the State of Israel. At last, the beleaguered Jews had a home of their own in which to carry on a normal and happy life—a life free from physical and mental torture from foreign oppressors. It indeed gives me a great deal of pleasure to salute them on their seventh anniversary.

Today the Republic of Israel celebrates the seventh anniversary of its independence. I wish to express my congratulations to that gallant little state that has come so far in so short a time. When we stop to consider the great odds against them, we are forced to admire the unflagging courage and determination with which the 20th century pioneers of Israel have tackled their problems.

Perhaps the most difficult task for the young nation was the absorption of the refugees. In 1948 Israel flung wide its doors. Displaced Jews from Europe, many of them penniless and broken by years of Nazi oppression, were given sanctuary. When Jews from the Middle East and Africa asked admittance, they too were welcomed. Since then the population of Israel has doubled. Housing and food had to be provided and work found for the enormous influx. Seven hundred thousand people, fortified by their faith and ennobled with a cooperative spirit, made room in a country about the size of New Jersey, for their less fortunate brothers.

Israel is today still faced with difficulties. Although great strides have been made in turning barren desert wastes into flourishing farm land, the country is unable to feed its own population completely from its own resources.

It is confronted with problems related to blending the diverse elements of its population, some of whom come from large urban centers, while others have migrated from areas with nomadic and tribal traditions. Ostracized by its neighbors and surrounded by borders bristling with hostile arms, Israel must pour vital funds into military preparation to defend its independence.

On this anniversary of their independence it is my fervent hope that the Israelis will find the peace necessary to permit them to continue unmolested their progress toward establishing in the Middle East a shining example of democracy at work.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the seventh year of Israel's independence. In commemoration of Israel Independence Day, I am pleased to include the following article by an eminent and highly esteemed member of the rabbinate, Rabbi Jacob Goldberg, of the Fort Tryon Jewish Center, New York City:

SEVEN-YEAR MIRACLE IN COMMEMORATION OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY, APRIL 27, 1955

This year, the celebration of Israel Independence Day by men of good will everywhere, serves as an opportunity for assessment of the meaning of this modern miracle. Even the casual observer will readily recognize that the achievements of this tiny state in the Middle East is an inspiring example of what can be accomplished by courage and the spirit of never-say-die.

Israel's accomplishments in the short years of its existence as an independent state are both material and spiritual. In the brief years since May 1948 almost 1 million refugees were welcomed and absorbed into its productive economy, industry and agriculture increased by over 80 percent, the political processes of government have been firmly cast in a democratic mold, and tremendous strides have been made in improving the social and health services on a national scale. Ambitious exploration and mapping of the natural resources has begun and engineering feats have been carried forth to harness the waters of the Jordan and Yarkon Rivers.

Truly, Israel has become the most progressive, the most energetic, and the most modern state in the Middle East. When one remembers that this economic and political maturity has been achieved by people, at least 50 percent of whom had been rescued from death in Nazi Europe and from primitive poverty in the oriental countries within the last 6 years, the miracle becomes all the more amazing.

But there is more to celebrate even than the miracle of physical success. Israel is becoming the symbol of hope and courage for all the oppressed and downtrodden peoples of the earth who yearn for the chance to be free. Israel is the latest chapter in the drama of freedom and justice that began to unfold itself on the stage of world history in our own United States in 1776.

There is ferment in Israel today, a social, moral, and cultural movement which seeks to find a just and wise way of life. On this land, where first the prophets of old preached their message, where first the ways of God were revealed to man, a people today is being fashioned that shall walk in the footsteps of the ancient sages, and shall tap anew the sources of a divine wisdom.

All Americans have every right to be proud of Israel's past, to rejoice in its contemporary success, and to wish it well in its future undertakings.

If ever there was a living demonstration of the truth of the Prophet Zachariah's call, that victory shall be achieved "not by might nor by power, but by my spirit, sayeth the Lord of Hosts," Israel's history is that. May the Lord in Heaven that has brought the miracle of the present State of Israel to pass, guide the people of Israel along forward and blessed paths in the future.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago a new nation was born.

Through the blood of its valiant sons, it has maintained its borders against its enemies.

Through the industry of its citizens, it has prospered.

I have watched with great interest the development of this brave young state. It is with satisfaction that I remember the encouragement that some of us in Congress gave to the development of Israel as an independent nation. I feel that the accomplishments Israel has made in 7 years justify the position we took. After studying the Balfour Declaration, we were convinced, as we are now, that a valid agreement existed whereby the Jewish people were entitled to a homeland.

And we watched with pride the victory of the Jewish legions in the war for independence; and we have watched, as a result of this independence, the desert begin to bloom as more and more land was put under cultivation.

In its young life, Israel has faced grave problems. There was the threat of internationalization; the threat of partitioning, and the threat of invasion.

Those of us who had faith in Israel backed efforts to prevent internationalization and the partition of Israel was prevented.

Unfortunately, the road ahead is still not entirely smooth for this young state. Reclamation still must be accelerated in the Hills of Judea, the Mountains of Galilee, and in the Negev Desert. There must be established a firm and honorable peace between Israel and the Arab States. Toward these goals I will continue to work.

I was pleased to note that President Eisenhower recognized Israel's needs in his recent message to Congress on foreign aid. It is my hope that we will see Israel's self-sufficiency in agriculture and industry continue to increase, for Israel is, and must continue to be, a bastion of freedom in the Middle East.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 27th of April is the seventh anniversary of the rebirth of a state in the Middle East which had lost its political independence for more than 1,900 years. In those distant days almost 20 centuries ago the people of Israel not only lost their independence; their country was not only overrun and conquered by foreigners, but they were dispersed in all directions, and for centuries they were banned from their homeland.

It seems that from the moment the Jews were driven out of their country they had vowed to nurse and cherish and keep alive the heritage of Israel, hoping to return to Palestine some time in the future and to resume their traditional life in their ancient home. In the past, in the course of their long and diverse history, the Jewish people have manifested many fine qualities: tenacity and perserverance, ingenuity and resourcefulness, unlimited capacity for hard work, and an almost unbelievable will to pursue the end in view. All of these qualities, these fine traits, have served them well in times of adversity. Their determination not to be discouraged and downhearted, and not to despair when the odds have been heavily against them, has been their most enduring trait. And the reward which has been theirs since 1948 was certainly not easily earned. As much as any other of the newly born and recently proclaimed independent states, Israel was created out of the blood, the sweat, and the tears of its people.

The long and remarkable history of the Jews is well known to us. A part of it has become familiar through biblical literature, and we have learned the more recent history of the Jews through the many accounts of their sufferings, especially under totalitarian dictatorships. But now that their trials and tribulations under the dictators have been relegated to the past, it is certainly an infinite joy for me today to participate in this celebration and join, at least in sentiment, all those who were in some way instrumental in the creation of the new State of Israel. We salute them all, both those who have passed on and those who are still with us, for the fine work they did in behalf of a great human cause.

What the new State of Israel is, what the Jewish people have accomplished there in a very short time, and what they are doing now for the benefit and welfare of the newly arrived refugees under politically uncertain conditions, is not well known to some of us. The herculean task of resettling hundreds of thousands of refugees in the barren hills and arid deserts, and the converting of those unproductive lands, with the aid of modern technological methods, into productive farmlands, the creation of a progressive society with modern democratic principles in the relatively static Middle East, all of these remarkable feats are not as well known as they deserve to be. Israel today is a new, powerful, dynamic phenomenon in the Middle East, a refuge and haven for the long-suffering and wandering children of Israel, and a beacon light of inspiration and hope for Jews all over the world.

I am happy to say that the United States has played a significant role in assisting the people of Israel to establish a sound economy and a strong state. Former President Harry S. Truman, in the name of the United States, after the proclamation of the State of Israel 7 years ago promptly recognized the new nation and welcomed it to the family of nations. This country included Israel in its economic-assistance programs. According to a recent report of the Foreign Operations Administration:

United States development assistance and technical cooperation have played a major role in the tripling of the land area under irrigation since the state was founded, in the doubling of agricultural and industrial production and power-generating capacity, the reduction in the trade deficit by $75 million in 3 years, and the settling of nearly 700,000 immigrants in permanent or semi-permanent quarters.

However, Israel still faces both economic and political problems. It requires many commodities from abroad and has at its disposal only limited resources to pay for them. In other words, Israel still has the task of eliminating an adverse trade gap and putting its international finances on a favorable basis.

Although the military struggle with the Arab States has been ended by truces concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, real peace with the Arab countries has not yet been attained. Outbreaks of violence occur from time to time along the Israeli frontiers and other incidents continue to mar Arab-Israeli relations. The desire for peace on the part of the Israelis I know is deep and sincere, and I feel sure that with patience and good will it will eventually be achieved.

On this, the occasion of the seventh anniversary celebration of the independence of the State of Israel, I ardently hope that in the years ahead it will come into fuller realization of the noble purposes for which it was founded.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the seventh anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel. The remarkable growth and endurance of that infant democracy is nothing short of miraculous. With an area slightly smaller than the State of New Jersey, Israel's historic and continuing struggle for freedom is most like our own. And now, regrettably, 7 years after the international recognition and establishment of the only democracy by the Middle East, we are confronted with one of the cheapest forms of power politics imaginable. With the Arab States still breathing fire and raging at Israel's very existence, the Premier of Communist China has spoken out strongly in behalf of the Arab position. As a result, we are witness to a most cynical demonstration at the recent Asian-African conference at Bandung. The final communique of that conference, published April 25, contains a declaration supporting the Arab side in the Arab-Israel conflict.

This resolution was adopted despite the absence of any representatives from Israel. That little Asian democracy was excluded from the conference. It is not only inconsistent with every concept of fair play to consider a controversy in the absence of one of the principals, but, to take action on that controversy without hearing both sides can have no moral justification whatever. This performance is all the more cynical because the absent party was neither permitted nor invited to attend. This discrimination is all the more palpable because it was practised by a conference espousing bitter opposition to all forms of discrimination and segregation.

The resolution on the Palestine issue was adopted largely because the Premier of Communist China, Chou En-lai, associated himself with the Arab position in an address before the conference last week. It is not surprising that Communist China should make this brazen effort to seek the favor of the Arab countries by pandering to their anti-Israel views without regard to principle or equity.

This is not a new Communist tactic. For the last 5 years, the Soviet bloc has lined up with the Arab group in the U. N. and has voted with the Arabs because it seeks to expand its influence and prestige in the Middle East. This is one of the major reasons why the U. N. has not been able to take dynamic action in Palestine. Any resolution which calls attention to Arab defiance and rejection of U. N. Palestine policy is doomed to a Soviet veto.

Men of good will who believe in fair play will be repelled by these Soviet tactics of appeasement and by the readiness of the Arab States to seek and exploit the political assistance of forces which threaten the sovereignty of all states and the freedom of all peoples. I sincerely pray that Israel's existence will not be further imperiled by a new competition between our State Department and the Communists for Arab favor.

It should be pointed out that the resolution adopted at Bandung fits in neatly with the Arab propaganda line because it circulates the hoax that the Arab States have faithfully carried out U. N. resolutions on Palestine and may be regarded as the defenders of the U. N. Nothing is further from the truth. From the very beginning the Arab States refused to accept the major recommendations of the General Assembly on Palestine. They rejected the original partition resolution, which called for the establishment of two states and for the internationalization of Jerusalem. They went to war against that resolution and tried, unsuccessfully, to prevent the establishment of Israel. A year later they refused to accept a U. N. resolution which called upon them to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel. Since that time the Arab States have defied the Security Council decision calling for the end of the Suez blockade, and they have failed to cooperate with U. N. resolutions which recommended a large-scale program for the settlement of the Arab refugees in countries where they are now located. If the Arab States had accepted the original U. N. resolutions and had abjured war, there would today be two independent states in Palestine, living side by side in peace and economic cooperation, and there would not have been a single refugee displaced by the conflict.

The Arabs frankly, openly, and officially maintain that they are still at war with Israel. This is a defiance of the principles of the U. N. Charter, which calls upon loyal members of the U. N. to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Moreover, the Arabs labor under the illusion that they can carry on a limited liability war. They felt free to go to war against the 1947 partition resolution. They hoped to seize all of Palestine, if possible. Having failed in that venture, they then saw nothing incongruous in demanding the implementation of the original resolution which they defied. Having failed to capture all of Palestine, they thought that they could then fall back and rely on the resolution which offered them a part, the very resolution they tried to stamp out. The Arabs rely on the shortness of human memory.

Such a position is not sanctioned in equity. The Arabs do not enter this controversy with clean hands. The Arab pretense that they support U. N. resolutions and the Israelis do not is a propaganda device. The Arabs are not sincere in their call for support of U. N. resolutions. This is not speculation. We may go to Arab sources for confirmation.

On January 28, 1955, Major Salem, Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, declared:

> Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war. Even if Israel should fulfill all U. N. resolutions, it will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel-Aviv, we shall never put up with that.

That statement is of special interest in view of the fact that the Bandung Conference called for a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question.

Up to this moment, 7 years after Israel's establishment, there has not been the slightest indication from the Arab States that they are ready to make peace with Israel under any circumstances. Responsibility for the continuing tension in the Middle East rests on them. It is the Arab States which must take the initiative and modify their attitude if there is to be a reduction of tension and stabilization of conditions in this disturbed area.

In this connection, I call attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, April 22, 1955. I would like to enter it in the RECORD at this time.

BANDUNG AND ISRAEL

The political committee of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung has approved a resolution, backed by a strange combination of Arab and Communist States, supporting "the rights of the Arab peoples in Palestine" and calling both for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Palestine and for a peaceful solution of the Palestine question. The Arabs hail this resolution, now likely to be passed by the Conference as a whole, as a victory over Israel. In the interest of such victory they do not gag at accepting the aid of a tyrannous and aggressive force which their own statesmen denounce as a new colonialism threatening them as well.

But it will be noted that, thanks to Prime Minister Nehru's first constructive action at the Conference, the resolution is a double-barreled one and contains the overriding demand for a peaceful settlement of the issues involved. Such a settlement has been the constant demand of Israel. The resolution bars the constant border clashes, for which both sides have been censured by the United Nations. But it also calls for a start of actual negotiations to convert the precarious 6-year-old armistice into a real peace. On that score the Arab States themselves have been most amiss.

The Arab States declare that before they can even consider negotiations Israel must consent, among other things, to a readjustment of the present Palestine demarcation lines in conformity with the original United Nations partition plan and to repatriation and compensation of the Arab refugees. The Israelis declare themselves ready to make some concessions along these lines. But they also point out that the United Nations partition plan was rejected by the Arabs themselves; that there was war as a result, and that this war was terminated by armistice agreements which, while disclaiming any intent to establish political or territorial

boundaries, do not presume to prejudice the rights, claims, and positions of either party—thereby putting the Israeli claims on a par with those of the Arabs.

If, therefore, the Bandung call for a peaceful settlement is to be honored by the Arabs themselves, they will have to enter into negotiations with Israel on a basis that does not prejudice the Israeli position, but rather permits the reconciliation of rival claims in the interest of peace on which depends the welfare of both sides.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the seventh birthday of the new nation of Israel is being observed today by addresses of congratulation and good wishes by Members of this body. This reflects the close ties between our country and Israel.

I am extending my remarks to include some observations additional to those in my remarks earlier in the well of the House and which time did not suffice for their utterance then.

Our interest in the Near East is in the importance of the area in defending and strengthening the free world. Our faith in democracy impels us to see Israel as a center of creative civilizations and the cultural enrichment of the world community.

We support Israel in her struggle to attain cultural freedom for dispossessed and persecuted Jews. We hail Israel's advances in founding a democratic society and in reclaiming a neglected land.

The Near East is emerging from its ancient patterns and seems destined to secure a greater measure of good life for all the people in the Mediterranean.

The Jewish people throughout the world have provided immediate relief for the 750,000 Israel newcomers—350,000 of them from the Arab and the Moslem lands of the Near East and Africa—and are helping to settle them on farms and in factories with a reasonable standard of living for all, Jews and Arabs alike.

We applaud Israel's acts of friendship and good faith—

First. In releasing Arab-blocked bank accounts of former Palestinian Arabs despite the failure of the Arab States, notably Iraq, to release the blocked accounts of their former Jewish residents;

Second. In offering to pay for Arab lands abandoned in Israel as part of a peace settlement, taking into account the lands and property abandoned by Jews in Arab lands;

Third. In offering Jordan the use of a free port in the newly constructed Kishon River Harbor in Haifa Bay;

Fourth. In accepting as citizens some 28,000 Arabs who have illegally returned to Israel since hostilities in 1948;

Fifth. In voting for the admission of the Arab State of Libya into the United Nations; and

Sixth. In offering to redraw the Israel-Jordan boundary lines in major trouble areas, so that farm homes might be reunited with farmlands, and so that the constant human pressures to break across artificial and arbitrary boundaries will not continue to be the cause of daily depredations from both sides.

We applaud Israel for seeking to establish a democratic society with full civil, religious, cultural, and political freedom for all its citizens.

First. Eight Arabs are members of the Israel Parliament.

Second. There is in Israel universal education, universal franchise, equal wages for equal work.

We applaud the Zionists and the friends of zionism throughout the world who have long sought to provide a homeland so that Jews who felt the sting of discrimination and the lash of persecution might live in freedom and dignity.

Like their Nazi predecessors, the Communists portray Israel as an agent of British and American expansion because they recognize that the stability, trade, and mutual help flowing from an Israel-Arab peace would forever doom Russian imperialist designs on this strategic and oil-rich area.

The future of the free world hangs in the balance in the Near East. Israel is the light in the darkness.

There are many citizens of Israel who are Christians, Mohammedans, and agnostics. It is a nation of predominantly Jewish population that practices no discrimination and accords complete freedom of religion.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Israel is today celebrating its seventh anniversary as an independent and sovereign state. Seven years are but a fleeting moment in the annals of human history, but in this instance the rebirth of the State of Israel after a period of 2,000 years of exile and oppression constitutes a unique event in world history. It is the realization of the prophecy of Isaiah, who said:

> The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. For Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor.

We in the United States take note of this event with much pride because it was our country which played an important role in the creation of Israel and in helping it during these 7 years to attain a more solid economic foundation and greater political security. By now Israel has attained political maturity. Its people are possessed of an indomitable spirit to restore their ancient homeland and their long-persecuted coreligionists to an honored position in the family of nations.

The United States has found in Israel a great and devoted ally in the Middle East. It is shaping its way of life along the standards and concepts of our country. Its people believe in the same principles of freedom, democracy, and human dignity as the American people. During Israel's 7 years of independence a warm friendship has developed between the two countries.

Unfortunately, of late our State Department has embarked upon a policy in the Middle East which is endangering this relationship. In its efforts to gain Arab favor, the State Department is going all-out to appease the Arab States. Israel is being gradually isolated, its national security is threatened, and its very existence is at stake.

This is an erroneous policy. While we are anxious to gain Arab adherence to a defense pact in the Middle East, it should not be done at the expense of Israel. As we enter into alliances with the Arab States and agree to extend military assistance to them, we should do the same with Israel. The United States should grant military aid to Israel and enter into an arrangement whereby the security of Israel would be guaranteed and the integrity of its borders respected.

Freedom-loving people everywhere join with the Jews of America and their coreligionists in Israel in celebrating this memorable event—the seventh anniversary of the Jewish State. I extend my greetings to the Jews in this country for their great devotion and sacrifices in helping Israel solve many of its economic problems. I pray that the relations between Israel and the United States will continue as friendly and cordial as ever and that both countries will prove to be a great force for the good of all mankind.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on this day, April 27, the anniversary of independence of the State of Israel, it is fitting that we, as Americans, pay tribute to a courageous people who have added so much to the culture of our United States of America.

Since World War I, America has been lending wholehearted support to the aspirations of the people of the Middle East in their struggle for independence. The knowledge that the Jewish people were the victims of mass annihilation and suffering by anti-Semitic people compelled a response from the American people whose basic philosophy is founded in the principle of man's right to life and liberty. It was approximately in the year 1933 that Adolf Hitler began his reign of terror against the German and Austrian Jews and later traveled on to other European countries spreading destruction. More than 6 million Jews were murdered in his so-called revenge on Jewry.

The path to independence was not smooth and easy but filled with many obstacles. Through the untiring efforts of the Jewish people and their many friends and allies, this independence was finally achieved on April 27, 1948. In the creation of a Jewish State, a national homeland, refugees were given a chance of survival. Refuge, livelihood, and freedom from persecution were offered them. The state became to the Jewish people, the modern day fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy, "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, wither they be gone, and will gather them into their own land."

But 7 years after this great beginning, peace does not reign in the Middle East. A great amount of hostility and tenseness exists between the Arab States and the State of Israel. It is highly essential in this day and age that peace come to this troubled area. It is essential that tensions be removed and that peace and harmony be restored to the Middle East as one more defense post against godless communism.

In its democratic thinking, Israel is seeking equal opportunity for its people. With the help of the Western World, this objective can be achieved and peace will ultimately come to the Middle East region so that its people may share in a cooperative endeavor to resolve the problems which now face our world.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to vacate a special order for today, and to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE MAID OF COTTON VISITS THE CAPITOL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have the happy privilege of calling the attention of the House to the fact that we have a distinguished and accomplished visitor in Washington. She is a welcome guest, one I am proud to number among the residents of the Second Congressional District and one of whom the whole State of Oklahoma is proud.

She is Miss De Lois Faulkner, of Sallisaw, Okla., the beautiful and charming Maid of Cotton for 1955.

Today, Miss Faulkner will be presented at a reception at the Mayflower Hotel and many of you will have the pleasure of meeting her. You will then understand why I am so proud of this constituent.

As most of you know, the Maid of Cotton, who always comes from one of our great cotton-producing States, is the official representative of the cotton industry. She travels from coast to coast in this country and in Canada and Europe extolling the virtues of American-grown cotton.

She is outfitted in a beautiful all-cotton wardrobe, designed especially for her by the leading designers of this country and Europe. She is living proof that cotton has truly arrived as a high-fashion product.

Miss Faulkner is well qualified to represent our great cotton-producing industry. She comes from a section of Oklahoma that has long engaged in the production of cotton as part of a diversified farm operation. Oklahoma may not be the largest cotton-producing State, but we certainly have a vital stake in seeing that the cotton industry remains stable and prosperous. We produce about 300,000 bales each year in spite of tight acreage controls.

The Maid of Cotton has played a big role in the industry's efforts to retain its historical markets against the inroads of competition from synthetics. And, more importantly, the Maid of Cotton has been a big factor in successful efforts to expand cotton markets.

All of us know the hardships caused by cutting back cotton acreage. We urgently need a market for more cotton. Then our farmers could be freed of the necessity of severely adjusting their production to meet restricted demand.

All of us from cotton producing States can be proud of the efforts of the industry itself to meet this problem. Through its own organization, the National Cotton Council, the industry has successful programs underway to win new and expanded markets for cotton.

Not many years ago, cotton was not considered by many women good enough to be worn outside the home. Today, however, cotton is worn for almost all occasions the year around. Through promotions such as the Maid of Cotton, the National Cotton Council has developed cotton into a high-fashion product. More and more cotton goes into the apparel uses each year, providing additional markets for the product of our cotton farms.

The cotton industry is working hard to build greater consumer acceptance of cotton in all markets. I wish them well in this endeavor.

All of us can agree, I am sure, that the long-range solution to the problems facing our cotton farmers is expanded markets—not restricted acreage to hold production to a level that is uneconomic and wasteful of the resources of our farmers.

So you can see that the Maid of Cotton has a serious and important job to do. I know that we can count upon her doing a good job of selling cotton.

THE OLDEST TWINS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1862, twin daughters were born to John M. and Mary Long who resided in a little community known as Tunica, 7 miles south of Winnfield, La. They will celebrate their 93d birthday on July 16 of this year. Their names are Mrs. Olive Long Wright, of Winnfield, and Mrs. Julia Long Nugent, of Alexandria, in the Eighth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

Nephews of the twins include Julius T. Long, a Shreveport attorney; United States Representative George S. Long; the late Senator Huey P. Long; former Governor of the State of Louisiana, Earl K. Long. United States Senator Russell B. Long is a great-nephew; and a cousin, Tom Wingate, of Leesville, served several terms as a State senator.

The twins had four brothers who lived to be nearly 80 years of age. Their father and mother lived to be 83 years old, and two cousins, Perce and John Smith, of Sikes, La., lived to be 99½ years of age. So, you see the Long family is long-lived. We would like to know if there are others who can compare with this record?

We do know there are two known sets of twins approaching the age of the Louisiana twins, both sets being somewhat younger. They are brothers, Fred and August Schulze who will be 93 August 11, 1955, and two sisters, Mrs. Mary Cullen, of Maysville, Ky., and Mrs. Eva Bowman, of Newport, Ky., who will reach their 93d birthday on January 11, 1956.

ISRAEL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] in a salute to Israel on its seventh birthday. Israel is the torch of hope in that troubled area. On this day, the seventh birthday of that nation, young but great, virile and dynamic, the heart and the thought of all America go out in compliment in congratulation and in affection. In the brief span of her sovereignty Israel has been to all the world of freemen a heartening inspiration. Israel shares with the United States of America a common destiny. It is the destiny of bringing to mankind everywhere through the influence of good example in democratic government the blessings of a world of brotherhood in which man shall move in the full dignity of his being and in communion with his God according to his own faith.

In these 7 years Israel has faced many dangers that would have engulfed a people less courageous. The people of Israel were rebuilding on old soil a new and resurrected world of freedom, dignity, and tolerant brotherhood. To perform the prodigious task to which they gave themselves, to overcome countless presumably insurmountable obstacles, to end with the conversion of the waste of a desert to the fertility of an area, required the courage that comes only with abiding faith. The fall of Israel after this brave and inspiring start would be one of the great tragedies of history. It would come as a devastating, if not a fatal, blow to the cause of democracy.

I feel so strongly on this subject that in the 81st Congress and again in the 83d Congress I, with other Members of this body, waited upon the Secretary of State to protest the giving to the enemies of Israel arms and ammunition, even though the intention was their legitimate use for defense against Soviet invasion. It can happen that guns and ammunition intended for one purpose are put to a quite different use. It is for this reason that we have our rigid state and municipal laws forbidding even the possession of firearms by ordinarily peaceful persons unless authorized for specific and definite purposes. It is not wise that we should be a party in any way or in any sense to contributing to the great and grave dangers facing Israel in an inflamed area.

The hearts of the people of our country are with the people of Israel. Our national interest is tied up with the interest of Israel. If ever two nations were brothers in a common cause, wedded by the same aspirations as well as the same interests, those nations are the United States of America and Israel.

Long live Israel.

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the 38th annual report of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. in my district, a report which I consider worth your time to read. Here is a company that in the past 10 years has spent $188 million in expansion programs. They recognized the needs for increased power requirements in the area in which they are located, and they immediately proceeded to develop a program to produce it. They didn't come to the Government to ask that it subsidize their program; they did not request to be exempt from taxes; they raised their own money to finance and to carry out their expansion program to meet increased demands.

One significant matter I wish to call to your attention is that this company's operating revenue increase 1.9 percent in 1953—to $56,219,000; while at the same time the company's total tax bill went up 8.8 percent—to $12,485,000 in 1954, which was higher than the 1953 taxes by $1,010,000. Taxes for the company in 1954 took 22 cents of every dollar received by the company. Net income was $11,012,518, or 11.8 percent less than the tax bill.

So one can readily recognize why Pennsylvania is losing its industries—a State where companies such as the Pennsylvania Electric Co. have to compete with the Tennessee Valley's federally subsidized, tax-exempt, steam powerplants, having also the additional advantages of the low-paid labor and advantageous freight rates. It is not difficult to see why, in this highly competitive situation, that an industry will prefer to go to the TVA to locate rather than in Pennsylvania. Certainly I say to the Members of the House, we must be fair and equitable to all sections of the country. Why one section of the country should be subsidized with steam powerplants which are tax exempt, in competition with the rest of the Nation, is beyond my powers of comprehension. How the TVA ever got away with this program at the expense of every American taxpayer I am unable to say. For the past number of years I have been calling to the attention of the House this situation that has given the Tennessee Valley advantages over the other parts of the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to compliment the administration for the very firm and determined stand that it has taken regarding further subsidization of steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley. The TVA has now grown into a lusty giant from an infant child of 20 years ago. It is about time it stands on its own feet and not be given preferred consideration over any other competing utility company.

All we have been doing in my State, Pennsylvania, has been paying the money in taxes into the Federal Government to have it siphoned off into projects such as the TVA. Or in other words, we are sharpening the razor that cuts our economic and industrial throats.

If they want to build steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley, let them build steam powerplants in the same manner in which we build them in Pennsylvania. Certainly we have no objection to their financing and developing their own steam power projects to meet their industrial requirements, provided they use their own money the same as any other section of the country. If they need steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley, let them go out and raise their own finances and build them, and discontinue asking the American taxpayer to put the cash on the barrelhead to build steam powerplants, federally subsidized, tax exempt, in the Tennessee Valley.

The TVA started as a flood-control project. When they found that in the summertime that they did not have sufficient water to generate the power necessary, they had to supplement water power with steam power. So they conceived the idea to let the Government build them—and a generous Government certainly has made a great contribution in this respect. Also being tax exempt, they could produce cheap power, which naturally attracted industry to the valley.

One would think, after the generosity of the American taxpayer over a period of years, that they would be content, but no, they are not. New ideas are being developed—new programs to involve the Government in their financing plans.

We have coal in Pennsylvania, and we have just as much right as the TVA to ask the Government to subsidize steam-power plants, tax exempt, adjacent to a coal mine where we could feed the coal into the boilers and produce cheap power. This arrangement would not only be helpful to Pennsylvania's coal industry and its thousands of unemployed coal miners, but at the same time, cheap power would attract industries to our State the same as it does down in the Tennessee Valley.

This report of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., of Pennsylvania, is worth your reading. It will give you an idea of how other companies have to compete with the TVA to stay in business.

PENELEC SPENDS $16 MILLION IN IMPROVEMENTS—GREATER RESIDENTIAL USE OF ELECTRICITY IS REFLECTED IN REPORT

The 36th annual report of Pennsylvania Electric Co., released today, indicates that 1954 was a record sales year for the utility.

Signed by President O. Titus, the report also carries the prediction that the company's 340,000 customers in 24 counties of western and south-central Pennsylvania will use even more electricity in 1955.

Penelec customers used 2,495,195,000 kilowatt-hours in 1954, an increase of 29,470,000 over the previous year's 2,465,725,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of customers Penelec serves increased by 3,950 during 1954.

To meet increasing demands for power, the utility is spending $16 million this year to improve and expand its facilities. Penelec's generating capacity was increased by nearly 50 percent last year with the completion of the 276,000-kilowatt Shawville generating station near Clearfield, built at a cost of $40 million. Because engineering studies indicate that still more capacity will be needed in the near future, construction will start this year on a 137,500-kilowatt addition to Seward generating station near Johnstown, which will be completed in 1957 at a total cost of $20,600,000. The new unit will increase Seward's capacity to 2,295,000 kilowatts and bring the company's total capacity to almost 1 million kilowatts.

SPEND $188 MILLION IN 10 YEARS

By the end of 1955, Penelec will have spent $188 million for expansion since January 1, 1946. To continue its construction program, the utility sold $12 million in first-mortgage bonds and $6,235,000 in common stock in 1954, and plans call for the sale of an additional $17,500,000 in securities this year.

The company's average residential customer used 2,331 kilowatt-hours in 1954, for which he paid $77.44. The year before, the average residential use was 2,177 kilowatt-hours. The average rate per kilowatt-hour to residential customers last year was 3.3 cents, 1 mill lower than the 1953 rate.

Greater residential use of electricity helped to offset a 9.6-percent decline in sales to industrial customers in the past year. Metals and metal products industries accounted for the largest single share of Penelec's industrial sales, taking 15.4 percent of the total. Coal mining was second at 13.8 percent and machinery industries third with 9.5 percent. An improvement in industrial sales has been noted since the end of the year.

OPERATING REVENUE INCREASES

Penelec's total operating revenue increased by 1.9 percent over 1953 to $56,219,000, while at the same time the company's total tax bill went up 8.8 percent to $12,485,000, higher than 1953 taxes by $1,010,000. Taxes in 1954 took 22 cents of every dollar received by the company. Net income was $11,012,518, or 11.8 percent less than the tax bill.

Penelec's operating expenses dropped by 10.1 percent in 1954 to $22,735,000, mainly because of operating economies resulting from the improvement of generating facilities. For 1954, the total wages and cost of welfare benefits for all employees, including those engaged in construction, amounted to $15,480,000. Of this amount, $2,852,000 represented costs of employees' benefits such as pensions, insurance, hospitalization, paid vacations, holidays, etc. The number of employees at year end, including 22 in military service, was 2,902 or 41 less than the previous year. The total of all fringe benefits in 1954 was equivalent to $1,000 for the average employee. At the end of 1954, the average Penelec employee had about 15 years of service with the company, and for each employee's job Penelec had an investment of $93,000.

FUEL BILL HIGHER

Fuel was another major expense item, although the total fuel bill decreased by 1.9 percent to $9,485,000. A total of 1,842,437 tons of coal was used last year as compared with 1,713,084 in 1953.

In addition to the Shawville project, Penelec last year completed a number of installations important in maintaining good service to its customers. Early in 1954, the last section of the company's first 230,000-volt transmission line was energized. The line extends 87 miles from Shawville station to Montebello, Pa. The line and accompanying substation at Lewistown cost $6 million. Another line, a 115,000-volt installation connecting Penelec and Northern Pennsylvania Power Co., was completed in June of last year. This 50-mile line is now supplying about 30,000 kilowatts or two-thirds of North Penn's electrical needs and will be supplying practically all of its requirements by the end of 1955. An application is pending before the Securities and Exchange Commission to merge North Penn into Penelec. Both are subsidiaries of General Public Utilities Corp.

Late in 1954, work was completed on a new northwestern division service center at Erie. The modern building, erected at a cost of $2,300,000, replaces six separate buildings formerly occupied in downtown Erie and will bring about greater operating efficiency in the division. Also, remodeling of the utility's office building in Oil City was completed last year.

SUBSTATIONS IMPROVED

Along with the Seward expansion, numerous improvements in transmission distribution and headquarters facilities are planned for this year. Transmission lines from Geistown to Hooversville, Philipsburg to Westfall, and Warren to the border of New York State are being built or improved, and major substation improvements will be started or continued in or near Johnstown, Altoona, Oil City, Erie, Corry, and Punxsutawney.

Penelec employees established the best safety record in the company's history in 1954, winning several honors for their accident prevention achievements. Employees worked a total of 6,057,288 man-hours with 16 lost-time accidents, for an accident frequency rate of 2.64 accidents per million man-hours. That was the third-best record among the 21 largest electric utilities in the Nation, and earned a certificate from the National Safety Council. The average frequency rate for the 21 companies was 5.53.

Penelec had the best safety record of all the major electric companies in the State for the year ended June 30, 1954, and won a Pennsylvania Electric Association award for that accomplishment.

Seward and Warren generating stations won General Public Utilities president's award plaques for their record of no lost-time accidents in 1954, and Seward won additional recognition for having amassed more than a million consecutive man-hours without a lost-time accident in the form of certificates from GPU and Edison Electric Institute.

The southern division, with headquarters in Johnstown, had the best record among Penelec's four divisions last year, winning the Penelec president's award plaque for the second time in 3 years.

Management changes in the past year included the appointment of F. W. Womer, vice president formerly in charge of the northwestern division, to the position of vice president in charge of division operations for the entire company. Mr. Womer was succeeded as northwestern division manager by K. H. Ishler, former northwestern division operating superintendent.

Penelec continued its participation in GPU site-service, a program to attract new industries into the area the company serves, and also continued to take part in a 33-company group known as Atomic Power Development Associates, which is studying the use of atomic fuels in generation of electricity. The latter is a long-range program, since it is not expected that atomic power will be commercially feasible for several years.

Concluding the report, President Titus says that Penelec is well equipped to supply all anticipated power needs of industry and other customers and to meet the increasing use of electricity throughout its territory. He said Penelec's expansion program assures continued good service to all customers and observed that present trends indicate that 1955 will be another good year for Penelec.

[From the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., of April 21, 1955]

NEW FINANCING PROPOSAL FOR TVA WOULD PUT SOCIALISM IN FOREFRONT

(By Walter Chamblin)

WASHINGTON.—The Tennessee Valley Authority can kick up a fuss on Capitol Hill at any time, but it appears to have outdone itself with its proposed new financing plan.

Critical Members of Congress now accuse TVA of a grandiose empire-building scheme. Charges are made that TVA now seeks to change its original purpose into an unblushing socialistic electric-power business far bigger than had generally been foreseen.

The new power-financing scheme seems likely to overshadow the Dixon-Yates controversy. Critics say that TVA plans now make President Eisenhower's reference to it as "creeping socialism" a gross understatement.

Under the new financing plan, TVA would cling to the Federal Treasury. It would continually seek Federal appropriations for the billion-dollar project.

But in addition it would have authority to issue its own bonds. Critics say there is another catch here. While the bonds would not be guaranteed by the Federal Government, they would be issued by a Government agency and the Federal Government would be said to have a moral obligation to make them good if TVA defaulted. Further, TVA wants the Treasury to be authorized to buy its bonds, presumably if there is difficulty in selling to private investors.

Still nother gimmick favors TVA. It wants authority to lease new electric steam plants. These could be built by counties, cities, or public-power districts. Thus, TVA would get the advantage of the tax exemption accorded these governmental units.

One reason for the proposed new financing plan is that Congress has been growing more reluctant to appropriate money to provide electric powerplants for TVA with taxpayers money when in most parts of the country private utilities or local governmental units provide for needed expansion of electric power.

Representative GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan contends that TVA has departed from its original purpose. It was claimed in the early thirties that TVA would be a yardstick by which the country outside its area could decide whether or not electric utility rates were too high.

But TVA, he pointed out, has now become a billion-dollar utility empire, which is a far cry from a yardstick project. It has also declined to put itself on a tax basis identical with that of public utilities and thus the yardstick is again abandoned. And one of the early acts of TVA was to force private utilities out of business in its area so that there could be no yardstick competition.

Originally, TVA was authorized as a navigation and flood-control project, with hydroelectric power being produced and sold. However, the navigation and flood-control program was finished long ago, and TVA has tended to become more and more a Government power-producing project.

In 1938, hydro-electric power produced 85.5 percent of the total power output. But within a few months from now hydro-electric power will be but 33.5 percent, with 66.5 percent produced by steam plants.

TVA critics say that if the new financing plan goes into effect, there will be no limit on TVA expansion and that eventually at least 90 percent of its power would be produced by steam.

Federal taxpayers have spent more than a billion dollars on it, but TVA wants to continue to expand at the rate of $150 million a year.

FORMOSA

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concern at the rumored possibility of our entering into discussion with the Chinese Communist Government about a so-called cease-fire in the Formosa area without the Chinese Nationalist Government being represented. I thought we had learned something from the Yalta experience when we bought Russia's aid with other people's property.

We took a strong position about Formosa in January and February. Are we going now to take a weak one? No sooner do we blow cold in Asia than we flirt with the idea of blowing hot. Let us remember that what lost us China in the first place was our immoderate enthusiasm for a cease-fire, which resulted in ruin for our friends and victory for our enemies.

The conference at Bandung indicated to me that we could have plenty of friends in Asia and Africa by opposing colonialism in every form. But if we weaken about Formosa, who can or will respect us?

ISRAEL

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish a happy seventh birthday to the State of Israel and its people. No one can visit that miracle land, as I have done, without being thrilled with the realization that it is an outpost of democracy and western technology in a part of the world where those developments are little known. So all who are interested in the welfare of that great and new nation today wish it well on this seventh anniversary and wish its people prosperity and further development in the wonderful work which they are doing in that part of the world for the cause of democracy and peace.

UNESCO

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspaper, under a Geneva, Switzerland, dateline, states that a three-man tribunal of the International Labor Organization has ordered that 3 Americans who were fired from the United Nations and UNESCO for disloyalty to the United States be either reinstated in their jobs or that damages totaling $43,800 be paid to these 3 characters. This news item quotes the tribunal as saying:

> Loyalty toward a state is entirely different from the idea of integrity as embodied in the UNESCO staff regulations and rules.

Mr. Speaker, here is complete evidence of the fact that for American employees of the United Nations their loyalty is not

to the United States but to this international organization. I leave it to the Members of the House to supply their own comments.

FOR PEACE AND FAIR PLAY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States want peace. They want a foreign policy designed to promote peace because by doing so they promote the best interests of the United States. That is why it is encouraging to note the action of our State Department in attempting to come to some agreement now which will allay existing tensions in the Far East. A stubborn, intractable, unbending attitude not consonant with the ever-moving needs of the time in which we live, ill becomes a nation of our traditions and ideals.

Mr. Speaker, although it is clear that the Department of State must give its immediate attention to the critical situation in the Far East, it cannot and must not overlook the necessity for maintaining a foreign policy which will promote peace in other areas of the world where potential conflict exists. I have been impressed for some time, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that the policy of our State Department in the Middle East is moving more toward promoting hostility rather than peace. Its attitudes have been dangerous and its reasoning fallacious. Its policy has encouraged Arab belligerency over Israel's protests. It has rejected Israel's request for equal treatment. Surely the best interests of the United States are not advanced by a policy which not only does not encourage peace between feuding nations, but which if anything, serves to perpetuate and aggravate their tensions.

The Arab countries have been adamant in their refusal to even consider negotiations with Israel to convert the present armistice to a permanent peace. The statements of the Arab leaders have been highly inflammatory and belligerent, and these, taken with the increasing number of armed border incidents should sound the alarm that the current armistice is becoming more and more tenuous. And yet, in the face of this situation, what does our State Department do? It announces it will send arms to some of the Arab countries, although peace has not yet been established. Is this fair play? Of course not.

It has entered into agreements to furnish military assistance to some of Israel's neighbors, although it has refused to furnish similar military assistance to Israel. Is this fair play? Of course not. Although there is in existence a blockade by the Arab nations against Israel which is in itself an act of belligerency, our Department of State has refused to persuade the Arab nations to terminate the blockade and to permit the channels of normal trade to be restored with Israel. Is this fair play? Of course not.

In contrast to a policy of the previous administration which offered the hand of friendship to Israel as a democracy fashioned in the image of our own, a nation which cherishes the traditions and ideals upon which our country has grown to its present preeminence, this administration has undertaken a policy which has isolated and rendered Israel politically and militarily insecure.

If the reasoning underlying this policy is to gain favor with the Arab States, it is reckless and dangerous to do so at the expense of Israel. The best interests of the United States are not served by favoring one belligerent against another, but rather by helping both achieve a modus vivendi. People are perishing today on the Arab side of the border as well as on Israel's side. This deplorable situation cannot be eliminated by a policy of indifference and vacillation on the part of the United States.

If our State Department were so inclined it could do much to encourage permanent peace. In the interests of peace, in the interest of fair play, we must not prefer one belligerent to another. Our aim must be to eradicate belligerency.

Before the situation becomes too explosive, I trust the Department of State will move to improve the relations between Israel and the Arab States and insist that they enter into discussions leading toward peace. If this cannot be accomplished, we should then extend to Israel the same type of military aid that we are offering to Arab countries.

Israel is now in the midst of a struggle to achieve its destiny. Today is the anniversary of its birth. After 7 years of heartbreak and struggle, its people must be given the opportunity to solve their tremendous problems in freedom and with security. The time for peace in the Middle East is now.

FIELD MARSHAL P. PIBULSONGGRAM, PRIME MINISTER OF THAILAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker at any time on Wednesday next to declare a recess of the House for the purpose of receiving His Excellency Field Marshal P. Pibulsonggram, Prime Minister of Thailand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, May 3, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII AND ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 223, Rept. No. 449), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 7 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except the Committee amendments printed in the bill, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

TO AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT OF 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 222) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption by this House of House Resolution 222 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 222 would provide for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H. R. 2107.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to continue the work which was initiated during the 81st Congress to provide a long-range armory and other facility construction program for all civilian components of the Armed Forces. As the report stresses, Mr. Speaker, this bill looks to the combined efforts of the Federal Government and the States in order to suc-

cessfully carry out the program, and along these lines it would continue the concept of the greatest possible joint utilization of these armories and other facilities by the various civilian component organizations.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2107 would extend the program of providing facilities and grant the Department of Defense the authority to provide these facilities for an additional 3 years. In addition to this the bill would authorize the appropriation of an additional $250 million in order to carry out the program.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2107 is a part of the legislative program for the Department of Defense for the 84th Congress and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The bill is open for amendment from the floor so that any desirable changes may be presented and carried if the House membership so desires. I hope that the House will adopt the rule and that the bill itself will receive the serious consideration of the Congress.

I know of no objection to the rule on this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Texas has explained the rule. I know of no opposition to the rule on this side.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS OF LOW-INCOME FARMERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the message which the President has just sent to Congress dealing with the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture on the problems of low-income farmers and the development of agriculture's human resources has a significance which goes far beyond the farm.

Our human resources are the Nation's greatest asset. Rural people have long been the custodians of our richest heritage and our most precious freedoms. The number one basic farm crop of America is the children, the boys and girls, the young men and young women growing up on our farms.

Mr. Speaker, 4 out of 5 of our Nation's leaders throughout its history have come from a rural environment. Many of our Presidents, even in recent decades, have come from such a background, including President Eisenhower.

In our young people we have a resource which perhaps more than any other stands in need of cultivation, development and conservation. We must be sure that we open the doors of opportunity for as many as possible of our farm youth.

We know that the agricultural picture in this respect contains wide variations. Many of our farm families have made immense strides toward security, better education, in easing the drudgery of farm work and in raising their material standards of living.

But it is unfortunately true that a large proportion of the Nation's low-income families are on our farms. According to the 1950 census, about 20 percent of our farm-operator families had cash incomes of $1,000 or less.

The general cause of low income on farms is low productivity. This stems from unproductive land, inadequate capital, poor education, and such factors as old age and disability. We have found that poor land and poor people—poor in worldly goods and in spirit—generally go together. We know that poverty begets more poverty. We know that it is characterized by lack of educational opportunity, medical services, and housing facilities as well as a lack of interest and participation in community, religious, and civic matters.

Mr. Speaker, if present and past trends prevail, about half the young people now growing up on our farms will someday be living off of the farm and engaged in nonfarm work. In other words they will have to find jobs in economic competition with the rest of society. They deserve a fair chance to do so. But unless we do something effective to raise the level of living and opportunity among the low-income families now on our farms many of these young people will enter adult life and economic competition with two strikes against them.

The whole Nation will suffer if this results in these citizens of the future being ill-nourished, poorly educated, a prey to prevalent diseases, and mentally and spiritually unstimulated.

I am very much pleased that this long-needed and thorough study of agriculture's human resources has now been completed. It will put back into focus some of the truths too long neglected in agriculture and especially the basic truth that the most important product and resource in agriculture is people.

I congratulate President Eisenhower for directing that this tremendously important study be made. I congratulate Secretary Benson and those who have worked with him on bringing it to completion.

Any program of this kind will necessarily take time. By its nature it must be of a long-range character but it should start now. What delights me in reading the message of the President is that something is going to be done right away. Pilot operations are to be started in not less than 50 of the 1,000 low-income-farm counties during the next year. Congress is being called upon to authorize certain programs such as making loans to part-time farmers and changing the present agricultural extension formula in order to conduct the pilot activities. But most of the program can be carried out under authority already in effect.

I like also the recommendations to set up coordinating committees to work with other agencies of the Government in connection with those parts of this program which these agencies must undertake.

To sum up, this is not a study or a theoretical program. It is an action program and action is going to begin right away.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] and ask unanimous consent that he may be allowed to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to add my congratulations to Secretary Benson, the Department of Agriculture, and all those who have played a part in the preparation of this report on the development of agriculture's human resources.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the Agricultural Act of 1954, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and other legislative advances are by no means a complete solution of farm problems. These measures were enacted as so many steps toward the ultimate goal of a truly prosperous, productive, and free agriculture. But these measures with respect to farm prices and trade will not in themselves do very much to alleviate the difficulties of low-income farm families.

We know that many farmers have become prosperous. But we know, also, that many others are, relatively speaking, just about as bad off as they ever were. I note from the 1950 census that 45 percent of all American farms produced only one-twentieth of the value of products sold.

Let me quote for you a portion of an address made by Secretary Benson before the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in Davenport, Iowa, October 11, 1954:

> In the 1950 census there were 1½ million farm-operator families with incomes under $1,000. There were another half-million male migratory and local farm workers who had very low income.
>
> How is it possible for farm families with a total income of less than $3 per day to get along decently? Surely such conditions do not make farming attractive. * * * These families are a long, long way from having opportunities for physical, mental, and spiritual development in keeping with their dignity as children of God.

The first thing we must recognize in our approach to rural poverty is that there are more American families trying to make a living from farming than our agricultural resources are presently able to support at reasonable standards. The second thing we must recognize is that there is no quick answer to the problem—and that for all practical purposes price supports are no answer at all.

About 3 months ago there was testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I was intensely interested in some of the facts about low-income farm families that were brought out in that hearing. The dean of the College of Agriculture at the University of Kentucky, talked about these problems as they appear in the southern Appalachian region. He pointed out that here is a region that is very predominantly agricultural and that is noted for

small farms, small production, and small incomes. The entire region is typified in part by the 31 counties commonly referred to as eastern Kentucky. Dean Welch showed that it is a region in which the educational level of the population is from 1 to 3 grades below the average for the country. In one extreme county in Kentucky the median income per household was only one-fourth that for the United States as a whole. In 1950, children under 15 years of age constituted about 27 percent of the total United States population. But in eastern Kentucky this percentage ranged to as high as 45 percent in one county.

Each farm on the average in this area had only 6 or 7 acres of land suitable for cultivation. Two-thirds of the farms in this area of eastern Kentucky sold less than $400 worth of agricultural products. One-third of the farmers had no work animals or tractors. And another one-third had only one work animal.

In such areas there is, as Dean Welch says, a kind of "piling up" of problems. Not only is production and income extremely low, but there is a concentration of low education. Communication and transportation are backward. There is a lack of churches, organizations, and other institutions—in other words, a poverty of the social organizations and institutions which are so important for living a full life in this 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, we must understand that such problems as these cannot be isolated. We must realize that it is from such areas that an unusually high proportion of our people come. It has been the long-time trend for about half of our farm boys and girls to leave agriculture for nonfarm work and living. And the proportion is even higher from low-income farm areas, from areas where population pressure is greater, and from areas where the proportion of school-age children to adults is large. The young men and women who migrate from farms to the city have been, through the years, one of our greatest sources of strength. They are renowned for the qualities they bring to the cities—such qualities as responsibility, thrift, hard work, self-reliance, and a love of independence. This I say has been the record of the past and we are justly proud of it.

But let us not forget that it can be tragic to send into today's complex society youth who are gravely handicapped by lack of education and habits of living which may be greatly to their disadvantage. Let us never forget that the basic patterns of our lives are developed in our childhood homes.

Obviously then, the way of life of the millions of low-income farm people is of great importance to the entire Nation.

We must, in the interest of a strong and growing economy, do more than we have done to improve and develop the productive resources of our low-income farm families.

We must do more to provide opportunities for low-income farm people to find good jobs off the farm—and this applies particularly to the young people.

We must give more emphasis in our educational work to train farm and rural youth in both farm and nonfarm skills.

These jobs and these skills need not necessarily take them out of the farm and rural living, but they should provide opportunities for greater productivity, income, and service.

We should do as much as we are able to provide more of the social organizations and institutions which are so conspicuous by their absence in many of these areas today.

Mr. Speaker, these problems have been with us for a long time. Public and private agencies have been trying to cope with them for many years. We have, it is true, made some progress. But our progress has been piecemeal. We have done a little here and a little there. We have been striving to solve the problem through piecemeal efforts.

Now is the time for a determined and concerted attack. We have learned over the years that in this as in almost all social problems there is no panacea, no cure-all, no single answer. The only real answer is a combination of many answers.

I am confident that in this study which has been completed and is now released by Secretary Benson and the Department of Agriculture, we will find guidance we need to make an aggressive, concerted attack on the difficulties of the low-income farm areas.

Again I join with my colleagues in congratulating the Department on the completion of this most significant guidepost to a prosperous, stable, and free agriculture.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2107, with Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill that comes before us today—yet it is an extremely important one in connection with the building up of the program of our Reserve forces throughout the United States. It will be recalled that at the beginning of this session, the President of the United States sent down a rather lengthy message containing his suggestions regarding need for the building up of our Reserve Establishment.

I am not going to take the time of the Committee now to read this message to you; but the message did make reference to the urgent need for training our Reserve forces. This morning the Committee on Armed Services of the House reported the national Reserve plan by an overwhelming vote.

This bill presently being considered is not tied in with the national Reserve plan excepting this bill provides or seeks to provide adequate training facilities for our Reserves, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. It amends a law now on the books. It amends an act we passed in the 81st Congress, and I am glad to report here today to the House that this act has been very successful generally in its operation. Even prior to the passage of the original National Defense Facilities Act in 1950, we found the urgent need of facilities for training our Reserves. Even before we could get this basic act on the books, appropriations had been put through the House, and without prior authorization in some instances, to provide for Reserve facilities throughout the United States. I think we actually appropriated $18.5 million without authorization for this purpose, but so worthy was the cause of the appropriation that no one made objection to it. In 1951 it was thought that we ought to have a definite program for the construction of our Reserve facilities. It was thought that if we did have that definite program, we could save money; we could do far more efficient training with our Reserve Establishment by having a definite act under which we could operate.

I was chairman of the subcommittee in 1950 which took testimony on this matter, and out of our hearings and our work we presented to the full committee the basic law which we desire now to amend. Under the terms of that law, we provided $250 million to be spent for Reserve facilities throughout the United States to meet the need of training the Reserves in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps. That money was to be spent over a period of 5 years. The 5 years have now passed.

The amount of money spent is $235 million, and there are additional obligations against the remaining $15 million under the original authorization. Now it becomes necessary for us to amend that act to give additional funds to the armed services for the purpose of providing armories and Reserve training centers, facilities of that character, throughout the length and breadth of the United States in order that we may have a competent, well-trained, well-organized, and adequate Reserve force.

This bill simply seeks to extend the time in which the money can be spent for 3 years and to increase the amount of money provided for this particular purpose by $250 million. That is all it does. Otherwise the act is not changed one bit. We did not change it, because uniformly this has been a successful program. I am glad to be able to report to you today that it has been not only successful in giving the Reserves what they need, but it has been successful finan-

cially. It has saved this Government a great deal of money. For instance, when we started this program, we found that to a large extent the only branch of our Reserve Establishment that had large numbers of Reserve training facilities of any consequence throughout the United States was the National Guard, and therefore, under the terms of the act in effect, the National Guard had facilities which they were able to turn over to the Reserve training program. The estimated cost of those facilities, paid for by the several States and not the United States, was some $500 million, and that started our program. We set up a system of matching under the basic law. By matching we were able to obtain from the several States as contributions almost $300 million to assist in this program—to be exact, $297 million. The $297 million was contributed by the States to the cost of construction of armories in the National Guard phase of this program. Out of the original program of $250 million, money has been disbursed to the various branches of the service. It is not necessary that I go into the specific detail of number of facilities built, completed, remodeled, repaired, extended, or those contemplated in projects. I might say that the total number of projects reached some 2,600 for the Army alone, as I remember. That does not give you a fair idea of the type or character of the program, because a great many of these projects are merely alterations of existing projects.

But this bill is urgently needed. If you are going to have a Reserve program, you have to have a home for your Reserves in which to train. You cannot train men when you have no place to put the equipment and keep it safely. You cannot train men without equipment. You cannot train them unless you have armories and places for them to train and practice as we contemplate under the Reserve program.

We present to you a bill that has been uniformly satisfactory. It has saved our Government money in the handling of this program. When we held hearings on this measure, no one testified against the bill. Everybody was for it. The bill came out of the subcommittee unanimously. It came out of the full committee unanimously. There was no trouble with it in the Committee on Rules, I am glad to report to you. So it comes to you today as a bill that we need badly if we are to continue our program of training our Reserves in the United States.

They came to us and said to the subcommittee, "We need $1,030,000,000 for this Reserve training." The subcommittee said, "That is too much money to think of at one time. We have given you $250 million. We cannot give you a blank check to spend at your leisure when you want it and for what you want it under the terms of the bill." We cut the amount down to another $250 million, and we said, "We require under the law that you make continuing reports to the United States Congress of the progress of this program." In that way we keep a check on what is being done.

As far as I know, there was no criticism of the program except by one witness who came from the National Guard and complained that there was a little bit too much regulation and red tape in the matter of technical design of the buildings which the Guard needed throughout the United States. We heard witnesses on that point. It seemed to me that the witnesses cleared up the situation very well. I talked to General McGowan, who was the witness in question, and who testified regarding the red tape difficulties after the hearing was over. He indicated that he thought everything was going to be cleared up and the program was going to move on.

I can say that those in authority have kept the program going. The program under the terms of the original bill contemplated 5 years in which to allocate and spend this money. They have actually consumed almost the 5 years and consumed practically all of the money. I find no fault with them in the handling of this construction program.

I present to you again today a program that, by the use of these joint facilities, is saving the Government many hundreds of millions of dollars. As you remember, under the terms of the basic law of 1950, we provided a program whereby the armories would be used by all of the component parts of the Reserves. Before that time we built an armory for the Guard and nobody else could use it. We built an armory perhaps for the Navy, and the Navy had $46 million left after World War II which was available, and they built armories with that money, but those were for the Navy. Perhaps the Marine Corps could use them. But under this bill that we are sponsoring, any component part of the Reserve Establishment may use any armory which is built. If we build, for instance, an armory for the National Guard, the National Guard signs a contract at that time that that armory shall be available to other component parts of the Reserve Establishment if it will not interfere with the Guard training.

If we build an armory for the Navy or the Air Force, we require the same thing. We require that that armory be shared by the other branches of the service insofar as it will not interfere with the training in the basic purposes of the Army. By doing so we have reduced the number of armories needed and we have multiplied the use of these armories until many of them are used every night in the week and oftentimes in the afternoon, and at other times, even Sundays, for certain purposes in the training of our Reserves. I think we are approaching the time when we are getting the very maximum use out of our installations for the Reserves.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It might be well to mention that this joint facility program is saving the taxpayers' money by having the Navy, Marine, and Air Force Reserve units, including the National Guard, all use the same airfields for training purposes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the whole program has been a very useful one. The reason I am so enthusiastic about it is that it has been handled very well, without any friction among the services. We have had no criticism; we have had no trouble. We use those armories to the very maximum ability of the armories to perform.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has answered one of the questions I have had in mind. I am glad to hear him say that dual use is being made of the armories.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Not dual use but multiple use, because in many instances four component parts are using the same armory, and very successfully, too. They use the same equipment in many instances.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. My question now is, There are a great many stations and camps of various kinds scattered throughout this country. Where convenient to do so, does the Reserve Corps have an opportunity to use facilities in, let us say, a Regular Army camp or station?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is one thing I want to call to the gentleman's attention. Very often there is an excess facility of that character, but it is not suitable in some instances for Reserve training. We have to place the Reserve facilities where they will be convenient to the Reserves, because we are calling on our civilians now to come in and train for the national defense. We do not want them to go to dilapidated barracks, rundown barracks, perhaps built for 5 years' use but that are now maybe 20 years old. We do not want them to have to run out of their way to get to a facility that is very inconvenient. We do not want them to be ashamed of a facility when it shows up in your locality. We want to be able to give them facilities that are in a way of the type, style, and character that we would want in our public schools.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Reserve units today are using not only active and surplus military installations but surplus Government property in general where the installation itself is suitable and accessible to the Reserves of the area where it is located?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution. In many instances they are training on active bases, but we have found in many instances that this joint training with the active forces is not entirely satisfactory.

Mr. GROSS. But it does not necessarily have to be limited to the surplus facilities?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; it does not. Wherever there are adequate and convenient quarters for the Reserves we want them to train. We are really putting on for the Congress a good economic program, one that you will really be proud of.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say is that where convenient and where the entire facilities of a camp or a station are not being used for the purpose of training Regular personnel or drafted

personnel, certainly it seems to me that money can be saved by allotting quarters and training facilities and equipment to the Reserves; and I think the utmost use should be made of them.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. I think in my home State, Camp Polk is being used for the guard in summer.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. To further answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa, we have an example right here in Washington where the Reserve units are using the air field at Anacostia. That is the Reserve flying units are using that. Then we have the Reserve units doing their training at the navy yard here in Washington. The Army also uses Fort Myers. So I believe that that matter has been given very careful and thorough consideration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Maryland very much.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if this bill becomes law all it does is add to the original $250 million we authorized some years ago, another $250 million, making available the overall sum of $500 million for the construction of facilities for training purposes for the Reserves of the country?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman has been most active in this program. That is correct. And when they finish the 3-year period, we are going to review the whole program before they get more money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 2107 is to grant continued authority to the Secretary of Defense to provide training facilities for the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. Present authorization for this program is contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, enacted as Public Law 783, 81st Congress, which expires with fiscal year 1955.

We all accept the fact that a most important part of our military strength lies in a large and well-trained Reserve, including the National Guard. The Armed Services Committee has recently completed exhaustive hearings in order to recommend legislation which will strengthen and continue the development of a sound and strong Military Reserve. Our committee considers that the legislation we are recommending today is essential to this development.

The Congress recognized the need for specific authorization for a Reserve construction program by the enactment of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950. The lack of armories at that time was one of the limiting factors in developing the Reserve forces after World War II. By this act the Secretary of Defense was authorized to provide training facilities for the Reserve components and to contribute Federal funds to the States for the provision of National Guard facilities. At the time of enactment of Public Law 783, 81st Congress, the ultimate size of the Reserve had not been determined, so that it was difficult to estimate the amount of money which would be required to provide sufficient training facilities. The House and Senate, therefore, in conference, agreed to limit the authority granted in this act to $250 million, to be provided over a period of 5 successive fiscal years. It was understood at the time this limitation would have to be extended at such a time when the authorization had expired or when the needs of the Defense Department justified such extension.

In the recently conducted hearings on the proposed extension of authorization under the National Defense Facilities Act, each military department presented a detailed account of the progress made under the act to date, and an estimate of future requirements for each year through fiscal year 1960. According to the witnesses heard, the act has been invaluable in developing and maintaining a facilities program for the Reserve Forces. The committee was favorably impressed with the manner in which the authorized funds have been administered by each service, and was particularly impressed by the extent to which the joint use of facilities has been accomplished between the various Reserve components.

The Armed Services Committee feels that the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 has served its purpose well in providing the first step toward the development of adequate training facilities for our Reserve. We also feel that the greater emphasis being placed on our Reserve as a vital part of our national defense structure necessitates a continuation of this authorization. Although much has been accomplished by the military departments under the existing law, much yet remains to be done before adequate facilities are provided to house and train the Reserve components at their ultimate strengths.

The estimated requirements of the Military Departments projected through fiscal year 1960 amount to $1,030,000,000. The committee proposes to extend the current authorization in one more increment at this time by authorizing $250 million over a period of the next 3 years, through fiscal year 1958. As such time that the Secretary of Defense considers that further authorization is required, the Reserve Forces facilities program and requirements will be reviewed and an additional extension will be considered by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of explaining an amendment which I propose to offer. I have discussed my amendment with the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee handling this legislation. It is appropriate to consider my amendment during debate on this legislation, it being an amendment to the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

My interest in this subject stems from the fact that the airport which is the commercial terminal for Detroit, Mich., at Willow Run, is owned by the University of Michigan in my hometown of Ann Arbor, Mich.

A great deal of concern has arisen in that district recently because early in March the University of Michigan was notified by the Corps of Engineers that commencing in July the 10th Air Force intended to base a squadron of jet fighters at Willow Run Airport for the training of Reserves.

I have spent a great deal of time on this problem which is of great interest to the people in that community, and I have twice addressed the House, and my remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 4131–4138 on March 31, 1955, and at pages 4388–4392 on April 13, 1955.

Let me say that the Willow Run Airport is the sixth busiest commercial airport in the United States. As of the 1st of May it is expected there will be 350 scheduled airline operations there per day.

Five air miles away from Willow Run is the Detroit Wayne Major Airport. For years there has been a controversy largely kept alive by the Wayne County engineer, Leroy Smith, and there has been a concerted effort on the part of Smith and his associates to drive the commercial airlines out of the Willow Run Airport and force them to be based at Wayne Major Airport.

When this question of basing the 10th Jet Air Force Squadron at Willow Run arose, Mr. Smith took advantage of that situation to urge, through the mayor of Detroit and other officials, that the Defense Department concentrate all military operations at Willow Run.

I might say that starting last December the Navy Department requested the Wayne Major Airport to permit it to base two squadrons of jet fighters at Wayne Major Airport. The Navy is presently operating out of Grosse Ile in the Detroit River, and their facilities are inadequate and cannot be expanded.

Leroy Smith denied the request of the Navy on the ground that several airlines were going to move away from Willow Run to Wayne-Major, and then Wayne-Major would be too crowded and could not accommodate the Navy.

I point out that this act under amendment today provides in its purposes in section 2, for the joint utilization of these training facilities. It is my contention that the intelligent thing to do in this situation is to base the 10th Air Force Jet Reserve training operation and the Navy jet training operation at Wayne Major Airport. The reason is that already at Wayne Major Airport the Michigan Air National Guard is operating approximately 50 jet fighters, and have their training operations based there. Over $2 million worth of buildings have been erected to accommodate them, and they are presently in the process of erecting a $700,000 hangar, and they do not intend to move away from Wayne-Major. They say Wayne-Major is far preferable to Willow Run, from the point of view of using it for jet-training operations. So, in line with the policy already in the act, I contend that the Navy and the Air Force should conduct their jet-training operations at the same field where the Michigan Air National Guard is now based.

My amendment proposes going one step further in announcing congressional policy—that is to say that where facilities which are suitable are available in a particular area there should be as little interference as possible with commercial airline operations. In this instance it would require the basing of the jet-training operation of the Navy and the Army together with that of the Air National Guard, at a perfectly suitable airport, namely, Wayne-Major, and would avoid interference with the busy commercial operations at Willow Run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I inquire how much time is left and who has control of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 22 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield me some time?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The reason I hesitate to give the gentleman any more time is because he is talking about a matter extraneous to the bill. I will be glad to yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Two minutes is not enough to discuss this Willow Run business.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman should have sufficient time to discuss this because there are others interested in Willow Run. It cannot be used as a jet training plane field and still be used commercially.

Mr. MEADER. It would seriously interfere with the commercial operations at Willow Run to base a jet squadron there; and I may say I have not developed the entire picture because there is another defense program of great importance which will be interfered with if the 10th Air Force Reserve is to make use of Willow Run.

Willow Run Airport was procured by the University of Michigan at a 100-percent discount. The university may have paid $1, but no more, for this specific reason: The university is conducting very important and highly secret research programs at this very airport. The building which the 10th Air Force wishes to use, the so-called Packard Building, is a permanent structure, whereas the buildings which the university now uses for its research operations are temporary wooden buildings; they were barracks, mess halls, and some small wooden hangars that are not at all suited for their purposes.

Last July, in July of 1954, because of the urgent need for additional space to house these very important research activities, the University of Michigan addressed a letter to the Air Force requesting this Packard Building and the 23 acres on which it is situated. By the way, that Packard property was not deeded to the University of Michigan back in 1946 when it got Willow Run, but it is completely surrounded by land that has been deeded to the University of Michigan. The operations of the research center there are of the utmost importance to our defense. The University of Michigan Engineering Research Institute has research contracts totaling in annual volume $8 million, employing 1,200 persons mostly scientists and technicians. Approximately one half of those persons are stationed in inadequate quarters at the Willow Run Airport.

The university asked for that property because it is a far more suitable building than anything they now have. They asked for it last July, and were not even given the courtesy of an acknowledgment by the Air Force. The only acknowledgment they got—7 months later—was an indirect one. A letter from the Corps of Engineers dated March 3, 1955 stated that the Air Force was going to move into this Packard property that the university itself needed so badly.

Therefore I say from the point of view of defense, this property which the Air Force wants to use is under demand by another branch of the Department of Defense, a most important one; namely, research and development; and that is another matter that should be considered in connection with this property.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. If the Air Force decided to use Willow Run instead of using Wayne-Major how much would it cost the taxpayers under the civil airport aid program to make the Wayne Major Airport suitable for civilian flying? Is not that one of the questions involved here?

Mr. MEADER. It certainly is, and it is something we should not overlook when we are talking about facilities and airports.

The fact of the matter is that if Leroy Smith is successful in this nefarious scheme in which he is attempting to use the Defense Establishment to aid him in driving the airlines out of Willow Run, there will be required an expenditure well in excess of $20 million for building hangars, terminals, parking space, aprons, access roads, and all that will be necessary to put Wayne-Major in position to handle heavy commercial airline traffic. Where is he going to get the $20 million?

We in Michigan are familiar with the administration of the Federal airport aid since 1947. Smith and John P. McElroy—heads of the Wayne County Airport lobby—are in a favored place to get heavy Federal subsidies because of McElroy's membership on the Michigan Aeronautics Commission. The result is that Wayne County has received $4 million out of $7 million, or 52 percent under Federal airport aid since 1947. That is something we ought to bear in mind when we take this initial step.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, my able and respected colleague, Mr. BROOKS, has clearly outlined the necessity for providing additional funds under H. R. 2107 for the construction of facilities urgently required by our Reserve Forces. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Air Forces, I am personally familiar with Reserve facility requirements and wish also to speak briefly to this same point.

Currently, many of our Reserve centers are conducting training in inadequate leased or Government owned or controlled facilities located in many instances where they are practically inaccessible to reservists residing in the area. In addition, many of the Reserve groups and squadrons are required to hold their meetings in rent-free facilities on a space available basis which prohibits the timely phasing of training meetings which is so essential to preserve continuity and achieve maximum results. Some of these units are actually occupying facilities located alongside slaughterhouses, on the fourth floor of a building without elevator service after 5 p. m. and only a few weeks ago a request was received at the Pentagon from a city in the Midwest for the return of their jailhouse which was being used by elements of the Air Reserve to conduct its training program. These are the types of facilities which we have provided to train those officers and enlisted men supposed to have an immediate mobilization capability necessary to augment and strengthen the combat forces of the Regular Military Establishment at the outbreak of hostilities. The $250 million to be provided under H. R. 2107 will go a long way toward correcting these deficiencies and will serve as a clearcut indication to our reservists that we are aware of their important contribution to the defense of this country. When you consider the type of support that is being given to some of these patriotic reservists, many of whom give of their time unselfishly with no monetary remuneration it is no wonder that they are losing interest in the Reserve program.

As we have never won a war yet without the full mobilization of our Reserves, I maintain that in these days of the threat of atomic attack ever with us it is a matter of the greatest urgency that we provide those facilities required in order that our reservists may become thoroughly familiar with the complex weapons and equipment now necessary to conduct modern warfare. A portion of the funds to be provided by this bill will be used for the construction of facilities necessary to train the jet-fighter wings of the Air Reserve Forces. These units have an initial D-day assignment to Air Defense Command and must be capable of immediate offensive action in the event of attack. Headquarters Air Defense Command has indicated where these fighter squadrons must be located in order that their firepower may be used to cover likely avenues of approach used by hostile aircraft.

Modern jet-fighter aircraft require extensive runway and taxiway systems so that they may be scrambled in the event of emergency on extremely short notice. They also require adequate hangar space where maintenance may be performed in order to keep these aircraft, which are so vital to the defense of our country, in commission and ready for action. All of these facilities must be provided at the earliest possible date if we are to have the knockout punch available to counter the blows launched by our enemy. Without adequate facilities it is impossible for our Reserve Forces to attain the combat capability so urgently required if this Nation is to survive the initial onslaught of atomic attack.

While the funding authorization contained in this bill is insufficient to provide all the facilities required by the various Reserve components of all our armed services, it will enable them to carry on a construction program which was started under the provisions of Public Law 783, 81st Congress. Passage of H. R. 2107 will insure continual progress in the development of an effective, combat Ready Reserve and will provide, in conjunction with our Regular branches of the armed services, the strongest deterrent to any nation entertaining ideas of waging atomic warfare against this country.

In summary, let me say with reference to H. R. 2107 that I regard it as one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House during this session. Its passage is most essential for the continued well-being of each citizen of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Forces, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and also the members of that committee for the excellent work they did in reporting this bill, which I think is a very necessary one for the security and the welfare of our country.

Mr. Chairman, my respected colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], has spoken trenchantly in support of H. R. 2107, a bill to provide additional funds for construction of facilities to be used by our Nation's Reserve forces. I wish also to talk briefly to this same point.

Above all, I want to emphasize that in my opinion the $250 million called for by H. R. 2107 is the absolute minimum that will be required for the existing Reserve program, to say nothing of potential expansion. It is the intent of the committee that defense officials will be called to testify again in a year or so in order that we can check on the progress being made. I am sure that the armed services will be obliged to request further funds to carry out their fiscal year 1957 construction program.

I wish also to emphasize that the amount of money expended for Reserve facilities in past years is by no means an accurate criterion of what is needed today.

When, for example, Public Law 783 was passed by the 81st Congress, it was believed that many of the active force facilities then in being or under construction could eventually be earmarked for Reserve utilization. This is not the case. The buildup of our Regular Establishments has necessarily been so great that many bases and camps and stations have not been, and will not be, available for use by the Reserves. This is particularly true in the Air Force.

A number of other factors enter into the situation. Some facilities have become outmoded or deteriorated. Some leased property on which leases cannot be renewed will have to be replaced. Reserve activities are being conducted in many temporary structures on which maintenance costs have become prohibitive.

Dispersion of Reserve units is essential to our national defense. Where this, under present-day circumstances, calls for replacement or relocation of units, new facilities will have to be built which were not formerly programed.

The overriding factor is the D-day combat capability of our Reserve forces. If we are to develop a truly Ready Reserve, these forces must be given modern equipment and be thoroughly trained in its use. Much of this equipment imposes a need for additional facilities not foreseeable a few years ago.

Take the dramatic case of aircraft. Jet fighter planes and larger combat cargo aircraft have given rise to a requirement for longer runways, expansion of parking aprons, and a general increase of aircraft maintenance facilities. Equipment of surface drill units likewise calls for major remodeling and overall new construction.

I need not remind Members of this House that a successful Reserve program requires much more than good old-fashioned, red-blooded patriotism on the part of our young men. They must be furnished the equipment and facilities with which to do their job. Many people have observed that while our Nation has theoretically believed in the citizen-soldier concept since the days of George Washington, we have never really had a combat-ready Reserve.

We have had Reserve programs and our reservists have in past wars always acquitted themselves with great distinction and honor. But it has invariably taken months to bring these forces to an acceptable degree of combat capability. Today and tomorrow we will have no time for the luxury of a leisurely mobilization.

We must look to the morale of our reservists. We have charged them with, and they have accepted, a clear, compelling mission. They must be instantly available for a call to the country's colors. To achieve that degree of readiness, we must give them the equipment and facilities they require.

To restate my principal belief with regard to H. R. 2107, let me say that I regard its passage as essential to a successful Reserve program. It provides the irreducible minimum of funds for the facilities requirement, will permit an orderly yet rapid buildup, and because it calls for a common authorization, will promote the economical joint utilization and construction of facilities which we all desire.

Support of our Reserve forces is no partisan issue. It is a national problem on which we can all unite—and the time is now.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 830) is amended by deleting "in an amount not to exceed $250 million over a period of the next 5 fiscal years" and by inserting in lieu thereof "in such amounts as may be appropriated from time to time."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 830) is amended by deleting 'in an amount not to exceed $250,000,000 over a period of the next 5 fiscal years' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'in an amount not to exceed $500,000,000 over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951'."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 1, strike out line 8 and insert "That section 2 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (a), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (b) and inserting '; and' in lieu thereof, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(c) the minimizing of interference with commercial civil airline traffic by locating reserve flight training operations, insofar as possible, at airports which do not handle heavy commercial scheduled airline traffic'.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed under the time so graciously granted me in general debate both by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Louisiana, chairman of the subcommittee.

This amendment raises a question of policy. It adds to the section which declares the policy of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950. In substance it states that, to the extent possible, these Reserve flight training operations shall not interfere with commerial line traffic.

That general policy affects my district and many other congressional districts in the United States. Perhaps other Members of the House are not aware of it, but there are many other locations beside the Willow Run area where this new expanded jet-training program may cause trouble back home. At any rate, the policy announced in my amendment is precisely in line with Government policy which was worked out by the Doolittle Commission.

I hold in my hand the Commission's report on airport safety dated July 1954. I want to read two recommendations from the report of that very fine Com-

mission. Recommendation No. 20 reads as follows:

MINIMIZE TRAINING FLIGHTS AT CONGESTED AIRPORTS

Flight crew training should be conducted, as far as practicable, away from thickly settled areas and with a minimum number of flights into and out of busy airports.

Recommendation No. 23 reads:

SEPARATE MILITARY AND CIVIL FLYING AT CONGESTED AIRPORTS

Military aircraft should not be based on congested civil airports except when it is not economically or otherwise feasible to provide separate facilities for them nor should commercial aircraft operate regularly from busy military airports.

In other words, the amendment I have suggested as a policy of the act we have under consideration is precisely that of the Doolittle Commission. I am sure that it is of nationwide interest. It happens to be a serious matter right in my own district, and that is why I have taken the trouble to make a rather extensive study of this problem.

I would hope that this matter of policy could be settled here in the Congress where it belongs. And, I might say that I think the committee has done an excellent job in expediting this legislation. The committee did have testimony from Mr. Lee, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, and it is contained in the printed hearings which you have available on this bill. I realize, however, that the committee did not in committee consider the precise language of my amendment, and I realize that perhaps they would not want to have a matter of that character decided on the floor of the House of Representatives without careful committee study. However, I hope that the Committee on Armed Services and the Members of the House are sympathetic to the objectives of this amendment and will express congressional intent that these training operations be conducted in line with the policy already contained in the act, namely, the joint utilization of facilities by Reserve units where practicable, and that commercial air traffic be interfered with as little as possible. I hope the committee will accept my amendment. If it feels it cannot, I hope it will give consideration to this problem and recommend to the House a policy of the Congress that is clear and unmistakable, giving adequate support to defense-training activities and at the same time prevent injury to our commercial air operations.

Let me make it very clear that neither I nor any constituent I represent desires in the slightest degree to interfere with the defense of our country. Wayne Major Airport is available—only 5 air miles distant from Willow Run. In bad weather take-offs and landings at Wayne Major Airport are controlled from Willow Run. If there was no Wayne Major Airport, where there is already a National Guard operation, the military might have a good case for moving into Willow Run.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It would follow, then, that it would not be along with your thinking to move a commercial operation onto a military reservation?

Mr. MEADER. I would apply the same reasoning there. And, I might point out in this connection that the Michigan Air National Guard is not about to move. They like Wayne-Major, and they are going to stay there, and I do not think the commercial airlines are going to move over there.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In this particular area we had a suggestion made one time that the overflow from National Airport would be moved over to Andrews Air Field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am most sympathetic with the gentleman from Michigan who has just spoken. He came over to my office yesterday afternoon late—I suppose it was 6 or 6:30—and we talked there about 45 minutes about his problem. He has a real problem there, and I am most sympathetic with him, and I commend the people of his district for sending down here a man who really is on the job, working tirelessly for the benefit of the problems of his district as he sees them. At the same time, I recognize in his problem one that might affect any part of the United States. It so happens in the gentleman's case, I think, that one portion of this problem is in Wayne County and one portion is in another county, which makes it more difficult. Now, I do not know whether the entire matter is in his own congressional district or whether it is divided between congressional districts, but at least he has a major problem that has to be worked out and perhaps stand on its own bottom. So I say I am sympathetic to the position in which the gentleman finds himself in respect to his own area. I am opposed to his amendment principally for the reason of my fear that in the administration of that provision, which I have studied, there might be a serious interference with the air defense of the United States some time in the future and at some other place. The training of our Reserves is one thing; the air defense of the United States is another and quite a different thing.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, both the Air National Guard and the Air Reserves perform—and I mean perform—today a specific defense mission. These boys are on the alert 24 hours a day, waiting beside their planes. This is not training, this is air defense, and it provides a most important supplement to the Regular Force in this respect.

I feel, therefore, that I must reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment while at the same time expressing the sincere hope that the military departments will examine very carefully the principle which is contained in the amendment.

I should not want to accept an amendment of this type until the committee has had an opportunity to consider it in all its various ramifications. With that in mind I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I concur heartily in what our chairman has said. Certainly we cannot decide this matter here at this moment. We should have exhaustive hearings on the matter. I am sure that our chairman will give the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] a chance to be heard at the appropriate time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I understand from what the gentleman says that in general he is sympathetic to the purpose of the amendment in minimizing the interference with commercial air traffic, but he does not believe at this time and without further study by the committee it should be incorporated into the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. MEADER. In view of the gentleman's statement, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object; and I seek recognition in support of the amendment.

The issue raised by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], concerns not only his district but it concerns all of those people—and there are many of them—who use the Willow Run Airport. The gentleman made a very effective and logical argument and I am sure, I almost know, that he appreciates very deeply as do I the sympathy offered by the subcommittee chairman. But it will not do him any good—that sympathy. It will not have any effect on the program. Sympathy is one thing; votes are something else again.

The air transport business is somewhat similar in one way to automobile transportation in this country. Continually there is more of both. Last March, I believe it was, or the month before, the automobile manufacturers put out 710,000 new automobiles. They expect to maintain that record. If that record is maintained and those automobiles go out on the highways, there will not be room to drive, will there? Will there be? No. They will be bumper to bumper pretty soon on all the main improved highways unless we build more roads.

Here at Willow Run you have a great airport. Many people from the South and the Northwest go that way when they come from the East and Southeast. As the gentleman said, with the commercial business that airport is overcrowded today.

Are we to put jet planes in there for the training of the Air Force? And if you are, why? Do you want to crowd

out the commercial business? We are paying the commercial airlines subsidies running into millions of dollars. We are spending other millions on air training for the armed services. Is it not foolish to destroy the value and service of Willow Run by establishing a training center?

As long as we are spending today and apparently will continue to spend billions of dollars—whether we have the money or not; and apparently no one represents the taxpayers—in training an air force do we find it expedient or wise to put a commercial field out of existence? In theory, Members of Congress seem to feel that way. But when bills come before committees of the House and then to the House calling for dollars to be spent—I have yet to hear anyone speak up or hear any witness testify in behalf of the taxpayer before a committee on the average income of the average citizen, and how much of that income goes by way of taxes to benefit first, members of one group, then of another. How long can we continue to tax and spend as we have been doing, as we are doing, witnesses do not tell us.

I am not objecting to this bill, mark you, but I am objecting to the taking over of commercial airports either for Reserve training or for the use of the armed services.

I know that in the northern part of the southern peninsula, up near the Soo, there is an airport there that driving by I should judge is something between a mile and a half and two miles away, with no buildings. It was put there during the war, I assume to protect the locks. Why they do not use it I do not know. But one thing is sure about this jet program, and there is one at the Soo, we are there training the armed services, it would answer the purpose or, as my colleague said, the Wayne Field can be improved and used. In any event, my objection is to driving out an established, busy airport by installing there a jet training outfit. If they could get a few more jet planes up there, incidentally, inadvertently, accidentally, they might be found using the incoming transport planes to practice on.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think the point our colleague from Michigan was making, at least one of the points, is that there are two airports involved here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The Air Force can make its choice either to use Willow Run or Wayne-Major. Why should it take over Willow Run when that airport has been built up as a civilian airport for the entire Detroit area, and leave Wayne-Major, which has been subsidized ever since it started, and got the lion's share of the civilian aeronautics money for years, and now convert that to military use for the purpose of building up the need for greater civilian expansion at the expense of every other airport in the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no sound reason for that policy. Not only that, but as I understand from the gentleman's statement and from my own knowledge of the situation, the Wayne people already have training quarters over there, do they not?

Mr. MEADER. That is absolutely correct. To answer the gentleman's question further, the Michigan International Guard personnel, the representatives on the field told me that it was far more suitable for jet flying operations than Willow Run Airport. It has one runway which is almost 8,000 feet long, over 600 feet longer than the longest runway at Willow Run Airport. The traffic at Wayne Major Airport is so thin now that the operations of the Michigan International Guard account for one-third of the operations at Wayne Major Airport.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In contrast, from my own experience at Willow Run, I know, and so does everyone else who travels through Willow Run, that Willow Run is crowded all the time, day and night, and it would be folly, at least, so I think, and so do others, to use that field to put your jet training in there.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Willow Run is an excellent airport for the purpose it is now being used for. If you put jet operations in there, someday someone may rue it. I only need to call the attention of the Members to the Bolivian flier, who did not have a jet but a P–38, who caused the loss of lives because he was using the civilian terminal here at the National Airport at Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's amendment is in the nature of a statement of policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all it is. The subcommittee chairman admits it is sound policy but opposes the amendment. He extends his sympathy but apparently some bureaucrat objects.

Mr. GROSS. In what way does this amendment do injury or violence to the bill presently before us?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It does not hurt the bill, but it does hurt the feelings, the sensibilities of—well, I will not say it—but that is it. This seems to be just another of those times when the soundness, the desirability of an amendment is recognized but the committee just will not take it. If the gentleman's amendment is rejected in Committee I shall offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes had it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is an improper procedure to delay the announcement of the vote and the count should not be delayed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is still counting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Chairman is not counting, but just waiting.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCARTHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 222, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment, adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Adair	Edmondson	Miller, Md.
Andersen, H. Carl	Elliott	Miller, Nebr.
Auchincloss	Fallon	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Fascell	Morrison
Berry	Flood	Moulder
Bolling	Fogarty	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bonner	Gamble	O'Neill
Bowler	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Bray	Gregory	Powell
Brownson	Gubser	Reed, Ill.
Burnside	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Byrd	Hillings	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Hoeven	Sadlak
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Chase	Holifield	Sheppard
Chenoweth	Hyde	Sieminski
Chiperfield	Jackson	Sikes
Christopher	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Chudoff	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Thompson, Mich.
Corbett	King, Calif.	Tollefson
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Van Pelt
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Wainwright
Denton	Latham	Walter
Dingell	Lovre	Wickersham
Dollinger	McCulloch	Williams, N. Y.
Eberharter	Macdonald	Willis
	Machrowicz	Withrow
	Madden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In its present form; yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the bill be recommitted to the committee and the committee be instructed to report the bill back to the House with the following amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 8 and insert "That section 2 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (a), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (b) and inserting '; and' in lieu thereof, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) the minimizing of interference with commercial civil airline traffic by locating reserve flight training operations, insofar as possible, at airports which do not handle heavy commercial scheduled airline traffic.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EIGHTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY OF A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 30, a great American and one of the most distinguished citizens of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable Homer Stille Cummings, will celebrate his 85th birthday.

Homer Cummings has already taken his place among the great citizens of our State and of the United States.

As Attorney General of the United States he made a record in that office that is without parallel in our history. He served longer as Attorney General than any other man in our history and he did more to improve and reform the administration of the law in his time than any other Attorney General.

He was born in Chicago, Ill., is an alumnus of Yale University, a member of the bar of Connecticut, New York, and the District of Columbia. He served as mayor of Stamford for three terms, from 1900 to 1906, and then as Stamford's corporation counsel from 1908 to 1912.

As State's attorney for Fairfield County from 1914 to 1924, he produced one of the most glowing pages in the history of American justice by his handling of the Father Hubert Dahme murder case. Father Dahme was slain in Bridgeport in 1924 and a friendless young man, Harold Israel, was accused of the crime. Mr. Cummings, discerning the innocence of the accused, acted not as a prosecutor but as a dedicated member of the bar, and won release for Israel.

I recall that the celebrated Wickersham report of 1931 commended Mr. Cummings for his conduct in his landmark case.

Mr. Cummings has been a great leader of the Democratic Party both in Connecticut and in the Nation.

He attended his first Democratic National Convention in 1900 as a delegate at large from my State. He served as a member of the Democratic National Committee from 1900 to 1925 and during that time was both vice chairman and chairman. In 1920 he delivered the keynote address at the national convention in San Francisco and in 1932 he was floor leader for the successful candidate, the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Homer Cummings, of course, will be remembered as a great lawyer and as a great leader of the Democratic Party, but he will also be remembered as the gentle patron of many young men.

Today he resides here in Washington, still practicing the law he loves and serves so well. Across the years he has been a wise counselor to many, a friend to countless men and women in all walks of life who have valued his judgment and perception and have profited by his example and his guidance. His wisdom has been deep, tested by a vast experience spanning more than half a century, and encompassed by a reverence for the philosophy of his party and the tenets upon which our Republic rests.

I am proud of the fact that I was privileged to serve under him as his special assistant, and I feel that I speak for a vast number of Americans as I congratulate him on the attainment of his 85th birthday.

Homer Cummings carries with honor unchallenged the proud title of citizen of the United States.

He is worthy of the title which we tender only to the most deserving of our fellows, a great American.

ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today another year is added to the brief but illustrious life of the newest nation member of our community of free states and freemen. This date is the anniversary of the independence of the stalwart State of Israel.

Five years ago, on the second of these anniversaries, I had the honor of offering for this RECORD a report by a distinguished clergyman, Rabbi Leon D. Stitskin, now director of community relations, Yeshiva University, who had just returned from a visit to the new state. His conclusions which have been fortified today were:

Israel's accomplishments during the first years are phenomenal. Everywhere there is much progress. The functions of the government are conducted with western efficiency. Law and order rule supreme. The humanitarian impulse and the willingness to build cooperatively a state based on justice, equity, and peace—are auspicious portents for the future.

In view of the recurrence of the controversy over the Negev, it is pertinent to call attention to Rabbi Stitskin's observations on that subject:

Although Israel has fully earned its right to the Negev, Egypt has not become reconciled to this state of affairs. Great Britain, too, is dissatisfied with Israel's hold on the Negev. Why? In case of another war it would serve the best interest of Britain that all Arab countries be united by land as well as by sea. The assignment of part of the Negev to Egypt would establish a direct route from Egypt to Transjordan while depriving Israel of the important strategic port of Akaba. Thus, if Egypt were to close the Suez, Israel would have no outlet to the sea.

But aside from this consideration, Israel must have natural boundaries. The Jewish state needs bridgeheads and outposts to protect the heart of the nation. The Negev will not only serve as a vast reservoir for the resettlement of thousands of refugees but also as a military zone protecting the southern entrance to Israel. Every colony and settlement is in a sense a strategic outpost, a military zone, in addition to being an agricultural settlement. Hence Israel needs the Negev not only for settlement but also as a natural boundary for the defense of the land.

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAINST ATOMIC WAR

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, what we are concerned with in this talk today is the saving of human life on a mass scale.

By mass I mean hundreds of thousands of American lives—perhaps millions. Our problem is the use against us of the A-bomb or the more awful H-bomb.

The only possible enemy we know of capable of such a deed is the Kremlin. It can be assumed that this Communist

oligarchy, which thinks nothing of murdering each other, will not hesitate to seize upon a twist of fate to destroy the great multimillion population centers of the United States.

This oligarchy thinks of us as their great potential world war III enemy, and our destruction means the achievement of their goal—world domination.

That is the base from which I speak today about civil defense.

Against what I have just told you I ask you to remember this:

Whether they rain this frightful weapon down upon us or not, they will already have won a great victory if they frighten us into hysteria with the threat of it and get us to act stupidly, wastefully, and dangerously.

For fear is the perpetual weapon of the Kremlin. Sometimes they call it the war of nerves.

But the Kremlin has still a third weapon and when fear fails they haul this one into action.

This weapon is the inculcation into us of a feeling of complacency.

We may face unutterable catastrophe because we have on one side the highly alarmed hysterial or semihysterical viewers-with-alarm, and, on the other side, the professional pooh-poohers, who are as complacent as a Virginia vegetable in the spring sunshine.

The difficulty, it seems to me, is that the human mind has not yet been able to adjust itself to the magnitude of atomic war. Either we do not seem able to believe it at all or much of what we do believe is not true.

This we know: The Kremlin is capable of waging atomic war against us.

Whether they will or will not do so is a guess.

The question before us then is are we willing to risk millions of American lives and whole cities on a guess?

It is doubtful that the Kremlin will strike at us, say, in the next half decade or so. It is even improbable. What deters them—it is generally believed in the highest quarters—is definitely not a moral position, or a lack of ruthlessness. What deters them is the gravity of the risk.

But we can have no certainty and we know that it is wholly possible that they will attack.

Therefore we can have only one answer beyond and behind military preparation and that is civil defense.

Strong civil defense is the answer to hysteria, to complacency. It means our own peace of mind.

But, ladies and gentlemen, civil defense in the atomic age, is expensive in energy, cash, and leadership. It calls for planning on the national, the State, the local level—the highest order of interlinked coordination. It calls for psychological preparation so that catastrophe—God forbid—will not be compounded by self-created chaos and disorder.

First, we must get across to every man, woman, and child in America the elementary fact that since the atomic era, the world has been changed so radically that the only comparable event is creation itself. It is impossible to discuss it without employing descriptions that have the ring of the fabulous and the unbelievable.

I do not know whether I have myself emerged from the amateur class and am now an atomic veteran or not.

But I have been witness to atomic explosions in Nevada.

There have been greater nuclear explosions than those I have witnessed but all of them have the essence of what I have seen: the sense of the imminent presence of a universal elemental force. The impact on the imagination is indescribable. The nearest I can come to it is to say that it gave me the feeling of being present at some act of cosmic creation as when the Bible speaks of the formation of this earth: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God hovered upon the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light, and there was light.' "

What I was witnessing had an illimitable quality like that.

Time had suddenly lost its meaning and the ages were telescoped into this single burst of the sun's power there in front of me. Here was a force capable of gouging oceans of space out of the earth, capable of destroying this planet; evil enough, if so used, to eliminate life on some continents or all of them.

The First Book of Moses spoke of creation—a majestic act of construction—but what I saw carried within itself the potentialities of doomsday and—literally the apparatus for encompassing the end of the world.

I am giving you this literal translation of what my eyes saw and my mind grasped to convey to you the sweep and the scope of the problem we are dealing with. In this way we can perhaps give it focus and attack it from the civil-defense angle of approach with some prospect of realism and the practical.

They tell us there is no absolute defense against a nuclear attack.

In the same sense there is no absolute, no complete civil defense, against this awesome thing.

That is why it becomes imperative for us to achieve the greatest possible percentage of safety, of rescue, of salvage.

My broad concern is, of course, for the whole United States. But my immediate responsibility is New Jersey and the more than 312,000 people in the counties of Essex and Hudson. I get it from Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, that the radioactive fallout of bombs—the kind of bombs that were exploded in the Pacific last year—is capable of covering more than 7,000 square miles, or the whole of New Jersey. We must get hold of that statistic and deal with it in terms of civil-defense programs. The fireball alone of an H-bomb is 4 miles in diameter. The radioactive dust it kicks up forms a cigar-shaped cloud of death covering 220 miles one way and some 40 miles the other. It moves ominously with the wind.

What does all this mean to New Jersey?

Without civil defense, that is to say if we had no preparation so that our people did not know how to protect themselves, the resultant casualties would mount up to 90 percent of the population. That is 90 percent of more than 4,800,000 people. Of that 4,800,000 people some 45 percent—almost half—certainly more than 2 million would be dead. I ask you to reflect for one moment on what that means in the midst of such a cataclysm for the souls that remain. Picture the chaos, the disorganization, the terror, the smell of death, the madness that must follow for many, the despair.

There I have given you the proportion of such a disaster as determined by actual test. Unless we know these things, comprehend them sanely and act accordingly, how can we hope to meet the awfulness of such an event should it occur? We must prepare that with a tendency to hysteria against their own painful tendencies. We must have people who, by repeated routine, know where their battle stations are—so to speak. We must have people who know how to make instant decisions and have authority, and who it is known have authority. We must have leadership for just this sort of event and we must have a program tailored in detail to meet the dimensions of such a monumental agony. If I have to worry today about whether what I am saying is going to frighten you there is no hope for protection. You have to know the facts of life in the atomic age. And I am giving you the facts. Hiroshima and Nagasaki are small stuff compared to what we have now. If we are the kind of people who succumb to fear then there is no hope for our survival—especially if we are paralyzed or semiparalyzed by fear even before the event. But I think we are of tougher fiber than that and I think the Kremlin knows it and I think we will make out all right. Why? Well, the reasons are several.

For one thing we have today a coordinated continental defense program. We have a Federal Civil Defense Administrator providing a centralized clearinghouse of authority. Back in 1952 it looked as if all the warning we might have of an approaching atomic attack would be 15 minutes—or practically no time at all. The developments since indicate we might have some hours of warning. For we have stepped up our capacity to detect approaching aircraft. Yet hours of warning seems to me an optimistic estimate. We know there has been at any rate considerable improvement. An improvement definite enough to allow for more elaborate planning and action than was formerly possible. We have some 4,000 civil-defense officials all over the United States. We have statistical and scientific studies on atomic fallout. These prove the danger not as great as formerly supposed but a danger nevertheless calling for the utmost in vigilance and preparation.

We have learned beyond all question that we have got to have civil defense as we have to have a Military Establishment, as, in fact, we have to have government. The atomic age has produced this new indispensable need. It cannot be ignored unless peace becomes permanent and secure, or until our strength-in-being is such that no enemy can attack

us. Neither of these conditions prevails today.

Thus civil defense and our survival go together.

We also know that the best form of civil defense is military defense. My best information convinces me that the military authorities are doing everything possible to provide this defense. But they cannot be expected to do the total job. And the position of war in the air and thermonuclear weapons are such that some of the enemy is bound to get through our defenses. This accentuates the indispensable need for powerful, resilient, highly alert civil defense, especially in such areas as New Jersey.

Now civil defense operates under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. Under law civil defense must be affected generally "as an extension of the normal duties of various officials at all levels of Government assisted by volunteers and volunteer organization." I repeat: "assisted by volunteers and volunteer organizations." New Jersey has developed a good civil-defense organization. Radioactivity is an insidious killer because it is odorless and invisible. The Federal, State, and local governments must be depended upon to furnish monitoring instruments to people in civil defense, to the fire and the police authorities, and perhaps to certain levels of authority in our schools. A Geiger counter should in time become as commonplace as perhaps the radio. Newark alone has a $157,409 civil-defense budget. This includes some $84,000 which has been matched by Federal funds for warning equipment and the stockpiling of emergency supplies. We shall have more than $130 million worth of medical supplies stockpiled for use by civil defense by July 1, this year.

New Jersey is on its toes in civil defense. But I do not believe we have fully grasped the enormity of the problem. Evacuation is the one magic word in the event of attack. And evacuation can only be accomplished through a system of highways. A highway program substantially aimed to provide us with a better network of highway transportation that will bring our great cities and ports, our defense centers, our military defense, in closer coordination is an essential. I think I am not understating the case for civil defense in terms of protection and especially evacuation when I say that an up-to-date highway system is the best possible feature in the future program for the national defense on home soil. It is precisely and particularly meaningful in the event of atomic attack. And it is of course always productive—unlike other methods of purely military defense—in the forward movement of our national economy. Even without war or atomic attack it will still pay its way in terms of a progressive national wealth, better business efficiency, and a higher standard of living.

What is appalling to me is our bafflement in the face of this problem—the problem of civil defense. I was quite shocked when I walked from the plane that had just reached Newark Airport into what appeared to be a Newark air raid alarm. No one seemed to know what it was about or what to do about it. We must have the facts hammered into us and we must take pains to do this. I think consideration ought to be given to a new series of tests. Consideration should be given to the advisability of running such tests not for 5 minutes, or 30 minutes, but for an entire hour. There should be surveys and reports. Perhaps such a test should be followed by a test taking the better part of a whole morning for selected areas and for selected groups—schools, factories, hospitals. The mistakes in one test should be corrected in the test that follows.

These longer period tests should be followed by a series of shorter ones. And then there should be—if it is found advisable—a repetition of the long-period tests. Persistent tests, acclimatization to routine, familiarity with alerts, quick response, coordinated action would so prepare the public mind that should catastrophe strike hundreds of thousands of lives would be saved that otherwise would perish.

We should go about this job in the interest of peace of the public mind, in the interest of security, in the interest of survival.

THE RUSSIAN MENACE AT NEXT YEAR'S OLYMPICS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the quest of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955, Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, reports what he saw inside Russia during an inspection of the Soviet athletic program. His conclusion? Things look bad for us at the 1956 games in Melbourne, Australia.

Mr. Brundage warns that—

Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known. Unless there is a sudden awakening in this country, Soviet sportsmen are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia. They threaten to seize the initiative even in track and field, the feature phase of the games, in which United States athletes have always been supreme—although to a lessening degree—since the games were revived 60 years ago.

The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R., regardless of age or sex. Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, which was started more than 20 years ago, was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people. Mr. Brundage expresses alarm over the contrasting decline of amateur sport in America. He writes:

We in America have become too complacent over our past successes. We think we are the greatest sports nation in the world. For many years we were, as a long history of Olympic triumphs indicates. But are we today? Let's not delude ourselves. We have become a race of grandstand and bleacher sitters. We think it is sport to find a good vantage point in the stands and watch professional baseball, football, boxing, and horseracing. This is not sport. These events shouldn't even be carried on the sports pages. They should be described in the amusement sections of newspapers, along with the theater, circus, and vaudeville.

In a speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed. America, he said, has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. He asked: How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

Mr. Hearst pointed out that—

From Moscow radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism. It stands to reason that such extensive wooing of impressionable minds is likely to pay dividends—unless we compete vigorously with the Communist effort and even surpass it. We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.

But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete. Nor is it enough for our leaders to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think they have met the challenge.

Money is not enough. I came away from Russia convinced that only deep thought and long-range planning would suffice to prevail over communism in the conflict of coexistence. Money spent on foreign aid will not get the most effective results unless it is thoughtfully expended in those fields where it will do the most good.

Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists. This board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life. It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side.

Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems—

Mr. Hearst said, and added:

Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?

Because the very survival of our way of life may well depend on taking concrete action in time I wish to commend to my colleagues the splendid article by Mr. Brundage and the warning of Mr. Hearst which we can ignore only at our peril.

I have developed a plan, and presented it to this Congress, for meeting the propaganda offensive of the Russians. This plan is developed in several bills—H. R. 5040, H. R. 4307, H. R. 4215, and H. R.

4109—which are now under active consideration. These bills are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst. There is very little money involved but, if adopted, they would go far toward meeting the major attacks the U. S. S. R. is making upon us in the fields of culture and sports.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to establish a public-works program to offset declining employment in certain areas of our Nation by providing Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of repair, alteration, expansion, and construction of public facilities and improvements.

I desire to call this bill to the attention of the Members of the House, and to urge that should it be reported favorably from committee, that every Member earnestly consider supporting it. This public-works program is aimed, primarily, at aiding distressed areas where unemployment has reached the point that real hunger and suffering is only being alleviated to some extent by the distribution of surplus food commodities.

Realizing that many Members of the House, whose districts may be prosperous in most respects, are perhaps unaware of the tremendous need for a public-works program to provide a measure of temporary relief until economic conditions again are on the upswing, I wish to discuss briefly such Federal assistance and to call your attention to the plight of these good people in areas of Virginia, and in the neighboring States of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

My bill would authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Public Works Administrator. The Administrator would then receive applications from States, Territories, possessions, and subdivisions thereof, including municipalities, for Federal assistance in public-works projects. As I have stated, this bill would authorize the construction, repair, alteration, or expansion of public facilities, and would include also such projects as reforestation, flood control, and others which would conserve the natural resources of the United States.

As the Administrator receives applications for Federal funds under this bill, he would approve such projects as in his judgment will materially assist in carrying out the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government enunciated in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946, which includes the promotion of useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and in promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. In authorizing and approving these projects, the Administrator would give priority to projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas having a substantial surplus of labor. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the Administrator currently informed with respect to the areas so designated.

When an application for Federal assistance under this act has been approved, funds will be allotted to the appropriate agency having responsibility for the project for which Federal assistance is sought. Such Federal funds shall be allotted in a ratio of $45 of Federal assistance for every $55 of State or local funds made available for the project.

This bill also provides for the appropriation of $3 billion in Federal funds to carry out this works program.

Now, you may ask why such a works program is needed in these days of relatively high prosperity. I will explain why. It is because several sections and regions of our Nation are suffering from depressed economic conditions. In this country unemployment in January of 1955 stood at 3.3 million, and I am informed that it has hovered near this figure during the past 3 months of this year.

In 1954, 20 major labor-market areas and 51 smaller areas were classified as "chronic labor-surplus areas," where special action is needed in order to provide employment for the local labor force. This public-works bill is one of those special actions which will provide employment while plans are made and carried out to locate new industries for these areas.

A portion of the State of Virginia where the mining of coal has been the primary occupation of thousands of workers is one of these depressed areas. As you may recall from the debate on this floor a few weeks ago concerning the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, the coal industry has been adversely affected by imports of residual oil and changes in consumers' fuel demands. There has been a great loss of the coal market, and unemployment has resulted in the coal-producing sections of the country. Virginia has only a few counties producing coal, and these are in the Ninth District, which I am honored to represent in the House. However, I am certain that my colleagues from the neighboring States of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania will tell you of the economic conditions that exist in the areas of these States where coal is produced from much larger regions than in Virginia.

In the mail that comes to my office each day, there is usually at least one letter telling me of the difficulty these people are having in securing food, clothing, and shelter for their loved ones. These are people who would work if they are given the chance.

Mr. Speaker, these depressed areas of our Nation must be recognized as such by the Federal Government and appropriate action taken to improve conditions. These good people, who have worked steadily and faithfully in the past to produce fuel for our Nation's homes and industries, now find themselves without means to provide the necessities for their families. Through the years they have labored to keep our Nation's fuel supply adequate. They have faced dangers underground that would cause many a man to abandon his job. They are good citizens—good Americans who paid their taxes and raised their children to respect the flag and all that it stands for, to obey our God, and to be self-reliant in every way. However, today, through no fault of their own, these same American citizens—and I want to emphasize that these are our own people who are suffering in this Nation of plenty—these men cannot find jobs to support their families.

Many of these workers have left their homes to go to the large industrial centers to find employment. Some have been successful. Others have returned to their homes with less funds than when they left. They have exhausted their unemployment benefits and are now relying on surplus foodstuffs as the sole supply of subsistence for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is time for this administration to recognize that we have these soft spots in our economy, and to take positive action to do something about them. The coal areas are only one example. There are others that are in just as bad shape as the coal-producing regions. They must have help on a larger scale than the States and local governments can provide.

I, of course, realize that the States and localities should try to help themselves in solving their unemployment problems. Local actions which lead to new jobs include reserving and zoning land for industry, organizing industrial districts, establishing industrial foundations, locating new markets for their principal products, analyzing and cataloging available resources, and locating firms in growing industries that might be interested in locating in their community. These things are underway in my section of Virginia, but they do not provide jobs now—immediately. These are long-range projects that will eventually solve the labor-surplus problem. However, we need jobs today, and I believe this public-works bill is one of the actions that will make those jobs available.

As these long-range plans for new industry are worked out and carried through to completion, this public-works program will aid these areas to shift from a declining economy to a more virile one as well as contribute directly to the new economic base. Such projects as schools, playgrounds, hospitals, water and sewer systems, and water-storage reservoirs would serve to make these distressed areas more desirable industrial locations.

It is generally recognized that public works should be expanded if our economy is declining. Our economy is declining—in certain areas where unemployment has hit; in fact, it has declined just about as far as it can. We should use public works for stabilizing purposes in these areas. There is a tremendous backlog of needed projects that could be started almost immediately should this bill be approved by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have not tried to burden the Members with a sheaf of facts and figures. I have tried to outline the sit-

uation in general terms. I think it is enough to say that in my district there are 10,000 workers ready to line up for a job tomorrow—any job. I am not certain of the exact figures for my neighboring States, but I know that they run well into the thousands.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, the President recommended that an Office of Coordinator of Public Works be established in the Office of the President. It was stated that the Nation's public works are tremendous in scope; and coordination of Federal, State, and local activities is needed. My bill goes farther than these recommendations. We not only need a coordinator of our present public-works projects, but we need an administrator to cooperate with the States, to make available Federal funds so that new works can be started to provide jobs for our unemployed and to improve these depressed areas so that industry will find them more attractive.

There are other things which the Federal Government can do to improve the situation in the coalfields. These include the development of new markets for coal, the restriction of residual oil imports which have caused a great loss in coal markets, the starting of a program of research and development for new uses of coal, and the broadening of the unemployment insurance benefits to make them available after the regular unemployment insurance has expired.

Mr. Speaker, we have a recession of limited nature in sections of our country. It is high time that the Federal Government take action to help the States meet this drastic unemployment situation.

Last week the President asked the Congress for $3.5 billion in foreign aid to be used in the fiscal year beginning July 1. I understand that $2.1 billion would be earmarked for Asian countries where—and I quote the President:

> The immediate threats to world security and stability are now centered.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been in favor of assisting our allies when the need has been demonstrated. I realize the necessity for foreign-aid funds. However, I wish to say here that I am beginning to feel like the old gentleman who approached me while I was in my district last week. He stated emphatically, that "charity should begin at home."

It seems to me that it is necessary for the President and this administration to consider the fact that in these depressed areas, there is a threat to "security and stability" of our economy.

I believe that this bill which I have proposed will aid in solving the problems of our blighted areas. Let us give a measure of temporary relief to these good Americans who are ready, willing, and able to work to build up their own communities.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today I join with the civilized world in saluting the State of Israel on this, the seventh anniversary of its official birth and legal recognition, in the fraternity of nations. I have purposely used the term "official birth" to distinguish it from the fact that Israel never did die or go out of existence in the minds, hearts and aspirations of the Jewish people during their 2,000 years of enforced dispersion—20 centuries of homelessness and frustration, except in the spiritual encouragement which a people devoted to God could not help but attain. And so, long before its legal birth the Jewish people of the world, clearly established a moral claim to independence.

The astounding accomplishments of the state of Israel in these 7 short years in the establishment of a purely democratic government in an enlightened social and economic society, in education, including that of the establishment of the world renowned Hebrew University and its progress embodying the best features of highly advanced governments, including our own, are most commendable. Yet they are understandable in the light of the fact that the leaders of Israel came as they did from all corners of the world—men and women skilled in the science of government and all its phases.

With a devotion to this leadership which could only be inspired by a love for freedom, love for country, and love for God, the hundreds of thousands of workers, clerks, students, laborers, and farmers, Jews from all walks of life, girded their loins and with unequaled inspiration assumed the back-breaking tasks of making farmlands out of deserts, creating new industries, making order out of chaos.

The pioneer spirit of Israel bears striking similarity to the pioneer spirit of our own forefathers, who similarly called up cities and farms out of a wilderness and whose zeal and spirit made America and western democracy possible.

Today the State of Israel stands alone in Asia and the Middle East as a beacon for democracy, an island surrounded by forces which threaten its life and very existence, forces who see in Israel a threat and living refutation of the systems of despotism and absolutism, whether same be the leftism of communism or the rightism of feudalism or colonialism to which most of the surrounding nations, despite certain lip service to the contrary, are clearly wedded and devoted.

The 29-nation Asian-African conference at Bandung, Indonesia ended just a few days ago. It is alarmingly significant that the democratic State of Israel was not invited to, or officially represented at, that conference. Thus, while Red China's spokesman, Chou En-lai, was using the Bandung conference as a sounding platform and forum for pro-Communist propaganda, and the leaders of the Arab bloc were using the conference to threaten and challenge the State of Israel, the only true spokesman for democracy in Asia, the dangerpoint of the world, was conspicuous by its absence.

And so, on this occasion, I wish to reaffirm my own faith in the success of Israel and to proclaim that our own country should not, in these critical times, forsake its chief supporter and intelligent spokesman in Asia.

As a Member of Congress, I am alarmed at the present policy of the State Department in our present administration in the Arab-Israelian controversy—a policy which is clearly and definitely pro-Arab and, therefore, necessarily is anti-Israel. This State policy was recently exposed by John D. Jernegan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. It can be briefly summarized as follows.

I quote:

> Although "it would seem highly logical that Israel should be incorporated in a collective defense arrangement at an early date," Israel will not be included in such arrangements now under way in the Middle East as long as Arab-Israel relations remain what they are. Because of these relations Israel does not even come within the purview of current State Department defense planning for the area. The State Department deplores this and is seeking to improve Arab-Israel relations—but how this is being done was not indicated.
>
> In addition to continuing arms shipments to Iraq, the State Department will try to negotiate military pacts with "certain other countries" in the area. While the State Department "understands the anxiety felt by the people and the Government of Israel at their continued isolation in the area of which they are a part," Mr. Jernegan declared that he does "not see evidence of any intent on the part of her neighbors to attack Israel." He stated emphatically that "Israel as a nation is not in danger, except to the extent that all other states in the Near East are in danger from the common threat of outside aggression. Israel is, in fact, in less danger than some others of those states."

The present administration has released arms to Iraq and the Arab nations while refusing arms to Israel since 1952. This can hardly be squared with the announcement of our State Department that the United States has "maintained a position of impartiality, not discriminating against the Arab States or Israel." Nor with the remarks of our President, that—I quote:

> In helping to strengthen the security of the entire Middle East, we shall make sure that any arms we provide are devoted to that purpose, not to creating local imbalances which could be used for intimidation of or aggression against any neighboring nations.

The attitude of the present administration ignores the true facts concerning the Arab-Israel situation. The outstanding facts are tersely as follows:

The refusal of the Arab nations to heed the request of the United Nations Organization to enter into a final peace treaty with Israel. The brazen belligerence and threats currently expressed at Bandung. The passionate address of the Egyptian Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser to the wildly cheering students of his country's military college in Cairo:

> We are now strong enough for Israel. If we enter war again, we will depend on our forces and not on the Security Council, and we will give Israel a lesson they will never forget.

An editorial in the October 15, 1954, issue of Al Gomhouria, the official

mouthpiece of the Egyptian regime, states:

> Egypt and the Arabs must turn in the name of humanity and its culture to all nations of the world who will aid in wiping Israel off the face of the map because of its barbarism.

In addition to the outspoken official utterances of the heads of the Arab States, all prowar and antipeace, there are the series of incidents for which the responsibility has clearly been placed in the lap of the Arab States. Between September 1954 and February 1, 1955, Egypt has been condemned on no fewer than 27 occasions for violations of the Israel-Egypt Armistice Agreement, including armed attack, murder, and sabotage. Repeated warnings by the Mixed Armistice Commission to Egypt to put a halt to these acts of aggression have had no effect.

The New York Times of March 21, 1955, reports that Maj. Saleh Salem, the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, has demanded that Israel cede the Negev to the Arabs. The following is a statement made by an Israeli spokesman in reply to questions:

> Major Salem has thrown light on the underlying cause of current tension between Egypt and Israel. An arrogant and utterly lawless claim to the Negev, which is more than half of Israel territory, is at the root of Egypt's policy, and especially of the military harrassment launched from Gaza. It should now not be difficult to understand, why Egyptian headquarters in Gaza is so active in preventing peaceful Israel life and development in the Negev. The Egyptians will, of course, not get the Negev, but the frank publication of their expansionist design is most significant and disquieting.

Opposed to the war policy pursued by the Arab nations, is the unabated desire of Israel for friendly relations and for the lasting establishment of a modus vivendi with its Arab neighbors. Commonsense dictates that before our country agrees to furnish any more arms to any of the Arab States, our Government should require the Arab States to sign and honor a treaty of peace with Israel and end their boycott and blockade of Israel before they receive any of said arms.

In view of the belligerent statements made by the Arab leaders, our Government cannot trust the Arabs not to use the arms against the Israelis. Our Government should concern itself with the statements of enmity made by the Arab leaders against Israel. Our Government should be concerned, too, about the overt acts of violence which have been engaged in by the Arab States against the State of Israel. Our Government should not send arms to the Arabs when the Arabs refuse to honor the United Nations and continue to violate that norm and standard of conduct which has been set up and prescribed by the United Nations.

Yes, I repeat, our Government should not furnish arms to the Arab States while they continue these acts of aggression against the small State of Israel. The least that our Government should do is to require that the Arab States sign a treaty of peace with Israel to demonstrate their good will and prove that they will honor that peace before we furnish them with any more arms.

Our Government should go even further and make it clear that Israel will be included in any arrangements made for the defense of freedom in the Near East. Such an undertaking would contribute to stability and peace, for it would discourage aggression, encourage reconcilation, and thus promote true, regional cooperation.

In summary I wish to say that—

First. Our Government should make a determined effort to bring about direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States so that peace between them can be effected.

Second. Our Government should not furnish any arms to the Arab States until and unless they sign treaties of peace with Israel and give indications that they will honor and be bound by the terms of such a treaty.

Third. Israel should be included in any defense arrangements for the Middle and Near East.

Fourth. Our Government should continue to give economic and technical assistance to Israel and to the Arabs.

Fifth. Our Government should facilitate the resettlement of the Arab refugees.

Sixth. Our Government must continue to promote friendship between our own democracy and the democracy of Israel.

It is my feeling Israel has tried to be friendly with her Arab neighbors but has been rebuffed. When the regime of King Farouk was overturned in the summer of 1952 by the revolutionary council led by General Naguib, the then Israel Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, publicly expressed Israel's readiness to cooperate with the new government. In a public statement on August 18, 1952, Mr. Ben-Gurion declared:

> Israel wishes to see Egypt free, independent, progressive. There were no grounds, nor are there now, for a quarrel between Egypt and Israel. There is no cause for territorial disputes, nor any reason for political or economic problems. We have no enmity against Egypt for what was done to us 4 years ago. We have never sought to exploit Egypt's political difficulties with a great power by attacking her or taking revenge upon her, as she did upon the establishment of our State.

These friendly overtures, which have been frequently repeated, have brought no response. Indeed, the record of recent months indicates a growth in Egyptian hostility and a deliberate rejection of a policy of reconciliation.

If the Egyptian Government would agree to give consideration to the Israeli desire for peace and for settlement of the differences between Israel and the Arab States, as was envisioned in the Rhodes agreement of 1949, the whole free world would have great reason to rejoice.

However, in spite of the problems of the present, when we view the brilliant and glorious past of the Jewish people and nation, we know that we shall see from them an even more brilliant and glorious future as the Jewish nation, with the support of the civilized world and, particularly, with the support of the United States, is permitted to maintain its seat in the councils of the nations of the world.

Civilization will be the gainer and the entire world will be more hopeful, more prosperous and more peaceful. I salute Israel.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to our majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call attention to the fact that the first nation to recognize Israel was the United States, and that was done by former President Truman. I call attention also to the fact that in 1944 the Democratic platform, and it happened that I was chairman of the committee on platform and resolutions that year as well as in 1952, we put a plank in pledging the Democratic Party for a free and independent Jewish nation in Palestine.

Mr. BOYLE. I respectfully thank our majority leader for his observation at this point in my speech.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his very eloquent tribute to the State of Israel on this their seventh anniversary. I would like to join with him in the content of what he says. I have had considerable correspondence with the Department of State on this subject, the last letter of which was dated April 1. I would like to call to my colleague's attention this particular letter, which comes from Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thruston B. Morton:

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, April 1, 1955.*
>
> The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: This is in reply to your letter of March 18, 1955, in reply to mine of February 10, 1955, with which was transmitted a copy of a departmental statement entitled "United States Policy With Regard to Military Aid to the Near East." In your letter you raised a number of questions. This reply endeavors to go into those concerning which the Department may be in a position to shed some light at the present time.
>
> The Department does not feel that its policies regarding delivery of military equipment constitute discrimination and abandonment of our policy of impartiality in United States relations between Israel and the Arab States. Iraq, a country of strategic importance because of its geographical situation, is the only Arab State receiving United States grant military aid. While Israel does not receive such assistance she is strong militarily and has been able for some time to purchase military equipment in the United States under the terms of section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Act of 1949, as amended. Furthermore, Israel has benefited disproportionately from United States economic assistance. During the past 6 years the United States Government has expended $223 million on behalf of Israel, a country with a population of about 1.5 million, and $241 million, half for Palestine refugee relief, on behalf of the Arab States whose population in the aggregate amounts to some 40 million. Our Export-Import Bank has loaned Israel an additional $135 million.
>
> In your letter you remark that the language in the United States military assistance agreement with Iraq is extremely vague and that there is no commitment undertaken by the Government of Iraq not to use our arms for "renewal of aggression against Israel." Please note again article I of the

agreement which says: "It is the understanding of my government that the Government of Iraq will use such equipment, materials or services as may be provided solely to maintain its internal security and its legitimate self-defense and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state." It does not seem that there is any vagueness in these commitments assumed by the Iraq Government.

The United States military assistance program for Iraq has been formulated and is being carried out in accordance with section 202 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, which authorized United States military assistance to certain countries of the Near East area where the President considers such assistance would serve the purposes of the act. Your letter suggests that no military assistance should be given to any country of the Near East until peace negotiations have been promoted between the Arab States and Israel. A careful analysis of the history of the Arab-Israel dispute would make it clear that the probability of its early settlement, however much it may be desired, is remote. It is doubtful if direct intervention by outside powers would bring about a solution of this dispute. On the contrary, it would appear that a settlement can be achieved only through a step-by-step reduction of tensions by action on the part of the states directly concerned in an effort to create an improved atmosphere. The United States will continue to encourage the creation of such an atmosphere in the hope that such a state of affairs will make it more likely that long-term solutions will be examined in a constructive spirit and that a measure of cooperation between Israel and the Arab States can be achieved. A matter of great importance in this regard would be agreement between the parties on a fair division of the water resources of the area—a problem which has engaged the attention of Ambassador Eric Johnston and a staff of experts for 16 months.

In view of the exposure of the Near East to possible Communist aggression, the Department believes it is in the interest of the United States to take such measures as it can to promote the defensive capabilities and the internal security of this region while, at the same time, taking all possible precautions to insure that the arms supplied will be used for the purposes for which they are intended. In this area, as in other areas, the Department considers it would be unrealistic and dangerous to continue to defer all preparations for security until final solutions are found to disputes which may exist between states in the area. At the same time we recognize that until these disputes are settled the full security system we desire to see created is impossible to attain.

I enclose a copy of the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, which, as stated previously, continues to guide United States policy toward the Near East. In this declaration you will find evidence of a clear determination on the part of the United States Government to take action in the event any state in the Near East should embark upon a course of armed aggression. Furthermore, we are doing everything in our power to prevent an arms race between Israel and her neighbors. We fully recognize the problem of reassuring Israel's Government and have seized every opportunity to do so.

In carrying out a policy of impartial friendship with all nations in the Near East, the United States not surprisingly often finds its actions misinterpreted both in Israel and in the Arab States. Our interest in the welfare of all states in the area, including Israel, will, we believe, be borne out by a dispassionate examination of the record. We recognize Israel's potential ability to contribute to the strengthening of the Middle East against the danger of Communist encroachment and consider such a contribution would assume increased significance were Israel's relations with her neighbors to undergo substantial improvement.

I enclose a copy of a speech made March 6 by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John D. Jernegan. A perusal of this address will, I believe, provide you with the Department's point of view on a number of issues raised in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

In other words, impartiality means that you give arms to the Arab States and you allow Israel to buy them if they have the money. That is not my idea of impartiality.

In this letter Mr. Morton refers me to a statement that you have just referred to from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Jernegan. In that statement, as you have well pointed out is this unfortunate and sad declaration:

What is even more important, I do not see evidence of any intent on the part of her neighbors to attack Israel.

There is so much evidence, and I hope my distinguished colleague from Illinois will bring out some of that evidence, and I hope that when the Members of this House have a chance to declare congressional intent on arms to the Middle East, they will set the State Department right on this most important matter.

Mr. BOYLE. I want to thank the gentleman from California for the statement he has just made in supplementing my remarks.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his very excellent and eloquent remarks and would be pleased and happy to be associated with him. I would be honored to join with him in the eloquent expression he has made and the logical argument that he has made for the change in our State Department attitude towards the State of Israel. I would like to join with him in extending to that state the congratulations and best birthday wishes on this, the seventh birthday, of Israel, and to wish it and the Jewish people the best of all the goods of this world that they have so long pursued and have so long been denied.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in extending best wishes and congratulations to the State of Israel on its seventh birthday. It has always been a source of pride to me that many of my constituents joined together and helped develop a community in Israel which bears the name of Seattle, named after a city in my district.

The distinguished gentleman has mentioned regional cooperation. It has also been a great source of pride to me that President Eisenhower selected a native of the State of Washington to try to work out some of the regional problems with regard to water and power over there. In choosing Mr. Eric Johnston, he chose a friend of mine and I believe a great friend of the Jewish people, also a friend of the Arabs. I am very hopeful that through his efforts eventually a program can be worked out to help in the economics of that region.

We all know that in Israel today we see the marks where once were waterways left from Roman ruins. We know that once the forests there now are bare hills and that if water can be brought onto the land the people of Israel can and will enjoy a self-sufficient economy and will help in the peaceful development of the world. I am very happy that the gentleman from Illinois has marked this occasion with such eloquent and appropriate talk. I commend him for it, and I thank him for yielding to me on this occasion.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation in this matter.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss the Federal aid to school construction bill that is now pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor. The Committee on Education and Labor has been considering this bill since February. Now, some impression has been going around that we are all bogged down in committee; that we will not get out a bill, and the needs have been minimized, and that no good will come from the efforts of the committee. I want to inform the House that such an impression is entirely erroneous; that in my judgment we will get out a bill, whether it be the Bailey-Kearns bill, the Hill bill, or part of the administration proposal.

There is one thing that I do want to discuss for a few moments, and that is the testimony of Mrs. Hobby. I feel that it is appropriate for us to have a little discussion on her testimony in view of the statements which I will read into the RECORD in a few moments that she made before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 16, setting forth the needs, and within a few weeks those needs were minimized by the same witness before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

First I wish to call upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to clarify this erroneous impression which has resulted from Mrs. Hobby's testimony on the President's proposal before the House Committee on Education and Labor. It seems to me that there has been an attempt on the part of the officials of the Department—and I think that is putting it mildly—to pass over the real meaning of the statistics gathered by the United States Office of Education under phase 2 of the school facilities survey. After hearing and reading Mrs. Hobby's testimony on these recent statistics, one is given the impression that the data gathered under phase 2, the long-range planning phase, is a reestimate of the figures determined by phase 1. Since this is not true, the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare should make a detailed statement clarifying this rather glaring misapprehension. It would seem from Secretary Hobby's statement that in 1953 phase 1 of the school facilities survey found that an estimated 312,000 classrooms were needed. The implication is that the new estimate, a sort of reevaluation of the original estimate, shows quite a different situation since phase 2 reports that the classroom deficit in 1959 and 1960 will be only 176,000 classrooms. That is according to her testimony before our committee. Actually, the second phase of the school facilities survey is based on a very different premise from the first phase, which was an estimate as of September 1952, based on an inventory by the States from a district level of the unsatisfactory school plans.

Phase 2, as I understood the testimony, is based on the reports from the States in response to specific questions supposedly of long-range plans by the States to meet their known needs up to 1959 and 1960, which, of course, is quite different from the study and estimate made under phase 1.

I feel that we all can agree that under phase 1 the study and estimate took into consideration many sound factors in determning the actual needs for classrooms throughout the Nation. I do not want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but I would like to read into the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Mrs. Hobby given before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in support of S. 968 on February 16, 1955. At the bottom of page 4 we find in Mrs. Hobby's testimony this statement:

Before describing the proposals in detail, we would like to present our analysis of the classroom shortage, the factors contributting to it and the impediments to local financing of schools. I shall now ask the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, to present this information.

Here is what Dr. Brownell states in the presence of Mrs. Hobby:

Thousands of children are attending classes only part time, are under severe conditions of evercrowding that militate against good education. This is due to a longstanding deficit of classrooms. To provide room for these children requires the construction of approximately 90,000 classrooms costing $3 billion or more. Approximately 210,000 additional classrooms are needed to replace the persistent deficit of unsafe or outmoded schools that accumulated over the years.

Our latest information indicates that the Nation must construct 50,000 classrooms for approximately 1,500,000 school children each year merely to keep up with increased enrollments over the next 10 years. It is necessary also to replace approximately 8,000 classrooms housing approximately 240,000 children.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Did I correctly understand the figure the gentleman used, that it is necessary to replace 8,000 classrooms for obsolescence?

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. METCALF. Classrooms are becoming obsolete or unsafe or worn out or destroyed every year. I call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky and the Members of the House to the article that Dr. Ray L. Hamon wrote in the November 1951 issue of School Life.

Mr. PERKINS. By the way, if the gentleman will let me comment, I feel that there is no person in the Office of Education that knows as much about these statistics as Dr. Ray Hamon, because we know his connection with the school facility survey from the time we first made the $3 million available.

Mr. METCALF. I heartily concur in the gentleman's estimate of the worth of Dr. Hamon. In 1951 he wrote an article for School Life magazine in which he said that we have 900,000 classrooms, and they are becoming obsolete at the rate of not 8,000 a year but 18,000 a year. He bases his estimate on the life of a classroom at 50 years. He says obviously that is too long. Since 1951 we have increased our classrooms to over 1 million. If we take the same rate of obsolescence it will mean that we would replace a classroom every 154 years if we adopt the figures the gentleman has just presented. This means that classrooms are supposed to last about 150 years before they become obsolete or worn out or destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the entire article written by Mr. Hamon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

[From School Life of November 1951]

HOW MANY CLASSROOMS DO WE NEED?—AN ESTIMATE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY RAY L. HAMON, CHIEF OF THE SCHOOL HOUSING SECTION

This question has been asked and guessed at many times by several people, including the writer. Various estimates have been made through publications, news releases, and interviews. All such estimates are based on certain conditions and assumptions. Often when estimates are quoted and requoted they are lifted from their original context, thus resulting in some confusion. It should be acknowledged that there is no accurate answer to the question: "How many classrooms do we need?" Much depends upon the interpretation of "need." A nationwide school-facilities survey is now in progress. Until results become available from that survey, it is difficult to make any more than a guess, and that must be based on stated assumptions.

The estimates, or guesses, submitted in the accompanying table are based on the following assumptions and deductions:

ENROLLMENTS

As used in this article, this term means the enrollments in the public elementary and secondary schools (kindergarten through grade 12) as estimated in table 1, page 116, School Life, May 1950.

CLASSROOMS

This term is used to mean public elementary and secondary school instruction rooms or teacher stations, and includes all of the supplementary facilities necessary to constitute a complete school plant.

DEFERRED BACKLOG

In order to arrive at any reasonable estimate of the existing backlog of classroom needs, it would be necessary to establish a base date when we had sufficient, suitable, and well-located classrooms and then proceed from there with such factors as replacements, enrollment increases, population shifts, district reorganization, and program expansion. This is not possible for several reasons, one being that there was never a time when all the American schoolchildren were adequately and satisfactorily housed. The size of the deferred backlog depends upon how far the American taxpayer is able and willing to go in replacing hazardous and obsolete facilities. Until the current school-facilities survey has been completed, it seems conservative to assume 252,000 as the backlog of needed public elementary and secondary school classrooms as of 1950–51 to correct the most obviously unsatisfactory conditions. Although the need is immediate, it is obvious that this backlog cannot be erased in a single year. The accompanying table arbitrarily distributes the assumed 1950–51 backlog uniformly over 7 years.

NORMAL REPLACEMENTS

This means the annual normal requirement of classrooms to replace facilities worn out or becoming obsolete. This must be based on assumption rather than fact. If we assume a base of 900,000 classrooms and a normal school-building life of 50 years (obviously too long), it will require 18,000 classrooms for normal annual replacement. This is used as a constant in the table. Although new classrooms erected will increase the base, these new rooms will not need to be replaced during the period of these estimates.

PUPIL-ROOM RATIO

Since 30 is usually considered as the maximum class size and since many school systems attempt to operate on an average of 25, for the purposes of this article, enrollment increases are divided by 27 and rounded to the nearest thousand to obtain the number of needed classrooms each year to accommodate enrollment increases. This calculation is on the conservative side.

COSTS

Although classroom needs are not reduced to cost estimates in this article, at current construction prices, a classroom with all of the supplementary facilities including equipment and professional services, but exclusive of land, may be estimated to cost something like an average of $30,000 to $35,000, depending upon type of school and local conditions. Just prior to restrictions on critical building materials, public-school construction was running at an annual rate of about $1.3 billion. At this rate we were erecting only about 40,000 classrooms per year, or only about one-half enough to meet current needs and wipe out the backlog.

Estimated public elementary and secondary school classrooms needed, by years

School year	Estimated public elementary and secondary enrollment	Classrooms needed			
		To house increase	For normal replacements	To reduce backlog	Total annual need
1950–51	26,259,000	-------	-------	-------	-------
1951–52	26,907,000	24,000	18,000	36,000	78,000
1952–53	28,329,000	53,000	18,000	36,000	107,000
1953–54	29,610,000	47,000	18,000	36,000	101,000
1954–55	30,722,000	41,000	18,000	36,000	95,000
1955–56	31,484,000	28,000	18,000	36,000	82,000
1956–57	31,966,000	18,000	18,000	36,000	72,000
1957–58	32,251,000	11,000	18,000	36,000	65,000
7-year total	----------	222,000	126,000	252,000	600,000

Mr. PERKINS. Even conceding, which I know the members of this committee will not do, that the need in 1959 and 1960 as minimized by Mrs. Hobby is only 176,000 classrooms, that figure alone builds a good case for our education bill.

However, there is another factor that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] just pointed out, that none of these obsolete buildings to which Dr. Ray Hamon referred were taken into consideration in her account of the 176,000. I feel that the Secretary should make some explanation, since she had before her all of the data at her command when she appeared before the Senate committee only 3 or 4 weeks before she appeared before the House committee, and stated the need was 407,000 classrooms and then reduced her estimate to 176,000 in her statement to the House committee.

The witness before the Senate committee further states:

During the current school year, new classrooms being constructed sufficient to house approximately 1,800,000 children costs more than $2 billion. This is an alltime high in school construction. At this rate of construction, the Nation could keep abreast of the needs for more classrooms and for replacements.

Here is what they say about the need for school buildings over a long period:

There was a period of limited building during the depression when enrollment was declining.

I think everyone will agree with that statement.

That was followed by further limited building during war due to the shortage of materials and labor.

We can all agree with that statement.

The annual growth in the years ahead will decrease slightly if present enrollment continues. It will remain constant or increase somewhat if younger and older pupils in larger percentages enter into the remaining schools. The annual need for public school buildings—

This is the statement of Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Brownell before the Senate committee—

as we projected approximates 50,000 classrooms. The annual need is 50,000 classrooms. The projections do not include construction needs of higher education. Classrooms have to be replaced. Some are destroyed, some become unsuitable. This annual replacement need approximates 800,000 classrooms. Present construction will provide rooms to house a little more than the number of increased enrollment and from the annual replacement demands.

If present construction rate continues, the deficit would be reduced some each year, but in the meantime—

I am still quoting—

several million children are on double-session shifts in overcrowded classrooms in unsafe and otherwise undesirable school structures. It is imperative to wipe out the deficit and to make it possible to continue the present rate of construction. Approximately 300,000 classrooms are needed to eliminate overcrowded, unsafe, and unhealthy conditions—unhealthy classrooms.

That is the statement of Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Brownell before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this year.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Last year, as the gentleman knows, we had a subcommittee of our Committee on Education and Labor study this problem of school construction. We came up with a figure which was very close to the shortage estimated in the school facilities survey—that is 312,000 classrooms. Of course, as the gentleman has pointed out, Mrs. Hobby——

Mr. PERKINS. I listened to that figure before the Senate committee——

Mr. METCALF. Yes, and Mrs. Hobby told the House committee that the estimate last year was 407,000. However, I feel that in dwelling upon her figures we are losing sight, perhaps, of the significance of the 176,000 figure that she has brought in. Let us assume that her rate of obsolescence of 8,000 a year is correct. Let us assume that we are building schools now at the rate of 60,000 a year and can continue to build schools at the rate of 60,000 classrooms a year for the next 5 years. We will still come up with a classroom shortage of 176,000 classrooms and estimating 30 children to the classroom means about 5 million children are going to be housed in obsolete and antiquated classrooms which are firetraps and should be replaced by adequate housing. The 176,000 figure, then, admitting the figures of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, points up the real need for this program. We do not have to go to the 312,000 figure or the 407,000 figure or any of these other figures. In 5 years, we are going to have 5 million children unhoused even in spite of the efforts which are being made by the States, according to Mrs. Hobby's own figures. We have been saying all along that the Federal responsibility in this program is about $5 billion.

The report from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare says it cost $30,000 to $35,000 to build a classroom. Let us take the lowest figure, $30,000. Multiply that by 176,000 classrooms which she says are needed, we have something over $5 billion for the kind of program we have been insisting is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

Mr. McCONNELL. I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and also to congratulate him on his great interest in the school problem. I know he has been sincerely and earnestly interested in it for some time.

I would like to make this comment as we are discussing this problem. It seems to me we are getting lost in a maze of arguments over estimates. It depends a great deal on when those estimates are made and what new information is received; what we consider to be the number of schools to be replaced for one reason. Some may include one reason and not include another. Some may include more reasons than others, but I have a very definite impression from conversation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that there is no deliberate attempt in any respect to minimize the shortage of classrooms in the country. I think it is a genuine effort to determine the most accurate and up-to-the-minute figures. All of this boils down to the summary which our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], has made; that is, that we do have a problem, and it is a problem which concerns all of us, whether in the State or the Federal Government. There are differences of opinion, sometimes, as to the best way of handling it. Our real arguments are not in a desire to aid in the situation or to help out on the national situation, but as to the methods used. What is the best approach to this problem? The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], and myself may disagree in that respect, but I do not think there is any member of our committee on either side who does not have a sincere interest in the solution of this problem.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly wish to thank the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee for his observation. I agree with him that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] made a substantial contribution when he stated that the figure which Mrs. Hobby gave us in our committee well demonstrated the need for school construction legislation, and that it would require some $5 billion to construct these 176,000 classrooms.

I want to say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] that I feel we will resolve all of our differences in committee, toward that one purpose of getting out the best school construction bill possible. I feel confident, with the effort and time that all Members on both sides of the aisle in that committee are giving to this problem, that we are still going to write this legislation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would also like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for his very timely remarks, because we have been studying this matter for a good many months.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman agrees that we should wind up this study within the next few weeks and write this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I most certainly do, because no matter what bill we pass I think it is important to point out that the State legislatures which are now meeting may have to act on some of the legislation which will finally come out of this Congress. The longer we take the fewer States will be able to act upon that legislation, and the harder it will be for the children in those areas to get adequate care and relief.

I would also like to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], who I think is one of the leading students and proponents of this problem, that I agree with him that the problem is one of the different solutions which have been offered. I have been somewhat worried by the solution advanced by the administration, because in answer to a question which I put to Mrs. Hobby during her appearance before the committee she admitted that part of that solution would require that the title to these schools not finally rest in the school districts. I cannot help

but believe that any solution must provide that the title to the schools should rest in the school district itself.

Also, I cannot help but feel that while we have all generally agreed not only that the need exists and not only that it is necessary to find a solution, but recently in this committee we have seen signs of what I would call a delay program. We have seen a day or so ago a gentleman from the President's Committee on Education who spent all of his testimony trying to convince us that the States themselves could take care of this job.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky will remember Mr. Freeman's testimony. It was largely based upon that premise. I hope that Members of this House will not be distracted from the main job at hand simply because we know that the job is not being done adequately by the States and that there are States that could do a better job. We should not, therefore, abdicate our responsibility on a national level, because I think that all of us who have studied the problem recognize that we do have a distinct responsibility on the national level.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. In just a moment I will yield to the gentleman. I certainly want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California. I agree with the gentleman from California concerning his statement about Mr. Roger A. Freeman, research director for an education subcommittee of the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, when he told Congress every State could meet the problem of inadequate school facilities if the States really went to it.

I wondered who he was speaking for when he appeared before the committee yesterday. One of the witnesses, the gentleman representing the State chamber of commerce from West Virginia came in last week and stated that certain counties in West Virginia could build all the schools they needed. I picked out Mingo County, next to the district that I represent, and asked what about this county, which has floated all the bonds and built all the schools already that they possibly could build under the constitution and statutes of West Virginia. He said they did not need any more school buildings down there in Mingo County. So I dictated a note to the school superintendent. I got an immediate reply stating that the need was in excess of $2 million for new school buildings in Mingo County, West Virginia.

I certainly think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] yesterday asked an important question of one of the expert witnesses when he asked how many States would have to pass enabling legislation in order to take advantage of the administration's school construction program. This witness answered, "All 48 States." We particularly like title 3 of your bill, Mr. McCONNELL, but we would like to up that amount several hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter before the House at the present time. It certainly is an important issue and one with which our committee has been preoccupied for some time. As to the administration program, I would like to correct an impression which I got from the statement of the gentleman from California. If I am wrong, the gentleman will correct me. It is not my understanding that the administration program has as a part of its tenets that the title to schools cannot vest in a school district, and it is my understanding, and there was testimony before our committee to that effect, some State laws may well now be in the position that in order to make the school building authority constitutional under the constitution of the State itself, title must remain in the school authority and not go to the school system itself. However, I would certainly like to assure the gentleman and Members of the House my best understanding is that the administration favors a plan which would eventually provide title in the schools to be in the school district which occupies the schools. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and I say again, I compliment the gentleman for bringing this most important matter to the floor.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for his great interest in this problem. It is because of such interest that we intend to get legislation out of committee and not let it die.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to say to the gentleman from Arizona that he has correctly stated the problem. Of course, my interest is in seeing it tied down specifically in whatever legislation is passed so there cannot be any question and so that title does stay in the school district.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I want to return, if I may, to the main burden of the message of the gentleman from Kentucky, and I, too, want to compliment him and the others who have participated in this discussion. I was disturbed at the time Mrs. Hobby made her appearance before our committee and came up with these new figures because I felt that whether it was intentional or not it hurt the case which many have been trying to make out for a Federal-aid program.

As I recall it, the President in his message to the Congress on February 8 stated there was a classroom deficit or shortage of over 300,000 classrooms. Mrs. Hobby appeared a week later on February 16 before the Senate committee and stated the same figure. These figures were not something that those of us who advocate a Federal program had gone out and drummed up. They were the result of surveys made by the Department, so they were Department figures.

The thing that bothered me was that many times it has been said in discussions, and critics of some of us on this side of the aisle have stated, "The trouble with you Democrats or New Dealers is that you go out and find a problem, then you create an emergency and you rush in and say that we have to have a Federal program."

It seems to me—I may be wrong—that what was in someone's mind was they were going to show that the problem was exaggerated and that, therefore, we do not need a substantial Federal program, that the States can take care of it themselves. I think that was extremely unfair because, as I say, we took the figures that the President sent up, we took the figures that Mrs. Hobby gave the Senate. Those were the figures we were proceeding on. I was disturbed and upset when this 176,000 figure was pulled out of the hat because 90 percent of the legislation we enact is on a present-need basis; in other words, what is the need now? I do not think we can look on ahead and let someone project or guess what a shortage is going to be a few years hence, or say in 1959. I think if we are going to legislate we should legislate on what the shortage or deficit is today. In 1952 the figure determined by the Department, at that time in the hands of Democrats, as I recall it, was that the shortage was about 300,000. We were told, if my figures are correct, that in the two subsequent years up to last fall 108,000 classrooms were built. We were also told that due to increased school population and obsolescence we are falling behind about 50,000 a year. So, if my figures are correct, as of right now the shortage is, as the President said earlier and as Mrs. Hobby told the Senate, today, in April 1955, somewhere around 300,000 classrooms. I think all this talk about any other figure means nothing, even though I agree fully with the remarks of my colleague from Montana. I think that that ought to be the basis that we should work on from here on out, and I think this figure juggling has hurt the case of those who favor a Federal-aid program. Whether that was the intention or not I could not say, but I think it is time we stopped juggling figures and got down to the true facts of the situation.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for his great interest. The gentleman served as a member of a school board before coming to this body.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I wanted to see if we could not clarify the situation here. I am wondering if we are not getting mixed up in what we are talking about on estimates. I am under the impression—and correct me if I am wrong—that there was no dispute on the part of any of those who testified as to the present figure being around 300,000, or around that general level. But, the 170,000 and some-odd represents a lower estimate for, I think, the year 1960 or right in that period; is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. If we continue our present rate of construction until 1960, we will still be short 170,000 classrooms.

Mr. McCONNELL. I do not know of anybody disputing present figures.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman would agree with me that the present deficit is in the neighborhood of 300,000 classrooms?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is my understanding, and I do not know of anybody who disputes that fact at the moment. It is in the projection that we are getting a change in our figures.

Mr. UDALL. I think that figure was lost sight of in the discussion because of what the headline said, or the word that went out at the time of the testimony before the House, and I think it was unfortunate. This 176,000 figure was given as the need figure, and I thought that it tended to upset the picture that had been presented previously by the President or the Secretary.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think it was stated at the time that the rate of projection of classrooms which is occurring at an accelerated rate in the last year or so would cause a change in the estimates, and they would be revised downward as to a shortage up to the time of 1960 or something like that.

Mr. METCALF. I think the gentleman from Arizona has brought out an important point, and that is that the revision of these figures has caused confusion, 407,000 down to 312,000, down to 176,000. I was very glad to hear the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the former chairman of the committee, assure us that he believed that Mrs. Hobby did not mean to minimize the very great need. To my mind, the outstanding domestic crisis is the present classroom shortage. I had that same impression, that she did not mean to minimize the need. She pointed out that there was a real need. The trouble with this revision downward from 407,000 to 312,000 to 176,000 was brought out in the testimony before the committee in the last few days when members of taxpayers' associations and members of chambers of commerce from all over the United States, including one representative from my own State, came in and said, "Well, now, it is not such a problem. If we will just close our eyes and not pay any attention, it will go away." It will not go away. It is an important crisis. It is a need that we all agree is presently existing. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], who has introduced a bill, agrees that there is a need. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has a bill with which I concur, and agrees that there is a need. Other Members have different methods of approaching this need. Everybody agrees there is a need except those people who testified last week. Everybody says we must come to a solution of this particular problem, but we cannot get down in our committee to write the kind of a bill to solve it.

Mr. PERKINS. I feel that the new figures did not minimize the emergency one particle. As I understand it, the 176,000 figure from the evidence and from Mrs. Hobby's statement—and I questioned her closely—the long-range planning at the present rate of construction in 1959–60, did not include the classrooms that have to be replaced. That figure did not include classrooms that are destroyed or become unsuitable for use for other reasons. It did not include a number of sound factors that were thoroughly considered at a district level under phase 1 when we appropriated the money and distributed it among the States to make a thorough study of this problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE COTTON PROBLEM

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, cotton is a bulwark of the American cotton economy. Cotton has been aptly described as America's No. 1 agricultural enterprise, providing directly and indirectly a livelihood for 10 million people and producing an income, even in this year of reduced acreage, estimated at $2 billion.

Cotton is no longer a regional crop. It is now being produced in a belt extending from the Carolinas to California. The desert literally has been made to bloom with cotton.

Obviously, the entire country has a stake in cotton. Repercussions would be felt throughout the entire economy should cotton become depressed to a point where farmers could no longer earn a living producing it. It is vital that we have a healthy, efficient cotton industry, capable of meeting the demands for fiber from a rapidly growing population both at home and abroad.

Many vexing problems confront the cotton industry today. Basic decisions must be reached, and soon, on the future of cotton. The answers we arrive at must be the right ones. Otherwise, we very well could see this basic agricultural industry diminish in importance.

By August 1 of this year the carryover of cotton is expected to be slightly more than 10 million bales. Both domestic consumption and exports are below expectations. Cotton farmers are reducing acreage for the second year in a row as strenuous efforts are made to bring the cotton supply into line with demand.

The present unfavorable outlook for cotton has prompted many people in the industry to raise the question of whether we are pricing ourselves out of the market, both at home and abroad.

Can we continue to maintain a price level which enables competing products to win markets away from cotton and encourages foreign producers to grow cotton which replaces ours in world markets?

It is time that we took a hard, realistic look at this question.

No one denies that from the standpoint of price cotton today is at a disadvantage. Rayon undersells cotton. The synthetic fiber has the added attraction of being free of waste and being available 12 months of the year, not just during a short marketing season. The same textile spindle system can be used to process either rayon or cotton, and textile manufacturers, hardheaded businessmen, are going to choose the fiber which offers them the most return.

Cotton has lost the large market for tire cord for automobile tires. Once about 700,000 bales of cotton annually were used for this purpose. Rayon now has the bulk of the market. I am informed that price, and price alone, was the determining factor. Other examples of lost cotton markets, principally in industrial markets, could be cited as evidence of the influence of price.

Abroad, too, our cotton producers face many serious problems in this connection. Many serious students of the industry argue that one result of our price-support operations has been to encourage foreign production of cotton. The price we establish automatically becomes the world price. And today our price is so high that we encourage producers in foreign countries to raise cotton instead of alternate crops.

Foreign production today is about 5 million bales higher than the 1934–38 average. How much of this increase can be attributed to our support program I am unable to say. I do know this raises serious implications for the future and should be studied.

The cotton we produce in this country must find market outlets at home and abroad. Price seems to be one of the major factors in determining the level of consumption. I believe it would be advisable for the Committee on Agriculture to conduct a painstaking study in an effort to pinpoint as accurately as possible just what part price plays in the present cotton situation.

Such a study, conducted on a nonpartisan, factual, and objective basis, might reveal that in pegging the price of cotton at 90 percent of parity we are doing the farmer disservice. Perhaps we have lost sight of the fact that volume, as much as price, determines the farmer's income. Certainly we have not helped the farmer if we peg his price so high that he is rigidly restricted in the amount of cotton he can grow.

Such a study conceivably could reveal the level at which the price could be supported to insure the farmer an adequate return and yet move cotton into normal trade channels. We need to know, if such information is available, the potential market for cotton at various support levels. Certainly, we need information as to what support level would tend to discourage foreign production and further expansion of synthetics abroad.

With such statistical information at hand, I for one would feel much better qualified to legislate on this fundamental question.

Experience of producers of extra long staple cotton in Arizona and other Western States teaches us that price alone is no answer. For years these men have tried to put the production of this high-quality cotton on a stable basis.

The price support has fluctuated from about 65 cents to more than $1 per pound, and at almost all times the domestic price has been more than that for Egyptian and similar foreign-produced extra long staple cotton. The result was inevitable. American-produced cotton has piled up in warehouses and manufacturers have imported cotton to fill their needs.

The producers of this cotton came to Congress last year and had their support

price lowered to 75 percent of parity. They believe this new level will make their cotton competitive and they are optimistic that a promotion program which they, the producers, will finance will enable them in the future to expand production and enjoy a greater return. The long-staple situation is not completely analogous to upland cotton. But I mention this to show that at least some cotton producers are taking factors other than price into consideration in planning their future. Perhaps we can learn a lesson from the experience of these men.

I have been told that our cotton farmers need a production of 15 million bales annually to operate at peak efficiency. With that acreage they can use the latest labor-saving practices, improve efficiency, and reduce production costs.

I seriously doubt that without some change in our present program we can achieve that goal. On the contrary, I have been told that if the present emphasis on price, and price alone, is continued, we face a continuation of drastically restricted acreage and the distinct possibility of shrinking markets. We are in a vicious circle.

No one is advocating the complete abandonment of a price-support system for cotton. That would be disastrous to the farmers and to the country. What I am suggesting is that we carefully study the price situation to determine if we can arrive at a realistic support level that will give farmers more volume, and consequently more income and will move cotton into expanded markets at home and abroad.

I fully realize that price is not the only factor affecting consumption of cotton. The quality of the product, in relation to competing products, plays a major role as does the promotion effort made in behalf of cotton. I have heard it said that these three factors—price, quality, and promotion—make up a three-legged base for the cotton industry. All are equally important.

There is no question that from a quality standpoint cotton can hold its own. According to Dr. M. K. Horne, chief economist of the National Cotton Council, the effective strength of all cotton grown in this country has increased 13 percent in the last 15 years and our raw cotton is more even and better ginned. These are things which appeal to textile manufacturers and they have devised improved processing techniques to take full advantage of these improvements in the fiber. The effort to improve quality never ends and extends from the breeding of seed through the finishing and styling of cotton.

On the promotion front, cotton can hold its own. The industry-financed program as operated through the National Cotton Council has achieved notable success. Losses in industrial markets have been more than made up in apparel and household uses. In women's wear, for example, a market in which competition from synthetics is always present, consumption of cotton is at alltime peaks. Cotton is now a high-fashion product—it is worn almost the year around. Promotion has been a major factor in these encouraging results.

I have no fear that from a quality and promotion standpoint, the cotton produced in Arizona and all the other States of this cross-country Cotton Belt can hold its own. I would hate to see the tremendous progress in these two fields lost because the third leg—price—is out of proportion.

In the very near future the Congress will be considering H. R. 12 dealing with price supports and adjustment programs. I hope the members of this House will study all the facts with regard to the agricultural situation, especially as it applies to the basic commodities. I believe you will conclude, as I have, that extending rigid 90-percent price supports for a 3-year period may be doing the producers of these commodities a great disservice.

The Congress last year passed the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provides for some flexibility on a very gradual basis. I think we should give this law—which does not become operative until the 1955 harvest—an opportunity to work. I doubt if we contribute to the solution of the agriculture problem by extending for 3 years the identical law that has caused cotton and other basic commodities to get into real trouble. We must expand consumption, both at home and abroad, if we are to have a prosperous agricultural economy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY), for April 27 and 28, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. KEOGH) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts and to include an address.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. ENGLE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include a communication.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1628. An act to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 26, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

736. A letter from the Assistant Chief, Fiscal-Personnel Management Department, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the 19th Annual Report for the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the year 1954, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

737. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

738. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2535, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; without amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4904. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; with amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 5873. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5874. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5875. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5876. A bill to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5877. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5878. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 5879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 5880. A bill to provide the same basis for awarding pensions to widows and children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict as is now provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 5881. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5882. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damage to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5883. A bill to appropriate $810,000 for a citrus products laboratory at Winter Haven, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 5884. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5885. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5886. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5887. A bill to provide in certain cases that a person holding a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 who is placed in a lower grade shall not receive less pay as a result thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 5888. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5889. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5890. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 5891. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 5892. A bill to authorize officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia voluntarily to perform certain services on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty and to receive compensation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5893. A bill to amend paragraph I (a), part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 5894. A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5895. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHANSEN (by request):

H. R. 5896. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5897. A bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 5898. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5899. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5900. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 5901. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5902. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5903. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 5904. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 5905. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5906. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD: Memorial memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting a relocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway 2 to the National Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt House Joint Resolution No. 102, proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate moneys for market-reporting and crop-estimating work in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5907. A bill for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5909. A bill for the relief of Margaret Stiasny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Victor Francis Higgs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 5911. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Suyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5912. A bill for the relief of Lee Fay Fan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5913. A bill for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5914. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 5915. A bill for the relief of Joseph Miller (also known as Eugene J. Miller); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5916. A bill for the relief of Valeriano Melchiori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5917. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Byrne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 5918. A bill for the relief of the Erie Railroad Co. and Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co., et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 5919. A bill for the relief of Kan-Nien Chen, Lihwa Y. Chen, and Nancy Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of William George Courtney, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 5921. A bill for the relief of Julius Gyula Sternberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5922. A bill for the relief of Yuen Q. Low; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

220. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Petition presented by a group from Centralia, Wash., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

221. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Certified copy of resolution adopted unanimously by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, Wis., in opposition to any Federal legislation which would eliminate Federal regulation of natural-gas rates at the wellhead; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas B. Grayson, Toledo, Ohio, relating to petition for writ of mandamus, etc., to the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mayor Wagner Submits Board of Estimate Resolution on Natural Gas Regulation to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of his excellent discussion today of natural gas issues while a witness before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mayor Robert F. Wagner submitted to us copies of the resolution on this subject adopted by the board of estimate of the city of New York on April 21.

This resolution pointed out the effects upon New York City consumers of natural gas of the proposal to exempt producers of natural gas from Federal price regulation. The Supreme Court, as we know, settled a long-standing argument on this question last year by declaring that the Federal Power Commission has the power, and has always had the power under the Natural Gas Act, to regulate the price of gas moving in interstate commerce.

The oil and gas industry which controls so much of the natural gas now moving through the interstate pipelines is determined to overturn this decision. They are hoping to lull the consumer into sitting quietly by while this exemption legislation is pushed to enactment, and are using every means available to them, which are indeed tremendous, to accomplish that purpose.

The citizens of New York, however, are becoming aroused over this effort to undercut effective Federal regulation of natural-gas rates, and we all owe much to our mayor for spearheading the fight and helping to form a national committee of mayors opposing this legislation.

Following is the resolution adopted by the board of estimate on April 21, as presented this morning to the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

RESOLUTION ON EXEMPTION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM REGULATION BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Whereas the millions of consumers of gas in New York City are dependent upon a supply of natural gas for cooking, and many of them for other domestic uses, such as water heating, refrigeration, and space heating; and

Whereas the Transcontinental Pipe Line Corp. is the sole supplier of natural gas to the six local gas companies in the city of New York, and the Transcontinental Pipe Line Corp. is dependent in great measure upon a supply of gas purchased from so-called independent natural gas producers who have heretofore been free to sell their gas at prices affected by competition between natural gas pipeline companies seeking a supply of natural gas to satisfy their respective customer demands; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently determined in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *Wisconsin*, that independent producers are natural gas companies within the purview of the Natural Gas Act and are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission to prevent unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory prices for natural gas produced and sold in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the oil and gas interests in the United States have initiated a nationwide campaign through the press and other media for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission so that they may exact from those who supply gas for ultimate consumption in the homes of New York and elsewhere the highest price obtainable by the incidence of competition among the pipelines for their sources of supply; and

Whereas such competition and competitive prices will rapidly increase the cost of gas for domestic uses in New York and elsewhere and will inevtiably increase such cost as to restrict the nomal use of gas necessary for the health and comfort of residents of New York: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States be fully informed of the consequences of such legislation and that the corporation counsel be, and he is hereby, directed to use all proper means, and to make such representations to the Congress of the United States, to prevent the enactment of legislation exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report

of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 81st Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker	Martin.
3	Jan. 3	H. Res. 5, calling for adoption of an amendment to the rules of the House permitting chairmen of committees which have favorably reported legislation to move for the adoption of a resolution providing for the consideration of such legislation if the Committee on Rules has adversely reported or failed to report within 21 calendar days such a resolution for consideration. On adoption. (275–142).	Yea.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22, postponing consideration of a legislative budget until May 1, 1949. On adoption. (230–142.)	Nay.
5	Feb. 7	H. R. 2361, authorizing President to reorganize executive departments in line with Hoover Commission report. On passage. (356–9.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78, providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. On adoption. (353–29.)	Yea.
	Feb. 9	H. R. 1211 reciprocal trade agreements, repealing Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 and extending until June 12, 1951, the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements:	
7	Feb. 9	On recommittal with instructions to provide that Tariff Commission shall make findings as to limit to which modification in duties may be made without causing serious injury to domestic industry. (Rejected, 151–241.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 9	On passage. (319–69.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 15	H. Res. 99, providing rule for consideration of H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which waived point of order against provision for rehiring certain persons discharged from Reclamation Service because of incompetence. On adoption. (212–121.)	Nay.
11	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
12	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
14	Feb. 16	On recommittal with instructions to increase to $14,000,000 the amount for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment-service administration. (Rejected, 148–237.)	Yea.
15	Feb. 16	On passage. (367–19.)	Yea.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1661, providing for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports:	
17	Feb. 17	On recommittal with instructions to provide for a 1-year extension of the present controls with an amendment prohibiting control over commodities in surplus supply. (Rejected, 139–222.)	Yea.
18	Feb. 17	On passage. (259–139.)	Nay.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	Feb. 21	H. Res. 75, authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (331–4.)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 199, providing privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, and to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples:	
22	Mar. 1	On recommittal with instructions to report the bill forthwith, with amendment "except those in West Indies Archipelago." (Rejected, 39–336.)	Nay.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663, granting Central Intelligence Agency the authority necessary for .ts proper administration. On passage. (348–4.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3347, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
27	Mar. 14	On recommittal for further study (Rejected, 163–181.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 14	On passage. (Rejected, 166–176)	Nay.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1731, providing extension of Federal control over rents:	
30	Mar. 15	Amendment providing for decontrolling areas when requested by a resolution from the duly-elected local representatives of any State, county, or city. (Adopted, 227–188.)	Yea.
31	Mar. 15	Amendment deleting from the bill authority to recontrol hotels which have heretofore been decontrolled. (Adopted, 237–175.)	Yea.
32	Mar. 15	On recommittal with instructions to report bill back with a 90-day extension. (Rejected, 260–154.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 15	On passage. (260–153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148, providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States. (Adopted, 368–1.)	Yea.
	1949		
35	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 21	H. R. 1757, extending rent control in the District of Columbia. On passage. (247–117.)	Nay.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	Mar. 22	H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and Air Force of United States and other purposes. On passage. (395–4.)	Yea.
	Mar. 22	H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on attained age (First Rankin pension bill):	
40	Mar. 22	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 187–223.)	Yea.
41	Mar. 22	On move to strike out enacting clause. (Rejected, 120–291.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
44	Mar. 24	H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on attained age: On recommittal for further study. (Adopted, 208–207.)	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
47	Mar. 28	S. 135, authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District. (On passage, 223–130.)	Nay.
48	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950 and for other purposes:	
50	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment barring use of funds for acquiring additional land in connection with Garrison Dam in North Dakota. (Rejected, 194–203.)	Yea.
51	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment providing that of the amount appropriated $500,000 shall be used for the Red Run-Clinton River, Mich., project. (Adopted, 256–138.)	Yea.
52	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment changing amount from $57,000,000 to $63,000,000. (Adopted, 277–177.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
53	Mar. 29	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 177–218.)	Nay.
54	Mar. 29	On passage. (216–180)	Yea.
		H. R. 1731, extending rent control:	
55	Mar. 29	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 263–143.)	Nay.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
58	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
59	Mar. 31	H. Res. 168, providing for consideration of H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine. (Adopted 383–9.)	Yea.
60	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine:	
62	Apr. 1	On adoption of amendment inserting provisions of H. R. 3, permitting shipment of oleo across State lines and removing all taxes upon its sale. (Adopted, 242–137.)	Nay.
63	Apr. 1	On passage. (287–89)	Yea.
		H. R. 1823, establishing a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve:	
64	Apr. 4	On adoption of Marcantonio antisegregation amendment. (Adopted, 193–153.)	Yea.
65	Apr. 4	H. R. 3830, amending the China Aid Act of 1948 and authorizing reappropriation of $54,000,000 of funds already appropriated but not obligated and an interim advance up to $50,000,000 of such funds by the RFC pending action on the appropriation bill. (Passed, 279–70.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4016, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
66	Apr. 7	On adoption of H. Res. 180, making in order consideration of H. R. 4016 and waiving of points of order that might be raised. (Adopted, 246–137.)	Nay.
67	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
68	Apr. 7	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 145–212.)	Yea.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4046, second deficiency appropriation, appropriating $671,047.84 to supply general deficiencies in various branches of Government departments:	
70	Apr. 8	On recommittal with instructions to provide funds for War Claims Commission and relief of American citizen internees and prisoners of war of the Japanese. (Rejected, 149–190.)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
73	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
74	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
75	Apr. 12	H. R. 3748, amending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and continuing the European recovery program until June 1950. (Passed, 354-49.)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
78	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
	Apr. 26	H. R. 2032, repealing the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and reenacting the National Labor Relations Act of 1935:	
79	Apr. 26	On adoption of H. Res. 191, providing for 8 hours of general debate and waiving points of order. (Adopted, 369-6.)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
82	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 3	On adoption of amendment substituting provisions of H. R. 4290 (Wood bill), as amended, for H. R. 2032. (Adopted, 217-203.)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 4	H. R. 2032. On recommittal. (Recommitted, 212-209.)	Nay.
87	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2989, creating Virgin Islands Corporation under Federal law to succeed the Virgin Islands Company. (Passed, 273-62.)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2203, providing for a decennial census of housing. (Passed, 223-51.)	Yea.
90	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4392, authorizing payment of not to exceed $16,000,000 for compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by U. S. Armed Forces:	
91	May 10	On adoption of amendment to prevent payment of interest on Swiss war-damage claims. (Rejected,172-191.)	Yea.
92	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 11	H. R. 2682, amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act by providing acquisition of storage facilities and providing exchange of surplus United States agricultural commodities for stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad. (Passed, 326-52.)	Nay.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
96	May 16	On adoption of conference report. (292-17)	Yea.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	May 17	H. Res. 190, providing for consideration of H. R. 195 to assist States in collecting sales and use tax on cigarettes. (Adopted, (322-24.)	Yea.
99	May 18	H. R. 1036, paying $8,437.98 to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps which were completely destroyed by fire. On passage notwithstanding President's veto. (Passed, 318-48.)	Yea.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
102	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
103	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4591, providing increased pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the uniformed services:	
104	May 24	On recommittal for further study. (227-163)	Nay.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for District of Columbia:	
105	May 26	On adoption of conference report. (184-152.)	Yea.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 1	H. R. 4617, providing pensions for veterans without regard to service-connected injuries or unemployability at attained age.(Second Rankin pension bill.) (Passed, 365-27.)	Yea.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4963, providing for appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges:	
109	June 16	On recommittal with instructions to include language barring appointment of more than ⅔ of new appointments from same political party. (Defeated, 195-135.)	Yea.
110	June 21	H. R. 4332, amending the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to permit national and State banks to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed, 293-55.)	Yea.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
114	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4009, the Housing Act of 1949:	
117	June 29	On amendment, deleting title II, providing for public housing. (Rejected, 204-209.)	Yea.
118	June 29	On amendment, barring payment of salary to any employees who fail to sign an affidavit stating they are not members of a subversive party and do not belong to an organization that may strike against the Government of the United States. (Adopted, 283-129.)	Yea.
119	June 29	On recommittal with instructions to report revised bill eliminating public housing:	
120	June 29	H. R. 4009—Continued On passage. (228-185)	Yea.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission appointed by Secretary of State and providing for settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments:	
122	July 6	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 151-177.)	Yea.
123	July 6	H. Res. 277, providing for consideration of S. 1008, legalizing basing-point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws. (Adopted, 305-22.)	Yea.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 937, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of four claims against the United States in behalf of foreign claimants:	
125	July 11	On amendment deleting from the bill 1 claim amounting to $3,024.38. (Adopted, 167-142.)	Yea.
126	July 13	H. R. 2960, amending the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones. (Passed, 282-109.)	Nay.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
	July 21	H. R. 5345, the Agricultural Act of 1949:	
132		On amendment, extending for 1 year the present farm program. (Adopted 239-170.)	Yea.
133	July 21	On passage. (383-25.)	Yea.
134	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 102-243.)	Nay.
135	July 25	On motion that Journal as read stand approved and motion moving the previous question. (Previous question ordered, 259-88.)	Yea.
136	July 25	On motion approving Journal of last day's proceedings. (Adopted, 285-54.)	Yea.
137	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 113-243.)	Nay.
138	July 25	On ordering previous question, making in order rule for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 262-100.)	Yea.
139	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 110-252)	Nay.
140	July 25	H. Res. 276, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 265-100.)	Yea.
141	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3199, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers:	
143	July 26	On recommittal. (Rejected, 123-267.)	Nay.
144	July 26	On passage. (273-116.)	Yea.
		S. 1184, encouraging private construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to military installations:	
145	July 27	On recommital of conference report. (Rejected, 52-289.)	Not voting.
146	July 27	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3282, repealing Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin:	
148	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (Defeated, 131-168.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5602, authorizing an allocation of $4,000,000 of China's ECA funds for relief of Chinese students:	
149	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (254-46.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5598, increasing compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, providing minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increasing certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizing requirement for dependency allowances, and redefining the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct":	
150	Aug. 2	On suspension of rules and passage. (354-0.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 2	H. R. 5632, military reorganization and unification bill. On adoption of conference report. (356-7.)	Yea.
152	Aug. 2	H. Res. 289, providing for consideration of H. R. 29, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide parity for tung nuts and honey. (Adopted, 335-21.)	Yea.
153	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
157	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
158	Aug. 4	H. Res. 310, providing for consideration of, and 3 hours of debate on, H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938. (Adopted, 233-113.)	Yea.
159	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
160	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Absent.
162	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 1758, clarifying the Natural Gas Act to exempt independent producers and gatherers from regulation by Federal Power Commission:	
163	Aug. 5	On recommittal. (Rejected, 124-187)	NVA.
164	Aug. 5	On passage. (183-131)	NVF.
165	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 183, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3910, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by expanding its coverage and increasing the minimum wage:	
166	Aug. 8	On adoption of committee amendment making rule applicable to H. R. 5856, a modified version of H. R. 3910, and ruling out consideration of H R. 3910. (Adopted, 249-124.)	Nay.
167	Aug. 8	On adoption of H. Res. 183, as amended. (351-17.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, making appropriation for foreign aid for fiscal year 1950:	
170	Aug. 9	On motion to instruct the conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment providing for continuation of watchdog committee. (Passed, 210–164.)	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5856, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act:	
172	Aug. 10	On adoption of amendment, substituting the provisions of H. R. 5894, as amended, for the text of H. R. 5856. (Adopted, 225–181.)	Yea.
172	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 11	H. R. 5856, providing for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Passed, 361–35.)	Yea.
175	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
176	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5526, authorizing the President to provide for the performance of certain executive functions by other officers of the Government:	
178	Aug. 12	On amendment limiting authority to administrative duties. (Rejected, 114–162.)	Yea.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. J. Res. 339, extending indefinitely the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills.	
180	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and adoption (176–145.) (⅔ majority vote required.)	Nay.
		H. R. 2734, amending the Clayton Act, relative to acquisition by one commercial corporation of the assets of another corporation:	
181	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and passage. (223–92)	Yea.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
185	Aug. 17	H. J. Res. 339, extending until Sept. 15 the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills. (Adopted, 213–114.)	Yea.
186	Aug. 17	H. Res. 327, providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations. (Adopted, 275–47.)	Yea.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, promoting the foreign policy and providing for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations:	
188	Aug. 18	On adoption of amendment to reduce the amount provided for rearming the North Atlantic countries from $1,160,990,000 to $580,495,000. (209–151.)	Yea.
189	Aug. 18	On passage. (238–122)	Yea.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
191	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
	Aug. 19	H. R. 6008, making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
192	Aug. 19	On amendment deleting $3,000,000 for expenses of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. Adopted. (150–129.)	NVF.
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6070 to amend the National Housing Act:	
197	Aug. 24	Motion to adjourn. (Adopted, 186–132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 25	H. Res. 342, providing that motions to suspend the rules may be in order on Aug. 25, 1949. (Adopted, 270–1.)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
202	Sept. 27	H. R. 4495, providing additional benefits for certain postal-service employees with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion. (Passed, 332–2.)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, providing military assistance to foreign nations:	
204	Sept. 28	On recommittal of conference report. (Rejected, 113–213.)	Yea.
	1949	H. R. 5895—Continued	
205	Sept. 28	On adoption of conference report. (224–109)	Yea.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, foreign-aid appropriations for 1950:	
207	Sept. 29	On amendment providing that the Administrator of ECA be authorized to issue $150,000,000 of notes for purchase by Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of providing loans. (Passed, 177–124.)	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5903, amending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, to extend its duration and to provide double amount Federal financial aid for assistance in the construction of hospitals:	
209	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (236–43)	Yea.
		H. R. 5739, providing for advance planning of public works by providing for Federal loans to States to aid in surveys and plans for State and municipal public works:	
210	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (210–69)	Yea.
211	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, the Army civil-functions appropriation bill:	
212	Oct. 3	On motion to instruct conferees to insist on disagreement to an allocation of any funds for flood control for Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River. (Rejected, 101–153.)	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, the Social Security Act, under closed rule prohibiting amendments:	
214	Oct. 4	On adoption of motion ordering previous question on resolution. (175–154.)	Nay.
215	Oct. 4	On adoption of resolution. (189–135)	Nay.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act:	
217	Oct. 5	On recommittal with instructions to report provisions of bill H. R. 6297. (Rejected, 112–232.)	Yea.
218	Oct. 5	On passage. (333–14)	Yea.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for 1950:	
219	Oct. 6	On adoption of conference report. (269–18)	Yea.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
221	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
222	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendments providing for 48 air groups instead of 58 air groups as passed by the House. (Adopted, 305–1.)	Yea.
223	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
224	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendment rescinding $275,000,000 previously approved by Congress for stock-piling strategic materials and banning long-range contracts for the purchase of critical or strategic materials abroad. (Adopted, 305–0.)	Yea.
225	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6008, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1950:	
227	Oct. 11	On recommital of conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to amendment relative to $3,000,000 for National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. (Rejected, 158–165.)	Yea.
		H. R. 1370, authorizing the appointment of 3 additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribing the qualifications of appointees:	
288	Oct. 13	On recommital. (Rejected, 30–286)	Yea.
		H. Res. 390, for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, to extend certain provisions of the National Housing Act under a rule prohibiting amendments:	
229	Oct. 13	On adoption. (290–34)	Nay.
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1008, legalizing basing-point system when not in conflict with antitrust laws:	
231	Oct. 14	On recommital to conference. (Rejected, 138–178)	Nay.
232	Oct. 14	On adoption of conference report. (200–104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2105, authorizing an appropriation of $240,000,000 to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
234	Oct. 17	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Rejected, 176–118.) (⅔ majority required.)	Yea.
235	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.

Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the domestic sugar producers of this country are the victims of an extremely unfair set of circumstances. Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds and is consuming more sugar each year. And yet our domestic sugar producers are denied the right to grow and sell one single pound of this increased consumption. I have introduced a bill which will correct this situation.

Under the 1948 Sugar Act, domestic sugar producers can market no more than 2,300,000 tons in 1 year, while Cuba was given the right to market 95 percent of the amount by which the war-damaged Philippine industry would fall short of its quota while rebuilding. At the same time, Cuba continued to share with domestic areas in making up deficits. Thus Cuba has marketed some 5,250,000 extra tons of sugar in the United States, almost 30 percent more than its basic quota.

The domestic producers relinquished their own just rights to give Cuba an opportunity to reduce production. What

has happened? Cuba not only did not reduce but increased production, and in 1952 it produced 8 million tons, one-third more than could be marketed anywhere in the world.

Here at home, due to improved technology and better farming methods, sugar beet tonnage yield per acre has increased 20 percent since 1948. Last year sugar beet acreage was 10 percent less than before the first Sugar Act went into effect, but production was 14 percent more. The fixed quota of 2,300,000 tons is forcing further acreage cuts of 10 to 15 percent by established growers. Hardly any other farmer will be permitted to plant sugarbeets at all, and many of the latter are war veterans on newly opened reclamation projects of the West, where sugarbeets are vitally needed in the crop rotation.

If we now increase the 1955 marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane areas, as I have proposed, we do no more than to restore a just and basic right to a domestic farmer, that of sharing in the economic growth of his own country. Right now, in spite of the acreage cuts, production is exceeding marketing quotas, although the markets exist. The prime beneficiary, Cuba, has had ample opportunity to comply with the spirit of the 1948 Sugar Act by reducing production from wartime levels. In contravention of this spirit, Cuba has increased production. We now feel that the right to share in our own growth, which we temporarily relinquished, should be restored to our growers.

Passage of this bill will not be a repudiation of the historic rights of Cuba to market sugar in this country. It will only restore what has been the historic right of the American producer.

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education.

This bill is identical to the bills already introduced by the gentlemen from Louisiana and California [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. JACKSON].

Many parents have told me that they are finding it extremely difficult to afford higher educational opportunities for their children.

Educators have informed me that most of our colleges and universities have reached the limit of their scholarship possibilities.

There is no more valuable asset of this Nation than the development of the minds and characters of our young people.

This is the best proposal that I have seen because it will insure freedom of choice with respect to educational opportunities and will preserve private initiative and family interests in the educational future of our young people.

The Andrada Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1955, a new statue was dedicated in Bryant Park on the Avenue of Americas in New York City. The statute of José Bonifacio de Andrada e Silva, patriarch of the independence of Brazil, took its place with two other great South American liberators as a visible symbol of good will toward our South American neighbors.

Presiding at the dedication was the Honorable Robert Moses, commissioner of parks for the city of New York. The invocation was given by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. The presentation and unveiling of the statute were made by His Excellency, Joao Carlos Muniz, Ambassador of the United States of Brazil to the United States of America. The acceptance of the statute was made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York. Also at the dedication were the Honorable Hulan E. Jack, borough president of Manhattan; the Honorable Edward J. Sparks, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs of the United States of America; and Consul General Hugo Gouthier, of the Brazilian consular office in New York City.

I am pleased to direct the following words regarding this dedication to the attention of our colleagues:

THE ANDRADA STATUE

The dedication today of the statue of José Bonifacio de Andrada e Silva, patriarch of the independence of Brazil, marks a third significant addition to the Avenue of the Americas since its renaming 15 years ago as a symbol of hemisphere solidarity. The Andrada statue, located in Bryant Park at 42d Street, joins with Bolívar and San Martín, great South American liberators whose statues were dedicated in 1951 at the north end of the avenue in Central Park.

Andrada was as much dedicated to the freedom of the individual and the abolition of slavery as he was to the independence of Brazil as a state. It is fitting that a memorial to Andrada, a professor and scientist, a scholar and statesman, should be located near New York's great central public library.

The statue is by Brazilian sculptor José Otavio Correia Lima, the winning design in a competition. The idea was conceived by former Consul General de Berenguer-César, authorized by Foreign Minister João Neves da Fontoura and followed through to reality by Brazil's present Consul General Hugo Gouthier. The $60,000 contribution for the plaza and base was made by the Government of Brazil to the Avenue of the Americas Association and transferred to the department of parks.

The 9-foot 2-ton bronze statue is located at the northwest corner of Bryant Park in an open plaza facing the avenue. The 2,000-square-foot plaza rising three steps above the surrounding sidewalk, is paved in bluestone flagging and granite block in a fish-scale pattern. The statue stands on a 9-foot-high granite base. Steps at the east of the plaza give direct access to Bryant Park.

The people of the city of New York are indebted to the United States of Brazil for this magnificent gift and it is their hope that it will serve as inspiration for continued cooperation between North America and South America. The park department will consider it a privilege to protect and maintain this distinguished memorial.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that it would have been more accurately labeled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

The gentleman from southern California, and the rest of the critics of upper Colorado River development, have made a great to-do about the so-called hidden interest in the irrigation features of the project. Because the irrigation features are non-interest-bearing—as have been, and are, all irrigation projects under reclamation law for more than 50 years—there has been a ridiculous effort to show that the so-called hidden interest will be a burden on the taxpayers of each of our 48 States.

There is no hidden interest in the Colorado River storage project.

Rather, there is a very definite hidden profit, which will benefit all the taxpayers of these United States.

A study has been made of reclamation projects over the years. To the year 1953, the new taxes returned by the new wealth created by these projects totaled 25 percent more than the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed since the beginning of the reclamation program in 1902.

Now this analysis included all reclamation projects, many of which were still in the construction stage and had not yet begun to produce and pay out. A study of 15 typical projects which are in full production disclosed that new tax revenues attributable directly to them not only exceeded in amount the so-called hidden interest, but actually totaled 4½ times the total construction cost of the projects.

This additional tax revenue goes directly into the United States Treasury, for the relief of all taxpayers. It is entirely a net benefit to the public, as it is not counted in any way toward repayment of project costs.

I hope the people who have been figuring so hard to show what the cost of the Colorado project will be to each of the States will now do a little more figuring to see what the net gain in tax relief will be to each State.

It is time we forget about mythical bananas and fanciful applesauce, and get down to some good, solid facts on the subject of the Colorado River storage project.

Seventh Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the thoughtful attention of Members and citizens, the address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, delivered last night at the second national dinner of the American-Israel Society at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D. C.

The occasion was held on the eve of Israel Independence Day and marked the observance of the seventh anniversary of Israel's independence, which falls on this date, April 27. Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, president of the American-Israel Society, was master of ceremonies and introduced Speaker MARTIN.

His address bespeaks the friendly interest of Americans in the State of Israel and its people. He spoke as follows:

Governor McKeldin, Mr. Ambassador, Dean Pike, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to appear before you tonight, for this is an unusually important occasion, the eve of the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

Four years ago, on July 19, 1951, I appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of my bill, H. R. 3483, to provide a grant of $150 million to the State of Israel.

You will bear with me, I know, if I recall part of what I said to the committee at that time:

"The devotion of the people of Israel to liberty is one of the bright spots in the Old World today. We have seen how the gallant young people of that country bravely fought through a war of independence, a struggle which stirred the American people, for it recalled the epic chapters of our own history."

At that time, I also said:

"The Israelis have not relaxed their vigilance. They live in a tense and troubled area; they know that they are on the frontier of danger. They are prepared for any eventuality. The young army of Israel, with more than 200,000 men and women, is one of the strongest forces for the survival of freedom in the Near East."

In concluding my statement before the House committee, I said:

"The expanding industrial plant in Israel, steadily growing in quantity and diversity of output, can make that country the industrial workshop of the Near East. By word and by deed, the young State of Israel has demonstrated its willingness to stand firmly and resolutely against the forces of tyranny and despotism. It can be an outpost of American strength and influence in the Middle East. There is no doubt in my mind that to help Israel is to make America more secure."

Nothing has happened since then to alter my estimate of the importance of the State of Israel to the United States of America and to the entire free world. On the contrary, much that has taken place since has not only confirmed my conviction but deepened it.

The development of the agriculture and the industry of Israel has exceeded my fondest expectations. The devotion of the people of Israel to democratic institutions and to the protections of the rights of her citizens without regard to race, color, or creed has been steadfast.

But what seems to me to be equally remarkable is that the people of Israel, pressed on every side by economic stress and constant dangers, have found time and energy to evolve a flourishing and, in some respects, an original culture.

It is true that Israel has the resources of an ancient Hebrew tradition and is the inheritor of the experience of the Jews in more than threescore countries.

Yet it is well-nigh amazing that, in the midst of irrigating the desert, draining the swamps, building new cities, and establishing factories, the Israelis still have a flood of energy to release in a surge of painting, sculpture, music, literature, drama, and all the sciences, including archeology, the science that gives us insight into our own origins.

Many of you may have attended the Land of the Bible exhibition when it came to the Smithsonian Institution not long ago here in Washington, and I know you were as thrilled as I was by the many reminders of the sources of our religions.

The Israel Symphony Orchestra has visited Washington and toured the major cities of our country. It has been acclaimed widely by our critics. Soon Americans will have an opportunity to see the Inbal dancers. Not long ago an exhibit of paintings by Israeli artists was shown in leading museums of art across our country. At least one Israeli play has been produced in English on Broadway.

Unfortunately, not all Americans can read Hebrew or, as I believe it is now called in Israel, Ivreet. For that reason, I cannot speak with personal knowledge of the literature of Israel. Yet, when I visited the bookshops of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa 3 years ago, the shelves were full. Hundreds of American classics, translated into Hebrew, were there—books by Walt Whitman, James Melville, Mark Twain, and many others. Lately, I am told, a Hebrew edition of the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin has been having a lively sale.

Soon, I predict, translation of original works by Israeli authors into English will become a commonplace. I believe the little State of Israel has so much to say that its mark will be as great in modern as it was in ancient times.

It is admiration for this creative spirit of the people of Israel that has brought us together—Americans of all faiths—to dine on the eve of Israel's Independence Day. As an American, I am proud to pay my tribute. It is one of the privileges of being an American. In fact, encouragement of other peoples and nations with similar ideals and aspirations is the highest expression of loyalty to ourselves.

The people of Israel, in the first 7 years of the existence of their state, have set an example of industry, energy, devotion to the principles of genuine democracy, and creative effort from which any nation in the world could take inspiration.

True, there have been many incidents of stress and strain. However, I have learned over a lifetime in public affairs that one should not judge a man or a nation by what is exceptional, nor what happens under abnormal conditions.

The abnormal condition that makes the achievements of the people of Israel almost unbelievable is absence of peace in the Middle East. This state of uneasy armistice is a heavy burden. It is damaging not only to Israel but to the surrounding Arab States.

The Middle East is one of the most underdeveloped areas in the world, but it has enormous resources as a region. These resources, without genuine peace, can be developed only in a patchwork fashion. With peace, they can be developed on a wide scale.

Arid acres can be blessed with the fertilizing gift of water—water now running to waste in flash floods or evaporating on salt-hard ground. The ribs of mountains can be fleshed with forests as in the old days. Empty lands can provide livelihood and homes for the hungry and the destitute. The Middle East has been the place of miracles. It can be so again.

This may sound like a dream, but it is a dream based on the solid, hard-eyed estimates of engineers, geologists, and agronomists. It is a dream that has been realized to an unexpected extent already in Israel. It is a dream that can become reality throughout the whole region.

Israel is showing the way. This young nation has demonstrated its capacity to survive. It has had help from individual American citizens and from the Government of the United States. The promise that we would help to establish the Jewish State was made by a Republican Congress; and the fulfillment of that promise, in a Democrat Congress, was supported by our party at every crucial moment over the years.

If ever the Congress of the United States truly reflected the wish of the American people, it has done so in keeping its pledge to the people of Israel. The people of the United States have had the satisfaction of playing a large part in bringing comfort and peace to those once living in the displaced persons camps of Europe—in bringing them to our shores. The people of Israel, with utter selflessness, have kept open their doors for all who knocked upon them. No greater act of sacrifice and love has ever been recorded in the history of the world.

The expressions of the creative spirit that we honor here tonight have come not only from the pioneers but also from the new immigrants from the oriental lands. Just as the United States has built its own culture from the resources of many lands, so it is in Israel. The result is good. Israelis have a right to be proud. We should be thankful for the opportunity we have had to help.

Israel has proved itself. In its reception of the stateless, it has put the world in its debt. In its initiative and determination, it has shown that it has the ability to be not only a stable entity but a nation which has much to give to the society of free nations.

Seven short years after the establishment of the State of Israel, it is hard to recall the dark events before its birth and the misery to which it gave relief. What American would tolerate a return to that darkness?

One thing is certain: The State of Israel has proved its permanence and its value. I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of the Congress of the United States, in my opinion, is determined to see to it that the people of Israel shall have the opportunity to build their homes and evolve their culture in peace and safety.

In saying this, I do not mean that I have conducted any poll to ascertain sentiment. But I have been in Washington long enough to sense the sentiments of my colleagues at the Capitol. The support of the ideals that gave birth to the State of Israel by the people of the United States is rooted in our history.

Now, as much and perhaps more than at any other time, Israel should be a concern

of all Americans. On other occasions before and since the statement I made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have stressed the value to the United States of having in the Middle East a vigorous, genuine democracy linked by spiritual heritage to us and to the freedoms for which we stand.

This struggle to maintain a free world is not an easy one. Great forces seek to destroy freedom and progress. In this struggle, we must all work together for a common cause. And it is gratifying to know that in this fight, Israel and the United States will be on the side of freedom.

Within the last few days, Communist threats have been made against Israel, voiced by those who have been holding American airmen in illegal imprisonment. These are threats of further restriction or even dismemberment of Israel's territories. It is clear that the Communist menace is worldwide. They would destroy the free countries one by one.

Israel faces the same threat as we do. We shall not yield in the face of this threat and neither will Israel. We have the same common foe, and we will be united in our defense against world communism.

Peace is the great need of the hour. Peace that will permit nations to consolidate economic gains and achieve greater spiritual and material blessings for all. Peace and a better understanding among the different peoples of the world will banish the black clouds of doubt and fear, and usher in a golden era of progress.

We, in the United States, have no malice toward any people. We wish all, in their own way, to have the kind of life they desire. At the moment, we are spending billions upon billions for peace. We know that only the strong can be free, and only the free can be strong. And it is only a strong free world that can preserve the freedoms gained through hundreds of years of sacrifice.

Here tonight, I emphasize the common tradition of the United States and Israel again. Material strength is vitally important in preventing the spread of Communist aggression. Also important is spiritual strength. It is upon mutual understanding of ways of living, upon mutual standards, upon mutual modes of thought, upon mutual aspirations, that mutual good faith must rest.

That good faith exists between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Israel. I congratulate Governor McKeldin, the founders, sponsors, and members of the American-Israel Society upon their efforts to deepen and strengthen it, here and in Israel.

A Tribute to Mrs. Sarah Lee Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure and pride in paying tribute to Mrs. Sarah Lee Fleming, of 216 Dwight Street, New Haven, Conn., who was recently the recipient of the sojourner truth scroll, an annual award for meritorious community achievement sponsored by the New Haven chapter of the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club.

Mrs. Fleming is the founder of the Phyllis Wheatley Home for Girls. It was while she was a member of the Twentieth Century Club that she conceived the idea for a place of supervised residence for colored stranger girls those either employed or looking for a job in New Haven. To promote the enterprise she organized the Women's Civic League in 1929 and spread the idea everywhere in spite of the apathy and opposition it encountered. To arouse interest among such girls in a home where they might go for a chat and tea, Mrs. Fleming opened her own home monthly for Phyllis Wheatley days.

Various expedients were used to obtain support and contributions and eventually the league took over the annual charity ball of the Twentieth Century Club, and renamed it the Benefit Follies. Lively programs, appealing to the younger set, made money for it and finally in 1936, a neighboring building seized by the city for taxes and repaired by national relief funds, was vacated and Mrs. Fleming, alert to the chance, obtained its grant from the city.

This is only one of her many civic and community achievements. In 1952, she was elected Connecticut Mother of the Year. Mrs. Fleming was born in Charleston, S. C., raised in Brooklyn, N. Y., and has resided in New Haven for the past 40 years. She is the wife of Dr. Richard S. Fleming, prominent New Haven dentist. They have a son, Dr. Harold Fleming, also a dentist, with a masters degree from the University of Pennsylvania, and a graduate of Harvard Dental School. Dr. Harold Fleming was the winner of a $3,000 fellowship given by the United States Public Health Service for studies in cancer, heart, mental diseases, and arthritis and metabolic ailments caused by micro-organisms and various dental disorders. The Flemings also have a daughter, Dorothy, who is a social worker and is prominent in working on problems of teenage groups.

Mrs. Fleming numbers among her many personal friends, John Lodge, former Governor of Connecticut, and former Mayor William C. Celentano, whom she has known since he was a small boy in the Dwight Street neighborhood.

A founder of the Connecticut State Union of Women's Clubs and the Women's Civic League, Mrs. Fleming is still actively engaged in her many civic undertakings. More than 400 people watched the recent presentation of the Sojourner Truth Scroll which reads:

> In recognition of her meritorious community service, her deep concern for and participation in all activities advancing the status of women, her sincere effort and acceptance of responsibility to advance the brotherhood of man.

Reclamation: The Nation's Wisest Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there are before the American people at this time a great number of impassioned reports, pleas, speeches, and articles which have been sired by both the proponents and opponents of reclamation. Some of these have been helpful in gaining a better understanding of the reclamation program. Many have been completely the opposite—inspired by a small group who are waging a vigorous campaign against the program. I do not propose to waste time in answering those few who have evidenced deliberate intent to misinform and misrepresent. If the value of reclamation to a sound national economy is known and understood, then I have no fear of the program being hurt by a few misrepresentations. My concern then is to produce proof as to the value of irrigation to the West and to the Nation. If the Nation is to continue to support an expanding economy and become economically stronger then the Nation must develop its land and water resources.

Agriculture is most important in my home State of California. And, considering American eating habits, California agriculture is mighty important to the entire Nation. You use California fruits, nuts, vegetables, and agricultural produce to balance your diets and to give you a seemingly endless variety of delightful health-giving foods. Most of this bounty comes exclusively from irrigation and virtually all future expansion must come from extending irrigation.

The value of California crop production when measured in the more usual monetary terms rounds out at a staggering billion and a half dollars annually.

History is full of stories of the fabulous California gold rush beginning with the discovery of gold in 1848. Perhaps no single event had a more profound effect in the settlement of the West; yet all of the gold produced during the first 10 fabulous years of that epic amounts to only one-third of the present annual value of crops produced in the State. Two years of California crops exceed the total of all gold produced in California since 1848. Gold is important to the economy of California, the West, and the Nation as are the products of the other great industries of my State. But none is more important than our agriculture. Every schoolchild learns of the gold-rush days but few of us take notice of the continuing bounty and wealth created through irrigation agriculture.

Since the days of the sourdoughs of 1849, the population of California has increased to almost 12 million persons. Retail sales total almost $15 billion each year, an amount equal to $1,295 for each man, woman, and child. This is $200 per person or from $600 to $800 more per family than the average per capita retail sales in the whole United States. Federal taxes paid in California last year total over $5 billion and State taxes exceed $1 billion. Total taxes paid will equal about $550 per person. The high level of retail trade and taxes paid in California cannot of course be credited to irrigation alone. However, the phenomenal growth and stability of the State could not have been attained without irrigation nor may we expect further expansion without additions to irrigation. This is important to the entire

Nation. If you question it, consider that California retail sales represent an all-American market equal to or greater than the value of all United States exports.

Now as to Federal reclamation we may take pride in the wisdom of our predecessors in Congress who enacted the original reclamation law more than 50 years ago, and pride too in the accomplishments of the program they set in motion which has made possible many of the flourishing and prosperous valleys and cities of the West as we know them today instead of the endless desert of jackrabbits and sagebrush.

Some of the uninformed critics of the Federal reclamation program would have us believe that projects such as the Salt River project in Arizona, the Yuma project in Arizona and California, the Minidoka project in Idaho, the Yakima project in Washington, the North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska, and the other reclamation projects are on the verge of bankruptcy, but let us look at the record.

The Federal Government has spent on the Salt River project about $24.6 million for plant, property, and equipment in development of this project. More than 300,000 acres now are under irrigation which provides about 25,000 family-size farms and small suburban units.

The valley supports a population of more than 400,000 people and each year crops produced exceed 3 times the Federal expenditure. A total of almost $1.2 billion in crops or about 50 times the Federal expenditure have been produced on this project since its construction.

Federal taxes paid from the area last year which stem from the development of this irrigation economy are estimated at more than 3 times the total of Federal project funds spent, and the cumulative total of all Federal taxes is estimated at more than 22 times the Federal investment.

In addition to these contributions to the growth, strength, and stability of the local, State, and national economies we should not lose sight of the fact that the Federal funds spent on the Salt River project, as well as all other projects, are being repaid to the Federal Treasury.

Similar evidence of the real and lasting value of Federal reclamation is presented on the Yuma project in southeastern California and southwestern Arizona. Plant, property, and equipment provided with Federal funds total less than $6 million, of which more than 90 percent has already been repaid directly to the Federal Treasury. The project has produced crops valued at more than 40 times the Federal expenditure, and each year this production is about 3 times the Federal funds spent.

On the Minidoka project in Idaho, the Federal investment in plant, property, and equipment totals approximately $26.6 million. This area also produces a harvest each year which exceeds three times the total Federal expenditure. Over the years this project has produced crops valued at more than $1.5 billion, an amount 60 times greater than the Federal investment in the project and an amount equal to about three-fifths of the total Federal investment in all reclamation projects built during the 53-year history of Federal reclamation.

Keep in mind also that many of these projects, in addition to irrigation, provide flood control, hydroelectric power, and serve other useful purposes.

The Yakima project in the State of Washington represents a Federal expenditure in plant, property, and equipment of almost $50 million. The two older divisions, the Tieton and Sunnyside, have already repaid to the Federal Treasury the entire initial expenditure. Of the two new divisions, the Roza is essentially completed while on the Kennewick construction is in progress. Crops produced through 1953 aggregate about $1.3 billion, an amount 26 times greater than the Federal plant cost for both the old and the new divisions. This is just another example of the true worth of western irrigation. No one of us would suggest the Yakima Valley is not a real national asset.

In the arid region east of the Rockies, an equally impressive record of reclamation accomplishments can be found. The North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska produces annually more crops than the total Federal cost of plant, property, and equipment and over the years these values have accumulated to 16 times the project-construction cost. This production will continue year after year and will provide opportunities and the means of livelihood for many people both locally and in distant States through the trade-creating aspects of this basic production. The steers raised on this project may be fattened in Iowa, butchered in Chicago, with the steak eaten in Washington or a dozen other cities, with the leather and other by-products consumed in any of the 48 States.

The story of the true value of Federal reclamation is further revealed in a recently released dramatic story on one of the newer and more expensive Federal projects, the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Just 1 year ago the daily newspapers were reporting the disaster of duststorms throughout much of the West. Northern Colorado, east of the Rockies, experienced the worst drought in 20 years, and therein lies a dramatic episode in the history of Federal reclamation. Streams normally fed by the mountains' melting snow pack dwindled to trickles, and disaster lurked over hundreds of thousands of parched acres. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was the one hope to save the land and the farmers of the region. This project, a dream of 75 years, 16 years a-building, was about ready to deliver water.

The area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project represents a substantial, thriving economy with its many cities and towns and its numerous small manufacturers firmly dependent on agriculture as the basic industry. Practically all manufacturing, trade, and transportation involve agricultural commodities, and irrigation water shortage affects the entire local economy.

Into this drought-stricken area more than 300,000 acre-feet of water, accumulated on the western slope of the mountains, was delivered through project facilities for use on the farms. With the aid of this water nearly normal farm production was attained. In terms of dollars the water meant $22 million of additional crops for 1954. Gross crop values in recent years averaged $46 million. In 1954 it was $41 million. Without project water the value would have been $19 million. Thus, the water made available through the Colorado-Big Thompson project made it possible to more than double the return in this drought year. The use of project water also provided stability to the livestock industry of the area. Without project water roughtly one-half of the available feed supply would have been produced, resulting in the proportional reduction in numbers of lambs and beef cattle fattened for market.

Business failures, anticipated earlier in the year in the local area, did not occur. Furthermore, project farmers were able to continue to contribute through normal trade relations to the welfare and stability of the local economy and, in turn, to the strength and stability of the entire United States. Who were the beneficiaries? Well, take folks living in Moline where tractors are made; Chicago where fertilizers are synthesized; Port Arthur where insecticides are produced—or almost anywhere else you can name.

The critics of Federal reclamation would attempt to have us believe the Federal Treasury is being emptied to build worthless boondoggles. Again let us put this program in perspective. The total cost of plant, property, and equipment in 53 years of Federal reclamation history totals less than $2.6 billion. This is less than 6 percent of the proposed fiscal year 1956 budget for national security. The proposed budget for reclamation construction in 1956 is less than one-third of 1 percent of our national budget. We are committed to spend about $1.7 billion for irrigation and power developments in foreign countries under the foreign-aid programs since 1948. This compares with the $2.6 billion investment in plant, property, and equipment of all the Federal reclamation projects built in the United States in the past 53 years.

By these comparisons I do not imply in any sense that appropriations for national security or foreign assistance should be reduced; however, we should take stock of the accomplishments of the past and the contributions that Federal reclamation has made to the development of this great Nation and provide sufficient funds to provide opportunities through further development of our own natural resources in the West. Investment of funds for reclamation is investment in the future of our Nation.

The dramatic story of the Colorado-Big Thompson is repeated time and time again in varying degrees and in different localities. I am sure there are many inspiring facts that could be presented if only we had the information. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House in particular, and in fact all Members of Congress should be acquainted with the true facts about reclamation. Accordingly, I am requesting the Commissioner of Reclamation to assemble brief but cogent reports on

other projects, such as the Central Valley project and the Columbia Basin project, which may be used as a guide in appraising the value of this program and as a means of presenting the true facts to the American people.

Disposition of Surplus Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the January hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations under the chairmanship of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, the fact was elicited from Dr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that there was no program for the use of rice under the various Federal programs on surplus commodities.

Indeed, at the time of the hearings, as Dr. Butz pointed out, there was no holding of rice under the Commodity Credit Corporation. However, it was known that there would be a carryover, and this surplus of rice had been responsible for the action by the Secretary in establishing rice acreage allotments and calling for a referendum on marketing quotas.

For this reason, I called on the Department to begin the formulation of a program for the disposition of these surpluses of rice under the Federal programs, calling special attention to the school-lunch program.

To indicate the actions of the Department of Agriculture in this matter, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a communication from Dr. Butz. In his letter, Dr. Butz states that the Department expects to utilize approximately 20 million pounds of rice by the end of June and that the program of the Department calls for the use of an additional 90 million pounds for distribution during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

Dr. Butz's letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1955.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: This will reply to your letter of March 23, 1955, regarding plans to encourage the greater use of rice in the school-lunch program.

Large quantities of rice are now being made available for distribution to school-lunch programs, charitable institutions, and needy persons and families. It is expected that over 11 million schoolchildren, 1 million indigent residents of institutions, and over 3 million welfare recipients will participate in this program. Shipments got underway in late February and are now being made at a rate that will permit utilization of approximately 20 million pounds of rice by June 30. It is anticipated that an additional 50 million pounds will be distributed during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

As an aid to increasing the consumption of rice, the Department has prepared informational material, for the use of schools and institutions throughout the country, on the methods of storage, preparation, and suggestions for the use of rice.

Using this information as well as material developed within the States, local school authorities and institutions are, we believe, doing an excellent job of promoting maximum use of donated rice. Some of the uses of rice actively sponsored, to mention a few, include turkey on rice, rice meat loaf, ham and rice casserole, scalloped rice and cheese, Spanish rice with meat, rice peach pudding, baked rice pudding, cinnamon rice, waffles and rice cake, rice peach loaf, and rice salmon casserole.

You may be interested to know that the Department, working through the Food Trades Branch of the Food Distribution Division, has pledged its full support of the rice industry promotion plans to increase the movement of rice through regular commercial outlets. At the present time, the Food Distribution Division also has in preparation plans for coordinating the Department's participation in the producer-industry-Government merchandising drive this fall. This participation will include the facilities and activities of many other agences in the Department such as the Federal Extension Service, Agricultural Research Service, and the Office of Information.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

I believe that this is a fine start by the Department, and I wish to commend Dr. Butz and the men in the Department on devising this program so rapidly and putting it into motion.

And, Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to call attention to the fine work and cooperation of all the Members of Congress representing rice-growing areas. These gentlemen, without fanfare or publicity, have been working together to endeavor to work out this present problem in rice. As you know, rice growers faced a heavy cutback in rice acreage allotments in 1955 and many of them received acreage allotments that barely give them a margin of economic living. It is evident that if we are to help these rice growers, consumption of rice must be greatly increased.

Together we have worked to aid this program. The Congress has watched closely the operations of the various programs to increase domestic consumption.

And, we have watched even more closely the endeavors of our Government under the provisions of Public Law 480 to dispose of our surplus in the world markets. We have watched the increasing action by our Department of Agriculture in this field and we have studied the work of the agricultural attaches since they have been transferred to the Department from the Department of States. We have watched the actions in connection with the Japanese negotiations, and we will continue to watch just as closely the negotiations with the Government of the Philippines. It is our understanding that our friends in the Philippines are seeking 100,000 tons of rice under the provisions of Public Law 480. Since the Philippines may be considered a part of the southeastern Asia markets, those of us who represent rice-growing areas will want to know for certain that the Department of State has no desire to withhold our rice from this market.

We were pleased last week when the Council on Foreign and Economic Policy, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph C. Dodge, cleared the way for the negotiations with the Government of Japan to continue without opposition. We are just as eager that this council approve the policy of making our commodities under the provisions of Public Law 480 available to all friendly nations anywhere on the globe.

Marine News Magazine Says Philadelphia Area's Fight for Delaware River Dredging Is "A National Issue, a Fight in Behalf of All Waterway Interests To Sustain the Historic Policy of Federal Responsibility for the Development and Improvement of Our Nation's Navigable Waterways"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions will shortly be holding hearings on the proposal in my bill and in others introduced by Philadelphia area Members of Congress to appropriate $25 million for a start on the dredging of the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to Trenton.

In pushing for this appropriation—without the strings which the Budget Bureau and the White House have attempted to tie to any funds for the work—we are only seeking to have carried out what has already been established as the will of Congress on this important project.

Congress said the full cost of this improvement should be a Federal obligation, in line with historic principles and policies dealing with navigable rivers. The Budget Bureau, in the authorization bill last year, attempted to require that local interests, in this case, the United States Steel Corp., be required to shoulder $18 million of the cost of the project.

BUDGET BUREAU PROPOSAL WAS REPUDIATED BY CONGRESS

Members of Congress from the Philadelphia area, including many of our colleagues from New Jersey, were instrumental last year in defeating that proposal. We succeeded in having enacted an authorization law which provided that the entire project was to be a Federal responsibility.

But in his budget this year, President Eisenhower has again insisted on the United States Steel contribution. He has said no funds should be appropriated for the project unless the $18 million contribution from United States Steel is put forward. This would not only negate the will of Congress but would for all practical purposes stymie the project.

We do not intend to permit this to happen. We intend to fight for the ap-

propriation this year of an initial $25 million to begin work on the project, as called for in my bill, H. R. 3594, and in similar bills by other Members from the Philadelphia area.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members to an editorial which appeared in the April 1955 issue of Marine News, As the Delaware Goes.

This editorial points out that our efforts to have the Delaware River channel work prosecuted as a Federal project exclusively is "a fight in behalf of all waterway interests to sustain the historic policy of Federal responsibility for the development and improvement of our Nation's navigable waterways."

Answer to Private Utility Proposal on Trinity Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in California, offered to build the powerhouses on the Trinity River project, which has been authorized for construction by the Federal Government under the reclamation law. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s so-called partnership proposal was the subject of extended testimony by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This proposal will not only, if adopted, reverse a half century of Federal Government power policy but will have a serious effect on the operation of the Central Valley project and probably delay for many years the construction of the much needed Trinity River project. Following is a brief summary of the reasons the P. G. & E. proposal should not be adopted:

COMPANY'S PROPOSAL VIOLATES FEDERAL POWER POLICY

First. Acceptance of the company's proposal would be a reversal of half a century of power policy in the Federal Government. The principle of low-cost public power with preference to municipalities and other public agencies has been stated at least 13 times in acts of Congress dating from 1906. In other words, for almost 50 years the Federal Government has consistently followed a policy of selling publicly produced power at the lowest possible rates, giving preference to municipalities and public agencies. If the Federal Government's power policy was to exploit the power potential for profit-making purposes, then it could raise power rates to make a financial showing for the Trinity Project which would completely nullify the company's argument that its proposal would place the Government in a better financial position.

THE AMOUNT OF THE OFFER IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO MEET FEDERAL COSTS

Second. The P. G. & E. Co. has made an offer to the Department of the Interior to purchase falling water from the Trinity project for $3.5 million annually. This happens to be the only firm part of the offer—the offer in all other respects being very vague, as discussed herein under other headings. With respect to the $3.5 million, it is not even sufficient to return to the Federal Government its actual costs at the Government's rate of interest. The amount would have to be about $4,150,000 annually to accomplish this. Therefore, there would be, under the company's proposal, an actual loss to the Federal Government of $650,000 annually, or over $32 million in 50 years. Even if the company paid the Federal Government its full costs of $4,150,000 it would be comparable to the Government loaning the company funds to expand its power facilities at the low Federal interest rate.

COMPANY'S CLAIM THAT ITS PROPOSAL RETURNS $36 MILLION MORE REVENUE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVER PROJECT REPAYMENT PERIOD IS IN ERROR

Third. The company's claim, in its proposal to the Department and in its widely distributed pamphlet on the proposal, that under its proposal an additional $36 million would be returned to the Federal Government over the project repayment period is not supported by testimony given to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Bureau witnesses stated that amortization with interest of the increased cost of enlarging the tunnels under the company's proposal would exceed the $36 million by about $6 million, and that therefore there would actually be less revenue under the company's proposal by about $6 million.

COMPANY'S PROPOSAL WOULD INTERFERE WITH CVP OPERATION AND REDUCE FIRM CAPACITY OF EXISTING FEDERAL POWERPLANTS

Fourth. The firm generating capacity at the existing Shasta powerplant under the company's proposal would be reduced by 60,000 to 100,000 kilowatts, or 16 to 27 percent, and this is a most important and serious aspect of the company's proposal. The Bureau witnesses testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that this reduction was estimated at 100,000 kilowatts, or around 27 percent, and that such reduction would decrease the firm energy below that required to continue service to all existing preference customers. The effort then would be to dedicate a large block of power, about 100,000 kilowatts according to Bureau estimates, from the Central Valley project powerplants to company use. This would be power taken away from existing preference customers now having contracts with the Federal Government, in contravention of the law with respect to preferences.

CLAIMS BY COMPANY REGARDING THE ADDITIONAL POWER-GENERATING CAPACITY UNDER THE COMPANY'S PROPOSAL ARE MISLEADING

Fifth. The P. G. & E. proposal call for installation of 130,000 more kilowatts of generating capacity than the Bureau proposes to install.

In the first place, this figure is misleading because this additional installation results in the firm generating capacity at existing Federal plants being reduced by 60,000—100,000 kilowatts—60,000 kilowatts by the company's estimate and 100,000 kilowatts by the Bureau's estimate. This matter is discussed under the preceding heading.

In the second place, with respect to the increased generating capacity, it must be pointed out that the amount of energy generated is dependent upon the amount of the water which runs through the turbines and not upon the powerplant capacity. An equal amount of water will generate the same energy whether it runs through the Bureau's plants or the company's plants. The company proposes to use the plants for peaking purposes by running the water through in gushes in certain periods and then shutting down the plants completely during other periods. It is like pouring a bucketful of water through a funnel. Increasing the size of the funnel only results in getting the water through faster.

The effect of the company's proposal to release the water in this manner upon the operation of the Central Valley project and its primary purpose of supplying water for irrigation is not known and requires much additional study as discussed under the next heading.

THE EFFECT OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED OPERATING PLAN UPON THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT OPERATION IS UNKNOWN

Sixth. The company in its proposal reaches certain conclusions which are based upon a suitable release schedule. The effect of a suitable release schedule for operating the company's powerplants for peaking purposes upon the Central Valley project's primary purpose of supplying water for irrigation is not known and will require much additional study. It is questionable, and Bureau witnesses so testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, whether the reregulation of the Trinity flows which are gushed through the powerplants can be accomplished by the existing Keswick Reservoir without additional storage. If additional costly storage is required, the whole economics of the proposal are affected.

The P. G. & E. proposal is quite vague in other respects. The proposal includes no details as to how and on what terms it will exchange power for pumping energy. Also, the proposal includes nothing as to how the company would support long-term preference customers of the Bureau of Reclamation.

THE COMPANY'S CLAIM THAT ITS PROPOSAL MAKES 5 PERCENT MORE WATER AVAILABLE FOR THE FARMERS IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY IS NOT CORRECT

Seventh. The P. G. & E. Co. states that its proposal would make 5 percent more water available to the farmers of the Central Valley than would be available under the Bureau's plan on the basis that the company would divert 5 percent more water from the Trinity River for operation of its powerplants.

Information given the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee indicates that the releases would be at such time as to make this additional water unusable in the Central Valley. It would simply waste to the ocean through the Sacramento River rather than through the Trinity-Klamath Rivers.

FEDERAL AND STATE TAXES PAID BY P. G. & E. UNDER ITS PROPOSAL ADDS ADDITIONAL COSTS WHICH POWER CONSUMERS MUST PAY

Eighth. The P. G. & E. Co. states that under its proposal $70 million in additional Federal taxes would be paid and $65 million in taxes to State and local governments would be paid—a total of $135 million. This, of course, is simply an additional cost to the company which, along with the company's profits, would necessarily have to be passed on to the power consumers. The Federal Government could likewise pay these additional amounts as in-lieu-of-tax payments by simply raising the Federal power rates in the service area. The energy could be marketed at these higher rates. However, as discussed under item 1 above, the power policy of the Federal Government, as established by law, has been to dispose of electric energy at the lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

THE ADDITIONAL $50 MILLION CAPITAL OUTLAY INVOLVED IN FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION DOES NOT COST TAXPAYERS ONE PENNY

Ninth. The company's statement that its proposal would save the Federal taxpayers $50 million in capital outlay is misleading. Under Federal construction, this $50 million would be returned to the Federal Government with interest within a period of about 30 years after it had been appropriated and would not cost the Federal taxpayers one penny.

PUMPING POWER FOR SAN LUIS PROJECT IS AN IMPORTANT ASPECT WHICH MUST BE CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMPANY'S PROPOSAL

Tenth. The only way that the San Luis project can have an assured continuous supply of low-cost energy for pumping purposes is to integrate the Trinity power into the Central Valley project system. The company's proposal includes no details as to how and on what terms it will exchange power for pumping energy.

THE DELAY DUE TO COMPANY'S PROPOSAL

Eleventh. Testimony given to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee indicates that it will probably take 3 years to complete all the studies required in connection with the company's proposal and to iron out all the points of controversy, assuming that they can be ironed out. We cannot afford the resulting delay in construction of the Trinity River division.

Mayors Clark, Wagner, and Lawrence Organize Opposition of Nation's Major Cities to Legislation Intended To Remove Consumer Protection on Natural-Gas Rates

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the mayors of more than 50 major American cities of 100,000 population or more, having a combined population of more than 30 million Americans, have joined with the mayors of Philadelphia, New York, and Pittsburgh in launching a consumers' fight against pending natural-gas legislation.

This legislation is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I have the honor to serve, in the form of bills to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the so-called field price of natural gas. If this price—the price paid by the pipelines to the producers—is removed from Federal regulatory jurisdiction, the price can, of course, shoot up drastically and be reflected in the monthly gas bills of every American consumer whose household is supplied with gas shipped in interstate commerce.

The Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, was the originator of this consumers' movement by the mayors of our major cities. He enlisted the early support of the Honorable Robert Wagner, Jr., of New York, and the Honorable David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh. The three then invited mayors of all large cities to join them in this endeavor. Following is the list of mayors who accepted their invitation, and who have joined in representations before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I think it fair to say they have been making a most convincing case on behalf of the consumer:

MEMBERS OF MAYOR'S COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa.: Joseph S. Clark, Jr.
Pittsburgh, Pa.: David L. Lawrence.
New York, N. Y.: Robert F. Wagner.
Akron, Ohio: Leo Berg.
Birmingham, Ala.: J. W. Morgan.
Baltimore, Md.: Thomas D'Alessandro, Jr.
Boston, Mass.: John B. Hynes.
Bridgeport, Conn.: Jasper McLevy.
Buffalo, N. Y.: Steven Pankow.
Cambridge, Mass.: John J. Foley.
Camden, N. J.: George E. Brunner.
Chicago, Ill.: Richard J. Daley.
Cincinnati, Ohio: Carl W. Rich.
Cleveland, Ohio: Anthony J. Celebrezze.
Columbus, Ohio: Maynard E. Sensenbrenner.
Denver, Colo.: Quigg Newton.
Detroit, Mich.: Albert E. Cobo.
Duluth, Minn.: George D. Johnson.
Elizabeth, N. J.: Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte.
Erie, Pa.: Arthur J. Gardner.
Fall River, Mass.: John F. Kane.
Flint, Mich.: George M. Algoe.
Gary, Ind.: Peter Mandich.
Grand Rapids, Mich.: George W. Welsh (city manager).
Kansas City, Kans.: Paul F. Mitchum.
Knoxville, Tenn.: George R. Dempster.
Louisville, Ky.: Andrew Broaddus.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Frank P. Zeidler.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Eric G. Hoyer.
Montgomery, Ala.: W. A. Gayle.
Nashville, Tenn.: Ben West.
Newark, N. J.: Leo P. Carlin.
New Bedford, Mass.: Arthur N. Harriman.
New Haven, Conn.: Richard C. Lee.
New Orleans, La.: deLesseps S. Morrison.
Paterson, N. J.: Lester F. Titus.
Portland, Oreg.: Fred L. Peterson.
Providence, R. I.: Walter H. Reynolds.
Richmond, Va.: Thomas P. Bryan.
Sacramento, Cal.: H. H. Hendren.
Springfield, Mass.: Daniel Brunton.
St. Louis, Mo.: Raymond R. Tucker.
St. Paul, Minn.: Joseph E. Dillon.
Syracuse, N. Y.: Donald H. Mead.
Tampa, Fla.: Curtis Hixon.
Toledo, Ohio: Ollie Czelusta.
Utica, N. Y.: Boyd E. Golder.
Waterbury, Conn.: Raymond E. Snyder.
Yonkers, N. Y.: Kristen Kristensen.
Youngstown, Ohio: Frank X. Kryzan.
Jersey City, N. J.: Bernard Berry.

STATEMENT BY MAYORS' GROUP ON H. R. 4560

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, a group of these mayors met with the chief city attorneys of many of our major cities to work out the details of their presentations before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to the pending natural-gas exemption bills.

Following is the statement issued that day in the name of the mayors' group by the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia:

[For immediate release—April 25, 1955]

STATEMENT OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE HARRIS BILL REMOVING POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO REGULATE NATURAL-GAS SALES BY PRODUCERS

On behalf of the committee, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, made the following statement at the close of an all-day conference held in the Jefferson Room of the Mayflower Hotel:

"This group here today represents most of the natural-gas consumers of the United States.

"Representatives of mayors of more than 50 cities having a total population of over 30 million people have been meeting with the chief city attorneys and representatives of mayors of many other cities, large and small. Our purpose has been to organize presentation of the consumers' case against the Harris bill and similar legislation now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of these bills is to remove the authority presently vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to pipeline companies which transmit gas to our city borders.

"Protests against this legislation are national in scope. Cities from Oregon to Alabama, from Louisiana to Massachusetts have joined our committee to oppose this legislation. The interests of all gas consumers require that it be defeated.

"Huge increases in the price of natural gas during the last few years are largely due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission has heretofore failed to exercise the powers given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case. If this legislation passes, the power of the Federal Power Commission to exercise its obvious duty in the consumer interest will be removed. Gas bills all over the country will inevitably increase in an aggregate of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Experience has amply demonstrated that the unregulated operation of the law of supply and demand with respect to a national resource in as short supply as natural gas, whose ownership is monopolistic in character, results in one thing only: higher prices to consumers and unwarranted profits to the big oil companies of the country who control over a third of the supply of natural gas.

"It is clear that regulation of the profits of pipeline companies and retail distributors of natural gas is not enough. The weak link in the armor of consumer protection is failure to regulate the initial sale from producer or gatherer to pipeline company.

"A priceless national resource such as natural gas affected as it is with a public interest and in increasingly short supply must be

subject to effective regulation from wellhead to the tip of the burner if the interest of the average American consumer is to be adequately protected.

"We are accordingly united in our opposition to legislation which would remove this key protection to the consumer which exists in the present law."

H. R. 5986

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5986 to provide for Federal employees who are injured in the line of duty the right to ultimate review by the courts of their claims for workmen's compensation—a right which they do not now possess.

A Federal employee, who is injured on the job, is entitled to compensation upon application and approval of his claim by the Bureau of Employees Compensation in the Department of Labor. Should the Bureau deny his application, the worker is privileged to request the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board to review his case. Under the present statute, this is the court of last resort.

The procedures for making such claim and the right of appeal from an adverse decision from the Bureau of Employees Compensation are described in the Federal Employees Compensation Act of 1949—Public Law 357, 81st Congress.

In most States there is an analogy between the Federal Bureau of Employees Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and the machinery established by the States for presenting and reviewing compensation claims of private-industry workers. In one important respect, however, the comparison is not valid. Under the law covering Federal employees, the claimant exhausts all rights after appealing to the administrative tribunal, the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board. An employee in private industry in 47 States is permitted to appeal to the courts following use of all procedural machinery established under the various State laws. Attached is a list showing the type of judicial review accorded by the States. Hence, Federal workers are not granted the same rights as their fellow employees under State laws.

Review of proceedings before the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board will reveal that approximately 70 percent of Federal employee appeals are decided adversely to the employee. Ignoring appeals which are completely without foundation in law or fact, there remains a substantial number of cases where the worker has no further recourse.

The bill I have proposed is an effort to remedy this defect by extending to Federal workers the right to secure judicial review of compensation claims after use of all administrative procedures. I am hopeful that the appropriate committee of the House will consider this legislation at an early date.

The list showing the type of review accorded by the States follows:

STATE AND TYPE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

Alabama: Supreme court within 30 days.
Alaska: United States district court in 30 days.
Arizona: Supreme court within 30 days.
Arkansas: Circuit court within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
California: Supreme court or district court of appeals within 30 days.
Colorado: District court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Connecticut: Superior court within 10 days.
Delaware: Superior court within 10 days.
District of Columbia: Federal district court within 30 days.
Florida: Certiorari to supreme court in 30 days.
Georgia: Superior court within 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
Hawaii: Circuit court in 20 days.
Idaho: Supreme court within 30 days; 6 percent interest from date of acicdent.
Illinois: Circuit court or city court, in cities over 25,000 population, within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court in 60 days.
Indiana: Appellate court within 30 days.
Iowa: District court within 30 days.
Kansas: District court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Kentucky: Circuit court within 20 days; further appeal to court of appeals if amount involved is sufficient.
Louisiana: Proper appellate court; further appeal to supreme court.
Maine: Law courts within 20 days.
Maryland: Circuit court or Baltimore common law courts in 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
Massachusetts: Supreme court within 10 day.
Michigan: Supreme court within 10 days.
Minnesota: Supreme court within 30 days.
Mississippi: Circuit court within 30 days and further appeal to supreme court.
Missouri: Circuit court within 30 days then to appellate court.
Montana: District court within 30 days after decision; further appeal to supreme court.
Nebraska: District court within 14 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Nevada: No provision.
New Hampshire: May be taken to supreme court.
New Jersey: County court within 30 days; further appeal to appellate division of superior court.
New Mexico: Supreme court as in other cases.
New York: Appellate division of supreme court in 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
North Carolina: Superior court within 30 days.
North Dakota: District court within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Ohio: Common pleas court within 60 days after rehearing; further appeal to supreme court.
Oklahoma: Supreme court within 20 days.
Oregon: Circuit court within 30 days; further appeal as in other cases.
Pennsylvania: Common pleas court (county court in Allegheny County) within 20 days; further appeal to superior court. To the circuit of county of which applicant was a resident.
Rhode Island: Superior court within 10 days; further appeal to supreme court.
South Carolina: Common pleas court within 30 days.
South Dakota: Circuit court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Tennessee: Circuit court within 10 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Texas: Court of county where injury occurred; within 20 days.
Utah: Supreme court within 30 days.
Vermont: County court within 15 days, questions of law and fact; or to supreme court within 15 days, law only.
Virginia: Supreme court of appeals within 30 days.
Washington: Superior court within 30 days.
West Virginia: Supreme court of appeals within 30 days.
Wisconsin: Circuit court for Dane County within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Wyoming: Supreme court within 70 days.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Jews in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was present at a ceremony on the East Side of New York City, in the district that I represent in Congress, of so distinctive a character that I ask for leave to incorporate some material about it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The occasion was a tribute in the year of the 300th anniversary of the Jews in America. What gave it a special character that deserves to be called to worldwide attention as illustrative of the best in American life was that the ceremony was held by and at the St. Mark's Church In-the-Bowerie, one of the oldest and most historic religious edifices in the city.

In the words of the rector, the Reverend Richard E. McEvoy, the celebration was held for the following reason. The invitation by the rector in the vestry stated:

> Partly because of the history of this church in the lower East Side, where Peter Stuyvesant is buried, and where many Jewish boys and girls have grown up to become prominent in American life—partly because we recognize the inescapable debt of Christianity to Judaism—partly because over the past three centuries the Jewish contribution to all areas of our common heritage has been distinguished and great-hearted—partly because we feel that in these critical days it is important that the world see witnesses to convictions in common ideals of democracy and faith in one God—and not least because of our affection for our neighbors—we would like to pay this timely tribute in this 300th anniversary year.

At the ceremony itself, a distinguished gathering assembled that represented a brotherly affection that is the pledge of mutual respect and confidence and of the brotherly affection that is the pledge of the Judaeo-Christian heritage by which we aspire to live and which remains now as it has been, the world's hope.

The program was outstanding in many respects. There was reverence; there was the piety appropriate to the sacred grounds on which the meeting was held; there was the laudable patriotic animation of gratitude and appreciation for a country in which such an event could

take place. There was fine music and there were excellent speakers. Everyone who spoke deserves to be quoted and his words remembered, and they included the highly respected rector himself, the Honorable Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., one of New York's leading citizens and a distinguished son of a family whose national services, dating back to the days of the Revolutionary War, are far too many to enumerate. Another speaker was Mr. Lee Thompson Smith, past president of the St. Nicholas Society of the City of New York, chairman of the executive committee of the Home Title Guarantee Co., and one of our great city's leading civic personalities.

Their addresses on that occasion were more than a tribute to the history of the 300 years of Jewish settlement in the United States. They were, in fact, a tribute to the spirit of our country and a clarion call to all within the sound of their voices and to all who could be reached by a reading of their text, to maintain and to carry further the American traditions and ideals that made possible this history, and that evoked this inspiring and beautiful ceremony.

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS BY LEE THOMPSON SMITH, PAST PRESIDENT, ST. NICHOLAS SOCIETY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AT THE HISTORICAL CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEWS IN AMERICA, ST. MARK'S CHURCH IN THE BOUWERIE

It is a great privilege to be asked to speak on this unusual occasion. In this historic Christian church on New York's Lower East Side; we are met together to pay a tribute to our Jewish friends and fellow citizens in this 300th anniversary year of the coming of the first Jewish community to New York.

It is worth while stopping a moment to consider where we are. I do so because of a very real interest in this historic place and in its work. I know that the rector, the Reverend Mr. McEvoy, has a high regard for the unusually rich historical background of St. Mark's. He looks upon this shrine of our early history as a place which, in a sense, is more than the church of a denomination. He feels that it belongs to all Americans, and that those who are now charged with its direction have a responsibility to maintain its best traditions. More than that, he and his vestry believe that this church is here, not to be a museum, but to be of service in the neighborhood where it has been set for these generations. Over the years of his rectorship, that is the endeavor St. Mark's has been trying to carry out.

The church and neighborhood are indeed rich in our history. Beneath the right aisle of this church is buried Peter Stuyvesant, during whose governorship in 1654, the 23 members of the first Jewish community came to New Amsterdam, to receive from him, as we know, a not-too-cordial welcome. In the same vault was interred a British Governor, Henry Sloughter, and three centuries of the direct descendants of Peter are buried there. The churchyards on the east and west sides are lined with vaults, and resting in them are two presidents of Columbia University, Nathaniel Moore and William Harris, and a rector of old Trinity Parish, Dr. Berrien. Fifteen of the original members of our own St. Nicholas Society, founded by Washington Irving, are buried in these grounds, which gives our society a special interest here at St. Mark's. Here, too, were buried Philip Hone, well-known mayor of New York, Thomas Addis Emmet, the Irish patriot, Nicholas Fish and Nathaniel Prime, Revolutionary War patriots. Gen. Horatio Gates worshipped in pew 46, where a plaque has been placed in his memory. Daniel Tompkins, Governor of the State of New York, 1807–17, and Vice President of the United States under Monroe 1817–25, is buried outside these walls, and we might name others well known in our State and city history, whose last resting place is here. This, then, is not an isolated spot honoring one American; it is a commentary on three centuries of our history.

Let us go a bit further afield into this historic neighborhood of the lower East Side. At Cooper Union, a block away, Abraham Lincoln made his famous Cooper Union address, which won him the attention that led to his nomination as President. George Washington met his troops at Sixth Street and Third Avenue to march downtown to take over the city again after its long occupation by the British. Just a stone's throw from this old church is a building that thousands upon thousands pass by in ignorance. There we read the name "Haym Salomon Home for the Aged." The name of Haym Salomon is one that ought to be more widely known than it seems to be. He was one of those distinguished Jewish citizens of American life who have rendered conspicuous service to the cause of freedom. As soon as the Stamp Act was passed in 1765 every Jewish merchant in New York agreed not to import goods subject to the provisions of that law. In the same year, 1765, the Society of the Sons of Liberty was formed to aid in carrying out these nonimportation agreements, and one member of this society was Haym Salomon, born in Lisa, Poland, of Jewish ancestry, who came to this New World several years after agitation against Britain had begun in 1772. He was a friend of Kosciusko and Pulaski, Polish defenders of freedom, who aided our own War of the Revolution. Salomon became a friend of Alexander McDougall, Isaacs Sears, and John Lamb, leaders of the New York Sons of Liberty. While many patriotic and unselfish men assisted in the financing and management that led to a successful conclusion of the War of the Revolution, it has been said that Haym Salomon, almost single handed, kept up the credit of the bankrupt revolutionary government. He was twice arrested by the British on account of his activities. Upon the second occasion he was found guilty of treason and sentenced to be hanged, but by the next morning Salomon and his Hessian guard had escaped from the dreaded provost jail, presumably aided by some of the members of the Sons of Liberty. The notebook of Robert Morris shows not less than 75 transactions in which Salomon loaned or gave about $700,000 to the government for which he received no reimbursement. His record of unstinting service and generosity was not unusual. Wherever Jews lived throughout the colonies we find them in the forefront of the emerging Nation's problems, giving generously of leadership and financial assistance.

Within this church today we, too, bridge that gap of 300 years by having as our next speaker Judge Nathan, one of the descendants of that original Pilgrim group of 23—a distinguished jurist and a devoted member of the Congregation Shearith Israel, which reaches back to 1654. Under the leadership of noted rabbis, including today's Dr. David de Sola Pool, it has made an invaluable contribution to the life of this city. It could be most interesting to know how many of those who are present today were brought up in this lower East Side and remember it with affection. We know that it has produced and will continue to produce its fair share of distinguished Americans.

Now let us explore for a moment what has happened since a little group of 800 resided in New Amsterdam in 1653. A city that has grown to almost as large a population as the present Netherlands, with more Irish than Dublin, more Italians than Rome, more Jews than Tel Aviv and probably more of almost any country than one of its large cities.

The greatest city in the world with more firsts than any other city on this continent—the first President installed in office here, the first stock exchange established in America.

I could go on indefinitely about the growth of our great city but time does not allow me to do so. A city which has everything of which we can boast.

We cannot retell the history of our country today, or single out from an innumerable host the great army of those representatives of the Jewish faith who have contributed to our Nation's history—in religion, politics, the arts and sciences, in industry and philanthropy, in the social and educational sciences, in the wholesomeness of family life. They have performed these obligations because they are citizens of our American democracy and because they have been loyal to the religious tradition of Judaism which is inevitably a part of the tradition of every Christian, too, for doing what is their duty, they would neither want nor expect more thanks than any other responsible and loyal group of Americans.

What we might think about, more effectively and to the point today, is a matter more vital to our times and to the future of our country. We should remind ourselves on an occasion such as this, that the Jewish pilgrims who came to New Amsterdam, the Pilgrims who came to Massachusetts, the founders of Rhode Island, the settlers of Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and many another colony, came, in part, not only because this was a new frontier offering opportunity, but also because there was a new spirit in the air and a hope that greater freedoms and liberties were to be won in the New World. Wave after wave of immigration over the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries brought to these shores peoples out of every nation, who were challenged by these twin dreams of opportunity and democracy.

It has worked. When we say that it has worked, we must not be unmindful of failures, of prejudices, of bigotries, of dark and unhappy events, which mar the pages of our story of democracy. They are there, and they must be acknowledged. But there have been, in every generation of our country's history, men and women of courage and sensitivity, who have called the people back to loyalty and to responsibility for these hopes. The course of history has led the Nation to a place of leadership in a world where those hopes, which we know can work, are still high. On the other hand, the course of history has brought us into a time where, in recent decades, these basic hopes and aspirations have been challenged.

We know these things. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the grave dangers which confront peoples concerned about freedom, equality of opportunity, and the search for truth. Nor is it necessary for us to remind ourselves in such gravely troubled times of the vital necessity for cooperation, wisdom, and patience toward those in high places charged with the delicate and sensitive task of working through to positive and just solutions.

It is, however, a time for responsibility, self-control, and understanding. Someone wrote recently: "Cynicism seems silly in an atomic age." There has never been a time when understanding of others, a love for our country, our city, and our homes, has been more important. Being a citizen, and not a preacher, that is the central thought I would like to leave with you. When our Nation has been at its best, it has been because its men and women and children, of whatever background or faith, have been responsible, steady, wise, and understanding. Along with their rights, as free people under God, they have recognized that there are duties and obligations which, as citizens, they must assume. It is because of this faith, this love of democracy, this sense of responsi-

bility, that what we call our way of life has worked here, and can work wherever freedoms and responsibilities are kept balanced and controlled by a wise and informed citizenry and its leaders. The heritage of our country's past, in which peoples out of many races have made great contributions, is evidence of the capability of people to live together, work together, in understanding, and toward common goals that are positive and creative. It is fine, and certainly, I should think, in the best spirit of the Jewish and Christian faith, that we have such opportunities as this to meet together to give thanks to God for what has come down to us. Let us go away from this place with a new resolution in our hearts and minds—that we will be promoters of understanding, of cooperation, of continuing responsibility to the common and universal elements of our faiths that have brought us to this time.

ADDRESS BY EDGAR J. NATHAN, JR.

I am honored to have been invited to participate in this afternoon's celebration commemorating the 300th anniversary of the first Jewish settlement in this country. It is a beautiful tribute to our American way of life wherein all faiths join in perpetuating America's religious ideals.

It is indeed fitting that St. Mark's Church In-the-Bouwerie is the sponsor and host today, and it is particularly appropriate that the ceremonies are being held in its church for two very special reasons. In the first place, as you have heard, there lies buried here Peter Stuyvesant, the governor of New Amsterdam in 1654. And in the second place (as many of you know) the Jews and other neighbors helped repair and rebuilt the four-faced clock in the belfry of this church as did the Jews and other neighbors of Trinity Church in the early 16th or 17th century help reconstruct the steeple on that church, then as now on Broadway at Wall Street.

I am delighted at this opportunity to talk about some things our ancestors, and our contemporaries, have done—things that give evidence of a very precious freedom, the freedom to participate in the life of our country.

Coupled with this is another precious right—the right to be different from our neighbors, and their right to be different from us.

These are freedoms that make our Nation great, that enable a Jew to be both an American and a Jew, a Protestant to be an American and a Protestant and a Catholic to be an American and a Catholic. That makes it possible for American culture to benefit from the peculiarly individual contributions of the various groups of people that make up America.

In his letter to the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, R. I., George Washington summarized this significant greatness of America when he wrote in August 1790:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that tolerance is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Here, George Washington summed up for all time the essence of American freedom; the ideal for which all of us—Jews and non-Jews—have striven and are striving. These are the self-evident truths of man's equality under democratic government, which guarantees his "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These are the things the first Jewish settlers sought to gain when they came here in September 1654 and faced the despotic Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. These are the things summed up in the theme of the American-Jewish Tercentenary: "Man's Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom."

The American Jewish tercentenary just concluding its year-long celebation will, it is hoped, inform every one of us in America, and possibly throughout the world, what history has recorded; that the freedoms we all cherish and enjoy in America came into being through the cooperation of all faiths. History establishes that it was not only one man, or one group, or one religion, that brought this about. It was accomplished by the religious groups of all faiths, and it was the spiritual values that stem from religion which gave the lifeblood to the determined fight which resulted in the establishment of the freedoms we now enjoy.

The history of these 300 years has certainly taught us the values of these freedoms. It has shown us that, by the exercise of understanding between people, they can achieve their ideals, their goals, and that war is not necessary. There have been wars before and during these 300 years, but they have been futile wars, all except our own war for independence. Going backward, the Second World War has not yet resulted in peace, indeed, if it is yet ended. The First World War led to the Second World War. Battles were won, but the goals for which the wars were fought were not achieved. The only times when there has been spiritual progress and peace in the world has been when there has been understanding among the people. An instance—perhaps the most significant one to us, at least—that is proof of this, is the birth of the United States. It was made possible, in the first instance, by the 23 Jews who landed here in 1654, who, with others, fought for their human rights and won them, not only for themselves but, in the words of Peter Stuyvesant, for the "Lutherans and Papists," as well. It was one of the great landmarks in the ancient Dutch tradition of religious freedom and human decency when, just 300 years ago last month, the Dutch West India Co., overruling the edict of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, granted these first Jewish settlers permission to remain in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam. By the time of the Revolution, 100 years or so later, these freedoms were firmly entrenched on American soil. The war was fought to preserve them and to establish what became the United States of America. That war was won; its goals were achieved; and the ideals, the preservation of which made that war necessary, were maintained and have survived unto this day. It is for us to keep them strong.

Last October, at the American Jewish national tercentenary opening dinner in this city, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said: "We have come together in memory of an inspiring moment in history—that moment, 300 years ago, when a small band of Jewish people arrived. * * * It was an event meaningful not only to the Jews of America but to all Americans—of all faiths, of all national origins."

He continued: "On that day there came to these shores 23 people whose distant ancestors had, through the Old Testament, given new dimensions of meaning to the concept of freedom and justice, mercy and righteousness, kindness and understanding—ideas and ideals which were to flower on this continent. They were of a people who had done much to give to Western civilization the principle of human dignity; they came to a land which would flourish—beyond all 17th century dreams—because it fostered that dignity among its citizens. Of all religious concepts," said the President of the United States, "this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic."

Let us seriously ponder and long remember the words of this great leader. They may contain the key to the future for many of us in this land.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 25, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. Stanley Lowell, minister, Virginia Beach Methodist Church, Virginia Beach, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who guidest the stars in their courses, who considerest the fate of the nations, and who carest for all the sons of men—even unto the last and the least—we rejoice in another day to serve. What we have done and been Thou knowest. What is in us to achieve Thou knowest. Help us to repent of our wrongs, to learn from our mistakes, and to hold fast to that which is good.

We pray for the Members of this body, humbly thankful for their service to their country and to mankind. Bring to their deliberations and decisions the wisdom that is from above. Equip their power with restraint and their knowledge with humility. Teach them when to shift and accommodate and when to stand fast. Imbue their realism with idealism and their idealism with realism. Let there be that nice balance between the things that ought to be done and the things that can be done, so that the two may be constantly merged in helpful action.

As we pray for them, we pray for the Nation they represent—a nation bearing awful responsibilities in a frightening time. Bestow upon its citizens the boon of self-discipline. Grant them such integration of character that, seeing the right, and knowing the right, they may do the right. May virtue be the undergirding of their power. Let their strength be as the strength of ten because their hearts are pure. We pray through Him whom men call Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 26, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; and

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the development of agriculture's human resources, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of April 27, 1955, p. 5149, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the routine morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the information of the Senate, that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 14, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

At the conclusion of the morning hour the Senate will consider that bill; and I expect action on that measure to be followed by the consideration of Calendar No. 223, a bill (S. 148) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa; Calendar No. 224, a bill (S. 653) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, Louisiana, to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 225, a bill (S. 933) to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 226, a bill (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; Calendar No. 228, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California; Calendar No. 229, a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; Calendar No. 231, a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; and Calendar No. 232, a bill (S. 1271) to authorize the the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

I might say that at the last session I discussed these bills and resolutions with the distinguished minority leader, and he agreed to their consideration. I have asked the aides of the Senate to inform interested committee chairmen and Senators that the bills and resolutions will be taken up.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 26 reports on overobligations of appropriations received from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, covering its activities as of December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1157, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract, within Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SAMUEL E. ARROYO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to the inclusion of United States Highway 101 (from Los Angeles to the Oregon State line) and United States Highway 199 (from Crescent City to the Oregon State line) in the national system of interstate highways

"Whereas United States Highway 101, which traverses the State of California from the international boundary line near Tia Juana to the Oregon State line via Los Angeles, San Francisco, Eureka, and Crescent City, is one of the most important highways in this State, carrying as it does a tremendous volume of international, interstate, and local vehicular traffic; and

"Whereas United States Highway 199, which joins United States Highway 101 at Crescent City in this State and traverses the inland area of the State of Oregon by way of Grants Pass, is also an interstate artery of major importance, carrying heavy traffic of all types; and

"Whereas United States Highways 101 and 199, which are included in the Federal primary highway system, are essential links in the interstate and international highway system of the Nation; and

"Whereas in the event of atomic attack or any other national defense emergency on the west coast, United States Highway 101 would assume even greater importance as an avenue for necessary evacuation of inhabitants of urban areas and transportation of civil-defense equipment and personnel; and

"Whereas the only form of ground transportation between Grants Pass and Crescent City is via United States Highway 199 and between Crescent City and Eureka is via United States Highway 101 (both being sections of State Highway Route 1), there being no railroad facilities between these points; and

"Whereas under section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, provision was made for the selection of a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent, so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas additional allocations of Federal-aid highway funds are made by Congress for expenditure on this national system of interstate highways, as evidenced by the additional allocation of $175 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and $175 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, made by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for this purpose; and

"Whereas the Congress is now in the process of enacting legislation which would supply hundreds of millions of additional funds for the national system of interstate highways; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recommended 'that the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for the cost of a modern interstate network to be completed by 1964 to include the most essential urban arterial connections at an annual average cost of $2.5 billion' for the next 10 years; and

"Whereas while the portion of United States Highway 101 in this State from the Mexican border to the city of Los Angeles was included in this national system of interstate highways, the remainder thereof from Los Angeles to the Oregon boundary was left out of said system, as was United States Highway 199, and neither are at the present time included therein; and

"Whereas it is felt by the people of the State of California that it is imperative for the sake of interstate and international vehicular traffic and national defense, that all of United States Highway 101 in this State, and also all of United States Highway 199, be included in the national system of interstate highways and thereby be eligible for the additional Federal-aid highway funds expended on such highways in order to bring portions of said highways up to the standards necessary to adequately handle the volume of traffic now in existence on said highways and the certain increase thereof due to the continuing growth in the population of this State and to cope with the increased burdens which will be placed on said highways in case of a national defense emergency; and

"Whereas the County Supervisors Association of California, at its annual convention in Los Angeles last September 1954, adopted a resolution urging the inclusion of United States Highways 101 and 199 in the national system of interstate highways, indicating statewide support: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, the California Highway Commission, and the State department of public works to take whatever steps are necessary to include the highways described in this resolution in the national system of interstate highways; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to the chairman and members of the California Highway Commission and the director of public works, to the County Supervisors Association of California, and to the supervisors unit of the Redwood Empire Association; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Oregon State Senate, to the speaker of the Oregon State House of Representatives, and to the chairman and members of the Oregon State Highway Commission, with letters of transmittal expressing the friendly greetings of the California State Legislature and the hope that the Oregon State Legislature, now in session, will take similar action calling for inclusion of sections of United States Highways 199 and 101 within the State of Oregon in the national system of interstate highways and also that the agencies concerned in the States of Oregon and California may work cooperatively together for the accomplishment of common objective, in the public interest nationally."

A current resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island, to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics

"Whereas the Federal Government has recently abandoned the use of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island in the harbor of the city of New York which it has operated for many years as a center for the reception, care, custody, and processing of persons immigrating into this country; and

"Whereas the said lands, properties, and facilities are no longer being operated or maintained by the Federal Government for any purpose whatsoever, and unless properly and continuously maintained they will inevitably deteriorate through nonuse and will ultimately become obsolete, uninhabitable, and valueless for any purpose; and

"Whereas the State of New York and the city of New York are in dire need of additional facilities for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the legislature, that the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island are ideally suitable for and can be readily converted into a well-equipped clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, to be operated and maintained by the State or the city of New York, or jointly by both the State and the city of New York: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and/or the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island, formerly used by the Federal Government as a reception center for immigrants, for use by the State and/or the city of New York as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York, and that they be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk."

"In senate, April 1, 1955, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate moneys for marketing reporting and crop-estimating work in Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has appropriated funds to the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture for the maintenance of crop estimating and market reporting service in most mainland agricultural areas; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii now maintains crop estimating and market reporting services solely through the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Hawaii;

"Whereas crop estimates and market reports are an indispensable aid to farmers, dealers, military, and governmental consumers, and the general public; and

"Whereas the production information covers commodities having an annual wholesale

value of approximately $40 million and the market information covers approximately $50 million; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America, paying its full share of Federal taxes and is being denied equal treatment with the States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii because of its geographical position is in greater need than most of the States of having complete and accurate information on prospective crop harvests and market conditions: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to include in the current budget of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture an appropriation of $16,000 to the market reporting division and $25,000 to the agricultural estimating division thereof to be expended in Hawaii for crop estimates and market reports in cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 22d day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 59

"Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to consider favorably the proposed revision of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946

"Whereas a spirit of good will and amity exists between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, and the Republic of the Philippines stands as a trusted friend of the United States in the Pacific and the Far East; and

"Whereas the young Republic of the Philippines is valiantly and conscientiously attempting to achieve economic self-sufficiency and stability and a sound governmental budget through the development of its natural resources, industrial plants, and commercial enterprises; and

"Whereas part of this economic development will be dependent upon the ability of the Philippine Republic to import the industrial machinery, equipment, and tools necessary to this development, and such importation requires a favorable balance of trade with other nations, particularly the United States; and

"Whereas United States Government expenditures in the Philippines have declined from an average annual figure of $345 million during 1946 to 1950 to a sum slightly over $140 million in the years 1951 to 1953, and the dutes foregone by the Philippine Republic on United States imports were three times those foregone by the United States on Philippine imports from 1946 to 1954 under the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; and

"Whereas the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (Bell Trade Act) is now undergoing revision in the Congress of the United States and such a trade agreement is of vital importance to the United States and the Republic of the Philippines: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to the following provisions of the proposed revision to the Philippine Trade Act of 1946: The acceleration of duties on imports to the Philippines from the United States and the deceleration of duties on imports to the United States from the Philippines; the removal of certain commodities from absolute quotas with proper and judicious safeguards; a 12-month restrictive quota or quotas on certain commodities as necessary by both countries to safeguard their domestic production; the mutual protection from discriminatory export taxation by either country; the deletion of currency and exchange provisions and the inclusion of 'treaty merchant status' provisions applicable to aliens of the two countries; the mutualization of rights of the citizens of one country engaged in business in the other and the reciprocity of nondiscrimination; and the requirement that neither country be compelled to furnish any information contrary to its national security; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, President of the Philippines, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., at Eau Claire, Wis., relating to unfair import competition under the present Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by Marian Council, No. 3852, Knights of Columbus, Cutchogue, and Rev. James V. Rogan Council, No. 1816, Knights of Columbus, Central Islip, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., protesting against the enactment of legislation to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, at Santa Monica, Calif., relating to wages paid in the Forest Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 20

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

"Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and the preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule here complained of; and

"Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union of any portion of their power to tax Government contractors there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in balance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 56th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That the general assembly respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union and the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the law of any State of the Union, except such taxes the direct incidence of which would be upon the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to initiate action by the Army engineers for the development and improvement of harbor facilities in the town of Bristol

"Whereas the town of Bristol has always been a center of maritime activity; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of Rhode Island depends to a great extent upon ample harbor facilities, not only for the use of its thriving industry but also as a means of sending forth its manufactured products into the stream of interstate and foreign commerce; and

"Whereas the harbor of the town of Bristol is an important element in the potential commercial harbor facilities of the State; and

"Whereas said harbor of the town of Bristol would provide an excellent base of operation for shipping of all types if said harbor were to be properly dredged and improved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to initiate action by the Army engineers for the dredging and improvement of the harbor at Bristol; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, duly certified copies of this resolution."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States including the State of Rhode Island have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages, and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purposes of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in

maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Rhode Island to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is the considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Rhode Island the power to restore the proper balance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to transmit to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 18

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States

"Whereas the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has reportedly recommended to the Commission the transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States; and

"Whereas the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing more than 2,600 soil-conservation districts in the United States, and the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing 86 soil-conservation districts in this State, along with other individuals, groups, and organizations who are vitally interested in the program, are opposed to the reported recommendation; and

"Whereas if the reported recommendation is approved, it would place an inordinately heavy financial burden upon the State of Oklahoma, since the contemplated State appropriation each biennium would amount to a sum in excess of $4 million in addition to sums now being appropriated if assistance to local soil-conservation districts is to be maintained at current levels; and

"Whereas such program would greatly retard, if not eventually destroy, the national program of soil and water conservation now being carried on, and since the problem is national in scope, it should be dealt with accordingly: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, relative to gradual transfer of soil conservation technical assistance functions, from the national authority to the various States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Oklahoma in the Nation's Capitol.

"Adopted by the senate the 6th day of April 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 13th day of April 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to cause to be minted a half dollar commemorating the 50th anniversary of the State of Oklahoma

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America on June 16, 1906, enacted the Enabling Act providing the means whereby the people of Oklahoma Territory and Indian Territory did, on November 16, 1907, become the 46th State of the Union; and

"Whereas in the short period of 50 years, the State of Oklahoma has had an unprecedented growth and development in the fields of agriculture, oil, mining, and arts and sciences, and has furnished outstanding leadership both in civil and military endeavors; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oklahoma have a great heritage from their pioneer fathers and mothers who overnight established cities, towns, and government upon a raw and unsettled land; and

"Whereas Oklahoma now proudly stands as the most progressive State in the Union, and has in its short lifetime achieved miraculous accomplishments and is entitled to receive from the Government of the United States just recognition therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as will cause to be minted by the Government of the United States a half dollar of such design as will properly commemorate the State of Oklahoma upon its 50 years of progress, and that the same be dated 1957; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to each Member of the Oklahoma Delegation in Congress, the chairmen of the appropriate committees dealing with the matter before the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and that a copy thereof be furnished to the Treasury Department and the Governor of the Federal Reserve System.

"Adopted by the senate the 23d day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 13th day of April 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 528

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States relating to legislation designed to limit imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil

"To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"1. That imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil have forced a curtailment of production of these products within the State of Oklahoma.

"2. That said curtailed production has caused material unemployment within the State of Oklahoma with great damage to the economy of our State because of losses in income to employees in the several industries mentioned.

"3. That the foreign products so imported are manufactured with substandard labor, are of inferior quality, and, therefore, should not be permitted to compete with domestic products to the detriment of both labor and management in the industries mentioned.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, prays:

"That the President and Congress of the United States enact such legislation as will curtail the imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil to the end that full-scale domestic production may be restored.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 24th day of March 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 559

"Resolution calling attention to drought-stricken areas of the State of Oklahoma and requesting aid through the Federal drought emergency feed program and urging that consideration be given by the Oklahoma representatives in Congress to legislation authorizing long-term low-interest-rate loans to drought-stricken farmers in Oklahoma

"Whereas extreme drought conditions throughout the State of Oklahoma, particularly in the northwestern and southwestern counties of the State, have caused the destruction of pastures and have so affected the economics of farmers in said areas that there is grave danger that valuable foundation herds may be sacrificed because of lack of feed; and

"Whereas the Federal drought emergency feed program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, if authorized to do so, can greatly alleviate the situation in the counties affected by supplying much-needed feed, as provided in said program; and

"Whereas unseasonable drought conditions in Oklahoma for the past several years have been the cause of many farmers in Oklahoma becoming unable to meet their financial obligations and causing them to be in danger of losing their farms and their homes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That the United States Department of Agriculture be requested to allocate assistance to farmers in all counties in Oklahoma where same is needed under the provisions of the drought emergency feed program and that said assistance be made retroactive to April 1, 1955; be it further

"Resolved, That the 25th Oklahoma Legislature hereby expresses the view and strongly recommends that the Congress of the United

States give careful consideration to legislation which will authorize a complete refinancing program permitting drought-stricken farmers to secure long-term loans at low interest rates through the Farmers Home Administration, and that such agency be permitted to regulate the processing of such loan applications in such manner that immediate assistance may be granted to applicants in drought-stricken areas of the State; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Department of Agriculture and to each of the Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation in Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of April 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF SOUTH MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Louis J. Mosakowski, city clerk of the city of South Milwaukee, the text of a resolution which had been adopted by the common council of that municipality in opposition to pending Federal legislation which would destroy Federal regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead.

I heartily endorse this resolution and know that it represents the sentiments of the people of Wisconsin as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certain legislation is pending before the Congress of the United States, including the so-called Harris bill which would amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and exempt from rate regulation of the Federal Power Commission those companies producing and supplying natural gas for sale in interstate commerce; and

Whereas it appears that passage of such legislation would result in increased gas rates to the consumers of South Milwaukee; and

Whereas it appears regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead is required to protect the public because of limited competition and concentration of ownership in a few companies; and

Whereas the League of Wisconsin Municipalities and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers have already gone on record in opposition to such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee hereby records its opposition to any Federal legislation which would eliminate Federal regulation of natural gas rates at the wellhead, and calls upon Members of Congress to defeat any such legislation, including the Harris bill; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, to both Wisconsin Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

Adopted April 6, 1955.

LOUIS J. MOSAKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

Approved April 7, 1955.

DEAN L. POTTER,
Mayor.

LETTER FROM WISCONSIN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from the director of the department of national affairs of the Wisconsin Optometric Association concerning two important matters of interest to its membership.

The first is the upholding of the Church-Wiley law against fireworks bootlegging. The second is an amendment to the bill introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], entitled the Medical Research Act of 1955—an extremely important bill to provide grants-in-aid to accredited nonprofit universities and schools of medicine, dentistry, to hospitals, laboratories and other nonprofit institutions engaging in research, and to defray the cost of construction of facilities for the battling of crippling and killing diseases.

I believe that Dr. Jacobson's letter will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for its favorable attention.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., April 26, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the Wisconsin Optometric Association I wish to invite your attention to Public Law 385 and bill S. 849 and to express our concern in regard to them.

First, concerning Public Law 385 which provides for regulation of fireworks distribution on which you did such a highly commendable job last year, it has come to our attention that efforts are being made by new legislation (bill S. 1297) which would in effect provide for later repeal of Public Law 385. Although we are sure that you are well aware of this measure our association wishes to apprise you that we are vitally interested in upholding Public Law 385 for its unestimable benefits toward public safety and in particular the preservation of human vision. We hope and trust you will continue your efforts to maintain this law for all time to come.

Secondly, in reference to bill S. 849, to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases including blindness. The profession of optometry is interested in this legislation not only because the bill would provide funds for research facilities to aid in preventing blindness, but also because of the relationship between vision and the nervous disorders or mental illness. Optometry is rendering a vital service to the public and to improve and expand this service additional research facilities are most necessary. The bill as it now stands makes no specific mention of optometry, therefore, we feel that the bill should be amended to expressly include optometry in its provisions and also that one optometrist should be appointed to the council whose function it would be to recommend the allocation of funds for the various projects.

I have learned that although a Senate hearing has been held on S. 849 this month, it is still pending before the committee to meet in executive session to consider it. I realize that you are not a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, however, any favorable consideration for our views which you may be able to bring to the attention of the members of this committee will be sincerely appreciated.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. JACOBSON, O. D.,
Director of Department of National Affairs, Wisconsin Optometric Association.

CLOSING OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICE AT VIRGINIA, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of Virginia, Minn., stating their opposition to the closing of the Internal Revenue Service office at Virginia, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6202

Resolution by the city of Virginia, Minn., April 12, 1955, in opposition to the closing of the Virginia internal revenue office and the moving of same to Hibbing

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas the City Council of the City of Virginia has been informed that the local office of the internal revenue department is being closed forthwith and the personnel being transferred to the office in Hibbing, Minn.; and

Whereas the office in the city of Virginia has been maintained for 20 years or longer in office space made available to the revenue department by the city of Virginia without charge to the department; and

Whereas the development of the taconite industry has greatly increased the work of the Virginia office, and the transfer of personnel to Hibbing will make the cost of rendering service to the Virginia area and the newly developed taconite area increasingly expensive to the revenue department and increasingly burdensome to the public in securing the benefits of such service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Virginia for itself and for all of the citizens of the city of Virginia and in behalf of the people in the area served by the Virginia office place itself on record in opposition to the discontinuance of the Virginia office and the transfer of same to Hibbing and request that the revenue department reconsider its action and make available to Virginia and this area the service that it has had in the past 20 years. Further, that copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman Blatnik and Senators Humphrey and Thye and to Mr. A. R. Knox, district director of internal revenue.

Adopted April 12, 1955.

Attest:

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
President of the City Council.
J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
City Clerk.

Approved April 18, 1955.

JOHN VUKELICH,
Mayor.

REORGANIZATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association at a meeting on April 13, 1955, at Wells, Minn., stating their opposition to the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration as proposed by the Hoover Commission Task Force.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the task force on lending agencies of the Hoover Commission has recommended the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association of Wells, Minn., is of the opinion that the proposed reorganization is not in the best interest of the Rural Electric Cooperatives, or of the farmers of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Wells Electric Association is opposed to the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration as proposed by the Hoover Commission Task Force, and that each of the United States Senators and Congressmen in whose district the Wells Electric Association operates be instructed to vote against any such reorganization.

Dated at Wells, Minn., this 13th day of April 1955.

WELLS ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
OTTO FAHNING, *President*,
GEORGE LORENZ, *Vice President*,
DALLAS YORKY, *Secretary-Treasurer*.
WILLARD MILLER, *Director*,
BEN REDMAN, *Director*.

EXPANSION OF CANE AND BEET SUGAR ALLOCATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted at a special meeting of the board of directors of the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce on March 28, 1955, at Moorhead, Minn., supporting the appeal of our sugar-beet producers for expanded allocation.

I have received similar resolutions from the following organizations: Commercial Club at Frost, Minn.; Hallock Lions Club, Hallock, Minn.; Kennedy Chamber of Commerce, Kennedy, Minn.; Chamber of Commerce, Blue Earth, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1951 expires December 31, 1956; and

Whereas the sugar industry of the United States is today operating at a minimum of capacity; and

Whereas the annual consumption increase since 1947 has been 1 million tons; and

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital portion of the economy of the Red River Valley of the North; and

Whereas we do have at the present time capacities to produce and process more than double the amount of beet sugar being produced and marketed from this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, Minn., go on record requesting that any increase in the consumption of sugar within the United States be given to the beet and cane producers within the territorial boundaries of this country commensurate with their ability to produce and market this additional consumption economically and in the best interest of the sugar industry of the United States, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to all other interested parties.

PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners for Hennepin County, Minn., on April 12, 1955, relative to the plight of the American Indian and requesting that steps be taken to correct the situation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the deplorable condition of the American Indian has again been brought before the citizens of Minnesota and this county board; and

Whereas the well-meant efforts of a board member to solve the problem by giving a job to an unemployed Indian can only be a temporary solution to a single case, while there are thousands existing in America; and

Whereas the white settlers of a previous century seized from the original owners, by force and superiority of weapons, land, minerals, timber, and power sources of untold value; and

Whereas our attitude toward conquered peoples has changed, and instead of appropriating the wealth of the conquered we rebuild the bombed homes and public buildings, rehabilitate the sick and wounded, and restore the shattered economy of the conquered nation; and

Whereas our debt to the former owners of this broad land is greater than to the Nazis, the Japanese, and others conquered in recent wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to alleviate current suffering among the Indians and to appoint a commission for a thorough study of the Indian problem to the end that all may be trained to become employable and self-supporting, and that attention to the problem of the original Americans be given priority to the subject of displaced persons from foreign lands. Integrating the Indian into our economic life will do much to erase from our history one of its blackest pages.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution passed by the Minnesota Holstein Breeders' Association of Stillwater, Minn., stating their endorsement of the amendment to the Selective Service Act, relating to the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 23.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Selective Service is in many cases drafting young men between the ages of 25 and 28, who often have established farming operations or other occupations, and family life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse the amendment to the Selective Service Act, as proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, which recommends the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 23, an age which would be far more desirable for the draftees.

THE SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the delegates at a meeting of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware on Friday, April 22, 1955, reaffirming their support of the Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are the highest peak of human accomplishment in mankind's struggle for freedom; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements may override the Constitution and cut across the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights; and

Whereas unlimited treaty power poses a continuing threat to the Constitution, this threat having been recently augmented by the fact that four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that the United Nations Charter—ratified treaty—supersedes our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware division of the Polish-American Congress, in plenary meeting assembled, reaffirm its previous support of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) and petition the State of Delaware Representatives in the United States Congress to support the adoption of this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to State of Delaware Representatives in the United States Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 300. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; with amendments (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 265. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; with amendments (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 52. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Arizona (Rept. No. 249); and

S. 53. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a

portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States (Rept. No. 250).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 732. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 246);

S. 748. A bill to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; without amendment (Rept. No. 247); and

S. 1529. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 234);

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 237);

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana; with an amendment (Rept. No. 235);

S. Res. 33. Resolution for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 238);

S. Res. 92. Resolution providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; with an amendment (Rept. No. 239); and

S. Res. 94. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 236).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 741. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title; with amendments (Rept. No. 244);

S. 743. A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 245); and

H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 258).

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 35. Resolution providing for a study of merchant-marine training and education in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 669. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 253); and

S. 727. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 184. A bill to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 391. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 654. A bill to extend the direct-loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 243);

S. 755. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va. (Rept. No. 242); and

S. 1645. A bill to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1507. A bill to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 252).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2581. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendments (Rept. No. 259).

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, House bill 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 232) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BYRD. I ask permission to file minority views on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and that the report and minority views be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Virginia submitting a report on the reciprocal trade bill?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator also filing minority views?

Mr. BYRD. I have asked permission to file minority views on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the Senator can tell us when the hearings on the bill will be printed and available?

Mr. BYRD. They are printed now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They are printed and available now?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. A copy of the bill and the report and minority views will be sent to each Senator tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I inquire of the Senator if it will be agreeable to him to proceed to the consideration of the bill following the morning hour on Monday?

Mr. BYRD. That will be agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Virginia, that the Senate may remain in session until rather late in the evening—6:30, 7, or 7:30 o'clock—during the discussion of the bill, certainly until we reach the voting stage, so that we may perhaps complete consideration of the bill next week.

Mr. BYRD. That will be entirely satisfactory to me. I agree with the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have been able, while waiting for committees to report bills, to recess from Thursday until Monday, and frequently from Monday until Thursday. From now on committees will be reporting important measures, which the Senate must consider. I therefore hope that the Senate will take notice of this fact, and that Senators will adjust their engagements so that they may be present for a full week, and prepared to remain in attendance until the early part of each evening while the Senate is in session.

ELIMINATION OF CUMULATIVE VOTING OF SHARES OF STOCK IN ELECTION OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 256) to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, and I submit a report (No. 240) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the minority views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be printed as a part of the report of the majority of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and the report, including the minority views, will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the

Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960, vice Nelson Lee Smith, term expiring June 22, 1955; and

Richard Newton Abrahams, and sundry other cadets, to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Forty-five postmasters.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably 1,560 nominations for appointment in the Navy. This group includes appointments as ensigns in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps of this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as a group of NROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

In addition to the above, I report the names of 326 Military Academy cadets for appointment in the Regular Army as second lieutenants and a group of 135 names of distinguished military students for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army.

Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1837. A bill to amend section 15 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Tomasso Scotto DiPerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1839. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing for a toll road connecting the east and west coasts of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1840. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; and

S. 1841. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of lawyers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

S. 1842. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of Ehstathios Aristidou Spathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1844. A bill amending paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a) by including the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1845. A bill to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang; and

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1849. A bill to provide for the grant of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1850. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Kamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1851. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to Mary Ann Aust; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1852. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1853. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1854. A bill to permit amounts paid motor-carrier transportation systems as compensation for the possession or control of such systems by the United States to be attributed, for income tax purposes, to the period of such possession or control; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 1855. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1856. A bill for the relief of Alina Kosmider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEGOTIATION OF INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR A TOLL ROAD CONNECTING THE EAST AND WEST COASTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing a toll road connecting at a point on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, east of Pittsburgh, and extending westward, following the general course of the National Pike, known as U. S. Route 40, to San Francisco.

I hope the Members of Congress will give this subject careful consideration.

A road of this character would connect the Atlantic seaboard with the Pacific slope. It would tie America together industrially, culturally, and spiritually. It could be used in case of necessity as a great military highway. Rights-of-way wide enough should be secured to take care of future needs of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1839) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of an interstate compact providing for a toll road connecting the east and west coasts of the United States, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, and any other State or States, to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the construction and operation of a toll road connecting the Pennsylvania Turnpike with the west coast of the United States, beginning at a point east of Pittsburgh, and extending westward, south of Pittsburgh, following the general course of the National Pike known as U. S. Route 40 to San Francisco. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE TO DENTISTS AND LAWYERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference,

two bills designed to extend social-security coverage. The first provides for voluntary coverage for dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, and the other provides for the voluntary coverage of lawyers under that system.

Members of the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress at the time that we were considering revisions of the Social Security Act, I submitted an amendment to extend this coverage to members of the dental profession. I did so as a result of a poll which had been taken by the Minnesota dentists which demonstrated overwhelming support for that social-security extension. Since that time there has been added evidence demonstrating to my complete satisfaction that members of the dental profession in other States, whenever given an opportunity to do so, voted to be covered by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

In connection with this matter I have just had an opportunity to learn from a poll taken in the State of Iowa that 81 percent of the voting dentists are in favor of coverage under social-security coverage, with only 12.5 percent opposed to it.

I ask unanimous consent to have an item from the Cedar Rapids News of January 10, 1955, and a memorandum from the Altman-Gilbert Advertising Agency of Cedar Rapids dealing with this subject included in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids News of January 10, 1955]

STATE'S DENTISTS FAVOR ACCEPTING SOCIAL SECURITY

The majority of Iowa dentists do not agree with the American Dental Association's stand on the question of social-security coverage.

And they do not agree with the Iowa delegation's vote on the question at the association's last convention, results of a poll of Iowa dentists showed Monday.

The poll was taken by the Altman-Gilbert Advertising Agency of Cedar Rapids, on behalf of a group of 22 Cedar Rapids dentists and 1 living in Dubuque. Results were tabulated by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co., a Cedar Rapids accounting firm.

The result, announced Monday, showed 81 percent of the voting dentists in favor of coming under social-security coverage, while 12.5 percent were opposed.

Of nearly 1,700 dentists in Iowa, the advertising agency report showed, 995 were accounted for in the tabulation.

It said that every registered dentist in the State was given an opportunity to vote—including about 400 who do not belong to the Iowa State Dental Society. The group which sponsored the poll includes both members and nonmembers of the society.

Only votes signed by the dentists were tabulated, the ad agency said. The names were checked against the list of Iowa dentists, and duplicate votes were eliminated.

Of the 995 ballots returned, 806 favored inclusion of dentists in the social-security program, while 124 were opposed.

Another 10 favored giving individual dentists the option of accepting or rejecting social-security coverage, while 15 reported "no opinion," and 3 wanted more information before voting.

Thirty-seven ballots were not delivered—either because the dentist had died or because of change of address or wrong addresses.

A spokesman for the group of Cedar Rapids dentists said that at the national society's last convention the vote was 215 against social-security coverage and 167 for coverage. He said the vote gets closer each year.

The Iowa delegation, he said, voted 4 to 3 against giving dentists social-security coverage.

Dentists now are excluded from the social-security program, because of the dental society's stand.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *January 7, 1955.*

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT OF IOWA DENTISTS FAVOR SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THEMSELVES—12.5 PERCENT ARE OPPOSED TO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THEMSELVES

This information was gained from the figures tabulated by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co., certified public accountants in Cedar Rapids.

Following are final results of figures they tabulated from returns received by us on the recent poll we conducted at the request of, and financed by, 22 Cedar Rapids and 1 Dubuque dentists.

Nine hundred and ninety-five answers, signed by dentists, were turned over to the certified public accountants named above.

Dentists in favor of social security, 806; 81 percent.

Dentists opposed to social security, 124; 12.5 percent.

Dentists in favor of optional coverage, 10; 1 percent.

Dentists with no opinion, 15; 1.5 percent.

Letters returned because dentist deceased, 11; 1.1 percent.

Dentists wanting more information, 3; 0.3 percent.

Letters returned because of change of address, wrong address, and reasons other than deceased, 26; 2.6 percent.

Every registered dentist in Iowa was given the opportunity to vote, including about 400 who do not belong to the dental society.

Only votes signed by the dentist were included in the tabulation. These were checked on arrival against the list of Iowa licensed dentists, and all duplicate votes eliminated.

The original tabulation by McGladrey, Hansen, Dunn & Co. is on file in our office for inspection by anyone interested.

ALTMAN-GILBERT ADVERTISING AGENCY,
M. A. GILBERT.

Mr. HUMPHREY. According to Dr. H. W. Stonebrook, president, Iowa State Dental Society, Eldora, Iowa, in a letter dated December 21, 1953, to Secretary Hobby of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department:

Iowa favors inclusion of self-employed dentists to the ranks of OASI. In fact, the Des Moines District Dental Society, which comprises about one-fifth of the total dental population of Iowa, favors inclusion by 97 percent.

I am also advised that Mr. Schenck, a member from Ohio, shared my conclusions as a result of interviews and conferences he has held with the dentists in his State. His conclusions are identical with the results of an Ohio dental poll which found on the basis of 1,685 returns that the dentists voted 8 to 5 to be included under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Dental societies all over the Nation have conducted polls in many States, results of which show favor of the adoption of social security by a ratio of 8 to 1. This includes polls relating to the States of Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Oregon, which I brought to the attention of the Senate last year. The polls show, according to the February 1954 issue of Oral Hygiene, the following results:

	Yes	*No*
Massachusetts	1,164	51
Minnesota	927	325
Oregon	397	140

I recently heard of a referendum conducted among members of the Chicago Dental Society which demonstrated that approximately 81 percent of the dentists voted to be included.

I am convinced that our Nation's dentists are fully deserving of the opportunity to participate in the social-security program.

On the basis of information available to me, it is made clear that the members of the legal profession share the same attitude. This was dramatized a few weeks ago at the annual midwinter meeting of the American Bar Association in Chicago.

The recommendation of the association's board of governors, which was approved by the house of delegates, is as follows:

In view of the present sentiment of the members of the legal profession in favor of voluntary social-security coverage, the board of governors recommends to the house of delegates that the American Bar Association favor voluntary coverage under the Social Security Act for lawyers and such of the professional groups as desire to be included.

The action of the American Bar Association is thoroughly consistent with polls taken of lawyers in a great many States and in my judgment, on the basis of information given to me, carries out the wishes of the members of the legal profession.

It is my hope that Congress will act in favor of my proposals and thus allow lawyers and dentists to share in the benefits that other citizens enjoy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1840. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of dentists under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; and

S. 1841. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage of lawyers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act.

GRANTING OF CAREER-CONDITIONAL AND CAREER APPOINTMENTS TO CERTAIN INDEFINITE EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a new appointment system was put into effect by the Civil Service Commission on January 23, 1955. The new system is designed to accomplish two primary objectives. First, to establish a stable yet flexible appointment system for the long range future and, secondly, to eliminate the emergency procedures established under the Whitten amendment. The system sets

up a new kind of civil-service appointment called career-conditional. This type of appointment will generally be given to persons appointed from registers of eligibles set up through open competitive examinations. The first year of service is a probationary period which is considered an integral part of the examination. After completion of probation, the employee acquires competitive status. After 3 years the employee acquires a full career status.

When the new system went into effect some 220,000 indefinite employees, who entered the Government service on a competitive basis and who had 3 years or more of service, were converted to career status employees. An additional 235,000 indefinites, who also entered the Government service on a competitive basis, but who had less than 3 years' service, were converted to career-conditional. These employees will acquire full career status as soon as they complete the necessary 3 years of service.

Mr. President, the objectives of the new system are splendid and it is a fine thing from the standpoint of both the Government and the 455,000 indefinite employees who were converted to career or career-conditional that the system was adopted. However, there is a large group of indefinite employees who were not so converted and who should be, in my opinion. The group consists of employees who competed successfully in regular competitive civil-service examinations but were not appointed from a register of eligibles because they were already in the Federal service under some other type of appointment. I do not believe they should be barred from conversion to career or career-conditional status because of a technicality. Following are typical examples of the situation to which I refer:

(a) Eligible A was certified for the position of O. and M. examiner, grade 11. Upon reporting for interview he was advised the job was filled. However, he was offered, and accepted, a position as statistician, GS–11, outside the register. Within a few months he was reassigned to the O. and M. examiner position for which he was originally certified.

(b) A stenographer working in agency A under an appointment outside the register was offered appointment in agency B as a result of her certification from a stenographer register. She was persuaded by agency A to stay with them.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive Civil Service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1849) to provide for the grant of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1852) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPUREY, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

The bill which I am introducing, and in which I am being joined by Senators MONRONEY, HUMPHREY, and SPARKMAN, would, if enacted, require the Eisenhower administration to restore the Federal Crop Insurance program to its original purposes. The original purpose of the crop-insurance program was to establish a means by which farmers and the American people could prepare themselves ahead of time to cushion the disastrous shocks of reduced farm income in local areas that always results when flood, drought, insect infestation, or disease strikes a debilitating blow to the farm production.

The American people have never been known to sit idly by to allow human suffering when disaster strikes their fellow citizens anywhere. We have always been generous of our work and our treasure to help rescue those who suffer from national disasters. The Federal Crop Insurance program was set up to make prior provision for such catastrophes on individual farms, in local areas, and in regionwide disasters. It was never intended that crop insurance would be a money-making proposition nor a Federal subsidy, rather it was intended that the American people would insure themselves against heavy future relief loans by paying the administrative costs of a crop-insurance program wherein the payments of indemnities for loss would be paid by farmers in premiums.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Benson, the Department of Agriculture has begun to erode this original purpose, adding purely administrative costs to the premiums charged to farmers. It has gone further and had bills introduced into the Senate (S. 1165) which would allow the charging of all administrative costs of the program to premiums. To do so would be to ask farmers to assume the entire risk of adverse weather and to shoulder the social costs of disaster always heretofore borne by the population at large.

The bill I am introducing (sec. 4) would prohibit the administration from loading up the premiums charged to farmers with administrative costs. This would return the program to its original purpose whereby farmers would assume the costs of the risk of crop failure and the people as a whole through their Government would pay the costs of administering the program.

When originally established, the current crop-insurance program was not applied nationwide to all crops, but only in a few counties to a few crops. The idea was that the program should be expanded gradually as experience in its application was acquired. Now, however, we have seen the program jerked out of 9 drought-stricken counties with 7 more drought-stricken counties threatened. Moreover, we have heard that consideration is being given to eliminating crop insurance for durum wheat, which was stricken by rust and complete elimination of crop insurance for tobacco and other southeastern areas because the small size of the individual policies bring about a high ratio of administrative costs to premium income. This kind of action and reasoning is completely inconsistent with the purpose of the crop-insurance program. It is consistent only with the mistaken notion that the purpose of the Federal crop-insurance program is to do the experimental work required to turn a paying proposition over to private insurance companies in disregard of public and farmer needs for greater protection than can be insured by a profit-type insurance corporation.

The bill I am introducing would reverse this trend by requiring a 2-year notice of intention before an operating crop-insurance program could be jerked out of a county.

The Eisenhower administration has further revealed its intentions of turning the program over to private interests in two other ways: One, I understand that they have turned over a large part of their public actuarial records to be photostated by private-profit corporations for their own use. And two, the administration has in a dynamically progressive manner removed administration of crop-insurance program from the hand of democratically elected county and community committeemen and turned it over to the same private-profit insurance companies who have gotten the records and who have made some trial runs on skimming off the cream of the low-risk crop insurance business.

The bill I am introducing (sec. 1) would stop this kind of thing by requiring that the Secretary utilize the farmer committees in carrying out the crop-insurance program.

It was expected when we passed the 1947 crop insurance law, that the program would be expanded into additional counties and ultimately into all 3,000 farm counties. This expansion, while still provided by law, has made little progress recently. The bill I am introducing (sec. 2) does not put a mandate for rapid expansion. To do so might require unsound speed. My bill does require that if 200 farmers in a county petition for the program, the reasons for not so expanding the program must be incorporated in the next budget message of the President.

My bill has another provision that experience in the drought areas of the Southwest have shown to be needed (and this provision is not included in the administration bill, S. 1165). If a certain crop, for example, winter wheat should be adjudged a complete failure—the indemnity will be paid and the land immediately released so that it can be put into other soil holding land cover without cost of indemnity payment.

In a county where drought and destructive dust storms usually occur together, it is senseless to require land to lay bare as a requirement for collecting the crop insurance indemnity on a previous crop that has been a complete failure.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF PIPESTONE, MINN.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, and ask to have appropriately referred, amendments intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 210, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain property in the city of Pipestone, Minn., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL (S. DOC. NO. 40)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 1, 1953, the Senate approved, at my request, a motion to print as a publication as Senate Document No. 47, 83d Congress, 1st session, a compilation of Federal statutes, Executive orders, and congressional resolutions relating to the internal security of our country.

Toward the end of the 83d Congress, a mass of important new legislation was enacted by the Congress in this field.

Since the start of this Congress, great numbers of messages of inquiry have come to me as to when a revision of the manual would be forthcoming, since it is now obsolete.

I ask unanimous consent for the revision of Senate Document No. 47 and for its publication as a new document in the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to elaborate on the unanimous-consent request, and I ask unanimous consent that I be given 2 minutes in order to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, prior to Senate Document No. 47, there had never been available, in one place, all of the material, statutory and administrative, bearing upon the administration of internal security in our land.

Each day, however, congressional committees, executive agency personnel, newspaper editors, law-enforcement officers, security officers in industrial plants, union officials, attorneys, and a tremendous variety of other Americans have occasion to look up security data.

I am pleased to say that thousands of copies have been sold by the Government Printing Office at a cost of 70 cents apiece. The intelligence agencies of the United States Government, the security agencies, have secured hundreds of copies through my own office, the document rooms, and other congressional sources.

They have reported the manual as virtually indispensable to their work.

The manual was, of course, thoroughly proofread and checked prior to its issuance. It was reviewed by all the congressional investigations committees bearing upon the internal-security field, and by all the sources in the executive branch having responsibility for this problem.

The Library of Congress, which was responsible for the basic compilation, has now, in accordance with my instructions, compiled the necessary data for the revised edition.

Since there is, I understand, somewhat of a logjam at the GPO, in view of the wide number of other hearings and documents now being published, I feel that the green light should be flashed for the publication of this revised document today, because it will obviously be some time before the revised document itself can be printed and available for distribution.

The manual has, I feel, reflected great credit on the Senate as an important guide, and I feel sure that the revised edition will be as well or even better received than was the original edition, which found great acceptance among all responsible observers.

ORDER TO RETURN CERTAIN PAPERS TO HIALMAR H. CARPER

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Hialmar H. Carper recently submitted a written request to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia to return certain papers which were obtained from him by the Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Law Enforcement in nineteen fifty-two. Yesterday an order, made in compliance with Mr. Carper's request, was approved by the Committee. I now present that order, and to the end that it may become operative, I ask unanimous consent that it be approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the order was read and agreed to, as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

It is ordered, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be and is hereby authorized to return to Mr. Hialmar H. Carper, 4021 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va., the following documents which were produced by the said Hialmar H. Carper in 1952 to the Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia Investigating Crime and Law Enforcement:

1. Nine hundred and seventy-seven canceled checks of Mrs. H. H. Carper, drawn on the Arlington Trust Co., Arlington, Va., covering the period May 9, 1945, to October 31, 1951, inclusive.

2. Twenty-seven bank statements, Arlington Trust Co., Arlington, Va., showing the account of Mrs. H. H. Carper, from March 7, 1945, through July 24, 1951, inclusive.

3. Seven United States individual income tax returns, as follows:

(a) Return of Hialmar H. Carper, 1946.
(b) Return of Eunice R. Carper, 1946.
(c) Return of Hialmar H. Carper, 1947.
(d) Return of Eunice R. Carper, 1947.
(e) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1948.
(f) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1949.
(g) Return of Hialmar H. and Eunice R. Carper, 1950.

4. One 27-page financial questionnaire of Hialmar H. Carper.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement made by him before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor in support of S. 662, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Statement by him with reference to the Committee for a National Trade Policy and Mr. George W. Ball, in connection with the hearings on H. R. 1, providing for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES B. CONANT TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO THE REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to the Federal Republic of Germany. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, Fifth Circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

Ruben Rodriguez-Antongiorgi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico, for the term of 4 years, vice Harley A. Miller, resigned.

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal, division No. 2, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years, vice Benjamin B. Mozee, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Thursday, May 5, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

THE CHALLENGE OF MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Mr. Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, an important message concerning the need for comprehensive action for the strengthening of the mental health of the American people.

I have long felt that the forces of spiritual faith and science should be mobilized to the maximum in taking steps to assure sound minds and sound bodies for our people and, in particular, a healthful, cheerful, faithful outlook by them.

Mr. Gorman's message was accompanied by an important booklet depicting, in a wide variety of statistical material, the challenge to our country in this field.

I believe that it is most appropriate that this material be presented to my

colleagues in connection with the observance next week, in accordance with Presidential proclamation, of National Health Week.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In connection with the observance of Mental Health Week, May 1 to 7, the National Mental Health Committee encloses its 1955 edition of What Are the Facts About Mental Illness in the United States?

The highlight of the 1955 fact sheet is the increasing annual cost of mental illness to Federal and State Governments. During 1954 the overall cost of mental illness rose to a new high of $2,867,877,000. In one area alone, the cost of caring for the mentally ill in Veterans' Administration hospitals, it has gone up a staggering 500 percent in a decade—from approximately $44 million in 1945 to more than $200 million in 1954.

Contrasted with these staggering expenditures for care and treatment of the mentally ill is the very insignificant sum spent on psychiatric research. During 1954, Federal, State, and private expenditures for private psychiatric research together amounted to only a little more than $10 million.

The recent development of the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a dramatic example of the enormous dividends resulting from medical research. Although only a relatively small amount of money was spent in the perfection of this vaccine, its success means the savings of millions of dollars in medical costs and, more important, the removal of fear and anxiety from the minds and hearts of millions of American families.

On April 12, on the momentous night when the success of the new vaccine was announced, Drs. Jonas Salk, Thomas Francis, and Alan Gregg appeared on Edward R. Murrow's See It Now broadcast from Ann Arbor. All three were in unanimous agreement that mental illness was the next big frontier facing medical research.

To conquer this great frontier we must begin now to finance a major journey to explore its many mysteries. This can only be done if the following goals are set:

1. The training of thousands of additional psychiatrists and auxiliary personnel, for new knowledge will go to waste unless it is applied promptly.

2. A gradual rise in the annual amount spent on psychiatric research until we reach a figure of at least $100 million a year.

3. Immediate appropriation of Federal and local matching moneys for the construction of desperately needed psychiatric laboratory facilities.

4. The National Mental Health Committee, on behalf of the 46 State governors who are its honorary chairmen, appeals to you to help us achieve these objectives in the next few years. We enlist your help, not only during Mental Health Week, but throughout the entire year.

Cordially,

MIKE GORMAN,
Executive Director.

ASSISTANCE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to hear from officers, members, and friends of chapters of the National Association for Retarded Children relative to two important bills now pending before the House of Representatives.

One is H. R. 2205, introduced by Representative SMITH of Mississippi. It provides for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors system of children's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18, but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability.

The other, likewise by Representative SMITH, is H. R. 4278. It would allow additional tax exemption of $600 for permanently and totally disabled dependents, including those who have attained age 18, but are unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity because of permanent physical or mental condition which began before the age of 18, as well as including those who have not attained the age of 18, but are likewise, unfortunately, incapable of gainful employment.

One parent in my State who wrote me endorsing this proposed legislation wisely recalled the ancient injunction beginning with the unforgettable words: Even as we do unto the least of these we do it unto Him.

I earnestly hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will be in a position to give its sympathetic attention to this proposed legislation in the interest of retarded youngsters and their parents.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND ON PROPOSAL FOR NEGOTIATION WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I issued yesterday afternoon, Wednesday, April 27, relative to the proposal for negotiation with Communist China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

According to reports of the press conferences of yesterday and today, it is now intended to negotiate directly with the Chinese Communists.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking powers.

Their minimum price will be a "down-payment" of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

They don't need a conference to bring about a cease-fire. All they need is to stop shooting and building up their aggressive forces in that area of the Formosa Straits.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China is an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I for one do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots. Their objective has, is, and will continue to be the destruction of human freedom.

To me the State Department's statement of last Saturday seemed consistent with our long-established policy of expecting deeds rather than words as a prelude to another conference. It did not on Saturday and it does not now seem unreasonable that prior to such a conference American prisoners should be released in accordance with the terms of the Korean armistice. Nor did it seem unreasonable that the Communists place in effect in the area an immediate cease-fire.

Unless there is some formula regarding which I have not been advised and which is difficult for me to now envision, I find it hard to comprehend how we could enter into direct negotiations with Communist China without the interests of the Republic of China being deeply involved.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia and to Yalta with its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China.

Some unanswered questions are:

"Will a cease-fire cover the offshore islands as well as Formosa and the Pescadores?

"If it does cover the offshore islands how can it be negotiated without affecting the Republic of China?

"If it does not it still vitally and perhaps fatally concerns that nation.

"Will a cease-fire permit Communist access to the harbors of Foochow and Amoy and would the Republic of China be expected to sit quietly while watching the buildup of a large invasion fleet in the harbors as well as airpower in the adjacent mainland area?"

That we are at one of the great turning points of history I would not deny. Whether it is a turn for the better or for the worse only time will tell.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON CHEST X-RAYS FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND STAFFS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each year we appropriate funds to the United States Public Health Service for the grants-in-aid program for the States of our Nation. A considerable part of these funds are used in the battle against tuberculosis which continues to be our leading communicable disease problem. One of the cornerstones in the program to control and eradicate this disease is the search for unknown cases among apparently healthy people by using portable and mobile chest X-ray units. Such a unit will be available to us and the members of our staffs beginning at noon on Monday, May 2.

The X-ray unit will be located in the first-aid room of the Senate Office Building. Since we are living and working in a city where TB is prevalent, I strongly urge that the Members of the Senate and all the members of their staffs make use of this service while it is so readily available.

There is no charge for this service, which is being provided by the United

States Public Health Service, the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

Detailed information concerning this X-ray program is available at the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama and would urge from this side of the aisle that we most certainly make use of the mobile unit referred to.

Mr. President, I have a very brief statement which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

In the State of Minnesota, we have made great progress in controlling tuberculosis. This has been achieved through active cooperation between the general public, local and State health departments, and the tuberculosis associations. Failure to cooperate and actively participate on the part of any one of these groups would have greatly handicapped our efforts which are now paying us such great rewards in terms not only of saving human lives but also in the saving of both public and private funds.

I should also like to note that we have not become complacent toward this problem in Minnesota, for so long as there remains one active unhospitalized case there is the danger of that infection spreading to others.

Therefore, I wish to take this opportunity to offer my wholehearted endorsement to the statement of the senior Senator from Alabama, and to also urge that we and all the members of our staffs avail ourselves of this opportunity to protect ourselves and the members of our families and the community in which we are living.

AMENDMENT OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, April 25, I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], a bill comprehensively amending the Refugee Relief Act.

The bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee. I was very glad indeed to learn, from yesterday's press conference at the White House, of the President's statement that he favors revision of the present act. I promptly issued the following statement:

I am pleased that the President has at long last taken cognizance of the crippling defects in the Refugee Relief Act. I hope that the President's advocacy of amendments to the act will facilitate the holding of early hearings, favorable consideration, and speedy passage of suitable amendments. I, of course, will strongly press for approval of our bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 26, and an article from this week's issue of Life. It will be noted that these very interesting articles strongly support the amendments which my colleagues and I have proposed, by means of the bill we have introduced.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 26, 1955]

RESCUING THE REFUGEES

Senator LEHMAN has proposed several amendments to the emergency Refugee Relief Act of 1953 designed, as he says, to rescue a law which Congress intended to be "a great undertaking in humanitarianism." That this was actually the intent of Congress when it passed the Refugee Act is open to some skepticism; but it was certainly the intent of many Members of Congress like Senator LEHMAN, and it was also the avowed purpose of the President at whose behest the act was introduced and adopted. Members of Congress who desired to exclude refugees from the United States rather than admit them loaded the measure with such restrictions in the name of national security as to make this expressed intent very difficult of fulfillment.

Had there been a will to make the administration of the act humanitarian, however, there might have been a way. But this was precluded by a stipulation in the law itself that the emergency refugee program be administered by the head of the Bureau of Consular Affairs. The head of this Bureau, handpicked by the enemies of immigration in Congress, is Scott McLeod, kingpin of the State Department's security system. Thus, as Edward Corsi so illuminatingly pointed out the other day, the refugee program was put into the hands of policemen, with its administration "dominated by the psychology of security."

Mr. McLeod is one of the impediments to immigration which Senator LEHMAN'S amendments are expressly aimed to remove. The Senator's proposals make no reference to Mr. McLeod by name; had they done so, they would have involved an improper legislative interference with executive discretion. They simply provide that the administrator of the refugee program should be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate—which is precisely the way he should have been chosen in the first place.

Beyond this, Mr. LEHMAN would remove from the act a requirement that a 2-year security history be compiled for all refugees granted visas; the requirement is an absurd and unnecessary one in view of the stringent security standards of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which refugees as well as all other immigrants must meet. It thwarts the hope held out to escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who cannot possibly provide the requisite information. Mr. LEHMAN would also ease the present law's insistence that a home and job be guaranteed each refugee by an American citizen and permit the guaranty to be made by responsible organizations. And, finally, he would extend the life of the Refugee Act in order to make up for the time lost under Mr. McLeod's administration. These improvements are essential if the law is to become in reality, the "significant humanitarian act" which President Eisenhower called it nearly 2 years ago.

[From Life magazine of April 25, 1955]

IMMIGRATION—THE REAL ISSUE IS AN EVIL LAW

In scores of drab detention camps all over free Europe are thousands of men without a country. They have no home, no haven, and (so it has begun to seem to most of them) no hope. They are refugees, many of them displaced by the upheavals of World War II; others, victims of the cold war, are escapees who fled their homes behind the Iron Curtain rather than live in slavery. Many of them did so in the belief that they could find refuge in the United States of America after passage of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, which authorized the admission of 214,000 refugees.

How false that hope has so far been has just been emphasized by the peremptory dismissal of Edward Corsi, the Secretary of State's special assistant on refugee problems, only 3 months after he took the assignment. Corsi, who built a fine reputation in his long career as United States Immigration Commissioner and as Governor Dewey's labor commissioner in New York, claims he was fired because he was trying to do something about these refugees. Dulles says he was fired for trying to circumvent the restrictive features of the law. Whether Corsi or Dulles is right is not really the issue. The real issue is the Refugee Relief Act, which President Eisenhower called a new chance in life [for] 214,000 fellow humans. It has not worked.

The law was boobytrapped from the start. It requires the act to be run by the State Department's Security Administrator. This is Scott McLeod, a pleasant but unimaginative flatfoot. The law itself is so full of restrictions that McLeod cannot be entirely blamed for the fact that, after 20 months, only 158 escapees and about 1,000 refugees have managed to qualify. But certainly he is no man to speed things up.

One of the chief obstacles keeping refugees out is the requirement that each individual must have an individual American sponsor who guarantees a home and a job. Few Americans are willing to guarantee shelter and employment for people they have never seen. Under the old Displaced Persons Act, groups such as churches and unions could give blanket guaranties to a specific number. Moreover, the law makes each refugee give a detailed account of his last 2 years, requiring proof which escapees seldom have and certainly cannot go back to get. Most people have to spend nearly 2 years in a detention camp just in order to acquire this history. As a consequence of all this, the Refugee Act, instead of being a testament to American compassion, has become a sardonic travesty. Says one anti-Communist Albanian escapee, waiting hopelessly in an Italian camp: "It would be better if America did not have the law. First you raise our hopes and then you don't live up to it."

The Corsi controversy will serve a useful purpose if it succeeds in showing up the true nature of this McLeod cuckooland. If Dulles has damaged the Republican Party by firing Corsi, President Eisenhower can do it a great service by putting his prestige and support behind the best features of the several amendments now in the congressional hopper to eliminate the worst discriminations of the Refugee Act. In the meantime, the best service Eisenhower can pay the existing Refugee Act, as it is, would be to put it in sympathetic hands. That would mean firing Scott McLeod as Security Administrator, and that would be no great loss.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI DAVID DE SOLA POOL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of Thursday, April 21, a great and moving tribute was paid, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, to Rabbi David de Sola Pool, on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

Dr. David de Sola Pool has long been Rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel, the oldest synagogue in America.

At the dinner, tributes were paid to Dr. Pool by President Eisenhower, Mayor Wagner, Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many other leaders of our Nation.

Dr. Pool is a wonderful man, by whose friendship I have been honored for more than 40 years. He is one of the great spiritual leaders of my faith, and has long been an outstanding civic leader, public servant, and scholar. He has earned the high respect and deep affection, not only of people of my faith, but also of millions of others of every race, creed, color, and national origin, who recognize him as an unflinching and vigorous fighter for the dignity of man and for freedom for all peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, April 22, describing the dinner and the many tributes paid to Dr. Pool, be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. DE SOLA POOL IS HONORED AT 70—FETE ALSO CLOSES 300TH-YEAR CELEBRATION OF SHEARITH ISRAEL CONGREGATION

A thousand persons paid tribute last night to the Reverend Dr. David de Sola Pool, rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel, the oldest in America, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

The dinner, in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, also brought to an end the tercentennial celebration of the Shearith Israel Congregation, which was founded in September 1654, by 23 Jews who had just arrived in New Amsterdam.

President Eisenhower sent a message honoring Dr. Pool's "long years of accomplishment as a public servant, scholar, and spiritual leader."

Other tributes were paid by Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of The New York Times; Ralph E. Samuel, chairman of the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee; Mayor Wagner, Supreme Court Justice Edgar J. Nathan Jr., president of Congregation Shearith Israel, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Greeting his well-wishers, Dr. Pool said it was now clear that "we can never attain that world security through another worldly flight from reality or through a self-regarding pursuit of salvation for individuals, but only through a religion which like Judaism, seeks salvation for all mankind."

Mr. Sulzberger paid tribute to Dr. Pool as "a spiritual man and one recognized as such by the entire community."

He had directed his remarks largely to the concept of the responsibility of the newspaper reader, asserting that responsible newspaper readers were essential to the maintenance of a free and responsible press.

Mr. Sulzberger expressed confidence in the ability of American citizens to understand "the great forces that push them toward war or that help safeguard the peace." He said he did not believe that citizens of a country who "are well and truly informed" would ever be enemies of other peoples similarly informed.

Democracy, he said, requires a press that presents the news "without fear or favor of any party, sect, or interest and which acknowledges that the manner in which it presents the news is a matter of legitimate public concern."

"The newspaper can do only half the job," he said. "The reader must help himself by doing the rest. If you agree that responsible newspapers are essential to the exercise of all the other blessings of freedom, you must go a step farther and agree that responsible readers are necessary, too."

He defined the responsible reader as one concerned about the character of the newspapers he buys. In these hectic times, he noted, the reader does not have time to read everything.

"The minutes he devotes to daily newspapers can either supply him the information he needs to be a good citizen," he said, "or they can bring him up to date on the state of prostitution in New York and the thinking of the third juror who found the young osteopath guilty.

"Which shall it be?

"I repeat: If you want responsible newspapers you must be responsible readers."

Mr. Sulzberger took issue with those who believe that public opinion tends to be wrong in judging the vital issues of war and peace—that the public mind always lags behind events and is swayed by rumors, emotions, and fears rather than by realities. He said the great hope of democracy was a better and better informed citizenry.

GROUP RELATIONS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Samuel declared in his address that group relations in the United States were at an all-time high.

"Prejudice and bigotry, by the same token," he said, "are less prevalent than at any time in the 20th century.

"American Jews have lost their self-consciousness, in their adherence to their faith, in their organized and communal behavior, in their daily lives as human beings associating in their neighborhoods, their schools, their jobs, their businesses, with people of other beliefs and origins."

Mr. Samuel said the United States had come closer to achieving the American ideal of group harmony than ever a Hitler or a Khrushchev could have feared. He attributed what he called "this new friendliness in America" to many reasons, among them the celebration of the American Jewish Tercentenary. He said the telling of the story of the contributions made to America by Jews over the past 300 years had done much to create the warm and healthy flowering of a new friendliness in America.

Justice Nathan declared that Dr. Pool's life had epitomized Judaism and that he had won the respect of all citizens by reason of his untiring efforts to bring justice, freedom, and happiness to all mankind.

Mayor Wagner, referring to the first Jews who arrived in New Amsterdam in 1654, said: "There was no immigration legislation in those days—happily for them perhaps."

Mrs. Roosevelt appeared unexpectedly at the dinner to wish Dr. Pool a happy birthday. She said that through Dr. Pool's research into the history of the early Jews in New Amsterdam she had discovered that her family had close connections with the early Jewish congregation here.

Dr. Pool received a hand-illuminated testimonial from his congregation.

FORMOSA, QUEMOY, AND MATSU

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 21, when the announcement was made that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson had left for Formosa, I issued a statement on Formosa and the Quemoy and Matsu situation, reiterating my strong belief that Quemoy and Matsu are positions of weakness from which we should withdraw as rapidly as possible. The purpose of the withdrawal would be to strengthen our position, both vis-a-vis Communist China and vis-a-vis our allies.

I also pointed out that withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would greatly add to our strength, would greatly increase our prestige among our allies and among the uncommitted peoples of Asia. It would be a move to strengthen our security and not to weaken it.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON RADFORD-ROBERTSON MISSION TO FORMOSA, AND THE QUEMOY-MATSU SITUATION

This morning's press carried the report that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Assistant Secretary of State, Walter Robertson, have left for Formosa.

The exact purpose of their visit has not, of course, been made public, but we can safely assume that their mission concerns the fateful decisions that have been made, are being made and are yet to be made in respect not only to Formosa, but more immediately to the question of the defense of Quemoy and Matsu.

There has been a sense of relief—a sense of relaxation of tension—felt throughout the country in recent days at the impression which has emanated from the State Department and the Defense Department that our officials are aware of the intense feeling in the country that we must not go to war, or risk war, over Quemoy and Matsu.

There were but few of us here in the Senate who took this position at the time the Formosa resolution was considered and at the time the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek was under debate.

Those few of us were joined by some other few Members of the Senate as the days went by and the enormous danger of the situation we confronted began to dawn on the country—the danger of disunion with our allies, the danger of a war without moral basis in which we could find ourselves alone, in Asia and in the free world.

The clear, sensible voice of Mr. Adlai Stevenson was heard some 10 days ago on this subject. His views epitomized, I think, the feeling of the American people. This feeling was surely conveyed to those in charge of our Government.

And so there has been a perceptible change of attitude in the executive department. Indeed, it was stated by Secretary Dulles that some of the proposals made by Governor Stevenson, which were a refinement of views which I and others had previously expressed on the floor of the Senate, were, in fact, being pursued by the United States Government.

This was a far different note from that which we had heard before. To the extent that these proposals are being pursued, I commend the administration and wish our officials every success.

I must say, however, that there is danger of confusion concerning the nature of the position which we occupy today with regard to Qemoy and Matsu. A mistaken impression is held in some quarters—a most dangerous impression, in my opinion—that Quemoy and Matsu represent positions of strength which we are willing to give up for a price.

In my opinion—it has always been my opinion—Quemoy and Matsu are positions of weakness from which we should and must withdraw as rapidly as possible. The purpose of the withdrawal would be to strengthen our position, both vis-a-vis Communist China and vis-a-vis our allies.

A withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would greatly add to our strength—would greatly increase our prestige among our allies and among the uncommitted peoples of Asia. It would be a move to strengthen our security and not to weaken it.

I am sure that the Chinese Communists, as well as the rest of the free world, would recognize it as such.

I think this truth is almost self-evident. Yet it is widely overlooked.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER IN ANSWER TO RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in Tucson, last week, the convention of the Arizona State Federation of Labor heard Mrs. Margaret Thornburg, of Washington, D. C., a director of the women's division of the Labor League on Political Education, label me as "one of the most hated men in the United States"; and I understand that the convention itself is reported to have adopted a resolution calling for the end of my political career.

I ask unanimous consent that my answer to those remarks be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

What transpired in Tucson should be of great concern to all Americans. There, a representative of the labor bosses from Washington used the word "hate." Hatred is the weapon of revolutionists, and I don't believe that she spoke for the majority of people of Arizona or the United States.

The meeting was interesting, too, because the political implications of what transpired in Tucson are pretty self-evident. It was just another clear indication that the professional labor bosses have taken over the Democratic Party and are calling all the plays.

What interests me particularly is the personal attack upon myself and the injection of the word "hated" into the picture. I have had many disagreements with the leaders of labor, both in Washington, and in Arizona, but the feeling of hatred has never entered my mind, and I sincerely believe it has never entered theirs. Stretching disagreement into hatred is one of the tools used by those who would destroy our way of life, as hatred creates class difference, and I hope that Mrs. Thornburg and the Arizona State Federation of Labor will soberly reflect on their intemperate language. But, because they injected the word "hate," I will have to refer to it in answering their charges.

My sole objective in the field of labor legislation has been to preserve the freedom of the individual workingman and woman and to protect them against abuse and coercion by either management or labor. To that end I favor and have favored what is commonly called "right-to-work" legislation. "Right-to-work" legislation is simply a prohibition against compulsory unionism. It prohibits employers and unions from entering into contracts which make union membership a condition of employment. It places the right to earn a living above any obligation to pay tribute, compulsory or otherwise, to professional labor bosses. The professional labor boss "hates" me for trying to deny him that compulsory tribute.

The right to work in Arizona is a part of our constitution, and elected officials are sworn to defend constitutions. I am trying to protect that portion of Arizona's constitution that gives a man the right to work, and which was voted in by an overwhelming majority of the people. It seems peculiar to me that any labor official would "hate" a public servant who is performing his sworn duty.

To that end I favor, and have favored, so-called "States' rights" legislation designed to retain in the States their inherent power to protect the individual workingman and woman and the individual citizen against the abuses and coercion involving minority strikes and secondary boycotts. The professional labor boss "hates" me for trying to deny him those illegal weapons.

To that end I favor, and was instrumental in obtaining, the enactment by Congress of the Communist Control Act of 1954, designed to eliminate from trade union leadership the Communists and fellow travelers who so notoriously dominate some unions. The purpose of that law is to free the individual workingman and woman from that Communist domination. Most professional labor leaders do not attack me openly for my stand on that legislation because to do so would be considered unpopular and unpatriotic. But the professional labor leader, nevertheless, "hates" me secretly for trying to deny him the fruits of labor dictatorship, whether Communist or otherwise.

Who are some of the professional labor leaders that "hate" me for these efforts on behalf of the individual working man and woman? Well, one of them is right in my hometown. Don Baldwin, czar of the Bartender and Culinary Workers Union "hates" me because, by violating the State's right-to-work law and the State antiminority picketing law, he virtually destroyed his own dictatorship. Another one is Maurice Travis, former secretary-treasurer of the National Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers and an avid believer in Communist control of the trade-union movement. Travis is under indictment for perjury. Another one is Walter Reuther, president of the CIO. He is a Socialist and believes in control of all phases of our lives by the Federal Government, except the activities of professional labor bosses. He "hates" me for my stand on States rights, because the States might infringe on his Federal license to victimize individuals through minority strikes and secondary boycotts.

I have long since recognized the disagreement between these professional labor bosses and my objectives in the field of labor legislation, but this has not deterred, and it will not deter, me one iota from my objectives to preserve the freedom of the individual against oppressive power by either labor or management. Hatred is the weapon of revolutionists, and I do not think that the majority of the people of this country are as yet in revolt against the institution of individual liberty.

THE RIGHT TO WORK—ADDRESS BY FATHER JAMES A. MAJOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 18, the Reverend Father James A. Major delivered an inspiring address on the subject of the right to work. His address was delivered before the 18th annual convention of the Northwestern Council of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers at Missoula, Mont.

Father Major discussed the ethical and moral questions relative to the right-to-work proposals. I was so much impressed with his address that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SO-CALLED RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

First of all, may I extend good wishes for success in the work that lies ahead and for which you have assembled in convention.

A convention of this kind is a vantage point reached in the forward march of your organization. From it the record of past achievements can be reviewed, while from the study can be had guidance in the task of planning for the future.

Past accomplishments, worthy and commendable as they are, do not necessarily have in themselves the quality of finality, of a completeness. They are, as they were intended to be, the bases for such greater works as may be required to meet future needs.

Facing the future, however, is not a matter of prime importance. Its importance is only secondary. Of prime importance is faith in the future. It is faith in the future that provides the incentive whence come both initiative and enthusiasm. It is enthusiasm which generates the power of sustained endeavor and endurance.

Too often attempts to weaken a people's faith in the future are made by men saturated with the poisons of a materialistic philosophy, whose vision is so marred by the dollar sign that they cannot see the God-given dignity inherent in the human nature of their fellow men, and who in their blindness fail to recognize the inalienable rights with which those fellow men have been endowed by the Creator, and for the protection and preservation of which this constitutional democracy, called the United States of America, was forged upon the battlefield, with its various parts being cemented firmly with the warm blood of men who cherished their sacred heritage of God-given dignity and God-given rights.

Too often the devotees to greed for wealth and dominating power obstruct the cause of justice by intrigue. Too often they distort the truth and seek in high places approval of their distortions, the while they seek to confuse and deceive by questionable slogans or catch phrases the mind of an unsuspecting public. Too often they send their slogans throughout the land to peddle their ideologies, to be the salesmen of their errors. But well dressed as the ideologies may be, respectable as they may seem, and freely circulated as they are, they still remain the sinister agents of a group unscrupulous in aims and tactics, and cynical toward all social welfare measures which do not offer bankable gains.

In recent months the American people have had such salesmen of error trying to high pressure them into buying a certain commodity called right-to-work. This article has been heralded as a medicine with miracle performing properties. It has been publicized as a medicine which everybody should buy. In fact, it has been declared so indispensable a medicine for the cure of all industrial ills that its purchase should be decreed and enforced by law.

While 18 States have bought the commodity, the others as yet have not done so, although some loud voices are clamoring persistently for the purchase. Whether or not the purchase will be made will depend on the public's attitude. If the public remains indifferent to what the legislatures do, the purchase will be made; for the originators of the commodity are at no time indifferent. On the other hand, if the public shows any sign of an awakened interest the originators will not doff their hat and politely bid good-day. To the contrary, they will stick both feet in the doorway and renew their efforts, using every trick in the book of high-pressure tactics. For one thing, they are determined to make the sale; they are determined to get the legislatures to buy the medicine and administer it to their constituents; they are determined to have John Q. Public placed under their sedative. They want him in this condition so that he can easily be manipulated as a pawn on the chess board of dollars-and-cents, and, if neces-

sary, even be sacrificed to greater bankable profits.

If public indifference is to be overcome and public resistance is to be had, then public interest must be aroused. It must be an enlightened interest; for he guards best who best understands what he is guarding. To secure this enlightened interest a definite program must be carefully prepared, prudently directed, and steadily administered to the end that, the public will be correctly informed as to the poisonous contents of the medicine and the disastrous effects it will have on their sacred heritage of God-given dignity and God-given rights, should it be purchased through their legislatures, or taken by themselves in whatever dosage may be recommended to them.

Our allotted time will not permit a full study of this so-called indispensable remedy for industrial and economic ills. We may, however, make a partial study. To this end let us put the wonder drug under the microscope of logic, then drop it into the orientating principles of morality and ethics.

Under the microscope of logic we see one potent ingredient, technically called sophistry, popularly described as double talk. Consider briefly the terms right and work. Joined they make a catchy label. They appeal to one's innate sense of justice. They suggest economic security. Yet in these subtle suggestions they are deceptive. They speak the language of appearances, not the language of reality. They overexpand the meaning of the word right, they shrink the meaning of the word work.

In the Standard Dictionary, to work is defined thus: "To put forth physical or mental effort toward a set end." Note the extension of that definition. It includes mental effort. Accordingly it extends itself into the field of education, a factor of no slight concern; certainly not to Congress. For Congress refused to ignore the extension of the meaning when it debated the Child Labor bill some years ago. The right-to-work commodity is silent on this extended meaning. It uses the word as having no extension beyond the output of physical effort involved in manual toil. By so doing it shrinks the meaning unto its purposes, the while it presumes to be using the term honestly. This is sheer verbal trickery, shabby double talk, smacking of discriminatory class legislation, long ago outlawed by the Constitution.

It seems to me that this hidden ingredient has a realistic potency which educators should not ignore; for if the materialistic-minded man behind this "right-to-work" measure should find it to their advantage to step into the field of education later on, they have an open door. They need only to insist upon a complete extension of the word's meaning. They can point to the Standard Dictionary to prove the reasonableness of their demands. And the courts will have to go along. For once a law is upon the books the courts must abide by the terminology used. The educators might then find themselves facing a future devoid of opportunity for them to have any faith in the future, be it for themselves or for society. It seems to me that educators cannot afford to ignore this danger, nor sit back with any degree of indifference to the issues involved. Their own security is secretly jeopardized by the verbal trickery, the sophistry of the glib peddlers of error.

As for the word "right." What is a "right"? Simply it is this: a title of ownership to property, to a course of action, to an adherence to ideologies, and the like. By reason of their source, rights are either substantive or remedial. Substantive rights are those which are inherent in a man as a person; inherent because they have been received from the Creator as endowments—such as the rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and so forth. "Unalienable" the Declaration of Independence calls them. "Inviolate" the Constitution proclaims them. These rights have the quality of stability and permanency. Remedial rights are those which accrue to men from law. They are political in their source and are given for protection and preservation of the substantive, or natural rights.

Of such are the amendments to the Constitution (originally called the Bill of Rights) the first 10 of which were demanded by the Founding Fathers who were on guard against the dangers arising from language in which terms are used loosely. These fathers wanted to see the realities behind the words. They wanted words used in a way that did not permit of verbal trickery. For this reason they insisted on clarification of the terms "unalienable rights." They wanted specific listings of these rights. And they wanted them so that they could safeguard these rights against attempts by politicians to tamper with them by specious juggling of words or spurious interpretations.

Keeping before us these few observations, let us take a closer look at the word "right." Beneath the abstract notion we see the practical aspects. These aspects are two in number. One is called "possession," the other "use, or exercise." The distinction is real, not figurative. And it is vitally important. The common experience of every man, woman, or child bears out the fact that the possession of a thing, or a right, and the use of that thing, or right, are entirely different; that the mere possession does not always permit the use; that the possession is not destroyed just because the thing, or right, cannot or may not be used. Experience proves that the use of rights is permitted or justified only under certain conditions; never indiscriminately. In other words, experience teaches that, while man possesses rights, he does not always have the right to use those rights.

As we look at the commodity which we are urged to buy we find that it gives the word right an overextended meaning. It would have us believe that possession and use are inseparable; that the mere fact of possession includes the use—includes it unconditionally, so that a man in possession of a right may automatically and unconditionally assert, use, or exercise that right. It would have us believe that, because a man has a license to own and carry a loaded gun he has a license to use that gun whenever, wherever, and for whatever purpose he chooses. By way of corallary, it would have us believe that, because he has a right to fire the gun in any direction somewhere in the hills, he has the right to fire it any direction on a city street, even in the direction of a crowd of people leaving a theater; nor is he to be punished if he should fire it under those conditions. Briefly, the proponents of the "right-to-work" bill would have us subscribe to the proposition, as to a sound principle, that a man's right to possess a loaded gun carries with it unconditionally his right to do as he pleases with it; and that no one can do anything about the matter.

No; the mere possession of a right does not carry with it the permission to use the right indiscriminately. The exercise of rights is always conditional. And the basic, fundamental condition which supports the social superstructure, the while it protects, preserves, and promotes law and order—and through these makes possible and secure government—is the condition whereby the superior rights of society take precedence over the individual's use, or exercise of rights. The overextension of the meaning given to the word "right" by the proponents of the measure is sheer verbal trickery, sheer sophistry. And any legal decree based upon it is inimical to the public good; wherefore such a decree lacks the force of a law. No decree, however well-dressed it may be with legal language, has the force of a law if it is adverse to the public good. Certainly not in a civilized society.

From these observations through the microscope of logic—necessarily limited as they are—let us now drop the ingredients of the commodity into the orientating principles of morality and ethics. Here again our observations must necessarily be limited. The most we can observe are a few salient points.

Wherever rights exist there also duties exist. In its positive aspect a duty consists in the recognition of, and respect for, the rights of another. In its negative aspect a duty consists in the noninterference with or the nondenial of the possession or the use of the rights. This does not mean that a person's possession or exercise of rights is immune to their loss or curtailment by others. The giver of the rights may attach to the grant specific stipulations whereby the possession may be forfeited, or the exercise may be controlled. Thus, for the crime of murder the Creator has stipulated that the grant of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall be forfeit to the superior, corporate rights of society. Similarly, the civil law, in the name of the superior, corporate rights of society, stipulates forfeiture of the possession where certain crimes have been committed, and forfeiture of the exercise where the public good is involved and demands curtailment. Accordingly, recognition of, respect for, noninterference with, nondenial of another person's rights constitute a duty only so long as that person has not forfeited the possession or the exercise of his rights. If forfeiture has been made, duty does not bind. And where duty does not bind, justice is not violated.

Dropped into these orientating principles of morality and ethics, what happens to the wonder drug, the right-to-work bill? Plainly, there is no question of forfeiture as regards the possession of the right to work. What is involved is not the possession but the exercise of the right. The right to work may be exercised on condition that it does not jeopardize the superior, corporate rights of society; or, to state it in other terms, when it does not pose a threat to the public good.

Because the laboring men and their families in these United States constitute the majority of the population, what affects them as a class affects the public good. And because as a class they have mutual, corporate interests wrapped up in the circumstances and conditions of their labor they have the right both on moral and ethical grounds to unite themselves freely into a unit, a union, through which they can act jointly, as well as effectively, for the protection and preservation of their immediate interests and those of society—the public good—with which their immediate interests are inseparably fused.

When the employees in a given industry have freely united themselves in such an organization dedicated to such purposes; and when by law they have had their organization recognized and their declared purposes sanctioned, then they constitute a legitimate society with sufficient properties as to make it an organic society. As a legitimate organic society they may use such means to secure their objectives as are found necessary and efficient, keeping those means at all times within the moral and ethical boundaries of reason and justice. When, therefore, they stipulate conditions for employment and insist on having these stipulations embodied in their negotiated contracts with management, they are placing controls on the exercise of a man's right to work in said industry. Note, they are not denying that the man has the right to work. They simply declare that the exercise of the right will be permitted if the man will comply with the conditions which have been found necessary for the security

of mutual, corporate interests. This demand does not violate justice. It is simply the application of the moral and ethical principle according to which the superior, corporate rights of legitimate society take precedence over the individual's unconditional, indiscriminate exercise of his right.

If the application in this instance is a violation of justice, then it is equally a violation of justice when the Government makes an application of the principle. And Government very definitely does make the application. It applies it in two instances. First, by curtailing the exercise of rights through the various amends to the Constitution; and secondly, by obliging its citizens to surrender the peaceful, comfortable pursuits of homelife to the regimented, disciplinary, hazardous life of the soldier on the battlefield. And this not withstanding its proclamation that man's rights to his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness are inalienable, inviolate.

Any body of lawmakers, therefore, who ignore these moral and ethical principles and attempt to legislate in violation of them are violating justice. And justice miscarried is tyranny.

If the proponents of the bill—and they certainly are not the laboring men themselves—insist on legislation according to a materialistic philosophy; if they insist on rule by tyranny through miscarriage of justice, in the hopes of greater bankable profits, they are blind to the lessons which were taught by the Minute Men at Concord and Lexington, April 19, 1775, when in answer to Major Pitcairn's shout: "Disperse, ye villains," Capt. John Parker said to his 50 men of toil: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon; but if they mean to have war, let it begin here." Let the proponents remember that those men of toil were not cowards; that the words of their captain were not words of double talk. They had one clear meaning. And that meaning would be endorsed by action. It was. And how it was. For there, when men who would be free stood face to face with tyranny's agents, there was fired—in the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson—"the shot heard 'round the world."

If the public interests, as vested in the interests of the working classes, are to be undermined in legislatures by defiance of both the rules of sound logic and the principles of morality and ethics, then the States, like the instigators of the right-to-work bill, should be prepared to pay the price. For treason to human dignity begets slavery. And while slavery in the industrial world may provide cheap labor and fattened pocketbooks for the would-be masters, it ultimately begets economic disaster both for the State—by loss of revenue derived from taxes on earned income—and for the special groups whose vision is so marred by the dollar sign that they invite slowdowns, production cutdowns, and not improbable permanent shutdowns of their plants.

Regarding such undermining legislation Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII have spoken out vigorously, declaring it a violation of moral principles and therefore forbidden. In his encyclical Forty Years After Pius XI stated definitely: "Labor is not a mere commodity. On the contrary, the worker's human dignity in it must be recognized. It therefore cannot be bought and sold like a commodity." In his message, Christmas 1942, Pius XII said: "If legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker * * * from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person."

Strongly does he condemn the tenet that, workingmen may by legislation be made subject to the will of industrialists as regards wages, working conditions, etc. Legislation, he declares, which puts the worker at the mercy of management, denying them the use of united efforts—unions—to protect their mutual, corporate interests in securing decent, sufficient returns necessary for a decent, sufficient livelihood, is legislation which is contrary to the natural rights of men; hence contrary to moral principles and therefore is forbidden.

All three pontiffs have further declared that they are aware of the fact that, man is an individual person endowed with free will; that he is exercising his free will when he enters into an individual agreement with management regarding wages, conditions of labor, etc. But they insist strongly that, he is also a social being, so created by God. They point out that the rules of sound reasoning (logic) are violated by those who stress the exercise of personal rights, the while they ignore the obligations arising from the social nature of man. Such stress, they maintain, is placed on the theoretical aspect of the case, and this without any regard to the indispensable practical aspects. The matter, however, is not simply one of logic. It is an ethical, moral matter.

The fact that man according to his God-given nature is not merely an individual person but a social being places restrictions on the exercise of his freedom. He is not allowed to agree to wages which are insufficient to meet his own needs and those of his dependents. Neither is he allowed to agree to wages, or other conditions of labor, if in so doing he threatens to place fellowmen in the danger of receiving insufficient wages or enduring conditions of labor which are not consonant with human dignity. His social obligations override his personal choices in such matters; and any disregard of them is a violation of morality. In other words, the individual's exercise of his rights is conditioned by the superior rights of society. Nor is this principle to be voided by any legislative enactment.

These are only a few of numerous Papal pronouncements pertaining to social and industrial matters. They are, however, adequate to point up the insidious nature of legislation which undermines public interests under the guise of promoting them by so-called right-to-work laws. Economic disaster invited by specious legislation is never permitted by sound logic, or by ethical, moral principles.

Incidentally, this field of economic disaster should be explored by your organization on a nationwide scale. The findings should be publicized. By showing the effects of slave labor to industry and to the States which permit it, the hidden dangers of the right-to-work bill will be revealed, for "by their fruits you shall know them." Our study has been made, not in the field of the actual effects, but in the field of logic and moral principles. We have chosen this field, rather than the field of effects, because the immediate question is one of law. And where the enactment of a law is foremost on the docket, attention to the meaning of words and the combined rules of logic and moral principles becomes the first order of the day.

As you, therefore, review in this convention the record of past achievements and plan for the future, fail not to make provisions for a program of enlightened education, whereby public interest may be secured and public awareness of the dangers may be aroused The future cannot be faced with indifference or lukewarmness. It must be faced with faith and courage and concerted action.

The stakes are high.

Human dignity is on the auction block.

It must not be bartered for bankable profits.

IS IKE AS INVINCIBLE AS DEWEY?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an unusually important article entitled "Is Ike as Invincible as Dewey?" It was published in the May 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IKE AS INVINCIBLE AS DEWEY?

"The Republicans," commented the Berkshire Eagle, "are once more conceding the 1956 elections to themselves."

The Eagle was taking note of a curious phenomenon—a concerted drive by Republican leaders to persuade the public (and possibly the current occupant of the White House, too) that Ike is invincible in 1956. Of course within Republican strategy circles, the slogan "Ike Is Invincible" is translated, "Ike Is Indispensable."

But the "Ike Is Invincible" line does not belong solely to official Republican spokesmen. Almost without exception, an Eisenhower victory in 1956 is being accepted as an unarguable fact by political writers, columnists, and commentators.

Noting the unanimity with which his colleagues were conceding the election many months before the voters had had a chance to make up their own minds, one columnist commented, "I'm beginning to get worried. This sounds too much like 1948 when we were all telling each other that the Republicans were a 'shoo-in.'"

There are many similarities between the prevailing psychology today and the thinking in 1948 that prompted Life magazine to caption a picture of candidate Dewey, a week before the election, as the next President of the United States. One similarity is the rapt attention most commentators are devoting to the public-opinion polls, which show that a very large percentage of the people polled still think kindly of the President, but which admittedly do not purport to bridge the gap between liking Ike and voting for another 4 years of Ike and Republican Government. These, incidentally, are the same opinion polls that knew positively that Dewey was going to be elected before the people knew it themselves.

But perhaps the most striking parallel with 1948 is the prevailing opinion that the Democrats lack issues that will have a decisive popular appeal in the 1956 campaign. This was also the popular view in 1948, even among reporters who accompanied Mr. Truman on his "give 'em hell" whistlestop trips, and who persisted in this belief right up to election day. It wasn't until after the voters had confounded the pollsters and the pundits that these reporters began to think back over the campaign, and to discover that there had been, all along, an impressive list of issues—such as taxes, housing, inflation, farm slump, power, and reclamation cutbacks—issues that Mr. Truman had brought to the voters with great force.

Reviewing the issues that played an important part in the 1948 election, it appears that most, if not all of them, are present again today, or are developing into major issues for the 1956 elections. The issue of tax reduction is a perfect example. The Republican 80th Congress insisted on cutting taxes by $5 billion. Then, as now, they proudly claimed that this was the largest tax cut in United States history. Then, as now, the major part of the tax relief went to wealthy individuals and to corporations. Then, as now, Democrats pressed for tax relief for lower income-tax payers, through an increase in the personal exemption. Then, as now, this effort was opposed by the Republicans in Congress, almost to a man, and was defeated. The Republican "rich-man's tax bill" became a major issue in the 1948 campaign.

The farm vote is most often credited with defeating Mr. Dewey and electing Mr. Truman. What stirred up the farmers most was the fact that the 80th Congress had de-

prived Mr. Truman of the authority to provide the added grain-storage facilities which were needed to get price-support loans.

In the summer and fall of 1948, corn and wheat prices fell off sharply as bumper crops overflowed existing storage bins, and thousands of farmers were forced to go without price supports. Today, farm income is sliding—down 10 percent in 1954—and the buying power of the farmer's income is at the lowest point since 1940. Despite this, the administration continues to think of price supports merely as protection against undue disaster and administration spokesman continue to say that the solution to the farm problem is to get the small inefficient farmer out of agriculture.

The workingman, as well as the farmer, had reason to vote against the Republicans in 1948, for the GOP 80th Congress had enacted over President Truman's veto, the Taft-Hartley Act. Today, the workingman again has compelling reasons for mistrusting the GOP; not only has the President failed to fight for the Taft-Hartley changes he promised in the 1952 campaign; he has also packed the National Labor Relations Board (which administers the Taft-Hartley Act) with avowedly promanagement men who have succeeded in toughening up Taft-Hartley in practice, even though the law itself remains the same. Union men also get a hint of the President's attitude toward labor versus business from the list of guests at the Eisenhower stag dinners. Up to the time this information was classified secret by the White House, the guest list had included 294 businessmen, and only 8 union officials.

Another issue that spans both 1948 and 1955, and that affects the workingman and his family, is whether the Republicans are willing and able to control economic boom and bust. In 1948, inflation was the main threat and President Truman repeatedly asked the GOP 80th Congress to give him power to put the lid on prices. When the Republicans turned a deaf ear—even during the famous "turnip day" special session of Congress following the two conventions, President Truman took the inflation issue to the people.

Today there is far more danger of deflation than inflation, but the Republicans have shown themselves equally unwilling to take positive action to meet that danger. The President talks about an economy that should expand by $14 billion a year. Yet neither he nor his economic advisers seem very concerned about the fact that in 1954, the economy shrunk by nearly $8 billion; and at one point, Treasury Secretary Humphrey told Congress he didn't think 4 million unemployed was an excessive figure. The efforts of Democrats to warn of the growing slack in the economy are shrugged off by administration officials as gloom and doom, and Democratic efforts to bolster consumer purchasing power by tax relief for lower income families are decried as irresponsible and inflationary.

In 1948, as he "whistle-stopped" throughout the Western States, President Truman pounded home the way in which the Republican 80th Congress had decimated the reclamation and public power programs launched by the Democrats. As a result, Mr. Truman swept every Mountain and Western State except Oregon.

In 1954, Oregon furnished the clearest evidence (in the surprise election of RICHARD NEUBERGER as the first Democratic Senator from Oregon in 40 years) that the public power and reclamation slowdowns, plus the resource giveaways of the Eisenhower administration are redhot issues in the West. Hells Canyon, the greatest undeveloped waterpower site left in the United States, lying along the Idaho-Oregon border, promises to focus the power issue sharply in 1956. The Eisenhower administration favors turning over the power site to the Idaho Power Co., at the expense of wasting one-third of the available waterpower; while Democrats in both the House and Senate are pushing a bill for a Government dam that will turn out larger amounts of power at lower rates.

Moreover, the Dixon-Yates deal, in which the President directed the Atomic Energy Commission, against the wishes of a majority of its members, to sign a 25-year contract with a favored utilities syndicate not yet formally in existence, has helped to dramatize the administration's tender concern for the private power utilities.

Of course the controversies of 1956 will not be confined to those that have an exact parallel in 1948. There will be other vital issues: One of the most prominent is the crisis in our schools and the Republican versus the Democratic methods of coping with it. Although the President acknowledges a shortage of over 300,000 classrooms, he has proposed a cumbersome school-aid program which 40 State school officials have opposed in whole or in part, which forces the States and localities to rely almost entirely on their own nearly exhausted resources, and which in fact imposes higher costs on States and local school districts, mainly for the benefit of bond brokers and bankers. The Democrats, on the other hand, have proposed a $1 billion emergency school-aid program which can be put to work building schools just as soon as the States put up matching funds.

Another administration program that seems designed mainly for the benefit of banks and other lending institutions is the highway program. Because of the devious financing methods proposed by the administration, the taxpayers will have to spend roughly $2.7 billion in needless interest payments on highway bonds. Here again, Democrats in Congress have a more direct program to propose as an alternative, one which avoids the high-interest payments.

Some skeptics, may wonder if any of these issues will have enough impact on the voters to carry the day in November 1956. The same question was asked in 1948, all during Mr. Truman's campaign. When the election was over, however, most analysts concluded that it wasn't any one of these issues, taken separately, that had had the decisive impact. It was the fact that they all added up to one very simple and overwhelming truth: Government under the Republicans is, by and large, government for the few, while the Democrats represent government for the many.

Judging from the 1954 congressional elections, 2 years of Republican rule was enough to convince a majority of the voters that this truth still holds good, for despite President Eisenhower's personal intervention in last fall's election, he became the first President of this century to lose control of both Houses of Congress 2 years after his first election to office.

And, as 1955 progresses, government for the few becomes more rather than less apparent: Democratic tax cuts for the many are again pitted against Republican tax cuts for the few; an administration school-aid program written with the help of bankers for the benefit of bankers versus a Democratic bill to build more schools as soon and as economically as possible; a GOP electric-power program that favors the utilities is pitted against one designed to bring the most power at the lowest cost to the consumers.

Nor will government for the few be the only issue in the 1956 campaign. There will be the administration's foreign policy, best described by the phrase, "Diplomacy by bluff"—the bluffs of liberation, unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek, massive retaliation, agonizing reappraisal, and the blustering confusion of the administration's course in Indochina.

There will be the question of the adminisration's huckstering in dealing with the American people; the-pie-in-the-sky campaign promises of 1952 on which the Eisenhower crusade came to office, but which have been so largely unfulfilled; the numbers racket in the Government security program; and the sloganeering which tries to magnify a $200 million Federal outlay into a $7 billion school-aid program.

Finally, there will be a. w. o. l.—administration without leadership—the specter of a government in which cabinet officers contradict each other, and operate at variance with the President, with complete impunity; of a political party in which leading spokesmen openly defy the President's wishes, without a word of protest from the White House, of a President who tolerates the release of secret and explosive documents without his knowledge or consent.

One Democrat commented recently, "Maybe all the good issues we have won't be enough to win in 1956. But," he added dryly, "I think it will be worth our while to go through with the election even though the Republicans have conceded it to themselves again."

RECOMMENDATION OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO ELIMINATE QUANTITY DISCOUNT RULE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, businessmen of Minnesota are seriously and understandably concerned over the report of the Attorney General's committee to study the antitrust laws, which they quite rightly feel is a sharp blow to independent business in this country.

Because a letter sent to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald April 1 by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, effectively states the same concern expressed by hundreds of letters to me from Minnesota small businessmen, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 1, 1955.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note with considerable interest the editorial in the April 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Competitive Business. I am just wondering whether real competitive business exists in our overall economy today.

The conclusions reached in these remarks do not come about from experience as a professional trade association executive, or from the study of textbooks, but, on the other hand, from the school of hard knocks, either through having owned and operated an independent business establishment for better than a quarter of a century or more or for close to 50 years in the overall having basic factual knowledge of what is happening affecting the whole small-business structure of our economy.

To substantiate this view a good glaring example regarding competitive business is the recent happenings in the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants to private industry.

It was a most unfortunate situation for those few Members of Congress who asked the Congress to stop, look, and listen before this deal was consummated that their opposition could have been helped if the independent factors in the rubber industry had come forward and expressed their fear of what would take place in the sale of these plants to giants, both in the rubber and oil industry. The reason they did not come forward was because of their fear of retaliation.

In my official position with the federation as vice president in charge of the legislative activities, many cases are channeled through our hands during any given year from independent business of all descriptions, both at the production and distribution level. In many of these cases which come to our attention the reports are of alleged violations of the antitrust laws. When we dig into these cases and find that the charges can be substantiated we request of the members: "Do we have the privilege of disclosing the source of our information to either the antitrust agencies of the Government or to congressional committees?" and in 99 cases out of 100 the answer is "We would like to grant this privilege, but we are fearful of retaliation from our source of supply." Would you call this real competitive business as we know fair competition should be?

In the very first instance if there had been consistent, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, and particularly the Robinson-Patman Act, there would never have been any need for independent business or their few sincere leaders to demand new legislation such as the Fair Trade Acts, so as to give fair competition in the retail field.

You said in your editorial, which we quote in part: "But it is unanimous in recommending retention and strengthening of the antimonopoly acts." Let us see how sincere the study committee was in their recommendation on this above quote.

Page 177 in the report of the Attorney General's Committee discloses its disapproval of another section of the Robinson-Patman Act. This section is known as the "quantity limit proviso." The act authorizes and empowers the Federal Trade Commission to take action against price discriminations based upon quantity discounts, but only after the Commission finds as a fact that the challenged discount system is unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly.

Yet the committee in its report states: "We deplore this singling out and penalizing of the quantity discount system." In other words, the committee recommends elimination of that section of the law.

The truth of the matter is that this section of the Robinson-Patman Act is looked upon by small business as the heart of the act, namely, that it is the special and preferred discounts given to a few which causes the chaos for small factors both in the production and distribution field.

This section of the act has been in the law since the creation of the law in 1936 and no attempt was made by the Federal Trade Commission to invoke this section even though the Commission was well aware of the fact that in certain industries the discount system in that or those industries was unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly.

The action which was instituted in the summer of 1947 was upon due urging by small business, through the National Federation of Independent Business, with the cooperation of the House Small Business Committee.

Some few years later, after due public hearings, etc., the Commission invoked that rule under the law and the actions of the Commission have been challenged through the courts, where a final decision is still pending—and it will be found that one of the principal legal opponents to the rule is the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who it would also appear is one of the signees of the report of the Attorney General making the above recommendation.

We question the sincerity of the committee in its report on this major subject.

It will be interesting to note that in a letter dated February 21, 1955, directed by the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission to the Chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Commission stated:

"The Commission believes that the antitrust laws afford means of dealing with competitive abuses in the distribution of tires. It is aware of the problems of the small tire dealer, particularly the inequitable price leverage which may be exerted by a giant rival able to purchase in far greater quantities, and thus at a lower price. The quantity-limit proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act empowers the Federal Trade Commission to fix quantity limits where available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render price differentials based thereon unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly."

I believe we have proved our charge of lack of good faith by the study group to bring about the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Again we quote from your editorial: "The urgent need, as one dissenter put it, is for more rather than less antitrust enforcement." In reviewing the list of members of the legal profession from the Washington area it will be found that one former high Government career man, then a ranking member of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, told a Senate committee in February 1947 and we quote, that "For 35 years or more the administrations had merely given lip service to the enforcement of the antitrust laws." We wonder, in these conferences, if the committee took into consideration his findings as a high-ranking member of that agency? The gentleman should be in a position after his years of extensive experience in antitrust enforcement to know what he was talking about.

In conclusion, it was a matter of common gossip and public information from the inception of the study group that they would recommend the repeal of the Fair Trade Acts. That was the easiest course to pursue, and if such action is adopted by the Congress the victims will be millions of small businesses throughout the Nation, including the smaller producers—and this will be felt if and when this Nation of ours ever really gets back to a peacetime economy.

Finally, constructive small business of this Nation is not looking for any handouts, subsidies, or even any special preferred legislative help, but they do and must insist on a fair break to exist in our overall economy, and this can only be brought about—not by study groups composed of lawyers and economists—but for the Government itself to show its sincerity through speedy and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

When the day comes that these antitrust laws—and particularly the Robinson-Patman Act—are further weakened, small business better get wise and put a lock on their door because they are through.

It is my hope that in the interest of small business this letter may appear in its entirety in your valued publication.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the comments in that letter about the Commission's recommendation to eliminate the existing quantity discount rule under the Robinson-Patman Act. The Commission's report was signed by Edward Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. It is significant to note that Edward Howrey was counsel of record for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., one of the opponents to the quantity discount rule now seeking to upset it in the Federal courts, up until the time he was confirmed as a member of the Commission and later as Chairman.

I also ask unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD, an article from the Akron Beacon Journal of Thursday, March 31, telling how this recommendation plays right into the hands of the tire firms in their effort to defeat the Federal Trade Commission's 1951 order putting a ceiling on tire and tube discounts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TRADE ORDER HIT—TIRE FIRMS UPHELD IN DISCOUNT STUDY

(By Milt Freudenheim)

WASHINGTON.—A 61-member national committee to study the antitrust laws today advised Attorney General Brownell it "deplores" Federal quantity limit restrictions now being tested in court by most of the tire manufacturers.

The report seems sure to be picked up by the tire firms as an important aid to their effort to defeat the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) 1951 order putting a ceiling on tire and tube discounts.

The committee was headed by Assistant Attorney General Stanley Barnes of the Justice Department Antitrust Division and Prof. S. C. Oppenheim, of University of Michigan Law School, with top private attorneys and economists included.

FTC Chairman Edward Howrey also signed the report but stated "This should not be construed as a prejudgment of issues which may come before the Commission in individual cases."

Barnes also said the committee report does not bind the Justice Department. He declined to comment on the quantity limit criticism because it is under litigation.

But Barnes said many of the findings in the 394-page report are likely to be read by judges and cited by lawyers.

However, the Justice Department will ignore the report and go ahead with its announced intention of moving for summary judgment in the case brought by the tire companies seeking to upset the 1951 FTC order.

Special assistant to the Attorney General, Albert Parker, in charge of the case, said he expects to file his motion within a week or 10 days.

The case has been in Federal court more than 2 years. A FTC contention that the suit was premature was overruled on appeal. The case now will be tried on its merits.

The FTC rule, invoked for the first time against the tire firms, would limit the maximum discount to buyers of tires and tubes to that allowed on single carload purchases.

The tire companies say the rule would upset their established business arrangements selling to oil companies, mail-order houses, and other large customers.

The Oppenheim-Barnes report has this to say about the discount rule:

"At all events, the proviso necessarily aims to threaten price differentials which reflect economies in efficient distribution—thus offending the consumer interest which the cost defense was designed to preserve.

"We believe that any rational antitrust policy must leave the American business community free to explore new methods of distribution.

"Arrangements to impede distributive techniques have long been viewed as unreasonable restraints of trade.

"Hence we deplore this singling out and penalizing of the quantity discount system.

"And while a free economy must place primary reliance on the play of market forces as the determinant of price, the quantity limits proviso, in our view, defeats this policy through ineptly sanctioning a crude form of price fixing by administrative fiat where

competition should safeguard the public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Burger has performed a service to independent business of the country by calling public attention to the dual role of Mr. Howrey as representative of an interested party in a dispute over FTC regulations, who has now become Chairman of the FTC. Mr. Burger has, in a letter to the President, called for removal of FTC Chairman Howrey.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the National Federation of Independent Business, containing a copy of Mr. Burger's letter to the President, and subsequent news clippings from the Akron Beacon Journal, the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Times about the requested removal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

A demand for the removal from office of Federal Trade Commission Chairman Edward F. Howrey was made to President Eisenhower today by the National Federation of Independent Business through its vice president, George J. Burger.

In a strongly worded letter to the President, Mr. Burger charged that Chairman Howrey, because of his previous legal background in representation of cases before the Federal Trade Commission "would have his hands tied" in carrying out his full responsibility under the law as Chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

In his letter, Mr. Burger reiterated that there was nothing of a personal or political nature involved, but that the situation was serious enough to call for the special attention of the President.

Following is the text of the letter directed to the President:

APRIL 6, 1955.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The matter which we are bringing to your attention in this communication is one we believe is so serious that it requires your immediate and personal attention.

We are referring to the responsibility of the man now holding the top position (Chairman) of the Federal Trade Commission.

This communication has no reference to, and must not be considered as such in, any personal attack, and also must not be considered as a political move, as we have no interest in personalities or the political lineup.

Our action in bringing this to your attention is for the overall good of the American public and, secondly, for the good of small business nationwide through an impartial, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

We have maintained from the very first that people going into high positions in the Government, irrespective of what their personal opinions on the laws might be, when they take an oath of office to enforce the laws, we expect them to carry out to the fullest degree their oath of office, with no exceptions or omissions.

Based on this premise, we are making two specific charges against the administration of the laws entrusted to the Federal Trade Commission, now headed by Mr. Edward F. Howrey:

"Charge No. 1 is Mr. Howrey's inability to act on the entire matters coming before the Commission, in view of his previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission on antitrust laws violations, on cases coming within the confines of the FTC jurisdiction."

To clarify this charge, it must be brought to your attention that Mr. Howrey stated at the time of his appearance before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, March 18 and 19, 1953, which committee was considering his nomination as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, that he would divorce himself from any participation in cases before the Commission with which he had previously been connected in his private capacity.

Mr. President, charge No. 2 is the natural outcome of Mr. Howrey's inability to act as set forth in charge No. 1.

"Charge No. 2 is that because of the divorcement or disassociation cited in charge No. 1, it would of necessity follow that he must divorce himself from numerous other cases similar in nature coming before the Commission, to those which he had represented before the Commission in his private capacity."

This charge is based on the fact that he would be unable to act impartially even though there had been no previous connection with the case in question.

The concern of the Senate committee at the time of his appearance before them was as to what action he would take due to his previous legal background in representation of clients before the Federal Trade Commission. Along this line of questioning by the members of the committee it is well to note the statement of Senator MAGNUSON:

"I am afraid that you might be on a vacation almost permanently down there."

You will find, Mr. President, through the committee's action at that time in the examination of Mr. Howrey, their concern about a section of the Robinson-Patman Act, namely, the quantity discount rule, and at that time Mr. Howrey was counsel of record for a very large factor in a major industry who was opposing the adoption of that rule under the law for that particular major industry.

At the time of my appearance before the Senate Commerce Committee on March 18, 1953, in opposing Mr. Howrey's nomination, I said:

"We put the question to the committee in behalf of small business of this Nation, Is it possible a gentleman going into this high position in the Federal Trade Commission can in reality serve two masters?"

Now, a little over 2 years later we find the suspicion registered in our question to the committee is confirmed through Mr. Howrey's actions, where he, as a member of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, which report was made but a few days ago, signed that report, with others, recommending the elimination of the quantity discount rule under the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is significant and important to note, Mr. President, that with reference to the above action, Mr. Howrey is quoted in the press, with reference to his signing of the report recommending the repeal: "This should not be construed as a prejudgment of issues which may come before the Commission in individual cases."

In view of this alarming situation we again ask, "How can Mr. Howrey render to the Agency as its head the full requirements in the enforcement of the laws entrusted to that Agency by the Congress of the United States?"

It is for this reason, Mr. President, in behalf of small business of this Nation, that we earnestly and sincerely request the removal of Mr. Howrey from his position as Chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal of April 8, 1955]

BURGER CALLS ON IKE TO FIRE HOWREY

WASHINGTON.—George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, today made public a letter to President Eisenhower calling on him to fire Edward F. Howrey, Federal Trade Commission chairman.

Burger, a professional foe of tire manufacturers, based his request on Howrey's part in signing a recent antitrust advisory report calling for abolition of the quantity discount rule in the Robinson-Patman Act.

The discount rule now is in the courts, with the tire makers fighting the FTC rule.

Howrey, a former attorney for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., has disassociated himself from all tire cases.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 11, 1955]

SMALL BUSINESS SPOKESMAN ASKS OUSTER OF HOWREY

WASHINGTON.—The head of an organization which claims to speak for small businessmen asked President Eisenhower to fire the Federal Trade Commission's present chairman, Edward F. Howrey.

In a letter to Mr. Eisenhower, George J. Burger, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., said Mr. Howrey is unfit to head the FTC because of his "previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission."

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1955]

REMOVAL OF HEAD OF FTC IS URGED—SMALL BUSINESS GROUP SAYS HOWREY'S LEGAL PRACTICE TIES HIS HANDS IN JOB

WASHINGTON, April 8.—A demand for the removal of Edward F. Howrey as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission was made today by the National Federation of Independent Business.

The federation's vice president, George J. Burger, wrote to President Eisenhower. He said that Mr. Howrey, because of his legal background in representing clients before the Commission, "would have his hands tied" in carrying out his responsibility.

The federation asserts it has a membership of 100,000 individual small-business men.

A high official of the Commission said Mr. Burger had been carrying on a running attack against Mr. Howrey ever since his appointment to the Commission 2 years ago. In fact, it was stressed, the federation head testified against Mr. Howrey when a Senate committee considered his nomination.

This official declined specific comment on the Burger letter to President Eisenhower. Mr. Howrey could not be reached for his reaction to it.

Mr. Burger did not say why he had chosen this particular time to direct the attention of President Eisenhower to his long time criticism of Mr. Howrey.

However, he noted that the Commission Chairman had been a member of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Anti-Trust Laws. As a member he had signed a recent report of the committee recommending legislative changes that Mr. Burger's organization feels inimical to the interests of small business.

At the Commission, it was explained that, while Mr. Howrey took part in the studies of the Attorney General's committee, he had not voted on any of its specific recommendations. Also, it was asserted, Mr. Howrey, in

signing the report as a whole had stated that his doing so should not be construed as his prejudicing issues that might come before the Commission in individual cases.

Mr. Burger made two charges:

First, "Mr. Howrey's inability to act on the entire matters coming before the Commission in view of his previous legal connection as attorney of record for many clients who now have cases pending against them before the Federal Trade Commission on anti-trust laws violations."

Second, that because of the divorcement or dissociation cited in the first charge "it would of necessity follow that he must divorce himself from numerous other cases similar in nature coming before the Commission to those which he had represented before the Commission in his private capacity."

SECOND CHARGE EXPLAINED

The second charge, Mr. Burger said, "is based on the fact that he would be unable to act impartially even though there had been no previous connection with the case in question."

Mr. Burger added that when Mr. Howrey appeared before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on March 18 and 19, 1953, when his nomination was being considered, he testified that he would divorce himself from any participation in cases before the Commission with which he had previously been connected in his private capacity.

The Senate approved the nomination on March 23 and the next day the President named him chairman to succeed James M. Mead, of New York. Mr. Mead, a former Democratic Senator, remains a member of the Commission.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TEX., TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 14.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 12, after the word "used," it is proposed to strike out "primarily", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, in and to the following-described land in Austin, Travis County, Tex., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land, including approximately one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres out of the original 200 acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range Tract, also referred to as the "old Deison farm":

Beginning at the southwest corner of the 53 acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the thirty-eight-and-fifty-five-one-hundredths-acre State tract No. 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north 60 degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin tracts 1,113 varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract, north 36½ degrees east one thousand eight and eighty-two one-hundredths varas to a point; said point being south 36½ degrees west one hundred thirty and sixty-eight one-hundredths varas from a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east along the south lines of the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel comprising five and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps, armory parcel comprising 5 acres, four hundred seventy-eight and eight-tenths varas to a point, the southeast corner of the said Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel;

Thence north thirty degrees east with and along the east line of the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, one hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths varas to a point on the southerly line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east one hundred forty-six and eight-tenths varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Deison and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Deison and Thiele tracts and also the Deison and Reid tracts, south one hundred and sixty-eight varas to a point;

Thence south fifty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty varas to a point;

Thence southeast one hundred and eight varas to a point;

Thence south nine degrees west one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south ten degrees east one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south five degrees west eighty-six varas to a point;

Thence south three degrees east seventy-seven varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser fifty-three-acre tract;

Thence north sixty degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, one hundred and forty-seven varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south thirty degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, six hundred forty and one-half varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres of land more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original two hundred-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Deison, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82–84, inclusive, of the deed records of Travis County, Texas, after deducting therefrom the five and eighty-nine one-hundredths-acre United States Air Force parcel and the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel above described, a total of ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres to be retained by the United States.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this Act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. There shall be further reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres referred to in section 1 of this act as the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, powerlines, and such other utilities as now exist, or which may become necessary to the operation of the above-described ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Texas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 5. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Texas, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Texas, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement which I have prepared on the bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Texas title to approximately 189 acres of land in Travis County, Tex.

The land to be conveyed would be used primarily for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes.

The land comprises the major part of a 200-acre tract purchased by the United States in 1909 for the sum of $5,000. It has been used since then by the Texas National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps.

No monetary consideration is involved in the proposed conveyance. Rights to repossess the land if needed during a national emergency would be retained by the United States.

I urge passage of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, desires to propose two amendments to the bill. They are standard amendments, and I have no objection to them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, they are merely clarifying amendments, and I now offer them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 17, after the word "made", it is proposed to strike out "by the State of Texas during its occupancy" and insert in lieu thereof "during its occupancy by the State of Texas."

On page 6, line 6, after the word "thereon", it is proposed to insert "during its occupancy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas if this bill complies in all respects with the so-called Morse formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are three bills which I am asking the Senate to consider at this time. They are similar in nature. I am informed that they comply not only with the Morse formula but with the formula of the Armed Services Committee in such cases.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested to know if there had been a change of heart on the part of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] since he moved across the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that the Senator from Oregon has had any change of heart with respect to his so-called formula since he moved across the aisle. It may be that it has resulted in amending bills to make them comply with his formula.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the bill require the State of Texas to pay for the land involved in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; and I do not understand that the Morse formula requires any State to pay for land which is to be used exclusively for National Guard purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information. I want to be sure that no advantages are taken of the Senator from Oregon during his absence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Vermont is only seeking information.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN POLK COUNTY, IOWA, TO THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, S. 148.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 148) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 8, after the word "used," to strike out "primarily", and on page 3, line 15, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, located in Polk County, Iowa, comprising 1,848.32 acres, more or less, and Polk County target range, Iowa, comprising 742.34 acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in the first section of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of enactment of this act: *Provided,* That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes. The State of Iowa further agrees that it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description of and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the bill and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after the word "made", it is proposed to strike out "by the State of Iowa during its occupancy" and insert in lieu thereof "during its occupancy by the State of Iowa."

On page 3, line 1, after the word "on", it is proposed to insert "during its occupancy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa."

CONVEYANCE OF JACKSON BARRACKS, LA., TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Calendar No. 224, S. 653.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 653) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 4, to strike out "interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, being one hundred forty-five and twelve one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, in Orleans" and insert in lieu thereof "interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease numbered W–766–QM–6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana" and insert "training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes"; and in line 12, after the word "national", to strike out "emergency, and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States" and insert "emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W–766–QM–6117, and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate 104.06 acres, more or less, in Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States.

SEC. 2. The costs of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I do not have a copy of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], together with his colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] is the author of the bill. It is similar to the two bills previously passed today. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services. It authorizes the conveyance of certain land to the State of Louisiana, to be used for National Guard purposes.

Mr. THYE. The land would be transferred for the exclusive use of the National Guard, in its training activities. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The bill also provides that, in case of emergency, the property will revert to the Federal Government.

Mr. THYE. How many acres of land are involved?

Mr. LONG. Sixty-six and one-half acres.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, it has been a Federal reservation for many years.

Mr. LONG. The State of Louisiana has used the property for many years under a long-term Federal lease. The State has always used the property during peacetime for National Guard purposes, and the lease has always contained a recapture clause, which would become effective in the event of war or other emergency. Almost all the improvements on the property have been constructed by the National Guard of Louisiana. The bill is in accord with the general understanding that exists with respect to similar installations used by the National Guard.

Mr. THYE. The Senator has explained the bill sufficiently for my purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert a comma and "and in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Louisiana shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 225, Senate bill 933.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 933) to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate bill 933 has to do with military compensation due a member of the armed services between the time he was last paid and the date of his death. The committee heard testimony from representatives of the General Accounting Office and from the Department of Defense, and they strongly support the bill and say it should be passed in the interest of economy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services were on page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "the United States" and insert "the uniformed service of which the decedent was a member"; on page 3, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Amounts payable under this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned or upon settlement by the General Accounting Office as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation authorize and direct and any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, amounts payable to beneficiaries designated by the member under section 2 of this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned. All other payments under this act shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

On page 4, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted and the following statutory provisions shall have no application in such cases.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted. The following

statutory provisions are repealed as of the effective date of the payment provisions of this act except with respect to the deaths of members occurring prior to such effective date.

And on page 5, after line 15, to strike out:

SEC. 6. The Departments shall take such action as is deemed necessary to notify members of the provisions of this act and of their rights to designate beneficiaries hereunder.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act the term "Department" shall mean the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, and the terms "uniformed services," "member" and "Secretary" shall have the respective meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Career Compensation act of 1949 (63 Stat. 804), as amended, on the date of enactment of this act, except that "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" shall be substituted for "the Federal Security Administrator" in the definition of the term "Secretary."

SEC. 2. In the settlement of the account of any deceased member of the uniformed services or of the National Guard or the Air National Guard, the amount found due therein from the uniformed service of which the decedent was a member shall be paid to the person or persons surviving at the date of death in the following order of precedence:

First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries named to receive any such amount in a written designation executed by the member and received, prior to his death, in the place designated for such purpose in the regulations of the Department concerned;

Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such member;

Third, if there be no beneficiary or surviving spouse, to the child or children of such member, and descendants of deceased children, by representation;

Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of the member, or the survivor of them; and

Fifth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of the estate of the deceased member, or if there be none, to the person or persons determined to be entitled thereto under the laws of the domicile of the deceased member.

SEC. 3. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, amounts payable to beneficiaries designated by the member under section 2 of this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned. All other payments under this act shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

SEC. 4. Designations of beneficiary under this act, and changes therein, shall be made under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries concerned, and such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable: *Provided*, That any designation of beneficiary made for the purposes of any 6 months' death gratuity (including any designation of a person whose right to the gratuity would not depend upon such designation) and heretofore or hereafter received in the Department concerned before the effective date of the payment provisions of this act shall be considered as a designation of beneficiary for the purposes of this act, in the absence of a designation of beneficiary under this act, unless the member making the designation shall have been missing, missing in action, in the hands of a hostile force, or interned in a foreign country during any part of the period between the date of enactment of this act and the effective date thereof as prescribed in section 5 of this act.

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted. The following statutory provisions are repealed as of the effective date of the payment provisions of this act, except with respect to the deaths of members occurring prior to such effective date:

(1) The paragraph of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 750), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, as amended by the act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 795), and section 4 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 10 U. S. C. 868).

(2) Section 1 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30), as amended by section 18 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 560, 34 U. S. C. 941a).

(3) The paragraph in section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 531), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted persons of the Coast Guard (14 U. S. C. 466).

(4) Section 507 of the Public Health Service Act, approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 711), as amended by section 2 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 42 U. S. C. 225).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 226, Senate bill 1094.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "existing on the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

S. 1094 is a technical amendment to the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act approved September 1, 1954. Enactment is necessary in order for the act to be administered in a consistent and equitable manner.

Serious inequities will occur under existing provisions that limit eligibility for the allowance to employees who were required by regulations "existing on the date of enactment" of the act to wear a prescribed uniform. It has been found that many employees wear uniforms solely as a matter of custom, so would not be eligible for the uniform allowance under the restrictive language of the act. S. 1094 would make the benefits potentially available to employees who are required by regulation or law, to wear a uniform. I am confident Congress intended this to be the result when it enacted the Uniform Allowance Act last fall, and therefore I believe there should be no objection to S. 1094 as proposed.

Enactment of S. 1094 will add no cost to the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954 because the cost of the uniforms herein authorized were included in the estimated cost of that act.

RELEASE OF THE REVERSIONARY RIGHTS IN A CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND TO THE VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, House Joint Resolution 107.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a $36^{759}/_{1000}$-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDY MADE BY THE STAFF OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few moments regarding something which occurred yesterday. I have various news reports of yesterday's White House press conference. I hold in my hand an item from the Washington Post and Times Herald headed "Ike Flays GOP Book Blunder."

I have another from the Washington Star, headed "Eisenhower Calls GOP Pamphlet Security Error."

I have another from the New York Herald Tribune, headed "Eisenhower Hits Arms Data Leak—Sees Blunder by Republicans."

I have another one which appeared in the New York Times, giving a detailed report of the press conference, but I do not happen to have the headline.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator read the New York Times report carefully?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he will find that the President does not blame the Senator from New Hampshire for the blunder; he blames those who have been leaking information from the Department of Defense for the past 2 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. The President's reference to the national-defense study made by the staff of the Republican policy committee as a blunder is most unfortunate.

The President's opinion might possibly be explained by his statement that our defense study was called to his attention on the way to the press conference by an aide. The President said:

> They (his aides) made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

If the President's aides gave him such an opinion, then I say they are very much misinformed.

I offer the flat statement here and now that there is not a single piece of classified information in this defense study. Every item dealing with weapons was carefully cleared with Defense Department officials with whom we conferred and was expressly declared by them to be unclassified. We stated directly that we did not ask for any classified material.

Moreover, practically all of our material dealing with weapons has appeared in public print in newspapers, magazines, service journals, aircraft yearbooks, and other periodicals available to all the public.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the purport of the Senator's remarks, if a blunder was made, it was not made by the minority policy committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. The purport of my remarks is to show that the compilation made by the committee was devised in order to give the American people, Senators, and others, a fair understanding of our defense position, and the information it contained was entirely unclassified. I feel just as strongly about classified material leaking as does anyone else. I have cautioned against it. I have condemned it. I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee, or its predecessor the Military Affairs Committee, for almost 19 years. I have been on the Appropriations Committee and on the Armed Services subcommittee or its predecessor subcommittee of that committee for almost 19 years. I believe I am the only Senator in the Senate today who was among the first four Senators who were approached by President Roosevelt and, in turn, by Secretary Stimson, in connection with providing money to develop the atom bomb, which was the best kept secret in America. I look askance upon anyone who leaks classified material. There is no one who could deplore it more than I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with everything the Senator from New Hampshire has said about his service in the Senate and about his high regard for classified information. Is my understanding of the Senator's statement correct that if a blunder was made, it was not made by the Senator's policy committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was not made by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. I assume, from a reading of the verbatim transcript of the statement that it was made by the President's aides who gave him the information, because the President's sole information on the matter apparently came from his aides.

I wish to give an example. One of the subjects the policy committee booklet discussed was the Nike. This is what our report said about the Nike:

> Surface-to-air guided missile used by the Army for antiaircraft defense.

Let us hear what someone else had published months earlier. The U. S. News & World Report of March 11, 1955, said of the Nike:

> Seeks out approaching enemy aircraft by radar long before the aircraft can reach target city. Launching sites now being installed around major United States cities, with missiles in "quantity production" at this time.

This is what Newsweek said about the Nike on February 21, 1955:

> The Army's sensational rocket-propelled antiaircraft guided missile: Traveling at supersonic speed, "Nike" tracks down, outmaneuvers, and can hit enemy planes 30 miles from its launching platform. Now being installed around United States cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full at this point in my remarks this example of comparisons between material printed in the policy committee booklet and material printed in publications of general circulation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NIKE

What policy committee booklet says:

The Nike: "Surface-to-air guided missile used by the Army for antiaircraft defense."

What U. S. News & World Report says March 11, 1955:

The Nike: "Seeks out approaching enemy aircraft by radar long before the aircraft can reach target city. Launching sites now being installed around major United States cities, with missiles in quantity production at this time."

What Newsweek says February 21, 1955:

The Nike: "The Army's sensational rocket-propelled antiaircraft guided missile. Traveling at supersonic speed, 'Nike' tracks down, outmaneuvers, and can hit enemy planes 30 miles from its launching platform. Now being installed around United States cities."

What Newsweek says January 3, 1955:

The Nike: "The Army's supersonic Nike antiaircraft missiles (range 20 miles, speed up to 1,600 miles per hour) are being stockpiled here in impressive quantity for instant shipment to key United States cities in the event of enemy air attack. Meanwhile, the Army is coming along fast with a new-model Nike with a range of 50 miles."

What Newsweek says February 28, 1955:

The Nike: "It's not generally realized how fast guided-missile and antiaircraft batteries are springing up around the United States. Between 14 and 15 major cities will be protected within a short time by 78 missile 'nests.' Next in line is a series of Nike bases to protect strategic points in Alaska."

What the 1954 Aircraft Year Book says:

Caption over picture of the Nike: "Here at home, the Department of Defense announced the Douglas Nike has been deployed as a first line of defense in case of air attack.

"Typical was the Douglas Nike, a pencil-shaped missile named for the famous Winged Victory of Greek mythology, and capable of intercepting and destroying enemy aircraft regardless of evasive action (p. 196).

"Nike is a two-stage rocket classified as a surface-to-air weapon. It is a dart-like rocket with sharply swept cruciform fins near the nose and similar fins near the after end. It is about 20 feet long and 1 foot in diameter.

"The missile is attached to a booster section which also has stabilizing fins at the base. After a period of initial thrust which attains supersonic speed, the booster portion drops off and a sustaining rocket motor takes over.

"An explosive warhead and electronic guidance equipment also are carried in the body of the basic missile. As a safety measure, the warhead is designed to explode only when in flight.

"The rocket is an integral part of a complex spotting and guidance system which electronically picks up and tracks a target plane and automatically launches a rocket at the proper moment to intercept aircraft.

"Essentially, a defensive weapon, the Nike system provides strategic areas of the United States with a far greater degree of antiaircraft protection than was possible with the more limited ranges and altitudes reached by conventional antiaircraft guns.

"The missile operates effectively regardless of weather conditions or visibility.

"Nike may be employed either from fixed or mobile battery installations. All of its units, except steel launching racks, are housed in all-weather van-type trailers, also designed by Douglas. The entire system is designed to be transportable by air.

"Should enemy aircraft approach a strategic area defended by the Nike system, this would be the sequence of events:

"1. A Nike battery receives information that hostile aircraft are approaching, and radar follows the target automatically.

"2. Nike missiles are readied in vertical position on their launching racks.

"3. Radar provides a running account of the target's changing position.

"4. When the target crosses Nike's distant and invisible deadline, the missile is fired.

"5. Within seconds, it closes in on the airplane.

"6. When it reaches the target, the warhead explodes and destroys the plane (pp. 197–198)."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have in my hand material which contains most important defense information, but which was published in U. S. News & World Report, Newsweek, and various other magazines. Every item in our report has been either declassified by the Department of Defense or has been in print time after time previously. I do not think some of it should have been released originally, but it has been released and used. There is not a single classified item in our whole pamphlet.

For instance, I have before me the United States Aircraft Yearbook for 1954, which contains a chapter on guided missiles. The text of the chapter not only describes in general what such missiles are, but also contains pictures and intimate details of the engines.

Mr. President, this material has been published in newspapers and periodicals

in the United States, and it has been reported over the radio and on the television in its most intimate details. The report which the Republican policy committee has developed has assembled declassified and other material much of which has been in print time after time. In most instances what is contained in the policy committee's booklet is in very much less detail than has been referred to previously.

The Defense Department examined this study with a fine tooth comb a few days ago. It found that there were only three slight items which have been subjects of speculative writing and published in technical magazines. Even these were given to our staff by the Defense Department in the course of our original research. After reviewing our study carefully the Defense Department declared:

As the document contains no significant technical information about new weapons, the compilation of the material is not considered a breach of security.

The Defense Department then concluded that—

In fact, as a whole, this document presents many of the positive accomplishments and goals of the Department of Defense, and should be reassuring to the American people.

This is precisely the reason the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee undertook this study. It was to give a rounded picture of American defense policies and programs as developed by the Eisenhower administration and the Defense Department. For months political critics have been charging the administration with weakening national defense. Newspaper editors were protesting what they called suppression of legitimate news by the Defense Department. And the American people were becoming deeply concerned about our defense in these critical times of tension in foreign affairs.

So long as our defense policies and program remained vague, such criticisms and confusion could arise. Our staff undertook our study to meet these criticisms which in the light of the facts were unjustified and to dispel public confusion.

We believe we have made a valuable contribution to a better understanding of the administration's program. We have equipped our Senators to inform the public accurately. If the President's aides gave him a different impression of our study than appears in the above facts, they have grossly misinformed him.

Mr. President, I desire to read a letter written by Robert Tripp Ross, Assistant Secretary of Defense, to Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, under date of April 26, 1955. The letter is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Reference is made to the memorandum from Special Counsel John J. Courtney to Col. Wade M. Fleischer, Director of Legislative Liaison, dated April 25, 1955, concerning an article published in the Washington Evening Star on April 23 relative to the pamphlet, National Defense Under the Republican Administration—Today and Tomorrow.

As the document contains no significant technical information about new weapons, the compilation of the material is not considered a breach of security.

The Chief Security Review Officer, Department of Defense, has reported to me that a security review of the material has been completed, and reveals only three minor technical items associated with projects which had not heretofore been cleared for open publication or general dissemination. The mention, however, of the names of these projects does not in itself constitute any revelation of information which would be of aid to a potential enemy, nor does it amount to a security violation.

Most of the factual information contained in the pamphlet was taken from unclassified documents furnished the Senate Republican policy committee by, and cleared for publication by, the Department of Defense. In addition, the three items referred to in the preceding paragraph have been subjects of speculative writing and published in technical magazines.

The security-violations information in the Star article is not correct and was obviously obtained from some unauthorized and as yet unidentified source before the review of the document had been completed.

In fact, as a whole, this document presents many of the positive accomplishments and goals of the Department of Defense and should be reassuring to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for bringing up the point which he has made. I simply wish to say that what I object to, as chairman of the Republican policy committee, is the inference that the committee would give out any classified information.

Obviously, the President had not read the booklet, had not seen it, and depended upon his aides for information, and they gave him wrong information.

I know what classified information is. I know what secret information is. I have been around Washington about as long as anyone else who is concerned with these matters, whether he be in the Department of Defense or in the United States Senate. I have handled all kinds of secret documents, and I would be the last one to be a party to publishing anything which I thought was classified.

However, after I have seen material published time after time in the press, and when I have checked with the Department of Defense to determine whether other material has been officially declassified, I think that the policy committee and its chairman proceeded correctly in publishing such information.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would object to having printed at the end of the discussion the text of the verbatim remarks of the President as published in the New York Times this morning. If one reads them carefully, he will see that the President was not accusing the Senator from New Hampshire and the Republican policy committee of the blunder. He is quoted as saying:

I heard about this pamphlet just before I came over. They gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

Now, for the past 2 years—I say "a blunder," somebody, I think was—gave out information that I wouldn't have given out, at least.

The President did not accuse the Republican policy committee of giving out the information. He accused someone of making a blunder by giving out information during the past 2 years, which, to quote the President, he "wouldn't have given out, at least."

If the President had been in Washington at the time he was in Europe during the war and after the war, he would have found that much information had been given out of the type which might be considered secret information, and that this is not something which has occurred only in the past 2 years.

I have been here almost 15 years, and I have heard given every year on the floor of the Senate information which I would have considered as something that should have been classified, or, at least, not widely publicized. That is why I should like to have the verbatim statement of the President printed in the RECORD, because from reading it one cannot get the inference that he accused the policy committee, but that he criticized the leaking confidential information out of the Pentagon, I suppose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AIKEN. It is unfortunate, I say to the President and to the Senator from New Hampshire, that some of the newspapers saw fit so to write up the subject as to make it appear that the President was attacking the Republican policy committee. Of course, that will help sell more newspapers tomorrow. We understand newspapers thrive on controversy; and controversies being lacking, controversies can always be provided.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

EXHIBIT 1

SECRECY POLICY DISCUSSED

Mr. DRUMMOND. Mr. President, may I ask a brief question about this matter of making military information easy or too easy for an enemy to get?

May I ask whether you feel entirely relaxed about the pamphlet issued by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate detailing information about new weapons and related military information?

Answer. I heard about this pamphlet just before I came over. They gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred.

Now, for the past 2 years—I say "a blunder," somebody, I think, was—gave out information that I wouldn't have given out, at least.

For some 2 years and 3 months I have been plagued by inexplicable, undiscovered leaks in this Government. But we mustn't be too astonished when we recognize that great numbers of people in this town who necessarily know details of one kind or another.

I just don't believe that it is justifiable for any governmental official to release anything that applies to the secret war plans, war policies, war purposes, and war equipment of this Government. That is the kind of thing that foreign intelligence systems spend thousands and thousands of dollars to get, unless we give it to them for nothing. And since we don't get it for nothing, I just don't believe in that kind of a trade. [Laughter.]

Now, this is what I believe in giving away: I think today to hold secret any document of the World War, including my own mistakes, except only when they are held there by some past agreement with a foreign nation that has not yet been abrogated, it is foolish.

Everything ought to be given out that helps the public of the United States to profit from past mistakes, to make decisions of the moment; that is current information.

But this is one thing I say it doesn't help any of us to make a decision merely to know that a plane can fly 802 miles instead of 208. That is a secret we should not be giving out. And that is the kind of thing I am talking about, and that only, I assure you.

Mr. CUTTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER OF PEOPLES OR TERRITORY TO COMMUNIST CONTROL BY CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on January 6, 1955:

"It is of the utmost importance that each of us understand the true nature of the struggle now taking place in the world.

"It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist described as 'a little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

"It is, therefore, struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world. * * *

"The massive military machines and ambitions of the Soviet-Communist bloc still create uneasiness in the world. All of us are aware of the continuing reliance of the Soviet Communists on military force, of the power of their weapons, of their present resistance to realistic armament limitation, and of their continuing effort to dominate or intimidate free nations on their periphery. Their steadily growing power includes an increasing strength in nuclear weapons. This power, combined with the proclaimed intentions of the Communist leaders to communize the world, is the threat confronting us today."; and

Whereas President Truman said, on March 12, 1947, in announcing the program for Greek-Turkish aid:

"One way of life is based on the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guaranties of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

"The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the area and power of military dictatorships shall not be permitted to expand; and it is essential to the honor of the American people that no part of any population now free shall be subjected to totalitarian slavery: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (a) no official or employee of the Government of the United States, or member of its armed services, may take part in any conference, or in steps leading to any conference, or in any commitment, open or secret, which has for its purpose or effect the transfer of any territory to the control of a Communist police state, or the transfer of any people or any part of the population of any nation to Communist enslavement.

(b) No such agreement or commitment shall be binding upon the United States.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at this particular time in history, will give consideraiton to this important resolution. I also hope that, relying upon quotations from statements by President Eisenhower and President Truman, we, as a nation, and our leaders, mean what we say and say what we mean.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NO MORE YALTAS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the air is, and for the past several days has been, full of foreboding that a carefully laid plan is under way for the United States to give up, bit by bit, its commitments in the Formosa Strait.

We sense that the decisive moment is close at hand.

Since the passage of the Formosa resolution by a nearly unanimous vote, the policy embodied in that resolution, of drawing a line which the Red Chinese armed forces were not to cross, has been undermined by a series of seemingly simple, but really very skillful steps to remove the props on which it rests.

The appeasers are cleverly trying to change the Formosa resolution from a courageous stand on the world conflict with communism, to a minor difference of opinion about a few little islands off the coast of Asia.

This planned shrinkage of a major world crisis to a minor border clash is back of the proposals to ask for a cease-fire, to send to the United Nations the question of setting up two Chinas, to hold a plebiscite, and to ask our allies to help guard Formosa.

Every one of these proposals was designed to belittle the Formosa question, and to induce us to consent to surrender by implying we were debating a minor adjustment involving no decisive issue.

The issue in the Formosa strait is not a few islands. Formosa is an outpost on the boundary line which protects the free world. This line marks the limits behind which those who oppose communism are safe. If the line breaks at Formosa, the whole free world will be imperiled, and in retreat.

All the Asian nations which live on the borders of the Soviet empire—Japan, the Phillipines, southeast Asia, and Pakistan—know their security is in peril.

All the frontier nations in Europe read the warnings the same way.

Surrender at Quemoy will shake Germany to its foundations, tell Austria it has no hope, warn Italy it is now on the crumbling frontier, tell France it is the next victim.

As our minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] said at Indianapolis, only a few days ago, Quemoy and Matsu are outposts as important as the island of Berlin.

When the Communists attempted to blockade Berlin, why did we resist? Berlin is only a city, an island surrounded by enemy territory. Why did we not retreat? We did not retreat because a retreat from Berlin would have endangered the entire frontier of freedom in the West. Retreat would have weakened the morale of our supporters behind the Iron Curtain and in the line of fire.

How absurd to judge the importance of a battle by the size of the battlefield. Bunker Hill was only a hillock. Valley Forge was only an encampment, Mr. President. Thermopylae was only a mountain pass. They were portentous because two worlds, two ways of thinking, faced each other in mortal combat; and the issue was victory or death.

Mr. President, I would that every Member of the Senate could have heard the testimony, this morning, of General Frank Howley, in his appearance before the Internal Security Committee. He is a man who, as military commander of Berlin, has dealt for 4½ years with the Communist tactics. He has made a first-hand study of what it is all about.

Mr. President, what is the matter with our leaders? What is the matter with the Senate? Do we not yet know what it is all bout?

If surrendering a few islands will avoid a world war, why not surrender Hong Kong to Red China? Why not surrender Berlin to East Germany? Why not give Denmark to the Soviet Union? It will ease her tension for the moment.

But if we start to retreat at Quemoy, where do we end our abject surrender? Americans are on the side of free China, because free China shares our belief in the dignity of man. Free China has been fighting since 1927 to hold back the onslaught of the modern Genghis Khan. We have pledged our word to free China again and again.

Only a few weeks ago our Navy was assigned to help in removing the pitiful inhabitants of the Tachen Islands, whose families had lived for centuries on their rocky fields.

We were told the move was necessary in order to straighten the line that marked our outposts. If that was not a commitment to help guard the corrected line, including Quemoy and Matsu, I do not know what a commitment is.

Since the end of the Second World War, the Communists have started three wars against legally established governments in Asia—first, against Nationalist China; second, against the Republic of Korea. In the third war, against Indo-

china, their legions were moved from North Korea to South China. They helped seize half of Viet-Nam, and enslaved millions of human souls.

Now they boast of plans for a fourth war in Asia, and we know the fourth war will not be the last.

They still hold our American prisoners of war in common jails, in spite of their specific agreement, in the cease-fire settlement, to return all prisoners of war.

Furthermore, they hold hundreds of other prisoners illegally. Yet, Mr. President, at this time we are willing to sit down at a table to negotiate with known bandits, gangsters, and murderers. Those who are discussing that proposal have not even laid down any conditions to the effect that the criminals in the Korean war should pay the price that the German criminals paid, following World War II.

Mr. President, have you seen any of them punished for illegally murdering American soldiers? Have such atrocities been called to the attention of the world? Have there been trials, as a result of the Korean war? No. On what grounds does anyone dare ask America to appease these bandits?

The United States has been slow to use its power in every crisis in Asia.

Like Gulliver in Lilliput, the great strength of the United States has been pinned down by men too small for it to notice.

I will not go into the question of who is responsible.

This is a time for Americans to agree insofar as they can find agreement.

Our problem today is to make sure our strength will not be pinned down again if the Communists start a fourth war in Asia.

We must find a way to lock the stable, before the horse is stolen.

We must have a formula to prevent surrender or appeasement; and that formula must be so clear, so simple, so self-executing, that no hidden appeasers can pervert it. That is what will be done by means of the resolution I have submitted, Mr. President.

I submit the resolution to that end. It follows closely statements of policy made by President Eisenhower, President Truman, and many other distinguished American leaders. It rests on the belief that the Communists will never stop their militant aggression until our country is destroyed. It rests on the belief that there is a moral difference between Soviet philosophy and that of the free nations—not only a political difference or an economic difference but a difference in the meaning of promises and agreements and truth, a difference in the way human life is to be valued. We compromise on such issues at our peril.

It follows, I believe, that in our national interest we cannot surrender a single square foot of free land to Communist rule, so long as that rule is inhuman tyranny. We cannot morally subject a single freeman to Communist rule so long as that rule is human slavery.

Mr. President, my proposal is simple. I propose that no official of our civil or Military Establishment shall participate, in any way, in any act which has the purpose or effect of surrendering either territory or people now part of the free world.

I propose that if any American official does participate in any such agreement, his acts shall not be binding on the Government and the people of the United States.

Any American official who attempts to negotiate another Yalta agreement will be on notice that he cannot commit the United States.

Any nation which attempts to inveigle our officials into another Yalta agreement will be on notice that it can gain nothing.

There is no aggression here, Mr. President. This is a purely defensive resolution. We seek no territory. We threaten no part of the Communist empire. We want no war.

Our only purpose is to prevent another sell-out, of free lands and free people, to the Communists.

Members of Congress have spent years, Mr. President, trying to get the true record of Yalta, where our representatives surrendered central Europe and north China to the Soviet Union and sent millions of human beings to death or hideous slavery.

We shall spend more years trying to get the record of Teheran and Potsdam.

When we shall have finished we shall not have touched the secret agreements, the hidden deals. We shall not have remedied one iota of the damage.

I, for one, am tired of trying to undo the past. I want to prevent new damage. I want a rule of policy so simple and clear that there can be no more Yaltas.

I offer that rule here today—a binding commitment by the Congress that no American official can surrender any more land or people to the Communists, or if he attempts to do so, he can not bind the United States.

I want to make it useless for any official to promise appeasement.

Our honor and our self-interest are one in this matter. Both honor and self-interest forbid us to make deals or sell out to a totalitarian empire armed with guns made by human slavery, enforced by the firing squad.

We know where the American people stand. Surely there is enough political skill in the Congress to make sure none of our officials take a path contrary to what our people wish.

Let this be the beginning, Mr. President, of an unshakeable American policy. Let it be the end of surrendering lands or people to slavery. Let it be the basis of a true and honest promise that the United States has put appeasement and double-talk behind her.

One-third of the world is, alas, now under the dark cloud of slavery. Let us make certain that America shall never again consent to surrender any lands or people, now free, to that darkness.

Once we draw a firm line, and cut off the ability of the Communist nations to such sustenance from countries now outside the Iron Curtain, I am confident that the robber states of communism will wither away, and true peace will come again to a weary world.

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since 1944, 31 Negro colleges in the country have been aided from funds raised by the United Negro College Fund drive, which takes place annually. This year the campaign will be held during the first week in May, and I commend the appeal to our people.

The funds so derived are devoted to Negro scholarships, improved teaching facilities, health programs, library facilities, and other constructive and useful purposes.

The 16 million Negroes in the Nation constitute about 10 percent of the population. Yet of the 2½ million students enrolled in colleges and universities, only 4 percent are Negroes. Here is a gap that can be filled in large measure by aiding the Negro colleges who share in the united fund. More and more Negro students are seeking a college education, but their hopes can be realized only if the facilities are available.

The goal of the drive is $175 million. This represents the 10-percent gap between the needs of these colleges and what they expect to derive from tuition and endowments. It is a modest sum. The total budget of all 31 colleges is less than that of the budgets for some of our single universities. This sobering fact portrays the need. For such a worthy cause, I am sure the people of the country will respond.

AIRPOWER AS OUR NATIONAL STRATEGY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, throughout our entire history our national and international policy has been and still is one of peace, and because of that our people have looked upon war with repugnance and distaste. We as a people have never understood war nor what war is supposed to accomplish. War used to be something remotely connected with our daily domestic problems, but modern war means total war. Admiral Mahan said:

> It behooves countries whose people, like all free peoples, object to paying for large military establishments, to see to it that they are at least strong enough to gain the time to turn the spirit and capacity of their subjects into the new activities which war calls for.

In modern war there is every possibility that there will not be time to accomplish the objective outlined by Admiral Mahan, so we must turn our attention to the problems of war in times of peace, realizing that, should we ever have to become engaged in war, the strength that Mahan speaks of will be with us immediately.

It is with that in mind that I approach my subject, hoping during the discourse to throw some light upon the general nature of war and upon the position which we in the United States find ourselves at this period of history.

War is but an instrument of policy, of international policy. We have other instruments we use to accomplish our policies; one is psychological, another economic, still another political. It has been possible in our history to avert the

use of the last-resort instrument, war, by the proper utilization of some or all of these other instruments. However, in this modern day we find ourselves in an entirely different position than that at any other time in our history. We know who our enemy is and what his intentions are. We know our enemy to be Bolshevik communism, and his intentions to be the substitution of his philosophy of government for those of the free countries of the world. His philosophy of government is tyranny, ours and our allies, freedom. Our differences, we know, are not based primarily on economics nor upon the needs for geographic expansion, so we can, therefore, confine the issue as being one of completely opposite political philosophies. We can direct our policy of peace and freedom toward the conquering of this issue of communism. In directing our efforts toward the furthering of our policy to the end that all of the peoples of the world may be free, we will pursue psychological methods and economic and political efforts, but at the same time we must be realistic in our approach to this problem by recognizing that when there are two philosophies existent in the world, and they are diametrically opposite; there is always the possibility that war might have to be the instrument we ultimately use to insure the furtherance of our own policy. Recognizing this, it is well that we as a nation understand the position that we are in today as leaders of the free world, and how through the evolution of transportation and weapons we arrived there.

In the past it has been the professional soldier who has always been reluctant to give up his old weapon for the new or to give up old strategy for the new. Now we must be concerned not only with the attitude of the professional soldier, but also with the attitude of our citizenry as a whole, whom we now ask to understand more fully problems which heretofore the citizens considered as the sole property of the military. I feel that it is necessary in developing a discussion of this nature to go back briefly through history to demonstrate how power has developed throughout the centuries and why power has rested for brief moments in the hands of various nations.

Last year, during a speech on the floor of the Senate I discussed the development of transportation and the attendant tenure of world power in those countries which mastered transportation. I should like to repeat at this time a portion of what I then said:

Civilization began in the river valleys of Asia. Men assembled there in small villages and towns, and, almost at once, the desire to communicate with one another led to traffic up and down the rivers of that vast continent. Their transportation was confined to the rivers, however, because, when the tiny and primitive boats reached the mouths of the rivers, they were turned back by the heavy and awesome seas. Asia grew, then, within itself, its development being confined to the length and breadth of the valleys. Men did not dare to venture past these confines, and this restrictive influence of Asian geography is still reflected in the backwardness of the Asiatic countries. While it is true that their cultures flourished, the lack of contact with the outside world brought about a narrowness and provincialism in their ranks which persists even to this day.

Turning next to Egypt and her great Nile River, we find that there men also assembled in towns along that river; but as they approached the mouth of this one, they found a small, quiet sea whose islands were easy points of recognition for navigation and whose nearly always placid waters offered no great obstacle to commerce between the countries which bordered upon it. Hence, great countries like Greece, Egypt, and the Roman Empire came into being. As the means of transportation gradually improved, commerce flourished, and these Mediterranean countries became the great powers of the then known world.

The ability which man acquired in the navigation of the Mediterranean made it only natural that he should venture even farther into the unknown vastness of the deep oceans. With the advent of deep-sea navigation and transportation, the countries whose harbors bordered on the Atlantic in Europe began to grow into world powers. In the logical course of such events, Spain and Portugal became the first of these countries to assume power through their mastery of the ocean. It followed, then, that little England, heretofore only an island kingdom, would assume world leadership through her inheritance and dominance of the seas. Through seapower, England became the master country of the world, not only politically but also economically, and it is interesting to note that until the advent and development of aviation she successfully retained that position, and, I might add, through its use, enjoyed a rather peaceful existence.

Before coming up to the present day to discuss the new transportation era in which we find ourselves, we should look briefly at the impact which the advent of the railroads made on the inland empires of the world. Until the railroad chugged across the American scene in the 1830's, the economic dominance was confined to those countries controlling the seas. The railroad, however, made it possible to develop our own country and it is probably the greatest single contributing factor to the economic growth of the United States outside our basic free-enterprise system.

The railroads opened up the power of Germany. Even Russia began to construct a railroad system, but fell short of its needs, and today much of the Soviet Union's backwardness, up until the air age, can be blamed on an inadequate railroad system. In China, likewise, we find a large interior country whose commerce has been stagnant because no proper means of inland transportation has been developed and maintained. The iron horse moved the people away from the rivers, across the plains and mountains, and interior countries began to compete on a more equal basis with the seabound countries in the race for world power.

A new method of transportation came into prominence between the First and Second World Wars, however; and, since that time, it has risen in the extent of its impact upon the course of human affairs. Airpower has completely destroyed the transport barriers of yesterday, and today we live in a world whose wide and farflung points can be visited easily and quickly for business, pleasure, or, sadly and more significantly, for the purpose of war.

Having seen how power passes to those countries who master new and improved transportation systems, we are in a position to understand how the United States, with its superiority in technology and production, and with its long interest in air transportation stands dominant in that field today. We are, by that criterion, the leading world power. It is necessary, though, that we explore another avenue of history so that we can relate the power of air transportation with the power of modern weapons before developing fully the role of the United States as the leader in the efforts for peace and to attempt to develop the role of airpower and air supremacy as a means of keeping the peace.

Mr. President, historians are pretty much in agreement that there have been 6 weapons systems developed for land warfare and 4 for sea warfare during the history of the struggle of men with each other. Looking first at the weapons systems developed for land use, we see that the horde army as used by the Genghis Khan and later by Alexander was the first of these. During the early period of history there was no change in this system. It was not until the year 500 B. C., when the Greeks introduced the phalanx, that a new system replaced the old one. Within 300 years, however, the Roman legion was able to defeat the phalanx and the legion became the weapons system used for the next 500 years. When the advantages of mobility became recognized as a military factor, cavalry came to dominate the scene for nearly a thousand years. With the invention of gunpowder, however, cavalry was replaced with unarmored, and more recently, armored and mechanized infantry.

While these military developments were taking place on land we find that on sea the first system which was used was the old galleys propelled by oars. The strategy involved in their use was to conduct a battle as nearly like a land battle as was possible. It was not until the battle of the Grand Armada, in 1588, that we saw naval warfare developing as we know it today. Even this system was improved with the advent of steam-driven and armor-plated ships. World War I introduced a new element in naval weapons systems. This was the submarine. To meet this new threat, naval tactics were drastically changed with the naval carrier task force becoming the striking force of the modern navy.

Mr. President, all of these various systems were developed for the sole purpose of controlling specific land or sea areas, and each was the result of an improvement in fire power. It is more interesting to note, however, that even with this evolution of weapons systems, strategies remained tied to the earth's surface.

The only thing that changed was the degree of power; one nation's field military force unleashed against another nation's army and navy. These forces used their national resources to wear down and destroy enemy forces. This destruction had only an indirect effect on national resources, and the outcome was determined by the degree to which the power of armies and fleets was eliminated.

I have devoted some time to outlining the development of weapons systems for two reasons. First, it shows us that man is an inventive being. Civilization is not static, and with each successive generation, improvements, both military and social, have been effected. My second reason for this summary, and to me the most important reason, is to show that

man is not and should not be necessarily restricted by what we call tradition.

We must be willing to take from the past only those things which will be useful today and tomorrow. We must not substitute precedent for the maximum use of those resources and realities that we are aware of today; the prejudices of history must be overcome.

The advent of the far-ranging airplane in our time has changed all the concepts of conflict which were developed from the time of man's birth to the start of the 20th century. Aerial operations have had a profound effect, not only upon the nature of land and sea conflict, but also on the daily relations of the nations of the world with one another. Both military and commercial air development shook the complacency of nations that hitherto had been able to isolate themselves from the cause and effects of international behavior. Land and sea barriers melted away, and it was as though the very soul of a nation became vulnerable to any and all peoples.

World War I demonstrated this offensive capacity of a nation and its ability to disregard those barriers designed by both man and nature. Aircraft with offensive speed and maneuverability, armament, and penetrating characteristics, gave all nations an ability to strike directly at all the resources, human and material, of a nation in their primary and raw form before they could be used for military purposes. Military operations were no longer restricted, for now we were able to go over and not through or around. Forces tied to land and surface strategies literally and figuratively looked up to this new weapon, for now they were vulnerable to attack from any and all directions.

From the time the first airplane was used as a weapon, military concepts and doctrines based on centuries of precedent became obsolete.

Airpower gave new meaning to such principles of war as economy, flexibility, security, surprise, and control. The factors that modified the courses of previous conflict became meaningless for the most part, since the nature of the medium of space gives to air forces a versatility never known to surface forces. Thus, just as Mahan recognized that the primary medium of power of a maritime nation was seapower, more recent events have pointed to airpower as the key to national strategy. Since it is the key, it must be the dominant force.

Now, having related the improvement in each new weapons system to firepower, we can place the modern weapons system in its proper perspective when viewed alongside of air transportation. Neither our present weapons system nor our means for transporting it are new. After the first daylight air raid on London in 1917 General Smuts said:

> The day may not be far off when aerial operations, with their devastation of enemy lands and destruction of industrial and population centers on a vast scale may become the principal operations of war, to which the older forms of military and naval operations may become secondary and subordinate. Air supremacy may in the long run become as important a factor in the defense of the empire as sea supremacy.

How prophetic were those words of General Smuts in 1917. During World War II and the Korean conflict we found that both land and sea power remained, as before, extremely important to the pursuance of war. However, the forces required to exercise both of these powers had changed considerably in character. We found that air superiority was now the prime requisite to all operations of war whether they be on land, on the sea, or in the air. We found, too, that even to begin to wage a war required that our air arm be able completely to deny air operations to our enemy before our own operations could proceed. This is what we now call air superiority.

Mr. President, in order more fully to develop the role of air power in our national strategy, I must at this time revert again to history—to that portion of the history of transportation and the development of weapons systems that brought about sea power. Great Britain, it will be recalled, mastered ocean navigation and likewise mastered the weapons system of the sea when in 1588 she defeated Spain in the first modern naval battle. Great Britain continued to be dominant in this new field of transportation and to be dominant also in the utilization of this new weapons system. By the judicious use of both, she was able to maintain a peaceful situation for many years. With the coming of the air age, however, Great Britain no longer dominates the world as she did when sea power was her strength. The thesis of Admiral Mahan was now only valid as it applied to a new element—the air. Great Britain recognized this change; she accepted the fact that with this new dimension in the element of power, surface forces and surface strategies were vulnerable and obsolete. The Royal Air Force replaced the Royal Navy as the key to her military doctrine. History having overtaken the British Navy, that country's Air Force assumed the dominant role. The reasoning of Billy Mitchell now applied. Just as it once was necessary to bring matters to an issue upon the broad sea, it is now possible to resolve conflict only in the medium of the limitless skies.

Mr. President, it may be well now to examine our military policies to see how we can best bring matters to an issue in the vast expanse of the sky, and, by doing this, maintain peace throughout the world as England so successfully did when following the concept by the proper use of seapower. On January 12, 1954, Secretary of State Dulles made a speech which I feel was not thoroughly understood by the American people. It was entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," and it became controversial because it stated that the President had made a decision to "depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing." What people failed to notice was the continuing statement:

> Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our military establishment to fit what is our policy instead of having to try to meet the enemy's many choices.

In the past the enemy's many choices were reflected in such areas as Greece and Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Indochina. In the past our actions have been emergency actions which while effective were inadequate because, as Mr. Dulles said:

> What we did was, in the main, emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies.

One of the basic concepts of warfare as expressed by Clausewitz is that a defensive position is strongest particularly when the defense has strong means of retaliation. Following this concept, what Mr. Dulles' statement implied was that the United States had decided to "place more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power." Mr. Dulles went on to explain this by saying:

> What the Eisenhower administration wants is a * * * international security system.

I see in that January 12, 1954 speech of Secretary Dulles' the first official recognition by any person in a position such as he occupies that airpower has replaced seapower and landpower as the dominant force for peace in the world. What Mr. Dulles said in effect replaces a Mahan theory for the seas with a Mitchell theory for air, in that air, having developed as the strongest means of transportation, and the United States being dominant in this field, we can well accept airpower as our national strategy and build around it the organizations of the land and sea forces.

Just as England, when she had control of the seas, maintained a highly mobile and effective sea force, so must we today maintain a highly mobile and increasingly effective Air Force. The truth of this doctrine cannot be doubted with the results of World War II and Korea freshly in our minds. We have seen that military operations on land and sea cannot proceed without air superiority. We know, too, that transportation can be denied on the surface of the seas and underneath the seas by airpower. We know, too, that land transportation can be completely destroyed by airpower. Knowing these things, we can generalize as follows:

Airpower is the national strategy which relies for force on a weapons system in which the land and sea forces are organized around the air forces.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to make it clear that I am not either advocating or opposing the cuts in the military budget as recommended by the Department of Defense. What I am now suggesting is a new national concept of airpower strategy which may be applied to our land and sea forces in the future, to the end that those forces will reflect their adequate strength as being dependent primarily upon the power of the Air Force.

This means that airpower becomes the primary manifestation of national power, in war and in peace, because of its direct influence upon the social structure and warmaking potential of an enemy nation. If we, as a people, are willing to accept the new doctrine that peace can be maintained through airpower, then we will not be like the professional soldier of old who was very reluctant to give up his particular weapon or his particular pet strategy. We will

become a people fully aware of the problems of war and a people determined to support this kind of an approach to peace, psychologically, industrially, politically, and in every other way incumbent on us. It will better enable us to understand the necessity of evaluating existing and contemplated weapons systems. This is not a question of subjugating one service at the expense of another. Rather it is a matter of obtaining the greatest possible return from our dollar investment in the military forces as a whole. Once this is done, the force requirements can be determined accordingly and phased to meet the time requirements of our strategy.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems have become the cornerstone of modern military power. We all recognize it to be the key to American security. Military tasks, therefore, primarily consist of maintaining armaments in such a state of readiness and in such quantities that the Communists will find it disadvantageous to solve their problem by the use of nuclear weapons. They must not only be faced with an impossible task of neutralizing our retaliatory effort but must also be made to realize that should retaliation on our part be necessary, such an action will be instant and complete.

Unfortunately many in this country, both military and civilian, do not realize the full scope of these military responsibilities. These are the people whose thinking is clouded by historical prejudice. These are the proponents of "balanced forces," "supercarriers," duplications in military effort, conflicting service roles and missions. These are the wearers of the "old school tie" in a day and age when a new school has been founded.

It is not suggested that we do away completely with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is difficult to understand, however, why many still do not see the need to tailor service needs and requirements to conform to modern patterns of political and military reality. This is not simply a question of money—although I believe that billions of dollars could be saved if forces were designed around service missions—but a recognition that nations control war, and therefore peace, by their dominance in modern weapons and the expeditious means to deliver them. We must accept the influence of powerful air forces upon international behavior. An understanding of the implications of this new weapon is not a matter of choice; it is the very condition of national survival.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am very sorry that I did not have the privilege of listening to the entire address just delivered by my able friend from Arizona. I heard a part of the speech, however, the other night, and I hope that my colleagues will give it very careful consideration.

Knowing some of the contents of the Senator's address, I should like to ask the Senator what attention he has given to the question of basic military training, as related to universal military training.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad that such an eminent military authority as the Senator from Pennsylvania has asked that question.

I feel that the United States must maintain a strong Reserve system. I do not believe that the rather pussy-footing bill, I may call it, which was passed by the House yesterday, is an approach to that end.

There can be military training in our high schools and colleges. There can be voluntary military training. It should be adequate; but I think it can be arranged so as to require a minimum of time from the boy who must take such training.

I feel that a strong reserve force in the United States will save the people of the Nation billions of dollars. But, more important, there will be an adequate reserve which can be called on immediately. It will not take 2, 3, or 4 years to train forces, as has been necessary in the past.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Speaking from the viewpoint of a young American, as compared with one of my age, does the Senator see any objection to a proposal to require every boy in the Nation to have some basic military training?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel that the boy not only owes it to his country to have basic military training, but he owes it to himself.

The eminent Senator from Pennsylvania served as a general in two World Wars. He knows from experience that the boys who get hurt are the boys who are quickly trained in boot camps, boys who are given 6 weeks of training in military camps, and who have not had much exposure to actual combat conditions. The boys who come home safely, 9 times out of 10, are members of the National Guard or the Reserves.

I can answer only by saying that my two boys will enter the military service and are already looking forward to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In part, my next question will be in the nature of a comment. Does the Senator from Arizona, based upon his experience with military affairs, know of any reason why there should not be a large permanent reserve of officers who are especially well trained in the American way of life and in military affairs, and who would be able to train civilian components, particularly the National Guard and the Organized Reserves?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That system is utilized at present. I do not know whether the present supply of officers is adequate or inadequate. But certainly those who are engaged in the task of training our young men should be skilled primarily in all things pertaining to the American way of life, especially economic and social systems, and secondarily in the military strategy and weapons of this country.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield further, I should like to comment that in World War II, I trained a division, and I had as instructors quite a number of very fine Regular Army officers. I used all those officers in places of command. For example, the 109th Field Artillery was commanded by a Regular Army officer. The 112th Infantry was commanded by a Regular Army officer. My G–2, for example, was a Regular Army officer. They all worked magnificently together.

I am suggesting now that many of such officers could have permanent command in the National Guard and Reserve, and thereby themselves acquire additional training. Unfortunately, in our country general officers do not have sufficient opportunity to command troops in the field, commensurate with their own rank. Does the Senator see anything that would not be good, from an American standpoint, in giving such officers such opportunity?

Many persons feel that Regular Army officers do not have a full conception of what America means. I do not agree with them. Some of the finest advisers I have had, political and otherwise, have been officers of the Army.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator about the quality of Americanism found in our armed services. I do not think those men can be topped. I regret that some people, perhaps, do not look up to our military officers, and appreciate the training that has resulted in their holding their present positions.

To answer the first part of the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as the Senator knows, one would have to consider that there is a constant pressure of young officers who desire to move up. I think the Air Force has taken a wise tack in not waiting until officers are about ready to retire before giving them high rank, but in having their officers become generals at a young age, such as 40, 42, and 45, so that they can have 10, 12, or even 18 years of command under their belts, and be available should trouble arise.

However, to provide adequate space in the table of organizations in the Reserve and National Guard for officers who are no longer connected with active military service would probably present problems because of there not being a sufficient number of vacancies for those officers. The Senator knows what happens when there may be a full colonel or a general who is getting along in years, and a captain who is eager to advance, but who cannot be promoted because the "stars" keep him down.

If we should develop the Reserve program and Congress should provide adequate funds for pay, summer camp, and equipment, then I feel we could expand the program somewhat. Such a program would have to have help from the Federal Government, and moneys now directed to the Regular Military Establishment would have to be transferred to the Reserve Forces for arms, equipment, and pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time. I wish to express my appreciation for having had an opportunity to hear a part of a very well prepared thesis respecting certain elements of our military forces. I am still old-fashioned enough to think that, in the finality, we will need ground forces.

One of the questions I am particularly interested in is rapid transportation. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a bill this morning providing for a toll road clear across the United States, because it is surprising how much we have to depend on a good road system, regardless of other modern transportation means.

I appreciate very much having been permitted the time to make a brief statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want the Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Senator, or anyone who might read my remarks, to think I am advocating doing away with ground forces. I do not believe the day will ever come when we will not need to have doughboys who can take over ground and stick our flag in the ground to indicate that the territory belongs to us. However, I believe that, instead of building our forces around naval power, as we have done in the past, we should now consider the possibility of building our forces around airpower.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. From the transportation standpoint, airpower is what saved us in Korea. I think one of the greatest military exploits in the history of America was the way we transported equipment and reinforcements of men to and in Korea. It was a magnificent accomplishment. I wish people would give more consideration to what our army accomplished in that respect in the Korean conflict.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before I turn to the subject on which I am prepared to speak, I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arizona for the address he has just made. It is the type of speech which carries upon it the brand of statesmanship.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS FROM LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, PA.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Vermont yield for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there are in the gallery today students from Lafayette College, Pa., who are studying international affairs. They are contemplating governmental service, service with business concerns, and kindred activities. They have entered upon a new element of study. I should like to have them stand up, so that Senators may be able to see these young men.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause.]

PLIGHT OF LOW-INCOME FARMERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope everyone will consider seriously the message which the President has sent to the Congress relating to the plight of a million and a quarter low-income farmers.

We spend days and weeks—and even months—in seeking to maintain and raise the income of the 2 million highly mechanized farming units of our country, but it is so easy to forget the problem of those farmers who cannot afford mechanization, and could not make a decent living on their small farms even if they could afford mechanization.

Price-support programs have been very helpful to the commercial farming interests of America, but no price-support legislation is going to bring the million and a quarter small farmers selling less than $1,500 a year from their farms to a very high level of personal security.

Even 200 percent price supports would not enable most of them to live decently.

As the President and Secretary Benson point out, these people not only must have other income, but they must be helped and shown how they can improve their present income from the comparatively small amount of agricultural production which they now have.

It will be noted that most of these extremely low-income farmers are located in 12 to 15 States.

This fact, however, does not mean that every State does not have communities which can be greatly improved through methods which we have talked a lot about, but which we have not put into fullest application.

The report to the President from the Secretary of Agriculture does not contain many new suggestions. It does recommend putting into effect our backlog of knowledge and the acquisition of more.

Very little legislation will be needed to implement a program which will enable a million farm families to make a markedly greater contribution to the national economy, to security, and to society.

There is no one solution to the problem of America's low-income farm people.

In one community, it may mean better use of their existing resources.

In another, it may require more vocational training, both agricultural and industrial; in another, it may mean a change of employment; and in still others, it may be that the communities are well adapted to small industries which will provide part-time employment for those whose production on the farm is inadequate to support a family.

We all remember the days when the county-agent system was started. Today, there are in America thousands of prosperous farmers whose status at that time was not much better than that of the million farm families which are referred to in Secretary Benson's report. It was the individual attention of the county agent which helped many low-income farmers of a generation ago to become the prosperous producers of today.

It is equally certain that if more personal attention can be paid at this time to the condition of the remaining low-income families, many of them would also attain more satisfactory levels of existence.

We have known for years that we should inaugurate and expand a program directed to the plight of low-income rural people. President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson believe that we should now have more action in this direction.

It will make a stronger America if these low-income farm people become more independent, if more of them can have higher education, if all of them can have better health.

The proposal of Secretary Benson to launch pilot operations in not less than 50 of the thousand low-income counties of the United States will give us within a few year's time most valuable criteria upon which to base more widespread operations.

Our goal, Mr. President, should be complete victory over rural poverty. As I have said, that will take little money. It will take little legislation. It will take a good deal of coordination of effort, and it will result in a better agriculture and a stronger, healthier United States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and for his reference to the President's report and Secretary Benson's study of this problem, for it is a serious problem which confronts agriculture, and one to which I believe a solution must be found.

I also commend the Secretary of Agriculture for commencing this vital project. It seems to me that measures must be devised to increase the income of farmers of low income. This matter is most important to 1¼ million people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. I wish to point out that the problem we are now tackling again is not a new one. On the contrary, it has been with our country for centuries. Even before our country was established as a Nation there always were rural areas which were poverty stricken.

There is no perfect solution to the problem. There has been a constant trend toward mechanization, commercialization, and larger farming units. But we can do much. We already know how to do much to make better the life of this category of farmers who, unfortunately, for the time being, at least, have to eke out a living on very small incomes. If we can help them enjoy life more fully, we should do so. We should make a full-fledged assault upon this problem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from

Vermont yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I, too, wish to join, in association with the distinguished Senator from Kansas, in commending our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, for pointing out the very constructive suggestions which have been brought about as a result of the plan to aid the low-income farmers, who are found, as my distinguished colleague well knows, not only in the South, but in many other regions of the Nation, including the northeastern area.

This is the first time I have seen offered a really constructive suggestion as to how the low-income farm groups can better their position. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

From his work and his long labors on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I know that he certainly recognizes the value of a program of the kind proposed, and I know he will work to see that such a program is adopted, if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine. I may say that he and I are very fortunate in living in States which do not have an entire county which qualifies as a poverty-stricken county. But that does not mean that we do not have in our own States many individual farmers who at this time are barely holding their heads above water.

I think we should realize that when, in any part of the Nation, there are a considerable number of rural persons who are living in poverty and in unfortunate conditions, such a situation affects all of us; it affects the entire country. Certainly we should do what we can to overcome these conditions wherever they may exist.

RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY RIGHTS IN A TRACT OF LAND TO THE VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36 759/1000-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The unfinished business is House Joint Resolution 107, Calendar No. 228, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY AND REPORT ON BURLEY TOBACCO MARKETING CONTROLS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 60, Calendar No. 229, directing a study and report on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of developing basic information which will aid the Congress in formulating an improved program for the production and marketing of burley tobacco, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed (a) to make a study of the various methods of marketing control which have been or could be made applicable to burley tobacco, including farm marketing quotas, poundage limitations, acreage limitations, and a combination of both poundage and acreage limitations, and (b) to submit to the Congress on or before July 1, 1955, a detailed report thereon showing among other things the probable costs, effects, and feasibility of each type of operation studied and what legislation, if any, would be needed to put it into effect. The Secretary may conduct such hearings and receive such statements and briefs as are necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 231, Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, relating to observance of National Hospital Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas the American hospitals are the centers of our community's health services to its citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American community has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 8, 1955, and ending May 14, 1955, will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it.

APPOINTMENT IN A CIVILIAN POSITION OF BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 232, Senate bill 1271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1271), Calendar No. 232, to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1271) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Brigadier General Howard's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however*, That during his incumbency in a

civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of Senate bill 1271 a statement which I have had prepared explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The purpose of this legislation is to permit Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard to forego his present retired pay as a general and accept a civilian position in the Department of Justice, for which he would be paid a civilian salary. Section 2 of the bill would permit him to resume his retired status upon the termination of such civilian employment.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Attorney General. In his letter he stated that the unit of the Immigration and Naturalization Service known as the Field Inspections and Security Division is responsible for the inspection, analysis, and evaluation of all the activities of the Service for the purpose of making recommendations to the Commissioner and his staff for securing the most effective method for insuring adherence to prescribed standards and observance of Service policy at all levels of organization.

The Attorney General further stated that numerous assignments of Brigadier General Howard during his more than 30 years of active military service demonstrated exceptional organizational ability, aggressiveness tempered with mature judgment in both administrative and executive capacities. Furthermore, the Attorney General stated that by reason of certain of his military assignments, he has a personal and intimate familiarity with the conditions which pose problems for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the division which he is to head.

The Attorney General concluded with the statement that: "I am satisfied that he is eminently qualified for that position, and that his military training and experience will be of tremendous value to the Government in this important and sensitive task to which he is to be assigned."

Gen. J. M. Swing, the Commissioner of Immigration, made a personal appearance before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, in executive session, and also urged the passage of this legislation as well as the bill (S. 1272) extending the same privilege to Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge.

APPOINTMENT IN A CIVILIAN POSITION OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1272, Calendar No. 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1272) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Major General Partridge's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however*, That during his incumbency in a civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of Senate bill 1272 a statement which I have had prepared explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The purpose of this legislation is to permit the Attorney General to appoint Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, to a civilian position in the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. General law prohibits a retired Army officer, unless retired for combat connected disability, from being appointed to civilian employment with the United States at a salary or annual compensation of $2,500 or more. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Immigration both state that General Partridge is eminently qualified for the position to which he is to be appointed and that his main duties will be the reorganization of the border patrol and a solution of the wetback problem. If the bill is enacted, General Partridge will forego receipt of his retired pay as long as he holds the position. Section 2 of the bill would permit him to resume his retired status upon the termination of such civilian employment.

EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1, extending the Trade Agreements Act. I make this request, in order to have House bill 1 made the unfinished business, with the understanding that no votes on the bill will be taken today; and that when Senators conclude their speeches today, the Senate will adjourn until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today. it stand in adjournment until Monday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to obligate $63 million during each of the next 4 fiscal years, by entering into grant agreements under the Federal Airport Act for payment of the Federal share of the cost of the construction and improvement of public airports needed to develop an adequate nationwide system of public airports. Sixty million dollars of that amount would be for projects in the continental United States and $3 million for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1855) to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and

other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when we consider the rapid tempo at which America is developing in both military and civilian aviation, it is disturbing, indeed, to realize that our airport program throughout the 48 States has been left without adequate funds to bring airport facilities serving the hundreds of thousands of people who use the airlines and other air services up to a point where they will be modern, or capable of accommodating the new jet transport planes and other fast flying aircraft which will be in the air in a matter of only a few years.

It is later than we think, in the development of adequate airports for this new type of equipment. It is with this in mind that the bill has been introduced by my colleagues and myself.

The bill makes no change whatsoever in the basic policies and purposes previously laid down by Congress in the act. Thus there are no changes in the requirements with respect to the administration of the grants authorized, such as the distribution and apportionment of funds, the eligibility of the various types of airport construction and improvement, sponsorship requirements, congressional approval of projects for large airports—class 4 and larger—and so forth. The only purpose of the bill is to prescribe specific amounts that may be obligated by grant agreement over the period indicated, namely, the next 4 years, rather than to leave such amounts to be determined from year to year, as is now the case.

At the time of its enactment in 1946 the Federal Airport Act contemplated or intended that $520 million in Federal grants would be made available over a period of approximately 7 years to match State and local funds in the development of a nationwide system of public airports. The only limitation on the availability of the $520 million within the 7-year period is the provision that not in excess of $100 million may be appropriated for projects in the continental United States in any one fiscal year. Consequently the States and their counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions began planning for airport development on the assumption that Federal funds within the amounts stated in the Federal Airport Act would be available for matching purposes—generally on a 50–50 basis—over the 7-year period prescribed in the statute. In the great majority of cases it took the States and local agencies involved 1 or 2 years to complete arrangements for financing their share of the cost of the airport development needed and to develop the plans for the actual construction. The latter, of course, required the development of an overall master plan of the ultimate airport facility that was considered needed to serve civil aviation within the foreseeable future. Also a majority of the public agencies involved are not able to obtain within 1 or even 2 fiscal years the full amount of their share of the cost of the entire amount of airport construction costs that would be incurred in developing the entire airport facility contemplated. This, of course, results in the necessity of planning for the total airport development to be undertaken in stages over a period of years.

For the first full fiscal year after the enactment of the act, $45 million was appropriated for the program. It is my understanding that a larger amount was not appropriated for that fiscal year for the reasons previously stated, namely, that many of the States and local agencies had not had time to complete their planning and financing arrangements, and in many instances, the enactment of legislation necessary to enable them to participate in the program that early. It was contemplated at that time that larger appropriations would be made during the succeeding years, as the States and local agencies completed their planning and financing arrangements. However, only $32,500,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1948. Further, subsequent annual appropriations have not even approximated half of the authorized amount of $100 million. In fact, as of today, approximately 9 years after enactment of the act, there has only been appropriated and made available for projects $236,221,154, out of the total $520 million originally authorized for a 7-year period.

Many States, municipalities, and other local agencies have suffered considerable losses due to the preparation of plans and making of financing arrangements, such as issuance of bonds, and so forth, in contemplation of the availability of the Federal assistance in accordance with the authorization prescribed under the act and the subsequent failure of the Federal Government to provide that assistance.

In 1950 it became apparent that the airport development program which the act contemplated being completed in approximately 7 years, would not be completed within that time. The Congress, therefore, by the enactment of Public Law 846, 81st Congress, approved September 27, 1950, amended the act to extend the program over an additional 5 years, namely, until June 30, 1958, instead of June 30, 1953.

Notwithstanding the planning and financing arrangements that had been made by States and municipalities in contemplation of continuation of the program, the Secretary of Commerce in early 1953 decided that no further funds would be requested for the program unless and until a complete and thorough study had been made and disclosed a definite need for Federal assistance in public airport development. To this end the Secretary appointed a committee composed of Government, State, municipal, and private industry representatives to make a thorough and complete study of the matter and to report to him their findings and recommendations by the end of 1953. This action, of course, completely upset the planning of States and local agencies. Many of them had undertaken the development of their airport facilities in stages, in order to utilize the small amounts of money that had been becoming available during the prior years and with the expectancy that at least these smaller amounts of money would continue to be available until the entire $500 million had been utilized. Many were faced with the possibility of not being able to complete facilities that were only partially completed, having been undertaken on a stage basis in contemplation of additional funds becoming available in the following years for the remaining stages.

In the fall of 1953, the committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce completed its investigation and study and reached the conclusion that the Federal Government should participate in the cost of public airports needed to serve air commerce, and recommended that the program under the Federal Airport Act be continued. The report of the committee called particular attention to the fact that larger amounts of funds than had been previously appropriated over the years would have to be made available to effectively and efficiently carry out the purposes of the act.

On the basis of the findings and recommendations of the committee $22,500,000 was requested and appropriated for the fiscal year 1955. At this time, as in the case of the first appropriation for 1948, there were statements and indications to the effect that a larger amount was not being requested for the fiscal year 1955 for the reason that that amount would be sufficient to get the program started again after the 1 year layoff—that the States and local public agencies had deferred their planning during the 1 year layoff pending the decision of the Federal Government as to whether the program would be continued. The general understanding of the States, municipalities, and other local agencies was that the $22,500,000 was just to get the program underway again and that the larger amounts required to meet their needs and to carry out the program, as contemplated by the act, would be made available during the years following.

Accordingly, as in the case of the years immediately following the enactment of the act, the States and local agencies again started their planning and negotiating for financing, and so forth, in contemplation of Federal grants being made available in amounts approximating the amount authorized by the act, or at least considerably in excess of the relatively small amounts heretofore appropriated. According to the budget for the fiscal year 1956, however, only some $11,500,000 is being requested, which is smaller than the annual appropriation of any prior year, with the exception of the fiscal year 1954, for which no appropriation was made. The States and local agencies are therefore again faced with the loss of considerable planning and financing costs that have been incurred in contemplation of the reestablishment of the Federal airport program on a scale approximating that which is contemplated by the act.

In addition to the loss in money that has been suffered as a result of the failure of the Federal Government to provide the funds contemplated by the act, within the period of time prescribed in the act, civil aviation has suffered because of the delay in providing much needed airport facilities.

In order to develop the nationwide system of public airports that is needed to serve civil aviation, such as is contemplated by the Federal Airport Act, it is essential that the States and local agencies be given definite assurance of the money that will be available for matching their local money when and as their plans and financing arrangements are completed and they are ready to undertake the actual construction work involved. Only a relatively few airports in the country today can accommodate the civil jet transport plane that undoubtedly will be in service by the time the airport construction financed with funds authorized by the proposed bill is completed. In fact, it is entirely possible that jet aircraft will be in service even before that time. In any event, the planning for its accommodation must be undertaken now or in the fairly immediate future. Furthermore, even without regard to the advent of civil jet aircraft transportation, municipalities are finding that it is necessary to plan and provide for almost continuous expansion and improvement of their airport facilities if the needs of the constantly increasing civil air traffic are to be met.

The same situation prevails with respect to road and highway construction and for that reason the highway programs have consistently been authorized on a 2-year basis, with the exception of the postwar highway program authorized by the Highway Act of 1944 which authorized funds for projects over a period of 3 years. In addition, in recognition of the necessity for allowance of time for planning, and so forth, prior to actual construction, the highway acts consistently authorize funds to be obligated during the 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year next succeeding the year in which the authorization is granted. In other words, the Highway Act of 1952 authorized the obligation of specific amounts for road and highway projects during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, and the Highway Act of 1954 authorized the obligation of specific amount for such purposes during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Therefore, the States were assured in 1952 of the Federal highway money that would be available for matching their money in the second and third year hence, namely, in 1954 and 1955. Likewise, in 1954, they were assured of the Federal money that would be available in 1956 and 1957.

In the airport program there is even more need for advance knowledge and assurance of the availability of Federal assistance because of the fact that municipalities as well as States are involved and funds for the local share of costs in many instances must be obtained from the issuance of bonds pursuant to elections held for that purpose. In addition, highway network planning is much farther advanced than is airport planning, the Federal-aid highway program having been in effect since at least the early 1920's.

The bill I have introduced would provide the States and their political subdivisions with definite assurance that $60 million will be available to them for grants under the Federal Airport Act for each of the next succeeding 4 fiscal years, and the Territories and possessions that $3 million will be available to them for that purpose for each of such years. This will enable the States, Territories, and so forth, to undertake the planning, financing, and other preliminary work for development and improvement of public airports needed for air commerce, with definite assurance of the amount of funds for the payment of the Federal share of the cost thereof that will be available to them as and when they are able to undertake the actual construction work within that 4-year period.

Attention is invited to the fact that this authorization of $63 million for each of the next 4 years, or a total of $252 million, added to prior appropriations in the amount of $236,221,154, is approximately $31,700,000 less than the $520 million originally authorized.

CLARIFYING AMENDMENT

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 2 (a) of the act, relating to the definition of "airport development." This amendment is intended primarily for clarification purposes in that it specifically provides that airport passenger or freight terminal buildings are among the types of airport administrative buildings that are eligible under the act. It is believed that the amendment is in accordance with the original intent of the Congress at the time of enactment of the Federal Airport Act in 1946.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 3 (a) of the act in two respects, namely, first, by prescribing a specific time limit for each annual revision of the national airport plan, and second, by providing that the projects in such plan shall include all types of airport development that are eligible for Federal aid under the act.

Under the existing provisions of the act there is no specific time prescribed for each annual revision of the national airport plan, the act merely providing that the plan be revised annually. As a result, in the past, each annual revision has been issued at a different time, the revision for one year, 1954, not having been issued until the fall of that year. Under the act no project application may include any airport development other than that included in the national airport plan. Therefore, it would appear almost essential that each annual revision of the plan be completed within a reasonable time before the commencement of the next fiscal year, so that plans may be developed for the submission of applications for projects included in that revision that are to be undertaken with funds appropriated for such fiscal year. It is believed that 3 months, as prescribed in the amendment, is a sufficiently reasonable period of time for that purpose.

The second part of the amendment to section 3 (a) is intended to make it clear that the annual revisions of the national airport plan are not to exclude any types of airport development eligible for Federal participation under the act. It is entirely possible that during any particular fiscal year the amount of funds authorized may not be sufficient to enable the Secretary to participate in all of the projects which are needed at that time to carry out the purposes of the act, and under the act he clearly has discretion, and in fact has a duty, to so allocate the funds available as to accomplish those projects which are of the greatest importance and urgency from the national standpoint. However, this he is expected to do on a State-by-State and project-for-project basis, by use of his programming and project approval authority, and not by making all projects of certain types ineligible for inclusion in the program, as would be the result if all such projects were excluded from the national airport plan. The amendment is intended to make it clear that the national airport plan is not to be so used.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to be associated with my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] in sponsoring S. 1770, the domestic parity certificate bill, of which he has recently spoken.

When I was assigned in 1940 to write a series of articles about Oregon's Senator Charles Linza McNary, I first became acquainted with the so-called two-price plan for the marketing of farm products, particularly with respect to wheat. Senator McNary, who was a friend of mine, had sponsored such a proposal in the 1920's, but it was vetoed by President Coolidge after its passage through Congress in the form of the McNary-Haugen bill. Yet this illustrious Oregon Senator continued to have faith in the idea.

In 1954 a similar proposal, known by this time as the domestic parity certificate plan, was discussed in the Oregon senatorial campaign. My opponent abruptly endorsed the plan, although he had shown practically no interest in it during nearly 11 years in Congress.

Friends and supporters in eastern Oregon, one of the great wheat-producing areas of the Nation, urged me to approve the plan, too. After talking over the matter with my wife one night at the height of the campaign, I decided not to do so. In the first place, in the midst of the campaign, I had had no genuine opportunity to study and analyze the domestic parity plan carefully. If I endorsed it under such circumstances, it would be purely a political decision rather than one based on the economic factors at stake. I made up my mind that this kind of endorsement would not be fair to me, and would not be fair to the eastern Oregon wheatgrowers, and to the people of the State of Oregon, generally.

WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE BACKS PLAN

But, since the November 2 election, I have had a chance to look at the domestic parity plan a good deal more objectively and in less hurried and frenzied conditions. Early in December, at the Multnomah Hotel in Portland, I had a conference lasting nearly 4 hours with past and present officials of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Here in Washington, D. C., during the recent months, I have spent considerable time with two

spokesmen for that organization, Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg., and Jack Smith, of Condon, Oreg. In fact, I had the privilege of inviting other Members of the Senate to hear these men explain the domestic parity plan in terms of the problems now confronting the wheatgrowers of the entire Nation. The explanation of the plan by Mr. Weatherford and Mr. Smith also impressed other Senators with many of the merits of this particular proposal.

As a result of these conferences, and because of close personal study of the plan, I now have decided to join with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] in sponsoring this bill providing the domestic parity certificate plan for wheat.

My decision has been shaped, in part at least, by my increasing alarm over the general plight of agriculture throughout the United States—a plight which contrasts jarringly with the present boom on Wall Street in the stock market.

In recent months the deepening agricultural crisis has increasingly occupied the attention of many Members of the Congress.

INCOME OF AMERICAN FARMERS ON WAY DOWN

Congressional committees have repeatedly studied the farm problem and have reported the ominous downward trend. In reporting the Agricultural Act of 1954 in the 83d Congress, the House Committee on Agriculture showed in its report on the bill a 13-percent decline in net farm income in the preceding 2 years, while the rest of the economy reached new heights. In reporting a new farm bill last month, the same committee again reviewed the facts:

> Farm prices down an average of 22 percent since 1952. Net farm income down 28 percent since 1947—10 percent below 1953, with further declines scheduled for this year and 1956.

The House Appropriations Committee reports that "the cost of farming continues to increase, with a 14-percent increase in prices paid by farmers during the past 5 years." Farm mortgage debt has nearly doubled since the end of World War II.

Farmers' share in the national income has dropped from 9.4 percent in 1951 to 7.2 percent in 1954.

The New York Times and other leading newspapers and periodicals have also drawn public attention to the squeeze on farmers' income resulting from continued high operating costs in a time of falling farm prices and stringent acreage limitations.

A well-documented article in the U. S. News & World Report for March 25 reminds us of the sinister parallel with the 1920's, when a spectacular industrial and financial boom obscured the early danger signals of a prolonged agricultural slump. The article states the facts with simple logic:

> Farmers are getting less for their crops. They are being forced to grow less. Their costs are high. Their incomes are shrinking.

And it concludes that "the farm problem is worsening, now that more trouble lies ahead."

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS NOT THE RIGHT ANSWER

Yet President Eisenhower is offering no leadership beyond continued insistence on the so-called flexible support program—an economic wringer which seems designed to seek a kind of agricultural "survival of the fittest" by driving a substantial number of farm families to the brink of bankruptcy. But when we remember that more than 20 million Americans live on farms, and more than 30 million in rural areas economically dependent on farm prosperity, we see the illusion of expecting a continued boom for banks, for big business, for the stock market, while an agricultural depression threatens this one-third of the Nation.

The crisis is particularly acute in the case of wheat. In its April issue, the Farm Journal poses the question, "Can we rescue wheat?" This article, and the other sources I have mentioned, give us some idea of the dimensions of the problem.

The carryover of wheat on July 1 will be nearly a billion bushels—as much as five times the amount considered a normal carryover—and $2½ billion worth of that is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The carryover will be more than a whole year's supply of wheat for this country, without this year's crop.

Yet acreage restrictions, which have forced 24 million acres, about 30 percent, out of wheat, and reduced support percentages, give little promise for restoring order to wheat production. Rather, they add to the pressure to grow varieties which will yield the most bushels per acre, regardless of quality—to produce more wheat, of types which no one else may want, for the No. 1 customer, the Federal Government.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN OFFERS THREE MAJOR ADVANTAGES

Far from reducing these pressures, the further lowering of support levels under President Eisenhower's so-called flexible support program would only force the wheat farmer to squeeze every last bushel from each acre of allotment remaining to him, regardless of quality or demand on the commercial market.

The 90 percent of parity support program certainly was not a perfect answer to the wheat farmers' problems. But its greatest drawback—the accumulation of Government-owned surpluses—is continued under the President's program for flexible supports, flexible only downward, without accomplishing the supposed objective of protecting the farmer.

I believe that the certificate plan may well be the most constructive alternative, which deserves a trial. Briefly stated, it offers the following advantages:

First, it would return the sale and purchase of wheat to the open market, where the price is determined by factors of quality and demand.

Second, the resulting lower market price would make it possible for more wheat to move into export, feed, and industrial uses, and thus increase the total overall use of wheat.

Third, it would guarantee wheat farmers full parity on that part of the annual crop which goes into domestic human consumption.

Finally, and most important, it should get the Government out of the business of buying, storing, and trying to dispose of wheat.

The bill which my colleagues and I have sponsored is basically similar to subtitle D of H. R. 9680 of the 83d Congress, by which the House of Representatives last year adopted the domestic parity certificate plan for wheat. And the House Agriculture Committee has again this year included the plan in its recommendation for farm legislation to be enacted by the 84th Congress.

This bill may not be a perfect bill. A certificate program for wheat must be fitted carefully into the structure of our agricultural economy, particularly in relation to our support programs for corn and other feed grains. Thus, it is contemplated that the Government would continue to make available support loans for wheat at a lower level, related to that for corn. Yet these support loans must not become another "market" for wheat, if the plan is to succeed in ending the accumulation of surplus wheat by the Government.

Moreover, operations under the certificate program need to be coordinated with the policies of our Government to cooperate with other friendly wheat exporting and wheat importing nations in seeking stability in the world market.

For the foreseeable future, at least, it will be necessary to continue restrictions on wheat acreage in order to keep production within manageable limits. As the price of wheat is to be determined by supply and demand for different varieties in the open market, the administration of production controls to maintain market prices close to the support and world price levels will also have to be thoroughly thought out before the plan is put into operation.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN MERITS FULL AND FAIR TRIAL

I hope that these problems, as well as the obvious advantages of the domestic parity certificate plan will receive the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The alarming downward trend in farm prosperity, to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks, shows that some action will have to be taken during the present session of Congress to review and revitalize our agricultural programs.

In choosing between alternative courses, we will not find a perfect solution. I hope that we will give the domestic parity certificate plan a thorough trial. There is no substitute for experience, and I am sure that the farm problems which may arise will be easier to solve than are those created by the present policies of the national administration.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Hottest Farm Argument of the Year," from the Farm Journal, written by Herschel D. Newman, master,

National Grange, explaining why the National Grange supports the certificate plan for wheat.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOTTEST FARM ARGUMENT OF THE YEAR

(By Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Grange favors a two-price plan for wheat: "It will increase sales; bolster farm income; cut tax costs; and do away with acreage controls and regulations," says Newsom.)

The present wheat program is a failure. The jam it has led us into was explained in Farm Journal last month.

This is our most serious commodity problem of the generation. To continue down the present road is to insure lower income and less markets for United States wheat growers.

Flexing wheat-price supports down to 75 percent of parity is not the answer:

That will only lower wheat farmers' incomes.

It will do little—or nothing—to either increase the sale of wheat or decrease production.

What is the answer then? The only sensible, workable plan that we've seen is one that organized wheat growers are supporting. Developed by the Grange several years ago, it's called the domestic parity or wheat certificate plan. Actually, it's a plan to limit effective price supports to the wheat used in the United States for food.

Remember three facts:

1. Your entire wheat crop (except wheat you fed or stored) would sell on the open market—at whatever price your quality, variety, or type of wheat would bring. The better grade wheat would naturally bring more.

2. Selling on the open market at prevailing prices would also eliminate the need for extensive program policing or segregation of wheat.

3. You'd get certificates—and price supports—on your proportionate share of the wheat crop used for food (to be estimated each year by the Secretary of Agriculture). You'd get this support by cashing the certificates.

Each wheat farmer would then adjust his own acreage—by deciding how much unsupported wheat he wanted to raise above his share of the supported, domestic food market.

As time went on, you'd get more, or fewer, certificates, depending on whether you raised or lowered your production. Farmers who raise the better quality wheat, or raise it more cheaply, would be more likely to increase output. Thus we would be using the historic function of price to change production patterns according to efficiency and ability.

The Secretary of Agriculture would set a floor price through a stop-loss wheat loan designed to prevent dumping on the world market or on our own feed market. He'd set this floor by taking into account the feed equivalent value of wheat in the United States and the probable world market level.

Such a floor would be temporarily necessary because of the sheer size of the present surplus. In fact, it would be necessary no matter what kind of a wheat program we have. Acreage controls would also be continued for a while for the same reason, but they could soon be abandoned.

There are several advantages to this plan:

Wheat income would be as high or higher than under any other program.

Production controls would be greatly minimized—eventually eliminated so that farmers would use their own judgment to adjust production.

Livestock and poultry farmers could grow their own feed wheat, even sell to each other.

People might pay a higher price temporarily for their cereal products, but this would be offset by progressively eliminating the Government expense of the present program.

It would lead to greater farm efficiency and better conservation.

Because of the competitive prices more wheat would be sold for feed in foreign trade and for new uses.

It would get the Government rapidly out of the business of handling, buying, selling, and storing wheat. Private trading would take over. This is the way to expand markets.

Yes; bigger markets are there. We can gradually recapture and expand global markets. We used to export a third of our crop; now we export only when the rest of the world doesn't have wheat to sell at our Government's support price minus subsidy.

Wheat has been priced out of the feed market. By allowing wheat to sell at going prices, it will take its normal place in all secondary markets instead of going into Government storage.

Some corn growers argue against this program. Actually, they have little to worry about. The stop-loss price floor would take care of this. Besides, wheat never was, and never will be, a serious feed-grain competitor of King Corn.

Corn outyields wheat by far. It can be raised for less.

And when wheatgrowers are asked to take the competitive price for nonfood wheat, a lot of them are going to grow something else.

To sum up, wheatgrowers, in order to share world and feed markets, may do 1 of 3 things:

1. They may flex the price of all United States wheat down to the world level—about $1.50 to $1.60 per bushel (which amounts to practically no wheat price support program at all).

2. They may continue to subsidize—at 60 cents on up—all export wheat. This is bound to lead to still further losses in world markets because of governmental stagnation of sales.

3. They may develop some kind of domestic parity, or self-financing two-price plan, to protect the income of wheatgrowers—while making it possible for them to compete for secondary markets.

This is not a cure-all. It will, however, put wheat into use instead of into storage. And it's a part of the commodity-by-commodity approach so necessary for improving the farm program—and it needs to be done now.

VACANCY IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to refer very briefly to one other matter which concerns my home State, and which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, this week marks the end of 1 whole year since the elevation of Judge James A. Fee to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit—1 year during which the President has failed to fill the vacancy thus created in the United States District Court for Oregon.

In 12 months, Mr. President, the Eisenhower "team" has been unable to agree upon the selection of a much-needed Federal judge for the district of Oregon. Of course, I have no firsthand knowledge of the reason for this delay; but, I regret to say, it seems to be a case of politics and patronage first, and judicial needs second.

Judge Fee was appointed to the court of appeals on April 1, 1954, after many years of able service on the United States District Court in Oregon, and he actually left the district court on April 30—a year ago next Saturday. For 12 months since that day, the Eisenhower administration has virtually turned its back upon the vacant judgeship in Oregon, while the Republican Party engages in internal guerrilla warfare over the vacancy.

Perhaps the President does not think it necessary to have three Federal judges in our State. Should we perhaps expect him to send to the Senate, instead of an appointment, legislation to abolish the post?

Mr. President, in recent years the Federal court in Portland, Oreg., has maintained a good record of keeping up with its docket, of dispensing justice to litigants with the dispatch which in practice is itself such an important ingredient of justice. It has managed to maintain this record in spite of the occasional illness or infirmity of one or another of its judges.

But in the last year, Mr. President, with only two judges left on the Federal bench in Oregon, it has been necessary to have cases tried by a succession of visiting judges from other districts. In the year during which the President has failed to fill the vacancy, the Oregon court has enjoyed the temporary services of Judge G. H. Boldt, from Tacoma, Judges Bowen and Lindberg, from Seattle, Judge Ling, of Arizona, Judge Clark, of Idaho, and Judge Pope, of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Of course, I want to make it very clear that there has been no criticism of the judicial service of these excellent Federal judges, but it is also obvious that the temporary assignment to Oregon of judges from other districts creates problems in their own districts, as well as in Oregon. Of necessity, it becomes more difficult to set cases for trial on a definite date until the visiting judge arrives, and in some instances it becomes necessary to have cases tried before a different judge than the one who presided at pretrial conferences. I need not speak of the confusion this creates in connection with the orderly administration of justice.

It is clear to leading members of the bar of my home State of Oregon that this system is not a satisfactory substitute for the long delayed appointment of a new judge to the vacancy on the Federal court.

I have not expected, of course, to be consulted about this appointment by the Republican administration. So far, the only contact I have had has been an interview back in February with the FBI about one candidate, Judge Wm. G. East, of Lane County. I gave Mr. East a clean bill of health. Then an Oregon newspaper published an editorial implying that East had been involved in an alleged drunken-driving incident. I felt obliged to ask the FBI to make a review of the incident. I have heard nothing further about the episode. That, to my

knowledge, is where the judgeship now stands.

My colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I have stated many times that we will not oppose any of the possible appointments which have been mentioned and which have the support of the Oregon State Bar, unless we are presented with reasons not now known to us. I believe, Mr. President, that this necessary and long overdue judicial appointment for my State should no longer be held up because of political skirmishing in the Republican Party over who should get this choice plum.

A few months ago there was much discussion in the press to the effect that action on the nomination of Judge Harlan to the Supreme Court of the United States had been delayed 3 or 4 months because the Committee on the Judiciary allegedly had not considered the matter as speedily as the White House had wished. Perhaps the criticism was justified. I was not sufficiently close to the situation to know.

But I think it is significant that for 1 whole year—12 months—a vacancy has existed in the United States district court in Oregon, a court of original jurisdictions, so far as the Federal bench is concerned. Yet the administration has not made one move, or certainly nothing visible to the naked eye or to the general public, to fill that vacancy.

I submit that if Oregon is entitled to 3 Federal district judges—and Congress, in the form of a statute, has authorized 3 Federal district judges for Oregon—it is the duty of the administration to make an appointment.

In February, when the vacancy had existed for about 10 months, I recommended to the Department of Justice an outstanding lawyer in Medford, Oreg., Mr. Edward C. Kelly. Mr. Kelly is a veteran of World War II, a distinguished member of the bar, a leader in his community, a former member of the Oregon State Legislature, and is himself the son of an illustrious former judge in our State. It seems to me it is up to the administration either to accept my recommendation of Mr. Edward C. Kelly or to make an appointment of its own; but I do not believe that the vacancy on the Federal district bench in Oregon should be continued beyond 1 year.

LOW INCOME IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to speak briefly on a message sent to Congress yesterday by the President on the problem of low income in agriculture. All of us interested in agriculture welcome the recognition by the executive branch of this major social and economic problem. However, I think it would be putting it mildly to say that the program is most disappointing. If this is all that the Department of Agriculture can suggest after a full year's study, then the low-income farmers will have to look elsewhere for some practical assistance.

Nothing new is provided in either the study or the recommendations which were presented to Congress as of yesterday. Legislative proposals for a broader attack on the acute problem are already before Congress under Democratic sponsorship, and they come much closer to carrying out the objectives outlined by the President than do his own meager recommendations.

After a year of study, the Department of Agriculture as of today has not even caught up with the broad recommendations for a long-range attack on the problem of low-income farmers which were submitted to Congress by the Department of Agriculture back in 1949.

I have in my hand the report of several hearings entitled "Low-Income Families," held by the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 81st Congress.

Also, I have before me a "Synopsis," and "Conclusions, Recommendations, and Report," of the same subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, entitled "Families and Economic Stability," of the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

As I pointed out a moment ago, long-range studies were made in the field in 1949 pertaining to some of the difficulties which face a large part of the farm population. The intervention of the Korean war suspended action in that direction at that time. Those reports were made late in 1949. By June 1950, the Korean war had started.

However, most of the same objectives are before Congress in a proposed family-farm development bill, S. 1199, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has long given attention to this particular problem in agriculture; and in my own family-farm policy review, Senate Joint Resolution 20. These two measures supplement each other; one providing for a practical approach to a more effective action program to help the low-income farmers; the other providing for an annual checkup to make certain that all the farm programs are doing what they are intended to do toward aiding the farmers. I recommend that my colleagues who may be interested in the President's message take a look at these two measures now before the Senate.

It is my hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will proceed with hearings on the measures and will submit a program which will meet the situation better than the administration's disappointing program ever can.

We welcome the President's support for the objectives of these Democratic-sponsored measures. At least, we are now publicly agreed on the common objective of greater attention to the human resources in the struggle for survival of American farmers having less than $1,000 a year cash income, instead of considering such farmers expendable, as previous farm policies of the administration have indicated was the idea.

I cannot help noting some of the effects of the administration's twists and turns on the farm policy, which are similar to its twists and turns on foreign policy. I could not help thinking there may have been an early mistake in the appointments to the Cabinet. I am certain the President wanted to have as Secretary of Agriculture one who had a firm agricultural policy. Likewise, I feel certain he wanted to have as Secretary of State one who had a flexible foreign policy. Somehow or other the appointment signals must have become mixed.

It would be interesting to lay alongside the President's fine objectives some of the quotations from statements by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Butz, saying very bluntly that agriculture is now big business; and if a farmer cannot survive, he had better get out. That was the established line and the established policy of the administration until the report on low-income farm families was brought to our attention by the President only as of yesterday.

It is also interesting to note that while the President's message talks about increased loan authorizations, increased technical assistance for the Soil Conservation Service, and increased funds for vocational education, the same President and his departments have consistently sent to Congress budgets reducing the funds required for farm-loan authorizations through the Farmers' Home Administration. The President, through the Department of Agriculture, has raised interest rates, thus making it more difficult for farmers to take advantage of credit assistance. The Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the Executive Office of the President, has sought to reduce rather than to increase the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. And it is set to slash rather than increase funds for vocational education.

Mr. President, we get high-sounding pronouncements in these messages, but we get very little substance to back them up; and I am of the opinion that it is going to take more than a well-worded, cleverly and wisely conceived message to bring some semblance of equality of treatment to our farm families. It is going to take much more than words; it is going to take action.

I suggest to my colleagues that they read the fine print in the recommendations submitted by the President. While emphasizing the need for greater vocational training in the low-income group areas, it does not propose to provide such training. What it really says is that the administration wants the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the States to expand vocational training in rural areas. That is a nice way of having somebody pay the bill while you call the tune.

Please note that the President in his message simply tried to shift the burden back to the States.

I regret that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, in many of her proposals before the Congress of the United States, or our committees, has advocated some kind of do it yourself formula. We have a do it yourself formula that some of us individually carry out in our own homes in the form of repair jobs, and even then there are indications that the do it yourself advocates sometimes require professional treatment later on in order to repair the damage they have done.

I point out one more inconsistency. Recommendation 15 of the President's

program calls for the Secretary of Agriculture each year to submit a comprehensive report to the President on progress of activities directed toward alleviating the problems of low-income farmers.

Mr. President, I have before me a report from the Bureau of the Budget reporting on my resolution (S. J. Res. 20), which would require such an annual review and incorporation of resulting recommendations in the economic report.

I make note of the fact that the President of the United States, in his message, asked that the Secretary of Agriculture make a yearly report on progress of activities directed toward alleviating the problems of low-income farmers.

That was exactly what was provided in the resolution which I introduced in the Senate of the United States on January 14, as Senate Joint Resolution 20; and the Bureau of the Budget, in the report on that resolution, had this to say:

> It is questionable whether the family-farm problem changes rapidly enough to warrant an annual review.

Here is the President's own executive office which says categorically to the Committee on Agriculture, despite the messages sent yesterday:

> It is questionable whether the family-farm problem changes rapidly enough to warrant an annual review.

The very thing the President recommended yesterday, his own executive agency said, on April 21, should not be done.

I merely wish to say I do not know how many administrations there are operating. Possibly the President's office is not informed what the Bureau of the Budget is doing, or possibly the Bureau of the Budget is not informed what the President's office is doing; but I suggest the law of the land requires that each know what the other is doing.

The Bureau of the Budget further said:

> If the pertinent facts were to be assembled and analyzed annually, the conduct of such a periodic review would likely be quite expensive.

The President, however, tells us the Secretary of Agriculture should make such a review and report to him annually. He apparently did not think it was too expensive yesterday, but on the 21st of April, his personal representative, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said it should not be done, and that if it was done it would be expensive.

This is the type of language which appeals to both groups in America—those who would like to have it done and those who would not. This is a good way to stay popular, as long as someone does not expose what is going on. But I submit there is no consistency of policy or program. It is downright double talk, and there is no intention to implement it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota was impressed, as I was, to hear some of the comments about this being a brandnew idea. I heard it said today by one of our distinguished friends across the aisle that this is the first time anyone had come forward with any such idea as this. Did the Senator hear that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I heard it. I want to say to the Senator I was just alluding to the fact that even back in 1949 the distinguished Senator from Alabama was on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was chairman of the subcommittee which made the study.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It made the report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the Senator seen the recommendations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely have. I note that the Senator introduced a measure on the subject on February 23, 1955.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if he has read the statement I put in the RECORD at that time and the bill I introduced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a copy of the statement before me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator had preceded that by a month or more with the introduction of a measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I introduced my proposal on January 14.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which covered some of the same ground, but covered other ground as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So, as stated by some of our friends, the idea of proposing technical studies of low-income families was not heard for the first time in the President's message. Had the Senator heard of the idea before?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I heard it yesterday in the message as if it was a news flash. It was just as much of a news flash as would be the announcement of the Magna Carta.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator recall that in my resolution—I am not sure the measure introduced by the Senator from Minnesota contained this particular provision—it was provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should pick out 500 low-income counties and do the technical work in those areas? Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. That is in section 3 of the Senator's proposal. I have it in my hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To hear some persons talk about the proposal, one would think it was a brandnew idea. I dare say the headlines will probably scream out about "Ike's farm idea."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The headlines will probably scream "New Idea. New Idea." It is just as new as old candles.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reminds me of something I read in the press the other day. The press wrote about "Ike's highway program." The headline read, "Ike Will Get His Highway Program," and one would presume that the article related that the Eisenhower road program was going through Congress. If one read the article, he would find it said that, of course, the committee is not going to agree to the financing plan, and, of course, it is not going to agree to the scheme which was advanced, but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has introduced a bill, and undoubtedly that bill will be reported and a highway program will be enacted. So they tabbed that as the highway road program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not the same thing true of the proposed low-income farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The President said he was for roads, so if any program is enacted, it will be said it is the President's program. The President said he is for the low-income farm program, so if any low-income farm program is enacted, it will be stated that it was the President's program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By the way, I wonder if the Senator remembers, when the question came up year before last, the proposal that surplus farm commodities be made available to friendly nations throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that he offered an amendment to that effect in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I recall that very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With solid Democratic support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I am sure the Senator will remember the solid Republican opposition to that amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it, sir, very vividly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Minnesota remembers his offering of the amendment, here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I remember it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I am sure the Senator from Minnesota remembers what the Republican majority did to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I remember that, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, within a few days, the tremendous program came to us from the White House, recommending exactly and identically what the Senator from Minnesota had proposed in his amendment. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I do. Let me say that perhaps other Senators will recall the incident. I had earlier requested some information on the program I had advanced from the executive agencies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Senator from Minnesota had obtained approval of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; there had been approval of it by the Foreign Operations Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the President had not heard of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, they had not told the President about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, as in the case of the release of the Yalta papers, the President had not heard of it because those in the departments had not told him about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. That situation was similar to the one in the case of the President's recent message, following the Senator's introduction of his bill on the same subject. We were told that it could not be done and, furthermore, that even if it could be done, it would be too expensive.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Although I do not believe the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget have yet responded to my bill—and I shall await with great interest their report on it—now it seems they have recommended the same thing in the program the President sent to us on yesterday; that is to say, they recommended a part of it; they did not go all the way.

While I am on my feet, let me ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota: Is it not true that many of the things the President recommended in his message of yesterday, he can do today under existing laws? Certainly he can tell the Secretary of Agriculture what to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed he can.

While we in the Senate are discussing these matters, the President can tell the Secretary of Agriculture—who is trotting around in the drought-stricken areas—to come back home and take action to reduce the interest rates on emergency loans. I can imagine how popular the Secretary of Agriculture is with a farmer who has lost his crop and has lost his livestock and has suffered from a drop in farm commodity prices; and now the Secretary of Agriculture comes to him and says to him, "I am here to give you a little help; and I am happy to say that we have raised the interest rate by 2 percent."

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is said that is done in order to make such loans competitive with private loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet the President follows that with a suggested program of how to help the farmers. Probably there should be some liaison between the White House and the Department of Agriculture. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think that would be a good thing to have?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be very, very helpful. Of course, I do not wish to upset what seems to be the present program, under which those in responsibility in the administration do not talk to one another. But if they believe that things are not in good shape, they might call on one another and discuss these programs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain that the Senator from Minnesota is of the same opinion that I am. I, too, do not wish to see the program upset. But, after all, the Department of Agriculture administers the program. What good can be done by all the laws Congress passes, if the Department which administers the laws does the kind of administrative job Secretary Benson has done, so that the President can talk one way and the Secretary of Agriculture, who is administering the program, can act in another way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama has undoubtedly noted in the President's message that one of the recommendations is to increase technical assistance for soil conservation. Is not that interesting? In his message, the President tells the American people, "Increase the technical assistance for soil conservation." Then the Bureau of the Budget comes running down here, like Scrooge, and says, "Cut it."

Then the President says, "We should provide more vocational training to farmers." What a warm heart the President has. What great compassion he has for people. But then, all at once comes down the Bureau of the Budget, the President's own executive agency, and says, "Cut it."

That has happened again and again. Even in the case of the home-economics pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture, the same thing has happened. Recently the Department of Agriculture decided that it would stop distributing such prepared material, which it had assembled, and which is of assistance to thousands and thousands of farm homes. In that connection, the Department has assembled some very important research data. The President says, in his message, that we must do more and more to bring better education and modern living into the homes of those who have small incomes. But just last week the Department of Agriculture said, "Stop it."

I do not wish to criticize the President's objectives. I think everyone in the Nation believes the President has fine instincts and good intentions and honorable objectives. I merely wish he would hire a Cabinet which would agree with him. If he does not hire or appoint such a Cabinet, I wish he would exercise the responsibilities and prerogatives of his office, by calling the members of his Cabinet to come into his office, one at a time, and then asking each one, "Did you read my message?" I believe that might be somewhat helpful.

But, Mr. President, I am afraid that the situation we are observing is one in which the President—a popular President—appeals to the people by his very fine-sounding messages; but then come along Ezra Taft Benson, George Humphrey, and Secretary McKay, and they are the ones who get out the apparatus which is wielded by the wrecking crew.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is it not true that they are the ones who are running the Government? After all, they administer it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, it appears to me that they have the responsibility for administering these programs. However, I want to hold the President accountable for the administration. We do not have a constitutional monarchy. We have a President of the United States, and he is responsible for the administration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have been listening to the very interesting discussion between my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The discussion they have been conducting prompts me to ask a question: Is not what we are seeing today an example of what the President calls "dynamic conservatism"? While he is being dynamic, his Cabinet members are being conservative. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the Senator's suggestion, if he will amend it by saying "dynamic in spirit, but conservative in action."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota, who is so well informed on the farm question, and who has been giving us such an able speech today, that the phrase "dynamic conservatism," which the President likes to use, reminds me of a passage in a book by the late Stephen Leacock, the great Canadian humorist, in which he speaks of someone as "a large, small man." I have always felt that the phrase "dynamic conservatism" both gives and takes away, as does the phrase "a large, small man." I think that indicates the situation of the President, which the Senator from Minnesota is describing today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I am reminded that in the recent campaign many of the Republican spokesmen used to say, "Elect a Republican Congress and help Ike to finish the job." In that connection, I ask this question: What job, and with whom? The job of cutting out vocational training? The job of reducing assistance to soil-conservation districts? Or the job of reducing price supports? The administration has reduced them to 82½ percent. Are we supposed to finish the job by reducing them to 75 percent?

We can go right down the line in that connection. For instance, we can refer to the National Health Institutes. I know that recently the President conferred a very high honor upon Dr. Salk. That honor was well deserved, and I wish to congratulate the President upon that very timely and worthy presentation. But at the same time, Mr. President, one of the best ways to confer honors upon a great scientist is to back his scientific program. Yet the heart research funds were cut more than 45 percent, and the cancer research funds were cut 35 percent, and the mental health research funds were cut more than 30 percent from the amounts recommended by the Advisory Board, constituted of prominent professional and technical persons. In other words, the recommendations of the Advisory Board were ignored, at least, in part.

The greatest honor which can be given to one who already has made a great contribution to society is not just a citation, but is to give the honor of forwarding and advancing the program to which such able and wonderful men dedicate their lives.

I think the best way that farm families of low income can be helpful today is literally to strengthen and firm up the programs which have been discussed here today, and which were referred to in the President's message.

There is not much need for much new legislation in this field. We already have authorized vocational training and soil conservation and the Farmers' Home Administration. The Farmers' Home Ad-

ministration should have many more millions of dollars for its use. The present administration should devote its efforts to obtaining such funds. The Farmers' Home Administration could have lower rates of interest if the administration would only dedicate its efforts to obtaining such lower interest rates. There are many things that could be done, but they will not be done by having the President, on one day, utter kindly, compassionate words and the next day, or the day after, having the responsible administrative officers in the Cabinet do just the opposite.

So, despite President Eisenhower's message, his own Bureau of the Budget appears opposed to taking an annual look at whether or not our farm programs are accomplishing their objectives in this field.

In conclusion on this subject, let me say that the spirit of the President's avowed intentions is strong, but the flesh of his specific recommendations is weak. The spirit triumphs over almost everything except the problems. It will require the hard substance of legislation, money, credit, and programs to realize these objectives. Farmers cannot survive on good intentions. The President, quite rightly, calls for a many-sided attack on this problem, but he arms us only with pea shooters. It is deceiving to create the impression, when we are squarely faced with an economic problem confronting one-fourth of all the families who live on American farms, that the problem can be solved by so-called pilot operations of counsel and guidance in only 50 counties of the Nation.

I wish my friend from Alabama to know that the President's recommendations covered 50 counties in the Nation. The Senator himself must realize that that is better than five, but it is very, very short of reaching the needs. It is only 10 percent of the 500 counties which the Senator from Alabama recommended. Anyone who looks over this great America of ours, and who proposes to engage in any kind of pilot operation as a basis for a farm program knows that such an operation cannot be successful when it uses only 50 counties in 48 States. Because of the nature of the land, the economic distribution, and the marketing practices, at least the number of counties proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be required, as the Senator has recommended in his very well conceived and well supported bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I remember correctly, there are 3,000 farm counties in the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Approximately that number.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota may have heard the exchange today between the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in which the Senator from Vermont reminded the Senator from Maine that in neither State was there an entire county which could qualify as a low-income county, but that there were low-income farm areas, nevertheless.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota recognizes that the same situation is true all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is indeed the truth.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the low-income areas are not concentrated in any particular section of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota recalls, I am sure, that of the 3,000 counties, it is estimated that 1,000, or one-third of them, would qualify as low-income farm counties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is the general estimate which has been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Remembering that 1,000, or one-third of the counties, are reckoned as low-income counties, and that certainly there are many other areas where, perhaps, an entire county would not fall in that category, does the Senator believe it is unreasonable to carry on a pilot study, or a technical assistance program, in 500 counties?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, would that be an expensive program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not be an expensive program, because the machinery is already in existence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may recall that in my bill I proposed that the existing machinery be used to do this particular job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In our Extension Service, our State farm committees, the so-called ASC or former PMA committees——

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; also in the Farmers' Home Administration, the Crop Insurance Administration, and in the land-grant colleges, we have facilities at our fingertips to do the job. All that is required is a sense of direction and a desire to get the job done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Starting with 500 counties, will the Senator agree with me that that would really be inaugurating an attack on the problem, which might offer some hope of success?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whereas 50 counties would amount to little.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

The Senator may recall that in the Midwest, in the two Dakotas, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, Colorado, and Wyoming, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is now employing competent research people and accountants to make agricultural income studies in those States. In other words, a private farmers' cooperative is taking on a bigger job, with its own resources, than the President of the United States proposes for the entire Government of the United States. I think that bears out what the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, that if we are to do the job, we ought to do it in enough areas so that the statistical information we may obtain and the reports we may ultimately receive will be at least sufficiently embracive in their coverage so that we can actually know what the results of the program have been.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator agree with me that one of the greatest needs of the operator of the small-sized farm, the low-income farm—the farmer we still like to think of as using the farm not only as a place to make a living, but a place to live—is adequate credit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator agree that the banking system of our country and our banking laws are not designed to afford the farmer that kind of credit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely true. It has been recognized by the Government of the United States for 25 years that the existing private banking system is simply not established upon principles and economic standards which permit the kind of loans, at low rates of interest, which would enable farm families in the low-income areas and groups to lift themselves by their own work, after they receive such credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is aware, I am sure, of the professed desire on the part of the Department of Agriculture to encourage farmers to diversify their farming, and make it flexible, so that they can change from one crop to another?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A part of the theory of the sliding scale supports is that as a crop comes into surplus the farmers will change their type of agriculture and go into the production of another crop. Can the average small farmer make that change?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does he have the flexibility which would make it possible, and can he obtain such flexibility unless he has a more nearly adequate credit system than he now has?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know of no Member of the Senate who is better informed on the subject of fiscal policy and credit policy than is the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He has been chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He has been a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency for many years. He has concentrated on these problems. I think what the Senator has indicated by his questions is obviously the fact. I think the truth of that statement is apparent. A farmer cannot possibly make shifts in production, particularly if he is already in the low-income brackets, without having additional capital resources, which means, for this farmer, the availability of long-term credit at low rates of interest, which he cannot obtain in the private market.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to my friend from Minnesota that I do not consider that this problem necessarily lies exclusively in the field of finance and fiscal management. My experience has come from another angle. All my life I have lived among people who fall

in the category described. In fact, I have been one of them. Today I own a small farm. There are two tenants on it who fall in that category. I know something about their ability to do or not to do what they want to do.

I know something about where the pinch is felt. It is felt by the little farmer, who does not have the means himself and who never hopes to accumulate a great amount of money by farming, but who believes, at least, that it is an occupation in which he and his family can make a living and can rear their children and make good citizens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe we must always look at agriculture as being more than merely an economic function. It is also a social function. As the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, family farms and the family farm pattern are basic to the entire structure of our society. It is the keystone, we might well say, to individual liberty, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. The individual farmer and the individual small-business man and the independent proprietor are standing on their own. They are the bulwark of traditional liberalism and of traditional freedom in the whole world.

We do not need any experiments. The Department of Agriculture has all the experience and training necessary at its beck and call to undertake a practical action program offering some hope of results. All that it needs is the emphasis and support at the top and willingness to back up with deeds the fine words the President has expressed.

If, as the President says, "We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people." let us really open that door, instead of just letting a crack of light seep through.

Let us open the door, instead of opening it just a little crack and then snapping on the safety lock as soon as someone wants to go through that little crack to see what is beyond the horizon.

That situation should be very evident, and I know it is evident to farm families. It is extremely evident to them.

Farm income continues to go down. Nevertheless, all we get from the administration is a message. Disaster has overtaken area after area in this country, through drought, wind erosion, and blight. Still, all we get is a trip by the Secretary of Agriculture and a rise in interest rates of mortgage loans.

The Government still complains about the problem of surpluses. At the same time it seems to be lost and uncertain as to what it can do about this wonderful abundance which it is our privilege to have.

I hope no one will be misled by the message on low farm income which has been placed before us. I commend the President for his objective. I should like to encourage him now to hold a Cabinet meeting, or at least a departmental meeting, and to have the Secretary of Agriculture make certain that these objectives are pursued.

Then I would like to have the President call in his Director of the Budget and indicate to him what is contained in the President's message, and direct the Director of the Budget to send a new letter to the Committee on Agriculture in connection with bills now before that committee which are designed to carry out the very objectives to which the President has pledged himself and has generously commented upon and has supported.

The only way to have something done is for the President to be President, and for the President to make decisions, and for the President to recognize the fact that he himself will be held accountable for the farm program.

It is not the Benson program; it is the Eisenhower program. Mr. Benson just works for the Government. He did not get elected. He was appointed. He is carrying out the President's policy. Supposedly, the Bureau of the Budget is carrying out the President's policy. The Bureau of the Budget is a part of the executive department. It is in the President's office. I would remind the President of the United States this afternoon—and I do so most respectfully—that his own Director of the Budget has already sent a message to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which negates a part of the purpose and objective of the President's message; it repudiates the message and cancels it out for all practical purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While we are talking about the small farmers, the Senator from Minnesota may recall that a year or more ago there was considerable discussion about the desirability of a great many of the small farmers leaving the farms. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember some of the comments of the administration which encouraged people to start moving from the farms?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember the speech of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Butz. I believe that speech was made in Washington, D. C. At least a speech like that was made by him in Washington. He said that farming today is big business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I happen to have that quotation before me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Alabama to inform me and the Senate and the RECORD and the minority leader what the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had to say.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is a quotation from the Record Stockmen, of Denver, Colo., of March 10, 1955. That was not so long ago.

"Adapt or die, resist and perish," declared Earl Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in Denver in November as he spoke to the National Farm and Ranch Congress on New Frontiers for the West.

"Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity," he added.

Does the Senator from Minnesota subscribe to the philosophy that it is desirable to have agriculture limited to the big business field?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do not. One of the great prides and joys of America is the small family farm. One of the basic problems in the world, I may say to the Senator from Alabama, is the large collective farm and the corporate farm. The difference between American agriculture and Soviet agriculture today is the difference between individual family farm ownership and state collective ownership. Whether it be state collective ownership or corporate ownership, the undertaking still gets too big. It loses its personality. It loses its identity with people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, if we compare farming with industry, we narrow the base considerably. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not well to recognize the principle that strength—political strength and strength of every other kind—is buttressed by having as broad a base as possible; and is that not what we get when we hold onto the small family-sized farm?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely right. I point out to the Senator again, and for the purpose of the record, that the challenge which was laid down before us by the studies which have been made on agricultural income, namely, that agricultural family income is dropping, that agricultural farm mortgages are increasing, and that the low-income group is beginning to get larger, calls for positive and effective and immediate action, if we are to preserve the kind of economic system which so many commentators talk about, write about, and obviously think about, namely, the free enterprise and private ownership system.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield once more, I shall not impose upon him further. The Senator has made some reference in the course of his remarks to the fact that one part of the administration does not know what the other part is doing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator feels that perhaps some times Secretary Benson does not realize what Secretary Benson is doing or saying. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota is familiar with the speech Secretary Benson made on November 19, 1953, in which he said:

Farm income and buying power has declined (because of) the repeated urgings of our predecessors for all-out production. Year after year, farmers were urged, coaxed, begged, and almost threatened to step up production of feed grains, cotton, meat, and dairy products. The resulting flood of wheat, cotton, corn, and beef now bulges our bins and markets.

In other words, he was speaking against abundance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota knows that on the very next day, November 20, 1953, Secretary Benson said in a speech:

Naturally, then, some people are inclined to look upon such surpluses as a terrible calamity. But I cannot agree. Abundance is one of the greatest blessings in this choice land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to the Senator that there are some advantages in that kind of talk. For those who are against abundance Mr. Benson has a speech, and for those who are in favor of abundance he has a different speech. But does the President know about either speech?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish I could answer the distinguished Senator's question on that point. I do not know. I have noticed the comments of Mr. Merriman Smith, who has been writing all sorts of articles to the effect that the President did not have much time to devote to newspapers and magazines. So it may be that the President did not have an opportunity to read the speeches which Mr. Benson made. Undoubtedly he was not briefed, and probably he was not briefed on the idea of the 66⅔-percent rise in the interest rate for marginal farmers of the kind he talked about yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that the President wants the marginal farmers saved, but he wants them saved at good, solid interest-rate levels. He does not want to save them with lower, cheaper interest rates. Let us get them up to good banking standards, according to the traditional Republican idea of how to save someone. Just raise the interest rate. Whenever we see a rise in the interest rate, a rise in the stock market, and a reduction of farm income, we do not need to ask what party is in power. It is the Republican Party. It never fails.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not also true that we do not need to ask which party will be in power the next time the voters have a chance to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are going to have a chance. We will set the record straight so that they can view both sides of the issue.

In this instance the administration has covered several sides of the same issue in each pronouncement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the philosophy advanced by the present administration goes into effect with reference to the small farmers leaving the farms, and too many people trying to farm, where is the farmer going; and what is he going to do when he and his family get there?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, he can become a Republican precinct worker on election day——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am talking about his making a living.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, if the Senator wants the Republican leadership to think about that, we must get another message here. What I think should be stated is that if farmers continue to leave the farm, there is only one place for them to go, and that is to the cities. If they go to the cities, they either have to find industrial employment or become public charges. Surely we do not want the latter to happen. The possibilities of rising industrial employment, in the form of new jobs in terms of our increase in population, becomes ever more difficult.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that the sensible position for any administration to take would be to try to preserve the stability of American agriculture and to broaden the home-ownership and land-ownership base in this country by supporting a program that makes it possible for a farm family to make a living off the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator completely. I am sure we are both in agreement that our criticism of the President's program has not been based on the fact that he has proposed something, but on the fact that it is entirely too little, and also reminding him that it comes rather late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I now wish to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk in recent days on a subject which is close to the hearts of all of us, namely, American foreign policy. I wish to spend a few moments to make one or two observations on what I think is happening. I have read the comments of the distinguished minority leader and other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I do not seek an argument. I should like to state my observations. I lay no claim to having a grasp of the truth. I seek only the truth, and whatever I say I hope all will accept in the spirit of its being nothing more nor less than the expression of one Senator.

None of us has as much information at his fingertips as have those who are responsible for foreign policy in the executive branch of the Government. But the Constitution places a responsibility upon the Senate to advise and consent as to matters which relate to treaties, the appointment of ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary, and other questions relating to the area of defense, foreign policy, and security. It is within that field that I direct my remarks.

Mr. President, some of us have warned time after time on the floor of the Senate that Communist strategy changes from time to time, but its objectives remain the same. I can recall 2 years ago standing right here at this desk and pointing out to my colleagues in the Senate the importance of the meeting in Moscow in September and October 1952, of all the Communist nations and their representatives in the 19th Communist Party Congress. I pointed out then, as did others, that the Soviet Union laid down as its objective dividing the United States from its allies, primarily Great Braitain; pursuing a relentless economic war against the United States and its allies; seeking new markets; and emphasizing the Communist strategy of infiltration, subversion, and coercion.

I think I said that day, Mr. President, that the Communists had abandoned the policy of violence and force momentarily and had embraced a policy of a political offensive based upon negotiations, alleged peaceful pursuits, diplomacy, and economic activity. This has come to be. We have seen it in our time.

One of the regrettable aspects of our work in the Senate is that we have no committee or subcommittee in the Senate of the United States which concentrates upon the study of Communist strategy and tactics. We receive a little bit of information here and a little bit there, a little bit from the State Department, a little bit from the Central Intelligence Agency, a little more from the press, and from visits with informed persons. But no concentrated, coordinated research study of Communist tactics and strategy is made, so that in every instance we are more or less planning, thinking, and speaking from inadequate evidence and inadequate information.

I am confident that the executive branch, through the Central Intelligence Agency, through the National Security Council, through the State Department, through the Department of Defense, and the intelligence services of the Armed Forces, receives a vast amount of information. But the information is important only if it is properly evaluated, and from that evaluation proper conclusions are drawn as a basis for effective policy.

What is the situation as we see it? Ten years ago this week our Government was participating in negotiations in San Francisco for the establishment of the United Nations organization.

Think of what has happened in the 10 years since 1945. Think of the world as it was in 1945. World War II was still raging in Europe and in the Pacific. Our forces were fighting their way back from the Philippines—back to victory. Hitler's armies were still strong in Europe.

Since that time we have been a victor in Europe and in the Pacific. Our forces have occupied Germany and Japan. Both of those nations now have had their sovereignty returned, and both have treaties of friendship. Both nations have been generously treated by the Government and the people of the United States. Never in history has a conqueror treated the conquered so kindly and so generously as the United States of America has treated those who were its former enemies.

We have come through a decade in which it was necessary for us to feed the poor and heal the sick; in which we have had to help those who were impoverished and unfortunate. This was done through UNRRA and interim aid, and then through the Marshall plan, working in cooperation with the nations of Western Europe.

We have witnessed an amazing recovery. Ten years ago Europe was in ashes. Today its production is, on the average, more than 50 percent greater than it was in the best year before World War II.

We have consummated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and have sent American troops to Europe. I remember the historic decisions which were taken in Congress. I recall participating in the debates and casting my votes for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for troops to Europe, for military assistance, and then for mutual security.

How well I remember President Truman's proposal known as point 4, the technical and scientific assistance program for the underprivileged peoples

and the underdeveloped areas. It was a great and magnificent idea. It has had a great impact, despite the limitations which have been imposed on the program.

We had to fight a war in Korea. Not very many people were happy about that situation. But the objectives and the purpose of that struggle were fulfilled. We stopped Communist aggression. We stopped, at least momentarily, the Communist time table for moving into Southeast Asia. We unified the nations of the Western World. The Soviet Union never made a greater mistake in its history than when it had its satellite, North Korea, attack the Republic of South Korea. It was that attack which alerted the Americans, the British, the French—yes, everyone—to the military menace of the Soviet Union and its satellites. It was that attack which proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the Communist Party is an international conspiracy, dedicated to the overthrow of free men and their institutions.

I said late in 1952 and early in 1953 that I was convinced there would be a truce in Korea, because the Soviet Union realized that the Korean war was not paying dividends for the Communist world.

I have said on the floor, time after time, that the central problem in Europe to which the Soviet Union was directing its attention was Germany. I repeat that here today.

I have said time after time in the Senate that the central area of concern for the United States of America in Asia was not Formosa, but that it should be Southeast Asia—India, Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Indochina, and Indonesia. I repeat that assertion and statement today. That is the area which is vital to our national security.

Germany is vital to the security of Western Europe.

Mr. President, I think it is crystal clear that at this very hour the Soviet Union is seeking by diplomacy and by all other means at its command to neutralize Germany, so that German manpower will not be integrated into the Western Defense System under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Why do I say that? Because within recent weeks, again, the Soviet Union and Red China have seized the initiative.

I do not wish to be partisan about the matter, but I want to say that although I have heard much about our seizing the initiative, we have not seized it. We have not even seen it. We have, rather, lost it.

Mr. Molotov, in his message to the Chancellor of Austria, inviting Chancellor Raab to go to Moscow and negotiate an Austrian treaty, seized the initiative in Western Europe. The United States of America, France, and Great Britain are now preparing to negotiate a treaty to return to Austria her independence and to make her neutral.

The Soviet Union in many ways was reasonably generous in her terms. Why negotiate such a treaty now? Because once the Paris Accord had been ratified by the German Bundestag, the French Chamber of Deputies, the British House of Commons, and the United States Senate, restoring sovereignty to the Federal Republic of Germany and bringing West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the next step, the crucial step, will be the rearmament of West Germany, so that German manpower, German divisions, can share in the defense of Western Europe.

This is what the Soviet Union will attempt to stop. This is their prime objective in Europe. Therefore, they are using the device of negotiating a treaty with Austria.

I have great sympathy for the Austrians. Our Government, of course, is bound and committed to negotiate a treaty with Austria. We have long pursued a policy of independence for Austria. We must now join in the negotiations and support the treaty. But I think we should know that what the Soviet Union and Mr. Molotov did was to set a trap, or at least to bait a hook, for the West Germans, because everyone in West Germany who is in public life, and even those in private life, thinks of one thing first—the reunification of West Germany and East Germany. This is a passion with the German people, and it is understandable why it should be. It is the promise of every political leader in every political party, without exception, including Chancellor Adenauer.

It is dangerous to make predictions, but I shall take the risk and predict that before too long, once the treaty with Austria has been consummated and Austrian independence has been restored, and Austria has declared her neutrality, as she must do under the treaty by her commitment to the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union will then proceed to try to negotiate with West Germany and East Germany for the reunification of Germany, and to have Germany be a neutral.

This would be a blow to the foreign policy of the United States and to the safety and security of the free world, because our plans in the Western European area have been built around the proposition and the hope that West German manpower would be integrated with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

There are neutralist parties in Germany. In the recent elections in Germany some of those parties gained strength over Chancellor Adenauer, who has been devoted to the efforts of the West and to the rearmament of West Germany and its participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

So I simply wish to say in a spirit of friendship that I hope the Secretary of State of the United States will be in the closest consultation with our allies in Western Europe, and in particular with the leaders of the West German Federal Republic, to see to it that the aim and objective of the Soviet Union foreign policy is not realized. I should like to say to the Secretary that he can expect, as the newspaper headlines now proclaim day after day, that the Soviet Union will press for negotiation, and negotiation at a high level conference; and we must be prepared to participate. I am not one to say that we should not engage in such negotiations. I am merely one who says that when we engage in them, we should know why we are there, what we are going to do, what we are not going to do, and what we have for our objective.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], has said, the United States of America must be willing to negotiate at any time with any nation about any problem. I think the distinguished Senator from Georgia has done a great service to his country by speaking out so ably and boldly on these many critical and difficult subjects. I praise him, commend him, and thank him as a fellow citizen and as a colleague.

I also say, Mr. President, that in the months to come we can expect the Soviet to coo like a dove. She will have on her Sunday manners, if she believes in Sunday. This has been inherent in everything that has been happening.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of an address which I gave before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Calif., on February 24, and I should like to read something that I said on that occasion which I regard as somewhat pertinent at this time:

> There are apparently some who feel that the appointment of Marshal Zuhkov as Minister of Defense presents the opportuniy for negotiation and easing of the tensions between the United States and the Soviet. This soothing hope is undoubtedly based upon the acquaintance of President Eisenhower with Marshal Zhukov during World War II. For American policy to be based upon this wishful hope would be a serious error. Marshal Zhukov as Minister of Defense is under the immediate control and direction of Khrushchev and the heirarchy of the Communist Party. He will be held strictly accountable and responsible for the fullest cooperation and participation by the Red army in fulfilling the policy and strategy of the Communist Party. Zhukov is undoubtedly a popular hero in Russia, but with Marshal Bulganin as premier, Zhukov will be taking and carrying out orders. If he fails to do so, he will suffer the fate of other Soviet leaders. By the mere fact of his professed respect for President Eisenhower, he is all the more suspect. How easy it would be if Zhukov should get out of line to readily prove, Communist Bolshevist style, that Zhukov was a traitor, puppet of the West.

That is commonly known as liquidation.

Continuing with the speech I made:

> There is a good reason to believe that Zhukov will be used on the international propaganda front, first, to arouse fears in Europe of German rearmament, and, secondly, to arouse hopes in America of peaceful coexistence, thereby helping to bring complacency to our shores.

Mr. President, it has happened. Mr. Zhukov is remembered as the great hero of the Red armies of World War II; and a great general he is and was. I want the record clear, as far as the Senate is concerned, despite Mr. Zhukov's personal desire, if he has it, and let us assume for the moment he does have it, of friendly, agreeable relationships because of his admiration and respect for his wartime compatriot in the Armed Forces command, General Eisenhower—despite that desire, let no American be deluded

into believing that Zhukov can like somebody and do something about it and at the same time violate the rules, discipline, and policies of the Communist Party, and still live. It is impossible. So it is apparent that the Soviet wants, for a period of time, in Western Europe, relaxation of the tension. This we want, too. It would seem, on the face of it, we both should be very content.

Why does the Soviet Union want relaxation of tension in Europe? Because if the Soviet acts too belligerently, if there is too much trouble, then Western Germany will rearm. The Germans will become fearful again of Soviet power and will rearm. But if it can look peaceful, if it can look as if Zhukov, Bulganin, Voroshilov, Khrushchev, and the others are taking things easier, and are being more cooperative, then indeed the neutralist spirit in Europe will rise, particularly in Western Germany. The day that Germany is reunited and declares her neutrality, the Soviet Union will become belligerent.

Russia turns off the faucet one day, and on the next day. She is sweetness and light one month, then a vicious dragon the next. We should not be deluded by Communist strategy. We know its objective.

I have said I am confident that the Soviet will recommend negotiations and seem to be prepared to negotiate. Those negotiations may lead to the relaxation of tension. They may lead to the reduction of armaments. That is a possibility, and I do not think too remote a possibility. Then we shall have a certain number of years of what may be called cessation of hostilities, or "peace." I prefer to call it time.

The question about time is what we do with it. Time is meaningless and valueless unless it is used. The importance of time is, Who will use it, and for what purpose?

Supposing that negotiations with the Soviet were reasonably successful; supposing we could reduce some of our armaments and expenditures for defense; I wonder if we here in the Congress would be willing to dedicate the same amount of resources, money, and dedication to the pursuits of peace as we have to the pursuits of defense. In other words, I wonder if we would be willing to utilize the same amount of actual expenditures we have devoted to military uses to economic, social, and political betterment?

I remember well what Senator McMahon said in one of his last speeches: If we could have disarmament, if we could have reduction of arms, what great good would come if we could devote a portion of that effort to cultural, social, and health improvement throughout the world.

I wonder if we are prepared, morally, politically, and in every way to follow through on that kind of a commitment? Because, make no mistake, the Soviet Union has an oriental attitude about time. The people in power think if they can keep on putting enough pressure, using propaganda, using their economic power, using infiltrators and agents, in due time they will pick off one country after another without war.

I want to meet that challenge. I am one who does not want war, either. I think a defense based on nuclear or atomic weapons is just planned suicide. I know certain persons will say we have more weapons than Russia has and that gives us temporary superiority. Yes, it does; but I do not know who would be around to calculate who was superior after a war. I am confident we could survive such a war but no nation will win it. Can anyone tell me that any war promoted liberty, independence, equality, and the kind of society we want?

After World War I, democracy was not stronger; it was weaker. After World War II, communism reached out and took in hundreds of millions of people. If world war III should occur, there would not be a world which could engage in parliamentary discussion of its problems; it would be a world of dictatorial authority and communism or some other ism which would undoubtedly have been strengthened.

Therefore our policy must be dedicated to peace. It must be a policy which is based on strength and knowing what we want, and there must be a consistency of policy. Let us not talk about hydrogen bombs. We are scaring away our friends by that kind of talk. But there should be more talk and more emphasis upon our real resources and the real strength of our country, namely, our faith; our economics; our political system; our land system; our programs of health, education, and welfare; and our love and understanding of people. We should also have a cunning understanding of the tactics and strategy of the enemy.

Mr. President, now let me move to a discussion of the Far East. Some persons have been disturbed because our President—and, Mr. President, he is my President, too, even though I did not vote for him; he is the President of all Americans, and particularly as regards the vital areas of security and defense—the President has said he is prepared to negotiate with Chou En-lai. Again I say that Americans must be prepared to negotiate any time, any place, with anyone who wishes to negotiate; and I think it is an expression of weakness on the part of any citizen of the United States to say that we will "be taken," that we will lose out. That means that we could lose out and could be fooled and could "be taken" if we are not prepared to go to such a negotiation with a strong program and a strong policy and if we do not know what we want. We have had one example of that situation. We went to Geneva, last year. The Geneva Conference will go down as one of the greatest and most colossal diplomatic failures in American history, and I think it is one which will haunt us for years to come. Our representatives went there. The United States invited the Red Chinese to send representatives to Geneva. After our representatives went to the conference, the Secretary of State decided—because of a little political heat, back home—that he should come home; and he decided to leave his assistants in charge at Geneva. Mr. President, one does not win football games by having the captain go home, particularly when the team is playing Notre Dame or the University of Minnesota; and one does not win diplomatic conferences, when Mr. Molotov and his kind are there, and when there is present Chou En-lai, an able and astute man, as opposition.

Mr. President, I say that once our country had invited the Red Chinese to come to Geneva, our best representatives should have been there, to see that the Red Chinese did not run off with half the world. They ran off with half of Indochina. Mr. President, I am of the opinion—and I express only my own personal opinion in this matter; I have no particular insight into it; I speak only from what I have seen and from what I have read—in my opinion, Chou En-lai, the Red Chinese Foreign Minister and Premier, wants to negotiate because he, too, would like to have a little time—time in which to see whether Southeast Asia may simply fall into his lap. I say that because we Americans have whipped ourselves into a frenzy of thinking that the whole world rises and falls on Formosa. Formosa has been the central point of American thinking and discussion for 4 months. Formosa has 9 million people. Formosa cannot be defended without American defense.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me; I, too, wish to defend Formosa. But I do not think everything we do must be predicated upon the Island of Formosa. I think we should take Formosa in our stride, and then should proceed with the real business at hand.

Formosa is but a part of the landscape of the world; it is not all the world. Chiang Kai-shek is not the embodiment of all the political leadership in the world—important as he is, and valuable as he is, and ally that he is. I do not say this by way of deprecating either the Formosa area or its leadership. I merely wish to have us put Formosa in proper perspective.

I repeat now what I have said before, in many places in the country, namely, that if tomorrow morning the Soviet Union could choose between Burma and Formosa, the Soviet Union would give many Formosas for one Burma; and if tomorrow the Soviet Union could choose between Japan and Formosa, the Soviet Union would give many Formosas for Japan. Mr. President, Japan is vitally important in the Far East. What is going to happen to Japan? What is our State Department doing about the rising tide of anti-American feeling in Japan? What are our policies toward that nation? During the last 6 months, I have not heard an intelligent presentation of American policy and opinion on Japan. Yet there are 80 million people in Japan, and Japan has the largest industrial-enterprise system in all of Asia, and the fourth largest in the world. Yet we have fixed our minds and our attention entirely upon Formosa. I wish to put Formosa in its proper perspective. Formosa is part of the problem, but not all of it.

Mr. President, at the end of 1952, our relationships with India were good. Chester Bowles was our Ambassador to

India. He had made, as the expression is, "a hit." We were then in closer cooperation with India than we have been either before or since. But since 1952, and to this very hour, our relationships with India have steadily deteriorated, until today India, a nation of over 350 million people, finds itself on many an issue on the opposite side of the table from the United States of America.

This situation should be of great concern to all of us—and of deep diplomatic and political concern, much more concern than the Matsus and Quemoy, a couple of warts in the Pacific, in terms of area. Mr. President, just think of Quemoy and the Matsus, as compared to India. Just think of Quemoy and the Matsus, as compared to Burma, or as compared to Japan.

Mr. President, anyone who would focus his attention on Quemoy and the Matsus, at the expense of these other areas, is one whose sense of judgment is misleading him.

Our relationships with Quemoy and the Matsus are apparently good; but for 9 solid months the United States of America did not even have an Ambassador in Burma, a country with 1,200 miles of common frontier with Red China. Burma is a surplus-rice-producing area, whereas it is not even possible to produce rutabagas on Quemoy and the Matsus. Burma has 18 million people. Burma has rich mineral resources. Burma was our ally in World War II. But the Prime Minister of Burma has told prominent Americans who recently have seen him that during a period of almost a year he did not see any important Americans. Every other weekend, and sometimes even twice a week, some representative of the United States runs from Washington to Taipei. But how many Americans have been going to see Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma? How many representatives of the United States have taken the time to go see what is occurring in India? How much time have our representatives spent in India, as compared to the amount of time our representatives have spent in other areas of the world?

Mr. President, to refer once more to the matter of negotiation, it is my feeling that we should negotiate, and that we will negotiate, with Red China. However, I hope that we shall recognize that before we negotiate with the Red Chinese, we should have a clear understanding with our friends in the Southeast Asia area. We should talk over all of this matter with them, and should obtain their point of view, and should let them be a part, at least indirectly, in these negotiations. Let us not arrange to have only two big powers go there and decide what they will do, despite the wishes of anyone else. I hope our Government will keep all our allies, including the Nationalist Government of China, on Formosa, continuously informed as to anything we may be doing. This is not to say that they should have a veto power, because I do not think they should have. I do not think the Nationalist Government of China should have a veto power. After all, we have pledged our resources; and I want the American people to know that by means of the Formosa resolution and the treaty with the Nationalist Republic of China, we have pledged the rights and the fortunes and the honor of every living American, as well as those yet unborn.

This was not some little scrap of paper, some little treaty that did not mean anything. It was the pledge of American lives, fortunes, and honor. That ought to be enough to bolster anybody's morale. When I hear that Chiang Kai-shek is going to suffer a drop in morale if he must get off Quemoy and Matsu, I am inclined to think he does not think very much of the 160 million Americans who have pledged everything they have to his defense. If an ally needs that much pumping up, I am not sure that he is a good ally. I do not think he will need that much. I think he realizes the support he has—and he has that support. I want the record to be clear on that point. I think he has been treated a little unfairly and unkindly. I can understand how Chiang Kai-shek must feel. This administration encouraged him to fortify the Tachens, and then came along and said "Get out." We sent in our demolition crews to blow up the fortifications to the north of Formosa.

This administration "unleashed" Chiang Kai-shek, according to the President's message, in 1953, and undoubtedly encouraged him to fortify the Matsus and Quemoy. I predict that the administration will abandon those islands.

No wonder Chiang Kai-shek feels bad. But he should have known that a good deal of the talk of the administration was for local political purposes, at home. There has been far too much of it. Such an effort has been made by the President to appease and make peace with certain elements of the Republican Party that he has had little or no time to make adjustments looking to peace in the world.

Sometimes I think the President should make up his mind as to where he wants peace. I think he can much better tolerate a little fight in the Senate than out in the Formosa Strait. It is less costly to the American people. Sometimes our squabbles and battles here are not too encouraging to the American people, but I am sure every mother and father realizes that there are fewer casualties when we battle here than when we battle out in the Strait of Formosa.

Mr. President, I say that we are going to be negotiating with Chou En-lai, and I hope that when we do so we will recognize that it is only a part of the package which we must carry and deliver. I hope that now we realize that things are in a bad state of affairs tonight in Indochina. I ask on the floor of the Senate tonight, What is this Government's policy toward Indochina, toward South Vietnam? What is its policy toward Premier Diem? The Premier does not know, and neither do I; and I doubt whether anyone else does. We cannot have a policy which flip-flops from one side of the street to the other and expect anything but trouble.

What is this Government's policy toward Indonesia, with its 88 million people? It is 1 of the 4 or 5 largest nations in the world in terms of population, and one of the potentially richest nations in the world. Today in Indonesia there is a coalition government, with Communists in the government.

I want to know why we do not hear more before our committees from the Secretary of State and other top officials about Indonesia. I want to know why we are not being informed. I want to know what our policy is toward these areas. What are we doing there? How much technical assistance are we offering? How much economic assistance are we rendering? What kind of information program have we there? What are we doing about the Indonesian labor movement? Two years ago I advised the Senate that the Communist Party was taking over the Indonesian labor movement, and I called upon the Government to strengthen our labor attachés, to give more emphasis to the labor movement, to strengthen our exchange program, to bring young Indonesian leaders to America to train them in democracy, and in the experiences of freedom. We have not done that, Mr. President.

What is our policy toward Burma? I do not refer merely to our military policy. I know that America feels strongly committed to the military defense of these areas; but it is highly likely that there will be no military action. Those countries can fall into the orbit of the Communist world one by one.

I say on the floor of the Senate that 2 years ago those countries were in a much better position. Two years ago Indonesia was a considerably stronger country, and more friendly to the United States. What about Burma, India, and Indochina? I charge here on the floor of the Senate that this administration's foreign policy in Southeast Asia has been a dismal failure.

I further charge that too little attention has been given to it. I further charge that we have had a sort of fixation upon limited objectives, the most recent of which has been Formosa and Quemoy and Matsu.

I further charge that we have not really developed a policy in our relationships with an independent Japan, and I say that those countries are fast slipping away from any friendly contact and friendly association with the United States. I say that the situation has become worse each month during the past 2 years.

What should we do about it, once having made these charges? First, as important as it is to balance the budget, and as important as it is in the minds of some people to reduce the budget, I suggest that the United States look to the areas of the world which may be lost forever, and see whether or not we can find it within our resources and means to be of some help, even if it costs something.

Let us take a look at our adversaries, the Communists. How do we compare with them? First, in the matter of capital, what this world cries for today in every one of the countries I have mentioned is capital, gold, money, currency. The United States has almost a monopoly on the capital of the world. We are

the richest nation on the face of the globe.

What are we going to do with this capital? If the rest of the world becomes a Communist satellite area, our gold standard will not be worth anything. We had better begin to use our gold resources. We had better make up our minds that we are playing for keeps.

So we have the capital. The dictatorship of the proletariat does not have capital. I hope that my free-enterprise business friends will admit that we have a better economic system, a more productive and better balanced system; yet how many times have I heard prominent exponents of free enterprise in American capitalism say, "If this cold war continues much longer we shall go bankrupt."

That is about the finest way I know of to admit to the Soviets that they are better than we are, because, after all, the cold war affects them, too. If we are going to throw in the towel halfway through the fight, they will win by default.

We lead in the field of capital. Capital is more important in the world today than all the hydrogen bombs we can stockpile from now until kingdom come. Capital will build. Hydrogen bombs will destroy. Hydrogen bombs are, at best, a supplemental weapon. We have capital. Let us use it. How shall we use it? We do not need to give it away. Many of these countries want long-term loans at low rates of interest. Why do we not apply the REA principle of 25- and 30-year loans at 2 percent interest?

Why do we not realize that not all the private investment capital will go to those countries we would like to have go there. That is because many of the countries are too unstable, and therefore Government capital will have to be loaned to them. Many of those nations, like India, are not asking for grants; they are asking for loans.

How many Americans know that last summer and fall Indian representatives were in the city of Washington trying to negotiate a loan and to plan a program for building a steel plant in India with a capacity of 1 million tons.

Those representatives did not get anywhere in Washington. I do not know why that was so. I have never had any explanation for it. I do know that their proposal was rejected, or at least it was never accepted.

Those same representatives went back to New Delhi. The Soviet Ambassador contacted them. Today the Indian Government and the Soviet Union have come to a tentative agreement to build a million-ton-capacity steel plant in India, with Soviet technicians doing it, and with Soviet technicians training 300 Indian technicians in Russia to run the plant.

Do Senators know what I believe our Government should have done? Our Government should have done as it does with young men when they are called in the draft. The Government should have gone to one of our big steel companies and said, "Greetings. Try this on for size. We are going to make you a new kind of GI. You are going to go to India, and you will build a steel plant over there. You will build one of the finest American steel plants in the world, and you will build it in record-breaking time. In addition, you will train young Indian men to run it. We will show what American capitalism and free enterprise and ingenuity can do. Oh, you will get paid for it. Of course, you will not get as much as you would get for selling steel today at high prices, but you will get paid to do it."

Instead, I suppose the Indians did not want to pay as much interest as this administration wants to charge. Mr. President, interest rates are becoming the curse of this administration. Anyway, we did not do it.

Today for the first time the Soviet Union has many technicians in India. Today for the first time in Pakistan the Soviet Union has dozens and perhaps hundreds of technicians. Today the Soviet Union has technical assistance programs in effect in six Asian nations. Today the Soviet Union is stepping up its exchange program, and is taking thousands of students into Russia every year.

Apparently they are rich, and we are so poor that we cannot afford it. Mr. President, apparently they are peasants; they do not take month-long vacations on Miami Beach and at other places, as we do. They do not have the resources we have. Nevertheless, what they do have, they use.

We persist in cutting our exchange program. We persist in higgling and arguing over interest rates. We persist in putting up obstacles. In the meantime we lose golden opportunities.

At the present time we are far ahead of the Soviet Union and any of its satellites in the field of science and technology. Let us use more of our knowledge.

I say that the technical-assistance program is one of the real secret weapons in our possession. Yet we have persisted in trimming the program instead of expanding it.

I wish to say that much of it ought to be done through the United Nations. We are not very popular in some parts of the world. I am a domestic American politician. When I cannot appeal successfully to someone directly when I am running for office, I do not mind having someone else do it for me.

We need people in the State Department who know how to make friends and persuade and convince people. Certainly, we ought to have sense enough to know about it in the Senate, because although we can excuse people in the State Department, it is inexcusable for us not to know about it.

The United Nations technical-assistance program is an effective program. America should contribute much more to the program and should seek to have the program expanded. We should always try to put the Soviet Union on the spot in that connection. We should lead instead of always pulling back. It is only through programs such as that, in which we train farmers and put people on farmland and train young men and women how to run a government that we will ever have any hope of success in the areas we are talking about. Otherwise, Chou En-lai will not only get what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is worried about, namely, Quemoy and the Matsus, but Chou En-lai will also get Burma and Indochina and Indonesia. Indonesia is so close to him now that it is practically within his reach and he may be able to take it at any time he wants to do so. It may even be—and I pray to God it may never happen—that he may even get India, with her vast resources and manpower and natural resources and timber and minerals and water and land, or at least that it will fall within the economic and political orbits of communism.

If that happens, we will really be singing God Bless America, and we will be singing it for every minute of our lives, because we will be in serious trouble.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that we should go on the offensive and use our capital. I am not asking that we give it away. I say we must take calculated risks in using it and in lending it. That means international development. It means working with the Colombo nations. It means a closer integration with our British allies and with the British Commonwealth nations. It means trying to do in that part of the world what once was done in Western Europe; namely, we must ask them to come forward with their own plans, and we must try to help them. We should have done that with respect to the Bandung Conference.

Mr. President, we did not even send a representative to Bandung. Representative POWELL went there on his own. I wish to compliment Representative POWELL. He did a great job over there, and he brought great credit to his country. He stood up for his Nation. He did not go there with the blessing of the State Department or the White House.

Our Government did not even send a message of greeting to Bandung. The Moscow radio was playing greetings all day long. Thank God for Sir John of Ceylon. Thank God for Mohammed Ali of Pakistan. Thank God for Carlos Romulo of the Philippines. I mention only a few. We were not treated too badly by some other representatives at that conference. The Prime Minister of Burma was complimentary.

Therefore, I say let us use our science and our technology. Let us expand our exchange program and our information program. The Senator from Oklahoma had in his possession comments about the Voice of America program, and its effectiveness. The Voice of America is effective if we in Congress do not wreck it. We need more of it.

I heard General Gruenther, the Supreme Commander in Europe, state before a committee of the Senate that the Soviet Union was spending more money to block our radio broadcasts, which we beam behind the Iron Curtain, than we spend on our whole Voice of America program all over the world.

Just who is it that is supposed to be the poor nation—we or the Soviet Union? I have been led to believe that we have a better system. I am convinced of it. I believe we have more money in the

bank, and I believe we have greater resources, and I believe we are much better off than the Soviet Union.

There is another need in that part of the world, Mr. President. It is food and fiber. The administration has been trying—at least so it says—to dispose of substantial quantities of our so-called surplus production. It has had a bad time with it. It has not done too well. I am not going to be critical of it, because perhaps it has run into great difficulties in that connection.

However, Mr. President, what prevents this Nation from going to the United Nations and saying to all the Nations assembled there:

"We have 400 million bushels of wheat over and above our needs. We have 500 million bushels of corn. We have 5 million bales of cotton. All of that is over and beyond our needs. We do not want to dump these commodities on the world market and thereby destroy normal channels of trade.

"But what we will do is to offer them to the United Nations and let them set up a special commission within the United Nations to study how these commodities can be used to stabilize world markets, to alleviate human suffering, and to provide a reasonable diet for mankind."

The Communists cannot do that, Mr. President. One of the reasons why the Soviet Union has become so apparently tame and peaceful is because her agriculture has failed. It has broken down. Is it not interesting, Mr. President? It is a sad commentary, I may say, that the practical problem which seems to plague this administration is that our farmers are too efficient, too productive; they just do not know what to do with this great burden of food. The problem of the Soviet Union is that they have a collective agricultural system which is not functioning, and they have not enough food for their own people or for anyone else.

Here is a natural asset on our side. What are we doing about it? We are complaining about it. We are persisting in trying to do it alone instead of using international agencies which could well be used for solving the problem.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that we set up an international food and fiber reserve, which some of us have proposed 3 or 4 years in a row.

Mr. President, I also suggest that we take the message of land reform to the world; first, to the Soviet Union. I can imagine how much fun we can have with this. Here are Soviet propagandists going all over the world telling the peasants to divide up the land, take the land away from the big landowners, and give everyone 5 or 10 acres. That is the Soviet line.

We should do two things: We should point out to the natives that that is a good idea, and that the best place for it to start is in the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union needs land reform more than does any other country on the face of the earth. It has the worst possible land system. We should be literally goading them. We should be shoving it down their throats through the Voice of America, through every conceivable means of propaganda and information, and saying, "You really ought to see some of our Iowa and Minnesota farms; you ought to see some of the farms in Nebraska, and on the west coast and on the east coast. We would love to have you come over here and see those farms. It is too bad you folks do not have farms such as ours."

We have not anything to lose in their seeing our farms. As a matter of fact, I am sure that if some of the Russian farmers could see our farms they would not want to go home, and it would not take them long to forget all the communism that has been foisted upon them. After all, there are only a few Communists in the Soviet Union. The first victims of communism were the Russians. They are not all Communists; they are only semi-Communists.

So I say, Mr. President, let us be less fearful. We act as though we are afraid. We are afraid that some Russians will come here and destroy our society, or that if Russian editors come in without fingerprinting, something will go wrong. Of what are we afraid? If we know what we are after, if we know what our assets are, if we are willing to lead and not to follow, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that the best things we have are our own history and traditions. I have said to many young people in America that it was my duty as a student to read Das Kapital by Karl Marx. I have read some of the writings of Lenin, some of Trotzky's, some of Stalin's. I have read the Communist Manifesto, and I never got a thrill out of reading one line of it. It did not make any goosepimples come on this man. But I wish to say that we can get a thrill when we read the Declaration of Independence, or the Gettysburg Address—"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." If that does not send a few chills up and down our spines, we are just dead and not yet buried.

What do people want more than anything else in this world? They do not want to be told, "If you do not behave, we are going to use atom bombs on you." That has been the line of many petty political leaders. They say, "We will use precision atom bombs on you."

That is not what people want to be hearing. If we have the bombs, we do not need to talk about them. The enemy knows we have them, and so do our friends. We should be talking about equal rights, proclaiming our Declaration of Independence, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which are God-given rights that no Communist can ever take away from us. If we believe this—and we should believe it, because it is our faith—and after we announce it, we should interpret it in terms of health and education, programs of working with free labor and free management, training people how to run industry, run unions, run credit unions, teaching them how to bring water to the dry and thirsty land, how to reclaim the swamps, how to reclaim the soil, and how to plant crops.

Mr. President, I have been told many times that if a man is going to be successful in anything, he should be what is natural for him to be—to be himself.

We are not being ourselves when we are afraid, and we are not being ourselves when we ape the Communists. We are not being ourselves when we talk as if we are the god of war. We are the children of peace. We have dedicated our resources, energies, and talents since the beginning of this Republic to the good life, to raise the standard of living, to improve the lot of the common folk, to raising a new standard around which men can rally. It is not enough to do it at home; we have got to do it abroad.

I suggest, Mr. President, that while we negotiate—and that is what we are going to do, apparently—and while the Soviets in Red China seek those negotiations, we should constantly keep in mind that what they are after is not a permanent settlement of these problems, but time. Once the time is obtained from an easing of the tensions, time is in any man's hand that takes it. It does not belong to the enemy and it does not belong to us; it belongs to those who preempt it and use it. It belongs to those who preempt it and use it intelligently.

I say it is time to reevaluate our policies. It is time to reemphasize certain aspects of our policies which have been de-emphasized. Time is running out, Mr. President. We can no longer permit Molotov and Chou En-lai to capture the headlines. We can no longer let them believe they are the peacemakers. We can no longer permit people to believe that they are the emancipators when, in fact, they are the oppressors. We should stand up and be what we are, liberators, emancipators, freedom-lovers, and, above all, the creators of things which are good and wholesome, because I am sure our struggle will not be won in a short time.

It is a long pull, and I think we are prepared for it if we but dedicate ourselves to it.

Mr. President, I am about to move that, under the order previously entered into, the Senate stand adjourned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, and if no other Senator desires to speak, I move that, under the order previously entered, the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 25), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years, vice George Templar, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by me under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. S. Baxton Bryant, First Methodist Church, Duncanville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God of our Pilgrim Fathers, send Thy spirit to be with us today. Sacred to us all are the memories of those who have given their lives in defense of our country's freedom. Make our lives fit subjects to carry on this priceless heritage. Like millions of other Americans we pray for our Congress today. Give to these Thy servants in government a clear insight to Thy will for our country. Help every Member to be faithful to the trust that has been committed to him. Give each Member of this House the faith to believe that Thy will is always best for a world, a nation, a district, or an individual.

Help the people of our land to serve Thee. Save us from making demands upon our Representatives that are selfish and unreasonable. Keep in the mind of this great body that they represent not only their own districts, but the hope of freedom-loving people everywhere.

We thank Thee for our Speaker and for his long, devoted service to his country.

We thank Thee for the wonderful example that the Speakers of both parties have set before the world of how two great leaders of opposing political parties can honor and respect one another in a free country. Give to each of them the wisdom so to lead their parties in giving our country good legislation that we may lead the world in paths of peace and good will may live in the hearts of all people. In Christ's name we make our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years. This bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, in response to a message from the President of the United States requesting and recommending its passage.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MASON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to call attention for the record to the fact that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], prepared a minority report, which I have signed, expressing reasons why the two of us opposed the bill in committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, I think I should state that the vote in the committee on both sides was unanimous except two Members. Therefore, this bill comes before the House with the overwhelming approval of the committee. The views of the two Members who could not approve the bill are clearly expressed in the minority report.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 102 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U. S. C., App., sec. 1212 (a)) is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1956."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (d) of section 102 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U. S. C., App., sec. 1212 (d)) is hereby amended by inserting after 'title' each place it appears 'or would be subject to this title except for the provisions of section 106.'

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to contracts with the departments and subcontracts only to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor after December 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may also be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill would continue for 2 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, by making that act effective with respect to receipts or accruals attributable to performance under contracts or subcontracts through December 31, 1956. The act expired on December 31, 1954, but, as the Members know, due to the way in which the renegotiation process works, no problems are caused by extending the act from that date.

It will be recalled that receipts and accruals under defense contracts are not now subject to renegotiation unless they exceed $500,000 in a year. Also, when the act was extended last year, the Congress wrote in an exemption for standard commercial articles. These two amendments exempted a considerable amount of defense business from renegotiation, and have enabled the Renegotiation Board to concentrate on areas where renegotiation is most needed.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG] have also introduced bills which would extend the Renegotiation Act 2 years. The President has recommended that the act be extended for an additional 2 years, as provided in the bill before the House today.

Although it has become possible, through better contracting and price redetermination procedures, to eliminate to some extent the uncertainty as to what eventual fair prices to the Government should be, renegotiation is still necessary to insure that the Government is protected against unreasonable prices and gets value received on defense procurement. This is particularly true in the case of electronic and scientific military equipment, where the Defense Department must procure the very latest types of supersonic aircraft and continually make modifications during the production of such aircraft. It is also true in those many areas where there are limited sources of supply for items that are essential to our national defense.

Our defense expenditures still represent more than half of our national budget; and renegotiation is the only means by which, due to the peculiarities of defense procurement, we can guarantee that our Government is getting the maximum return on the dollars spent on defense. The President in his message requesting the 2-year extension which is provided in this bill stated:

I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it.

The committee adopted an amendment to the bill to clarify a situation arising out of a recent Treasury Department ruling which several industries felt would impose an undue burden on them. It will be recalled that, where the receipts and accruals from contracts and subcontracts were subject to renegotiation, the Renegotiation Act of 1951 suspended the application of the profit limitations in the Vinson-Trammell Act and in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The provision suspending the application of these other acts is very clear in those cases where contractors and subcontractors are subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act. However, a problem arose as to those cases which were exempted from renegotiation under section 106 of the Renegotiation Act. The Treasury Department has held that such exempted items were still subject to the profit limitations of the Vinson-Trammell Act and the Merchant Marine Act.

The committee amendment provides that these profit limitations are also suspended in those cases where items are exempted from renegotiation under section 106. The interested departments indicated that they had no objection to the committee amendment.

I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4904 extends the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years. This extension was requested by President Eisenhower on March 4 of this year. Immediately following submission of that request, the gentleman from New York, Representative REED, ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced H. R. 4694 on March 7 to carry out the President's recommendation. The bill now before the House was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman COOPER, 1 week later. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is truly bipartisan in nature.

The last previous extension of the Reorganization Act expired December 31, 1954. H. R. 4904 extends the authority until December 31, 1956. I should point out that the fact that the 1951 act expired last December 31 will in no way permit any defense contracts to escape renegotiation, assuming the pending bill is enacted.

Our committee heard the testimony of witnesses from all the major Government agencies concerned with this legislation. We heard testimony from representatives of the Defense Department, including the Departments of Navy, the Army, and of the Air Force, as well as representatives of the Department of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, and of the Renegotiation Board. In addition, while we did not conduct public hearings, written briefs submitted by non-Government groups were considered in detail. Each suggestion made by these groups was discussed by our committee. I might point out that the amendment contained in the bill was a direct result of our consideration of this written testimony.

I believe that the only serious question contained in this legislation is whether or not the Renogiation Act should be extended for 1 year or the 2 years provided by this bill. I believe the proposed 2-year extension is appropriate in that it will permit more time for consideration prior to the next scheduled termination on December 31, 1956. Although, that date is already considerably less than 2 years away. One of the difficulties which always confronts us in connection with mere 1-year extensions is the fact that so little time is usually available for careful study and public hearings.

It is true that our Nation is not now in a state of war. The continued efforts of President Eisenhower to establish a firm foundation for lasting international peace show great promise today of achieving ultimate success. Be that as it may, our defense expenditures continue to remain at a very high level and they must continue at this level for some time to come. Moreover, as the President pointed out in his message requesting this legislation, much of our defense spending is in the area of new and experimental equipment with respect to which careful initial contracting is seldom possible. In view of these considerations, I believe that this bill should be passed without undue delay.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. I take this opportunity to inquire as to the legislative program for the coming week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday, which is the day for the call of the Private Calendar, there are only three bills and I meant to consult with our Speaker and my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to apologize now for having temporarily overlooked it. But in view of the fact that there are only three bills, I intend to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN. I have no objection to that.

I would like to know if there will be any suspensions on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, there will be no bills taken up under suspension of the rules on Monday.

So on Monday, we will have the Consent Calendar.

For Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the program will be as follows: On Tuesday, we will take up the bill, H. R. 12, the agricultural price-support bill. Debate will start on Tuesday and go over until Wednesday. That is, final action will not be taken on it until Wednesday. Following that, we will take up the bill, H. R. 5297, the National Reserve plan, that is, the manpower bill. If those bills are finally acted upon by Thursday, we will then go over until the following Monday.

Of course, there is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand there is a proposed trip to be taken to New York by probably 100 of our Members, and I was going to suggest that perhaps it might be necessary to come in earlier on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I have that in mind. I was going to consult with my friend with reference to that. But we ought to be able to get through both of these bills by Thursday. I do have that in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the National Reserve training bill will come up then on Wednesday or Thursday? Which day will it come up?

Mr. MARTIN. If the agricultural bill is disposed of on Wednesday in time to start the other bill, of course, we will begin with the consideration of that bill. If not, it will come up on Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate that that bill will be taken care of on Thursday and that debate will be completed on it should it come up on Thursday afternoon?

Mr. McCORMACK. We could meet earlier on Thursday. The rule has not been reported on the bill as yet, but I am sure Members will have ample opportunity for debate on the bill. I am hopeful that both these bills can be disposed of by next Thursday, and also give ample time for debate. Mark you, I want my friend from Iowa and all Members not to misunderstand me. I thoroughly respect the rights of all Members and will protect them to the full extent of my ability. I am keeping in mind that Members want the opportunity to fully debate both these bills, but I believe we ought to be able to complete both bills in view of the fact that we have Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in which to consider them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 224, Rept. No. 451), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill. At the con-

clusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. CARTER

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report to the House the death of a former distinguished Member of the Congress, Hon. William H. Carter, of Massachusetts.

Born in Needham, Mass., on June 15, 1864; president of the William Carter Co., of Massachusetts, one of the largest mills of its kind in America; he has always been an outstanding figure in the community, admired and respected by all.

He served with ability as a member of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts; as a member of the Republican State Committee in Massachusetts; and for 4 years, and as a Member of this House in the 64th and 65th Congresses, from 1915 to 1919, during the trying period of World War I.

On the occasion of his 90th birthday, last June, he was honored by 450 persons, including employees, town officials, and other friends, who knew him affectionately as "the General," a title acquired when he received a five-star diamond pin in recognition of 75 years' service.

I have known and admired him as a friend and neighbor for many years.

He will be greatly missed by his wide circle of friends.

I extend by heartfelt sympathy at this difficult time to his wife, to his family, and all of those close to him.

INDUSTRIAL PLANT EXPANSION IN DEPRESSED ECONOMIC AREAS

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to encourage industrial plant expansion in depressed economic areas. The bill extends tax amortization benefits, identical with those extended for defense production, to industries who construct new facilities in any area where there is a labor surplus, as determined by the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor.

The suggestion for such legislation was contained in the annual message of Gov. George M. Leader in his annual message to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania on March 28. Subsequently the general assembly has passed a resolution memorializing this Congress to enact legislation embodied in the bill I have introduced today.

The principle of tax amortization credit to meet an emergency has been established for defense purposes. Unemployment is as much a threat to the well-being of the United States and its citizens as any we face today. A strong, balanced economy is vital to our defense against foreign enemies. The existence of spotty, serious unemployment indicates our economy is out of balance.

The need for encouraging plant expansion in labor surplus areas is demonstrated by the March 1955 Bimonthly Summary of Labor Market Developments in Major Areas published by the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor. Of 149 major and smaller areas surveyed by BES, none are found to be experiencing a labor shortage. Only 18 of these 149 are areas of balanced labor supply. In the remainder—131 areas—there is a labor surplus. In other words in 131 of 149 areas in the Nation, there exists an unemployment problem.

Any industrial concern expanding its facilities in these labor surplus areas would be eligible for tax amortization credit under the terms of my bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the listing of the 149 cities included in the March area classification summary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Group I listings are those areas of labor shortage; group II are those areas of balanced labor supply; group III are those areas of moderate labor surplus; group IV–A are areas of substantial labor surplus; while group IV–B are areas of very substantial labor surplus.

CLASSIFICATION OF LABOR MARKET AREAS ACCORDING TO RELATIVE ADEQUACY OF LABOR SUPPLY, MARCH 1955

REGION I

Group I: None.

Group II: Hartford, Conn.; New Haven, Conn.

Group III: Bridgeport, Conn.; New Britain, Conn.; Stamford-Norwalk, Conn.; Waterbury, Conn.; Boston, Mass.; Brockton, Mass.; Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.; Worcester, Mass.; Manchester, N. H.

Group IV–A: Bristol, Conn.[1]; Danielson, Conn.[1]; Torrington, Conn.[1]; Portland, Maine; Fall River, Mass.; Fitchburg, Mass.[1]; Lowell, Mass.; Milford, Mass.[1]; New Bedford, Mass.; North Adams, Mass.[1]; Providence, R. I.; Springfield, Vt.[1]

Group IV–B: Lawrence, Mass.; Southbridge-Webster, Mass.[1]; Burlington, Vt.[1]; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine.[1 2]

REGION II

Group I: None.

Group II: Rochester, N. Y.

Group III: Newark, N. J.; Perth Amboy, N. J.; Trenton, N. J.; Binghamton, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Syracuse, N. Y.

Group IV–A; Atlantic City, N. J.; Bridgeton, N. J.[1]; Long Branch, N. J.[1]; Paterson, N. J.; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N. Y.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Hudson, N. Y.[1]; Oswego-Fulton, N. Y.[1]; Utica-Rome, N. Y.; San Juan, P. R.

Group IV–B: Amsterdam, N. Y.[1]; Auburn, N. Y.[1]; Gloversville, N. Y.[1]; Mayaguez, P. R.; Ponce, P. R.

REGION III

Group I: None.

Group II: Richmond, Va.

Group III: Wilmington, Del.; Washington, D. C.; Baltimore, Md.; Charlotte, N. C.; Greensboro-High Point, N. C.; Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Lancaster, Pa.; York, Pa.; Hampton-Newport News-Warwick, Va.; Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.; Roanoke, Va.

Group IV–A: Asheville, N. C.; Durham, N. C.; Fayetteville, N. C.[1]; Kinston, N. C.[1]; Rocky Mount, N. C.[1]; Shelby-Kings Mountain, N. C.; Waynesville, N. C.[1]; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Berwick-Bloomsburg, Pa.[1]; Erie, Pa.; Lewistown, Pa.[1]; Meadville, Pa.[1]; New Castle, Pa.[1]; Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pa.[1]; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; Williamsport, Pa.[1]; Radford-Pulaski, Va.[1]; Clarksburg, W. Va.[1]; Huntington, W. Va.-Ashland, Ky.; Parkersburg, W. Va.[1]; Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio.

Group IV–B: Cumberland, Md.[1]; Atloona, Pa.; Butler, Pa.[1]; Clearfield-DuBois, Pa.[1]; Indiana, Pa.[1]; Johnstown, Pa.; Kittanning-Ford City, Pa.[1]; Lock Haven, Pa.[1]; Pottsville, Pa.[1]; Scranton, Pa.; Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Pa.[1]; Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa.[1]; Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Pa.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.[1]; Covington-Clifton Forge, Va.[1]; Richlands-Bluefield, Va.[1]; Beckley, W. Va.[1]; Bluefield, W. Va.[1]; Charleston, W. Va.; Fairmont, W. Va.[1]; Logan, W. Va.[1]; Morgantown, W. Va.[1]; Point Pleasant, W. Va.[1]; Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.[1]; Welch, W. Va.[1].

REGION IV

Group I: None.

Group II: Jacksonville, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.

Group III: Birmingham, Ala.; Mobile, Ala.; Miami, Fla.; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.; Columbus, Ga.; Macon, Ga.; Savannah, Ga.; Jackson, Miss.; Aiken, S. C.-Augusta, Ga.; Charleston, S. C.; Greenville, S. C.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.

Group IV–A: Alexander City, Ala.[1]; Anniston, Ala.[1]; Decatur, Ala.[1]; Florence-Sheffield, Ala.[1]; Gadsden, Ala.[1]; Talladega, Ala.[1]; Cedartown-Rockmart, Ga.[1]; Cordele, Ga.[1]; Greenville, Miss.[1]; Walterboro, S. C.[1]; Bristol-Johnson City- Kingsport, Tenn.-Va.[1]; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.

Group IV–B: Jasper, Ala.[1]; LaFollette-Jellico-Tazewell, Tenn.[1]; Newport, Tenn.[1]

REGION V

Group I: None.

Group II: Flint, Mich.; Lansing, Mich.; Saginaw, Mich.; Columbus, Ohio.

Group III: Louisville, Ky.; Detroit, Mich.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Akron, Ohio; Canton, Ohio; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio; Lorain-Elyria, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio.

Group IV–A: Frankfort, Ky.[1]; Owensboro, Ky.[1]; Battle Creek, Mich.; Bay City, Mich.[1]; Benton Harbor, Mich.[1]; Monroe, Mich.[1]; Muskegon, Mich.[1]; Port Huron, Mich.[1]; Athens-Logan-Nelsonville, Ohio [1]; Findlay-Tiffin-Fostoria, Ohio [1]; Mansfield, Ohio [1]; Marietta,

[1] Smaller area covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

[2] With the issuance of this release the Biddeford, Maine, area is being redefined to include several nearby townships in York County, Maine. As a result of the redefinition the name of the area has been changed to Biddeford-Sanford; the classification of the area has also been changed from IV–A to IV–B to reflect the somewhat higher volume of unemployment in the larger areas. The revised boundaries of the Biddeford-Sanford area are listed in the section on geographic boundaries of new smaller group IV areas on the following appendix.

[1] Smaller area covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

Ohio [1]; New Philadelphia-Dover, Ohio [1]; Newark, Ohio [1]; Sandusky-Fremont, Ohio [1]; Springfield, Ohio [1]; Toledo, Ohio; Zanesville, Ohio.[1]

Group IV–B: Corbin, Ky.[1]; Hazard, Ky.[1]; Henderson, Ky.[1]; Madisonville, Ky.[1]; Middlesboro-Harlan, Ky.[1]; Morehead-Grayson, Ky.[1]; Paintsville-Prestonburg, Ky.[1]; Pikeville, Ky.-Williamson, W. Va.[1]; Iron Mountain, Mich.[1]; Cambridge, Ohio.[1]

REGION VI

Group I: None.

Group II: Kenosha, Wis.; Madison, Wis.

Group III: Aurora, Ill.; Chicago, Ill.; Davenport, Iowa-Rock Island-Moline, Ill.; Joliet, Ill.; Peoria, Ill.; Rockford, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Racine, Wis.

Group IV–A: Galesburg, Ill.[1]; Mount Carmel-Olney, Ill.[1]; Connersville, Ind.[1]; Evansville, Ind.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Muncie, Ind.[1]; South Bend, Ind.; Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.; Beaver Dam, Wis.[1]; La Crosse, Wis.[1]

Group IV–B: Harrisburg, Ill.[1]; Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Ill.[1]; Litchfield, Ill.[1]; Mount Vernon, Ill.[1]; Michigan City-La Porte, Ind.[1]; Terre Haute, Ind.; Vincennes, Ind.[1]

REGION VII

Group I: None.

Group II: Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans.

Group III: Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Nebr.

Group IV–A: Burlington, Iowa [1]; Ottumwa, Iowa [1]; Sioux City, Iowa [1]; Joplin, Mo.[1]; St. Joseph, Mo.[1]; St. Louis, Mo.; Springfield, Mo.[1]

Group IV–B: Pittsburg, Kans.[1]

REGION VIII

Group I: None.

Group II: Tulsa, Okla.; Dallas, Tex.

Group III: Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.; Baton Rouge, La.; New Orleans, La.; Shreveport, La.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Austin, Tex.; Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; El Paso, Tex.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Houston, Tex.; San Antonio, Tex.

Group IV–A: Fort Smith, Ark.[1]; McAlester, Okla.[1]; Muskogee, Okla.[1]; Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.[1]

Group IV–B: None.

REGION IX

Group I: None.

Group II: Denver, Colo.

Group III: Salt Lake City, Utah.

Group IV–A: Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Group IV–B: None.

REGION X

Group I: None.

Group II: None.

Group III: Phoenix, Ariz.; Fresno, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Sarcamento, Calif.; San Bernardino-Riverside, Calif.; San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Stockton, Calif.; Honolulu, T. H.

Group IV–A: San Diego, Calif.

Group IV–B: None.

REGION XI

Group I: None.

Group II: None.

Group III: Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.

Group IV–A: Portland, Oreg.; Tacoma, Wash.

Group IV–B: None.

[1] Smaller area covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES OF NEW SMALLER GROUP IV AREAS (NOT PREVIOUSLY LISTED IN DIRECTORY OF IMPORTANT LABOR MARKET AREAS)

NAME OF AREA AND AREA DEFINITION

Areas classified in February

Galesburg, Ill.[1]: Knox and Warren Counties, Ill.

Mount Carmel-Olney, Ill.[1]: Edwards, Lawrence, Richland, and Wabash Counties, Ill.

Fayetteville, N. C.[1]: Cumberland County, N. C.

Rocky Mount, N. C.[1]: Edgecombe and Nash Counties, N. C.

Marietta, Ohio [1]: Monroe and Washington Counties, Ohio.

Long Branch, N. J.[1]: Monmouth County (except Millstone and Upper Freehold townships and Allentown and Roosevelt Boroughs), and Ocean County (except New Egypt and vicinity in Plumstead township), N. J.

Areas classified in March

Torrington, Conn.: Towns of Burlington and Hartland in Hartland County, Conn., and towns of Barkhamstead, Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Goshen, Harwinton, Litchfield, Morris, New Hartford, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Torrington, and Winchester in Litchfield County, Conn.

Greenville, Miss.: Washington County, Miss.

Bridgeton, N. J.: Cumberland and Salem Counties, N. J., and part of Buena Vista township (Landisville, Minatola, and Buena minor civil divisions and south) in Atlantic County, N. J.

Shelby-Kings Mountain, N. C.: Cleveland County, N. C.

New Philadelphia-Dover, Ohio: Carroll, Harrison, and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio.

Zanesville, Ohio: Morgan and Muskingum Counties, Ohio.

Lewistown, Pa.: Juniata and Mifflin Counties, Pa.

Meadville, Pa.: Crawford County (except boroughs of Centerville, Hydetown, Spartansburg, Titusville, and Townville; townships to Athens, Bloomfield, Oil Creek, Rome, Sparta, Steuben, and Troy), Pa.

Biddeford-Sanford, Me.[1]: Cities of Biddeford and Saco; towns of Acton, Alfred, Buxton, Cornish, Dayton, Hollis, Kennebunk,-port, Lebanon, Limerick, Limington, Lyman, Newfield, North Kennebunkport, Old Orchard Beach, Parsonfield, Sanford, Shapleigh, and Waterboro in York County.

[1] Revised definition.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I speak today to request congressional investigation of one of the most disturbing breaches of security I have witnessed in my 10 years of service in the House of Representatives. I refer to the publication of March 10, 1955, compiled under Republican auspices and discussed on the House floor on April 21 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. This is a 31-page pamphlet entitled "National Defense Under the Republican Administration—Today and Tomorrow." This memorandum purports to summarize the progress made by the present administration in strengthening our military defenses. In actual fact, this pamphlet constitutes a veritable gold mine of sensitive and hitherto classified military information for the use of our enemies. In my opinion, never has a single publication contained so much vital information of so much use to the Kremlin.

The document outlines the present strength of our Army in great detail, and tells exactly where the divisions and regiments of our Army will be stationed in June of next year. It gives a detailed breakdown of our naval strength as of today and a year from now. It lists the numbers and types of wings we have in our Air Force today, and portrays the precise buildup of our airpower between now and June 1957.

But the most disturbing feature of this document is the information it contains on new weapons in general, and on guided missiles in particular. The status of our guided missile program has properly been treated as one of our most closely guarded military secrets. Despite this, the memorandum in question gives a detailed description of more than a dozen types of missiles we now have under development. It goes so far as to describe how many of these missiles would be employed and it sets forth the nature of their propulsion system.

I grant that some of the individual items contained in this pamphlet have been previously leaked to the press under unauthorized circumstances. But two wrongs do not make a right, and a security breach in the past is no less serious for being compounded in the present. In all sincerity, I was shocked when I studied this document and discovered that it contained, in one place, many pieces of information which should never have been released in the first place, and which should still have been classified as of now.

How did this all come about?

The document states on page 11 that, insofar as its discussion of new weapons is concerned, the "information and data in this list have been cleared by the Department of Defense for publication purposes." Yesterday, however, the Pentagon said that the Department of Defense had not approved this pamphlet for publication. Yesterday, also, Secretary of Defense Wilson stated that the document contained information about three technical items which had not been previously cleared for publication. I myself believe that a more careful study of this document would reveal at least a dozen items which have never been published before because of security reasons—and which should not have been revealed today.

This pamphlet, furthermore, appeared at a time when the Pentagon was supposedly tightening up security, and supposedly revamping its information and clearance procedures to put a stop to the unending series of security leaks from the Department of Defense.

With each week that passes, the American press has become more and more conscious of the blackout on legitimate news which has been descending over the Pentagon. More and more, responsible journalists are fearing that arbitrary information control procedures

are being used by the Department of Defense and the executive branch as a whole—not for the proper purpose of safeguarding classified information but for the improper purpose of concealing bureaucratic fumbling. As one example of this, I cite the fact that the information on radioactive fallout from the hydrogen tests of a year ago spring—information vitally needed for realistic civil-defense planning—was withheld from the American people for almost a full year.

I wish to make it plain that my remarks are not intended to gain partisan advantage, and that I would have been no less critical of this pamphlet had it been issued under the auspices of my own party.

Yet the publication of this document raises grave questions. Is there to be a double standard of security—one for the American press, and another for the political strategists of this administration? Can it be also that Secretary of Defense Wilson wears two hats—one where the press and the public at large are concerned, and another when Republican strategists try to win a few additional votes by irresponsible publication of security information which should be tightly held and closely guarded?

I will pass over the fact that this pamphlet paints an entirely too rosy picture of our real military strength. I will say nothing of the fact that the document advances a military doctrine refuted by all history—that new weapons can somehow bring about miraculous reductions in taxes and in our need for trained military manpower. I will ignore the fact that the new weapons system cited in this document as examples of progressive military thinking on the part of this administration were without exception proposed and developed by the previous administration.

My real concern today is not with the misleading nature of this pamphlet—my concern is with the question of the security of vital information. Both President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Defense have rightly warned against making life easier for our enemies by gathering military data from a wide variety of sources and assembling it under one cover. And yet here, in this document issued under Republican Party auspices, we have a perfect example of how to simplify the work of our foes by handing them sensitive data, free of charge, on a platter.

Every year, our Nation spends hundreds of millions of dollars in guarding our precious military secrets. Notwithstanding this, we are now treated to the spectacle of previously unpublished information being set forth in a pamphlet issued under a partisan label. Is this what the administration means by nonpartisanship in national security policy?

I am confident that, as we meet here today, the Kremlin is now congratulating itself on its good fortune in getting this free gift of information. I am sure that the Soviet leaders find it hard to understand the folly of those who were rash enough to permit publication of this document. I predict that our enemies will reproduce this pamphlet by the thousands and circulate it throughout the intelligence service and armed forces of the communistic world.

It is high time that we put a stop to this kind of folly; it is high time that we make sure there will be no recurrence of this disgraceful episode. I therefore urge the House Armed Services Committee immediately to undertake a nonpartisan and thorough investigation of this episode, in order to determine who was responsible for this dereliction in security, and in order to find whether remedial legislation is now needed to prevent a repetition of this sorry incident.

THE LATE JOHN W. FLANNAGAN

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce the death of a former very eminent Member of this body, the Honorable John W. Flannagan. Mr. Flannagan represented the ninth Congressional District of Virginia for 9 consecutive terms. He was one of the outstanding Members of this House during his long service. He was held in such high regard by his fellow citizens of the Ninth Congressional District that during all his service he was never challenged by opposition from his own party and was elected by large majorities for each one of the 9 terms which he served in the Congress from a district which historically had been represented by a Member from the opposite party.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Flannagan was born in Louisa County, Va., in my district. He comes from an old established Virginia family that is so highly regarded in his home county. He was my warm, personal, as well as political, friend. He was educated in Louisa County in the public schools, at Washington and Lee University, and obtained his law degree from that university in 1907. He served as commonwealth attorney for Buchanan County, Va. He was married to Miss Frances D. Pruner of Mendota, Washington County, Va., in 1910. They have 3 children; 2 boys and 1 girl. He was elected to the 72d Congress and consecutively thereafter to and through the 80th Congress. He was a Member of this House who was popular with all parties and all factions. He was an outstanding personage in that he had the courage of his convictions. He stated them forcefully but without animosity.

He had a host of friends in the House during his long service here of whom I am proud to record myself as one of the closest.

During the latter part of his service, he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and served there with great distinction and performed eminent service for the agricultural industry of this country. In fact, he brought about the enactment of the so-called tobacco bill which has the distinction, I think, of being the one feature of agricultural legislation that we have here which has met with complete success during its entire existence and has met with the approval and now meets with the approval of all parties concerned in the production and sale and consumption of that product. He performed a great service while in this body. We all regretted to see him leave here voluntarily as he did, and it is with a sense of sadness and personal loss that it becomes my unpleasant duty to announce his passing.

To his faithful and devoted wife who during the last years of his illness, dedicated her whole time and energy to his care and nursing, I extend my sincere and affectionate sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman representing the Ninth District of Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] may extend his remarks at this point and include therein a resolution of regret adopted this morning by the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply saddened today to learn of the death of a beloved former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. Flannagan, Jr., who served the Virginia Ninth District ably and nobly for 18 years. He had been in ill health for several years, but his passing comes as a great shock to me and to his thousands of friends in southwest Virginia, throughout the State of Virginia, and the Nation.

John W. Flannagan, Jr., had the respect and love of almost every resident of his district, no matter of what political faith they may be nor their station in life. He made a distinguished record during his tenure in the Congress; he was conscientious in all that he did; he worked untiringly to better the lot of his constituents and the people of this Nation.

I heard of John W. Flannagan, Jr., from my own late father, who spoke of him with respect born of knowing of his years of service. As I grew up in the Ninth District, I came to know of his devotion to duty, his courage in facing the issues of the day, and his conviction that the farmer held an all-important place in our Nation's economy.

John W. Flannagan, Jr., was born on a farm near Trevilians, Louisa County, Va., on February 20, 1885. He attended public schools and was graduated from the law department of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., in 1907. He was admitted to the bar the same year and started on a career as a brilliant lawyer, prosecuting attorney, an energetic, conscientious, and valuable Member of this great body, and a true statesman.

John W. Flannagan, Jr., commenced his practice of law in Appalachia, Wise County, Va. He served as Commonwealth attorney for Buchanan County,

Va., in 1916–17, then moved to Clintwood, Va., in 1917, and then to Bristol, Va., in 1925, continuing to practice law in both of these areas. During the period of 1917–30, he also engaged in the banking profession.

Having demonstrated his ability as an attorney, John W. Flannagan, Jr., entered the congressional campaign of 1930 at the request of the Ninth District Democrats who recognized him as the best candidate for the district seat. He won that race handily and was never seriously challenged after being elected to the 72d Congress. He served his district through every Congress until the 81st when he helped elect an outstanding successor.

John W. Flannagan, Jr., became a member of the House Agriculture Committee when he came to Congress and remained a member of that great committee throughout his tenure. He served as its chairman in the 79th Congress and also as a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. In 1945 he was a congressional adviser to the first session of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at Quebec.

During the entire 18 years that this distinguished Virginian served as a member of the Agriculture Committee, he championed the Nation's farmers. He was closely associated with the farm legislation approved during the administration of President Roosevelt and gave his support to those measures which he believed would benefit the farmer. He helped draft the parity plan for farm-price supports which has played such an important role in the farm economy of this country. He also helped push through to completion the acreage-allotment programs for such basic crops as tobacco and wheat.

In 1948, John W. Flannagan, Jr., was mentioned prominently as being the best choice for the Cabinet post of Secretary of Agriculture. He declined to be considered for the position, saying that he had no ambitions for such a Cabinet post. He thus retired from his seat in the House to Bristol where he reentered private law practice with his son.

Mr. Speaker, John W. Flannagan, Jr., was a silvery-tongued orator who was able to captivate audiences with his fiery brilliance. He was widely in demand as a speaker and I am sure that the older Members of this body recall his speeches on the floor of the House. I can recall vividly hearing him speak in the Ninth District and I know that his passing at his home yesterday will sadden the thousands who have thrilled to his speeches.

The Nation's press has taken note of Mr. Flannagan's death in their news columns this morning. He is described in the New York Times as a stanch Democratic liberal who was identified with farm legislation throughout his 18 years in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to sum up the many facets of the Honorable John W. Flannagan's career. He had a multitude of interests and his life has been so fruitful and full of service that it is impossible to do justice to his memory. I am not blessed with his oratorical abilities, but I know that every Member of this body who can recall this great man's speeches realize what I am trying to say.

I count John W. Flannagan, Jr., among those great Virginians who have served their country from the time of George Washington.

It is futile for me to evaluate John W. Flanngan's contribution to our country with a few poor words. His work on the floor of the House, his services on the Agriculture Committee in the formation of countless laws of the land, his shining intellect, his bright spirit, and his love for his fellowman have engraved themselves permanently in our minds.

This morning the House Agriculture Committee adopted a resolution in memory of Mr. Flannagan.

Mr. Speaker, in all humbleness, I wish to say that I feel a great void has been left in my life with the passing of this outstanding American. I am humble in the knowledge that I fill the seat of such a great man as was John W. Flannagan.

I am sad, indeed, at his passing. However, I know that he will live forever in hearts of his thousands of friends and his colleagues who knew him during his service in the Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know John W. Flannagan well. I considered him a close and certainly a valued friend. The district that he represented is a great district and has been represented in the years I have been in Congress by outstanding men of both parties.

John Flannagan's greatest service was to agriculture. He was chairman of that great Committee on Agriculture, and one of the ablest and most effective chairmen of that committee that I have ever known since I have been here; and I have seen outstanding chairmen from both parties.

That district was fortunate in having a man like John Flannagan. It was fortunate in his successor, Tom Fugate, who was an outstanding businessman and was a wonderful Member of this House. The district now has the honor of being represented by a brilliant young man by the name of PAT JENNINGS, whom all of us know and respect for his gentlemanly traits, his high character, and his splendid ability.

My sympathy goes out to Mrs. Flannagan and all who were related to him, and to his friends in that district. I had the privilege of speaking in that district last year, and the greatest demonstration that occurred during all of that evening was when I referred to my admiration for John Flannagan. They were devoted to him. They loved him, because he was the type and character of man people could trust and for whom they could have a great and tender affection.

I say again, my sympathy goes out to his loved ones, his relatives, and to the thousands of his friends in that part of the great State of Virginia.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the Committee on Agriculture a number of years ago, John Flannagan was one of the senior members. I looked upon him as one of those who was then shaping the agricultural legislation of the country. After I had served several years on that committee, John Flannagan became the chairman of that committee. Although we have had many fine chairmen, and have today an outstanding chairman, and have had great chairmen of that committee under the administration of both parties, John Flannagan set a fine and an enviable record for all who might follow him.

John Flannagan served as chairman of the committee in a manner that endeared him to all of the members of the committee. He maintained at the same time the full confidence and trust of the membership of the House so that when he came on this floor with proposed legislation from the Committee on Agriculture, the Members of this House knew that they were receiving an accurate, a fair, and an intelligent appraisal of the problems that were presented.

We, as members of the committee, all felt a very personal loss when John Flannagan decided not to come back to Congress. His retirement from Congress was entirely voluntary. John Flannagan could have stayed in Congress as long as he desired.

I did not know at that time that he was suffering any kind of ill health, but he must have had some premonition of the affliction that later came upon him, because he has suffered for a number of years. For some years he has been unable to speak to his friends, but his friends were able to speak to him. His friends have appreciated John Flannagan all these years as we do now. Not only the members of the Committee on Agriculture, but all of the Members of the House of Representatives who knew him and all of the people of this country whom he served so well and so faithfully are going to join with his family, his wife and children, and his numerous friends in Bristol in expressing the real loss we feel at his parting. We are saddened by the news that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, brings us.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may during the day extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD, and that other Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in my early service in the Congress it was my privi-

lege to be associated with John Flannagan. I learned to love and respect him for his good judgment, his keen sense of values, his dry and subtle humor, but most of all for the intelligence and integrity which personified him.

I was saddened by his decision to retire from active service, and subsequently by his illness, and I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to the members of his family.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLTON, JACKSON COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the good citizens of Holton, Jackson County, Kans., I would like at this time to extend an invitation to all Members of Congress to attend their 100th anniversary celebration this June. As a special designation of all Members of Congress attending the centennial, you will be presented with a necktie exactly like the one I have on.

STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT OF THE ROSE AS THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to insert into the RECORD, memorials to the Congress by the Legislatures of the States of Ohio and New York, and the city of Lorain, Ohio, in support of House Joint Resolution 102, which I have introduced, and Senate Joint Resolution 11, introduced by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. This legislation would designate the rose as the national flower of the United States.

MEMORIAL FROM THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF OHIO

House Joint Resolution 22

Joint resolution to memorialize Congress to pass Senate Joint Resolution 11 designating the rose as the national flower of the United States

Whereas the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator from the State of Maine, and FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman from the State of Ohio, have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 11, designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; and

Whereas the State of Ohio, and the kindly and well-meaning people of this great State, have long cultivated, admired, and loved the rose as a flower and as a symbol, emblematic of the many virtues which it represents; and

Whereas in recognition of the cultural and spiritual value that the beauty of the rose instills in the hearts and in the minds of men and the nobler virtues that it fosters, it is fitting and proper that we here in America give evidence of our idealism in proclaiming and in naming the rose, which God has given to mankind, as the national flower of our Nation; and

Whereas this matter of naming a national flower is and should be a matter of nationwide concern: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That we, the members of the Ohio General Assembly, memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass Senate Joint Resolution 11 naming and designating the rose as the national flower of the United States;

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to both of the United States Senators, to the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator from the State of Maine, and FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman from the State of Ohio, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Ohio.

KLINE L. ROBERTS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.
JOHN BROWN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted March 24, 1955.

MEMORIAL FROM THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Resolution 106

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the House joint resolution proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States

Whereas by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, it is proposed to designate and adopt the rose as the national flower of the United States; and

Whereas the finest qualities cherished by mankind are reflected in the beauty of the rose, which has been the unofficial flower of the State of New York and appears to be the overwhelming choice of the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to adopt, with all convenient speed, House Joint Resolution No. 102 or its companion resolution in the United States Senate, which provides that the flower, commonly known as the rose, be designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States, and that the President declare such fact by proclamation; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, April 2, 1955. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:
WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LORAIN, OHIO

Resolution 4031

Resolution declaring council's approval and recommendation of the rose as the national flower

Whereas the rose has been suggested as the symbolic flower of the United States of America by Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, and its adoption as the national flower by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Lorain, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the council of the city of Lorain, Ohio, goes on record as approving and recommending and does hereby approve and recommend the rose as the national flower of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the council be authorized to mail a copy of this resolution to Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, Washington, D. C.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

JOHN A. REPKO,
President.
JOHN C. JAWORSKI,
Mayor.

Passed April 18, 1955.
Attest:
ANTHONY VAZZANO,
Clerk.

Approved April 19, 1955.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEARNS and to include several statements.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and to include an address by David S. Smith, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, made at Lowell, Mass., to the junior chamber of commerce.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of chemicals in food.

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous material.

Mr. UDALL in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include a speech by the Honorable GEORGE DONDERO.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. FASCELL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

739. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 26 reports received from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force covering 38 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 entitled, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

740. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

741. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

742. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a proposed increase in the limitation on expenses for the fiscal year 1956 for the Export-Import Bank of Washington, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $15,000 for the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 224. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 12, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 109. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 489. A bill authorizing the transfer of a portion of the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range tract in the city of Austin, Tex., comprising 189.11 acres, to the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 755. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4294. A bill to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5170. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5297. A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5841. A bill to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5842. A bill to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5844. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4573. A bill authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2984. A bill authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5923. A bill to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5924. A bill to provide for the refund of certain estate taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5925. A bill to provide that Federal employees who are members of the National Guard shall not suffer loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating for periods of service pursuant to call by the Governor of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5926. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5927. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit use in food of new food additives and new packaging materials which have not been pretested to establish safety for their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 5928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5929. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5930. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to State veterans' homes shall be discontinued if fewer than half the beds in the home are available for domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5931. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 125th anniversary of the establishment of the savings and loan movement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to designate April 30 of each year to be known as Presidents' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 225. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the factors involved in the separation or proposed separation of Capt. Eugene A. Novak from service in the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider favorably the proposed revision of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 5932. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Hoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5933. A bill for the relief of Estera Morovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5934. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5935. A bill to provide for the conveyance of public land to Molly Lancaster and Mrs. Elizabeth Thomas, Niceville, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement by Senator Lehman Before Senate Subcommittee on Labor in Connection With Poposed Amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 26 I appeared before the Senate subcommittee on labor in support of S. 662, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR IN SUPPORT OF S. 662 AMENDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to testify on behalf of S. 662, which I introduced on January 21, for myself, Senator GREEN, Senator KILGORE, Senator MCNAMARA, Senator NEELY, and Senator PASTORE.

While not a member of this subcommittee, I have, as you know, been present during most of the testimony thus far on these various bills before you dealing with amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. I do not intend to speak at length at this time.

During these hearings, I have many times stated the basic sentiments which have guided me in sponsoring this bill providing a $1.25 an hour minimum wage and increased coverage. I would like, on this occasion, to highlight the major political, economic, and moral issues which I believe are at the heart of these proposals, affecting the well-being of millions of Americans, their families, and their children.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details of my bill, including the substantial increase in coverage which would result from its enactment. Other witnesses have testified on these technical aspects of coverage, and I know that the subcommittee has an excellent staff analysis of S. 662, as well as of the other bills on the subject. I feel strongly that the increased coverage and the elimination of unjustified exemptions are completely consistent with the basic purpose of the act and with the need to provide a fair amount of economic justice for all Americans.

Mr. President, I remember the arguments that were made against the first minimum wage bill back in the thirties. These same arguments were heard again every time proposals were under consideration by the Congress to raise the minimum wage, or to expand its coverage.

The cry was heard, in the first place, that the establishment of the minimum wage constituted regimentation, and worse: That it would drive many, if not most, of the businesses of America into bankruptcy, that it would result in economic ruin and devastation.

Those arguments were without foundation in fact when they were made 20 years ago, and again 6 years ago. They are without real basis today.

It is generally conceded today—at least no public official of any party would, I think, dare deny it—that a Fair Labor Standards Act is a sound and essential part of our economic structure. It is a necessary safeguard for the bottom ranks of the Nation's labor force.

There is, of course, the question of what a fair minimum wage ought to be. In my judgment, the figures that have been written into law have always been too low. The figure of 75 cents an hour was too low when it was approved in 1949. It is, of course, far too low today.

Since the time the first minimum wage bill was passed, our economy, far from faltering, zoomed ahead with giant strides. Never was progress greater than in the years immediately following 1949. The increase in the minimum wage level in 1949 gave a new impetus to the national economy.

Since 1945 we have had an inflation. It has been a severe inflation. It has been especially marked in the years since 1949, as a result of price increases brought on by the war in Korea.

The minimum wage has not risen since 1949 and the minimum wage in 1949 was already set too low.

It is now more than 5 years since the time the 1949 amendments to the Wages and Hours Act went into effect. During these 5 years, national income has increased from $218.9 billion to more than $303 billion—an increase of over 38 percent. In these 5 years, the gross national product expanded from $265 billion to more than $362 billion—or almost 37 percent. Finally, corporation profits after taxes increased from $16.1 billion to $18.8 billion at the end of 1954—or 16.8 percent.

Most of this expansion took place between 1949 and 1953. The expansion of our economy has proceeded at a slower pace during the last 2 years. If we are to have a dynamic and expanding economy to keep pace with our expanding population, the rate of expansion must be greater than it has been in the last 2½ years.

The passage of the Minimum Wage Bill I have introduced—increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and expanding the coverage to include about five million workers not now covered—would be a step in the right direction. It would help restore a dynamic quality to our economy. It would be a shot in the arm—a much-needed shot in the arm.

Testimony has been heard from some who complain that this increase in minimum wage would ruin this or that industry. While I am not in a position to comment on any particular allegation to this effect, I know that in general the result would be increased prosperity as a result of increased purchasing power.

Of course, it is generally conceded, even by President Eisenhower, that some increase in the minimum wage is desirable, but the increase recommended by the President is a paltry and insufficient amount. It reflects a backward-looking view of our economy. Ninty cents an hour might have been a fair figure in 1949. It is not a fair figure in 1955. Productivity has increased. There is unemployment as a result of automation and as a result of industries moving to low-wage areas. The increase of the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour would help meet the consequences of these developments.

I do not think it is necessary for me to prove that $1.25 an hour is a reasonable figure. I think it is up to the opponents of this measure to prove their case. Certainly the inflation has been no less than the amount of increase proposed in the minimum wage. And when we take into consideration that the minimum wage set in 1949 was already too low, we can easily see that a minimum wage of $1.25 would not be excessive.

In speaking of the desirability of increasing the minimum wage, I do not want to neglect those provisions of the pending bill providing for increased coverage. They are equally as important as the increase to $1.25 an hour. Too many of our workers are outside the protection of the Minimum Wage Law. I see no reason for many of the exemptions now in the law.

Of course, it should be borne in mind that in the last 3 years much damage has been done to the Fair Labor Standards Act by faulty administration. The law has not been policed as well as it should have been. Enforcement has been weak and tragically inadequate. I hope that these aspects of the situation will be remedied.

One of the most desirable effects of the bill I am proposing would be to establish a more uniform floor under the wage structure of the entire country. It is regrettable that there should be a lower standard in some parts of our country than is the case in others.

In this connection, it is paradoxical that so many Americans who have recently learned that what occurs 5,000 miles distant can affect the lives of every American, have not yet seen that what depresses the economy of one section of this country injures the economy of the entire country.

We all take pride today in stating and restating the lesson we have learned after two great wars—that we live in an interdependent world. When will it be said that all of us realize that we live in an interdependent Nation, and accept fully all the ramifications of that axiom?

One of the most potent arguments for a $1.25 minimum wage is in the finding and declaration of policy of the present law. This states that substandard labor conditions constitute "an unfair method of competition in commerce," and cause "commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States."

I need not reiterate to members of this subcommittee the problems of the runaway plants and industries which have been a cause of so much economic and human distress in many areas of the country, including my own, during the past few years. I do wish to emphasize, however, that these plants and industries have not only injured the economic well-being of workers and communities in the areas they have left. They are also an economic drag on the peoples and communities in the areas into which they have fled in their search for cheaper labor and substandard working conditions.

I have heard it said, even in these subcommittee hearings, that the administration's 90-cents-an-hour recommendation and its timid excursion into the field of expanded coverage does not really represent its desires, but is dictated by political considerations and the need for passage of some legislation, however meaningless, in this area. If such is the case, this represents one of the greatest abdications of leadership on an issue affecting the health and welfare of the American people that has ever come to my attention.

Congress, I am convinced, if given the proper leadership, would approve a bill raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and increasing coverage.

I hope, therefore, that this subcommittee, realizing the seriousness of the legislation before it and the overriding need for prompt action in this field, will report to the full committee a bill to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to increase coverage, substantially as outlined in S. 662.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a statement by Mr. George W. Ball, in which he answered some of the allegations and charges made against him before the Committee on Finance in the hearings on H. R. 1, extending the Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was much disturbed to learn that in the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, a statement was placed in the record near the conclusion of the hearings that severely attacks the character and motives of certain members of the committee for a national trade policy.

It has been reported that this material, on the basis that it is a part of the Senate hearings, is being circulated. Since it contains many misstatements of facts, innuendoes, personal attacks as "Foreign Agents" on many fine Americans, I feel that the Senate should be advised as to the truth in this matter.

Further, I feel that in sponsoring or opposing legislation, Americans, of whatever political faith they may be, should be allowed to urge the legislation without having their patriotism questioned or being accused of representing foreign governments.

Certainly the Senate, in the consideration H. R. 1, which extends this basic trade policy of this country under both Democratic and Republican administrations, should not have its attention distracted by such personal attacks in the form of statements placed in committee hearings. Because of the lateness of this insertion in the record, I feel that a clarifying statement is not only fair but necessary.

We should debate and even perhaps disagree on issues such as H. R. 1 as Americans and any attempt to allege or insinuate that foreign influence motivates legislation is not in the interest of sound consideration of important legislation. I shall perhaps differ radically from some of those on the committee for a national trade policy on some of the provisions of the act, but I certainly respect their rights to speak as Americans, in this case. Too often in recent years major debates have been thrown off the track by alleging that certain proponents or opponents of legislation were Communists or scoundrels or both. Such interjection of bitterness—or foreign intrigue and smears damages our standing in the eyes of our friendly allies and of the world.

The material to which I object was levied against the committee for a national trade policy and are of this order. They were largely designed to attack the character of the supporters of H. R. 1 and are malicious, irrevelant and unfounded. The material was placed in the record by a man named Robert M. Burr, who purports to be president of an organization calling itself the National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York.

Mr. Burr's attack was filed with the Senate Finance Committee just before the hearings closed, too late for reply or investigation and was included in the published hearings of the committee at pages 2306 to 2331.

I do not know Mr. Burr nor the interests he represents. Who his clients or customers are or who pays its expenses is not disclosed.

Conversely, the Committee for a National Trade Policy is a well-known organization and has made no secret of its sponsorship or activities because it has nothing to hide.

The Committee for a National Trade Policy is a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. It has about 1,000 members, of which approximately 450 of them are corporations, many being the largest and most important in the United States. There are 550 individuals associated with it as members, among them many leaders in the business world. On its advisory board are to be found representatives of major labor and farm groups.

It is important to note that this committee for the first time in history has joined important elements of American business and industry together, not to work for import quotas or subsidies or higher tariffs, but in an effort to assist in the development of a national trade policy.

The forces in the United States advocating higher tariff protection have long been well organized, for which every right exists. These include the American Tariff League, the National Labor-Management Council, and other bodies which support protective tariffs. The same is true of the many national trade associations which for most part have taken positions either against H. R. 1 or are in favor of its substantial amendment.

The recommendations of President Eisenhower and the report of the Randall Commission have been actively supported by the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Now it is supporting strongly H. R. 1.

Many of the most distinguished leaders of business in this country sit upon the board of directors of the committee and take an active part in its proceedings. The positions they advocate are in accord with the positions long held and publicly expressed by these men.

One of the principal points of attack in Mr. Burr's statement, graced only by the dignity of being included in the printed transcript of the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, is largely devoted to attempting to demonstrate that a lawyer named George W. Ball was responsible for the creation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy—that Mr. Ball has dominated the committee—and that Mr. Ball has been motivated by the fact that the law firm of which he is a member has included among its many clients several foreign business interests and has acted as counsel for various agencies for the French Government. Because Mr. Ball and his firm have had foreign clients in the past, Mr. Burr implies that the Senate should vote down H. R. 1.

If America is to have foreign trade and intercourse with other nations, our distinguished attorneys will in the course of their regular practice have clients from foreign lands. But it is a fantastic argument indeed that because an American lawyer has represented foreign clients the Senate should not pass legislation in the national interest of the United States.

Neither should the tag "foreign agent" be applied—else this necessary legal service and practice by members of the bar will take on a connotation of questionable patriotism.

It is far even more fantastic for Mr. Burr to make such an attack when neither Mr. Ball nor his firm have represented any clients in support of H. R. 1—nor have they been associated with the Committee for a National Trade Policy since long before H. R. 1 was introduced. Neither has this attorney nor his firm taken any part in trying to secure the passage of this bill—whether on behalf of the Committee for a National Trade Policy or for any other organization, company, or individual.

I have known Mr. Ball for many years. I know him to be an able and competent attorney, active in many phases of service to America, as an official and as a private citizen. In fairness to him and to the Committee for a National Trade Policy, he should have the right to keep the record straight. I would like to read into the record a statement prepared by Mr. Ball, commenting on the charges that have been made against him.

He is the holder of the Medal for Freedom, given him in recognition of his services during the war. His patriotism, his standing, and his dedication to public service should be unquestioned.

Mr. Ball's statement is as follows:

"Since July 1946, I have been a member of the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Hamilton, which has its principal office in New York City, and also maintains offices under the name of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Ball in Washington, D. C., and Paris, France. The firm comprises more than 45 lawyers. It is engaged in the general practice of law.

"While the great bulk of the firm's clients are United States corporations and individuals, it has in the course of its practice also represented certain foreign clients. Whenever such representation has come within the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the firm has fully complied with that act.

"In the course of the statement submitted by Mr. Robert Burr to the Senate Committee on Finance, I am described as a founder of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc. Mr. Burr seeks to imply that I was the leading spirit in the creation of that organization and that I was motivated by the fact that my firm represented some foreign clients.

"The facts are quite the contrary.

"On July 14, 1953, I received a telegram from Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of directors of General Mills, Inc., asking me to a dinner in New York to meet with a group of prominent American businessmen to discuss the formation of a proposed Citizens Committee for the Development of International Economic Relations.

"Present at the meeting besides Mr. Bullis were Mr. John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase National Bank; Mr. Joseph P. Spang, Jr., president the Gillette Co.; Mr. Ralph I. Straus, a director of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.; and Mr. Stewart F. Louchheim, president, Stewart F. Loucheim Co. of Philadelphia. I had not previously met any of these gentlemen except Mr. McCloy and Mr. Straus. I had been invited to the meeting because of my known interest in trade policy. I was asked to express my views with regard to the form of organization of a committee and the kind of program it should undertake.

"After this meeting I was advised that Mr. John S. Coleman had accepted the invitation of Mr. Bullis to undertake to organize such a committee. Mr. Coleman is president of the Burroughs Corp. and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. He was at that time also president of the board of commerce of Detroit.

"In August 1953 my law firm was asked by Mr. Coleman to act as counsel of the organizing group in supervising the legal steps necessary to create the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of the State of New York. When the committee was organized, my firm was retained as general counsel and I was elected secretary, with the task of keeping the minutes, and also a director. The articles of incorporation were filed with the secretary of state of the State of New York on September 16, 1953, and the organization meeting of the incorporators was held on September 17, 1953. The first meeting of the board of directors was also held on September 17, 1953. Under the certificate of incorporation, Messrs. Bullis, Coleman, Spang, Taft, and I,

along with Mr. Charles H. Percy, president, Bell & Howell Co., and Mr. Morris S. Rosenthal, then president, Stein, Hall & Co., Inc., were to hold office as directors of the committee until its first annual meeting. At the first meeting of the board of directors on September 17, 1953, Messrs. William L. Batt, Edward Littlejohn, Thomas B. McCabe, John J. McCloy, Ralph I. Straus, and Clarence Francis were also elected as directors.

"I mention these facts only because Mr. Burr has sought to draw some malign inference from the appearance of my name on the formal organization papers of the committee and refers to me more than once as being the 'founding secretary' or as having 'founded' the organization.

"The second part of Mr. Burr's attack on me consists of an attempt to show that in my relations with the committee I was really acting on behalf of certain foreign clients. Again, the facts are wholly contrary.

Let me make it emphatically clear that neither my firm nor I, nor, to my knowledge, any member or associate of my firm, has ever contributed one cent to the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Nor has any contribution ever been made by any foreign client which my firm represented; in fact, during the period that I served as a director it was an inflexible policy of the committee never to accept a contribution of any kind from any foreign company or interest. I recall, for example, that shortly after the committee was formed it refused a contribution offered by a Canadian company. Since I am no longer a director or officer of the committee I cannot speak for it today, but I should be amazed if there has been any change in this established committee policy.

"The relations of my law firm with the committee were on a professional basis. Not only did my firm make no financial contribution to the committee, it received from the committee fees amounting to $20,000 for the work it performed as general counsel. The implication in Mr. Burr's pamphlet that the services which my firm or I performed for the Committee for a National Trade Policy were compensated for by the fees which my firm may have received for work performed on behalf of foreign clients—work entirely unrelated to United States trade policy—is both absurd and insulting.

"Mr. Burr attempts to make a great deal out of the fact that in the early months of 1953, my firm had represented the Venezuelan chambers of commerce (composed of private firms doing business in Venezuela). Our representation was in connection with proposed legislation that would restrict the import of oil into the United States. My firm, in turn, retained a number of prominent law firms in various parts of the country to explain the issues involved to American companies in their communities. Included among these firms was that of Headley, Sibbald & Taft, of Cincinnati. Mr. Charles P. Taft, of that firm, had the previous year been the Republican candidate for Governor of Ohio. I knew him to be an expert in the field of commercial policy.

"My firm ceased active work on behalf of the Venezuelan chambers of commerce on August 1, 1953, and withdrew its registration for that client under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That was 6 weeks prior to the incorporation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

"When the Committee for a National Trade Policy was established, I informed the directors of these facts. I informed them also that my firm was then acting, and had acted for several years, as legal adviser to certain agencies of the French Government.

"Let me make it entirely clear, however, that my firm has at no time undertaken or attempted, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the French Government or any other foreign government, to influence the United States Congress with respect to legislation in connection with international trade, commercial policy, or any other matter. To the extent that our services for the French Government may have involved attention to international trade or commercial policy, those services have been confined to the traditional lawyer's function of interpreting laws or regulations.

"Knowing my interest in the subject of trade policy which had long preceded any professional representation in this field, the directors of the committee were of the opinion that, in view of all the circumstances, no fairminded person would misinterpret my professional activities in such a way as to cause any embarrassment to the committee or its work.

"In October 1954, I submitted my resignation as a director and officer of the committee for a National Trade Policy, as well as the resignation of my firm as the committee's general counsel. I did this entirely on my own initiative, without any suggestion from any officer, director, or member of the committee. I explained to the directors of the committee that my firm was considering a proposal to represent certain clients in connection with a matter bordering on trade policy (not covered by the provisions of H. R. 1 or any proposed amendments thereto), and that I wished to avoid any possibility of embarrassment to the committee because of innocent or deliberate misinterpretation in connection with this representation. My resignation was accepted by the directors of the committee at their annual meeting on November 2, 1954. This was more than 2 months prior to the introduction of H. R. 1, and neither my firm nor I has represented any clients in support of H. R. 1."

In view of Mr. Ball's statement—and I have confidence in what he says—I think we should return the argument on this important piece of legislation to the merits. I feel we have a serious task confronting us to chart the course of this country in its commercial dealings with the rest of the world. To perform that task properly will take all the sober and informed attention which we can muster. We shall not succeed if we are deflected by unfounded attacks or mean insinuations on character and motives.

Elizabeth Jane Hench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 2, Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, of New Cumberland, Pa., will observe her 100th birthday anniversary.

This event will be marked by a celebration on Sunday May 1 when the Medical Society of Pennsylvania will present this splendid lady with a plaque, which reads:

The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania extends greetings and felicitations to Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, born May 2, 1855, in recognition of one whose life span exemplifies healthful living.

The presentation will be made at the home of Mrs. J. Cover Sterline, daughter of Mrs. Hench, in New Cumberland, by Dr. Edward S. Kronenberg, Jr., president of the Cumberland County Medical Society. Later there will be a birthday party, at which there will be five generations of Mrs. Hench's family.

Doctors advise me that Mrs. Hench is in excellent physical condition and retains full use of all her faculties.

I am sure I express the sentiments of my colleagues in wishing this great lady a most happy birthday.

Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday it was my pleasure to attend the exercises on the Capitol grounds honoring the 133d anniversary of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant. This significant celebration is an annual event, and I was pleased to see that it was attended by a large number of people. The Marine Band played appropriate music; veteran and patriotic organizations laid wreaths at the monument; introductory remarks were made by Col. Randle Bond Truett, Chief of the National Memorials and Historic Sites Section, and Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the former President, expressed his appreciation for the observance.

The principal speaker was our amiable, capable, and devoted public servant, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, who spoke eloquently on the subject: Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man. I earnestly solicit the attention of my colleagues to Representative DONDERO's address.

ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT: THE MAN

(Address of GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress at the Grant Memorial in Washington, D. C., April 27, 1955)

One hundred and thirty-three years ago today, Ulysses S. Grant, one of our greatest Americans, was born.

It is not my purpose to dwell on his brilliant military career nor his political career as President of the United States. The great man in whose memory we have met to do him honor had certain striking elements of character which made him what he was and which enabled him to accomplish what he did. I propose to confine my remarks to his characteristics as a man.

I know of no place more appropriate to discuss his life and character than here in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol Building, and at this imposing memorial erected by a united people to commemorate his name and fame. May we rekindle within us respect and admiration for the knightly character and leader that he was.

General Grant presents one of the strangest anomalies in history: that a man so distinguished in war should be so unwarlike in personal characteristics and free from the ambitions supposed to dominate the soldier.

Among the qualities which enabled him to accomplish what he did were his self-confidence, perserverance, and firm discipline. These qualties were not manifested in an extreme manner, for they were balanced by his temperate character. His self-confidence was combined with humility; his perseverance was attended with adaptability; and his discipline was softened by his innate kindness.

His self-confidence is clearly illustrated in a unique way by a letter which General

Grant wrote to his sister Mary from his headquarters at Oxford, Miss., December 15, 1862. The Vicksburg campaign was in progress. The General was expecting his wife and his father to visit him in a few days. Notice what the General said to his sister: "We are now having wet weather. I have a big army in front of me as well as bad roads. I shall probably give a good account of myself however notwithstanding all obstacles." We all know that 5 days after the General wrote the letter to his sister, expressing supreme confidence in his plans, a Confederate force captured Holly Springs where Grant's supplies for his army were stored and where his sister and father were at the time he wrote the letter.

A man of less courage and resourcefulness would have been frustrated and discouraged, but not so with General Grant. He immediately sent all the wagons he had "to collect and bring in all supplies of forage and food from an area 15 miles east and west of the road," to subsist his troops on the people in the region. This lesson, that an army could live off the country, was used in order that he could persevere in his long-range plan to capture Vicksburg.

He was so averse to inflicting pain that as a boy he never enjoyed the sport of killing small animals. He sickened at the sight of blood, yet was forced to witness the greatest outpouring of human blood for freedom in all our history.

He was a lover of horses. During the Wilderness campaign, he came in sight of a teamster brutally beating his horse in the face with the butt of his whip. He directed that the scoundrel be taken in charge and tied to a tree for 6 hours as punishment for his brutality.

During the Vicksburg campaign, or seige of Vicksburg as it is sometimes called, General Grant and staff took possession of a house as headquarters. He informed the family they might retain the upper rooms of the house and the kitchen below. One day the General met a young girl in the hallway carrying a tray of food. He inquired whom it was for. Frightened and trembling with fear, she admitted it was for her brother, a young Confederate officer who was wounded and concealed in the basement of the house. She had visions of a Northern prison for her brother and punishment for herself. "Tell your brother I will have my personal physician attend him and he shall have what food he needs," was the General's directive.

During the late twenties or about 30 years ago, an old lady, on whose head the snows of many years had fallen, entered the office of Ulysses S. Grant III, grandson of President Grant and one of the most respected and highly esteemed citizens of Washington, and told him the story. She said "I am the little girl who carried the tray of food, and I wanted some member of the Grant family to know of the incident before I passed away." Such are the facts as I heard them from the lips of the distinguished grandson of the man we honor today.

General Grant always abstained from profanity and would not tolerate it in others. He hated liars and cowards. The familiar saying that "an honest man is the noblest work of God" could literally be applied to Grant. Characteristic of the man and his meticulous adherence to the truth in an incident which happened in camp. After returning from an inspection, he was heard to say: "I was told so and so about the wounded by Dr. Smith while we were talking this morning inside his tent." A half hour later, he took the trouble to come back and say, as if it were a matter of the greatest importance, "I was mistaken when I told you that my conversation with Dr. Smith occurred inside his tent, that was not correct, it took place while we were standing in front of his tent."

One of Grant's generals, Ingalls, who knew him at West Point while a cadet said, "He was always frank, generous, and manly." He would not tolerate obscenity or even off-color stories. They were objectionable to him. One evening a citizen who had come to camp said he would tell a story, and began by looking around and saying, "I see there are no ladies present." General Grant interrupted him with the remark, "No, but there are gentlemen present."

He entered the Military Academy because his father desired him to do so and not because he wanted to go. While there, he secretly rejoiced when it was rumored that Congress proposed to abolish the academy. While at West Point, he deliberately planned to be fired from the academy by putting on his full-dress uniform and leaving the grounds without permission. He walked a considerable distance to a favorite meeting place for the cadets. On the way, he passed several officers, who, believing he had authority to leave the grounds, made no report of his escapade, and his whole plan to be fired from the academy failed.

Years after graduating from West Point, he related that on his way to the academy from home he hoped the train would be wrecked and he would be injured just enough to disqualify him from entering. However, his training at West Point left its impress upon the young soldier. He was always refined in his manners at table and never violated the requirements of true politeness.

There was little if anything in Grant's early life to mark him as a man of destiny. Adversity, hardship, and poverty were not unknown to this famous soldier. Shortly before the breaking out of the Civil War, he pawned his watch for $22 in order to provide a few Christmas presents for his children. His weaknesses, if they can be called such, were his devotion to his family and his singular love for children.

When his family visited him at City Point, his headquarters during the last months of the war, his meeting with them afforded him the happiest day he had seen since they parted. The morning after their arrival an officer entered the general's tent and found him in shirt sleeves engaged in a rough-and-tumble wrestling match with his two older boys—age 14 and 12 years respectively. He had become red in the face and seemed nearly out of breath from the exertion. The boys had tripped him up and he was on his knees on the floor grappling with his playful youngsters,and joining in their merry laughter as if he were a boy again himself. Noticing the officer, Horace Porter, with dispatches in his hand, the general rose to his feet, brushed the dust from his clothes and said, "Ah, you know my weaknesses—my children and my horses." The older son, Frederick Dent Grant, was the father of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, my warm personal friend whom we all admire and respect.

This was the man who commanded the Armies of the Union. One army under his immediate command numbered over 100,000 men. He held in his hand the destiny of our Republic. He was intensely human and most considerate of others.

There is an erroneous impression abroad that General Grant was a poor student and left a somewhat indifferent record at West Point and graduated low in his class. His grandson, in an address delivered quite recently, called attention to the fact that this popular fallacy was incorrect. He quoted an officer who made a study of this subject and found that General Grant stood in the middle of his class and relatively higher than Jefferson Davis, General Hooker, Longstreet, Hancock, Custer, Pickett, Hood, and Sheridan.

His innate modesty is well expressed by Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, who said, "He is one of the most remarkable men I ever met. He does not seem to be aware of his powers."

Although his education was limited to country schools and the Military Academy, he acquired a general knowledge of literature sufficient to develop a most unusual facility for straightforward and clear expression, which assisted him greatly in later life. No one can read his memoirs without noticing his simple and direct method of expression. During the Civil War, his orders, written by himself, and many of them in the heat and confusion of the battlefield, distinctly conveyed his views, and none of them were ever misunderstood.

It is claimed that General Grant was careless about his personal appearance. It is true that many photographs of him as an officer during the Civil War show him with his vest unbuttoned or otherwise unconscious of his appearance. However, we have the authority of his grandson that his mother, in her effort to train him in the way he should go, tried to impress on him the scrupulous cleanliness of his grandfather and his meticulous insistence on clean linen. It will be remembered that when Lee surrendered to him at Appomattox, he apologized for his appearance because of his muddy boots and wearing no sword. These were his remarks when asked what his thoughts were at that supreme moment of his military career.

Those who knew him best loved him most; to dislike him was to misunderstand, like the little southern girl who didn't like the new minister. After the church service, she asked, "Mama, is the new minister a Yankee?" "Why, no, dear, why do you ask?" "Well, I don't like him, anyway; when he prayed he kept saying, 'Grant, O Lord; Grant, O Lord; Grant, O Lord,' and he never once mentioned General Lee."

Perhaps no better example of his extreme modesty exists than the occasion in 1884 when he wrote an article for the Century magazine on the Vicksburg campaign without mentioning himself. We all know he was the commander at Vicksburg and brought about its fall and the surrender of its garrison of 31,000 men.

Hamilton Fish, who was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Grant, when asked what he thought was Grant's dominant quality, said "absolute truthfulness, complete inflexible veracity. I do not think it would have been possible for Grant to have told a lie even if he had composed it and written it down."

It is a common expression among men in uttering the highest faith and confidence in a person to say: "His word is as good as his bond." During the administration of President Johnson, General Lee and other Confederate leaders were threatened with indictment and arrest for treason. Under the terms of surrender given by Grant they were paroled and were not to be molested as long as they obeyed their paroles. That his word be kept as good as his bond, General Grant told the President, "I will resign the command of the Army rather than execute any order directing me to arrest General Lee or any other of his commanders." That put an end to all attempts for vengeance against southern leaders.

Bearing on the character of the great Union commander is the statement of William H. Cook, chief usher at the White House during Grant's administration, who declared, "I have never seen a more devoted family or a happier one," and this during the tempestuous period of speculation and reconstruction of our country. Be it ever said to the everlasting fame and credit of President Grant he entered upon the duties of that high office without political experience or training in the art of diplomacy and statesmanship and made good. The only criticism leveled against him, and the one mistake he made, being as honest a man as God ever made, was that he believed other people in whom he placed trust and confidence were as honest as he.

A fair measure of the esteem and respect in which he was held is included in a tribute paid by a political opponent, a Democrat, assistant attorney general of New York, William A. Poste, who declared, "The century has produced and honored no more rugged and manly man than Ulysses S. Grant—he has gone down to his grave faithful unto death."

The estimate of the Confederate General Longstreet, foe and adversary in battle who fought on the other side and who knew Grant at West Point, speaks in loud praise of the man in whose memory we have gathered here today. He said, "Grant will hold a place with Washington in the hearts of his countrymen. Personally, Grant was a warm-hearted, lovable friend, a magnanimous opponent. His greatness was marked by a modesty so noticeable as to win him the appelation of the 'silent man of destiny.'"

We honor ourselves by honoring Ulysses Simpson Grant on the 133d anniversary of his birth. We bestow upon him today the affectionate appreciation of his countrymen and the loving memory of a grateful people. "A man he was without vices, with an absolute hatred of lies and an unreserved love of truth, of a perfect loyalty to friendship, neither envious of others nor selfish for himself. With a zeal for the public good, unfeigned, he has left to memory only such weaknesses as connects him with humanity, and such virtues as will rank him among heroes."

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill dealing with the use of chemicals in foods.

This bill represents an effort to modernize our Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act on a practical basis. The principal accomplishment of the bill is to close the loophole in the present law. This is done in two ways: First, by requiring the pretesting of food additives and food-packaging materials before they can reach the public; and second, by requiring the industry to submit a report of its pretesting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before marketing the new food additive or new packaging material. Although responsible companies follow the practice of pretesting, the present law is deficient in that it is legally possible for untested materials to reach the consumer.

The primary purpose of the bill is to protect the public health. I believe this has been done, and reasonable safeguards have been established. Other factors which vitally affect the national welfare have been given careful consideration. For example, although the bill provides for a reasonable degree of practical control over new products of the food packaging, and chemical industries, it also sets up balances which will prevent the stifling of research and competition in these important industries.

This bill provides a different approach than the Insecticide Act which I introduced in the 83d Congress. The reason for this is quite obvious. Many insecticides must be highly toxic in order to be effective. Food additives, however, do not present the same toxicity danger, and the possibility of a seriously hazardous food additive reaching the consumer is somewhat remote. Industry, as a whole, has performed an excellent and conscientious service by observing high standards of scientific testing before placing new additives in commercial channels.

The procedures established in this bill adequately serve to protect the public health, without requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to write and issue licensing regulations covering the use of new food additives or new packaging materials. The bill provides practical control mechanisms for the Secretary, without permitting strangulation of industrial research by capriciousness in the Department.

Outstanding representatives of science, industry, and Government have devoted many hours of thought and study to the legislative problems posed by the tremendous progress being made in this field. The bill attempts to incorporate the commendable features of legislation that has been proposed during this session of the Congress. It also attempts to meet many of the more serious objections to these bills.

The bill applies to all new food additives. By definition, however, substances generally recognized among experts as being without hazard to the public health in their present uses are excluded from its operation. Pesticide chemicals are specifically excluded, and new packaging materials are treated separately.

Under procedures established in the bill, before marketing a new food additive, the industry or person must file a report of investigations to show safety with the Secretary. The report contains, generally, all pretesting data and all pertinent information bearing upon the new food additive. The Secretary must render an opinion on the basis of the data before him within 120 days after the report is filed. If the Secretary renders a favorable opinion or fails to act within the allotted time, the applicant may proceed to market the additive.

If the opinion of the Secretary is unfavorable there are several courses which may be followed:

(A) The applicant may request a public hearing in the Department. After the hearing the Secretary shall enter a final order based upon the evidence adduced. Appeal from this order lies with the circuit court of appeals.

(B) Either the Secretary or the applicant may request an advisory committee, to be selected from representatives of science, industry, and Government under procedures outlined in the bill. This committee is so composed as to combine scientific knowledge with the approach of commerce and Government.

(C) The applicant may elect to market the additive at the risk of having an injunction proceeding brought against him by the Secretary.

Several courses remain open in the event an advisory committee is requested by the Secretary or by the applicant. If the report of the committee is favorable to the applicant and is affirmed in an order by the Secretary, the applicant may proceed to market the product. If the report of the committee is favorable but the Secretary does not aquiesce, the applicant may either request a public hearing, appeal the order to the circuit court of appeals, or place the product on the market at the risk of an injunction by the Secretary.

If the report of the committee is adverse, the applicant may use the public hearing and appeal remedy; or the applicant may, in the alternative, proceed to market at the risk of injunction, but here the bill gives to the Secretary the benefit of a presumption that the new food additive would present a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, and the burden falls upon the applicant to prove otherwise.

It should be pointed out at this stage that the applicant may withdraw the report at any time, and the Secretary may likewise modify or withdraw any opinion for cause.

New packaging materials have been treated separately in the bill because the potential hazard from packaging materials is very much less in degree, in that only trace contaminations generally may be involved. The bill does provide, however, that a report of investigations to show safety must be filed and, if the Secretary is of the opinion that the material presents a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, the main sanctions of the bill shall be applied.

This bill attempts to reconcile the many divergent and conflicting points of view relative to regulation of the use of chemicals in foods. It is my belief that this legislation will meet the needs of dynamic, growing industries, and will provide a system of adequate controls, with the public health paramount. It is in this interest that the bill is submitted.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 9	do	Present.
3	Jan. 18	do	Present.
4	Jan. 19	do	Present.
		H. R. 5330, authorizing economic aid for the Republic of Korea:	
5	do	On recommittal to Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearings. (Defeated, 190 to 194.)	Yea.
6	do	On passage. (Defeated, 191 to 193.)	Nay.
7	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 161 to 255.)	Yea.
9	do	H. Res. 133, amending rules of House by repealing 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules. (Defeated, 183 to 236.)	Nay.
10	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.
11	do	do	Present.
12	do	do	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	Motion ordering the previous question, thus ending debate on H. Res. 217, providing for the consideration of H. R. 331, a bill to provide statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 373 to 25.)	Yea.
16	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	do	Present.
18	do	do	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Jan. 27	do	Present.
21	do	do	Present.
22	do	do	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	do	do	Present.
25	Jan. 30	do	Present.
		H. J. Res. 398, Increasing the cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended:	
26	Jan. 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 136 to 239)	Not voting.
27	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	Motion that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. (Defeated, 104 to 271).	Nay.
29	do	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	do	Present.
31	do	do	Present.
32	Feb. 2	do	Present.
33	do	do	Present.
34	do	do	Present.
35	Feb. 6	do	Present.
36	Feb. 7	do	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	do	do	Present.
39	Feb. 8	do	Present.
		H. R. 2945, increasing certain postal rates:	
40	Feb. 9	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 150 to 218.)	Yea.
		S. 2319, authorizing economic assistance to Korea and certain parts of China for a period ending June 30, 1950:	
41	do	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce amount of authorization from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000 and limiting amount advanced by RFC from $30,000,000 to $10,000,000. (Defeated, 137 to 239.)	Yea.
42	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 134.)	Yea.
43	Feb. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
44	Feb. 15	do	Present.
45	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 257 to 82.)	Yea.
46	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 97 to 236.)	Nay.
47	do	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. (Defeated 94 to 238.)	Nay.[2]
48	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 109 to 218.)	Nay.[2]
49	do	Quorum call	Nay.
50	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 126 to 198.)	Nay.[2]
51	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under call of the House. (Approved, 243 to 102.)	Yea.[1]
		S. 2734, promoting the rehabilitation of the Navaho and Hopi Indian Tribes and provide for a better utilization of the resources of their reservation:	
52	Feb. 21	On amendment extending State laws to cover certain offenses to the Navaho and Hopi Reservations. (Defeated, 142 to 196.)	Yea.
53	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	do	Present.
55	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 278.)	Nay.
56	do	Motion to dispense with the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday and prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 121 to 285.)	Nay.
57	do	Quorum call	Present.
58	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 290 to 115.)	Yea.
59	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 284.)	Nay.
60	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. (Approved, 287 to 121.)	Yea.
61	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 165 to 239.)	Nay.
62	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453. (Approved, 270 to 134)	Yea.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin (FEPC):	
63	do	On amendment inserting the text of H. R. 6841 providing for voluntary compliance and removing the compulsory provisions of H. R. 4453. (Adopted, 221 to 178.)	Yea.
64	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin:	
65	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 177 to 239.)	Nay.
66	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 177.)	Yea.
67	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	do	Present.
69	Feb. 28	do	Present.
70	do	do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing point bill):	
71	do	Motion to send to further conference. (Adopted, 240 to 144.)	Yea.
72	do	Motion to table a motion instructing House conferees to insist on amendment of the House. (Adopted, 210 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5953, authorizing contributions of $1,229,240 to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. (CARE), to supply educational and scientific equipment and material to European libraries:	
73	Mar. 1	Motion to strike out the enacting clause, thus killing the bill. (Adopted, 265 to 163.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4846, creating a National Science Foundation to support and initiate scientific research:	
74	do	On motion to recommit to the committee for further study. (Defeated, 134 to 240.)	Yea.
75	do	On passage. (Passed, 247 to 125.)	Nay.
76	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Absent.
77	Mar. 3	do	Present.
78	do	H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	Yea.
79	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 7	H. R. 49, providing statehood for Hawaii. On passage. (Passed, 262 to 110.)	Yea.
81	do	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States and American nationals against foreign governments:	
82	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 209 to 165.)	Nay.
83	do	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and to repeal certain taxes relating to oleo:	
84	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 262 to 106.)	Nay.
85	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 87, providing promotions for veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	
86	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
87	do	do	Present.
88	do	H. Res. 481, making in order the consideration of H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States for Public Library Service Demonstration. (Adopted, 209 to 140.)	Nay.
89	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States, for Public Library Service Demonstration:	
90	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 162 to 176.)	Yea.
91	do	On passage. (Defeated, 161 to 164.)	Nay.
92	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
93	do	do	Present.
94	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 3247, amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia:	
95	do	On motion to consider bill. (Rejected, 69 to 241.)	Nay.
96	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
97	do	do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point bill):	
98	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 175 to 204.)	Nay
99	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
100	do	H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States by tightening safeguards against espionage and sedition, on passage. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Yea.
101	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938:	
102	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 116 to 225.)	Yea.
		S. 2105, to provide subsidies to certain mines for the exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
103	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 155 to 161.)	Yea.
104	do	On passage. (Defeated, 144 to 166.)	Nay.
105	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7057, relative to deductions by land-grant colleges of certain estimates of cost presented to the Veterans' Administration:	
106	do	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 245 to 101.)	Yea.
107	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7402, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate income families, and for other purposes.	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950	H. R. 7402—Continued	
108	Mar. 22	On amendment deleting middle-income housing section. (Adopted, 218 to 155.)	Yea.
109	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 261 to 10.)	Yea.
110	Mar. 23	H. Res. 482, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 248 to 12.) Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.	
111	...do.....	On adoption o. conference report. (Adopted, 197 to 156.)	Nay
112	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
113	Mar. 24	.....do	Present.
114	...do.....	.....do	Present.
115	...do.....	H. Res. 518, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 7797, providing foreign economic assistance. (Adopted, 262 to 22.)	Yea.
116	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
117	...do.....	.....do	Present.
118	Mar. 27	.....do	Present.
119	...do.....	.....do	Present.
120	Mar. 28	.....do	Present.
121	Mar. 29	.....do	Present.
122	Mar. 30	.....do	Present.
123	Mar. 31	.....do	Present.
124	...do.....	On motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title III. (Rejected, 150 to 220.)	Nay.
125	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 86.)	Yea.
126	...do.....	H. Res. 531, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 1758, amending the Natural Gas Act. (Adopted, 176 to 174.)	Nay.
127	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
128	...do.....	.....do	Present.
129	...do.....	.....do	Present.
130	...do.....	.....do	Present.
131	Apr. 4	.....do	Present.
132	Apr. 5	.....do	Present.
	...do.....	H. R. 7846, authorizing Army, Navy, and Air Force to contract for plans and specifications and to take options on sites, to expedite construction of rental housing on defense posts. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Present.
133	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
134	...do.....	.....do	Present.
135	...do.....	.....do	Present.
136	Apr. 20	.....do	Present.
137	Apr. 21	S. J. Res. 166, providing for posthumous award of appropriate medals to crew of plane who lost their lives over the Baltic Sea in performance of their duty. (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.
138	...do.....	Quorum call	Absent.
139	Apr. 24	.....do	Present.
140	Apr. 25	.....do	Present.
141	Apr. 26	.....do	Present.
142	Apr. 27	.....do	Present.
143	...do.....	.....do	Present.
144	May 1	.....do	Present.
145	...do.....	.....do	Present.
		H. R. 7185, providing open competitive examinations for veterans for position of apprentice in the Federal service:	
146	...do.....	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 209 to 93.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6354, authorizing District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia:	
147	...do.....	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 194 to 87.)	Yea.
148	May 3	Conference report on H. R. 5472, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Adopted, 210 to 137.)	Nay.
149	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
150	...do.....	Conference report on H. R. 1243, amending the Hatch Act relative to penalties for violations of this act by Federal civil-service employees. (Adopted, 203 to 140.)	Nay.
151	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
152	...do.....	.....do	Present.
153	May 6	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 98 to 170)	Not voting.
154	...do.....	Quorum call	Absent.
155	May 8	.....do	Present.
156	May 9	.....do	Present.
157	May 10	.....do	Present.
		H. R. 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951:	
158	...do.....	On Gore amendment increasing the funds for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. (Adopted, 258 to 131.)	Nay.
159	...do.....	On Case amendment reducing funds for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration by $2,950,000. (Adopted, 222 to 163.)	Yea.
160	...do.....	On Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment specifying certain percentage reductions of nonmilitary operation expenditures effecting a reduction of $600,000,000. (Adopted, 274 to 112.)	Yea.
161	...do.....	On Jensen amendment reducing number of Federal employees by not filling vacancies that occur in certain civilian agencies. (Adopted, 201 to 185.)	Yea.
162	...do.....	On passage of bill. (Passed, 362 to 21.)	Yea.
	1950		
163	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
164	May 15	.....do	Present.
165	...do.....	.....do	Present.
166	...do.....	.....do	Present.
167	...do.....	H. Res. 567, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5990. (Adopted, 194 to 32.) H. R. 5990, providing for construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as a part of the District of Columbia park system:	Yea.
168	...do.....	On motion for consideration of bill. (Adopted, 192 to 29.)	Yea.
169	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7941, amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways:	
170	May 19	On passage. (Passed, 246 to 34.)	Yea.
171	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
172	...do.....	Conference report on H. R. 7797, extending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and authorizing program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. (Adopted, 247 to 88.)	Yea.
173	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
174	June 6	.....do	Present.
		H. R. 7468, omnibus claims bill, for relief of sundry claimants:	
175	...do.....	On adoption of amendment deleting title III, for relief of Harry Tansey. (Adopted, 184 to 119.)	Yea.
176	June 13	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 143 to 227.)	Yea.
177	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 202 to 163.)	Nay
178	June 21	Conference report on H. R. 6567 increasing $2,000,000,000 the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Adopted, 235 to 81.)	Not voting.
179	...do.....	Conference report on S. 3181, extending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 by providing 6-month extension and giving local governing bodies the option of continuing rent control for another 6 months. (Adopted, 176 to 145.)	Not voting.
180	June 22	H. J. Res. 334, amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations by increasing United States share of expenses in 5 international organizations. (Adopted, 209 to 91.)	Nay.
181	...do.....	H. Res. 649, making in order consideration of S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. (Adopted, 232 to 61.)	Yea.
182	...do.....	S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. On passage. (Passed, 201 to 84.)	Yea.
		Veto by the President on H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
183	June 26	On motion that bill and message be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed. (Rejected, 115 to 165.)	Nay.
184	...do.....	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 213 to 72 (⅔ majority necessary).)	Yea.
185	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
186	June 27	.....do	Present.
187	...do.....	H. R. 6826, extending the Selective Service Act of 1948 to July 9, 1951. On passage. (Passed, 315 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes:	
188	June 29	On recommittal to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report it back as 2 separate bills, the 1st bill containing those provisions relating to excise taxes and the 2d bill containing the remaining provisions of H. R. 8920. (Rejected, 147 to 238.)	Yea.
189	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 375 to 14.)	Yea.
		S. 3550, extending import-control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products for a 1-year period from June 30, 1950, but discontinuing authority to control import of coconut oil:	
190	...do.....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment to include import control authority over coconut oil and cheese. (Rejected, 72 to 264.)	Yea.
191	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
192	June 30	.....do	Present.
		S. 3336, providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico:	
193	...do.....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with amendment providing that an islandwide referendum shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Defeated, 1 to 260.)	Nay.
194	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 10	.....do	Present.
196	...do.....	.....do	Present.
197	...do.....	H. Res. 647, disapproving Reorganization Plan 27, creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security. (Passed, 249 to 71.)	Yea.
198	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee United States private capital invested abroad:	
199	July 12	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 156 to 184)	Yea.
200	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 195 to 151)	Nay.
		H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by giving power to summarily dismiss employees for security reasons to Attorney General, Secretaries of State, Commerce, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force and Treasury, and Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950	H. R. 7439—Continued	
201	July 12	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing an additional right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any action by the heads of such agencies or departments. (Defeated, 144 to 193.)	Nay.
202	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 327 to 14)	Yea.
203	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. J. Res. 2, proposing constitutional amendment abolishing Electoral College and apportioning count of electoral votes in proportion to actual vote in each State:	
204	...do....	On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill. (Defeated, 134 to 210 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 502, continuing until June 30, 1951 the exemption of certain import taxes on copper:	
205	...do....	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed, 283 to 58 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
206	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
	...do....	H. R. 8763, giving Government right to sue for damages in violations of Clayton Antitrust Act and fixing statute of limitations at 6 years:	
207	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
208	...do....	H. R. 10, facilitating the deportation of undesirable aliens from the United States and providing for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of United States. On passage. (Passed, 326 to 15.)	Yea.
209	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
210	July 19	S. 3809, extending the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and authorizing appropriations therefor through the fiscal year 1951. On passage. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 2822, amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and increasing the insurance coverage of individual deposits by the Corporation from $5,000 to $10,000 and simplifying the computation of the assessments charged insured banks:	
211	July 20	On amendment authorizing $15,000,000 for a site and a new building for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (Defeated, 90 to 227.)	Nay.
212	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
213	July 24	...do	Present.
		H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois:	
214	...do....	On motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to reduce from 2 to 1 the number of judges to be provided by the bill. (Defeated, 116 to 163.)	Yea.
215	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 110.)	Nay.
		H. R. 6240, authorizing the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana:	
216	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to provide that the judgeship created by the bill be temporary. (Defeated, 102 to 171.)	Yea.
217	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
218	July 27	...do	Present.
219	July 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 120 to 179.)	Yea.
220	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
221	Aug. 3	...do	Present.
222	Aug. 4	...do	Present.
223	Aug. 7	...do	Present.
		H. R. 8396, authorizing President to grant financial assistance to States and local governments in major disasters:	
224	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing for congressional approval of such grants. (Defeated, 25 to 232.)	Nay.
225	Aug. 9	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 145 to 233.)	Yea.
226	...do....	H. R. 7009, making permanent the temporary district judgeship in the eastern and western districts of Missouri. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 133.)	Nay.
227	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9176, to provide for defense production and economic controls:	
228	...do....	On Spence amendment providing authority to stabilize prices and wages by either voluntary controls or by establishment of ceilings. (Adopted, 393 to 3.)	Yea.
229	...do....	On Wolcott amendment exempting new construction from credit controls. (Adopted, 202 to 188.)	Yea.
230	...do....	On Wolcott amendment limiting control of credit to consumer credit and real-estate credit. (Defeated, 173 to 224.)	Yea.
231	...do....	On Cooley amendment deleting from the bill provisions relating to control of commodity speculation. (Adopted 198 to 194.)	Nay.
232	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 383 to 12.)	Yea.
233	...do....	H. Res. 749, citing Julius Emspak for contempt of Congress by reason of failure to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 372 to 1.)	Yea.
234	Aug. 14	Motion to adjourn. (48 to 274)	Nay.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
235	...do....	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 667, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8195. (Adopted, 248 to 81.)	Nay.
	1950		
236	Aug. 14	S. 192, conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. On passage. (Passed, 295 to 4.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
238	Aug. 16	On amendment directing that other essential postal services shall not be curtailed or terminated by reason of the bill and authorizing appropriation of sufficient funds to restore former postal deliveries. (Rejected, 159 to 213.)	Yea.
239	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 111 to 261.)	Yea.
240	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 264 to 108.)	Nay.
		Conference report on H. R. 6000, extending and revising the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system and amending the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act:	
241	...do....	On motion to order previous question on motion to recommit. (188 to 186.)	Yea.
242	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 374 to 1.)	Yea.
243	...do....	H. Res. 716, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6277, giving military discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps. (Defeated, 91 to 242.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7570, providing for the appointment of 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio:	
244	Aug. 17	On motion to recommit to committee until such time as any vacancies existing in the northern district of Ohio have been filled. (Defeated, 142 to 146.)	Yea.
245	...do....	On passage. (Defeated, 133 to 148.)	Nay.
246	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
247	...do....	...do	Present.
248	Aug. 23	...do	Present.
	...do....	H. R. 8850, creating 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:	
249	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 123 to 222.)	Yea.
250	Aug. 24	H. R. 3775, providing for an additional district judge for the 3d division of the District Court for the District of Alaska. On passage. (Passed, 196 to 147.)	Nay.
251	...do....	H. R. 9477, providing allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services and suspending certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8677, providing for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone:	
252	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to amend bill to provide that no tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States. (Defeated, 20 to 330.)	Nay.
		S. 456, authorizing the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of an additional public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia:	
253	Aug. 25	On motion to recommit to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation. (Defeated, 124 to 226.)	Nay.
254	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 7786, making appropriation for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.	
255	Aug. 26	On passage. (Passed, 311 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 868, providing for dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry.	
256	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3357 to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.	
257	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
258	...do....	H. Res. 826, making in order consideration of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 357 to 1.)	Yea.
259	...do....	H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, barring Communists from Government jobs, requiring labeling and identification of Communist propaganda, denying passports to members of the Communist Party and prohibiting contributions by Government officials to Communist-front organizations. On passage. (Passed, 354 to 20.)	Yea.
260	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
261	...do....	S. 4029, providing for authorizations, through which the Armed Forces can meet the demands for additional personnel in the medical, dental, and allied categories to support the expanding forces without requiring the large scale call to active duty without their consent of Reserve officers who have had substantial periods of service in World War II. On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
262	...do....	H. Res. 834, citing Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 183 to 175.)	Nay.
263	...do....	H. Res. 835, citing William L. Patterson for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 238 to 106.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
264	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
265	---do----	---do----	Present.
266	---do----	H. Res. 836, citing Joseph P. Kamp for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 215 to 115.)	Yea.
267	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
268	---do----	H. Res. 818, providing for consideration of S. 784, for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Co. (Defeated, 139 to 159.)	Nay.
269	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
270	Sept. 13	---do----	Absent.
271	---do----	---do----	Absent.
272	Sept. 14	H. Res. 842, providing for sending H. R. 8920, tax-revision bill, to conference: On motion ordering the previous question. (Rejected, 106 to 226.)	Nay.
273	---do----	On Eberharter amendment requiring the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to levy an excess profits tax before the adjournment of the 81st Cong. (Adopted, 331 to 2.)	Yea.
274	---do----	H. Res. 847, providing for sending H. R. 9490, Communist-registration bill, to conference. (Adopted, 324 to 9.)	Yea.
275	---do----	Veto by President of H. R. 6217, providing out-patient treatment for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection: On overriding veto. (Overridden, 321 to 12.)	Yea.
276	---do----	Veto by President of H. J. Res. 238, providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence: On overriding veto. (Overridden, 307 to 14.)	Yea.
277	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
278	---do----	H. R. 9646, amending the National Security Act to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense. On passage. (Passed, 220 to 105.)	Nay.
	Sept. 18	S. 2609, providing a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States:	
279	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
280	---do----	Conference report on H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 303 to 20.)	Yea.
281	---do----	Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951: On motion to concur in Senate amendment dispensing with bonds for imported seasonal agriculture labor. (Defeated, 160 to 172.)	Nay.
		S. 3437, to strengthen the Atomic Energy Act by increasing the salary of the Commissioners and by establishing 3-year term of office for General Manager and amending patent provisions.	
282	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
283	---do----	---do----	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951—motion to concur	
		1950	
		Conference report on H. R. 9526—Continued	
		in an amendment of the Senate cutting off all aid to countries that ship commodities that may be used in manufacture of arms to Russia or its satellites with a House amendment providing that such aid should be cut off upon determination by the National Security Council that such trade is against the best interests of the United States:	
284	Sept. 21	On ordering the previous question. (Ordered, 167 to 149.)	Nay.
285	---do----	On concurring and adoption of amendment. (Adopted, 286 to 30.)	Yea.
286	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
287	---do----	Conference report on H. R. 8920, increasing individual and corporate income taxes and closing certain loopholes. On adoption of report. (Adopted, 328 to 7.)	Yea.
288	---do----	Veto by President of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. On overriding veto. (Overridden, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
289	Dec. 5	Quorum call	Present.
290	---do----	H. R. 9827, Excess-Profits Tax Act of 1950. On motion to recommit with instructions to increase the average earning credit and to increase the corporate surtax rate by 5 percentage points. On adoption. (Defeated, 145 to 252.)	Yea.
291	---do----	On passage. (Passed, 378 to 20.)	Yea.
292	Dec. 7	H. R. 9763, to extend and amend the Housing and Rent Act: On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Defeated, 153 to 223.)	Yea.
293	---do----	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 152.)	Nay.
294	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9853, to furnish relief policy assistance to Yugoslavia. On motion to recommit with instructions to furnish aid on a loan basis similar to that provided Spain. On adoption. (Defeated, 76 to 173.)	Yea.
295	---do----	On passage. (Passed, 225 to 142.)	Yea.
296	Dec. 15	Quorum call	Present.
297	Dec. 20	H. R. 9798, to authorize a Federal civil-defense program. On motion to consider: On adoption. (Adopted 297 to 0.)	Yea.
298	---do----	On passage. (Passed 247 to 1.)	Yea.
299	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
	1951		
300	Jan. 1	---do----	Present.
301	---do----	---do----	Present.
302	---do----	S. 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act relating to union contracts and agreements for deductions from wages of railway employees. On question of consideration. (Agreed, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
303	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3295 to amend Railway Labor Act. On motion to recommit with instructions.	
304	---do----	On adoption. (Defeated, 61 to 284.)	Nay.
305	---do----	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 52.)	Yea.
306	Jan. 2	Quorum call	Present.
	---do----	H. R. 5244, for the relief of Charles J. Trees. (Conference report.)	
307	---do----	On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 127.)	Nay.

A Resolution To Designate April 30 of Each Year as Presidents' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House joint resolution today which I commend to the attention and consideration of all our colleagues.

My resolution would designate April 30 of each year, the anniversary of the inauguration day of George Washington as first President of the United States, to be known as Presidents' Day. This resolution stems from a suggestion made to me by Mr. David McDonough, of Miami, Fla. He has long been active in community affairs and has a great sense of civic responsibility. This idea of his for the commemoration of our past Presidents is but one of the many fine civic endeavors on which he has worked.

I am hopeful that this Congress, during this session, will adopt this resolution in order that proper plans may be made throughout our country to officially honor our past President by April 30 of next year.

Understanding Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by David S. Smith, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, before the junior chamber of commerce, Lowell, Mass., on April 27, 1955:

UNDERSTANDING AIRPOWER

I consider it a great privilege to appear before the junior chamber of commerce of such an important city as Lowell, Mass. I am grateful to Mrs. ROGERS, your distinguished Representative in Congress, through whom the invitation was extended. I am grateful to the members of the junior chamber of commerce, who indicated their interest in hearing an Air Force speaker.

I accepted the invitation so cordially extended because of the opportunity it gave me to thank you, and through you Jaycees everywhere, for what they are doing for the Air Force. I accepted it also because it is a personal pleasure for me to get away from the Pentagon, and have a good heart-to-heart talk with people like you. You are the present and future leaders of your community. Many of you, probably most of you, are veterans of military service. All of you are citizens deeply concerned with national security. My job at the Pentagon lies in helping to make sure that our plans are right, and that our security will be maintained. I am happy to have the opportunity

to make a report to you on some of the things we are doing.

First, however, a further word about the junior chamber of commerce and the Air Force. Last January, as you well know, the national organization of the junior chamber of commerce launched its Air Force recruiting assistance campaign. It is a little early to identify the current success of recruiting efforts with any one type of assistance. In fact, it is not even desirable to identify different contributions to the recruiting effort, because we are all working as a team—a national team—and our pride must be in the success of the team, not the performance of individual players. I am sure, however, from the news that reaches my office, that your efforts are combining with various other steps being taken, and are bringing results. More and more young men are signing up for the Air Force, and reenlisting in order to make a career of service in the Air Force, and we are very pleased with the results.

Three months ago, only a little more than 20 percent of the airmen scheduled for separation in February 1955 indicated an intent to reenlist. The Air Force now estimates that this figure has increased to 30 percent for airmen who did reenlist in February or who plan to do so within 90 days from their separation. From 20 to 30 percent is a 50 percent increase. Things are really looking up.

We also believe that as a result of this increased interest in the Air Force, the bonds between the man in uniform and his civilian supporters are being greatly strengthened. The stronger those bonds, the stronger our national security. A few weeks ago the Gallup poll reported that 71 percent of the American people are convinced that if another world war comes, the Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy. Analyzed by age groups or by education levels, the percentage is the same. The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. The American sense of reliance on air power is strong.

I am not sure, however, that American understanding of airpower is commensurate with American appreciation of the traditions and the performance of the Air Force.

We are, we say, an airminded Nation. So rapid have been the developments in this half-century which we call the air age, and so conclusive are the lessons of history, that airpower is now generally accepted as the predominant military force. But we are tired of war. Recurrently through the last 15 years homes throughout the Nation have been saddened by the loss of loved ones. We are reluctant to face the fact that preparedness must be for a lifetime, and not merely for a foreseeable, limited period. We have not, as a nation, given evidence that we accept the security of our Nation as everybody's business, and not the exclusive responsibility of the man in uniform. We gripe—to use the GI term—because, 10 years after V–E and V–J Days, we still face the sacrifices necessary to maintain a huge Military Establishment.

This griping may well be a habit of democracy, but not all habits are good habits. The thought that preparedness can be seasonal is certainly a mistaken idea. William Jennings Bryan expressed a national attitude when he said that in times of national peril, a million men would spring to arms. And millions of men did spring to arms to defend the Nation in two world wars. However, millions of men have been reluctant to remain in arms, when the victory was won, to make sure that the peace was well guarded.

I am sure that all of you can recall the frantic effort to demobilize, after World War II. The sad truth is, that when the peace was won, no nation's people were ever quicker to lose interest in their armed forces than the people of the United States.

For this reason, the history of our armed services in America has been one of high peaks of military strength, followed by almost bottomless valleys of weakness. And the wonder is that we were able to rise from the valleys to reach the peaks.

We might ask what course history would have taken, if we had never permitted ourselves to descend into the valleys. If we had been strong in 1916, would Germany have sunk the *Lusitania?* If we had been strong in 1941, would the Japanese have dared to attack Pearl Harbor? If we had been strong in 1950, would the Communists have struck in Korea?

It may be academic to ask the questions, because there can be no definite answers. But it is necessary for us to realize that while our Nation has sprung to arms in the interest of national defense many, many times in the past, it is no longer possible to wait for war to begin, in order to start building national defense. Modern warfare begins too suddenly and strikes with too much devastation—witness Pearl Harbor—to permit delayed mobilization. We must be ready when war starts—if it should start again.

Quite aside from the fact that this is so because our survival as a nation depends upon it, we should be willing to admit that it is so because it is enormously expensive and wasteful—wasteful of human lives, money, material resources, and opportunities for the development of mankind—not to maintain preparedness. It is amazing that in the past we have seemed willing to pay so high a price for the privilege of ignoring danger until it was upon us.

What we now need to understand above everything else is that the price is higher, beyond estimate. Nuclear weapons, combined with the capabilities of long-range airus in a period of lessened guard and depleted power, have revolutionized warfare. And we hold no monopoly on such weapons.

We hold no monopoly—neither the practical monopoly in long-range bombers nor the absolute monopoly we once possessed in nuclear weapons—because there can be no monopoly in science. Our pilots who first encountered the Soviet-built MIG–15, in November 1950, were surprised to discover what a formidable weapon the Communists had. Before the war was over we learned a great deal about the general excellence of Soviet technology. We have developed a healthy respect for Soviet industrial capacity.

We know now that the Soviet Union has made remarkable progress in the building of nuclear weapons and modern long-range bombers. It is this progress that has put us in what President Eisenhower has forthrightly called an age of peril. Communist exploitation of the potentiality of their weapons makes it an age of tension as well.

In addition to the world's largest air force, containing some 20,000 aircraft in combat units, the Soviet Union has a huge ground force, a powerful submarine force, guided missiles, and a large industrial capacity, most of which is devoted to the production of war goods. As early as 1949 her industry was able to produce an atomic explosion, and in 1953 she announced to the world that she possessed the hydrogen bomb. Thus on the one hand, our national security program must be designed to meet the most serious of all threats to the survival of western civilization—the combination of Soviet long-range airpower and atomic weapons. On the other hand, it must also be designed to cope with the constant possibility of local warfare such engagements as the free world has experienced in Korea, in Indochina, and is now experiencing in the Formosa Strait.

The leaders of communism have repeatedly made it clear that their goal is communism worldwide. The United States is a principal obstacle which confronts them in their path to this goal, and the support you give your Air Force enables it to remain that obstacle. I said remain, not maintain. I do not mean maintain for a limited period, but maintain indefinitely. The United States is and must remain a roadblock to international communism. The understanding our air-minded Nation has not yet fully acquired is that if there is a new kind of war, there is also a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

It is not enough for our Nation to be airminded. It must possess air superiority. It must control the airways, and be prepared to defend them against all who would use them to violate our freedom and our democracy.

To give the Nation the strength necessary to maintain peace as the most precious gift of our times, and to resist and conquer aggression if it comes, the United States has established its Air Force, and assigned it certain definite missions. The development of nuclear weapons and of guided missiles carrying atomic warheads, which has come in the 8 years since the Air Force was established, has not altered these missions. What such development has done is to place greater responsibility on the Air Force for the successful carrying out of its missions. These missions are the conduct of strategic air warfare, the defeat of enemy air forces, combat support of the Army, support of the Navy in keeping the sea lanes open and the air defense of the United States directly related to Air Force offensive capabilities.

To perform its missions in this age of crisis, the Air Force is continuing today, and will continue for the next several years, the build up of air strength which was programed in 1950, after the Korean war caught military resources. When the Korean war began the Air Force consisted of about 42 effective wings and about 400,000 men in uniform. Today we have 121 wings, ready and effective, and about 960,000 men in uniform. By the end of June 1957, we expect to have reached our 137-wing goal, and 975,000 men in uniform. All Air Force wings are now equipped with modern aircraft, and all fighters are jet propelled.

Constant progress is being made in modernization of aircraft. New types are replacing outmoded types.

Technological advances in propulsion and electronics are making substantial contributions to the development of guided missiles. The Air Force has made significant progress in the development of strategic, tactical, and air defense missiles, all of which are being pushed vigorously.

Construction of the base facilities needed to support the 137–wing program is a most serious problem. Our offensive forces must be able to hit any potential enemy on short notice under all conditions. Our long range aircraft can operate from the United States in the event of war, and advanced refueling techniques have greatly lengthened ranges of smaller combat aircraft. However, the existence of bases overseas, equipped to handle all types of aircraft, greatly increases the flexibility, economy of operation, and hence the effectiveness of our offensive air forces. Overseas bases also increase the capability of tactical air forces to operate in overseas theaters.

Our air defense forces require bases located so that our interceptors can reach attacking enemy aircraft before they reach the line where they would drop their bombs on American cities. Radar facilities are needed to detect the approach of enemy aircraft, and communications and navigation

facilities are needed to direct the defenders to intercept them. It is not sufficient to have such facilities within the United States. We must have them in Canada, Alaska, and the Arctic.

Bases within the United States are needed for training our tactical forces, for providing logistic services, and to maintain a strategic reserve which can be sent to any theater of operation in need. I have just returned from an inspection of several bases. I can tell you that I was proud of what I saw.

Maintenance facilities must be increased to keep up with the increased complexity of modern aircraft and equipment. With the greater consumption of fuel by jet aircraft, increased fuel storage facilities are required.

In the past 4 years the Air Force has gone a long way toward building the base structure needed to support its modernized and expanded forces. Continued modernization of base facilities is required to provide base support for the programed increase to 137 wings.

All this costs money, lots of money. Whether or not we understand fully the continuing need for maintaining strength in order to guarantee peace, the American people have certainly been generous in supporting the build-up of the Air Force under the present program. In 1954 and 1955, the Air Force budget, requested by the President and approved by Congress, was for about $11.5 billion. For fiscal year 1956, beginning next June, the President has requested $14.53 billion, excluding appropriations for base construction. Our President, and his administration, have recognized the real nature of the continuing threat to national security, and the most effective way of countering it.

A great deal of the money appropriated for the Air Force will go in pay to personnel—and toward increasing the attractiveness of a service career in order to attract and retain qualified personnel. I said at the beginning of my remarks that we have been concerned about our reenlistment rate, and that it is improving. Now I want to backtrack on one score. Whereas the reenlistment rate in general has been about 20 percent, among the men we need the most—the trained, skilled, and experienced technicians—the rate has been even lower, below 15 percent. We are also losing veteran pilots and experienced staff officers. We are losing trained mechanics, radar men and technicians. So the shortage of trained, experienced personnel is the No. 1 problem within the Air Force.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Harold Talbott, has taken the keenest personal interest in accomplishing those things which will increase the attractiveness of a service career, and encourage men to reenlist, and remain in service. We are all grateful for the fact that Congress recently approved a substantial pay raise, earnestly advocated by Mr. Talbott, and is now considering other legislation designed to improve service attractiveness. One such measure is adequate family housing of proper standards and within the proper rental brackets for men in the Air Force. Considering what it costs to train a man, approximately $14,000 for an airman, and more than $200,000 for a triple-rated pilot of an atom bomber, his pay could be increased by many, many dollars before it would equal the cost of losing him. We could increase service attractiveness in many ways, and still not make the rewards of a military career comparable financially with those offered by civilian industry to these trained men.

Earlier, I also spoke of the bonds between the men in uniform and the citizens at home, that are being strengthened. These bonds are numerous and of many kinds, and I shall not attempt to identify them all or to define them. They are bonds of interest, affection, and sympathy, of gratitude and honor. But the most important bond of all is that which I have stressed, the bond of understanding. If the people of Lowell and of each community in this Nation develop a real understanding of our Air Force, of its responsibilities and its needs, your community will send more men into the ranks of the Air Force. It will also stand ready to support the Air Force in every necessary way in its supreme mission of preventing war, and securing peace under acceptable conditions.

When this understanding of airpower and of the role of our Air Force in maintaining it is widely and thoroughly understood, the youth of our land will turn naturally to the air, as the youth of England in the days of her greatest glory turned naturally to the sea, as the proper sphere for their noblest careers. When that happens, we will indeed have become an air-minded Nation.

I think that understanding is coming, and coming very rapidly. People like you, throughout the land, are helping to bring it about, and the evidences are unmistakable. I feel confident, therefore, that our Air Force will be able to carry out the missions for which it was created. I feel confident that our national security will not be violated, and that we will be able to enjoy those rights we consider inalienable—those rights which were won for us, and must constantly be rewon by sacrifice.

H. R. 5210 and H. R. 5211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statements on H. R. 5210 and H. R. 5211:

H. R. 5210 is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to promote diversified ownership of domestic corporations by encouraging small investors to buy stock and reinvest their dividends.

It is hoped that the passage of this bill will result in direct ownership of American industry by Americans. When the people of the Nation own the corporations, it will be impossible to socialize the country.

Through this bill millions of capitalists will be created. For example, the employees of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or other corporations would not only buy shares of their companies out of current income but would increase their ownership through the reinvestment of their dividends and yet would have the privilege of deferring taxes on those dividends for at least 10 years or until the shares disposed of, such as the provision which now prevails in the series E savings bonds.

The masses are customers of many of the American corporations. They should also be the owners. They can do this by purchasing shares directly or through an investment company. The investment companies and the New York Stock Exchange have automatic purchase plans whereby individuals can, out of current income, buy into American industry, and many corporations have the same provision for the purchase of their own shares by employees.

In connection with the use of common stocks in a long-term investment program, a research firm prepared a computation which will easily convince the most confirmed skeptic. These figures cover a 30-year period and assume that the investor will start with a salary of $3,500 and gradually increase until at the end of the 30-year period he was receiving $7,500, with the indicated changes over the period:

Years:	*Salary*
1–5	$3,500
6–10	4,500
11–15	5,500
16–20	6,500
21–30	7,500

The figures assume that the investor put 10 percent of his yearly salary aside and these amounts were invested quarterly in common stocks in over seven different 30-year periods and the dividends were reinvested. The averages of industrial common stocks were used in making these computations so that no assumption of better than average is involved.

Period:	*Value at end of period*
1858–88	$97,545
1868–98	61,070
1878–1908	65,515
1888–1918	70,400
1898–1928	107,585
1908–38	50,010
1918–48	52,860
Average	72,140

These remarkable results were achieved with a total investment of only $17,500. In the worst period, 1908–38, the fund at the end was worth a little less than $3 for every dollar put in and on the average it was worth about $4 for every dollar put in.

These results would certainly indicate that passage of the bill H. R. 5210 is a step in the direction of individual security for the individual to supplement his social security and pension plan. It is hoped that through this bill the 63 million working people of the Nation will own the business corporations and reverse the present trend—with 6 million to 10 million who now own these corporations.

H. R. 5211 is a bill to exempt from Federal income-tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is derived entirely from tax-exempt Government obligations.

Because of the Federal tax program of the last decade the number of wealthy individuals who normally would absorb a large amount of tax-exempt obligations has been greatly reduced. Therefore, to finance the $7 billion school program it will be necessary to get the masses to purchase such bonds. The investment companies have proved that their method of operation is the best yet discovered for reaching the masses—hence the provisions of this bill.

To sell $7 billion in school bonds, in addition to the normal amount of Government obligations, plus the expanded financing of toll roads will not be easy unless we reach the masses.

It is hoped that the various State regulatory authorities will declare as legal investments the shares of investment companies whose assets are invested in tax-exempt Government obligations and that the Congress will amend the proper bills to permit national banks to deal in the shares of the tax-exempt investment companies to the same extent that they deal in tax-free Government obligations.

From the standpoint of the small investor this is an ideal way to build an estate. For

example, an individual could systematically invest a specified amount—say, for example, $100 a month—in the shares of one of these investment companies and compound his earnings. When millions of Americans, through ownership of shares in a tax-exempt investment company own the obligations of the school districts and other Government agencies it is only natural to expect that they will take a greater interest in the operations of these agencies and will be more concerned as to the efficiency of those operations.

This bill (H. R. 5211) might very well go a long way toward revolutionizing the financing of municipalities because instead of having a few hundred dealers specializing in municipal bonds there would be more than 10,000 salesmen discussing these obligations with investors.

Senator George: Quarterback for the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Senator WALTER GEORGE has been doing a remarkable job in recent weeks as a quarterback on foreign affairs. From crisis to crisis he has been out ahead of the Secretary of State, and the President, and the country is the better for it. Last Saturday night he delivered an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, and again he seems to have influenced a change of policy by the administration. Those who heard this speech called it an "extraordinary address," and it deserves a wide audience. I present herewith a partial text of these impromptu remarks:

Jimmie Pope and ladies and gentlemen of this distinguished audience, now, I suppose you want me to talk to you a little bit about foreign affairs.

From the beginning, of course, we have had relations with other peoples, but prior to World War I, to the great masses of the American people, our foreign relations were hardly known.

These relations and the relations growing out of them occupied the attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and a small group of men in the United States Senate, and intellectuals—men and women throughout the Union.

Even after the outbreak of World War II we said: "Aren't we separated from all that clash and all that confusion by 3,000 miles of ocean and do we not live under other political institutions, and are we not dominated by other social and economical ideas?"

MARKETS DECLINED

Well, we very soon found the answer. The ranchers and cotton growers and manufacturers soon found their markets declining and all but disappearing. And in every accounting and banking house in this Nation, business, temporarily at least, came almost to a standstill. For the first time, Americans in all walks of life began to realize that every important public act committed on the other side of the globe directly affected the welfare and well being of the American people.

At that time and prior to that time and from the beginning, we had the policy of what you and I know as strictly isolationism. We were protected by two great oceans. The British Navy was the unquestioned mistress of the seas, and behind that navy and those two oceans, we enjoyed an immunity seldom found to a young and struggling people, for a long, long time.

World War I came and ended, but we did not reserve the power unity which enabled us to win that war. It fell apart. We were conscious, of course, of how slightly our interests were affected by international affairs, but the unity which enabled us to win that war fell apart.

At the end of the Second World War, the power unity was again dissolved and almost completely dissolved because the American people, true to their traditions, true to their innermost longings, wanted to get back home and wanted to get the boys back home and wanted to settle back into a normal life.

That war, of course, was marked by certain mistakes. All wars are, in point of policy or strategy, and we made some mistakes.

CREATED VACUUMS

I think it may now be said, since the Yalta papers have been published, that we made a great mistake in insisting upon the complete destruction of the great producing nation in Europe—Germany.

Then, after Japan came in and before the end of the war, we again insisted upon the complete, utter destruction of that great producing nation, upon the destruction of the two greatest producers in the world, outside of ourselves, unmindful of the fact that at the moment we were creating economic and political vacuums.

We were right, I think, in insisting upon the utter destruction of Hitler militarism as it had been developed in Germany and as it had lived in Japan.

At any rate we did, and at any rate, these two great powers were destroyed. We made a peace treaty with Japan and Japan is now slowly coming back. We made but recently a treaty with West Germany under which sovereignty is restored to West Germany. But more than that, she is entitled to come into NATO and under which she will come into NATO on May 5, according to present schedules.

Both Germany and Japan are moving back industrially, and commercially, especially West Germany, and you can't understand, I do not believe any of us can understand, what is going on in Europe and what has gone on there for several months, without a realization of what Germany's return to the sisterhood of states in that area of the world means.

SEES SOVIET RETREAT

Many of the actions taken by our Soviet friends undoubtedly are predicated upon the return of Germany, of the entry of Germany into NATO, upon the rearming under restrictions, of West Germany.

The coming back of West Germany, not immediately, but ultimately, will mean the organization of all Western Europe and the retreat of the Soviets back to their ancient boundaries with possibly the exception of one satellite which cannot be defended by Western Europe. Ultimately and at no great distant date, with the return of Japan, there will commence again the age-old struggle for Northern Korea and the rich area of Manchuria, and that struggle will be between what we now call the Chinese People's Republic and Japan.

Moscow is 6,000 miles away from that battlefront, and that battleground, and so two great significant facts have come to pass. They are: The peace treaty with Japan and her entry into world affairs; the peace treaty with Western Germany and her entry again into world affairs.

These are two important facts. I believe Justice Holmes once said that a single page of human history is better than a whole volume of logic. Here are your pages.

Many men and women in this audience tonight will see the day when our Russian friends will go back to their ancient borders and boundaries and when again there will be reestablished a power group in the Far East that will give some stability to that area.

STABILITY IN FAR EAST

Although you may disagree with me, I would be less than frank if I did not say to you that in my considered judgment, whatever it is worth, the great hope for stability in the Far East is somehow, sometime the revival, and I will not say consolidation, but I will say the solidification of the efforts of Japan and India, the most populous countries outside of the Chinese People's Republic, in all of Asia.

I know that you would say that oil and water can't mix, and sometimes we are all a bit worried with Mr. Nehru. Sometimes he is a bit trying and he takes some funny courses and yet he stands very definitely for something in the Far East. And when there is a great commercial power, which again can live and thrive in Japan, reaching out for markets, both for her fabricated goods, and particularly for her new raw materials, there will begin to be order in the Far East.

I am not speaking to you about tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I am simply saying to you what, in the course of human events must be the pattern which we will see for the development again, both in Western Europe and in the Far East.

We made the supreme mistake, perhaps, at the end of World War II, in assuming that because we had fought side by side with our Russian friends to win that war and because we had come to know them, that they must be, on the whole, people with aims and purposes and aspirations much or very similar to our very own.

AUSTRIAN TREATY RUSHED

Perhaps we were not justified in reaching that easy conclusion, but we did reach it. We acted upon it, and that is past history. There is no need to discuss it here.

We, of course, know that Russia is still actuated with the old Russian imperialism, plus the communistic ideologies of the 1917 revolution. Capitalism or the capitalistic system could, of course, not be tolerated inside the Russian state or empire, and capitalism and the capitalistic system, could not be tolerated outside because it is the way of Communist expansion.

Now, what is the state of the world tonight? Some most interesting things have been going on.

In Austria, a treaty has now been hurried to a conclusion and the four powers are invited to witness this ratification, and its signing.

A study of Russian tactics ought to show us that it can mean but one thing and that is that Russia is tremendously concerned with the rearming of West Germany and wth Germany taking her place in the NATO group.

A little while ago we were very much disturbed because the Colombo group had called a conference down in Indonesia. Now the nervousness in Washington and in some high places in Washington stemmed from the belief that we would have no friends in that conference and that resolutions would come out of that conference solidi-

fying the yellow and black races against the white man everywhere. So there was nervousness here.

STATEMENT BY CHOU

Then we began to speak in more optimistic language about that conference and only last Saturday, I was rash enough, perhaps unwisely, to say that I thought the heads of state should have something to say about that conference, that at least we should have an understanding of what that conference meant and what its real objective was and that I believed there would be some friends of the Western Powers there.

You have heard the speeches that were made within the past week. You have noted the utterances they have made, and while perhaps those speeches do not represent the rank and file of the Asiatic states represented there, they nevertheless do represent the thinking of some of the leaders of those Asiatic states. And then, just last night and this morning you read that Chou En-lai had said he had no purpose to go to war with the people of the United States; that he was not planning such a war, and indicated that he was willing to sit down and talk with us.

Now I have been thinking, for many weeks and even many months, that after a period of great wars, and particularly of great revolutions, fairly shaking the foundations of the old civilizations, a people into whose hands leadership has been thrust, or to which leadership had come, must be able to make some adjustments to meet the changing conditions of the world.

WOULD CONFER WITH FRIENDS

You may recall that not too long ago I said that I believed the time was rapidly approaching when the heads of government of the four great powers could sit down and talk about the problems of Europe and the tensions in Europe; the tensions, indeed, which shadow all civilization.

Day-by-day the conviction that grows—at least to my way of thinking—is that we should have a conference first with our friends, with those nations who have been uniformly friendly to us, and with those nations in the southeast of Asia who are our friends.

Why? Because I think it important that we know precisely their thinking on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what readjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say to another power that it is willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world.

I do not know and I doubt if anyone can know what degree of sincerity is in the mind and heart of Chou En-lai, but I do think the things that he saw and witnessed down in Indonesia since the last Sabbath have opened his mind and when he says that he is willing to talk, then I will unhesitatingly say that this Nation should be big enough and great enough, through its highest officials, to talk to him.

It is time that we were relieving the tensions of this world, if we can. We should know what our friends think and say, what position they have, in what conclusions they concur in about the trouble spot in the Far East. We should not be unmindful of the concurring judgment and opinion of our friends. Indeed, I do not think that any nation can be unmindful of the opinion and judgment of its friends.

I am not talking about what the President should do or should not do with reference to his position now or hereafter, in the Formosa area.

From the beginning I have said and taken one position, and I believe it is right. I still believe it is right, and that position is that this decision is with the President himself.

In that conviction I have not wavered and will not waver; but I have also expressed the belief, and I believe it profoundly, that when and if a fateful decision must be made by the President as to whether or not he will defend any island or islands in the area of Formosa, that he will get all the information that he can from his joint chiefs, from his military leaders, from every agency of information that is available to him, and if I do not mistake the man, he will then go into his closet and face-to-face with his Maker, he will make his own decision.

I say now that out of a world conference, there can come good, that a conference with our friends will be helpful to us, and that we ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese Peoples' Republic or their leaders. We owe this to our own country, to our friends, and to all mankind everywhere. Out of that conference might come, not a final solution, but a first step which could lead to a second and third step toward the solution of some of the problems of our present time.

WOULDN'T DENY AID

I know very well that there are many good friends of the United States who believe that the time has come when we should give more attention to our home affairs and when such aid and assistance as we might give to other countries should be very definitely marked in behalf of the essential American interests which we are seeking to serve.

With that general thought, no American can quarrel, but I say to you tonight, and I hope that you editors and managing editors will bear it in mind, that this is no time to do either of two things, or both. This is no time to say that there will be no further aid or assistance given to those people of the world that are struggling to make themselves strong.

I change my mind as I go along, frequently. I am glad I do because it is probably the only proof that I have that I am in existence. I have changed my mind about economic aid because undoubtedly tonight in many wide areas of this earth, especially in the Asiatic and African countries, economic aid, point 4 if you please, technical assistance if you wish to be more technical in describing it, is a far greater military aid to people who love peace and who don't want a war. This is no time to turn away from our international obligations; whatever those obligations are. It is no time for us, in the present state of the world, to grow soft in our own ability to carry out and execute those programs that we regard as vital.

STRENGTH IN BEING

No foreign policy will receive any respect unless the people who put it forth have the strength and the will to carry it to execution. In an atomic age, that means strength in being, because the nuclear weapons of this modern age threaten to destroy the productive capacity of the people on which great reliance could have been placed. You must have something ready and presently at hand.

So this is not the time for us to turn back in our efforts to continue militarily strong, nor is it the time for us to lose interest in the economic soundness and strength of the whole free world.

How can the free world be strong, militarily and economically unless through the cooperative efforts of all free peoples, ourselves included?

How can we turn the clock to another day and say that the trade and commerce of the world, especially the free world, again should be circumvented and departmentalized to the point almost of the stagnation of that commerce? How can we do this and yet hope all free nations will become economically strong and prosperous?

DIDN'T SEEK LEADERSHIP

Upon their prosperity and strength will depend their ability to maintain their own military equipment, their own military strength.

We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people; because of their devotion to duty, private, and public, because of their tireless exertions to bring it about.

Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

So it came to us. Would we pass it up? Can we pass it up? Future generations would hold us responsible and rightly responsible for failure to grasp the high responsibilities resting upon us.

The road which we are traveling may be long and hard and thorny. Indeed, it is hard and long and thorny, but it is worthwhile, my friends, to travel along that highway that can lead us, and will lead us, if we keep our courage and our faith, to a world in which the normal things of mankind and of human life again may be enjoyed and appreciated.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955, Has Been Officially Designated by Congress and Proclaimed by President Eisenhower as an Occasion for Rededicating Our Love and Devotion to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the President on April 27 approved House Joint Resolution 184 to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day and has issued a proclamation accordingly.

I had the privilege of introducing House Joint Resolution 184 in the House of Representatives and my good friend, Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas, sponsored the measure in the Senate. This is the successful culmination of several years of effort to designate a special day when the American people will be given special opportunities to reaffirm and rededicate their loyalties to the ideals and institutions of our American way of life. We know and recognize that every day is and should be Loyalty Day, but in designating May 1, 1955, as the Loyalty Day,

we are attempting to publicize and highlight at least one day on which the American people may give special emphasis and loyalty to our Government and its institutions.

The idea of designating May 1 as Loyalty Day originated among veterans on the Atlantic seaboard, who were disturbed by the traditional May Day rallies and parades of the Communists. These veterans decided that the best way to discourage and draw attention away from the Communist rallies and parades, was to organize a demonstration and parade emphasizing loyalty and support of the United States and the American way of life. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization of which I am proud to be a member and past commander in chief, has acted as sparkplug in organizing Loyalty Day rallies and parades over the years, until Loyalty Day observances around the first of each May have become the outstanding events in many cities in the United States. It was at the request of the VFW that Senator PRICE DANIEL and I sponsored legislation to designate May 1 as Loyalty Day.

I want to express appreciation to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House; to the Senate and House leadership and to the membership of both bodies for their splendid cooperation in making it possible for the Loyalty Day bill to become law. I am grateful to all those who have assisted in the course of this legislation through the Congress.

On April 25, 1955, following approval of the Loyalty Day bill by the Senate and prior to the Presidential approval, the Hearst press, in an editorial printed in all of their papers, commented on Loyalty Day in the following manner:

The designation of Loyalty Day as a special observance, to be held annually on the 1st day of May, reflects the awareness of Congress of the great value of commemorative occasions expressing the patriotic enthusiasm of the American people.

There was a time between the two great wars when many of the American people were inclined to be somewhat timid about showing enthusiasm for their country.

When the enemies of America scoffed at all display of patriotism as flag-waving, the timid people let themselves be persuaded to look the other way when the beautiful flag of the United States went by, and to be silent when the stirring national anthem was sung, and to make a great show of tolerance when American traditions and history were disparaged and besmirched.

Loyalty and love for America were derided by our enemies as forms of narrow nationalism, and while very few Americans believed this, too many of them let themselves be intimidated and looked around to see if anybody was looking before they displayed their emotions about the country, its flag, or the inspiration of its institutions.

But then the second of the two great wars came along, and millions of young Americans offered their lives in the fullest expression of loyalty and love, and thousands of them made the supreme sacrifice of life itself.

Since then there has been no timidity about patriotic enthusiasm in America, and our people are proud to express the sentiments that fill their hearts.

Loyalty Day is in keeping with the glad hearts of our people that sing and shout loyalty and love and pride, and it is good to have a special day dedicated to the patriotic ideals which dignify every day of our lives.

In addition to the Hearst editorial praising Loyalty Day, some of the great radio and TV networks are also extending an accolade to the purpose and intention of Loyalty Day. For example, on Monday evening, May 2, from 8 to 9:30 o'clock, the NBC–TV network will have a showing of the spectacular Darkness at Noon in color as well as in black and white. This special program, which deals with the issue of loyalty versus subversion, is an NBC contribution to the Loyalty Day theme. Commenting on the NBC–TV show Darkness at Noon, VFW Commander in Chief Merton B. Tice had this to say:

As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is tremendously gratifying to me to learn that the National Broadcasting Co. is planning to stage the great dramatic Broadway hit, Darkness at Noon, before the television cameras. This is one of the great plays to be done on the subject of anticommunism. When it was premiered on Broadway in 1951, the critics labeled it a "dramatic thunderbolt," and today we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars sincerely believe that the presentation of Darkness at Noon on television will be a potent force in the field of Americanism. We also feel that it will be a dramatic climax to the hundreds of VFW Loyalty Day celebrations that will take place April 30 and May 1.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present to you a brilliant report made by the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator from Arkansas, national director and outgoing president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I commend this report to the reading of all of the Members of Congress and to the people generally who receive copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the United States:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 26, 1954

Officers and directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, delegates to its 41st national convention, and honored guests, I am happy that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress can now resume its annual convention sessions which were halted 4 years ago by a defense emergency, and I am especially pleased that so many delegates from all sections of the country are in attendance here today as I give to you this report of activities of the congress since last we met.

You will recall that the fighting started in Korea 3 months to the day after our 40th session in May 1950 and thereafter all public-works construction except that of a defense nature was banned. In the light of this situation, our directors suspended the annual conventions until the emergency should be past.

In the spring of 1951, however, our officers and directors met together here in Washington, and invited a few leaders in our field to join us in discussions of policy and formulation of a plan of action to take while the Korean fighting went on. It was decided to continue the suspension of congress meetings, and the project hearings, until such time as they might be expected to have more direct and profitable result.

Meanwhile, the national officers, not desiring to lose, during a sustained period of inactivity, the impetus gained from 40 years of progress, conceived the idea of holding regional meetings where rivers and harbors, flood control, and other water-resource projects pertaining to the particular area might be reexamined and, if so decided, kept in an active status.

Three such meetings were convened, and each was well attended and achieved some beneficial results. The New England States held an area meeting at Taunton, Mass., in May 1952; the Florida Waterways Congress was host to a regional meeting at Orlando in December 1952; and a statewide conference for the State of Illinois was held at Springfield in September 1953.

Out of these meetings came sound advice at the State and local level as to which projects might be laid aside, and which others might be retained and advocated at a later time.

Now we are met here in the 41st national convention of this body to consider many important matters concerned with the general subject of water resources, and to formulate our policies thereon. Much of the agenda was outlined in the call for this meeting sent out in March of this year. The subject set forth included: The urgent need for enactment of an omnibus flood-control and rivers-harbors authorization bill; the long-neglected maintenance of important rivers and harbors channels; the rapidly deteriorating merchant marine; the advisability of a sound program of public works to help absorb any slack in employment by reason of economic readjustments; and, despite the truce in Korea, recognition of the continued need for major expenditures in expanding and maintaining a strong national defense.

You have heard brilliant expositions of these topics yesterday by an impressive panel of speakers. Others are to follow, after which our projects committee will report its findings and recommendations as to the vast number of specific projects which were submitted and argued before it. Matters of general policy decisions will be laid before you in the resolutions committee's report.

Leading the list of officials who appeared before this congress was the President of the United States. It is difficult to find exact words to express our appreciation for the interest that Mr. Eisenhower has shown in this program of conservation and development of the Nation's water resources.

This interest was first made manifest officially in the message to Congress on the state of the Union February 2, 1953, shortly after Eisenhower's inauguration, in which he called for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development. "Its major projects should be timed," he declared, "wherever possible to assist in leveling off peaks and valleys in our economic life. Soundly planned projects already ini-

tiated should be carried out. New ones will be planned for the future."

He urged that this program should not rest entirely on the shoulders of Federal bureaucracy, but rather should bring into partnership the States and local communities and private citizens, all working together. "This combined effort," he said, "will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power that they can generate."

Reiterating the theme of partnership and joint responsibility in his state of the Union message in January this year, Mr. Eisenhower declared that the next fiscal year will see work started on 23 new projects which have met the Federal Government's requirements of economic soundness. Stating these would be built "with local sharing of cost wherever appropriate and feasible," he added: "The Federal Government will continue to construct and operate economically sound flood-control, power, irrigation, and water-supply projects wherever these projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, and consistent with the needs of the whole Nation."

This message also recommended enactment of legislation to strengthen agricultural conservation and upstream flood-prevention work, and to achieve a better balance with major flood-control structures in the downstream areas. It promised recommendations for the adoption of "a uniform and consistent water-resources policy."

In transmitting his economic report to Congress in January, President Eisenhower wrote that "our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes it possible for the United States to turn more of its attention to a sustained improvement of national living standards."

Pointing out that the backlog of desirable Federal, State, and local public works is counted in tens of billions of dollars, he emphasized that such programs should be so designed and executed as to contribute to economic stability, by being accelerated in slack times and restrained in boom times.

The report promised that effort will be devoted during the present year to "the large task of evolving truly integrated long-term programs of major Federal works in the fields of water and soil conservation."

With regard to the advance planning of public works, our own national vice president, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, has introduced a bill in Congress which would require the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Public Roads to report to Congress comparative figures on public works money for the year 1935 to 1941, and from 1945 to 1953.

The bill states that a massive public works program conceived to make war on a future depression would require years of planning to prevent loss of millions of dollars through the necessity for urgency and emergency action, in many cases authorizing public works which cannot be economically justified.

Great further encouragement in our aims is provided by the President's message submitted to Congress with the budget for fiscal year 1955. Here he speaks of budget provisions for helping to prevent the ravages of floods and soil erosion as one of the "constructive domestic purposes designed to strengthen the foundations of a stable and prosperous economy." Further, under the subject of tax proposals, it is recommended that deductions up to 25 percent of the farmer's gross income be allowed for soil conservation expenses on farms.

Under new legislative proposals, it is recommended that the sum of $3 million be authorized for cooperation with State and local agencies on watershed protection; and $10 million for aid for non-Federal development of water resources, with an added $400,000 for Federal projects.

The sum of $580 million is recommended to be obligated for civil functions of the Defense Department; in other words, for construction work of the Corps of Engineers. Net budget expenditures of slightly over $1 billion are estimated for 1955 in the category of "natural resources."

Here again it is pointed out that "a strong program of resource conservation and development is necessary to support the progressively expanding demands of our increasing population and to contribute to the economic growth and security of the Nation."

Budget recommendations provide for the continuation of river basin work now underway. Less urgent features of the projects, not required for operation of going or completed units, will be deferred. Budget expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers include an estimated $443 million in fiscal 1955 to carry on construction of about 160 river basin development projects. A substantial amount of these expenditures is for multipurpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power. During the year, 20 projects will be completed or substantially completed, including 9 flood control projects, 5 irrigation projects, and 6 multipurpose projects with power facilities.

The budget further recommends starting work on 6 irrigation and water supply projects, 8 local flood prevention projects, and 8 navigation projects. In addition, it provides for resumption of work on 2 flood control reservoirs and 2 river and harbor improvements. This work is estimated to cost a total of $184 million, with expenditures of $20 million scheduled for the fiscal year 1955. Together with the St. Lawrence Seaway, this totals 23 new projects and 4 resumptions in the budget.

I think you will agree with me this by no means is all that is to be desired. We need to make faster progress—but as long as our Projects Committee continues to hear as many applications as they had before them on Monday, however, there is no danger of a shortage of proposals to be considered by the Federal Government in the way of land and water resources development.

Additional work should be undertaken, the President's message said, with a view to strengthening our vital upstream conservation activities. Farmers increasingly realize that it is in their own interest to do more of this work. Because the Nation, as well as farmers and local communities receive benefits, this work should be a joint responsibility. Existing law, however, does not provide an adequate basis for cooperative upstream detvelopment.

The 1955 budget, therefore, includes $3 million under proposed legislation to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with local and State agencies in the planning and installation on small watersheds of the necessary protective facilities, and to provide for better conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water. This will supplement the $11 million to be spent under existing law for watershed protection and flood-prevention projects, but still this amount should be larger.

We approve and applaud the administration's policy toward public works construction, their permanent value to the national economy, their present value as defense spending tapers off to act as a deterrent to unemployment and recession, and the view that, wherever feasible, they should develop as a partnership of all responsible interests or those which may enjoy the benefits.

Improvements of internal waterways for navigation and for flood control not only have a beneficial economic effect to make our Nation stronger, but they also effect beneficially the strengthening of our defenses. Particularly wise, we believe, is the resumption of flood-control works that are not completed, in order to avoid both the tragic waste from floods, and the loss of money already invested. Maintenance of navigation projects we consider foresighted action to provide water transportation to relieve congested railroads and highways, thus to prevent any future transportation delays which might adversely affect national defense efforts.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is pleased to find the administration in accord with its long-established policy favoring additional production of hydro-electric power, but opposing unnecessary Government competition with the private power industry in constructing such facilities. The budget report recognizes the "willingness of State and local groups to participate" in providing the power facilities, but states that where the necessary transmission facilities are not also being provided on reasonable terms, the Department of Interior will construct and operate them.

It is a source of great satisfaction to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to find itself continuing to work in the company of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. There seemed serious danger a while ago that civil functions might be removed from their roster of duties, and we would lose them as leaders, staunch allies and coworkers in this field. Fortunately, reason prevailed, and the Engineer Corps continues its supervision of navigation and flood-control projects, a job which it has done superbly for more than a century, a peacetime job much less spectacular but in the large sense as vital, as the great achievements of the corps in the works of national defense or helping to win a war.

We are greatly indebted to the distinguished Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., for the interesting and valuable contribution he made to yesterday's program when he discussed the rivers-harbors and flood-control program.

Another Goverment agency with which we have learned to work together over many years is the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, whose Secretary, Hon. Douglas McKay, honored us by attendance at this convention, and by his helpful presentation of his department's program of reclamation.

The great experience, expert techniques, alertness to improve their standards and methods in developing and utilizing our natural resources, of the Bureau of Reclamation, have certainly gained for them a reputation for competence which will reassure the United States Congress to believe that any moneys supplied to that Bureau will be completely justified and well expended. The same assurance should apply to any appropriations asked for the Corps of Engineers.

Another Cabinet officer who generously gave his time to appear before our congress was the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, who discussed intelligently the soil-conservation program of his Department. This congress has consistently supported the Agriculture Department's authoritative work on soil conservation, reforestation, and upstream watershed control. We support the future program in this field and oppose any change in it, unless perhaps it should come by way of expansion.

Foreign trade is much in the minds of nations throughout the world today, perhaps only secondary to the questions of war and peace. A vital factor in all considerations of expanding the trade of any nation is its merchant marine. A strong, effiecient, modern American merchant marine is indispensable to development of our trade with world countries, to the preservation of our domestic economy at high peak in peacetime, but also it has been, and shall continue to be, an invaluable aid to national security in a national emergency, a vital factor to success in time of war.

We should like to urge upon the United States Congress that there appears united sentiment throughout the country to support the development and mainetnance of our water-transportation facilities, as essential to our prosperity, with particular reference to the water carriers in the foreign trade, the domestic coastwise and inland waterways, the shipbuilding and repair facilities, and the maintenance of adequate harbors on our expansive coastline to service fully the commerce of our Nation.

The brilliant pages of history written by the American merchant marine during World Wars I and II were substantially augmented by further performance during the Korean emergency when American-flag vessels were available to serve the United Nations interests.

The United States, with its present world leadership in industry, finance, agriculture, and other fields, must continue to be a leading maritime nation. It must never have to depend upon foreign-flag shipping for bottoms to carry its exports, nor to aid its national defense.

Now, for a few moments before closing, I should like to talk about our organization and its future. After having served for 10 years as your president, I have not stood for reelection this time. This afternoon you will hear the names of your new directors. All 21 offices were vacant because we have not been able to hold elections for some time. With a wholly new board of directors in office, you shall be off to a flying start toward a richer and broader future. These directors shall meet and select a new president, and to him I wish to extend in advance my greatest good wishes, and a cordial pledge of cooperation, and the hope to be of further service to him and to the congress whenever either shall call upon me.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is a body which moves quietly, avoids criticism, and performs wonders. It should have the unqualified and continuous financial support of all interests and individuals who realize the long-range vitality of America is measured by our evaluation of the land and water resources so generously given us by Providence.

Transportation depends in part upon our inland waterways, our barge lines; the harm of devastating floods can be halted by measures of control; soil erosion and the dust bowls can ruin agriculture or, by proper measures, can be brought under control; foreign trade depends upon navigable harbors and inland waters, as well as the open seas; irrigation can bring desert lands into production of food; impounding of flowing waters and building of dams and hydroelectric plants brings light and power for manifold uses to the city, and the farm dwellers.

All these, and many more, conservation activities are the zealous concern of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Their work is fortunately at present in general accord with expressed policy of the Federal Government. This is a time for forward progress on all fronts. I wish you all every possible success in your part of this tremendous program, for America's sake.

False Witness Against Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it appears unmistakable that one of America's most widely circulated magazines, the Reader's Digest, has opened its pages to special pleading, or, perhaps more properly, has become public-relations agent for the new Hoover Commission.

In recent weeks it has been necessary for two of my colleagues—Senator GORE and Representative ROGERS of Colorado—to challenge the accuracy of material published in this magazine, and it has now become my duty to follow in their path and to make known certain falsehoods and half-truths that appeared in the May issue of Reader's Digest. I refer to the article Dollars Into Dust, a slashing, reckless attack on reclamation in general and the Upper Colorado and Central Arizona projects in particular.

The prejudice behind this article and its distortion about the "almost unbelievable Government extravagance" in Bureau of Reclamation projects should shame the editor of any honest, impartial magazine. One is tolerant of those who mislead through want of information. But, on the other hand, it is hard not to be indignant when reporters go into the field and glean the truth only to ignore it when it hurts their purposes.

The damage done by the misinformation in this article can never be completely undone, but I submit for those who read our RECORD the following statement and editorial which shed the light of truth on the Digest's latest example of shabby journalism. The statement was made late last month in Phoenix, Ariz., by Mr. David Brinegar, executive secretary of the Central Arizona Project Association. The editorial, printed soon after Mr. Brinegar's statement, was written by the respected editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Mr. William R. Mathews. The statement and editorial follow:

STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID BRINEGAR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT ASSOCIATION

Mr. Harvey had answers to every one of those false statements, but chose not to use them.

When he was here I gave him the facts about the Central Arizona project. Late in September 1954 he asked not only for facts on the Central Arizona project, but assistance in obtaining information about the upper basin project. Through John Geoffrey Will, of Denver, then executive secretary of the Upper Basin Commission, I obtained the upper basin material Mr. Harvey wanted.

The article published in Readers' Digest under the names of Mr. Miller and Mr. Harvey presented none of this material. It repeated a large assortment of propaganda statements almost verbatim out of California-published literature, with the implication that these statements were factual and could not be effectively answered.

For instance, the Digest article says that populous States would have to pay most of the bill for the Central Arizona project. That is false. The Central Arizona project would fully repay all its costs to the Federal Treasury and return an additional three to seven billion dollars of direct tax revenues to the Federal Government besides. This is not our estimate—this is the estimate of one of the most conservative agricutural economists in the United States, True D. Morse, formerly head of Doane's Agricultural Service at St. Louis and now Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project would irrigate only 226,000 acres. That is false. It would provide water for three-quarters of a million acres of the most valuable farming productionwise in America.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project construction cost would be $1,991 per acre. That is false. The cost of agricultural works never went beyond $400 per acre and several times was estimated lower. I suggest that in this instance the Digest was rather moderate. However, some Californians have used a figure as high as $5,000 an acre.

The Digest charges that there is a "concealed subsidy" to Arizona farmers of $9,200 an acre in the Central Arizona project. The Digest then lists, out of a California propaganda leaflet, figures indicating that New York State would pay $256 million of the project cost, and that other States would pay other large sums. These statements are false; all Arizona at any time asked was an opportunity to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury on a 70-year loan, cut to the same sound pattern as other large, multipurpose reclamation projects which have paid out, or are paying out, dollar for dollar.

The Digest uses other figures with an intentional shocking effect, whereas an analysis of the figures reveals there is no reason for shock. The pump lift out of the Colorado River is stated at 1,000 feet and the length of the major canals as 300 miles. Does the Digest know that within southern California there is a pump lift of 1,615 feet out of the Colorado River, feeding a major aqueduct system totaling more than the mileage involved in the Central Arizona project aqueducts, and involving transportation of very nearly the same amount of Colorado River water? The Arizona pump lift would be 985 feet.

It astounds me to have people seriously ask, "Is the Central Arizona project feasible?" when all they have to do is look around on any trip to southern California and see completely demonstrated the feasibility of transporting a million acre-feet of water annually through 300 or more miles of aqueducts, with a 985-foot or higher pump lift.

The Digest repeats the old canard that the Central Arizona project would unduly enrich 420 large landowners. The Digest says that this is one surprising aspect of the Central Arizona project which has escaped notice. Either the Digest writers and editors are ignorant or deliberately deceptive. This is a propaganda statement made for 8 years by the Colorado River Association of California in virtually every piece of that California group's literature, and totally refuted by Arizona and the Bureau of Reclamation in testimony before Congress. More than 30,000 farms of all sizes would benefit, not one of them in any disproportionate amount.

The Digest, in the Leslie Miller-Holman Harvey article, has picked up a long list of old, widely disseminated, but quite answerable statements made by California propagandists in an effort to frustrate use of Colorado river water by Arizona. The facts concerning these things were available to Mr. Harvey and presumably also to Mr. Miller. Certainly, in any publication office as large and as important as the Digest's some research checking should be performed to avoid carelessly reproducing outright misstatements of fact.

I have written Dewitt Wallace, editor of the Digest, suggesting to him that if the Digest has an honest intention of thoroughly discussing reclamation, there are several outstanding writers capable of handling the stories factually. I wish every person who knows reclamation's true story of benefits would also write him.

The Digest has done a disservice to the entire nation, and particularly to the business of reputable gathering, checking, and publishing of factual information.

[From the Arizona Daily Star of April 11, 1955]

A DISTORTED STORY

The Reader's Digest, with its multimillion circulation, wields powerful editorial influence in the United States. When this power is used to promote a special-interest group it can become a telling weapon.

In the May issue, we see the unfortunate spectacle of the Digest not only promoting a special-interest group, but doing so with a disregard for facts which is surprising in a publication with the reputation the Digest enjoys.

In an article entitled "Dollars Into Dust" the Digest launches an attack on reclamation in the United States, and therein devotes several paragraphs to the Central Arizona project.

The article is carried under the bylines of Lselie A. Miller and Holman Harvey. Mr. Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming, and Chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, and as such his name will carry great weight with those who read the article.

Unfortunately, it was Mr. Harvey, and not Mr. Miller, who visited Arizona gathering data for this report.

At the time he was here, Mr. Harvey was supplied with the facts about the Central Arizona project. None of these appeared in the article.

To the contrary, the paragraphs devoted to the Central Arizona project are based almost completely on distortions created by California interests who are battling the Arizona project with every means at their disposal.

And it is to the credit of these California interests, as propagandists, that they have been able to sell their distortions to a magazine with the circulation, influence, and reputation of the Digest. The article will mean much to the campaign they are waging.

The Central Arizona Project Association realizes how much this article can hurt Arizona, and answered the allegations in an article carried in yesterday's Star quoting David Brinegar, its executive secretary.

Unfortunately, such an article published in Arizona can do almost nothing to remedy the damage done by the Digest article, and with that realization, the association has written the Digest asking whether it is interested in publishing a fair appraisal of reclamation, and the Central Arizona project, or whether this biased and inaccurate report is to go unanswered in its pages.

Whether through careless reporting and editing, or through intentional distortion, the Digest stands now in the position of pulling southern California's chestnuts out of the fire, and using the half-truths and untruths from California's own battle guide.

Whether the Digest is going to remedy the damage it has unfairly done to Arizona, and at the same time to its own reputation for accuracy and fairness, remains to be seen.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, from whom no secrets are hid: Help us in this opening moment of a new week's council to draw near to Thee in tranquillity, in humility, and sincerity. With Thy benediction may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth.

In this dear land of our love and prayer, may we close our national ranks in a new unity, as sinister powers without pity or conscience plot to destroy the birthright of our liberty of worship and speech and the sanctity of the individual. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STENNIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Minimum Wages of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I have cleared the matter with the minority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the following nominations for appointments in the Army and in the Navy, all of which were received on April 25, 1955, and which were favorably reported by Mr. STENNIS and ordered to be placed on the Vice President's desk, for the information of the Senate:

Donald Arthur Andrews and 325 other cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army as second lieutenants, effective June 3, 1955, upon their graduation.

Jerry L. Hoover and 134 other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army.

Paul I. Abernathy, Jr., and 1,559 other nominations for appointment as ensign in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, coming from this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as from a group of ROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army and the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be subject to the usual limitation of 2 minutes on statements made in connection therewith.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $350,000, for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, covering the period July-December 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TOTAQUINE

A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 7,818,272 ounces of totaquine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS OF PYRETHRUM

A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 60,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stock pile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN NONIMMIGRANT ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on temporary admission into the United States of certain nonimmigrant aliens under section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Carlos Aravantinos from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on August 2, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, with drawing the name of Fu-Huan Fang from a report relating to the temporary admission of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, N. MEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris) in New Mexico, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the construction and improvement of highways necessary for civil defense purposes

"Whereas the rapid development of more efficient atomic weapons capable of a tremendous destructive force over a wide area, and of both piloted and guided aircraft to deliver these deadly missiles to any spot on the globe, has rendered every population and industrial center in this country susceptible to sudden attack by enemy forces with the catastrophic results; and

"Whereas it is obvious that if any of the great population or industrial centers of our country is the victim of an enemy bombing attack, the roads and highways leading out of such center will assume tremendous importance, since they will be used before the attack, if there is any warning thereof, to evacuate as many persons as possible, and will be used after the immediate devastation subsides to evacuate the wounded and homeless, to move in needed medical personnel and equipment, and for movement of military troops and equipment; and

"Whereas it is essential that as many such roads and highways as possible be constructed and improved to standards which will enable them to be put to the most effective use for the purposes described above in the event of enemy attack and thereby minimize to a great extent the loss of life and disruption of transportation and communication which will result from such an attack; and

"Whereas the present program of Federal aid for construction and improvement of highways is an important step toward the ultimate completion of an integrated system of adequate roads and highways throughout the Nation, but is limited, to a great extent, to the major roads and highways only; and

"Whereas there are many roads and highways which, while not presently considered major roads or highways for the purpose of Federal aid, are vitally essential when considered in the light of civil defense needs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a program for the extension of Federal aid for the construction of roads and highways necessary for civil defense purposes and to ap-

propriate funds to carry out this program; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 10

"Resolution commending the select committee appointed by the 33d legislation session of the house of representatives, and directing the legislative research committee to study the laws of North Dakota relating to mill storage of grain, and to confer with surrounding States on the problems of mill storage

"Whereas the 1953 session of the house of representatives deemed it advisable to appoint an interim committee to investigate the practices of mill storage grain and to report their findings to the 34th session of said house of representatives; and

"Whereas the said committee, at great sacrifice of their time and convenience, have made exhaustive and minute study of said charged practices, the result of which have revealed flagrant violations and misuse of mill storage grain: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the 34th session of the house of representatives directs that a copy of the select committee's report be forwarded to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the Governor of North Dakota, and to the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, and that a copy of this resolution accompany each report as directed above.

"Whereas such select committee found that the practice of mill storage of grain was widespread throughout North Dakota, and that such practice depresses the market of small grains grown in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives,* That the legislative research committee is hereby authorized and directed to study the laws of the State of North Dakota relating to mill storage practices, and to recommend improvements in such laws and the enforcement thereof; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the legislative research committee confer with similar bodies in the States of Montana, South Dakota, and Minnesota for the purpose of developing sound laws to prevent the practice of mill storage, thereby improving the market price of durum, hard spring wheat, flax, and other small grains grown in this area, and that the legislative research committee make its report and recommendations to the 35th legislative assembly in such form as it may deem expedient; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this house of representatives, as a body, commend the efforts of Representatives Snortland; Erickson, of Burke-Divide; and Rolfsrud; members of said select committee.

"K. A. FITCH,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution adopted by the executive board, Holy Name Society of St. Francis of Assisi, R. C., Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Woodhaven Council, No. 1866, Knights of Columbus, of Woodhaven; St. Kilian's Council, No. 2204, Knights of Columbus, of Farmingdale; Bishop McDonald Council, No. 2324, Knights of Columbus, of Babylon; and Patchogue Council, No. 725, Knights of Columbus, of Patchogue, all in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Zita Bakowski, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the appointment of Calvin C. Mcgregor for the position of judge of the United States District Court of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff

"Whereas the bicycle industry represents one of the major industries in several of the small cities and towns of the commonwealth; and

"Whereas many bicycles are being made and brought into the United States from several foreign countries and the rates of pay in these countries for the fabrication of materials and the building of the bicyles is greatly less than the prevailing rates in the United States, therefore making it impossible for the manufacturer in this country to compete in this business; and

"Whereas the United States Tariff Commission has submitted a recommendation to the President of the United States which would greatly help this industry to survive: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby strongly urges the President to accept these recommendations and to take such action which will result in these recommendations being put into effect at once; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and the commission now studying the subject of tariffs."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

"Whereas the recent dismissal of a high official from the State Department of the United States has created throughout the country varied expressions of dissatisfaction in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make a complete and thorough investigation relative to the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the State Department of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the presiding officer of both branches of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER ELLIS ISLAND TO STATE OR CITY OF NEW YORK — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the State Legislature of New York recently adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to cede to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over Ellis Island so that local authorities might use the facilities there as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics

Whereas the Federal Government has recently abandoned the use of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island, in the harbor of the city of New York, which it has operated for many years as a center for the reception, care, custody and processing of persons immigrating into this country; and

Whereas the said lands, properties, and facilities are no longer being operated or maintained by the Federal Government for any purpose whatsoever and unless properly and continuously maintained they will inevitably deteriorate through nonuse and will ultimately become obsolete, uninhabitable, and valueless for any purpose; and

Whereas the State of New York and the city of New York are in dire need of additional facilities for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and

Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the legislature that the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island are ideally suitable for and can be readily converted into a well-equipped clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics to be operated and maintained by the State or the city of New York or jointly by both the State and the city of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and/or the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island, formerly used by the Federal Government as a reception center for immigrants, for use by the State and/or the city of New York as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York, and that they be

urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the Assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In the senate April 1, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF INDIGENT PEOPLE—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation granting Federal aid to States and cities for medical care of indigent people.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a bill filed in Congress by Congressman REED would grant Federal aid to States and cities for medical care for medically indigent people and the welfare program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board favor this bill and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman LANE and Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY.

EXEMPTION OF PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM FEDERAL REGULATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park, Minn., the fourth largest city in the State of Minnesota. The resolution protests against the enactment of the so-called Harris bill, to exclude the producers of natural gas from Federal control.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in opposition to the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560)

Whereas the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park has given consideration to the provisions of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560); and

Whereas the city of St. Louis Park is a rapidly growing suburb of the city of Minneapolis, having a population in excess of 35,000 inhabitants residing for the most part in residences which have been constructed in the last 10 years and which are heated by natural gas, the cost of such heating in this climate being a substantial item in the budget of every householder; and

Whereas it appears to the city council that there is not a truly competitive market in the producing gas fields which constitute the supply of natural gas for this area, and that effective control of rates by the Federal Power Commission must necessarily include control of the prices paid to producers and owners of sources of supply; and

Whereas the city council concludes that it may be assumed that the Federal Power Commission will properly take into account the risks involved in exploration for oil and natural gas in determining the prices of natural gas under its jurisdiction: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park, That the Congress of the United States be hereby memorialized in opposition to the passage of the so-called Harris bill or any legislation having as its object the limitation of jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission with respect to prices and rates paid for natural gas to producers and owners of sources of supply; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park requests the members of Congress from Minnesota to exert their efforts in opposition to this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to submit forthwith a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 266. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; with amendments (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5085. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 261).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1488. A bill relating to the payment of money orders; with amendments (Rept. No. 262).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for March 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,355,810	2,353,908	+1,902	$754,426	$779,256	−$24,830
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,174,295	1,171,482	+2,813	383,073	392,765	−9,692
Department of Defense	1,181,515	1,182,426	−911	371,353	386,491	−15,138
Inside continental United States	2,134,994	2,129,235	+5,759			
Outside continental United States	220,816	224,673	−3,857			
Industrial employment	719,556	720,169	−613			
Foreign nationals	341,342	340,182	+1,160	25,139	25,780	−641

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1955, and comparison with February 1955, and pay for February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	73,318	71,330	1,988		$20,652	$21,967		$1,315
Commerce [1]	44,502	43,816	686		16,173	16,886		713
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,901	[2] 38,449	452		13,370	13,439		69
Interior	50,546	49,992	554		17,102	18,105		1,003
Justice	30,225	30,256		31	11,835	12,684		849
Labor	4,923	4,913	10		1,954	2,024		70
Post Office	504,434	506,090		1,656	165,419	164,164	$1,255	
State	20,758	20,740	18		6,349	6,713		364
Treasury	82,826	82,182	644		29,127	30,095		968
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	279	270	9		131	140		9
Bureau of the Budget	427	425	2		243	260		17
Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1	20	26		6
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1		23	21	2	
National Security Council [3]	26	27		1	15	15		
Office of Defense Mobilization	288	296		8	146	145	1	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5			3	3		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions [4]	8		8					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	11	5		3	5		2
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	4	4			1		1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	797	795	2		90	99		9
Atomic Energy Commission	6,036	6,040		4	2,693	2,861		168
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	586	4		235	243		8
Civil Aeronautics Board	537	534	3		254	272		18
Civil Service Commission	3,879	3,938		59	1,526	1,617		91
Commission of Fine Arts	10	[2] 10			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	61		2	23	26		3
Defense Transport Administration	17	16	1		8	8		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	143	137	6		71	74		3
Farm Credit Administration	1,096	1,088	8		481	497		16
Federal Civil Defense Administration	713	700	13		310	319		9
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	7		3
Federal Communications Commission	1,080	1,079	1		494	522		28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,097	1,084	13		417	450		33
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	352	354		2	208	215		7
Federal Power Commission	620	626		6	288	303		15
Federal Trade Commission	581	587		6	300	306		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	173	176		3	67	77		10
Foreign Operations Administration	6,395	[2] 6,292	103		2,719	2,871		152
General Accounting Office	5,734	5,773		39	2,201	2,313		112
General Services Administration	25,756	25,786		30	7,564	8,000		436
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4		4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49		2,525	2,678		153
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,815	10,504	311		4,047	4,340		293
Indian Claims Commission	14	14			9	9		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,802	1,810		8	783	838		55
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3			1	1		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56		2,910	3,049		139
National Capital Housing Authority	278	283		5	87	92		5
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21			10	9	1	
National Gallery of Art	316	311	5		89	90		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,150	1,149	1		538	575		37
National Mediation Board	110	111		1	70	72		2
National Science Foundation	257	175	82		85	81	4	
National Security Training Commission	6	8		2	4	4		
Panama Canal	15,401	15,618		217	3,378	3,398		20
Railroad Retirement Board	2,401	2,438		37	784	829		45
Renegotiation Board	536	584		48	316	335		19
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	21			11	13		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	28	20	8		11	11		
Securities and Exchange Commission	687	689		2	342	359		17
Selective Service System	7,113	7,136		23	1,492	1,564		72
Small Business Administration	745	749		4	366	368		2
Smithsonian Institution	635	640		5	202	209		7
Soldiers' Home	988	973	15		179	183		4
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	36		3	20	20		
Tariff Commission	198	197	1		99	102		3
Tax Court of the United States	142	141	1		69	71		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,007	21,379		372	8,463	9,599		1,136
United States Information Agency	9,809	9,811		2	2,243	2,267		24
Veterans' Administration	178,378	178,052	326		51,416	53,822		2,406
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,174,295	1,171,482	5,390	2,577	383,073	392,765	1,264	10,956
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			2,813				9,692	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,950	1,906	44		920	953		33
Department of the Army	463,070	463,105		35	137,058	142,993		5,935
Department of the Navy	409,839	409,211	628		138,118	143,605		5,487
Department of the Air Force	306,656	308,204		1,548	95,257	98,940		3,683
Total, Department of Defense	1,181,515	1,182,426	672	1,583	371,353	386,491		15,138
Net decrease, Department of Defense			911				15,138	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,355,810	2,353,908	6,062	4,160	754,426	779,256	1,264	26,094
Net change, including Department of Defense			1,902				24,830	

[1] March figure includes 527 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 10588 dated Jan. 14, 1955.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1955, and comparison with February 1955*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	72,135	70,178	1,957	
Commerce [1]	41,572	40,927	645	
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,359	[2] 37,908	451	
Interior	44,621	44,227	394	
Justice	29,709	29,749		40
Labor	4,815	4,810	5	
Post Office	502,090	503,746		1,656
State	5,850	5,854		4
Treasury	81,829	81,182	647	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	279	270	9	
Bureau of the Budget	427	425	2	
Council of Economic Advisors	31	32		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1	
National Security Council [3]	26	27		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	288	296		8
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions [4]	8		8	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	11	5	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	4	4		
American Battle Monuments Commission	18	16	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,019	6,023		4
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	586	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	533	530	3	
Civil Service Commission	3,868	3,928		60
Commission of Fine Arts	10	[2] 10		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	61		2
Defense Transport Administration	17	16	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	143	137	6	
Farm Credit Administration	1,084	1,076	8	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	713	700	13	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,051	1,052		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,096	1,083	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	352	354		2
Federal Power Commission	620	626		6
Federal Trade Commission	581	587		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	173	176		3
Foreign Operations Administration	1,662	1,660	2	
General Accounting Office	5,683	5,724		41
General Services Administration	25,647	25,681		34
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4	
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,680	10,372	308	
Indian Claims Commission	14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,802	1,810		8
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56	
National Capital Housing Authority	278	283		5
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21		
National Galley of Art	316	311	5	
National Labor Relations Board	1,128	1,127	1	
National Mediation Board	110	111		1
National Science Foundation	257	175	82	
National Security Training Commission	6	8		2
Panama Canal	472	542		70
Railroad Retirement Board	2,401	2,438		37
Renegotiation Board	536	584		48
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	21		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	28	20	8	
Securities and Exchange Commission	687	689		2
Selective Service System	6,914	6,935		21
Small Business Administration	745	749		4
Smithsonian Institution	633	638		5
Soldiers' Home	988	973	15	
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	36		3
Tariff Commission	198	197	1	
Tax Court of the United States	142	141	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,007	21,379		372
United States Information Agency	2,299	2,267	32	
Veterans' Administration	177,108	176,748	360	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,115,029	1,112,378	5,098	2,447
Net increase excluding Department of Defense			2,651	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,896	1,852	44	
Department of the Army	375,417	373,550	1,867	
Department of the Navy	378,679	378,241	438	
Department of the Air Force	263,973	263,214	759	
Total, Department of Defense	1,019,965	1,016,857	3,108	
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,108	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,134,994	2,129,235	8,206	2,447
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,759	

[1] March figure includes 527 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 10588 dated Jan. 14, 1955.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1955, and comparison with February 1955*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,183	1,152	31	
Commerce	2,930	2,889	41	
Health, Education, and Welfare	542	541	1	
Interior	5,925	5,765	160	
Justice	516	507	9	
Labor	108	103	5	
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	14,908	14,886	22	
Treasury	997	1,000		3
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	779	779		
Atomic Energy Commission	17	17		
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	11	10	1	
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	29	27	2	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Operations Administration	4,733	[1] 4,632	101	
General Accounting office	51	49	2	
General Services Administration	109	105	4	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	135	132	3	
National Labor Relations Board	22	22		
Panama Canal	14,929	15,076		147
Selective Service System	199	201		2
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,510	7,544		34
Veterans' Administration	1,270	1,304		34
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,266	59,104	382	220
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			162	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	54	54		
Department of the Army	87,653	89,555		1,902
Department of the Navy	31,160	30,970	190	
Department of the Air Force	42,683	44,990		2,307
Total, Department of Defense	161,550	165,569	190	4,209
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,019	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	220,816	224,673	572	4,429
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			3,857	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1955 and comparison with February 1955*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,845	2,825	20	
Commerce	2,173	2,160	13	
Interior	8,210	8,087	123	
Treasury	6,353	6,396		43
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	133	137		4
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	922	875	47	
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56	
Panama Canal	7,422	7,615		193
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,820	18,168		348
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,019	60,299	308	588
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			280	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 209,100	[2] 208,152	948	
Outside continental United States	[1] 43,000	[2] 43,953		953
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	238,129	237,693	436	
Outside continental United States	6,922	6,929		7
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	157,293	154,968	2,325	
Outside continental United States	5,093	8,175		3,082
Total, Department of Defense	659,537	659,870	3,709	4,042
Net decrease, Department of Defense			333	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	719,556	720,169	4,017	4,630
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			613	

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1955 and comparison with February 1955*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Austria	171	171					171	171
England	7,492	7,441					7,492	7,441
France	22,599	21,539	15,657	14,883			6,942	6,656
French Morocco	4,109	756	203		821	756	3,085	
Germany	125,305	125,291	101,716	101,707	1,965	1,969	21,624	21,615
Japan	155,756	155,445	94,299	[1] 94,299	18,481	18,457	42,976	42,689
Korea	23,222	26,824	23,222	26,824				
Lybia	967	1,048					967	1,048
Ryukyus	244	228			244	228		
Saudi Arabia	690	702					690	702
Spain	142	96					142	96
Trinidad	645	641			645	641		
Total	341,342	340,182	235,097	237,713	22,156	22,051	84,089	80,418

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,355,810. This was a net increase of 1,902 as compared with employment reported in the preceeding month of February.

This was the second increase in succession and it was the fifth increase in 32 months since July 1952. The other monthly increases were in June, October, and November 1954 and February 1955.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1954—July	2,387,833		5,187
August	2,375,988		11,845
September	2,355,170		20,818
October	2,359,325	4,155	
November	2,385,024	25,699	
December	2,368,072		16,952
1955—January	2,353,588		14,484
February	2,353,908	320	
March	2,355,810	1,902	

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of March was 1,174,295 an increase of 2,813 over the February total of 1,171,482. Total civilan employment in the military agencies in March was 1,181,515. This was a net decrease of 911 as compared with 1,182,426 in February.

The net increase was reported almost exclusively by the Department of Agriculture, which had an increase of 1,988. Other civilian agencies reporting increases were the Department of Commerce with an increase of 686, the Department of the Treasury with an increase of 644, the Department of the Interior with an increase of 554, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with an increase of 452, Veterans' Administration with an increase of 326, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency with an increase of 311.

These civilian agency increases were partially off-set by decreases by the Post Office Department with a decrease of 1,656, and the Tennessee Valley Authority with a decrease of 372.

Increases in civilian employment in the Department of Defense were reported by the Department of the Navy with an increase of 628 and the Office of the Secretary of Defense with an increase of 44. The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 35, and the Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 1,548.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 5,759, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 3,857.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in March totaled 719,556, a decrease of 613 as compared with February.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,355,810 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 341,342 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of March who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in February was 340,182. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	171			171
England	7,492			7,492
France	22,599	15,657		6,942
French Morocco	4,109	203	821	3,085
Germany	125,305	101,716	1,965	21,624
Japan	155,756	94,299	18,481	42,976
Korea	23,222	23,222		
Libya	967			967
Ryukyus	244		244	
Saudi Arabia	690			690
Spain	142			142
Trinidad	645		645	
Total	341,342	235,097	22,156	84,089

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1857. A bill to establish national policy respecting the development and use of water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1858. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1860. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1861. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1862. A bill for the relief of Oscar Ems deHuy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1863. A bill to provide for the demolition and removal of temporary buildings erected in the District of Columbia since the beginning of World War I, and for the substitution therefor of permanent-type facilities constructed under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1864. A bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1865. A bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels, and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women and provide insurance benefits for certain additional widows and parents, and to amend the public-assistance provisions of such act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1867. A bill for the relief of Mary Goodyear Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1868. A bill for the relief of the C–L Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1869. A bill for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1870. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling, and disposition of short-paid (postage due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes;

S. 1871. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes;

S. 1872. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

S. 1873. A bill to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes; and

S. 1874. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national policy for the development and use of water resources in the United States.

I appreciate this is a very broad subject and one which will take some time for consideration and the working out of a comprehensive plan. A great deal is being done in different areas by individual States and under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. It is my belief that a more effective use of our water resources will result if there is overall planning of such projects in relation to the major river basin within which they are located.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement of the bill be included with my remarks at this place in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1857) to establish national policy respecting the development and use of water resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In addition to the enactment clause (sec. 1) the bill consists of 11 sections the intent and purpose of each is, briefly, as follows:

Section 2 is a declaration of 16 basic principles designed to minimize centralization of authority in the Federal Government. The effectuation of these principles, among other ends, is intended to result in: (1) Cooperative and comprehensive river basin planning, (2) utilization of adequate and reliable basic data, (3) coordination of Federal agency activities, (4) realistic program and project evaluation, and (5) equitable sharing of program and project costs.

Section 3 is devoted to definitions.

Section 4 requires congressional authorization as a prerequisite to the participation of any Federal agency in water resources development programs. Federal agencies are required to file reports containing reliable and accurate data in sufficiency to enable Congress to determine the advisability of Federal participation.

Section 5 calls for the inclusion of statements of view in reports to the Congress by the governors of the States and by top-level officials of Federal agencies affected by the proposed program on projects of the sponsoring agency.

Section 6 limits the Federal Government's participation in hydroelectric projects to multiple purpose programs and projects devoted primarily to navigation, flood control and/or reclamation. The section also requires that the Federal costs of the hydroelectric features shall be repaid in full both as to principal and interest within 50 years.

Section 7 applies the same restrictions and repayment standards of section 6 to the Federal Government's participation in projects involving the development and supplying of water for domestic and industrial purposes.

Section 8 requires the beneficiaries of reclamation projects to repay the construction costs allocable to reclamation, without interest, within 50 years after the end of a development period not to exceed 10 years.

Section 9 requires the beneficiaries of flood control and navigation projects to repay any costs therefor adjudged to be reimbursable within 50 years after the benefits are available and can be utilized.

Section 10 authorizes State and local governments and interstate agencies under appropriate conditions and safeguards and pursuant to acts of the Congress to acquire water resources projects constructed by the Federal Government.

Section 11 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to specific acts of the Congress and under other appropriate conditions and safeguards, to make loans and cost-sharing payments to State, local, and interstate agencies for the construction and acquisition of water resources projects.

Section 12 creates a Federal Water Resources Board in the Executive Office of the President to prescribe standards for the planning, appraisal, and filing of reports to the Congress and to exercise other stated appropriate functions necessary for the development and effectuation of a desirable national water policy for the United States.

REMOVAL OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RETIRED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code designed to remove discrimination in existing law against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States. It is most unfortunate that the law adopted by the 83d Congress did not give servicemen the same liberalization of income-tax deductions on retirement pay as was given other retired people under the age of 65.

It appears to me as if the congressional action of last year was a legislative oversight, which ought to be corrected as quickly as possible. At the present time our tax law in discriminating against servicemen acts as a blow to the morale and combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces. It is another indication of the reasons why our services have had difficulty in getting qualified and experienced personnel to reenlist.

There are no windfall profits in the Army. There are no excess profits in the Navy. The pilots who man our jet aircraft are not overpaid. Our men and women in uniform want no special privileges. All they ask is that they not be discriminated against because they have chosen a career of service to their country. I, therefore, propose that we amend the new tax bill so that these men and women will enjoy the same liberalization

of income-tax deductions on retirement pay as other American citizens. Perhaps this discriminatory provision was an oversight on the part of Congress. If it was, let us admit the mistake and amend the law. Let us reaffirm our faith in those who man the ramparts of America.

It is my information that the existing operation of law costs affected servicemen about $240 a year. It is wrong to specifically exempt the retired personnel of our armed services from the benefits given to other retired people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, in support of the objective sought by my bill, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the American Legion convention on this subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1858) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follow:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I was very much interested in looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1955, to note your remarks on page 4008 at the time the pay increase bill for members of the Armed Forces was under consideration.

You commented about the fact that the recent tax act failed to provide exemptions and allowances under retirement, for retirement pay for members of the Armed Forces.

Enclosed please find copy of Resolution No. 647 adopted at our 1954 national convention asking for an amendment to the tax law to take care of just this very problem.

I also enclose copy of H. R. 3999 introduced under date of February 14, 1955, by Congressman COOPER at our request, to carry out the intent of the enclosed Resolution No. 647.

Should the bill 3999 meet with your approval, I would be very happy to have you introduce a companion bill in the Senate. On the other hand, if you feel the bill could be improved upon we would still like to have you introduce your version of such a bill. I am sure we would be more than happy to support it.

Thanking you for any consideration you can extend to this request, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

RESOLUTION NO. 647—REMOVE INEQUITIES IN INCOME-TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Whereas the recent tax law passed by the 83d Congress and signed by the President, gave certain income-tax exemptions or reductions to retired civil-service employees of the United States Government, States, municipalities, and counties; and

Whereas retired personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States are specifically excluded from receiving these income-tax benefits by the provisions of this law; and

Whereas Congress by its action in so excluding retired members of the military services has taken both discriminatory and punitive action against retired officers and men of these services without any justification: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30–September 2, 1954, That the Congress of the United States at its next session be strongly urged to amend that portion of the law so that retired members of the Armed Forces may enjoy the same income-tax reductions and exemptions as are now granted to civil service employees of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of all appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States, and to all Members of the Congress.

PROPOSED EMERGENCY PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955. This bill provides for grants and scholarships in postgraduate education in the field of public health. The need for legislation such as this is urgent and it is my hope the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will begin hearings on the bill and on the whole problem of Federal aid to medical education in the very near future.

The bill provides for direct grants through the Public Health Service to all accredited schools of public health on the basis of their enrollment to a total not exceeding $1 million for each of the five fiscal years. Further grants are also provided for construction needs not in excess of $1 million a year and for an additional sum for scholarships not to exceed $250,000 per year. The purpose of the bill and to these grants is to make it possible to continue and extend the training of personnel for public service in the field of public health.

There are today 10 accredited schools in the United States: California, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Tulane, and Yale. Six of these schools are supported by private philanthropy and four by the taxpayers of their States.

I have had a series of discussions with representatives of these schools of public health. It is their feeling—and I agree in that feeling—that the training of personnel to protect the public against disease is an essential part of public responsibility as is the training of personnel for the military forces to protect our Nation against a military aggressor. The request of the schools for Federal assistance to help support and expand their facilities and to aid such new schools as may be established is based on the recognition that our Government has a responsibility for the promotion of such training. The present plan for support of our public health institutions places an undue burden upon 6 privately supported institutions and upon the taxpayers of 4 States. Since our Nation gains from the training which these schools afford, it is desirable to equalize to some degree the financial cost which is now unevenly distributed.

The evidence is clear that the schools of public health are physically overcrowded. Their physical plant is bursting at the seams. The sum provided in this bill is a small fraction of what is needed, but it will help materially to provide facilities.

The scholarship section of this bill, section 376, is most desirable although it is less essential than the grants for maintenance and construction.

With specific regard to maintenance funds, a study of the facts makes it unmistakably clear that a number of the schools of public health are faced with the prospect of having to curtail or discontinue their operation unless financial relief can be found for them. In this critical period in our Nation's history, our Government cannot sit back and allow this to happen.

The formula for assistance submitted in this bill is the product of careful study by the schools of public health and by other experts in the field. It differs in some respects from the Federal aid to medical education bill of the 82d Congress which I was proud to cosponsor, and which I plan again to support. Instead of providing a lump-sum payment of $1,000 per graduate student plus an extra $1,000 for each student in excess of past enrollment, the bill which I now introduce provides for grants on the basis of 15 percent of basic operating costs of graduate instructions plus an additional $500 for each full-time student in excess of average past enrollment. This proposed formula was arrived at on the assumption that a grant based on a certain fraction of the total operating cost will cover a unit of about 30 students regardless of the size of the school. In addition, we all agreed that the larger the student body the greater is the need for additional funds. When new students arrive in a school—and the need is great, so we must encourage the enrollment of new students—the expansion of school facilities is necessary and hence my bill provides for a bonus clause of $500 for each new student.

As a safeguard, the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955 provides that the total grant to each school may not exceed 50 percent of the basic operating cost of the school. Furthermore, the maximum amount spent shall not exceed $1 million a year. It is also noteworthy that we determine average past enrollment on the basis of a sliding scale considering preceding fiscal years rather than any given calendar or academic years.

Finally, I wish to make it clear that in introducing this Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955 I am in no way minimizing the importance of the

desirability of enacting an omnibus Federal aid to medical education bill. We have tried to enact such legislation for a number of years and to no avail. It is my hope that some future Congress may enact the bill. We cannot wait for that period, however. The time to act in the field of public health is now. It is for that reason I have agreed to introduce this special legislation designed to cover the public-health phase of the medical problem on its own merits.

It is my hope that this bill will become law during the 84th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1859) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROHIBITION OF OPERATION IN COASTWISE TRADE OF CERTAIN REBUILT VESSELS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1864) to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 883), is further amended by inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first proviso thereof: "*Provided further*, That no vessel rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions, or the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be a vessel built in the United States for the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 808), is further amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "No vessel rebuilt outside of the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions, or the District of Columbia, shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade under any provision of this section."

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term "rebuilt" means altered in form or burden, by being lengthened or built upon, or from one denomination to another, by the mode or method of rigging or fitting.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective only as to vessels rebuilt after the date of enactment hereof.

The statement presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Due to a loophole in the laws governing the documentation of vessels for the coastwise trades of the United States, it appears likely that a considerable volume of ship conversion and rebuilding of vessels for this trade may be placed by American shipowners in foreign rather than American shipyards.

The present governing statutes clearly state, with certain special exceptions not here pertinent, that only vessels built in and documented under the laws of the United States may operate in our coastwise trade. However, no mention is made as to other types of work which may be done on vessels documented for this trade, such as rebuilding, reconstruction, and conversion.

The bill would amend pertinent sections of the shipping laws to make it clear that, in order to be eligible for coastwise operation, not only the original building, but also any rebuilding of the vessel must be done in American shipyards. The bill proposes that, if such work is done abroad, the ship thereafter cannot be operated in the coastwise trade of the United States. Of course, the vessel would continue to be eligible to operate under the American flag in our foreign trade or fisheries. Only its domestic trade privilege would be affected.

Also the bill would not affect the eligibility for coastwise operation of any United States-built vessel on which work performed outside the United States does not constitute a rebuilding as that term is used in the bill. In other words, as to minor renovations or voyage repairs, there is no intent to change present law.

Obviously, enactment of the bill would not of itself furnish a cure-all for the present depressed state of the shipbuilding and shiprepair industry. However, it would close one crack in the wall of legislation which the United States has relied upon to assure the continued existence of adequate and efficient private American shipbuilding and shiprepair facilities at all times. Like the leak in a levee, unless the breach is repaired, the flow of this type of work to foreign shipyards will tend to increase.

International conditions at the present time are such that it is vital that all maritime legislation should be directed to the promotion of the national maritime policy wherever possible. The proposed bill is certainly a measure which meets this test and should be enacted without delay.

It is pertinent in connection with the proposed measure to determine the legal scope of the word built as this term is used in the present statutes.

The original law restricting American-flag documentation to vessels built in the United States was enacted in 1792 and was later substantially reenacted as section 4132 of the Revised Statutes. Until 1912 the requirement applied whether the ship was used in the domestic or foreign trade—in all cases she had to be built here to be eligible for documentation as a vessel of the United States.

Due to this fact, viz, that both domestic and foreign trade American-flag vessels were covered in the same statute from 1792 until the enactment of the free-shipping provisions of the Panama Canal Act in 1912 and 1914, and also because during this same period of over 100 years, questions as to the meaning of the term built arose almost entirely in connection with the documentation of vessels operating in our foreign trade, the needs and problems of our vessels in foreign trade, rather than those in domestic trade, were the considerations which ultimately determined the construction given these words of the statute. These now ancient administrative and judicial decisions, made in an era when all American-flag vessels had to be built in the United States, are still in effect.

One leading decision which has since been confirmed many times was handed down by the United States District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, on March 13, 1876, in the case of the *United States* v. *The Steamer now called the Grace Meade*. In that case, the question posed was whether a vessel constructed from the parts of a vessel which some time previous had been considerably blown to pieces, should be allowed registry as a new vessel or should be required to continue her former registry and name as an old vessel merely rebuilt. The court held, as a principle, that "without regard to the particular parts used, if any considerable part of the hull and skeleton of an old vessel in its intact condition, without being broken up, is built upon, the law holds that in such a case it is the old vessel rebuilt, and not a new vessel."

The Meade case has been cited with approval by the Supreme Court a number of times and is considered to be the ruling law on this question.

Using this principle as a guide, it can readily be seen that it will be very rare indeed that any instance will arise involving a large ship where any conversion, reconditioning, or rebuilding will be considered of such scope as to require a finding that because of such work the vessel has become a new vessel for purposes of documentation. Any vessel originally built in the United States and thus eligible for coastwise operation will continue to be regarded as a vessel built in the United States under existing law, even after a radical rebuilding in a foreign shipyard.

The general rule as simply stated in section 3.12 (c) of the current Customs Regulations is that "The place of building is where the hull was built." Under this rule, it is obvious that even though substantial remodeling or other such work is done on the vessel outside the United States, if the hull was originally built in the United States the vessel will continue to enjoy all the privileges of an American-built ship including the right to be enrolled for the coastwise trade.

The bill would merely supersede the provisions of existing statutes insofar as eligibility to operate in the coastwise trade is concerned, so that, any rebuilding of an American-built vessel in a foreign shipyard after its date of enactment would prevent its subsequent use in the coastwise trade.

In order to assure ease and certainty of administration of the bill when enacted, a definition of the term "rebuilt" has been included (sec. 3). The terminology used is taken verbatim from section 4170 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 39), and it is intended that the language have the same meaning as has been applied to it over many years in the administration of that section.

The bill is consistent with the spirit of the original legislation to limit the coastwise trade to United States built vessels as a means of promoting domestic shipbuilding.

PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1865) to promote the United States Merchant Marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels, and to make possible, accelerate, or otherwise assist the construction of new vessels in shipyards of the United States, section 503 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1153), is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The Secretary of Commerce may release any vessel subject to this section from the requirement for further documentation as a vessel of the United States in consideration of an undertaking by the owner of such vessel that—

"(1) a new vessel or vessels which will meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, will aid in the promotion and development of such commerce and be suitable for use by the United States for national defense or military purposes in time of war or national emergency, will be constructed promptly in the United States by such owner to replace the vessel or vessels so released;

"(2) all indebtedness to the United States with respect to the vessel or vessels so released will be discharged prior to any transfer of such vessel or vessels to foreign registry; and that

"(3) all proceeds from the sale of such vessel or vessels not used to pay off any indebtedness to the United States on the vessel or vessels so released and transferred will be applied to the construction of such replacement vessel or vessels referred to under (1):

Provided, That, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the provisions of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1211), shall not apply to any vessel as to which a release has been executed by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the provisions and requirements of this section."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act or the release granted pursuant hereto shall be construed to repeal section 9 or sections 37 through 42 of the Shipping Act of 1916, or to diminish the authority of the Secretary of Commerce thereunder.

The statement presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

The Maritime Administration is attempting to solve the problem of block obsolescence of privately owned warbuilt merchant vessels, with which the several subsidized lines ultimately will be faced, by promoting agreements on the part of such lines to anticipate their replacement requirements. If such a program can be undertaken, it will avoid the concentrated replacement financing which otherwise will face such owners at a later date, it will avoid shipyard congestion and higher costs due to a concentrated ship construction program within a relatively short period of time, and it will serve to accelerate the reduction in the average age of existing fleets to make them competitive with more modern foreign flag vessels. At the same time it will assist in alleviating the present plight of the shipbuilding yards as a result either of lack of work or a low level of work by providing a reasonable continuity of the shipyard workload so essential to efficient and economic operation. Such a program, in addition to promoting foreign trade and thus the national economy, likewise will promote the national security by increasing the mobilization potential of both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry.

In addition to the trade-in-and-build cargo program sponsored by the Maritime Administration to that end, there is another avenue through which such an accelerated replacement program can be promoted, viz, the sale of older vessels in the world market. Such sales of war built vessels are effectively barred by certain statutory impediments in the case of vessels constructed with the aid of construction differential subsidies.

It is true that under certain conditions such vessels may be traded in to the Government for an allowance of credit on new vessels in the amount of their depreciated acquisition cost under section 507 or under section 510 on the basis of their reasonable value, considering the scrap value, the world market value and the depreciated value based upon a 20-year life.

On the other hand, section 503 specifically forbids the sale of such vessels to aliens for a period of 20 years by requiring them to remain documented under the laws of the United States for "not less than 20 years, or so long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the purchase price, whichever is the longer period." So it will be observed that the minimum period is 20 years and that no provision is made for the waiver of this requirement, no matter how justifiable the circumstances. The period of 20 years appears to have stemmed from the fact that, at the time the act was passed in 1936, 20 years was the then concept of age at which they should be replaced. However, if it is in the national interest to accelerate the replacement age, it appears logical that the prohibition should be correspondingly adjusted. Such action, if taken, would have the effect of placing vessels constructed under the 1936 act on a full parity with identical vessels purchased under the Ship Sales Act at substantially the same price, with respect to which latter group Congress specifically declined to attach such a condition in the Ship Sales Act of 1946, some 10 years later.

Obviously, this inflexible and arbitrary directive in the statute closes one of the most important outlets which would otherwise be available to the shipowner for the sale of these vessels. And in so doing, it contributes to the serious trend toward block obsolescence of the American merchant fleet.

While the need for legislation along the lines of the proposed bill has been recognized for some time, it has not heretofore been considered an urgent matter.

Now, however, it is understood that, in respect to certain vessels constructed under the act, the mandatory restriction above referred to is actually preventing the sale abroad of certain vessels constructed during the World War II era, even though the specific and sole purpose of such sale is to assist in financing the construction in American shipyards of replacement vessels.

The proposed bill would lift this complete embargo against the foreign disposal of such vessels before the end of the arbitrary 20-year period by granting to the Secretary of Commerce the discretion to release the owner from the restriction where such action would not conflict with the overall maritime policy of the United States as laid down in the act. An agreement by the owner to construct a replacement vessel would be a condition precedent to the exercise of such discretion by the Secretary of Commerce.

The President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, a group of impartial top business executives appointed by the President, after exhaustive study, filed its report in November 1947, almost 8 years ago, in which the committee even then recognized the problems raised by this restriction. The committee commented as follows:

"The fact that a very large percentage of the dry-cargo and tanker tonnage in the American merchant marine today consists of ships built during World War II and that these ships are, therefore, of substantially the same age, is a matter of concern in any long-range program for this country. These ships will depreciate as a block due to obsolescence and deterioration. A similar situation obtained after World War I. In the late thirties, the American cargo fleet, built during and just after that war, was rapidly being displaced in the trade routes by more modern and more efficient foreign-built tonnage. Corrective measures to avoid a repetition of this situation must be planned now to assure that the merchant fleet shall continue to include a proper proportion of modern efficient vessels. This is important from the viewpoint both of the economics of competitive commercial operations and of national security.

"Avoidance of block obsolescence can be accomplished most effectively by establishing a relatively uniform progressive replacement program. Such a program will also serve best to assure maintenance of the nucleus of specialized knowledge and skills in the shipbuilding industry.

"The early construction of new cargo tonnage, except for Government account, can be expected only if there arises commercial justification for increasing the size of the active merchant feet above its prospective level, or if ship operators can be induced to replace their existing tonnage with new ships. Since any considerable increase in the size of the prospective privately owned American merchant fleet is not assured, the construction of new cargo tonnage will hinge largely upon the replacement of existing vessels; and the problem becomes that of making it economically advantageous for operators to do so. It may be profitable to downgrade some of the better ships to be replaced from more competitive to less competitive American-flag services; but the less effective ships will require disposal. These ships can (a) be turned in for credit on new tonnage and be placed in the reserve fleet, (b) be sold foreign, or (c) be sold for scrap. To promote the building of new cargo tonnage, governmental policy should foster whichever one of these courses appears best suited to the individual case."

The committee then recommended:

"(a) Section 503 of the 1936 act should be amended to permit approval to sell foreign vessels built with a construction-differential subsidy when all indebtedness to the United States on account of such vessels has been discharged, even though the vessels may be less than 20 years old, provided it is determined (1) that the vessels are not essential for national security purposes, and (2) that the proceeds of such sale are applied to the construction of new vessels."

It is interesting to note that further on in its report (pp. 30, 31) the President's committee again emphasized this same recommendation—that some flexibility should be provided in section 503—so as to assure that United States flag vessels are the most efficient of their type in the trades they serve.

In this connection, the committee voiced its concern that, as the World War II built tonnage aged as a block, such vessels would be less and less able to compete with modern foreign-flag vessels. As a result, unless adequate corrective action is taken, foreign bottoms will carry an increasing amount of

United States foreign commerce and the need for Government operating support payments will tend to multiply.

In order to conform section 802 with this proposed amendment, it becomes necessary to eliminate the provisions of that section with respect to any vessel as to which such a release has been executed by the Secretary of Commerce.

GREETINGS OF CONGRESS TO GEN. CHARLES P. SUMMERALL

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas Gen. Charles P. Summerall retired from active service in the United States Army on March 31, 1931, after a distinguished military career commencing with his graduation from the United States Military Academy on June 11, 1892, and culminating with his service as Chief of Staff of the United States Army from November 20, 1926, to November 20, 1930; and

Whereas, despite his retired status, General Summerall's interest in national defense and in the security of his country has continued throughout his life, as evidenced by his distinguished service as superintendent of The Citadel (The Military College of South Carolina) from 1931 to 1935: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to Gen. Charles P. Summerall its cordial greetings and expresses its admiration and gratitude for the outstanding service that he has long rendered to his country.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,500 additional copies each of 14 hearings held before a subcommittee of the said committee, and not more than 3,000 additional copies each of 3 reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 452 AND 462 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 343 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 7, line 9, after $7,979,003, insert the following: "of which not to exceed $11,647 shall be available for reimbursing the city of New Town, N. Dak., for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for assistance to the public-school district for constructing additional classroom facilities at Seligman, Ariz."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 9, line 14, after Indians; insert the following: "advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the act of June 4, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 452), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 11, line 13, after tary insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 from the funds credited to the Indians of California under the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602); for expenses of moving and relocating houses available to said Indians under the act of August 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 590, 613), but not more than $300 may be expended for any one house."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 14, after line 15, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For the construction of the necessary laboratory and pilot plant facilities for conducting research on the distillation of coal and the products obtained therefrom and the direct reduction of low-grade iron ores to their minerals, $2 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the products derived from such facilities may be sold by the Bureau of Mines and the receipts therefrom deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 17, line 9, after amount insert the following: "of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for additional payments for the execution of the new figure for the Yorktown Monument, upon the completion of the figure to satisfaction of the Secretary, and the Secretary may release the contractor from all obligations with respect to the removal of the present damaged figure, the repair of the shaft, and the mounting of the new figure on the shaft."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment,

namely: On page 29, after line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. Limitations in this or any other act for the Department of the Interior on purchases of passenger motor vehicles shall not apply to vehicles known as coupe pickup trucks."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY EFFECT OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS—REPRINTING OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, since announcing, on April 20, 1955, the list of 24 cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, 2 more Senators have expressed their desire to join in co-sponsoring this concurrent resolution, which calls on the President to work to establish within the United Nations a scientific commission to study the effects of radioactivity on living things. I am pleased to announce that the two additional co-sponsors are the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I ask unanimous consent that the next time Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 is printed, that the names of Senators KEFAUVER and HUMPHREY be added to the list of cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR POLIO VACCINE—EDITORIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee an editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune with regard to the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis and the need for a national program to supervise our program against the dreaded disease.

I commend the editors of the New York Herald Tribune for a most incisive series of recommendations leading up to the conclusion that Washington must act. I respectfully suggest to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee that it is time for the Congress to make a constructive study as soon as possible so as to help develop a national program.

It is my intention to introduce a bill for consideration by the Senate which will embody the five pertinent suggestions in the editorial, outlining what the Federal Government should do to bring this much needed protection to our people.

The present situation, under voluntary agreement, is beginning to get out of hand. It is urgent that the Public Health Service, which has the authority under present law to regulate the source of supply and the quality, be given also the authority to make allocations and to set the price and to deal with violators of agreements. In that way we may save ourselves a great deal of trouble.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MUST ACT

The Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts have confirmed the vaccine's general efficacy. The demand is far greater than the supply. Every child in America has a right to its protection.

The serum can only be, and must be, controlled nationally.

Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which reserves great credit for initiative, efficiency, and determination, had made contracts for the purchase of vaccine for free administration to children. It is delivering the serum to communities, but has no authority over private distribution of quantities produced in excess of its own contracts, nor can it effectively control community action after the vaccine is in the hands of local health authorities.

States and localities have improvised their own distribution systems. For the most part, these are based on voluntary allocations and priorities, and are concerned more with the acquisition of and payment for the vaccine than with seeing to it that priorities are absolutely observed. Only on Friday, after it was clear that the voluntary system was breaking down, did New York City place penalties on the unauthorized sale or possession of the Salk serum. This was a purely local move; the penalties, moreover, are light in view of the great temptation offered by the short supply of the vaccine: $500 fine, a year in jail, or both.

The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. The Public Health Service licenses and supervises the manufacture of the Salk vaccine under the National Biologics Control Act. Powers under this act have been exercised in withdrawing the product of the Cutter Laboratories from distribution.

But the law applies only to the source, only to quality. It gives the Federal Government no authority over allocation, over price, over violators of agreements. The administration has relied on voluntary cooperation and on advisory committees.

The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of children to priority is unchallenged.

To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential. There are five requirements for such a law:

(1) It must be simple and sweeping, giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions and absolute priorities according to need.

(2) It must provide for the prompt dissemination of fully evaluated information on all medical aspects of the program. Doubts have arisen across the Nation over such matters as provocation and the timing of shots in relation to the incidence of polio. Parents are entitled to know what disinterested experts think of these questions as they arise. Their children's lives are at stake.

(3) It must be clearly limited in time and subject, so that there will be no doubt that this is an emergency answer to an emergency situation, not a step toward socialized medicine. A year, or at most two, will probably bring supply and demand into balance.

(4) It must have teeth. Penalties for violators—both users and sellers—should be harsh, several years in jail, some thousands of dollars in fines, so that there will be no prospect of profit in flouting the law.

(5) Finally, and of the utmost importance, the act must be passed immediately and administered vigorously. The emergency is now—not tomorrow or next month. Congress can pass a law through both houses in a single day, if the need is great enough. It should pass this legislation forthwith. The Government should be prepared to put its execution in the hands of the country's top administrators, experienced in allocations and priorities.

Given such leadership, working in harmony with all interested parties, red tape could be cut, the machinery set in motion and speedy enforcement assured.

The parents and children of the Nation demand it. The whole world is waiting to see whether the United States will use this great new weapon against polio swiftly, efficiently, and—above all—equitably.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND.

Address on the subject "May Day: United States Way," delivered by him at Burlington, Wis., on May 1, 1955.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day," delivered by him on April 29, 1955, at the Jefferson Memorial, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at Loyalty Day celebration at Burlington, Wis., and editorial entitled "The Celluloid Ally," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1955.

Release from Atomic Industrial Forum announcing the First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry; editorial entitled "Atomic Initiative" published in the Wall Street Journal of April 12, 1954; editorial entitled "Atom Show Ship Not Enough," published in the Milwaukee Journal of April 27, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, to the collegiate division rally of the Indiana Young Republicans, at Indianapolis, Ind., on April 22, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from Far Eastern policy addresses delivered by Governor Harriman, of New York.

By Mr. DUFF:

Article concerning Senator GEORGE, written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1955.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Article entitled "The United German Hungarian Honor Senator LANGER," published in Nord-Amerika, Donnerstag, of April 7, 1955.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FORMOSA POLICY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I spent Saturday in Chicago. In the Chicago newspapers, I read of a statement made by certain Republican Senators, in which I would gladly have joined, but had no opportunity to do so. I wish to read it into the RECORD, as expressing my own beliefs and convictions.

It reads as follows:

We believe that the President of the United States will act in the present framework of international deliberations with the same wisdom, good judgment, and full sense of right and honor he has always displayed.

Through Public Law 4, the Congress overwhelmingly expressed itself on the need to protect our interests in the Formosa area. Through this action the Congress demonstrated its faith in the President.

The President of the United States has a right and obligation to wage peace as well as to wage war. That is what he is trying to do.

As we supported the Formosa resolution, we now support the President's efforts for negotiation of a cease-fire with Communist China. We know he will carry them forward with candor and without sacrifice of this Nation's most solemn obligations.

Mr. President, including this brief statement in support of the declaration of certain Republican Senators, I may say that I first stated that although I would be for the treaty, I was against the Formosan resolution. That was because of the fact that I was very greatly disturbed by the briefing which we had before the committees. When the President said that he personally would take full responsibility, there was nothing for me to do except to trust the President completely. I did so then. I do now.

PROGRESS IN KANSAS IN THE CARE OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week we are observing National Mental Health Week, and it is most important that we observe some of the facts about mental illness in the United States.

It is estimated that approximately 9 million people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness. In other words, more than 1 person in every 17 is afflicted more or less. During the past few years, great progress has been made in the mental-health field, but much more can and should be made.

During the past 10 years, through the efforts of civic, religious, medical, and psychiatric organizations, we have witnessed great changes in the care of the mentally ill. Not many years ago a person committed to a hospital for mental illness and treatment was practically consigned to the institution for life. That is not the situation today. I think no better proof of this can be furnished than what has taken place in my home State of Kansas.

Records show that 80 percent of the patients committed to the Topeka State Hospital, at Topeka, Kans., are discharged as improved or recovered within 1 year. The improvement in care of the mentally ill in Kansas in the past few years is not only remarkable, but is proof of what can be done in every other State in the Nation.

In 1947, when I became Governor of Kansas, Kansas ranked 47th in the Nation in care of the mentally ill. Eight years later, or today, Kansas is in fourth place; and I think it is going higher. I do not want to leave the impression that this was the result of my efforts only. We had the full cooperation of the Kansas Legislature and of the citizens of the State generally. Our citizens were determined that our hospitals were to be for the treatment and cure of our mentally sick people, not jails or institutions for their permanent incarceration.

As Governor, I appointed a State committee on mental hospitals, composed of outstanding lay citizens and doctors, both medical and psychiatric. We were fortunate in Kansas to have assist us on the Commission, and to work with the Commission, Drs. Will and Karl Menninger, of the Menninger Foundation.

The Commission recommended an increase—so large that it looked almost staggering—in appropriations for our mentally ill. The Kansas Legislature voted greatly increased appropriations, and we placed in operation a training program and an out-patient program which have been most successful. Last year, for instance, 450 people who were emotionally disturbed were treated in the out-patient clinic in the Topeka State Hospital, and 77 percent were sent home without ever being hospitalized.

Today, Kansas is the only State in the Union that is reducing the number of hospital beds for the mentally ill. This, of course, is a source of great satisfaction to me, in that during my term as Governor, I had an opportunity—with the assistance of the citizens of the State—to bring about a program which now is recognized as a model for the Nation. Other States are sending to Kansas representatives to study the results of this program.

State hospitals of Kansas are under the direction of the State Welfare Board. The board has served for many years; and the members are E. A. Briles, of Stafford; Blake Williamson, of Kansas City; and Martin Trued, of Topeka. They are entitled to much credit for the fine way in which they are handling this problem.

At the opening of National Mental Health Week, I am pleased to report to the Senate the splendid progress we have made in our State.

Some time ago, I participated in a short radio broadcast with Blake Williamson, a member of the State Board in Kansas; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the broadcast were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTION OF WEEKLY RADIO BROADCAST BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON AND MR. BLAKE WILLIAMSON

It is a pleasure to have with me in the studio this afternoon Mr. Blake Williamson, of Kansas City. He and Mrs. Williamson are here with their daughter, Miss Betsy, who is our Kansas Cherry Blossom Princess.

It is a pleasure, too, of course, to visit with Mr. Williamson because I well remember the time that I asked Blake and Ernie Briles and Tuffy Lutz to serve on the board of social welfare, and I remember, Blake, how reluctant you were to take that job.

Well, Senator, you well appreciate all the problems that we had in our mental institutions and welfare at the time you appointed us, don't you?

I certainly do, and I am so happy you are here because we started a program at that time that I would like to have a report on and I think the people of Kansas would like to have a report on it.

Well, Senator, I don't know of anything now that would give me any more pleasure than to give you one of the best reports of a program that you started when you were Governor of the State of Kansas, and, in my opinion, has turned out as the outstanding program in the United States and I think you ought to have an awful lot of credit for your courage back years ago when it wasn't popular.

Well now, Blake, before you go any further, I am very happy to get some credit for it, but I think the credit should go to many people in Kansas, including the legislature, yourself, and Doctors Menninger and many fine folks who worked on it, too.

Well, Senator, that is true, and that credit should go to all those various individuals. You know it would have been impossible to do the things if it hadn't been for the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, and, incidentally, now all the States in the Union are calling our friend, Dr. Will Menninger, to address joint sessions of the legislatures of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and other States to explain just exactly what is being done in the mental health field.

Blake, I just want to say this, we are all proud of it and we are also proud of the fine work that is being done by the doctors and people who are working in our program in Kansas now. Tell me, we started in rather low among the number of States on our health program, where are we today, what is the situation?

We started out in 47th place in the Nation a little over 6 years ago—as you well remember—and today we are in 4th place and, Senator, we are going higher.

I think that is wonderful and I understand from the reports I receive from the State that literally hundreds of these people that come to these institutions are soon returned back to their families, their friends, and local communities.

Well, most of it is due to the fact of the fine personnel we have been able to attract to Kansas among the psychiatrists and our great training program out there. Last year, it might be of interest to you Senator, we had 450 people who were emotionally disturbed that were treated in the out-patient clinic at the Topeka State Hospital and 77 percent of those were sent home without ever having to be hospitalized.

Isn't that wonderful. I think that is a great thing, not only for the people who are closely affected with it but for the State as a whole and I think that is a great service to the State and the Nation. Now, I think I should mention that I am the cosponsor of legislation with other Senators providing for a nationwide action on the prevention, treatment, and cure of this mental illness.

We need to do some work nationally and I am so proud that you can come in here and tell us what we have done in the State because I think it is going to help me in presenting this matter to the Senate.

Well Senator, I don't know of anybody who is better qualified to be on a national committee than you are after the wonderful success that has been attained as a result of the program that you originated in Kansas. Do you know that we are the only State in the Union today that is reducing our hospital beds for mentally ill? That is a source of a lot of satisfaction.

That is indeed a lot of satisfaction to me and it is one of the fine things I like to look back on as my service, as Governor, having started a program and after all it is a satisfaction of doing some of these little things that you get as you go through life that makes life worth living.

I think that is right and I will tell you there are hundreds of people who were formerly patients at Winfield, at Parsons, at Topeka, at Larned, and Osawatomie that have an awful lot of thanks in their heart to you for making it possible.

Well I want to say Blake that it has been a privilege to have had you on this program and through the kindness of this radio station we are again permitted to visit the people of Kansas. I thank you kindly.

REFERENDUM ON REDUCTION IN BURLEY TOBACCO ACREAGES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on last Thursday a referendum took place in the eight-State-burley-tobacco producing area, which I believe to have profound significance to this body.

The referendum was held to determine if the growers of burley tobacco were willing to accept an additional 15-percent reduction in the burley tobacco acreages allotted to their farms on the 1955 crop, in addition to a 10-percent reduction announced last November. This referendum was brought about as a result of an unexpectedly large production in the 1954 crop, which could not be forecast or ascertained until the marketing of the crop was completed in January.

The results of the referendum demonstrated an overwhelming acceptance by the growers of further reductions in acreage. The total number of farmers voting, it appears from preliminary reports, was 333,053. Of this number, 319,639, or 96 percent, voted for the revised quota.

As I have said, the significance of this vote is far-reaching. Despite weighty pronouncements by administration spokesmen insisting that price supports are of little help to small growers, lately reiterated in the April 26 letter of Secretary Benson transmitting to the President his pamphlet on Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, I point out that the average allotment of the 333,000 voters participating in the referendum amounts to 1.2 acres. Actually, two-thirds of all burley allotments are seven-tenths of an acre or less. Certainly these are small growers in every sense of the word. If price supports are not significant to this group, it would be difficult to understand the overwhelming support given to the reduced quota by burley growers which was necessary in order to retain the program of 90-percent price supports on burley tobacco.

Equally significant in this vote is the substantiation of the belief of those of us in the Congress who have consistently supported 90-percent parity supports on basic agricultural commodities that such programs can and will be successful in the presence of effective production controls by and with the enlightened support of the farmers.

For the information and study of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a copy of the letter sent to me on Saturday by Mr. Joe R. Williams, Acting Director of the Tobacco Division, Department of Agriculture, advising me of the unofficial results of the referendum.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: These are the unofficial results of the burley tobacco referendum held April 28, 1955:

State	For	Against	Percent for
Indiana	7,236	419	94.5
Kentucky	220,207	7,363	96.8
Missouri	1,271	37	97.2
Ohio	5,820	501	92.1
Virginia	13,894	675	95.4
West Virginia	2,070	66	96.9
North Carolina	16,848	373	97.5
Texas	2	1	66⅔
Tennessee	52,291	3,979	92.9
Total	319,639	13,414	96.0

Sincerely,

JOE R. WILLIAMS,
Acting Director, Tobacco Division.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the growers in every State participating in this referendum gave hearty approval to the program. They realized that unless they saved the program in this way the price of burley tobacco would be 46, 48, or 50 cents a pound, and the grower would probably get 15 or 20 cents a pound on his crop this year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in expressing gratification that the burley tobacco growers in the several burley tobacco producing States have approved the program. In Tennessee there is a larger percentage of growers with less than 1 acre than in any other State. Their approval does not indicate that they are very happy about having to take this reduction, but they were presented with the choice of taking the reduction or losing the program.

I believe that every Member of the House from the burley growing section of Tennessee joined my colleague [Mr. GORE] and me in urging that the growers vote approval of the program, even though it might mean some temporary loss to them. I am happy that the program has been overwhelmingly approved in all the burley producing States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I think the referendum proves that if we are to have a 90 percent program on any commodity there must be acreage control. We cannot allow acreages to run wild and still have a high support program.

I emphasize the fact that the number of growers participating in this referendum broke all records in the burley tobacco area. Four years ago, at the previous referendum, 179,000 growers participated. In the latest referendum 333,000 growers participated, which indicates their desire that the program be retained, because it means so much to the growers of burley tobacco.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the senior Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield first to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators from the burley growing States in complimenting the growers upon this magnificent vote. I wish especially to compliment the small growers, because we all recognized, when we passed the bill, that because of their small acreage, the small growers would bear the brunt of the reduction. This vote is evidence of the confidence of the growers who, in large measure, will bear the brunt of the reduction. The reduction is necessary in order to reduce the unsalable surplus. The growers were intelligent enough—and I felt at the time we passed the bill that they would be—to realize that everyone growing tobacco, especially the burley tobacco growers, would have to take a cut. Otherwise, the entire program might be lost; and if, for any reason, the entire program should be lost, the small grower would suffer to a greater extent than any other growers. The large grower could divert the use of his land into some other crop. The small grower, one with an acre or so, could not divert, because such small acreages are not transferrable into some other crop.

Therefore I feel especially proud of the vote of the small growers, who had some reason to feel that, in proportion, their acreage was being reduced to a larger extent than was the acreage of the larger growers.

I believe that the entire process has been wholesome for agriculture. It has saved the program with respect to one vital crop—vital not only to those who grow it and those who use it, but also the Treasury of the United States.

I compliment all those who participated in the process, including Senators who, at the time the measure was before the Senate, did not feel enthusiastic about the bill. I compliment all those concerned upon the acceptance of this verdict by those who are most vitally concerned.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I could not agree any more completely with my colleague. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have sufficient time to yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall require only about 10 seconds.

Is it not a fact that the affirmative vote in the burley producing States exceeded 90 percent, except in one State, where there were only 3 growers, 2 of whom voted for the reduction and 1 against it?

Mr. CLEMENTS. My friend from Virginia is entirely correct.

ADMINISTRATION BUNGLING IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] recently made a very significant speech on the floor of the Senate. He documented the administration's bungling in foreign affairs, and placed the responsibility where it properly belongs, on the President. I am happy to report that the validity of the Senator's charges has been concurred in by a number of newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a representative selection of editorial comments on the speech of the Senator from North Carolina.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kings Mountain (N. C.) Herald]

MR. SCOTT'S SPEECH

Not long ago a Kings Mountain citizen wondered out loud when Senator W. KERR SCOTT was going to say something in Washington. Another commented that the new Senator must be getting his bearings, but offered the thought that the Haw River squire wouldn't remain silent forever.

As it happened, they did not have long to wait.

In his first major speech as a United States Senator, Mr. SCOTT was reminiscent of his old self, talking straight and talking strong. If there was any surprise, it was that the content concerned matters of international policy, where Mr. SCOTT had tread lightly during his primary campaign of a year ago, at that time on plea that he was not well-informed on global affairs.

Mainly, though, Mr. SCOTT's speech was an attack on President Eisenhower. The honeymoon for the President has lasted too long for the good of the Nation, SCOTT inferred, and it is time for the President to make decisions and to stop hiding behind his bureaucrats' skirts.

The Scott speech will get favorable cheers from the army of Democrats who are tired of having President Eisenhower regarded as a superhuman above the hoi polloi of workaday politics. It will not appeal to those Democrats who felt it was high time the checkrein was applied to the free-spending controlling element of the party from 1933 to 1953—even though many of these are disappointed that Eisenhower has not retrenched more.

At any rate, Senator SCOTT made a speech, and there will undoubtedly be more from him as the days and months unfold.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of April 5, 1955]

NO PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY

In his weekend blast at President Eisenhower as "the master architect of confusion," Senator KERR SCOTT was back in form.

Since entering the Senate the Squire has been laying low, as becomes a freshman, but last week he spoke up. His world food bank idea accentuated the positive; his acid comments about the drift and confusion of the Eisenhower administration had all the earmarks of the Haw River agrarian reformer pouring it on.

The Scott speech was no off-the-cuff performance; it was well planned and in advance and documented in detail (with appropriate quotations). While it had familiar political overtones, looking toward 1956, it also mirrored a growing opposition among many citizens against the "privileged sanctuary" status of the White House and the absence of any full-fledged criticism of the President himself.

SCOTT expressed these sentiments in typical, down-home language:

"When a baseball game is going badly the manager does not replace the bat boy. He replaces the pitcher. That is, he looks to the man most likely responsible for the bad turn the game is taking. * * *

"It is time we stopped criticizing the bat boys and begin to see just what kind of a job the pitcher is doing. It is time we began placing the responsibility for events where the responsibility really lies—on the President of the United States."

Senator SCOTT's criticism of the President referred to confusion and bungled leadership in these fields: (1) Release of the Yalta papers followed by the President's claim that he had nothing to do with it and saw nothing to gain by "going back 10 years and showing that, in the light of after events, someone may have been wrong, or someone may have been right"; (2) firing of Wolf Ladejinsky by Secretary Benson as a security risk and his rehiring by Harold Stassen—with the President again playing hands off; (3) Secretary of Labor Mitchell's advocacy of repeal of the "right to work" laws in 17 States and the President's disavowal of such views; (4) President Eisenhower's statement that "there must be no weakening of the * * * right to meet your accuser face to face," and Attorney General Brownell's opinion that the Justice Department couldn't handle the security-risk program if the accused had the right to be faced by his accuser; (5) administration confusion over policy in Indochina last year with several claiming to speak with authority (Nixon, Dulles, et al.), and final acceptance of a "bad bargain" truce; (6) planned confusion over Quemoy and Matsu and sounding off by various factions of the Republican Party.

Senator SCOTT is on sound ground, we think, when he points up these chinks in the Eisenhower armor. His speech is one sided in that it omits mention of the real achievements of the administration. But as a well-mannered criticism by the loyal opposition (not bitter in tone) it will serve a good purpose.

The White House itself is certainly no "privileged sanctuary." It is subject, and always has been, to democracy's partisan and nonpartisan cannonfire. The administration record, we think, has been surprisingly strong considering the inexperience of Mr. Eisenhower in the ways of Washington politics. But, as we stated last week, the Nation has seen numerous examples since Eisenhower's inauguration "of conflicting statements released by Cabinet members and assorted confusion about policy—all because the President himself did not seem to have a firm grip on the wheel of the Ship of State."

Along with Senator SCOTT we think General Eisenhower owes it to the American people—and to himself—to be the President of the United States in fact as well as in name.

[From the Arkansas Gazette of April 3, 1955]

A LOOK BEYOND THE BAT BOYS

KERR SCOTT's Senate speech characterizing President Eisenhower as an "architect of confusion" may at long last signal the beginning of a reasoned Democratic campaign to talk sense to the American people about what their President has done and hasn't done.

If the Democrats are to make a real fight for the presidency next year, they must cease to be dismayed by the Gallup poll's appraisal of Mr. Eisenhower's continuing popularity and join the fight on the issues.

There are plenty of valid issues, but the American people aren't going to hear about them often enough if the job is left to a few uninhibited columnists and a handful of cantankerous liberals of the WAYNE MORSE stripe. The most publicized criticisms of President Eisenhower this year have been Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler's wistful observation that the condition of Mrs. Eisenhower's health might affect a second-term decision and Senator MATT NEELY's fulminations against what he feels is an unwanted degree of self-conscious piety on the Potomac. Both incidents undoubtedly rebounded to Mr. Eisenhower's advantage.

Nobody is suggesting a willful campaign of obstruction against the President's proposals to Congress. The Democrats will continue to support the President where they think he is right, particularly in the broad field of foreign policy. But the Democrats not only must oppose the President when they think he is wrong, but must do a better job of telling the American people why.

It is past time that the people be disabused of some of the notions that have become a part of the Eisenhower mythology.

Dwight Eisenhower is not, as many voters have fondly believed, a nonpartisan President. He is an extremely partisan President, and it is good for the two-party system and the Republic that he is. But he should not be permitted to build up new strength for 1956 on the illusion that he is above politics.

Nor is Dwight Eisenhower a strong leader, as many more voters fondly believe. Except in the vital areas of foreign affairs, the President has rarely exercised the Executive authority as it should be exercised. When he has moved out forcefully, it usually has been at the wrong time and on the wrong issues.

One example serves to demonstrate both his partisanship and the faulty sense of timing inherent in his sporadic efforts to crack the whip over Congress:

President Eisenhower himself has said that his liberalized reciprocal-trade recommendations form a cornerstone of his long-term foreign policy. Yet the President has been unwilling to fight for his new Reciprocal Trade Act when the chips were down. The trade program is in grave danger in the Senate, and in fact may prove to have been just a year too late. If the President last year had used such words as "irresponsible" to describe Republican obstruction of the reciprocal-trade bill, he might have got what he wanted without the ignominious deal with Representative DAN REED which assured passage of his omnibus tax bill. Because he is a partisan President, he did no such thing. Yet, when the Democrats this year attempted to attach a small income-tax relief rider to the general tax-extension bill, Mr. Eisenhower was quick to cry "irresponsibility."

There are any number of specific issues. The 1954 tax bill itself offers a convenient example. The American people need to be told, and told repeatedly, that the loopholes left in that measure by Mr. Eisenhower's fiscal experts have cost the American people more than all the deep freezes and mink

coats that existed even in the imagination of the GOP's 1952 campaign-speech writers.

Mr. Eisenhower's new comptroller general, anxious to prove his independence, has recently drawn attention to two other issues: The past record of the company charged with building the Dixon-Yates steamplant, and the shortcomings of the administration's proposed highway-construction program.

As Senator SCOTT puts it:

"It is time we stopped criticizing the bat boys and begin to see just what kind of a job the pitcher is doing."

Senator SCOTT could have said that it appears very much like the bat boys are running the team.

PROPOSED WORLD FOOD BANK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago it was my great pleasure and honor to join the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in proposing the establishment of a World Food Bank. The Senator from North Carolina, and more than 20 other Senators of both parties, concurrently joined me in introducing a resolution aimed at the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. The success of these two extremely important and related proposals depends in good measure upon the public's understanding of them. Certainly if newsmen study these proposals, and give the facts to the people, the demand for such eminently sensible solutions to the problems of surplus and scarcity will increase.

In that connection, the largest evening newspaper in the State of North Carolina, the Charlotte News, on April 4 carried an editorial which succinctly summarizes the plan for a World Food Bank which could, says the News, become "an effective, doubled-edged weapon against the problems of terrible hunger abroad and mounting stockpiles at home." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the News editorial, which is entitled "KERR SCOTT'S Double-Edged Sword."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR SCOTT'S DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

W. KERR SCOTT waited long and patiently before preparing a piece of major legislation for the United States Senate. But when the time was ripe, he served up a chef d'oeuvre.

It is a bill to establish a world food bank patterned after the successful International Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment (known simply as the World Bank). He was joined in sponsorship of the measure by Montana's veteran Senator JIM MURRAY.

In the ruddy glow of last spring's campaign, a supremely confident Mr. SCOTT indicated that such a plan might be proposed when he got to Washington. As it turned out, this was not simply a hustings come-on.

The bill is worthy of serious consideration. On the surface, at least, it offers hope for a sensible solution to America's pesky farm surplus problem.

With near starvation and poverty in some parts of the world and bumper surpluses in other parts, a reasonable formula for redistribution is needed.

In Senator SCOTT's mind, a world food bank would "serve as a medium of distribution for the effective and businesslike disposal and utilization of so-called surplus food, fiber, and other agricultural products which have or may accumulate or be needed in this or other participating nations."

According to the Scott program, surpluses would not be given away. A bank would be created on which needy nations could draw when times are bad. Repayment would be in cash or in kind.

There are some kinks in the scheme which need straightening out. Are there really enough food-surplus nations to supply the demand? Can such an agency really deal in food as the present World Bank deals in cash?

But here, certainly, is the basis for an important program. If perfected, it could become an effective, double-edged weapon against the problems of terrible hunger abroad and mounting stockpiles at home.

WHERRY HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated April 18, 1955, which I have received for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The letter covered a sample report on Wherry housing projects. A copy of the full report has been forwarded to all appropriate standing committees of the Senate and the House.

It should be emphasized that this letter forwarded a report on only 4 of more than 250 Wherry Act projects. All of these projects, used for sampling, were within 150 miles of Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 18, 1955.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your letter of January 26, 1955, and subsequent correspondence relating to Wherry Act housing projects in Virginia and elsewhere, an investigation has been made of 4 Wherry projects in Virginia, and there are transmitted herewith 25 copies of the report of investigation.

We believe you will be particularly interested in that portion of the report which shows that rental rates for tenants on all four projects were fixed on the assumption that local real-estate taxes would be paid as a part of operating expenses, although it appears that the sponsors of the Quantico, Fort Belvoir, and Fort Eustis projects may either escape payment of such taxes or secure a refund of taxes paid. Also, we believe you will be interested in the fact that rentals of over $200,000, or the equivalent of about 6 months' rentals for the entire projects, were collected on the Fort Eustis project prior to the time monthly payments under the mortgage began.

You have also expressed interest in the right of local communities to tax Wherry projects, particularly as that right may be affected by the provisions of the lease under which Government-owned land for a project is made available to the sponsor. The specific question you have raised in this connection is whether title to the buildings and other improvements placed on the Government-owned land by the sponsor should be vested in the Government or in the sponsor during the term of the lease. Statutory authority for the leasing of Government-owned land for Wherry housing projects is found in the so-called Leasing Act of 1947, approved August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 774), which is made a part of the Wherry Act by reference. Section 6 of this act provides as follows:

"SEC. 6. The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated."

It has been suggested in the correspondence you referred to us that the language of section 6 of the Leasing Act requires that leases of land to be used for Wherry projects should be so drafted, if possible, that the lessee sponsor of the project shall be subject to local taxation.

The purpose of the Leasing Act was to permit the military departments to maintain in a standby status certain defense plants and machine tools which otherwise might have been sold as surplus. Authority was given by the act to lease such plants, or parts thereof, to private commercial interests and to accept maintenance and upkeep as partial rental. Wherry housing, of course, was not authorized until some 2 years later when title VIII was added to the National Housing Act by the act of August 8, 1949 (12 U. S. C. 1748).

Considerable discussion was had during the legislative history of the bill which became the Leasing Act of 1947 as to local taxation of the plants to be leased. The bill (H. R. 3471, 80th Cong.), as originally introduced, had no provision regarding taxation.

The hearings on the bill before subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee indicate that it was assumed the plants to be leased could not be taxed locally, and the military departments intended to charge correspondingly high rentals to prevent lessees from securing a competitive advantage through freedom from local taxes. As a result of these hearings, the following section was added to the bill by House action:

"SEC. 6. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated."

The "renegotiation" provided for in section 6 was a reduction in rentals in the event such local taxes were permitted to be levied, as is shown by the following comment at page 5 of the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on S. 1198 (H. R. 3471), 80th Congress:

"Section 6 recognizes the possibility of the passage of legislation permitting the taxing of federally owned property and permits renegotiation of the terms of leases executed when it was tax-free."

During the course of the Senate hearings the question of State taxation of the lessee's possessory or leasehold interest was discussed. It was stated to be the view of the War Department that property used for commercial purposes in any State should be taxed by the local authorities even though title to the property was in the United States and Under Secretary Royall suggested the addition of the following sentence to section 6 (hearings, p. 32):

"The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation."

Thus, the two sentences of section 6 as finally enacted deal with two distinct things, the first sentence with the possessory or leasehold interest and the second sentence with the physical property itself, as is evidenced by Senator Baldwin's statement in

explaining the bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 8, page 9798) as follows:

"Section 6 expressly provides that the lessee's interest in property leased under the bill may be the subject of taxation by State or local authorities. It further provides that should such leased property itself be subsequently rendered taxable by State or local governments through any future action of Congress, any lease made under the authority of the bill shall be subject to reopening. This provision was inserted in order to prevent a lease from the Government being made a vehicle for tax avoidance."

During the legislative history of the Wherry Act there was some discussion of the problem of local taxation but no significant conclusions were reached. It is, however, interesting to note the following comments on Wherry projects contained in the committee report on the 1950 school aid bill, Public Law 874, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 1100—House Committee on Education and Labor, Rept. No. 2287 on H. R. 7940, 81st Cong., June 20, 1950, p. 25):

"The term 'Federal property' is defined in section 9 (1) to mean real property owned or leased by the United States which is not subject to taxation by any State or political subdivision. The term includes real property leased from the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force under section 805 of the National Housing Act, as amended, for the purpose of title VIII of such act. Such property is to be included as 'Federal property' whether or not it is determined to be 'subject to taxation' by any State or political subdivision or by the District of Columbia. This is the so-called Wherry-Spence housing recently authorized by Congress which is intended to play an important role in providing housing to military and civilian personnel connected with Federal activities in areas suffering acute housing shortage. The State and local tax status of the federally owned lands involved and of the housing to be constructed on them under this section of the National Housing Act is not clear at this time, the situation being complicated by the fact that the program contemplates a lease of the land to private concerns to construct and manage the housing built on the land. If all or most of the real property values involved should turn out to be fully subject to State or local taxation, the inclusion of such property as Federal property under the bill would not be necessary. Pending settlement of this question, the bill includes this type of property. Whatever taxes are paid on it by the Federal Government or by the lessees and which are available to local educational agencies for current expenditures will, of course, be deducted from any payments authorized under the bill pursuant to applicable deduction provisions."

In our consideration of the proper construction to be given section 6 of the Leasing Act we have also studied the views of the Department of Defense as reflected in a letter to you under date of February 23, 1955, from Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, General Counsel of the Department. As is pointed out in that letter, it is by no means certain that the vesting of title to the buildings and other improvements in the sponsor (lessee) of a Wherry project would permit local authorities to tax such property because of the exclusive Federal jurisdiction over many of the areas involved. It is noted that the same point was mentioned by Assistant Attorney General Morton in his letter to you of January 18, 1955.

The first sentence of section 6 of the Leasing Act specifically deals with local taxation of the lessee's "possessory interest" under a lease. However, the property contemplated for leasing under this statute consisted of certain defense plants and machine tools, and the question of exclusive Federal jurisdiction over such property did not exist. Therefore, the legality of imposing local possessory interest taxes (as for example that imposed by section 58–758 of the 1950 Virginia Code effective January 1, 1955) against a possessory interest in property such as a Wherry project which is located within exclusive Federal jurisdiction is not free from doubt. This precise question is now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in the appeal from the decision in *Sheridanville, Inc.* v. *Borough of Wrightstown* (125 F. Supp. 743) which was argued last month.

It should also be noted that the property which was to be leased under the Leasing Act was already in existence and belonged to the United States. Since title to the property to be leased was already in the Government, it obviously was not contemplated that section 6 would compel the Government to transfer its title to the lessee in order to subject him to local taxation. Such a suggestion was in fact made during the course of the House hearings in 1947 when Mr. Blandford asked whether the bill could not provide that the leased property be deemed to be owned by the lessees for local tax purposes only. In reply Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenney stated he did not believe that would be a wise procedure. (Hearings on H. R. 3471, 80th Cong., No. 147, p. 2353, Subcommittee No. 3, House Committee on Armed Services.)

In view of the legislative history of section 6 of the Leasing Act of 1947, it is not believed that the drafting of leases to vest title to Wherry Act improvements in the Government rather than in the sponsor can be considered illegal. We are of the opinion, and the Defense Department undoubtedly would agree, that local communities should not be required to furnish municipal services to Wherry projects without reimbursement. On the other hand, if the greater part of such services are furnished to the sponsor of a Wherry project by the Government on a reimbursable basis, there appears to be no justification for subjecting the project to local taxation at full value.

Because of the complicated legal problems involved, we believe that adjustment of the respective equities of the local communities and the Government can best be accomplished by legislation. We feel this is a matter which should be given specific attention in the event the present program is to be renewed. Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Department of Defense have been lax in failing to establish a firm and uniform policy with respect to the tax problem and other aspects of Wherry housing. The lack of consistency in administration and the absence of proper coordination between the Federal Housing Administration and the Defense Department have been responsible for the tax windfall of some $30,000 received by the sponsor of the Fort Belvoir project and the possible similar windfalls of $14,000 and $22,000 which the sponsors of the Quantico and Fort Eustis projects, respectively, may receive. In addition, the FHA procedures in effect permitted the builder or sponsor of the Fort Eustis project to collect rents prior to the beginning of mortgage payments. So far as the tax problem is concerned, it appears that this matter will be considered by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas, which is mentioned in the letter of January 18, 1955, you received from the Department of Justice, and that committee may well suggest amendatory legislation.

The papers which you kindly made available for our use in the matter are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF POLAND

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I count it a privilege again to send words of warm and prayerful encouragement to the heroic people of Poland on Poland's Constitution Day, which will be tomorrow.

On May 3, 1791, 164 years ago, the constitution of Poland was adopted. This constitution was the product of 4 intensive years of deliberation by the long Parliament, which made a brilliant effort and composed a great charter.

In a series of subsequent raids by Poland's enemies, the state was partitioned until, at the turn of the 19th century, the Polish state disappeared from the map of Europe, but the Polish nation did not disappear. The heroic Poles never accepted the partitioning and dismemberment of their country. The fight for freedom was a continuing one.

At the end of World War I, the Polish Republic was restored, after 123 years of enormous effort and sacrifice.

In 1918, Poland assumed the tremendous task of reconstruction with inspiring vigor.

Poland resumed its traditional role among the nations of the world.

The attack on Poland on September 1, 1939, was the first application of the Nazis' blitzkrieg. Poland found itself under German rule and the heroic sons and daughters of Poland again had to go underground to resume their fight for freedom. In a quick series of heartbreaking developments, the master's yoke fell into the hands of Communists and additional tyranny was heaped upon these courageous people.

Steadily but surely, a Communist puppet government was set up in Poland, holding the people in its vice-like grip and following the now so familiar and devastating pattern.

Now Poland's people are continuing their struggle for the freedom and liberty which has again been snatched from them. We know that they shall never yield. As the fight goes on, they give renewed inspiration to the entire world.

We have a deep sympathy and a continuing concern for their welfare and progress. This is characteristic of all true Americans.

We undertook an enormous program of economic assistance to the people of Poland, mounting to approximately one-sixth of the total assistance given to all war-devastated countries throughout the world, but additional aid was choked off by the Communists because they had possession of power.

I believe I speak for all Americans when I say that no people on earth could more conclusively prove their undying love of liberty and their right to it.

Assuredly, all Americans have an enduring faith that the Polish struggle for liberty and independence will again be successful.

We pray that with God's help their day of ultimate deliverance will soon be reached. We send to our friends in Poland our encouragement, our best wishes, and our prayers.

NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND QUOTA REFERENDUM FOR WHEAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, by May 15 Secretary Benson must announce the date of the 1956 national acreage allotment and quota referendum for wheat, with the vote to be held not later than July 25.

The wheat referendum this year will confront farmers with a serious decision, greatly complicated by the policies of the administration severely limiting the inducements to cooperation in making necessary production adjustments.

I wish to warn that the impact of this referendum will be felt far beyond the confines of wheat-producing areas. It will have a profound effect on great segments of American agriculture, and very likely upon our economy as a whole.

In order to encourage a better understanding of all that is at stake, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the April 18 issue of the Farmers Union Herald published by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, entitled "Serious Problems Loom for Wheat," together with two enlightening articles from the same issue of that publication analyzing the coming referendum, one entitled "Farmers Face Year of Decision" and the other entitled "How Wheat Vote May Affect Prices." I urge my colleagues who are interested in agriculture to read them carefully.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERIOUS PROBLEMS LOOM FOR WHEAT

A look ahead to 1956 and beyond is not one to cheer the wheat farmer, nor any other farmer for that matter. What happens to wheat can affect feed grains of all kinds and meat, poultry, and dairy farmers as well.

The Eisenhower administration has engineered a declining farm economy in which the wheat farmer is the immediate goat. It has been some 23 long years since the wheat farmer has had to look at a future fraught only with uncertainty of costs and returns due to price uncertainty. Coming on top of the usual gambles of weather, rust, and pests, price uncertainty makes every year from 1956 on look bleak when compared to recent years.

If anyone, expert or otherwise, can see 90 percent of parity or better wheat prices anywhere in the distant future under the Eisenhower program, please lend us your telescope.

Now comes the wheat quota referendum. Sometime before the end of July, wheat producers will vote on marketing quotas for their 1956 crop. Heads or tails, wheat farmers are going to lose something. They most certainly aren't going to win anything, no matter how they vote.

Ovid Martin, Associated Press farm writer, says in a recent dispatch, the "referendum could rock the Nation's farm-commodity markets and shake Federal farm programs to their foundations. It also could have strong political effects on next year's presidential and congressional elections. And it might force the Eisenhower administration to change some of its thinking on farm programs."

The situation is serious, not alone for wheat farmers but for other farmers as well and, perhaps, for the entire economy. Wheat producers, themselves, stand to lose in 1956 an average of about $13 to $15 an acre in gross income compared with 1953, whether wheat quotas are voted in or out. John Baker, top researcher for the national Farmers Union, has estimated that farmers' average gross income per wheat acre will be about $24 with 25 acres in each hundred available to be planted in something else if farmers accept quotas.

On the other hand, if quotas are voted down, farmers might have a gross income of about $23 an acre with no diverted acres to be used in other production.

At the recent Grain Co-op Federation meeting in Washington, USDA people voiced anxiety over a possible rejection of the quotas. The word "disaster" was used by one expert and he applied the word to the whole economy, not just agriculture.

Rejection of the quotas would tumble the support price of wheat to around $1.20 a bushel. That would put wheat in competition with corn and other feed grains. The end result could be destruction of the price support program for corn and other feed grains as well as for wheat. Farmers could look for corn and wheat prices around $1 or a little more in a free market as rough as they've ever seen.

So we say, the situation is serious. That is why the Herald publishes on page 1 of this issue 2 analyses, 1 by Porter Hedge, our Washington correspondent, and another by Mr. Baker. We urge farmers to read both of them carefully.

Top people in the Farmers Union and the Farmers Union GTA and Central Exchange meet in St. Paul this week to discuss the serious situation facing farmers. They undoubtedly will lay a plan of action before their respective boards of directors. In this case, as in all others affecting farm and national welfare, the Farmers Union and Farmers Union co-ops, can be counted on to base action on grassroots opinion.

FARM REPORT—FARMERS FACE YEAR OF DECISION

(By Porter Hedge)

WASHINGTON.—This may be the year of decision for agriculture.

A few of the top marketing officials here attach this much importance to the wheat-marketing-quota referendum coming up this summer, and to its potential effects upon agriculture as a whole.

Wheat is a basic crop in more than one sense. It's important to the farm economy as a whole. It also is important to the legal price-support structure that has been built up over the last 15 to 20 years.

AFFECTS ALL COMMODITIES

What happens to wheat directly or indirectly affects all the other major farm commodities, especially the other grains, feeds, and livestock.

For this reason, wheat producers in a sense will be voting the proxies of other growers when they go to the polls this summer.

Wheat prices are on a downslide. Forces have been set in motion in the last couple of years which makes it impossible to stop this price movement, short of drastic new legislation, general drought, or war.

There is little question about the direction of wheat prices for the next year or two, barring dramatic new developments. They have to go down. The only question is one of degree—how far prices will drift before the reaction sets in.

Prices of many other crops—corn, other feed grains, protein feeds, hogs, poultry, and so on—will be pulled along by wheat.

Wheat stocks are of a size that with just average yields on the minimum acreage allotment—55 million acres—enough can be produced to supply domestic and export requirements. Anything more adds to the surplus.

PROSPECTS FOR 1956

Wheat yields have been above average, even during the last 2 drought years.

Only the tightest control of Government-held stocks could prevent depressed markets. Without this, it is the consensus among the informed that wheat prices can't hope to attain price-support levels in the market—unless supports are so low as to make little difference.

Here are prospects for the wheat loan rate in 1956, if nothing is done to change the present law:

If marketing quotas pass, the formula in the present farm act will determine the 1956 wheat loan. Support will drop from $2.06 a bushel this year, to $1.79 a bushel—because of the sliding scale provision.

If marketing quotas fail, the wheat loan would drop from $2.06 a bushel to $1.20, based on the present parity level. Control over acreage would continue, though marketing penalties would be dropped.

If marketing quotas fail and the law should be changed to permit a somewhat higher rate than half of parity, a support of around $1.60 to $1.65 is currently mentioned as a possibility.

A breakup in the marketing quota system might be in the making this year. Growers are hurt by the cut of about a third in acreage. Controls always have been irksome, however necessary they may have been considered.

CONGRESS DIVIDED ON QUOTAS

A minority of producers always has wanted to throw off controls. Others are willing to ditch quotas now, and to loosen up on acreage controls, in the hope they can get something better. Advocates of the 2-price wheat plan are in this group. There are others who want neither marketing quotas nor the 2-price system, but an in-between program.

There is general concern as to what might happen to the farm economy if quotas fail. At the same time, some of the farm groups still are uncertain as to what position they should take. In Congress, leaders are pretty well divided.

Alternative proposals are being advanced now for the first time. The Department of Agriculture's approach to the problem is to get new legislation giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to set the wheat loan at some point higher than 50 percent of parity, in the event quotas should be voted out.

MAY INCREASE 50-PERCENT PROVISION

Present talk in USDA is for setting a loan rate of around $1.65 a bushel—just over the support for corn.

Authority to do this is provided in H. R. 5396. This is a bill by Congressman BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan. It merely amends the present Farm Act to say that if quotas are voted down the wheat price support shall be set at not less than 50 percent of parity. The law now says the support level must be 50 percent of parity unless there are marketing quotas.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson is on record as favoring this kind of approach to the wheat question. "I think it has real promise, and has in it some real value," Benson told a recent press conference. This approach has been discussed also by the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission.

American Farm Bureau Federation also now has a new plan. Farm Bureau proposes to give producers an alternative choice on the ballot, though it would have Congress specify a minimum loan rate.

The Bureau plan: Set the minimum wheat support at 65 percent of parity ($1.55 now). Raise the minimum farm-acreage allotment from fifty-five to sixty-two million acres. Seal up CCC stocks so there could be no net sales with a wheat loan rate at the 65-percent level. Premiums and discounts for quality in the loan would be increased.

REFERENDUM LIKELY IN JULY

It's probable the wheat referendum will be held July 23. The 1956 national acreage

allotment and quota referendum must be announced by May 15, along with the date of the referendum. The vote must be held not later than July 25.

The first notion in USDA was to hold the referendum well ahead of the July deadline. Congress would still be in session and could take action in the event quotas were defeated. Now sentiment has changed to putting off the vote until late July.

HOW WHEAT VOTE MAY AFFECT PRICES

(By John A. Baker)

The Eisenhower flexible supports farm law has returned the big gamble to wheat farming. Not since 1932 have wheat farmers been faced with such uncertainty of costs and returns due to price uncertainty.

Looking ahead to 1956 and later years wheat farmers face a wide range of uncertain possibilities. None of them are good compared to recent years.

The possibilities are varied at present, largely because of the uncertain results of the referendum on wheat marketing quotas, which must be held by July 25.

The table which appears below this story summarizes the 1956 price possibilities that confront the Nation's wheat farmers as they await the referendum.

What wheat producers actually face in the way of 1956 prices and income, boils down to this:

1. If the required two-thirds majority approves quotas, harvested acres will be cut to about three-quarters of normal and backed up by 75 percent of "transitional" parity price.

2. If quotas fail to receive the necessary majority, there will be no limitation on acreage but a highly uncertain free market price will prevail.

Either alternative is a great loss from 1953, when mandatory 90 percent controls with no marketing quotas were in effect.

Price, income, acreage implications related to 100 acres of wheat to be harvested in 1956, compared to 1953

Situation	Acres harvested	Yield per harvested acre	Production	Expected price	Gross income	Acres available for other use
1953	100	18	1,800	$2.21	$3,978	0
1956—Alternatives and possibilities						
Quotas carry						
Cooperator	75	18	1,350	[1] 1.79	2,416	25
Noncooperator [2]	100	18	1,800	([3])	[4] 2,268	0
Quotas fail [5]						
90 percent corn [6]	100	18	1,800	[7] 1.57	2,826	0
85 percent corn [8]	100	18	1,800	[9] 1.48	2,664	0
75 percent corn [10]	100	18	1,800	[11] 1.31	2,358	0
50 percent wheat [12]	100	18	1,800	[13] 1.20	2,160	0
Damp wheat [14]	100	18	1,800	1.00	1,800	0

[1] 75 percent of transitional parity ($2.39×75 percent=$1.79).
[2] Farmers harvest full acreage regardless of quotas or 25 acres more than allotment.
[3] None of his production would be eligible for price-support loans, but would have to be sold on free market. Free market price might be about 85 percent of the support level or $1.83. But he would have to pay a penalty of 45 percent of parity on all excess production above quota or a marketing penalty of $1.08 in each of 450 bushels.
[4] 1,800 bushels at $1.53 equals $2,754; 450 bushels at $1.08 (penalty) equals $486; $2,754 minus $486 equals $2,268.
[5] If quotas fail, farmers could produce as much wheat as they want to and sell it all on the free market. Nobody knows or can figure what the free market price for wheat in 1956 might be under these circumstances. Listed in the next 5 lines of the table are the situations that seem to cover the range of probable outcomes in 1956.
[6] Should some disaster greatly reduce the production of corn and other feed grains the market price of corn might be 90 percent of parity or better. Since a bushel of wheat has about the same feeding value as a bushel of corn the free market wheat price might be slightly below 90 percent of corn parity of $1.57.
[7] 90 percent of transitional parity price for corn 1956 (down 5 percent from old parity).
[8] Reliable estimates now think that barring abnormal growing conditions in 1955, the corn supply percentage for 1956 will be such that corn will be supported at 85 percent of parity on the sliding scale.
[9] Assuming that for the first time in history the corn price support program is made effective in the market at the announced level of support, this would give a free market price for wheat of about $1.48.
[10] In most years, the free market price of corn has been about 5% or less of the announced support level. If the announced corn support price were 85 percent of parity, this would mean a corn free market price of about 75 percent of parity (transitional in 1956–57 down from old parity price).
[11] 75 percent of corn transitional parity.
[12] Should all get in 1955 a bumper production of corn and other feed grains, along with a bumper crop of wheat and oilseeds, it is likely that the corn support program might crack up under the strain dropping domestic United States prices to world levels even if CCC and Canadian wheat board hold on to present stocks. Most observers feel this figure might be 50 percent of the transitional parity price of wheat.
[13] Old parity price for wheat ($2.52) minus 5 percent equals $2.39; 50 percent of $2.39 equals $1.20.
[14] It is conceivable but not likely that the U. S. Government (CCC) and the Canadian Wheat Board might dump their stocks on the world market. In that case the world price might well drop below $1 per bushel and certainly would not be above that figure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, constructive action can be taken by this Congress to make the necessary production adjustments far more acceptable to farmers, and less disrupting to our entire economy.

In view of the seriousness of the future implications that might result from a possible rejection of quotas by farmers in the approaching referendum, I once again call attention to the Conservation Acreage Reserve proposal I have introduced, S. 1396, and urge its thoughtful consideration along with any other alternatives which may be suggested toward giving the farmer the opportunity of helping bring about needed production adjustments without severe financial loss and hardship that will affect our entire economy.

Personally, I shall urge our farmers to vote for continuing the quotas even though I fully realize the hardship it will entail for many.

However, I must point out that the serious situation now confronting farmers in the choice put before them in this referendum is the result of the policies of this administration and the action of this Congress in invoking flexible price supports.

Despite the argument that the purpose of flexible price supports was to curtail production, it now threatens to have just the opposite effect, as many of us feared, by making many farmers unwilling to accept quotas in return for such lowered support prices.

IMPORTANCE OF LEGISLATION TO ALLOCATE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we often have to learn the hard way.

Immediately after the announcement of the effectiveness of Salk vaccine I introduced S. 1691, which proposes to constitute a Federal commission empowered to allocate and establish mandatory priorities for the use of the vaccine. Meanwhile, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and local groups were attempting to devise advisory and voluntary systems of allocation.

I may say to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that I was very pleased to hear him say that he was planning to introduce a bill on this subject, but the introduction of a bill is not necessary in order to cover the points on which he commented in his short speech this morning, because S. 1691 carries out the objectives of the New York Herald Tribune editorial. The bill was introduced some time ago, and I have called upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold early hearings on it. No hearings have yet been held. I wish to say most respectfully that, in my judgment, not only is the executive branch of the Government derelict in this matter but I think Congress also has been derelict. If we had acted quickly, much of the difficulty could have been avoided.

The recent unfortunate experiences with the Cutter vaccine show that voluntary means are totally inadequate. When the Cutter vaccine was recalled in New York City it became known that it was being distributed with favoritism and going to many outside the 5- to 9-year group in which susceptibility to infantile paralysis is greatest.

So the New York press reports that 80 packages of the vaccine had gone to friends, relatives, and employees of those operating the distributing firms. Many doctors reported that they had used the vaccine on their own children. And it was disclosed that some adults, who need it least, were inoculated.

The New York Herald Tribune has performed a valuable public service with a front-page editorial entitled "An Editorial on Polio: Washington Must Act." The program advocated in that editorial coincides with most of the provisions of S. 1691. I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, but I understand the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has had it printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; so I shall not make the request. But, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statistics on the incidence of polio by age group and the expected vaccine supply in the next few months.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Polio incidence in 1954

Age group	Number of children [1]	Number of cases	Cases per 100,000
Under 5 years	17,807,000	9,608	54.0
5 to 9 years	16,347,000	10,576	64.7
10 to 14 years	12,886,000	5,811	45.1
15 to 19 years	11,055,000	3,254	29.4

[1] July 1, 1954.

Estimated vaccine supply

	Expected production	Cumulative total supply	Cumulative total immunizations
	Million cubic centimeter	*Million cubic centimeter*	*Million of children*
On hand Apr. 12		27	13.5
Production Apr. 12 to May 1	6.75	33.8	16.9
Production in May	13.5	47.3	23.6
Production in June	13.5	60.8	30.4

Present child population

	Mar. 1, 1955	Cumulative by age groups
1 to 5 years [1]	14,955,000	14,955,000
5 to 9 years	16,872,000	31,827,000
10 to 14 years	13,181,000	45,008,000
15 to 19 years	11,150,000	56,158,000
Under 1 year		4,037,000
Total, under 20		60,195,000

Polio contributions through March of Dimes in 17 years, $367,000,000.

[1] This excludes children under 1, because the polio "attack rate" for them is low.

Attack rate of polio in 1954

[Based on hospital admissions]

Age:	*Per 100,000*
Under 1	11
1–2	33
2–3	39
3–4	40
4–5	42
5–6	44
6–7	44
7–8	39
8–9	42
9–10	33
10–11	31
11–12	29
12–13	32
13–14	27

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said when I introduced my bill, I am not wedded to it. I am perfectly willing to accept any reasonable amendment to the bill, but it is perfectly clear that during this period of shortage in supply of vaccine, a supply which will perhaps last about 12 or 14 months, the Federal Government has an obligation to protect the boys and girls who are most susceptible to polio; namely, those who happen to be in the age group of from 5 to 12 years.

Mr. President, I advocate that the Federal Government take over the distribution of polio vaccine until such time as there is enough for all. We must not adopt anything which would produce a danger of socialization of medicine. But it is perfectly absurb for anyone to argue that the creation of a temporary bureau to control the distribution of the vaccine involves any danger of socializing medicine. What is necessary, Mr. President, is that the Congress and the administration live up to their obligations to the American people. When we have this great opportunity to speed up the means for checking polio, we cannot stand by and be responsible for a single boy or girl suffering an attack of this dread disease if it can be avoided by making the vaccine available under Government distribution.

I have provided in my bill the checks for the medical profession and the pharmaceutical houses and health groups to see to it that there is no danger that the Government is going into the business of medicine, but that it is only going to exercise its police powers in a way that will bring the greatest safety to the boys and girls of the United States.

Mr. President, the figures show that the highest polio rate occurs in the 5-to-9 age group. There are approximately 16.4 million children in this age group. By May 1, the estimated supply of vaccine was to be sufficient to immunize 16.9 million persons.

The supply now on hand just about equals the needs of the children who are in the greatest danger.

By July 1, there will have been a total production of vaccine for 30.4 million immunizations, not enough to meet the needs of all children under 10. Children under 1 year old are happily not greatly in need.

But it is obvious that effective allocation and priority control are needed immediately.

It hardly makes sense to burden every State and community with the task of attempting control. This is a national problem and should be met by Federal action.

The time to act was last month. But we should move immediately to enact the necessary legislation. I have no pride of authorship in my bill. It contains, however, some good features. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and two House Members have also introduced bills on the subject. They should be considered immediately, brought to the floor this week, and enacted.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should go to work within the hour to see to it that Congress lives up to the responsibility of saving the boys and girls of this Nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like my colleague from Oregon, I read the editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. Immediately on reading it, I prepared a statement which categorically outlined my own point of view as to the course Congress should follow. The statement reads as follows:

I believe the Herald Tribune of New York, in its fine editorial on polio which appeared this morning has rendered a highly important national service.

I favor and will support any Federal legislation that may be necessary to insure equitable distribution of Salk vaccine so as to make it available free as promptly as possible to all children, regardless of their age or other conditions.

I also favor and will support any Federal legislation necessary to prevent black markets and price gouging.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the discussion of House bill 1 two technicians from the Department of State, namely, Thorston V. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary, and Carl D. Corse, Chief of the Trade Agreements and Treaties Division of the Office of International Trade and Resources, may have the privileges of the floor of the Senate. Their presence on the floor will enable them to be readily available to furnish technical information in regard to the operation of the trade-agreements program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment by any Senator who may desire to propose an amendment either to a committee amendment or the original bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand, after the committee amendments have been agreed to, the bill, including the committee amendments, will be considered to be a new bill, and will be subject to amendment.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. That is the customary practice.

Mr. BARRETT. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request of the senior Senator from Virginia is agreed to.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "thereof", to strike out

containing provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most favored nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this section similar to any of the foregoing: Provided, That no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States;

on page 3, line 8, after the word "Provided", to strike out "further", and in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "organizational provisions of any foreign trade agreement entered into under this section" and insert "the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade".

On page 4, line 7, after the numerals "1955", to insert "or with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published in the Federal Register on November 16, 1954".

On page 4, line 14, after the word "subparagraph", to strike out "(E)" and insert "(C)"; in line 17, after the word "on", to strike out "July", and insert "January"; after line 17, to strike out:

(ii) In the case of any article which the President determines, at the time the foreign trade agreement is entered into, is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities, the rate 50 per centum below the rate existing on January 1, 1945. This clause shall not apply with respect to any article unless it is identified in the list

required by section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1360 (a)), for possible consideration as an article which is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities.

On page 5, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(iii)" and insert "(ii)".

On page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

(E) In order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President on or after June 12, 1955, to which the Government of Japan is a party and with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published on November 16, 1954 (19 F. R. 7379), if the President determines that such decrease is necessary in order to provide expanding export markets for products of Japan (including such markets in third countries), decreasing by more than 50 per centum any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945.

On page 6, line 17, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 6, line 23, after the word "on", to strike out "July" and insert "January", and on page 7, line 2, after the word "on", to strike out "July" and insert "January".

On page 7, after line 20, to strike out:

(D) If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of the amount of duty imposed with respect to an article, he may exceed any limitation specified in paragraph (2) (D) or (E) of this subsection or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph by not more than whichever of the following is lesser:

(i) The difference between the limitation and the next lower whole number, or

(ii) One-half of 1 per centum ad valorem. In the case of a specific rate (or of a combination of rates which includes a specific rate), the one-half of 1 per centum specified in clause (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be determined in the same manner as the ad valorem effect of rates not stated wholly in ad valorem terms is determined for the purposes of paragraph (2) (D) (iii) of this subsection.

(4) In exercising his authority under this section, the President shall avoid, to the maximum extent he deems practicable and consistent with the purpose of this section, the subdivision of classification categories.

On page 8, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 19, after "subsection (a) (2)", to strike out "(D) or (E)" and insert "(C) or (D)"; in line 20, after "subsection (a) (3)", to strike out "(B), (C), and (D)" and insert "(B) and (C)"; in line 25, after "subsection (a) (2) (D)", to strike out "(iii)" and insert "(ii)"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "and subparagraph (C) of this paragraph"; in line 12, after the word "on", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "July" and insert "January"; at the top of page 11, to strike out:

(C) In applying paragraphs (2) (D) (i) and (3) (B) (i) of subsection (a), the rate of duty on an article included in a foreign trade agreement with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published on November 16, 1954 (19 F. R. 7379), if such agreement is entered into before July 1, 1955, shall be considered to be the rate "existing on July 1, 1955."

On page 11, line 12, after "(e)", to insert "(1)"; in line 21, after the word "into", to strike out "thereunder." and insert "thereunder"; after line 21, to insert:

(2) The Tariff Commission shall at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the President under the authority of this section. The Tariff Commission, at least once a year, shall submit to the Congress a factual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program.

On page 12, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 5. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (a)), is amended to read as follows: "The Tariff Commission shall immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.".

On page 12, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.".

(b) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) As used in this Act, the terms 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products' and 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles' mean that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.".

On page 13, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 7. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended", approved July 1, 1954 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352a), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 2." and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.".

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the opposition to the Nationalist Government of Ngo Dinh Diem, which has never ceased in underground conspiracy and sabotage, has now come out in an open military action designed to destroy that Government. There has already been considerable fighting and bloodshed in the streets of Saigon.

For a time the Vietnamese Government appeared to be making some progress in consolidating the non-Communist position in South Vietnam. Headed by Ngo Dinh Diem, that Government has had the full cooperation of the United States.

From its inception the Diem government made clear that it was dedicated to the independence and welfare of the people of Vietnam. Because it was, it antagonized powerful forces, native and otherwise, in Saigon-Cholon. For the first time, the Viet Minh Communist forces in the north found themselves confronted with an opposition which had some chance of capturing the loyalties of the Vietnamese people which they had monopolized by default prior to its advent.

As Members of the Senate may recall, I have visited Vietnam during the course of two study missions in Indochina and have reported my observations to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have also spoken on the situation in Indochina from time to time in this body.

I have not been in Vietnam since last September, and I do not know the full details of the present crisis. I assume that the President and the Secretary of State do have those details since they bear responsibility for fitting our policy to developments in Vietnam.

Recent news reports from Saigon and elsewhere, however, give a general picture of what has been going on in south Vietnam. They tell of French dissatisfaction with the Diem government and the bitter animosity of various sects and other groups toward that government because of its attempts to curtail their independent power and revenue. The Diem government has been portrayed for weeks as on the verge of overthrow, with its Premier unable to consolidate his authority in the country.

They also tell of the incredibly sordid situation which the nationalist government inherited after the Geneva truce. They tell of the near anarchy in the south and the callous corruption in Saigon. They do not tell of the constant efforts to undercut the Government by an undercover conspiracy that operates back and forth between the French Riviera and the city of Saigon-Cholon.

Now that conspiracy has finally come out in the open. We see the incredible spectacle of the Premier of the Government, Ngo Dien Diem, being summoned to Paris in the midst of a revolt precipitated by racketeers. We see the incredible spectacle of a military leader who had sought refuge among the racketeers being appointed by a chief of state in Cannes over the head of the premier as commander of the national army which is supposed to suppress the racketeer's revolt.

Fortunately, over the weekend, some answers have been given to these questions, because Ngo Dinh Diem has refused to go to the Riviera to meet with Bao Dai, the chief of state, because he knew very well that the reason for the conference which had been called was to bring about his dismissal.

So far as General Vy, the inspector general, is concerned, he was appointed by Bao Dai to head the national army over the head of the Premier. He had come into power in Saigon over the weekend for 10 or 12 hours, but, fortunately, he is now out, the troops who went out with him have gone back to the national army, and General Vy has fled to Dalat, 240 miles to the northeast.

There is nothing new in this picture, except the open fighting. It is precisely the kind of situation with which the Diem government has had to contend since the outset. There is nothing in it which would lead me to revise the conclusions which I reached last year. On October 15, I reported those conclusions to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like to reemphasize them at this time by reading pertinent sections:

A year ago, the principal requirements for the success of our policy with respect to Indochina were political. These requirements, full independence and effective internal government, notably in Vietnam, have not been effectively fulfilled. The failure in this respect appears also to have been accompanied by a consistent underestimating of both the political and military strength of the Viet Minh, on the part of practically all concerned. In consequence, the situation has seriously deteriorated.

The United States shares responsibility for the reversal in Indochina. We should not make the mistake, however, of assuming all the blame. We gave material aid unstintingly, but its value was dissipated by inadequacies elsewhere. I report this, not so much in criticism—I am fully aware of the great contributions to the common cause made by sincere French officials and sincere Vietnamese nationalists—but rather to make clear that this country has discharged the commitments which it was asked to make last year and which it agreed to make. At that time it was not asked to commit and was even discouraged from committing manpower in Indochina. Not until the crisis of Dien Bien Phu did the question even arise. Then the pressures of American opinion operating largely through Congress discouraged a hasty, ill-conceived involvement. Our share in the defense of Indochina was clearly understood at the outset to be the supply of material aid only and we quite properly insisted that this understanding be maintained. The situation in Indochina is only one of the many crises that confront us and the burden of sustaining freedom in the world must be equitably borne.

At present, there appears to be, at best, scant hope of achieving the objectives of our policy in Indochina in the near future, with Cambodia the only exception to this conclusion. The present Government of Vietnam which is based on the sound principles of national independence, an end to corruption, and internal amelioration, is immobilized largely by a squabbling, plotting opposition. Its critics complain of the personality of the leader of that government. In view of the numerous and varied personalities who have occupied the presidency in Saigon during the past 2 or 3 years without tangible results, it seems more likely that the real question is one of dissatisfaction with the principles of the Diem government rather than the inadequacies of his personality.

Should the Diem government be forced out of office it is doubtful that under the pressure of time a more satisfactory substitute, subscribing to the same principles to which he does, will be found. Yet these principles must prevail in South Vietnam, if an alternative to the Communist Vietminh that is likely to be acceptable to the people of Vietnam is to exist. Any replacement of Diem at this time, if it occurs, will probably take the form of a military dictatorship based upon a coalition of the special interests, parties, and groups which now oppose the present Government. It is improbable that the substitute will be the kind of Government which will be generally supported by the Vietnamese people any more than the pre-Diem governments were. Nor is it likely to be a Government capable of sustaining a free and independent Vietnam eventually without foreign support. It was to develop that kind of Vietnam that the United States made available hundreds of millions of dollars of aid. In my view, only that kind of Vietnam can achieve the purpose of our policy in Indochina, which, in the final analysis, is its freedom and the consequent enhancement of our own security.

In the event that the Diem government falls, therefore, I believe that the United States should consider an immediate suspension of all aid to Vietnam and the French Union forces there, except that of a humanitarian nature, preliminary to a complete reappraisal of our present policies in Free Vietnam. Unless there is reasonable expectation of fulfilling our objectives, the continued expenditure of the resources of the citizens of the United States is unwarranted and inexcusable.

Two parts of those conclusions should be underlined in connection with the present crisis. They bear directly on it.

1. Should the Diem government be forced out of office, it is doubtful that a more satisfactory substitute subscribing to the same principles which he does, will be found. Yet those principles must prevail in south Vietnam, if an alternative to the Communist Vietminh that is likely to be acceptable to the people of Vietnam is to exist.

And:

2. In the event that the Diem government falls, I believe that the United States should consider an immediate suspension of all aid to Vietnam and the French Union forces there, except that of a humanitarian nature, preliminary to a complete reappraisal of our present policies in Free Vietnam.

A showdown in Saigon is now in progress. I know that there are side issues in this struggle. I know that it has been contended, and perhaps correctly, that Diem is too uncompromising in his dealings with other political leaders who are inclined toward the nationalist cause. Basically, however, the showdown is between two sets of forces in Vietnam. The one, presently personified by Diem, stands for a decent and honest government in an independent Vietnam. The military power alined against it is based on those who have little concept of or little concern for, what those terms mean, or have downright contempt for them. Diem has recently expressed his intention of holding elections as a first step toward representative government. Who opposes these elections? Those, apparently, whose power is not based on the consent of the people over whom it is exercised. The opponents of the Diem government have power, but it is power built largely on corruption and the fear which their private armed forces inspire. It is the power of the Black Hand, the pirate, the mercenary, the racketeer, and the witch doctor.

If the forces standing for decency and honesty and genuine national independence fail in this crisis, the cause of human freedom in Asia will not gain. This country will not gain. France will not really gain. Even those Vietnamese who help to bring about the downfall of the Government, in the long run, will not gain. Only the Communists will gain.

It is possible that a semblance of stability may be produced in Saigon if a coalition of the corrupt under a thin veneer of respectability replaces the present Government. Beneath the surface, however, the penetration of communism will go on inevitably.

My view of the present crisis remains as I expressed it in the conclusions of the report which I read today. Current developments seem to me only to emphasize the pertinence of those conclusions.

It is possible that the executive branch has information on the situation in south Vietnam going far beyond that which is currently appearing in the press. General Collins, who has been performing a difficult mission with superb devotion to duty, in support of the Diem government, has just reported to the President and the Secretary of State. It may be that in time this body will be advised of facts which we do not now have. It may be that the President and the Secretary of State will find it necessary to alter the present direction of our policy in Vietnam. That is entirely possible, and if that proves to be the case, it certainly will lie within their responsibility to make the necessary adjustments.

I am confident, however, that this Government will not aline itself with the kind of forces which are now in military and conspiratorial opposition to Diem. The expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in support of those forces would be, it seems to me, entirely unwarranted. I believe the American people would expect an explanation which would show how any such expenditures could contribute to the national interests of this country. It would be the responsibility of the Congress to see that they get such an explanation. Our national interests with respect to Vietnam can be furthered only if our policies serve to lead to a Vietnamese Government which is independent and which can put down solid roots in the Vietnamese populace.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana for his very timely address. I, for one, realize he has intimate knowledge concerning very complex, interesting, and challenging problems.

In the light of athe Senator's remarks today, I should like to call to his attention a statement which I issued on last

Friday afternoon, April 29. My statement was as follows:

There are persistent rumors here in the Nation's capital that our Government is going to permit developments in Vietnam to drift. There is far too much loose talk indicating that our Government's policy is no longer in full support of Premier Diem.

This must stop. Premier Diem is the best hope that we have in South Vietnam. He is the leader of his people. He deserves and must have the wholehearted support of the American Government and our foreign policy. This is no time for uncertainty or half-hearted measures. The Government of South Vietnam is facing open rebellion. It is receiving dubious support, and at times what appears to be opposition, from the French. We cannot display any sense of uncertainty or weakness. Premier Diem is an honest and a dedicated patriot. He is the only man on the political horizon of the Vietnam who can rally a substantial degree of support of his people. For America to default in backing him at this hour would be a display of weakness and irresponsibility that cannot be explained or condoned.

If we have any comments to make about leadership in Vietnam let it be directed against Bao Dai. It is time we broke our ties with him and not with Diem. If the Government of South Vietnam has not room for both of these men, it is Bao Dai who must go.

That statement was issued by me about 5 o'clock Friday afternoon, before open rebellion broke out on the streets of Saigon. I must say that developments since I issued the statement indicate to me that there were at least merit and validity to the observations I made. As the record reveals, and as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, Premier Diem did not go to Bao Dai. In fact, Premier Diem, for all practical purposes, through what I believe is called the revolutionary council, has broken ties with Bao Dai.

I believe the Senator's report, which was made to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Senate as a body, pointed out there may be an end of the line in terms of premiers; that if Premier Diem and the forces which are alined with him cannot stand and are not supported, there will not be much hope left. How right the Senator from Montana is.

How right he is when he points out that the group which is opposing the leader in South Vietnam consists of racketeers and those who have fought and conspired against South Vietnam and the security of the state, and that they do not merit the responsible attention of any leadership in the Government of the United States.

I was pleased to see over the weekend that we have again clarified our policy. But we cannot have these hot and cold flashes. We cannot have a policy that is in and out, that is certain and uncertain. There has been entirely too much of this. We must make our policy clear, because to waver and to indicate any doubt or uncertainty is to play into the hands of the rebel forces in South Vietnam, the forces that would destroy the government which has been trying desperately to meet almost overwhelming problems.

I for one want to raise a voice in the Senate to let the honest, patriotic leaders of South Vietnam, who are fighting hard to restore decent and honest government, know that they have friends here, and that we do not intend to back up or support those who are unprincipled, or who have waded through the sewers of corruption, those who have exercised dishonest tactics.

From all I have heard, Premier Diem is an honest, wholesome, and honorable man. He is the kind of man we ought to be supporting, rather than conspirators, gangsters, and hoodlums. Let us have a policy, win or lose, that will be based on principle and morality. If we do, we will not be in doubt.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota is right when he states that our policy should be based on morality and principle. In Diem we have a man who is known for his strong nationalism and for his devotion to duty.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana a question. Am I correct in my recollection that the Senator was in Indochina last fall?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I recall meeting the distinguished Senator from Montana in Manila, when he had just come from Indochina. I remember that in my talks with him, he stated he had personally met Mr. Diem, and that he had a very high regard for him. I wish the Senator would develop an appraisal of Mr. Diem as a man of integrity, as a man of vision, and as a man who is attempting to set up an honest government in South Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to do so.

I had the pleasure of meeting the Premier of Vietnam approximately 5 years ago. I knew him first when he was spending some time in seclusion in New Jersey. At that time I was able to gage his character; and I found him to be a man of patience and ability, and one who is sincere, honest, and incorruptible. Certainly he is a man upon whom we can depend.

Although he is stubborn in many respects, and although he lacks political experience, nevertheless his virtues far outweigh his shortcomings. In supporting him, I am sure we are backing one whom we can trust, for his interests are with the Vietnamese people, not with the French, the racketeers, or the sects, and he is trying to help the Vietnamese people take their proper places in the annals of world history. If he is given time and help, he may succeed.

I wish to say that even under the very best circumstances, the odds are against Premier Diem and a free Vietnam; but in that situation he is the only person with whom we can aline ourselves today.

I may call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey a remark made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia at the time of our consideration of the Formosa resolution, at which time the Senator from Georgia asked, "What is the alternative?"

Today I raise the same question, insofar as Premier Diem is concerned. What is the alternative, Mr. President? In my opinion, there is none, because on the other side there is an unholy alliance. A cablegram government is operating in Vietnam, or at least attempts are being made to operate such a government there. There is also a combination of the Binh Xuyen, a gangster-racketeer dominated group, which makes its living illegitimately, so to speak, and in turn gives a part of its take to the so-called Emperor, or I should say the chief of state, who is living on the Riviera. Although at one time he was Emperor, he abdicated that title, and was made chief of state by the French. Therefore, the strength of his connection with the government of Vietnam is, I think, open to question.

In addition to the Binh Xuyen, there are the Bao Dai and Hoa Hoa—religious sects which maintain private armies and carry on their activities on their own hook. Then, of course, there are the French.

Over the weekend, a very interesting thing happened—and not for the first time. When Premier Diem's government forces tried to pursue the Binh Xuyen forces of General Bay Vien, after they had been defeated, the French erected barricades in the European section of Saigon, so that Premier Diem's troops could not pursue the rebels.

But when General Vy, who had been appointed by Bao Dai as the new chief of the army, got together his 1,500 troops of the imperial guard, the French lifted the barricades, because General Vy was in opposition to Premier Diem; and the French allowed General Vy to go into the city. But as soon as General Vy's forces were overturned, the French again set up the barricades.

So in that situation we find the elements of importance to be the following: The Government forces under the direction of Premier Diem; the Binh Xuyen forces; the Bao Dai; and the Hoa Hoa. The latter three groups are opposed in whole, or in part, to Premier Diem; and his most recent opposition came from the recently overturned General Vy, who until his defeat was trying to make things difficult for Ngo Dinh Diem, the head of the recognized Government in Vietnam.

As I have pointed out, Premier Diem is the only one who can successfully oppose the Communist elements; and if he is unsuccessful in his efforts, the people of Vietnam will suffer immeasurably.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from Montana has said; and I commend him for advising us of the details.

I wish to commend him also for the tour he made to Vietnam, last year, and for the splendid report he made to our committee, upon his return from that trip.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that the United States has backed Diem ever since he was made Premier, has backed him consistently, and there has been no wobbling at any time, in our support of him? A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated that the United States had "wobbled" in supporting Premier

Diem; but I wish to point out that we have constantly maintained our position of support of him, and at the present time we are supporting Premier Diem's government, if it can be called that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply, let me state that what the Senator from New Jersey has said is correct, because, insofar as I know, there has been no letdown in our support of Premier Diem.

I was pleased to note from the newsticker, this morning, that General Collins met with Premier Diem immediately upon his arrival at Saigon, and again reaffirmed the support of our Government of Premier Diem's government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his contributions to this discussion, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to take exception to the conclusion which has been drawn in the matter of the support by our Government of the Government of Premier Diem in Vietnam. Some have said that our support of that Government has been unwavering. To be sure, on the face of things, our support of Premier Diem's government has been unwavering. However, the truth is that when General Collins was here, several weeks ago, the Vietnamese officials in Saigon were led to believe—at least, judging from the newspaper accounts I have received and also judging from the representations I have had from persons close to Premier Diem's government—that there was uncertainty as to the United States position; and some doubt was left hanging in the air. In fact, in the past 10 days our own newspapers have carried story after story regarding what would be the position of our Government toward the Diem government, in Saigon; and it was stated—and I can refer to the record to substantiate the statement—that the State Department was permitting the situation to "drift." The use of that word was not merely a slip of the tongue; but there was doubt as to whether Premier Diem could hold together the Government there. There was talk of a coalition; and the pressure was brought to bear from certain sources, and it was indicated that a coalition might be desirable.

So I think it fair to say that in some quarters there were feelings of uncertainty as to the position of Premier Diem's government, and this was so to such an extent that it affected the position of both the Government in Washington and the Government in Paris, according to the information I have had.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I, too, have seen those newspaper accounts. I do not know how much truth there is to them but I can understand that as a result of the stories or articles there might be a feeling of apprehension in Vietnam.

But I was pleased to note that the first thing General Collins did upon his arrival at Saigon, this morning, was to have a conference with General Diem, and to reaffirm, once again, the support of the United States Government for the Government of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem. I was pleased to note that because I was looking for such a reaffirmation; and I know that both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are likewise happy that such a statement has been made at this time to the head of the Government of South Vietnam.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased, too, Mr. President, to note that reaffirmation by General Collins. But I wish to state that there should be no doubt because of any statement in the press of our country or any statement in the press of any other country about our strong support of the government of Premier Diem. There is no reason to believe that we are in any way lukewarm, wavering, or doubtful in our support of Premier Diem's government. It is important that our support of his government continue to be firm and strong, for the situation in free Vietnam is critical, and it is needless to say that if there is any doubt in that area of the world as to the position or policy of the United States, or if there is any doubt as to American firmness of support or of the firmness and constancy of the United States policy, the result will be further weakness and further chaos.

I am delighted and particularly pleased at the meeting of General Collins with the leaders of the free Vietnamese, and with General Collins' statement reaffirming the American position. I am particularly pleased by General Collins' statement, because in the past there has been too much duplicity. Within the French political structure there are forces which were pro-Vietnam. Some of the French are still hanging onto the old French colonialism; and, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the forces are diabolical, sinister, and corrupt. Certainly this is one time when we should be as clear as it is possible to be in stating and maintaining our policy; and we should make it impossible for anyone to misinterpret it. I say this because of what I consider to be the on-again, off-again attitude of our Government regarding the Formosan situation.

Time after time I have heard, on one day, that we had pledged the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, and then that we did not pledge it. I have heard, for example, that we were going to station troops upon Formosa, and then that we were not.

Once these policies are made clear, we should stick with them. We should stand firm. During the past few weeks I have become somewhat sympathetic toward the Chinese Nationalist leader. He has been led uphill and down again. The point this Senator has made time after time, regardless of his differences with the administration policy in connection with some of these matters, is that we should make our policies clear. We cannot please everyone. If we intend to defend Quemoy and Matsu, for example, let us say so. Let us not say one thing to the Foreign Minister of Nationalist China and another thing to the American press. Let us not say one thing one day and another the next day, as was done, for example, in connection with the so-called conference with the Red Chinese leader, Chou En-lai.

On Saturday last our State Department said there would be a conference only if Nationalist China attended. On Tuesday at the press conference, it was said that Nationalist China might be represented there or might not be, but that it really was not important. As an individual, I happen to agree with the latter position. But who knows what our policy is? All I am asking is that we make our policies clear. We are not only confusing the enemy with this kind of uncertainty; we are confusing our friends, which is inexcusable. Our friends ought to know where we stand. In this instance, thank God, the situation has been cleared up. I think the Senator from Montana has rendered a distinct service in pointing out the alternatives, which are few. As a practical matter, there is no alternative except to support the Diem government in Saigon, in free Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. As I see it, there is no alternative to supporting the Diem government. I certainly hope we shall not lead Diem up the hill and then down again. Our support should be unwavering, and to the hilt. We ought to recognize that this man has made a great contribution toward stopping the spread of Communist ideology in southeast Asia. He, the French, and the Americans have been responsible for the repatriation of approximately 800,000 refugees from Communist-held and Communist-dominated north Vietnam into the south. He hopes to get out 250,000 more refugees by May 16, which is 14 days away. On that date the port of Haiphong will be turned over to the Communists, and they will exercise control there.

So I hope our Government, in the person of General Collins, our Secretary of State, and the President will see to it that the support of Ngo Dinh Diem, the present Premier of free Vietnam, is continued, and that we shall be able to give him every possible assurance that we are behind him to the limit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DEANE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. VURSELL, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of Oklahoma, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Finance, I submit the following statement on the bill H. R. 1.

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

H. R. 1 continues for 3 years the trade agreements program initiated in 1934. During the 20 years of its operation United States trade and the trade of the nations with which we have made agreements has expanded and international commercial relations have greatly improved.

The United States has an ever-growing surplus of the products of our farms and factories which must find markets abroad. Other nations need and desire our exports and are eager to negotiate for mutually lower restrictions on trade. The importance of the trade agreements program as a factor for expanded world trade has come to be accepted by the leading free nations of the world.

The President in his speech of April 25, 1955, emphasized the importance of foreign trade to the economy of the United States:

> Trade expands markets for the increased output of our mines, our farms and our factories. In return we obtain essential raw materials and needed products of the farms and factories of others. Likewise, the markets provided here for the products of other free world countries enable them to acquire from us capital equipment and consumer goods essential to their economic development and higher living standards.
>
> American agriculture sells abroad from one-fourth to one-third of major crops such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco. Without these export markets there can be, under current conditions, no enduring prosperity for the American farmer.
>
> American factories and labor likewise have an important stake in foreign trade. Last year this country sold over $9 billion of industrial products abroad. Over 3 million workers—American workers—are directly dependent on exports for their jobs. Jungles the world round are being tamed today by American bulldozers; new mines are being opened by our drills and equipment; fields that have been cultivated by hand for centuries are yielding new harvests to our agricultural machines; our automobiles, trucks, and buses are found wherever there are roads; and new industries to employ the teeming millions within the underdeveloped nations are being equipped with our machine tools.

The committee recognizes the need for a planned and well-organized program so that trade expansion can be obtained without serious injury to any segment of our economy. The President also recognized this need in his speech when he said:

> The expansion of our foreign trade should proceed on an orderly basis. Reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers, both here and abroad, must be gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Changes which would result in the threat of serious injury to industry or general reduction in employment would not strengthen the economy of this country or the free world. The trade measures that I have recommended to the Congress were prepared in recognition of these facts.

The bill as reported by the committee continues the trade-agreements program and strengthens the safeguards against serious injury to the country's economy.

SUMMARY

At this point I should like to give a summary of the bill, as amended by the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1 continues to June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. The present authority—extended by Public Law 464, 83d Congress—terminates on June 12, 1955. In addition to the extension of the trade-agreements authority, the principal features of H. R. 1, as reported by the committee, are as follows:

First. The President would be authorized to negotiate tariff reductions by either of two alternative methods, which may not be used cumulatively.

(a) The first method authorizes the President to reduce, by a total of 15 percent, tariff rates existing on January 1, 1955, in stages of not more than 5 percent of such rates in each of the 3 years of the authority;

(b) As an alternative, the President is authorized to reduce those rates which are higher than 50 percent of the value of an import to a rate not less than 50 percent, in stages of not more than one-third of the reduction in any 1 year.

The committee desires to emphasize that this authority is subject to all requirements of existing law for full public notice—including a list of products on which concessions might be made by the United States—public hearings, peril-point determinations, and escape-clause procedures—as modified by the committee.

Second. In the case of the proposal for a trade agreement announced on November 16, 1954, the bill authorizes the same decreases in rates of duty as are authorized by existing law—50 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1945—even though the agreement is signed after June 12, 1955.

Third. The peril-point and escape-clause sections of the law were amended to make more specific the definition of what constitutes an industry. The escape clause was further amended to make more specific the extent to which imports must affect an industry before injury can be determined.

Fourth. The President is given authority to adjust imports whenever he finds, after investigation, that an article is being imported, in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security.

I believe it may be safely presumed that, in the conduct of the investigation, interested parties will be given an opportunity to be heard to present evidence.

Fifth. The President would be required to submit to Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program. The bill, as reported, would require the Tariff Commission to continue to make the report on the program now being made under Executive order.

Sixth. Reports of the Tariff Commission containing recommendations for escape-clause action are required to be made public upon submission to the President.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL

I now refer to the amendments which were added to the bill by the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1 as passed by the House was amended by the committee as follows:

First. The House bill specified certain types of general provisions which may be included in a trade agreement and provided that no such provision should be given effect in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States. The committee deleted this language. The committee also changed the bill so as to make clear that its enactment should not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. These changes bring the language of the bill into conformity with that used in prior extensions, and do not change the authority contained in existing law.

They were made in the light of the fact that there is a pending House bill—H. R. 5550—authorizing United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Second. As passed by the House, the bill provided that rates of duty existing on July 1, 1955, could be reduced by 15 percent. This date has now been changed to January 1, 1955. Thus, the new 15-percent authority would not be applicable in the case of any product whose duty is reduced by 15 percent or more in the negotiations presently going on in Geneva. These negotiations are concerned with a wide range of commodities. Appropriate revisions were made in other sections of the bill to reflect this change in the base date for the 15-percent authority.

Third. The authority to reduce duties by 50 percent of the January 1, 1945, level in the case of articles normally not imported or normally imported in negligible quantities was deleted.

Fourth. The committee deleted those portions of the bill which authorized the President to round out rates of duty to an extent not exceeding one-half of 1 percent ad valorem, in making changes in rates.

Fifth. Also deleted was the provision in the House bill providing that the President should avoid to the extent practicable the subdivision of classification categories.

Sixth. The committee added a provision requiring the Tariff Commission to submit a factual report to the Congress at least yearly on the operation of the trade-agreements program.

Seventh. The committee also added a provision requiring the Tariff Commission to make public immediately, upon transmission to the President, its findings and recommendations in escape-clause proceedings, including any dissenting or separate findings, and to cause a summary to be published in the Federal Register.

Eighth. The committee added provisions to the House bill relating to the determination of injury for the purpose of escape-clause action and defining domestic industry for peril-point determinations and escape-clause cases.

Ninth. The committee had before it several proposals dealing with specific commodities, namely petroleum, fluorspar, lead, and zinc. In lieu of specific action on each of these, the committee adopted an amendment which specifies that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization shall report to the President when he has reason to believe that imports of a commodity are entering the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security; that the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made if he feels there is reason for such belief; and that the President, if he finds a threat to the national security exists, shall take whatever action is necessary to adjust imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

The committee believes that this amendment will provide a means for assistance to the various national-defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented.

The White House issued on February 26, 1955, a report based on a study by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy which indicates the importance of a strong domestic petroleum industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the President's Advisory Committee report to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.

Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

The committee recommends further that the desirable proportionate relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national-defense requirements.

In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into considerations the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign oil supplies both in peace and war.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, although no similar study is presently available for fluorspar or lead and zinc, the committee feels that the Director of Defense Mobilization will be cognizant of the serious situation existing in those industries.

Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken.

One commodity amendment would have changed the tariff classification of hardboard, a commodity which would not be covered by the amendment noted above. The committee, without in any way prejudicing the hardboard amendment did not vote on it because it concerns a matter of tariff classification and might better be taken up separately or in conjunction with some more closely related legislation. The merits of the hardboard amendment were therefore not voted upon.

An amendment was offered by Senator SMATHERS which would require the State Department to take positive action to protect exports of agricultural products from discriminatory practices engaged in by countries with which the United States has entered into reciprocal trade agreements. The amendment was withdrawn when it was agreed by the committee that it would be more appropriate for a statement to be made in the report expressing the wish of the committee that responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government make a full investigation and take appropriate action.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

H. R. 1, as amended, changes existing law in the following respects:

First. It extends the period during which the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements from June 12, 1955, until the close of June 30, 1958.

Second. The bill provides for changes in the existing limits on the President's authority to change rates of duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement showing the differences between existing law and the changes made by H. R. 1 as reported by the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITS ON PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO CHANGE RATES OF DUTY

UNDER PRESENT LAW

1. Duties may be increased by up to 50 percent of the duty existing on January 1, 1945.
2. No transfers of articles may be made between the dutiable and free lists.
3. Any rate may be decreased by up to 50 percent of the duty in existence on January 1, 1945.
4. Not in existing law.
5. Not in existing law.

UNDER H. R. 1 AS REPORTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. No change.
2. No change.
3. This authority expires on June 12, 1955, except that under H. R. 1 it may be used in order to give effect to the results of the negotiations, notice of which was published on November 16, 1954.
4. Authority to reduce rates existing on January 1, 1955, by 15 percent over the 3-year period of the bill (reductions of no more than 5 percent of the January 1, 1955, rate may be made in any one year).
5. Authority to reduce rates above 50 percent ad valorem down to 50 percent ad valorem (no more than one-third of any such decrease of over 15 percent may be made in any one year).

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, no part of the authorized 15 percent decrease in duty may become initially effective after June 30, 1958. However, if any part of the decrease has become effective and then the decrease is suspended for a period because of an escape-clause action, the period of time the decrease is not in effect is to be excluded in determining when the 3-year period expires.

Third. Under existing law the President "may" suspend the application of concession rates to the products of countries that discriminate against American commerce or engage in other conduct tending to defeat the purpose of section 350. The bill as reported provides that the President "shall as soon as practicable" suspend such application in like circumstances.

Fourth. Under the bill as reported the President is required to submit to Congress an annual report on the trade-agreements program. The report is to contain among other things information on modifications of trade agreements including a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing agreements and information relating to agreements entered into. An additional amendment removes the existing requirement that the President report semiannually regarding action taken to incorporate escape clauses into existing agreements.

Fifth. The annual report to the Congress by the Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program now required by executive order is, under the bill, made a statutory requirement.

Sixth. The existing escape-clause procedure has been amended to require the Tariff Commission to immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations.

Seventh. The escape-clause procedure is further amended to require that in the determination of serious injury "increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Tariff Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

Eighth. Under existing law there is no definition of what constitutes a domestic industry for the purpose of peril-point determinations and escape-clause procedure. The bill as reported in effect defines a domestic industry to mean "that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles." It is also provided that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, "distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury."

Ninth. The law has been amended to give the President authority to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of any article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security. Such action may be taken only after the completion of a factual investigation. Responsibility for advising the President when there is reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security is vested in the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a technical analysis of H. R. 1 as amended by the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF H. R. 1 AS REPORTED

The first section of the bill provides that the bill when enacted may be cited as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

Section 2: This section extends the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements for an additional period, from June 12, 1955, through June 30, 1958.

Section 3: This section amends section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which contains the basic authority to enter into and carry out trade agreements.

Subsection (a) of section 350, containing five numbered paragraphs, is set forth in the bill in its proposed amended form.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) sets forth the purpose for which the President may enter into trade agreements. The text preceding subparagraph (A) repeats existing law.

Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) authorizes the President to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof.

Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), as amended by the committee, contains a proviso, stating that the enactment of this bill shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Subparagraph (A) makes no change in existing law.

Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), authorizing the carrying out of trade agreements by proclamation, makes no change in existing law. The authority to carry out trade agreements by proclamation is no broader (and no narrower) than under existing law (the terms of which are identical with the terms of subparagraph (B)).

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is divided into subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D).

Subparagraph (A) continues unchanged the present prohibition against increasing any rate of duty to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on January 1, 1945.

Subparagraph (B) continues unchanged the present prohibition against imposing a duty on a duty-free article or exempting from duty a dutiable article.

Subparagraph (C) continues unchanged (with respect to trade agreements entered into before June 12, 1955) the present prohibition against decreasing any rate of duty to a rate lower than 50 percent below the rate existing on January 1, 1945. As noted above, a committee amendment to this subparagraph continues this authority with respect to the negotiations involving Japan now going on in Geneva, notice of which was published on November 16, 1954.

Subparagraph (D) fixes maximum limits on decreases in rates which may be made to carry out trade agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955. A rate of duty may be reduced under two alternative methods which are set out in clauses (i) and (ii). These alternatives are not cumulative but the President may decrease a rate to the lowest of the rates resulting from application of either of the alternative methods.

Clause (i) authorizes decreases in any rate to 15 percent below the rate existing on January 1, 1955 (that is, to a rate which is 85 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1955).

Clause (ii) authorizes decreases in rates of duty which are higher than 50 percent ad valorem (or equivalent) to 50 percent ad valorem (or equivalent). In the case of articles subject in whole or in part to a specific rate of duty (i. e., 5 cents per pound, or 5 cents per pound plus 20 percent ad valorem), the determination of whether a rate of duty is higher than 50 percent ad valorem, and the determination of a rate equivalent to the 50-percent ad valorem rate to which it may be reduced, will be made by the President on the basis of the value of imports of such products during a period which he finds is representative. In making such determination, the President is to be guided, to the maximum extent practicable, by the standards of valuation for customs purposes contained in section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as the provisions of that section exist during the representative period. The reference to the standards of valuation contained in section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is to make it clear that no action may be taken under the second sentence of this clause which would result in any change in existing rules for determining the basis on which any ad valorem rate of duty is to be assessed. For example, if a rate of 50 percent ad valorem is established pursuant to such second sentence with respect to an article subject to a rate of duty any part of which may be based on American selling price (as defined in sec. 402 (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930), the new rate would be subject to application on the basis of American selling price in the same manner as the ad valorem rate is applied under existing law.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a), divided into subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) establishes procedures for giving effect gradually (at intervals of at least a year) to decreases (under the two alternatives in paragraph (2) (D)) in rates made pursuant to agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955.

Subparagraph (A), except as limited by subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (3), continues in substance the provision of existing law that the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified in the proclamation.

Subparagraph (B) fixes the time limits within which the decreases in rates authorized by subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) described above may be made effective. These time limits are as follows: A decrease of no more than 5 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1955, may become initially effective at one time if the total amount of the decrease is 15 percent or less. If the total amount of the decrease is greater than 15 percent, no more than one-third of the decrease may become initially effective at one time. In the case of either of the two alternatives, no part of the decrease after the first part can become initially effective until the immediately previous part has been in effect for at least 1 year.

Subparagraph (C) provides that (subject to an exception stated in the second sentence of the subparagraph as explained below) no decreases under the first alternative method (the 15-percent decrease authority) may be made effective after the expiration of the 3-year period which begins on July 1, 1955 (that is, after June 30, 1958). The result of this limitation, when applied with the 1-year requirement for each decrease, is that the full 15-percent decrease under the first alternative cannot be made unless the first

5-percent decrease takes effect before July 1, 1956. Subparagraph (C) does not apply to the alternative (the authority to reduce a rate to 50 percent ad valorem). The exception to the June 30, 1958, deadline in the case of the first alternative method (the 15-percent decrease authority) relates to the situation where, by reason of legislation of the United States or action thereunder, a decrease which had been made by virtue of the exercise of that authority and given effect, and which was thereafter nullified, could be reapplied (and its successive stages, if any, applied), even though the 3-year period extended beyond June 30, 1958. The following illustrates the application of subparagraph (C) in a case where the first decrease takes effect before July 1, 1956:

(1) Assume the following:

(A) The first 5-percent decrease takes effect on April 15, 1956, and remains in effect until the close of November 30, 1956 (a total of 230 days).

(B) On December 1, 1956, the reduced duty is increased as a consequence of an escape-clause action.

(C) The duty resulting as a consequence of the escape-clause action remains in effect through May 31, 1957 (a total of 182 days).

(D) On June 1, 1957, the decreased rate is restored.

(2) Under the facts stated in paragraph (1) above, the 5-percent decrease will not have been in effect for a total period of 1 year until the close of October 13, 1957. Thus, if the second decrease is to become effective it must become effective no earlier than October 14, 1957, and no later than December 29, 1958 (182 days after June 30, 1958). In order to permit the third decrease to become effective, the second decrease must become effective on or before December 29, 1957.

(3) If the second decrease takes effect on October 14, 1957, and remains in effect for 1 year through October 13, 1958, then the third decrease could take effect at any time on or after October 14, 1958, and before December 30, 1958.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) provides that trade-agreement concessions shall apply to imports of the goods of all countries, except that the President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend the application of these rates to the products of countries which discriminate against American commerce or engage in other conduct tending to defeat the purpose of section 350. As under existing law, this provision is subject to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which requires the President to withdraw benefits of trade-agreement concessions to imports from U. S. S. R. and from any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) authorizes the President to terminate at any time in whole or in part, any proclamation made pursuant to section 350. This continues a provision of existing law; it has been moved to this separate paragraph solely for reasons of clarity.

Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill amends existing law to make applicable to products of Cuba the new limits of authority to reduce tariffs. In effect, this would permit maintenance of existing margins of preference with respect to such products.

Subsection (c) of section 3 makes necessary technical amendments to subsection (c) of section 350 to conform with substantive changes in other parts of the bill. It is made clear that the limitations on increases or decreases in duty relate to rates of duty other than rates of duty which apply to products only by reason of action taken under section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

Subsection (d) of section 3 adds a new subsection (e) to section 350.

Paragraph (1) requires the President to submit to Congress annually a report on the trade-agreements program as recommended by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. The report is to contain, among other things, information on modifications of trade agreements, including a report on the incorporation of escape clauses in existing agreements, and information relating to agreements entered into.

Paragraph (2) requires the Tariff Commission to keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements and to submit to the Congress, at least once a year, a factual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. This will require by law the report of the Tariff Commission heretofore made pursuant to Executive order.

Section 4: This section deletes the requirements now in section 6 (b) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 that the President report semiannually regarding action taken to incorporate escape clauses into existing agreements. New developments on this score would be covered by the annual report of the President provided for in the new section 350 (e) described above.

Section 5: This section amends the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 to require the Tariff Commission, in escape clause actions, to make public immediately its findings and recommendations to the President, including dissenting or separate findings, and to cause a summary of the findings to be published in the Federal Register.

Section 6: This section, added by the committee, amends the escape clause procedure and peril point provisions of the existing law.

Subsection (a) amends subsection (b) of section (7) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, containing the criteria for arriving at a determination in escape-clause proceedings, by providing that increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

Subsection (b) adds a new subsection (e) to section 7 defining (for the purpose of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions) the terms "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" and "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles" to mean that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. It is further provided that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.

Section 7: This section, also added by the committee, amends section 2 of the act of July 1, 1954 (the 1954 Extension Act) by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer a technical amendment, on page 10, line 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 25, following the period, it is proposed to insert quotation marks.

Mr. BYRD. This is purely a technical amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the committee consider the proposed amendment with relation to making the decisions of the Tariff Commission final, except in cases where the national security was involved?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. There was extensive discussion in the committee about it during the course of its hearings, which lasted almost 60 days. I think all such matters were considered very fully.

Mr. PASTORE. Can the distinguished Senator from Virginia enlighten me as to the reasons for the rejection of the proposed amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The reason which I think prompted the committee to reject it was that the President should not be bound in making such decisions. This is in harmony with the general procedure of the reciprocal trade agreements program?

Mr. PASTORE. Did the committee feel that a change in the present law with reference to that situation might disturb the whole philosophy behind tariffs?

Mr. BYRD. That was the belief of quite a number of the members of the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the bill as reported by the Finance Committee amends the bill as it came from the House, to the extent that the 15 percent cannot be further added to any concession made by GATT at the present session at Geneva. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct, if the Geneva reductions are 15 percent or greater.

Mr. PASTORE. There has been an additional improvement made by the Finance Committee in the bill as passed by the House, to the effect that the bill now provides, as an element of evidence before the Tariff Commission, that the Commission shall take into account a threat to American industry. Under the present law, there must be actual injury to American industry. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct that a change was made in the escape-clause procedure.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. My question relates to page 6 of the report, paragraph (7), which reads:

> The escape-clause procedure is further amended to require that in the determination of serious injury "increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the [Tariff] Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject, and I certainly am not an expert, but I know that many persons are alarmed about the long-drawn-out procedure or time lag between the making of a complaint to the Tariff Commission, and the date when some actually constructive action is taken or can be taken.

Will the Senator indicate if the committee considered that a time limit was already placed upon the action of the Tariff Commission, or was it thought that the Commission should be given unlimited time in which to investigate?

Sometimes the investigations run into long periods, so far as some of the industries which might be injured are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. A great deal of attention was given to that subject, but it was regarded as unwise to impose a time limit within which definitive action had to be taken.

I think probably the investigative machinery of the Tariff Commission could be improved. I agree with the Senator that many investigations have taken entirely too long. But I think we can all agree that to place an arbitrary limit on all investigations would not be practicable, because some investigations require much more time than do others.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I can see some justification for not fixing a positive time limit. It would not be practical to do so in all cases. But the criticism which has been advanced by industries which have been suffering losses heretofore has been the slowness with which the Tariff Commission procedure permits even some type of relief to be suggested or held out as hope.

I simply wonder whether the committee has gone into that question in its hearings. No doubt it has.

Mr. BYRD. The committee went into the question. The law requires that the Tariff Commission shall promptly make investigations and report thereon within 9 months. The existing law provides as follows:

> Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that a product on which a concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities—

And so forth. So apparently, the custom is to allow 9 months under the existing law. The bill makes no change in that respect. However, I agree with the views of the Senator from Kansas. I have suggested that the Senate Committee on Finance keep in touch with the Tariff Commission, whenever there is any unreasonable delay, to see if the Commission cannot make its reports more promptly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that under the bill as it came to the Senate from the House, before an industry could petition for relief it first had to be actually injured? As the bill has been reported to the Senate, is it not true that an American industry can petition for relief under the escape clause even when there is a threat that injury will result?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have had considerable correspondence with various producers groups in Minnesota, which have been very much concerned about the injury that might be caused them by undue or heavy imports of dairy products, more especially roquefort cheese, for instance, and also from those engaged in the fabrication of wool, such as the manufacturers of woolen blankets.

In the event there was a threat to those industries by reason of undue imports, the Department of Agriculture could immediately request consideration and action by the Tariff Commission, in order to stop imports of those commodities in such quantities as might well destroy some segments of the dairy industry, or even individual business firms, which might be engaged in fabricating woolen blankets, for instance. Does the bill provide such a safeguard?

Mr. BYRD. It does. The President, upon investigation, can impose quotas on agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. THYE. The President may do so. Such action will not have to await the cumbersome process of, first, the Department of Agriculture requesting the Tariff Commission to investigate, and then the Tariff Commission going through lengthy hearings and finally making its recommendation to the President? Can the President impose an embargo, and then have an investigation made?

Mr. BYRD. The President can impose quotas as he deems wise. I shall read to the Senator a list of articles on which quotas have been imposed by the Department of Agriculture. The existing law now provides that on agricultural products, the President has a right to impose quotas after an investigation has been made. He has taken such action in a number of cases.

Mr. THYE. That is true. One complaint, however, was that oftentimes the damage and harm would have been done by reason of carloads of products having been shipped in while the Commission was in process of holding hearings to ascertain the facts and needs of the industry.

Mr. BYRD. During the 19 years in which section 22 has been in effect, the Tariff Commission has been directed to make 12 investigations covering the following commodities:

Raw cotton, cotton products, wheat and wheat flour, edible tree nuts; wool, 2 investigations; certain dairy and other agricultural products, including tung oil; oats, 2 investigations; rye, tung oil, second investigation; and barley.

As a result of investigations under section 22, the President has proclaimed import restrictions on raw cotton, wheat and wheat flour, almonds, filberts, certain cheeses and other dairy products, peanuts and peanut oil, flaxseed and linseed oil; oats; rye; and barley.

The President did not make effective the Tariff Commission's recommendation, submitted early in 1954, for restrictions on wool imports since the administration had earlier submitted to Congress recommendations for a new wool-support program which would eliminate the necessity for such restrictions. The President also did not put into effect the Commission's 1954 recommendations on tung nuts and tung oil because of voluntary export restrictions applied by Argentina and Paragray.

Mr. THYE. One of the complaints which has always been lodged against the Tariff Commission and against the failure on the part of any administration to act was that the mechanics of the act itself were such that by the time the Tariff Commission had been requested to hold hearings, had completed hearings, and had made recommendations, often the injury had been done; the imports had come in by boatloads, with resulting damage to a concern, for example, engaged in the fabrication of wool blankets, or to the dairy industry as a whole because of imports of butter or other dairy products. The mechanics of administration were such that it did not make much difference what the action taken was; the harm had already been done. That is one of the complaints which seems to linger in the minds of persons who have written me.

I can share their feeling, because I know what damage the imports which came into this country did to them.

I am in full accord with H. R. 1. I intend to vote for it, and against any crippling amendments. I think the committee has reported a splendid bill. I wish to commend the committee for it. But I should like to make certain that if a hearing should be requested before the Tariff Commission, opportunity to appear would be afforded to those requesting hearings, and that reasonably prompt action would be taken, so that a person or an industry would not be ruined before a determination was finally reached. That is the only question which concerns me. Otherwise, I wish to commend the committee for bringing before the Senate what I think is a fine bill, proposing to extend for 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In general, enactment of the bill will make possible freer international trade, which will encourage not only foreign exporters, but likewise any American exporter who would like to get into the field of international trade.

I commend the Senator for the very excellent results of the committee's study and report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wonder if the chairman of the committee will yield to me so that I may ask him several questions.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I know the answers to them, but I should like to have the chairman confirm what I consider to be the answers. As the chairman of the Finance Committee knows, since I wrote him a letter on the subject and the letter went into the committee's record, we have a problem, particularly in Massachusetts and New England, in connection with the textile industry. I should like to ask the Senator 3 or 4 questions which are particularly important to the textile industry and to the men and women who work in that industry.

My first question is whether the effective date for lowering the tariff has been put back by the committee from July 1 to January 1, 1955. Am I correct in assuming that has been done?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of that is, is it not, to have any reductions take place based on what is already in effect and on what we know, rather than to leave open the question of what may be the base on which percentage reductions are taken?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Furthermore, the provisions regarding the inclusion of GATT, so called, and the new organization for trade purposes, have been omitted from the bill, have they not?

Mr. BYRD. They have been stricken from the bill in toto.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The provision regarding the opportunity for the President to reduce tariffs on goods imported in negligible quantities has also been stricken from the bill, has it not?

Mr. BYRD. It has been stricken from the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the provision regarding imports from Japan, which would allow greater leeway for reduction in tariffs, also been stricken from the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. That appears on page 6 of the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Another provision is that reports of the Tariff Commission are to be made public as soon as they are submitted, so that any interested person may have an opportunity to discuss any matter covered, or write the President of the United States about it. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Heretofore the reports were not made public for 60 days. Under the bill the reports are to be made public as soon as they are submitted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield, I should like to say I think that is a strengthening feature of the bill, because it will eliminate the long drag in administrative steps which have occurred in the past.

Mr. BYRD. Furthermore, the bill specifically provides that the Tariff Commission shall report directly to Congress, and the President also shall report directly to Congress. This is the first time legislation of this character includes those two provisions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, it will give opportunity to those who are interested to have full knowledge of what is contained in the report.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Moreover, it is provided that an annual report shall be made to Congress. Heretofore reports have been made pursuant to an Executive order. I am speaking of the annual reports. I believe the Senator is speaking of the escape clause.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides that under the escape-clause procedure the Tariff Commission shall make public its findings and recommendations when they are sent to the President. Heretofore they were not made public for 60 days.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the chairman of the committee describe a little more accurately than I perhaps am able to do, the committee's recommendation for redefining what a commodity or industry is, or perhaps both? The definition provides that if one part of an industry may be losing substantially, the Tariff Commission may make recommendations which will aid that part of the industry. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. If one segment of an industry is losing money by reason of importations of products manufactured by that segment of the industry, but the whole industry is making money, there could be redress for that segment of the industry. A half dozen different articles may be made by a particular segment of a particular industry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that involved in the so-called peril point or escape clause?

Mr. BYRD. That is involved in both the escape clause and the peril points.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are there any other new commodities which are given a peril point, or which are covered by the escape clause, which would help an industry which might be affected in any part?

Mr. BYRD. Here is one, section 6, which the Senator will find on page 12 of the bill. That section reads:

> Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

That provision was offered by the Senator from Colorado, who will speak later on the bill and explain it more fully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, that provision would liberalize or broaden the definition of what is competition. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the final question I should like to address to the Senator. The problem of oil imports is taken care of in the last section of the bill. This gives the opportunity to the President to adjust imports, under restrictive conditions or quotas, after a report by the Director of Defense Mobilization, and after a separate, independent investigation by the President, if he believes the national security is being affected.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct, except the amendment applies to all commodities; it applies not only to oil, but to all commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It applies to all commodities, does it?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. In other words, it puts other commodities on the same basis as agricultural commodities. It simply leaves to the President the power, in his discretion, to decide whether to impose a quota or to reduce the imports.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does that apply to every import of every character?

Mr. BYRD. It does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It applies to every commodity which might involve our national security, does it?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that, as one Member of the Senate, I certainly appreciate very much their efforts on this bill, because it is a measure which has caused great concern and worry to those of us in New England. Although we may not have gotten all that we requested—and, of course, we could not expect to do so—nevertheless, to me, as one Senator, the result has brought great relief, because the addition of these amendments gives me a clear conscience in voting for an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

I only hope that the chairman of the committee, with his customary persistence in matters in which he is interested, and—and I may add this with a smile—almost his obstinacy, will see to it that what the Senate votes for is maintained in conference.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think the question I have in mind may have been answered incidentally during the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the senior Senator from Massachusetts. In the report, on page 4, in paragraph 9, specific commodities are mentioned, namely, petroleum, fluorspar, lead, and zinc. As I remember, they were the only specific commodities which were discussed before the committee.

Do I correctly understand that if any other commodities whatsoever fall into that category, namely, the category of commodities being imported in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, whatever those commodities may be—the remedy in this paragraph will be applicable?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Vermont is entirely correct. The reason for mentioning fluorspar, lead, zinc, and petroleum was that they were the only concrete proposals before the committee.

But the amendment is very clear; at the bottom of page 13 it provides:

Whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security

And so forth.

Mr. FLANDERS. That seems to be clear. In accordance with that wording, if, for instance, imports of optical goods should seem to threaten the existence of an optical goods industry in this country or to seriously impair its existence, such imports would then be subject to the remedies provided in that section, would they not?

Br. BYRD. The Senator from Vermont is certainly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the answer—which is ample—given by the Senator from Virginia, in response to the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts, I may say that the amendment to which he referred was adopted by the committee in lieu of a number of amendments dealing with special commodities which affect all the States—mine especially; also the State of Virginia, represented, in part, so ably here by the Senator from Virginia; and also Massachusetts, Vermont, West Virginia, and many other States. Instead of adopting an amendment dealing with the separate commodities, each being dealt with in a separate amendment, and instead of undertaking to impose quotas, the whole subject was left to the discretion of the President, based upon recommendations by the Director of Defense Mobilization as to whether any of the commodities were essential to the national defense.

What might happen under another bill on this matter and what may happen under this bill may be two different propositions.

My own personal view was that I would have liked to see the bill passed in such a way as simply to extend for 3 years the authority of the President to deal with international trade agreements and to work out reciprocal concessions, agreements, and programs which would promote international trade, which is so essential not only to other nations, but also to the United States.

But in lieu of all those separate amendments—in 1 or 2 of which I, myself, was interested from the standpoint of my own State—this amendment was offered, giving the President authority, upon recommendation of the Director of Defense Mobilization, to do these things, if he finds and if the Director of Defense Mobilization finds that the commodities are essential to our national defense. I think it will be easy to prove that many of them are essential to the national defense.

So the amendment was approved by the committee because it sought to place the responsibility where it really ought to be, under the reciprocal-trade arrangement, namely, on the President of the United States, so that he would determine, upon suitable recommendations, whether any of these commodities—many of which were named in separate amendments—were essential to the national defense. If the President finds they are, he can impose such quotas or take such other steps as he may believe to be desirable in order to maintain the national security.

Many Senators felt impelled by local situations and their own obligations to support individual amendments calling for reservations, exemptions, or quotas for particular products. However, the amendment approved by the committee was voted for by an overwhelming majority of the committee, in lieu of the other amendments.

Although this amendment is not entirely satisfactory to everyone, yet in all likelihood it will result in as much benefit as the benefit which would have come by means of the adoption of the separate amendments which would have been offered by various Members of the Senate. I make that statement as a Senator who is particularly interested in some of the products which are affected by the bill and will be affected by whatever the President may do—products which have been rather disastrously affected by imports into the United States.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts will find that the amendment which has been approved in lieu of all the other amendments, will go as far, probably, as it is possible to go in this sort of a bill, keeping in mind that in the case of the industries of his State and the industries of other States in New England which are particularly involved, no one can know in advance what the President will do, because the President must act on the facts which are submitted to him by those who are named in the bill, headed by the Director of Defense Mobilization, whoever he may be.

I wish to make this explanation as to why some of us voted for this particular amendment, although we have in our own States industries which are affected by importations and by the economic situation brought about by the importations. We thought it wise to accept this amendment to this bill, as contrasted with another kind of bill. After all, the pending bill provides for a simple extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, thus authorizing the President to do these things. Under this bill, that authority would be extended for 3 years. Let me say that I think it could not wisely be extended for less than 3 years, for otherwise no agreements would be entered into, inasmuch as no one is able to know what any one year will bring forth.

So I think the Senator from Massachusetts is wise, as he usually is, in accepting this suggestion, as it presents itself in conection with a bill of this sort.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield once more to me, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said, for it seems to me that the amendment demonstrates draftsmanship of a remarkably high order and a great degree of commonsense on the part of the committee. I congratulate the committee for reporting an amendment which in so few words, if I may say so, satisfies so many persons.

All of us want the reciprocal-trade treaties to be extended, because we realize that trade is necessary. None of us wish to place greater burdens on the President, but in the case of national security he has the burden anyway. He cannot escape it. This measure is a logical extension of the reciprocal-trade program, which is in his lap anyway, and must be handled by him, particularly as it affects the national security.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I repeat that I think the committee is to be congratulated upon its ability to cover so many points and meet so many difficult situations by compromise language, if you will, which will allow the reciprocal trade treaty program to be administered with a greater degree of enthusiasm than, perhaps, has been present in the past.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. Let me add one word, in anticipation of a possible effort to reduce the period of the extension of the act from 3 years to some shorter time. I think it is absolutely necessary that the extension be made effective for 3 years, because that would give the President ample time, without restriction, to enter into agreements which are mutually advantageous. I hope, a little later in the debate, to show the advantage which has come to our country by reason of the increase in trade with nations with which we have had such agreements, as compared with those with which we have not had such agreements.

I think it is an indisputable fact that during the life of this law our prosperity and our trade with other nations have expanded almost beyond the anticipation of those of us who sponsored the law in 1934, and voted for it.

If we fix any period less than the 3-year period provided in the bill, we handicap the President and make it almost impossible for him to enter into any such agreements. For the past 2 years the law has been extended for only 1 year at a time, and practically no agreements have been entered into. If we shorten the period provided in the bill, I think the same result will occur.

We all know that we must have international trade. Men who work in any industry must find a market for what they produce, in order that they may sell it. That is as true of America as it is of any other country in the world.

So I hope no amendment will be offered to shorten the period, and if it is offered, I hope it will be defeated. I think the President of the United States, whoever he may be, be he Democrat or Republican, must have certain leeway in entering into negotiations, which are sometimes almost interminable, in order that equitable agreements may be reached with other countries for the exchange of our products for theirs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator from Kentucky says. I discussed with the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] the possibility of making the extension effective for 2 years instead of 3. I can see the point which the Senator from Kentucky makes. Furthermore, other language which the committee has placed in the bill, particularly with relation to the Tariff Commission, the publicity to be given its reports, and the greater liberality of the peril point and escape clauses, makes it desirable to have the period of extension sufficiently long so that new agreements may be entered into.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very able presentation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee, under its very capable chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has reported a good bill. It is not perfect.

One of the great pressures on the committee was for the adoption of amendments relating to specific commodities. The pressures were the greater because in each case there was a volume of evidence indicating the importance of those amendments to the livelihood and happiness of many people.

However, it was felt that it would be wiser to find some means of providing for an orderly and carefully considered method by which relief might be obtained by industries vital to our national security without coming to the Congress each time a threat of injury appears.

After a great deal of careful analysis and study a proposal was drafted which I feel is adequate and fair. It provides a method by which the President will be made acquainted with situations that might need correcting. The President is certainly the best informed of all those interested in our national security. When he is informed of the possibility that imports may be threatening that security he, under the amendment adopted by the committee, would have a careful study made; and if such threat is found to exist he must act to limit imports to a degree removing that threat.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, a capable and patriotic public servant, whenever he has reason to believe that imports are entering in such volume as to threaten the production of essential items, "shall" so advise the President who, if he believes that there is reason for such belief, "shall" cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If he finds facts that warrant action, then he "shall" take action and must adjust imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization can receive from many sources the information which may start the machinery of the amendment in motion. He will have his own staff alerted to the problem. All the agencies in any way connected with national-security problems will be watching carefully for possible cases. Domestic industries directly concerned will, I am sure, not hesitate to present evidence to the Director upon which he may base his decision to start that machinery. Congress always has the joint responsibility of national security and it, its committees, or its individual Members may inform the Director of circumstances which may call for action.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, or does he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he passes to some other point.

The Senator stated that he had explained the amendment which was offered with reference to imports which might endanger the national security. In connection with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization bringing to the attention of the President dangers which might be caused, for example, by excessive oil imports, is it not true that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has already reported, as a member of the President's Cabinet Committee on Essential Resources and Supplies, that any significant increase of oil imports above the ratio of 1954 would endanger the national security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Under those circumstances, does the Senator from Colorado believe that by the terms of this amendment the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization would have to make a new study? Or is it the Senator's opinion that the study which has already been made would be sufficient for the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization as a basis for his opinion to the President that there would be danger to the national defense if future imports were greater than the ratio which existed between imports and market demand in 1954?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have no opinion as to how the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization might feel, or whether he would consider that he should plow the field again. But certainly a large start has been made on the subject in the studies which have already progressed.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it that is probably one reason why the committee embodied the report from the President's Cabinet Committee in its report on the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. The significance of that decision was fully explained to the committee, and I think it has considerable cogency.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator feel that there was sufficient evidence before the committee to indicate that an increase of imports over the 1954 ratio might endanger the national security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my personal opinion. The judgment of the committee never focused on that question, but that is my personal judgment.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator feel that action would be taken if over an extended period imports should be in excess of the ratio which existed in 1954?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do; and while I do not propose to put a jinx on the processes we have recommended, if those processes do not work, I shall be among the first actively to support special measures.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have his statement. I know of the Senator's interest in this subject. I take it he believes that the national security should be protected, insofar as it would be adversely affected by imports of oil and other products mentioned in the committee report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my feeling. My own State of Colorado is an oil producer. It produces fluorspar; it produces coal; it produces many items which are essential to our national defense. If I did not think this amendment would protect us, I would be urging something else.

Mr. DANIEL. At least it is the intention of the Committee on Finance that this amendment shall be used to protect us in the matter of oil imports and the importation of other commodities which are necessary to our national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Committee on Finance did not make a direct decision to that effect. I can say, however, that the Senator from Colorado believes it should be used for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment which the Senator from Texas and I have been discussing has been accepted by the administration. It has been approved by Senators from States where the production of items essential to the national security is large and important.

Colorado has coal and petroleum; it is a very important supplier of lead and zinc; it is one of the few States producing fluorspar. Not many States have a greater interest in the effect of this amendment than the great State which it is my good fortune in part to represent.

It is of considerable importance to me that this amendment provide an adequate vehicle for assistance to industries whenever imports threaten to impair their ability to supply the commodities needed for national defense or security.

I am convinced that the proposal can and will work. It grants to the President authority to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports if they should threaten to impair the national security. He may use tariffs, quotas, import taxes, or other methods of import restriction. He is not limited as far as commodities are concerned except that they must be involved in our national security.

It is a proposition which should serve to alleviate many of the tensions and much of the anxiety in the industries affected. It permits the President to fully exercise his responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

It is my hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly accept this committee amendment.

Congress endeavored to make clear its intent regarding peril-point and escape-clause procedure. However, after several years of operation we find within the Tariff Commission, the agency most concerned with peril-point studies and escape-clause investigations, serious differences in interpretation of the intent

of Congress as outlined in the language of the legislation.

Section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by the law of 1953, reads as follows:

No reduction in any rate of duty or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

Two important points of difference have arisen, and the decisions of the Tariff Commission are frequently split and lack harmony because of varied interpretations. Some Commissioners have consistently held that Congress intended that, in a finding of injury under the escape clause, the imports in question must be the sole cause of the injury.

Other members of the Commission have taken the position that, even though there may have been other minor contributing factors, a finding of injury resulting from increased imports may be found so long as imports have contributed materially to the injury, and that said injury might be mitigated by a modification of the concession.

Another serious point of difference has been that some Commissioners have defined "industry" as meaning a large, all-inclusive category of producers and items which must show overall injury and perhaps an overall loss in total operations as a result of imports of a commodity which actually affects only one segment of that industry.

Other members of the Commission have argued that the term "industry" should be defined in a narrower sense so that producers would not be divested of their business segment by segment, without any recourse so long as they retained one profit-making line.

Just how these two major points of difference should be settled is a problem on which we have given much serious study and thought. I do not believe that there can be any doubt that the law, as it now stands, is being interpreted in different ways by the individuals who play such an important part in its administration. In the interest of good government it should be cleared up insofar as it can be done legislatively.

I want to quote from a couple of the reports of the Tariff Commission to indicate how serious the matter is.

With regard to differences of opinion as to whether imports need be the sole cause of the injury the majority report of the Tariff Commission on glacé cherries contained the following statement:

The decline in domestic production (of glacé cherries) was also partly attributable to the high prices that prevailed in 1951 for domestic sulfured cherries.

Although this was just one of the reasons why aid to the glacé cherry industry was denied, it indicates a difference of interpretation as the minority opinion was that assistance should be given the industry even though the high price of sulfured cherries in 1951 might have had some influence on the decline in domestic production. The minority did not feel that imports were required to have been the sole cause of the injury.

Another illustration of the widely divergent views of members of the Commission as to the intent of Congress is found in the report of clothespins. Here the disagreement was on a 3-to-3 basis.

I quote from that part of the report written by one of those divisions:

The decision was based principally upon a different assessment of the factual information obtained in this investigation in relation to the fundamental question of whether increased imports of spring clothespins are causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. It will be seen from this language (of the act) that while the increased imports need be only in part due to the customs treatment reflecting the concession, the serious injury to the domestic industry must be attributed to such increased quantities of the imports in question as to cause or threaten the serious injury. Literally, this means that increased imports must in and of themselves be found to be the cause or threat of serious injury before a recommendation for "escape" action can be justified. Obviously, therefore, the extent of the increased imports must be of such scope and intensity as to be in and of themselves responsible for serious injury.

The point of view of the other three members of the Commission was exactly the opposite. I quote again from the report:

Upon consideration by the full Commission of the facts obtained in this investigation, including the hearing, the Commission divided into two equal groups, each of which was unanimously agreed upon opposite findings.

Three of the Commissioners found that imports were "injuring or threatening with injury" the domestic industry, even though the imports were not the sole and only cause of the injury.

I do not believe that Congress would want this seemingly wide divergence of views to continue. The matter should be cleared up one way or another. Either we should decide that imports should be the sole and only cause of the injury, or we should say that if a substantial part of the injury can be definitely linked with imports, then the injured party should be subject to some form of relief.

We have given long and serious consideration to a means of making clear the intent of the Congress. I grant that that term we finally decided upon, after a great number had been carefully weighed, is subject to some varied interpretation. It is absolutly impossible to spell it out with mathematical precision and some judgment must be left to the members of the Tariff Commission. It was felt that if the imports did "contribute materially" to the injury, then the Commission may make its finding accordingly.

There is nothing unreasonable about such language. It seems a fair and equitable way of administering the law, and I feel that I am in a position to state that it was the intention of many of the Members of the Congress when the escape clause was written to provide such an avenue of relief, and it was not intended that imports need be the sole and only cause of injury if assistance to the injured industry was to be granted.

With regard to the difference of opinion as to what constitutes an "industry" the Tariff Commission is just as widely split.

The dissenting views of two Commissioners in the report on garlic included the following statement:

It is doubtful that the production of garlic in the Unied States is properly to be regarded as by itself constituting a domestic "industry" for the purposes of the escape clause.

Four members of the Commission based their findings on the fact that there did exist a "garlic industry" and that a number of growers were being injured as a result of low-priced imports.

The minority statement in the divided-vote report on glacé cherries included the following:

This situation apparently leads the majority to the conclusion that there is no glacé-cherry industry, as such.

Further in that report the minority stated:

Thus, based on such reasoning, even if imports of glacé cherries are seriously injuring the glacé-cherry business of domestic producers who manufacture and sell glacé cherries, no serious injury can be found to such producers because they are or may be producing other products as well as glacé cherries and their overall operations might still be profitable; the majority apparently believes that, if any injury that may be caused to producers of glacé cherries by a decline in the production of that product can be compensated for by the manufacture and sale of other products, no finding of injury is warranted. We wish emphatically to dissent from any such interpretation either of the facts as revealed in the investigation or of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

The Tariff Commission was evenly divided in its report on "wood screws" on the question as to what constitutes a domestic industry. Three of the members of the Commission were unanimous in the following statement. I quote from pages 9, 10, 11, and 12 of that report:

(2) "The domestic industry producing the like or directly competitive product" is the domestic producers of wood screws of iron or steel and no other products or producers are involved. The domestic industry in this case is the group of domestic productive units that make wood screws of iron or steel. Such wood screws are the only product under consideration in this investigation. It is the "like or directly competitive domestic product" and the only one domestic product which the law indicates is to be considered in this case.

Products other than wood screws of iron or steel manufactured by many of the same and other different concerns are: Wood screws made of nonferrous metals, machine screws, tapping screws, cap screws, nuts, bolts, and various other fasteners, locks and related hardware, other builders' hardware, and handtools, other hardware, and miscellaneous products. None of these other products, however, has any part in this investigation. None of them are included by the domestic industry in its application, by the Tariff Commission under its order of the investigation, and by the Commission in its order of the public hearing, and in its taking of

testimony at the hearing. The factors such as profits involved in the production and sale of these other products likewise are excluded from consideration in this investigation. All that may properly be considered under the law and under the orders in this investigation are those factors which are directly and inherently part of the operations in the production and sale of wood screws of iron or steel.

If, therefore, the domestic production and sale of wood screws of iron or steel in the United States market are being seriously and adversely affected as determined by the facts with respect to the criteria of the "escape clause" provisions (sec. 7 (b)) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 cited above, it would follow that a finding should be made that the domestic industry producing such wood screws is being seriously injured.

Were this phrase "domestic industry" to be interpreted as including the profits on all other products such as nonferrous wood screws, machine screws, tapping screws, builders' hardware, etc., that might be produced by these same concerns that produce wood screws of iron or steel, as long as the companies, though losing money on wood screws of iron or steel, were making such other products at a profit and the company was making an overall profit or could find some other alternative products to manufacture other than wood screws of iron or steel, that would show an overall profit, few claims of injury would be allowed as a result of escape-clause investigations. Under such an interpretation, a great part of domestic production, article by article, might be forced to stop by the destructive competition of imports and, if the manufacturing companies turned to importing and made good profits at it, they would be adjudged to be uninjured as a domestic industry. Such an interpretation of this "domestic industry" phrase in the escape-clause law would practically nullify the escape-clause provision in trade agreements as a possible remedy of serious injury, and in effect would almost, if not entirely, void the escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. One by one each small domestic industry could be severely injured and put out of business because of imports and section 7 would be inoperative as a remedy, and we believe Congress intended section 7 to be a remedy.

This is clearly recognized when it is recalled that perhaps 90 percent of all manufacturers and farmers in this country produce not just a single product, but a variety of products, sometimes many different articles in the same plant or on the same farm. No relief would be granted for any of the thousands of individual chemicals as long as the chemical industry was making satisfactory overall profits. The same with the textile, pottery, glass, steel, woodworking, machinery, machine-tool, metal-fastener, and many other industries.

To thus permit imports to take over the United States market one product at a time, because the domestic producers may have found or may be able to find alternative products that they can produce at a profit, may result in allowing imports to take over the domestic market for many articles produced in the United States if imports of such articles are able to enter in constantly increasing quantities over the lowered concession tariff rates and no relief under the "escape clause" is available. "Divide and conquer" is an old policy and an effective one if permitted to operate. Armies use it in war and the Communists used it after the war and are now making use of it with a number of European and Asiatic nations.

Again I say, Mr. President, the Congress has a responsibility in this matter, and its intent should be made clearer than it is at present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As a very junior member of the Senate Finance Committee, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado for his excellent leadership and cooperation with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in reporting to the Senate a bill which I think not only merits the Senate's approval, but the approval of the Nation. It is always difficult to deal with problems of this type, and it has been especially difficult this time, in view of the many witnesses representing industries who furnished proof and information that their industries were being damaged. But, through the leadership of the Senators whom I have mentioned and other members of the committee, the committee has reported a bill which I consider to be meritorious. I think it is a bill under which our Nation can not only expand its international trade, but under which, at the same time, American industry, American labor, and American agriculture will be protected.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia are entitled to much credit. I attended most of the hearings held by the committee, and I know some of the problems involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to mention one item which already has been discussed, namely, the section dealing with what started out to be several amendments regarding quota import limitations. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not feel that the committee has drafted a very satisfactory amendment which will take care of the situation regarding oil and other mineral products of that type.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the amendment is adequate to accomplish that purpose, and I believe it will be accomplished.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield. I saw the distinguished Senator from Kentucky on this side of the aisle a while ago. It took many years to get him over here, but then he did not stay long.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is no indication that I do not appreciate the comradeship and the camaraderie which exists now and then between the Senator from Kentucky—the junior Senator from Kentucky, I wish to emphasize—and many Members on the other side of the aisle.

When I was a Senator previously, and while I was honored to be the Presiding Officer of the Senate for 4 years, I found genial associations on the other side of the aisle. I find them now, although I have not taken advantage of them quite so frequently as I used to. Being a junior Senator, I am a little modest; I am making the approaches gradually, not by jumping over the fence suddenly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the Senator not be too modest; let him come over and join in the camaraderie.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his cooperative efforts in reporting from the committee a bill which seems to meet with the approbation of so many Members of the Senate.

As the Senator knows, I have been identified with the reciprocal trade program from its inception in 1934 under the leadership of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. While I was a Member of the Senate I voted for all the extensions of the act. I have been interested in the subject, not as a partisan but as a believer in the ultimate decision of Congress and the governments of the world to deal with tariffs as an economic and scientific question, rather than as a political question. I have always deplored the injection of partisan politics into economic and scientific problems, and I have contributed in my modest way toward keeping them apart.

I appreciate the cooperative spirit of the senior Senator from Colorado and other Members of both parties in the Committee on Finance. The committee held long hearings on controversial matters. We all sought information which would guide us in deciding upon the kind of bill to report. Therefore, it is really gratifying to see that, in spite of some adverse conditions and the local, particular interests which were presented to the committee in great detail, the committee was able to prepare and report a bill which is constructive. I think the bill undertakes to meet the problems which are involved in a constructive, forward-looking way.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from Colorado for his great contribution as the former chairman of the Committee on Finance, at a time when I was not a member of it, I regret to say, and also at a time when I am a member of it, and when he is the ranking minority member of the committee. He has really been constructive in his efforts to draft a bill which should be reasonably satisfactory. The bill cannot satisfy everyone, in the very nature of things, because it deals with a very controversial subject. But, on the whole, I believe the committee has done a good job by trying to resolve problems in a way which will place the responsibility where it really belongs, by authorizing the President of the United States, no matter who he may be, to enter into agreements with other nations to facilitate international trade.

I would not want the opportunity to pass without saying that I, as a member of the committee from the opposite party from that of the Senator from Colorado—not always opposite, but every now and then opposite—wish to commend him for his constructive efforts and cooperation in this regard.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky very sincerely for his compliments. During all the time I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Kentucky has been a

member, with the exception of a short period and has been a tower of strength there. I should not like the occasion to pass without saying that his cooperation in the work we have done has been of inestimable value in the past, as it is now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to ask my colleague, who is the ranking member of my party on the Committee on Finance, if, in his opinion, the selection of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization as the source through whom questions of injury to the industries affecting national security will come limits the initiative of investigations for that purpose to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not say so. The whole field of industry has its regular escape clause remedies before the Tariff Commission. The bill is designed to focus interest in national defense problems upon the special machinery designed for those problems.

Mr. BENNETT. If an industry feels that it is essential to the national defense, under the bill, will it be possible for such an industry to approach the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and have him consider its problems from that point of view?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If that should not be possible, I would like to see a new Director in that office.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Colorado that it is certainly within the power of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Ways and Means, specifically, to call the attention of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to an industry which the members of those committees feel is necessary to the national defense, and which may be injured?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say that it is the special prerogative of those two committees, as it is also the special prerogative of any Member of the Senate or House, to bring to the attention of the Defense Mobilizer any matter which bears upon the question of the impairment of an industry which is vital to the national defense.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not the effect of the bill to provide two avenues by which an industry which might consider itself injured could receive a remedy: One through the Tariff Commission, and the other through the Office of Defense Mobilization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say so; and I should further say that neither is exclusive. All the remedies available before these remedies were proposed will be available afterward, particularly those which focus on defense industries.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I, too, wish to commend the excellent work of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] relative to H. R. 1. I have attended practically all of the sessions of the committee, but I think those two distinguished Senators have attended every session. I think both of them, because of their long experience in financial affairs, as they relate to the Federal Government, probably understand better than any others of us the great issues confronting the Nation.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if those who will execute the proposed law and who are in conformity with our ideas of protecting the industries of America will find in the bill facilities with which to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say so.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As the distinguished Senator from Utah has stated, the American industries would also have the facilities of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say those committees especially should concern themselves with the operation of the amendments to the law which the bill contains.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Colorado is, of course, well aware of the fact that there are in the United States many vital industries which are now being affected by importations, particularly from countries where the wage and living scales are much below those of the United States. But under the proposed law facilities will be provided by which such situations may be corrected.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The bill specifically provides that the peril point and the threat of injury procedure shall be maintained.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the bill greatly strengthens the peril point and escape clauses of the laws which have previously been enacted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it does so in several respects, as I have indicated in my remarks to the Senate today.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in indicating to the Senate today why I intend to support H. R. 1 without crippling amendments, I wish frankly to admit that I consider continuation of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program with some additional authority to lower import duties to be only a part, and perhaps not even a major part, in an international program of restoration of normal international trade.

In the first place, some 800 million people now behind what we call the Iron Curtain are to a large extent excluded from what might be called normal trade relations with the remainder of the free world. In the second place, there are such roadblocks in Western Europe as lack of currency convertibility, quotas, and currency manipulations which can be just as disruptive of normal trade as high tariffs.

I am also aware, as I shall later point out in greater detail, that it will be neither practical nor feasible for us to reduce our import duties, even in return for commensurate concessions from some other nation, to the point where the dollar value of our imports will be expanded as much as some persons believe.

Therefore, in my humble opinion, the two principal values of the enactment of H. R. 1 will be: First, it will enable the President, after full and very careful consideration of all factors involved, to ease some irritating spots in our international-trade program; and second, it is a token of good will, friendship, and a willingness to cooperate with friends and allies, which we hope will strike a responsive chord in their hearts and prompt them to take steps to bring about a closer economic union among themselves as well as with us.

Every one familiar with the extreme nationalism which developed in Western Europe following World War II has realized the need in that area for three types of union—military, economic, and political. At long last, we have achieved in part, and part only, a military union under which it is possible for Western Germany to be rearmed. But little progress has so far been made toward a more perfect union among our allies either from the economic or political standpoint.

H. R. 1 MISREPRESENTED

During my 10 years of service on the Ways and Means Committee of the House, when I was devoting almost my entire time and attention to matters pertaining to taxes and tariffs, I became fully aware of the specious arguments presented by the high priests of protection whenever any proposal was pending to lower the inordinately high and, in many instances, prohibitive rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930. But in all of my 22 years of service in the Congress, I can recall no proposal for legislation which has been more widely misrepresented and misunderstood than the bill now before the Senate.

Knowing so well the type of fight that might be anticipated, had I been privileged to draft the bill I would have made it a bit simpler and a bit less comprehensive than was recommended by the Randall Commission. But since we now face a fact and not a theory, I feel it to be my duty and that of every other friend of international cooperation to take the time, even though it involves a rather extended discussion, to explain the true meaning of the pending bill and point out how its provisions have been so grossly misrepresented to the general public, and especially to the employees of numerous industries which in the past have enjoyed substantial tariff protection and who feel that in the future they will need the same measure of protection.

I have received hundreds of letters from constituents who felt they knew enough about H. R. 1 to take a positive position on it and to tell me how I ought to vote.

These have included many well-reasoned letters from persons who gave evidence of some knowledge of the principles involved and a basic understanding of the intention of the bill. Some of these reached conclusions which I share,

and others reached differing conclusions, which I, nevertheless, respect.

Unfortunately, however, a numerical majority of the letters I have received indicated that the writers had been given a distorted or completely false picture of the bill. I still recognize the right of these people to have opinions and I am pleased to have them advise me of their views. But I feel they have been victimized, cruelly in many instances, by persons who have unnecessarily aroused fears of job security or loss of earning power.

I have no quarrel with those who explain the provisions of H. R. 1 and then argue as best they can that it is to the disadvantage of certain individuals or groups of individuals. But I deplore similar arguments of disadvantage which are based on inaccurate descriptions of the content of the bill.

EXAMPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE

To cite a few examples from my correspondence:

I have received letters saying that H. R. 1 "would lower tariffs and give advantage to goods made in foreign countries," and that it "would reduce United States tariffs 15 percent over the next 3 years." These indicate only comparatively mild misunderstandings, but my colleagues, of course, know that the pending bill would not of itself necessarily lower any tariff.

It merely would authorize the President to negotiate for cuts on specific items when this can be done as part of a reciprocal agreement which he feels is to the advantage of the United States. Reductions which he might approve are limited to 5 percent a year for 3 years, except in the cases of items which have been under rates amounting to more than 50 percent of their value.

Other letters indicating greater misunderstanding of the bill have suggested that specific tariff cuts would automatically result from its passage. They refer to "Congress trying to push through tariff cuts on a lot of goods such as pants, shirts, blouses, and underwear made in foreign countries." Or they speak of a "bill that would lift the tariff on Japanese textile goods," or a bill "for Japan to manufacture our clothing."

Examples of even greater distortion have been letters saying H. R. 1 "gives the President the power to further reduce these tariffs even down to nothing without any action of the House and Senate," or which say the President's program calls for "across-the-board cuts and not reductions made on a factual basis by consideration of each product."

The source of some of these misunderstandings was suggested by a letter which said:

> There was a letter posted on our bulletin board stating that Congress is trying to put through tariff cuts on a lot of goods made in foreign countries. In doing this it will take jobs of a lot of United States workers and of course it will endanger my own job and that of my coworkers.

Now, it is obvious that most workers in industrial plants have no ready source of information as to the true nature of this bill or as to the overall value of a mutually beneficial system of international trade. But they know it is within the power of their bosses to reduce the number of employees or to close down the plant, so naturally many have written their representatives in Congress what they were bidden to write without pretending to a personal understanding of anything as complex as tariff legislation.

One correspondent took her instruction so literally that her letter to me began:

> DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Tell him to vote against H. R. 1.

Because of my sympathy with the position in which these people find themselves, the primary purpose of my remarks today will be to reassure them. I want them to know that the party of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson was not unmindful of the interests of those who work with their hands, whether on the farm or in the factory, when it adopted as one of its principal tenets the theory of tariffs low enough to stimulate rather than to stifle trade. I want them to know that Cordell Hull was thinking of the men in the factory and in the field when he proposed the reciprocal trade program. And I want them to know that members of my party who always have stood for this principle are happy to find themselves in accord with a President who believes in the same doctrine, even though he was elected as the nominee of the party which traditionally has advocated, and when in power has imposed, the highest tariffs.

In my effort to remove fears and clear up misunderstandings I want, first of all, to discuss briefly a booklet many of my correspondents apparently have seen which was gotten up in comic book style, with drawings and hand-printed text.

FALLACIES OF INNOCENCE ABROAD

This booklet, titled "Innocence Abroad, or World Trade in 10 Easy Lessons," is, in reality, a cruel attempt to take advantage of innocence at home, and to mislead persons who may find it easier to understand pictures than words. The tone of this essay is indicated by its jibing references to a boy who studied economics in college and went to a school of business administration and whose businessman father, therefore, "knows better than to argue with" him. The implication is that anyone with a formal education is incapable of understanding business problems.

Use of that argument in this context is understandable because the sponsors of the book must know that anyone who had studied economics would immediately see through some of their fallacious arguments.

For example, there is the statement:

> More than half of our imports enter free of duty now, and the other half pays an average duty of less than 13 percent. The high United States tariff wall that we hear so much about has long since been reduced to a low garden fence.

Mr. President, the ratio of duties collected on actual imports to the value of those imports cannot, of course, be honestly used as a measure of trade restriction because that ignores the fact that whenever a duty is high enough to protect, it keeps goods out. If we made our tariff rates so high that no product subject to them could be imported and sold at a profit, none of these items would be imported and no duties would be collected. The average duty on imports would then be zero; and, according to the theory of this uncomic book, we would have free trade.

And again it must be remembered that even under the Hawley-Smoot tariff there were a great many items which bulked large in our foreign trade such as rubber and tin, in addition to coffee, spices, and so forth, on which there has never been a tariff. Therefore, if we average imports on which the tariff is 50 percent or more with those on which there are no import duties we get what appears to be a low average rate; but it is a very deceptive figure. As a matter of fact, after adoption of the high Hawley-Smoot rates in 1930, the proportion of duty-free imports increased.

Again, the picture booklet distributed as a brief on the subject of foreign trade suggests that it is unfair to American workers to allow foreign-made goods to be sold here, unless there is imposed on them a tariff which makes up for the difference in wage levels here and abroad. It refers to workers in Germany who are paid 50 cents an hour, while American workers producing the same article receive $2.50 an hour; and it implies that the prices of foreign-made goods are low because their wages are low, and that the prices of American-made goods are high because our wage rates are high.

WHY WAGE LEVELS VARY

Actually, the sequence of cause and effect is just the opposite. The industry which can obtain a high price for its product can afford to pay high wages and can still make a good profit; but the industry which has to sell at a low price is unable to pay more than a low wage. In any case, the important factor is not the hourly rate for labor, but the cost of labor per unit produced. The claim that low-paid labor always can undersell high-paid labor is contradicted by the fact that the United States, with the highest wage-level in the world, regularly exports billions of dollars worth of goods every year, much of it to countries where wages are notoriously low. About 70 percent of our exports are manufactured items; and some of our leading exports, such as automobiles and machinery, are produced by industries which have the highest wage-levels, even in comparison with other American industries.

What the high tariff advocates' easy-to-read booklet does not reveal is the competitive effect of American mass-production methods and the high individual productivity of the American worker.

Research studies have shown that the average American worker, including those in small industries, as well as those in mass production lines, turns out three times as much per year as does the average European worker, and is paid, on the average, about three times as much per year. While the worker in an American factory is producing 100 units, the comparable worker in Canada will produce

80, and the worker in Western Europe will produce numbers varying from 49, in Sweden, and 45, in the United Kingdom, down to 20, in Italy, and 15, in Spain. Of course, the Spaniard who, with inadequate equipment, produces 15 units while the American is producing 100, cannot receive as high an hourly wage; and to say we will not accept Spanish goods until their wage-level equals ours or unless there is a tariff high enough to cover the difference in hourly wage rates, is just another way of saying we will not trade at all.

By adopting the wage-equality principle, we can keep out handblown glassware and leather gloves. We can exclude Swiss watches, because their finishers are paid only 55 cents an hour, while American finishers receive $1.85. But, naturally, other nations will follow our lead, and will exclude our automobiles and other products of industries with high wages but low unit costs; and they also will be unable to buy our great agricultural export commodities, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat.

The net result would be for us to subsidize those of our domestic producers who are least able to pay high wages because they are less efficient, and to penalize the American industries which have been able to pay the highest wages because they can compete successfully, not only with their own countrymen, but also with producers in other nations. This would mean lower overall wage levels in the United States and a checking of the gradual shift from low-wage to high-wage industries which raise our total production per capita and so raise our plane of living. It would simply be a refusal to accept the basic economic principle that standards of living are raised when those who can produce one item most efficiently exchange with others who can produce other items most efficiently.

Carried to its logical end, that refusal would lead to a situation in which a doctor would be making his own shoes and a shoemaker would be compounding his own remedies, because their hourly pay rates are not the same; and for them to exchange skills would therefore, according to the theory of the American Tariff League booklet, be unfair competition.

DAMAGE FEARS UNREALIZED

The argument that industries in the United States cannot compete with industries abroad, except under protected conditions, and that businessmen and workers in the United States will suffer irreparable damage if the lower tariffs, in order to promote world trade, is an old and familiar one. It was used when the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was proposed by Cordell Hull, in 1934; and it has been revived each time the act has been up for renewal.

Twenty years ago, before we had any experience with this program, these expressions of fear had at least a measure of credibility but it has been interesting to note in succeeding years how witnesses appearing against reciprocal-trade legislation have continued to rely primarily on warnings of dire consequences in the future rather than factual accounts of damage already done.

For example, in 1934 a representative of the United States Potters Association told the House Ways and Means Committee that the bill then pending would undermine our business, and he protested against taking away a man's business in this manner as a violation of the 14th amendment. This year the representative of that industry was back before the Ways and Means Committee, again opposing reciprocal trade and complaining that the Congress is ready and anxious to abrogate its prerogatives and duties under the Constitution and to make tariff reductions that will injure dozens of American industries.

In his last appearance the potters' representative referred to his business as one older than the Nation itself, that has always maintained an honorable position in the family of business.

Despite its age and respectability, however, the industry which produces china and tableware in the United States never has had the ability to expand which has characterized many newer industries and there have been wide swings between good and bad years regardless of tariff restrictions at the time.

In 1934, for example, the witness for the potters' association gave the Ways and Means Committee figures showing production of 18 million dozen items in 1933 as compared with 30 million dozen in 1929. This sharp decline had taken place while we had the highest tariff wall in American history; and if the industry was as sick as it then was made to appear, it might have been expected to expire within 6 years under the much-feared reciprocal trade law.

As a matter of fact, however, when I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, questioned the Potters Association witness in 1940, he testified that the industry was running close to capacity and had suffered no great damage from trade agreements. He said the payroll alone of the industry in 1940 was $23 million as contrasted with a total value of $16.3 million for the products it shipped in 1934. He still opposed the trade program, however, and predicted a dire effect on his business in the future.

This year the Potters' witness refused to accept as accurate production figures prepared at his own request by the Tariff Commission, which showed an output of 45 million dozen items in 1950. That figure would have indicated production 50 percent over the good year, 1929, and 2½ times as great as in 1933, the year before the reciprocal-trade program started.

The Potters Association's own figures, which differed apparently because of a more strict classification of articles included in the count, showed a production of 27,293,000 dozen in 1947, of 26,600,000 dozen in 1950 and of 19,337,000 dozen in 1953. From this it would appear that the industry is subject to yearly fluctuations now, as it was 20 years ago, but the swing from 1947 to 1953 was not as great as the swing from 1929 to 1933, when it had the highest tariff protection.

Another figure introduced at this year's hearing placed value of American potters' products in 1953 at $53 million, which is more than three times the 1933 value and would indicate it had about held its own with inflation.

Naturally those engaged in this industry would like to see it expand along with our rate of national production rather than barely hold its own, but I question the justification for the Congress to promote such expansion by a high tariff wall at the expense of every citizen of this country who buys a plate or cup and saucer.

Also, it is obvious that the industry has not been victimized, as its spokesman claimed it would be if the reciprocal trade program were adopted. The truth of the matter is that a major portion of the imported products which compete with this industry has come from Japan and there has been no reduction since 1930 in the tariff rates applied to those items. And so long as the industry is able to make out a hardship case for itself I see no reason why it need fear that during the next 3 years the President of the United States will approve tariff cuts which would bring about the total destruction of the industry which its spokesman said he feared.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY GROWTH

The prophets of doom resulting from continuation of our reciprocal-trade program include other small industries like the potters, which have obvious expansion problems, but it is harder to understand the quakings and tremblings of giants like our young chemical industry, which has been expanding at the rate of more than 10 percent a year and has been exporting from 3 to 6 times the value of chemical imports.

One witness for this industry testified this year before the Ways and Means Committee that the company he now heads was started on a modest scale by his father in 1901. In 54 years it has grown into one of our industrial giants with assets of $375 million and subsidiary plants in a dozen other nations, as well as scattered over the United States. Its sales have almost doubled every 5 years. It spent $255 million for expansion of facilities in the 10 years from 1943 to 1953, another $41 million in 1954, and has planned further expansion which will cost from $30 to $50 million.

This witness justifiably pointed out that expansion of organic chemical production in the United States was greatly stimulated when Germany was eliminated as a competitor during World War II, and that as Germany and other European nations rebuild their industry, competition will become increasingly hard to meet.

I can understand his desire, as a sound businessman, to retain, if possible, the advantage which has been given American producers by import duties on chemicals ranging from two-thirds of the value of the product to as much as 2½ times its value.

I do not blame him for telling the committee that if tariffs are reduced his company will alter its policies and will concentrate on production of products from raw materials which give it an advantage over foreign competitors rather

than items with respect to which others have an advantage.

It does seem to me, however, that a company which boasts in its annual report that 40 percent of its sales are of items which were not being made 10 years ago and which has pioneered in development of so many new products would be able to offer some kind of assurance to its present employees that they will be taken care of even if its phenomenal rate of growth slows down.

Employees of this company in Virginia have written urging me to vote against H. R. 1 and indicating their belief that their jobs were dependent upon the success of efforts to defeat this bill.

Perhaps foreign competition has made this particular plant less profitable than had been contemplated when it was built. Perhaps tariff cuts applied to its product, if they should be approved by the President, would make continued production by that unit unjustified.

This is a company, however, which has had the privilege of rapid amortization of an investment of many millions of dollars in recent years, and which has planned a vast program of additional expansion. It has built substantial reserves while still paying a handsome dividend to its investors.

I cannot conceive that the progressive management of this company would under these circumstances abandon its Virginia employees instead of including them in its plans for the future which involve new plants and new products.

This particular company increased its exports by 25 percent in 1954 as compared with 1953. The chemical industry of the United States increased its exports from $817.5 million in 1953 to more than a billion in 1954, a rise of more than 20 percent, while chemical imports declined from around $293 million in 1953 to around $249 million in 1954. Moreover, our imports are far less significant from the standpoint of our domestic industry than those totals might indicate, because about one-half of the imports are fertilizer or similar noncompetitive materials.

The chemical industry as a whole and the organic chemistry industry in particular cannot hope to continue indefinitely to expand at the same rate as during the last decade, but it should be able to stabilize at a high level. When it does this it should be able to meet import competition on terms which will not reverse the movement toward expanded world trade, and which will permit us to continue to sell to other nations the products of American ingenuity and scientific ability which we can produce most efficiently.

With all due deference to the industry witnesses to whom I have referred, I must say that their attitude reminds me of the story related by Cordell Hull when he was testifying before our committee in 1940.

Mr. Hull told of the man who complained to his neighbor that his wife always was worrying him about money. "Before breakfast she asks me for money," he said. "She asks for money when she sees me at lunchtime. She worries me about it at suppertime and when we go to bed all I hear is money, money, money. She's driving me crazy."

"How much money have you given her thus far?" the neighbor asked.

"Oh," said the complaining husband, "so far I haven't given her any."

Now, that is pretty much the position of most industries which have complained of damage from the reciprocal trade program. So far the damage has not been done.

As another example of fears about the possible effects of H. R. 1 which I feel are not justified by facts, let us consider the textile industry.

TEXTILES AND WORLD TRADE

It is, frankly, somewhat puzzling to me that the trade organizations representing this industry should be so well agreed on efforts to weaken the bill and thereby jeopardize our trade program when the industry has so large a stake on the export side of the picture.

In 1954 we exported 605 million square yards of cotton cloth, which represented more than 6 percent of our domestic production. Imports of cotton cloth that year were only 73 million square yards, which was less than 1 percent of our production.

For synthetic fabrics the situation was even more favorable, with exports amounting to 7 percent of our production, and our production and exports growing while our imports have been declining.

Industry spokesmen have been either extremely general in their expression of fear of injury from import competition or else have been specific only with regard to certain items such as velveteens, damask, and ginghams. It is only on these specialty items that imports amount to more than an insignificant fraction of our domestic production, and those lines represent in themselves only a tiny fraction of our total production. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the list compiled by the Randall Commission staff of commodities for which imports probably would supply from 10 to 90 percent of domestic consumption if tariffs were completely removed, there is only one cotton product—that is lace, largely a handmade material.

My attention was attracted to velveteen because there is a mill in Virginia which produces that material and I believe every employee of that plant wrote me a letter expressing opposition to H. R. 1. At least I know I received several hundred letters.

So, I looked into this particular item. I found that production of velveteen in the United States in 1954, as reported by industry spokesmen to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, was only about 3 million square yards as compared with 11 billion square yards of broad woven cotton cloth and that there are less than 1,000 workers producing velveteen, as compared with over 1 million textile mill workers of all kinds, including 320,000 producing broad woven fabrics.

I learned also that velveteen is manufactured by a branch of the industry which makes pile fabrics, including corduroy as well as velveteen and that velveteen comprises only about 20 percent of this industrial operation. Velveteen has been having difficulties since World War II in retaining its market, but during the same period corduroy has enjoyed tremendous expansion. For example, in 1939, the United States produced 5 million yards of velveteen and 39 million yards of corduroy and in 1953 our production figures were 7 million yards for velveteen and 142 million for corduroy. In the light of these figures it would seem reasonable that any excess of workers producing velveteen might be shifted to the production of corduroy by the same companies.

There are no imports of corduroy to speak of, and corduroy is not on the list of products being considered in the present trade negotiations. Corduroy is protected by a 50 percent ad valorem tariff, which has never been reduced in any trade agreement. Yet the workers who wrote to me had been led to believe that their livelihood depended on defeat of H. R. 1.

Leaving out corduroy and considering velveteen alone, I learned that imports of this material practically disappeared during the war and reestablished themselves slowly thereafter. The percentage of increase of velveteen imports from 403,000 square yards in 1949 to 4.7 million in the first 11 months of 1954 sounds tremendous. But it should not be overlooked that imports in 1936 were 5.2 million square yards and post-war imports have not yet reached the pre-war figure.

Another factor which must be considered is that an extra boost was given to imports when foreign producers found that by adding waterproofing, which disappeared at the first washing, they could get their product in at a tariff rate of 12.5 percent instead of 38 percent. That loophole was plugged in January of this year by administrative action, and this action should substantially reduce import competition. If, however, imports continue to threaten the existence of domestic producers of velveteen, they have the right to present their case under the escape-clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Act, and I have the personal assurance of President Eisenhower that their case will be given full consideration, consistent with his promise to administer the law in such a way that no American industry will be jeopardized.

Considering the cotton-textile industry generally, it appears that of some 320,000 workers employed only 2,000 or 3,000 are producing products directly affected by present imports, but that from 20,000 to 25,000 owe their jobs to exports of cotton cloth, and a far larger number depend indirectly on American exports for their employment.

Substantial increases in imports of cotton cloth from Japan in the last quarter of 1954 have been mentioned as an indication of the threat which our industry faces for the future, but it should not be overlooked that last year the Japanese Government undertook a policy of deflation, which left textile manufacturers of that nation short of resources with which to purchase raw cotton for

their production. They therefore began to liquidate their inventories of cloth at distressed prices to acquire capital, and this naturally resulted in a sharp increase in our imports.

With this liquidation completed the movement should return to a more normal volume.

The other side of this particular picture, of course, is that Japan took 963,000 bales of United States raw cotton in the 1953–54 crop year, and if a way had not been found to continue that trade our farmers would have felt the pinch and passed some of it on to those with whom they do business.

Production of textiles in Japan and other nations need not menace American manufacturers if expanded world trade is promoted, because world per capita consumption of cotton textiles is only one-sixth that in the United States. If we help to increase the buying power of other nations and their people are able to increase their use of cotton by only a small fraction of the amount we now use, there will be tremendous new markets for our products as well as those of Japan.

COTTON TEXTILES UNDER H. R. 1

But let us now consider the cotton textile industry more specifically with relation to H. R. 1 to see just what basis there is for fear of the results of passing this bill.

If H. R. 1 is enacted, authority to reduce duties on cotton textiles would not be radically changed from that which is provided by existing law. Tariff cuts up to 50 percent from January 1, 1945, levels can be made under the present law and negotiations with Japan and several other nations are now in progress under that law. The actual amount of reductions which might be made in these negotiations is limited, however, by the fact that many cotton items, other than those imported chiefly from Japan, already have been cut an average of 30 percent since 1945, so they could not now be cut more than an average of 20 percent.

H. R. 1, as it passed the House, theoretically would have permitted a maximum additional cut of 15 percent to be made during the next 3 years on rates resulting from the pending negotiations and textile industry representatives felt this put them in double jeopardy. The question of whether the 15 percent formula would have applied to concession rates made in the pending agreement with Japan was largely academic, because, on the basis of past experience, it seemed highly improbable that a concession rate to Japan on an important, contentious item such as cotton cloth, would be made the subject of a further duty reduction to that country within a period of 3 years.

But, in order to remove any doubt, the Finance Committee adopted the George amendment, which specifically prohibits any additional cuts in rates which are reduced as much as 15 percent by the current negotiations. And this amendment applies to items other than cotton and to countries other than Japan.

In response to another fear expressed by the textile representatives, the George amendment also deleted from the bill a provision allowing reductions up to 50 percent of the January 1945 rate on items normally not imported or imported in negligible quantities.

The chief difference H. R. 1, as amended, would make, therefore, from the standpoint of the cotton textile industry, is whether the current negotiations with Japan can be continued, if necessary, beyond June 12, 1955, when the authority given under the existing law will expire. Surely Senators having important cotton-textile industries—Senators who always have stood for liberal trade-agreements policy—who have had the bill amended in committee at their request, should support it now without other amendments that would further weaken the bill.

Let us see how little they have to fear.

The most important cotton-textile products are countable cotton cloths, which are listed for the current negotiations involving Japan.

Ever since World War I imports of cotton cloth have been small not only compared to United States production but also compared with their exportation, and since World War II the ratio of imports to production has been even smaller than it was before that war. Production in the United States of countable cotton cloths has risen since the immediate prewar years by as much as 10 percent to 25 percent, depending upon the years taken for comparison. Imports, however, have failed to regain their postwar magnitude.

In 1937, a year of record production and record imports for the 1930's, imports were equivalent to 1.7 percent of domestic production. In comparison, in 1954, a year of about average postwar production but record postwar imports, the yardage imported was equivalent to only eight-tenths of 1 percent of domestic production. Also, in 1954, the yardage imported was only one-eighth of the yardage exported.

So, we come back again to the picture of an industry not hurt by imports but fearing a blow, especially if concessions are made to Japan. The industry should realize, however, that if an increase in imports should threaten serious injury both the present law and the pending bill provide machinery for relief.

PROTECTION GIVEN COTTON CLOTHS

Back in 1935–36, in a Democratic administration, with Cordell Hull as Secretary of State, when we were threatened by excessive imports of cotton cloths from Japan action was taken to raise under the flexible provision of the law the rates which had applied under the Tariff Act of 1930 and those rates have never subsequently been lowered. That protective action was taken, moreover, without benefit of the escape clause which now permits action to be taken more quickly than under the flexible provision which required an exhaustive cost investigation. Additional protection has been provided by the peril-point provision and the President has never approved a reduction below a peril-point announced by the Tariff Commission.

So far as the branch of the textile industry which deals with manmade fibers is concerned the picture is this:

Almost the entire authority under existing law to reduce duties on textiles of manmade fibers has been exhausted and none of these fabrics are included in the current trade agreement negotiations. In spite of the reductions which have been made, however, total imports of these textiles are only one-fourth to one-seventh as great as our exports which exceed in value $200 million a year.

It would appear, therefore, that the limited new authority conferred under H. R. 1 would be to the interest rather than the disadvantage of the manufacturers of products like the synthetics which would gain by the reduction rather than perpetuation of existing barriers to world trade.

The safeguards for American industry which have been included in the existing Reciprocal Trade Act and the restrictions placed around the limited additional power which would be granted under H. R. 1, fully justify the position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce in calling the bill "an appropriately cautious and gradual approach" to an extension of the trade act, and the editorial comment in the Christian Science Monitor which said the President's program, which the bill represents, "actually is a mild one, not likely to achieve by itself either the great good or the great evil extremists foresee."

THE OIL AMENDMENT

Time will not permit me to discuss all details of the foreign oil limitation amendment, but I wish to mention briefly why I am opposed to it. It is being sponsored primarily on behalf of the bituminous coal industry which, of course, has suffered serious competition from both natural gas and oil since the coal operators permitted the head of the United Mine Workers to price their product out of the market to justify his boast to the members of his union that they were the best paid in the Nation.

I am, of course, very much interested in the coal business because of its importance to Virginia, and I am deeply concerned about the economic problems which now confront it, but I do not believe the answer to those problems is to cut off oil imports as is proposed. From 1947, the peak of coal production, to 1953 demand for our coal decreased by 155 million tons, but consumption of heavy residual fuel oil increased during that period only by an amount equivalent to 11 million tons of coal, and of that increase 6 million tons were in public utilities where coal consumption increased during the same time by 26 million tons.

The major reasons for the decline in use of coal were dieselization of railroads which cost 82 million tons and conversion of space heating to natural gas and light oil which cost 38 million tons. There also was a decline of 35 million tons in our exports of coal; and one sample of the reason for that decline was what happened in Denmark when we cut off the imports of bleu cheese they had been sending to us, and the Danes then stopped buying West Virginia coal and started using Polish coal instead.

Our coal exports in 1954 had a value of $304 million, and that represents the substantial stake of this industry in world trade, especially since industry spokesmen have testified that American miners who produce nine tons a day can make coal available to Europe at a lower price than German miners who produce only 1.2 tons per man per day.

An effort to regain lost markets by promotion of use of coal here and abroad would profit the coal industry much more than the amendment limiting oil imports.

Aside from the fact that the proposed oil limitation amendment would not materially benefit the coal industry, it would be distinctly detrimental to other American business and to consumers of fuel oil.

Most of the residual oil now comes from Venezuela, which has been taking imports from the United States to an annual value of $500 million. Manufacturers in 30 States employing an estimated 100,000 people now producing exports for Venezuela would be hurt by the loss of that business. There also would be a generally detrimental effect on our relations with Latin America which would mean loss of export business to other nations in that area.

Homes which now use oil for heating and industries which use heavier fuel oils also would be affected by a cutting off of imports to an extent out of all proportion to the benefits to the coal industry. Their problem would not be simply one of paying a higher price for fuel but of paying large amounts to convert heating plants from oil to coal use and to provide coal storage space. Many, of course, would refuse to do this and instead of changing from oil to coal, if oil became scarce, they would change to natural gas.

The national defense angle also must be considered. Existing coal mines, by going to a full week without overtime, could increase our coal production by from 150 to 200 million tons a year; so, without further stimulation, we have the potential to produce all the coal that would be needed in a war emergency. On the other hand, our need for additional oil in such an emergency would be critical and oil supplies from friendly countries would be badly needed.

To quiet any lingering fears as to the defense aspect of oil imports, however, the Finance Committee adopted the Byrd-Millikin amendment authorizing the President to limit imports of any article being imported in such quantities as to threaten our national security. That amendment would apply also to such items as lead and zinc.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, those of us who have supported the reciprocal trade program since its inception are primarily concerned as to whether this bill will be as effective as it should be in stimulating world trade. The effect of a reduction of not more than 15 percent in tariff rates over a period of 3 years on a limited number of items should be negligible from the standpoint of American industry, but the question is whether we shall be able to offer sufficient inducements to attract nations into agreements that would expand our exports as much as we would desire.

LARGER QUESTIONS INVOLVED

In considering the pending bill and the program with which it deals, we must realize that something much bigger is involved than the welfare of any one small segment of American industry.

We are proud of our American industrial system. We believe that citizens who are guaranteed religious and political freedom and an economic freedom which includes the privilege of profiting from the fruits of individual enterprise can compete successfully with any nation in the world.

We know that in spite of our overall ability to outproduce any national economic rival there are some specific items in which others who have a natural advantage excel. Where these are concerned our choice is to sustain our production through some kind of subsidy, whether direct or through import restrictions, or to let production dwindle and perhaps stop.

High-tariff advocates cry out that to allow any of our industries, however small and unimportant, to sink under the tide of foreign imports is a heartless deed on the part of the Government. It is self-evident, however, that many who take that position do not believe that what is good for the Government is good for them in their own business.

Large companies with multiple plants and diversified operations frequently find that a line of goods being produced is not returning a satisfactory profit; or that a factory unit, perhaps because of outmoded equipment or unfavorable location, is operating at a loss. Does the management then recommend to the board of directors that the status quo be maintained by taking from the return of the more profitable units enough money each year to balance the losses of the unprofitable ones? Oh, no. If it did, there soon would be a new management. What the competent manager does is to eliminate the cause of the loss.

Sometimes this can be done fairly simply by modernizing plant layout and putting in new machinery or by bringing out a new model. At other times the change is more complicated because it means teaching workers new skills or even abandoning a plant and reopening in another city, with new workers replacing those unwilling or unable to make the move.

These changes may be made coldbloodedly, as has happened in cases where employees and communities have complained bitterly of a runaway plant. Or they may be made considerately, with every possible effort to avoid injury. But successful business executives, including some who are pillars of the American Tariff League, know that operating at a profit is a fundamental requirement of our economic system, and that when this calls for stern measures they must be taken, or else business failure will result in still more losses of jobs as well as profits.

The puzzling thing is the unwillingness of many of these businessmen to apply the same principle on a national scale. I would be the first to protect against a policy of our Government suddenly removing tariff barriers and leaving some of our industries and communities in the same kind of difficulties as those caused by a heartless management which runs away with its plant. Whatever may be the theoretical advantages of free trade, I realize that that system is impractical and would be unjust in the position in which we now find ourselves. But even the original concept of the reciprocal trade-agreement program contemplated no such harsh measures, and the very much watered-down version we now have and propose to extend is more considerate of our problem industries than many individual corporations are of their own weaker units.

Having given full consideration to those who might be inconvenienced or whose prospects for future growth might be limited by a continuation of reciprocal trade, however, we must look to the larger interests of our Nation and the world.

A decision on freer international trade involves the hard core of our foreign policy, because economic warfare, while it may fall short of cold war, is nevertheless a disrupter of peaceful cooperation.

The Hull program, which those familiar with tariff history know was the only practical means of modifying the extreme and in some instances prohibitive rates of the last general tariff act of 1930, has its foundation in the Christian principle of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us. With some 800 million people already isolated behind the Iron Curtain of communism, the nations left in what we call the free world must have an opportunity to exchange the things they produce for things they do not produce and to have the mutual advantage of trading the things they produce best for things others produce best. If denied the privilege of such exchange with other free nations, some at least of them will be forced to exchange with countries behind the Iron Curtain, thereby increasing the military as well as the economic power of the Soviets and, by the same token, their potential threat against us.

A program of freer world trade also has deep domestic significance.

DOMESTIC SIGNIFICANCE

All of us who represent agricultural States know that farmers now engaged in production of cotton, tobacco, and wheat face a dim future if we must continue to shrink production to the level of domestic demand. For example, Secretary of Agricultural Benson recently referred to an export "goal" of 6 million bales of cotton, which would amount to around 40 percent of our annual production. But we have not exported that much cotton in any year since 1935, and to preserve our domestic market in recent years it has been necessary to reduce acreage quotas to a point where many small farmers have had too small an allotment for subsistence. Tobacco farmers who have counted on exporting 25 percent of their crop likewise have felt the pinch of acreage restrictions.

Representatives of industrial States cannot overlook the impact of our trade program especially on mass producers of durable goods. In 1953, for example, we exported 23 percent of our tractors, 22 percent of our textile machinery, 32 percent of our sewing machines, 15 percent of trucks and busses, 13 percent of refrigerators, and 36 percent of civilian aircraft. Our manufactured goods exported that year accounted for 70 percent of our total exports and had a total value of $9.5 billion.

A third and most important domestic factor which no member of Congress should ignore is the right of American consumers to buy in a free and competitive market. For many years we have had good antitrust laws on the books, but we have never had adequate enforcement of them, and I fear we never shall have it. The whole trend of American industry is toward domination of the domestic market by a relatively few large industries. Even if the leaders of those industries do not sit down behind closed doors and fix prices, it has become relatively simple, when only a few big industries are involved, for them to agree on a type of price fixing which is not illegal but is just as effective as if it were.

It does not take an investment of $1 billion or more in plant and equipment for an American importer to bring into this country manufactured goods the sale of which will constitute a restraint upon monopoly price control.

As an example of the influence of foreign competition on our prices: American manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment have complained in recent years because of orders given to foreign manufacturers, and their representatives appeared as witnesses against H. R. 1, pleading they must have tariff protection as a national defense measure.

Nevertheless, General Electric was able to bid $1.5 million less than was bid by the lowest foreign bidder for eight large generators for the Dalles Dam last September; and after all of the original bids for generators at the Chief Joseph Dam had been rejected, Westinghouse demonstrated what it would do when faced with competition by winning with a bid $716,000 below its original price.

It is understandable, therefore, that Secretary of Defense Wilson, with his background in big business, but with his devotion to the welfare of the United States, should have testified in favor of this bill and said that two-way trade with out allies is just as important, from a defense standpoint, as military alliances; and that Secretary of Commerce Weeks, another businessman, should have said the bill would foster prosperity and would not harm efficiently managed American industries.

It also is understandable that the principal farm organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and the CIO, and also organizations of consumer groups including housewives, who spend most of the family money, should have endorsed the bill because they felt the people of the United States should have the privilege of buying at a reasonable price foreign-made goods which complement but do not directly compete with domestic products.

A program of freer international trade is not a starry-eyed, visionary program of professional do-gooders. Neither is it what might be called a "give away" program under which we give or loan without hope of repayment. We have had too much of that in the past.

This program, of course, does involve permitting foreign nations which desire to purchase our products to acquire American dollars through normal channels of international trade. Some dollars can be acquired by services like shipping and by the spending of our tourists, but the bulk of dollars required to finance a proper export of American goods must be acquired through our purchase of foreign-made goods. This need not alarm us, however, because all economists except those employed to use tricky figures to prove the harmful effects of imports on domestic production are agreed that 95 percent of a good domestic market is better for our producers than 100 percent of a poor domestic market. There never has been a time, so far as I can ascertain, when if imports were properly dispersed and not concentrated we could not absorb without harm imports to the value of 5 percent of our domestic production.

The soundness of our present position from this standpoint is indicated by the fact that in 1953 the total volume of our imports represented only 3.2 percent of our gross national product and in 1954 only 2.8 percent.

A QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE

I am supporting H. R. 1 without hamstringing amendments, therefore, because my confidence in the value of promoting world trade on a mutually beneficial basis remains as strong now as it was 20 years ago, and also because I have confidence in the repeated statements of President Eisenhower that he will administer the law in such a way that no American industry will be jeopardized. That confidence, naturally, is in the President himself, and not in any underling in the State Department; and, therefore, when I say I trust the President and ask my colleagues to do likewise, it is with the definite and distinct understanding that when any issue arises as to the effect of tariff rates on domestic industry the President will get all the facts and then will make the final decision and assume responsibility for the action taken.

As I said at the outset of these remarks, despite misrepresentations to the contrary, not a single tariff rate can be reduced under the bill except by a deliberate and considered action of the President. The vote on the bill, therefore, boils down to one of confidence or lack of confidence in the man in the White House. The decision is one which should be made without partisan considerations. But I feel justified, speaking from the Democratic side of the aisle, in asking: If the members of the President's own party refuse to give him a vote of confidence on this issue, on what logical ground can they ask the people to back their choice in the next national election?

In supporting this bill I assert my belief in intangible realities—the value of good will among the democratic nations of the world, and the necessity for faith in assurances of our Chief Executive that his supreme purpose in life is to promote it.

ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE AT BANDUNG, INDONESIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, all of us have noted with considerable interest the reports of the recent Asian-African Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia.

While the United States Government was not officially represented at this Conference, and, in fact, failed even to transmit greetings to the Conference, a number of American citizens were in attendance at the Conference as unofficial observers.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, was among the unofficial observers who attended the Conference as an individual. We are proud of Representative POWELL's outstanding performance at Bandung. The Nation should be grateful to him. The plain fact is that Representative POWELL was one of the few Americans who understood the highly significant nature of the Conference and took it upon himself to indicate to the delegates and to the world that many Americans are interested in the problems and forces which concern the peoples of the great African and Asian Continents.

Representative POWELL understood the basic motivating forces behind the delegates attending the Conference. He understood the follies and errors of past Western colonialism, as well as the dangers and threats presented by present-day Communist colonialism.

Representative POWELL gave an on-the-scene answer to the erroneous and exaggerated propaganda so viciously spread by the world Communist propaganda mechanism concerning the treatment of Negro and minority groups in the United States. The strides which have been made toward the achievement of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens can be a great weapon against Communist propaganda, if the truth be placed alongside the realization that there is going on in the United States a constant struggle to eliminate from our Government and our society the remaining elements of injustice and discrimination.

It is interesting to note that Representative POWELL'S contribution has been recognized in all parts of our Nation. On April 22 a column written by the eminent editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mr. Ralph McGill, was published in the Miami Daily News. The column gives an extremely interesting analysis of Representative POWELL's attendance at the Bandung Conference, and of the official American attitude toward the Conference. I concur in Mr. McGill's observations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. McGill be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Daily News of April 22, 1955]

REPRESENTATIVE POWELL AT BANDUNG

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—One of the really astonishing stories in Washington is that of the Negro Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and the reluctance of the State Department to grant him a visa to go to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia.

He is paying his own expenses. He is at Bandung to say to the Communist world that the American Negro believes in democracy. It would have been a bad idea, in fact, to pay his way because he then would have been an official representative. But it is a sad commentary on the most public-relations and advertising-wise nation in the world that we did not encourage him to go.

I telephoned his office and a young lady said they had not heard from him but that this was good. He was to contact them only if he was in trouble. They said they were pretty proud of him and, I guess, we all are.

GEORGE EXPRESSED CONCERN

Representative POWELL met with very strong resistance when he applied for a visa. I tried to get an answer from the State Department and, of course, got nowhere. They said, "No comment." I got as far as the Assistant Secretary and it still was no comment.

Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, last week expressed a great concern about the State Department attitude toward this Asian-African conference. He said we were making it appear we were hostile to the meeting. He was of the strong opinion we should have been on record there as a friendly nation interested in peace.

Representative POWELL publicly and privately sought to have President Eisenhower send greetings to the conference. This, too, was refused.

Anyhow, Representative POWELL went. And he has proved to be a very real thorn in the side of the Communist leaders there. It is a conference of nations of colored peoples. The United States was not invited since the meeting was one of Asian and African countries. Yet Representative POWELL proved to be perhaps the most effective person we could have sent had we been invited.

They didn't allow him to speak, since he was not an official delegate, but at a press conference he naturally drew a great crowd of reporters.

At this press conference Representative POWELL fired both barrels at the Communists. He said he was there as a Negro to say the Communists lied when they talked about how horribly the Negro is treated in America. He was in the strong position of being there on his own. The could not charge him with being a paid voice.

He told them that racism and second-class citizenship are on their way out in America. He had a list of Negroes who have been elected to office in the United States and he made a point that a number of these were in the South.

WE ARE COLDLY ALOOF

Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, reported that the Communist reporters present put away their notebooks in disgust. They were not happy to have their favorite anti-American propaganda upset by an American Negro who had paid his own way there to tell them the truth.

There are 29 nations at Bandung. Romulo of the Philippines has done a good job of carrying the ball for the free nations. It is interesting to note that he placed his finger on our great foreign policy weakness which is our support of unworthy, colonialtype governments. We had other friends there.

But this great world power sent no greetings. We stood coldly aloof despite the fact we had stanch friends there. Representative POWELL did a great service to his country. He said the tyranny of communism lied about the place and the role of the colored people in America. Why they didn't want him to go and why we did not send greetings is a troublesome mystery. And, also, an accusing commentary on the State Department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there was another individual at that conference, an official representative of his country to whom the United States and the entire free world owe a debt of gratitude. I refer to Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the chief of the delegation of the Philippine Republic to the Bandung meeting. General Romulo is, of, course, an old friend of the United States, while he is at the same time a tireless advocate of the interests of his own country.

I think he is generally recognized, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world, as one of the leading statesmen of the free world. He has long been one of the most eloquent spokesmen of the ideals and aspirations of the peoples of Asia and of Africa, too. General Romulo played a magnificent role at Bandung. In the actual developments of the conference, his was one of the most influential and forceful voices. He did much—as much as any other single individual I know—to expose, at that conference, the concept of Communist colonialism.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a commentary on General Romulo's role at Bandung, written by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the New York Post of April 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMULO'S MANEUVER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps as important as anything that happened at the recently concluded Asia-Africa conference at Bandung, Indonesia, was the constant repetition of 1 simple, but telling, message to people who are still free in that great area of the world.

This is that Russia and the Red Chinese colonialism is just as bad as, if not worse than, the form of colonialism which nations of Asia and Africa have shaken off, or are in the process of shaking off.

What was so important was that this message—this truth—was spoken, not by the West, but by representatives of the Asian and African nations themselves. For the first time hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa, newly aroused, newly unshackled, looking about for means and measures to realize their independence, were plainly told by their own kind of the new danger. They were told, in effect:

"Be sure you do not drop 1 set of chains only to take up another."

One man is recognized here as the genius of this particular strategy. He long ago felt that the most effective way to check the advance of communism in Asia is for people of their own kind who know about communism and understand its devious and seductive tactics to tell Asia and Africa about it.

This man, the brilliant and eloquent Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, went to Bandung with the idea of making it a forum for the simple message. Very skillfully he outmaneuvered Prime Minister Nehru of India, who wanted to keep out critical talk; and he got the conference opened at the outset to all who wanted to talk—and many did, and critically of Russia and Red China.

Romulo, is, as we know, a friend of the West. He is also a champion of the Asians. Once he had the conference opened up, then he himself opened up, and one after another followed spokesmen for Thailand, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and, finally and to some unexpectedly, the Prime Minister of a country not hitherto identified with the West, as were the others. This was Sir John Kotelawala, Premier of Ceylon, which happened also to be one of the sponsoring nations, and thus a host.

Speaking up frankly and boldly, he said that the Soviet Union had colonialized Central and Eastern European countries from the Baltic States south to Bulgaria and Albania. As for Communist China, he challenged the sincerity of its pronouncements that it was ready to coexist with other countries without interfering in their internal affairs. All he had to do was to point, as he had done with Russia, to subversive movements by Red China. Of Russia and China, he said:

"They have not attempted to disguise the fact that their ultimate and constant aim is to weaken and undermine the legally constituted governments of our countries so that at the appropriate time we can be transformed into satellites of Soviet Russia or Communist China."

He asked that both Communist colonialism and western-type colonialism be condemned. There was no denying the effect of the Ceylon Premier's blunt speech. He and others skeptical of Russia's and Red China's motives shunted aside Indian Prime Minister Nehru's tightrope-walking performance.

It was in a comprehensive speech showing how Russia and Red Chinese colonialism has meant the end of liberties that General Romulo delivered his warning to Asian and African delegates present not to shake off one colonial domination only to come under enslavement of a new tyranny.

"I do not think," he declared, "we have come to where we are only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower."

He told how the yearning for national independence can be exploited.

"It is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact," he said. "Because it expresses the deepest desire of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a facade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection."

His hearers knew of whom he spoke there. They did, too, when he said in countries thus subverted in the name of national freedom he wondered if you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence.

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have the privilege of serving as honorary chairman of Mental Health Week in the State of Delaware this year, and in that connection, we will have in Wilmington tomorrow an appropriate observance of the occasion.

In accepting the chairmanship of the week-long program, I did so with the conviction that the Nation's mental health problem is of such proportions as to require significant and constructive attention from public and private sources alike.

I understand that more than half the hospital beds in this country are devoted to the care of the mentally ill, and that, at the present rate of illness, 1 in every 12 children born in this country will spend some time in a mental institution—Hoover Commission's Task Force on Medical Services.

In my State of Delaware, which is an affiliate of the National Association for Mental Health, we are hoping to make every Delawarean aware of his stake in the often neglected health problem of mental illness.

We are trying also to demonstrate ways and means of improving the mental health of our communities, and to this end we have been seeking the support of voluntary organizations, Government and professional groups, churches, business and labor organizations, service clubs, schools, hospitals, and clinics.

It is our hope that by the development of a detailed plan of activities and events we can make real advances in striking back at mental illness and can build mental health in Delaware and throughout the Nation.

HIGHWAYS FOR SURVIVAL COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the April 28 issue of the New York Journal-American an important article describing the formation of a new rational organization, entitled "Highways for Survival Committee."

The organization's leaders include Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, who took a key part in organizing this committee.

The distinguished men and women who will comprise the committee are an encouraging indication of its outstanding caliber. And, so, I wish this committee every success in its vital efforts.

Here in the Congress, while there are obviously some difficulties being experienced in working out the financing of America's highway modernization program, the fact of the matter is that neither this, nor any other obstacle, should prove insuperable or should cause long delay in getting this indispensable highway-expansion program under way. Highways for survival can help, and will help, point the way.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Journal-American's article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAYS FOR SURVIVAL: FORM NEW GROUP TO SPEED ROADS — THIRTY-EIGHT LEADERS UNITE TO GET MORE ACTION ON PROGRAM IN CONGRESS

(By Don O'Connor)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—A new organization called the Highways for Survival Committee was formed yesterday to get more action and less talk out of Congress on an improved national highway program.

Thirty-eight prominent industrial, business, and civic leaders, including William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, took part in organizing the committee.

The group announced its sole aim is to arouse public opinion to the need for modernizing and completing the 40,000-mile interstate highway system within the next 10 years.

This, they said, would lead to greater interest in primary, secondary and urban roads.

Arthur O. Dietz, president of the CIT Financial Corp., was named provisional chairman of the committee.

WANT PROGRAM STARTED

In explaining the group's aims, Dietz declared:

"Our committee does not advocate any specific legislature. Our only concern is to get an adequate highway program underway and get it completed as soon as possible."

While not endorsing any one plan, Dietz said the committee is satisfied that President Eisenhower's recommendation to spend $101 billion in Federal, State, and local funds over the next 10 years would provide adequate roads.

He said the organization also believes the administration's proposal to finance highway construction with long-term credit is feasible, but emphasized that any sound financing method would be acceptable.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Other members of the committee are:

Murray A. Baldwin, former mayor of Fargo, N. Dak.; J. D. Biggers, Toledo, chairman, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; Walter Bimson, Phoenix, Ariz., chairman, Valley National Bank; Mrs. Theodore Chapman, Jerseyville, Ill., president, Women's Clubs of America; L. L. Colbert, Detroit, president, Chrysler Corp.; John L. Collyer, Akron, chairman, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Gardner Cowles, New York, president, Cowles Magazines; Harlow H. Curtice, Detroit, president, General Motors Corp.; Donald K. David, Boston, Harvard University.

Calvin Fentree, Jr., Skokie, Ill., president, Allstate Insurance Co.; Charles T. Fisher, Jr., Detroit, president, National Bank of Detroit; Henry Ford, II, Dearborn, president, Ford Motor Co.; Walter D. Fuller, Philadelphia, chairman, Curtis Publishing Co.; Hugh Gregg, Nashua, N. H., former Governor of New Hampshire; Paul G. Hoffman, Los Angeles, chairman, Studebaker-Packard Corp.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.; Oscar Lawler, Los Angeles, president, Farmers and Merchants National Bank.

Paul W. Litchfield, Akron, chairman, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.; Thomas R. McCabe, Chester, Pa., president, Scott Paper Co.; Alan C. McIntosh, Luverne, Minn., publisher, Rock County Star-Herald; Robert Moses, New York City Coordinator of Construction; Herschel D. Newsom, Washington, master, National Grange; Howard C. Peterson, Philadelphia, president, Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.; B. Earl Puckett, New York, chairman, Allied Stores Corp.; Alfred Reeves, New York; John A. Riggs, Jr., Little Rock, Ark., president, J. A. Riggs Tractor Co.

W. F. Rockwell, Pittsburgh, chairman, Rockwell Manufacturing Co.; George Romney, Detroit, president American Motors Corp.; Harold F. Schnurle, Augusta, Me., vice president, Central Maine Power Co.; Louis B. Seltzer, Cleveland, editor, Cleveland Press; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York, president, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc.; Robert G. Sproul, Berkeley, president University of California; John Wickham, Cutchogue, N. Y., president, New York Good Roads Association; Frazar B. Wilde, Hartford, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; and Ben Wooten, Dallas, president, First National Bank in Dallas.

THE INSPIRING FILM "ASSIGNMENT: CHILDREN"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 5 there will be an invitation screening here in Washington of a notable American film. It is "Assignment: Children," filmed in color by Paramount Pictures, with the world-famous comedian, Danny Kaye, on behalf of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

This film is one of the finest short features which it has ever been my privilege to witness. It will give a great lift to all who see it. It will show them, as only the magic of the motion picture camera can, what is being done on behalf of the children of the world.

The children of today will be the men and women of tomorrow who will conduct the affairs of the world. This picture will cause us and them to realize and accept the responsibility which we and they have. I suggest that all who can see the motion picture do so.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A MODERN FULFILLMENT OF "SUFFER THE LITTLE CHILDREN TO COME UNTO HIM"

All religion teaches us love of children and tending to their needs for "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

Throughout the world, in every faith is found the injunction to protect these innocent little ones.

Yet, it has been estimated that 600 million children—two-thirds of the children of the world—are without adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, or minimum medical protection.

That is certainly a shocking fact to us Americans whose children fortunately enjoy the highest standard of living and the highest life expectancy of any youngsters on earth.

Everything in America's humanitarian tradition, everything in our religious background, impels us to do what we can on behalf of suffering youngsters abroad.

UNICEF's marvelous accomplishments

Fortunately, we have in the U. N. Children's Fund an ideal medium by which to fulfill our responsibilities.

With a relative minimum of appropriations, UNICEF has performed sheer miracles.

This year in its tuberculosis vaccinations, in its treatments against malaria, yaws, and trachoma, and in its child-feeding projects, it is reaching 31.8 million mothers and children throughout the world.

To date, it has vaccinated 43.5 million youngsters in 58 countries and territories against tuberculosis alone. It has provided penicillin to cure 3 million children of yaws. It has protected 13 million against malaria. And there are countless other impressive statistics on UNICEF's work.

UNICEF involves no handouts

Let me point out that UNICEF is no handout organization. While it draws contri-

butions from nearly 100 countries and territories, it works on a matching basis with the governments of the countries which benefit from it.

Much of its work is in the training of nurses, midwives, and other child-care workers in backward countries. And implicit in all the work is the concept of real continuity, having the country which benefits carry on with the work long after UNICEF has helped get it underway.

Film industry cooperation on picture's release

All this is the great subject matter of the Danny Kaye movie—an enterprise for which he traveled 40,000 miles.

The fact that the feature comes off well is attested by Hollywood itself, which gave Mr. Kaye a well-deserved academy award for his contribution to the film and to American entertainment in general. The film is, of course, being greeted enthusiastically throughout the Nation and Paramount Pictures which has done such a tremendous job in the nonprofit production is going all-out in its distribution plans with the cooperation of theater owners throughout America. Proceeds are, of course, donated to UNICEF.

Back in February, Assignment: Children was previewed at the U. N. General Assembly Hall and at the Paramount Studio on the west coast where it was welcomed with unanimous acclaim.

At the United Nations preview, Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold expressed his appreciation for the great job which had been done by Paramount Pictures and others on the film, as did Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, chairman of the United States Committee for UNICEF, and Dr. Balachandra Rajan, chairman of the UNICEF's Executive Board.

Here in Washington, I had personally arranged for a preview screening which numerous public officials and private citizens indicated they thoroughly enjoyed.

Now, I am pleased to announce the public international screening this coming Thursday night, at the Ontario Theater. We hope that all of the many individuals in the executive and legislative branches having to do with UNICEF will have the opportunity to see this fine film at that time. Assignment: Children is, it should be noted, being presented by the United Nations and the motion-picture industry.

Washington premiere committee

A distinguished local committee for the premiere has been working on it, and I am pleased now to list the members of the committee.

Washington premiere committee of "Assignment: Children"

Honorary chairman: Mrs. John Foster Dulles.

Chairman: Mrs. Robert Low Bacon.

Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, Mrs. Mary M. Bethune, Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, Hon. Frances Bolton, Mrs. Fred H. Brooks, Mrs. Morris Cafritz, Mrs. Julius Cahn, Mrs. J. Miles Carter, Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, Mrs. Raymond Clapper, Mrs. Harry Davidow, Mrs. Carlos Davila, Dr. Martha Eliot, Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Dr. Dorothy Ferabee, Hon. J. William Fulbright, Mr. Marvin Goldman, Mr. Philip Graham, Mrs. Robert Guggenheim, Mrs. J. Dennett Guthrie, Miss Christine Heinig, Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Mrs. James W. Irwin, Hon. Walter H. Judd, Mrs. Randolph Kidder, Mrs. John Lee, Mrs. Herbert Lehman, Mrs. Reeve Lewis, Mrs. Roy St. Lewis, Mrs. Olya Margolin, Miss Margaret Mealey, Mr. Robert McLaughlin, Mrs. Perle Mesta, Mr. Edgar Morris, Miss Marguerite Rawalt, Mrs. Nelson Rockefeller, Mrs. Francis Sayre, Mrs. Bernard M. Shanley, Mrs. Carolyn Hagner Shaw, Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Miss Bess Davis Schreiner, Mrs. John Farr Simmons, Mrs. Hobart Spalding, Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Mrs. J. Austin Stone, Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, Mrs. Frank Strope, Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck, Senator Alexander Wiley, Mrs. Charles Willis, Mr. E. Raymond Wilson.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

THE MINORITY REPORT ON THE EXTENSION OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States, recognizing the temptation to barter the domestic economy for foreign policy considerations, pointedly separated the responsibility for the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade from the fixing of foreign policy.

The first is delegated to the legislative branch under article I, section 8; and the second is definitely the responsibility of the executive branch, under article 2, section 2.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY TIED TO FOREIGN POLICY

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act tied the two together under the President through the simple expedient of transferring the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade from the Congress to the President. It effectively amended the Constitution without submitting the amendment to the people, and constituted one more link in the 22-year chain of the transfer of the legislative power of Congress to the executive branch.

The act places in jeopardy every product or industry in this Nation needing protection to maintain our wage standard of living as compared to the lower wage standard of living of foreign nations.

Prior to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the century-old principle of adjusting the duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition was to develop the whole country and industries alike. Now, under the principle of including international political considerations, the President may trade any sector of the American economy for an international political purpose if in his judgment the overall interests of this Nation are benefited.

NATIONAL ECONOMY—BASIC SECURITY

Mr. President, an amendment to H. R. 1 was accepted, in the Senate Finance Committee, providing that if the Office of Defense Mobilization, which Mr. Flemming heads, reports to the President that imports are endangering the security of the Nation, the President may investigate, and if he finds as a fact that the security is endangered, then he may arrange quotas or safeguards.

Mr. President, any imports from the nations of the Western Hemisphere will not seriously impair the security of our Nation, but such imports may seriously impair the national economy upon which the basic security of this Nation is founded.

FLEXIBLE DUTY—IMPORTS

Mr. President, a flexible duty or tariff, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, does not prevent imports; it simply brings the imports in when they are needed on the basis of our own wage standard of living.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is considering what could easily be the most vital piece of legislation in the 84th Congress—H. R. 1, a bill to extend and modify the reciprocal trade agreements program. The course of action taken by the Senate may very well prove to be the making or undoing of a strong foreign policy and a stable economy in the United States and the world. Congress must, and I am sure they will, send to the White House a trade program which will cement the solidarity of free nations and promote the economic stability of our own people.

The United States must take the leadership in liberating the free world's great economic potential. This is imperative because we in America have the political and economic power to lead the course of action.

What we do in the next few days may mean the success or failure of our foreign-trade policy. The final form of H. R. 1 can mean prosperity, a high level of employment, a sound trade policy, and a stable business economy, or it can mean falling prices, unmanageable surpluses, unemployment, and a slump in our domestic economy.

Since 1934 the reciprocal trade agreements program has been an essential part of our foreign economic policy. An expansion of this program is in our own enlightened self-interest just as much as it is in the interest of the peace and security of the other nations of the free world.

Since 1947 the Trade Agreements Act has been somewhat diluted. In that year there was reached between congressional leaders and the State Department an understanding under which an escape clause was to be written into the agreements. Two years later came the peril-point provision, which requires that before reducing any tariff duty the President must first secure the advice of the Tariff Commission as to the points beyond which he cannot reduce duties without injuring domestic producers. By 1951 both the peril-point provisions and the escape clause were incorporated in the Trade Agreements Act itself. H. R. 1 represents a modification of the present law and increases the President's power to negotiate limited tariff cuts.

H. R. 1 provides the authority to reduce duties by 15 percent of their July 1955 levels. Another provision would allow the President to reduce duties presently higher than 50 percent to that ceiling. An additional provision gives the authority to lower duties to 50 percent of their January 1, 1945, levels on imports entering in negligible quantities only. This is somewhat of a curtailment because under the present law the President has the power to reduce all duties

by this amount. In addition, the Senate Finance Committee has made other modifications and compromises.

It is important to bear in mind that H. R. 1, like the present law, is authorizing legislation only. It would confer powers upon the President; but its enactment, in and of itself, would not assure the reduction of a single tariff duty.

H. R. 1 has become the occasion for an old-fashioned, knockdown, drag-out, protectionist free-trade fight. I think all Senators are generally familiar with the operation of the Trade Agreements Act. So let us turn to the two important issues at stake in the free world, namely, the effect of this trade program on our domestic and foreign policies.

American industry has a big stake in export markets. In 1953 we exported nearly 25 percent of our lubrication oil, nearly half of our tracklaying tractors, and 36 percent of our civilian aircraft. In addition, 9 percent of our anthracite coal, 10 percent of our tinplate, 10 percent of our steel rails, 13 percent of our refrigerators, and 31 percent of our construction and mining equipment found overseas markets last year; also, 45 percent of our copper sulfate, 27 percent of penicillin, 55 percent of rice, 31 percent of dried fruits, and 60 percent of tallow. For us now to take steps which would endanger these exports would force many of the industries into the most fundamental readjustments, and would set off a wave of repercussions which would affect our whole economy.

Even small local businesses share in the benefits of a high level of foreign trade, because of the extra purchasing power placed in the hands of workers in export industries.

There is much to be gained from increased trade. As taxpayers, we benefit because more imports help reduce the need of other countries for our aid. As all of us know, there has been extensive criticism of foreign aid. Increased trade is one substitute which will not upset the applecart.

Increased trade makes it possible for consumers to purchase more foreign-made goods than we need. Producers benefit because imports help foreigners earn the dollars they need to buy more American goods which they need and want, but cannot otherwise afford. Foreign trade promotes more profitable American investments abroad. All of us benefit because increased international trade creates a stronger free world, and thereby contributes to the possibilities for maintaining world peace.

The case for a sensible and practical foreign-trade policy does not rest simply upon its impact on our need for friends and allies. We ourselves stand to gain in economic terms if we choose the right policy. If we do not, we stand to suffer a heavy economic loss if we err. In dollar terms, our foreign trade amounted to $37 billion in 1953; $16 billion of imports and $21 billion of exports. This amounts to 5 or 6 percent of our total production which goes into export trade. These figures seem insignificant at first glance; but we cannot overlook the fact that imports and exports, taken together, sustain 4½ million American jobs. We forget that we are no longer self-sufficient; we must rely on foreign sources for many of our critical raw materials and pleasures of life. Fifty years ago we could close our eyes to the rest of the world, and would retreat into our shell. Not so today. The world has become smaller, through the new and modern modes of transportation and communication. Our population is steadily increasing; our standard of living and consumption of raw and finished materials continues to rise. We must cooperate with the rest of the free world if we are to survive.

As pointed out in the House Report on H. R. 1, probably no segment of our economy has a greater stake in foreign trade than does agriculture. It has been estimated that annual exports of agricultural commodities represent the production of from 50 to 60 million cultivated acres. Our agricultural exports provide a market for the produce of 1 out of each 10 acres of cropland. In 1951, when our agricultural exports ran to $4 billion, this was the equivalent of $1 out of each $8 in cash farm receipts in the United States.

In 1953, of our total production we exported 45 percent of our rice, 26 percent of our tobacco, 24 percent of our cotton, 21 percent of our soybeans and products, 19 percent of our wheat and flour, 18 percent of our lard, 17 percent of our barley, 6 percent of our raisins, and about 5 percent of our pears and apples. From these statistics it can be seen that we export about one-fourth of our total production of some major agricultural commodities.

Since 1951, our agricultural exports have been falling off. Any time there is a falling off in exports of agricultural commodities, there follow lower prices and increased surplus problems, and there may follow acreage restrictions and marketing controls. In many cases, cropland is diverted from production for export to production of other commodities for domestic consumption. This means that even the agricultural commodities that are not exported can be directly affected as a result of a reduction in exports.

One of the most important answers to the problem of our agricultural surpluses is an expanded foreign market. Under the trade-agreements program, concessions have been obtained for almost every agricultural product customarily exported from the United States in any significant amount. The enactment of a liberal trade program will expand the foreign markets for agricultural products produced by American farmers—expanded foreign markets which they need so badly.

It is frequently stated that future reductions in tariffs will cause serious unemployment in particular industries by permitting large volumes of imports to enter the United States, underselling domestic production. The unemployment resulting from reduced tariffs is frequently exaggerated. As I have already stated, over 4 million jobs are attributable to work generated by our foreign trade—both export and import. On the other hand, it has been estimated that not over 100,000 workers might be threatened directly or indirectly, with the loss of their jobs, by increased imports resulting from a hypothetical reduction across the board of 50 percent in present tariff rates.

In order to displace 5 million jobs, there would have to be an increase of over $25 billion in imports. This is equal to twice our actual imports, and four times our dutiable imports. The $25 billion figure is arrived at by taking the Department of Labor figure on the average value of output per employee—$5,000—and multiplying by 5 million workers.

Low tariff barriers have failed to depress labor standards and wages in the United States at any time in our history, and I do not think they will now. During the period in which the trade-agreements program has been in effect, the people of the United States have achieved the greatest prosperity the country has ever known. During this period, wages and working conditions of our workers have steadily improved, despite increased imports.

Opponents of the trade program often argue that tariff reductions in industries essential to national defense in time of war, endanger our mobilization base. They state that excessive imports can so reduce domestic production in these industries that capital investment declines and skilled workers disappear into other lines of work, with the result that the rapid buildup necessary in an emergency would be impossible. H. R. 1 calls for a selective, not an indiscriminate, reduction of tariffs. The President, with his National Security Council and Department of Defense, will retain his full responsibility for safeguarding the national defense.

Since the introduction of H. R. 1 on the first day of the 84th Congress, the Nation's Capital has been bombarded with "protectionist" groups seeking to subordinate vital American interests to the creation of privileged, non-competitive positions for a few industries. If they are allowed to succeed, these few who are seeking privileges will become many. These protectionists would cut off many imports. In short, they would insist that we use up our own scarce resources, rather than draw them to the fullest economical extent from nations more willing to sell from their own abundance. These interests would impair the administration's power to grant firm tariff concessions to others in exchange for concessions to us.

The protectionist would, of course, impose upon the consumer the high prices that must always rule in a protected industry. By stimulating fears of imports, they attempt to divert attention from the need for genuine remedies in situations of industrial weakness.

The vital question here is, Would higher tariffs actually contribute to their strength, or would they merely add an unnecessary burden on the consuming public? Tariffs do not necessarily give new life to a dying industry; nor do they give life to an industry that is noncompetitive in the world market. Higher tariffs are not a sure cure by any means; they can easily increase and intensify the problems.

Too much emphasis is being placed on tariffs as a cure-all. Industries can find

much more shelter if they pursue the possibilities of improved management, shifts in production lines, modernizing investment, withdrawal or relocation.

We should not freeze domestic production against all import competition. One of the great virtues of our individual enterprise system is its adaptability, its ability to adjust to technological and other changes.

There are problem areas. I am among the first to admit this, but higher tariffs will not help much. In the case of hand-blown glass, it has been stated that we have more of an art than an industry, and I am inclined to agree. It competes more on prestige and taste than price. The hat industry has reason to complain, but the United States Government cannot insist that American men and women wear hats.

Perhaps the two most publicized instances of sick industries are coal and textiles. The coal industry needs help, and we should do all we can to help, but placing quotas on heavy fuel oil imports will not be of any material help to the industry.

It has been pointed out to me that, should restrictions be placed on the importation of heavy fuel oil, the existing work force would only have to work 5 more days over the year, or a total of 179 days, to supply the maximum amount of coal that the east coast consumers could possibly require should all who are able to do so convert to coal from heavy fuel oil. In 1954 these workers worked 3.3 days per week, and consequently we could not anticipate the reemployment of any coal miners who are now unemployed.

The chief causes of coal's losses have been the dieselization of railroads and the appeal of cleaner, more convenient fuels for home heating. The decline in use of coal by railroads between 1946 and 1953 amounted to 83 percent of the total decline in the United States use of coal during this period. The consumption of coal for space heating in 1953 was approximately half of that in 1946.

Another area in which coal has lost markets in recent years is in the export field. Bearing in mind the recognized reciprocal aspect of foreign trade, coal producers can hardly expect to retain the export market they have while urging that heavy fuel oil imports be shut off. A unilateral program to the benefit of coal interests is impossible, so they must reciprocate.

In addition, natural gas has become a major competitor of both oil and coal. The solution to the crisis in the coal industry is not quotas, tariffs, or a forced conversion back to coal.

Turning to textiles next, we find another instance in which the facts need to be considered. There is not one textile industry but many, and only a few are sick. Woolens and worsteds and carpets have been sick. Cottons and synthetics have not. We export 6 percent of our production of cotton textiles and import the equivalent of only one-half to 1 percent. Our cotton textile industry is the most efficient and most innovating in the world. Any temporary advantage in wages abroad will not upset the industry. The synthetic textiles are even better off.

Wool textiles are in a different status. The industry is badly organized. Many inefficient mills need to be reorganized. Synthetics hit the industry hard. From 1947 to 1953 there was a decline in sales of men's woolen suits of 7 million units. A high protected wool price, fluctuating widely, aggravated a bad situation. I believe the solution probably lies in a system of integrated woolen textile companies which can adjust flexibly to consumer tastes and demands—not in higher tariffs.

When an industry fails to demonstrate actual injury they shift to the argument—protection against cheaper labor costs abroad. This again is a baseless argument. In the majority of cases, European industries' cheap labor is not cheap at all, once the manufacturer calculates his costs on a unit basis. These foreign products may cost little by the hour, but often they cost a great deal more by the piece. In most every industry, the European pays 2 or 3 times more for his capital than does his American competitor. In every industry, his power costs are higher; in most industries, his raw material costs are higher, too. Almost universally, he does his business on a scale so small that he cannot begin to equal the economies of our own industries. Finally, he often operates in an environment saddled with the restrictions of the cartel, in which the incentive to cut costs is weak and diffused. His wage costs are multiplied by fringe benefits, too. With these handicaps, I think the European who can match our prices in our market is a man to be admired. One additional fact—American industries, large and small, have been able to outsell Europeans even in their own home territory.

We cannot freeze domestic production against all import competition. One of the great virtues of our individual enterprise system is its adaptability, its ability to adjust to technological and other changes.

Imports naturally will create competition. In some cases such imports might displace a few workers and firms, yet the imports might be essential to the national interest. Adjustments will have to be made. Adjustments can be made through legislation at Federal and State levels. There are many things that can be done which will cushion the impact of justified foreign imports—an increase in unemployment-compensation benefits, advancement of the age of retirement, provision for retraining for younger workers, provision of moving allowances, an increase in the lending power of the Small Business Administration, and provision of engineering assistance and marketing advice to firms finding it necessary to adjust their operations, to mention only a few possible approaches.

We are living today in a divided world, the free and the enslaved, with the two parts engaged in a competitive struggle to prove the superiority of their respective systems. Economic solidarity on our side in this struggle is imperative if we are to maintain our position and increase our influence in those parts of the world which are as yet uncommitted. Now to proclaim, by failure of our trade system, that we are ending our policy of cooperation in trade and tariff matters in favor of protectionism would drive a wedge in Western economic unity which would go far to undo all the great efforts we have made in the last few years to build strength and vitality in our part of the world, through the Marshall plan, point 4, and other economic and military-aid programs.

Our free-world friends have made great strides since the war in regaining their economic strength, aided in substantial measure by United States assistance. As their economic health has returned they have been faced increasingly with a dilemma whether they can confidently rely on the United States for an expanding two-way trade with their exports and as a source for their necessary imports. If we do not make it possible for them to develop their trade with us they may be forced by the economic facts of life to yield to the inducements of the East and become more and more dependent upon trade with the Soviet bloc. The danger to us and to them of a development along this line is so obvious that it needs no emphasis. Economic dependence can become political dependence, and our laboriously built system of free-world alliances could easily begin to disintegrate while we stand helplessly by.

The days of economic aid, except for certain particular areas, are just about over, but the dollar gaps remain, concealed to some extent by our extraordinary military aid and military expenditures abroad. As these taper off, as we plan they should, the gap will become more apparent again and we shall be faced with the alternative of continuing some sort of aid program, reconciling ourselves to a reduction in our exports which foreign countries will still need, or accepting more imports. The last alternative can be mitigated considerably by increases in United States foreign investment. A general increase in trade, including triangular trade made possible through greater currency convertibility, will enable all of us to expand our economies and our output, and at the same time contribute to the removal of the currency imbalances. An essential element in any such development would be, however, a liberal United States trade policy and a willingness on the part of the United States to cooperate fully in the economic sphere. Renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation must be an integral part of the cooperation.

In recent months Formosa and the offshore islands have had the major part of the attention of our foreign-policy interests. While we have been preoccupied with the Formosa Straits, we have come close to losing an outpost in Asia far more important than Formosa; namely, in Japan. We have been striving to build up Japan as a bastion of United States and free-world defense in Asia. But the Japanese still face a desperate economic situation. Japan must sustain 88 million people in an area smaller than Montana, with few natural resources and only 16 percent of its land arable. As an industrial and island

economy, Japan must import raw materials and export the manufactured goods. In short, Japan—like Great Britain—must trade to live.

We want the Japanese to limit their trade with Communist China for strategic reasons. But to compensate for its former large trade with mainland China, Japan must find greater outlets in the free world.

This, in my judgment, is a deadly serious issue. The world must open its markets to Japan or risk the greatest industrial nation in Asia slipping into the Communist orbit, either by the sheer necessity of trading with the Chinese Communists, or by growing economic distress leading to internal Communist subversion.

It is essential that Japan be kept within the orbit of the free world. In a very real sense, an economically strong Japan is an integral part of the defense system of the United States in the Pacific. There is no assurance, of course, that the strengthening of Japan, tradewise, will automatically hold Japan in the free-world orbit. But the opposite is a foregone conclusion if the free world closes its markets to Japanese goods. Japan inevitably will trade with the Communist bloc. For Japan must trade.

Japan's natural markets, to be sure, are in the Orient, and at the present time the only Asiatic countries with whom she can trade in volume are Communist controlled. Eventually, perhaps, Japan will be able to rely on her Asiatic neighbors for markets. This area, however, is presently underdeveloped, and until it becomes developed the countries of the West, particularly the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, will have to be willing to take their fair share of Japanese merchandise. Figures for January–October 1954 show that the United States exported to Japan $758,857,000 in goods and produce. In return, during the same period we imported Japanese products valued at $221,366,000. If we lost our Japanese markets, we would be losing a very valuable source of income. If we cut off the Japanese imports, we certainly cannot expect to maintain the Japanese market for our goods. Oriental imports may hurt several of our smaller industries, but in light of the overall picture, should we sacrifice a $750 million market and an ally for the sake of several small industries that can be helped by other methods, adjustments, relocation, and conversion?

It is not my intention to give the impression that the United States is the only nation which needs to revise its trade regulations. Far from it. If freer trade is to be worth while, other nations will have to remove trade restrictions. But because of the dominant role of our economy in the world system, we must participate in the elimination of restrictions, and it is important that we be among the first to take the necessary steps.

Freeing trade will not cure all the world's economic maladies. Underdeveloped areas, for example, will need economic assistance for a long time to come. But United States leadership in reducing trade barriers may, in addition to its economic effects, remove a convenient scapegoat on which some nations have fallen back in making excuses for not putting their own economies in order. United States action in this matter will also rob Communists of a propaganda weapon to use against the United States.

Freer trade between the nations of the free world with their abundance of resources and skills will increase opportunities and standards of living everywhere. To reverse the trends of the last 20 years now, and return to policies of restrictionism and protectionism, would lead to rigidity and stagnation in our economic life.

In addition, we need our friends and allies as much as they need us; we should not let any part of the free world go by default.

Many countries view us almost entirely through our trade policy. We are the chief market for Swiss watches, for Scotch whisky, for Cuban sugar; Spain sends us three-quarters of her pickled olives; Portugal sends us 40 percent of her cork. It is easy to lose sight of cork in all the trade statistics, but we can be very sure that Portugal does not lose sight of it. When we raise the tariff on a foreign product, we not only hurt a good customer but we cut down sharply on what the nation can buy here and at the same time we give deadly ammunition to our enemies, who live by poisoning the minds of our allies.

In the last analysis, we are all in the same boat. This is true not only of Americans, but of millions of people around the world who trade with us, who share in the common defense and who are trying to make a success of democracy.

When we hurt a neighbor's trade, we hurt his capacity and his will to be strong. A poor nation cannot afford defense; and when its citizens feel they have nothing to defend, it is no longer an ally, but a liability.

We have come to the crossroads. We must make a choice now whether we will lead the free world forward to widening markets and expanding production, or permit it to lapse into intensified economic nationalism and political division. The adoption of a clear-cut policy of tariff liberalization would provide fresh impetus toward liberating the free world from crippling economic restrictions. It would be a powerful stimulant to other free nations to liberalize their own trade policies and move toward currency convertibility.

On the other hand, our failure to assert such leadership would be interpreted by our allies as a retreat from our present foreign policy.

An increased and freer flow of trade among the free nations would promote the most economical use of our own resources, just as it would promote the most economical use of our allies' resources. It would enable the United States to concentrate on producing those things we make most efficiently, and to exchange a part of our efficient production for the things we need which other people make more efficiently than we can.

It is only common sense for us to trade typewriters or refrigerators for coffee or bananas, rather than try to produce the latter ourselves at exorbitant costs.

The success or failure of America's future in the world depends more than we realize on the final form of this one piece of legislation, H. R. 1. I sincerely hope that we adopt the avenue to a prosperous future, embodied in a liberal trade policy.

In closing, I think that a quotation from the President would be most appropriate: "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all."

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until tomorrow Tuesday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a year or so ago the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], stated in effect on the floor of the Senate that he presumed he was one of the last fundamentalists remaining in this body. I do not wish him to think that he stands alone in such a corner. I am there with him.

I have some basic and fundamental objections to the whole tariff and trade program as embodied in H. R. 1.

The Finance Committee has embraced the three specific amendments which I introduced on March 28, 1955, as separate amendments in the Senate. I am glad that the Finance Committee of the Senate in its consideration of the bill has incorporated these amendments in its report of last Friday. In the statement which I submitted to the Finance Committee and in my conversation with individual members of the committee, I have argued for their incorporation in this measure. In so doing, I offer apology to no one. These amendments have been called crippling by some who do not approve of them. They are safeguards, and I will discuss them later.

One fundamental objection I have to the entire tariff-fixing program em-

bodied in this and former bills is that the Congress is delegating a constitutional function solely entrusted to it. We have a Tariff Commission wholly answerable to the President. We set up certain standards to guide the President, but transferring to him a function which the Constitution vests in us in effect results in a total abdication of our own responsibility. It is a desertion of a duty belonging to us. It is a departure from the division of our constitutional powers. We give the President a slide rule with which to raise or lower taxes. We will not let the executive branch of the Government fix the value of our postage stamps; we will not permit the Treasury Department to change the face on a penny or coin a new dime in the absence of legislative authority. Why the President should fix our tariff rates when the Constitution invests the Congress with such power has never been justified.

Buried in the recesses of the State Department and other departments of the Government and maintained by a generous Congress in appropriating annually millions of dollars to sustain them, are many so-called experts, economists, internationalists, and what-nots. We and the American people are victimized by them by night and by day with all sorts of statistics, charts, programs, arguments, and platitudes.

I shall not be confounded nor confused in this major premise; I shall not be hoodwinked nor led astray in the simple concept of my constitutional duty to which I have given my solemn oath. No amount of laborious reasoning, doubletalk, or circuitous thinking, and, I shall add, no amount of detailed labor involved in carrying forward the constitutional responsibility of my office, is able to persuade me that in voting for this bill as amended, reluctantly as I may do so, and with tremendous reserve, I should not now state that the time must soon come when the Congress should take complete stock of itself and determine whither we are going. These so-called experts are responsive, let us not forget, only to the will of their immediate superiors. They are not required every 2 or 6 years to have their charter of authority renewed by the people of the United States. They remain from Congress to Congress. They come before the committees of the Senate with the unique ability to talk smoothly out of both corners of their mouths. I, for one, sometimes become awfully fed up on some of their doubletalk.

Reference was made in the Senate the other day to the many letters that had been received from constituents which may have been inspired by the so-called "special interests." Inspired or not, I wish to assert today that I am happy to have received in excess of 12,000 letters from the workers in the textile industry in my State who fear the consequences of the provisions of H. R. 1. They may not know its detailed provisions or implications; they may not be aware of its far-reaching consequences; they may not be conscious of the fact that the Congress is sidestepping its constitutional duty; they may not know the refinements of the delegation of a legislative power to the President, the power to fix tariff rates and excise and import duties, or to regulate commerce. Their purpose in writing is praiseworthy; their conclusions are sound; their judgment is unassailable; they are right in principle. I shall not desert them, neither shall I scold them for writing to me; nor shall I lead them astray. I shall never make light of their interest in their daily work which means life or death for them and their families. I shall not put them in competition with products resulting from cheap foreign labor.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that at the present time laborers in Japan are paid approximately one-sixth of the amount which laborers in the United States are paid.

The Senate may pardon me as I restate a fact with which many are already familiar; I was myself once a textile worker. I received a part of my education while working in a cotton mill, working 1 week, studying the next week. I knew what it was to work in a cotton mill from daylight until dark. I know the problems of the textile workers; I know their heartaches; I know their fears. I know their wants, and I share their aspirations. If the amendments which I have offered are called "crippling amendments," and the act of submitting them becomes "heresy" on my part, then the devil may make the most of it. I am not going to become scared at the words "special interests" in fighting for the adoption of the amendments. To prevent the destruction of the means of livelihood of hundreds of thousands of Americans is of special interest, of very special interest, to me, as I trust it should be to every Member of this body. Those who would tear down or do harm to one of the basic industries of this country would cause untold human suffering, misery, hardship, and privation to that great segment of our people who know no other way of life.

The textile worker, the manufacturer, and the cotton farmer alike are concerned with full employment, at fair wages, with a market which affords a reasonable return for their labors. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the other day stated that cotton imports aggregated $83.1 million and that exports amounted to $317.3 million. He stated that fiber imports were $32 million and exports $217 million. Then, in making a comparison, he said that if in his own business he sold a customer eight times as much as he bought from him, he would try to keep that patronage. The Senator from Tennessee left many factors out of the picture. He left out entirely the ratio of costs of production; he left out entirely the relative standards of living of those who produced the $83 million compared to those who produced the $317 million. A true picture must include the fact that the worker engaged in producing the $83 million worth of imports was employed on starvation wages and virtually as a slave laborer.

That picture would also have included, not an 8-hour day as in the United States, but possibly a 12-hour day; it would have included child labor, sweat shops, and other hardships too numerous to mention. The picture, as given, did not include the relatively high living standards nor costs of living here in the United States; it did not include our burdensome taxation, local, State, and Federal. There is a whole lot more to the picture than mere cold figures in terms of dollars and cents.

On April 13, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorial of the Legislature of South Carolina urging me to vote against H. R. 1 in its entirety. Having been a member of that body early in my public life, and having represented two separate constituencies successively in my service there, I shall be the last to say that that body is subservient to anyone classified as a "special interest."

Another great organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, memorialized the Congress to vote against H. R. 1 and to resume its constitutional functions of levying taxes and fixing the tariffs. I shall be the last one in this body to criticize that organization as being subservient to any but the "best interests" of our country. I have found that group of fine women to be as stanch and as true advocates of Americanism, American principles, institutions, and ideals—the things which have made and maintained us a great Nation—as any group that can be found in the land; certainly more stanch and true than the so-called experts in the motley crew of unidentified specialists who, by night and day, are eating away to the vitals of our form of government, even as termites destroy the structure of a house.

In the passage of H. R. 1 extending to the President the authority to enter into trade and tariff agreements, specific exception is made on page 3 of the so-called executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The country needs to be alerted; the Senate needs to be alerted, and alert; there is no use for us to complain when a situation becomes an accepted fact. Every grant of our authority, every abdication of our responsibility, every transfer of a legislative function, leads us into a wilderness that results in a slow but gradual change of our form of government. When we surrender our constitutional duty of levying taxes and fixing import and excise duties, we invest one man with too much power—a power we have no right to relinquish.

Worker and manufacturer alike must guard against the language found in section 3, subsection D, wherein, on page 4, the Senate Finance Committee has added the language, "or with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published in the Federal Register on November 16, 1954."

This embraces, undoubtedly, the smart boys' "escape clause" to accomplish what they wish with respect to the Japanese agreement. Not only is it wrong as a matter of principle for us to delegate a power to the executive branch of the Government to fix tariff rates; that wrong is compounded and made more insidious when we delegate such a power to fix a rate on a basis yet to be computed and yet to be determined. It is not a

crippling amendment to set the date back to January 1, 1955, rather than to advance it to July 1, 1955, knowing not what the rate may be at such a future time. The extent of the injury we have empowered the President to inflict can be measured by having a known date and a known basis for computation.

I am glad the Finance Committee has adopted the amendment which I offered on March 28, striking out subsection (ii) of section D, on page 4 of the bill. I remarked at the time in my brief statement before the Senate that the language contained was so elastic, so uncertain, and so susceptible of distortion that it could mean almost anything the experts would wish it to mean. What may appear normal to me may seem abnormal to another; what is negligible in my judgment may be wholly important in the judgment of another. The use of such loose language and the grant of such elastic powers could very well wreck our entire economy. No guideposts are erected; no standards are prescribed; no safeguards are set up when we use the terms "normal" and "negligible."

I cannot for the life of me vote to submit the very existence of a single cotton millworker in South Carolina to the judgment of some expert operating in secret in Geneva, Switzerland, or in the caves of an executive department in Washington. The waving of the red flag of special interests, textile lobby, or what-not, in my face only angers me and strengthens my purpose to preserve the worker's right to steady employment at fair wages. I do not wish him to be placed in a position where he must compete with the low-wage scales and substandard conditions of living prevailing in Japan, India, or any other country in the world. He is an American, and as a United States Senator my duty to him is clear. I must have a single purpose to ascertain for him, with what light I have, where his best interests may be protected. He sent me here for that purpose, and I shall not, God willing, fail him. It is my conviction that every time we sit in conference with foreign negotiators and particularly where we negotiate in secret, we come out shorthanded. This conclusion is easily proved.

I believe in foreign trade; I believe in exporting our surpluses so long as there are people in the world who can use them; I realize the necessities of trade; I shall not be a party, however, to bartering away at some foreign conference table, in secret, the rights of the American worker in mill or factory here at home in the United States.

Other objections occur to me in respect to the whole program advanced by H. R. 1. At a subsequent hour I may elaborate on them. Suffice it for the moment to say that, in my judgment, it has never and may never accomplish its stated purposes. A year or so ago, while in conference with some friends who were urging me to support some foreign-aid project concerning textiles, I stated to them that they were building a Frankenstein which would destroy them. H. R. 1 is another such monster if all its implications are fully known and all its possibilities are fully explored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further business to come before the Senate?

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30 1956, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 261) thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When will the Senator from Arizona be prepared to have the Interior Department appropriation bill taken up by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should say not later than Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is hoped that the Senate may be able to complete action on the trade agreements bill before proceeding to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill. Now that the appropriation bill has been reported and the hearings are available, I wish to serve notice on the Members of the Senate that it is the intention to call up the appropriation bill sometime this week, if action can be concluded on the bill now under consideration. I had thought that there would be other Senators who would care to speak on the bill today. I am informed that some Senators are now preparing remarks, but will be unable to present them until tomorrow.

Mr. President, it is expected that the Senate will remain in session to as late as 7 or 8 o'clock tomorrow, if there shall be speakers who will need that much time. I am hopeful that tomorrow we may be able to obtain a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the pending measure before the end of the week.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1—S. 1723—BASIS OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION—THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 1, the bill extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the 1930 Tariff Act, which would strike out all after the enacting clause and insert my Senate bill 1723.

Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate as S. 1723, amending the 1930 Tariff Act, provides for the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade through adjustment of flexible duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, all that the American workingmen and investors of this Nation have ever asked for is an even break in their own American markets.

FLEXIBLE DUTY TO EQUALIZE EFFECTIVE WAGES

They have demanded a flexible duty or tariff to equalize the effective wages and taxes here and in the chief competing country on each product.

DUTY REDUCED AS FOREIGN LIVING STANDARD RAISED

Such a duty would be reduced as the foreign wage standard of living increased and when the cost of production approached our own, then free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The principle of fair and reasonable competition was the answer of Congress to the low-wage foreign competition for almost a century of time. It established the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

The principle established equal access to the American market for the American workingmen and investors.

DUTY TAKES PROFIT OUT OF SWEATSHOP LABOR

Such a flexible duty, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, simply takes the profit out of foreign sweatshop labor. It does not prevent imports, but brings them in on our wage standard of living basis.

AMENDMENTS TO SAVE INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

The desperate effort of investors' and workingmen's groups to save their own particular industry or product from annihilation by amending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is proof enough of the damage the act has done and that it offers for the future.

The amendment provides the flexibility needed, after 22 years, to establish foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and to provide equal access to his own American markets for the American workingmen and investors.

MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

It is well known that the low-wage foreign nations manipulate their price, their currency in terms of the dollar and subsidize their own exports through grants, multiple rates of exchange and by other methods to defeat any regulation of imports into this country, and to prevent American imports into their own nation.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION COST

The amendment provides that the Tariff Commission may take cognizance of such manipulation in the adjustment of duties or tariffs, and may take into consideration the landed duty paid price, and the offered for sale price in the determination of the cost production of an imported article.

QUANTITATIVE LIMITS

The amendment also provides that the Commission may impose quantitative limits—quotas—on the importation of any article, in its determination of the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my proposed substitute regulating foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, giving to the American working men and investors equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert certain language, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential further ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission, is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exists."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding the provisions of section 101, title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect as of June 12, 1955.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my proposed amendment would return the regulation of domestic economy and foreign trade to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, through the adjustment of the duties or tariffs in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from the determination of foreign policy.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution places the regulation of the domestic economy and of foreign commerce in the legislative branch, and article II, section 2, places the determination of the foreign policy in the executive branch.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to adjust the duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce in the executive branch, thus amending the Constitution through a simple act of Congress.

TO DEVELOP THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 proposed to adjust imports or tariffs—"So as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country."

Nowhere in our Constitution or Bill of Rights is there any power delegated to the executive branch to favor the development of one industry over another, or one region of the Nation over another area of the Nation.

The 1860 principle held, in general, until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The 1934 act provided, and still provides, that the President may trade any sector of American industry, American jobs, and investments for a fancied concession in foreign policy.

ABANDONED PRINCIPLE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The 1934 act for the first time abandoned the principle of regulating foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition for all products produced in appreciable amounts here—and made the domestic jobs and investment pawns in the hazardous game of international politics.

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is a "dead-fall" over the head of American jobs and investments.

The President may at any time trade any sector of the economy—dependent upon a duty or tariff to equalize the standard-of-living wages—for a foreign political adjustment that he may judge to be important. Investors and workers are even required to show their importance in national defense as well as serious injury to be eligible for the "escape clause' 'which even then may or may not be invoked.

Mr. President, under the proposed amendment, the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade, through adjusting the flexible duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, would revert to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress. Rates adjusted by the Commission would become effective within 60 days—that is, within 90 days after the Tariff Commission's decision—and within 60 days after submission to Congress, in the absence of congressional disaproval, through a concurrent resolution.

NECESSARY LATITUDE IN ADJUSTMENT OF DUTIES

Since many of the duties and tariffs have been lowered from 50 to 75 percent under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and since the fixed duties have been lowered at least 50 percent through inflation over the past 2 decades, the provisions of my proposed amendment embodied in Senate bill 1723, already before the Senate, would give the Tariff Commission the necessary latitude to adjust the flexible duty or tariffs to give the American workingmen and investors equal access to the American markets.

Mr. President, let us return to constitutional government, treating alike all industries and areas of this Nation, through adjusting the duties and tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and withdrawing from the international game of politics the jobs and investments of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment printed, and to have it lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

A short time ago the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] reported the Interior Department appropriation bill. I am informed that other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee are nearing the end of their hearings on other appropriation bills. It is now less than 2 months before the end of the fiscal year, and during that time the Senate will have to consider more than a dozen appropriation bills, pass them, send them to conference, work out the conference agreements, and act on the conference reports.

Therefore, the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, is very hopeful that some agreement may be reached to have the Senate vote later in the week on the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act.

I shall not propose such an agreement today; but I express the hope that it will meet with the pleasure of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance either tomorrow or at a subsequent time to propose to the Senate that it agree upon a time for taking the final vote on the pending bill.

Today 7 or 8 speeches have been made on the bill, including the very able speech by the chairman of the committee, the very able speech by the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. MILLIKIN], and excellent speeches by a number of other Senators.

I do not wish to call the Senate into session early tomorrow, because such good work is being done in the committees. On the other hand, I hope the Senate will be able to take final action this week on the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act, and also on the Interior Department Appropriation bill, as a minimum for the week.

If the chairman of the committee is willing, I shall propose—after talking further with the minority leader—some time limitation on debate on the pending bill.

Mr. BYRD. That will be very satisfactory to the chairman of the committee, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And on tomorrow we shall continue in session until as late as 7 or 8 or even 8:30 p. m., if there are then Senators who desire to be heard.

Mr. BYRD. That is agreeable to me.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no further statements to be made at this time, then, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 2, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 2, 1955:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years from March 4, 1955.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to the grade indicated:

To be ensigns

Richard Newton Abrahams
Kenneth Donald Albritton
Gordon George Allen
Donald David Anderson
Joseph Nicholas Andrassy
William John Bickford
Charles Anthony Biondo
Carmen Joseph Blondin
Alan Dorr Breed
Richard Lee Brown
Theodore Gregg Brown, Jr.
Edward Hegeler Carus, Jr.
Arthur Ernest Champagne, Jr.
Daniel Buell Charter, Jr.
Joseph Leo Coburn, Jr.
Robert Lee Cook
Donald Clair Cunningham
Leon Thomas Dankiewicz
Stephen John Dasovich
Kenneth Roy Depperman
John Joseph Dirschel, Jr.
John Martindale Duke, Jr.
James Joseph Dunlop
Gary Benbow Erekson
Ralph Walston Eustis
Joseph Francis Fallon
Charles William Fead
James Edward Ferguson
David Brockman Flanagan
Francis Duane Forbes
Kenneth Wahlin Forslund
Carlos Anthony Garcia
Ronald Nicholas Gaspard
Arthur Edwin Gerken
Charles Bertram Glass
Donald Leroy Gordon
David Lorance Green
Henry Haugen
Frederick Ferdinand Herzberg, Jr.
Bobby Flynn Hollingsworth
Robert Louis Johanson
John Bennett Jones-Bateman, Jr.
Leo Jordan
Martin Jay Kaiser
Robert Allan Knight
Herbert Herman Henry Kothe
Ira Leslie Krams
Alban Landry
Robert Earl Larson
Thomas Stanyer Latham
Charles Leddy
Edward Francis Lewis
Irvin Wayne Lindemuth
Thomas Channing Lutton
Charles Franklin McFadden
Thomas Joseph McKey III
Charles Anthony Mullradt
Edward William Murphy
Richard Nielsen, Jr.
Daniel Carl Olson, Jr.
Robert Henry Overton III
Richard Rounsevelle
John William Sheedy
Ralph Elmer Slater
William Neil Spence
Edmund Joseph Spillane, Jr.
Henry Suski
Joel Richard Swanson
Ira Edward Thompson
Howard Benton Thorsen
Howard Michael Veillette
George Edward Walton
Robert Ireton Welsh, Jr.
Norman Randolph West
Jimmie Dale Woods

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Leonard O. Vittitow, Eloy.

CALIFORNIA

Wyvonne R. Bibb, Alpaugh.
James I. Bailiff, Arcadia.
John H. Shepard, Carpinteria.
Albert B. McVeigh, Eldridge.
Guido Berti, Greenfield.
Bruce L. Hunt, Paradise.
Lawrence W. Elledge, Trona.
Maxine M. Spradling, Vernalis.

CONNECTICUT

Robert A. Chadsey, Middlefield.

DELAWARE

Elwood B. Rickards, Selbyville.

GEORGIA

Mildred B. Pierce, Waverly Hall

IDAHO

David P. Woodard, Sandpoint.

IOWA

Oscar J. Hertel, Burlington.
Paul R. Bender, Monticello.

KANSAS

Gertrude M. Retter, Denton.
Harold H. Bennett, Haviland.
Max R. Donahey, Logan.

LOUISIANA

John E. Bishop, Lacombe.

MAINE

Joseph S. Dinsmore, Bangor.
Elmer C. Davis, Northeast Harbor.
Everett W. Harrington, Winthrop.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph A. Cunis, Ashland.
Alfred G. Davis, Lincoln.
Barbara J. Coombs, South Harwich.

MISSOURI

Perry M. Sprague, Fair Play.
George O. Clarke, Laddonia.
Fred W. Aderhold, Purdy.

NEBRASKA

Louis Kerst, Crete.
Duane M. Vannice, Halsey.

NEVADA

Alice M. Gabler, Zephyr Cove.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Reginald W. Stevens, Wolfeboro Falls.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hugh D. Bradner, Yanceyville.

OHIO

Joseph M. Alcorn, North Lima.

OREGON

Jack R. Bailey, Scio.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur C. Tidd, Avonmore.
Norman L. Foust, East Brady.
Roy D. Cunningham, Farmington.
Eugene E. Thompson, Foxburg.
Charles F. Yost, New Holland.

WASHINGTON

William A. Penn, Bothell.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer K. Beitz, Buffalo.
Kathleen M. Fry, East Lynn.
Mary P. Evans, Minden.

WISCONSIN

Robert H. Prideaux, Dodgeville.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Donald Arthur Andrews and 325 other cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1955, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald Arthur Andrews, which appears on page 5027, and ending with the name of Edward John Zaborowski, which is shown on page 5028.

The nominations of Jerry L. Hoover and 134 other distinguished military students for appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jerry L. Hoover and ending with the name of Daniel R. Zenk, both appearing on page 5026.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Paul L. Abernethy, Jr., and 1,559 other persons' for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul L. Abernethy, Jr., which is shown on page 5028, and ending with the name of Walter N. Yanochik, which appears on page 5031.

This group includes appointments as ensigns in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps of this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as a group of NROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the God and Father of all mankind, may we begin this new day with an earnest desire to be loyal coworkers with Thee and with one another in the great enterprise of building the kingdom of peace and good will.

Strengthen and encourage us in our endeavors to penetrate and pierce the world's darkness and shadows with the mind and spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee and bring to light its hidden moral and spiritual treasures.

May we be willing and able to break through and break down all the barriers of prejudice and selfishness which keep men and nations from brotherhood and a true understanding and valuation of the worth and dignity of every member of the human family.

Inspire us to make adventures of friendship and may we always try to see the best in others, to believe in it, and to trust it.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1955:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

On April 30, 1955:

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a concurrent resolution, and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County target range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954;

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–14.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, MARSHALL, DEANE, NATCHER, CANNON, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, VURSELL, and TABER.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The establishment of the International Finance Corporation and our participation in it will strengthen the partnership of the free nations. In my message to the Congress, January 10, 1955, on the foreign economic policy of the United States and in my annual economic report transmitted to you January 20, 1955, I stated that I would recommend at the appropriate time legislation to permit United States participation in the Corporation as part of our effort to increase the flow of United States private investment funds abroad.

I now forward to you the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation and an explanatory memorandum approved by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing me to accept membership in the Corporation for the United States and providing for the payment of our subscription of $35,168,000 to the $100 million capital stock of the Corporation as set forth in the articles of agreement. The subscription was included in the budget.

The entire free world needs capital to provide a sound basis for economic growth which will support rising standards of living and will fortify free social and political institutions. Action to that end by cooperating nations is essential.

In its own enlightened self-interest, the United States is vitally concerned that capital should move into productive activities in free countries unable to finance development needs out of their own resources.

Government funds cannot, and should not, be regarded as the basic sources of capital for international investment. The best means is investment by private individuals and enterprises. The major purpose of the new institution, consequently, will be to help channel private capital and experienced and competent private management into productive investment opportunities that would not otherwise be developed. Through the Corporation, we can cooperate more effectively with other people for mutual prosperity and expanding international trade, thus contributing to the peace and the solidarity of the free world.

Economic recovery, notably in Western Europe, enables nations other than the United States to participate substantially in furnishing capital to the less developed areas. The International Finance Corporation is an undertaking in which all nations, as members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, will be able to pool some of their resources to spur such investment. All subscriptions to the Corporation will be paid in gold or dollars.

The Corporation, as an affiliate of the International Bank, will serve as an international agency, which will provide, in association with local and foreign private investors, risk capital for financing the establishment, improvement, and expansion of productive private enterprises in member countries when other sources of funds are not available on reasonable terms. This type of risk or venture capital is most urgently needed.

By providing the margin of capital needed to attract other funds, the Corporation will help expand private investment abroad. It will make its investments without guaranty of repayment by the member governments concerned.

Accordingly, it will complement the activities of existing international investment institutions.

The Corporation will not duplicate the operations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for the investments of the International Bank are guaranteed by its member governments and are of fixed-interest nature in projects not usually attractive to risk capital.

Since the Executive Directors of the International Bank would serve ex officio as Directors of the Corporation, and the President of the Bank would serve as Chairman of the Corporation's Board, effective collaboration between the two agencies and operating economy is assured.

Nor will the Corporation's operations duplicate the work of the Export-Import Bank. That bank, an agency of the United States Government, is an instrumentality of our foreign and trade policy. It is not designed to provide venture capital; its loans are at definite interest rates with fixed schedules of repayment.

The Corporation will not hold capital stock nor participate in operating control but will rely on private management. It will not be a holding company retaining its investments on a long-term basis, but will dispose of its holdings to private investors as opportunity offers so that it can reinvest its funds in new activities. Since its main mission is to supply risk capital where it is needed, its investments will be highly flexible.

In some cases the Corporation may take fixed-interest obligations, in others it may receive obligations bearing a return related to the earnings of the enterprises, and in others its holdings may be obligations convertible into stock when sold by it to private investors. Thus, the Corporation will supplement private investment, and will operate only in association with private interests which are willing to carry a large share of the total investment in each enterprise. In no event will it supply capital for an enterprise which could reasonably be expected to obtain the funds from private sources.

United States participation in the International Finance Corporation will be a step forward in our foreign economic policy in cooperation with the other free nations. It is, however, only one step among several which we must take. In my message to the Congress on January 10, 1955, I outlined other important steps.

These actions—such as extension of the Trade Agreements Act, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, simplification and improvement of customs valuation procedures, increased tourist allowances, changes in the law concerning the taxation of income from foreign sources and further developments in tax treaties designed to encourage private investment abroad, continued technical cooperation with other countries, and necessary programs of foreign assistance—are essential to a sound and foresighted foreign economic policy for the United States.

I urge the Congress to enact promptly the legislation permitting the United States to join with the other free nations in organizing the International Finance Corporation—an important part of our foreign economic program which will foster more rapid advance by free people everywhere as they strive to improve their material well-being.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 1955.*

POLAND APPEALS TO THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of Free Poland's Constitution Day, forever reminding us of a friend who is enslaved calling to us for help.

It is hard to believe that the diplomats of the United States Government are annoyed, whenever we remind them of this injustice for which they must share the blame.

One would expect them to work night and day to overcome the mistakes that were made; to speak up courageously for Poland's right to independence; and to work on plans for her liberation.

Even though the ghosts of Yalta will not be stilled, American leadership will not face up to the issue. They defend those agreements, or attack them, on the basis of domestic political expediency.

Even as they regard the fate of Americans who are illegally held as prisoners by the Chinese Reds, as subordinate to the strategy of peace at any price.

How long must we retreat, not only surrending the freedom of others and the respect of those who look to us as their only hope, but giving up, bit by bit, our own honor and integrity?

Leadership that speaks mightily but acts cravenly, in the false hope that 24-hour peace may be extended indefinitely by appeasement, is heading for moral bankruptcy. After that there is nothing left.

Guns and dollars are needed to halt aggression, but they alone will not succeed. Without the backbone of moral courage and unwavering devotion to the principles of freedom and justice, we shall be caught in the web of our own contradictions, which is precisely what the Communists want us to do to ourselves.

In the long run, our greatest weapon is steadfast practice of those truths that offer hope and opportunity to all men of good will.

Confusion in foreign policy, abandonment of friends, and the instability that results from expediency and lack of fearless moral purpose, these will lose us the trust and support that military alliances and economic aid could never win or hold.

The decline of American prestige began with the so-called practical arrangements that were made regarding the amputation of Poland and the setting up of a government without the advice and consent of the Polish people.

The other compromises that developed like a chain reaction from the first surrender of principle have caused hundreds of millions of people who yearned for freedom to lose faith in us. The light that once beckoned to them with hope, and the promise of deliverance, has begun to flicker, as the victory that was won by the faith, and sacrifices, and will of citizen-soldiers and citizen-workers, is being lost by fumbling leaders.

If we are ever to have peace with honor, the American people must be the ones who shall determine our foreign policy.

They must be given the facts before a decision is made—not 10 or 20 years later—or never.

Unless public opinion has a voice in these fateful matters, to replace the one-man verdicts of recent times, then freedom itself is in danger, not only in Europe and in Asia, but right here at home.

The American people have never endorsed the bargaining at Yalta.

They will not be satisfied until the unfortunate train of events that follows has been reversed and the blunders redeemed.

Poll the American people before it is too late.

Give their conscience a chance to make itself heard.

I am certain that they will welcome an opportunity to tell the Polish people that they have not been deserted by their brothers in humanity.

As a faith-bearing message to them, to others who have since been traded into slavery, and to those who even at this moment are in danger of betrayal, that the American people will not rest until the aggressors purge themselves of their crimes.

People of Poland, do not judge us entirely by the seeming inconstancy of our public officials.

The great strength of our free country comes from the conscience-inaction of our people.

Most of the time it is content to let its elected representatives exercise the judgment and the power which it has delegated to them.

But when great issues arise public opinion takes command with an authority based upon what is right and just that has no counterpart in this world.

People of Poland, the American conscience is awakening.

On this anniversary of your constitution day, we can say with greater confidence than ever before that the day of your liberation is coming nearer and nearer as fearful expediency gives way to that mounting moral courage against which communism can never prevail.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I observed in the Washington Daily News today that I have been accused of being sanctimonious because I had some friendly suggestions to offer to citizens appearing before the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations several nights ago. Sanctimonious could mean holy or saintly, or it could mean hypocritically pious. Therefore, I do not know whether the News meant to be complimentary or derogatory, but may I say that when you stick a pig, it squeals, and when you molest a skunk, it has a habit of throwing off a very unpleasant odor. This statement is directed only at the warped thinking, in this instance at least, of those responsible for the editorial of the Washington Daily News on May 2.

At the proper time I shall explain to the House just what I had in mind when I suggested to the interested citizens appearing before the subcommittee that the only way they could get the improvements for their schools, recreational centers, and other institutions was to adjust the District of Columbia tax system. I pointed out that the citizens of the District paid only from 34 to 37 percent the amount of taxes on a per capita basis that are paid by the citizens of the average city of comparable size in our Nation. I believe I am approximately correct in my analysis.

It is now crystal clear why certain phases of the educational system of the District of Columbia, the recreational facilities and many other public institutions are lagging so far behind in modernization as compared with public institutions of other cities of a similar size. Why does this condition exist in the city of Washington? A major reason is that when Members of Congress attempt to point out the weaknesses of the District tax system, then they are lambasted and insulted by the local press. If you are going to have improvements, certainly they will require money. Where are you going to get the money? If you pursue the same course that is pursued in other cities, then it will be through increased taxes. Mr. Speaker, just so long as the press of the District of Columbia chooses to lambast a Member of Congress for trying to be helpful, just so long will the city lag behind other cities of the Nation.

I want to be helpful, and when I suggested to the group of citizens appearing before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that they endeavor to create community interest with respect to an adjustment of District taxes, I was accused of being sanctimonious. But until such time as you develop community interest, there will be no particular interest among the city commissioners. A combined display of interest by the citizens and the city commissioners will be reflected in the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, not only am I embarrassed, but I am humiliated over the fact that instead of getting cooperation from the press and the citizens in my endeavor to help them, I get an uncalled for lambasting, or it would be more proper to state, an outright insult. I doubt if any Member of Congress has ever had a more uncomplimentary and sarcastic statement directed at him than was directed at me in the Washington Daily News editorial of May 2, 1955.

Furthermore, I doubt if in the history of editorial writing an editorial has been filled with any more untruths than the one in which the News, in effect, indicted every public official in Louisiana of indecency, dishonesty, and inefficiency. Every citizen of Louisiana, and especially the thousands of public officials, will deeply resent this untruthful attack.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a peculiar method of making friends. As a part of my remarks, I am inserting the editorial from the Washington Daily News:

HOT AIR

Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, Louisiana, gave a bit of sanctimonious advice Thursday to some District of Columbia citizens who were at a House hearing trying to persuade Congress to give the District more money.

Like a good father enlightening a stupid but innocent child, Representative PASSMAN told us all that what our town needed was not more Federal money but a "drive to raise your taxes to the level of some of the States."

His own State of Louisiana, he piously pointed out, had a 9-cent tax on cigarettes compared to the District's 2 cents, and an alcohol tax some three times as high as ours.

Also, he said: "Your real estate is not assessed at its actual value. Some is assessed the same as it was 20 years ago."

This newspaper has pointed to the need of modernizing real-estate assessments many times, but before the innocent children rush to pattern their taxes after Louisiana's they might consider a few items Papa PASSMORE overlooked:

Louisiana's big city, New Orleans, has what New Orleans civic groups insist is the worst assessment system in the Nation. If any property there is assessed at anything like its value, it is probably pure coincidence.

Assessments are used primarily as political weapons, with political friends getting low assessments, political enemies high. Assessors are elected. Each is the creature of a powerful political machine. Out-of-office politicians promise faithfully to clean the assessment situation up. It never gets cleaned.

Louisiana has higher taxes than practically any other State—but, we feel this is not altogether a virtue. A great percentage of one major revenue source, the sales tax, admittedly never gets to government but is admittedly diverted into private hands. Louisiana's tax law is so written that it is impossible to ever tell how much money is due the government.

Louisiana has a State income tax which the majority of its citizens simply ignore. No real attempt is made to collect it.

The New Orleans Levee Board has an accumulated fortune in tax money, although it has long since lost its only reason for existence—maintenance of the levee system. The levees were taken over years ago by the Federal Government. The board, which has nothing else to do with the money, uses it in real-estate speculation making more money. It has long been a political truism in Louisiana that if you ever get on the New Orleans Levee Board you're set financially for life.

In spite of the high State taxes, Louisiana over the years has received more in Federal grants and allotments than it has paid in Federal taxes.

All in all, Mr. PASSMAN, we think the District citizens needn't feel guilty because a beer and a cigarette costs more in Louisiana.

INVITATION TO ENJOY WISCONSIN CHEESE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Members will probably receive in the afternoon mail this announcement, but I wish to read it again to be sure nobody forgets this Wednesday, May 4:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND COLLEAGUES: I am pleased to announce that, through the courtesy of Mr. John W. Wuethrich, Greenwood, Wis., arrangements have been made for a selection of Wisconsin cheddar, swiss, and brick cheeses to be served in the House dining rooms on Wednesday, May 4, 1955.

Donors of this cheese are:

John W. Wuethrich Creamery Co., Greenwood, Wis.

Blue Moon Foods, Inc., Thorp, Wis.

Neillsville Milk Products, Neillsville, Wis.

Clark-Marathon Cooperative, Abbotsford, Wis.

E. Hilfiker, Rice Lake, Wis.

Greenwood Milk Products, Greenwood, Wis.

Stewart Cheese Corp., Greenwood, Wis.

South Alma Cheese Factory, Alma Center, Wis.

Lloyd Dickrell, Junction City, Wis.

I want to invite you to this fine treat arranged by the cheese factories of Wisconsin's Ninth District, and I hope my colleagues will make it a point to eat in the House dining rooms on May 4 and enjoy this fine cheese for which the dairy State of Wisconsin is justly famous.

FEDERAL CLASSIFIED PAY BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 I called the attention of the House to Joseph Young's column in the Evening Star in which he stated the fate of the Federal classified pay bill was delayed pending the outcome of the postal pay raise. I drew attention to the unfairness of such a situation and pointed out the parallel with the "no action" of last year. I have since conferred with a number of my colleagues, some of them members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I know that they think as I do—that there should be no relationship between these bills. Last week I was heartened by reports that the committee was swinging around to this viewpoint. However, on Thursday last I find the committee met in executive session to consider a change of policy on this matter, and no action was taken. I am distressed at this, as I know are the hundreds of thousands of loyal Federal classified employees. How long must this large group of fine and conscientious public servants be discriminated against

and used as a political football? How long are we to fiddle while Rome burns? These people by law have no recourse for the legitimate barter and sale of their labors, as do employees in private industry. Their only agent is the Congress of the United States, and I say to the distinguished Members of this House that unless concerted action is taken to persuade the committee to adopt a more liberal view, a grievous wrong is being perpetrated. I have had in mind filing a discharge petition because I know the majority of the Members of this House favor immediate relief for the classified Federal employees, and want an opportunity to express their will.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members of this House express their sentiments in a mighty chorus that will be heard through the closed door of the committee room, and in this way, maybe, bring the classified Federal pay raise bill to the floor of the House for appropriate and expeditious action.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CAUSES, EFFECT, AND PREVENTIVE TREATMENT METHODS OF DUST STORMS

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent drought and accompanying devastating dust storms that have scourged the Great Plains region, I would like to call the attention of the House to a research project that I think is of paramount interest to all Members and especially those Members from the Middle West. Although my district in Kansas is not within the grip of this devastation, probably one of the greatest agricultural colleges in the Midwest is located in my district at Manhattan, Kans.

Since 1947 our college has been conducting scientific research by mechanical devices upon the causes, effect, and preventive treatment methods of these dust storms. I have asked Dean Harold E. Myers, of the school of agriculture, to prepare a brief report on these experiments and research. I would like to point out that the cost of the experiment is one eighty-fifth of the emergency funds allocated to Kansas this year.

THE 82D AIRBORNE DIVISION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in company with 23 other Congressmen and a number of Department of Army officials including Under Secretary Charles C. Finucane and Assistant Secretary Chester R. Davis, I went to Fort Bragg on Friday, April 22, to see the airborne troops of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps display their prowess. The world-famous 82d Airborne Division demonstrated to us the training, religious, recreational and other influences that go to make up the present-day airborne trooper.

We hear a lot about "morale" and "esprit" in our dealings with the Armed Forces. I was tremendously impressed by the obvious pride of belonging which exists among the troopers at Fort Bragg.

We saw demonstrations of the rugged physical training that goes into the making of a paratrooper and noted the stress on mental alertness which permeates all phases of training. We were shown how, in the 82d's basic airborne course, the swinging harness was used to simulate the oscillating of a parachute as it comes to the ground; troops executed landing falls from a 4-foot platform; the 34-foot tower from which the trooper actually leaps into the air, riding a cable to the ground some 150 yards distant was utilized; wind machines blew the troopers along the ground in the process of teaching them how to collapse a parachute in high winds.

The light aviation and helicopter elements of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps Artillery and the 8th Helicopter Battalion showed us their versatility in equipment drops, wire laying, and message pickups. The "Whirly-Birds" demonstrated their specialty of troop movement and evacuation, as well as the hauling of supplies.

We saw the Army's giant atomic weapon, the 280-millimeter gun. We were also impressed with the 155-millimeter gun, the 8-inch howitzer, and the 240-millimeter howitzer.

Saturday morning, April 23, at exactly 9:00 a. m. more than 1,000 troopers from the 504th Airborne Infantry Regiment and the 456th Airborne Artillery Battalion parachuted into simulated combat before our gathering. Fifteen tons of heavy equipment—jeeps, three-fourth-ton vehicles, artillery pieces, and resupplies—were dropped within moments of the initial assault landing.

Later on in the day, 504th Airborne Infantrymen teamed with troopers of the 44th Tank Battalion and the 456th Airborne Field Artillery Battalion to demonstrate the shock power of the coordinated infantry-artillery-tank team. Their regimental exhibits were excellently presented.

The 2-day visit was climaxed with a review of the entire 82d Airborne Division and elements of the XVIII (18th) Airborne Corps Artillery, a thrilling sight which graphically depicted the power, might and mobility of the United States Army.

I was greatly impressed with the physical demonstrations which I witnessed. The Army is doing a magnificent training job at Fort Bragg. The demonstrations we witnessed were awe-inspiring in their sheer tactical impact.

Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, gave our group a short narration on the mission of the infantryman. I cannot remember ever having previously heard a more lucid or succinct explanation of the role of the fighting soldier. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD Captain Hamblin's talk titled "The 82d Trooper—Epitome of Fighting Men." I recommend that you not only read it, but that you retain it for future use. It will properly orient you on the individual soldier's role in warfare.

THE 82D TROOPER EPITOME OF FIGHTING MEN

(Narrated by Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, at Field House on April 22, 1955)

The mission of the 82d Airborne Division is destruction of the enemy on the ground. The only effective way to completely destroy the enemy and his will to fight is to seize and hold his real estate. And the only way to completely accomplish this mission is by the use of the ground combat soldier—the infantryman. The advancement in arms and machines has exceeded man's wildest expectations. The modes and methods of warfare, for all services, have been greatly changed by these advancements. With each successive development of these arms and machines, man has had to adapt himself in order to survive. That we, as a race, do survive, is proof that it is man, not the machine, that constitutes the force for final success. For ultimate victory it is the individual soldier, with his skill, his courage, and his mental strength that we must look.

The infantryman's mission is threefold: First, to carry the fight to the enemy on the ground. Second, to close with the enemy and destroy him. Third, to hold what he has seized and force the enemy to his knees. This is the infantryman's task.

Basically, an infantryman is a soldier trained, equipped, and organized to fight on the ground. He is a dismounted, close-in fighter. His advances are characterized by relentless pushing, elbowing, and clawing inch by inch, yard by yard, mile by mile. He hangs on to his gains with bulldog tenacity. On the battlefield he moves in small, hard-to-see formations, taking advantage of routes which provide concealment—at times only enough for a single man.

No war has been won until the infantryman imposes his will on the enemy infantryman. No land is conquered until the man on foot plants his muddy GI boot on the enemy's homeland and holds it.

The sole purpose of all the marvelous machines of war, regardless of whether they travel on the water, in the air, or on the ground, is to enable the infantryman to come to grips with the enemy and to support him in this effort.

The men who fly over him, the tankers that thunder by his side, the sailors who buck the seven seas, the men who build bridges in the face of enemy fire, the artilleryman firing

his missions, these and his many other comrades-in-arms sweat only in support of the infantryman fulfilling his mission. Every weapon, from the awful awe-inspiring new ones to the blackjack and trench knife, is conceived in his behalf so that, with the guts and skill that are his, he can carry the fight to the enemy, destroy him, seize the ground, and hold it.

It is an irrevocable fact that our most precious commodity is the individual trooper. We—you and I—are derelict in our duty if we do not do all within our power to insure that he is the ultimate fighting man.

Here, this evening, our displays stress the many activities and functions needed to satisfy the requirements—mental, physical, and psychological—of the fighting infantryman. All that you will see this evening—the equipment for training, the supplies, the supporting elements—all have as their sole reason for existence, the development of the individual soldier into the fighting soldier.

PROPOSED TREATY WITH AUSTRIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking this time is to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the provisions of article 16 of the proposed treaty between the allies and Austria and to give hope that the Secretary of State will direct the American conferees that under no circumstances will another blot be placed upon the escutcheon of this Nation in returning to Soviet Russia refugees or persons who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. The massacre after the war of thousands of such persons, when the United States agreed to such a return, was a disgrace from which we have never recovered.

I feel certain that with this attention directed to the language of article 16 as it now exists, before such treaty can be agreed to, the wording will be such that this horror can no longer be perpetrated and that security can be assured to these people who have escaped and sacrificed many things, endangering their lives once to come to freedom and seek the aid of the United States of America and her western allies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his sound and able remarks. It would violate the time-honored policy and principles of our country. Furthermore, it would seem to be inconsistent with the great principle we fought for when we insisted that none of the North Koreans or those who served with the Chinese Reds would be compelled to go back against their will. It would be most unfortunate, expressing myself mildly, to those thousands of persons who escaped from Communist-controlled countries if they were compelled against their will to go back to basic imprisonment and possible death.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5089) to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes," enacted October 20, 1951 (Public Law 187, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 5 years after October 20, 1951, or within 5 years after the date of the veterans' discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after October 20, 1951; except that in the case of any veteran whose loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision, as specified in section 1, shall have occurred subsequent to his discharge or release from active service, application may be made within 3 years after the occurrence of such disability. Notwithstanding the foregoing time limits, no otherwise eligible veteran shall be denied the benefits of this act who makes application within 1 year from the date on which his entitlement to compensation for loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision, as specified in section 1, shall have been determined."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of said act is hereby renumbered 7 and said act is further amended by inserting immediately following section 5 the following:

"SEC. 6. Any person in the active service who has a condition as specified in section 1 which was due to disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service during one of the periods specified in section 1, and who has remained in the active service since sustaining such disability, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act subject to the other applicable provisions, except that application under this section must be made within 1 year after the effective date of this amendment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3092) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I intend to object, I think the attention of the House should be called to the fact that a similar bill was vetoed last year. It still has opposition from the Department of Justice. It would seem that a bill that has gone through that procedure certainly should not pass the House on the Consent Calendar. So, I do object.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. It is not the identical bill that was vetoed by the President. Since the veto the Court of Claims has entertained a number of these claims by these prison workers, and the Committee on the Judiciary thought, in view of the fact that the Court of Claims had so acted, that in order not to have an imbalance whereby some claims would be recognized and others not, the jurisdiction should be conferred on the Court of Claims to hear and determine all these cases.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to criticize the Committee on the Judiciary. It may be a very meritorious bill. The only question, Mr. Speaker, is whether a bill that has had that history should be considered on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF AUGUST 18, 1941

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill as to what this does to section 5 of the Flood Control Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1954, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT BONNEVILLE, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3879) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1954, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg., is hereby amended by striking out the amount "$50,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "$185,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL PROVISION OF SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3123) to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the last paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs" in title I of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), is hereby repealed, effective July 1, 1955. This act shall not affect recoupments made prior to July 1, 1955.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "Effective on July 1, 1955, the recoupment requirements of the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), shall become inapplicable to the unrecouped balances of funds expended pursuant to such acts.

"SEC. 2. In order to permit the granting of privileges to the public school board at Walker, Minn., that are consistent with those granted other public school boards pursuant to the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), is hereby amended by striking out the following: 'Provided, That in consideration of the amount heretofore appropriated and the amount which may be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, all Indian children residing in such district shall be admitted to the schools of the district without further cost to the United States for instructional, operation, and maintenance purposes.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211) with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459) relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT OF 1955

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4753) to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this bill before I approve it; I object.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS TO AND WITHIN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 948) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1956, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO SALT RIVER AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DISTRICT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the State of Arizona and to the town of Tempe, Ariz., so much of the right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to the following described property, formerly constituting a part of the Papago Saguaro National Monument in Arizona, which was transferred in part to such State and in part to such town pursuant to the act of April 7, 1930 (46 Stat. 142), as supplemented by the act of July 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 646), on the condition that it be used for park, recreation, public convenience, or municipal purposes, as may be necessary to enable such State and town to convey to the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, a political subdivision of such State, such property as a site for an office building (including facilities and improvements related thereto) to be used by such district:

All that portion of the north half of section 9, township 1 north, range 4 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, bounded on the north by the south right-of-way line of Van Buren Street, on the east by the right-of-way of the State of Arizona at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Van Buren Street, on the south by the north right-of-way line of Washington Boulevard and on the west by a line parallel to and fifty feet east of a line described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the center line of East Washington Boulevard from which point the north and south midsection line of said section 9 bears south 81 degrees 52 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 554.5 feet; thence north 21 degrees 37 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 1,116.12 feet to a point; thence on a curve to the right, having a radius of 655.73 feet, a distance of 198.57 feet, as measured along the arc of said curve, to a point; thence north 38 degrees 58 minutes east a distance of 96.74 feet to a point; thence on a curve to the left having a radius of 221.5 feet a distance of 153.51 feet, as measured along the arc of said curve, to a point; thence north 00 degrees 44 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 210.2 feet to a point on the center line of East Van Buren Street from which the point of intersection of said center line of East Van Buren Street and the north-south midsection line of said section 9 bears north 33 degrees 51 minutes west a distance of 160.98 feet.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROTECT SCENIC VALUES ALONG OAK CREEK CANYON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2679) to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 75; 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, 482n and the following), is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act are extended to the following-described lands within the Coconino National Forest, Coconino and Yavapai Counties, Ariz.:

"Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and the southwest quarter of section 25, township 18 north, range 4 east;

"Sections 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and the east half of the east half of section 29, township 18 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32, township 18 north, range 6 east;

"Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 17 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and all of section 8 except the southeast quarter, township 17 north, range 6 east;

"Sections 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, and 24, township 16 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 16 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River Base and meridian: *Provided, however*, That as applied to any lands described in this section, the word 'hereinafter' in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and the words 'date of the enactment of this act' in section 3, shall be deemed to relate to the date of the enactment of this section 4."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3948) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, S. 1094, and substitute it for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "existing on the date of enactment of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3948) was laid on the table.

FURNISHING SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS TO EMPLOYEES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4936) to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 5, 1928, employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged on floating-plant operations may be furnished subsistence and/or quarters on vessels without charge whenever messing and/or quartering are determined to be equitable to the employees and to be necessary in the public interest in connection with such operations. Any such subsistence and quarters shall be furnished in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note the presence on the floor of the author of the report, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I have one question I should like to address to the gentleman. In his opinion does this in any way make possible favoritism to be shown by the Postmaster General in the new authority which it gives to him?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, answering that inquiry, it does not. That question came up in the hearing of the subcommittee and we checked into it. We found that existing law requires advertising for competitive bids in matters of this kind. Inasmuch as it is already in the law, we decided there was no point in putting a provision in this bill merely to confirm an existing provision of law. We did refer to it in the committee report, on page 2, in the paragraph which is headed "Statement." The last sentence in that paragraph reads as follows:

Such purchases will be subject to existing requirements of law governing official and penal bonds (title 6, U. S. C.) and to the standard requirement of advertising for public purchases (41 U. S. C., sec. 5).

Mr. Speaker, I understand, however, that there is a member of another committee who wanted to ask that this bill go over without prejudice this morning in order that his committee might make some study of the entire question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very appreciative of the explanation just given by the gentleman. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this matter go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4817) relating to the payment of money orders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 4 of the act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107), as amended and codified in section 730 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) That part of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 416), as amended and codified in section 731 of title 39, United States Code.

(c) Section 12 of the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1229), as codified in section 725k of title 31, United States Code.

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883, as amended and codified in section 718 of title 39, United States Code.

SEC. 2. No money order heretofore or hereafter issued shall be paid after 6 years from the last day of the month of original issue. Claims for unpaid money orders shall be forever barred unless received by the Post Office Department within such 6-year period. Any excess of funds accrued because of money orders remaining unpaid may be transferred to postal revenues at such times and in such amounts as the Postmaster General shall determine. The records of the Post Office Department shall serve as the basis for adjudicating claims for payment of money orders after 1 year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of this act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month beginning after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "6-year" and insert in lieu thereof "20-year."

Page 2, beginning with line 15, strike out "after 1 year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF AN INEQUITY IN THE PAY OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4659) to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat.

632; 39 U. S. C. 876c), is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a sentence to read as follows: "On and after June 30, 1952, postmasters, officers, and employees covered by this act may be paid the compensation prescribed for their grade and position."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed or interpreted to reduce the pay of any employee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1952" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING PERMANENT THE INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY TO FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3486) to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over for the moment, and that we pass to the next calendar number and take up S. 37, which is similar to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 878), is amended by deleting the following: "*And provided further*, That the increases provided herein shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on July 30, 1955."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill (H. R. 3486) was laid on the table.

ELIMINATION OF OATHS ON INSPECTION DOCUMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4646) to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirements as to certifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4421 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 399), is amended to read as follows:

"4421. When the inspection of a steam vessel is completed and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating approves the vessel and her equipment throughout, he shall make and subscribe a certificate to that effect. He shall deliver such certificate to the master or owner of the vessel to which it relates, shall keep one copy thereof on file in his office, and shall deliver one copy to the official who is performing the duties of the collector or other chief officer of the customs of the district in which such inspection has been made, who shall keep the same on file in his office. If the Secretary refuses to grant a certificate of approval, he shall make a statement in writing and sign the same, giving the reasons for his disapproval. Upon such inspection and approval the Secretary shall also make and subscribe a temporary certificate, which shall set forth substantially the fact of such inspection and approval, and shall deliver the same to the master or owner of the vessel and shall keep a copy thereof on file in his office. The said temporary certificate shall be carried and exposed by vessels in the same manner as is provided in section 4423 for the regular certificate, and the form thereof and the period during which it is to be in force shall be as prescribed under the authority of section 4405. And such temporary certificate, during such period and prior to the delivery to the master or owner of the regular certificate, shall take the place of and be a substitute for the regular certificate of inspection, as required by this section and by section 4426, and for the purposes of said sections. Such temporary certificate shall also be subject to revocation in the manner and under the conditions provided in section 4453. No vessel required to be inspected under the provisions of this title shall be navigated without having on board an unexpired regular certificate of such inspection or such temporary certificate: *Provided, however*, That any such vessel operated upon a regularly established line from a port of the United States to a port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States whose certificate of inspection expires at sea or while said vessel is in a foreign port or a port of Hawaii may lawfully complete her voyage without the regular certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section, and no liability for penalties imposed by this title for want of such certificate shall be incurred until her voyage shall have been completed: *Provided*, That said voyage shall be so completed within 30 days after the expiration of said certificate or temporary certificate: *Provided further*, That no such vessel whose certificate of inspection shall expire within 15 days of the date of her sailing shall proceed upon her voyage to such port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States without first having procured a new certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BETWEEN ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 208) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the development and protection from pollution of the water resources of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment among them of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries flowing between such States, and for matters incident thereto, upon the condition that one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sufficient sum to pay the salaries and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States while so employed, shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, before the word "Congress" insert "President of the United States and the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS MAY BE DEFINED OUT OF EXISTENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions Congress has passed laws setting out our national policy on the Government's business dealings with small firms. Public Law 413, 80th Congress, 2d session, which sets out the methods by which the military departments may award defense contracts and purchase supplies and services, declares that small business shall be awarded a fair proportion of such contracts and purchases. This is the act which authorizes the military departments to negotiate contracts in about any way they please, rather than awarding contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids. Similarly, the Administrative Services Act of 1949 sets out the methods by which the General Services Administration and the other executive agencies may purchase goods and services and by which they may dispose of excess or surplus Government property. This law likewise declares that small business shall receive a fair proportion of the purchases of goods and services and that it shall be given fair consideration in the disposal of Government properties.

Finally, the Small Business Act of 1953 repeats these declarations of policy, and

it goes further: It declares that small business shall be aided, counseled, and assisted to certain ends, and it places upon the Small Business Administration the responsibility for seeing that small business receives fair treatment from the executive agencies, in their procurement, disposal, and other activities.

TINY LENDING PROGRAM OF SBA

This policy as to business dealings between the executive agencies and private firms refers to no small matters. The way in which these dealings are carried out can have, and are having, terrific impacts upon the competitive structure of American business. The Department of Defense alone is spending between $15 and $20 billion a year with business firms. Government disposal of excess and surplus property frequently runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars a year. There is a tiny lending program carried on by the SBA for the purpose of aiding small business in obtaining financing. In addition, there may be other Government activities which directly affect competitive relationships, such as the granting of tax-amortization certificates, the allocation of production materials released from the GSA inventories and the stockpile, and many others.

Obviously the question whether the policies toward small business and toward preserving the competitive enterprise system are carried out hinges upon the question whether there is a definition of small business, and more particularly whether there is an intelligent definition of small business which is reasonably designed to accomplish the objectives which are intended by these laws. These laws do not define small business except in an extremely general way. On the contrary, the Small Business Act of 1953 places squarely upon the Small Business Administration the responsibility for making a definition of small business within each industry, so that the policies of Congress can be carried out. Today Mr. Wendell Barnes, the head of the Small Business Administration, announced that he is now about to carry out this responsibility and issue a definition of small business. This definition, if and when it is issued, will then determine how the policies declared in the laws affecting the military departments and the other executive agencies will be carried out. This is a step which should have been taken at least a year and a half ago. The definition which Mr. Barnes makes, if it is a sound one, will go a long way toward stopping the trend to monopoly which is being caused by the way in which the executive agencies are favoring big business. It is to be hoped therefore, that Mr. Barnes' definition will be a good definition and not one which merely defines small business out of existence; and it is to be hoped that this definition will be forthcoming promptly.

Insofar as the small business lending program is concerned, SBA is already using a definition of small business which agreed at least in principle with the definition in the Small Business Act. I cannot at the moment appraise this definition in all its particulars. It may be too restrictive in certain respects. For example, the SBA will not make a loan to a business firm having more than a thousand employees, no matter how small a firm may be in its particular industry. As we know, in some industries a firm with a thousand employees is indeed a very small firm, both from the standpoint of its competitive strength and the access which it has to private capital. It was in recognition of the great differences from one industry to another, in the number of employees which a small firm may have, that the Small Business Act sets out the general definition of small business as one which is independently owned and not dominant in its field of operation. Moreover, the House Report accompanying the Small Business Act of 1953 described how the Small Business Administration was to make its determination of small business as follows:

> The determination must take into consideration the general size structure within the industry or commercial group to which the particular concern belongs. For instance, a given volume of sales or number of employees for a concern considered small business in one industrial group, if applied to a concern in another industrial group might well place that concern in the big business category of its particular group. It would be impractical to include in the act a detailed definition of small business because of the variation between business groups. It is for this reason that the act authorizes the administration to determine within any industry the concerns which are to be designated small-business concerns for the purposes of the act.

In contrast to this clear requirement of the law, most of the executive agencies, including the Department of Defense, are using a definition of 500 employees or less as small business, irrespective of line of business or the industry involved. It is for the purpose of correcting this matter that Mr. Barnes now announces that he has appointed a task force, made up of representatives of the various executive agencies, to work out a definition which accords with the law. I hope that this task force will act promptly and come up with a definition which will force the executive agencies to conduct their procurement and disposal activities in ways which are reasonable and equitable to all classes of business, and not in ways which favor just big business.

BOUQUETS TO GSA AND AEC

Now, I would like to pass out some bouquets. I have been told that in the past I have sometimes been too critical of the executive agencies for their failures to carry out congressional policy toward small business. In the past when some of the executive agencies have taken half measures toward carrying out these policies, or have announced some pretentious step which would really accomplish nothing, I have on occasion been critical of these half measures. And recently I have been told that my criticisms are sometimes too severe, that I should compliment the heads of the executive agencies and thank them for taking steps that are at least in the right direction, although these steps may not go far enough.

Today, therefore, I want to pass out some compliments, not for half measures, but for some genuine progress and accomplishments. I want to compliment and congratulate particularly Mr. Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of the General Services Administration, for the prompt and intelligent manner in which he has put procedures into effect to carry out the GSA's obligations to help maintain the competitive-enterprise system. In carrying on the GSA procurement programs, Mr. Mansure did not wait for SBA to prescribe a definition of small business. He did not, like the Department of Defense and most of the other executive agencies, allow his procurement programs to go along willy-nilly while waiting for a definition from the Small Business Administration.

Recognizing that a given number of employees which might be defined as small business in one industry would make a nonsensical definition in another industry, Mr. Mansure adopted a formula which depends upon a firm's size within its industry. Furthermore, Mr. Mansure has simplified his buying standards and has had established 12 procurement stations over the country, so that small-business firms wishing to deal with the GSA may deal simply and at places not too far distant. In other words, a small-business man wishing to sell to the General Services Administration does not have to get bogged down in a lot of unintelligible papers and forms and then make a trip all the way across the country to see the procurement officer in order to find out how he can do business with the Government.

The statistical reports showing the results of GSA's new program are not out yet, and we cannot yet say how much of this agency's procurement business has been placed with small firms in each industry, nor how the results compare with the proportion of civilian business that small firms normally account for in each industry; but I feel sure the results will show up well. Mr. Mansure has told us that in the first half of the fiscal year 1955 the results show that, in total, 62½ percent of the value of all GSA's business went to small firms.

The GSA negotiates only about 22 percent of the purchases made through its general supply fund, which purchases are for the other executive agencies. In contrast, more than 85 percent of the purchases made by the Department of Defense directly are awarded on a negotiated basis. This contrast, I think, tends to confirm the judgment of Congress in passing the Federal Property and General Services Administration Act of 1949. One of the primary purposes of this act was to centralize in the GSA the procurement of civilian-type items which had previously been procured directly by the military departments and other executive agencies.

Now, I should congratulate also the Atomic Energy Commission for its small-business program. Mr. George C. Taylor, Assistant Director for Supplies of the AEC, has given the Small Business Committee a most promising account of the small-business program they have in progress at the AEC. The AEC has likewise gone ahead and adopted a sound

method of defining small business without waiting for the Small Business Administration to prescribe a definition. The AEC's definition also takes account of a firm's size within its industry, and the AEC makes an active effort to see that a fair share of its procurement business is placed with small firms. The AEC's prime contracts are mostly very large contracts and they are substantially all placed with big firms. But the AEC has set up a staff of about 10 people who are devoted to the effort of making their big prime contractors place subcontracts with small businesses. Mr. Taylor has told us that about half—49.5 percent—of the subcontract work awarded by the AEC's prime contractors is placed with small business.

MILITARY SMALL-BUSINESS PROGRAMS

I wish that I could also congratulate the Department of Defense on its treatment of small business. While the amount of contracts placed by the General Services Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission are important, they are only a drop in the bucket compared to the military department's spending. And while the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Services Administration, and the other executive agencies spend a few billions of dollars, the Department of Defense spends many billions of dollars. The Department has, however, certain small-business programs.

For example, the Department has a great number of people which it calls small-business specialists. These small-business specialists try to advise and counsel small-business men who come into the Department trying to find out how they can participate in the military's procurement programs. They also help to explain the Department's red tape and help the small-business man in making up his bids and in preparing his contract when he succeeds in getting a piece of defense business. In this way the small-business specialists take the place, to an extent, of private agents who would normally negotiate with the military departments on behalf of small business. As we know, small-business firms normally transact business in civilian markets through a variety of sales agents, brokers, factors, and business specialists of one kind or another who do this kind of work for a percentage fee. It appears to take a great deal of specialized talent to do business with the military departments, and the small-business man does not have the time, even if he had the ability, to act as his own salesman, his own lawyer, and his own engineer, in negotiating for a defense contract. But, as we know, the law prohibits small-business men from employing agents on a fee basis to negotiate defense contracts for them. The Armed Services Procurement Act forbids the military departments from entering into any contract which has been negotiated and involves a contractor's paying a fee to anybody else. The big corporations have, of course, all kinds of specialists on their permanent payrolls to negotiate contracts with the military departments. The law does not apply to agents who are on the payroll of a corporation. More than 85 percent of the value of all defense contracts are negotiated.

The Department of Defense is also carrying on a joint operation with the Small Business Administration which is known as the joint-determination program. The Small Business Administration has a representative in a number of military procurement offices, and these small-business representatives are given an opportunity to look at certain of the proposed contracts and to recommend which of these contracts are suitable for small business. If the military accepts the SBA's recommendation, the contracts are then reserved for competition among small firms.

The Small Business Administration does not have a representative in all of the important procurement offices, and even where it does have a representative, the representative does not have a chance to see all of the proposed contracts. The Department of Defense's regulation on this subject requires that the small-business representative be given an opportunity to see only those contracts which are not of an emergency nature and those which are not of a classified nature. Contracts which are classified as "confidential," or which carry some more secretive classification, are usually for research or development work. Through these contracts the Government pays business firms for trying to work out improved production techniques or improved products. The Department hands out more than a billion dollars a year for such purposes, and the distribution of this money is, of course, extremely important in determining which firms will have the long-run competitive advantages.

The defense contracts which are called emergency are those which are awarded by negotiation rather than by advertised competitive bids. Substantially all of the military's contracts are awarded in this way. Some of the military procurement offices have, however, gone beyond the Department of Defense's regulation on this subject and are more generous in their treatment of the SBA representatives than the regulation requires. Some of these offices, particularly in the Navy, are allowing the SBA representative to see proposed contracts which will be negotiated, and a few of the offices even allow the SBA representative to make recommendations on the placement of research and development contracts.

THE MILITARY FAVORS BIG BUSINESS

In spite of all this effort however, the Department of Defense uses a definition of small business which limits the SBA representatives' recommendations to firms with 500 or less employees, irrespective of all other considerations. The illogical result of such a definition has been illustrated for the benefit of the Small Business Committee by my colleague, Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington. Mr. PELLY pointed out the case of a small firm out on the west coast which is mostly a jobbing firm but which operates a small soap plant. The soap plant is really a converted malt plant which went out of operation because of the dry laws. All told, this firm employs 700 employees, and for that reason the Department of Defense treats it as a big business along with the big international soap companies, such as Lever Bros., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, the Procter & Gamble, each of which has well over 10,000 employees and each of which has assets running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Examples of this kind can be multiplied in industry after industry. For instance, the Newport Steel Corp., which is located down in Kentucky, produces only a fraction of 1 percent of the steel sold in the United States. Compared with 20 or 30 of its bigger competitors, it is infinitely small, yet it has more than 4,000 employees.

Reo Motors and the White Motor Co. produce, I am told, very fine motortrucks. They produce only a small fraction of the trucks General Motors produces. Yet they have about 4,000 and 8,000 employees, respectively. In the field of rubber tires, we find that all of the manufacturers with up to 2,500 employees produce only 7 percent of the tires. Similarly, in rubber footwear all of the manufacturers with up to 1,000 employees produce only 12 percent of the total output. All of the manufacturers of steam engines and turbines with up to 2,500 employees account for only 11 percent of the production.

On the whole, when the executive agencies aim at placing a fair proportion of Government purchases with small business, their sights are much too low. But no matter what number of employees might be chosen as a standard of small business, no single standard can be successfully applied to all segments of business and to all industries. There are, for example, several industries in which every firm has less than 500 employees. Mr. Barnes has stated that the SBA staff has pointed out about 20 such industries. We find for example, that a very large percentage of all of the vinegar and cider, the natural cheese, the gum naval stores, the woodworking machinery, the paints and varnishes, and others, are made by firms having fewer than 500 employees.

It is not enough that the Department of Defense award a large volume of contracts among small firms in, say the garment-making and food-processing fields, while it allows the small auto and truck companies to be squeezed out. Yet the joint determination program which the Department is carrying on with the SBA has largely this effect: It reserves for competition among small firms those types of purchases which would go to small firms anyway, and it allows the Department to negotiate and place the big contracts with the top corporations in their fields.

If we are really serious about having the Government distribute its purchases among firms in such a way as to avoid further distortions of the competitive structure of business, it is not enough that we be concerned merely with the small firms in certain industries. Steps must be taken to see that Government business is distributed proportionately among the medium-sized firms, the small-medium firms, and the small firms as well, as at present, the tiny firms.

I hope that the Department of Defense will cooperate in this new concern evidenced by Mr. Barnes, and that it will

take steps to see that its huge spending programs are distributed fairly among all-size classes of business.

THE BILL DIGEST

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration, of which I have had the honor of being a member since I first became a Member of Congress, has many important functions.

Among the functions of the Committee on House Administration are those in connection with the Library of Congress and among the very important services rendered to Members of Congress by the Congressional Library are those performed by the Legislative Reference Service. The Legislative Reference Service has been of great assistance to all Members of Congress by the research they have done on legislative matters and which, in turn, has been of great service to the entire Nation. I want to sincerely commend and thank Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director, and his associates in the Legislative Reference Service for the fine job they have been and are doing.

Recently the Committee on House Administration approved a survey of the present usefulness of the Bill Digest and ways for its improvement. Most of us received a communication in our office last Friday, April 29, with which was enclosed a 2-page questionnaire relating to the Digest of Public General Bills, and I sincerely hope each Member of the House will take the time to answer this survey fully and completely.

It has been brought emphatically to my attention recently by several of our colleagues, the importance of this Digest in our everyday legislative responsibilities and as a great assistance in the answering of inquiries from constituents.

I am sure that my own experience has not been unique. In fact, I am persuaded that my own experiences have been repeated almost daily by practically every Member of the House.

A number of constituents who have the same interests and problems are informed through their friends or organizations to which they belong that certain legislation affecting them personally has been proposed to the Congress and they are urged to immediately write their Congressman and express their point of view. Other constituents request specific information on the proposed legislation. They want to know sometimes why was the legislation proposed—what are its provisions—what is its status—and when will it be considered, along with a lot of other questions. Such inquiries are entirely right and proper. Such inquiries also encourage each of us to keep well informed so that we can make proper replies rather than just a form type reply.

Often times the office staff of the Member must use an unreasonable amount of time and a number of telephone calls to secure the information on which the Member can base his reply. This occurs because the Bill Digest published by the Legislative Reference Service, in spite of all the helpful information it contains, is nevertheless from 30 to 60 days behind current dates.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 29, Members received issue No. 3, of the Digest of Public General Bills for the first session of the 84th Congress. This Digest included information on legislation introduced in the 84th Congress for the period of January through March. A quick look at this issue of the Digest which is cumulative will show that 6,050 legislative proposals of all kinds were introduced in the House and 1,782 were introduced in the Senate for a total of 8,832 legislative proposals. This is all very fine and helpful, Mr. Speaker, except for the fact that when we received this Digest it is still 30 days behind being current.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that although issue No. 3 of the Digest includes only those measures proposed up to April 1, it was nevertheless not until approximately April 15, that it was sent to the Government Printing Office for printing.

Naturally it takes some time for the GPO to print and bind this material together and, hence, we did not receive it until April 29.

I am also told, Mr. Speaker, that during the month of April a considerable number of important legislative measures were proposed. All of us will be receiving inquiries on these proposals and our only way of obtaining the necessary information on which to base our replies will be to do a lot of telephoning and thus disturb a considerable number of busy people.

It is, therefore, my earnest hope that a considerable improvement in the publishing of the Bill Digest will result from the current survey. It is my hope that those who prepare the copy for this Digest will complete their work each day so that it can be prepared promptly for printing. This preparatory work should all be completed within not more than 2 days from the close of the period. If the GPO is given the copy each day as this preparatory work is done they also will be enabled to reduce the time required for printing and binding. This could easily reduce the publishing time to a week or 10 days instead of the 30 days as now required. Careful consideration should also be given, Mr. Speaker, to publishing this Digest of Bills at least each 2 weeks during the session. This would result, Mr. Speaker, in considerable time saving, increased efficiency, and would be in the public interest.

No doubt there are some proper economies which could be installed and which would also be in the public interest.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on House Administration, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office will collaborate fully in making this study so that proper improvements will result. It is also my very sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that each Member of the House will give this matter his serious prompt consideration and will return the completed questionnaire immediately.

Each of us, Mr. Speaker, is dedicated to rendering the best possible service to our constituents and to the Nation. Proper improvements in the Bill Digest and more up-to-date information will help each of us achieve this goal.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANOTHER LARGE CARRIER OF THE "FORRESTAL" CLASS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been requested to approve the construction of another large carrier of the *Forrestal* class. As in previous years, this has aroused controversy. There are those who feel that the expenditure cannot be justified. But there are many others who believe that a well-rounded defense requires the additional carrier. I am an advocate of the large carriers and I believe the need for the one now proposed is fully justified. The basic questions involved may be translated in this manner:

A. Will United States carrier forces be necessary in the 1960's?

B. Should we start construction of a carrier in 1956?

The purpose of the United States Navy is to fulfill its part in providing for the security of the United States and to support our national policy throughout the world. The primary means by which the Navy does this is by gaining and maintaining command of the seas, to use the seas for our own purpose and that of our allies, and in time of war, to deny these seas to an enemy.

If we command the seas we can—

First. Project our military power overseas and sustain it there.

Second. Support our allies.

Third. Maintain our own economy and industrial base.

Fourth. Insure that much of devastation and ravages of war is in enemy territory and not in our own.

In order to maintain our control of the seas we must have the ability to defeat any threat to that control. These threats are:

Enemy air: The Soviets will contest the control of the sea by use of their air power. In order to defeat this threat we must have a strong air arm which moves with and is an integral part of naval forces. This is the carrier task force, the heart and backbone of modern naval forces and the principal offensive power of a navy.

Enemy submarines: Our carrier forces play a vital part in elimination of this threat by providing defense of convoys, conducting hunter-killer operations, and destroying the submarines at their bases.

Enemy surface: These forces are present and are growing. The Soviets are building destroyers and cruisers in considerable numbers. They are weapons which must be destroyed, and this will involve the effort of carrier air and our own submarines.

Carrier task forces are the principal mobile offensive power of a navy. They are employed against any forces which threaten our supply lines, and are used to provide direct support of amphibious operations and for defense of our forces after landing. In many cases they are the only air cover available—Inchon-Tachens. They also can be employed on collateral duties—Korea. They are not in competition with SAC. The might of carrier air power is directed at enemy forces and bases rather than the industrial heart of an enemy, which is SAC's job.

In the foreseeable situation it is most important that the retaliatory striking power of the United States be preserved from enemy attack, this means dispersion, defense, and deception. The carrier task force has great potentiality in these aspects and should be exploited to the maximum.

We hear suggestions that future wars will be decided quickly by thermonuclear weapons and no naval power, land power, and air power as we know them will be required. There are many reasons why naval power will be essential in the future.

First. Let us concede that there will be a nuclear exchange. What happens after this is over? Tough people can and will carry on, and fight with what they have left. Also, unless an enemy gained sea control he could not invade our land and take control of our Government. Naval power remains an elemental consideration in the follow-through phase of all-out nuclear war.

Second. We know we will need naval power in event there is a war in which there is no initial nuclear exchange between continents. Possibilities of a long war are evident. We are building at highest priority the means of deterring nuclear attack. The carriers are an important part of this deterrent. Also we know we will not start a nuclear war. Further the Soviets have embarked on an extensive naval building program. The conclusion is inescapable that we must maintain the ability to control the seas in future wars of any type.

The question may now be asked whether the aircraft carrier will continue, through the 1960's, to be the backbone of naval power.

We can foresee no substitute for the versatility of the small piloted aircraft as a general purpose weapon for attacking the great variety of fixed and moving, airborne, seaborne, and ground targets within the naval missions. The carrier airplane and pilot can attain the precision required and can make prompt evaluation and decision in a fast moving situation.

The carrier is the one naval vessel usable alternately or simultaneously against submarines and their bases, surface ships and their yards, aircraft and their airfields, and for support of amphibious, land and air operations as well. The carrier is never without employment—the type of high utilization which spells high efficiency for any capital investment.

The question of vulnerability is sometimes raised. Carriers are not invulnerable; neither is anything else on the face of the earth to nuclear attacks. But the carrier's defenses will be as good if not better than anything existing. And if a weapon hits, we have a dispersion not always possible ashore, such that no more than one major ship will be seriously damaged. Further, moving ships are not suitable targets for ballistic missles.

In addition to the primary naval missions for which carriers are required, there is another important function which they play. This is the carrier contribution to deterring an all-out nuclear war, and the part played by the carriers in the nuclear-retaliation phase should this war take place. This highly mobile striking force is powerful and difficult to locate. They cannot be eliminated by surprise attack.

NEED FOR ORDERLY REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

All the carriers now in commission were designed prior to and during World War II for the operation of propeller-type aircraft. With the advent and rapid introduction of jet aircraft, and their high rate of fuel consumption, the carriers had to be modernized to accommodate the large, heavier, and faster aircraft with their higher takeoff and landing speeds. Such a program has been underway for several years. However, the limit for substantial improvement of these carriers by modernization has been reached. Accordingly the Navy designed a new type carrier, the *Forrestal*, which has the following aeronautical features:

First. Angled deck for greater safety and consequent economy;

Second. Increased catapult capacity;

Third. Increased arresting gear capacity;

Fourth. Large elevators; and

Fifth. Higher hangar deck overheads.

This new carirer does not represent an abrupt changeover in the concept of carrier aviation but rather is a logical and orderly step in the development of a proven weapon in the overall program to keep our forces superior to those of prospective enemies.

The construction of major naval vessels poses a requirement for anticipating the future to an extent not comparable with other types of weapons. The reason is that it takes almost 4 years to build such a ship, and thereafter we must expect this investment to yield a first-line combat usefulness for at least 10 years and other roles for 10 more. Unless we are willing, in the case of ships, to look 15 years ahead, and make decisions as to our requirements over that period, we will virtually have to forego maintaining a Navy. It is obvious we should have a program which anticipates future needs and provides for them on a pay-as-you-go basis. Unless we continue to build at an average rate of not less than one carrier each year, incorporating the latest changes available, we will not have an adequate carrier force in the 1960's, and we will rapidly fall below the force level requirements for carriers approved by the JCS, the NSC, and the President.

Lacking adequate naval striking power we will lose control of the seas and will be throwing away a valuable weapon which we alone possess. The preservation of modern seapower is essential to the survival of the United States and fulfillment of the role it is destined to play in world affairs.

WE SHOULD AMEND THE CAPPER-VOLSTEAD ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have introduced in each Congress a bill to correct an antiquated provision of present law regarding the prosecution of certain monopolistic practices. At this session, the number of my bill is H. R. 141. It is now before the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is designated as "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith."

I bring this bill to the attention of the House at this time, Mr. Speaker, because the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws has recently submitted a lengthy report in which it voices conclusions with regard to the inadequacy of the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 which are very similar in thought to those that first impelled me to suggest the amendment that is now before the Judiciary Committee.

In 1922, when the Capper-Volstead Act was adopted, cooperative associations were small and unassuming; their competitive position in the economy was hardly conducive to price-fixing or monopolistic practices. Congress gave them what amounted at the time to a rather unnecessary immunity from prosecution as monopolies, thereby demonstrating the same evident desire to help the farmer that it had in 1913 when it gave farmer cooperatives exemption from payment of the then 2-percent Federal income tax on earnings.

There was no way of knowing, thirty-odd years ago, that the little cooperatives of that day would expand on their tax-free earnings to the multi-million-dollar tax-dodgers that they have become, or that they would achieve monopolistic size and arrogance, as many of them have.

And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the designation of the Secretary of Agriculture as the complainant against any cooperative that might be accused of attempting to become a monopoly seemed a normal procedure to Senator Capper and Representative Volstead. The little co-ops of 1932 were, in effect, the wards of the Department of Agriculture and if they were naughty and needed to be spanked it may have seemed proper that a friendly hand should lead them to the woodshed. But like all young people who have been pampered too much, many of the co-ops have grown into overbearing and insolent adults, because unfortunately the policy of all 9 of the Secretaries of Agriculture since 1922 has been to "spare the rod and spoil the child."

The Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws states that—

The failure of the Secretaries of Agriculture over 2 decades to institute a single proceeding against an agricultural cooperative at least suggests that enforcement responsibility be put elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, that was exactly my thought when I first introduced a bill to substitute the Attorney General for the Secretary of Agriculture as the proper Government official to deal with cooperatives that got too big for their britches—in other words, co-ops that had picked up the notion that because they were favored taxwise they could also get away with violation of our antimonopoly laws.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, it might be informative to look for a moment at the 1948 case of the United States against the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association—one of the very few attempts that has been made to punish a cooperative that appeared to have monopolistic intentions. That case fell apart when the attorney for the cooperative pointed out to the court that under the Capper-Volstead Act "elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative" and " the very end and purpose of a cooperative."

I understand that further action is now being instituted by the Department of Justice against this same milk cooperative, and that a Federal grand jury in Boston has returned an indictment against two cranberry cooperatives. In each case, it is alleged that the cooperative conspired with outsiders to restrain interstate trade, to monopolize business, to fix prices and to drive competing concerns out of the market—all of which is in violation of section 1 of the Capper-Volstead Act though apparently not of section 2 of that act.

Inasmuch as the Attorney General now appears to be looking with some concern at the monopolistic tendency among cooperatives, it undoubtedly would be well to give him the authority that is suggested by the Antitrust Committee and by H. R. 141, namely to supervise and police cooperatives when they try to engage in activities in restraint of trade for the purpose of controlling market prices.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when these overgrown, arrogant, economic giants, known as cooperatives, must be treated as economic giants and not treated as if they were still weak, puny children that need coddling and pampering because they are unable to stand upon their own feet and make their own way in a competitive world. Let us be realistic in this matter. Let us treat these economic giants in the same way we treat all other economic giants, let us give the Attorney General the authority and the police powers over cooperative corporations that he now has over all other corporations. Mr. Speaker, we should pass H. R. 141 and do it without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. FLOOD).

Mrs. KEE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) and include a speech.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas.

Mr. SHELLEY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. AVERY and include a statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT and to include correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture in respect to flexible and rigid price supports.

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include an address by Majority Leader MCCORMACK.

Mr. BARRETT.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

744. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of aliens. This letter is supplemental to one dated April 12, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

745. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the 19th Semiannual Report, covering the period July-December 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

746. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952, and 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo or Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, requesting the case of Fu-Juan Fang, A-6271451, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

749. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, requesting the case of Carlos Aravantinos, A-1431996, involving suspension of deportation be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, relative to a proposed disposition of approximately 7,818,272 ounces of totaquine now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

751. A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, relative to a proposed disposition of approximately 60,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant

to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 208. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 245. A bill to amend the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322); with amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 603. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 625. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5166. A bill relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5860. A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; with amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 899. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5936. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1956, and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before July 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 5937. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the period during which wage credits are provided under title II of the Social Security Act for military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the time for filing noncorporate income-tax returns shall be May 15 in lieu of April 15, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5939. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5940. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5941. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5942. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5943. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5944. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5945. A bill to establish the Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5946. A bill to further extend the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories; to facilitate the procurement of physicians and dentists for the Armed Forces by establishing scholarships; to provide for the continuation of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 5947. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by prohibiting the acquisition of assets of other banks by banks, banking associations, or trust companies when the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the issuance of a commemorative 10-cent piece to commemorate the discovery, by Dr. Jonas Salk, of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and to honor the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for its sponsorship of the March of Dimes campaign which provided funds to make such discovery possible; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 226. Resolution ordering the printing of 1,000 additional copies of Study of Newsprint Expansion: Part II, Newsprint Production From Hardwoods; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the construction and improvement of highways necessary for civil-defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the legislative research committee of the State of North Dakota to make a study of the laws of the State of North Dakota relating to mill storage practices, and to recommend improvements in such laws and the enforcement thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5949. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall issue posthumously in the name of Robert F. Tomaszewski a commission as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5951. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5952. A bill for the relief of Adel Khalil Raffoul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 5953. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Ethel Hoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

223. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha, Wis., Taxpayers Inc., that the Congress of the United States work for the preservation of national solvency and desist in attempts to extend Federal control into local schoolrooms under the guise of aid for school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

224. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Transport Workers Union, CIO Local 260, Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

225. Also, petition of the president, Holy Name Society of Church of St. Francis of Assisi, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. Also, petition of the grand knight, Woodhaven Council No. 1866, Knights of Columbus, Woodhaven, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. Also, petition of the grand knight, Bishop McDonnell Council No. 2324, Knights of Columbus, Babylon, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

228. Also, petition of the grand knight, St. Kilian's Council, No. 2204, Knights of Columbus, Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. Also, petition of the grand knight, Patchogue Council No. 725, Knights of Columbus, Patchogue, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Moundsville, W. Va., April 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a forceful, factual and memorable address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner held on the evening of April 30, 1955 in Moundsville, West Virginia, under the auspices of the Marshall County Democratic executive committee.

In a dramatic and challenging presentation of the administration's many failures to practice what it preaches and to perform what it promises, Mr. McCORMACK documented for a spellbound audience, each broken campaign pledge and disavowed promise made to the American people since the Republican administration took office.

With merciless logic, Mr. McCORMACK turned the spotlight of fair and objective criticism upon the administration's lack of direction and uncertainties in foreign affairs; upon its dangerous tampering with the national security through the reductions it has ordered in our armed strength; and upon its cynical catering to the wishes of its big corporation supporters and their high-powered public relations representatives at the expense of the American worker and the average American taxpayer.

His audience loved every word of it and the press has given widespread coverage to the majority leader's speech. It should, I believe, become recommended reading for all members of this Republican administration. They would do well to take heed of this great American's just indictment of their mismanagement of the Nation's affairs. They might also do well to borrow a page from his sterling record of unstinting, unselfish, unbiased, and devoted service to his country:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the clergy, my valued friends and colleagues in Congress, Senator MATTHEW NEELY, Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN, and Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, distinguished and invited guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with more than one-half of the present administration over, we now have an opportunity of appraising it objectively, whether or not it has kept its promises, of evaluating its policies, as well as the kind of government the present Republican administration has given to our country and our people.

In connection with the conduct of the Government, we must always bear in mind that the first domestic duty of our Government—as so eloquently stated in the preamble of the Constitution—is to establish justice.

This means that the powers of government are dedicated and should be utilized to bring about justice to our people.

With the depressed economic conditions of West Virginia, with the large number of unemployed in your State, do you think the present Republican administration is performing the constitutional mandate of our fathers and bringing justice to the people of West Virginia?

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relations representatives of the big corporations of the country who are operating in Washington for the Republican Party in an effort to sell President Eisenhower and the Republican Party to the people, in the same manner as they sell coffee, cigarettes, or some other commodity, the people are commencing to catch up with the broken promises of the present administration, of its control and domination by big business, and of its failures.

The record of the Republican administration, for which President Eisenhower is responsible, is such that I predict with confidence the election in 1956 of a Democratic President—of a Democratic Congress—and convincing Democratic victories in the several States and political subdivisions of the Nation. For there are millions of Americans who voted for the Republican candidate for President in 1952 who now wish they had Harry S. Truman, or some other Democrat in the White House.

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relations representatives of the big corporations to pressure the American people by organized propaganda, that President Eisenhower occupies a lofty, elevated position, immune from criticism of any kind or of unfavorable comment; and thereby to attempt to create in America a political vacuum—the people are awakening and are properly holding President Eisenhower, as the leader of his party and as Chief Executive, responsible for the policies of the present administration—and properly so, because President Eisenhower is responsible—and should be held responsible by the people.

As the President claims credit for any good policy, so is he responsible for any unwise and harmful policy.

In the last campaign in a speech in Boston, Vice President NIXON, whose political shifts are well known, said, "a political party is to be judged by the promises it keeps."

I agree with that statement, Mr. Vice President, but I go one important step forward—that a political party is also to be judged by the promises it does not keep.

And the Republican record of broken promises—for which President Eisenhower must accept full responsibility—is one that is subject to justifiable severe criticism.

Let me refresh your memory and call the roll of some of the broken promises.

1. To balance the budget.
2. To reduce the national debt.
3. The great crusade.
4. Instant and massive retaliation.
5. The new military look.
6. The liberation of enslaved peoples.
7. Cooperative peace.
8. Peaceful coexistence.
9. Peace through trade.
10. Agonizing reappraisal.
11. Trade, not aid.
12. To unleash Chiang Kai-shek.
13. To meet the problems of distressed labor areas.
14. To assure equitable distribution of Government contracts to small and independent businesses.

And there are many others.

On the question of lack of coordination—and of confusion and irresponsibility on a high level—all any one has to do is read the newspapers of the past few days.

It is only a few days ago that the Under Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr., after a telephone talk with the President—issued a statement that our Government would not negotiate with the Chinese Reds unless four conditions were met—one of which is the release of American prisoners—and another that Chiang Kai-shek's government would have to participate in any negotiations.

A few days later, Secretary Dulles indicated our willingness to negotiate without Chiang Kai-shek or his representatives being present.

These two statements clearly indicate that they are inconsistent with each other.

Prepared by the Republicans was a complete compilation of our military strength, directly in violation of the position and wishes of President Eisenhower and Secretary Wilson. It is the most complete compilation that I have ever seen. While not so intended, it is a most valuable document for any potential enemy of ours to possess, such as the Soviet Union or Red China.

If this document had emanated from Democratic sources, the Democrats would be accused of everything under the sun.

And yet, while it violates the position of Charles Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, and also of General Motors fame, as well as other fame—as Charles Wilson, the Republican, he undertook to defend the publication, which he knew, or ought to know, was not for the best interests of our country.

It was so bad that even the President, at his press conference a few days ago, termed this compilation as a blunder.

Is this evidence of coordinated and responsible leadership? It clearly shows lack of coordination, which leads to irresponsibility.

And that has been the situation that has existed quite generally throughout the past 2½ years.

These two happenings of current nature clearly show the lack of leadership of the Republican Party in Washington.

You will remember that last year we were told that the Navarre plan to save Indochina from the Chinese Reds was foolproof, and that it could not fail. In other words, that the Communists could not win in Indochina. We know, to our sorrow, the results.

We know that a good part of Indochina is now lost to the Communists; that Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are threatened; in fact, all of southeast Asia.

In the national interests of our country, we cannot afford to see all of southeast Asia dominated by the Communists, for this could result in our own Far Eastern defenses being outflanked.

In other words, one statement one day, and the opposite the next day or the next month.

It is no wonder that the people are commencing to catch up with such inconsistent and irresponsible leadership.

It is not difficult to understand why the people last fall again turned to the Democratic Party in Congress, and in many States of the Union, for leadership.

Is it any wonder that the people are going to turn to the Democratic Party again for complete leadership in 1956 by the election of a Democratic President, and the reelection of a Democratic Congress.

In dealing with the gang of international brigands in the Kremlin and in Peiping we must realize that we are dealing with Communist leaders who are possessed of the minds of world killers. They are dedicated to world revolution and world domination.

Until they renounce such objectives, despite their soft talk from time to time, they are determined to conquer and enslave the world.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear; and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

We cannot negotiate or deal with them on a moral plane, for they have no spiritual values. They not only deny God, but they are fighting Him by attempting to conquer and enslave peoples throughout the world who believe in Him and His law. They know that as long as there is any place in the world free from Communist domination, where people believe in God, His law, and His word, that the Communist ideology will be constantly threatened. They are the prisoners of an ideology that, in order to succeed, forces and compels them to attempt to conquer and dominate the entire world.

We cannot negotiate with them on any idealistic level, for they have no ideals. But, there is one level on which we can deal with them, and that is on the basis of the law of self-preservation.

For even the Communists cannot deny the existence of the law of self-preservation, that it applies to them and their country—just the same as it applies to all others and their countries.

And it is only through military strength, which they respect through fear; that negotiations on this level can be conducted with them.

It is only military strength which they fear, that can deter them, because of the fear of the consequences to themselves.

And yet, despite the opposition of General Ridgway, we are sharply reducing our Army, with reductions in our Navy and our Marine Corps.

In the world of today it is better that we have too much military strength, and not need it, than to have too little, and need it.

When one talks as I do the stock-form answer one receives is that President Eisenhower is a great military leader, and that he knows better than anyone else what military strength we should have.

Respecting as I do his military knowledge and experience, my judgment tells me that it is dangerous to rest the safety and security of our Nation on the judgment of one man, for he is human, and it is human to err.

Suppose the President guesses wrong?

Let me remind you that he guessed wrong in 1953, when he ordered the Truman air program of 143 air wing groups reduced to 120 air wing groups.

We Democrats opposed it. We were ridiculed, despite the fact that the late General Vandenberg, Chief of the United States Air Force, took the same position, for putting our judgment against that of President Eisenhower.

And yet, one year later, in 1954, President Eisenhower recognized that he had erred; and changed his mind, and recommended appropriations for 137 air wing groups. He could not be right both years.

He erred only 2 years ago on the strength of our Air Force. He could be wrong now in the reductions he has ordered in other military components. And if he is wrong, and a conflict comes, the consequences could be dreadful to all of our people.

In Washington, we know that at least three of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a majority of the National Security Council have recommended against the reductions of our Armed Forces. So we have plenty of competent military leaders, who have led armies in time of war, differing from the President.

In any event, to the Communists this is evidence of weakness and not of strength.

And remember—there is only one thing they heed and that is military strength and its relationship to the laws of self-preservation.

If they are afraid of us they will not attack.

If they are not some day they will.

The lack of direction and the uncertainty of the Republican administration in the field of foreign affairs is most noticeable. A reader of the newspaper can detect that fact.

Is there any one of you who can tell me what the foreign policy of our country is? We started out with (1) "The Great Crusade," (2) liberating of enslaved peoples, (3) agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy, (4) massive and instant retaliation, (5) threatening utterances. And in less than 2 years we ended up with (A) peace through trade, and (B) peaceful coexistence.

In other words, we have gone from one extreme to the other.

But in this crisis the country was fortunate that last year it elected a Democratic Congress. For in the field of foreign affairs the Democratic Party is united. The Republican Party is badly split with bitterness existing in their ranks.

And frequently in recent months it has been the Democratic Party in Congress, under the leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and of Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—both Democrats, speaking with logic, wisdom, and experience—who have saved our country from serious embarrassment.

When the Republican administration does not know what to do and is manifesting uncertainty bordering at times on confusion—when the Republican administration appears to listen to the voices of both the appeasers and those who would hurl the world into another world conflict—it has been the logic, the judgment, and the voice of these two legislator-statesmen speaking out with firmness and strength in the national interest of our country that has led the way.

The leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress, as a minority party during the past 2 years, and in this Congress as the majority party, has been one of supporting and fighting for all measures, both in the field of foreign and domestic affairs, that are in the best interests of our people.

Might I say that our people need have no fear of the united Democratic Party cooperating in the field of foreign affairs in a real, effective, bipartisan manner. The problem of President Eisenhower on bipartisanship is not with the Democratic Party—it is with his own Republican Party in Congress.

In this respect the President's problem is to try and establish bipartisanship between himself and the conflicting and fighting factions of his own party.

In his efforts to harmonize the differences within his own party, the President has had to frequently compromise his views—based on political considerations involving the different factions of his own party.

The Nation is witnessing the inability of the President to get the support of his own party in Congress. In the field of foreign affairs this could result in great harm to our country.

For the record indisputedly shows that President Eisenhower does not command the support and allegiance of at least one-half of the Republican Members of Congress.

Another matter of concern to the people of the country is the big-business control of our Government, as well as the giveaways of the resources of the people by this administration to certain vested interests.

As we view the Dixon-Yates contract; as we view the change in the wise public power policy of the past 20 years; as we view the intense concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, through giving to some corporations far more than their share of defense contracts, through an inequitable tax bill of last year, through lax enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is well that the people of America might feel gravely concerned about what the present Republican administration has done and is doing.

Outside of the few beneficial pieces of legislation, such as increased social-security coverage, and which was saved by the Democrats because they were extensions of Democratic measures, every action done by the present administration has been to give preference to big business and the big bankers.

Under this administration the situation of the small and independent businessmen, who are the backbone of our economic strength, has weakened tremendously. Very little consideration has been given to protective and strengthening this important segment of our national economy. When the present administration terminated the RFC, which had done a lot of good for small and independent businesses, it established in its place the Small Business Administration. But the Republican Congress put limitations into the law which makes it difficult for any real benefits to flow to this important element of American business.

In the extending of this law, which expires in a few months, the Democratic Congress will strengthen it so that real service will be rendered to our small and independent businesses.

One thing is also certain, that so far as the Democratic Congress is concerned, the passage of legislation for the benefit of big business and big bankers will not take place, and under a Democratic Congress there will be no more legislative giveaways.

So that despite the efforts of the press to cover up, the people are commencing to realize that the present administration is not representative of the people, but essentially is representative of big business.

In 1954 the people returned in part, through the election of a Democratic Congress, our Government to the people.

In order to stop further damage which is taking place through Republican administrative action, not by legislation, the people will have to complete the job in 1956 and return the Government to the people. For a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress means a people's Government.

On the cold record of this administration, of its broken promises, of its failures, of its domination by big business for the benefit of big business, of its inability to be a party of responsibility, all of which comes under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the people of the country are again turning to the Democratic Party for that leadership in which the Republican Party has failed.

There is no question but what the Democratic Party would win if we had had a Presidential election in 1954.

There is no question but what the party of stability and responsibility is the Democratic Party. With the bitterness existing among the Republicans in Congress, it is most fortunate for our country that the Democratic Party is in control of the Congress. With the constructive record of the Democratic Party—dedicated to the national interests of our country, and the inability of the Republican Party in Congress to assume responsibility, I confidently predict that the people in their wisdom and in their sound judgment will again turn to the Democratic Party in 1956 for leadership in both the White House and in the Congress.

In conclusion, I want to pay my special tribute to the delegation from West Virginia in the Congress, both in the national House of Representatives, and in the Senate of the United States. The delegation from West Virginia in both branches is one of the ablest and strongest, the most respected delegation of any of the States of the Union. West Virginia has sent to Congress a solid delegation of Democrats. Each and every one of them is truly a people's representative. The people of West Virginia and of the different congressional districts are justified in feeling proud of the members of their districts in both branches of the Congress.

I am particularly proud to see my good friend, Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, here tonight. I deeply respect him. He is one of the most courageous Members of our national legislative body.

I am particularly pleased to come here at the invitation of Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN. In his second term in the National House of Representatives, Congressman MOLLOHAN has already made an outstanding record for himself. He is a member of the important Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services. Both Speaker RAYBURN and I have profound respect for him. Like Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY and the other Members of the House and Senate from West Virginia, Congressman MOLLOHAN enjoys the confidence of the Speaker and myself.

As you well remember, our "Mr. Democrat," who is Speaker RAYBURN, of the national House of Representatives, addressed you last year. I know that you will always remember his visit to your midst. When I told him I was coming to Moundsville to address a Jefferson-Jackson Day rally he asked me to particularly convey to you his highest regards and fond recollections of his visit here last year.

Causes, Effect, and Preventive Treatment Methods of Dust Storms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, dust storms in the Great Plains recently attracted national attention and prompted Secretary of Agriculture Benson to tour the area for first-hand information. The Secretary and our United States Congress have recognized the gravity of wind erosion to farmers and to other industries of the Great Plains. I should like to point out that there are great hopes for controlling this damage in the future.

Eight years ago the Federal Government, working with the Kansas agricultural experiment station, starting studying this problem scientifically. At that time, Austin W. Zingg, engineer, and W. S. Chepil, a soil scientist, were brought to the Kansas station to seek scientific answers to the problems of dust storms. Zingg was given larger responsibilities with the soil and water branch of the Agricultural Research Service. Dr. Chepil has remained in Kansas on a cooperative basis between the United States Department of Agricultural and the State experiment station. (Incidentally, the United States Department of Agriculture, I am convinced, is wise in using existing State experiment stations. We get a lot more mileage from the tax dollars by using these existing facilities. Dr. Chepil and his coworkers, stationed in Kansas, have had the cooperation of land-grant colleges in Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and California in their studies. Using these great land-grant institutions speeded the work and saved money.)

Research is slow and tedious, so we could not expect the scientists to have the dust storm problems solved by now. However, they have made remarkable progress in their research and already can make some definite recommendations on how to reduce dust storms.

In the 8 years, the researchers have found scientific proof that farmers can apply in the Great Plains to reduce dust storms:

First. Vegetation and/or vegetative cover are the best protection against soil erosion from wind.

Second. Strip-cropping will reduce erosion by trapping soil near its origin.

Third. There are different tillage practices suitable for different soils to roughen the surface, to bring up clods, and to maintain stubble, straw, or other residue on the soil.

Soil particles most easily blown are about the size of fine sand, sugar, poppy seed, or salt. That is one-tenth of a millimeter in diameter. Tests in a wind tunnel at Kansas State College and in a portable wind tunnel taken into fields have shown that these particles are bounced along the surface of the ground and start the soil eroding. These bouncing particles also start the dust to lifting in the air. Tillage and crop practices that do not get the soil in a loose, finely granulated condition keep the land from blowing.

The scientists have found that dryland sands require at least 4 tons per acre of wheat stubble to "tie it down" during strong winds. The sands—as opposed to sandy soil—normally will not produce that much wheat stubble, so the sands should be "tied down" with permanent vegetation, Dr. Chepil said.

Sandy soils require from 1 to 2 tons per acre for almost complete protection from the high plains winds. Nearly always this amount of wheat or sorghum stubble and straw can be produced.

From one-half to 1 ton per acre of stubble will almost always protect hard lands from soil erosion during high winds.

The USDA researchers, working with their wind tunnels, derived a formula that indicates how to reduce the erodibility of a field to an insignificant amount. With the formula the scientists, studying three major factors, can predict quite accurately what is needed to prevent erosion. For example, if land has no vegetative cover, its surface must have 60 percent or more clods to resist wind erosion. If the land had 1,000 pounds of wheat stubble and straw—about the amount from a 6-bushel crop—it would resist strong winds with only 30 percent to 40 percent of its surface composed of clods.

Likewise, roughening the soil's surface with ridges will prevent wind erosion. Lister ridges 10 inches high will prevent soil erosion by wind, even if the surface of the soil has only 20 percent to 30 percent clods with virtually no vegetative cover. In practice this means that almose any soil that is not pure sand can be "tied down" against the wind. Exploratory tests with V-blade cultivators have been highly successful in the dry soils of the high plains area. The V-blade works beneath the surface, undercutting and killing weeds, but it leaves the stubble standing to protect the surface from winds.

A recent discovery by the USDA scientists at K-State is that a farmer can make his soil more erodible to wind by pulling his "chisel" either too fast or too slow. N. P. Woodruff and Dr. Chepil recently found in tests that speeds 1 and 2 on a caterpillar are too slow and that speed 5 is too fast. Soil "chiseled" in speeds 3 or 4 resisted the wind considerably better.

I should like to emphasize that all this scientific information has come from the work of only a few scientists. At present two are on the wind project at Kansas State College. The cost of obtaining this information is now less than $25,000 a year.

Kansas' share of the emergency funds recently allotted this year to alleviate dust and drought conditions is 85 times that amount—$25,000 compared with $2,125,000.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the Government could wisely invest more in research and education aimed at per-

manently controlling the dust, stabilizing great plains economy, and reducing the frequency of such emergencies.

More research is needed to determine the effects different tillage implements have on different soils and under different moisture conditions. Information on this subject is fragmentary and inadequate.

Whether deep plowing is beneficial or not needs to be determined scientifically.

More information is needed on the influence of type, quantity, and position of crop residue.

Virtually no information is available on the relative effectiveness of standing stubble compared with stubble that has been knocked down by tillage.

An expanded research program is needed dealing with climatic factors. We need to know more about wind velocity and direction, temperatures, and rainfall. They are the principal factors that influence erosion. Many of the presently unsolved mysteries of winds, temperatures, and rainfall as they apply to farming conditions in the Great Plains and elsewhere can be solved in research laboratories and fields.

The Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, of Ohio's 11th District, has called my attention to a series of timely articles on world events written by Robert C. Dix, publisher of the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier, and his wife, Helen, who have just returned from an extensive tour of Europe and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, has been ill for the past several weeks. I am happy to report that he is now feeling much better and it is expected, by his physicians, that he will soon be back with us again carrying his full share of our important responsibilities in his usual able and conscientious manner. His illness was caused and precipitated by the complete and full way in which he dedicated himself to the service of his congressional district and our entire Nation. We will all be glad to welcome him back and wish for him a lifetime of good health and opportunity for service. In the meantime, I consider it a privilege to join with Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON and in his behalf to point out the following to the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, these stories, exceptionally well written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dix, out of their own personal and keen observations furnish us, as Members of Congress, extremely helpful information in our quest for knowledge about the threat of communism. They prove all over again, Mr. Speaker, that it may well be much later than we think and that it behooves all of us to leave no stone unturned to protect the rich heritages, the freedoms, and the rights of all our American citizenship that have been gained for us by the clear thinking, hard work, dedicated service, patriotism, and even the supreme sacrifice of life itself by our forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, have written many stories for their newspaper as a result of their extensive tour of Europe and Russia. Each of these stories is well worth reading. I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, in requesting unanimous consent that the attached three stories by Publisher Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, be printed herein for the information of the Members and also as illustrative of their keen observations of these important situations.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 7, 1955]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNHAPPY LAND UNDER TIGHT COMMUNIST RULE

(By Robert C. Dix)

PRAGUE, March 29.—I am writing this article in the seclusion of my room here at Hotel Alcron and I shall not mail it until I am outside the Iron Curtain area. As it unfolds, you will see why.

This is an unhappy land. Everybody eats here. Everybody works. But the standard is low in this one-time high standard country and hope of better things, a little economic independence perhaps, has all but faded away.

People can listen to Voice of America and Radio Free Europe in spite of the rather complete jamming. And the police don't object if you do listen, but they do object if you talk about it or in any way pass on the information. But many have quit listening anyway. It's like passing in front of a candy store every day with no money in your pockets. Finally you come to the deadening realization that the candy is not for you. Then you quit looking. Finally you go to the other side of the street. Maybe some day you'll even forget that it's there.

Political control is complete. If you're young and coming up in the world, it doesn't take long to learn that getting ahead means playing the game. And if you really want to get ahead, it means getting into or close association with the party somehow.

But membership in an area already taken over is low and exclusive. If you have any kind of a record—like if your parents were bourgeoisie—it's almost impossible.

Leaving the country now is exceedingly difficult. Some do. Some die trying. Others are just sitting it out, making the best of it and trying to get along. On them the heavy propaganda is, if it isn't penetrating, at least anesthetizing in its effect.

Travel is, of course, restricted to Czechoslovakia. A person can't travel even between the satellites. He must remain within his own "concentration camp," as one person described it to me.

Some day, perhaps, everybody will be sufficiently conditioned to be trusted.

What effect the latest turn to heavy industry will have on this little satellite, no one knows. At present consumer goods are fairly plentiful, by Iron Curtain standards, but nowhere close to the standards that this once highly developed area knew. Prices are high. But since there is no incentive to save anything, people spend what little they have.

Book stores, carrying their propaganda message, stand out in the downtown shopping district. There were at least 6 or 8 within a 4-block area.

The people converse in Czech. They all know German. A large percentage understands and speak English. But it may not be many years until Russian is the second language here. It is a "must" in the schools. And it is a language that a person will have to learn if he wants to get anywhere in this particular sphere under present conditions.

All trade that amounts to anything is with the East. Skoda at present is making a large number of powerplants, big and little, for Red China. Grains are coming back in return.

All of America's 48 States are making their contributions to our fine foreign service. I met a person, Albert Sherer, here with a Wooster, Ohio, background.

He came to the foreign service from the Air Force after the war and has specialized in the satellite countries. All of these career men know the language of the area in which they are to serve before they go there.

Rather descriptive of the situation here was the way in which we held a conference with our ambassador at the embassy. We all entered the spacious living room. Aides closed the doors and stood guard in front of them. And then, just before we began to talk, another aide turned on a sound jamming machine that would negate the effectiveness of any listening device that might be planted there.

All of the native employees at the embassy come from a central source. And they all are approved by the Communist government before they are permitted to work there.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of March 30, 1955]

ALONG THE WAY

(By Helen Dix)

ATHENS. — Gracious Queen Fredericka winked at my husband, and like any tactful woman, probably though "how I love that man for changing the subject." The subject was "Cyprus" a red-hot but embarrassing question here in Athens and one which this editor's tour, having been, as they say, "brain-washed," wished it could forget.

All this happened during the most exciting moments of my life or, as other members of the party agreed, the most exciting moments of the trip so far. Those moments stretched to more than 1 hour and 15 minutes while we were being received by their royal majesties "King Paul and Queen Fredericka, rulers of the Hellenes."

The wink, now famous especially in the Dix family, was a result of Bob's quick thinking in changing the subject from Cyprus when one editor blundered into the subject in a conversation with the queen. Her wink betrayed her gratefulness to my gallant husband for saving her from the Cyprus situation.

What does a mousy little midwestern housewife do when she goes "to visit the queen"? First she has misgivings about her clothes * * * but assured that street attire is correct she dons her best "party-go-to-PTA-meeting gown," makes sure gloves are white and spotless, takes a couple of doubtful extra glances in the mirror, then because her husband screams she is late, rushes from her hotel room convinced this whole trip is a mistake.

With the 28 other tour members (seven women) the housewife walks past the gaily dressed guard at the palace gate for about 200 feet. Here is the palace entrance, unassuming door, tiny vestibule where we deposit our coats and cameras. Up one flight of blue carpeted circular stairs, across a formal marble hall to an anteroom, also carpeted with royal blue and furnished in lovely beige Americanish furniture.

The little tinkling chimes of a clock had not completed their twelfth stroke when the

"master of ceremonies" beckoned to the Queen's lady-in-waiting, the King's naval attaché, United States Ambassador and Mrs. Cannon, then our group to follow. Across the white marble hall, up the broad blue carpeted stairs to the first landing. There we were literally overcome by the most heavenly fragrance I ever expect to smell * * * the hall is apparently kept perfumed and we seven women couldn't sniff enough.

At the door of the royal apartment stood Ambassador Cannon, who shook our hand then eased us to the Queen. We had been instructed to shake hands with their Majesties (don't curtsey, you might fall) then state your name, hometown, and State, verly clearly. I took a deep gulp of air as I took the Queen's hand and my name came out beautifully but with the King I didn't get the deep gulp of air and it just squeaked out. (The Illinois editor's wife in front of me later confessed that nothing came out of her mouth to the King * * * the saliva just stuck, she wailed.)

From then on it was a lark, many uniformed waiters served a delicious little beverage and trays and trays of heavenly tidbits, the King and Queen moved with ease from group to group and within seconds we were all old friends, laughing, chatting and loving their Majesties.

The Queen is all charm, beauty and brains. She is thinner than pictures in the United States showed her, due no doubt to the two severe ear operations she has undergone this winter. Both were successful.

Her stories, her humor, her timing * * * all were excellent. She has a most eager and exciting catch to her voice as she tells of "kidding" the doctors about her "thick skull" during her ear operations, or telling of the wonderful work done by Boy Scouts during the war or talking of her three children or of America.

Both she and the King hope to bring their children to America for a summer vacation tour soon.

What did the Queen wear? Her dress was a simple green jersey with a small black leather cord detail at the neck held by gold buckles at each side. She wore black alligator pumps. Around her neck was a single strand of large pearls which held a large diamond-studded pendant and an uncut ruby. She wore 4 bracelets, 2 gold and jade on the right arm, 2 gold and diamond, matching her necklace on the left. She wore 5 rings, 2 matching her necklace. Her hair cut informally is black and brushed into a short mass of curls.

The King, a handsome man (tall enough to come from Texas, one Texan in the party told him) wore a uniform with five rows of decorations and a large gold cross hung midway on his coat. He talked of sports and good times in America and sorrowfully of communism.

When after more than an hour and 15 minutes elapsed the King and Queen walked down the stairs with us to pose for pictures and when the photographer motioned us closer the Queen chuckled, "Shall we sing for you, too?"

As we filed past to shake hands again in goodby Their Majesties repeated time and again, "Do come back to see us," and we, like next-door neighbors, begged them to come to America to see us all, too.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 11, 1955]

RUSSIAN PEOPLE LIKE AMERICANS—KREMLIN HAS TIGHT GRIP

(By Robert C. Dix)

STOCKHOLM.—It's a relief to leave Russia. And that's nothing against the Russian people. Individually, so far as the ones we met are concerned, they're just ordinary human beings like you and me. Same hopes and same fears.

It's the system. And even that is difficult to put into words. Perhaps the best way to understand it is to use their own words.

Government, to them, is a thing, an institution, apart. At Leningrad on the way out we picked up a couple of American students who had had a better opportunity to talk to the average Russian than we had. Always the Russians expressed affection for the American people. Too bad, they would always say, that our Government is so warmongerish and so imperialistic.

They would always look bewildered and unbelieving when a person would try to explain that our Government was the people.

At Intourist one day, I was trying to explain to Mr. Rogov, the head of that department, that we would like to meet some Russian officialdom, that we would like to see something besides a works project, something human. We got onto the same subject. Too bad, he said, that our Government was delaying on an exchange of farm experts.

The American people wanted the exchange, he was sure. But the Government would never permit it.

I told him that if the American people wanted it, the exchange would take place. The Government is the servant of the people, I tried to explain.

But the thought didn't make a dent. Thirty-seven years of obedience and conditioning in a complete public opinion vacuum leave their mark. They have resulted in the evolution of a tremendous human force under the unchallenged authority of nine men in the Kremlin.

No other place does human history record so much power in the hands of so few.

Those were almost the exact words of our Ambassador, Mr. Bohlen, who briefed us himself on the country.

If you can imagine a group of nine men in the United States running everything here, including the United States Steel Co., the auto factories, all of the other great industries, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the newspapers and the radio, all Government functions and everything else, you might come close to some comprehension as to the power, the aloofness and the necessary ruthlessness of the government.

There is also nowhere a tighter security in the world than at the Kremlin. There are no leaks there.

Their Achilles heel so far is their agriculture. They have industrialized their country at the expense of the peasantry. They are trying now to get agriculture back on its feet. One of their biggest gambles is putting to the plow 66 million virgin acres of prairie land, which in size is as large as all of the arable land in France and Italy.

If their gamble works, look out.

Russia has a dictatorship without a dictator. The experts seem to think that a new one will, in time, emerge. Probably Khrushchev.

Something like this takes a lot of policing. That they have. One of the highlights of my visit in Moscow was meeting Joyce Marshall, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Leon Marshall. An old hand at being arrested, she was detained once for several hours. She told me she would show me what a member of the police force looks like. So we went for a walk in some of the little streets away from the wide boulevards. It wasn't long until our follower was visible to the disc[illegible]ning eye.

He stopped when we stopped, always about a half a block behind. She is often followed when she goes out. Most embassy people are. They get used to it.

But if a person is inclined to let things like that worry him, he ought not to accept an assignment in Moscow.

Whether or not any of our newsmen were followed, I don't know. We were mostly shepherded around in a group anyway. We probably were not.

One thing I kept looking for was some evidence of civil defense. War, if it ever comes, will obliterate a populace that has no civil defense program.

There may have been some. I didn't see it. But, of course, the Moscovites have their subway system. It's over 65 kilometers long and is as much as 200 feet below the surface at points.

Besides being a good transportation system and having civil defense possibilities, it's also sort of an art gallery.

Each of the 41 stations tell a story. At the Station of the Revolution, the entire struggle of the Russian people is told in pictures on the ceilings.

What are my conclusions to all this? Even the fuzziest of thinkers must have a few after an adventure of this type. They are:

1. On the possibility of change, nothing at the people's level. At the palace level, changes will continue until power gravitates to one person again.

2. The future? Well, the system holds close to a billion persons within its iron grip. Only Tito has successfully broken away. He did so because he had the strength to ward off an initial blow and because we stepped forward to provide him with needed assistance.

Other satellites do not have the strength or the will of a Tito. And all of the means of implementation of any such ideas are within the control of the faithful.

Unlike the absolute authorities of old, these modern ones don't ignore the people completely to the point that they will face guns with pitchforks. They try to mold the force, keeping it above subsistence level and then working constantly on its mentality, winning it over completely or deadening it to the inactive stage.

3. What about war? It's on now. It's at the propaganda stage. Very hot there. They will try hard to win it at that level. We must not only counter but try to win it there, too. There's also the economic phase. They would like to break us by developing all the world's resources and people. That we can't allow to happen either.

4. The length of the struggle? A long one.

Seventh Anniversary of Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel proclaimed its independence, and today, April 27, 1955, her people are celebrating this momentous event.

I am proud to count myself among the many American supporters and well-wishers of Israel who join on this occasion in felicitating its people upon attainment of another milestone in their thrilling history.

In an area no larger than the State of New Jersey, Israel's 1,600,000 inhabitants, surrounded by enemies on three sides and the sea on the fourth, have written in these 7 years an epic of indomitable courage and inspiring ingenuity that parallels the early struggles of our own Republic.

There, at the ancient crossroads of the Old World, men women, and children

who fled from tyranny, persecution and concentration camps, have made new headway in their mighty efforts to build a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

From the streams and mountains of Galilee, through the stony hills of Judea and the arid area of the Negev, to the fertile coastal plain these pioneer people have labored to wrest a living from soil which yields mainly citrus fruits, but nothing of mineral wealth or fuel.

It has been well said that Israel's greatest natural resource is its people. They have developed industry where none flourished before, utilizing the mechanical and inventive skills of craftsmen from all parts of Europe. Industry and crafts, indeed, have become the leading economic factor; agriculture second.

But the new nation's greatest need—its exports boycotted by its immediate neighbors—is for trade abroad to bring an inflow of dollars to buy raw materials for its own necessities and for processing and resale to others.

The progress Israel has made so far, be it remembered, has been achieved in the midst of an uneasy truce with the Arab nations which, after all these years, are still unreconciled to its existence.

It is to be fervently hoped that the United Nations, which is struggling with the issues, may yet find a solution that the contestants may ere long agree upon the proposal for harnessing the lifegiving waters of the Jordan.

Then Israel would not need to work with one hand and a gun in the other; peace would indeed settle upon the Holy Land; once more would milk and honey flow there, and the vision of a Promised Land, now spiritually and politically fulfilled, could become an economic fact.

This is my anniversary wish for Israel.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the occasion of the observance of Loyalty Day, a day set aside by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States to enable Americans everywhere to rededicate themselves to the fine ideals and spiritual values inherent and practiced in the greatest Nation in the world—the United States of America. Moreover, it is a day designed to offset the May Day rallies held under Communist auspices.

The address follows:

LOYALTY DAY, MAY 1, 1955

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD)

The Congress by joint resolution has designated May 1, 1955, as the date for the observance of Loyalty Day here in the United States. In so acting, Congress is giving recognition to a custom which has become prevalent in recent years throughout almost the entire Nation. Every year since 1950, the governors of 47 of the 48 States have officially designated May 1, or a day very near to it, as Loyalty Day.

Patriotic organizations from time to time have urged an even more wide-spread recognition of this day. In many places throughout the United States, May 1 has been chosen as the particular day for the celebration of Loyalty Day to offset the many May Day rallies held on May 1 under Communist auspices.

The real purpose of Loyalty Day, it seems to me, is to provide an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the American way of life, to reaffirm for all the world to see our devotion to the principles underlying that way of life, and to deepen our loyalty to the principles set forth in the American Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

Seldom if ever in the history of the United States has our way of life been as seriously threatened by an alien philosophy from beyond our shores. This alien philosophy, of course, is world communism. It is the sworn enemy of every principle which has undergirded our national life in all of our history. It is implacable, malevolent, and unrelenting in its determination to destroy us. The United States is at one and the same time the greatest objective in communism's program of world conquest and the greatest barrier in its path to domination of the world.

What are some of the qualities and principles which characterize the American way of life and the American Bill of Rights—qualities and principles to which I urge every citizen to rededicate himself this year on Loyalty Day?

Our American way of life rests on two fundamental principles which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions, and which clearly distinguish our system from all totalitarian systems, whether they be Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or any other.

The first of these principles is the importance of the individual, the foundation of all our other beliefs. It guarantees to each person the undisputed right to personal freedom and dignity, and to equality before the law. In the words of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable right, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These ringing words leave no doubt as to how the Founding Fathers felt about the worth and the dignity of the individual.

Since the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, the American people have been wise enough to realize that although under our system the worth and the dignity of the individual are fully recognized, certain rock-bottom rules must be established to give life and meaning to the concept of the individual's worth and dignity. Accordingly, in the Bill of Rights to our Constitution, and in other important documents as well, there are laid down certain basic rights to accomplish this purpose. These rights are the mainsprings of our American way of life. They can be summarized briefly in the following paragraphs.

Every person is free to worship according to the manner dictated by his conscience.

We enjoy freedom of speech and freedom of the press, including the right to criticize our Government and our public officials.

The right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, whether fancied or real, is guaranteed.

We have the right to keep and to bear arms, though this right is frequently limited by Federal, State, or local laws and regulations.

We are protected against unreasonable search and seizure of person and property by the Government without proper authority and good cause.

No person shall be held to answer for any major crime without review and indictment by a grand jury.

No person shall ever be placed in double jeopardy for the same crime.

No person shall be compelled to act as a witness against himself in any criminal case.

If a person is accused of crime, he has the right to a speedy trial; the right to the help of a lawyer; the right to trial by jury, impartially selected; and the right to call witnesses in his favor.

No wife may be required to testify against her husband, or vice versa, in any criminal proceeding.

Private property may not be taken for public use without just compensation and due process of law.

Excessive bail may not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Every person is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty.

The right of the individual to vote, and to vote secretly, cannot be abridged.

Every person has the right to the protection of habeas corpus, which gives anyone who claims to be unlawfully held by an officer or private person the right to have a hearing at once so that he may know the reason why he is being held. This means that the Government of the United States cannot either secretly or openly arrest persons as individuals or groups, throw them into prisons or concentration camps, hold them there indefinitely and do what it pleases to them.

Congress can pass no ex post facto law. This means that in our daily living and thinking we can enjoy the liberty of doing and saying all that the existing law permits. Even if at a later date our Government makes these things illegal, it cannot date back the law to make illegal anything that was done before the law was passed.

Treason against the United States consists only in levying war against our country, adhering to her enemies, or giving them aid and comfort. No person can be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or upon confession in open court. This precise definition in the Constitution prevents any possibility of the slightest criticism of the Government being branded as treason, as well as prohibiting secret trials and giving accused persons no opportunity to confront witnesses.

These then are the rights which we enjoy as citizens of the United States and which are part and parcel of our American way of life. It is altogether right and proper therefore, that we should review their significance in the observance of Loyalty Day. A discussion of our rights as individuals, however, of necessity must take into account our responsibilities to the group, and these responsibilities are the second fundamental principle which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions.

In a large society such as we have here in the United States, the interests of individuals are bound to clash from time to time. It is at this point that responsibility to the group enters the picture. The individual, while exercising his own freedoms, must not deprive others of their freedoms. Freedom does not imply unrestrained or irresponsible action. Group responsibility requires that no individual be permitted to bring harm to other people. Freedom of speech, for example, gives no one the right to shout "Fire" in a crowded theater or restaurant.

Group responsibility means giving full obedience to the laws under which the individual lives, since they were made by duly authorized representatives of the group. If a particular person dislikes a certain law, he can criticize it and make every effort to

change or repeal it by constitutional means. But while that law remains in force, no person can break it without expecting to incur whatever penalty is involved.

Group responsibility means that each man is responsible for his family and loved ones. He must provide for them and ensure their well-being. It means, furthermore, that the individual bears responsibilities to his community, his church, and other groups which work for the good of all. Lastly, but perhaps of paramount importance, group responsibility means the willingness of all of us to bear arms in the defense of our country.

These, then, are the rights and responsibilities which are the warp and woof of the American way of life. They are the bulwark which protects our way of life from such abuses and totalitarian excesses as are suffered by the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain by governments imposed upon them by force.

Loyalty Day presents a splendid opportunity for all American citizens once again to pledge themselves to the principles which have made our Nation the finest example of freedom, justice, and opportunity the world has yet seen. If we do pledge ourselves and continue to do so, we, as our Founding Fathers did in 1787, will also "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The Late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an address I delivered at Hargrave Military Academy, Chatham, Va., on April 23, 1955, at the unveiling of the portrait of the late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford.

Dr. Sanford was a devoted and consecrated churchman, an outstanding educator of great note who wielded a wide and wholesome influence in Virginia. For more than one-half century he was prominent in the work of the Baptist denomination and distinguished himself in the ministry. He was an alumnus of the University of Richmond, where his athletic prowess, his manly traits, and nobility of character are the source of legends and will ever be appreciated. Under his leadership Chatham Training School, at Chatham, Va., was established in September 1909. It later became and is now known as Hargrave Military Academy. It is a fine Baptist institution, and I was privileged to be a student there while Dr. Sanford was president. He enjoyed the high admiration, the confidence, and the esteem of all who knew him. I had for him the warmest personal affection.

Col. A. H. Camden succeeded Dr. Sanford as president of Hargrave Military Academy and served eminently in that capacity for approximately 40 years. He is now connected with Hargrave on an emeritus basis. Colonel Camden is an outstanding southside Virginia educator, a solid, substantial, and dependable citizen. Upon his retirement, Col. Joseph H. Cosby became president, and he is carrying on in the finest and highest traditions. I take this opportunity of publicly commending the services of these distinguished Virginians as well as those who are now and have been associated with them.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK DELIVERED AT HARGRAVE MILITARY ACADEMY AT THE UNVEILING AT THE PORTRAIT OF THE LATE DR. T. RYLAND SANFORD APRIL 23, 1955

Colonel Cosby, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the invitation to be here today and to have the privilege of participating in this merited tribute to the late Dr. Thomas Ryland Sanford, the founder of Hargrave Military Academy. I have come in obedience to that invitation to pay this public tribute of respect to one who has answered that final summons to which every ear shall some day harken and all mortality obey, a beloved schoolteacher and preacher to whom I am greatly indebted, and a long-time friend whose memory I shall ever cherish.

Dr. Sanford was born 75 years ago in Westmoreland County, Va., near Montross. His unfortunate and untimely death occurred on April 8, 1952.

Although I had first met him at my home in Halifax County where he had come to enroll me as a student in this institution, it was here at Hargrave Military Academy (then Chatham Training School) that I first knew him.

From that time on, until he delivered his last sermon after more than one-half century in the Baptist ministry and came to the end of his labors here on earth, I was among the many thousands who held this devoted educator and consecrated churchman in the highest esteem and affection. Few men in the history of Virginia have wielded a wider and more wholesome influence over the lives of their contemporaries. It was a high privilege to have come under his beneficent influence and guidance, and to have the opportunity of basking in the warmth of his great mind and radiant personality on many occasions through the course of the long years which intervened during our acquaintance.

Dr. Sanford was the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Millard Fillmore Sanford. His father was a distinguished consecrated Baptist minister, and his mother was a lovely lady of the highest character and attainments. I likewise had the privilege of taking classes under both of them and through those and later associations came to know, understand, and appreciate the sterling qualities so characteristic of the entire Sanford family.

Early in his boyhood, he left the Northern Neck when his father moved to a pastorate in Burkeville, and it was only in the sunset of life that he finally came back to reside in the midst of the memories he had nurtured from childhood. During the long interval, he frequently returned for visits and the fishing trips which he enjoyed to the fullest. But he once remarked he never would have gotten back to stay had it not been for the affliction which forced him into partial retirement. However, that affliction never diminished his interests or dimmed the broad horizon, encompassed by his exceptionally active mind.

Much of his colorful career and certainly many of his principal interests were associated with this academy, the University of Richmond, and the Baptist Church. His athletic prowess at the University of Richmond is the source of legends which rightfully should never fade. But it was not as an athlete alone that he won the hearts of his fellow students, his teachers and the thousands who came to know him. It was primarily the spiritual magnetism of the man, the exuberant spirit that shown in his countenance, in his handclasp, and in his every word.

Like many a student since, he took delight in healthy competition—and no doubt tremendously enjoyed contributing to the 42–0 football victory over my alma mater, William and Mary, in his first game back in 1899. He had the same enthusiasm for baseball and basketball, in which he also excelled.

In fact, there was no activity in which he engaged that he was not enthusiastic and intensely interested. But the underlying theme of his life early became apparent and he was still a student when he began preaching at Branch's Church in Chesterfield County. He solved the transportation question by commuting between campus and church by bicycle—another typical example of his self-reliance and ingenuity in meeting problems as they arose. Dr. Sanford was ordained in 1902 and left school to serve three Chesterfield churches—Branch's, Gill Grove, and Second Branch. Needless to say, the salary of the pastor was not excessive. But Ryland Sanford knew his economics as well as his religious teachings and saved enough to complete his education. Dr. Sanford possessed in a preeminent degree all of the qualities of a successful businessman. Had he turned his attention in that direction no doubt he would have also made a splendid success in that field.

He was a lifter, not a leaner. He believed in giving, not receiving. He believed in honest pay for a day's work, and vice versa. He was not spoonfed or pink pilled. His powers came from struggle, effort, and determination. He was reared in the atmosphere of that period of our history known as the "tragic era" when our southland had been overrun by an overpowering army; our fields impoverished; our resources exhausted; and our manpower depleted. Despite the handicaps imposed by such conditions and others unspeakably horrible, men of his generation rebuilt Virginia and made it the great Commonwealth it is today, standing as she does—proudly at the top of the sisterhood of States—able to chart its own course, unencumbered by bonded indebtedness and contributing its full share to the support and maintenance of the national structure. It is worthy to note, too, that this was accomplished without the aid of any Marshall plan, Federal aid, giveaway programs, or technical assistance.

In 1903 he accepted a pastorate in Buckingham County where he first became widely known, having conducted a great revival at Old Sharon Church. In addition to his other outstanding qualities, Dr. Sanford was blessed with an impressive and commanding personal appearance. He was tall and strong and robust. He was handsome. His face radiated those intangible but incalculable values which constitute courage, character, and manhood. He looked and acted the part of a leader. He had a complete knowledge and use of the English language. He enunciated clearly and beautifully. His words flowed freely and with facility and ease. He was a speaker of great force and when he released the full powers of his oratory, which seemed at times to be unbounded, he could stir, move and control his congregation. These were natural talents and blessings with which he was endowed and which enabled him to be such an effective influence for good in every community in which he labored.

From Buckingham County he moved to the Memorial Baptist Church at Hampton, and then to Chatham in 1908. It was here that he contributed 10 fruitful years to his church and the people of Virginia.

When he heard the Warren Training School might close, Dr. Sanford with his customary energy and enthusiasm, decided that the Baptists should have a school of their own. Under his leadership they established

one and in September 1909 Chatham Training School opened its first session with 18 students and Thomas Ryland Sanford as founder and first president. Mr. J. Hunt Hargrave, a deacon in the Chatham Baptist Church, and his father were coleaders in this undertaking and it was the younger Hargrave's great contribution to the school which led to the change in name in 1925 to Hargrave Military Academy.

Dr. Sanford, who saw the school grow from that modest beginning to essentially its present status, was more than president. He was a teacher, coach, and companion to his boys, of whom I was privileged to be one. He supervised and worked with the boys—in those early days in clearing the 28-acre site for the expansion which he was sure would come.

I shall never forget the experience of my student days here. I learned many valuable lessons the hard way. In those days demerits were positive, tangible things, and some of the most lasting lessons I have ever learned came about by the impartial and firm discipline dispensed by this great man who recognized that knowledge and character were not to be instilled and cultivated by association alone, but by hard work, discipline, self-denial, and determination. These principles were inculcated by the methods he applied and the example which he set.

South Boston, Fredericksburg, Norfolk, and Luray were subsequent pastorates for Dr. Sanford before arthritis seriously handicapped him in 1941. Six years later he returned to his beloved Northern Neck to serve four more churches and finally to conclude his more than 50 years of outstanding service to his fellow man.

It was characteristic of the man that he never considered himself, but only those he was in position to help, whether in spiritual guidance, educational development, or physical health. Often he preached three times a Sunday, paid many visitations to the sick and those shut it, and still found time for a rich family life and a myriad of other activities.

His stature in church and educational affairs was such that he yielded much of his time to the demands upon him. He served as a member of the board of trustees of Hargrave and of the University of Richmond, the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Virginia Baptist Board of Missions and Education, and held various district and State offices in his church. The University of Richmond awarded him the degree of doctor of divinity in 1922 in recognition of his many contributions not only to the institution but to Virginia generally.

While participating in these extensive activities, Dr. Sanford was guiding his own family to fruitful maturity. I need not recount for this audience the story of the Sanford boys whose athletic, academic, and postgraduate accomplishments are in themselves a dramatic and entrancing story. Hargrave Military Academy has shared the benefits of this younger generation of Sanfords.

Such leaders as Dr. Sanford are responsible for the strength and durability of our free institutions in America. Our Nation was built on the foundation stone of respect for the rights of man and the dignity of the individual. Education has been an important factor in building and perpetuating this great heritage. Dr. Sanford exemplified the characteristics that thoughtful and patriotic citizens admire and shall ever champion, because he represented in wisdom, vision, and action the epitome of good citizenship. He not only was a minister, educator, and leader; he was a man steadfastly devoted to making the world a better place in which to live—and he went about this task by seeking to elevate the thoughts and aspirations of the people themselves.

It is highly appropriate that his portrait should be hung here, the scene of so much of his valuable labor, and from whose sheltered walls so many young men have gone forth with unbounded hope and opportunity to meet the challenging problems of life made strong and confident because of the principles instilled in them here. A great philosopher once said that the founding of an institution is like the well spring of a stream—the small beginnings of which are indeed plain to all, but the full, ultimate and expansive powers and influence only the omniscient can discern. We know that Hargrave Military Academy has deepened and expanded its influence everywhere, and it is the fervent hope and prayer of many that it may never wane.

Joy and sorrow are closely intermingled in this busy world of ours. Sometimes the happinesss incident to the birth of a precious baby is shadowed and saddened by the death of its mother. And frequently on the highway of life the bridal procession must tarry while the funeral train passes by.

Today we come with grief and sorrow that a life fraught with so much good should be so suddenly cut off from amongst us, but in our chastened reflections we can discern echoes of counsel and encouragement because we are filled with gratitude and appreciation for the example of such a life as that of Thomas Ryland Sanford, which should animate us all to a higher and renewed consecration to worthy and unselfish devotion to the principles which he espoused and for which he stoutly stood.

Through the lives of many individuals who came within the great expanse of his influence, the people of Virginia have reaped an enormous benefit. And through them and the unnumbered generations to follow his magnificent contribution to his people and to the general advancement of mankind will live forever.

At such a time as this when our thoughts are turned to a loved one or a friend to whom the grim messenger with the inverted torch has beckoned onward, it is good to have the sweet assurances of our religion that though dead, he yet liveth.

"He is not dead, but sleepeth, well we know.
The form that now lies mute beneath the sod
Shall rise when time her golden bugles blow,
And pour its music through the courts of God."

Willis W. Bradley and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the finest memories of my congressional career are associations, during the 80th Congress—1947 to 1949—and subsequently, with the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California. His stature as a statesman, naval officer, and Government administrator has been extensively portrayed in the annals of the Congress by others and requires no emphasis from me.

There is, however, one facet of his congressional career that I feel ought to be described in greater detail. This concerns the Panama Canal of which he was a discriminating and objective student. As qualifications for his inquires in this field he had the background of a lifetime of study, an extensive naval experience, and a wide knowledge of the merchant marine. Moreover, it was through Representative Bradley that I first became seriously interested in the canal subject, for which service I shall always be grateful.

As a fellow member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, we worked in close association. Early in 1947, he became keenly aware of the Isthmian Canal studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, then in progress. In his search for information he did not restrict himself to routine officials temporarily serving as administrators of the canal enterprise, but sought advice from all responsible sources. For example, he arranged with Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal for a presentation on the operational problems of the Panama Canal held in the Navy Department on March 14, 1947, for the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Later, as a leading member of a congressional visitation in the Canal Zone in April of that year he was most effective. Thereafter, he rapidly assumed the status of congressional spokesman on canal matters, and had the opportunity of consulting many independent experts.

Among the most comprehensive treatmeants of the interoceanic canal problem in the records of the Congress is a notable address by Representative Bradley before the Cosmos Club of Washington on April 19, 1948, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" Published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449, this address, by its forthright and objective clarification of key issues, contributed materially toward preventing hasty action by the Congress on a then pending report of the indicated investigation and formed a solid basis for much that followed in the consideration of the canal problem. The principal sections of this address of Representative Bradley are still applicable.

In the course of his membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, its distinguished senior minority member, the late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, and Representative Bradley became close friends and collaborators, with a great common interest in the Panama Canal. Thus, these two leaders formed an effective nonpartisan team in securing proper consideration by the Congress of important canal issues before acting on recommendations of administrative agencies—a policy that the Congress has continued to follow.

Toward the end of the second session of the 80th Congress, Representative Bradley published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, page A3890, an extensive bibliographical list on the Panama Canal question—the first time, as far as I can determine, such a list was ever published in the RECORD. Since then I have prepared additional comprehensive lists, the last having been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 3, pages 3601–3616, under the title "Isthmian Canal Policy of the

United States—Documentation." For this effort Representative Bradley's original contribution in 1948 was my inspiration.

With the convening of the 81st Congress in January 1949, Representative Bland resumed his chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, over which he had presided so long before the 80th Congress. One of his first official actions was to secure authorization for an inquiry into the financial operations of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, 81st Congress. For this task, he appointed me as chairman of a special subcommittee.

As part of his preparations, Chairman Bland conferred as to procedure with Captain Bradley, who in 1949 left the Congress. Captain Bradley suggested that the chairman of the subcommittee visit the Panama Canal exhibit in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy Department.

With the authority of Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, I visited this exhibit on February 10, 1949, and was accompanied by Captain Bradley, and Gen. James G. Steese, distinguished engineer and former Engineer of Maintenance—Chief Engineer—of the Panama Canal. We were received by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, who, at the time, was Panama Canal liaison officer and Coordinator of Isthmian Canal Studies of the Navy Department.

Using terrain models of the canal and other exhibits in that office dealing with its marine features, Captain Bradley explained the problems of operations; and General Steese, those of engineering.

The explanations by these two authorities gave me a deeper insight into the nature and magnitude of the principal problems involved in the canal question. They started me on a search for knowledge that has never ended.

Later, on the evening of February 24, 1949, in company with Representative—now Senator—THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa, I attended a comprehensive presentation by Captain Bradley before the Engineers' Club of Washington in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, entitled "The Why's of the Panama Canal."

The proceedings of that evening, which I included in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, March 4, 1949, page A1303, were a further important contribution of Captain Bradley toward the increased understanding of the canal problem, especially in legislative and executive circles.

At this point, it is pertinent to mention that at each of Representative Bradley's notable canal addresses, he was introduced by the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, a former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and later a Member of Congress, lifelong student of Panama Canal problems and an early and long-continuing advocate for the creation of an unbiased and independent canal commission representative of all the major interests involved as offering the best means for their resolution.

At the present time adequate means for the objective handling of the canal question do not exist. To supply such means, Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN and I, early in the present session, introduced identical measures, S. 766 and H. R. 3335, respectively, to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission. These bills are modeled after a measure introduced in the 80th Congress by Representative Bradley.

In the perspective that is now possible, the constructive leadership of Representative Willis W. Bradley with respect to interoceanic canals, in and out of the Congress, firmly establishes him as one of most outstanding authorities on this gravely important subject. His statements in regard thereto are accordingly indispensable sources for study not only for students and historians but as well, and more particularly, for engineers and navigators, and all the legislators and administrators charged with direct responsibility for operation, maintenance and improvement of the Panama Canal.

No one who has attempted to make an objective study of the problems of interoceanic canals can fail to note how intensely the proponents of various plans defend their ideas. They have reached their conclusions and they are apparently unwilling to consider any deviations. Sometimes they are even unwilling for Congress to appoint a commission to report on all phases of the controversy. To these partisans, each one of whom is an able and patriotic man, I suggest that if his program is sound, he need not fear to have it carefully scrutinized by an independent commission. To refuse to submit it to such an impartial group is to suggest that perhaps it lacks the merit which would insure its approval by such a group.

Foreign Aid Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, when "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, Benj. Franklin" and those other patriarchs of the long lost days of America were writing America's genesis in the early history of this new Nation, no one ever thought about setting up a constitutional authorization about taxing American citizens to aid foreign lands around the world. But somehow we drifted into that unique practice under New Deal radicalism and now the foreign-aid rut seems to be still holding us tight. Down in southeastern Kentucky, Jeff Abbott, the coal miner, works hard in the blackness of the underground caverns and has little above cornbread and occasional chuck roast for his meager table. Yet Jeff, as an American, pays some of the necessary tax that goes forth to aid Turkey, Belgium, and Brazil. Then there is Cora Bunch, a mountain schoolteacher, and Jim Meadors, a country merchant, and neither knows aught but consistent hardship and normal scarcity. Yet Cora and Jim, as Americans, pay some of the necessary tax that goes forth to promote Germany and Spain under our various foreign-aid schemes.

As the emerging picture of this present enlightened hour takes form, it would now be sheer folly to grant more aid to these various countries in far-off places. Why does this statement make sense? Surely our past experience with foreign aid since 1945 is ample enough proof of this observation. Since the inception of the Marshall plan in April 1948, it will be remembered that about $35 billion has been spent for economic and military aid abroad—about $20 billion for military and $15 billion for economic assistance. A complex labyrinth of economic-aid programs has existed since the end of World War II, but each has had the same purpose—to give away some of the hard-earned substance of Jeff, Cora, and Jim. During World War II we gave away billions of dollars worth of goods as lend-lease. That program was justified, as we all concede, since we and our allies were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the force of tyranny. It might be said that we gave our wealth and substance rather than suffer the devastation befalling other parts of the world.

But since the end of World War II we have continued to finance one aid program after another. And let the average man question one proposal for aid or try to reduce the amount of aid in any proposal and someone proclaims that communism will be aided. The big, bad Russian bear has been a handy whipping-boy to make us toe the line for more foreign aid. And while it is not to be denied that the Soviets are out to do the free world all the harm possible, yet little evidence has emerged that our aid to other countries has made any difference in the behavior or accomplished ends of the Soviets. In fact, they regard such aid, which are sacrifices for us, as only further evidence of our so-called imperialism.

And now we are confronted with a current demand for still more aid. This year the emphasis is on Asia. This latest request is for $3.53 billion for economic and military aid in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Two-thirds of this sum, $2.14 billion, is for aid to Asia. Only $712.5 million of this total is for economic aid.

It seems that Miss Europe does not now need further aid. In 1954 her trade within Western Europe was 128 percent above that of 1948 and 69 percent above that of 1938. Imports from the outside world were 24 percent above those of 1948 and 11 percent above those of 1938. Exports were 83 percent above those of 1948 and exports to the dollar area were 130 percent above 1948, while imports from that area were 7 percent below 1948.

Consumption per capita in Western Europe reached the 1938 level by 1950. By 1953 it was 7 percent above that level, and in 1954 it jumped to 12 percent above prewar. The United States was 45 percent above the 1938 level.

Industrial output was about 50 percent higher than in 1938. Agricultural production was 30 percent greater.

In 1951 the countries of Western Europe planned for an annual increase of 4.5 percent in gross national product during the next 5 years. This increase was not realized in 1952, but it was realized in both 1953 and 1954.

Granted that foreign aid did promote the economic progress of some of the countries of Western Europe, it is soundly logical that any such aid anywhere has now outlived its usefulness. Countries receiving aid have become less and less reliable as allies. We need only to point to the Korean war and the fiasco of the European Defense Community to realize that our allies are little interested in a genuine attempt to unite for common defense. Selfish interests have either killed or emasculated most attempts at collective defense. Obviously the change from Marshall plan to mutual security shows little relationship of the one to the other. There is no mutual security unless we finance it. Our insistence on some compliance with promised objectives has caused United States popularity throughout the world to reach an alltime low. Despite our bungling attempts to become the big brother of the world, the mere spreading of dollars has not and will not bring popularity or good will. The sooner our Government realizes this simple truth the sooner have we reached maturity in our contemporary statesmanship.

Perhaps the most patent result of foreign aid has been the enforced postponement or rejection of necessary social and economic projects here at home. It is a well-known fact that our highways are inadequate; that new hospitals and schools are needed; that reclamation and flood-control projects have been postponed for lack of funds. How can we justify spreading money abroad for aid when we do not have sufficient funds to undertake such programs at home? We must wake up to the fact that we cannot carry the financial burdens of the free world on our backs. Why should an American shrink from being called an isolationist when his desire has been to make his own country a better place in which to live? Our neglect of highways, to cite one example, has contributed materially to 38,000 traffic deaths a year and has cost much time in travel. The disastrous floods of our river valleys could be eliminated by correct methods of flood control.

Continuation of our program of broadcasting billions will cause us eventually to face one of these two "ins"—insolvency or inflation. Who then is likely to come forth to bail us out? Certainly no European government will come to our aid. It should be considered that our Federal debt was 74 percent of our gross national product in 1953. But let us take a look at the debt of those nations we are aiding; the relationship of debt to gross national product of selected countries was as follows: Norway, 53.3 percent; Spain, 26 percent; Belgium, 67 percent; France, 37.5 percent; Germany, 32 percent; Turkey, 22 percent; Japan, 12 percent; the Philippines, 10 percent; Brazil, 7 percent; and Mexico, 4 percent. Truly we are burdened when compared with nations who are receiving our largesse; yet they claim that they cannot finance their own economies.

Foreign aid has not contributed to an increase in our real wealth. As one author has said:

> Admittedly the foreign-aid program, financed by the United States taxpayer and purchaser of Federal securities, has contributed to the striking postwar growth of this country. Yet it is a fair question whether the expenditure of equivalent resources on domestic development might not have led to an equal growth, even though of a different type. For it can hardly be argued that the export of very large quantities of goods for which the United States has not been compensated has increased this country's real wealth.

The French and Italian tax structures seem hopeless to American eyes. They fall heavily on consumers and permit flagrant violations by the wealthy. Yet little has been done toward remedying these conditions. True, at American insistence, new and more stringent tax laws have appeared on statute books, but they appear to have been evaded. Numerous disinterested persons who have traveled abroad have attested to the fact that wealthy people pay for less taxes than we do in the United States; yet that they refuse to invest in the economic development of their own countries. Why should American citizens be taxed to aid foreign nations when their own wealthy people evade taxes?

Much of the foreign aid money expended in other countries has gone to help export industries which now compete in world markets with our industries.

Communism has not been stopped by foreign aid. About 1 Frenchman in 4 is a Communist despite our expenditures of billions of dollars in rebuilding France. In Italy parties of both the left and the right have grown in power despite Marshall plan aid. Yet we are told whenever we question increased subsidies to European nations that they will fall to communism unless we continue to finance them.

Other examples of the folly of foreign aid could be cited. But it should suffice to say that our aid program has been used to finance socialistic governments in Europe and is now suggested as a bulwark of socialistic governments in Asia. That is a facet of the aid program that deserves special treatment, and so there will be no more than mention of it here.

The foreign aid program has been characterized by a proliferation of conflicting offices in many countries. Departments of our Government have worked at cross-purposes, frequently denying each other and working directly contrary to each other. In Paris until recently there were four individuals with the rank of Ambassador. In many European and other overseas areas, American Ambassadors must work with representatives of the United States Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, and Foreign Operations Administration. What a field that creates for misunderstandings and difficulties. Congressional committees have called attention to this anomalous situation and let us hope it is now on the way out.

These are some of the reasons why further foreign aid is futile. Certainly, such a program will not now contribute to anything like substantial furtherance of the economic rehabilitation of the world.

As of December 31, 1954, net foreign aid had cost each individual in the United States $298.52. If one were to consider the figures on a gross basis it would probably have cost each person in the United States far more than that. For my native State of Kentucky that would mean a contribution to foreign countries of about $904 million. How much improvement could be undertaken within the borders of Kentucky with a sum of that size. Truly, we could make it a far better State that it is today. This latest request for $3.53 billion more for the next fiscal year would increase each person's contribution by $21.51, or about another $65 million from Kentucky. This means that Kentucky has contributed nearly a billion dollars for aiding foreign countries. It seems to me that we have already done far too much. Considering the aid we have given since 1940, it is no wonder that we are regarded as an impractical Santa Claus of immature judgment.

James Haskell really hit the nail on the head in reciting what we could do with the money which has been expended and is to be spent for foreign aid through June 30, 1957. He believes that by that date our postwar foreign aid to Europe alone will have totaled $60 billion. Graphically, he shows what could have been done with that tremendous sum:

1. It could have saved the average American taxpayer $1,000 in taxes.
2. It is 2½ times the total amount of the United States farm program in a decade.
3. It is nearly 4 times as much as the Government spent for public works during the New Deal.
4. It could have paid for all the new highways that America needs; also schools, hospitals, and other institutions.

Henry Hazlitt aptly expressed the contrast between foreign aid and assistance for needy domestic programs when, in discussing point 4 above, he stated:

> The Government has nothing to give or lend to anybody that it does not first of all, or ultimately, take from its own taxpayers. By at least as much as it adds to the purchasing power of Paul, it must reduce the purchasing power of Peter.

Charity and mercy are admirable, desirable qualities of the human heart, but that is not so of a political machinery which should have only the function to govern for its own people and not a semblance of any function to tax those same people to further Formosa or promote Pakistan. Wake up "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, and Benj. Franklin" and see what we, the people, have been doing to your country through foreign aid folly. Wake up Jeff, Cora, and Jim, write your Congressmen, tell them how well you like being taxed for Turkey.

Flexible and Rigid Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 19, 1955.*
Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am interested and concerned about matters that affect all, and of course, the farmers of my district. You will recall that in the 83d Congress it was my privilege and honor to be chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and that at that time it was our responsibility to examine into and devise the increase of the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation in order that it could play its part in the mechanics of commodity support which is a part of the law.

I am no longer burdened with the responsibility of the chairmanship of this important committee, but I am still the ranking minority member of this committee which has jurisdiction over Commodity Credit Corporation authorizations of the House of Representatives. However, I am concerned about the situation in support prices that may or may not affect the farmers in my district and in other areas of the United States.

I would appreciate your informing me at your earliest convenience of the following:

(a) What is now the commitment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in dollar valuation for all agricultural goods, either by purchase or by loan?

(b) In the judgment of you and your experts, what will be the commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation for purchase or loan in the forseeable future in dollar volume, based on the present law?

(c) Will you please give me your best estimate of the commitments by Commodity Credit Corporation under the projected situation if the law should be amended to give to the basic commodities 90 percent of parity as is contemplated under H. R. 12?

Believe me, Mr. Secretary, I ask these questions because it seems to me that the farmers of my district and others should be fully familiar with the situation as it now exists and as it may exist if H. R. 12 should become law. I am,

Yours most respectfully,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 22, 1955.
Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLCOTT: I appreciate your interest in the financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, expressed in your letter to me of April 19.

We have made projections showing by months the status of our statutory borrowing authority, based on economic assumptions set forth in the 1956 budget estimate of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Using these projections, I shall do my best to answer your very pertinent questions.

(a) Currently (April 1955), we have in use approximately $8,400,000,000 of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization. This includes funds invested in commodities owned and under loan, as well as the investment in accounts and notes receivable, fixed assets and the unrestored capital impairment of the capital of the Corporation.

February is normally the seasonal peak in the commitment of CCC funds. In February 1955 we had $8,396,000,000 in use. This amount is very close to our estimate of last July, when Congress was considering the proposed increase in the borrowing authority of the Corporation from $8.5 to $10 billion. At that time we estimated our use of CCC borrowing authority in January and February of 1955 at $8.4 billion.

(b) Based on the present law, we expect to have in use in February of 1956 approximately $9,465,000,000 of our $10 billion borrowing authorization. This estimate assumes average yields, some rise in the level of economic activity, present price levels, some increase in exports, and acreage allotments for the basic crops. It is believed that these projections represent conservative rather than liberal projections of the volume of price support activity.

Based on present law, we would expect the peak in CCC of borrowing authority to be reached in February of 1956. Thereafter, we would expect CCC financial commitments to decrease as a result of reduced acquisition and increased disposal.

(c) H. R. 12 would make price support for the basic crops mandatory at 90 percent of parity. We estimate that the enactment of this law would increase the peak use of the Corporation's borrowing authority in the fiscal year 1956 by $247 million. On the basis of assumptions indicated in (b) above, this would put us within $300 million of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization—a margin of safety that could easily be wiped out by better than average yields, a drop in exports, or a decline in prices and economic activity.

I share the concern which your letter expresses about the increase in financial obligations which will result if H. R. 12 or other such legislation is passed by Congress. Even without a return to mandatory high rigid price supports the present $10 billion borrowing authorization may not be adequate.

I enclose a brief report which gives some of the above data in tabular form. This statement does not reflect the probable effects of H. R. 12 if it were to be enacted.

The Crop Production Report for July 1955 will contain the first most reliable source of information regarding production from 1955 crops. At that time the Department will be in a better position to appraise the potential use of the Corporation's borrowing authority and whether or not any legislative action need be proposed.

Sincerely yours,
TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes for the week of April 28, 1955, on the subject of our Capitol Building:

KEENOTES
(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE)

The Capitol of the United States is much more than a building; to every American, it is a strikingly beautiful symbol of our Nation's strength.

Probably no architectural feature in all of the United States is as well known as the Capitol dome rising majestically above the Washington horizon—visible from almost any part of the city, a thing of breathtaking splendor when lighted at night.

The clean, straight, vertical lines of the main portion of the structure, when topped by the gentle, graceful curves of the huge dome, provide a picture of deep serenity in the midst of national controversy—of solidity and calm and reason no matter what the issue which might divide us in debate.

So it is only natural that our Capitol is everyone's business—that what happens to it inside or outside is a matter of national interest and personal concern. Therefore, I know there will be general interest among West Virginians in the newest proposal for "completing" the Capitol—for, literally, giving it a "face-lifting."

Former President Truman once said the dome would fall someday if the east central front of the building were not extended outward. Others have said the dome sits on top of the main structure like a derby hat without a brim. Architects say the facade is incomplete, because the central portion was not brought forward in keeping with the two wings which were added to the original building to provide the present House and Senate Chambers.

The architects may be correct that extension of the facade is an "architectural necessity" but I'm sure that most of us who are not architects would have gone right on thinking the building beautiful indeed just as it is.

Nevertheless, the space requirements of the Congress have provided a practical stimulus to accomplish an architectural objective which has been discussed since 1863. The House has finally approved—after many years of refusing to act on the matter—a resolution calling upon the Architect of the Capitol to draw up plans for the "completion" of the facade.

The additional space added to the east central front of the building, besides bringing it closer into line with the House and Senate wings, will provide much-needed space for committee rooms, for restaurant and other facilities, and for a through-passage on the gallery level between the House and the Senate sides of the building.

The decision to proceed with the planning of this improvement came shortly after a very significant improvement was made inside the building—the opening of an impressive, nonsectarian prayer room to which Members of the House and Senate can go at any time for quiet meditation.

Before a beautiful stained glass window depicting George Washington kneeling in prayer, Members can find inspiration in the Bible, or in our own quiet prayers as we seek Divine guidance in carrying out our heavy responsibilities. It is good to have this tiny chapel available in the Capitol. And, best of all, it is being used every day.

The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Significance of Thomas Jefferson For Our Day," delivered by me, on Friday afternoon, April 29, 1955.

The meeting at which the address was made was held on the steps of the beautiful Jefferson Memorial, in a setting befitting the occasion. It was held under the auspices of the Washington Pilgrimage, ably assisted by Dr. and Mrs. Harold Dudley. Gen. Willard Paul presided, and the occasion was favored with selections by the Oxen Hill, Md., High School Band, and a wonderful chorus from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

The Washington Pilgrimage is an organization of clergy and lay church people dedicated to the preservation of our Nation's religious heritage. Annually they select and present awards to the outstanding clergy churchman, the lay churchman and churchwoman of the year. This year the awards were as follows:

Clergy churchman of the year 1955—Dr. Ralph W. Sockman:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation, as an eloquent preacher of God's word, the minister for more than 20 years of the National Radio Pulpit, a valiant guardian of world peace, the director of the Hall of Fame, an inspiring teacher, and the author of many volumes of practical religious truth.

Lay churchman of the year 1955—President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation in his leadership for peace, spiritual devotion, and inspiring example of steadfast attention to religious values as President of the United States.

Churchwoman of the year 1955—Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON:

In recognition of her outstanding service to the Nation as a spiritual interpreter of public life in the Halls of Congress, in the field of international affairs, the ministry of nursing and public health, and the advancement of educational institutions and values.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE, JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, 4 P. M., FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman, we meet here today to remind ourselves of our goodly heritage. As we stand here before the great Jefferson Memorial, we can also see the monuments of Washington and Lincoln. They remind us again of not only our great heritage, but the fact that religion has played a vital part in the development of our great Nation.

They remind us, too, that religion is not only necessary, but is vital to the existence of a virile democracy. It would be a sad day indeed for our Nation should our people forget the basic fundamental principles of the Christian religion, which, after all, is the foundation stone of this great democracy—a democracy that is on trial at the present time in the conflict of the ideologies of Christianity and paganism.

Our Nation has been blessed by having leaders with a Christian faith and a firm conviction in the continued welfare of this Nation and the preservation of its ideals.

I am pleased today to read to you a telegram from the President of the United States:

"The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

"Please convey my greetings and good wishes to all participants in this year's Washington pilgrimage. I am glad that on April 29 you will speak on 'The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day.' I hope that everyone in the pilgrimage will return from his visit to Washington with increased knowledge of Jefferson's life and thought and increased determination to uphold the principles of liberty in which Jefferson believed.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Thomas Jefferson may well be called the apostle of liberty. He expressed his attitude emphatically when he declared: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." His life was the fulfillment of this vow.

Jefferson was given the supreme opportunity to express his dedication to the principles of freedom when he was asked to draft the Declaration of Independence. Those memorable words will ring forever in the hearts of men through every age and clime, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Some petrified minds and withered hearts have tried to demonstrate their superiority by libeling Jefferson and labeling this statement a lie. They remind us that some men are born weak and sickly and others are born strong and rugged, and some are born morons and others are born geniuses—as if Jefferson didn't know this too, or was referring to any of this!

No. Jefferson's statement must not be taken from its literary and historical context. His declaration, in the only sense that it can be understood, means that all men stand equal before the law.

The wealth of the rich shall not shield him from the same penalty a pauper would suffer for the same crime. Priests are not to be tried by a different code or before different courts than laymen. The accident of birth does not automatically make a man the ruler of his fellow men, whether he is a Tudor, a Stuart, a Hanover, or a Roosevelt. This equality is predicated on the fact that all men receive their life from the same Creator, who endows them also with the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These benefits flow reasonably from belief in a Creator, and it is only what might be expected that those who are atheists are the foremost in denying to their fellow men "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The contrast between countries dominated by atheistical communism and those countries blessed by faith in God is an existing proof. Jefferson's concern was that abomination called the "divine right of kings" and that other abomination, a fixed and immutable social and economic stratification.

Even here, in God's America, Jefferson's ideals have not met complete fulfillment, but to the extent that they have, this has been, and still is, the land of opportunity for the oppressed of earth.

Perhaps no other statements made by Jefferson demonstrate his right to be called "Apostle of liberty" as do those selected for the marble memorial in the Capital of our Nation. Of religious liberty he wrote:

"Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens * * * are departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion * * * no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship or ministry or shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief. But all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion."

This is from an Act Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia. Its authorship is one of the three things which Jefferson wanted to be remembered by and asked to have mentioned on his tombstone.

Jefferson was against slavery of all kinds, whether of body or mind, and he believed in education for all as a bulwark of freedom. In the stately marble memorial erected to his honor by a grateful nation one may read his words:

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free. Establish the law for educating the common people. This it is the business of the state to effect and on a general plan."

Jefferson was in France when our Constitutional Convention was meeting. He approved in general of the work done by the Convention, but greatly deplored the absence of a Bill of Rights. He wrote to Washington, Madison, Monroe, and others, earnestly advocating a Bill of Rights. To Madison he wrote:

"I will now tell you what I do not like. First, the omission of a Bill of Rights, providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of nations. Let me add, that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference."

Many others agreed with Jefferson, and the Bill of Rights, comprising the first 10 amendments, was quickly adopted. The putting of these essential freedoms on an undeniable legal basis owes much to the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the bill for establishing religious freedom in Virginia.

Jefferson's service as our Minister to France during the several years just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, extended his influence as an apostle of liberty to that land also, and increased the already strong effect which our own successful Revolution had upon the French.

Throughout his long life, whether as Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, as President for two terms, or as the retired sage of Monticello, Jefferson ever and always was able to say as an apostle of liberty, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We who are privileged to gather here today can well take to heart the admonitions of our third President and rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the Christian principles that must guide this Nation if we are to be the Nation that God intended us to be.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the 82d Congress.

The record indicates all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

(Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan, 82d Cong. 1st sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
1	Jan. 3	Call by States	Present.
2	---do----	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn, 231—Martin, 192.)	Martin.
		H. Res. 7, providing that the rules of the House of Representatives will be the same as those of the 81st Cong.:	
3	---do----	On previous question. (Defeated, 179 to 247.)	Yea.
4	---do----	On substitute repealing the 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules in bringing up legislation. On adoption. (Adopted, 244 to 179.)	Nay.
5	Jan. 17	H. R. 1001, authorizing the construction of 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels, conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels and the construction of an aircraft carrier. On passage. (Passed, 365 to 0.)	Yea.
6	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 1724, providing for the creation of a 5-member board to renegotiate contracts that are made by certain Government agencies exercising functions in connection with the national defense. On passage. (Passed, 377 to 0.)	Yea.
8	Jan. 24	H. R. 1, authorizing the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. (GI insurance bill.) On passage. (Passed, 390 to 0.)	Yea.
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	---do----	---do----	Present.
11	Feb. 7	---do----	Present.
		H. R. 1612, extending for 3 years the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements:	
12	---do----	On amendment providing for congressional notification by the President prior to any reduction of tariffs below a level determined by the Tariff Commission to be perilous to domestic industries. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 168.)	Yea.
	Mar. 5	H. R. 2615, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, relative to peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas:	
13	Mar. 7	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 174 to 212)	Yea.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 13	---do----	Present.
16	---do----	H. R. 1545, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 to authorize emergency reorganizations. On passage. (Defeated, 170 to 227.)	Nay.
17	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
18	---do----	H. Res. 142, rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relative to the RFC. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 197, not having received a constitutional majority of 218.)	Yea.
19	---do----	H. Res. 166, providing for the consideration of H. R. 2988, a bill to provide housing and community facilities and services in connection with national defense. On adoption. (Defeated, 170 to 219.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 21	On amendment cutting $22 million from the money provided for postal operations. On adoption. (Defeated, 136 to 138.)	Yea.
21	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
22	Apr. 4	---do----	Present.
23	Apr. 5	---do----	Present.
24	Apr. 9	---do----	Present.
25	Apr. 10	H. R. 2612, authorizing District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriation for certain Government agencies for the remainder of fiscal year 1951:	
26	---do----	On amendment reducing the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $750,000. On adoption. (Defeated, 159 to 250.)	Yea.
27	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 12	---do----	Present.
29	Apr. 13	---do----	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service, and amending Draft Act:	
30	---do----	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 121 to 296)	Nay.
31	---do----	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 44)	Yea.
32	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
33	---do----	On amendment permitting covered agencies to fill only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 208 to 145.)	Yea.
34	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 25	---do----	Present.
36	Apr. 26	---do----	Present.
37	May 1	---do----	Present.
38	May 2	---do----	Present.
		H. R. 3790, appropriating funds for Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1952:	
39	---do----	On amendment deleting language providing $3,400,000 for Southeastern Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 149.)	Yea.
40	---do----	On amendment reducing by $550,000 the funds for construction by the Southwestern Power Administration. On adoption. (Adopted, 222 to 173.)	Yea.
41	---do----	On amendment preventing the use of funds for developing the western Missouri project. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 152.)	Yea.
42	---do----	On amendment cutting $5½ million from funds allotted for Bonneville Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 167.)	Yea.
43	May 2	H. R. 3790—Continued On amendment cutting $800,000 from funds allocated for management of lands and resources and to earmark $1,200,000 for use in soil and moisture conservation. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 148.)	Yea.
44	---do----	On amendment reducing by $10 million the funds provided the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 160.)	Yea.
45	---do----	On amendment preventing use of funds to construct duplicate power transmission facilities where wheeling service contracts have been entered into. On adoption. (Adopted, 226 to 165.)	Yea.
46	---do----	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department of Interior in 1952 with certain exceptions. On adoption. (Adopted, 224 to 169.)	Yea.
47	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
48	---do----	H. Res. 220, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 220 to 159.)	Yea.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952:	
50	---do----	On amendment limiting to 5,000 the public dwelling units to be started in fiscal year 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 181 to 113.)	Yea.
51	---do----	On amendment fixing the emergency fund for the President at $1 million, plus certain unexpended funds from 1951. On adoption. (Adopted, 160 to 128.)	Yea.
52	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 9	H. R. 3576, amending the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by extending program for 6 months to Dec. 31, 1951, with no increase in number of authorizations for admission and no extension of the term of office of Displaced Persons Commission. On passage. (Passed, 312 to 63.)	Yea.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 15	---do----	Present.
56	May 17	---do----	Present.
		H. R. 3096, requiring congressional approval relative to certain defense land transactions by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
57	---do----	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 312 to 68.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1952:	
58	---do----	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 216 to 153.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
59	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 23	---do----	Present.
61	May 24	---do----	Present.
62	---do----	H. R. 3791, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On passage. (Passed, 293 to 94.)	Yea.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
64	---do----	---do----	Present.
65	---do----	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 9 to 224.)	Nay.
		H. R. 4141, providing more effective prevention, detection and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia:	
66	---do----	On motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole to consider bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 231 to 3.)	Yea.
67	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 5	---do----	Present.
69	---do----	---do----	Present.
70	June 6	S. 872, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 250 to 82.)	Yea.
		H. R. 314, providing for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va.:	
71	---do----	On motion to strike enacting clause. (Adopted 223 to 117.)	Yea.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	---do----	S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service and amending Draft Act. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 339 to 41.)	Yea.
74	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
75	June 13	---do----	Present.
		H. R. 4386, appropriating funds for Department of Army civil functions for fiscal year 1952:	
76	---do----	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 170 to 165.)	Nay.
77	June 15	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 75 to 161.)	Nay.
78	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
79	---do----	S. J. Res. 70, suspending application of certain Federal laws with respect to employment of attorney by Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. On adoption. (Defeated, 120 to 164.)	Nay.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
80	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
81	do	do	Present.
82	June 21	do	Present.
		H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951:	
83	June 22	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 171 to 220.)	Yea.
84	do	On passage. (Passed 233 to 160)	Yea.
85	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	H. R. 4431, extending rent control in the District of Columbia until Mar. 31, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 171 to 120.)	Nay.
87	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
88	do	S. Con. Res. 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 351 to 6.)	Yea.
89	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
90	do	H. R. 3283, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949 relative to recruitment of agricultural workers from foreign countries on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 139.)	Yea.
91	do	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 28	do	Present.
		H. Res. 287, a closed rule providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills:	
93	do	On ordering the previous question. (Adopted, 196 to 192.)	Nay.
94	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 195 to 191.)	Nay.
		H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills:	
95	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate certain amendments to effect a 10-percent reduction in funds of departments and agencies. (Defeated, 190 to 200.)	Yea.
96	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
97	do	H. Res. 294, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 278, on adoption. (Adopted 297 to 85.)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 278, extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; and certain import control authority:	
98	do	On amendment preventing roll-backs or the lowering of price ceilings below those on enactment date of resolution and prohibiting any new price ceilings on materials or services during the period of the temporary extension, except for the placing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities if they exceed their parity price. On adoption. (Adopted, 232 to 159.)	Nay.
99	do	S. 1590, extending rent control in the District of Columbia for 1 year. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 242 to 126.)	Nay.
100	June 30	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 256 to 12.)	Yea.
101	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
102	do	do	Present.
103	do	do	Present.
104	July 6	do	Present.
105	July 9	do	Present.
106	July 10	do	Present.
107	July 11	do	Present.
108	July 12	do	Present.
		H. R. 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security agencies for fiscal 1952:	
109	do	On motion to recommit to committee on conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952 in the offices, bureaus, etc., covered by this bill. On adption. (Adopted, 223 to 170.)	Yea.
110	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
111	July 16	do	Present.
112	do	do	Present.
113	do	do	Present.
114	July 17	do	Present.
115	July 18	do	Present.
116	July 19	do	Present.
117	July 20	do	Present.
		H. R. 3871, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
118	do	On Andresen amendment restricting until June 30, 1953, imports of fats and oils, cheese, dairy products, peanuts and rice. On adoption. (Adopted 266 to 147.)	Nay.
119	do	On Davis (Wisconsin) amendment establishing 1 Government agency through which all claims of municipalities for materials, etc., would be channeled. On adoption. (Defeated, 164 to 251.)	Yea.
120	do	On Hope amendment preventing the placing of quotas on livestock slaughtering. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 167.)	Nay.
121	*1951* July 20	H. R. 3871—Continued On Wolcott amendment deleting language enlarging the President's authority to acquire property, including facilities, and to erect plants, factories, etc., and to engage in the marketing, transportation, and storage of such critical materials necessary to national defense; but authorizing installation of additional equipment, facilities, etc., in Government-owned plants and the installation of Government-owned equipment in privately owned plants. On adoption. (Adopted, 233 to 184.)	Yea.
122	do	On Hardy amendment deleting authority to create new Government corporations by Executive orders. On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 167.)	Yea.
123	do	On amendment authorizing a roll-back of 10 percent below the May 10, 1951, prices of agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 234 to 183.)	Nay.
124	do	On Cole amendment providing a fair and equitable margin for each species of livestock processed to insure a fair profit to all segments of the industry on each species. On adoption. (Defeated, 166 to 249.)	Yea.
125	do	On Davis (Georgia) amendment providing that for a period of 120 days following enactment of bill prices and wages, salaries, and other compensation shall not be raised above the levels prevailing on July 7, 1951, except that agricultural products may not be prevented from reaching parity. On adoption. (Defeated, 172 to 243.)	Nay.
126	do	On Poage-Cole amendment to set up a formula, including parity costs, for arriving at ceiling prices for all commodities to insure a reasonable profit. On adoption. (Defeated, 181 to 233.)	Nay.
127	do	On amendment exempting strategic metals and minerals from ceiling prices when in short supply. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 216.)	Yea.
128	do	On adoption of amendment deleting from the bill language authorizing the licensing of and suspension of licenses of certain businesses covered by the scope of the bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 333 to 82.)	Yea.
129	do	On amendment deleting from the bill language relating to control of commodity speculation. On adoption. (Adopted, 242 to 172.)	Nay.
130	do	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 117 to 299.)	Nay.
131	do	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 92.)	Yea.
132	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.):	
133	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. On adoption. (Adopted, 188 to 186.)	Yea.
134	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
135	do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to reduce appropriation for the international information and educational activities of the State Department by $15 million. On adoption. (Defeated, 142 to 245.)	Nay.
136	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
137	do	H. J. Res. 289, terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. On adoption. (Adopted, 378 to 0.)	Yea.
138	do	H. Res. 335, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 92.)	Yea.
139	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
140	do	S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 294 to 80.)	Yea.
141	do	H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On passage. (Passed, 265 to 109.)	Yea.
142	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3790, making appropriations for Department of Interior for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.)	
143	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952. (Recommitted, 189 to 170.)	Yea.
144	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
145	Aug. 1	do	Present.
146	Aug. 2	do	Present.
147	Aug. 8	do	Present.
148	do	do	Present.
149	Aug. 9	do	Present.
150	Aug. 9	H. R. 5054. On passage. (Passed, 348 to 2.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 13	do	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
153	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
154	...do...	H. R. 4914, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations. On passage. (Passed, 353 to 5.)	Yea.
155	...do...	H. Con. Res. 140, expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government. On adoption. (Adopted, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
156	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices. (Conference report):	
157	...do...	On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House provision relating to public housing. On adoption. (Defeated, 169 to 207.)	Yea.
158	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 290 to 80.)	Yea.
159	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 349, providing housing and community facilities and services in connection with the national defense:	
160	...do...	On amendment fixing the termination date of the act of June 30, 1952, instead of June 30, 1953. On adoption. (Defeated, 184 to 188.)	Yea.
161	...do...	On amendment striking out provision for acquisition of sites for development in connection with isolated defense installations. On adoption. (Defeated, 175 to 199.)	Yea.
162	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3193, increasing and extending pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities:	
163	Aug. 17	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 318 to 45.)	Nay.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report):	
164	...do...	On motion that House concur in an amendment providing additional $1 million for fighting spruce bark beetle infestation. (Passed, 222 to 138.)	Nay.
165	...do...	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce funds for economic aid by $350 million. On adoption. (Recommitted, 186 to 177.)	Yea.
166	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 101.)	Yea.
167	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	...do...	...do...	Present.
169	Aug. 21	...do...	Present.
170	Sept. 13	...do...	Present.
171	...do...	...do...	Present.
172	Sept. 14	...do...	Present.
173	...do...	...do...	Present.
174	...do...	H. R. 1005, providing for the free importation of baler twine. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 41.)	Yea.
175	Sept. 18	Quorum call	Present.
176	Sept. 19	...do...	Present.
177	Sept. 20	...do...	Present.
178	Sept. 24	...do...	Present.
179	...do...	H. R. 4419, authorizing the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ up to 15 retired members of the armed services as teachers of military science and tactics. On passage. (Passed, 238 to 53.)	Yea.
180	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
181	Sept. 25	...do...	Present.
182	...do...	S. 2006, increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and extending its life 5 years to June 30, 1958. On passage. (Passed, 259 to 69.)	Yea.
183	...do...	H. Res. 429, providing for the consideration of H. R. 39, a bill for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 211–112.)	Yea.
		H. R. 39, providing for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities:	
184	Sept. 26	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Recommitted, 180 to 162.)	Yea.
185	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
186	...do...	H. Res. 430, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 82, relating to the unification of Ireland. On adoption. (Defeated, 139 to 206.)	Nay.
187	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
188	Oct. 4	H. R. 5118, amending the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees. On suspension of the rules and passage. (Defeated, 197 to 140.)	Nay.
189	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
190	Oct. 5	...do...	Present.
191	...do...	H. R. 5113, the Mutual Security Act of 1951. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 235 to 98.)	Yea.
192	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
193	...do...	H. Res. 436, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (Adopted, 284 to 15.)	Yea.
		S. 1959, amending the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking of non-Communist oath by labor-union leaders, and to dispense with the requirement of existing law that an election be held before a labor organization and an employer may make a union-shop agreement:	
194	Oct. 9	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 22 to 304.)	Nay.
195	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 307 to 18.)	Yea.
196	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 5650, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year, 1952:	
197	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to strike out funds for Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri. On adoption. (Defeated, 127 to 183.)	Not voting.
198	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 301 to 19.)	Not voting.
		H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal 1952. (Conference report):	
199	...do...	On motion the House recede and agree to a revision of the language of the House bill relating to United States contributions to international organizations. On adoption. (Adopted, 200 to 126.)	Not voting.
200	...do...	H. R. 5684, making appropriations to carry out provisions of Mutual Security Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 222 to 99.)	Not voting
201	Oct. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
202	...do...	H. R. 5411, amending Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Cong. with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas. On passage. (Passed, 257 to 55.)	Not voting.
203	Oct. 16	Quorum call	Present.
204	...do...	...do...	Present.
		H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951:	
205	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Defeated, 157 to 204.)	Yea.
206	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
207	Oct. 18	H. Res. 463, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 285, authorizing appropriation of $95,000 for commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the U. S. Military Academy. On adoption. (Adopted, 179 to 149.)	Nay.
208	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
209	...do...	S. Con. Res. 36, authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 75.)	Yea.
210	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 355, adjusting the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
211	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 339 to 7.)	Yea.
		S. 622, increasing the basic rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government:	
212	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 318 to 26.)	Yea.
213	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951:	
214	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 185 to 160.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3669, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees:	
215	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 341 to 0.)	Yea.
216	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1864, providing or assisting in providing an automobile or making a cash payment to certain disabled veterans:	
217	...do...	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 223 to 53.)	Nay.

May Day: United States Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made yesterday in Burlington, Wis., on the celebration of May Day: United States Way.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAY DAY: UNITED STATES WAY"

(Address by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND in Burlington, Wis., May 1, 1955)

Fellow Americans, it is fitting today that the citizens of Burlington, Wis., a typical American community, demonstrate May Day, the United States way. The theme chosen today to symbolize this patriotic ceremony appropriately sets forth the difference between our way of life and that offered to the world by international communism. "Faith shall make you free," is not a slogan for Americans; it is the very foundation on which our country and Government are based.

Ten days ago, the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued through its official news service, Tass, 69 annual May Day slogans. These slogans

were broadcast to their satellites in Europe and in Asia and, bearing the official stamp of the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, represent communism's May Day sentiments to the world.

I want to quote you just two of the 69 official May Day slogans of the Communist Party. One reads as follows, and I quote: "Fraternal greetings to all the peoples fighting for peace, democracy, for socialism." And I might say, socialism is in capital letters.

The last slogan reads, "Under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin; under the leadership of the Communist Party, forward to the victory of communism!"

Fellow Americans, contrast those slogans with the sentiments which are in your hearts today. Contrast them with our spiritual theme today, "Faith makes men free."

Communism which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time a denial of human freedom Communist is godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of, the common man.

But there is that which will defeat communism. It is just the twofold vital quality which all people of courage have wielded as their weapon—faith in God and faith in human freedom. These are indestructible and while we cling to them we are indestructible, too.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist iron curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held, I shall not remain silent.

What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

Based alone on the Soviet Union's failure to support the United Nations action in Korea and to abide by its charter obligations the Soviet Union should have been expelled from membership.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of freemen.

We seek not 1 foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy would contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy which is dedicated to the destruction of the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and membership in the United Nations.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States, are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I, for one, do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots. Their objective has been, is, and will continue to be the destrcution of human freedom.

Unless there is some formula regarding which I have not been advised and which is difficult for me now to envision, I find it hard to comprehend how we could enter into direct negotiations with Communist China without the interests of the Republic of China being deeply involved.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, and to Yalta and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China.

Patrick Henry, on March 23, 1775, in the Virginia Legislature, said: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God: I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

In his day, Lincoln understood that this Nation could not continue "half slave and half free."

In 1865 at his second inaugural, Lincoln expanded this doctrine when he said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history—we here have the power and bear the responsibility—in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept up a free nations, this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expediency; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa, or Asia, in a dishonorable appeasement at a Far Eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

With the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat as Philadelphia and gave us, first, our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution there, are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Loyalty Day Celebration at Burlington, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to address an outstanding patriotic celebration at Burlington, Wis., which was part of the Nation's wide observance of May Day—Loyalty Day.

I commented on various phases of the challenge to America's patriotic citizens, including our need for upholding our end in the battle of ideas throughout the world.

I also referred to the problem of the impact of American motion pictures overseas.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address which I delivered and the text of a pertinent editorial which was carried in the April 28 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "The Celluloid Ally," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES "365-DAY DEDICATION TO UNITED STATES"; URGES HOLLYWOOD SIFT OUT OBJECTIONABLE MOVIES FROM OVERSEAS SHOWINGS

Many years ago, when the first telegraph message was clicked out, the message read, "What hath God wrought?"

Today, we proudly see and hail what faith—faith in America—has wrought. We see that faith has "moved mountains," mountains of fear and despair and other limitations to bring into being and to preserve the greatest country on earth.

And so, I am thrilled to be with you today at this historic ceremony.

I am delighted that it is the patriotic leaders of my own State—you here in Burlington and surrounding areas—who are stirring this Nation by your great patriotic demonstration.

The eyes of all America are rightly upon you—and with deepest of pride.

DEMONSTRATING AMERICANISM

Here, today, you are expressing the finest in American ideals.

You are showing by the flags that wave aloft and the flags, so to speak, that wave in your hearts and shine in your faces—you are showing by these beautiful floats, by the magnificent bands and marching groups—what it means to be a dedicated, loyal, reverent American.

And what a contrast Loyalty Day here is to May day abroad—particularly in the fear-filled, hate-filled centers of our godless enemy, in Moscow and in other headquarters of the atheistic Communist conspiracy.

Today, here, in God-loving America, you are showing what it is to be a real Yankee Doodle Dandy. You are recapturing the devotion, the enthusiasm, the giving of one's self, which has helped America through all its severest crises.

This was the spirit which saw us through Valley Forge; it was the spirit of Gettysburg, and San Juan Hill, and the Argonne Forest, Iwo Jima, and Heartbreak Ridge. It is the spirit of Burlington, Wis., May Day-Loyalty Day, 1955.

INSTILLING PATRIOTISM IN YOUNG PEOPLE

I am particularly thrilled by what you are doing today—the example you are setting—for the young people in our midst.

Every parent among you who has a child at his side or a child in his arms or a child at home, can feel a well-justified glow of pride.

You are showing the children of Racine County and surrounding counties and of all America, what it means to be an American.

You proved in the houses of worship earlier today that love of God is a sinew of love of our country and all that it stands for.

And, too, in the great patriotic demonstration which we have been witnessing, you have been showing that we must prove in deeds, as well as by our words that we are faithful to this land—the finest, freest, most magnificent country ever to exist on the face of the earth.

You are proving your allegiance to your Government, to our constitutional Republic, the longest-lived major Government on earth today.

You are showing how May Day has been restored as a hallowed day, after years and years in which May Day had been taken over by the enemies of America for their own propaganda purposes.

You are establishing a basis for rededication to America, not just on one day a year, but 365 days a year.

And, too, you are today showing the full splendor of the American heritage.

It is the heritage purchased for us by blood and tears of heroic generations gone by.

It is a heritage of unparalleled wealth, not just material wealth, but, far more important, wealth in things of the spirit.

AMERICA'S MATERIAL WEALTH

In material wealth, we are the envy of the world.

Our abundance-producing agriculture, our humming factories, our crowded, thriving stores, the happy faces of our contented people—these are the admiration of the world.

We are but 165 million people out of 2½ billion on earth. But we have one-half of the wealth of the world today in our own country. The total production of all our goods and services amounts to over $367 billion; 49 percent of our families enjoy an income of $5,000 a year, or more.

And income is becoming distributed ever more equitably among our people.

OUR PRICELESS FREEDOMS

But we possess an infinitely greater wealth. I refer to our freedoms, the tangible and intangible freedoms guaranteed to us under our sacred Bill of Rights, the freedoms which make the state the servant of man, instead of man the servant of the state.

I refer to freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, freedom to own property, freedom to work at a place and under conditions of our own choosing.

And greatest of all our wealth is the wealth of the human spirit, of free men under God who are able to worship as they please—as you and I have worshipped today—in the faith of our fathers, and freedom to grow, to develop.

And there is the wealth of American culture, of our great literature, our music, our art, our poetry, to which you and I are heir.

No land in the world today enjoys wealth or a standard of living such as this, particularly the countries from which many of us here in Wisconsin and from which many of our forebears have come.

A PLEDGE OF FRIENDSHIP TO POLAND

I point out to you, for example, that next Tuesday, May 3, is the national holiday of a great land from which many of Wisconsin's people and their forefathers had come.

I refer to Poland—devout, faithful, gallant Poland, now enslaved under the heel of the Communist aggressor.

On this Loyalty Day, we pledge to Poland our continued warm friendship. And to all the other lands under the yoke of the Red tyrant—to the people of Eastern Germany, the people of the Baltic and Balkan States—we pledge they shall yet be free.

We shall never accept their condition of enslavement. We shall never recognize their domination under the heel of the godless tyrant.

WE PLEDGE VIGILANCE AT OUR RAMPARTS

We pledge, today, moreover our vigilance against the armed aggressor who has enslaved these people. We pledge our strength to be on the alert against this Communist enemy.

We pledge our awareness of our own danger to enemy attack, our awareness of the danger of an atomic Pearl Harbor—which must never occur.

For you and I know that man's ingenuity has contracted space and time. Wisconsin is now next-door neighbor to all the world in this age of supersonic speed.

We are but 3,500 miles away from Soviet airbases and launching sites.

By means of the great circle aerial route, Milwaukee and the other cities of the Middle West are nearer to attack than are the cities of the East. That is why our defense authorities have made Milwaukee a "Nike" guided missile site.

As a matter of fact, we of America today are imperiled basically by three types of possible long-range attack:

First, by intercontinental bomber;

Second, by intercontinental guided missile (guided to its target by electronic devices); and

Third, by intercontinental ballistic missile. (Such a missile can be shot from a launching site like a bullet from a gun or a shell from a cannon.)

Such a ballistic missile, unlike the guided missile, could not be "jammed" by counter-electronic devices. Once it is shot from its site at a speed of perhaps 10,000 miles per hour, nothing now known could stop it, except perhaps another missile or other device to ram it. Such an intercontinental missile, when it is developed 5 or 10 years from now, might be able to reach Burlington or any other city of Wisconsin—just one-half hour after it might be shot from its Soviet launching site. That is why it is we who must develop an intercontinental ballistic missile—an IBM—first, not second. We dare not be second-best. We must be first in this technological race. We must have the strongest possible deterrents to aggression.

It is of these facts that we must be aware. This is a part of intelligent, thinking citizenship—not just 1 day a year—but all 365 days.

We must be aware that the American continent has already been crossed by jet plane in 3¾ hours, and that the Atlantic Ocean has been crossed from Newfoundland to Ireland in less than that time.

We must be aware of the fact that we have wisely erected a worldwide chain of ramparts, defensive air bases in Greenland, Iceland, Britain, North Africa, Turkey, Greece, and elsewhere. These bases grimly tell the Kremlin in the only language it understands, the language of potential force, that we are on the alert.

WE HAVE FAITH WAR WILL NOT COME

These facts do not mean that we believe that war will come, or that war is inevitable.

On the contrary, it is our firm faith that war is not inevitable, that it can be avoided, provided we are strong.

We must, of course, be invincible in relation to Red Russia. We must be invincible in relation to Red China, strong and firm in our insistence on concrete demonstrations on her part that she means peace, not war.

Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung cannot be trusted any more than Krushchev or Molotov can be trusted. Deeds still speak louder than words.

If the Reds really mean peace with regard to Formosa, as we hope they do, then let them prove it by acts.

As for ourselves, we truly want peace in the western Pacific and everywhere else.

We will talk over issues, but we will not cringe; we will not abandon principle nor our Nationalist Chinese ally; we will not appease. The rule of reason in negotiation will prevail, but never the rule of surrender.

We want those 15 United States airmen—totally unjustly imprisoned—back; and we demand the return of all the other imprisoned Americans, as well. We do not propose to abandon a single United States serviceman or civilian.

The righteousness, strength, and faith which made us free will keep us free.

This faith which can move mountains can also move the course of world events.

WINNING WAR OF IDEAS

But guns and steel alone will not protect us in this world today. We are in a critical worldwide battle of ideas, of free ideas against slave ideas.

And it is on this last point that I should like to make these concluding remarks.

It is up to us as loyal Americans to tell and sell the American story to the peoples of the world. We have made great progress toward this end. The leading patriotic organizations of America—the church, fraternal, veterans', labor, business, and other groups—have acquainted the rest of mankind with much of the true meaning of America.

In particular, a great many Hollywood motion pictures have been shown throughout the world which have thrilled audiences to the fine meaning of America. These films have faithfully shown the real America of the grassroots—the America of devotion to God, the America of wholesome individual enterprise, of building great and everlasting and universal values.

SOME FILMS DO US HARM ABROAD

On the other hand, I say very sincerely and frankly that one of our serious problems today is that some of the motion pictures being sent abroad by private firms depict a distorted kind of America. Such films—in the name of so-called realism—have portrayed an America of sex, sin and sadism, of gangsterism, corruption, filth, and degradation.

Such films—few in number—but powerful in effect, have literally been poisoning the minds of some people in the world against us. These films are causing the very opposite of the friendly effect which should be created, if we are to defeat Soviet propaganda.

While the United States Government will be spending some $80 million of your taxpayers' money for a worldwide program of truth, a few films produced privately in Hollywood or elsewhere have been undoing, in part, the very objective for which we, as a people, are striving.

And so I want to issue this word of caution, frankly and emphatically, to the motion-picture film companies.

It is not a new word of caution. I have consulted with them in the past in connection with the work of our Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Overseas Information programs. I have advised the companies as to the seriousness of the problem. I had met with some of their outstanding leaders, and I am glad to say I found in those leaders a deep patriotic awareness of their international responsibilities. Certainly, for example, too, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Mr. Eric Johnston, has proven his tremendous devotion to this country both in that capacity and in many other roles in which he has served America long and well.

The major film producers themselves have done a fine job for America by and large at home and abroad. They and the theatre owners have contributed abundantly to all sorts of charitable and good-will causes. Ours is the only nonsubsidized motion picture industry in the world, and it is the envy of the world.

But a small minority among the film companies seem occasionally more interested in greedy profit, in squeezing the last possible dollar from the overseas market, than they are interested in contributing to an accurate picture of America by withholding some possibly misleading films.

The American people—or some of them—may be able to stomach some of these sinstrewn films. An American can ordinarily interpret such films in proper perspective. He will know that this is not the real America, although it may characterize a very small part of America.

But foreign peoples—who know very little of our country, who don't have a sufficient background properly to interpret these pictures, can be utterly confused by this type of misleading film.

MORE VOLUNTARY FILM SELF-REGULATION NEEDED

What is the answer? The answer is intensified voluntary self-regulation by the film industry. It must sift out more of these misleading films. It has already sifted out many such films and prevented their distribution in countries where they could do harm.

But the fact of the matter is, and it is attested by leading authorities of the industry itself, that some motion pictures have been shown in some countries overseas which very definitely should not have been shown.

Even so renowned and universally respected a trade publication as the newspaper Variety has just recently headlined the deep concern of many industry people, themselves, over some types of films which are going overseas.

I, of course, do not believe in Government censorship. I fought against Federal censorship of Hollywood when it was proposed.

But I say that the American people will insist that we not be misrepresented in the eyes of the world.

The Reds are pouring out enough filth about us without our adding to our own problem.

It is up to Hollywood, therefore to demonstrate its further loyalty—loyalty which I know to be a fact, by taking the appropriate voluntary action. An unscrupulous few should not be in a position to tarnish the good name of the overwhelming mass of deeply responsible industry leaders.

CONCLUSION

Meanwhile, it is up to you and to me at the grassroots or in Washington to do our part in telling and selling the American story right here at home. We must reaffirm our gratitude for our American blessings. We must demonstrate dynamic, active citizenship—365 days a year.

We must demonstrate our gratitude for the unexcelled privileges and rights which are ours—"the jewels of great price."

We must demonstrate our faith that this Nation, "of, by and for the people," shall not perish from the earth.

And by our faith, this objective shall be fulfilled. Our Government shall remain the light of the world and the beacon for all mankind.

THE CELLULOID ALLY

"Poor patriotism is bad business." Thus speaks the chairman of the Motion Picture Producers' Association. Mr. Y. Frank Freeman's declaration is a welcome sign of a sense of responsibility in the film industry for the effects of American movies on the United States' world prestige.

But application of patriotism to production of films to be shown throughout the world is a complex and often exacting requirement.

It involves, indeed, the challenging artistic problem of presenting American life as it really is. This is an exercise in selectivity and emphasis guided by a sense of cultural, social, and moral values which not only Europeans but Americans themselves often feel is wanting in film entertainment.

One often hears it said that Europeans "must like our films, they patronize them enough." Undoubtedly the resources, the photography, direction, and other aspects of technicial finish make American movies relatively attractive even when story content is poor or misleading. But it is one thing for mass audiences abroad to like the pictures as sheer entertainment and quite another for them to like the country they believe these films portray.

Europeans who know America well often remark the disparity between their own firsthand impressions of American life and those they receive from films. They note that Americans do not spend most of their waking hours in cocktail lounges, that they are not all glamorous mannequins or limousine-ensconced racketeers.

They note that there are families in America as in Europe, and that they live in quiet, cozy, modest little houses, planning the children's education, how to plant the new garden, where to spend a holiday.

Films that show this side of American life are sometimes seen in other countries. And when they are first-class films their audiences like not only the films themselves but the country they represent.

The Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary. On April 27, Mr. C. E. Bell, vice president of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., and Mr. Norman Quayle, assistant traffic manager, both of Norfolk, Va., saluted the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service by presenting to the chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Richard E. McArdle, in his office a menu of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad which contained on the back cover a tribute to the splendid work of the Forest Service. I am pleased to include this information, and in so doing, I want to pay tribute to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, which serves so much of the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, for the interest they take in the forestry improvement of our State and Nation, and I also want to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. The Seaboard's tribute follows:

We salute the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary.

Established in 1905, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the United States Forest Service had as its first chief, Gifford Pinchot. Making forestry the Nation's business, Roosevelt and Pinchot built up the national forests withdrawn from the public domain to 173 million acres. Through their efforts groundwork was laid for the eventual purchase of additional millions of acres on the watersheds of navigable streams. Jointly they made both people and Congress conservation-minded.

Since those early years the United States Forest Service has been the symbol of integrated land use. It will continue to face new problems in making the multiple use concept a reality for the increasing population of our Nation.

The United States Forest Service has been a tremendous factor in the cooperative approach to forestry problems. Their work in fire protection, in production and distribution of nursery stock, in extension-education, and in technical service to small owers have been major factors in strengthening State forestry. The Service has spearheaded research in forest management, range management, watershed management, fire control, forest products, forest insect control and forest disease control.

Today, more than 10,000 men and women employed in this organization are charged with the responsibility of developing the multiple-use concept on 181 million acres of national forests in addition to assisting State forestry organizations on cooperative programs.

In the six Southeastern States served by the Seaboard, more than 110 million acres are classified as timber cropland. There are 15 national forests in these States, with an acreage comprising 5,427,049. These forests furnish timber for the manufacture of lumber, pulp, and paper, and furniture, valued in 1953 at $2,464,000,000. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. works closely with industry, State forestry organizations, and the Federal Forest Service toward forestry betterment which contributes to our higher standard of living.

The United German Hungarians Honor Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The United German Hungarians Honor Senator LANGER," which was published in the column entitled "Here and Abroad, a Weekly Chat," by Austin J. App, published in the Nord-Amerika Donnerstag, of April 7, 1955. The article concerns one of our colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE AND ABROAD

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D.)

THE UNITED GERMAN HUNGARIANS HONOR SENATOR LANGER

On Easter Sunday, April 10, the 10th Easter after the infamous Yalta agreement, which plotted the most tragic expulsions in history, the United German Hungarians of Philadelphia and vicinity are honoring with a dinner and plaque the man who did most in the United States Senate to make known and to alleviate the plight of the ethnic German expellees—Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. The dinner, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph Wolf, will be at 3 p. m. in the hall at 2007–2013 North Second Street.

For Senator LANGER, coming to Philadelphia will be revisiting familiar scenes, for he was twice honored here before. On March 26, 1949, at a testimonial dinner at the Adelphia Hotel, sponsored by the Pastorius Unit, Steuben Society of America, he was presented with a magnificent portrait of himself painted by Mr. Conrad Linke, outstanding artist of Philadelphia. On February 19, 1950, under the joint sponsorship of the United Action Committee for Expellees and the United German Hungarians, he was honored with a purse and dinner in the United German Hungarian Hall as the courageous champion of the cause of the German expellees. In those years the so-called Langer amendment had finally succeeded in making possible the first immigration to America of people of German ethnic origin, who had before been totally discriminated against. Since then the full German quotas have been restored, many thousands of new German immigrants have come to America and can look gratefully upon Senator LANGER's pioneer efforts in their behalf, and West Germany has been given sovereignty and admitted to a nearly equal partnership with America, Britain, and France in the defense of Europe.

Senator Langer still on the job for justice

By a strange irony when the Senate on April 2 ratified the Paris Pact, by a vote of 76 to 2, one of the dissenting votes was that of Senator LANGER. The first voice in the Senate which from 1945 on was raised against the criminal Allied policies of dismantling, perpetual disarmament, dismembering Germany was now once again almost a lone voice to protest the most shameful provisions of the Paris Pact, the Saar Statute. It was a shameful choice which the Western Big Three had given the Bonn government: either to sacrifice the Saar and its people to France, or to suffer denial of sovereignty and self-defense. In such an alternative, what could Bonn and the West German people do but accept the betrayal of the Saar in return for sovereignty and self-defense, both inalienable rights which it had been a crime in the first place to take away.

But what the German people had to accept in silent desperation, an American Senator had the right and the courage to protest. When he saw that the Paris Pact, the best bone Germany could get from the dogs at her throat, was sure to pass, he rose to register his protest against their flagrant anti-German injustice of the pact. As the Philadelphia Bulletin reported it (April 2, 1955):

"Senator LANGER who voted with Senator MALONE against the treaty predicted that 'the Saar question will rise up and haunt the signatories of this treaty and in my opinion will be one of the causes of a world war'."

God bless Senator LANGER. Of all the men in the Senate Senator LANGER most courageously and farsightedly has from the beginning and even now seen the German problem steadily and seen it whole. He alone seems fully to understand that the only thing wrong with the Germans is that the power politics of envious neighbors has not permitted them to form that more perfect union of all German lands which is their inalienable right.

Senator Langer on the German expellees

Senator LANGER fought the brave fight to get the mails opened to Germany, to get relief allowed for the Germans, to stop dismantling, to get confiscated private German property returned, to get justice for German soldiers accused of war crimes at Malmedy and elsewhere, to have German prisoners of war sent home, and to remove the IRO and UNRRA discriminations against German immigration.

But what the whole world will probably longest thank him for is his championship of the 12 million surviving German expellees, victims of the greatest of the many crimes imbedded in the Yalta and Potsdam pacts. Here are just a few excerpts on the "Inhuman Mass Deportations" from his great speech in the Senate on April 5, 1949, entitled, "Germany and the ECA: If Western Civilization Is To Survive in Europe It Must Survive in Germany."

Referring to a directive entitled "Population Transfers," Senator LANGER says it concerns "one of the greatest crimes against humanity in all history," and declares:

"Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already, from fifteen to twenty million people have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell, to perish, or be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed, even by the Nazis themselves."

Langer first in the Senate to prove expulsions a war crime

Senator LANGER then cited count 3, section J, of the Nuremberg indictments and boldly declared: "as far back as November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nuremberg tribunal."

He then also cites Churchill's statement in the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, in which Churchill likewise proposed this crime of expulsion, urging (in Churchill's own words) "the total expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south." Churchill at that time added, "For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting."

Well, while Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin were plotting the expulsion of millions of East, Sudeten, Balkan Germans, in the greatest mass crime of history, they were also blueprinting how to hang Germans for having committed a few minor expulsions involving thousands of people, not many millions, as behooves master-criminals who at Yalta presumed to remake the world in 5 days.

We resolve: the expulsion must not prove satisfactory and lasting

It was Senator LANGER, who more clearly than anyone else in the Senate, recognized the mass expulsions of Yalta and Potsdam for the enormous crimes that they were—and who spoke out against them. He was one of the first to help prove Churchill wrong in making these criminal expulsions satisfactory and lasting. It is up to all of us to see to it that these expulsions will not last, that the expellees will get their homes and homelands back. We must dedicate ourselves to proving that this greatest of all

international crimes, the expulsion of 15 million Germans, will not pay.

Let the Langer dinner this Easter at the United German Hungarian hall both honor Senator LANGER for his great work and also strengthen our resolve to carry on what he started. The United German Hungarians, their president, Mr. Joseph Ball; the chairman, Mr. Joseph Wolf; their helpers; and the Ladies Auxiliary—all deserve our support and thanks for this dinner in honor of Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Power Politics is Our Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, high in the Cascade Mountains where the weather and climate of Washington State is cut in two is Cloudy Pass. Trying to count the distant and surrounding snow-clad peaks from this lofty ridge of rock, someone once counted to 10,000—and then gave up. The beauty of this spot is surpassing. Standing here once, a woman, with eyes uplifted said, "Thank you, God."

There was more than the beauty of nature to thank God for, although she did not think of other blessings, because our greatest resource in the Pacific Northwest is not scenery, priceless as that is—it is water. In the mountains, the moisture of the sky is gathered and harbored on high, and as the snows melt, by rivulet, lake, and stream, the water descends endlessly and irresistibly to the sea. Thus, our great resource of power—the force that gives our region the cheapest and greatest potential waterpower in the Nation.

In the Pacific Northwest, people and politician alike, say, "Thank you, God," for their natural resource of water—not only for its potential for needed cheap hydroelectric power, but also because nearly a million acres of arid soil, rich in minerals, lie here awaiting water by irrigation to transform a dry desert into a paradise of food-producing farms.

This makes for a complementary economy; the cheap power means industrialization and more jobs; the reclamation and agricultural development mean an outlet and prospective purchasers for the products of industrialization; and the workers in the factories mean more consumers for the farmers' produce.

Out in the Pacific Northwest, the people are united when it comes to the immediate and pressing need of further developing their resource of water. Strangely enough, of all the areas of the United States, we are the most power starved; yet we have the greatest potential. It is somewhat analogous to the Nile delta in Egypt where the poorest people in the world live on the richest soil. Our problem is that it takes 5 or 6 years after construction of a project is commenced before we will begin to get needed power. Normal population growth means our power shortage will become increasingly acute by 1960, so we must get a major power project started at once.

Aware of the growing reluctance of the Congress for the Federal Government to assume the huge financial investment of the Pacific Northwest power projects, President Eisenhower proposed a partnership program where local interests would pay for power-generating facilities while the Federal Government would contribute toward flood control, navigation, and other improvements properly coming under its realm of responsibility. I think it is fair to state this plan met with widespread approval. Of course, those who wish to see a Federal power monopoly did not approve. These socialistic and bureaucratic-minded individuals were not left to their own devices and desires. An unholy alliance was immediately effected with the keepaways, those secret obstructionists who would sacrifice the needs of this great region on the altar of their own political advantage. Thus, there does exist a small but vocal bloc who would hope to generate votes in 1956 rather than kilowatts because a failure now to carry out the President's program would allow them to scream that this is a do-nothing administration.

To tie in with the partnership program, the 83d Congress deauthorized the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River to allow local interests to proceed under this plan. Our distinguished and able colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] is entitled to great credit for this legislation to meet the impending power shortage, and I am happy to say there would seem to be reasonable expectation that the Grant County Public Utility Department in Washington State will successfully resolve the financing and problems incident to starting such a project.

However, partnership is not the only answer. We have certain multipurpose dam sites which require Federal financing and construction. Here the vast Federal appropriations involved constitute a serious barrier which has seemed almost unsurmountable because the projects are needed now. Defense is a huge drain on the Federal Treasury and the tax burden has been so heavy that it is difficult to get support for appropriations which would have such an effect on the budget.

Our colleague from Oregon [Mr. COON] has introduced H. R. 5789 calling for construction of the multipurpose John Day Dam on the Columbia River. He has recognized the need—that a new start must be made now. The gentleman from Oregon has also recognized fiscal responsibility and the budget situation. In his measure he provides, therefore, that local groups put up the money for the Federal Government. So while the dam would be owned, built, and operated by the Federal Government, like other multipurpose projects, the money to build the generating facilities would be advanced by local groups, as advance payments for the power they will receive when the construction is completed. Thus the Federal budget is not increased; nor are the taxpayers in other areas putting up money for the Pacific Northwest.

Hearings on H. R. 5789, I understand, will be held soon. There are many details which will have to be spelled out. No doubt there will be some areas for dispute as between private, municipal, and local, publicly owned distributors of electric power. But in general the people of the Pacific Northwest will wholeheartedly support this measure which may well contain the solution to their future. It may be the difference between economic salvation or ruin in the area. If this bill passes, the citizen can raise his eyes unto the hills and reverently and prayerfully say, "Thank you, God."

Of course some political sour grapesters will wrathfully oppose this legislation, for surely it precludes the issue in 1956 of do-nothing. The slogan of such obstructionists might well be "Power politics is our politics."

I strongly urge consideration of H. R. 5789.

Excerpts From Addresses by Governor Harriman, of New York, on United States Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, among the courageous voices which have been publicly heard in recent weeks on the question of our Far Eastern policy is that of the distinguished Governor of my State, Averell Harriman.

All except a few of us here in the Senate were silent in the face of the catastrophic implications of the administration's policy in the Formosa Straits. That policy seems to have been sharply modified in the past fortnight—largely as a consequence of the mobilization of public opinion against that policy. One of the courageous public figures who helped mobilize that public opinion was Gov. Averell Harriman.

Governor Harriman is in Washington this week, attending the Governors conference. I am happy to call the attention of the Senate to speeches on this subject which Governor Harriman made, one as long ago as March 8. I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from a speech Governor Harriman made on March 8, in New York City, before the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with similar excerpts from a speech he delivered on April 3, at the inaugural dinner of the joint defense appeal, also in New York City.

Governor Harriman's views command public interest and attention because he is not only chief executive of the largest State in the Union, but he is also a man who speaks with consummate authority on foreign affairs. He was, as everyone knows, one of the principal architects

of our foreign policy and one of the principal leaders of that policy for more than a decade. When he comments on our foreign policy, he speaks from a background of knowledge and experience which few individuals in America can match.

New York State is fortunate to have him as governor; and in these difficult times the Nation is fortunate to have the counsel of his authoritative voice on matters of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MARCH 8, 1955

* * * * * * * *

You who are here tonight have an especially deep and personal understanding of the need for the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the world.

No nation can go it alone—not even powerful America.

From a military standpoint, we cannot.

From an economic standpoint, we cannot.

* * * * * * * *

Last November, Secretary Dulles and Mr. Stassen were talking about what was called a bold, new economic program for Asia. Although late, this made sense. Under President Truman's point 4 program, we had learned much about these countries and what can be done by America to help people to help themselves—in developing resources and raising living standards and productivity and morale.

In this proposal, the Administration seemed to realize that what is needed to counter the external and internal threat of Communist expansion in Asia is a program bold enough to capture the imagination of the people, and vigorous enough to demonstrate that a decent life can be achieved under freedom. They seemed to understand that the cost to us of such an economic offensive would be a tiny fraction of our expenditures for military defense and military aid. And the effect of our help would be multiplied if cooperative undertakings could be developed among the participating countries as was the case in Europe.

So the talk went on. But the men who appear to have had the last word with the President are those who regard this sort of thing as beyond America's capacity—or not worth bothering about. So the idea was laid aside. Great had been the expectations—and equally great was the letdown throughout free Asia.

In this connection, it is significant that a conference of most of the Asian and African nations has been called to convene in Bandoeng, Indonesia, next month. Red China has been invited to participate—whereas Chiang Kai-shek is excluded. We can be sure that the Communists will try to turn the whole meeting into a "hate America" crusade.

Compounding the effects in Asia of all the lack of understanding has been the incredible story of the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek.

You recall that President Truman, in 1950, ordered the 7th Fleet to neutralize the Formosa Strait—preventing attacks upon Formosa by the Communists and forbidding attacks upon the mainland by Chiang. And you remember how President Eisenhower, in his first message to Congress, reversed all that.

I doubt that anyone would now deny that behind this "unleashing" episode was domestic politics and appeasement of members of his own party.

Yet to the rest of the world it sounded ominous. To the rest of the world, it could only mean that we intended to support Chiang's ambition to return to the mainland; and that, in turn, could only mean world war.

The "unleashing" episode, and the continuing failure to explain or retract it, injured our relations with our European allies—who were quite understandably not ready for such recklessness. And it soured our relations with many countries in Asia.

Last week, Chiang Kai-shek was still asserting that he intended to return to the mainland, with the help of this country. Asked about this, the President finally said "the United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war." In effect, after 25 months, Chiang was to be leashed again.

The President appears to have realized at long last the wisdom of President Truman's policy of neutralizing the Formosa Strait.

Of course, we should and will defend Formosa. There has never been any doubt about that. But it should also be clear that there is no future in any Asian policy which pays more atention to the objectives of Chiang Kai-shek than to the aspirations of the 900 million people of the other free countries of the East—as well as the peoples of Europe.

I am sure of this: The first thing we must do in the Formosa area is to end our desperately dangerous policy of going it alone. Whenever we take positions alone, it offers a temptation to the Comunists to take risks in the hope of furthering their basic objective of splitting us from our North Atlantic allies, and our friends everywhere. We must get our diplomacy back on a basis of collective action. We must internationalize the defense of Formosa, and do this, if possible, through the United Nations.

What we need now is a new spirit in the conduct of foreign affairs—a spirit of humility, of moderation, of partnership, and of peace—a spirit which would ring with a new sound in the ears of the world, but which would gain its strength because it would be a reaffirmation of the finest strains of American realism and idealism—of the values which made our Nation so long the refuge of the suffering people of mankind and the embodiment of the hopes of freedom and justice in the light of God, everywhere in the world.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to lead.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to survive.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE INAUGURAL DINNER OF THE JOINT DEFENSE APPEAL, WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 3, 1955

* * * * * * * *

What we are saying applies to world affairs in the same way. In the free world, just as at home, there can be no true strength without unity. And unity in turn depends on a mutual respect and equality of status among peoples of all races and creeds. Prejudice and claims of inherent superiority have no more place in international life than in domestic life.

I submit that we are in danger of losing the whole cold war if we fail to recognize this principle and make it live.

Every time an American rattles the atomic saber in Asia, every time an American talks about Asians fighting Asians, we lose friends among the uncommitted peoples.

Perhaps most tragic of all, for months now our policy in regard to the Formosa Strait has failed to take into account the sensibilities of either our Asian or our European friends and allies. Unhappily, there are those who have put our country in the position of appearing not to care for the judgment of those whom we would have as our friends. This is basically, I am afraid, an expression of that intolerance which we are seeking to stamp out in our domestic life and everywhere.

Surely there is yet time to bring together all of the countries involved—not only in the East but in Europe—in order to internationalize the defense of Formosa, so vital to our own and free world security. The whole world is a party at interest—and it has been not only illogical but deadly dangerous to arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for decisions which involve the future of many peoples.

It is a great enterprise in which we are engaged—that of making America and the world more tolerant and happier and stronger. There have been temporary setbacks, and there will be more. But over the years there have been even greater advances, and there will be more. The setbacks serve to make us realize how precious are our liberties, and to stimulate us to work harder for their protection. As long as we are in there doing battle, in good spirits and with confidence, I shall not doubt the outcomes.

For I have infinite faith in the triumph of true brotherhood, not only in this great country of ours, but—with our inspiration and our patient and steadfast leadership—throughout the world.

New Orleans-Mexico Air Route—Let's Not Cut Latin Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans Item, has directed my attention to two editorials which recently appeared in the Item and which I believe should be brought to the attention of this body.

Both editorials pose very serious problems. One is more or less limited in scope to a local condition but most definitely involves a very serious and basic deficiency in the operation and conduct of the Civil Aeronautics Board. There is indeed something very peculiar and most strange in connection with the activities of this particular board. As a matter of fact, there is such great suspicion as to its operation that my distinguished colleague from New Orleans, HALE BOGGS, has before the Rules Committee a resolution to which I heartily subscribe, to investigate, fumigate, and ventilate the whole business.

There is one thing certain about the granting of a permit for direct service between New Orleans and Mexico City and that is that it is most assuredly bipartisan. When President Truman was in the White House he voided an order of the then constituted board, and now President Eisenhower refuses to vacate the order of his predecessor. I have always been of the opinion that what one President can do the other can undo, but apparently neither the desire nor the inclination is here.

The failure to establish a direct airline between New Orleans and Mexico City is one of the most discriminatory acts charged against any board created by the Congress.

There is something present which does not meet the eye, and I frankly do not

believe all the cards have been placed face up on the table, and I would not be at all surprise if there were several cards concealed in somebody's sleeve. How to shake them loose is the real problem.

The item in its editorial gives a splendid statement of the case.

In the second editorial which Mr. Chaplin has called to my attention the very provocative question of Latin oil is dealt with.

Here are the two editorials in question:

DIRECT FLIGHT 9 YEARS OVERDUE—NEW ORLEANS-MEXICO AIR ROUTE

The 22d of next month marks the 9th anniversary of a frustrating case in New Orleans' aviation history.

On that day in May 1946, President Truman authorized a direct air route between New Orleans and Mexico City. He was acting under executive power, pursuant to the Civil Aeronautics Act.

What's happened since shouldn't happen to a dogma—much less to a great transportation center like ours. New Orleans today is the only large city on the United States southern border without direct air service to the Mexican capital.

Here, in brief, is the story:

After Mr. Truman O. K.'d the route, the State Department and Eastern Air Lines—which was given the permit to operate the service—ran into snags with the Mexican authorities.

These included a Mexican demand that the United States grant similar rights to a Mexican airline, with the proviso that the agreement would be in force only as long as the Mexican company continued service. The State Department objected that this proviso would set a bad precedent for other bilateral pacts.

This stalemate continued until Mr. Truman on September 8, 1952, withdrew his approval of Eastern's permit and of two other unimplemented certificates concerning service to Mexico City from Laredo, Tex., and Los Angeles.

His view was that this would clear the air and enable a more effective new negotiation.

This was the situation when last November the Civil Aeronautics Board began hearing Eastern's request for a New York-Washington-Mexico City service.

The airline contended that the way in which President Truman had revoked its New Orleans-to-Mexico City permit was unconstitutional. On April 18, CAB bureau counsel made the same argument, that the President had not complied with the procedures set out in the law of canceling, suspending, or revoking a certificate.

Earlier in the hearing, there had been several different approaches taken on behalf of New Orleans.

Mayor Morrison and a spokesman for Governor Kennon asked the CAB to suspend the hearing of the New York-Washington-Mexico City case until our prior claim is satisfied.

The chamber of commerce took—and presently maintains—a somewhat variant view. It is less concerned with whether the New York-Washington-Mexico case is halted—possibly because it doubts that it will be—than with whether New Orleans-to-Mexico City service can be made a part of that case.

Contends the chamber: No agreement as to any route should be negotiated between our country and Mexico, unless such agreement includes the New Orleans-Mexico service.

That's a sound, practical stand.

New Orleans is entitled to such a direct route.

This is an international city—in location, in ideas, in trade and in communication.

Particularly is all of this true in relation to Latin America. We are a natural north-south gateway, a fact of which the CAB is, of course, fully aware.

We urge the CAB to end this delay and to make direct service between here and Mexico City a requisite of the next bilateral air agreement between the two countries. Let's "rev" up and get off the ground. This flight is 9 years overdue.

NEELY PROPOSAL HARMFUL—LET'S NOT CUT LATIN OIL

An amendment by Senator MATTHEW NEELY, West Virginia Democrat, threatens to cut the heart out of President Eisenhower's foreign-trade program.

NEELY hails from a State whose coal industry unfortunately is having a rough time. But the Senator's plan to drastically curtail oil imports into the United States—especially heavy-fuel oil imports—isn't going to solve whatever is wrong in the coal fields.

Homeowners who heat with oil or natural gas aren't going back to coal furnaces. Ships and factories fueled by oil won't turn the clock back either. And diseled locomotives are going to stay dieselized.

We can understand NEELY's feeling that something must be done to help coal. Certainly, a thriving domestic coal industry is desirable. But his amendment, while failing to provide the remedy he seeks, would work incalculable harm to our foreign relations.

Reciprocal trade is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. To sell abroad, we must buy abroad.

The State Department stressed this among the 10 points it advanced this week why the Neely amendment is contrary to the national interest.

A good example of what the State Department is talking about is one of our neighboring lands to the south, Venezuela, whose economy largely floats on oil. (In the last 9 years, United States companies have invested $800 million in Latin American oil; of this $575 million in Venezuela.)

Our trade with that country has jumped thirteenfold since World War II. She spends almost a billion dollars a year for United States goods and services. And on a per capita basis she buys more from us than any other country in the world except Canada.

The investment climate there for United States capital is healthy—and our venture dollars have helped Venezuela to develop her resources, expand and begin to diversify her economy, and to raise her living standards.

The desirability of such conditions was the dominant theme of the recent Inter-American Investment Conference here. The Latinos sought United States capital. American businessmen wanted assurances of a favorable atmosphere in which to operate. Venezuela, now the world's largest oil exporter, combines both.

We have in recent years cited her as a model of what good trade and friendship with us can achieve. It has been a big talking point in our good-neighbor policy.

But such legislation as that proposed by Senator NEELY would wreck this policy and convince the hemisphere, in particular, that our actions do not square with our words.

* * * * *

Some independent oil men share the coal industry's belief that legislative quotas should be placed on petroleum imports.

Their views, too, must be fairly weighed in terms of both our domestic economy and our foreign relations.

The State Department, in expressing its opposition to NEELY's amendment, noted that the domestic oil industry is operating at or near its all-time peak, that it is prosperous and its outlook is bright.

We use about half of the oil the free world produces. But our known reserves are only about a fifth of the free world's.

The demand for oil products in the United States is expected to double by 1975. And we must not overlook the possibility of having to sharply and quickly step up the rate of domestic oil output in event of war.

Against this backdrop, the State Department's stand makes good sense.

There should be an intelligent balance between oil imported and oil produced domestically, but it is best to achieve that balance by voluntary action of importers.

Unless and until it is demonstrated, after a fair test, that such voluntary restraints will not work, we as a Nation should steer clear of legislative intervention. The Neely amendment should be roundly defeated.

Senator George: Preeminent Senator of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PREEMINENT SENATOR OF 1955

Who would you say is the preeminent figure in the United States Congress today?

Would it be Representative SAM RAYBURN, the shrewd, respected Speaker of the House? Or Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the able, malleable leader of the Democratic majority? Or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, the earnest, lone-wolf Senate Republican leader who sometimes speaks for the administration?

If you name any of these you will at least be going against the majority judgment of the Washington press corps.

Their almost unanimous judgment today is that the single most powerful, most influential person in the whole legislative branch of the Government is Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, the veteran Georgia Democrat, who accepted the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to President Eisenhower's great satisfaction.

Senator GEORGE is today proving himself to be a more positive force than any of the other preeminent Senators of the last quarter century.

He is far more powerful constructively, say, than Senator William Borah, who was largely a negativist, and who in his implacable isolationism stood astride the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when the United States was trying to free itself from a policy of neutrality as Hitler began to topple Europe and strike at the shores of Britain.

He is more influential than Senator Arthur Vandenberg whose great influence centered principally in foreign affairs.

He seems to me to be more influential than even Senator Robert Taft, whose interest and talents were mostly focused upon domestic legislation, and whose influence did

not cut as widely across party lines as does Senator GEORGE'S.

This Congress is hardly 4 months old and Senator GEORGE has personally put his imprint on the mood and substance of the largest and most significant congressional actions.

I think it no exaggeration to report that today the quiet, poised, deep-voiced Senator GEORGE is the second most powerful and most influential man in Washington—second only to the President himself.

When this session of Congress began last January, Mr. GEORGE was the ranking Democratic member of both the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He could be chairman of either one. He chose Foreign Relations because his primary interest was foreign policy, and because he knew that the Senate's greatest decisions would almost inevitably be in the field of foreign policy.

He chose the Foreign Relations chairmanship knowing that President Eisenhower had privately expressed the hope that he would do so. He knew that they could and would work together well. He knew that it would be important—important for the country—for him to help create the climate which would give the President the maximum freedom and flexibility of action to take steps which might run counter to short-run public opinion.

He is accomplishing this objective decisively, sometimes against considerable odds.

By his own quiet authority, by his detachment and by his leadership, he has erected a strong barricade around the bipartisan conduct of foreign policy—a barricade against both Democratic attacks and Republican attacks.

Mr. GEORGE helped put through the Senate the President's fight-if-we-must Formosa resolution with only three votes in opposition—two from Democrats; this at a time when many of his Democratic colleagues were looking hungrily at this issue as a means of belaboring the Administration and when, without his restraining influence, many Democrats might have leaped off the reservation.

He deliberately stepped out ahead of the President to break ground in favor of a Big Four conference at the summit at a time when Mr. Eisenhower needed to have public opinion responsive to a Big Four meeting he couldn't avoid if he wanted to.

While the White House was being indecisive, he spoke out instantly in favor of accepting Chou En-lai's offer of direct negotiations over Formosa, and undoubtedly influenced the administration's policy.

In domestic legislation, it is probable that no single Senator was as influential in helping the President defeat the quickie, premature $20-for-everybody tax cut as Mr. GEORGE.

This is some of the evidence that WALTER F. GEORGE is more powerful than any other Democratic or Republican Senator today.

Atoms for Peace—Phases of the Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 8 there will convene in Geneva the United Nations Conference on Atoms for Peace.

At that time, the United States will open an historic exhibit, where a research reactor will actually be demonstrated.

The participating nations among the 84 governments who have been invited will be able to see at first-hand how the United States is moving ahead toward harnessing of the atom for peace.

The following month, I am glad to say, here in our own country, and indeed in our own Nation's Capital, will occur an important event when the first Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will open. This will mark a significant occasion in America's own progress of applying the atom for an ever-higher standard of living for our own and other peoples.

Of course, the making available of the atom for peaceful purposes has not been without its problems.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, heavily burdened by its massive responsibilities, has been moving ahead, although numerous suggestions have been made to it for intensified efforts in "flashing the green light" so that United States private industry can carry the ball more and more.

Meanwhile, on the international front, the need is increasingly apparent for the United States to accelerate its efforts to bring the peaceful miracles of atomic energy more meaningfully to foreign countries, particularly among underdeveloped peoples.

I have in my hand three important expressions on the various phases which I have mentioned.

The first is a welcome release from the Atomic Industrial Forum announcing the First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry. I know the fair will receive the fullest cooperation from the Washington community.

The second is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 12. It comments frankly on the need for encouraging increasing private participation in atomic work so as to speed what has been called the "atomic revolution."

And, finally, there is an important editorial from the April 27 Milwaukee Journal stating that the atomic power ship of peace, while an outstanding contribution, is by no means more than an introduction to what America can and should do in bringing the atom miracles to the attention of foreign lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these three items—each pointing up an important phase of the problem—be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the release and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will be held in Washington, D. C., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, September 26–30, it was announced today by the Atomic Industrial Forum. The trade fair, which will be held in conjunction with the forum's fall meeting, will have as its theme, "Marketing the Products of Atomic Energy."

According to the forum's executive manager, Charles Robbins, this pioneering trade fair will demonstrate the extent to which peaceful atomic energy and its associated products and services have advanced as an important sector of our industrial economy.

The fair will be seen by an audience of key management and operating officials in organizations engaged or considering participation in atomic-energy development and use, Members of Congress, the staffs of interested Government agencies, and the commercial and scientific attachés of the various embassies and legations in the Nation's capital.

A survey of the exhibit plans of member organizations indicates that there will be displays in such fields as design engineering, package power, medical and research reactors, control systems, reactor materials, instrumentation, construction and fabrication techniques, isotope sources and applications, shielding materials and devices, and reactor components and auxiliaries, in addition to various consultant services.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—ATOMIC INITIATIVE

At a conference on atomic energy in industry held in San Francisco last week, it was evident that many companies are putting far more manpower and money into the field than anyone expected at this early date.

At the same time the Atomic Energy Commission announced it has received four new proposals for the construction of demonstration nuclear electric powerplants to cost an estimated $150 million and produce a total of 455,000 kilowatts. These were in response to the AEC's offer of financial aid in such construction. Significantly, though, the share asked of the Government was only 10 to 20 percent—far lower than had been expected.

These 4 projects, all except 1 of which were suggested by groups of private companies, are in addition to the 250,000-kilowatt, $55-million powerplant New York's Consolidated Edison Co. plans to build without any Government help.

All this—the specific power projects and the general industrial atomic fever reflected at San Francisco—is a direct consequence of the amended atomic energy law enacted last summer. It is a startling tribute to those who got the bill through against the embittered opposition of men willing to stultify progress for the sake of what they thought could be a political issue.

But the progress, impressive though it is, is not an occasion, for complacency. To speed the atomic revolution the amended law will need further liberalizing, and it is none too soon for Congress to be thinking about this.

For the 1954 law did not make atomic industry so much a free enterprise as a mixed Government private enterprise. That is better than leaving it a wholly Government monopoly, but the faster the emphasis can be further shifted to private activity the faster will the benefits of the atom be realized.

Meanwhile there is reason to believe that more could be done even within the framework of the present law. Several witnesses before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy have pointed to continued secrecy as 1 of the major deterrents to more widespread participation in the field.

Partly the complaint is that the AEC could make nonsecret material more readily accessible and explain to industry just how much is already available in the nonsecret category. But there is also a strong feeling that much information presently classified could be made generally available under the 1954 statute without impairing national security.

One recent witness, Francis McCune, vice president and general manager of the Atomic Products Division of the General Electric Co., put the case for more information particularly well. Noting that bars to the availability of information about atomic energy cannot but operate as obstacles to entry into the industry, he said: "Information should be made available not merely to those who are already interested but, perhaps even more importantly, to those who are not yet interested, for information is required to stimulate interest."

The suggestion here is not that any and every kind of company would promptly plunge into atomic energy if more were known. Rather, it is that a company cannot determine whether or not it should be interested in atomic energy in the absence of sufficient knowledge. "Without adequate information," Mr. McCune said, "industry cannot be expected to show real initiative."

Considering the hobbles on it, industry is showing considerable initiative. It is in the interest of the AEC, Congress and the people that this initiative should not now be frustrated either by too much law or by too little knowledge.

ATOM SHOW SHIP NOT ENOUGH

President Eisenhower's announced plan for an atomic-powered ship of peace is a dramatic proposal. Sent on a world cruise, the merchant vessel would be a floating showcase in which people everywhere might see the promise of atomic science to improve human living—not destroy it.

For us, the vessel would have additional practical value. Its construction and operation would teach us valuable lessons about the cost and efficiency of an atomic surface ship now that we have the submarine *Nautilus* in use and other atomic submarines under construction or planned.

A danger inherent in the President's plan, however, is that the peace ship might become a gimmick that would constitute our do-all in the field of international atomic energy. Instead of a supplement, it might turn into a substitute—a huckster's blurb rather than the production followthrough.

People of the world, we are sure, will be mightily impressed when a sleek ship, driven by atomic power and displaying the good things the atom can bring, sails into their harbors. But unless they are shown a way whereby they can enjoy these atomic benefits, won't they feel like a waif at the candy shop window, permitted to admire the mouth-watering sweets but denied the means of obtaining them?

Like the test reactor that America plans to display at the International Conference of Atomic Scientists in Geneva this year, the peace ship should represent the salesman's sample case of products which America stands willing and ready to help bring to the world.

The peace ship must implement President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan. An atomic powerplant in India, Japan, or Egypt—built with American technical help, manned by native technicians trained in American skills and fueled with some of the fissionable material America has earmarked for world use—will do more to demonstrate American good will than just a showcase ship.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pride and gratification to me that the Governor of my home State of Georgia has proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day. I am proud also that many of the mayors of cities and towns in my congressional district at home likewise proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day, and that pursuant to these proclamations Loyalty Day was observed by parades, rallies, and patriotic activities. Participating in these ceremonies were many of our officials, numerous patriotic groups and veterans organizations, as well as individual men and women, boys and girls who love our country and appreciate the priceless blessings which we enjoy as free American citizens.

It is fitting that May 1 has replaced the spot on the calendar that for many years was a rally day for Communist organizations and the other units of radicalism which oppose every concept of patriotism, every right of free men, embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Loyalty to flag and country is the keystone in the arch of good citizenship. Designation of May 1 as Loyalty Day takes the battle to the hordes of subversion on the date such forces had preempted over many years as their day of demonstration.

Today I received a letter from Charles A. Moran, chairman of the loyalty day committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Atlanta, Ga., who has enlisted the aid of radio stations, newspapers, and speakers in publicizing Loyalty Day by repetition of patriotic slogans.

I would like to place 1 or 2 of those slogans in the RECORD. One reads:

On Loyalty Day let us recite the new pledge to the flag: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Another reads:

Loyalty means liberty. Observe Loyalty Day May 1 in your own way. Reaffirm loyalty to God, our country, and our flag.

To these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in saying a fervent "Amen."

Address by Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona, Before the Indiana Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 22, 1955, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, addressed the Collegiate Division rally of the Indiana Young Republicans, in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RHODES, OF ARIZONA

In deciding the mental makeup of the 1955 model Republican, it might be well to first consider the type of party which the Republican Party has always been. It was born amidst the strife and dissatisfaction preceding the War Between the States. It came of age during the terrible test of physical and moral courage which this country underwent and which we know as the Civil War. It presided over the destinies of this Nation during the boom period of the 19th century, which saw the construction of railroads from coast to coast, the western land migration, and the beginning of the industrial revolution in this country.

This era also produced such industrial giants as the oil and steel trusts, and witnessed the evils of railroad rebates, yellow-dog contracts, and other abuses of "bigness," which were to the detriment of all American people. This party was responsible for the Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman Anti-trust Act, the Clayton Act, and many other pieces of legislation aimed at maintaining the interests of the average individual as against the industrial giant. It is to the credit of this party that this great purpose was accomplished without materially slowing the rapid development of our natural resources and industrial plants. This party ended the spoils system when it enacted the Civil Service Act.

In the early 20th century, the Republican Party was responsible for the Reclamation Act which has been so instrumental in the development of the West. The Panama Canal was conceived and constructed during a Republican administration. The first attempts to protect the farmer from the speculator at the market place, and to assure the farmer of a fair return on his investment and labor occurred during the Republican administration in the 1920's.

Domestically, the Republican Party has always stood for progress under the mantle of free enterprise. Yet this party has always jealously guarded the rights, political and economic, of our citizens. In other words, this is a party which does not believe in giving advantages to special groups or interests, or allowing such groups or interests to possess advantages which are used to the detriment of the average citizen. Our theory of government places the Federal Government in the middle of a teeter-totter, acting as a balance so that neither side is able to gain advantage to the detriment of the other side.

It is significant to note that although the Republican Party has brought this country its greatest periods of prosperity, it has not, in this century, been in power at the start of any war. Therefore, Republican prosperity is based upon sound economy and does not arise from the stimulus provided by emergency situations. We have not, and I pray that we may never follow the policy of government by crisis.

So what kind of a party are we?

We have never been moss-backed; we have never been reactionary. Whether we are dynamic-conservative or enlightened-liberal, we have never believed in standing still or going backward. We have created a climate favorable to the full development of our resources by private endeavor, with only such help from the Government as is needed to get the job done.

The 1955 Republican should continue to provide a government which balances all interests to benefit the whole Nation. We should neither insert the Government into situations where it is not needed, nor should we shirk governmental action where such action is necessary. As President Eisenhower has said on occasion, "We should walk forthrightly up the middle of the road, because no real progress is made by those who walk in the gutter to the right or the left."

It is hard to be a Republican. During the New Deal era, the pendulum swung to the left. The cry of "soak the rich" rose. This fallacy, sponsored by the Democrats, failed to take into account the facts that: (1) All income of persons who made more than $100,000 a year was very small compared to the Federal budget; and (2) to provide jobs, you must provide a climate favorable to the investment of capital. Roosevelt recognized this, finally, when in 1936

he tried to get Congress to exempt all dividends from taxation. (When we just exempt 5 percent, Democrats say we favor the rich.) But priming the pump did not produce prosperity, nor build it.

But we still have attempts made to prime the pump for the political advantage to be derived from posing as the friend of the little man.

I deny there is a permanent class of people known as little men. There are many of us who are not doing as well as we would like to. We can afford to help those people when they are unemployed, injured on the job, and too old to work. But we can best serve the little man by creating a climate in which he can (1) get a job and hold it, at fair wages; and (2) get as big as he is big enough to get. Do not make him a little man all his life. A job is worth more to a man than is a $20 tax cut.

In order to provide this climate for investments which means jobs, we have had to make some unpopular decisions. In the 83d Congress we had to forego the pleasure of increasing the personal exemption by $100. In this one, we had to vote against a $20 tax cut across the board. We have had to cut spending, curtail contracts, and thereby create local economic crises, and, in general, "kill Santa Claus." This is because a serious Government deficit would cause another round of inflation, and siphon off the capital needed for industrial expansion, which, in turn, means jobs.

After the free-and-easy days of New Deal hand-outs, it is hard to explain to our average citizen that he must forego his candy to have his bread. But we Republicans must continue in the path President Eisenhower has set up for us, and sell Mr. Average American on the wisdom of this course.

I repeat, it is hard to be a Republican.

At home, it must be the job of the 1955 model Republican to keep our country strong, free, and prosperous, by maintaining conditions in which the inherent ambition, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of our citizens may have full sway. But today we live in a world which is becoming, more and more, one community. We of this generation will mold the face of this community. Our actions, or inactions, will determine whether this community will be devoted to individual freedom, or to the 1955 model of slavery known as communism.

I do not believe that Republicanism and communism can exist in the same community, or world. Therefore, we must inevitably conclude that we must pit our way of life against theirs in a struggle for survival.

When we think of such a struggle we inevitably assume that trial by arms will become necessary, as indeed it may. But to assume that this is our only means of triumph is to sell our way of life short. The peoples of the world, if fully informed and free to choose, would certainly choose our free society to the chains of communism. Our task is to so inform them, and to help create a situation in which their composite will may assert itself.

The Bible tells us that at one time all men spoke the same tongue. Then man got too big for his pants, and to chasten him, God caused all men to speak different tongues. The inability of man to communicate with his fellowman has ever since provided us with our greatest inconvenience and our greatest challenge. We have means of sending signals throughout the earth, but still a very few methods of really communicating thoughts. It is still very difficult to determine the composition of the soul of our fellow man.

I hope that some day we will put our brains and treasure to work to learn to communicate thoughts to each other. But maybe something else comes first. Maybe there is still a lesson to be learned from the ancient punishment visited by God on Man. Maybe the sentence was that we must learn to live together before our souls may communicate.

Therefore, with the feeble means at our disposal, let us try it. Let us keep our guns, tanks, planes, and hydrogen bombs, but let us add a new weapon to our arsenal—truth.

Our Government, and most of our people, believe in telling the truth. Most of us can spot a lie—it takes some longer than others. On the other hand, communism, fascism, etc., are nurtured by lies, for they are themselves the greatest fabrications of all time.

Therefore, our best weapon is truth. It is devastating to the enemy; beneficial to us. Imagine the impact it would make on the world if we were to offer Russia free space in our newspapers, free time on radio and TV, to tell whatever they might desire, in exchange for similar free time and space in Russian mediums which would reach an equal number of people, who would be free to listen.

There is no doubt in any of our minds that the Communists would feed our people their choicest selection of tall tales. Let them. We will tell the people of Russia the truth, which the rulers of Russia will brand as lies. But truth can be masked only for a short time, and lies can remain undetected for a neven shorter period.

The end result would be a thorough knowledge on the part of the Russian people of our lives, our aspirations, and our souls. Also, they would be able to see that our republican form of government creates a climate for a better life than the one the Russian people have under communism. Once this realization occurs, all the secret police in the world cannot save communism.

An immediate benefit might be a lessening of war tension; 99.44 percent of the peoples of the world want peace. With direct knowledge of our own peaceful intentions, you can imagine the resistance the Russian people would have to aggression and saber-rattling on the part of their leaders. Not even a police state can wage a major war successfully without the support of the people.

I do not offer this idea as a panacea to cure the world's ills, but as a step in the direction of a peaceful world, devoted to the preservation of the freedom of the individual. In this struggle with communism, we must win the minds of men, or the product of those minds may destroy man and our planet. These thoughts consist of my individual ideas on the best weapon to use in winning this war for the minds of men. Only by winning this war can we avoid fighting another and far different kind of war.

This, then, is the challenge which is faced by the 1955 model American of all parties. God give us the strength, wisdom, and courage to face up to this great responsibility.

H. R. 5928

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I introduced H. R. 5928, a bill which extends tax-amortization benefits to those who construct new plant facilities in areas of labor surplus as designated by the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

In remarks made on the floor at that time, I referred to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania memorializing the Congress to enact legislation of this type. As a part of my remarks, I include the text of the resolution to which I referred:

Whereas under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code it is permissible to amortize more rapidly certain expenditures made for emergency facilities; and

Whereas the President of the United States if he so finds may declare any area in the United States an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause: Therefore be it

Resolved (*the senate concurring*), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation amendments to the Internal Revenue Code so that capital expenditures in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause may receive the same treatment with regard to depreciation allowances as emergency facilities receive under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Resolution Adopted by the County Commissioners Association of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Georgia, a board of commissioners constitutes the governing body of the individual county governments. These county commissioners have formed an association which is known as the Association County Commissioners of Georgia. Each year this association holds an annual convention at which convention discussion is had and action is taken upon current problems and subjects of importance to these county government officials.

These county officials are elected by a vote of the people in their respective counties. They are persons of recogized ability and standing. I would say that their collective judgment is an accurate reflection of the sentiment and collective judgment of the people of Georgia.

This County Commissioners Association held its annual meeting last week in Augusta, Ga., and one of the subjects which came under discussion at the meeting was the United States Supreme Court school decision of May 17, 1954.

This attempt of the Supreme Court to usurp legislative functions which the Court does not possess has been the subject of discussion at a number of meetings and gatherings which are representative of Georgia citizens and which reflect their feelings. Such a meeting

was the State convention of the Democratic Party held at Macon, Ga., in the autumn of last year. A strong resolution was adopted at that convention condemning the outrageous action of the Supreme Court in attempting to amend the laws and change the Constitution illegally.

There have been other meetings, some statewide, some local, at which similar resolutions have been adopted expressing the resentment which people of Georgia feel and expressing their condemnation of this high-handed action on the part of the Supreme Court.

At the County Commissioners Association convention above mentioned, on April 26, 1955, that group of representative Georgians adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the people of this sovereign State of Georgia have been and are devout and law-abiding people, and throughout the history of our country have opposed tyranny in any form; and

Whereas on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court chose to abandon all principle and to strike down legal precedent established by able, representative, and distinguished jurists, and by such untoward decision it threatened to attempt to destroy the peaceful relationships existing between the white and black races in the South and Nation; and

Whereas this untoward and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court was encouraged by the President of the United States through the office of his appointed Attorney General; and

Whereas such a decision is an affront and challenge to the traditions of our people, to the peace and goodwill of our black and white citizens and to our way of life; and

Whereas this decision will breed chaos where there is now harmony and mutual progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association County Commissioners as follows:

(1) That this association and the members thereof both jointly and severally pledge to the Governor and all public officials of the State, full support in each and every way or means required or necessary, or advisable to protect and maintain the segregation of the races in our schools;

(2) That regardless of what the Federal Government or any division thereof says or does, that there will not be a mixing of the races in our schools and we positively and unequivocally so pledge ourselves;

(3) That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the Governor of Georgia and to the governors of each of our sister Southern States, and to each member of the Georgia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out on the floor of this Congress as long ago as 1949 that the Supreme Court was planning to usurp legislative functions, and to assume authority which the Court in fact does not possess, by handing down a so-called decision, the effect of which would be to amend the Constitution and to change the law of the land.

The Court has endeavored to do exactly that. When this so-called decision was published, the then Governor of Georgia characterized this outrageous and highhanded action of the Supreme Court as an unwarranted assumption of authority, and as the chief executive of a sovereign State, declared that Georgia would not submit to any such assault upon her rights as a State and upon the constitutional rights of her citizens. The present Governor of Georgia has likewise declared himself and stands firmly upon that same position.

This resolution of the County Commissioners Association is another declaration by the people of Georgia that they know their rights, and that they will not suffer those rights to be wrongfully taken from them by a group of would-be reformers who happen for the moment to be sitting in high place in one branch of our Government.

Shorter Route to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a little news item in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer brings to mind the ancient Chinese saying "A picture is worth 10,000 words." On May 10, 1955, this newspaper described 10 American soldiers with their wives and children at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport after disembarking from a regularly scheduled commercial flight from the Far East.

This article depicted the fathers wrestling with paperwork in connection with processing by officials of the Seattle port of embarkation, while wives, mothers, and children drank milk, munched cookies, or watched TV. Significant was this statement:

The group was the first of 357 men and dependents who will make the trip by air during May. The armed services are making use of regularly scheduled commercial flights.

The point is this, and this picture does not require 10,000 words. Whoever is responsible for this travel routing should be commended. Someone has recognized the advantage of the shorter circle route to the Orient, which, according to the Library of Congress, is as follows:

	Miles
By sea:	
From San Francisco to Yokohama (via Honolulu): Actual steaming time (15 days 18 hours and 30 minutes)	5,488
Distance taking great circle route: Actual steaming time (13 days and 45 minutes)	4,536
Difference in miles, 952; difference in time, 2 days 17 hours and 45 minutes.	
By air:	
From Seattle to Tokyo (via Anchorage and Cold Bay): Flying time (10 hours 45 minutes)	4,806
From San Francisco to Tokyo (via Honolulu and Wake Island) (Pan American route): Flying time (17 hours and 15 minutes)	6,256
Difference in miles, 1,450; difference in time, 6 hours and 30 minutes.	

By sea or by air, whether it is personal property, postal mail, or perishable food, there is only one answer—the saving in distance is a saving of time and dollars. All oriental service should be concentrated through the Port of Seattle, even though the Chief Examiner of the Federal Maritime Board classified Seattle as "economically tributary" to San Francisco.

Low Strike Record in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a release from the Department of Industrial Relations of the State of California calling attention to the State's outstanding 1954 labor-management relations record. In actual man-days lost on account of strikes, the 1954 record was the lowest in 10 years. The time lost in 1954 represented a 64 percent decrease from the 1953 figures. This splendid record is even more remarkable than it seems at first glance when we take a look at some of the other factors involved.

In the 10 years since the war California has had a tremendous influx of people finding new jobs in the State. There has been a corresponding increase in new industries and plants, and a terrific expansion in size of existing industries in California. Nonagricultural employment in the State varied between 3,800,000 and 3,900,000 wage and salary workers in 1954. The corresponding figure in January 1946, following the war's end, was 2,787,000—so we have over 1 million more nonfarm workers at this time. Normally, with such conditions industrial unrest could be expected to follow. This is well demonstrated in other sections of the country right now, where an expanding industrial economy is plagued with serious labor-management difficulties and where such difficulties can be expected to multiply unless a way is found to promote harmonious relationships.

It might be well to look for a moment at the reasons for California's stable labor-management picture. Let us remember that the tabulations in the release accompanying these remarks do not tell the whole story. While the numerical decline in strike situations shown is encouraging in itself, when we consider the great expansion of industrial activity and total employment in the State at the same time it is truly remarkable. California is one of the most highly organized States in the country, unionwise. Through a long period of years, during which I played an active part, labor organizations and management groups in the State have worked out a highly effective technique for composing their differences and negotiating issues with a minimum of strain and violent reaction. The methods used require that each of the groups recognize and respect the rights and position of the other. The statistics in the accompanying release show how this mutual respect has paid off in dollars and cents

for both sides, to say nothing of the avoidance of tension and physical violence now widespread elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a lesson in this from which other areas in the country might well profit. As a tribute to a successful labor-management cooperation in my own State, and for the benefit it may have for others, I ask that the release to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

TEN-YEAR LOW OF STRIKE ACTIVITY IN CALIFORNIA

Idleness in California due to labor-management disputes was lower in 1954 than in any of the last 10 years, Ernest B. Webb, California director of industrial relations, announced today. Work stoppages during the last year caused 1,070,000 man-days of idleness. This represents a 64-percent drop from 2,960,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in California work stoppages beginning in 1954 was 88,100, well under half of the 1953 figure of 210,000. In only 1 of the last 10 years did fewer workers participate in strikes. That year was 1949.

Altogether last year there were 206 stoppages compared with 269 which began in 1953. In only 2 of the last 10 years, 1945 and 1948, California had fewer strikes than were counted in 1954.

The largest work stoppages in 1954 in terms of man-days idle resulted from 3 disputes, 1 in the lumber and 2 in the rubber industry. These were 3 multi-State disputes affecting California; they accounted for more than 40 percent of all man-days idle in the State in 1954.

Major issues: Nearly 90 percent of California's strike idleness in 1954 resulted from disputes over wages, hours, and wage supplements, such as welfare and pension plans. Inter- and intraunion disputes (sympathy, jurisdictional strikes, etc.) played a very small role in the strike picture of last year, resulting in less than 1 percent of all man-days idle.

Los Angeles metropolitan area: Strike idleness in the Los Angeles metropolitan area decreased sharply last year. Man-days of idleness dropped by 61 percent between 1953 and 1954—from 957,000 to 373,000.

The number of workers involved in Los Angeles strikes in 1954 was 44,700, about 22 percent less than the 57,000 workers idled in 1953.

Last year 88 work stoppages occurred in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. This was nearly one-third less than the 122 stoppages counted in 1953.

San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area: A similar sharp reduction of strike idleness occurred in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area where 186,000 man-days idle were reported in 1954. This was 75 percent below the 731,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in strikes decreased even more sharply, about 80 percent. In the past year 11,100 workers, contrasted with 58,900 workers in 1953, participated in strikes.

Work stoppages beginning in 1954 numbered 70 compared with 81 in 1953.

Area	Stoppages beginning in year				Man-days idle during year	
	Number		Workers involved			
	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954	1953
California	206	269	88,100	210,000	1,070,000	2,960,000
Los Angeles metropolitan area	88	122	44,700	57,000	373,000	957,000
San Francisco metropolitan area	70	81	11,100	58,900	186,000	731,000

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever: We beseech Thee to grant unto us who, in the morning, seek Thy face, fervently to desire, obediently to fulfill, all that is pleasing unto Thee. Out of the shadows we would lift our faces to the one true light, knowing that if we keep our hearts with Thee there is no darkness from without which can quench the light within.

We would lay aside any selfish, partisan ambitions, so that with tallness of stature we may see above the walls of our prideful opinions the good of the largest number. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, make us worthy of these demanding times that call aloud for wisdom and character. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 2, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.;

H. R. 3123. An act to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public-school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the Public School Board of Walker, Minn.;

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4659. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations; and

H. R. 5089. An act to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; and

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by

such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations; placed on the calendar.

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 3123. An act to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the Public School Board of Walker, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4659. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c); and

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5089. An act to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, holding hearings on minimum wage legislation, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Council 222, Knights of Columbus, Seneca Falls, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treatymaking power, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS IN MISSOURI—RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for many months now, farmers in Missouri have been concerned over the apparent flagrant mishandling of the agricultural stabilization and conservation programs in our State.

In the closing days of the last session, on July 22, my colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and I called to the attention of the Senate many specific examples of the way in which the ASC program had been manipulated in our State, through arbitrary dismissal of duly elected county committees.

Recently, in Texas County, Mo., there has been another example so flagrant, that on April 14, the Missouri House of Representatives, by a vote of 82 to 47, adopted a resolution requesting that the Secretary of Agriculture investigate the activities of the Missouri ASC committee in the dismissals of duly-elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri, and the suspension of two authorized drought feed dealers in Texas County.

Subsequently these two dealers have been reinstated. However, the reports we have received, alleging highhanded, arbitrary action on the part of the Missouri State ASC committee and by some of the county office managers and district field men, are so shocking that a complete investigation seems warranted.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives be printed in the RECORD at this point, and referred to the appropriate committee for attention.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Memorial 1

Whereas it has been stated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the policy of the present administration to administer our agricultural stabilization and conservation programs with the farmers themselves being given a voice in the supervision and control of such programs; and

Whereas the State agricultural stabilization committee, presided over by Murray C. Colbert as chairman, has discharged 3 elected committeemen, suspended 4 elected committeemen, and forced 1 elected committeeman to resign in Texas County, Mo., with just the broad charge of certain irregularities without any specification of what particular irregularities; and

Whereas at a hearing held by the State committee in February of 1954 on the proposed discharge of certain elected committeemen in Texas County, Mo., one William Young McCaskill, a qualified dealer under the emergency drought feed program and also a special correspondent for a metropolitan newspaper of this State, was denied access as a member of the press to such hearing by Murray C. Colbert after the said Murray C. Colbert was requested by the committeemen of the local ASC committee to hold a public hearing; and

Whereas William Young McCaskill was suspended on February 3, 1955, for alleged irregularities in drought feed certificates, and on April 6, 1955, was reinstated after an investigation of the alleged irregularities by the commodity and investigation division of the commodity stabilization service, and on April 7, 1955, the said Murray C. Colbert again suspended William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co., alleging that William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. had made an agreement to circumvent the first suspension; and

Whereas it has been charged that the State ASC committee, presided over by Murray C. Colbert, is not operating the ASC committee on an impartial basis, free from personalities and pressures; and

Whereas numerous counties in the State of Missouri have experienced similar wholesale dismissals and suspensions since Mr. Colbert assumed the office of State ASC chairman; and

Whereas the farmers of Texas County and the State of Missouri are greatly disturbed by the aforementioned actions of the State ASC committee, which is definitely hindering the successful operations of such ASC program; and

Whereas a suspension of a dealer under the emergency drought feed program practically destroys the business of such suspended dealer and does great damage to the reputation of such dealer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Missouri, That the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to investigate the activities of the State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri and the suspension of the said William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers for the purpose of bringing the true state of facts to light and of

ascertaining whether the declared policy of the present administration of giving the farmers themselves a voice in the administration of the ASC program is being carried out in Missouri; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME OF EXPENDITURES FOR MEALS AND LODGING BY CERTAIN PERSONS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to receive from Walter Jensen, president of the Wisconsin State Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, a message endorsing a bill offered by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] Senate bill 1058. The purpose of the bill is to allow a deduction for Federal income tax purposes of expenses paid for meals and lodging by persons who are necessarily employed so far removed from their regular place of abode as to make daily commuting impractical or inconvenient.

I feel there is real merit in this proposal and trust it will receive the sympathetic attention of the House Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committees.

I present Mr. Jensen's brief letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, A. F. OF L.,
Madison, Wis., April 28, 1955.

To All Wisconsin Representatives in Congress.

DEAR SIRS: At a meeting of our executive committee of the Wisconsin State council of carpenters, several letters were received from local unions requesting the executive committee's support for Senate bill 1058 relating to deductions from gross income for expenditures for meals and lodging by persons employed away from their homes.

As the members of the carpenters union construct buildings all over the State and oftentimes in other States, the carpenters have to leave home to work on these jobs and are away from home for months at a time. This means that besides maintaining their homes, they must also pay for meals and lodging while away from home. We therefore are very much in favor of Senate bill 1058 and sincerely request your support for this bill's enactment.

Very truly yours,

WALTER JENSEN,
President.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is hardly a port of any consequence on the west coast whose representatives have failed to voice the prevailing sentiment of my area for reexamination of the policies of the Panama Canal Co., looking toward a more equitable system of tolls.

Typical of the many expressions of interest in this subject are the resolutions adopted by the progressive Port of Olympia Port Commission, the Lions Club of Oakland, Calif., and the Oakland Inter-Service Club Council, and the Memorial of the City of Alameda, Calif.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT OF OLYMPIA RESOLUTION No. 561

RESOLUTION OF THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE PORT OF OLYMPIA URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE PANAMA CANAL SO AS TO RELIEVE COMMERCIAL CARGOES OF EXCESSIVE TOLLS TRANSITING THE CANAL

Whereas it has been recognized for some time that the vital national defense features of the Panama Canal, by organization, operation and intent, are separate and distinct from the equally important features of an important link for commercial shipping between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; and

Whereas the payment of tolls by commercial vessels transiting the Panama Canal reflects an inequitable distribution of the military and commercial operating costs of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas such inequality of cost distribution places an undue burden in excessive costs to commercial shipping, reflecting unfavorably to shippers and industries in this area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Port of Olympia Commission does hereby urge that the Congress of the United States, as a matter of transportation policy, enact legislation to amend the fiscal policy of the Panama Canal so as to relieve commercial cargoes transiting the canal of those Canal Zone costs properly applicable to the noncommercial departments or agencies of the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of Washington, and to the members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PORT OF OLYMPIA COMMISSION,
By ALLEN T. NEWMAN, *President.*

Attest:

EDWARD ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Unanimously passed by the Port Commission of the Port of Olympia, this 23d day of March 1955.

RESOLUTION

The board of directors of the Lions Club, of Oakland, Calif., urges the 84th Congress of the United States to thoroughly examine the fiscal policy in regard to the Panama Canal, particularly the matters of allowance for amortization and depreciation.

We also express the hope that such examination will fully justify a reduction in tolls for commercial shipping.

We certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution passed unanimously by the members of the board of directors of the Lions Club, of Oakland, Calif., present at a regular meeting of the board held on March 29, 1955.

CLYDE R. WOOLRIDGE,
President.

CHARLES C. ADAMS,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF OAKLAND INTER-SERVICE CLUB COUNCIL: EXCHANGE CLUB, LIONS CLUB, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB, INC., ROTARY CLUB, KIWANIS CLUB, OPTIMIST CLUB, OAKLAND ROUND TABLE, JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LAKE MERRITT BREAKFAST CLUB, ZONTA INTERNATIONAL CLUB, PILOT CLUB, QUOTA CLUB, SOROPTIMIST CLUB, OAKLAND CIVITAN CLUB, ALTRUSA CLUB

Whereas the Inter-Service Club Council of Oakland, Calif., recognizes the Panama Canal as a vital and indispensable part of our country's defense in that it allows speedy transit of military and commercial vessels between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans; and

Whereas the commercial cargoes transiting the Panama Canal now pay tolls which reflect an inequitable distribution of the operating costs of the Panama Canal thereby causing the shippers and receivers of such cargo to carry an excessive burden which should be borne by the Defense Department of our Government; and

Whereas this excessive cost places the shippers and industries of our community at an unfair disadvantage in carrying on their business: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Inter-Service Club Council of Oakland, Calif., does hereby urge that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as will alter and correct the fiscal policy of the Panama Canal so as to relieve commercial cargoes transiting the Canal from the burden of paying depreciation, interest, and Canal Government costs which are justly chargeable to other departments and agencies of our Government; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be and is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of California, and to such other persons as may be designated by the council's chairman.

INTER-SERVICE CLUB COUNCIL,
W. ELWYN DUNSTAN,
Chairman.

RAYMOND H. MILLER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION No. 5078

MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE MATTER OF THE ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION EFFECTING AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE COST OF OPERATING AND MAINTAINING THE PANAMA CANAL AND RELATED ACTIVITIES BY A REDUCTION OF TOLLS PRESENTLY CHARGED AMERICAN BOTTOMS USING SAID CANAL

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore recognized the need for legislation designed to effect a reduction in tolls charged American bottoms using the Panama Canal and thus establish a more equitable and realistic distribution of the cost of operating and maintaining said Canal and related activities; and

Whereas the recognition of the need for such legislation is evidenced by the introduction by the 83d Congress of H. R. 9681, which failed of passage due to lack of time; and

Whereas legislation similar to that proposed by said H. R. 9681 is urgently needed if the inequitable sharing of the costs of the Panama Canal presently existing is to be corrected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Alameda, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby respectfully urged and requested to introduce and enact legislation similar to that proposed by H. R. 9681 of the 83d Congress to the end that the conditions hereinbefore recited may be speedily remedied.

SHIRLEY H. FENNIER,
City Clerk of the City of Alameda.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1633. A bill relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska (Rept. No. 264); and

S. 1650. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 263).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 824. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas (Rept. No. 266).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1875. A bill to grant tax relief to members of the Armed Forces of the United States held by a Communist government authority or missing in action from a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. THYE):

S. 1876. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1877. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) (by request):

S. 1878. A bill to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1879. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1880. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1882. A bill for the relief of Constantine Salmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1883. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Gertraut Hildegarde Marie Hubinger and Franz Hubinger; and

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide for the most effective use and distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RELIEF FROM INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS OF AMERICANS HELD AS PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 13, I introduced in the Senate—and a companion measure was introduced in the House of Representatives—a bill dealing with relief from income-tax payments in the case of Americans being held as prisoners of war. Following consultation with the chairman of the Finance Committee and its ranking members, and also with the leadership in the House of Representatives, the bill has been redrafted by the Defense Department and the Treasury Department, and a companion bill dealing with the same subject matter, is today being introduced in the House of Representatives.

I now introduce the redrafted bill and request its appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1875) to grant tax relief to members of the Armed Forces of the United States held by a Communist government authority or missing in action from a combat zone, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with further reference to this issue, I have before me a telegram, which I received yesterday from Charles O. Morgan, commander of the California wing of the Air Force Association. The telegram reads as follows:

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 1, 1955.*

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The California wing of the Air Force Association, representing thousands of Air Force Veterans, from throughout our great State, in convention assembled in Fresno, Calif., today unanimously endorsed your firm stand in behalf of the 15 American airmen unjustly imprisoned in Red China, and empowered me to send you this message of encouragement and support of your outstanding efforts in this vital cause.

CHARLES O. MORGAN,
Commander, California Wing,
Air Force Association.

Mr. President, I also wish to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, then a Member of the House of Representatives. The letter is under date of March 11, 1954, and is from Col. George Patrick Welch, Chief of the Public Information Division of the Defense Department. I wish to read into the RECORD two paragraphs of the letter, as follows:

A list of approximately 3,400 U. N. personnel carried as missing in action—including 944 Americans—was presented by the U. N. Command to the Communist representatives on the Military Armistice Commission on September 9, 1953.

While the U. N. Command had no conclusive information regarding the death or survival of these individuals, there were definite indications that the Communists possessed information in this regard. Evidence in our possession pertaining to these persons is based upon letters written home by prisoners, prisoner of war interrogations, questioning of returnees, Communist radio broadcasts, and the actual circumstances of their disappearance from U. N. Command control. As you know, the United Nations made a demand that the Communists account for these personnel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 11, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: In response to your request through Mr. David Keyser for information on United Nations prisoners of war missing in Korea, I am forwarding the enclosed material in the hope that it will be of some assistance to you.

Generally, the story of the missing prisoners runs like this:

The Korean Armistice Agreement provided for the return of all prisoners of war desiring repatriation within 60 days of the effective date of the armistice. Evidence available to the United Nations Command indicates that there may be, or at one time there may have been, U. N. C. personnel in Communist custody who were not returned during the prisoner of war exchanges, were not turned over to the Neutral Nations Repatriation Committee, and were not otherwise accounted for by the Communists.

A list of approximately 3,400 U. N. personnel carried as missing in action—including 944 Americans—was presented by the U. N. Command to the Communist representatives on the Military Armistice Commission on September 9, 1953.

While the U. N. command had no conclusive information regarding the death or survival of these individuals, there were definite indications that the Communists possessed information in this regard. Evidence in our possession pertaining to these persons is based upon letters written home by prisoners, prisoner of war interrogations, questioning of returnees, Communist radio broadcasts, and the actual circumstances of their disappearance from U. N. command control. As you know, the United Nations made a demand that the Communists account for these personnel.

In the meantime, further evidence regarding the fate of the missing in action has been obtained from returned Korean prisoners and other Korean veterans. Also, Public Law 490 directs review of each individual case at the end of 12 months and authorizes the appropriate departmental secretary to make a determination of death. Although Public

Law 490 will operate to declare administratively some persons on the original list as dead, inasmuch as we have evidence that they were once alive in Communist custody, we still desire an accounting for them.

These findings have no effect upon the insistence of the U. N. Command that the Communists give a full and complete accounting of the status and disposition of these individuals while they were in Communist custody.

On September 21, 1953, the Communists replied relative to the complete list of names presented to them by the U. N. Command on September 9. They stated that many of the men on the list had never been captured by their forces. They conceded knowledge of approximately 900 U. N. Command personnel (including only 112 Americans), all of whom the Communists claimed were either deceased, escaped, or released at the front.

Gen. Mark W. Clark, in a letter of September 24, 1953, to the Communist side, stated that he considered their reply wholly unacceptable and pointed out that by signing the armistice agreement the Communists had undertaken a solemn obligation to repatriate directly or to hand over to the custody of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission all of the captured persons held by them at the time of the armistice. He pointed out that this obligation was binding upon them and applied to all U. N. Command persons held in custody.

On November 21, 1953, the U. N. Command again protested in the Military Armistice Commission to the Communists that they had still failed to give a satisfactory reply concerning the list of unaccounted-for U. N. personnel and pointed out that additional evidence provided by three Korean prisoners of war who had recently defected to the U. N. side corroborated the U. N. Command statements that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war. At that time the U. N. Command demanded that the Communists "hand over to the custody of the custodian forces of India all those prisoners that your side still retains."

On December 7 the U. N. representative to the Military Armistice Commission requested the Communist side to agree to an impartial investigation of the evidence given by the three defectors. The Communists refused.

Once again, on January 18, 1954, the United Nations representative to the Military Commission made a unilateral request to the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to investigate the charge that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war.

Of course, to obtain the return of all United Nations personnel in Communist custody is a continuing purpose of the Military Establishment, and all feasible measures are being taken to accomplish this objective.

If we can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to communicate with us.

Sincerely,

GEO. PATRICK WELCH,
Colonel, GS;
Chief, Public Information Division.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN FOREST LAND TREE PLANTING AND REFORESTATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States in their reforestation program, in a similar manner to that provided by the Watershed Act of 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement showing the need for this type of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1876) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That building up and maintaining a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood is essential to the public welfare and security; that utilizing the more than 50 million acres of idle non-Federal and Federal lands for this purpose would not only add to the economic strength of the Nation, but also bring increased public benefits from other values associated with forest cover; and that it is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture in order to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate future resources of readily available timber should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

SEC. 2. Any State may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan for forest land tree planting and reforestation for the purpose of effecting the policy hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 3. When the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plan, he is hereby authorized and directed to assist the State in carrying out such plan, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions: *Provided,* That, for the non-Federal forest land tree planting and reforestation, the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government during any fiscal year to assist the State to carry out the plan shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State.

SEC. 4. In any plan that coordinates forest lands under jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain the cooperation and assistance of the Federal agency having jurisdiction in the approval and carrying out of the plan.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this act, such sums to remain available until expended.

The statement submitted by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

NATIONAL DEFENSE PLANTATIONS

Introduction

In the lengthening struggle against Communist aggression, economic strength based on a plentiful supply of basic raw materials and a steadily expanding industrial output may be the decisive factor. The United States, if it is to safeguard its future, must constantly grow stronger, and some of that added strength must continue to flow to other friendly free nations. Among other things, the world situation calls for forest resources large enough to meet our own growing needs for wood and wood products as well as to help in meeting those of timber-deficient friendly countries. If we fail to do this, the long-term tendency will be greater dependency on the forest resources of Russia, especially softwood.

Furthermore, as our nonrenewable resources are gradually used up, the greater will be our dependence upon renewable resources, such as forests. Our higher-grade nonrenewable resources have in many cases already been heavily drawn upon and the proportion of the annual supply represented by imports is steadily growing larger. Russia, on the other hand, still has vast undeveloped resources which when developed will support a greatly expanded economy as compared with the present.

The United States, within its own boundaries, can do little to counterbalance Russia's superiority in nonrenewable resources, but a great deal more could be done to build up our renewable resources, such as commercial timber, to a safer level. Our softwood resources in particular should be built up faster—to provide for increased future needs for industrial wood. Wood is now recognized as a basic raw material with ever-increasing possibilities as a substitute for other materials in short supply. It is dangerous to assume that our increasingly greater future needs for raw materials can be met by increased imports from the rest of the world or drawing upon the atmosphere and oceans.

In addition to the need to enlarge its material resources at home, the United States, in the opinion of many of its leaders, has need to develop increased moral and spiritual resources. The people are seeking more than ever before opportunities to get away temporarily from the stresses and strains of modern life and to rebuild jaded minds and bodies through healthful outdoor recreation. Highway plantations, especially within reach of the larger centers of population, would have great social as well as economic value. Today, a public roadside picnic table, if only a few yards from the roar of traffic, is a highly prized acquisition by the family that got there first. The public demand for attractive roadside recreation places is potentially so great as to warrant special consideration in any now program of tree planting.

The softwood situation internationally

1. Softwood constitutes between 70 percent and 80 percent of the world's total consumption of industrial wood. Softwood is inherently preferable to hardwood for such general-utility purposes as construction lumber and plywood, boxing and crating, pulp and paper, etc., as well as being generally more economical to utilize than hardwood. The possession of large softwood resources by any country lends strength to its economy. The Soviet bloc (not including Communist China) possesses nearly three-fourths of all the softwood timber in the North Temperate Zone, which is almost the same as saying in the world. The volume has been estimated to be at least 55 billion cubic meters. This compares with 9.5 billion for the United States and Alaska combined, 8.1 billion for Canada, and 2.5 billion for northern Europe.

2. The free world cannot overcome the Soviet bloc's great superiority in softwood timber by turning to the Tropics and the South Temperate Zone. Only from 5 percent to 10 percent of the combined forest area of these parts of the world support softwoods. Furthermore, most of the free world's great tropical forests (hardwood) are sit-

uated in remote places such as the Amazon Basin and equatorial Africa.

3. Our Western European allies are in a timber-deficient area and have depended heavily upon the United States and Canada in recent emergencies. The free world's deteriorating softwood supply situation is gradually forcing greater dependence on Russian timber. East-West European trade is increasing. But the U. S. S. R. can regulate its timber exports in whatever manner it may consider most advantageous at any given time.

4. The Latin American Republics and other free-world countries having little or no softwood resources of their own also look to North America as a source of supplemental supply. Rapid growth in population together with gains in industrialization in the underdeveloped countries will mean greatly increased future requirements for industrial wood. Industrialization calls for heavier consumption of lumber, shipping containers, plywood, pulp, and paper, etc. The per capita consumption of industrial wood in North America is now about 1.8 cubic meters, as contrasted with only 0.15 in Latin America, 0.07 in north Africa and the Near East, 0.03 in central and south Africa, and 0.02 cubic meters in southeast Asia.

The softwood situation domestically

5. The United States within recent years has become a net importer of softwood timber products, largely from Canada. But Canada itself is undergoing rapid industrial growth and will require increasingly greater quantities of industrial softwood for domestic consumption. Also, most of Canada's remaining softwood forests are in the northern part of the country where growth is slow and transportation to principal consuming centers costly.

6. The heavier cutting of softwoods in the United States, as compared with hardwoods, has resulted in a larger proportion of hardwoods in second-growth mixed forests. This makes more difficult and costly the restoration of the softwood component to its former level on cutover lands. Open-land planting has much in its favor.

The timeliness of such a program

7. The people of the United States are becoming increasingly concerned about their security and are looking to their leaders for action to strengthen the Nation's economy. Putting more idle land to work growing more trees could be expected to gain wide public support, if properly publicized, particularly from veterans, conservation, youth, fraternal, and other public-spirited groups having some appreciation of the value of adequate natural resources in the struggle against Communist aggression.

8. Requirements for national defense must take into account the eventual possibility of a highly destructive war. If the opening phase of such a conflict should not be decisive, there would follow a great struggle to recover and rebuild. Forests conveniently located along highways could be drawn upon quickly for urgently needed construction and repair material, even though crudely processed. They could also supply urgently needed fuel wood if coal and oil supplies temporarily were shut off through disrupted transportation.

Plantations established by the British Government following World War I were heavily drawn upon, and to good advantage in the Second World War even though only about 20 years old. According to estimates believed to be reliable, Russia planted about 5.1 million acres of forest in 1949 through 1951, or an annual rate of about 1.7 million acres. The current annual rate for the United States is less than half this amount.

Obviously, any defensive measures involving the production of tree crops should be taken with the least possible delay.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask leave to add the names of additional colleagues as sponsors of the bill, before it goes to press.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF MILES CITY, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the city clerk of the city of Miles City, enclosing a resolution adopted by the Miles City Council on April 25, 1955, requesting that the time be extended. The resolution explains why it is necessary that the time which will expire on June 16, 1955, should be extended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1878) to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. MANSFIELD are as follows:

MILES CITY, MONT., *April 27, 1955.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of resolution No. 1180, passed by the city council on April 25, 1955, regarding industrial site lands west of Miles City.

We hope you will give this matter due consideration.

Yours very truly,
C. H. STANGLAND,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION NO. 1180

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILES CITY URGING THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO EXTEND FOR A PERIOD OF 5 YEARS FROM AND AFTER JUNE 16, 1955, PUBLIC LAW NO. 563 AS IT RELATES TO TRACT NO. 5 AND THE REMAINING PORTION OF TRACT NO. 6

Whereas Public Law 563 of the 81st Congress became law on June 16, 1950; and

Whereas section 2 of Public Law 563 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to convey by patent or patents to the city of Miles City, upon the payment of a just and reasonable consideration, determined by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of use for industrial purposes, such portion of tracts No. 5 and 6 within the United States Range Livestock Experiment Station as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be more suitable for the use of the city of Miles City; and

Whereas the city of Miles City has endeavored to find suitable industries to occupy tract No. 5 and the unpurchased portion of tract No. 6 but has as yet been unable to find, within said five-year period since the enactment of said law, industries determined to be suitable for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Miles City, Mont., That the United States of America extend Public Law 563 for a period of five years from and after June 16, 1955, to enable the city of Miles City to continue to develop said tracts for industrial purposes; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior and also to Senator JAMES MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and Representative ORVIN FJARE.

Passed and approved this 25th day of April 1955.

FARNHAM L. DENSON,
Mayor.

Attest:

C. H. STANGLAND,
City Clerk.

PROPOSED NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there is a growing realization that the continued progress of the Nation, the increasing impact of scientific and technological advance, and the maintenance and growth of our democratic way of life depend on a literate citizenry. The Founding Fathers saw this interrelationship, and suggested the necessity of providing the elements of education broadly.

Nothing has happened to change the views I expressed on this matter several years ago when I first introduced my literacy education bill—nothing except an accelerated pace of life which makes the problem of illiteracy much more acute now than it was then.

In again introducing proposed legislation on this subject, I wish to emphasize its importance and the urgency and magnitude of the problem which it is designed to solve. I wish also to emphasize the terminal nature of this bill, as well as the matching provision which will serve as a stimulus to those States that really want to attack the problem.

I ask that the text of the bill which I am introducing be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1879) to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Literacy Education Act of 1955."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) whereas, according to the 1950 census, nearly 10 million of the adult citizens of the United States had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling and were accordingly to be accounted as functionally illiterate; and

(b) whereas the United States was by reason of this widespread adult illiteracy deprived of the fullest use of its military and industrial manpower during World War II and during the Korean conflict; and

(c) whereas the lack of basic elementary education among these millions of citizens,

both native and foreign born, constitutes a continuing national problem of great magnitude and urgency in time of peace, as well as war, because it increases the amount of ill health and poverty, retards economic development, lessens efficiency, and impedes the personal growth and social contribution of citizens in a democracy; and

(d) whereas the excessively high illiteracy rate in the United States and our programs for reducing it have a direct influence on our international relations; and

(e) whereas the States are making progress in providing general elementary education for all their children, which will aid eventually in preventing the recurrence of illiteracy among adults; and

(f) whereas adult functional illiteracy was reduced only one-half million during the past decade, in spite of the Armed Forces educational program and other adult educational activities; and

(g) whereas the urgency of the times makes it unwise to wait on the "natural process" to reduce adult illiteracy;

(h) Now, therefore, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of national security to assist the several States in speedily removing adult illiteracy in the United States by the establishment and maintenance of programs of basic elementary education for adults, for a period not to exced 10 years, which period may be materially shortened by the speed with which such a program is established and the progress made by the States in their general elementary education programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, a Territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "basic elementary education" means education designed to develop the ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language, to perform elementary arithmetical computations, and to understand the main features of our constitutional republican form of government and of our American way of life, equivalent to the ability of the average person who has completed 4 years of schooling.

(c) The term "adult" means any person beyond the compulsory school age who is not enrolled in a regular fulltime day school.

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "State educational agency" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer); or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia, it shall mean the board of education.

(f) The term "index of ability" means the percent that the State per capita income is of the national per capita income for the latest year available as reported by the Department of Commerce. The "inverse ratio" of the index of ability is obtained by subtracting the State index of ability from "200 per centum."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. In order to promote the development and maintenance by the States of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the sum of $7,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the sum of $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the sum of $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $3,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $2,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $1,500,000. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to the States which have submitted and had approved by the commissioner applications for funds as set forth in section 5 hereof for carrying out the purposes of this act.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) In order to be approved by the Commissioner, a State application for funds shall—

(1) designate the State educational agency to be responsible for the administration, or for the supervision of the administration, of a program of basic elementary education for adults within the State;

(2) outline the State plan for a program of basic elementary education for adults which shall include provisions for the organization and conduct of classes for adult illiterates, for the training of teachers and supervisors for such classes, and for the fostering of research, experimentation, and demonstration in educational institutions or other approved agencies or organizations in cooperation with local public school authorities of improved methods and materials for use in such classes;

(3) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official shall act as custodian of funds made available to the State under this act and shall expend the same only on warrant of the State educational agency;

(4) provide that the State educational agency shall make reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and give the Commissioner upon demand access to the records upon which such information is based;

(5) provide for the designation of a State advisory council of not less than seven persons representing the major interested groups to consult with the State educational agency in planning and promoting the State program of basic elementary education for adults; and

(6) provide assurance, satisfactory to the Commissioner, that such State will satisfy the requirements of section 7 of this act relating to expenditure of State and local funds for such programs of basic elementary education for adults.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State application for funds which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Not less than 98 percent of the funds appropriated under section 4 of this act shall be distributed to the States in the following manner: Each State for which a State application under section 5 has been approved shall be entitled to an allotment from any appropriation made pursuant to section 4 of the sum obtained by multiplying (1) the sum which bears the same ratio to the total amount of such appropriation as the number of adults in such State who have not completed the fifth year of school, according to latest figures available as reported by the Bureau of the Census, bears to the total number of such adults in the United States, by (2) the inverse ratio of the State's index of ability. In the event the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 4 of this act are insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to such States as such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotment to all eligible States: *Provided*, That no State's entitlement shall be less than $10,000. The Commissioner shall, before August 15 of each fiscal year, estimate the sum to which each State is entitled under this section during that fiscal year and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced, or increased as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commissioner finds that his estimate for a prior year was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such year. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

(b) Any funds paid to a State under this section and not expended for the purpose for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States. Sums allotted to a State for any fiscal year for the purposes of this Act and unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for the next fiscal year (and for such year only) in addition to sums allotted to such States for the next fiscal year.

STATE EXPENDITURES

SEC. 7. Any State receiving a payment under the provisions of this act shall—

(1) Expend from State and local sources for its program of basic elementary education for adults during the fiscal year for which such payment was received an amount not less than was expended in such State from such sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for basic elementary education for adults; and

(2) expend, beginning with the second fiscal year for which any such payment is received, an additional amount from such sources for such program, which amount shall be (A) for such second year, not less than one-fourth of such State's allotment for such year as determined under the provisions of section 6 (a) of this act, (B) for the third fiscal year for which any such payment is received, not less than one-half of such State's allotment for such year, (C) for the fourth such fiscal year, not less than three-fourths of such State's allotment for such year, and (D) for any such fiscal year thereafter, not less than such State's allotment for such year.

WITHHOLDING OF CERTIFICATION

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds (1) that such State is not complying substantially with the provisions of this act or the terms and conditions of its application approved under this act, or (2) that any funds paid to such State under this act have been diverted from the purposes for which they had been paid, the Commissioner may forthwith notify the Secretary of the Treasury and such State that no further certification will be made under this act with respect to such State until there is no longer any failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b) The final refusal of the Commissioner to approve any application made under this act, and the Commissioner's final action under subsection (a) of this section, shall be subject to judicial review on the record, in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

SEC. 9. (a) This act shall be administered by the Commissioner under the supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the advice of an Advisory

Council composed of persons representing the major interested groups. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations and to perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction in any State with respect to which any funds had been or may be expended under this act.

(c) The Commissioner shall annually report to the Congress upon his administration of this act, including the progress made by the several States in the removal of adult illiteracy and any related matters.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—BILL INTRODUCED—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have scheduled hearings on the very important and highly controversial gas bill. The hearings will begin next Tuesday.

A bill on this subject was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], but since the introduction of the bill and its reference to the committee, he has asked that his bill be withdrawn.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill, S. 1498, to amend the Natural Gas Act, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

This action is taken at the request of the author of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the parliamentary situation, I have scheduled hearings on this subject to begin on next Tuesday. A new bill has been introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which is substantially the same as the bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. Open hearings will begin on Tuesday next. The hearings will cover the entire field of gas legislation, and the Natural Gas Act, which we hope to bring into line with modern conditions and the present needs of the country.

The old act, passed 17 years ago, has been outgrown in many respects, and we have many bills and suggestions on how we should amend it. It is a very controversial subject, and the producers, the interstate carriers, and the consumers all have different ideas as to how we should proceed.

We must not only report a bill which will meet the approval of the Senate, but we must bring in a bill which will be fair to the producers and the carriers, and one that will assure justice in prices to the consumers.

We desire to consider fully all proposals and give everyone interested in the Natural Gas Act a full opportunity to state his views.

To help get all suggestions before our committee at the hearing starting next week I am introducing today suggestions made in the annual report of the Federal Power Commission for amendments to the act which the Commission believes will modernize it and make it meet the changed conditions of the day, conditions which did not exist when the original act was passed.

I wish the record to be absolutely clear on this matter. Several amendments are being proposed. Some of them are very controversial. With some I agree, and with others I do not agree. I am introducing, at the request of the Federal Power Commission, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. The bill involves a very controversial question. It deals with distribution and rates to be applied to natural gas. Included in the proposed legislation is the so-called Fulbright bill; the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which, in my view, is largely a consumer bill; and 10 or 12 other bills, all of which deal with this very important subject.

I want that point clear as I introduce this bill and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I also wish it to be clearly understood that with some of the amendments I am in agreement and with others I am not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1880) to amend the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

USE AND DISTRIBUTION OF INFANTILE PARALYSIS VACCINE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which is designed to provide for the effective use and distribution of the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis. The temporary emergency, which has arisen as a result of the great demand for this vaccine and the possibility of the exploitation of its use, requires immediate action by the Federal Government. I am introducing this joint resolution urging that it receive the earliest possible consideration by the Senate. In dealing with this vitally important matter speed is most essential.

Joining me in the introduction of this joint resolution are the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I invite any other Senators, who desire to do so, to add their names at the desk.

I have prepared a statement pertaining to this joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with the text of the joint resolution, following the statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) to provide for the most effective use and distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Since the recent public disclosure of the discovery of a vaccine which prevents poliomyelitis by Dr. Jonas Salk, the grateful people of this Nation have been seriously concerned over its most effective use and distribution while the supplies are substantially less than the total needs of the entire country. In fact, this concern has created a temporary national emergency which must be alleviated immediately by the institution of a national program.

The development of this great medical discovery was made possible through contributions of the people of the United States to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the many dedicated scientists, including Dr. Jonas Salk, who have specialized in the study and treatment of poliomyelitis without thought of personal gain. The inevitable problems of distributing this precious vaccine, while it is still in short supply, in a manner which will accomplish the greatest national good, demand the immediate attention of the Federal Government. To provide for the free flow of such vaccine throughout the several States, in order to insure its most effective and equitable distribution, is a definite responsibility of the Federal Government to all of the people of the United States.

This joint resolution would authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare immediately to institute a Federal program for the distribution and use of all Salk vaccine, which would include the establishment of priorities by age groups, physical condition, and geographic location; the maintenance of distribution records by all principals involved; and the distribution of the Salk vaccine at a reasonable cost to the purchaser. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is further authorized and directed to consult with State health officials, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, manufacturers of Salk vaccine, and prominent scientists, including Dr. Salk, who have specialized in the study and treatment of poliomyelitis, concerning the promulgation and operation of this vital national program. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may well wish to utilize the services of some outstanding American to take charge of its administration, in the event that the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is unable to undertake this additional task.

Regardless of who is selected by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out this important work, it is urgent that the Congress take immediate action authorizing the establishment of a Federal

program for the distribution of all Salk vaccine until sufficient vaccine is available to make unnecessary further Federal regulation and control. Therefore, in order to eliminate this national emergency, I urge the earliest possible consideration of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. IVES is as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 68

Whereas the development of an infantile paralysis vaccine, a national blessing, has also created a temporary nationl emergency resulting from a demand far in excess of the supply; and

Whereas this development was financed by the voluntary contributions of the people of the United States and the untiring efforts of dedicated scientists; and

Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to the people of the United States to provide for the free flow of such vaccine throughout the several States in order to insure its most effective and equitable distribution and use while supplies are less than the total needs of the entire population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to issue mandatory rules and regulations regulating the distribution and use of all Salk vaccine manufactured in, imported into, and exported from the United States (including but not limited to the establishment of priorities by age groups, physical condition, and geographical location; the maintenance of distribution records by manufacturers, distributors and members of the medical profession engaged in the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine; and the distribution of Salk vaccine at a reasonable cost to the individual purchaser), during the temporary national emergency which has resulted from the insufficient supply of such vaccine.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed (1) to consult with State health officials, representatives of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, representatives of the manufacturers of Salk vaccine, and prominent scientists, including Dr. Jonas Salk, who have specialized in the study and treatment of poliomyelitis, concerning the promulgation of mandatory rules and regulations regulating the distribution and use of all Salk vaccine during the temporary national emergency, and (2) to make such reports to the Congress as the Secretary may deem necessary, including recommendations for further legislation deemed by the Secretary to be desirable to implement the policies of this joint resolution. Any such report may recommend the enactment of legislation by the Congress to maintain reasonable prices of Salk vaccine whenever the Secretary shall determine that the price of such vaccine or substantial amounts thereof has become unreasonably high.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as the Secretary deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in order to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The functions exercised under this joint resolution by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the Secretary shall provide for the greatest practicable distribution and publication of rules and regulations issued under this joint resolution.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to limit or supersede the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 7. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited or willfully fails to perform any act required by any rule or regulation promulgated under the authority of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 for each such offense.

SEC. 8. All of the authority conferred under this joint resolution on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall terminate at such time as the Secretary shall report to the President and the Congress that there is sufficient Salk vaccine to make unnecessary further controls under this joint resolution.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, reports of the administration of Salk vaccine to adults and others not in the priority groups are deeply shocking.

The public, whose contributions made the Salk vaccine possible, the parents whose children are of the ages most susceptible to the dread ravages of polio, and the overwhelming number of parents and citizens who respect the priorities set by medical authorities and are quietly awaiting their turn, have every right to expect that immediate steps be taken to insure fair distribution throughout the country.

There is no dispute about the fact of a shortage. So long as the shortage continues, we are confronted with the unfortunate but, to my mind, undeniable, fact that no voluntary system of distribution can be expected to withstand the many various pressures for evasion. Whether these pressures arise from natural parental zeal or from selfish fear or cupidity, does not matter. The interests of all the children of the land are involved, and our children come first.

Doctors themselves will, I believe, welcome for the most part the institution of a distribution system under Federal control. This is not because most doctors will not respect to the full the priorities already established. No profession has set itself higher standards of conduct and none is more scrupulous in their observance. But today many doctors find themselves besieged, by anxious parents, by patients asking, in some cases threatening, for injections to which they may or may not be entitled, and for which the doctors may or may not have the necessary supply of vaccine.

I have therefore been very glad to join in sponsoring the joint resolution introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], directing the Secretary of Health, Welfare, and Education, to establish an orderly and fair distribution system throughout the country during the period of shortage. This measure is a purely temporary measure. Its terms will expire whenever the Secretary finds that the shortage is ended. I regard it as in no wise setting a precedent, but rather as the fitting response of the Congress to a national situation which is both acute and unique.

I hope Congress will act on this proposal promptly. But inevitably there will be some delay. In the interim, I am confident that the administration will take whatever steps are possible, perhaps through a voluntary embargo on commercial shipments, to insure that all presently available vaccine will be channeled to school systems and educational institutions to take care of those chidren at the most affected age levels.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED COMMUNITIES AT OAK RIDGE, TENN., AND RICHLAND, WASH."

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 7,000 copies of the Committee Print of the said Joint Committee during the 84th Congress entitled "Disposal of Government-Owned Communities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash.," dated April 1955.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1501) to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

PROGRAM OF HIGHWAY MODERNIZATION IN CONNECTICUT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1577) to enable the State of Connecticut to proceed with its program of highway modernization, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STUDY OF MERCHANT MARINE TRAINING AND EDUCATION—REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 35

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 260, Senate Resolution 35, to authorize a full and complete study and investigation by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of merchant marine training and education in the United States, which was favorably reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee on April 28, 1955, be taken from the calendar, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF WILLIAM G. EAST TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated, to file with the committee in writing on or before Tuesday, May 10, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF WILLIAM C. FARMER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States Attorney for the district of Kansas, for the term of 4 years, vice George Templar, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Tuesday, May 10, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HOUSING BILLS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKNG AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to give notice that public hearings on several housing bills pending before the subcommittee will begin at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, May 10, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons desiring to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, as soon as possible.

Bills presently before the subcommittee expected to be considered during the hearings are as follows:

S. 1800, the administration housing bill, which I introduced by request.

S. 789 and S. 1022, to continue authority to make funds available for farm loans and grants under title of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. S. 789 was introduced by me for myself and 35 other Senators. S. 1022 was introduced by Senator MUNDT and would also provide a method for insuring farm loans.

S. 1501, introduced by Senator CAPEHART for himself and 28 other Senators, to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title providing authority for the insurance by the Federal Housing Administration of private loans made for the construction of military housing.

S. 1412 and S. 1642—both dealing with housing for elderly people. S. 1412, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, would authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to make agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly widows, widowers, or single persons to public low-rent housing projects. S. 1642 was introduced by me to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 in order to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income.

S. 1524 was introduced by Senator LONG for himself and 24 other Senators to create a corporation for the extension of credit to aid local public bodies in the financing of public works.

S. 1565 was introduced by Senator CAPEHART for himself and two other Senators to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title providing authority for technical research and studies on problems of air pollution and establishing a loan program to aid in the installation of air pollution prevention equipment.

S. 1744 and S. 1766—both dealing with the college housing program. S. 1744 was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT for himself and me to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to aid educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties. S. 1766 was introduced by Senator Magnuson to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to make loans available to certain junior colleges to provide housing for students and faculties.

PROPOSALS FOR PURCHASE OF THE BAYTOWN, TEX., GR–S FACILITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have just received from the Chairman of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, listing the names of bidders for the rubber facility at Baytown, Tex.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: As you know, the period for the receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Baytown, Tex., GR–S facility expired last Friday, April 29. I am pleased to advise you that the Commission has received proposals for the purchase of that plant from the following nine prospective purchasers: Baytown Rubber & Chemical Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. in conjunction with Midland Rubber Corp., the American Resinous Chemicals Corp., Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., General Tire & Rubber Co., Thiokol Chemical Corp., United Carbon Co., Goodyear Synthetic Rubber Corp., Mr. Edwin W. Pauley.

Such wide interest attests, we believe, to the value of the Baytown facility.

Sincerely yours,

HOLMAN D. PETTIBONE,
Chairman.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which has been approved by the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee. I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, May 4, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I point out that it may be necessary to keep the Senate in session late today, and I should like to have Senators put on notice of that possibility. So long as there are any Senators who care to address the Senate, the Senate will remain in session. It may also be that the Senate will remain in session late tomorrow evening.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, taking advantage of the fact that I have the floor, I should like to ask the majority leader if there will be any votes taken on the bill today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will be no vote today. The agreement just entered into will not go into effect until tomorrow. I shall discuss later with the

distinguished minority leader the desirability of having the Senate meet earlier than usual tomorrow, at perhaps 10 or 11 o'clock, so that the bill may be disposed of tomorrow. However, I shall make an announcement with respect to that later, after I have consulted with the minority leader.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today marks the 164th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. In this connection, I have prepared a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, MAY 3, 1955

I am once again highly privileged to join my fellow citizens of Polish descent in commemoration of the auspicious anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. On this significant national holiday, while the gallant people of Poland continue to endure the suffering inflicted by the Communist tyranny, it behooves free people everywhere to recall the heritage of freedom which is embodied in the history of Poland.

Polish Constitution Day is of special significance at this time—for the revelations of the infamous Yalta agreement are fresh in our mind. We shall never waver in our determination to support Poland in her resistance to the oppressors. Let us therefore reaffirm our traditional friendship with the Polish people and rededicate ourselves to their liberation. Only when that day arrives will the wrongs committed at Yalta be righted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], today, May 3, is the national holiday of a gallant ally of this country. It is Polish Constitution Day.

Ten years have elapsed since the guns ceased firing in World War II, but Poland, the land in whose defense Britain and France took up arms in that global conflict, is enslaved rather than free, and the world mourns for her.

Yet, Poland still lives. Poland has not abandoned hope. Poland remains as faithful to its ideals, to the church of its fathers, to aspirations for its sovereignty, just as throughout its history it never yielded in its zeal for freedom in spite of all the persecution of foreign tyrants.

Last week, in anticipation of this day, it was my privilege to release a statement broadcast to the people of Poland by Radio Free Europe. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as one small indication of the friendship of the people of this land for a faithful, courageous, worthy ally.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON RADIO FREE EUROPE ON POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

I should like to convey my warmest personal greetings to the people of Poland on the occasion of their national holiday—Constitution Day.

As in the most recent years, the celebration of Constitution Day this year will once more be a sad one because of Poland's enslavement under the heel of a godless tyrant.

We know, however, that Poland shall yet be free, as time after time in her previous history she rose successfully against aggressors who thought they had permanently enslaved her.

The people of the United States maintain their warmest fraternal ties with the people of Poland. We pledge to you that we will never accept your enslavement. We will never tolerate foreign rule of you.

We look forward to that day when your sovereignty shall be restored, when you shall be free once more to worship devoutly in the faith of your fathers.

We salute the invincible spirit of Poland. We express our gratitude to the countless contributions of the Polish people to the liberty and independence of my own country.

We urge you men and women of Poland to keep your spirits high, never to let your faith dim that you shall be relieved of the yoke of the atheistic enemy.

The serious disturbances inside the Soviet empire, at the top and at the bottom, show that the day shall yet come when the armies of the aggressor shall recoil and the enslaved peoples shall be liberated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

On this anniversary commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, it is a fitting occasion to pay tribute not only to this historic document, but also to pay tribute to the Polish people themselves. It ought not to be forgotten that this constitution was, after all, the product of the genius of the Polish people.

The May 3 constitution stands among the great constitutional documents of the world perhaps for one singularly significant reason: It gave to the Polish people a plan which, if put into practice, effectively, would surely have brought orderly government to Poland and undoubtedly would have enlarged substantially the area of freedom throughout the nation.

Hopes of the Polish reformers and the Polish people who enthusiastically acclaimed promulgation of this constitution were soon destroyed, when in 1792, almost a year to the day after the constitution was adopted, Russia intervened in Poland, defeated the Polish army, abolished the constitution of 1791, and subsequently partitioned Poland for a second time.

Although both their state and their constitution were destroyed, the hopes of the Poles were not crushed. Rather, their hopes for constitutional democracy and freedom continued to thrive and became part of the Polish tradition. These hopes, along with those other commendable Polish qualities of courage, patriotism, resistance to oppression, and a fighting spirit, all helped to shape what can be termed the "Polish national spirit."

It is this idea of the Polish national spirit which, during decades of oppression, was one of the principal sustaining forces of the Polish people. And today as Poland is again suppressed by a foreign power, it will be this same national spirit which ultimately will be the determining factor in the salvation of Poland.

Upon all Americans as well as the entire free world there rests the obligation to give encouragement to the oppressed people of Poland and all other peoples compelled to live under Communist tyranny. Never should it be said that the American people were indifferent to the fate of Poland. Although Poland does not today enjoy the freedom for which it yearns, our country looks to that future date when, freed from Communist tyranny, the Polish people will once again be joined in brotherhood with all free men.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him on the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCNAMARA

To address you, the valiant people of Poland, today, on the 164th anniversary of the adoption of your constitution of 1791 is a high honor.

For the American people recognize that your constitution of 1791, like our own Constitution of 1787, is one of the great landmarks in the continuing struggle of mankind to live in freedom. It stands as a glorious symbol of the deep-seated dedication of the Polish people to govern themselves, free from foreign tyranny.

Time and time again, throughout the painful centuries of Polish history, your heroic land has been enslaved by cruel oppressors. Yet Poland has never died and Poland never will die. The spirit that brought forth the constitution of May 3 cannot be smothered or crushed, because it lives in the hearts of Polish men and women.

It was this same spirit that brought Thaddeus Kosciusko to the shores of America to join in the struggle of our Nation for freedom—Kosciusko, of whom Thomas Jefferson, the architect of the American Declaration of Independence, declared, "He was as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known."

It is the same spirit that moves today in the hearts of 5 million American citizens of Polish descent who have made and continue to make great contributions to the strength and vigor of our own democracy. In my own home State of Michigan, within the boundaries of just one city, Detroit, there are 350,000 Americans of Polish origin and they are among our finest and most useful citizens.

The spirit that gave birth to the constitution of 1791 is, finally, a spirit that will not be destroyed by the terror and tyranny of Soviet communism. For, as your national anthem magnificently declares, "Poland is not yet lost."

No, Poland is not yet lost. And I assure you that the American people, bound to the people of Poland by a common faith in liberty and democracy, will not rest until your nation is finally free.

People of Poland, take heart. For Poland will live again.

SANFORD, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last year, the town of Sanford, Maine, was hit by a major economic disaster when control of the Goodall-Sanford mills was acquired by the Burlington Mills Corp. Burlington immediately began to close the Goodall-Sanford mills. When more than 3,500 people lose their jobs in a town with a total population of 15,000, it is enough to make anyone question the prospects for the community's future.

The people of Sanford, however, rallied. With a sense of urgency, as well as faith in the future, a chamber of commerce was organized. A vigorous campaign to bring new industry into

the community was undertaken. This campaign is beginning to show results which are inspiring even greater efforts in Sanford's behalf.

Faced with a major crisis in their community's life, the leaders and people of Sanford have risen to the occasion with a fervor reminiscent of our Nation's pioneers. They refused to sit on the sidelines and watch their town die.

I want to pay high tribute here in the Senate today to the Yankee ingenuity and old-fashioned resourcefulness which the citizens of Sanford have shown. So long as our people have such faith, we need not fear for the future of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald and the New York Herald Tribune, together with articles from those papers and from the New York Times, all paying tribute to Sanford, may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 30, 1955]

THE BELIEVERS IN SANFORD SHOW OLD-FASHIONED RESOURCEFULNESS

As far as we are concerned the most stimulating news of the week is Sanford's show of old-fashioned resourcefulness in sending a delegation to New York to look for new industry.

If ever a community had reason to invite ghosts to take over, Sanford did when its world-famous Goodall-Sanford mills faded into the Burlington mill system and Burlington faded away to the South. Nearly 4,000 lost their jobs in a town of 15,000. It was enough to break the heart and the faith of any but the most persistent believers in the future of Sanford.

The encouraging news this week is that Sanford is full of such persistent believers, full of people who stubbornly refuse to let their home town die. The trek to New York by a group of prominent Sanford citizens, their invitation to New York industrialists to come to Sanford to look the facilities over, and the launching of a full-scale promotion program are but the more dramatic results of weeks of work, weeks of planning and sacrifice by those with faith in Sanford.

People in other parts of Maine can look at Sanford as an inanimate problem. But to Sanford people the success or failure of efforts to lure new industry is a personal thing, closely related to the rearing of children, the financing of schools, and medical care; in other words, the people of Sanford need to replace their lost industry in order to live normal lives, in order to plan for the future.

Sometimes breaks come to those who wait. More often they come to those who go out looking for them, as the believers in Sanford's future have been doing this week.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, 1955]

A CITY THAT WILL NOT DIE

Sanford, Maine, is a town that doesn't know when it's licked. And not knowing, it probably isn't. A one-industry city that lost its principal means of support last August when its textile mill moved south, Sanford is fighting back after a blow that might well have proved fatal.

New York first became aware of the city's fight to live through an advertising and publicity campaign carried on with considerable skill by a chamber of commerce formed to fill the breach when Sanford found it had to bring in new industry or perish. "We refuse to die," proclaimed advertisements designed to inform employers of the advantages of setting up shop in the city. The story of manufacturing space available, of willing labor anxious for work, was also told at a luncheon for businessmen in New York last week. A picture was painted that might well attract manufacturers northward to the small Maine city.

Another picture emerges on the scene. A reporter visiting the town found evidences of real New England character in the well maintained houses, in the surprising low caseload of the relief agencies, in the unexpanded debt, and undiminished savings at the banks. He found that reading is on the upgrade—there's a small boom on at the public library. The belles of the city are wearing simpler, less expensive flowers at the dances, or no flowers at all. Cheaper foods are being sold, and business at the beauty parlor has suffered. No cries for help are being heard, no breast beating over injustice, no suggestion that some one is obligated to step in and save the town. Sanford will save itself.

Few people will follow the Sanford story without a feeling of admiration for the fortitude and initiative being shown there. Dislocation is not uncommon in this active economy, even in the midst of prosperity, and there is an example here worthy of study. It is to be hoped, though, that not every one will sit back lost in admiration. There is an opportunity for some one to do himself and a worthy community a lot of good.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 28, 1955]

SANFORD PUSHES NEW YORK DRIVE TO GAIN NEW INDUSTRIES

NEW YORK, April 27.—The unemployment-ridden textile town of Sanford, Maine, invited New York industry today to "come on up and look us over."

Disaster hit the New England community of 15,000 when Burlington Industries, Inc., world's biggest maker of synthetic fiber fabrics, acquired control of the town's major industry last year.

Step by step, the sprawling Goodall-Sanford mills suspended operations. Workers were laid off in successive waves as Burlington shifted the mill's production to the South; some 3,600 lost their jobs. Four weeks ago, when the shutdown was complete, townspeople flocked into Sanford's churches for a day of prayer and mourning.

Today, at a luncheon at the Lambs Club here, Sanford businessmen launched a full-blown promotion and sales campaign aimed at attracting New York industries to Sanford.

"We decided on the New York area because it has the biggest concentration of industrialists in the world," auto dealer Edwin Ballenger said. He heads the Sanford Chamber of Commerce.

William "Bud" Wright, vice president of the chamber and publisher of Sanford's weekly newspaper, listed Sanford's major attractions for the audience of New York bankers and businessmen: 1½ million square feet of modern factory space for sale or lease in whole or in part, plenty of cheap water and electric power, low tax rates, first-class schools and recreational facilities "all bought and paid for," easy accessibility to Boston and New York, and the best labor market in the country.

The impact of the textile mill's closing was described by Maine State Senator Carl J. Broggi: "We survived Hurricane Carol and Hurricane Edna," he declared, "but Hurricane Burlington almost knocked us out. All our merchants and businessmen suffered; some went out of business."

The New York campaign will start with a series of display ads in virtually all newspapers in the New York City area. Brochures and sales letters extolling Sanford's virtues are being mailed to 10,000 New York area industrial concerns, to be followed by personal calls on likely prospects.

Promotion tools include a brochure reporting results of an aptitude test on Sanford's unemployed, and a movie showing the town, the mill, and the people.

William Rogers, executive secretary of the Sanford Industrial Development Commission, reported that unemployment has now been reduced to about 3,200. The Goodall mills originally comprised two million square feet. The entire property was bought by a Quincy, Mass., industrial development firm, and space totaling half a million square feet has since been leased to new industries, leaving 1½ million still available.

One further attraction cited by Sanford business leaders: Sanford has been classed by Washington military authorities as a nontarget area.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1955]

SANFORD'S BATTLE TO SURVIVE—FIVE INDUSTRIES MOVE IN, ADULTS LEARN NEW SKILLS

(By Robert A. Poteete)

SANFORD, MAINE, May 1.—The textile mills that were the economic heart of this southern Maine town for 87 years have all closed down now, and 15,567 Sanfordians are fighting a remarkable battle for their economic life.

By all the rules, Sanford ought to be breathing its last. It was a one-industry town; 4,000 workers earned $15 million a year at the looms and vats of the Goodall-Sanford Corp. Less than a year was required to end what had been a way of life to three generations.

But Sanford decided it wouldn't expire just now. There were the buildings, good ones with 2 million square feet of floor space; a pool of highly skilled industrious workers; a plentiful supply of fine water; adequate transportation; hospitable State and local governments, and a fine community.

TWENTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR WAR CHEST

There was no reason, Sanford figured, why new industries shouldn't occupy those buildings and employ those people. So, while the mills obviously were succumbing to southern competition and the other ills of New England textile mills, Sanford organized in search of new growing-type industries.

The business community took the lead, with the backing of most Sanfordians who love their clean town, their good schools, their churches, their good neighbors and friends. They agreed on a terse little statement of common sentiment: "We refuse to die."

They formed a chamber of commerce, gave it a $25,000 war chest and started getting the word to industrialists. They drew up a brochure and a letter and mailed copies to 10,000 industrial leaders—in envelopes addressed by women volunteers.

They persuaded an industrial development firm to buy up the mill buildings—once valued at $2,658,725—for $525,000 and put up the space for sale or rental.

FIVE INDUSTRIES MOVE IN

Last week they dispatched six of their brightest young business men to New York—volunteers who took advertisements to tell industrialists about Sanford, then told them about the town personally in interviews and at lunch.

Five industries have moved into the mill buildings, taking one-fourth of the floor space. So far, they offer more promise than employment, although the largest—the Wasco Chemical Co., makers of plastic building domes—has 155 persons on its payroll and expects to add 350 more within a year.

The high schools have opened classes to teach new skills to adults. The Maine Employment Security Commission gave aptitude tests to a cross-section of the unemployed and cataloged the skills available in Sanford.

Meanwhile, the pinch is on, individually and in the city government. Removal of a $15,000,000 payroll would make a gap even in a much larger community.

PEOPLE ARE HOPEFUL

Yet morale apparently is high, fed on hope, faith and determination. Sanfordians have added prayer to their more immediate efforts—April 1 was a city-wide day of prayer for guidance.

"The people are hopeful," said the Reverend Rosario E. Ouellette, Catholic priest. "I haven't seen any one discouraged. They can get along on much less. I don't know any one who is down and out. They're not down, not licked; they have faith in the town. They'll take anything; they're not spoiled. I find that there is a note of hopefulness."

Sydney Waterhouse, 54, was a supervisor in the mill. When he was laid off, he bought a model A truck for $50 and went into the odd-job business, which keeps him hopping. "I like this," he said. "Even when I get back to regular work, I'll keep it up. I've lost 23 pounds, and I feel great."

"I put my name everywhere they ask for it," said Mrs. Solange Lamontagne, "but so far, they look at me with a sad face, and say, 'No job.'" Mrs. Lamontagne and her husband both worked at the mill. He has found temporary work in a near-by town, and she is drawing unemployment compensation of $27 a week, which she is entitled to for 20 weeks a year.

I WANT TO WORK

Mrs. Anita Demers, a former mill worker now a temporary clerk in the employment office, said she was "not satisfied, but happy." People she knew at the mill come into the office. "Some," she said, "are glad for the vacation—I shouldn't say that, but it's true. And others are anxious to find something soon."

Verdi McFarland, 58, former weaver, is concerned that his age may prevent his being hired. "I want to live here, and I want to work," he told an employment clerk, gesturing vigorously. Would he seek relief? "I can't do that," he said: "I've got too much pride for that. Just give me a job; I can do it."

A majority of the mill workers are still in Sanford. Some work in neighboring areas, full or part-time; a great many others are making-do with the unemployment checks and an occasional day's work. Probably because of the prosperity Sanford has enjoyed for many years, the pattern of economic life in Sanford is not clear yet—some factors are obvious, but often contradictory.

They are still buying their weekly newspaper, "The Sanford Tribune," regularly, according to publisher William F. Wright Jr., 30, who is one of the chamber of commerce's most active members. They count on Miss Elizabeth Mitchell, editor, to keep them informed.

BUY FEWER FLOWERS

They are buying fewer flowers, by half. And where young girls once wore gardenias, roses, and orchids to dances, they now wear daisies, carnations, sweet peas or no flowers.

Women still go to the beauty shop, but only for haircuts, which they cannot manage for themselves; they manage their own shampoos, rinses, and waves.

They are buying some 50 percent fewer refrigerators, washing machines, and kitchen ranges. But the repossession rate remains normal, even on long-term purchases.

Savings are down $50,000 in one trust company, but up $100,000 in another. Loans are definitely down in both places, but the foreclosure rate is at a normal low. In some cases, borrowers are paying only interest and deferring principal.

"Unemployment payments are carrying them," one banker said.

There is no more crime than usual, which means there is little for the 13-man police force to deal with.

They are eating more casseroles and cold cuts, fewer steaks, chops and roasts. The Ideal Restaurant's $2.25 Porterhouse steak has vanished from the menu; a $2 club steak is now the highest-priced item there.

TOWN READS MORE

They are reading more. During the first 3 months of this year, they borrowed 3,000 more books from the public library than they did in the first 3 months of 1954. There is a heavy demand for gardening and other how-to-do-it books.

They're not asking for relief. Thomas A. Meunier, selectman, assessor and overseer of the poor, said he had been surprised at the lack of applicants. There are 358 persons on relief now, compared with 304 in April of 1954.

"Most people have enough to carry them through to the fall," he said. "We expect quite a few more then."

The town faces heavy budgetary trouble this year. Goodall-Sanford paid more than a third of the real estate taxes that make up most of the city budget. Assessed at the price paid for them for industrial development, the buildings will yield much less tax revenue.

In many cases, this would indicate development of a ghost town. But Sanfordians figure that their trim, neatly painted homes are too good for ghosts.

[From the New York Times of May 1, 1955]

MAINE CITY FIGHTS LOSS OF INDUSTRY—SANFORD LEADERS SEEK NEW ENTERPRISES AS TEXTILES ABANDON TOWN

SANFORD, MAINE, April 30.—Abandoned by textile interests, this town is tackling the problem of restoring economic security.

Six members of the chamber of commerce paid their own expenses to New York this week and interviewed prospects.

Carl J. Broggi, chairman of the chamber's industrial development committee, reported talks with 62 concerns that were interested in decentralizing present plants or in moving to Maine to start new enterprises.

The last textile operation is the Goodall-Sanford, Inc., division manufacturing summer suiting. The company originally operated six mills in Sanford, each turning out a separate textile product. At the peak, about 3,600 persons were employed.

COURT RESTRAINS COMPANY

Burlington Mills Corp., of Greensboro, N. C., bought out the Goodall-Sanford interest last November. Last month the new owners announced they were dismissing 1,800 employees and shutting down the last operation.

A Federal court injunction has enjoined Burlington from carrying out its intention. This is not expected to be permanent. The Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, obtained the injunction. It wants the workers placed on lay-off status, instead of outright dismissal, to protect vacation, insurance, and other fringe benefits.

Since last November, close to 1,500,000 square feet of the Goodall-Sanford mill properties were purchased from Burlington by the Grossman family trust of Quincy, Mass.

The Grossman family, largely concerned with lumber and building supplies, recently has bought up abandoned mill properties in New England. In several cases, it has managed to resell or lease space to new, diversified industries.

Sanford has a population of 15,000. It is situated about 30 miles south of Portland. There still are many idle. Thomas Meunier, a Sanford selectman, says an exact figure is unavailable since many Sanfordites have found jobs outside. They would prefer to work in their own town if new industries arrived.

As it is, some commute more than 100 miles a day to Laconia, N. H., where there is work in mills. Others drive to Exeter and Newington, N. H., or to Biddeford and Saco, Maine.

SMALL CONCERNS MOVE IN

Already several small companies have moved in. The Wasco Chemical Co., plastic manufacturers, began operations in the former Goodall-Sanford property and is employing 189.

The Seamlock Carpet Co., with around 20 employees, was formed by men once employed by Goodall-Sanford. They expect to expand as soon as the Burlington interests move out textile equipment.

The whole town is interested in the chamber of commerce and the Grossman promotions to attract new industry. This week, advertisements were run in metropolitan newspapers in the east. They were entitled "We Refuse to Die * * * 15,000 People Fight Back."

Maine has no corporate or personal income taxes. It does have a 2-percent sales tax. In addition to the regular banking facilities, Maine also has the pioneer State development credit corporation. This is a privately operated agency that has funds available to lend to risks who cannot qualify through normal channels.

COMMENTS BY THOMAS L. STOKES ON FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S RECENT VISIT TO WASHINGTON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 2 weeks or so ago the former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, was in Washington. He met with some of us here in the Senate. As an honored former Member of this body, as well as in his capacity as a former President, he visited with us here on the floor.

Among other things, President Truman delivered a speech at a Democratic dinner in honor of Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Most, if not all, of us took pleasure in seeing Harry Truman again. He is a truly lovable man, quite aside from the political principles and ideals for which he stands with which I happen to agree. Others may differ.

There was much editorial comment, pro and con, on President Truman's speech at the Rayburn dinner. I was there, and I thought it was a great speech, a fighting speech, a much-needed speech. With all my heart I subscribe to what President Truman said.

Of all the public comments that have been made upon President Truman's visit to Washington and his activities while here, I have read none which pleased me more than a column written by that veteran Washington reporter and commentator, Mr. Thomas L. Stokes. This particular column was an appropriate reflection of the sharp and brilliant powers of observation which have long characterized this eminent political reporter.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stokes' commentary on Mr. Truman be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN REFRESHING IN STUFFY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—It was nice to have Harry Truman back in town for a few days—and how refreshing!

Since he went away 2 years ago, Government has become aloof and stuffy, and sort of exclusive, lacking the human warmth he gave it. It's become more of a private affair, like a board of directors' meeting behind closed doors or a session of the Joint Chiefs of Staff — very hush-hush. Government doesn't seem so close to people any more.

It's funny that you don't realize what has happened, often what is missing, until it suddenly becomes very clear, just as when Harry Truman came back, and moved about our city and among the folks, friendly and smiling—and then you could understand.

You wouldn't think the spirit of one man could so permeate something as big as a whole government.

You suddenly realized, too, what is missing from our national politics, which has been so full of high-minded talk about "bipartisanship" and "cooperation" and "good will" that it became chilly and cheerless and boring.

Not until Harry Truman came back, and got himself a platform, and made one of his bristling speeches full of stout adjectives and burning indignation and honest concern for what Government ought to do about plain folks—why, you wouldn't know we still had the two-party system in this country.

In just one speech he brought the two-party system back, but it probably left town again with him. Always amusing is the way he stirs up Republicans whenever he opens his mouth, and they are crying now to high heaven about his criticism of the Eisenhower administration as if it were a crime. Then you remember the names they used to call him. But he could take it.

He seemed hale and hearty again and maybe he can take the two-party system on tour later and show it to the people and bring some life back into our politics, which is so much a part of our national life.

When Harry Truman came back, you had the feeling he was coming back home—and yet this is not his home. That's out in Missouri. But he had become somehow a part of this community, and never seemed just a transient. To so many people this city is just a place to hire a furnished house and a caterer and a butler to give cocktail parties to other people also here temporarily—though to lots of us it is home and the hometown. Harry Truman had become part of that hometown.

That explains the friendly feeling that people for whom Washington is the hometown have for him, which was so obvious in the warmth generated toward him by people wherever he appeared on his visit and for the question heard so often:

"It's good to have Harry back, isn't it?"

SHORTAGE OF PRIMARY ALUMINUM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in view of the current tight supply of primary aluminum adversely affecting independent users of aluminum and the inadequacy of steps taken by the Government to relieve the situation, I wish to place in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks an exchange of correspondence I have had on this matter with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 1, 1955.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Recurring stories in the press and private advices to me indicate a current or imminent shortage of primary aluminum in the United States. According to information I have received, the 3 primary aluminum producers in the United States took 83 percent of their entire primary aluminum production in 1954 (all the aluminum produced in this country in 1954) for their own use either in their own fabricating and sheet facilities or for sale to the Government stockpile. The 4,000 independent pig and ingot users in the United States, who sell their products in competition with the 3 primary producers, received only 17 percent of the total domestic primary aluminum production.

As this is written, the independent users are finding it increasingly difficult to either place spot orders for primary aluminum with the primary producers or to get acceptances for orders placed with the primary producers earlier this year or in 1955.

Since the Federal Government, through administrative agencies operating under the Defense Production Act of 1950 has repeatedly gotten into the field of aluminum, to assure the Nation increased primary aluminum capacity, it now seems necessary to examine Government activity in this field to determine whether its actions under established Federal policies have fulfilled the goals of those policies.

In inducing primary aluminum producers to expand their production capacities by extending to them accelerated tax amortization, guaranteed market contracts, and, in some cases, loans and loan guaranties, it was the twofold intention of the Government to (a) increase the Nation's ability to produce primary aluminum; and (b) assure that substantial additional quantities of primary aluminum would become available to independent users from the expanded production capacity.

To achieve the second of these two goals, the Government originally planned to write the guaranteed market contracts with distribution clauses reserving one-third of the production from the expanded capacity for sale to the independent users, one-third for the use of the prime producers, and one-third for sale by the prime producers to the stockpile. The contracts were intended to provide separate sources of primary aluminum from the new capacity for both segments of the aluminum industry and the Government stockpile.

Reservation of one-third of the new capacity for the independent users would have achieved one of the primary goals for which the Government sponsored programs were created. Fulfillment of this goal was never achieved.

When it came to writing the guaranteed market contracts, the primary producers saw to it that one-third was reserved for their exclusive use. However, by a deception little noticed at the time, the contracts combined the one-third that was to be set aside for independent users with the one-third to be sold to the Government stockpile in a single clause reserving two-thirds of the expanded capacity for the independents subject to a prior call for the stockpile. The independents got two-thirds of the new expansion capacity diluted by the stockpile take which came out of their two-thirds before they received their own share. No ceiling was placed upon the amount of stockpile metal the Government could take out of the two-thirds reserved for the independents.

It was made to appear that the Nation's credit, through its lending and loan supporting powers, was extended to guarantee independent users a firm supply of one-third of the output of the new capacity. In reality, however, while the prime producers have a guaranteed one-third take of the new capacity not subject to invasion by the stockpile take, the independent users have no firm guaranteed take from the expanded capacities. The two-thirds reserved for the independent users is subject first to the call of the stockpile, and the independents get only what is left. In addition, the primary producers have combined the less than one-third of expanded capacity shipped to independents and the aluminum shipped to independents from old or pre-expansion capacity and regarded the total arrived at thereby as fulfilling their obligation to the independent users under the guaranteed market contracts.

These procedures have worked to: (a) Reserve absolutely one-third of the new capacity for use by the primary producers; (b) Reserve all of the old or pre-expansion capacity for use by the primary producers; (c) Reserve most of the two-thirds of the new production set aside for independent users to the prime producers for sale by them to the Government in fulfillment of stockpile requirements. (The sale of primary aluminum to the stockpile by the prime producers is the same as sale of primary aluminum to any user by the prime producers since dollar receipts for all sales go into the same till).

In 1954, the year of highest production from the expanded facilities since inception of the expansion programs, the independent users, instead of receiving 33⅓ percent of the expanded capacity production, as was intended by the Government, received only 16⅔ percent of the expanded production, and a total of only 17 percent of the entire production of the domestic aluminum industry for the year 1954.

Defeat of the Government's aims in this matter is demonstrated with the following figures: (see chart A following. In 1950 total primary aluminum production from the three prime producers in the United States amounted to 1,403,000,000 pounds. Of this production 300 million pounds was shipped to independent users. The Government recognized at the inception of its aluminum production expansion programs that independent users were to receive the 300 million pounds they had received from the primary producers in 1950, in addition to the amount provided for them under the guaranteed market contracts.

In 1954, total primary aluminum production in the United States was 2,921,000,000 pounds, including 1,204,000,000 pounds resulting from the Government's aluminum expansion programs covered by guaranteed market contracts. From this production, there should have been available to independent fabricators (a) 300 million pounds from the old primary aluminum capacity, as in 1950, and (b) one-third of the new capacity of 1,204,000,000 pounds (403 million pounds) as per the guaranteed market contracts. In other words, there should have been available to independent fabricators in 1954 a total of 704 million pounds.

On the basis of distribution figures available to me for the 1954 primary aluminum production, the primary producers shipped only 500 million pounds of aluminum to the independents. The remaining 2,421,000,000 pounds of aluminum was retained by the three producers for their own fabricating facilities and for delivery to the stockpile.

CHART A.—*Primary aluminum sold independent fabricators from 1950 and 1954 production*

1950:	
Total production	1,403,000,000
Shipped to independents (21 percent)	300,000,000
1954:	
Total production (old and new capacity)	2,921,000,000
Available to independents from old capacity	300,000,000
Available to independents from new capacity	403,000,000
Total available to independents	704,000,000
Shipped to independents (17 percent)	500,000,000

Examining first the 500,000,000 pounds shipped to independents: (a) 300,000,000 pounds of this total was shipped to the independents from old capacity (as in 1950); (b) 200,000,000 pounds, therefore, was shipped from the new capacity. This amounts to approximately 16⅔ percent of the new capacity instead of 33⅓ percent the Government intended to be shipped to independents from expanded capacity as provided under guarantee market contracts. Independents received a total of only 17 percent of the entire 1954 domestic production.

Examining next primary aluminum from expanded capacity retained by the primary producers (see chart B following): (a) The total expanded new capacity amounted to 1,204,000,000. Of this the primary producers retained one-third or 400,000,000 as per the guaranteed market contracts for their own fabricating uses; (b) since 200,000,000 pounds of this new capacity was sent to independent users, assumedly, therefore, 604,000,000 pounds was shipped to the stockpile in order to fulfill requirements under the guaranteed market contracts that two-thirds of the aluminum from new capacity be reserved for independent fabricators and stockpile.

CHART B.—*Primary aluminum distributed to independent fabricators, producers, and stockpile from 1954 production*

1954:	
Production from new capacity	1,204,000,000
Shipped to independents from new capacity (16⅔ percent)	200,000,000
Shipped to prime producers from new capacity (33⅓ percent)	400,000,000
Reserved for stockpile from new capacity (50 percent)	604,000,000

In order to substantiate or correct the above figures, I wish to have copies of all guaranteed market contracts between the Government and primary producers now in force, as well as direct answers to the following questions:

1. How does the Government know whether provisions of guaranteed market contracts between it and the primary producers are fulfilled, i. e., that the primary producers retain one-third of the aluminum from expanded capacity and the remaining two-thirds is dedicated to the stockpile and sale to independent users?

2. What Government agency or what individual in the Government is responsible for keeping track of the administration of the distribution clauses of the guaranteed market contracts between the Government and primary producers?

3. What steps have been taken by the Government or a designated agency or officer to assure that the intention of the Government in executing the distribution clauses in the guaranteed market contracts is followed, i. e., that of the two-thirds of expanded primary capacity reserved for stockpile and independent users, one-third goes to the stockpile and one-third goes to independent users?

The Office of Defense Mobilization has recently announced that it will forgive delivery of 150 million pounds of aluminum to the stockpile by the primary producers under its guaranteed market contracts during the first half of 1955.

Since, under the guaranteed market contracts, the stockpile metal comes out of the two-thirds of expanded production reserved for stockpile and independent users, how is the Government supervising and directing distribution of the 150 million pounds to independent users?

It has come to my attention that primary producers or their representatives serve as members of industry advisory committees on primary aluminum to various agencies of the Government. Presumably this places them in a position of considerable influence with respect to decisions made concerning distribution of primary aluminum. In what way is this influence offset or counterbalanced by equal representation of the independent aluminum users?

I would appreciate prompt reply to my questions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This will acknowledge your letter of April 1 stating that the independent users of aluminum are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain their requirements of primary metal from the producers, and requesting information in reply to a series of questions related to the rights and obligations of the primary producers and the independent fabricators under the market guarantee contracts with the Government. You have also requested copies of all such contracts now in force between the Government and the producers.

In view of the fact that your questions relate primarily to the contractual responsibilities set forth in the market guarantee contracts, and since the administration of these contracts has been delegated to the General Services Administration under the provisions of Executive Order 10480 of August 15, 1953, I am taking the liberty of transmitting your letter to Mr. Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of GSA, for appropriate reply.

I am quite certain that Mr. Mansure can supply the desired information and sincerely trust that our action will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
May 3, 1955.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense, Mobilization, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I have your letter of April 14 and find it an inadequate response to my inquiry of April 1 for the following reasons:

I do not believe delegation of the administration of market guarantee contracts to General Services Administration by Executive Order 10480 relieves you as Director of ODM of your obligations and responsibilities under the Defense Mobilization Act as regards the Government stockpile in general and stockpile aluminum in particular.

It was by your order of March 23, 1955, that primary aluminum producers were permitted to reduce their shipments to the stockpile by 150 million pounds in the first 6 months of 1955.

I understand that under the guaranteed marketing contracts, two-thirds of the production of primary aluminum covered by the contracts, less the quantity purchased by the Government for the stockpile, should be made available by the primary producers for sale to nonintegrated users. It is further required that notice of the offer of such aluminum shall, under the contracts, be appropriately published.

The aluminum released by you from shipment to the stockpile should, by the terms of these contracts, be made available for sale to the nonintegrated aluminum users. It was not sufficient for you to merely direct forgiveness of the stockpile shipments. It was necessary for you thereafter to assure that the 150 million pounds of aluminum released to the primary producers be distributed to the nonintegrated users.

I therefore ask: By what directive to General Services Administration, the agency charged by Executive order with administering the guaranteed marketing contracts, or to any other Government agency, have you protected the rights and interests of the nonintegrated aluminum users by guaranteeing that they will have the forgiven stockpile aluminum made available for sale to them by the primary producers.

I would also like to know if your legal counsel advised you of the rights and responsibilities of all the parties involved. If so, I would like a copy of any such advice. If you were not so advised, I would now like the benefit of such advice from your legal counsel.

I would appreciate the pleasure of a prompt reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.

THE AUSTRIAN TREATY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Austrian Treaty has been the subject of considerable discussion. Over the wire service this morning has come a story datelined Vienna, and reading as follows:

VIENNA.—Soviet Russia demanded the Austrian State Treaty contain controversial "article 16" which would permit the Communists to retake some 36,000 iron curtain refugees in Austria.

The Russians want a clause in the treaty allowing Communist "interviewers" to visit Austrian refugee camps and arrange wholesale deportation of men, women, and children back to the Communist nations from which they fled.

The United States is dead set against the article and informed sources said it was likely to be one of the thorniest points of East-West dispute at the treaty conference which opened here yesterday with Big Four envoys and the Austrian foreign minister present.

The envoys, who announced in a communique they made "notable progress" at the first session, were reported to have approved 15 treaty articles at their first session including one providing for Austria's reestablishment as a "sovereign, independent, and democratic state."

The draft treaty, ending 10 years of occupation and restoring Austria's freedom for the first time since it was absorbed by Hitlerite Germany in 1938, has 59 articles. The controversial 16th article was to be discussed first at today's meeting, 9:30 a. m. EDT.

Inasmuch as a great deal of concern has been expressed in this country, and a number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are receiving mail from persons who are concerned lest people might be forced back

behind the Iron Curtain, I ask unanimous consent that article 16 of the proposed treaty be printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION V, ARTICLE 16, DISPLACED PERSONS

1. Austria undertakes within the period determined by the Allied Commission for Austria to take all necessary measures to complete the voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory.

2. Austria undertakes to render full assistance to the Allied and Associated Powers concerned in regard to the voluntary repatriation of their nationals and will enter into direct bilateral negotiations for this purpose.

3. Austria further undertakes:

(a) to permit accredited representatives of any Allied or Associated Power whose nationals are in camps or assembly centers allotted to displaced persons now in Austria to visit freely such camps or centers for the purpose of conferring with its nationals;

(b) to prohibit such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the Allied and Associated Powers and any activities designed to induce such displaced persons not to return to the countries of which they are nationals;

(c) to dissolve immediately any "committees," "centers," and other similar organizations existing in those camps and assembly centers that may be found to be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of the Allied and Associated Powers;

(d) to prohibit the recruiting of displaced persons into military or paramilitary organizations;

(e) to provide the means of transportation necessary for the transfer of repatriates to the frontier of their countries of origin nearest Austria.

4. Austria undertakes to grant to such displaced persons the same rights in all respects as those normally accorded to non-Austrians who have been legally admitted into Austria.

5. (No relief shall be given by Austria to persons who refuse to return to their native countries, if these persons fought on the side of the enemies of the Allied and Associated Powers, or voluntarily collaborated with the enemies of these powers, or are engaged in hostile activities against their countries of origin, as well as against any of the United Nations, or are members of organizations and groups which encourage displaced persons not to return to their countries of origin.)[1]

6. This article shall be applied without prejudice to the provisions of article 11 of the present treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I raised this issue with the White House this morning, at the bipartisan conference. I have also asked for a full report from the Department of State.

[1] Proposal by Soviet delegation.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, because of the congestion in the work being handled by the Committee on the Judiciary, and because it is very difficult at times to get a quorum in committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be given leave to hold meetings during the sessions of the Senate, in order to catch up with the work of the committee, without the necessity of coming to the Senate each time to make the request for leave; also, that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation be permitted to hold meetings during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have no objection to the Senator asking for consent that his committee and subcommittees meet today during the session of the Senate. If the Senator will get in touch with the majority leader each time and have his request come to the Senate through the majority leader in the regular order, there will be no disposition on my part to object to his request. However, we do have an objection to a request covering a prolonged or extended period of time, such as for a week or for the remainder of the session. If the Senator will make his request for today only, I will not object.

Mr. KILGORE. My reason for making the request on behalf of the full committee is that frequently I must get in touch with members of the committee on the floor of the Senate and then hold a meeting with them in a side room in order to have some bills reported by the committee. Private bills and claim bills are piling up in the committee. We can get the work done in the subcommittees, but it is very difficult to get a quorum present in the full committee meetings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from West Virginia will yield to me, I should like to say that I was not in the Chamber when he made his request. I will say to him that the procedure outlined by the minority leader is the procedure we attempted to follow last year at the insistence of the then minority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, except in the case of the Appropriations Committee, because it has always been the custom to give the Appropriations Committee such consent at the beginning of each session.

If the Senator from West Virginia will prepare a request on behalf of his committee and give it to the majority leader at the opening of the session on the day on which he would like to have his committee meet, the majority leader will be glad to present his request to the Senate. The majority leader presents such requests to the Senate immediately after the prayer. In that connection, I should like to say that we have had excellent cooperation from the other side in granting such requests.

The statement made by the present minority leader is in accordance with the position I took in the last Congress as minority leader. If the Senator from West Virginia will give me each day the information with respect to his committees and subcommittees, I am sure we can work out the details for him.

Mr. KILGORE. The only trouble with that is that at the present time it is difficult to get a quorum of the full committee, and I must practically gather a quorum on the floor of the Senate and get the Members off into a side room to hold a hearing, in order to report some bills. Therefore, it would be impossible to make a written request each time. That was the only reason I was asking that it be done in the way I suggested. Otherwise, I do not know how we can keep up with the work of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What was the Senator's request today?

Mr. KILGORE. I request that the full Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to hold hearings in the afternoon during the sessions of the Senate, perhaps for 2 or 3 weeks, until the committee can catch up with its work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator would have to make his request on a day-to-day basis, because the rules require that committees shall not meet during the sessions of the Senate except by unanimous consent of the Senate. It has been the custom not to give consent except on a day-to-day basis. I should like to do as much for the Senator's committee as for any other committee. For example, the Subcommittee on Internal Security is meeting now under a request made earlier today. That is a very important subcommittee, too. That subcommittee makes its request each time it desires to meet. The subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is considering minimum wage legislation also follows that practice. I shall be very glad to work out the problem with the Senator from West Virginia, and I am sure that we can arrive at a solution.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

Subsequently, on request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an editorial from the New York Journal-American, entitled "Propaganda," concerning efforts now under way in this country and abroad to discredit the Cargo-Preference Act passed by the Congress last year.

My attention was called to the editorial by Mr. Henry C. Parke, chairman of the national merchant marine committee of the American Legion National Security Commission. This Nation is fortunate in having two such good friends of American shipping as the Hearst newspapers and the American Legion.

Both have been doing yeoman work in spreading information concerning this vital phase of our economy to our people throughout the country for a number of years.

Helpful, likewise, toward more general understanding of merchant marine problems is an editorial published in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, which suggests a more equitable formula for fixing Panama Canal tolls. I also ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Uncle Sam's Free Ride," together with the bulletin of the Pacific Coast Committee on Panama Canal, in which the editorial was reprinted, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials and bulletin were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of February 4, 1955]

PROPAGANDA

Since 1936 this country has paid subsidies to American shipping interests in order to have an American merchant marine to carry a fair portion of our maritime commerce and to serve as an auxiliary to the Armed Forces in time of war.

In World War I, we had to spend billions of dollars to build ships. Then the costly process had to be repeated in World War II because of our own negligence. Experience has plainly demonstrated that the ship-subsidy plan is both cheaper and safer.

Now, it appears, Great Britain has a scheme to divert American subsidies to the support of the British merchant marine, which competes with ours.

Under the foreign-aid program, Congress requires that part of the goods we give away be carried overseas in American vessels. Our Government, of course, pays the cargo charges as well as the cost of the goods. And lately the Government has been giving away $700 million worth of farm products as a means of reducing $7 billion worth of surpluses accumulated through the agricultural price-subsidy plan.

We read, however, in the London Sunday Despatch that the British Government "is refusing large quantities" of these free goods because "the United States has laid it down that half the goods must be moved in United States ships."

"The United States Government has been told," the report continues, "that unless the rule is altered, the United States economic-aid plan is in danger of breaking down."

Perhaps, in the circumstances indicated, the sensible course would be to let the aid plan break down, and save our money. We certainly cannot afford to let our merchant marine be broken down by subsidized foreign competition—much less, ourselves pay part of the foreign subsidy.

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of March 4, 1955]

UNCLE SAM'S FREE RIDE

San Francisco supervisors now have added their voice to the plea of shipping interests here and up and down the coast for a more equitable formula for fixing Panama Canal tolls.

At their meeting this week, the board called upon Congress and President Eisenhower to take action toward a reduction in toll charges.

San Francisco has an interest in the question because, as a great seaport, we profit from intercoastal shipping, and a toll reduction would serve to stimulate such shipping.

At present, Uncle Sam is getting very much of a "free ride" insofar as the operation of the canal is concerned, at the expense of the cargo carriers.

Earlier this year, for example, the United States concluded a treaty with Panama under which the Department of Defense obtains the rent-free use of 20,000 acres of Panamanian land for military training purposes.

But to obtain this, the Government made several concessions to Panama the net effect of which will be to increase the costs of the Panama Canal Co. which are charged to tolls.

This means, in effect, that the cost of the military training program, to the extent that it is facilitated by the new pact, will be borne by the shipping interests which use the canal.

The steamship operators have no objection to bearing their fair share of Canal Zone Government costs. They'd be willing to shoulder half the burden.

But at the present time, they're carrying about 84 percent of the load, and much of the burden is due to the fact that the Canal Zone is a vital defense area.

They feel, and rightly so, that national defense costs should be borne by the Government, and not by the shipping operators who use the canal.

Legislation to equalize the burden of operating the Canal Zone was introduced in the last Congress but failed of passage.

As a result, American shipping through the canal is still carrying more than a fair share of the load. Uncle Sam is still getting that "free ride." And intercoastal shipping suffers as a consequence.

This Congress and the President should act to remedy the situation. San Francisco and other Pacific ports, and American shipping generally, would benefit by such action.

UNCLE SAM'S FREE RIDE

The editorial appearing as the first page of this bulletin points up the need for corrective legislation on the Panama Canal and stresses that present unfair burdens on commercial cargoes transiting the canal should be eliminated.

We appreciate receiving permission from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin to duplicate and distribute this timely message.

SPRING THAW BRINGS MORE REQUESTS FOR ACTION ON PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM

Steel, lumber, agriculture, General Motors, Ford, Sears, Roebuck, were all represented in a policy resolution passed on February 24, 1955, by the Traffic Managers Conference of Southern California.

Directors for the Traffic Conference who passed the strongly worded resolution include traffic managers from the above industries and firms who called for a material reduction in Panama Canal tolls. The traffic conference in a letter to congressional committee chairmen said, "Tolls are an important factor in the freight rates, despite the fact that they are levied against and paid by the ship using canal facilities."

Also included in the letter was a reference to the fact that the United States now owns 12 other federally built canals on which no tolls are charged and no interest is paid by users, indicating that this is one reason for calling on Congress to prevent continuation of unfair tolls on commercial cargoes transiting the Panama Canal.

ANOTHER LARGE SHIPPER GROUP URGES CONGRESSIONAL CORRECTION

Twelve hundred retail stores in the Mountain Pacific States, acting through the Western Traffic Conference, have passed a resolution urging, through proper legislation, recognition of the national defense value of the canal in cost allocations. The resolution also stressed the need for altering present financial and fiscal policies to prevent continuation of present inequitable, burdensome tolls on commercial cargoes transiting the canal.

Resolutions by these two organizations representing over 1,350 shippers emphasizes the vital need for congressional and administrative action on this problem.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD CONTAINS REQUESTS FOR POSITIVE PROGRAM

Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1955, that many individuals and organizations had corresponded with him about the Panama Canal problem and that many had "writen me asking that Congress act to prevent the imposition of any undue tolls burden" on American shipping as a result of the recently completed treaty with Panama.

SERVICE CLUBS AND TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION URGE ENACTMENT OF CORRECTIVE LEGISLATION

The Inter-Service Council of the Oakland-East Bay area, an organization representing service clubs in that area, recently passed a resolution asking for congressional action on the Panama Canal problem.

Another East Bay organization, the Grand Lake Taxpayers Association, has urged Congress to recognize the national defense value of the canal and the need for altering present financial and fiscal policies "to the end that a reduction in the tolls will result in fair taxation which will benefit us all."

OTHER GROUPS ADDED TO LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS URGING CORRECTIVE ACTION

Harbor Commission, Port of San Diego; Wilmington Chamber of Commerce; Marine Firemen's Union, A. F. of L., San Francisco; San Francisco Mayor's Committee on Shipping, Shipbuilding, and Ship Repair; Stockton Chamber of Commerce.

The above organizations represent the variety of business and persons interested in seeking a proper solution to the half-century of confusion which surrounds the Panama Canal.

THE PLACE OF THE SUPREME COURT IN OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on April 28 the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] delivered a significant address at the annual dinner of the Harvard Law School Association of New York City, Inc., at the Harvard Club in New York City. In his remarks the Senator from North Carolina dealt courageously and forthrightly with a very grave problem which confronts the people of the United States. It is a problem that men have spoken of only in whispers, but it is one which the American people must face and solve if our great experiment in free government, which has brought so many blessings to our people, is to be a success and is to survive.

The address deals with the proper place of the Supreme Court in our scheme of government. It points out that the Court in recent days has departed from the path designed for it by the Founding Fathers. The address is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S PHANTOM

For reasons which will become obvious, I entitle my remarks to you Alexander Hamilton's Phantom.

I desire at the outset to absolve my host, the Harvard Law School Association of New York City, and my legal alma mater, Harvard Law School, from all complicity in my foolish endeavor to tell you the truth. Since they do not know what I am about to say, they cannot be accessories before the fact; and since they do not encourage me to say it, they cannot be aiders and abettors. I believe that the remoteness in point of time of my student days will remove any danger that the Harvard Law School will be convicted of participation in my folly on the theory of guilt by association. But if positive evidence of its innocence in the premises is necessary, Harvard Law School can call to the witness stand an old friend of mine, who once presented me to an audience with this statement: "Our speaker is a Harvard Law School man, but nobody would suspect it."

Some years ago, Jim's administrator was seeking to hold a railroad company civilly liable for Jim's death on circumstantial evidence. The administrator called to the stand

a witness who testified that he was walking along the railroad track just after the train passed and that he observed Jim's severed head lying on one side of the track and the remainder of Jim's remains on the other. The counsel for the administrator then put this question to the witness:

"What did you do after discovering these gruesome relics?"

The witness replied, "I said to myself, something serious must have happened to Jim."

Something serious has been happening to the law of the land and the supposed sovereignty of the States. I propose to talk to you briefly about it. In so doing, I am activated by motives somewhat akin to those which resulted in the conviction of Job Hicks in the superior court of Burke County, N. C., a half century ago on the charge of disturbing religious worship.

John Watts took a notion that he was called to preach. John was skilled in the science of a bricklayer, but was sadly deficient in the art of an exhorter. He was nevertheless expounding the gospel in a rural church one Sunday, when Job Hicks, who had partaken too freely of Burke County corn, happened to stagger by. Upon observing John in the pulpit, Job Hicks entered the church, dragged John to the door and threw him out upon the ground. When Job Hicks was called to the bar to be sentenced for his offense, Judge W. S. O'B. Robinson, the presiding judge, remarked to him in a stern tone of voice: "Mr. Hicks, when you were guilty of this unseemly conduct on the Sabbath day, you must have been so intoxicated as not to realize what you were doing."

Job made this response to His Honor: "Well, Judge, I had had several drinks. But I wouldn't want your Honor to think I was so drunk I could stand by and see the Word of the Lord being mummicked up like that without doing something about it."

My endeavor to tell the truth must begin with the American Constitutional Convention of 1787.

The men who composed the American Constitutional Convention of 1787 comprehended in full measure the everlasting political truth that no man or set of men can be safely trusted with governmental power of an unlimited nature. In consequence, they were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men.

To prevent the exercise of arbitrary power by the Federal Government, they inserted in the Constitution of the United States the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers.

In so doing, they utilized the doctrine of the separation of powers in a twofold way. They delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government, and they left to each State the power to regulate its own internal affairs. It was this use of the doctrine of the separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make these memorable remarks in his opinion in *Texas* v. *White*:

"Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indissoluble Union, composed of indestructible States."

In their other utilization of the doctrine of the separation of powers, the Members of the Convention of 1787 vested the power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Supreme Court of the United States and such inferior courts as the Congress might establish. Moreover, they declared, in essence, that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers of the Federal Government should forever remain separate and distinct from each other.

The Members of the Convention of 1787 did not put their sole reliance upon the doctrine of the separation of governmental power in their effort to forestall the exercise of arbitrary power by the Federal Government. They balanced the President's power to veto the acts of Congress against the power of Congress to legislate, and they balanced the power of Congress over the purse against the President's power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. They made the Supreme Court of the United States independent of the President and the Congress by giving its judges life tenure during good behavior and by providing that their compensation should not be diminished during their continuance in office. They failed, however, to place in the Constitution any provisions to restrain any abuse of its judicial power by the Supreme Court of the United States.

This significant omission was not overlooked at the time. Elbridge Gerry, a delegate from Massachusetts, asserted:

"There are no well defined limits of the judiciary powers, they seem to be left as a boundless ocean, that has broken over the chart of the Supreme Lawgiver, thus far shalt thou go and no further, and as they cannot be comprehended by the clearest capacity, or the most sagacious mind, it would be an herculean labour to attempt to describe the dangers with which they are replete."

George Mason, a delegate from Virginia, made this more specific objection:

"The judiciary of the United States is so constructed and extended as to absorb and destroy the judiciaries of the several States."

Others declared, in substance, that under the Constitution the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States would "not be in any manner subject to * * * revision or correction"; that "the power of construing the laws" would enable the Supreme Court of the United States "to mould them into whatever shape it" should "think proper"; that the Supreme Court of the United States could "substitute" its "own pleasure" for the law of the land; and that the "errors and usurpations of the Supreme Court of the United States" would "be uncontrollable and remediless."

Alexander Hamilton rejected these arguments with this emphatic assertion: "The supposed danger of judiciary encroachments * * * is, in reality, a phantom." He declared, in essence, that this assertion was true because men selected to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States would "be chosen with a view to those qualifications which fit men for the stations of judges", and that they would give "that inflexible and uniform adherence" to legal rules "which we perceive to be indispensable in the courts of justice."

In elaborating this thesis, Alexander Hamilton said: "It has been frequently remarked with great propriety, that a voluminous code of laws is one of the inconveniences necessarily connected with the advantages of a free government. To avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts, it is indispensable that they should be bound down by strict rules and precedents, which serve to define and point out their duty in every particular case that comes before them; and it will readily be conceived, from the variety of controversies which grow out of the folly and wickedness of mankind, that the records of those precedents must unavoidably swell to a very considerable bulk, and must demand long and laborious study to acquire a competent knowledge of them. Hence, it is that there can be but few men in * * * society, who will have sufficient skill in the laws to qualify them for the station of judges."

By these remarks, Hamilton assured the several States that men selected to sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States would be able and willing to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process. Experience makes this proposition indisputable: Although one may possess a brilliant intellect and be actuated by lofty motives, he is not qualified for the station of a judge in a government of laws unless he is able and willing to subject himself to the restraint inherent in the judicial process.

What is the restraint inherent in the judicial process? The answer to this query appears in the statements of Hamilton. The restraint inherent in the judicial process is the mental discipline which prompts a qualified occupant of a judicial office to lay aside his personal notion of what the law ought to be, and to base his decision on established legal precedents and rules.

How is this mental discipline acquired? The answer to this question likewise appears in the statements of Hamilton. This mental discipline is ordinarily the product of long and laborious legal work as a practicing lawyer, or long and laborious judicial work as a judge of an appellate court or a trial court of general jurisdiction. It is sometimes the product of long and laborious work as a teacher of law. It cannot be acquired by the occupancy of an executive or legislative office. And, unhappily, it can hardly be acquired by those who come or return to the law in late life after spending most of their mature years in other fields of endeavor.

The reasons why the mental discipline required to qualify one for a judicial office is ordinarily the product of long and laborious work as a practicing lawyer, or as an appellate judge, or as a judge of a court of general jurisdiction are rather obvious. Practicing lawyers and judges of courts of general jurisdiction perform their functions in the workaday world where men and women live, move and have their being. To them, law is destitute of social value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents. An additional consideration implants respect for established legal precedents in the minds of judges in courts of general jurisdiction and all appellate judges other than those who sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States. These judges are accustomed to have their decisions reviewed by higher courts and are certain to be reminded by reversals that they are subject to what Chief Justice Bleckly of the supreme court of Georgia called "the fallibility which is inherent in all courts except those of last resort," if they attempt to substitute their personal notions of what they think the law ought to be for the law as it is laid down in established legal precedents.

The States accepted as valid Alexander Hamilton's positive assurance that men chosen to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States would subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process, and were thereby induced to ratify the Constitution notwithstanding the omission from that instrument of any express provision protecting the other branches of the Federal Government, the States, or the people against the arbitrary exercise of its judicial power by the Supreme Court.

For several generations next succeeding its utterance, the people of America had no reason to doubt the accuracy of Alexander Hamilton's assurance. With rare exceptions, the Presidents selected for membership upon the Supreme Court of the United States men who had long and laboriously participated in the administration of justice either as practicing lawyers or as judges of State courts or

as judges of the Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court. As a consequence, the overwhelming majority of the men called to service upon the Supreme Court were able and willing to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process and to perform their tasks in the light of the principle that it is the duty of the judge to interpret the law, not to make it.

I was taught in my youth to repose an absolute confidence in the Supreme Court by my father, an active practitioner of law in North Carolina for 65 years, who was accustomed to refer to the Supreme Court with reverential awe. He used to say that this tribunal would administer justice according to law even though the heavens fell.

I regret to say, however, that the course of the Supreme Court of the United States in recent years has been such as to cause me to ponder the question whether fidelity to fact ought not to compel us to remove from the portal of the building which houses it the majestic words, "Equal Justice Under Law," and to substitute for them the superscription, "Not justice under law, but justice according to the personal notions of the temporary occupants of this building." In making this statement, I reveal my acceptance of this observation made by the late Justice Robert H. Jackson in *Brown* v. *Allen:* "But I know of no way that we can have equal justice under the law except we have some law."

Candor compels the confession that on many occasions during recent years the Supreme Court has to all intents and purposes usurped the power of the Congress and the States to amend the Constitution. This abuse of power was made manifest even before the decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which repudiates solely upon the basis of psychology and sociology the interpretation placed upon the 14th amendment in respect to racial segregation by Federal and State courts, the Congress itself, and the executive branches of the Federal and State Governments throughout the preceding 86 years. Time does not permit me to cite all the cases supporting my present contention. I mention only one, namely, *Williams* v. *North Carolina*, where the majority of the Court altered the meaning of the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution by overruling the holding of *Haddock* v. *Haddock* to the effect that a State court, even of the plaintiff's domicile could not render a judgment of divorce that would be entitled to Federal enforcement in other States against a nonresident who did not appear and was not personally served with process. In so doing, the majority of the Court held, as the late Justice Jackson asserted in his dissenting opinion, that "settled family relationships may be destroyed by a procedure that we would not recognize if the suit were one to collect a grocery bill."

Recent decisions make it manifest that the Supreme Court has usurped the power to nullify acts of Congress. Perhaps the most glaring of these decisions is *Girouard* v. *United States*, where the Court overruled three previous decisions and a subsequent confirming act of Congress simply because a majority of its members did not believe that Congress had exercised its legislative power wisely in denying the privilege of citizenship to aliens who were unwilling to bear arms in defense of this country. To be sure, the majority of the Court did not say that it thought that Congress had legislated unwisely. But a statement to this effect would have been a far better reason for its decision than any of those it gave.

In addition to its revolutionary decisions on constitutional and statutory subjects, the Supreme Court of the United States has substantially impaired the doctrine of stare decisis and the stability of the law of the land which this doctrine formerly insured by overruling, repudiating, or ignoring its established precedents of earlier years. Former Justice Owen J. Roberts, a recent member of the Court, made this comment in this connection in his dissenting opinion in *Smith* v. *Allwright*: "The reason for my concern is that the instant decision, overruling that announced about 9 years ago, tends to bring adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, good for this day and train only."

It must be added, moreover, that the Supreme Court has handed down numerous decisions which place limitations on the powers of the several States wholly inconsistent with the constitutional principle that the States of the Union are indestructible. This is particularly true in the field of criminal law. By their virtual abolition of the doctrine of res adjudicata, these decisions make it extremely difficult for the States to enforce their own criminal laws against their own citizens in their own courts.

To satisfy these decisions, the States have been compelled to enact statutes providing for post-conviction hearings which, in plain English, permit the accused to try the State court after the State court has tried the accused.

Other decisions of the Supreme Court sanction a practice by which the lowest court in the Federal judicial system, to wit, the United States district court can set at naught the decisions of the highest court of a State. This practice seems particularly ironic and indefensible in the light of Alexander Hamilton's explanation as to why the Supreme Court was invested with original jurisdiction in cases "in which a State shall be a party." His explanation was as follows: "In cases in which a State might happen to be a party, it would ill suit its dignity to be turned over to an inferior tribunal."

In protesting against this practice, I am not a lone voice crying in a legal wilderness. I hold in my hand a clipping taken from the New York Times for August 14, 1954, disclosing the fact that on the previous day the Chief Justices of the 48 States of the Union had unanimously proposed that the Congress should amend Federal procedural laws so as to curtail the power of lower Federal courts to interfere with the administration of criminal justice in State courts.

The question naturally arises: Why does the Supreme Court of the United States prefer to make constitutions and laws rather than to interpret them?

The answer to this question appears in the assurance which Alexander Hamilton gave to the States when he was urging them to ratify the Constitution. It is simply this: The majority of the members of the Supreme Court during recent years have been either unable or unwilling to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process.

When all is said, it is not surprising that this is so. The custom of past generations of appointing to membership upon the Supreme Court men who have worked long and laboriously in the administration of justice either as practicing lawyers or as State judges, or as judges of Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court, has been more honored of late in its breach than in its observance.

All of the members of the Supreme Court are genial gentlemen of high attainments and significant accomplishments. But the majority of them have not worked either long or laboriously as practicing lawyers, or as State judges or as judges of the Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court. As a consequence, the majority of them have not undergone the mental discipline which enables a qualified occupant of a judicial office to lay aside his personal notions of what the law ought to be and to base his decisions on what the law has been declared to be in legal precedents.

The writer of the Book of Proverbs said:

"There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four which I know not: The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid."

Experience is undoubtedly the most efficient teacher of all things. This being true, there is one thing more amazing and more incomprehensible than the four mysteries enumerated by the writer of the Book of Proverbs. It is this: Why do Presidents of the United States ignore the numerous servants of the law who have performed years of devoted judicial service on State courts and on Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court when they are called upon to make appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States?

These facts are astounding:

1. No member of the Supreme Court as it is now constituted, ever served as a judge of a court of general jurisdiction, either State or Federal.

2. No member of the Supreme Court as it is now constituted, ever served as a judge upon an appellate court in any 1 of the 48 States; and

3. Only 2 of the 9 members of the Supreme Court as it is now constituted, ever served as an appellate judge on any Federal Court inferior to the Supreme Court before he was elevated to his present office. Moreover, few of them have devoted their major efforts to the actual practice of law.

It is high time for the bench and the bar and the people of America to ponder the question whether the Constitution of the United States ought to be amended so as to make it certain that in the future men will be selected for service upon the Supreme Court because of their possession of what Alexander Hamilton called those qualifications which fit men for the station of judges, and because of their ability and willingness to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process.

It may be that in making these observations, I am merely enacting the role of a fool who rushes in where discreet angels fear to tread. If so, I can plead in extenuation of my folly that I love the American Constitution and know that an indissoluble Union composed of indestructible States cannot endure if our government of laws does not survive.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST ACTION AGAINST AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES AND CERTAIN ADVERTISING MEDIA ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which was made by Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, before the Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary this morning. In this statement Judge Barnes made an explanation of why he refused the request of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, known as the 4 A's and certain newspaper and magazine associations, their request being not to have a consent decree written in a case in which he felt that a violation of the antitrust laws had been committed by those organizations. The Assistant Attorney General said that, in his opinion, this group of advertising agencies had set up a sort of private government in advertising by which they excluded competition from the field. It is one of the most interesting and one of the most important statements in the field of anti-

trust legislation that has been made in many a day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY STANLEY N. BARNES, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL IN CHARGE OF THE ANTITRUST DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, REGARDING PROPOSED ANTITRUST COMPLAINT AGAINST AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES AND CERTAIN ADVERTISING MEDIA ASSOCIATIONS

Many of you perhaps have read in the recent press about the Government's proposed antitrust suit against the American Association of Advertising Agencies, known as the 4 A's, and various newspaper and magazine associations. Public statements by counsel for the 4 A's as well as the American Newspaper Publishers Association have challenged our proposed complaint, while admitting its principal allegations, and have urged their clients to shun consent settlements and proceed to trial.

As a law enforcement officer, I do not propose to try any cause, pending or proposed, in the public press. Our prized tradition of unbiased trial bars any prosecutor from unseemly comment on such proceedings. However, public responsibility here requires some explanation of those violations the Government charges, and those procedures chosen to strike down the actions alleged to be illegal.

The story begins with a letter to me, dated 10 days after I took office on May 1, 1953. This letter of complaint came from an advertising agent claiming he had been injured by acts of the proposed defendants. He charged that he had previously been given the "run around" by the Department of Justice. My investigation first disclosed that a proposed grand jury investigation into this subject, recommended by a field office in 1951, had been denied by Washington.

After some 3 months of careful consideration, in September 1953, I ordered reopening of the preliminary investigation closed in 1951. As a first step, we searched the records of four associations of newspaper and magazine publishers, as well as the 4 A's. This survey soon revealed the existence, as our complaint in substance alleges, of a veritable private government known as "the recognition system." This system fixed conditions for newcomers' entry into the advertising agency business; fixed rates which those ad agencies already in business might charge; and fixed a sanctuary from competition for ad agencies by in effect barring advertisers from dealing directly with newspapers and magazines. As a result, the Government feels two classes of businessmen were injured—ad agencies whose entry into the business was impeded, and advertisers who were prevented from cutting sales costs, if they so desired, by placing advertising directly with newspapers or magazines. As a result, national advertisers were compelled to pay media the full ad rate, including payment for advertising agency services they did not want, and never received.

In 1930, the FTC dismissed a complaint involving many of the same issues. No opinion of any kind accompanied this dismissal. I am informed that the sole ground for this dismissal was the legal conclusion that there was want of interstate commerce.

That dismissal some 25 years ago, however, was under the narrower interstate commerce definition embodied in the Federal Trade Commission Act * * * not the broader standards of the Sherman Act, under which we now proceed. Furthermore, subsequent to 1930, the Supreme Court has squarely held that under the Sherman Act, local "distribution * * * of * * * advertisements transmitted * * * in interstate commerce * * * is an inseparable part of the flow of * * * interstate commerce" (*Lorain Journal v. U. S.* (342 U. S. 143, 152)).

Thus defendants' recognition system, it seems clear, rests on the traditional hard-core antitrust violations of price fixing of ad agencies' commissions, and group boycott of nonrecognized agencies. These practices the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared illegal per se. As the recent report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws put it, "Certain forms of conduct, such as agreements among competitors to fix market prices—[or group boycotts] are 'conclusively presumed to be illegal by reason of their nature or their necessary effect' so that they can quickly and positively be adjudged violations of the Sherman Act."

Faced with this situation, I ordered a complaint prepared. That complaint charges, first, that 4 A's and the 5 defendant media associations conspired with each other. Second, it charges a separate conspiracy between each association and its members.

At the heart of the offenses alleged is the recognition system. Under this system, newspaper and magazine associations recognize those advertising agencies which are entitled to receive agency commissions and credit. Failure by an ad agency to secure recognition from any one of the defendant media associations constitutes a severe competitive handicap. First, a nonrecognized agency is denied advertising commissions and credit. Second, perhaps equally important, its nonrecognized status is proclaimed among national advertisers and media. This imputes to the nonrecognized agency an aura of financial instability and business incompetence.

Standards for agency recognition adopted by each of the defendant media associations, our complaint alleges, are practically identical. Briefly, these standards require that an ad agency seeking recognition must represent and assure in writing, among other things, that (a) it functions as an independent contractor, not a house agency controlled by or affiliated with an advertiser, or an owner of a printing or engraving establishment, and (b) that it retains all agency commissions and does not discount to its clients any part thereof.

Agency commissions, it should be said, are paid by media in the form of a discount allowed to ad agencies on gross rates. All defendant media associations, our complaint charges, have agreed to standardize their 15-percent commission for advertising agents. The only way, therefore, that an advertising agency could cut rates to an advertiser is through a rebate. Thus media associations' requirements barring rebates result in price fixing.

In addition, all defendant media associations, the Government charges, insisted that each "recognized" ad agency agree to abide by the 4 A's standard conditions governing advertising contracts and orders and to use the 4 A's standard contract and order forms. The essentials of the media associations' standards for agency recognition were proposed by the 4 A's. A's aim, our complaint charges, was to free ad agencies as a class first, from price competition among themselves and, second, from competition in advertising services from national advertisers who wished to deal directly with the media.

Further pursuing its plan, our complaint alleges, the 4 A's and its members agreed to retain their full commission and not rebate any part to advertisers. Beyond that, they agreed to fix and maintain agency commissions at 15 percent and to refrain from competing with each other for new business by submitting speculative material.

After the complaint was drafted and approved by the Attorney General, the Department notified the ANPA and the 4 A's that the Government contemplated suit against them and others. This was done in accordance with our usual procedures, after a specific request made by these two associations during the investigation that we so notify them of our intentions. In response, several officials of ANPA sought, and had, a meeting with us. Further, I explained that while settlement could be fairly negotiated, the ANPA, like any other potential defendant, must consent to have its settlement embodied in a consent order. For my belief is that all groups—no matter what their power—must be treated alike. The ANPA officials requested several days to consider the matter and advised us we would have their answer.

The next I heard from counsel for this proposed defendant was via the public press. There statements by counsel for ANPA as well as the 4 A's proclaimed each association was free from any taint of violation and attacked the Government's proposed complaint. In addition, counsel for ANPA sought to distort our efforts to curb the ANPA's stifling of competition as an effort to control the operation of the press. Suffice it to say, in the language of the Supreme Court in the Associated Press case: "Surely a command that the Government itself shall not impede the free flow of ideas does not afford nongovernmental combinations a refuge if they impose restraints upon that constitutionally guaranteed freedom. Freedom to publish means freedom for all and not for some * * *. Freedom of the press from governmental interference under the first amendment does not sanction repression of that freedom by private interests" (326 U. S. 1, 20 (1944)).

These statements by counsel, it seems clear to me, make prefiling negotiation impossible. Soon after he took office, you may recall, the Attorney General announced the Antitrust Division would, in certain civil antitrust cases, offer businessmen a chance to negotiate a settlement before we file suit. Such prefiling procedures aimed to ease consent negotiation by enabling settlement before the position of either party had been frozen by public announcement. This aim, of course, counsels' public statements have defeated.

Consequently, I expect to file our complaint in the United States Court for the Southern District of New York, within the next several days. In light of public statements by counsel for some of the defendants, I feel sure defendants will share our desire for prompt decision of the issues soon to be at bar. For this reason, I trust they will answer promptly and thus put the matter at issue. As soon as this is done, I shall be glad to cooperate in any endeavor to speedily bring the matter to trial at the earliest possible moment.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). If there is no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CASE OF MRS. LUCILLE AFFOLTER, FORMERLY MISS LUCILLE MILLER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during the investigation of the office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Pittsburgh, Pa., the identity of one of the employees with whom I had been in contact was discovered.

The employee to whom I refer is Mrs. Lucille Affolter—formerly Miss Lucille Miller. She had been working with the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Pittsburgh for a period of nearly 15 years, having entered the service on February 2, 1938. The latter 10 years of this period she had been the receptionist in the office of the Director.

Notwithstanding this long service record, within 8 days after my interviewing her on June 17, 1953, Mrs. Affolter's identity had been discovered by the Department and she had been given her separation notice. She was only reinstated following my vigorous protests, and continued to work until January 1954, at which time she voluntarily resigned, having married during this interval. Her case would have ended with her retirement had I not discovered that her civil-service file had been flagged by the Bureau in such a manner as to prevent her future reemployment by the Government. I am convinced that this blemish on her record resulted solely from her cooperation with me during that investigation, and therefore, I would be most negligent in my responsibilities if I did not clear her record. It is now Mrs. Affolter's belief that she will not desire reemployment by the Government, but should circumstances develop whereby she would want reemployment, I do not intend that her cooperation with me should prove a handicap.

This question has been taken up with the Bureau officials, but they have refused to reconsider their decision to flag her files; therefore, my only alternative is to point out publicly why this action was wholly unjustified and in my opinion indefensible. I review her case.

Beginning in 1952 and extending through early 1953 I received numerous reports charging gross irregularities on the part of employees and former employees in the Pittsburgh office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. These charges were developed and referred to both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice along with the confession of one of the participants involved.

During the past 2½ years there have been several indictments and convictions and several employees removed, and the investigation is still going on.

I review these results to demonstrate that there was a serious condition existing in the Pittsburgh area and one which demanded attention.

I do not wish to infer that all these results were obtained from information furnished by Mrs. Affolter or from information furnished to the Departments through my office. However, I believe that both the Departments of Justice and Treasury will confirm that it was information they received through my office which broke the case.

In the early development of this case a question arose as to the accuracy of the statements of two certain individuals who were denying acquaintanceship. I was informed that the receptionist, Miss Lucille Miller, had in her possession a diary of her office work carrying personal notations of visitors to the office along with information as to whom they saw.

Through correspondence and telephone conversations I verified the fact that she did have such records and suggested that I come to Pittsburgh to examine them. Miss Miller was very much concerned lest any cooperation she might give would, if discovered, cause her trouble. To reassure her I promised that I would withhold her name but that should it be discovered I would most certainly defend her.

The reason I did not refer this question through the Bureau of Internal Revenue and allow their agents to check the report was that the allegations involved certain officials in the Pittsburgh office who, by virtue of their positions, might be able to censor the report. Also, thus far I had been unsuccessful in convincing either the Treasury Department or a congressional committee that conditions in that office were other than normal.

On June 17, 1953, I went to Pittsburgh and met Miss Miller, at which time I examined these diaries. My secretary took notations from these books, but when I recognized that they contained more information than first indicated, I persuaded Miss Miller to allow me to bring the books back to Washington.

At this point it should be made perfectly clear that these books or diaries contained no information which made it a violation of any law for Miss Miller to give them to me. To support that statement both these books are here on my desk today available to any Member of the United States Senate for his examination.

Within a few days after my visit Miss Miller was questioned by intelligence agents, and during that questioning admitted our conference. She told them that she had turned these two appointment books, or diaries, over to me, and when they expressed interest in examining them she suggested that they could be seen at my office in Washington.

My conference with Miss Miller was on June 17, 1953; the questioning referred to above was a couple of days later; and on June 25, exactly 8 days after our conference, Miss Miller received her dismissal notice. The charges were:

First. That she had violated paragraps 65 of Rules of Conduct and Other Instructions for Employees of the Internal Revenue Service. I quote that regulation:

> Title, Responsiveness to Proper Authority: Employees are expected to respond readily to the direction of their supervisors and to cooperate fully with all other properly constituted authority in the Internal Revenue Service. This includes compliance with directives as well as cooperation with investigating or examining officers of the Service.

Second. That she had made accusations against her superior officer reflecting upon his official integrity.

As to the latter charge of submitting allegations to the Bureau questioning the integrity of an officer of that agency, I point out that if this were a crime I would have been removed from the Senate long ago.

With the notice of June 25 she was given 5 days to show cause why she should not be removed from the Service or otherwise disciplined.

Miss Miller immediately advised my office of her difficulty, and I told her to file an appeal. I then called Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews and arranged a conference.

This conference was held on July 1, 1953, in the Capitol Building. As observers at this meeting with Commissioner Andrews were two other Members of the United States Senate.

During the discussion it was obvious that the principal charge against Miss Miller was that she had given these books to me rather than having turned them over to the Bureau inspectors.

It also developed that during the cross-questioning of Miss Miller by the intelligence agents she admitted having written certain letters to the Bureau in Washington complaining of conditions in the Pittsburgh office; but that when confronted with the demand by the intelligence agents either to prove or to retract the charges, she took the easier course and retracted them.

During the past 3 years I have on several occasions submitted allegations to the Bureau for their further examination, knowing at the time that I could not actually prove the charges. That is why I sent them down with the request that they be further investigated.

If these employees or myself are going to be called upon to prove every allegation referred to the Bureau, then why have an intelligence unit.

But that is not the reason Miss Miller was given her separation notice. There was no doubt in my mind at the time, nor is there any doubt today, that Miss Miller was suspended for one reason only, and that was for cooperating with me.

The Bureau complained that Miss Miller had throughout the questioning been a reluctant witness. She was also reluctant when I talked with her, but that is understandable. The girl was scared. She knew that some of her superiors were involved in the investigation.

If a Government agency is going to demand that every employee who forwards information regarding questionable conduct of officials in their department stand ready to prove such charges or be disciplined they will never get any information of wrongdoings, nor will they be able to clean up the corruption. Every employee has a responsibility to submit to his superiors any information or even rumors regarding corrupt practices on the part of his superiors, but at the same time he has a right to expect protection and not reprisals.

In the conference of July 1, 1953, all this was pointed out to Commissioner Andrews, and the dismissal notice of

Miss Miller was rescinded. But apparently her case did not stop there.

It now develops that during the succeeding months a series of investigations centering around the work of Miss Miller was quietly conducted, but since she was retained on the job the charges against her, so far as I knew, had been dropped.

Having married during the interval, Mrs. Affolter on January 27, 1954, resigned. She advised me at that time that her resignation was of her own accord and expressed her appreciation for having been protected during the latter days of her employment.

It was not until March 19, 1954, that I again heard from Mrs. Affolter, when she called and said that she was again in difficulty with the Department. She explained that after her marriage she and her husband had purchased a home, and in order to assist in the payment she had at the time of her resignation requested a refund of her retirement credits. Now, with the settlement date approaching, she had just been advised that her retirement credits were being held up by the Department on the basis that she had "resigned while under investigation."

Mrs. Affolter said that she had not known there was any investigation under way at the time of her resignation, and she requested my assistance in finding out what the trouble was.

I immediately wired the Director of Internal Revenue in Pittsburgh, asking whether Miss Miller had resigned while under investigation, and if so, the charges, or if her resignation had been purely voluntary, as she claimed. I received a reply from the Director stating that her resignation was voluntary. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point both these telegrams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The telegrams are as follows:

MARCH 22, 1954.

Mr. A. J. DUDLEY,
District Director, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Has Lucille M. Affolter been separated from your office? If so, was separation purely voluntary or for cause? If latter reason, explain.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *March 23, 1954.*

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator:

Re your telegram of March 22, 1954, Lucille M. Affolter voluntarily resigned on January 27, 1954.

A. J. DUDLEY,
District Director, Internal Revenue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I then contacted the Treasury Department, read to them the telegrams, and asked for their explanation. They said there was no suggestion of any fraud on the part of Miss Miller to justify such withholding of her retirement credits, and that it was an error that such action had been taken. Accordingly, they promised that this error would be promptly corrected and her check immediately forwarded. This was done. Her check was mailed.

However, in getting this straightened out I discovered that a question mark raising doubts as to her eligibility for reemployment was being noted on her record.

So far as Mrs. Affolter was concerned, the case was closed, since in her opinion she did not think she would be seeking reemployment. However, I was not satisfied to allow the case to remain in this condition, since I knew that if, as a result of unexpected circumstances, Mrs. Affolter should again seek Federal employment this question on her record could prove a handicap. I therefore advised her accordingly and suggested that I proceed to clear the record. I felt morally bound to see that this was done, since I was convinced that all of her difficulties had developed as a result of having been identified as cooperating with me.

During the intervening months I have been working toward that end; however, the Bureau of Internal Revenue in a recent letter has flatly refused to reverse their action and insists upon keeping the civil-service record of Mrs. Affolter flagged in such a manner that it would practically prohibit her from ever being reemployed in any agency of the United States Government.

They unhesitatingly admit that a part of the charges against Mrs. Affolter is a result of her willingness to cooperate with my office, although they claim that this was not the determining factor.

Mrs. Affolter—or Miss Miller—was employed as a receptionist in the office of the director at Pittsburgh, and in that capacity she could not possibly have been in a position to have had any connection whatever with the improper handling of tax cases, nor is there even any suggestion of this by the Department.

I have discussed her case and all the charges involved with the Bureau officials, and they have at no point presented me with any evidence or any suggestion that she was a party to any of the fraudulent activities in that office.

For a period of approximately 16 years Mrs. Affolter had been working with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Pittsburgh, Pa., and for approximately 10 years of this time she served as the receptionist in the office of the director. Her record was clear until after she had been identified as an employee with whom I had talked. Within 8 days after the Bureau discovered that I had interviewed this girl, she was fired.

I am thoroughly convinced that her difficulty arises solely as a result of her willingness to cooperate with me and a resentment on the part of certain officials that I kept insisting on a full disclosure of the activities in the Pittsburgh area.

I never met Mrs. Affolter until the June 17, 1953, meeting, but I was greatly impressed with her sincerity and her loyalty to the Bureau. While apparently anxious to do the right thing, she was greatly concerned over the propriety of giving me possession of the two diaries or appointment books, and I take the sole responsibility for having persuaded her to allow me to bring them back to Washington.

I repeat: There is nothing in these books regarding any individual's tax returns or tax liabilities. They deal solely with a record of appointments plus some notations of a personal nature. They are here on my desk today and can be inspected by any Member of the Senate interested in their contents.

Furthermore, with Mrs. Affolter's full consent, these books have been made available to the Treasury Department.

I certainly do not want to leave the impression that all the information I obtained in the Pittsburgh area was from Mrs. Affolter, or Miss Miller, as her name was then. However, the information which I received from her did furnish a missing link. Likewise, I cannot overlook the fact that all the information which I have ever developed, either in regard to the Pittsburgh area or in regard to any other area, has been obtained from the "Miss Millers"—those honest and loyal employees of the Government who, when the chips were down, gambled the security of their jobs in an effort to cooperate in exposing corrupt practices in their departments.

To my knowledge this is the only instance, during the past several years in which I have worked in this field, that anyone with whom I have worked has been identified, and I would be most negligent in my responsibilities and unworthy of the cooperation I have received from these persons if I did not see that the civil service record of this girl is cleared. I do not know that she will ever desire reemployment with the Government; however, if she should, I am determined that her having cooperated with me will not destroy that opportunity.

Had the Bureau of Internal Revenue demonstrated but a small degree of diligence in investigating the charges against the corrupt officials in the Pittsburgh area that they did in investigating Mrs. Affolter after it was established that I had interviewed her, the conditions in that Department would have been cleared up months sooner.

I do not question that having gone over her record with a finetoothed comb they may have found that she violated some technical rule, and I should say that the same thing would be true in regard to most other employees. But the record stands that her slate was clear until after my visit to Pittsburgh. Eight days later she was fired and since that time has been subjected to one of the most extensive investigations possible.

I have read all the charges against Mrs. Affolter. I have discussed time and time again with the Treasury Department the complete story surrounding her case, and I most emphatically state that there is nothing in any of the information which they have given to me which would justify such action on their part. There is nothing in her record which has been shown to me which would raise any question as to her eligibility for future reemployment. Without any hesitation, I make the statement here today that, having met Mrs. Affolter, having been greatly impressed with her sincerity and loyalty to her job, and having examined

in detail her complete service record, I would recommend her most highly for employment by any agency of the Government. I only wish we had more Federal employees of her caliber.

I am authorizing Mrs. Affolter to use my name as a reference should circumstances ever develop whereby she would apply for reemployment in the Government or in private industry.

Also, a copy of my remarks here today is being forwarded both to the Civil Service Commission and to the Treasury Department, with the request that they be made a part of her permanent files.

It will be noted that in this report I have referred to Mrs. Affolter on occasion as Miss Miller. This has been done, since I first interviewed the girl prior to her marriage, and the Department records will therefore refer to her on those dates as Miss Miller.

I am sorry this difference of opinion as to the official action taken in this case has developed between the Bureau of Internal Revenue and myself, but I am convinced that in their decision on this case they are wrong.

With corruption existing at the very top level of the Department itself, employees who had suspicion of such wrongdoing had no alternative other than to seek outside assistance. Furthermore, they had a legal right to bring such information to Members of Congress, and we in Congress had a right and a responsibility to expose the corrupt conditions. I quote:

United States Code, title 5, section 652: "(d) Right to petition Congress: The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with." (August 24, 1912, ch. 389, sec. 6, 37 Stat. 555; June 10, 1948, ch. 447, 62 Stat. 354; 1949 Reorganization Plan No. 5, effective August 20, 1949, 14 F. R. 5227, 63 Stat. 1067.)

In the past I have made it a practice that upon receiving allegations regarding the official conduct of Government employees first to make appropriate inquiries to reasonably substantiate the charges, and then to forward the information to the agency of the Government involved. Naturally in every instance the name of the employee or nonemployee with whom I had discussed the case was omitted.

This information was forwarded to the agency affected on the basis that each agency should take the initiative in cleaning up its own corruption. It has been only when the agency involved failed to handle the case as I thought it should that I have gone to the Senate floor with a public statement.

That practice has been followed in regard to the Treasury Department under both the previous administration and the present one; however, I can only interpret the Bureau's action in the case of this girl as an indirect warning to all employees as to what they can expect if in the future they are caught furnishing me any information. Therefore, I have no alternative other than to advise the Bureau of Internal Revenue here today that they will receive no further cooperation nor reports from my office until they have withdrawn all charges against this girl.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Delaware has called the attention of the Senate to a rather serious charge, in that, as I heard his statement, a classified civil-service employee had been dismissed for the reason that she furnished information to a Member of Congress. It seems to me as though the discharge of this employee was really a reprisal for that act on her part.

As a Member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would say that to such an incident I think we should give some attention not merely because of this individual case, but because other employees of the Government who are patriotic enough to cooperate with the Congress in giving its Members information may at some time be affected. So I wish to commend the Senator for advising the Senate of this situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Kansas, and I point out again that while Mrs. Affolter was first given a separation notice, she was reinstated after my complaint. At the time of her resignation a few months later, both she and I thought it was a purely voluntary resignation. It was only after this other difficulty that we found out her file was flagged with the notice that she would not be eligible for future employment.

I have talked to Mrs. Affolter. She does not have any intention of seeking reemployment with the Government, nor does she wish reinstatement. I think, however, in fairness to her record and to all employees who have cooperated with the Congress, her record must be cleared.

At the conference which took place in the Capitol, at which were present two Members of the United States Senate other than myself, it was clear that the furnishing of the information was the determining factor in the dismissal of Mrs. Affolter.

I repeat again: There is nothing in the books which I obtained from Mrs. Affolter dealing with income taxes of any individual, or any information the divulging of which would be considered a violation of the law.

I shall not be satisfied until the record of this girl has been cleared.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the unfinished business, which is H. R. 1.

Thanks to the foresighted efforts of those who have planned our international programs from the end of World War II up to the present time, the free world has grown strong, and may now be in reach, at long last, of winning the cold war.

We have every right to be proud of the part our Nation has taken in helping to rebuild a world torn asunder and left in an utterly chaotic condition as a result of the devastating effect of World War II. But our work is by no means complete.

I can think of no more important task than that of leading the way to the establishment of a healthy, worldwide trade among the nations of the world. To help do just this is the purpose of H. R. 1. I hope and I believe that the Senate will approve the bill without crippling amendments.

The choice now before this body is between the general and the particular good. On the one hand stands the policy of continuing, as conditions permit, to reduce the barriers to free world commerce, and by so doing to enhance our prosperity and our freedom. On the other hand stands the policy of acceding to the petitions of an injured few who, by dint of organized complaint, have created an army out of what is really a platoon.

On the one side are ranged the Democratic Party, in its historic free-trade role, the present Republican administration, and leaders in public and private life. Groups there are also—the American Bankers Association, American Cotton Shippers Association, Farm Bureau, American Federation of Labor, Chamber of Commerce, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cooperative League, Tobacco Associates, Tobacco Association of the United States, and Leaf Exporters Association, to mention a few. In addition, liberalization has been endorsed by every public advisory board on trade policy established since the end of World War II—by the foreign economic policies study group headed by Gordon Gray; the International Development Advisory Board, under the chairmanship of Nelson Rockefeller; the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, led by Daniel Bell; and the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, directed by Clarence Randall.

Who are those in opposition? Some are those who historically, traditionally, and inherently are opposed to imports, who favor high tariffs, and who seem never to have recognized the shrinking of the world.

But there are others opposed to H. R. 1. There are those relatively few industries who could be hurt, and some of which may be hurt. With these, I have complete and real concern and sympathy. However, I feel that H. R. 1 as it comes to the Senate from the Finance Committee carries provisions for protecting these industries. Furthermore, President Eisenhower has given his positive assurance that the act will be administered so as to prevent undue injury.

There is another group—a rather large group—whose fears, I hope and I believe, are not based on reality. One of the industries in this group is one of great importance to my own State. I refer to the textile industry. I felt that the textile people were justified in asking that the applicable date be one prior to the enactment of this measure, rather

than July 1, 1955, as was proposed. They were entitled, as were other affected industries, to know just what the starting level was, rather than to be dependent upon what might come out of the Geneva conferences. The committee wrote this amendment into the bill.

There is only one basic determinant, namely, the good of our country as a whole; and there can be no question that our country's welfare depends on an ever-expanding reciprocal reduction of trade barriers.

The moment the Congress yields to particular interests, will be the moment when our Nation ceases to have a trade policy in the national interest. Instead, we shall be on our way back to the log-rolling tariff days, and shall have abdicated the leadership opportunity of building a fine, healthy, worldwide trade calculated to give even greater strength to the free world.

This is not to deny the need for cushioning possible damage to American industry which reduced trade restrictions may bring. I would agree with the Bell report—

> That in cases where choice must be made between injury to the national interest and hardship to an industry, the industry (must) be helped to make adjustments by means other than excluding imports—such as through extension of unemployment insurance, assistance in restraining workers, diversification of production, and conversion to other items.

I may add that similar recommendations for adjustment were made last year by a member of the Randall Commission, Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, whose proposals were subscribed to, in varying degrees, by other members of the Commission, and now have become the subject of proposed legislation.

Our serious consideration of these and related suggestions would seem appropriate.

With these principles in mind, I should now like to speak briefly about the benefits of the pending bill to our national economy, as well as to our worldwide military, political, and economic relationships.

One of the pillars of international economic trade policy, of course, is the long-term equalization of imports and exports. It is illusory to talk, as was once the vogue, in terms of a "favorable balance of trade." If a country's exports exceed its imports, the difference must be found in grants, loans, and gifts. Trade restrictions are thus a subsidy of the domestic producers whose products cannot successfully compete with imports, and of the exporters whose high volume of business can be sustained only by having the Nation as a whole—through governmental action—provide other nations with the funds which it is necessary for them to have if they are to purchase our exports without commensurately exporting to us.

Between the two World Wars, our excess of exports was compensated for by a high flow of gold bullion from Europe to this country. Since World War II, with European gold reserves greatly reduced, we have abridged the gap between exports and imports by $35 billion in economic aid.

And still the dollar gap persists. In 1954, for example, our nonmilitary exports in goods and services approximated $15,850,000 as compared to imports of only $10,250,000,000. The difference was covered in part by $4,750,000,000 of United States governmental grants or sales for foreign currencies.

"Trade, not aid," some say. But it is elemental economics that no aid and not enough trade are mutually exclusive conditions. Either we have aid in the amount necessary for absorbing the excess of exports, or trade will reach a level at which exports and imports are equal.

This means, of course, that if we wish to maintain—and, if possible, to expand—our present level of exports, we must either make possible greater imports, or expect to continue, and even to enlarge, our aid program. Few would argue in favor of expanding foreign aid; many, in fact, wish to see it curtailed. By the same token, we can hardly afford a decline in our exports.

Our export trade, which comprises about one-quarter of the world's total, annually consumes one-sixth of our total national production—more than a third of our cotton, one-quarter of our tobacco, 25 percent of our wheat, 50 percent of our rice, 10 percent of our machine tools, 20 percent of construction and mining equipment.

Since 1945, the value of agricultural exports alone has, each year, equalled about one-eighth of our annual cash farm income. One acre in every 10 of our total farmland is producing for foreign consumption.

My own State of Alabama knows the reality of these figures, for of its farm crops, about 35 percent of cotton and 15 percent of peanuts are sold abroad each year.

What, then, is the sensible course for the protection of our national economy? The eminently sensible course is to approve the trade-agreements program contained in H. R. 1.

Equally important are the effects of this measure on our worldwide military, political, and economic relationships. No one will deny that the vitality of a nation's economy directly affects its political and military strength. It is also indisputable that if nations are thwarted in their trade with us, they will soon turn to other markets, even markets within the Communist bloc.

Under the Marshall plan, for example, we gave to Denmark $1 million for the establishment of a blue cheese merchandising system especially adapted for sales in the United States. Several years later, upon complaints by cheese interests in this country that imports of Danish blue cheese were depressing their market, a quota on the imports of that product was established. The Danes thereupon cancelled permission for us to use islands in the Baltic Sea as sites for air bases; and, deprived of American dollars exchange, the Danes turned from coal purchases in West Virginia to coal purchases from Communist Poland.

Europe as a whole has made remarkable strides in economic recovery since the end of World War II. Steel production in Britain is approaching 20 million tons annually; Italian automobile production has increased 31 percent since 1953; West Germany's unemployment is below our own; and France's industrial output has soared from an index of 90 in 1948 to 128 at the present time. These are startling gains, but they can be maintained and strengthened only if we permit less restrictive access to our own markets, in return for the large volume of our products being sold in Europe.

In the Pacific, Japan is a keystone in our military and political planning. But there are disturbing signs that the economic vitality of that country is being impaired by limited access to markets in the United States, Europe, and the Commonwealth of Nations. A nation of 87 million inhabitants, increasing by a million and one-half a year, Japan is somewhat smaller in size than California. Of its total land mass, reduced 44 percent in World War II, only 16 percent is arable. The agricultural population is relatively constant; and industrial expansion is the only source of employment for population increases. In 1953, the per capita income was $190, in comparison to a per capita income of $1,850 in the United States.

Mr. President, on April 29 of this year, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article entitled "Warning Signals in Japan." The article was written by Mr. Joseph Alsop; and in it he gives a very good picture of present conditions in Japan, and points out some of the danger signals to which I have just referred. I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

WARNING SIGNALS IN JAPAN

In the past month, things have been happening in Tokyo that ought to have alarmed even the most complacent and self-satisfied American policymakers.

The theme of the drama has been a Japanese-American negotiation about the scope of Japan's "self-defense" program and the size of the "defense contribution" Japan pays the United States for its present defense by American forces.

At one stage in this drama, tension reached such a point that the Foreign Minister, Mamoru Shigemitsu, attempted to fly to Washington on 24 hours' notice to seek a new basis of agreement. When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles refused this abrupt visitation, Shigemitsu was publicly humiliated.

At another stage, the most powerful figure among Japanese conservatives, Finance Minister Hisato Ichimada, declared he would resign his post rather than present a Japanese budget drawn up in conformity with American ideas.

Prime Minister Ichiro Hatoyama was forced to warn United States Ambassador John Allison that Ichimada's resignation would bring down the cabinet and precipitate the ugliest kind of political crisis in Tokyo. On Allison's frantic plea, Washington's position on Japanese defense policy was then somewhat modified. In this manner, the Hatoyama cabinet was finally enabled to agree on an annual budget for presentation to the Diet.

As these words are written, however, everyone is forecasting that the budget debate in the Diet will be extremely stormy.

Above all, the Diet is expected to ring with furious charges of American intervention in Japanese internal politics and policymaking. And unfortunately these charges will be hard to answer.

Such are the results, such is the really appalling aftermath, of the bargain struck by Secretary of State Dulles when he negotiated the Japanese Peace Treaty and the linked understandings concerning defense problems.

The Dulles bargain was hailed at the time as a brilliant feat. But events have proved that it had two vices, which really should have been discerned at the time by simple, common foresight.

Vice No. 1 was to convince the Japanese that their own defense program was something imposed by America and designed principally to serve American interests. The rule that a national effort must grow up from the nation that makes the effort was lamentably ignored by Secretary Dulles. Japanese divisions were needed to make pretty patterns in the paper games played by the American Chiefs of Staff. That need, essentially a need of American domestic politics, was given first consideration.

Thus today, the much touted Japanese defense effort is still basically a phony. More than 100,000 men are now in training in the self-defense force. But with great numbers of Japanese, including many Japanese conservatives, the program is bitterly unpopular. And because the defense effort does not truly represent the Japanese national will, because it is regarded as something done at America's behest, the value of the new Japanese defense force is at least highly questionable.

The second vice of the Dulles bargain greatly inflames the effects of the first vice. America has not only been entangled in Japanese defense planning. Because of the so-called "defense contribution," America is also automatically entangled, each year, in the process of preparing the Japanese annual budget.

Maybe it looked like good business to provide that the Japanese would pay the United States $150 million a year for helping to defend Japan. Maybe it seemed a good way to spur the Japanese to build their own defense force, and so escape the burden of this "contribution."

But the sum involved, while a drop in America's fiscal ocean, is a very large sum indeed in the eyes of Hisato Ichimada and his hard-pressed budget makers. And because of this annual payment, the kind of Japanese-American drama that has just taken place here inevitably occurs whenever Japanese budget making begins. The Dulles bargain provides, in short, for an annual, automatic, unavoidable row between America and America's most important ally on this side of the Pacific.

To date, to be sure, the results have been just bad, not fatal. Anti-Americanism has been greatly encouraged. The Japanese have been given an excellent excuse for not thinking independently and realistically about their own national problems. But there has been no breach between America and Japan.

On the other hand, the present American policy line on Japanese defense and related problems plays directly into the hands of the astute Chinese Communist diplomats who are working overtime to promote an eventual Japanese-American breach. It is melancholy to contrast American clumsiness with Chinese Communist adroitness.

On the vital China trade issue, for example, the American line seems to have been carefully calculated to infuriate the Japanese, having the same look of heavy-handed intervention in Japanese affairs as our line on defense. The Chinese are taking brilliant advantage of this. While British and other Western trade negotiators are not asked in Peiping to deliver embargoed goods, the Communist trade mission now in Japan is asking for almost nothing except embargoed goods. The idea is being emplanted with great skill that only American obstinacy stands between Japan's struggling exporters and great profits in trade with China.

All of which leads to the conclusion which, it is authoritatively understood, has already been presented to Washington by the Embassy here. In brief, it is high time for a radical reexamination of our policies in Japan and our relationship with Japan.

Any such reexamination must lead to voluntary revision of the bargain struck by Secretary Dulles in 1951. The Japanese defense program must cease to be an effort made by contract with the United States. All American pressure on the defense issue must end forthwith. Such irritants as the nonsensical defense contribution must be altogether removed. If possible to reduce the Japanese sense of still being occupied, the American ground forces should be withdrawn from Japan to Korea or elsewhere.

By such steps as these, and only by such steps as these, a wholly new Japanese-American atmosphere can be created. And this is urgent, for if the present poisoned atmosphere persists, the eventual result is going to be a shattering shock to the Washington policymakers who so comfortably take Japan for granted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Japan's central economic problem lies in its dependence on external commerce. Situated similarly to Great Britain, it must receive from the outside world 20 to 25 percent of its food supplies and a major portion of its raw materials. Before World War II it not only had raw material sources within the limits of its empire, especially Manchuria; it also had a firm trade relationship with mainland China, which during the 1930's consumed 18 to 20 percent of all Japanese exports. Now, deprived of Manchuria, and faced with the control of China by a Communist power, Japan has been experiencing a steady import-export disparity.

In 1953, imports were $2,410,000,000, and exports $1,275,000,000, leaving a payments deficit of $1,135,000,000. Of this amount, $785 million was shaved off by United States Government and troop disbursements; another $150 million by miscellaneous receipts, leaving a final deficit for 1953 of around $200 million. For 1954, due largely to increased trade outside the dollar area, this was expected to drop to within a one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollar range—a significant improvement, but still a deficit, with long-range consequences for a viable economy.

Trade with the United States has been particularly disparate. In 1953 Japan received one-third of her imports from the United States, largely in the form of grains, cotton, iron ore, phosphates. In the same year, Japanese exports to the United States were only 17 percent of her total export trade. During the first half of 1954, exports to the United States declined 32 percent, while imports gained 50 percent.

It is interesting to note, in passing, that while 1954 imports of Japanese cotton textiles constituted a mere one-half of 1 percent of our total domestic cotton textile production, Japan purchased in 1954 about 25 percent of our raw cotton exports. Interesting, too, is the fact that while total imports of cotton textiles in 1954 were less than 1 percent of our total domestic cotton textile production, our exports of cotton textiles were 6 percent of our total domestic cotton textile production. One might very well question the wisdom of risking possible reduction in Japanese purchases of our raw cotton for the sake of blocking the small flow of Japanese cotton textiles coming into this country at the present time. One also might query whether, in the world trade picture as a whole, our domestic cotton textile industry, with such a high volume of exports, should not be interested in freeing, rather than restricting trade conditions.

We recognized from the very end of the war the important part Japan could play in giving stability to the western Pacific area—indeed to the whole world—if she could be kept on the side of the free world.

We took it upon ourselves to give to Japan every assistance and every encouragement to regain an economy that would make her self-sustaining and a strong force against Communist encroachment.

We helped her rebuild her industries. One of her prewar industries was textiles. We sent a commission made up of textile experts to Japan to study the problem and to make recommendations for the rehabilitation of her textile industry. One of the foremost textile experts in this country, a large manufacturer of cotton textiles, from my State of Alabama, Mr. Donald Comer, was a member of that commission.

We put Japan back into the textile industry. Naturally she should be able to sell her product. But we insisted that she not sell it in her traditional trade territory—the China mainland. Shall we now close our market to her entirely, or can we afford to continue to take the mere dribble from Japan and sell her in return our cotton?

The figures I have given assume greater significance when considered in the light of other factors in Japanese-American economic relations. We know, for example, that exports by Japan to Communist China have been very small, amounting to only $18 million in 1953, or 0.4 of 1 percent of total exports as compared with $278 million to the United States during that same year.

What may not be generally known, however, is that under our foreign assets control law, assets in the United States of individuals or concerns engaging in commerce with Communist China may be frozen at the discretion of the Treasury Department. Similarly, this statute prohibits the importation into the United States of any raw materials from Communist China, or of finished products made from such raw materials.

As an illustration of the comprehensiveness of this provision, I have been told of a recent instance involving 20 cases of Japanese mushrooms which were retained by customs officials, on behalf of the assets control group, until their non-Chinese origin could be proven by the importer.

The vitality of Japan's economy is also affected by the United States military procurement policy.

Upon the advent of the Korean war, the Japanese industry capable of making and supplying military goods underwent a large and rapid expansion. At present there are 126 major industrial establishments capable of producing arms, munitions, and maintenance services of up to $100 million per year. But whereas during the 1951–54 period the United States purchased through the offshore procurement plan almost $300 million of products from these companies, orders for the current year are only slightly more than $12 million.

Moreover, Japanese self-defense forces now consume only about $35 million of those same products, which, added to United States orders, totals slightly under one-half of full production. Unless steps are taken to find markets for the remaining $50 million of military products and services, a serious decline in that segment of the economy will take place in the latter part of this year.

What about possible markets for military products apart from procurement by the United States and self-defense forces? Here the problem is not only that most Asian countries are not in the market for this type of commodity, but that United States restrictions on weapons and technical information, presently used and produced by Japanese concerns, prevents those companies from dealing with certain potential Asian customers. The export of such military items is discouraged by our practice of paying for such items in local currency, rather than in dollars, thus removing them from the export category, and from the special Government preferences and allocations to which industries in that category are entitled.

Finally, there is the burden on the Japanese economy resulting from the maintenance of 100,000 self-defense forces, at a current annual cost of about $220 million, plus the present $161 million contribution made by Japan for the support of United States Armed Forces stationed within her borders.

From recent press comments one would judge that the United States is endeavoring to persuade the Japanese to increase both the size and the budget of self-defense forces, even though this may necessitate a reduction in Japanese support of United States forces.

Japan, for its part, appears eager to reduce, rather than increase, the present 14-percent proportion of its budget devoted to the armed forces. Premier Hatoyama, whose Democratic Party stoutly campaigned in the recent election on the pledge of restoration of political and economic relations with all nations, insists that if military spending is not reduced his Government will be unable to fulfill election pledges of new housing. If this should happen, it is the Premier's contention that the Socialists will become the majority party, thereby endangering the defense system so carefully established by the United States.

All of these facets of the Japanese economic situation, Mr. President, are related to H. R. 1, as well as to the broader aspects of American policy toward that important country.

They call, of course, for an orchestration of means and ends which I think is absent from official planning at the present time.

At the very least they call for our approval of H. R. 1, by which Japan can be helped to secure the markets for her products, to which she is not only entitled, but to which she must have access if she is to continue to survive as a free nation.

I understand that there is at present in Japan a Communist Chinese trade mission. It is reported that this group is seeking agreements on a wide variety of goods, particularly those which are included in the embargo on trade with Communist countries.

These Chinese Communist traders, the report continues, are skillfully manipulating the theme that only American dominance and American control prevent such trade relations from being consummated. This is, indeed, not the time to let such a patently false idea gain currency through any default of our own. H. R. 1 may not be the final answer, but it is a partial step toward helping Japan to satisfy her trading needs within the free world.

Mr. President, I have discussed today the importance of basing our decisions on trade policy on the good of the Nation, rather than on the good of particular interests. I have stressed the benefits of reciprocal reductions in trade barriers to our own economy. Finally, I have emphasized the importance of H. R. 1 in relation to our worldwide economic, political, and military relationships, with particular reference to the country of Japan.

Here, my countrymen—

In the words of Alexander Hamilton to an earlier age—

impelled by every motive that ought to influence an enlightened people, let us make a firm stand for our safety, our tranquillity, our dignity, and our reputation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a brief but very clear and pointed editorial published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE

"The United States has an ever-growing surplus of the products of our farms and factories which must find markets abroad," reads one of the first sentences in the report of the Senate Finance Committee recommending extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

And that is precisely what the high-tariff lobbyists have ignored in their strenuous efforts to persuade Congress to erect barriers against international trade.

They have tried to alarm practically every industrial community in the land about the largely mythical dangers of competition from abroad. But they never get around to mentioning that every dollar we spend for imported goods comes back to us in payment for American products, and that the primary reason we can't sell more goods to foreigners is their lack of dollars.

Chairman HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and the other members of the committee—with the exception of Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, and Senator KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma—wisely recognized the facts of the situation and have submitted a report favoring extension of the Trade Act, as President Eisenhower had recommended.

Prospects seem good for a favorable vote, and that is as it should be.

This is no time for the United States to make even a gesture against economic cooperation among the free nations of the world. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act will stand as evidence of our sincerity in this field, and our wisdom as well. For sound trade, now as always, benefits all parties to it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise to support H. R. 1, and to congratulate the distinguished and able chairman of the Finance Committee, and the committee itself, for the accomplishments expressed in this bill.

As we all know, trade is the channel through which the benefits of free enterprise flow.

Through trade, the products of our farms, factories, and service industries move from producers to consumers.

The American standard of living is based upon trade. As trade ebbs and flows, so does the employment of our labor, our farmers, our management, and our capital goods.

Obviously areas with the least trade have the lowest standards of living; and are therefore more susceptible to the inroads of communism.

Approximately 25 percent of all goods exported, come from the United States, although our population is but 6 percent of the population of the world.

Fortunately, America is also the world's leading importer. Otherwise, we would be giving away our wealth, because imports are the way we obtain payments for our exports.

It is true that we do give some of our wealth to others. For example, not counting military supplies and services, this country last year gave foreign aid amounting to four-tenths of 1 percent of the country's total production.

That, of course, was not trade. We hope, however, that such gifts will bring the world dividends in peace and freedom.

It is, of course, desirable to have free movement of goods and services between countries. But some of our industries are conditioned to tariff protection.

There can be no universal across-the-board policy of raising tariffs, or lowering tariffs; or freezing tariffs at their present rates.

Each industry, and in some cases certain individual products, should be studied carefully from the standpoint of tariff protection.

Some people repeatedly point out that the United States is a low-tariff country, with an average rate of but 12 percent on dutiable items.

But this figure is about as meaningless as the compilation of the average sales price of goods on a grocer's shelf; because such discussion of averages tends to obscure the fact that our tariff protection ranges from zero on many commodities to as high as 200 percent on others.

Whether these varied rates are proper depends upon the individual facts in each case; and it is only right that a procedure be established for changing rates based on changing conditions.

As I understand it, that is one of the features of this reciprocal trade-agreements program, within the range of change authorized by law.

There are also cases where possible heavy additional unemployment requires careful analysis before any changes are made.

Several segments of the economy obtain advantages from increased imports into the United States. They include most producers, and ultimate consumers, who thereby obtain commodities in greater quantity and at more competitive prices.

Exporters also benefit, because dollar purchasing power is thereby created in foreign lands, and used, in turn, to buy more of our goods.

There are some companies in the United States which cannot increase their efficiency, and therefore, cannot meet foreign competition. Fortunately, however, their number is small.

We would not be the greatest exporting country in the world if we could not, in most instances, undersell foreign competition.

Nor could we have history's highest wage rates, and highest standard of living, if our productive efficiency did not surpass that of all other countries.

Representatives of some industries stress the fact that foreign countries have lower wages. That is true.

With that premise, those representatives of these industries seek higher tariffs.

But wage rates are not the same as labor costs per unit of output. American industry can outproduce and outsell all other countries in practically every commodity where large-scale production methods and skilled organization are the determining factor.

The State of Missouri has a wide range of economic activities, along with 4 million consumers. What might help one Missouri business, however, might damage another.

As I see it, therefore, one should weigh all the effects of any particular tariff proposal; and then try to come up with whatever decision is best for all the people.

As example, a tariff request backed up by proof that the application in question would contribute to the defense of the United States should be approved. Anything which strengthens our national defense is vital to the interests of us all.

When the bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came before the Congress last year, I submitted an amendment to prevent any decrease in the tariff rate on a particular commodity when the President found that such a reduction would threaten the domestic production of that commodity in the quantity needed for national defense requirements.

Last January I wrote the Secretary of State, asking what procedures and criteria had been established to administer that section of the law which dealt with these defense requirements.

Mr. President, I ask that at this point in my remarks copies of my correspondence with the State Department be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN F. DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended last session, an amendment was included, providing that national-defense requirements tests be applied. The language of this amendment reads as follows:

"No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements."

Currently, consideration is being given to further expansion of this act, giving certain authority to the President in regard to tariff changes. Having sponsored the amendment just quoted, I am particularly interested in being advised of the procedures and the criteria which have been set up to administer the language and intent of this provision. It would also be helpful to me to know just what actions, if any, have been taken in the use of such procedures and criteria.

I would appreciate your arranging to have the above-mentioned information given to me at the earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1955.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Reference is made to your letter of January 26, 1955, requesting information on the procedures and criteria set up to administer the language and intent of section 2 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954, which provides that no action should be taken under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to decrease the duty on any article where the President finds that such reduction threatens domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and the requested information will be sent to you soon.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

MARCH 4, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN F. DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of January 26, 1955, I wrote you to learn of the procedures and criteria which have been set up to administer the language and intent of the amendment I introduced last year to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Enclosed is a copy of my January 26 letter for your ready reference.

I was advised by letter of February 2, 1955, from your Department that a reply was in preparation. It is the purpose of this letter to suggest the timeliness of such reply from you as soon as appropriate information can be assembled.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 10, 1955.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Further reference is made to your letter of January 26, 1955, requesting information on the procedures and criteria set up to administer the intent of section 2 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954, which provides that no action should be taken under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to decrease the duty on any article where the President finds that such reduction threatens domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements. Your letter of March 4 is also acknowledged. It is regretted that preparation and clearance of this reply involved so much delay.

In a memorandum dated October 5, 1954, to the Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, the President asked that Committee to provide him with appropriate information and advice in order to enable him to make the appropriate determination under section 2 of Public Law 464. He asked, in addition, that the Chairman of that Committee take appropriate measures to keep the Office of Defense Mobilization informed of any serious problems which may from time to time arise in connection with this provision of the act.

In compliance with the President's request, the Chairman of the Committee proposed to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization that the following procedure be followed:

1. The Department of Defense member of the Trade Agreements Committee would inform the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization if in his opinion serious problems were involved by reason of the applicability of section 2 of Public Law 464.

2. In addition, when the trade-agreements committee published a list of products to be considered for possible tariff concessions, a copy would be sent to the Director.

3. Whenever the Director might desire to bring to the attention of the committee any matters relating to section 2 of Public Law 464, the committee would be glad to receive his views.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization informed the chairman of the trade-agreements committee of his agreement with the procedure outlined above and confirmed with the Department of Defense the liaison function of the defense member of the committee. He added that it was clear that in those rare instances where a difference of view within the trade-agreements committee could not be resolved and was referred to the President for his information, the Office of Defense Mobilization might be called upon to provide additional advice and information on the policy questions involved. He recognized that the procedure outlined by the chairman would not preclude calling on the Office of Defense Mobilization for this purpose.

In addition to establishing the foregoing procedures, the chairman of the committee specifically reminded the members of the committee of their standing obligations, under the Executive order governing operation of the committee, to report to the President their reasons for dissent from any recommendation of the committee. Should any member deem a recommendation of the committee to threaten domestic production needed for projected national-defense requirements, it would consequently be his responsibility to furnish a full report of his views to the President, giving reasons for such a dissent.

The first occasion to utilize these procedures arose when the trade-agreements committee in November 1954 published a list of products to be considered for possible tariff concessions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations involving Japan. In accordance with item 2 of the procedure, a copy of the list was immediately sent to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The oral and written statements received from the public by the committee for reciprocity information and the Tariff Commis-

sion, as a result of the hearings which they held in December in preparation for these negotiations, included in a number of instances the claim that a tariff concession on a particular product would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements or would otherwise impair the Nation's defense capabilities. The chairman of the trade-agreements committee sent to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization a complete list of industries and industrial groups making such claims, the products involved, and in most instances, a brief summary of the information and views offered in support of the claim. The Director was invited to examine the full text of the written statements or oral testimony on any or all of such claims.

In discharge of the responsibility of the Department of Defense under item 1 of the procedure outlined above, its member on the trade-agreements committee has informed the Office of Defense Mobilization of all instances in which he believed, after examining all relevant facts and opinions, that any problem might be involved by reason of the applicability of section 2 of Public Law 464. In arriving at his views, the Department of Defense member has called on experts within that Department for technical information and advice. The Department of Defense member brought to the attention of the trade-agreements committee those products on which it appeared that action to reduce the duty would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements. In this way, the committee is given the guidance needed to assure that it avoids recommending to the President any offer of a concession which would threaten domestic production needed for projected national-defense requirements.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after receiving these replies from the Department of State, it was suggested to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that it might be desirable to strengthen this section by directing the President to prepare and issue criteria, and to make specific findings based on such criteria, in each instance where defense requirements were involved.

At this point I would like to place in the RECORD my letter to the chairman of March 22 last, and to acknowledge with appreciation his gracious reply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1955.

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Chairman, Finance Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Last year, I submitted an amendment to H. R. 9474, the bill to extend the Trade Agreements Authority under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The amendment went to conference of the Senate and the House. The language, as passed, is as follows:

"SEC. 2. No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements."

On January 26 of this year, I wrote the Secretary of State asking what procedures and criteria had been established to administer that section of the law. (See attached copy.)

Having received only an acknowledgment of my January 26 letter, I repeated my request to the Secretary of State on March 4. (See attached copy.)

Under date of March 10, I received a letter from Assistant Secretary Morton, replying to my previous letters. (The former is attached.)

As will be noted from the above-referred-to letter of March 10, a somewhat voluntary and loose procedure has been established, which permits, but does not require, that section 2 of the act, or the clear intent of Congress, be administered effectively.

Could not the failure of the State Department's letter to reply to the specific inquiry be interpreted to mean that no criteria have been set up to administer this section.

Accordingly, it would appear that legislative action may be the only way to stipulate that the President make findings and give appropriate consideration to such findings in respect to the effects of tariff reductions upon domestic production of articles needed for projected national defense requirements.

I submit, therefore, for your consideration the necessity for not only including section 2 as presently written but for adding an additional paragraph to that section, as follows:

"To implement the preceding paragraph of this section, the President shall prepare and issue criteria to be applied in making the required findings. In each instance of a tariff reduction under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President must make a specific finding under such criteria prior to any change in the tariff duty."

I would deeply appreciate your giving consideration to this proposal, and would be very glad to discuss it with you further any time at your convenience.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this defense amendment of last year has been retained by the committee, and a subsection added. The latter places full responsibility upon the President for any adjustment of imports which are important to our national security.

It would be difficult to gage the effect increased imports would have on increased unemployment, just as it would also be difficult to gage the increase in employment which would result from increased exports.

From figures obtained, however, it appears that any possible increase in imports resulting from the President's utilization of his authority under this bill would have little if any effect upon unemployment. In fact, the Randall Commission estimated that an across-the-board reduction of 50 percent in our tariffs would result in an increase in unemployment of less than 1 percent of the total labor force in the United States.

The pending bill concerns itself primarily with a maximum permissable decrease of 15 percent in individual rates; and this is over a 3-year period.

Nor did the Randall Commission study take into account any new product developments, or the development of more efficiency in the industries concerned.

Any action which results in unemployment is a very serious matter indeed to those who become unemployed. Accordingly, one factor which should be given weight in the administration of both the peril-point clause, and the escape clause, is what any decision does to employment.

We all know, however, that in this type of economy most unemployment develops for reasons completely unrelated to the question of imports.

In that tariffs ultimately become a price burden on consumers, they should be avoided when possible and the unemployment issue should be handled directly.

In this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, tariff reduction possibilities are relatively limited.

Any reduction in duties is in itself permissive; and the maximum amount of permitted decrease is relatively slight.

There seems to have been much public misunderstanding on this point. Based on our mail, apparently many persons believe the proposed legislation would permit a tariff duty of 20 percent to be reduced, over a 3-year period, to 5 percent.

As has already been pointed out by other Senators, however, if a tariff duty were 20 percent, and the President elected to reduce that duty the maximum allowed in any one year, the reduction would be 5 percent of 20 percent, or 1 percent. Hence a 20 percent rate would become 19 percent.

It is, indeed, a rare situation in the United States if such a slight reduction in tariff duty could have the devastating effects some advertise. One should have more confidence in the ingenuity and efficiency of American industry.

I believe in the reciprocal trade-agreement approach to tariff adjustments. But that does not mean favoring any giveaway approach; nor does it mean that all negotiations should be turned over to any group unilaterally committed to free trade.

Every time a representative of the United States sits down to discuss tariffs with representatives of foreign countries, hard-headed bargaining should characterize the proceedings.

In addition to obtaining tariff understandings which are so needed by our export industries and our farmers, those meetings should emphasize the importance of lessening exchange controls and various other devices which are now being utilized against American products.

In the improved trading atmosphere which H. R. 1 should create, much of our agricultural surpluses can and should be disposed of.

This result also would be accomplished by businesslike bargaining at the tariff table. In fact, the taxpayer has the right to expect the same trading approach from his Government that the stockholder expects from his management.

In reporting the bill, apparently the committee has made some modifications, some of which might not have been decided upon under ideal conditions. But the advantages of the bill far outweigh any possible defects.

When H. R. 1 becomes law, its administration should be watched with care, particularly wtih respect to the defense aspects and the escape clause. I am confident that will be done, because on February 17 last, in referring to H. R. 1, the President said, "No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure."

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I recommend the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, it was my privilege to attend most of the open and executive sessions of the committee in their consideration of H. R. 1.

I can honestly state that I know of no proposed legislation that has received more thorough consideration by the committee than has this measure dealing with the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement.

The sessions, both open and executive, lasted approximately 8 weeks. During that period of time, we heard representatives of the Tariff Commission, representatives of the various Government agencies who are vitally concerned with this program, as well as witnesses representing all phases of industry, agriculture and labor.

In our executive sessions, we had the benefit of the advice and counsel of the State Department and our own staff members. Their help and counsel were invaluable.

In an issue that is so far reaching and involved as is the reciprocal trade agreement program, there is bound to be a great divergency of opinion. I think it is to the credit of our committee that, after weeks of executive sessions, we were able to report to the Senate a bill by an almost unanimous vote. This, of course, does not mean that there were not closely-divided views on many amendments which were adopted.

Our committee is especially indebted to the skillful handling of this bill before the committee by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the ranking Republican Member, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. These Senators have spent years studying this problem and are thoroughly conversant with every phase of it.

The report of the Senate Finance Committee on this bill and the debate have, in my opinion, clarified and expressed very definitely the congressional intent.

I wish to discuss two phases of this proposed legislation that are of special interest to the people of my State.

First, I desire to discuss reciprocal trade agreements from an agricultural standpoint. I feel it is imperative and in the best interests of the farmers, as well as in our national interest, that we provide for an expansion of international trade.

I do not wish to discuss the value of agriculture exports merely from the standpoint of agriculture itself, but from a broader viewpoint—the national interest. Everyone must realize the best customer for the American farmer is, after all, the American consumer; that is, the United States domestic market. On the other hand, it is our surpluses which we need to market outside the United States that largely restrict the income of the American producer on his total production.

The total value of our farm exports has increased from the July–December period each year since 1952. In July–December 1953, our farm exports were $29 million more than in the same months of 1952. During the last 6 months of 1954 the dollar value of our farm exports was up more than $100 million over the 1953 level, reaching $1,582 million.

In the last session of Congress, we passed Public Law 480, through which our Government is continuing to move farm surpluses into foreign countries. This program is well under way, and the Department of Agriculture is entitled to much credit for the increased exports of a number of commodities.

The importance of the export market can be somewhat visualized when we realize that we exported last year the amount of raw cotton grown on over 6 million acres; that is, almost one-third of the entire cotton crop harvested last year. In that year we exported wheat grain and wheat flour from the equivalent of more than 14 million acres of wheat. This quantity of wheat exported totaled almost 26½ percent of the total wheat acreage harvested in the United States last year.

In the case of tobacco, we exported the equivalent of almost 1 acre out of every 4 harvested. In the case of rice, the 1954 exports represented almost 22 percent of the acres harvested.

In addition to this, we exported sizable quantities of many of these commodities in processed form.

These figures demonstrate that we must not in any way impair the effectiveness not only of the present trade policy but we must not enact any legislation which would endanger the exports of agricultural and industrial products.

The American farmer has demonstrated his ability to produce not only for domestic needs but also in a volume that requires export markets. In order to maintain a prosperous agriculture, we need export markets of at least $4 billion a year at present prices.

We have the capacity to supply an even larger foreign demand. At the present time, through our price-support programs, we have accumulated more than $6½ billion worth of surpluses of agricultural commodities. We have accumulated these surpluses despite production controls on basic commodities of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, tobacco, and rice.

Agriculture must be given its fair share of the export market if we are to have a prosperous agriculture and a sound domestic economy.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss a problem before our committee which is of great concern to the citizens of Kansas, and of course to the Nation generally, and that is the ever increasing amount of oil imports.

This problem has been of growing concern to not only the oil industry, but to our citizens generally, for the past 10 years.

It was only a few years ago that oil imports were at a figure of around 300,000 barrels daily, while figures for the first quarter of 1954 were at a daily average of 1,102,000. For the first quarter of 1955, the daily average was 1,328,000 barrels, or an increase of 20½ percent.

The oil imports had increased so consistently and so rapidly that the President, on July 30, 1954—last year—established an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The Director of Defense Mobilization was designated as chairman, and the heads of the following agencies served as members: Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor. This committee was directed by the President to evaluate all the factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the United States, keeping in mind not only our national economy, but national defense.

The Advisory Committee reported to the President shortly before we began our hearings on H. R. 1. The Advisory Committee makes the following statement in its report:

> The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.
>
> In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.
>
> The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

During the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we heard much testimony urging the limitation of oil imports to 10 percent. As a matter of fact, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and several other Senators, including the junior Senator from Kansas, cosponsored such a proposal.

I did this because it was my conviction that petroleum imports were excessive and that they constituted a definite threat to the welfare of a great domestic industry to my State, and, what is more serious, to the security of our Nation.

If the trade-agreements program is to continue to justify the support that it has previously had, it must be realistic and demonstrate that it is capable of being administered in such a way as to give recognition to conditions which might lead to undermining the security of our country.

I feel that sufficient recognition of some problems has not heretofore been given ir the administration of this program. I, therefore, came to the conclusion that specific legislation was indicated, not only to protect the industries concerned and the security of our coun-

try, but also to insure the maintenance of the trade-agreements program itself.

I believe that a majority of the Members of this body have reached a similar conclusion. I further believe that the administrative agencies charged with this responsibility have themselves recognized the problem.

The proposal I was supporting for specific treatment as to oil was made necessary because of lack of any effort to restrict the excessive importation of oil, coupled with the potential power to increase imports of oil to such an extent that they could destroy the domestic petroleum industry and render our country dependent on uncertain sources of oil to sustain our expanding economy as well as our security.

I now know that this situation is recognized in the highest places in our Government. The Senate Finance Committee, in approving H. R. 1, specifically recognized the problem and inserted in its report a portion of the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources which had been submitted by the White House. In addition, the committee added section 7 delegating to the President specific authority to act with relation to the restriction of imports of certain commodities, which I understand to include petroleum. Under this provision the Director of Defense Mobilization, when he has reason to believe that any article is being imported in such quantities as to threaten or impair the national security, may so advise the President. Then, if the President agrees, he may cause an investigation to be made and, if the investigation supports the findings of the Director, the President is required to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level which will not threaten to impair the national security.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I supported this proposal as a substitute for various amendments providing limitations upon the importation of specific commodities, one of which amendments was the one which I had supported in regard to petroleum. I supported the proposal adopted by the committee because I was assured by those in the administration responsible for the administration of the trade-agreements program that if such amendment were adopted by the committee and by Congress action would immediately follow, and that imports of petroleum and its products would be definitely restricted.

I was further assured that such restriction would be based upon the study previously made, to which reference was made by the committee; that the basis of the limitation would be in accordance with the recommendation of that study. This study indicated the necessity of limiting imports of petroleum and its products to an amount and in the relative position of the imports of petroleum in 1954 as related to domestic production of crude oil in 1954.

I was further assured that the Director of Defense Mobilization would take the action indicated as necessary to adjust imports of petroleum and its products to the level and relationship of 1954.

It is my judgment that, if these assurances can be supported by such further evidence as this body may think proper, we can all rely upon these assurances and that the importation of petroleum and its products will forthwith be limited to a relationship to our domestic production and in an amount equal to the 1954 position.

Since the report of the Finance Committee, I have further explored this situation with administrative agencies charged with the responsibility for the application of this program, and I can say to the Senate that again I have complete assurance of compliance of these agencies with the direction set forth in that amendment.

Based on these assurances, I heartily support the report of the Finance Committee.

During the executive sessions much consideration was given to the limitation of oil imports and the limitation of other imports on a percentage or quota basis. After literally days of discussion and thought, the committee wrote in a general amendment dealing with these commodities. There can be no doubt in my mind as to the intent of the committee, nor, do I believe, as to the intent of the Senate in regard to limiting the oil imports to the average daily imports of the year 1954, based on the report of the President's Commission on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

I can assure the Senate that I would not have agreed to the amendment in H. R. 1, dealing with imports of commodities which are of national defense interest, had I not been assured that it would be the policy of those who administer the act to follow the intent of those who participated in preparing the report of the Advisory Committee.

I think it is interesting to note that on April 18 Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, who was a member of the President's Advisory Committee, stated in a speech at Mount Vernon, Ill., in referring to the question of oil imports, that he not only approved the committee's recommendations but also stated:

> To state it simply, it means that appropriate governmental action should be taken if the importers do not voluntarily hold down the rate of imports in proportion to the 1954 level.

I think, as the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee, stated yesterday, that we expect those in authority to administer this program on the basis of a limitation of imports; and if it develops, and we find that the program is not being so administered, then it will become the duty of the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, or individual Senators or Members of Congress to demand full compliance with this intent.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall be most pleased to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Kansas knows, some oil is produced in my State, and the oil producers there are very anxious about this question of oil imports. At the same time I value the stand and the opinion of the Senator from Kansas very highly. Does he feel that the oil producers of my State would be justified in taking the assurances given as guaranties that the oil industry is not going to be disrupted by unusual and devastating amounts of oil imports?

Mr. CARLSON. I am pleased to state to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who always follows closely the interests of not only the people of his own State, but of the people of the Nation, that had I not believed that the amendment we approved in committee, which was recommended by a very substantial vote, would protect the oil industry from ever-increasing imports, I certainly would not have voted to report the bill to the Senate, and I certainly would not be on the floor today stating I favored it and would vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kansas, in whose State there have been oil operations of long standing. Some of us were somewhat worried by the situation, so far as reducing importations of fuel oil was concerned, because we felt it was crude oil which was causing a great deal of the trouble. At the same time, if there is only one amendment before the Senate, the easy and natural thing is to vote for the amendment, if it is in the interest and welfare of one's own State. With the proposal in the present language, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas, for whom I have great respect, if he feels that, along with other Senators who come from oil-producing States, we are doing all we can be expected to do if we vote for this type of amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I believe that this amendment will establish a standard on which we can rely; that it will limit oil imports, as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Energies Supplies and Resources Policy, to 13.6, and we expect that recommendation to be carried out.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Kansas for that information. It is reassuring to me.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Kansas is aware of the situation in the State of Texas. Today we are restricting production of oil in our State to only 16 days a month. Our production has been cut back to 16 days a month, partly because of excessive oil imports. Then, as the Senator knows, the wells in our State are permitted to produce an average of only 20 barrels a day. It is true that we have a great oil industry, and that industry furnishes the main portion of our tax revenues; but the Senator from Kansas knows that when the production

of that great industry is cut down to a total of 20 barrels a day, and only 16 days production a month, not only does the industry suffer, but, likewise, the State and all the local taxing agencies suffer, because of the loss of revenues which otherwise would be collected from the production of oil. Is that not true?

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state to the Senator from Texas I have noted some figures on production, and I believe they are correct. During the month of May, Texas was cut back 208,000 barrels a day; Oklahoma was cut 20,000 barrels a day; Kansas was cut 25,000 barrels a day. In addition to production cuts, the Senator well knows of other restrictions during the past years. I would say the problem is of great concern, not only to our States, but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. DANIEL. That was the next point I was about to make. Not only is it of great concern to our States and to the independent oil industry, but it is of national concern if we are to believe the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, and I certainly do believe them. If imports are allowed to exceed the ratio they bore to market demand or production in 1954, the national security would be endangered. Is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Texas. It was for that reason that the junior Senator from Kansas and the junior Senator from Texas and many other Senators cosponsored an amendment making the limit 10 percent. I say very honestly and sincerely, had it not been that I was satisfied with the amendment adopted by the committee, after days and days of hard work and conferences, I would still have supported a limitation on oil imports of 10 percent.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that the independents in the industry are the ones who are most seriously hurt by excessive oil imports, because of the fact that the major oil companies which operate in this country have foreign supplies of oil, which they can bring to this country and use. The independents in the industry do not own foreign oil. Their only production is domestic, and that production is being reduced because of excessive imports. They are the ones who are hurt by excessive oil imports. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. CARLSON. I agree with that statement. By the last order, flush production was cut to 25 barrels a day in Kansas, and other production was cut 10 percent, based on March runs. That is what hurt the independent oil producers. There can be no question about that.

Mr. DANIEL. The national security requires that the independents form a progressive and important part of the oil industry, because they are the main ones who explore for new oil reserves. Is that not true?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. It is the independent oil producer, the wildcatter, who goes forth and looks for oil.

Mr. DANIEL. Why should the major oil companies explore for new oil and develop new reserves owned by them at home, when they have so much oil in the Far East and other foreign countries? In other words, they do not have the same incentive to discover and develop new oil reserves in our country that the independents have. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. DANIEL. In addition to what the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy reported, I ask the Senator if there was other evidence before the committee which indicated the injury that would be suffered by our Nation and its national defense and security if oil imports exceeded the 1954 ratio between imports and market demand?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. There was much testimony both from witnesses who favored importation of oil—importation in large quantities—and from those who were opposed to all imports of oil. There is no question that excess importation will affect not only our national defense, but our economy, and it is important that we have an economy that is thriving and growing.

Mr. DANIEL. Based on that evidence, is it the Senator's understanding that if oil imports should exceed the 1954 ratio, there would be injury to our national security?

Mr. CARLSON. There can be no question about that.

Mr. DANIEL. Was there any reason why the committee included the amendment at all, if the committee did not feel that the national security would suffer if oil imports were in excess of the 1954 ratio?

Mr. CARLSON. As I said earlier in my remarks, the Finance Committee spent much time on this amendment and on other amendments dealing with quota imports and their effect on the national defense. We were seriously concerned about the matter. For that reason, we have assurances that those administering the act will act in accordance with the proposals submitted by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy and the evidence submitted to our committee. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. DANIEL. As a member of the committee, is it the opinion of the Senator from Kansas that a majority of the committee, which supported the amendment, intended that the necessary action be taken to keep imports from exceeding the 1954 ratio, which has been interpreted by the President's advisory committee as the ratio beyond which injury would be done to the national security?

Mr. CARLSON. One reason why I say that is very definitely the opinion of the committee, or at least the intent of the committee, is the fact that the chairman of the Finance Committee included in the report of the committee a part of the Advisory Committee's report, which, after all, in my opinion, gives the intent of the Finance Committee.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. I was particularly impressed by what the Senator from Kansas has said in the course of his able address today to the effect that he has received from administrative officials assurances that they will enforce this provision and will see to it that imports are not allowed to damage the national security.

Mr. CARLSON. Of course, I would say—and I think it was mentioned yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Colorado—we expect the administrative agencies to carry out the intent of the Senate and of the Finance Committee; and I feel confident they will do so. In fact, I think I can say we had definite assurances that they intend to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. A moment ago I understood the Senator from Kansas to say that, as a member of the committee, he has received such assurances.

Mr. CARLSON. I have.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to say that I, also have today received such assurances. However, I think it is more important for us to consider the assurances made to the Senator from Kansas, who is a member of the Finance Committee. Further, he is a coauthor of the Neely amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Since the Senator from Kansas was an original coauthor of the Neely amendment, I think his statement as to what the administrative official will do with the committee substitute for the Neely amendment is very important.

As I understand it, the President's advisory committee which wrote the Flemming report recommended that if imports of crude oil exceed the 1954 ratio between imports and production—I believe they used the word "production" rather than the words "market demands"—appropriate action should be taken to limit the imports. That portion of the Flemming report on oil imports is contained in the report of the Finance Committee; is it not?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. In my statement to the Senate, just before this interrogation by the distinguished Senator from Texas, I read a statement and an excerpt from a speech by the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, who was a member of the President's advisory committee. I shall read it again; this is a quotation from the statement he gave on April 18, at Mount Vernon, Ill., when he was speaking of the report of the Advisory Committee:

> To state it simply, it means that appropriate governmental action should be taken if the importers do not voluntarily hold down the rate of imports in proportion to the 1954 level.

I do not see how anything could be any plainer than that.

Mr. DANIEL. I certainly agree with what the Senator from Kansas has said; it seems plain to me. I simply wanted to have assurance from the Senator from Kansas, who, throughout the hearings, served on the Finance Committee and heard the evidence. I wished to be sure that he understands the matter as I understand it. I refer to the reports of the danger to national security which already have been made, and to the statements that administrative officials feel they can stop the threat to our national security under the provision the

Finance Committee has written into the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas that, insofar as the junior Senator from Kansas is concerned, this colloquy at least interprets the congressional intent, including the intent of the Finance Committee, as I interpret it, as a result of my attendance at the hearings—and I attended most of them. I feel confident that this situation can be taken care of on the basis of the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope that action will be taken, and I am sure the Senator from Kansas will be one of the first to support enactment of a stronger provision requiring the reduction of excessive oil imports, if the administrative officials fail to carry out the intent of the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Kansas understand that after the Cabinet report was issued, administrative officials expressed themselves to importing companies as feeling that the recommendations of the Cabinet committee should be followed, and that the importing companies should voluntarily cut their imports to the 1954 ratio?

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a very fair statement. As a matter of fact, during the hearings, when we had before us some of the presidents of and other witnesses representing the larger importing companies, I brought out the fact that I did not like to have imports limited by means of a rigid percentage basis, and that I hoped they would voluntarily make an effort to hold the imports within the limits set forth in the advisory committee's report. They assured us they would. So we are taking them on faith. If they do not do so, I assure the Senator from Texas that, insofar as I am concerned, I shall propose that action be taken to have them comply.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask one more question, which may appear to be somewhat technical: As I understand, under the amendment the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization would be the Government official who would report to the President that imports might be at such a ratio that they would endanger the national security.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Since the same official was on the Cabinet committee—as a matter of fact, he was chairman of the committee, was he not?

Mr. CARLSON. He was.

Mr. DANIEL. Since he was on that committee, and since his committee has already made one investigation and report as to a ratio of oil imports which would endanger the national security, is it the understanding of the Senator from Kansas that that official already has sufficient information to report to the President, and to justify action by the President under this amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. Not only is it my understanding but it is most reasonable that he should do so, and I so stated earlier in my remarks.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, there would be necessity now to make a further examination of the evidence, insofar as oil is concerned. If it continues to exceed the danger point there is no need for a new investigation.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

CHILDREN IN RURAL AREAS NEED ACCESS TO SALK VACCINE INOCULATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak, not on the bill providing for extension of the Trade Agreements Act, but on a subject of vast importance to all the people of the United States, especially the parents of children. I wish to speak briefly on the methods of distributing the Salk antipolio vaccine, and particularly with reference to getting it to the rural areas. I in part represent a State which has vast agricultural realms in which many farm and ranch families dwell at places remote from medical centers, remote from doctors, remote from hospitals. Many of these people have sent to my office letters in which they express considerable concern as to whether their children are to have as ready access and availability to this miraculous vaccine as will the children who live in the cities.

I think experience has shown us that, unfortunately, disease, especially this tragic one, is no respecter of areas, boundary lines, or frontiers. In fact, if I am not mistaken, one of the most devastating, far-reaching, and long-lasting polio epidemics of recent years occurred in rural areas in the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, the families of America have been blessed this spring with one of the great accomplishments of medical science in recent years—the discovery of the Salk vaccine to protect our children against the crippling attacks of poliomyelitis, or infantile paralysis. But the critical season when this dread disease is most dangerous is close at hand, and parents all over the country are deeply concerned that their children will have a fair chance at this protection to the full extent that it can be made available.

According to all authorities in the field, the Salk vaccine will be in short supply during the coming "polio season," which will threaten the children of the Nation from the beginning of June on through the early fall. There will be far from a sufficient supply of vaccine to confer immunization upon all the children in the vulnerable and susceptible age groups.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis made a good start with its program for the 6 and 7-year-olds in the first and second grades, and even this program will provide only 2 of the 3 shots needed for immunization to the 9 million children covered.

The vaccine available between now and June 1 will be enough for 7 million additional immunizations at the "preseason" level of 2 shots each. This could be just enough to inoculate the most critical age-group—between 5 and 9 years—if we had an effective program to assure these youngsters of priority during the weeks immediately ahead.

During the months of June and July, the second most susceptible age group, between the ages of 1 and 4 years, could also receive protection—if an effective program of priorities were maintained.

There is substantial agreement on this sequence in which different age groups of children should receive immunization, in accordance with their relative susceptibilities as shown by experience. Well-meaning efforts have been made to set up and observe this sequence by a system of voluntary priorities. But so far, however well-meaning most people concerned with the vaccine may be, the fact remains that drug salesmen and doctors can make the vaccine available to just about anyone they wish.

FARM CHILDREN NEED POSITIVE PROGRAM OF VACCINE DISTRIBUTION

Furthermore, Mr. President, we have no assurance that even a system of priorities will succeed in making vaccine available to children in the age groups which are entitled to first consideration. Beyond priorities, a positive program of distribution is needed during these immediate months of the greatest shortage and the most urgent need.

I am particularly concerned about the children in the wide rural areas of the Nation, where there is less direct access to members of the medical profession. A child in a farmhouse may be far from clinic or hospital, but the disease does not respect city boundaries. I repeat, only a positive program of reserving adequate supplies of vaccine for these children and making it available in their communities can assure them of protection.

No child in these most susceptible, highest priority age groups should be deprived of immunization because of geographical or because of economic barriers. The easiest and most effective way to reach the children in the high-priority, 5 to 9 year age group who have not yet been inoculated is obviously through the schools, where the National Foundation has already carried on its program for the 1st and 2d graders. But time is of the essence. The schools will close in another month, and it will become far more difficult to get the children together again for another organized program of distribution.

Mr. President, it has been apparent that during the weeks immediately preceding the announcement that the statistical tests of the vaccine had proved it a success, the national administration had done nothing to prepare a genuine, effective plan to avoid chaos in the scramble for immunization.

When it became plain that the Nation faced, unprepared, the serious problem

of distributing an unhappily limited supply of a marvelous medicine, forward-looking men in the Congress, with the support of public-spirited organizations, tried to fill the vacuum of leadership. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Senator HILL] urged the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to get the President to act, and he succeeded in having the administration set up a conference on Salk vaccine. Subsequently, he wrote the President additional specific suggestions designed to facilitate the orderly development of a program in the best public interest. My senior colleague, Senator MORSE, has introduced a bill (S. 1691) to furnish positive Federal guidance and assistance to the wisest distribution of the wonder drug in the immediate critical period. In recent days, other Members of both Houses of Congress have expressed their concern about the snags resulting from our national unpreparedness for the distribution of the marvelous vaccine.

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP STILL NEEDED

So far, we still have seen no convincing evidence of effective national leadership toward taking action on this problem. There have been, and there still are, studies and conferences and talk. But I sincerely hope that, in this vital matter, we shall soon get something beyond the study and discussion conferences which, under this administration, we have come to expect as substitutes for action.

I hope, Mr. President, that the administration will act soon on some of the sound suggestions which have been urged upon it by representatives of public-minded organizations. I hope that, at least, the studies will result in a very early statement—today rather than tomorrow—by the President of the United States setting forth a schedule of priorities which will lend the great national prestige of his office to assure that our children will be able to get immunization in accordance with their probable danger.

Beyond that, I would support the modest Federal appropriations which would be necessary for distribution to the States to enable them to carry out organized plans for immunization through the schools, while these are still in session, and for preschool children when the higher-priority group has been taken care of. And I hope that the administration will inform the Congress immediately of any legislation that may be necessary to enable it to require the records and other controls to make such programs work, and to assure us that Dr. Salk's vaccine will indeed reach those first who need it most.

In conclusion, I should like to add that in my opinion the greatest oversight up to the present time has been in the rural areas to which I have referred, because those are the areas which have the least contact with doctors, clinics, and hospitals. Unless we have a program whereby children in the dangerous age groups, so far as susceptibility to polio is concerned, can receive the vaccine soon through their schools, whether they be public schools or private schools, there will be the danger that a great many of the children on the farms will be beyond the scope of this marvelous protecting vaccine.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss another subject very briefly before yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

EGYPT GETS HIGH DAM, BUT NOT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the very day that the Republican national administration turned its back upon a great power and irrigation project in our own Pacific Northwest, the supposedly backward land of Egypt announced plans for construction of the greatest power and irrigation dam in history, on the headwaters of the legendary Nile River.

On May 2, 1955, the Eisenhower administration sent to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs statements renouncing Federal erection of the Federal high dam on the Snake River in Hells Canyon, finest natural hydroelectric site left in our country.

On May 2, 1955, the Egyptian Government heralded plans for Sadd el'Ali—the high dam—across the Nile, to cost $516 million. This vast edifice will be 3 miles long, 365 feet in height, and will generate 10 billion kilowatt-hours of power. Furthermore, Sadd el'Ali will irrigate 2 million acres of potentially fertile land, thus increasing the cultivated area of Egypt by 33 percent.

I regret the willingness of this national administration to abandon the magnificent Hells Canyon Dam, which would generate 5,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity and could furnish financial assistance for the Mountain Home irrigation project in our own Northwest. Yet I rejoice that the Government of Egypt has had the foresight and courage to plan for Sadd el'Ali—the high dam—even if the Republican administration in the United States has spurned the great plans of our Corps of Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation for the high dam at Hells Canyon in our own land.

The letter to the Senate Interior Committee, setting forth the Eisenhower administration's opposition to a high dam at Hells Canyon, was signed by Interior Secretary McKay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a story from the New York Times of May 2, 1955, entitled "High Dam Is Key to Water, Power," describing Egypt's bold venture in the realm of hydroelectricity and irrigation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH DAM IS KEY TO WATER, POWER—SADD EL'ALI, WORLD'S BIGGEST, WOULD INCREASE TILLABLE ACREAGE BY A THIRD

(By Richard Rutter)

The land of the Pharaohs is taking a giant step into the 20th century.

Five thousand years ago Egypt built the Pyramids, among the mightiest projects of history. Today, the young Republic of Egypt is planning another tremendous undertaking—the world's greatest dam.

A few months ago Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, leader of the 1952 revolution that threw out King Farouk, announced that his Government intended to build a new dam on the Nile, 4 miles south of the present Aswan Dam, 800 miles south of Cairo, and 200 miles north of the Sudan borden. Since then, at the request of Egypt, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has dispatched a mission to study the project on the spot. The financing remains the major obstacle.

FOUR TIMES BOULDER DAM

The cost of Sadd el'Ali (the high dam) is estimated at $516 million. According to present plans, it will be 3 miles long and 365 feet high, and will hold 130 billion cubic meters of water—5 times the annual flood of the Nile and 4 times the capacity of Boulder Dam.

The benefit to the Egyptian economy would be far reaching. For industry, Sadd el'Ali would provide 10 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power. But since Egypt is primarily an agricultural country, the High Dam is regarded, first of all, as an irrigation project.

As planned, Sadd el'Ali would give enough additional water to reclaim 2 million acres of untilled land, increasing the nation's cultivated area by 33 percent. It will permit rice to be planted on an additional 700,000 acres and allow other crops to be raised on another 700,000 acres now irrigated only during flood periods.

In all, Egyptian economists estimate that the High Dam will add $430 million to the annual national income, now put at $2,847,000,000 a year.

Egypt's economic problems—and they are great—all revolve around the land and its use. In the last 50 years the population has nearly doubled, while cultivated land has increased by only 12 percent.

Today 16 million of the 21 million Egyptians derive their livelihood from farming an area of 13,000 square miles. That means a population density of more than 1,200 a square mile, about 22 times that in the agricultural areas of the United States. As a result, the standard of living is appallingly low.

The great majority of farms are 1 to 5 acres, too small to be operated economically. This fragmentation has been accelerated by inheritance laws that divide land among many heirs. Some of the most fertile land, moreover, has been held in "Waqf." This is land bequeathed to a religious or charitable institution or to heirs who may not dispose of it but may enjoy the income.

The Nasser regime has initiated an industrialization program as a partial solution. At a cost of $78 million, generating stations are being built at the Aswan Dam.

An iron and steel works is being constructed at Helwan, near Cairo. It will cost $45 million, and produce 240,000 tons a year in about 4 years. (The iron ore deposits at Aswan are estimated to be sufficient to supply Egypt's steel industry for the next 500 years.) Other plans call for a 375,000-ton fertilizer plant to be powered by Aswan, a 20,000-ton paper plant, a 50,000-ton beet sugar factory, a 200,000-unit tire factory and a 20,000-ton jute plant.

MUCH OF FLOOD WASTED

But the basic answer to the nation's problems, it is generally agreed, lies in harnessing the Nile. At present, the waters of the great river are controlled by a system of barrages and dams extending from just below Lake Tana on the Blue Nile in Ethiopia and Lake Victoria on the White Nile to Lower Egypt. The dams, however, cannot handle the heavy amount of silt that comes down during the floods. In August the sluice gates are opened and the water rushes to the sea taking silt

with it. As the crest passes and the water clears, the sluices are closed and storage begins. This system means that each year billions of cubic yards of water are lost.

Some areas of the country still employ the basin system of irrigation, dating from the days of the Pharaohs. The land is permitted to flood and when evaporation and soil absorption have done their work, it is cultivated. The drawback is that only one crop can be grown each year.

If and when the high dam is built, it will revolutionize the control of the Nile and its waters. The dam would be of solid construction; allowance for silting in the reservoir would make sluicing unnecessary. Thus Sadd el'Ali could hold back the full force of the Nile's annual flood and save billions of cubic yards of water for irrigation and power.

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM

There is, however, one important complication—aside from the critical matter of financing. The High Dam would back up the Nile for more than 200 miles, with about half of the flooding in the Sudan. The town of Wadi Hafa in the Sudan would be completely inundated.

Egypt will have to reach an agreement with its neighbor on compensation for the flooding as well as on a division of the water.

But Egypt seems determined to go ahead with the High Dam project. Upon its success depends the rebirth of an ancient land.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are now debating what in my opinion is certainly one of the most important single pieces of legislation which will be considered in this session of the Congress. The importance of this proposal was attested to by President Eisenhower when he warned: "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all."

I

FUTURE STRENGTH OF FREE WORLD REQUIRES ECONOMIC COOPERATION

I shall support the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance by a vote of 13 to 2.

Nevertheless I do not contend that concerning this important legislation, there exist only "pros" and no justified "cons." This is certainly not the case. The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada and other Senators have made very honest and sincere arguments to support their position. In this particular instance my interpretation of what is best for all the people of America and for our friends and allies throughout the world has led me to a different conclusion than that of these distinguished Senators.

It is because I feel strongly that this program, so ably and so energetically supported by the President, is in the national interest, that I shall vote for it.

Mr. President, in these days of international tension, the strength of the free world is our only deterrent against aggressive action by the Communists which might easily lead to all-out war. We have worked long and unceasingly to forge military and political unity. We are continuing to do so. But from my experience as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I can assure you that the political and military arrangements which we have developed with our friends and allies will inevitably be weakened unless they are established on a foundation of economic stability and cooperation.

The three pillars upon which we must build are political security agreements, military strength, and economic cooperation. Millions of people in the free countries and also the leaders in the Kremlin are watching closely this congressional debate to see whether we will unite behind our President in building this third pillar of economic cooperation.

General Gruenther in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee in March brilliantly described the dangers of Soviet efforts in propaganda and political warfare. He attested to the existence of a certain skepticism in Europe as to our ability to meet the Communist challenge on all these fronts. He stated, and I quote:

> The Europeans realize that the United States is in a leadership position in the world, and they wonder whether we have the wisdom to carry that leadership in this kind of competition.

Today in the world there exists an almost bridgeless gap between the Communist and the anti-Communist nations. Despite this vast canyon between East and West, in fact partially because of it, the United States has developed with its friends and its allies a degree of unified purpose probably unparalleled in world history. Both parties in this country of ours have been of one mind with regard to the principle that the security, health, and happiness of our 48 States cannot be achieved, maintained, or increased unless free people in other lands are making progress in the same direction.

We are unified here in America in believing that our foreign policies should and must be based on national self-interest. We have come to realize from past experience that enlightened self-interest requires us to be concerned about conditions in other lands. We have learned that our independence is strengthened by the growth of independence elsewhere, and that our security is increased by the development of security abroad.

The great pattern of mutual defense systems that we have helped develop in the free world would never have reached present heights of achievement, if there had not existed feelings of mutual respect, confidence, a willingness to compromise, a marked lessening of suspicion and fear, and an increasing sense of stability and prosperity. Furthermore, this partnership approach is in line with the yearnings of the non-Communist underdeveloped nations of the world for greater freedom, independence, and self-determination.

Militarily and politically there has been remarkable success. But in the field of international economics and trade there continues to linger age-old prejudices, suspicions, fears, jealousies, and threats of reprisal. An aura of instability and lack of continuity exist in this great field of trade relations. History has shown that this unhealthy climate always is a fertile breeding ground for the growth of economic warfare, and today such a climate is a fertile breeding ground for the spread of communism.

It is the purpose—perhaps the highest purpose—of this modest program for reciprocal trade and gradual lowering of trade barriers to stamp out this disease before it can spread and undo all the progress which has been made since the war. President Eisenhower laid it on the line for us when he frankly warned:

> To abandon our program for the gradual reduction of unjustifiable trade barriers—to vitiate the administration proposals by crippling trade barriers * * * would constitute a serious setback to our hopes for global peace.

II

EFFECT OF H. R. 1 ABROAD

Before considering why the passage of this bill is important for the continued growth and prosperity of America, let us look for a minute at H. R. 1 in terms of the future prosperity and strength of our much-needed friends and allies overseas.

During the past few months our attention has been necessarily focused in the Pacific-Far Eastern area on the Formosa situation. This Congress is united in its belief that the security of Formosa is vital to our own security. But, if it is important for us that Formosa remain free, strong, and prosperous, it is even more important that the free world strive to assure the future of Japan. It does not reflect one bit on the importance of Korea or Formosa, on which we are so much interested, for us to recognize that in Japan we have an even heavier weight on the scales of a free Asia. And so, if we are concerned about the future of Formosa—as we are and should be—we must be at least equally concerned with maintaining Japan as a strong and friendly ally against Communist colonialism.

Japan has aptly been called the workshop of Asia. But without food, and without raw materials, there can be no workshop. The industrious Japanese depend on imports for one-fifth of their food and most of their raw materials, and they rely on exports to pay for them. Yet the volume of exports in 1953 was well below the 1934–36 volume. Japan has suffered an adverse balance of trade every year since the end of World War II.

JAPANESE TRADE AND RED CHINA

Before the war, in 1937–38, the Chinese mainland was Japan's largest customer. Now, for a number of reasons, primarily because of the policies of the Chinese Communists themselves, the Chinese mainland market hardly exists.

Japan is desperate for other markets for its goods, in order to earn the necessary foreign currency for financing imports of food and raw materials. As the present artificial prosperity in Japan—which resulted from the occupation and the Korean conflict—lessens, Japan's degree of desperation and the threat of economic disaster increases. Of course, this would fit very nicely into the Communist blueprint for eventual subversion

of Japan. And if the Japanese are discouraged by the Western nations from building new non-Communist markets, she naturally will turn, I fear, to Red China.

But America is only one possible market in the free world for Japan. It is certainly to our advantage to assist Japan in its efforts to increase its trade with the free nations of southeast Asia. However, before these countries can become good customers of Japan, they must achieve higher standards of living, which in turn will increase their desire for imports.

Here, Mr. President, is one of the very good reasons for continuing our economic aid to this entire area. By helping these peoples to help themselves toward greater economic prosperity, we are helping Japan. Cut off this economic aid, deny Japan other markets in the West, and we will certainly drive that power toward the outstretched arms of the Communists. If we do this, I have no doubt that future historians will state with considerable justification that it was this Congress that helped to seal the fate of Japan and "sold it down the river."

It is in the interest of the United States and also of Great Britain and our other allies to give Japan the opportunity to achieve economic stability. Without it there can be no political stability and no military strength. Japan can be a good friend, an equal partner, and a strong ally if we desire to help. The Japanese people are willing if we are. Let us therefore realize in this debate here today that part of this responsibility rests squarely on our shoulders.

H. R. 1 AND THE FUTURE OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. President, one aspect of H. R. 1 has received very little attention. Nevertheless, in my eyes, it is one of the most important parts of H. R. 1. I feel that the case of H. R. 1 is exceptionally strong in terms of the future strength and stability of the so-called underdeveloped nations. About two-thirds of the world's population live in these areas, which have become the chief battleground in the war of ideas between communism and democracy.

Mr. President, at the conference in Manila last year, at which I had the privilege of being present with Secretary Dulles, the United States joined other nations from the West and three important underdeveloped nations in signing the Pacific Charter. In that declaration, the signatory powers agreed, among other things, "to cooperate in the economic, social, and cultural fields in order to promote higher living standards, economic progress, and social well-being in this region."

In the passage of H. R. 1 we are helping to meet that pledge of cooperation and partnership. By assisting these nations in their search for markets, and providing them with American goods and services in return, we will be helping to assure that these all-important areas remain on the side of freedom. If we were to defeat this bill, we would be saying, in effect, "Please ignore the Pacific Charter; we did not mean what we said."

It is highly important, Mr. President, that the millions of inhabitants of the underdeveloped areas have confidence in the words and actions of the United States. These nations need assurance that markets for their exports will be available throughout the world when their economic development has progressed to that degree. Defeat this bill, and we will undermine their confidence in us and discourage their incentive to develop economically. In terms of the worldwide struggle of ideas, the consequences for democracy everywhere would be very grave.

H. R. 1 AND THE FUTURE OF OTHER NATIONS

The people of Europe and other parts of the world have an equally strong stake in H. R. 1. Their prosperity and standard of living depend to a large degree on their ability to buy our goods and materials. But they must have dollars with which to pay. Either we give and lend them the dollars, or else we must permit them to trade with us and earn our dollars. Trade has to be two way. Otherwise, it cannot exist. If we wish to export, we must permit imports.

The progress that has been made in Europe toward developing a system of freer trade has been real. The Council of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation has initiated a plan to remove quota restrictions from 90 percent of the trade among the Western European countries. These nations intend to liberalize their trade 100 percent as their balance-of-payments position improves.

But mere regional lowering of barriers by this OEEC action will not alone solve the problem, because of the powerful role which the American market plays in most of these countries. Without continued access to the American market for the products of Switzerland, Portugal, and Italy, among others, the domestic economies of these nations would be threatened. American import policies may mean life and death to Chile, which exports 71 percent of her total copper production to our market, or to Indonesia, which sold us 28 percent of her rubber in 1953. The economic prosperity of these and other nations depends heavily on our import policies.

The weapons of economic warfare are not expensive to manufacture; but the results of their use can be very costly. The tariff and the quota can be just as devastating to the prosperity and security of a nation as a rain of well-aimed bombs.

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE TO AMERICA

This can work the other way, too. We are totally dependent on imports for our coffee, cocoa, bananas, and tea. We rely almost entirely on imports for the tin, chromite, nickel, manganese ore, graphite, and cobalt we need for our industrial prosperity and military security. If it is right for us to cut off swiss cheese imports, then certainly we cannot complain if other countries cut us off from much-needed raw materials.

American agriculture and industry continues to rely considerably on export markets for rice, cotton, tobacco, sulfur, heavy machinery, and pharmaceuticals. If we are to follow a policy of arbitrary import restrictions, then certainly other nations will be justified in limiting, and can be expected to limit, imports of these American commodities which mean so much to segments of our own economy.

These few examples should certainly be sufficient to demonstrate the great degree of economic interdependence of the free world. This fact should be recognized, just as we now have come to realize the interdependence of free nations in the realm of political agreement and military strength.

III

THE EFFECT OF H. R. 1 ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY

The great majority of the opposition to the President's trade program stems from the sincere belief of many persons that a further lowering of barriers to imports will result in mass unemployment and in a crippling of many American industries.

As a Senator from the State of New Jersey, I am, of course, intensely interested and concerned with the prosperity of all the people and industries of my State. But without intending in any way to deny the seriousness of the situation among some industries and in some areas, I am compelled by a close study of the facts to state that there has been considerable misunderstanding in regard to the provisions of H. R. 1, the meaning of reciprocal trade, and the relationship between domestic prosperity and imports.

Many persons have expressed the belief that their continued employment and increased prosperity depend on the defeat of this bill. This is looking only at the import side of the picture.

But I am forced to conclude from my studies that the jobs of at least as many Americans depend primarily on exports.

Almost all the industries which have expressed to me their concern over possible damage caused by imports or the threat of increased imports derive a substantial part of their income from exports.

For example, in 1954 total imports of cotton cloth to the United States are estimated at $22.4 million. But total exports of cotton cloth for the same year were $162 million. Are the manufacturers of cotton cloth willing to lose this valuable export trade in order to limit imports?

Take the chemical and allied products industry, which is New Jersey's No. 1 industry, employing over 57,000 workers in 800 different firms. In 1954 the Tariff Commission estimates imports to the United States valued at about $250 million. But exports for 1954 were valued at over $1 billion. This suggests that even in New Jersey many more jobs in this industry depend upon maintaining exports than are threatened by increasing imports.

The manufacture of heavy electric power machinery is another important New Jersey industry. In 1954 the value of United States imports of this machinery was $10,483,639, while the value of exports was about 16 times that figure, or $160,426,701.

I cannot but conclude from these and other facts which I have studied that the maintenance of markets for these exports is also important to the security and prosperity of the United States.

IV

H. R. 1 AND THE PROBLEMS OF SOME DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES

I shall not pretend that some of the industries, such as textiles, do not face some difficult problems. This has been true for a number of years. Some segments of the textile industry have moved to the South. Others face stiff competition from producers of synthetic commodities. The total per capita consumption of textiles in the United States has decreased.

These are real problems which must be dealt with realistically.

H. R. 1 AND FEARS OF RESULTING HARDSHIPS

It should be emphasized and reemphasized that the program recommended by the President will entail gradual and selective tariff reduction over a 3-year period. In his message to Congress last January, President Eisenhower made this clear when he said that "radical or sudden tariff reductions would not be to the interest of the United States and would not accomplish the goal we seek." I am sure that the President will always keep in mind the welfare of the American people and will not permit their security to be jeopardized by any arbitrary act. And my confidence in the President is so strong that I believe it would be both unwise and unnecessary to limit further his power of decision in matters of trade negotiations.

He, after all, is President of all the people of the United States and is directly responsible to them. From this position, he can see a broader picture of our national interest than any individual commission, or any individual Senator, for that matter.

Let me point out that our President is not oblivious to the welfare of American industry. I should like to quote from a letter which the President wrote to Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, last February 17. The President was commenting on the administration of H. R. 1 if enacted. He said:

> Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril-point and escape-clause safeguards in the legislation.

Many sincere Americans are opposed to a reduction in trade barriers, because they fear a lowering of these barriers will cause severe hardships. As I have pointed out, I believe such hardships will be very few. But where injury directly due to our trade policy can be established, some adjustments will be necessary. In cases of dislocation, unemployment compensation and placement programs are available. The Government has a policy of letting Government contracts to depressed areas and industries. The Small Business Administration is empowered to make loans for the construction of new facilities. These forms of adjustment assistance are available when economic changes result in dislocation, no matter what the cause.

Various other proposals which have been suggested for adjustment assistance should receive the careful consideration of the appropriate committees. But I do not believe it would be wise so to amend the proposed legislation before the Senate today until further study of the adjustment proposals is made.

H. R. 1 AS REPORTED WILL HELP TO PREVENT SERIOUS DAMAGE

Besides my confidence in the President's assurance that there will be no radical or sudden reductions, I should also like to point out that the Committee on Finance has amended the bill. I wish to commend that committee most heartily for the work it has done on these amendments. Without changing the essence of the bill, these amendments will, in the main, help to assure that serious damage will not be inflicted by increases in imports.

One committee amendment concerns present trade negotiations involving Japan. Under existing authority items could be cut in these negotiations by 50 percent of 1945 levels. I think it would be somewhat unjust if under H. R. 1 additional cuts in the same items were made. This committee amendment to the bill before us would preclude such additional cuts where these items are cut by more than 15 percent after January 1, 1955. I am glad the committee saw fit to make this change in the bill, where a kind of double jeopardy seemed possible.

It seems to me that the committee amendments should be sufficient to allay most of the justified fears of various segments of the American economy.

In my judgment, the proposed legislation will in the long run benefit all Americans.

The entire free world looks to us for leadership in this problem of international trade. The future security and strength of many nations will in part be decided here today. This bill will strengthen our friends and allies, and it will strengthen America, too.

The self-interest of all free men requires that we act favorably. To do otherwise would be to court economic warfare and the deterioration of the strength of the non-Communist world.

I hope H. R. 1 will receive the wholehearted support of the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the Senate Finance Committee for the very fine work of the members in considering and reporting to the Senate the amended version of H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade bill. It is my opinion that the committee, under its able chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has done the Nation a tremendous service.

I particularly wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for his successful advocacy in the committee of the amendments which I presented to the committee on March 23, on behalf of 16 of my colleagues and myself.

As the bill comes to the Senate from the Finance Committee, it preserves the well-established principles of trade with the nations of the free world. It also establishes some safeguards for the thousands, yes, even millions, of workers in various industries of this country, against reductions of tariff rates which might endanger the American economy.

Opponents of amendments to H. R. 1 have presented their case well. I am not so sure those of us who believed some amendments vital have made absolutely clear the principal point regarding the amendments.

There may be some persons who have been convinced that the amendments we suggested to the committee would mean that all reductions in tariff rates would be ended. That is not correct. The bill as it was reported to the Senate by the committee does not in any way prevent the negotiators at the GATT conference in Geneva, Switzerland, from carrying out their negotiations with the same authority as under the present law.

The accusations which have been made against the people of the textile industry, which has about 90 percent of its products under negotiation at Geneva, that this industry is opposed to our Nation helping to develop world trade is entirely incorrect. The truth is that the industry does not believe it would be fair to place in double jeopardy any items being negotiated at Geneva.

With present authority to reduce the tariff rates on textile items up to 50 percent at Geneva, the additional authority to make further reduction up to 15 percent in the next 3 years, as provided in the bill before amended by the committee, would actually mean that reduction could total 57½ percent of the present rates. It should be remembered that textile tariff rates were reduced early in the reciprocal-trade program. The average reduction in tariff rates, ad valorem equivalent, on cotton textile products since the beginning of the reciprocal-trade agreements has been 37 percent.

Cries have been heard that we must protect the Japanese textile industry. I agree that it is essential for Japan to have adequate markets outside the home islands for her textile products. I do not agree that her best market is the United States. Japanese products can best be purchased by the nations of Asia and Africa, which have living standards and wage levels similar to those of Japan.

Permit me to cite a few statistics. Between 1947 and 1954, United States exports of cotton textile products dropped by more than 50 percent. In 1947 we exported 1,478.8 million square yards of cotton goods, but in 1954 we exported only 605 million square yards.

On the other hand, Japan's exports of cotton textiles rose by more than 200 percent in the same period. In 1947 Japan exported 399.2 million square yards

of cotton textiles. Last year her exports amounted to 1,296 million square yards. Surely our friends in Japan cannot charge us with having unduly restricted her trade by imposing unjust tariff rates, when Japan has multiplied her trade with other countries to such an extent.

Mr. President, the people of South Carolina and of the entire Nation are a patriotic people. I know they do not want the Senate to take any action which will endanger relations with our friends overseas or even to injure those members of the family of free nations.

However, we cannot forget the possible situation which could be created in this country by the reckless wiping out of justified regulations on foreign trade. I believe that the strength of the free world depends largely upon the strength of the economy of the United States. If we damage our domestic economy, we also endanger the freedom of many lands. This is true because the United States stands as a bulwark against the insidious tactics of the Communists—both at home and abroad.

We must remain economically strong if we are to remain sufficiently strong militarily to maintain our position of world leadership.

I do not believe that we could afford to approve any legislation without proper safeguards against imperiling the steady jobs of any segment of our population as large as the more than a million employees of the textile industry. These people are working in the plants of 26 States of this Nation. Many of them are engaged in defense production. For these reasons, I have steadfastly maintained during the consideration of H. R. 1 that certain amendments were necessary to the bill.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I believe the bill as reported by the Finance Committee is an excellent one. I believe it to be a well-considered middle ground between the extremes of no tariff and of complete regulation by quotas.

I hope the bill will be approved by the Senate without further amendment.

H. R. 1: EXTENDING 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AN ECONOMIC YALTA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, H. R. 1 is an economic Yalta. It is worse than Yalta for this Nation. Yalta was simply a sellout of a friendly foreign people, while H. R. 1, extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, is a sellout of American workingmen and investors, making us dependent upon foreign nations across major oceans for some of the critical materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace—and we could not get them during an all-out war. Yalta is history. H. R. 1 is current.

DEATH WARRANT

Yalta has long been an accomplished fact; any investigation of it could only fix responsibility.

H. R. 1, which extends the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, signs the death warrant for American industries, workingmen and investors throughout the Nation.

H. R. 1 CONTINUES GATT

H. R. 1 provides for a continuation of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and, to all intents and purposes, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT. The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has testified that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and, as amended, H. R. 1, give the President full authority to participate in GATT. The President, in 1947, proclaimed our adherence to GATT.

Now we have the spectacle of the Secretary of State promising the Senate Finance Committee that he will bring the organizational provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, before the Congress.

SUBTERFUGE PREDICTED

Mr. President, I assert at this time that the bill introduced in the House will not bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to the Congress at all. What it will do will be to promote one of those subterfuges for which administrations for 22 years have been famous. It will bring before the Congress a new international agency, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which is a reorganized GATT.

Should Congress approve Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC—it will have approved GATT. If Congress should refuse to approve it, GATT will remain untouched. That is the situation. GATT will continue as organized in 1947.

H. R. 1 states that nothing in it shall be construed as approving GATT. That proviso has been in practically all of the extensions, but that means nothing.

PROTECTION PRINCIPLE SCUTTLED

Mr. President, what has actually been done in the whole setup is to change the centuries-old policy of protection of the investor and the workingman from competition with low-priced labor, the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia by imposing, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, a duty, or a tariff. Such duty or tariff was made flexible in order to equalize the difference between the cost of manufacturing products by workers enduring low-wage standards of living in the chief competitive countries, and the costs of manufacturing the same products in this country, taxes and other costs being considered. That is what the tariff, or duty, is supposed to be for, and it was so used until 1934, for practically a century.

LINCOLN'S PLATFORM FOR EQUAL TREATMENT TO ALL INDUSTRIES

What was the object of the tariff, or duty? Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 stated the objective. It said the purpose was the development of the industrial interests of the whole country. That is what is was for.

Congress followed that principle for a century. Then in 1934 it repealed the principle. While article I, section 8, of the Constitution makes it mandatory for Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and to impose the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs, the Congress has forgotten its responsibility. In 1934 it said: "We will transfer to you, Mr. President, on your request, the right to trade any section of the domestic economy for a fancied foreign policy."

That is what the original trade agreements act said, and that is what has occurred for 22 years. Since then the economy of the United States has been geared to wars and preparation for war, and our wars are never settled. After World War I was fought to prevent war, we had two wars.

Mr. President, presumably the trade agreements law was enacted as an emergency measure to improve the trade position of this country, but today several provisions to that effect are out of the act entirely. So what does the Secretary of State say? In his testimony before the Committee on Finance he said, in effect, that he could trade any job or any investment in America for a policy in Europe or Asia. Those are not his exact words, but that is his thought. He could do that if, in the judgment of the President of the United States, it was beneficial to the United States.

Mr. President, let us make no bones about it—there is now no principle left.

FREE TRADE EQUALS FREE IMMIGRATION

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, is an economic Yalta insofar as the United States is concerned. No one can vote for free trade in this country and vote against free immigration, because if one votes to allow the products of cheap labor—50-cent and 12-hour-a-day labor in countries which produce those products with machinery which we have given them—to come into this country, without a duty to balance the difference between costs of production in low-wage-standard-of-living countries and in this country, then one cannot be against free immigration.

Mr. President, do not think there are not plenty of people in this country who are for free immigration. There is the Federal Union, which is for free trade and free immigration.

I read an article in today's Washington Post and Times Herald with a Geneva date line. Geneva is getting to be quite a place. That is where is located the headquarters for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. O'MAHONEY, who addressed the Senate. On request of Mr. MALONE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. O'MAHONEY's remarks and the colloquy which ensued were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following Mr. MALONE's speech.)

TWO APPROACHES TO DESTROY AMERICA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada has many times stated on the floor that there are two approaches which can bring about the destruction of America. One is the political approach; the other is the economic. Yalta was one phase of the political approach begun in 1933, when President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia by executive agreement with Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, without any safeguards to the United States. What we did by that action was to build a spy hideout within the boundaries of the United States. A spy headquarters, if you please, Mr. President.

So why do we complain about it? Mr. President, 12 years later the President entered into other executive agreements with Soviet Russia at Yalta. The agreements were not submitted to Congress or to the Senate for approval or rejection. The economic approach has followed a similar pattern.

YALTA PARALLEL FOUND IN TRADE ACT

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, drafted by the State Department and requested by the President, authorized the latter to negotiate with foreign countries to cut tariffs. The President turned this authority over to the State Department and negotiations were conducted on a bilateral basis.

CONSTITUTION PLACED RESPONSIBILITY ON THE CONGRESS

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States placed this responsibility on the Congress. Why did it place it on Congress? Because Congress represents the people of the United States of America, the people in every precinct in the United States. The Members of the Congress know what is good for this country and they know how to build the economic structure. It had been built for a century on the basis of fair and reasonable competition by adjusting tariffs so as to equalize the wages paid here and those paid in the chief competitive nation, on each product. So the Constitution placed the responsibility on the Congress.

CONGRESS THROUGH TRADE ACT AMENDED CONSTITUTION

Congress, by a simple act, amended the Constitution and transferred its responsibility to the President; the President lodged it in the hands of the State Department; and the State Department then placed it in the hands of GATT, which holds its sessions in Geneva 3,000 miles away, and conducts them on a secret basis. Prior to GATT 29 trade agreements were entered into on a bilateral basis. None of them was ever submitted to the Congress. These bilateral agreements did not come fast enough to suit the New Deal planners.

ITO INITIAL SCHEME OF GLOBAL PLANNERS

From 1943 to 1945 many bureaucratic planners were engaged in scheming up some device by which the distribution of American jobs and markets among the nations of the world might be speeded up and placed under some international agency which could apply them multilaterally or wholesale.

The first plan was to set up an international trade organization, but the planners made one mistake.

ITO DIES IN CONGRESS; GATT LIVES ON

They submitted it to Congress where the plan died in committee.

This did not stop the planners.

They also had set up a so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades, or GATT, which held its first session coincidentally with the meeting to adopt an ITO or international trade organization charter.

GATT PROVISIONS DUPLICATE REJECTED ITO

GATT contained many of the same provisions as ITO, and our State Department and Treasury New Deal planners put it into operation by not submitting it to Congress.

GATT has been in operation now for 8 years and has never been submitted to Congress.

Mr. President, it will be found in the testimony of Mr. Dulles before the Committee on Finance, included in the 4 volumes of the testimony which are on the desks of Senators today, that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act gives the President all the authority he needs to further any organization such as GATT in any place in the world. So, Mr. President, the Senate committee was properly put in its place.

Members of the committee are always saying to each other that they will never approve GATT. It will never be submitted to them, Mr. President.

NEW INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION EMERGES

The chairman of the committee said in the hearing that if they expected to get H. R. 1 out of committee they had better bring GATT in. But instead of that, what was done? A bill was introduced to approve what? A new organization. The Organization for Trade and Cooperation. What is it? It is made up by an amendment of the rules covering the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If Congress approves it—and it is in the House today—it approves GATT. If it does not approve it, GATT goes on uninterruptedly, because the President already has the authority to act, and it will never be submitted to the Congress of the United States. The trade agreements bill which was passed in 1934 gave the President all the authority he needed, and he is going to continue to use it. If we pass H. R. 1, he will still have the authority. H. R. 1 is before the Senate today, to be voted on, probably tomorrow.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been in operation for 8 years and has never been submitted to the Congress. It never will be, Mr. President. In my opinion, the bill now introduced will not be pushed. Let it die, because it is wholly superficial and not needed.

GATT SIMILARITIES TO YALTA, POTSDAM, CITED

Mr. President, as I stated previously, GATT is our economic Yalta. As I said before, it has many similarities to Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran.

GATT's sessions are secret. So were the political sessions.

GATT's sessions are always held in distant foreign places. So were the political huddles in Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran.

Details of the deliberations, debates or conduct at GATT sessions have never yet been made public. Yalta is the first political session of its kind to be made public.

GATT is a sell-out of American interests to foreign countries.

Yalta was a sellout to Russia.

Where there are similarities there also are differences.

The then President of the United States attended the political huddles at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, accompanied by State Department advisers, including Alger Hiss.

NATIONS AT GATT PLAY FOR UNITED STATES JACKPOT

No President has ever attended a GATT session where American interests are being sold down the river on foreign soil, but has left that to second-string State Department advisers.

At Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran the United States had to contend with only two foreign countries trying for the jackpot.

At GATT sessions 33 foreign countries are trying for the jackpot, and we have to put up the pot.

It reminds me, Mr. President, and I so expressed myself in committee—it will be found in the record of the hearings, I think—that Yalta was just a sucker poker game. So long as we sat in the game, since we have the only markets of any consequence in the world, the game went on. If we had not sat in, the game could not have continued.

It was like a sucker poker game in any small town in America, or in any large town. When a man comes to town with a few uncashed checks or a pocket full of cash somebody persuades him that poker is a fine game, if he sits down, the game goes on. If he does not, the game breaks up. That is what happened at Yalta, where we sat in.

GATT SESSIONS PEACETIME SELLOUTS

The sellouts at Yalta and Teheran took place in wartime. Apologists for Yalta plead the urgencies and exigencies of wartime mitigate the mistakes and blunders that were made there.

The sellouts of American industries, workingmen, and investors at sessions of GATT held in Geneva, Switzerland; Annecy, France; and Torquay, England, were all in the postwar years and under conditions of relative peace in Europe.

Yalta is dead, and it is the hope of the senior Senator from Nevada that the political approach to destroy America has been halted through efforts of the present administration.

GATT, the economic approach, is very much alive, and the administration, it appears, wants it strengthened and expanded.

FOREIGN COMPETITORS EAGER FOR NEW GAINS

The enactment of H. R. 1, in my opinion, will make certain that there will be more economic Yaltas. As a matter of fact, those who favor the bill are waiting now, like a nest of birds with their mouths open, for its enactment. Then we will learn what they have been doing for the past 4 months. We do not know now.

The American workingmen, investors, and industries will be the victims of economic Yaltas, in which foreign interests and competitors will achieve all the gains.

The way to make certain that there will be no further economic Yaltas, selling out American investors and producers, is to defeat H. R. 1 on the floor of the Senate, and thus to let the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 die. I assure you, Mr. President, that its death will be unmourned.

ONLY DEFEAT OF H. R. 1 WILL ASSURE DEATH OF GATT

When the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 dies, as it will if Congress does not

pass H. R. 1, then the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva will die with it, as will its successor international agency, which the administration is endeavoring to set up. This new organization is merely being submitted to Congress as a smokescreen, which is not needed and whose demise will not be mourned. Its purpose is to continue the course which has been followed for 22 years.

The successor agency will be the same old GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with a new label. It is just like our giving the taxpayers' money to Europe. First, we gave three and three-quarter billions of dollars to England. Then came the Marshall plan, followed by ECA, which was succeeded by something else. Finally it became FOA. Whatever administration was in power simply changed the name of the agency often enough to keep the people confused; yet the assessment every year remains the same.

Mr. President, it has been a favorite New Deal device for many years to change the name of any agency which becomes too well identified for what it is, or which becomes unpopular. This helps to allay criticism or suspicion, and to blur out scandals or criticism of the past.

RECIPROCAL TRADE BRITISH CATCH PHRASE

The device which is laughingly called reciprocal trade, two words which do not appear in any act which Congress has yet passed, is simply a catchphrase framed by the bankers of London to sell free trade to the American people, so that the British can get a slice of the American economy.

Mr. R. A. Butler, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in 1952 that what the British wanted was trade, not aid. They wanted to get the basis of our income. They wanted to get at the basis of all the income we have, not just the income itself. That simplifies the situation.

I pinned that phrase on Mr. Butler the week after he made his statement. He is proud of it now, because he has made the President and the Congress of the United States accept it.

Thus our foreign-aid program has appeared under several different labels, without the program being changed, with only the name being changed. All that is necessary under this device is to change the name on the door and to print some new letterheads.

GATT TO BE RELABELED OTC

I regret that the present administration apparently has adopted this old New Deal device. In any event, if H. R. 1 shall be passed, we are to have the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade under a new name and with new initials. Instead of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, it will be the Organization for Trade Cooperation; and instead of GATT, the initials will be OTC, which more nearly approaches the original initials, ITO, which stood for International Trade Organization.

If by some subterfuge the proponents of the plan can get Congress to approve it, that will be fine for them. But they do not need it, because Congress has made it plain that in the original Trade Agreements Act it gave to the President the authority he needed to set up GATT, or the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

It is my belief that the Senators and Representatives were misled; that they did not know what was going on. But the people behind the plan knew. Who were the people behind it? They were the Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White crowd. They knew what they were doing when the Treasury and State Departments, in 1934, recommended the Trade Agreements Act. They deliberately placed the responsibility in the hands of the Executive to do what he has done. They knew what would happen. So it is time that Congress learned all about what has happened.

TRADE ACT SOLD AS 1934 EMERGENCY MEASURE

Mr. President, this is to be the same bad package, but having a different label. If H. R. 1 shall not be passed, then we shall have neither the package labeled as GATT nor the one labeled OTC, and we shall have no further economic Yaltas. All that is necessary is to sit still and not pass any bill of this nature; then there will be no more economic Yaltas. The remedy is as simple as that.

To recapitulate, Congress, in 1934, passed the Trade Agreements Act as an emergency measure, delegating to the President the powers of Congress under article 1, section 8, to lay and collect duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce.

The Constitution placed those powers in the hands of Congress definitely, for reasons which appear in the debates of that time, because the Members of Congress represent all parts of the United States and all its people. The President has turned those powers over to the State Department. That is now well known.

THIRTY-THREE NATIONS HAVE EQUAL VOICE TO THAT OF UNITED STATES IN GATT

The State Department, to all intents and purposes, has turned over the powers to an international agency operating on foreign soil, known as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in which 33 nations have a voice and voting power equal to our own.

Mr. President, some 55,000 trade concessions have been negotiated by GATT during its 8 years of existence, a great number of them, of course, affecting our import duties and foreign commerce. Not one of them has ever come before Congress, or the Senate, for approval or ratification.

H. R. 1 will continue this operation, or more properly permit the State Department to continue it, either as GATT or under a new label.

All the tariff cuts or concessions negotiated under GATT will remain in force, just as they are now, if H. R. 1 shall be enacted.

GATT A ONE-WORLD SCHEME TO DIVIDE OUR MARKETS

The State Department prefers the new label to GATT, doubtless for the reason that GATT has been stripped of its protective mask and coloring and stands before the public, at long last, for what it is—a one-world scheme to divide our markets with 33 foreign competitors, and to curb our economy and progress.

In each of our trade treaties, there is what is called the "most favored nation" clause, which means that any concession made to any nation is available to all. That is another fake end run.

NEW COMMITMENTS MADE IN LATEST GATT GO-AROUND

GATT has been meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, for the past 2 months, establishing more agreements on tariffs and quotas on a multilateral, 34-nation basis, and these agreements are being made public in a second document.

The second document, containing the provisions which will affect American business, industry, investors, and workingmen, will not be submitted to Congress. Instead the provisions will be treated as an executive agreement which under the State Departments interpretation, do not need to be brought before the Congress any more than the Potsdam, Teheran, or Yalta agreements had to be brought before Congress under the interpretation of that administration.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GATT CHALLENGED IN COURTS

The position of the State Department is that the President has the power to keep such important information from the Congress under the Trade Agreements Act.

This raises a constitutional question, of course, and I am happy that at the present time an American industry, stricken by GATT and the Trade Act, has had the courage to raise this question in the courts.

If the plaintiff in this case, the Glassware Guild, Inc., of Morgantown, W. Va., is correct that the Trade Act and delegation of powers to GATT are unconstitutional, then the administration is acting illegally in not submitting the new concessions made to foreign countries to the Congress.

Mr. President, I will say now that whether it is unconstitutional or not, it is unwise, and it is a deliberate sellout of the American workingman and the American investor.

If the administration is correct and is not acting illegally, then we have reached a point where one man through his agents controls the duties or tariffs, the regulations of foreign commerce, and, in effect, the economy of the United States.

CONSTITUTION PREVENTS ONE-MAN RULE, DISCRIMINATION

At that point, Mr. President, let me say it is not a question of trusting the President of the United States. I trust the President of the United States. I was one of his supporters in 1952, and I shall be again in 1956, if he runs for reelection. But the Constitution of the United States does not trust anybody, Mr. President. The great men who wrote the Constitution of the United States did not trust themselves in writing it. They wrote the Constitution so that they themselves would be bound by it, and they put into the Constitution of the United States what is necessary to prevent a one-man or a one-group government, or discrimination against one group in favor of another.

But what did Congress do? By simple act Congress in 1934 amended the Constitution and tied the regulation of the domestic economy and the regulation of foreign trade to the fixing of foreign policy. They are so tied today. The Constitution of the United States pointedly separates the two, for the very purpose of making sure that the President of the United States could not trade a segment of the national economy for a fancied foreign preferment. Yet that is what the President can do today.

GOVERNMENT BY EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, we have then arrived at government by executive agreement, entered into with or without the consent of Congress, and have effectively repealed article I, section 8, of the Constitution without an amendment proposed by Congress or ratified by three-fourths of the States as required by the Constitution.

Mr. President, George Washington warned us, in his Farewell Address, that only the people must have power to amend the Constitution of the United States; that while a violation of that Constitution in one instance might be helpful, it would be the opening wedge for foreign governments to control the United States of America and to destroy our free people.

Of course, Washington was right about that, but in the past two decades we have witnessed what might be called a sort of mental aberration. Whenever a group that was strong enough wished to have a certain law enacted, certain persons would say, "No matter whether it is constitutional or not, let us pass the bill."

SENATE WORLD'S LAST OPEN FORUM

Mr. President, on the Senate floor we have witnessed Senators advocating a rule for the operation of the United States Senate whereby a majority on the floor at any time could stop debate. This is the last open forum in the world today. The House of Representatives is not an open forum. The House can stop debate by a simple majority, and it does. One or two minutes of speaking is considered a long enough time for a Representative. He then puts his talk into the RECORD, and that is the end of it.

If that is the kind of government we are arriving at, then the advocates of the pending proposal are right. We might just as well stop debate at any time, and put everything in the hands of the President, and forget it.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention at this time to the fact that Mr. Hitler never violated any rule or law of the Reichstag. Always, they prepared the way for him ahead of time, just as the Congress of the United States has done for 22 years. Practically the only power remaining to the Congress is the setting of the tax rate. It does not have much to do with appropriations, except adjusting them perhaps 5 percent either way.

INTEREST ON NATIONAL DEBT EXCEEDS COST OF GOVERNMENT WHEN TRADE ACT ADOPTED

Mr. President, today the interest on the national debt, $7 billion a year, is twice as much as it took to operate the entire Government for a year 22 years ago; and the end is not yet.

Mr. President, the powers of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and lay duties and tariffs will be in the hands of an international trade monstrosity—indeed, they are now in the hands of an international trade monstrosity—before which Americans may not appear and to which American industries, workingmen, and investors cannot appeal.

FARMERS NEXT TARGET OF GLOBAL MANIPULATORS

Farmers, too, if we read the trade deal correctly, will be an early target of the global free trade agency, as will producers of milk, butter, cheese, and other farm commodities.

If they are to escape an economic Yalta, H. R. 1 must be rejected. Then the presumed authority of the State Department to turn over our markets and our foreign commerce to an international trade organization no longer will exist, even in the presumption.

Let me say, Mr. President, if H. R. 1 does not pass the Senate of the United States, then every product as to which there is not a trade agreement already made will revert immediately to the Tariff Commission, where duties will be set thereon on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. Due attention will be paid to the costs of doing business in this Nation and those in the chief competitive nation, and on that basis a flexible import fee, tariff, or "duty," as the Constitution calls it, will be fixed. The Tariff Commission could then, at any time, on its own motion, or on request of committees of Congress, the President, or a producer, reconsider the tariff and keep it flexible.

If the bill does not pass, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade will be out of the picture, but all the trade agreements already made will remain in full force and effect until the President cancels them. He would do this by giving notice to the country with which the trade agreement has been made.

REJECTION OF H. R. 1 WOULD AID INVESTORS, INDUSTRIES

Investors in America would then be back in business, competing with each other, because a flexible duty or tariff will be fixed on competing products to make up the differential between costs of doing business in a low cost, chief competitive nation and costs of doing business in this country.

REJECTION OF H. R. 1

Mr. President, this would be good news to the stricken industries throughout the land forced out of business or being forced out of operation by floods of imports which are being welcomed to our shores by our State Department.

It would be good news to the 3 million or more unemployed, and to the distressed cities, towns, and villages where they are unemployed and subsisting on doles and surplus food handouts.

Again, as in the first 150 years of our national life, the hurt and injured could appeal to their own representatives in Congress, who know the needs of their own States or congressional districts better than does any official in the State Department.

DEFEAT OF H. R. 1 WOULD RESTORE RIGHTS UNDER CONSTITUTION

The victims of the misguided free-trade policies of recent years again could utilize their right of petition and their rights of property guaranteed them under the Constitution.

They could exercise these rights with some hope of sympathy and help if their cause had merit—rights denied to them today.

Mr. President, I have great sympathy for the score of witnesses who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee during its hearings on House bill 1, and there pleaded for their right to live and to work and to produce for the United States of America.

Not one witness who appeared before the committee said he wanted any advantage over any foreign country in his own American markets. All that the witnesses requested, under cross-examination—and the printed volumes of testimony will so subscribe—was equal access to their own American markets. That is what they wanted, and only then in the case of imports of commodities of which we produce a substantial amount.

Sixty percent of the imports into our Nation do not have a tariff or duty, and never have had. All that was ever requested by any of those witnesses was a duty or a tariff which would represent the differential between the wages, standard of living, taxes, and cost of doing business in the United States and the comparative standards in the chief competitive nations, in the case of their particular products.

Mr. President, I know that to be so. I have witnessed for 9 long years the procedure of Senators and Representatives submitting proposed amendments to save industries in their own States, and then voting in favor of free trade as regards the industries of all the other States. In other words, they were willing to have all the others washed down the drain; they were favoring only the particular industries of their own States. Thereafter, when such a Member of Congress is not able to get the Congress to adopt the amendment he favors, he can notify all his constituents that he tried to protect them, and is in favor of the principle.

AMENDMENTS FUTILE SO LONG AS ADMINISTRATION BY EXECUTIVE

It does not matter what amendment is included in the bill, for so long as the administration of the bill is in the hands of the Executive and the State Department the industries of the United States will be subject to the same indignities and the same trades which have gone on for 22 long years, and which for the last several years have been accomplished through international GATT 3,000 miles away from the seat of our Government.

Mr. President, I have great sympathy also for the scores of witnesses who, for a like reason and in a like manner, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee.

CONGRESS LAST HOPE OF FREE-TRADE VICTIMS

Those witnesses appeared there to plead for their own industries. They did

that as a last resort. Congress is their last hope.

The 96 Members of the Senate and the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, coming from the 48 States, are the last hope of those witnesses and their industries. But unless the Members of Congress have the intestinal fortitude to exercise their constitutional responsibility, Congress will amount to nothing, Congress will not stand between those industries and bankruptcy. Instead, Congress will be causing their bankruptcy.

Those witnesses came to Washington at their own expense, to plead for the right to exist economically on an equal basis with their foreign competitors.

Those witnesses did not request any advantage. They asked only for equal access to their own American markets. In other words, those witnesses were willing to have foreign nations given opportunities which no foreign nation will agree to give the United States of America.

Mr. President, the United States of America is the only nation on earth, to my certain knowledge, that breeds people who are not in favor of their own nation.

Mr. President, I admire the English people; I do so on two counts, at least: First, they have brains; second, they are in favor of England.

BRITAIN'S EMPIRE PREFERENCE RATES UPHELD BY GATT

Mr. President, if an attempt were made to export to one of the British possessions any commodity the importation of which would not be for the best interests of the British Empire or Commonwealth of Nations, I should like to see just how far the attempt would go.

The British have the empire preferential rate, which GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, recognizes. As a result, it would not be possible for any American to trade on an equal basis with Britain in any one of the empire nations. That is recognized as axiomatic, because the British will not do business in any other way; and I admire them for it.

UNEMPLOYED CANNOT AFFORD TO COME TO WASHINGTON TO PLEAD THEIR CAUSE

Mr. President, when one considers the scores of witnesses who, at considerable expense, came to Washington to appear before our committees, one might well consider the hundreds of thousands of persons who could not afford to go to that expense, however desperate their need.

The unemployed textile workers of New England of the Mid-Atlantic States and of the South could not afford to come to Washington to appear before our committees.

The unemployed coal miners of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois could not afford to come to Washington.

The jobless lead and zinc miners of the West could not afford to come to Washington, nor could the workers in the hundreds of other industries which are suffering from import competition—unless a new Coxey's Army, backed by the money of some philanthropist, should spontaneously arise. The situation could ultimately come to that, too, Mr. President.

But during the hearings enough injured industries did manage to finance representation in Washington to make a remarkable showing in behalf of American industry, American workingmen, and American investors.

TRADE ACT AIM NOW TO AID OTHER NATIONS, NOT UNITED STATES

Mr. President, although the Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934, avowedly as an emergency act to improve the economy of the Nation, frankly, it has since been changed so that now it is a measure to help other nations. Those who favor the act say to us, "Japan is liable to go Communist unless we let the Japanese have the textile markets of the United States. Europe is likely to go Communist unless we let Europe have the mineral markets of the United States and the crockery markets of the United States, and unless we let Germany and Japan have the sewing-machine market of the United States, and also the chemical market, and also all the other markets the 5,000 products of our Nation create.

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF NATION BASED ON HOME MARKETS

Mr. President, the economic structure of our Nation is based on the markets our people have built up over a period of 175 years. We have been "sold a bill of goods" by the catch phrases, invented by the London bankers, that we should give away our markets, which are the source of our income, and that the more markets we give away, the richer we shall be.

Some time ago we had an example of such a "sale" to the United States, when Lord Keynes, of England, came to the United States and "sold" the President of the United States upon the theory that the more we owe, the richer is our Nation. I guess our President at that time was not very hard to "sell," because he needed a little more money to keep up appearances and to "keep prosperity rolling." But now both of them are dead, and our Nation had a debt of $275 billion, which requires $8 billion a year to finance. But they said, "The greater the debt, the richer the nation is."

Mr. President, I tried that on a banker, 25 years ago; and he cured me permanently of believing in anything of that sort.

But now we have the debt, although both Lord Keynes and the then President of the United States have passed away. Today we know better than that; but now we come to the basis of our income, namely, the markets of the United States, which have been built up over a period of 175 years. The representatives of foreign nations say to us, "We do not want your money; we merely want the basis of your wealth, the markets from which you make your money. That is what we want."

Mr. President, that is what it is proposed that we give to them, by means of extending the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. Butler, of Britain, used the catch phrase of "trade, not aid." The London bankers have used the catch phrase "reciprocal trade." For 22 years the advocates of this measure have been using such catch words, to which I referred a short time ago during the course of my remarks; and by using those catch words and phrases, the representatives of the nations which are our principal competitors have been able to "sell" their notions to the people of the United States, who could not interpret or understand those catch words and phrases. And all the time the people of the United States were selling more bonds, and were buying them with their own money.

ONLY CONGRESS GIVES SYMPATHETIC EAR TO PLIGHT OF AMERICAN INDUSTRIES

Mr. President, the representatives of many American industries have been heard by Congress. Congress is the only place where they can obtain a sympathetic or objective ear. They cannot be heard by the State Department. Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State, is carrying on exactly what the Secretary of State preceding him started. When Mr. Dulles appeared before the committee, he said—and he said it "cold turkey"—that he could trade any jobs or any investment in the United States for a foreign policy which in the judgment of the United States was of an overall benefit to this country. The Congress of the United States would not have the guts to do that, but it can transfer to someone else its constitutional responsibility to do it. That is what will be done tomorrow, if the pending bill is passed.

Mr. President, it is certain that American workingmen and investors could not have received a hearing at Geneva, Switzerland, where the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade meetings have been held in secret, with second, third, or fourth echelon officials from the State Department vieing with the smartest economic experts of 33 foreign nations. These are the same second, third, fourth, and fifth echelon officials who have been in charge for some time, some of them for 20 years. They have not changed.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC EXPERTS OUTSMARTED BY FOREIGNERS FOR 20 YEARS

I digress to point out that the economic experts of foreign nations are smart. As proof of that, they have been outsmarting our own delegates in trade and commerce negotiations for 20 years—8 of those years under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The empire-minded nations of Europe—England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and some others which have passed in review during the past 150 or 300 years—have been living by their wits on trade throughout the world. How did they do it? Through colonial slavery.

So long as the fleet of Great Britain dominated the world, the Malayan States, Indochina, the African States, and others elsewhere in the world dared not stage an uprising. What was the rule of the colonial slavery nations? They held the price of raw materials down, bought them and sent them to their own nations in Europe, manufactured the products, and forced the slave nations to buy through the Empire preferential-rate system.

COLONIAL SYSTEM DEAD

The Empire system is gone. The colonial slavery idea is as dead as Julius Caesar. Everyone will know, in 6 months or a year, that they are gone. The system was broken first in World War I, and destroyed utterly in World War II, because of the dominance of the airplane and the advent of improved transportation and communications systems, including radio. The slave nations found out for the first time what was happening to them.

What happened in Indochina, one of the colonial slaves for hundreds of years? We were for France. We signed the Atlantic Compact, and we guaranteed the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world, so we were in favor of helping France hold that colonial system. Not a single Indochinese was with us or with France. They did not know very much about communism, but they knew all about colonial slavery, and they were not having any more of it.

AMERICAN MARKETS BEING DIVIDED AMONG FOREIGN NATIONS

It is time to sit down, in the cool of the evening, and take a look at what is happening throughout the world. We are dividing our markets with other nations and trying to hold colonial-slave nations in bondage to the empire-minded nations.

The representatives from most of the foreign governments are experienced and trained in the field of trade. Our own delegates are untrained and inexperienced. Certain foreign nations have lived by their wits for 300 years in international trade.

If I may digress, sometimes I suspect that one reason our State Department officials prefer to have the international general agreement on tariffs and trade sessions held in Europe is that they suffer from an inferiority complex. They fear that they would suffer by comparison if they carried out their chores where Americans might observe them. The reason is ignorance of what they are doing, or worse. Either that or they do not want to be annoyed by mere American producers appealing for the economic life which those officials seem so eager to forfeit.

STATE DEPARTMENT CONTEMPTUOUS OF CONGRESS

The evidence in the volumes of testimony before the Senate Finance Committee will show that the State Department holds the Congress in utter contempt; and well it might. Why should it not hold the Congress in contempt? Everything the Department sends here is passed almost without debate.

As I have said before, Mr. Hitler never violated a rule or law of the Reichstag. They beat him to it. They passed what he wanted before he was ready to announce it; and when he was ready to put them out of business and stop their pay, they passed that measure, too. The Congress of the United States may not be so far from that situation as some of the very dignified Members who have been voting for this and other delegations of constitutional responsibility of Congress to the Executive may think.

These things come one at a time. It is easy to shrug off responsibility. We must face the people at home, no matter how we vote.

TARIFF ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD BE MADE AT HOME AND BY CONGRESS

In any event, Mr. President, there will be no more General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade sessions, either under that name or any other name, if the Congress rejects House bill 1 and permits the Trade Agreements Act to expire at midnight on June 12, 1955. Such economic adjustments as may be needed will then be made here at home, and by the elected Representatives of the people, as provided in the Constitution, instead of being juggled among the diplomats of 33 foreign nations.

This is as it should be, and as was intended by the Constitution of the United States. The diplomats of 33 foreign nations will no longer have the job of readjusting our economy to fit their pocketbooks, or of setting fuses to crack our markets open to their own low wage, low-taxed products.

Mr. President, I have heard even some Senators who came before our committee say: "We must pass this bill in order to avoid going back to logrolling tactics." We got away from logrolling tactics 26 years ago.

1930 ACT BASED ON FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The 1930 Tariff Act placed the administration of tariffs in the hands of the Tariff Commission. Congress authorized the Commission to fix tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. The Congress itself never got close to the problem. All anyone could do was to appear before the Tariff Commission, as everyone else was required to do. However, the principle was established as to how tariffs were to be fixed. They were to be based upon the difference in cost of production.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created by Congress when freight rates on various railroads were different for important shippers. What did the Congress do? It said to the Interstate Commerce Commission, "You fix freight rates uniformly on the basis of a reasonable return on the investment of principal." Likewise, the 1930 tariff law said to the Tariff Commission, "You establish tariffs, or recommend tariffs, on the basis of the difference in cost of production."

Congress did not say, "You can trade Montana or New Mexico for New York." It did not say, "You can trade the producing industries of the South and West to a group of waterfront brokers in New York or somewhere else." In effect, that is what the pending bill says, and that is what we would be doing if we should pass it. If we should not pass it in all probability the diplomats would then be out of a job, rather than the hundreds of thousands of unemployed Americans in industries blighted by foreign imports.

GATT ENDS WHEN UNITED STATES MARKETS NO LONGER IN POT

We may be sure that if the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is permitted to expire, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will be finished. That applies also to the OTC—the Organization for Trade Cooperation—or whatever the State Department wishes to call it. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will be finished, because our markets will no longer be in the jackpot. If we do not sit in the sucker game, there will be no game.

ITO HISTORY RECALLED

Earlier in my remarks, Mr. President, I mentioned the International Trade Organization, or ITO, which was set up by the so-called Habana charter in 1948.

This was another scheme to divide American markets with the world while denying world markets to Americans.

Fifty-two nations signed up for that one.

They were all very enthusiastic about it at the outset, too, I am told.

Uncle Sam was to be the banker, and they were all there with red stockings or little baskets.

But then our State Department made the mistake I discussed earlier; it submitted ITO to the Congress, and Congress sat on it.

When that happened, did the 51 other nations go ahead with their big plans for ITO? They did not. There were no markets, no trade plums in the pot, so it died aborning.

Unless Uncle Sam plays the sucker with his markets and his bankroll there is no game, and the other countries pick up their chips and go home.

What happened to ITO will happen to GATT, too, when Congress permits the Trade Agreements Act to expire, as I hope it will, on June 12 of this year.

There will be no game or GATT if H. R. 1 is rejected, because our money will not be in the pot.

Many times during the past 8 years the senior Senator from Nevada has urged that there be set up a United States of Europe, in which there would be a pot of markets and production.

Mr. President, the European nations will not trade with each other so long as our fat market is in the pot. They all get a piece of the United States market.

NEW TARIFF CUTS SOUGHT TO SWEETEN FOREIGN POT

We are the pot if we extend the act, and it is to sweeten the pot that new tariff cutting authority is asked.

The original act gave the President power to cut tariffs 50 percent, a power executed to all effects by the State Department. The foreign countries cleaned that pot.

Then an extension act was passed granting the President authority to cut the tariffs that were left 50 percent, making 75 percent in all.

That pot is about cleaned out, too. On the overall, tariffs have been reduced 68 percent.

INFLATION LOWERS TARIFFS, WAGES

I wish to mention at this point that inflation is as effective in lowering duties or tariffs as an actual lowering of them. We have an admitted inflation of more than 50 percent. I believe the actual figure is about 65 percent. In other words, we have a dollar which is worth about 35 percent of what it was worth in

1934. However, whatever the percentage may be, we have cut the fixed duties by that amount, and in that way lowered wages by that amount, too, I might say. An effective way to lower wages is to increase wages by 10 percent and to have a 20-percent inflation. In that way the person who raises the wages can go home and grin at the employee. However, it works both ways, and eventually everything catches up, and that is what is about to happen today.

With only a 7-percent margin left in the pot, it is only natural that we be asked to sweeten the margin, which is done in H. R. 1. H. R. 1 would empower the President to chip in another 15 percent tariff cut on some items, spread over a 3-year period, and to cut tariffs on other items as much as 50 percent.

This would make the pot interesting enough for the foreign nations in GATT to remain in the game 3 more years, cleaning Uncle Sam out of his markets further.

H. R. 1 is a bad bill that would sell out more American rights and interests than Yalta.

OWE LOYALTY TO OWN WORKERS AND INVESTORS

I have often stated that all Yalta did was to sell out foreign countries. This bill would sell out the workingmen and the investors of the United States. Even if we are not loyal to anyone else, at least we ought to be loyal to ourselves.

Mr. President, I have listened to the reading of letters before committees in the Senate and in the House, and I have listened to assurances to the effect that the President would not hurt any industry. Of course he would not hurt any industry knowingly.

However, it is impossible for one man's mind to encompass all the economic factors which go to make up the economic system of the United States. It is like a boy throwing a rock into a lake or rocking a boat in the bushes to scare up a duck that he did not even know was there. No man's mind can encompass this subject, and no group of minds can, either. It must be considered on the basis of principle. In that way all investors and companies and workingmen and everybody else interested in the subject can mesh production. If the law is based on a principle, they know what the law is. It is like the workings of the ICC, when it makes a ruling on freight rates based on a reasonable return on investment. If the Tariff Commission makes a ruling on the basis of fair and reasonable competition everybody knows what that means.

Nowhere in the Constitution or in any law passed by Congress up to 1934 will Senators find permission given anyone to trade one sector of the country for another or one economy for another, or one industry for another. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act allows the President to do it. It is not the President who does it, as everybody knows, but it is the State Department, which has been internationally minded for 22 years.

H. R. 1 OFFERS NEITHER HOPE OR ASSURANCE TO AMERICAN PRODUCERS

There is not one word of assurance, sympathy, or hope in this bill for the American workingman. I am talking about effect of the bill, not about lip service to the workers.

In this bill there is not one word of hope or assurance for the investor in American free enterprise.

There is not one word in this bill that says that any American's job in America will be protected.

There is not one word in the bill that says any American market will be protected from suffocation by foreign imports.

We have had the spectacle of a large producer, who has built plants in foreign countries and has used his investment there to bring into this country material which he has produced cheaper than it could be produced in the United States, saying, "We believe we should be the judge of how large imports into the United States shall be and how much shall be produced in the United States of America."

Under cross-examination by the senior Senator from Nevada, who asked if he would advocate that policy for all other products, he became a little pink around the collar and stuttered. He did not say he would advocate it for all other products, but only for his own. It would certainly be a spectacle if every producer in America who also is a foreign producer of the commodity could have it left to him to say how much he would produce in America and how much in a foreign country, and how much of his production he would bring into this country in future years. He could say to the domestic producers, "We do not need your production," and then increase foreign production until whatever competition was encountered in this country had ceased to exist.

H. R. 1 BANKERS AND WATERFRONT BROKERS BILL

This is a bill for international bankers, export industries and waterfront brokers who take an override on everything that goes out or comes in to our ports.

That is what we have traded for our producers in Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, and Pennsylvania. We have traded our producing industry for a group of waterfront brokers. That is what we have done. Tomorrow will be the test of whether we continue to do it.

This is a bill to protect money invested in foreign countries instead of in America. It is a bill to further the exploitation of cheap foreign labor while increasing unemployment, economic distress, and mine and factory closures here at home.

There is another bill before the Committee on Finance, a very interesting bill, which proposes that we reduce the income tax by 14 points on foreign-produced income.

In other words, it seeks to get the money out of this country and into foreign countries so as to help employment in foreign countries, in direct competition with our own.

A DEATH-SENTENCE BILL

The bill is a living threat to our wage and living standards and a death sentence to American industries across the land who prefer to produce in America for America than move their factories to a foreign land.

Mr. President, it is amazing, to me, that after 22 years of operation of such legislation as this the people of the United States and the Members of the Senate and the House do not understand that by a slight change in a tariff or an income-tax law we can change the course of production overnight.

Mr. President before the committee a statement was made which should explain how it works. It was stated that fluorspar is a very important national defense article the producers of which are being put out of business because of imports from Mexico and Canada. That is absolutely correct. But what is putting it out of business? The tariff or duty was approximately $8 a unit on low-grade fluorspar. On high-grade fluorspar it was $2.40. But up to that time there had been no high-grade fluorspar coming in. The man representing the industry in Mexico and Canada wrote those figures into the bill and went home, and now we are bringing in ore up to 97 percent and shutting down the mines in Illinois and Kentucky. Representatives of those States have appeared before the committee with reference to that matter.

MISTAKES STAND FOR 3 YEARS IF H. R. 1 ENACTED

There are thousands of things that can be written into a tariff bill or into a multilateral trade agreement that will be in effect for 3 years. If we left it to the Tariff Commission, which is an agency of the Congress, it could be handled properly. If the Commission made a mistake tomorrow, it could be corrected.

In Geneva, 3,000 miles away, our life is being sucked away, and we do not seem to know it, half the time. But many of the representatives of the State Department who appeared before the committee as advisers believe such a process is safe. They believe America will get rich if it can divide its markets with every other nation.

There is not one word in this bill to safeguard the interest of any American employed in domestic industry or whose dollars are invested in America.

It is because, Mr. President, there is not a single word of assurance, sympathy, or hope in this bill, that proponents have felt it necessary to make so many verbal promises about how carefully it will be administered.

No man or group of men has the ability to analyze the number of factors involved. One plank can be pulled out, and the whole structure will come down. How can an American, trying to promote an industry, such as construction, manufacturing, or mining, say, "Look, I can compete with all the firms in this business and make some money"? How can he send agents all over the world and know what he can do in competition with the cheap labor involved? How can he do it? He cannot do it, and therefore he cannot get the investment to put into the business. It effectively stops new investment in industries in the United States of America.

We have a plethora of verbal assurances, Mr. President, but none of them are in this bill.

They will be found in an amendment I am offering to this bill, but they are not in H. R. 1.

No administration spokesman coming before the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, or before the House Ways and Means Committee, has offered to include any assurances of any kind to our domestic producers or to American investors and workingmen.

ADMISSION INDUSTRIES WILL BE HURT MADE BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. Dulles, our Secretary of State, has very frankly admitted that American industries will be hurt, be injured, but he, too, proposes no specific safeguards to the administration bill.

The administration policy, on the other hand, has been to oppose such safeguards with all the vigor at its command, and it has been very vigorous in its opposition to any safeguards whatsoever.

Mr. President, may I repeat, there is not one word of assurance, sympathy, or hope in the administration bill for any American producing for the American market or any American investor who has risked his money in producing for this market.

It is a weakness, a fatal weakness in my opinion, which I am sure the administration recognizes.

If the administration does not recognize it then why, may I ask, did the President of the United States feel impelled to write his letter of February 17 to Speaker JOE MARTIN.

In that letter he sought to give the assurances which the bill, itself, so obviously lacks. He said in part:

> Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our workingmen and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be and will be administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure.

Mr. President, those are fine words, and I am sure that the President means them. But they are not in the bill, and the principle is not in the bill.

AMERICAN INTERESTS SACRIFICED ON ONE-WORLD ALTAR

Mr. President, I repeat that no man and no group of men can possibly analyze the economic factors which must mesh in order to make our economic structure work. Many Americans already have been injured by the operation of this act. The President has later said they will not be injured. Of course they will be injured. One of the worst features of the 1934 act was the taking away of the insurance policy, the principle of fair and reasonable competition, because now there is no assurance that a workingman or an investor or a businessman may not be sacrificed tomorrow on the altar of one economic world.

THE RUSSIAN POLICY

The State Department has asked for money to move such persons elsewhere, so that they may be able to have work. That is the Russian policy. That is the way it is done in Russia. We are given to understand that the Russians are the enemy of our system. Why are we adopting theirs? That I should like to know.

All that any witness representing American industry who appeared before the Committee on Finance asked for was equal access to his own American markets. He did not ask for an advantage.

There is no principle of fair and reasonable competition in H. R. 1 to give American producers equal access to American markets with American goods when they are faced with a flood of low-wage, low-tax, foreign-produced imports.

I am certain that the President has the highest motives and that he will act in accordance with these motives in the light of information placed before him by the White House advisers.

But, in my opinion, the White House advisers have grievously misinformed or misadvised the President in the past on matters such as these, and I have little expectation that these advisers will change their colors unless we spell the President's assurances into language in the bill, as was done in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The record of the action taken in escape-clause cases, cases in which the Tariff Commission, after extensive studies, recommended relief to stricken industry, is proof sufficient, in my opinion, that the President in times past has been woefully misadvised by his advisers, particularly the advisers from the State Department.

PRESIDENT'S ASSURANCES SHOULD BE INCORPORATED IN BILL

Nevertheless, I applaud the President's assurances, and it would be a very easy matter to include them in H. R. 1, together with the principle under which the assurances would be made more certain and effective.

No language, however, could give complete assurance to any American so long as our foreign trade and tariff policy seems to be governed and directed through, by, and for GATT and its 33 foreign participating nations.

So long as this matter is left within the control of the State Department—a one-economic-world-minded State Department—there will never be any justice for the workingmen or the investors of the United States.

Let this act expire.

Let us return to the Constitution of the United States.

Let the power be exercised as the Constitution directs it shall be exercised.

Even if the language of the devisers of the act has been clever enough to make constitutional—which I doubt—the action of transferring the constitutional responsibility of Congress, the legislative branch, to the Executive, the President, I think it would be unwise to allow it to be done, because to do so would be to trade principle for executive decision; and that is what is being traded.

TRADE PROGRAM NO CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

So we hold our economy together by what? By wars and preparations for wars. The water never settles. It has never settled since the Trade Agreements Act was first passed. The unemployment situation in the United States was not cured from 1934 until 1941, when the Second World War began in Europe. After that war, the United States, accumulated about 5 million unemployed and partially unemployed until 1950, when another war came along. That was a war which we could not win and could not lose. We were engaged in perpetual war for perpetual peace. But war kept out of the country the boys who might be looking for jobs. That is a poor way to prevent unemployment.

When war came in 1941, there were 9 million unemployed and about 17 million partially unemployed. Let Senators look at the record, if they doubt what I am saying. But in 1941 American boys were on their way all over the world. About 10 or 12 million of them were in the Armed Forces. So the unemployment situation of that day was cured.

Never since 1934 has the unemployment situation been alleviated one iota by the Trade Agreements Act. Since that time we have had government by emergency.

Now we are again preparing for war. In our manufacturing centers we are producing obsolete equipment for the next war, and are sending much of it to Europe, where it is being placed in warehouses from which it will never come out. We are afraid to stop such a program for fear of unemployment.

GATT POWERS NEVER OBTAINED FROM CONGRESS

There are many, Mr. President, who insist that during the past 8 years of its operation, GATT has far exceeded and supersded the powers a new deal Congress sought to grant in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Congress has not, of course, ever granted to GATT, any powers express or implied.

It has never recognized GATT, nor has GATT been considered in any legislation.

The powers that Congress delegated, or sought to delegate, were delegated to the President, who transferred them to the State Department, which transferred them to GATT with the approval of the previous President.

Many attorneys have expressed doubt that the State Department had the right to do this with or without the presidential consent, but the State Department claims it had that right by reason of the Trade Agreements Act.

TRADE ACT INTERPRETED TO FIT STATE DEPARTMENT'S PURPOSE

I have read and reread the act many times, but nowhere do I find that the act, in delegating its responsibilities to the President, authorized him to delegate them to somebody else, who in turn could delegate them to an international agency which meets only periodically, always in secret, and always on foreign soil.

In the light of the record, the senior Senator from Nevada must regretfully state that, in his opinion, whatever the language of any trade act Congress may pass, whatever the provisions or however carefully it is written, the State Department will seek some way to interpret, warp, or twist it in a manner to meet the State Department's purposes.

And that means the State Department's free-trade purposes, which is the only purpose and objective that it espouses.

If 25 years ago a Secretary of State had said what the present Secretary of State said before the Committee on Finance, I think he would have been impeached.

The Secretary of State said that what he wanted, what he had to have, was the authority to trade any jobs or investments in America for political considerations in Europe, if, in the opinion of the President, to do so would benefit the overall position of the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT IGNORES INDUSTRY, WORKINGMAN

Mr. President, I must regretfully state that, in my opinion, the State Department has never done anything, has never made one move, to protect American workingmen and American investors. What happens to American industry is no concern of the State Department.

The State Department is not concerned with what may happen to any American workingman in America or any American investor who has his investments in America. Americans investing in foreign countries are another matter. The State Department loves them because they help make State Department jobs.

Even Secretary of State Dulles, when he testified before the Senate Finance Committee, could offer no help to the American industry being injured by the foreign-trade program of the State Department.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada submits that passage of any trade bill by the Congress would be risky and dangerous business. The wise and safe course is to let H. R. 1 peacefully expire.

Then, as I have pointed out many times, we shall revert to the 1930 Tariff Act on all dutiable or duty-free articles which have not been included in trade agreements.

Where trade agreements exist the President might cancel them, and in 6 months the duties would be adjusted by the Tariff Commission, an agency of Congress, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition determined by the difference in cost of producing the article here and in the principal competing nation.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY SEEKS EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

That gives American free enterprise a chance to compete on equal terms against foreign competition in our own markets, and imposes no hardship on any foreign producer willing to compete for American markets on equal terms. A flexible import fee or tariff on that basis would not prevent imports; it would merely permit them to enter this country on our basis of costs, when they are needed.

Mr. President, that is all American industries threatened with destruction by import competition from foreign countries ask—equal access to our markets.

Scores of witnesses have testified against H. R. 1, in both the Senate Finance and the Ways and Means Committees, and invariably they have informed the committee that they would be content with equal access to our own markets.

But it has been amazing to the senior Senator from Nevada to see industrialists and representatives of working men and investors come before the committee with bowed heads and say "We realize this bill is going to pass, so all we want is an amendment to assure us we will not be run out of business for another year." Those are almost their exact words.

PROPAGANDA MACHINES OF FOREIGN TRADING NATIONS BUSY

Why are the people of the Nation in that frame of mind? What kind of propaganda goes forth which brings about a frame of mind of that kind? What is said to the workers and investors of this Nation? I will tell you, Mr. President, one thing which does not retard such a frame of mind, and that is the propaganda machines of the empire-minded nations of Europe. Some of them have the best propaganda machines ever devised. The people are sold on slogans for reciprocal trade to such an extent that control is gained of their minds in an emergency and they are caused to vote against their own best interests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is not talking about slogans such as The Great Crusade, Dynamic Conservatism, and slogans of that kind, is he?

MONEY GONE, FRIENDS GONE

Mr. MALONE. I am talking about any proposal to divide the money of the taxpayers of this Nation with the other nations of the world, on the theory that the more we give them, the more wealthy we shall be. That philosophy reminds me of the oldtime boxers who, when they were winning, stood at the bar, with plenty of money in front of them, and bought drinks for all present. When one of those oldtime boxers would lose a couple of times and there was no more money in front of him at the bar, he would look around and see that no one was there.

That is where we are headed. I am referring to anyone who holds that theory. I may say it is worse for a Republican to advocate it than for a Democrat to do so, because Republicans ought to know better.

M'KINLEY TARIFF SPEECH RECALLED

The witnesses who testified against H. R. 1 have been more generous in informing the committee that they would be content with equal access to our own markets, in my opinion, than a great Republican President, who, in a speech delivered while he was a Member of the House, asked this question:

> Why should he * * * (the foreign producer) enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our own producers, our labor, and our taxpayers?

William McKinley, a great American, expressed a great American principle. He said:

> Here we are 1 country, 1 language, 1 allegiance, 1 standard of citizenship, 1 flag, 1 constitution, 1 Nation, 1 destiny.

And I will go a step further, Mr. President—one standard of living.

Then he said:

> It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organization, a distinct and independent political society, organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resulting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties—he is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations.
>
> He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and the glory of the Nation.

And then he asked, as I stated before:

> Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our own producers, our labor, and our taxpayers?

Mr. President, every word that William McKinley said in that memorable speech in 1888 is as true today as when it was uttered.

The nations of Europe still are separate organisms, distinct and independent political societies, organized each for its own, to protect its own and to work out its own destiny.

Do they have free trade among themselves? Of course not.

FOREIGN NATIONS RAISE RIGID TARIFF BARRIERS

Against each of their neighbors they impose rigid tariff barriers, restrict imports by exchange permits, and import licenses and quota systems, just as they do against the United States.

Testimony has been presented before the Senate Finance Committee during current hearings that 32 foreign countries have increased their tariff rates during the past few years, when they have been so energetically urging that we cut out tariff rates still further, and receiving the sympathy and assistance of the State Department.

Of the 97 trading countries listed by the Department of Commerce, I find that 66 require an import license and 48 an exchange permit.

Many, of course, require both, which is why the total of nations with such restrictions, 114, is larger than the number of trading nations.

Examining the list I find few of these areas with neither of these restrictive devices, although most of them naturally have tariff barriers.

FOREIGN BARS HAVE ONE PURPOSE: TO KEEP OUT AMERICAN PRODUCTS

And they are barriers, Mr. President, because no nation on earth needs pro-

tection against America, since our wages, taxes, and standard of living are greater than those of any other nation on earth. Foreign nations erect barriers, both to keep out our products and to collect revenues from us.

Nations with neither import license nor exchange permit controls are Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Canada, El Salvador, French Somaliland, Guatemala, Haiti, Tangier, Peru, and the Philippines.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that while the United States has been cutting tariffs 68 percent, and has kept hands off any other trade barriers on industrial products except agricultural products imported into the United States, other countries of the world have been not only raising their tariffs, but imposing controls that can keep any American product they do not want in their market from entering their market.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and GATT were sold to the American people on promises to reduce foreign trade restrictions against our products. The promises have simply not materialized.

CONSTITUTION PROVIDED THAT CONGRESS SHOULD LEGISLATE, NOT PRESIDENT

The senior Senator from Nevada recognizes that among his colleagues there are some distinguished Members who believe that when the White House sends a bill to Congress, Congress must pass the bill. This is a far cry from the constitutional concept that Congress was the legislative branch, independent but coordinate, and that Congress would initiate and consider such legislation as was necessary to our Government.

I think it is fair to say that today more important legislation is initiated by the executive than in the legislative branch. Certainly that is true of H. R. 1, as it was of the Trade Agreements Act and the Extension Acts which have preceded H. R. 1.

Now we have H. R. 1, a bill which offers neither encouragement nor hope nor protection for any manufacturing industry in the United States, any investor in such an industry, or any workingman in such an industry. I am opposed to any extension or renewal of the Trade Act.

But if we must pass a bill on this subject, as the State Department, the President's advisers, and many of the Members of the Congress seem to think, then at least let it be a bill which in some measure will safeguard the interests of the American workingman, investor, and taxpayer.

Two such bills are now pending in the Senate. Both of them were introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada.

MALONE AMENDMENT WOULD SAFEGUARD NATION'S INTERESTS

One of them, Mr. President, is Senate bill 404, which I introduced, and which subsequently was submitted as an amendment to Senate bill 1723, and yesterday was submitted by me as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for House bill 1. That amendment now is at the desk, and will be called up tomorrow.

The amendment declares a policy of the United States which is in direct contradiction to the policies implied under H. R. 1, but a policy which is in the interest of American free enterprise.

Under the amendment the Tariff Commission would be authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations subsequently specified, to prescribe and establish import duties, which would provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar articles in the principal market or markets of the United States.

CRITERION ESTABLISHED IN AMENDMENT

The amendment likewise sets up a criterion. Here is the criterion:

A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States, is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

Mr. President, this amendment envisages no discriminations against foreign critical and strategic materials, nor against the importers. Neither does the amendment envisage any favors to domestic producers, over the foreign producers or importers. All that the amendment does, in fact, is to assure American producers equal access to American markets with foreign producers competing for the same American markets.

To determine what is a fair price and what is fair competition, the Tariff Commission would take these factors into consideration:

First. The lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition.

Second. Any change which may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries, either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious imbalance of international payments.

TRADE PACTS MERELY AGREEMENTS TO LOWER TARIFFS

Mr. President, that is one method of nullifying any trade agreement which may have been made between the United States and any other nation. Such agreements really are not trade agreements anyway, Mr. President, as you know. Instead, they are simply agreements to lower tariffs.

Before the ink on such a so-called agreement is dry, the foreign country participating in the agreement devalues its own currency, and thus defeats the objectives of the agreement; or else the foreign country participating in the agreement invokes exchange or trade permits, so that whenever a foreigner applies to one of the government departments for a permit to import any commodity to that nation, if that nation does not want the article imported, it is not possible for him to obtain such an import permit or exchange permit; and without an exchange permit, it is impossible to obtain funds of that country with which to purchase that commodity.

My amendment contains provisions which are designed to allow the Tariff Commission to overcome the subterfuges which are employed by other nations in an attempt to prevent imports into their own countries, and to increase their exports to the United States.

To continue with the factors set forth in my amendment which the Tariff Commission would take into consideration:

Third. The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at an unreasonably low and uneconomic prices, in order to secure additional dollar credits.

Fourth. Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each.

Fifth. The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively.

Sixth. The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices.

Seventh. The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies—effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise—excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin, and any other factors, either in the United States or in other countries, which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

FOREIGN TRADE TRICKS WOULD BE OVERCOME BY AMENDMENT

All these factors the Tariff Commission could consider, to overcome the tricks and the 200-year-old practices of the foreign nations to gain trade advantage, about which our State Department seems to be woefully ignorant.

Under the amendment decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles could be made by the Tariff Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or groups showing adequate and proper interest in the duties in question, is subject to one proviso, that is:

That no change in any import duty would be ordered by the Commission until after it had first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties had full opportunity to be heard.

RIGHTS OF INDUSTRIES PROTECTED

Mr. President, all the elements of fairness under our republican procedures are outlined here.

Full investigation, public hearings, the right of petition, all are present, and the criteria for adjustments assures that one reasonable objective would be accomplished—industries would be granted equal access to our markets, only that and nothing more.

As I have said, Senate bill 404 and the amendment now offered includes all materials, and all products.

Senate bill 400, which I also introduced and which is pending before committee, embodies the same principles and safeguards with respect to critical and strategic minerals and materials, including petroleum, petroleum products, or other liquid fuels.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is legislation to protect and strengthen American interests, on a fair and reasonable basis which, for the first time in history, would make of the Trade Agreements Act a trade act truly realistic and "reciprocal" insofar as it applies to this field.

As the senior Senator from Nevada has pointed out many times on this floor, the word "reciprocal" does not appear in the title or body of the act of 1934. It was not a reciprocal trade bill and was never intended to be. It was a bill to cut tariffs and to give foreign products an advantage in our markets not shared by the American producers against which the foreign suppliers were competing.

It was a bill to divide our markets among the slave-wage nations of the world.

H. R. 1 NOT RECIPROCAL

There is nothing reciprocal in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, in any of the extension acts, or in H. R. 1.

The legislation I propose would encourage true reciprocal trade.

It would encourage it, but whether or not it would actually bring it about would depend on our subservience to GATT, or to its successor agency, the OTC or the 1955 edition of ITO.

It would encourage true reciprocal trade in one field, directly related to our national defense, and if we are to have true reciprocal trade generally the senior Senator from Nevada would prefer passage of his bill S. 404.

That has now been offered, as I have previously explained, as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for House bill 1, and will be brought up tomorrow for debate and vote.

GREEN LIGHT GIVEN ADMINISTRATION BILLS OVER SENATE MEASURES

S. 404 is pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and has been pending before it for some time.

The senior Senator from Nevada well understands, however, that in the modern concept of the relationship between the executive and legislative branch, administration-sponsored measures seem to take precedence over legislation introduced by mere Members of the Senate or House of Representatives.

When a bill is introduced by a Representative or Senator on his own initiative, it is more likely than not to be opposed by whatever administration happens to be in power.

An example of that is the recent tax bill.

H. R. 1, which has administration backing and which is in no sense a reciprocal trade bill, therefore has been given the green light or right of way, while S. 404 has lain dormant, at least until the present, when I am offering it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H. R. 1.

S. 404 declares a policy, and I quote:

AN AMERICAN POLICY FOR AMERICANS

It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) To facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States;

(b) To foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports;

(c) To develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) To provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) To assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

Mr. President, this is a sound policy. It is an American policy for Americans.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S TARIFF POLICY

It is a policy similar in many respects to the Republican platform plank of 1860 on which Abraham Lincoln ran and was elected.

That plank read:

That, while providing revenues for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country;

And we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingman liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence.

Mr. President, the policy objectives of my amendment parallel the pledges of the Republican platform of 1860 on which Abraham Lincoln ran and was elected.

"Commercial prosperity and independence" was the Republican promise and Abraham Lincoln's objective in 1860, and commercial prosperity and independence is what American industry, workingmen and investors ask today from this administration.

INDEPENDENCE LOST UNDER GATT

Instead of independence we have GATT, 34 nations meeting in foreign lands to devise ways of wiggling into our markets, displacing our industries and workers, and disrupting our economy.

Instead of commercial prosperity for the whole country we have distressed industries, closed mills, mines and factories, and 144 distressed areas.

Instead of developing the industrial interests of the whole country, we have a scheme to destroy certain segments of our industrial economy on the theory that if we enable enough industries to be destroyed by imports the surviving industries will export more of their products.

This is the theory, held by the State Department and free traders for 22 years, that if you cut off a leg, you will be better off because the other leg will grow stronger.

If you cut off an arm, that will be dandy, because the muscles in the other arm will get bigger; and if you put out one eye you will see better with the other. If you put out both eyes that is better yet, because it will improve your sense of smell.

If we destroy our textile industry, these free trade theorists argue, we will sell more raw cotton, and if we destroy the coal industry we will sell more apples, because soon unemployed coal miners will be selling apples on the street.

DESTROY SELVES TO STRENGTHEN ALLIES

Destroy American free enterprise and our foreign friends will have less competition in American markets and so be firmer allies.

Of course these theories disregard the fact that 89 percent of all the trading nations in the world—and all of the important ones except Canada—impose import or exchange controls, or both, on what we ship to them.

This means that the foreign governments in these countries control what their nationals can buy from us, simply by granting or withholding import licenses and exchange permits.

This further means that foreign buyers can buy from us only what their governments think is necessary to acquire from the United States, or what we have bribed these governments to accept.

TRADE SUBSIDIZED BY BRIBES TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Since World War II we have given them bribes totaling more than $50 billion under pretexts, to induce those countries to accept goods that our taxpayers have already paid for.

The foreign countries have been getting away with this through a species of blackmail, threatening to go Communist if we attempt to return to a principle of fair and reasonable competition in foreign trade.

So long as they can get away with this they will do so, with the encouragement of our State Department.

When we return to a principle of fair and reasonable competition with flexible duties based on the cost comparisons I have outlined previously, this blackmail will cease.

Foreign countries will still sell to us the things we need and do not produce at home—two-thirds of our imports, including coffee, tea, tin, copper already come in duty free.

Foreign countries will have equal access to our markets on articles we both produce, the difference in production costs equalized by tariffs.

MAKE FOREIGN NATIONS EARN TARIFF CUTS BY RAISING WAGE STANDARDS

Foreign countries will be able to earn tariff reductions by improving their own wage and living standards.

America will continue to ship to foreign countries the commodities these countries require or need for their own economy.

America's principle of fair and reasonable competition may afford an example to foreign countries.

America's industries, investors, and producers will be given an equal oppor-

tunity to enjoy our own markets with other nations of the world, and again will enjoy commercial prosperity and independence.

I say that because when a tariff or a duty is adopted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, it means that when the living standards and wages and costs are raised in the foreign competitive nations, then the duty on a particular product will be decreased when the people of the competing nation are living on about the standard we are living on, and free trade will be the automatic and immediate result.

Senate bill 404, which I am offering as an amendment to H. R. 1, aims to achieve this goal of commercial prosperity and independence for the whole country.

AMENDMENT ADOPTION WOULD END TRADE PACTS

The amendment would authorize and direct that at the earliest practicable date all foreign trade agreements be terminated.

On termination of such agreements import duties established under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 would be restored.

Reductions or increases of import duties thereafter would be on the principle of fair and reasonable competition based on the same criteria as that which I outlined previously.

SAFEGUARDS DESCRIBED

There are several additional safeguards, however.

Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 declared that unfair acts in the importation of articles which tend to destroy or substantially injure an American industry which is economically operated shall be unlawful.

This amendment would provide that when an unfair method or act of this nature is established to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission, it shall have power to direct the exclusion of such articles from entry into the United States.

QUOTAS PERMISSIBLE

The Commission, likewise, would be empowered to impose quantitative limits on the importation of foreign articles in such amounts as it finds necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, the purpose of this provision is to give manufactured products of American industry a measure of the same protection now enjoyed by many of our agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The senior Senator from Nevada supports these acts as he supports all legislation to safeguard American interests, American jobs, American industries, and American producers.

The senior Senator from Nevada supports the principle of Abraham Lincoln's platform which pledged to agriculture "remunerative prices" at the same time it pledged "to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country."

INDUSTRY ENTITLED TO SAME SAFEGUARDS AS AGRICULTURE

Manufacturing and resource industries, in the opinion of the Senator, are entitled to the same safeguards that agriculture enjoys today, and that is the reason for the provision I have outlined above in both of my amendments.

Freetraders want no safeguards at all for either agriculture or industry.

To all practical purposes they have been successful in removing the tariff safeguards which for 150 years encouraged American manufacturing and resource industries to develop and expand.

Their next target is agriculture.

Foreign competitors are aiming at this target right now.

They opened fire on American agriculture at the recent GATT sessions in Geneva.

While they won no immediate victory, they did win a reluctant promise from the State Department of ultimate success.

GATT VERSUS UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

Here is a news dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, dated March 7.

It starts out by saying:

> The 34 member nations of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) have granted permission for the United States to continue to impose quantitative restrictions on certain agricultural imports, it was learned here today.

Mr. President, I interject at this point of the dispatch to ask: "Who and what is this GATT that it has power to grant 'permission' to the United States, its farmers or the Congress, to carry out a law that is on our statute books? What kind of super-sovereign power is this that it can conceive the power to grant or withhold permission to the United States to obey its own laws?"

FOREIGN "RETALIATION" APPROVES

I continue to quote from the Geneva dispatch, which reports that we have GATT's provision to carry out our own laws with respect to agricultural imports. The second paragraph reads:

> But the members also gave other countries permission to retaliate and seek compensation if affected by the restrictions, which are contained in section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act.

So GATT also extends its sovereignty over the other nations of the world and gives them authority to seek compensation. From who? Why the United States, of course.

Paragraph 3 of the report reads:

> This section (section 22) mainly concerns imports of dairy produce and has led to clashes with several nations in the past. Holland once retaliated by slashing imports of wheat from the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPEASES GATT WITH PROMISES

And here is the pay-off paragraph that tells what our State Department, which has representatives attending GATT, has been doing over there.

I quote:

> The United States is understood to have assured GATT that it will end any restrictions under the act as soon as they are no longer needed, and consult with interested countries before taking further action.

Mr. President, who in the United States has power to assure GATT that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act will eventually be set aside?

Who has the presumption to say that the Congress of the United States which passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act and has frequently extended it, is going to repeal section 22 at some future date?

Who is presuming to make our laws or change our laws or repeal our laws outside of Congress, when they are laws passed by the legislative branch of our Government?

Who presumes to be the "United States" when huddling in secret with representatives of 33 foreign nations in Geneva?

AUTHORITY OF STATE DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED

The State Department cannot do it, because it is no part of the legislative branch.

Congress has not done it, because it is not represented at Geneva, and has never recognized GATT in the first place.

But here we have some superauthority which presumes to be the United States assuring GATT at Geneva, according to this report, assuring GATT that it will end any restrictions under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as soon as they are no longer needed.

Who is to determine if and when the safeguards under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act are no longer needed?

The foreign countries participating in GATT?

The State Department, which is the agency of the executive branch of our Government that has been involved in GATT?

The President, to whom Congress delegated certain powers, unconstitutionally in my opinion, in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934?

Who?

ONLY CONGRESS HAS AUTHORITY TO ALTER OR REPEAL SECTION 22

Mr. President, no administration and no executive department in our Government has any authority to repeal section 22, or to give assurances to any international agency that the provisions of that section will not be carried out.

No one in Government or outside of Government can give GATT or any other international organization assurances of what Congress will or will not do in the future with respect to a legislative act that the legislative branch of government has passed.

STATE DEPARTMENT DELUDES ITSELF

Mr. President, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, this State Department of ours has just grown too big for its britches and has developed delusions of grandeur unsuited to a nation established on republican principles of government.

We still have a constitutional government, Mr. President, with three independent and coordinated branches, and no official of the executive branch has authority to give assurances to any international agency as to what Congress will or will not do.

Mr. President, the State Department has been suffering delusions of grandeur for some time and has long conceived itself omnipotent with superpower over both our political and economic affairs.

The senior Senator from Nevada was first to point this out in a floor speech delivered on July 12, 1949, during debate on the North Atlantic Treaty which was promoted as a blueprint for world peace and security, but which was in reality a device by which we would beef up the empire-minded nations and their colonial systems at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Dean Acheson was then Secretary of State and Willard L. Thorp was Mr. Acheson's Assistant Secretary.

In my floor speech of July 12, 1949, I quoted both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorp. I quoted a statement by Mr. Acheson that, and I again quote Mr. Acheson:

> It is hardly possible any longer to draw a sharp dividing line between the economic affairs and political affairs.

That is Mr. Acheson, our then secretary of political affairs, as it is called in some countries, or Secretary of State as we call the office here. Continue Mr. Acheson:

> Each complements and supplements the other. They must be combined in a single unified and rounded policy.

Mr. President, this is the type of thinking by which the State Department, or department of political affairs as it is known in some countries, Switzerland for example, presumes that it can repeal, or set aside, an act of Congress or a provision in an act of Congress, specifically section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPARENTLY UNCHANGED

The same presumption apparently exists today in the State Department as existed 6 years ago during the tenure of Mr. Acheson.

In his floor speech of July 12, 1949, the senior Senator from Nevada pointed out that "there positively cannot be a bipartisan foreign policy without extending it to national economic affairs" under this concept of the State Department.

This is equally true today if the State Department presumes that it has the power to promise an international organization such as GATT that in due course a vital act of Congress such as section 22 will be waived, ignored, or set aside.

It is significant also, that as far back as 1949 the State Department was plugging the International Trade Organization or ITO, which was turned down promptly by committees of the House and Senate when it was sent up to the Congress.

DISCARDED ITO TO BE REBORN

Now a new ITO is to be sent to the Congress, this time as an international organization for trade cooperation, or OTC.

The State Department never gives up in its efforts to subordinate the national economy and the Nation's trade and commerce to an international organization, where it can make promises of the end of safeguards such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides for the farmers of our Nation.

ITO, as I stated previously, did not become effective when it was repudiated by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

When the United States did not join, none of the other nations did either. Instead they preferred to carry on their work of dividing the markets of the United States between them through ITO's twin, called GATT, which never has been submitted to the Congress.

NEW GLOBAL AGENCY TO DIE IF UNITED STATES DOES NOT JOIN

The new ITO, or OTC, or IOTC, or IOT, whichever initials the State Department may seek to apply to it, is intended to absorb both GATT and original ITO provisions.

In a report from Geneva on the plan the Associated Press states significantly, in a March 21 dispatch:

> Failure either of the United States or the United Kingdom to ratify the agreement would mean that the new organization would not come into being.

Of course not.

In the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada the new organization will not come into being if the United States does not ratify the agreement, regardless of what the United Kingdom may or may not do.

These hungry nations are not concerned with British markets. It is the American market they are after.

The Associated Press report from Geneva adds another significant paragraph or two. It states:

> Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, signed the agreement today along with six other protocols of amendment and declaration growing out of the 4-month meeting of GATT members.
>
> Mr. Waugh said it was the plan of the administration to present the new agreement to Congress for ratification "at the earliest possible date" after a decision had been taken by Congress on the bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. President, if the present act is extended, it will not be necessary to do anything with the other organization. If we pass the pending bill, we approve GATT. If we reject the bill, GATT will not be injured; it will continue in force as before. That is the kind of subterfuge which has been going on for 22 years.

CONGRESS EXPECTED ONLY TO RUBBER STAMP STATE DEPARTMENT DEALS

None of the 6 protocols which Mr. Waugh is reported to have signed are to come before the Congress.

In other words, Mr. President, Congress is supposed to rubber stamp the State Department scheme in advance by passing H. R. 1, and without knowing any of the terms or provisions on which it is acting.

If Congress should enact H. R. 1 we will have OTC or GATT controlling our international trade and commerce regardless of whether the organizational provisions of the international agency are sent to Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT BEING GIVEN BLANK CHECK

Mr. President, Congress is being asked through H. R. 1 to give the executive branch, and the State Department, a blank check to remake the economy of America in collusion with 33 foreign countries, all greedy for our money and our markets.

We are asked to give a blank check without any knowledge of how or in what amounts the State Department intends to fill it out, or whether, when it does fill the check out, it will injure or bankrupt our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from my address of October 29, 1949, outlining the same subject and in much the same manner as I have done today. The excerpts are marked in this reprint of the debates in 1949 with reference to the Trade Agreements Act. This is not a new thing at all. It was recognized for exactly what it is, and it has been continued at our own risk. So I ask unanimous consent to have the marked excerpts included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT THREATENS WAGE STANDARD OF AMERICAN WORKERS

Ever since 1934, and particularly since World War II, the purpose of the administration of the Trade Agreements Act by the Democrats has been to prostitute the tariff policy of this Nation to bolster up a makeshift foreign policy—a policy dominated by others than Americans, and by persons whose interests are quite different from those of the American citizen.

Again and again we find evidence that the operation of the 1934 trade-agreements program was, in effect, a foreign-aid program, designed to throw millions of American workers into competition with sweatshop labor.

It is obvious that the nations involved in these trade agreements naturally desire to swamp American markets with low-priced imports in their all-important pursuit of the American dollar. I am not saying that this is their fault, but neither is it ours.

The tariff and import-fee policy of any nation has only two legitimate functions: First, to raise revenue; and second, to protect the jobs of its citizens. To use the tariff policy as a diplomatic pawn is to betray the economic security of the workingman.

The makers of our foreign policy have tried to frighten the Congress into subordinating the people's health and welfare to their international chess game.

It is not only bad economics, it is bad statesmanship, to weaken the security of the American worker, because today in this troubled world there is an extraordinary reason why America's productive processes should be maintained at full flood, namely, the need for security against any military threat from anywhere.

The argument that our economy must be weakened to placate or buy the friendship of any other nation is stupid. Strong nations never want for friends.

The American Nation is in great need of an American tariff policy, one which reflects the traditional policies and objectives of the American people.

Under the guidance of our State Department we are pouring out billions of sound dollars to maintain a hopelessly artificial world economy built on stage money. In so doing we are helping no one, and only prolonging the eventual return to reality.

There is much evidence that the peoples of the world are more conscious of this fact than are the politicians. It is certainly true of large segments of the American people, and only a few days ago a Scripps-Howard reporter sampled the man on the

street in London—the people who would be considered to have benefited most. As I recall the various interviews reported in the story, not a single person favored accepting additional transfusions from the United States. Yet, here we are debating the renewal of a politically controlled imitation of sound world trade.

AMERICA IS IMPORTING UNEMPLOYMENT

As Members of the Senate we are inevitably called upon to pass judgment upon technical matters which, in their detail, are beyond our knowledge and experience. In such cases we must seek the principles that underlie the problem and anchor our judgment to those fundamentals which we know to be true.

In foreign trade there is one principle that stands head and shoulders above all others, namely, every time we import something without exporting its equivalent, we are importing unemployment. Every British automobile that comes into America means about a thousand hours of unemployment, unless those hours are used to produce something that a foreign customer will buy.

We should be truly sorry for the pottery workers of Czechoslovakia and the watchmakers of Switzerland, but I am even sorrier for the idle pottery workers of Ohio and Arkansas and the watchmakers of New England.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be willing to comment on 2 sentences in the communique which was issued yesterday at the conclusion of the Anglo-American-Canadian financial talks, the 2 sentences being as follows:

"It was agreed that the United States and Canada should reduce obstacles to the entry of goods and services from debtor countries, in order to provide as wide an opportunity as possible for those countries to earn dollars through the export of goods and the provision of services, including tourism."

Then somewhat further along in the communique:

"There had already been significant and substantial reductions in United States tariffs during the last 15 years. The policy of the United States Government was to seek further negotiation of trade agreements through which additional reductions might be made, within the framework of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act."

Would the Senator care to comment on those two observations, issued yesterday, as I have indicated?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say that was simply another approach. In the past 2 or 3 years we have learned more different approaches, camouflaged approaches, to the markets of the United States, than I thought were available. When we consider the statements which have been made by leaders of European nations—England, for instance, because they seem to be taking the lead—every statement leads to an open door to United States markets. So, whatever the approach, just watch it long enough and it arrives at a method of entering the United States market.

In my opinion there are simply two reasons for this financial conference at this time. First, as I said before, it is something to direct attention from one of the most important happenings on the Senate floor in a century, namely, our deliberation over whether we will have free trade, whether we will take down tariff barriers and let the American workingman take his chances with the slave labor and the low-cost labor of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, or whether we will adopt some procedure through which he can be protected in his job while we are helping the other countries to raise their standards. So, every statement the leaders of foreign nations make, every approach they take, if analyzed, will be found to lead to easier entry to the markets of the United States and to the sharing of those markets.

As I have said before today, at the time of the meeting in San Francisco where the United Nations was formed, everyone had high hopes for the success of the new venture. It was my good fortune to meet nearly all the representatives from South America, Asia, Australia, New Zealand, and other nations. It has been my observation that if the United States is to have any trade future, it will be in South America and Asia, it will not be in old Europe, because in old Europe the people are producers, they are processors and manufacturers of goods; and that is what we are here in the United States. Asia and South America produce raw materials, so that our opportunity for trade is much greater in South America and in Asia than anywhere in Europe.

The same thing is true with respect to England. Of course, England is going to trade with Russia. All the subterfuge, and all the denials and everything else we do or say in connection with every loan we make, to the effect that the other country is not to be allowed to do thus or so, makes no difference. They are doing it. They go to the State Department and secure permission to go ahead. The Senator from Missouri is entirely familiar with all the trade treaties which have been made between the 16 Marshall-plan nations of Europe and Russia and the other countries behind the iron curtain.

So after they have used our money—and this is the second year we have furnished them money—used the Marshall-plan money and the ECA money to rehabilitate their plants, to buy raw materials, to do everything necessary to boost up their manufactures, for which we are largely responsible, what do we hear? We have heard debated on the Senate floor, and we have read in the newspapers statements put out by the State Department, that all that was necessary for the European nations to do in order to recover, was to produce. We have heard it said that production was the thing necessary in order for the European nations to solve all their problems. We have heard it said that they should greatly increase their production, double their production, in order to save themselves. That is the goal of most of those nations. Some are above 140 percent of prewar production now. Few are below 110 percent, except such countries as Italy, Austria, and Germany.

What has happened? The nations of Europe have taken our advice. They have taken our money and are producing. Where will they have to sell what they are now producing? They will have to sell it in the United States. So the chickens are coming home to roost.

I will again say to the Senator from Missouri that every approach, whatever it looks like—it may even be camouflaged with a sheet over its head, but if we pull the sheet off we find that the nations of Europe are after the markets of the United States and, of course, of Canada also.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator think that this sentence in the communication issued yesterday, on the conclusion of the Anglo-American-Canadian financial talks, tends to corroborate the view the Senator has suggested:

"This would require that the sterling area increase its dollar earnings so as to pay its way by 1952. This would require in the sterling area the creation of appropriate incentives to exporters to the dollar area and a vigorous attack upon costs of production to enhance the competitive position of sterling area products."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the ones who wrote those words have used a considerable amount of language to say only one thing, which is that they must sell more to the United States of America to get the dollars they think they need. I ask the distinguished Senator if he can make anything else out of it.

Mr. DONNELL. It seems to me perfectly clear that what they are geting at is exactly what the Senator from Nevada says, namely, a widening of markets for European products, the markets somewhere in the dollar area, which would enable them to collect dollars, and that would certainly seem to me to include the United States.

Mr. MALONE. There is also no question in my mind that the administration, through the State Department of the United States as it has long before this agreed, has agreed again to divide the markets of the United States with the sterling area.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I will state, if I have not already stated it in the RECORD—I think I did—that what I have been reading from is the text of the joint communique issued yesterday on the conclusion of the Anglo-American-Canadian financial talks, in which Great Britain, Canada, and our representatives, as I understand it, concurred.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that there can be no question that his conclusion is a correct one. They have come here for two reasons. One is further to break down the barriers with more secret talks and agreements. The Senate is not informed of all the agreements which have been made. The effort is made to divert the public attention from the floor of the Senate of the United States, where, as I have said before today, the subject which is being discussed now is one of the most important subjects to be discussed in a hundred years. Why? Because we have now arrived at the crossroads, and we must take one course or the other. We cannot be on both sides of this question. We must take either one side or the other. If we take one side we must be in favor of dividing all the markets with the nations of the world in the manner done hitherto under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—which means what? It means a lowering of the tariffs and the import fees below the differential in cost of production, with the resultant lowering of wages; so the workingman must make a choice. Of course, large groups of men are working now. Conditions are not like they were a hundred years ago, when comparatively few men were working. The workers are not all obliged to cease working at once. Our men are competitive workers. They will stay at their work for quite a while. But finally comes the time when the question is, "Either you have to take a reduction in wages or we will have to quit producing." We are getting to that point now in the United States. Business failures are today increasing beyond what they have been at any time since a considerable period before World War II. American workmen are going out on the street. It is not a question of whether or not they are going to go out on the street. They are now on the street.

So I say, Mr. President, that every time we import something which can be produced by the labor of America, we are importing unemployment. There are no two ways about it. It does not add up to anything else. So I say to the Senate of the United States that in my opinion there are no two sides to this question. We cannot be on both sides of such a question. Sometimes amendments can be suggested, and temporary steps may be taken so as to make a situation appear to be all right. But unless we stop this thing head on we shall be

in a bad way. When a football player is running down the field with a ball a proposal to amend him will do no good. He must be stopped in his tracks before he gets to his goal. We must stop this trend in its tracks now. I predict again that if we do not stop this thing on the Senate floor, if we extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, not only will there be amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to prohibit the importation of hand-made pottery and glass, not only will there be an amendment to place a quota on oil of 5 percent, but other amendments will be offered. Of course, no one can tell what is the right figure to use respecting oil, but we know we cannot continue to permit the importation of oil into the United States below our own cost of production.

In addition to the amendments I have mentioned, there will be an amendment to put a quota on furs, which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has already offered. There will be so many amendments offered that the Senate will not have anything else to do for a considerable time but to act on the amendments which will be offered.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] earlier this afternoon said that a manufacturer in his State suggested that he might transfer his plant, which manufactures heavy machinery, to a certain foreign nation, with the help of the point 4 guaranty of his investment, and under free trade he would send goods manufactured abroad to the United States, as well as sell his goods over there. The Senator asked me what effect my amendment would have on such a transfer of this businessman's plant to Europe. It would have a very simple effect, that is, if we adopted the plan of the flexible-import-fee principle, he would only compete with his own factory in Wisconsin on a fair and competitive basis.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. If I have been correctly informed, the Senator from Nevada has maintained that no trade agreements have actually been signed under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

Mr. MALONE. I know of none, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Washington. The Trade Agreements Act does not provide for, or at least the Department of State has not undertaken, so far as I know, to enter into any trade agreements. The Department agrees to lower a tariff or an import fee. That is not entering into a trade agreement.

Mr. CAIN. In the opinion of the Senator from Nevada, that is not entering into a trade agreement?

Mr. MALONE. No.

Mr. CAIN. The point is that merely agreements are reached to lower tariffs, but no trade agreements have actually been made.

Mr. MALONE. That is true. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that trade agreements are not being made. Agreements are made to lower tariffs and import fees. I think this is done without knowledge of what the effect is going to be. It is being done without regard to what the result will be whatever. I say that deliberately because of the extent to which the tariffs have been lowered, without any regard for the differential in cost of production or differences in wages and living standards in this country and in the country where the chief competition is located.

AMERICAN TUNGSTEN INDUSTRY WIPED OUT BY LOWERED TARIFFS

So it is not a question of a trade treaty. A trade treaty implies that we trade something—as England did with the Argentine, and with Russia. Those are trade treaties. We do not make trade treaties. We agree to lower a tariff, and we do not know where the chips are going to fall. We lowered the tariff on tungsten. It so happens that steel cannot be made without tungsten. Before the war, by virtue of a tariff of 50 cents a pound, we were producing about 45 percent of the domestic consumption of tungsten. No one paid very much attention to it. An import fee of that nature does not keep out imports. It merely brings them in at our level of cost, and everyone stays in business.

The war came on, and tungsten shipments from Burma and China, which are the greatest producers and suppliers, stopped. By virtue of the fact that we were in the tungsten business, production was speeded up by an increase in the price, and we became self-sufficient in the production of tungsten for war purposes. If we had been out of the tungsten business, and the miners had been scattered, we could have lost the war for that reason alone.

The tariff was reduced from 50 cents a pound to 38 cents a pound, which almost immediately shut down every tungsten mine in the United States with the exception of 2. Now all are closed except 1, and it is expected to close very soon.

In conversation with a State Department official he informed me that, "We did not lower the tariff very much. It was lowered from 50 cents a pound to 38 cents a pound." My answer was, "No; you did not lower it very much: but if you took a blowtorch and cut 2 feet off the end of the Potomac River Bridge you would not cut very much off it, but you would have no more bridge." So we have no more tungsten business in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Was not the so-called escape clause designed to correct domestic catastrophes such as the one to which the Senator has referred in the case of tungsten? It was not the intention of anyone, was it, to close the tungsten operations in this country?

Mr. MALONE. I think the escape clause was a compromise which was inserted because of the demand of Congress that something of that nature be put in the act; but the procedure is very complicated. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] explained how the escape clause is supposed to operate. Roughly, this is the way it is supposed to operate: One can make application, if he can get by the State Department; but the tungstein producers could not get by the State Department. They did not even apply under the escape clause. But if an effort is made to invoke the escape clause, that opens up the entire subject. The treaties which we entered into are not bilateral, but multilateral. We make a treaty with a certain nation and then immediately, under our multilateral system, every other nation in the world has the advantage of whatever we give to the nation with which we make the treaty. In many cases we have not dealt with the principal supplier. We have dealt with an insignificant supplier, and the principal supplier came in and obtained the same reduction.

But if the State Department does accept an application, and goes through with it, and attempts to invoke the escape clause, under the multilateral system every other nation which benefits from that treaty can also escape from everything which affects it. So in the long run it is not practical. That is what the State Department officials and others have explained. To my knowledge the escape clause has never been invoked. In other words, a producer can close down his business, but he is not able to prevail on the State Department to invoke the escape clause.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to state his interpretation of this further language in the joint communique issued yesterday by representatives of the three governments, namely, Great Britain, Canada, and the United States?

"There was agreement that one of the ways in which the competitive position of United Kingdom products might be improved, was by a widening of the area in which such products competed freely with those of other countries."

At the conclusion of the statement appears this language:

"In summary the Ministers of the three countries concerned are satisfied that a real contribution to the solution of the sterling-dollar difficulties has been made by the conclusions recorded above. They are confident that, with sustained efforts on all sides and with the seizure of every opportunity by sterling-area exporters to enter into and remain in dollar markets which are open to them, there is the prospect of reaching a satisfactory equilibrium between the sterling and dollar areas by the time exceptional dollar aid comes to an end."

Will the Senator be kind enough to state his interpretation of those two statements?

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me, I should like to say, as I previously stated, that it is another camouflaged approach to entry into the markets of the United States. When they are ready to increase their exports, the effect of that statement will be only one thing. That is nice language. It is not the language I would use as an engineer if I were to write about it, if I wanted anyone to understand it.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the Senator any objection to saying what language he would use?

Mr. MALONE. I should say, "Just drop the bars down, boys, and come on in." In other words, our workers who receive $8, $10, $12, or $14 a day will be competing with workers all over the world who receive $2 or $2.50, as well as with slave labor which receive 50 cents, which is a big wage for that kind of labor. We are placing the workingmen of America up against that sort of competition, and the language does not help.

Mr. DONNELL. Can the Senator inform me whether or not this communique has been placed in the RECORD today?

Mr. MALONE. I am not sure.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator object if I were to ask unanimous consent at this time to have the communique issued by the three powers printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks and all colloquy relative to those remarks?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very glad to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the communique will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there is no question that there is only one objective. There has never been more than one objective. I refer to what I called it at San Francisco. After we had finished there, I came east, through Denver. A reporter came to me and asked, "What do you think of the negotiations?" He spoke in a breathless manner. Everyone was approaching this question in a breathless manner. We were going to settle the problems of the world and have perpetual peace. I said to this reporter, "There were 49 nations at San Francisco. Forty-eight of them had market baskets under their arms, and the United States was the only Nation which had anything to put in them. What do you think?" I still think so.

Every country needs and should have sound international trade, but such trade cannot be built on discriminatory tariffs, artificial rates of exchange, and political rather than economic considerations.

Of particular importance is the overevaluation of foreign currencies.

There might be some temporarily disconcerting results if all currencies were to settle down to their true values, but it would be no worse than the sword of uncertainty that now hangs over the British pound.

If we stop to think we realize that money plays no part in foreign trade. It is an exchange of products which are simply measured in money.

It is the goods content of any currency—its buying power at home—that determines its value. What determines the value of the dollar is its buying power at home; and that would determine the value of the pound sterling if it were let alone. If we let it alone for a little while, if we quit putting the dollar behind it by way of gift loans to bolster the false value, it would find its level very soon.

TRADE SHOULD HELP OTHERS WITHOUT HURTING US

We must trade with the entire world, but do so on a basis that helps the other fellow without hurting us.

There should be no such thing as high or low tariffs; there should be only proper tariffs flexibly arrived at to insure fair and reasonable competition. This is not a 6-month job. It is not a year's job. It is a job for generations.

What should we do about England? What should we do about the others? We must do our honest best to help the world to permanent economic stability.

There is one certain way which will fail to do this—by continuing to weaken ourselves.

The answer to prosperity for the Asiatic coolie is not poverty for the American worker. We must help all workers to start upward, not drive ourselves down.

This would protect the American worker and be a constant inducement for the countries which now exploit their workers to set their living standards more nearly on the American level. This would be a great boon to foreign labor.

In other words, Mr. President, during the present debate on this floor it was pointed out that when we lower the floor on wages or when we have a fixed tariff or fixed import fee which cannot be changed for 3 years, the incentive for other countries is to lower their costs and lower their wages, drive their workers down, in their standard of living, so as to reduce total costs and be able to come under the fixed tariffs. But if the tariffs had flexibility and were administered under a foreign-trade authority, as I suggest, which would be only the present Tariff Commission, but would be working in that field, the flexible import fee would take care of that situation. Then, when a nation tried to lower the wages of its workers, when it found that it was simply paying the difference into the Treasury of the United States, it would soon decide that it might as well pay that money to its own workers, instead of to the United States Treasury. In that case, all the nations would be working with us, instead of against us. In my opinion, that is what we must do if we are ever to make any progress in this world in respect to bringing about higher standards of living.

For example, if a nation knew that cut-price merchandise could not be sold in America, the price could be safely raised, and so could the wages of the workers who made the goods.

The extra price would also finance the purchase of machinery which would enable the workers to produce more with less time and effort.

In this country we have about 7 horsepower of electric energy for every worker. That fact is rarely mentioned. Workers in other countries have, in some instances, less than 2 horsepower per worker, and in some countries the workers have no electric energy at all available to help them. Of course, both the tools and the horsepower available to each worker increase the worker's production.

Mr. President, it is impossible to do in 3 or 5 years the job of raising the standards of living all over the world. It is impossible for the other nations to be able to build and finance great projects of this sort in a limited period of time. So we are talking about the work of generations—25, 50, 75, or in some cases 100 years. Think of the Chinese coolies. In China, I was fortunate enough to be able to go pretty well over the country. I was in Peking when the Communists were said to be 8 miles away from the city. They were the so-called agrarian Communists, that we heard about for so long. I was in a camp with General Fu and with a number of other Chinese generals. Without going into detail, let me point out that around Shanghai we saw Chinese coolies going up and down the canal bank, each with a long bamboo pole across his shoulders. Those coolies would go along the canal 10 or 15 miles, at a dog trot, carrying heavy burdens balanced on the ends of those bamboo poles. After carrying one heavy burden for 10, 15, or perhaps even 20 miles, they would deliver it at its destination, and then would pick up something else. Such labor scarcely can be said to result in a standard of living. Mr. President, we are about the only nation in the world that can have a real depression without having its people starve to death.

The promise of British prosperity did not come from the American worker, who is now paying the bill. It came from the British politicians; and its fulfillment is not, and cannot, be the responsibility of our people, who now are making the sacrifices that preserve what is left of the English illusion.

EQUAL ACCESS TO ALL MARKETS

I am sure no one wants to hold a tariff umbrella over the head of inefficient business. In America, which is more free of monopoly than any other country on earth, that could not be the case, because domestic competition is adequate to force maximum efficiency and alert technological improvements.

In such a policy, two situations are envisioned: Free currency valuation, and equal access to all markets.

A good example of the currency valuation handicap under which American industry is working today is found in the woolen business. America must go abroad for about two-thirds of its wool, most of which comes from the sterling area. The American purchasing agent goes into the market with pounds which cost his firm $4.03, while the English purchasing agent has pounds that cost less than $3. Our people are not allowed to purchase in the sterling area with pounds which cost us less than $4.03. On the brown market, pounds can be bought for as little as $2.10, but our people are not allowed to use them, whereas the English purchasing agent uses pounds which cost him less than $3. Our purchasing agents must go into the market with pounds costing $4.03. Yet, in the market place both of those pounds have identical purchasing power.

The matter of equal access to all markets goes hand in hand with honest currency value.

If nation X has something that America might want to buy, under present conditions it might be necessary for nation X to first sell the goods to nation Y, who, in turn, would sell them to us with a stiff markup.

The question may arise: Do we have any right to interfere with the policies of the nations with whom we deal?

The answer is found in the analogy of a banker who is considering an application for a loan submitted by a man who is known to have certain bad habits in the handling of money.

As long as the banker has made no loan, he has no right to criticize that man's way of life. But as a condition of the loan, it is his obligation to determine the proper safeguard, because he is the steward of his depositors' money. After all, it was not the banker who suggested the loan.

Mr. President, I say to you that the Senate of the United States is the steward of the money of the taxpayers of the United States; and it is the duty of the Senate, when it puts the money of the United States taxpayers into other hands, especially when it puts their money into foreign hands, to expect not only that repayment will be made but that fair treatment will be received and that the standard of living of the people of the United States will not be interfered with. After all, in the example I just gave, it was not the banker who suggested the loan; and, after all, it is not the Congress of the United States that suggests the loan in this case. It is the foreign countries that suggest the loan.

So we have the duty of stewardship for the money of our taxpayers. We should not pour out their money, to the extent of billions of dollars, with no chance of return and no chance of improvement in the condition of the people for whom the money is held in trust.

From the results obtained from the program to date, beginning with lend-lease, and then continuing with UNRRA, the British loan, the Marshall plan, ECA, and now with the newspapers full of reports about additional foreign requests for funds from the United States, it must be clear to almost everyone where we are headed with the particular type of help and assistance we are giving, and under the conditions under which we are giving it.

Similarly, when the administrators of the United States Government grant some of its taxpayers' money to a foreign country it has not only the right but the obligation to see that the recipient conducts himself in a fair and businesslike fashion.

Naturally everyone in business is going to jockey for a stronger position in the market place, but the present policies and practices of shearing Uncle Sam are beyond endurance.

There is a great demand today for some device to balance American foreign trade.

As a matter of fact trade balances itself in strange ways.

It was said that during the twenties America exported far too much and imported far too little.

Actually much of this so-called trade was not trade; it was a series of transactions under which American bankers sold the bonds of other nations to American investors and the money was used to buy American goods. That money was never paid. That is the way much of this money was raised and the way it was used.

These transactions were not trade until and unless the bonds were paid off, and huge quantities of them were not. The amount of these repudiations must be subtracted from the so-called export surplus. It is held up to the people of the United States of America that, as a result of the trade-agreements program, we have increased our foreign trade, when as a matter of fact I shall submit definite proof during the course of this address, proof by way of a table, showing that we have not increased our export trade one iota. We have simply increased it to the extent of our gift loans to the foreign nations.

Similarly, the huge imbalance in our present situation is not the result of genuine trade. The American taxpayer puts up the money, and the dollars are used to buy American goods. We are now the recipients of a further request, indeed it is more than a request, for in my humble opinion it has been agreed to secretly how the money will be spent. They will not even buy the goods

in America with the money we give them, so we can make further subtractions. This is not a sale; it is a gift, and when we talk about how much more we are selling than we are buying it is nonsense. To get our real trade balance we must subtract the amount of the gifts. The key to balanced trade lies in letting the people conduct it with free currencies.

Mr. President, the Government should never attempt to conduct it, in any case.

They make their bargains, arrange their payments, and settle up.

If there is a shortage of goods at one end of the line a special kind of goods—gold—is used to make up the difference.

Fair tariffs are no hindrance to this kind of trade.

As a matter of fact, fair tariffs help sound trade because they protect the stability and earning power of the other fellow's market.

The American worker is now the greatest market in the world, but if his employment and his wage standards were to be destroyed by free trade he would not be worth anything to anybody, including himself.

I shall explain what I mean by that statement. Here we are, with a national income of $226 billion. Every nation in the world has its eye on this income, this great purchasing power, and if they could get two or three or four billion dollars apiece of this income, they do not see that it could hurt us very much, and they would be rich. Let us see what it would do to us. Let us say we allow them to have $1 billion, $3 billion, or $5 billion of our national income; the more they take of this income, the less purchasing power the workingman of America has, and when his purchasing power is decreased, the amount of goods he can buy is decreased. We already have complaints from other countries that their trade fell off this year, because, as they called it, we had a recession. We did not have a recession. They were bringing in goods and cutting down our income. Therefore, we did not have the income that they thought we had with which to buy goods from them. So what happens? They come and get the income and put our workingmen on the street and they go on unemployment insurance. So it is a two-way thing, so far as we are concerned. The income stopped, and even they themselves do not have what they thought was here, and we do not have it, either.

BIPARTISAN-POLICY MYTH

Mr. President, I come now to something which has haunted the Senate ever since I have been a Member of it—the bipartisan-policy myth.

There can be no bipartisan foreign policy, first, until there is a foreign policy that stops at the water's edge.

This evident truth was first laid down by the late Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, when he stated in 1941 that the foreign policy should stop at the water's edge. James F. Byrnes, a former Secretary of State, supported Senator Glass in his pronouncement that the foreign policy should in no way be connected with the domestic economy.

It will be remembered that the Republican conference at Mackinac Island held during the summer of 1941 formally established the principle that the domestic economy policy and the foreign policy must be two separate subjects, and that the State Department should have nothing whatever to do with forming the Nation's economic policy.

However, the present Secretary of State has attempted in every way possible to tie the two together, as witnessed by the testimony of Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in January of this year in support of the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act now before the Senate, when he said:

"1. The European recovery program (Marshall plan or ECA) extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

"2. The 1934 trade-agreements program is an integral part of our overall program for world economic recovery.

"3. The International Trade Organization, upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action provides a long-term mechanism—each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole."

Mr. President, the State Department has tied the domestic economy of this Nation to the foreign policy. Yet we have men on the floor of the Senate who still mouth the bipartisan policy.

It will be seen from the statements of the administration spokesmen that under their procedure a bipartisan foreign policy is impossible without extending it to national economic affairs.

The second step of the three-phase program was inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle, on the theory that the more we divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the world, the less their trade-balance deficits will be each year.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has been labeled "reciprocal trade," yet that phrase does not occur in the 1934 act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade under a more appealing name. That is the significance of the proposed 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which is before the Senate at this time.

The phrase "reciprocal trade" is just one more catchword boiled up out of a mess of catchwords and historic slogans such as "make the world safe for democracy," "the four freedoms," "the forgotten man," "economic royalists," "we owe it to ourselves," "we cannot be prosperous in a starving world," then comes the "bold new program," and dozens of other pithy expressions which divert the minds of men during times of extreme nervous stress and strain.

I wonder whether the American people will ever wake up and realize that some nation had better stay prosperous in a world that has had starving people through 5,000 years of recorded history. This dream of reciprocal trade, as now advocated in our world of plenty, will prove to be just one more method of dividing our substance with the nations of low-wage living standards by importing unemployment, instead of helping them to help themselves.

That is the answer, Mr. President, to the question of the senior Senator from Missouri as to what is meant by all the verbiage in the announcement of the New York Times regarding the international conference today.

THE COST OF OUR GIVEAWAY PROGRAMS: THE RUINATION OF AMERICA

Will we ever realize that huge loans and gifts to foreign nations, made without any definite international policy geared to our ability to pay, can only mean lower wages for Americans?

Will we ever understand that the pouring out of such floods of our substance—whether released by the direct action of congressional appropriations, by treaty commitments, forcing us to pay indirect reparations through one foreign nation to another; by the funds which come through the Import-Export Bank, through the securities sold to the American public by the World Bank, or by means of trade treaties which stifle our own production by importation of the merchandise and commodities of the low-wage nations of the world—that all this is all part of the grand plan directed at the same goal of lowering the standard of living of the American people?

Mr. President, every newspaper we pick up relates how some nation is going to get some funds from the Import-Export Bank. It is another kind of aid, but it will require appropriations, just the same.

THE LOSS OF OUR FOREIGN MARKETS

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act was passed for the purpose, among others, "of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States." At another place I shall examine whether this purpose is still part of the trade-agreements program, and whether this objective was accomplished. The act did not increase the markets for the goods of the United States. In the postwar era, we are increasingly shut off from the markets of the world by an economic stranglehold.

Discrimination against American goods has never been worse than it is at present. The Trade Agreements Act provides the President with the power to enforce the reduction of barriers against United States commodities, but this power is not being used. Through the use of bilateral trade agreements—which are really barter agreements, of the kind Hitler used—the United States is shut out of more and more foreign markets. Our export markets in South America, Africa, and Asia are being reduced by barter agreement with European nations. Their number has increased beyond anything Hitler ever dreamed of. The United States is denied not only equal access but almost all access to the markets of all the nations of the world.

Mr. President, instead of increasing the foreign markets for goods of the United States of America, we have reduced our tariffs and import fees to an all-time low, and foreign nations have increased their controls, their quotas, embargoes, the manipulation of their currencies, the specifications, the licenses—every type of control has been invoked by foreign nations, and they have made trade a one-way street.

Not only do barter agreements exclude the importation of goods of American origin by other nations, but exchange control and other forms of restrictions are building a high wall of restrictions against our exports, while foreign nations piously sign trade agreements while we call for the reduction of tariff barriers.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT DID NOT REDUCE TRADE BARRIERS

Instead of using the act for the purpose for which it was designed orginally, to increase markets for the products of the United States, and to decrease barriers against international trade, the act has become a hollow shell with respect to its original purpose, and has become a "foreign assistance" program, a weapon of the do-gooders, the fellow-travelers of foreign interests, in the State Department.

We are entitled to equal access to the markets of all the world, and we do not use the best weapon at our command to achieve that end.

TARIFFS ABROAD NO LONGER IMPORTANT

The tariff reductions which have been made under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act have not been international contracts where each party benefits by the other party's concessions. Instead, they have had the same effect as a one-way reduction of our tariffs by us would have had. Tariffs, except in the case of the United States, are no longer important barriers against the flow of international trade. They are minor factors.

Among the foreign nations using all the other forms of control such as barter agreements, exchange control, exchange manipulation, import licenses, quotas, and embargoes, tariffs have lost all effectiveness in controlling the flow of imports. The only and last country in which tariffs can still be effectively used in protecting the health of the domestic economy and the welfare of the country—where tariffs can still control the amount of imports—is the United States. We are losing access to foreign markets, and

are not doing anything about it. The Trade Agreements Act, as it is now used by the State Department, is not used to demand and enforce equal access to the markets of the world for the United States.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ARE IN REALITY TARIFF-REDUCTION AGREEMENTS

The name "trade agreements" for the treaties signed with foreign countries, under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, is a misnomer if there ever was one. A trade agreement is an agreement between two nations for the interchange of specific commodities, either in terms of volume, or in terms of value.

The agreements which the State Department insists on calling trade agreements are in reality tariff reduction or import fee reduction agreements. They do not deal with the interchange of specific commodities, but provide for the reduction of tariffs. Although these so-called trade agreements are bilateral or multilateral in the sense that there are two or more parties to them, the fact that the tariff reductions by the foreign nations have been ineffective through the use of other, stricter forms of control over imports, have made these trade agreements really one-sided tariff reductions.

The United States, through the hands of the State Department, has reduced the tariffs and import fees on imports into the United States without getting anything in return from other nations.

Under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, no trade agreement has ever been made. But our tariffs are now among the lowest in the world and do not constitute a barrier against imports. Had the 1934 Trade Agreements Act been called by the right name, a Tariff Reduction Agreement Act, I wonder whether the State Department propaganda machine would have been quite so successful in selling the free-trade philosophy to the American people.

SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS NEVER USED TO REDUCE BARRIERS

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act provides "That the President may suspend the application" of lower tariffs and import fees "to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts and policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section." The act says, further: "The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation" of lowered duties "in whole or in part."

Those provisions give the administration a strong weapon to enforce the reduction of the barriers against international trade. The ever-growing discriminations against the exports of American goods could have been prevented, but they were not. Foreign countries could have been forced, at the danger of losing the advantages of low American tariffs, to lower the barriers which have taken such varied forms, particularly since the end of the Second World War, but the State Department elected to reduce our tariffs and import fees more and more without regard for the increasing restrictions against us abroad, nor for any injury to domestic industries or the workingmen of America.

The provision in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for the suspension of the lowered tariffs or import fees on imports from a country discriminating against American commerce has only been invoked twice during the 15 years of the act. Before the war Germany, and for a short while Australia, were found to discriminate against American exports, and were therefore not given the benefits of the reduced tariff rates set in the trade agreements negotiated with other nations. But, Mr. President, no other restrictions have been invoked.

At the present time the provision is not being applied at all. Our low rates of duty apply to all the nations of the world. I am very conscious of the fact, however, that almost all countries do discriminate against American exports, through the various strict controls which I mentioned earlier.

BARRIERS AGAINST UNITED STATES GOODS

What are the restrictions which foreign nations have put about against the imports of the United States?

There are several kinds of barriers to international trade aside from the mildest one, tariffs. One of the easiest to apply, and one of the most efficient, is foreign-exchange control. This is only effective, however, in countries whose currency is not freely acceptable and convertible into others in foreign trade. For example, a French importer is unable to purchase American goods for francs. He must purchase dollars at his bank, and this purchase of dollars can be easily controlled by the French authorities by withholding issuance of dollars for nonessential purchases.

Another frequently concurrent control over imports is exercised by import licensing. In this case the importer has to apply for and obtain a Government permit to import certain commodities.

I might say that a shining example of such control is operated by the Dutch Government in Indonesia. They control all of the importers and exporters. They have about 5 importing firms, and nothing can be taken into the country unless it goes through one of these importing firms. Further, they control how much goes to an Indonesian who sells a dollar's worth of goods, to America, for instance, because the Indonesian does not get the dollar, it goes into the exchange pool which I have explained earlier. So the Dutch have complete control. They have the police control, they have the import and export control, and they have the money-exchange-pool control. That, Mr. President, constitutes control of the nation. It is practiced in all the empire-minded nations' colonies. The difference lies just in the matter of degree.

In some countries having exchange controls in addition to the licensing system, the foreign exchange is made available automatically after the issuance of the import permit. In other countries, having both controls, an exchange permit has to be obtained separately, with no guaranty that the issuance of one will be followed by the issuance of the other.

A third form of nontariff barriers exists in the form of bilateral clearing or compensation agreements. This control is independent of tariffs. In this type of discrimination purchases of goods are arranged between two nations, up to a certain value each way. The importer has no chance to go to the market place for his goods, to obtain them for the best price, and under the best terms, but he is restricted to buying commodities from the nation with whom the bilateral clearing agreement is in force. Although an agreement of this sort leaves the importer a certain freedom of choice regarding what commodities he wants to purchase it is restrictive in keeping other nations from entering the market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, other forms of controls that are entirely separate from tariffs, include the setting up of embargoes against goods from a certain nation. They operate just as the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] which would bar the importation of certain types of glass and handmade crockery from the United States.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada would be greatly disappointed to see the Senate and the Congress of the United States prolong the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which, in my opinion, would result in quotas being invoked in this country next year not on one product alone, but on hundreds of products, in an effort to save the American workingman.

The most vicious of the restrictive trade policies which are being followed by all the nations of the world, with the exception of the United States, is the negotiation of the so-called bilateral trade agreements. These agreements, which are in reality barter agreements, provide for the interchange of specified commodities in specified amounts or value. This completely disrupts the normal channels of international trade, and is used to great advantage for political purposes.

That is a practice in which our Nation has never indulged, but it is a practice in which the other nations of the world have always indulged, and has been accentuated now because of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which has made it possible to tie our hands with a low tariff so other nations can manipulate their trade in any way they want to, through embargoes, quotas, currency monopolies, or licenses or specifications, and we are helpless. We shall be helpless until we wake up. Then we will indulge in the same practice. But where will it get us, Mr. President? It will get us nowhere.

Other methods of nontariff import controls may also well be used. A nation may call for specifications in the imports of certain goods which can only be filled by the products of a certain nation. For example: A nation specifies that only trucks or automobiles of a certain weight may run on the roads of one of its colonial possessions. Oddly enough it happens that this particular nation is the only one which makes such a truck or automobile. This certainly is a barrier against the free flow of international trade. This particular wrinkle has been used successfully in Bermuda, where only automobiles of British origin fill the allowable specifications to run on the island.

One of the more devious methods to control trade is the manipulation of currencies. This method, however, I have elaborated at a different point in my address. Its ramifications extend far beyond the tariff field, and I shall merely mention it here as one of the factors used to control imports, and to upset the normal flow of commodities in international trade.

The result of all these restrictive practices is the maintenance of political power over colonial areas and territories, and the channeling of trade for political purposes. The State Department and the President have not used the weapon at their command to reduce these restrictive practices, but have used the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for a purpose for which it was not designed—the unilateral reduction of United States tariffs and import fees.

Mr. President, according to the reports appearing in the New York Times of this morning, and in other morning newspapers, the State Department and the President not only have not used the weapon at their command to reduce these restrictive practices, but they have entered into an agreement, in my opinion a secret agreement, to allow these practices to continue.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT IS A PROPAGANDA WEAPON

Mr. President, as I have said before, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is frequently

referred to as the Reciprocal Trade Act, even here on the floor of the Senate. Webster's International Dictionary defines reciprocity as follows:

"That relation or policy as to trade or other interests between countries under which special advantages are granted by one side in consideration of special advantages granted by the other."

First of all, the word reciprocity or reciproca does not appear in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, except in relation to the Cuban-United States agreement of 1902, and that is just as well. The benefits which we extended to foreign nations in our trade agreements have certainly not been reciprocated. The benefit which we gave the other party to our so-called trade agreements was the reduction of our tariffs. In return the foreign nation was to reduce its tariffs.

Legally speaking, they have done that as a stratagem, but have immediately nullified the tariff reduction by the imposition of some control over imports much more effective than the former tariff. Frequently currency devaluation was used to reduce the benefit which was to accrue to the United States from their reduction of tariffs. Yes, they did reduce their tariffs, but, before any court of the United States that kind of evasion of performance of a contract would have invalidated it. However, the State Department and the President have accepted the discrimination that resulted from the nonperformance of the contract. In fact, then, the operation of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act has not resulted in reciprocity for our tariff reductions, and we have given something for which there was absolutely no return benefit.

I charge that the use of the phrase "reciprocal trade" was merely a catch phrase to make the Trade Agreements Act palatable to the American people. "Trade" is desirable, and so is "reciprocity." Anyone will express himself in favor of those words, and that was the basis of the propaganda that has been pouring from the State Department and the proponents of the Trade Agreements Act for 15 years. "Free trade," too, is a highly desirable objective, and it has been sold to the American people, along with "reciprocal trade." Yes, free trade is desirable if it can be pursued without injury to our domestic economy. But if "free trade" is to be achieved at the cost of the American wage standard of living, if it is to be achieved at the cost of American unemployment, and reduction and extermination of our domestic industries, it is a dangerous phrase and one that should be labeled "dangerous trade propaganda."

It is a curious coincidence that Karl Marx once said that "The free-trade system hastens the social revolution." If we want free trade, we must realize that it is only feasible between equals, equals in standards of living and in productivity. If we desire free trade today, we cannot have it between equals, and it only results in bringing down our standard of living to that of the people whom we have tried to benefit. The result will be a United States which is weak and destitute, and the last example in the world of the benefits of free enterprise will have vanished from the face of the earth.

Here is an example of what happened in the operation of our trade agreement with the United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM INCREASES BARRIERS TO AMERICAN EXPORTERS

Under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 a trade agreement was entered into with the United Kingdom in 1938 which became effective in 1939.

This trade agreement was to reduce tariffs on products imported from the United Kingdom in exchange for their reducing barriers to our exports to their country. In other words, the purpose of the agreement was to increase United States exports to the United Kingdom in exchange for increased imports into the United States from the United Kingdom. What has been the effect of this trade agreement?

Since the end of the war in 1945 the United Kingdom has been raising various types of barriers to United States exports and the exports of other countries. These barriers take the form of exchange controls, import licensing, and embargoes or absolute prohibition of imports of certain commodities.

One of the most interesting components of this system of barriers raised by the United Kingdom against imports was the establishment by the British in 1946 of the token import plan. This plan is still in effect and limits the import of 200 different products into the United Kingdom to 20 percent, Mr. President, of such imports during the 3-year base period 1936, 1937, and 1938, prior to the war. The sum total of the imports from the United States of these 200 commodities during the prewar base period was $15,000,000 per year, hence, imports into the United Kingdom from the United States of these 200 commodities is now limited to $3,000,000 per year. That agreement is still in effect. Do we see any reciprocity in that arrangement?

The exports from the United States to the United Kingdom and imports from the United Kingdom into the United States by years from 1930 to the present are shown in table I.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

Year	Exports from United States to United Kingdom	Imports from United Kingdom to United States
1930	$678,000,000	$210,000,000
1931	456,000,000	135,000,000
1932	288,000,000	75,000,000
1933	312,000,000	111,000,000
1934	383,000,000	115,000,000
1935	433,000,000	155,000,000
1936	440,000,000	200,000,000
1937	536,000,000	203,000,000
1938	521,000,000	118,000,000
1939	505,000,000	149,000,000
1940	1,012,000,000	155,000,000
1941	1,637,000,000	136,000,000
1942	2,529,000,000	134,000,000
1943	4,505,000,000	105,000,000
1944	5,243,000,000	84,000,000
1945	2,189,000,000	88,000,000
1946	856,000,000	156,000,000
1947	1,103,000,000	205,000,000
1948	[1] 644,000,000	290,000,000
1949: January to June	391,000,000	112,000,000

[1] Of this $499,000,000 was ECA financed. Commercial exports derived by subtracting ECA-financed exports from total exports.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade.

Mr. MALONE. This table shows that the treaty went into effect in 1939. At that time we had $505,000,000 of exports from the United States to the United Kingdom. Excluding the years 1940 to 1945 inclusive, which took in the war years, we skip to 1946, when we had $856,000,000 of exports to Great Britain. In 1947 we had $1,103,000,000 worth of exports to Great Britain; in 1948, $644,000,000. Subtracting the amount of our contribution in goods to Great Britain, which is included in the $644,000,000 we find that we get about $145,000,000 worth of exports. That is what the trade agreement with Great Britain has done for us. In 1939 there were $505,000,000 worth of exports. In 1938 the amount was $521,000,000; and in 1937, $536,000,000. For prior years it was sometimes slightly less and sometimes slightly more, back to 1930. But when the great exodus of cash to the nations of Europe started, if we subtract the $499,000,000, it leaves very little on our side of the ledger.

Of the total exports of $1,035,000,000 from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, $536 million were paid commercial exports. This is an annual average of $357 million. The annual average for the 2 years 1937 and 1938, prior to the trade agreement with England, was $528 million. Hence, our commercial exports to the United Kingdom during 1948 and 1949 have been far below what they were prior to the 1939 trade agreement. In fact, our commercial exports are running only 68 percent of the pretrade-agreement level.

On the other hand, our imports from the United Kingdom since the 1939 trade agreement with them, which provides for lower tariffs on our part, have increased. The value of our imports from the United Kingdom for the 2 years, 1937 and 1938, before the trade agreement averaged $161 million annually. For the past 2½ years, ending June 30, 1949, our imports from the United Kingdom have average $240 million. This is an increase of 49 percent over the annual pretrade-agreement average.

I ask Senators to consider for a moment the tremendous decrease in our exports to the United Kingdom and the tremendous increase in their exports to us, since the signing of the trade agreement between this country and the United Kingdom.

In summary, then, we find that the consequence of our trade agreement with the United Kingdom which first became effective January 1, 1939, has been a decline of 32 percent in our exports, and an increase of 49 percent in our imports from the United Kingdom.

It is perfectly clear from these facts that the theory upon which the trade-agreements program was based has proven absolutely false. If they had not invoked the quotas, embargoes, currency manipulations, and the dozens of other subterfuges to prevent our exports from reaching the United Kingdom, it is perfectly possible that some good might have come from the agreement; but the provision of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act has not been utilized to reduce these barriers to our exports to the United Kingdom.

The New Dealers urged the passage of the Trade Agreements Act to increase our exports. They sold the American people on the theory that any lowering of our tariffs would be accompanied by a corresponding lowering of the barriers to our exports on the part of foreign countries with whom we made trade agreements. It has not worked that way at all. We have lowered our tariffs, while many of the nations with whom we have made agreements—and the United Kingdom is an outstanding example—have increased their barriers to our exports. There is nothing reciprocal about such trade agreements.

Let me repeat that we lowered our tariffs on English goods in what we believed was a reciprocal trade. But England has increased her barriers against our exports. The result is that our commercial exports to England have fallen off greatly since the trade agreement, while our imports from England have greatly increased. Great Britain is one of the 3 nations which have just completed an international conference here. Further concessions to Great Britain were requested, further entree into the markets of the United States, further lowering of customs barriers, and thus further lowering of the floor under wages. All this means importing more unemployment into the United States. The present administration has the brass to call this a Fair Deal. If this is what the President and the State Department mean by Fair Deal, it is time for a fresh deal as well as a new deck.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT AND RECIPROCITY ARE PARADOX

I stated earlier that reciprocity was not part of the effect of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. There is another reason why the benefits from the trade agreements could not well be reciprocal. The trade agreements made under the authority of the act have always included the most-favored-nation

clause in its unconditional form. Reciprocity in trade agreements, and the application of the most-favored-nation clause are really two diametrically opposed concepts.

I shall cite several reasons why this is so. The most-favored-nation clause guarantees that tariff reductions on any given commodity apply to imports from all sources, unless they discriminate against American exports. This reduced rate, then, is applicable to every other country wanting to export to the United States. "Reciprocity," however, means that a special benefit is given to a country in return for an equivalent benefit. It hardly seems that those two terms can live together very happily.

Friends of the trade-agreements program point out that tariff negotiations with a specific country concern only those goods of which the negotiating country is the major supplier. If this were always true, we could assume that the contracting party would be the principal beneficiary under the trade agreement. Unfortunately, there are a good many cases in which a trade agreement has been negotiated reducing the tariff on a specific commodity of which the other party was the principal supplier, but after the reduction, some third nation would suddenly expand the production of this commodity and take over the supplier position. The third country, we must remember, could enter its imports at the same favorable rates as the first one, through the operation of the most-favored-nation clause.

That brings me again to the point that while a tariff on any commodity might correctly represent the differential in cost of production or cost of manufacture in competition with our own higher cost of production at a particular moment, within 6 months or a year, the economies of all nations being in a state of flux, changing relationships might result in the tariff not correctly representing the differential.

In other words, this is not the only point where another nation may take more of an advantage of the markets through a reduction of the tariff. Also, Mr. President, the economic relationships between nations change, just as the economic relationships between individuals change, over the years. They are always in a state of flux. Therefore, it is utter idiocy to say that a 3-year agreement can be made to apply for the full 3 years to the changing economic relationships between 2 nations. That simply cannot be done.

That situation clearly demonstrates the advantage of a flexible import fee under which a Foreign Trade Authority would have absolute latitude, just as the Interstate Commerce Commission does in the fixing of freight rates, to adjust the import fee either up or down, according to the changing economic conditions between nations or, as I have already said, in connection with the manipulation of currencies or the purchasing by governments, to undersell goods in our markets, to secure dollars to be traded elsewhere at a profit.

Mr. President, whenever the statement has been made on the floor of the Senate that some conditions should be attached to the ECA money or the Marshall-plan money we give to foreign countries and that that money simply should not be given to foreign countries in the way a profligate person might be given sufficient money to last him for a year, and then be permitted to dissipate it, we have been told that no conditions should be attached to the money we give to other nations. Many Senators have offered perfectly fair amendments, which it would be proper to adopt if the money is to be spent for the purposes stated. However, all amendments were rejected; we were told that no amendments whatever could be added to the bill, that this is a sacred thing which cannot be touched.

Why were the amendments rejected? Why was there a complete unwillingness to accept any amendments? It was because of the argument that we in the United States cannot direct what another nation shall do; we must let each of the other nations have the kind of government it wants. I agree that we should let other nations have the kind of government they want; but let them have the kind of government they want at their expense, not at ours. The final result is that we have inserted no amendments at all; we have provided no limitations at all.

However, we have learned from sad experience what happens when we give money, without limitation, to other nations. This is not the first time we have had such a sad experience. I served, along with many others, in the First World War; and we know that following that war, money was borrowed from the United States by various European countries, although generally under a different name, but, whatever they were called, the repayment was of the same kind—in other words, none at all. So we have learned, the hard way, that we cannot control other nations.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us have an American program so that it will be to the interest of the other nations to do the right thing—to raise the standard of living of their people and to have good government. Then let them run their own government; but in such case their interests will be in common with ours, because they will know exactly under what conditions they can reach our markets, namely, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

FLEXIBLE-IMPORT-FEE SYSTEM GUARANTEES FAIR COMPETITION

The flexible import fee bill which I have offered as an amendment to the pending bill would immediately establish a fair and reasonable competitive basis for markets all over the world. That is all that any business in the United States has ever requested. Why should a foreign nation ask for more?

I have already referred to a case in which a third nation would suddenly expand the production of a certain commodity and thus take over the supplier position. Such a third country, we must remember, could enter its imports at the same favorable rates as the first one would have, through the operation of the most-favored-nation clause.

However, not only did this take place, but frequently the trade agreements affected the tariff rate on commodities for which the negotiating country was only a minor supplier. Let me cite you two examples:

During the prewar decade, France supplied only 17 percent of the rayon broadwoven fabrics imported into the United States, whereas Japan supplied 46 percent. Yet the rate of duty on this commodity was reduced in the trade agreement with France, effective in June of 1936. In this case one can hardly speak of negotiating with the primary supplier. In the same trade agreement with France, silk-woven fabrics were affected by tariff reductions, although France accounted for only 8 percent of the imports of that commodity in the period 1931–40, whereas Japan accounted for 75 percent. In this case the tariff negotiations and reductions were made with a country which supplied less than 10 percent of that commodity.

The record shows that during the life of the amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, the so-called 1934 Trade Agreements Act, 1 of our 2 most dangerous enemies, namely Japan, received the same reductions of duties which were extended to all countries with which we had trade agreements, simply through the operation of the most-favored-nation clause.

On the question of the anomaly of reciprocity and the most-favored-nation clause, the Geneva Agreements for Tariff and Trade, concluded in Geneva in October of 1947, are a good example of what is being done. The special privilege extended to us by each of the participating nations became available to all the nations of the world. In other words, the benefits accruing to the 23 member nations of the GATT are automatically extended to all the nonsignatory nations, including our former enemies.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT HAS NOT INCREASED UNITED STATES EXPORTS

I mentioned earlier that the avowed purpose of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is to expand the foreign markets for the products of the United States. We have been told, time and time again, that this has indeed been accomplished. We have been shown statistics which purported to demonstrate that United States trade with trade-agreement countries increased at a greater rate than with the non-trade-agreement countries. Let us look at the record, so far as it pertains to the exports from the United States to trade-agreement countries and to non-trade-agreement countries.

Mr. President, I submit in this connection a table entitled "The Effect of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act on United States Exports." I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The effect of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act on United States exports

[Table showing the percentage of total United States exports (including reexports) going to the listed countries. Countries 1 to 8 are those with which the United States has had trade agreements during the period shown; countries 9 to 17 did not have trade agreements with the United States. Percentages are based on dollar values. (Compiled from U. S. Government sources.)]

Country	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Effective date of trade agreements
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	
1. France	7.26	5.42	5.12	5.28	4.91	4.32	June 1, 1936.
2. Netherlands	2.9	2.39	2.15	2.16	2.79	3.12	Feb. 1, 1936.
3. Belgium	2.58	2.34	2.55	2.4	2.84	2.49	May 1, 1935.
4. Switzerland	.448	.395	.333	.312	.287	.342	Feb. 15, 1936.
5. Canada	12.6	14.2	14.1	15.7	15.2	15.1	Jan. 1, 1936.
6. Brazil	1.78	1.89	2.0	2.0	2.04	2.0	Do.
7. Cuba [1]	1.5	2.13	2.62	2.75	2.75	2.46	Sept. 3, 1934.
8. Sweden	1.11	1.55	1.67	1.76	1.9	2.07	Aug. 5, 1935.
9. United Kingdom [2]	18.6	17.95	18.9	17.92	16.0	16.8	None during period.
10. Norway	.424	.527	.596	.630	.663	.730	None.
11. Czechoslovakia [3]	0.094	0.129	0.141	0.190	0.395	0.86	Apr. 16, 1938.
12. U. S. S. R.	.536	.705	1.08	1.36	1.28	2.25	None.
13. Japan	8.53	9.89	8.9	8.34	8.62	7.75	Do.
14. Australia	1.57	2.02	2.49	2.38	2.19	2.23	Do.
15. Italy	3.66	3.03	3.16	2.49	2.29	1.88	Do.
16. Mexico	2.24	2.58	2.87	3.1	3.26	2.0	None during period.
17. Argentina	2.2	2.0	2.16	2.32	2.8	2.8	Do.

[1] Cuban preferential tariffs were maintained, but under the trade agreements her comparative preference was increased.

[2] Trade agreement with the United Kingdom did not become effective until Jan. 1, 1939.

[3] Trade agreement went into effect Apr. 16, 1938, therefore figure for 1938 should be ignored.

NOTE.—Germany is not listed in this chart, since the most-favored-nation commitment to Germany was terminated Oct. 15, 1935, and thus she was, with Australia (from August 1936 to February 1938), only nation that did not benefit indirectly through the lowering of tariffs under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the table I have just submitted shows no significant difference in the percentage, based on dollar values, of United States exports going to either trade-agreement countries or non-trade-agreement countries in the period 1933–39, a period more closely normal than either the World War II period or the post-war period. Five of nine countries listed, which did not have a trade agreement with the United States during this period, showed an increase of the percentage of United States exports they absorbed. Of eight countries which did have trade agreements with the United States, starting at some time during this period, as indicated on the margin of the table, only three showed significant increases in the percentage of United States exports they purchased. The remaining countries of each group showed either an erratic fluctuation or an actual decrease in their percentage of exports to the United States.

These figures certainly disprove the contention that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act has increased the export markets for the United States. At best, they prove that the trade agreements have not changed the percentage distribution of United States exports significantly. One might even deduct that the non-trade-agreement countries increased their purchases from the United States, as expressed in the percentage of exports going to these countries, whereas the countries with which we have had trade agreements declined in their percentage participation in United States exports. The purpose of the act has certainly not been accomplished, even during a period in the world's economy which was much more normal than the present.

I have pointed out earlier that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act did not increase the exports to the trade-agreement countries any more rapidly than exports to the non-trade-agreement countries.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table to which I have referred, entitled "Relation of U. S. Exports to U. S. Production Before and After Government Loan-Gifts, 1909–1949."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Relation of United States exports to United States production before and after Government loan-gifts, 1909–49* [1]

Year	Total production of exportable goods	Exports, United States merchandise	Percent of total	U. S. Government grants and loans	Exports minus United States grants and loans	Percent of exports minus United States grants and loans to total exportable goods
	Billions	*Billions*		*Millions*	*Billions*	
1909	$17.4	$1.7	9.8			
1914	20.2	2.1	10.3			
1919	47.5	7.8	16.3	$2,539		9
1921	33.9	4.4	12.9	28		
1923	44.8	4.1	9.1	−70		
1925	47.2	4.8	10.2	−8		
1927	47.5	4.8	10.0	−53		
1929	52.8	5.2	9.8	−14		
1931	32.0	2.4	7.4	7		
1933	25.2	1.6	6.5	5		
1935	33.1	2.2	6.8	0		
1937	43.5	3.3	7.6	48		
1939	41.4	3.1	7.6	16		
1941	65.1	5.0	7.7	1,348	$3.7	5.6
1942	89.0	8.1	9.1	6,434	1.6	1.8
1943	110.7	12.8	11.6	12,767	.1	.1
1944	115.0	14.3	12.4	14,016	.24	.2
1945	103.8	10.3	9.9	7,659	2.7	2.6
1946	100.4	10.0	9.9	5,053	4.9	4.8
1947	130.0	15.2	11.7	5,712	9.5	7.3
1948	[2] 145.4	12.6	8.7	4,658	8.0	5.5
1949, first quarter	[2] 36.0	3.3	9.1	1,568	1.7	4.7

[1] Figures in this table secured from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce. Table prepared by J. B. Crane and C. E. Toro.
[2] Estimated.

NOTE.—For the 6-year period, 1922–27, exports averaged 9.7 percent of United States production of exportable goods; for the 6-year period, 1942–47, exports, minus United States grants and loans, averaged only 2.9 percent of United States production of exportable goods.

Mr. MALONE. The table which I submitted for the record dealt with United States exports during the years 1934 to 1938. This period was taken on purpose because the world economy during that period was more normal than the years following.

During the postwar period we have exported in the neighborhood of ten to twelve billion dollars worth of goods, and we are being high-pressured into appropriating billions of dollars to hold up our exports. If the propaganda machine is not quite frank enough to state the objective so clearly, it is only a thinly disguised propaganda veil.

The extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is merely one part of this foreign-relief program which may benefit some of the domestic producers temporarily, but will spell ruin to the wage standard of living of the American workingman and the American producer alike, in the long run.

AMERICAN INDUSTRIES MOVING ABROAD AS RESULT OF LOW TARIFFS

Mr. President, at this point I should like to say we have in this country many producers of heavy goods, heavy fabricated material, such as machinery, automobiles, typewriters, and road machinery, which temporarily, foreign countries are unable to make in large quantities. I say temporarily because, as explained earlier in the day by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], businessmen, processors, and manufacturers are already thinking, in view of the great point 4 program, the bold new program to guarantee investments, of moving their heavy machinery to other countries, taking their foremen, superintendents, and principal workers to direct the low-cost labor, and to produce machinery at a cost lower than that at which it can possibly be produced in the United States. What happens? When that occurs, just so soon as it has a chance to become effective, they will not only serve the available area in the foreign nations which the great Marshall plan was supposed to develop in order to improve the market for the products of the workingmen and industries of America, but, through this great free-trade method of lowering our import fees and tariffs to a point where there is no competition, they will send the commodities thus manufactured into this country. They will do that, just as Jim Rand, of the Remington Rand Co., my good friend, intends to ship typewriters from Scotland and Ontario, Canada, into this country. He has already abandoned his plants in New York City, leaving several thousand employees there to shift for themselves.

I do not blame Mr. Rand. Those who have created the machinery which has changed the economics of the situation so as to make feasible this kind of trade in foreign-made typewriters should be blamed. The situation is changed. The area of feasibility is changed. Mr. Rand can take his machinery to Scotland, but the workers of America cannot go to Scotland, and they cannot go to Ontario and take the wages they would have to take there, because it would lower their standard of living to such an extent their children would not have an education. They would not know what to do there. Our workers cannot move. Money is fluid; it can go any place; money can be invested any place; but workers cannot be moved from one country to another—not our workers. I may say that heavy machinery, such as automobiles, and the machinery already described are the only things which will not be hurt almost immediately. Everything else will be hurt as soon as the buyer market becomes straightened out; indeed many industries are hurt now, as I shall later show.

For the benefit of some of the export industries, the taxpayer of the United States is paying for the goods which show up so proudly on our export statistics. Approximately 25 cents out of every tax dollar goes to the conduct of our foreign relations.

Let us take a look at the exports from the United States which are normal commercial transactions, in other words, exports which are paid for by the earnings of foreign nations, and not by the taxpayer of the United States.

The following table lists the production of exportable goods in the United States, and the percentage exported. Between 1909 and 1941 the percentage of the exportable goods actually exported has run from 6.5 percent to 12.9 percent with the exception of 1919, when the percentage was 16.3 percent. During that year United States Government grants and "loans" amounted to $2,500,000,000.

Since 1942 the percentage of exportable goods actually exported has ranged from 7.7 percent to 12.4 percent. The 1949 rate of exports, based on the first quarter, is 9.1 percent.

However—and here comes a little leveling off, looking at the situation as it actually exists—if we subtract from the values of exportable goods actually exported the amounts of United States Government loans and grants, we arrive at figures which show how low really the normal exports from the United States are. Ignoring the period during which lend-lease was in operation, the percentage of exports minus United States loans and grants amounts to only 4.8 percent in 1946, 7.3 percent in 1947, and 5.5 percent in 1948. Based on the rate for the first quarter of 1949, the "normal" exports amounted only to 4.7 percent of the production of exportable goods in the United States.

Mr. President, I shall state why I had the table made up. We get information on every hand. Consider the increase in exports—$12 billion. Exportations from the United States to foreign countries have not changed materially in percentage over the course of 30 years, when we subtract from

the exports the amount of dollars given to the nations to buy our goods. In other words, we are in exactly the same position as the grocer who feels his business is slipping. He goes to a bank and says, "I want to borrow some money. I want to borrow $10,000. I am losing my business. I am going to give this money to my customers. The customers are going broke." Perhaps he can make the banker believe it, the first time, and he gets the $10,000 and puts it out in the neighborhood. He gets back about 50 percent of it and does quite a business. But finally he fails to convince the banker, so he goes out of business. There is only one real difference between an individual conducting his business in an unbusinesslike way and a nation following the same course. The individual is through when his banker quits him. A nation is through when its money has but little value. That is the only difference. So I would describe table 2, which I have submitted for the RECORD, "Relations of United States Exports to United States Production Before and After Government Loan-Gifts, 1909–1949."

I may say to the Senate it will be a revelation to many to see how it acts, after we subtract the money taken from the pockets of the taxpayers of America. Some of them are beginning to object quite strenuously to keeping up foreign trade on that basis, I may say. The first column gives the year. The second column shows the total production of exportable goods, in billions of dollars. The third column shows the exports of United States merchandise, in billions of dollars. The next column shows the percentage. We then come to the column headed "United States Government grants and loans," stated in millions of dollars, which, subtracted from the column showing total production of exportable goods, gives another percentage figure, and so on. The next column shown exports minus United States grants and loans, in billions of dollars, and that gives an entirely different figure. In the last column is the second percentage—the percentage of exports minus United States grants and loans to total exportable goods.

That, Mr. President, tells the tale. That tells us where our money is going and just what kind of effect it has on our foreign trade. It is very revealing, I may say.

These figures show that the exports of goods from the United States has decreased consistently, if we take into consideration the exports for which the American taxpayer puts up the funds.

To talk about the 1934 Trade Agreements Act increasing the markets for the goods of the United States is plainly silly, in the light of these tables. Anyone can increase exports, if he wants to start exporting gifts. Philanthropy is a fine virtue, but if, in the guise of philanthropy, we use the funds of the taxpayer to foster the existence of empire nations, the exploitation of the subjugated peoples of the world, all we shall earn for our so-called philanthropy is hatred and the growth of alien political philosophies abroad. The active support we are giving to the socialist countries, which are socialist in their home countries, and empire-minded abroad, may well spell the doom of the United States as we now know them.

EMPIRE NATIONS STILL EXPLOITING COLONIAL PEOPLES

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate that it was my good fortune to spend a little time in the Tropics, in Batavia, in Indonesia, where the new government was established and which the Dutch knocked over a little later through the use of our money. We are spending millions of dollars over there to keep the people under the colonial yoke. The same is true in Singapore, Saigon, and Indochina. I visited those nations and found, first, that the empire-minded nations did not give the residents of those countries a fair share of the earnings. I have already described how they do it through an exchange pool in Indonesia, and it is done to a little lesser degree on the same principle in the other nations I have mentioned. But this may not be the most serious part of the picture over there. We have stated that under the United Nations every nation is going to be free. That is what was said in San Francisco. Every nation is going to shift for itself. It is going to hold up its head and have a higher standard of living. Why are we pounding the ears off the little Far Eastern people, furnishing money to buy the guns to do this job? What are we going to do with Holland or England or France if they lose their colonies? I do not know. But over a period of 2,000 years there has been a great deal of progress. Not always the same people have been progressing. If we are to stop all this progress, it will be quite a job.

The worst thing, in my opinion, is the fact that the people of the Far East know we are spending this money, they know where the money is coming from, and they know the Dutch would not be in Indonesia if it were not for the money coming from the United States. The Malayan people know that the English would not be in Singapore if it were not for the money coming from the United States. So what is the effect? It is not hard to guess. We are furnishing the money to keep them under the colonial yoke. Russia has promised them relief from the yoke. So, without any fanfare of drums, they are just waiting for the time to arrive, and eventually the people of those nations will try to kill everyone close to them and join with Russia. I see grave indications that we may be there. The British are arming Hong Kong. I have a newspaper clipping with reference to that subject.

UNITED STATES HAS NO ASIATIC POLICY

Mr. President, we are not sure at this time what the agreement is as to moving into Hong Kong. I do not say that we should not move into Hong Kong. I am saying that if we are going to move into Hong Kong, we need, first, an Asiatic policy, and we need to know where we are going from Hong Kong. I have seen China all the way from the Great Wall and beyond, I have been to the Equator and down to Melbourne, Australia. During World War II, I spent some time in New Guinea, Port Moresby, and other points. The people of these nations are not slaves; other nations have made slaves of them. We are fooling with fire. As I said earlier today, our course could lead us into a terrible conflict for which we are not ready. We are not ready for it because we do not have an Asiatic policy, and we do not have a European policy. What we need to do is to sit down in the cool of the evening, without the aid of any foreign nations, add this thing up, and determine what our Asiatic policy should be.

When I traveled from one end of China to the other, several interviews were given. I never said we should move into China or into Asia. I said we had better make up our minds. I was in Peiping. It was said the Communists were 8 miles out. I do not know whether they were 8 or 10 or 25 miles but it would not have made much difference if they wanted to do something. General Fu, the night I was in his camp, said to me, "I am through. I was through when General Marshall quit shipping ammunition for the American guns we had. I was through when General Marshall insisted that we get together with the agrarian Communists and let the Communists through the pass up above the Great Wall of China and into Manchuria," which we had already given to the Russians, thus giving Russia a foothold in Asia. The Chinese generals knew what would happen to them, but they stayed there and stuck it out as long as they could.

So, Mr. President, I say again, as I said when I was in China, in the Far East, and in India, that I do not know what our program should be, but someone had better find out before we stumble into Hong Kong to save someone else's hide, when we do not know where we are going from Hong Kong. One of these days the Senate, the House, and the people of the United States will wake up and start talking about a world policy, something which fits America, initiated in the Capital of the United States, and not in Europe.

AMERICAN INDUSTRIES OVERWHELMINGLY OPPOSED TO EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

In tabulating the replies to approximately 300 letters and telegrams sent to various manufacturing enterprises and trade associations requesting information as to their attitude toward a reciprocal trade program, I have already explained the relation which the reciprocal trade program has to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, I found that the overwhelming majority of replies expressed concern over our present tariff policy, our import fee policy, and opposition to the extension of the trade-agreements program. Of 194 replies received, 114 were against the extension of the program. Sixty-two either expressed no views or referred me to some other person for information. Only 18 of the replies were expressly in favor of extending the trade-agreements program.

Very often we hear someone say with a belligerent attitude, "Are you hurt yet?" I am from the West. If someone out there pointed a gun at your head, Mr. President, and you said, "Put that thing up; it might go off," and he said, "Are you hurt yet?" you would be looking for help from some place.

I want now to give a short outline of the various kinds of industry which feel their existence is endangered by the present policy on trade agreements.

Among the strategically important industries of this country are the producers of strategic metals, both the mining operators and the intermediate processors. The producers of the following strategic metals face either extinction or drastic retrenchment: Mercury, tungsten, antimony, silver-lead concentrates, zinc, copper, manganese, and aluminum. Many more industries have not been hurt yet, but fear for the future of their enterprises either because of the low level of tariffs on the commodities concerned, because of contemplated reduction of tariffs, or simply because foreign industries are becoming more competitive than ever, having frequently been expanded with American help.

TARIFF CUTS HAVE SEVERELY INJURED OUR MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota asked about mercury. He asked if it was not true that the mercury mines in the United States were closed down. It is true; they are closed down because of competition from abroad, principally from Spain. How did it happen? With her state trading, Spain would sell mercury for any price, just to get dollars, so that she could undersell the American market and establish her goods in the American market. When a mine is closed down in America, the price goes up. It is like a gasoline price war. When a station on one corner is closed down, the price on the other goes up, because there is no competition. There is no need to elaborate on the dangers to our security resulting from drastic curtailment of the production of these metals. The loss of the deposits in inundated mines, the loss of know-how, and the loss of the labor force, may well spell the difference between victory and defeat in any future conflict. What endangers the existence and health of these enterprises? Unfair, cut-throat competition from abroad, where low-cost labor, frequently exploited at a wage about one-tenth of our domestic wage, makes cheap production possible.

Without adequate tariffs the domestic producer is simply not able to compete with low labor-cost competition. The low, or nonexistent, tariffs on imports of strategic materials may put the domestic producer out of business.

Here is a direct threat to our security, and despite statements by many members of industry, and even by some members of the Government who are familiar with the technology of mining, that low tariffs endanger the security of the Nation, the free-traders in the administration persist in advocating the theory that we should preserve our resources in the ground and import the necessary strategic metals.

Mr. President, we hear it said that we will store the minerals in the ground. Minerals are stored in the ground all over the world, but when an emergency occurs, it is not possible to get them in time to do any good if the mining industry is not a healthy enterprise.

The loss in mining know-how, the loss in the deposits which have been laid bare in mines which will become a complete loss, and the lack of exploration for new deposits which can only be carried on by a healthy mining industry, is ignored by the fanatic believers in an impractical and dangerous theory.

NEW INVESTMENT CAPITAL LACKING

Further, Mr. President, all these industries with a sword hanging over their heads with authority to cut tariffs transferred to a Secretary of State whose chief interest lies abroad, whose main interest is in arranging some kind of a treaty or agreement he wants on some other entirely unrelated matter, find themselves in a dangerous situation. Results to date have shown that and I am sure it will again be proven by the 133 trade agreements or trade negotiations, as they are called, made in France, we will find that already dangerously low tariffs and import fees will be further lowered.

With that kind of a threat hanging over his head, what will the businessman do? Can he get new capital investments for his business? Would any Senator listening to me put money in a business when a Cabinet officer, appointed on account of his ability in some kind of business, although I have not been able to ascertain what it was, except that it was certainly not in an industry, held in his hands the power of life or death over his business? If a man does put money into his business, he has to do the best he can. No one is going to buy him out. Then it would be possible to confiscate, as England and France and other nations which have nationalist schemes and threats to industry are learning. It is possible to freeze the money already invested, and confiscate it, but it is not possible to find any new investments. Let us not forget that it has been new capital investments which have made America great. We are not getting new capital investments, and there are several reasons for that, but the principal ones are the high taxes and the lack of faith in the continued health of the domestic economy.

UNITED STATES TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS BEING HURT

Perhaps less important strategically, but probably more important in regard to its share of the employment of the domestic labor force, is the textile industry. The American textile industry employs about one-fifth of the labor force of the United States engaged in manufacturing. Many believers in free trade assert that with American know-how and American equipment, we can produce more cheaply and efficiently than foreign producers. What the theorists forget or purposely ignore, is the fact that the equipment used in the textile mills all over the world is generally very similar to ours in type and efficiency. Textile products require a large amount of labor, which therefore accounts for a large share of the total cost of the product. Here is an interesting fact; according to figures of the Bureau of the Census, one worker in the automotive industry produced $10,162 worth of automobiles in 1939, whereas in the textile industry one worker produced only $4,894 worth of cloth.

In that connection I want to say that there are old-fashioned spindles in Britain and in other parts of the world where textile industries are located, but they will be replaced. New spindles are available, and when the old ones are replaced, not only will the present rate of unemployment continue in the textile industry in the United States, but it will suffer a big increase.

That difference in productivity makes the textile industry very vulnerable to foreign competition. We have to consider that the wage level in the domestic textile industry is approximately 3 times as high as in England, 5 times as high as in Italy and France, and more than 20 times as high as in Japan.

Despite these obvious differences, which cannot be overcome by either better machinery or more efficiency, tariffs are being cut on textile products brought into the United States. The producers of rayon fibers, the glove manufacturers, the weavers of felts for paper making, the makers of woolen goods, the domestic carpet weavers, the industries using silk, all of these and others more, are deeply worried about the effect of tariff cuts on their production and employment. Despite rising imports, the worst has yet to come, since foreign textile production is only beginning to hit its stride. Most of the demands of their own people have been satisfied, or, in those countries which still have shortages, textile industries produce for export to the American market in order to earn dollars, leaving their own peoples only a small part of their production.

Mr. President, here is another situation we should consider. Nothing is left alone and unhampered within those nations which start to take over industry. They have the socialistic idea that they must interfere with the normal routine of commerce. So, regardless of all the things I have mentioned several times this afternoon, of quotas and currency manipulations, specifications, and other means of stopping imports, we will have lower tariffs and provide a free market in our country. One of the greatest activities is continual meddling in the channels of commerce, so that nothing is normal.

Our businessmen do not know how to deal with that kind of people. Our businessmen know how to deal only with those who live and trade according to some principle. Businessmen of America operate according to principles. They will take every advantage possible within the limits of these principles. But they do not depart from principles in their operations. They do not try to run the entire industry through a Government agency which can, by means of Executive order, break anyone or make him bankrupt, or upset the industry so no one can invest money in it with any assurance that his capital will be safeguarded, let alone that he will make a profit on his operations or interest on the investment of his money.

CONSTITUTIONAL SEPARATION OF POWERS IGNORED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that for 22 long years, under 3 Presidents, this policy has not changed. In 1934 Congress was prevailed upon to transfer to the President of the United States its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and to regulate the domestic economy. That constitutional responsibility is definitely set forth in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, and in article II, section 2, it is provided that the President shall regulate foreign policy.

The Constitution of the United States pointedly separates the two powers. But Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorpe, and now Mr. Dulles, have continually hounded Congress to put them together, which was done by a simple act of Congress amending the Constitution of the United States, and we have continued to extend it.

In 1951 we were able to cut the time of the extension to 2 years. It had always previously been 3 years. In 1951 we cut it to 2 years. In 1953 we cut it to 1 year. In 1954 we cut it to 1 year, and on tomorrow the Senate will vote on the question of extending it 3 years—to continue the marriage of the regulation of the national economy, the domestic economy, and the regulation of foreign trade, with the setting of foreign policy, and placing all in the hands of the State Department. So we are right back where we started before the Declaration of Independence was signed, when one man had everything at his fingertips.

FOREFATHERS' ADVICE FORGOTTEN

Washington, Jefferson, and Ben Franklin said, "That will never again happen to the American people." But in 1934 we were so far away from the dog that had bitten us that we passed the Trade Agreements Act, and now the Senate is seriously considering the continuation of the marriage to which I have referred.

During the delivery of Mr. Malone's speech,

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming with the understanding that I do not lose the right to the floor, and that any remarks the Senator may make will appear at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I intend to discuss this question at length a little later in the day, but when I look around the Chamber and see the great disinterest which Members of the Senate have in this measure, it seems to me that the title of this bill should be "A bill to take away from the Congress its legislative powers granted by the Constitution of the United States."

With the consent of the Senator from Nevada, who was present in the committee at the time I testified in support of an amendment which I shall offer later, I desire to read into the RECORD a letter which I sent to every member of the committee, boiling down, in less than two pages, the real meaning of what is being done here by the agreement of those who seem to imagine that they are delegating to the President of the United States the power to do the work which under the Constitution the Congress should do.

I wish to show, also, the extreme disregard in which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles holds the Congress of the United States. He told the Finance Committee, on which the Senator from Nevada sits, that Members of Congress

may have brains enough to know what their constituents may want, but they are not equipped to attend to the great international questions of the Nation. Mr. President, I deny it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this is the 9th year I have stood on the floor of the Senate and have said exactly what the Senator from Wyoming is now saying; and I said it when the Senator from Wyoming was formerly a Member of the Senate, and when he voted for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I said this 20 years ago.

Mr. MALONE. But the Senator from Wyoming voted for the last three extensions of the Trade Agreements Act; he voted for extending it, until he was no longer a Member of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let the friends of the Constitution and the Congress——

Mr. MALONE. The Trade Agreements Act is no more constitutional today than it was in 1934.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what is the use of the Senator from Nevada and myself engaging in a fight.

Mr. MALONE. I am not fighting the Senator from Wyoming; I am merely telling him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. But if I undertook to tell the Senator from Nevada, the Senate would never pass such a bill. However, there is a limitation on the debate.

Mr. MALONE. There is no limitation on the debate today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the kind consideration of the Senator from Nevada, I should like to read this letter, because I wish the Press Gallery to know what is coming up.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I hope the Press Gallery knows that for 9 long years the Senator from Nevada has said exactly what is contained in that letter, and is saying it again today, and will say it again tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this letter was written to every member of the committee, after I had testified. The letter I am about to read was addressed to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and it reads as follows:

DEAR BOB: Now that the Finance Committee is considering its final action on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years, I desire to call your attention first to a statement which I prepared for presentation to the committee in support of my amendment providing that no trade agreement negotiated by the President shall become effective until approved by Congress. I am also enclosing a copy of three paragraphs of the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, taken from page 2371 of the original transcript.

Mr. President, it is now to be found on pages 1240 and 1241 of part II of the hearings.

I wish that every editor in the United States and every Member of Congress, whether in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, would read these three paragraphs of the testimony of John Foster Dulles.

I continue to read my letter:

My deepest concern in this matter lies in the fact that, if this extension should be granted, Congress will have provided for the delegation to the President during a period of more than 20 years of a clearly legislative power. This it is doing at a time when free government, that is to say, government by authority of the people, stands at bay throughout the world, while executive authority with dictatorial power is proceeding in its effort to conquer the world.

A reading of the three paragraphs taken from the testimony of Secretary Dulles shows that the Secretary of State holds the following views:

1. That Senators and Representatives are primarily sensitive to local business and employment conditions.

2. That it is not possible for every member of Congress to "know with intimacy the international implications of our trade policies."

3. That these implications "are so delicate that they cannot be publicly discussed without endangering" the security of the United States.

Mr. President, at this point I suspend my reading of the letter to remark that almost 2 days before the Secretary of State expressed that view of the necessity of secrecy in international affairs, he was having the Yalta papers released to the press by devious methods.

I continue to read from my letter:

4. That "one man, and one man alone, is so situated as to have the complete, overall picture"—the President of the United States.

It would be difficult to compress into a smaller compass the modern argument of the totalitarian against government by the people. Is it true that Senators and Representatives of the United States are not capable of understanding conditions that exist beyond their own States or Districts? Is it possible that they are incapable of comprehending the implications of international trade? Is there any necessity for the secret negotiation of trade agreements? Is it possible that Secretary Dulles actually believes that the President is the only person in government capable of understanding the overall picture?

At the very moment that Secretary Dulles, on March 14, was giving this testimony and the Finance Committee was considering the bill, an Assistant Secretary of State in Geneva, not the President of the United States, was signing an agreement with 34 other nations with respect to international trade. At the same time, the Department of State, over which Mr. Dulles presides, was releasing the Yalta papers.

It is argued that the bill contains standards which make the bill a constitutional delegation of legislative power to the President. This argument overlooks the fact that there is no limit on the governments with which an agreement may be made, nor any limit upon the commodities or articles to be affected.

Since that time, Mr. President, I understand that a so-called textile amendment was submitted, and that it was designed to affect and restrain imports into the United States from Japan.

I read further from my letter:

The framers of the Constitution, with careful and deliberate forethought, divided the powers of government into three separate categories. When we say, as will be the case if congressional approval of trade agreements is not required before they become effective, that the Congress is unworthy to be trusted with knowledge of the contents of the trade agreements before they become effective, then we are saying that the legislative power so carefully described in the Constitution has ceased to be an efficient instrument of free government in our time.

Now, Mr. President, with the further indulgence of the Senator from Nevada, I shall read the three paragraphs of Secretary Dulles' testimony. He says, as appears on page 1240, part II, of the hearings:

It is understandable that there is, in the Congress, some reluctance to delegate to the President a discretion, the use of which might affect adversely certain particular business activities. I was myself a Senator long enough to appreciate the reasons for such concern. Each Senator and each Representative properly knows, and is sensitive to, business and employment conditions within his particular State or district.

But it is not possible for every Senator and Representative, or for the Tariff Commission, to know with intimacy the international implications of our trade policies. Oftentimes, indeed, these implications are so delicate that they cannot be publicly discussed without endangering the security interests of the United States.

One man, and one man alone, is so situated as to have the complete, overall picture. He is the President of the United States. He comprehends both the domestic and international aspects of the problem. If the President is not entrusted with discretion within the closely prescribed limits contemplated by H. R. 1, then that means that the tariff policy of the United States will be operated without due regard to international considerations. That will inevitably endanger our Nation.

Mr. President, when I was a student in high school, a student in college, or a student in law school, I never dreamed that the time would ever come when I would hear the chief Cabinet representative of the President, the Secretary of State, utter such words as those. They were not uttered on the spur of the moment. They were written down carefully.

What he was saying was simply that the framers of the Constitution did not know what they were doing when they gave to the Congress, in article I, section 8 thereof, the power to lay duties and imposts. Those are tariffs. Not a word is there about allowing the executive power to make such laws, to enact such legislation. The words uttered by Secretary Dulles in derogation of the dignity, the knowledge, the duty, and the ability of the Senate and of the House might well have come from a supporter of Hitler, a supporter of Mussolini, or a supporter of Lenin and Stalin. It is the language of the totalitarian. Congress makes its mistakes, but Congress is the legislative authority of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. A bill was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to compensate workingmen and investors when they sustain a loss of jobs and investments through the workings of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The State Department has many times suggested such an act by Congress, because members of that Department know they are going to move workingmen and investors around like checkers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, that is a bill which provides that, if Members of Congress, by neglecting their duty, by delegating it to the President and the anonymous assistants to whom he would redelegate the power, should cause injury to the people of the United

States, then the Congress should try to make amends for its neglect by granting monetary damages.

THE CASE FOR FLUORSPAR

Mr. MALONE. Of course. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a member of the Senate Finance Committee, stated that he was one of the authors of the original bill in 1934.

However, in this session, he wanted fluorspar protected, because fluorspar is used in making steel, and fluorspar is produced in Kentucky, and the miners of fluorspar were idle.

I reminded the distinguished Senator in committee that a bill had been introduced to compensate those people, and that the State Department had long since recommended such procedure. I reminded him, furthermore, that he could not maintain that considerations of national defense made it important to produce fluorspar in Kentucky or other States, because we can get it from Mexico and Canada, where we are now getting it, with the result that mines in Kentucky, Illinois, and other States are shut down. We can get it from Canada and Mexico in time of war as well as in time of peace. So the argument could not be based upon security reasons.

I reminded the chairman of the committee and the committee itself that the argument could be made on an economic basis.

The economic structure of the Nation is dependent upon the small communities. That is the only safeguard we have today. It is the smaller communities which suffer economically from such a policy as I have described. That includes every little community where fluorspar is produced, or where any one of the group of strategic minerals and metals is produced; communities where textiles are produced, where petroleum is produced, or where any one of 5,000 other commodities is produced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that if we continue the process of delegating away the authority and the duty imposed upon us by the Constitution of the United States, these seats on the floor of the Senate, which are now empty because Senators have already promised that they will go along, will be empty permanently, because we shall have transferred to the Executive the powers of the Congress.

CONGRESS HAS SHIFTED MOST OF POWERS TO WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the junior Senator from Wyoming that over a period of 22 years we have already transferred the greater portion of our constitutional authority to the Executive. At the present time practically all the authority Congress has is to set the tax rate. Over a period of 22 years we have established the policy of accepting the estimates for the budget from the White House. Nothing has ever been done on the floor of the Senate except perhaps to make an increase or a reduction of 5 percent. Our function in that field could just as well be performed by a group of high school students, because Congress accepts the policy represented by the budget sent to it.

The point I make is that so far as budgets and appropriations are concerned, for all practical purposes they are in the hands of the Executive.

TREATIES NOW CALLED EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS TO AVOID TWO-THIRDS SENATE VOTE

On the other hand, instead of calling treaties by their right name and submitting them to the Senate, where a two-thirds vote would be required to approve them, the executive department calls them agreements, requiring, for their approval, only a majority of each House—if, in fact, they are submitted to the Congress at all.

Now we come to the question of transferring the constitutional authority and responsibility of Congress to regulate the domestic economy as well as foreign trade, through adjustments of duties, imposts and excises—the language of the Constitution in article I, section 8. That authority was transferred to the Executive in 1934, following the admonition of the then President.

SECRETARY OF STATE IN 1949 QUOTED

Let me read what the Secretary of State said in 1949. I shall read from a reprint of one of my speeches at that time. The situation has not changed one iota since 1934. This is what I said, after a quotation from a convention:

> However, the present Secretary of State has attempted in every way possible to tie the two together.

Meaning the regulation of the domestic economy and the regulation of foreign trade. In the Constitution of the United States they are pointedly separated. I have already quoted language from the Constitution to the effect that the Congress itself must regulate foreign trade and the domestic economy.

In article II, section 2, the Constitution is specific in providing that the Executive shall regulate the foreign policy. The Secretary of State had been continually tying the two together.

> However, the present Secretary of State has attempted in every way possible to tie the two together, as witnessed by the testimony of Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in January of this year in support of the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act now before the Senate, when he said:
>
> "1. The European recovery program (Marshall plan or ECA) extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet."

In my speech in October 1949 I said exactly what the Senator from Wyoming is saying today.

> 2. The 1934 trade-agreements program is an integral part of our overall program for world economic recovery.
>
> 3. The International Trade Organization—

Mr. President, that is the organization which Congress refused to accept. That is the organization Mr. Thorp was promoting at that time. Today the department is promoting an organization called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I point out to the Senator from Wyoming that we did not approve GATT, but we did not interfere with the workings of GATT, because it never came before Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, we are sending abroad to Geneva the constitutional power of Congress?

Mr. MALONE. Very well. I am sure the Senator is old enough to remember the baseball play known as Tinker to Evers to Chance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I remember it very well.

Mr. MALONE. This is a Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance play. Congress makes the play to the President, and the President makes the play to Geneva, 3,000 miles away, to an organization in which there are 33 votes, and in which we have only 1 vote on multilateral agreements. When the President's representatives sign an agreement, we are bound by it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to elucidate a little further and bring up to date the Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance allusion which the Senator has made.

Mr. MALONE. It is not an illusion. It is exactly what we have done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is a baseball allusion, nevertheless. What the Senator means is Tinker—Dules—to—Evers—Eisenhower—to Chance—the 34 nations in the agreement.

Mr. MALONE. And the play is clear out of the Senate's hands when it votes tomorrow afternoon to approve the pending legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that he is a very good pitcher. However, we do not have any catchers.

Mr. MALONE. The people of the United States are the catchers.

I spoke on the floor of the Senate on September 13, 1949, and I should like to call the Senator's attention to what I said on that day, when we were discussing catchwords and catch phrases.

Incidentally, the phrase "reciprocal trade" is merely one more catchword, and it was invented by the London bankers.

I read from my speech:

> The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has been labeled "reciprocal trade," yet that phrase does not occur in the 1934 act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade under a more appealing name. That is the significance of the proposed 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which is before the Senate at this time.
>
> The phrase "reciprocal trade" is just one more catchword boiled up out of a mess of catchwords and historic slogans such as "make the world safe for democracy," "the four freedoms," "the forgotten man," "economic royalists," "we owe it to ourselves," "we cannot be prosperous in a starving world," then comes the "bold new program," and dozens of other pithy expressions which divert the minds of men during times of extreme nervous stress and strain.

Has that situation changed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I intend to offer when the opportunity presents itself be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text of the amendment intended to be proposed

by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties or other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement; and no notice of termination under section 2 (b) of the act of June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352 (b)), shall take effect with respect to any foreign trade agreement, or any amendatory or supplementary agreement, hereafter entered into under such section 350, until the Congress by law has specifically approved such notice of termination."

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say one more thing to the Senator from Wyoming. I am happy that he is joining the senior Senator from Nevada in this fight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I began my fight in 1934.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator voted for the program, however.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A different situation prevailed at that time.

Mr. MALONE. It is not any different from that of today. It is exactly the same as it was in 1934. It is history, like Yalta; and, like Yalta, let us never do it again.

The reason Washington, Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin, in writing the Constitution, separated the two powers was that they had been pushed around for a long time by a king who had at his fingertips the fixing of domestic policy and the fixing of foreign policy and the fixing of trade policy by executive order, and they resolved it would never happen to the American people. Therefore, they pointedly separated the power to fix foreign policy and the power to regulate the domestic economy, so that one could not be traded for the other without the concurrence of Congress.

We were in 1934, and we are now, so very far from the dog that bit us——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That it has become a habit.

Mr. MALONE. It was not a habit in 1934. The program was sent to the Congress with the demand that Congress pass it. Apparently Members of Congress were afraid to go home without voting for the program. The President said Congress must pass the legislation, and Congress did pass it.

ECONOMY TRADED FOR FANCY FOREIGN POLICY

Congress passed the act which tied the two powers together. By a simple act of Congress there was transferred to the Executive Department the responsibility of fixing duties and regulating foreign trade and regulating the domestic economy. Now what can the President do, and what has he been doing for 22 years? He is trading the American economy for a fancy foreign policy, and the pending bill, if passed, would tell him to go ahead and continue to do it.

DULLES TESTIMONY CALLED INSULT TO CONGRESS

I ask Senators to read the testimony given by Mr. Dulles before our committee. It was an insult to Congress. Yet Congress is taking it lying down. The regulation of foreign trade and of the domestic economy belongs to Congress, because every precinct in the United States is represented on the floor of the Senate—or at least it has a chance of being represented—and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Dulles and his predecessors have cohorts in Europe. I have stated on the floor of the Senate, and I say it again, that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden have been ex officio members of the State Department for 22 years. We do not do anything that they do not approve. Why? I should like to know why.

We are the only nation on earth that has in office men who do not work for our own people. I admire the English on two counts. I am a great admirer of the English, I will say to the junior Senator from Wyoming, first, because they have brains and, second, because they are for their own country. They have brains and they are for England. If we have brains, we have not learned to use them. We are not for our own country and for our own working men and investors. I am glad to be joined by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in that conclusion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator for having permitted me to make my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for at last speaking his mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have never hesitated to do so.

Mr. MALONE. I hope the Senator, in voting this time, will use his mind.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A. M. ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement.

It is my understanding that the conferees have agreed today on the conference report on the postal pay bill which affects half a million or more postal workers. I understand all the members of the conference committee have signed the report, and I should like to give notice that if we can work it into the schedule this week, consideration will be given to the conference report. I shall consult with the minority leader and with the chairman and ranking Republican member of the committee, and it may very well be that if we conclude consideration of the Interior Department Appropriation bill on Thursday, we can take up the conference report. I should like every Member of the Senate to be on notice that the conferees have reached agreement and their report will be taken up by the Senate as soon as opportunity is afforded. It is my understanding that the House will have to act first.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 3, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the senior Senator from Illinois is prepared to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today the Senate of the United States is engaged in debate on an issue which can be traced back to the very foundations of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, because of a previous engagement I shall be away from the Chamber for the next hour or so. I have conferred with the minority leader, and by a joint agreement, because of the fact that many Senators are attending the chamber of commerce convention, there will

be no business transacted this evening. I have asked the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to act for me in my absence in connection with any matters which require attention.

I understand there are other speakers scheduled for this evening. I merely wish the RECORD to show that both sides of the aisle, the majority leader and the minority leader, have agreed that there will be no business transacted, although insertions may be included in the RECORD. I should like the Senator from Illinois to act for me when he is present, or ask some other Senator to do likewise, if the Senator from Illinois is not present.

I should like the Chair to have notice that that is the agreement of the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Today, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is engaged in debate on an issue which can be traced back to the very foundations of our country. Tariffs and trade policy were major factors in the revolt of the colonies against Great Britain; in the establishment of our Constitution; in the strife which divided North and South; in the periods of panics and prosperity which have dominated our economic life; in the establishment and growth of trusts and monopolies; and in the latter-day development of America as the major creditor nation of the world and the leader of the free world fight against international tyranny.

This debate, on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act for another 3 years, is on an issue which transcends such questions as quotas for the independent oil producers, protection for the textile trades, or bounties for bicycles. It goes to the root of our historical processes.

A tariff, Mr. President, is a tax. It is a tax on consumers for the protection of producers. As a tax on consumers it is not unlike a sales tax. Like a sales tax it is regressive; that is, it hurts low income groups more than high income groups. Because of these elementary facts the tariff issue has divided the country, historically, between the protectionists—who since the days of Alexander Hamilton and before, have supported the rich and well-born—and those who wish freer trade, fewer restrictions, and who have fought for lower tariffs in the interests of the consumer and of the Nation as a whole. It is an issue which divides us between those who support the particular interest and those who support the general welfare. It is a question of taxing the many for the benefit of the few, or of temporary dislocation of the few for the benefit of the many.

It is an issue, also, Mr. President, where glib generalities and easy arguments, the slogans and shibboleths, lie with the protectionists, but where the truth, the hard, difficult, fundamental truth, lies with the cause of freer trade and fewer restrictions.

It is a paradox in our economic life that those who live by such slogans as "Free enterprise," "Competition," "Rugged individualism," "No Federal interference" are in general, although not universally, the supporters of protection which creates monopoly, limits competition, provides protection for the producer, restricts enterprise, and uses the Federal Government as an instrument to interfere directly in our economic affairs. On this issue, one must doubt either the fundamental sincerity or the consistency of those who call for no Federal interference, except when it helps them; who wish competition, except in their own business; who are for rugged individualism, for the other fellow; and whose real position measured by their deeds is for gross Federal interference if it benefits their own interests.

MODERN PROTECTIONISTS COPY BRITISH MERCANTILISM

The economic policies of Great Britain in the 17th and 18th centuries, which our forefathers rebelled against, were policies with which the protectionists, perhaps unwittingly and unknowingly, wish to shackle us with today. Those policies, Mr. President, were the promotion of nationalism, the protection of domestic industry, the restriction of trade, Buy-British policies, the attempt to export more than to import, and the demand that trade be carried in British ships, all summed up by the term "beggar my neighbor" policies. The counterpart of these policies is seen today in the Buy America Act, the attempt to impose quotas, the demand for protection against imports, and a subsidy for exports, the cries to equalize production costs against so-called cheap foreign labor, the largess received by the private merchant marine, and the swarm of industries who plead their cause in the name of national defense. Our Nation, Mr. President, was conceived in a rebellion against the very policies which the protectionists advocate today.

Let us trace briefly our tariff history so that the sins committed by the protectionists against our historical progress, against political democracy, economic liberties, and social justice may be made clear.

First, what were the British laws and regulations which led to the cry of "no taxation without representation"? They were the acts which every schoolboy is required to learn but the significance of which somehow gets lost by the time he reaches manhood. There were the various navigation acts, the principal one of which was that of 1660, which required imports and exports to and from the American Colonies to be carried in British ships "whereof the master and three-fourths of the mariners at least are English," in the terms of the act. There was the Wool Act of 1699 which prohibited the sale of wool, yarn, or woolen cloth by the colonists under any condition whatsoever, and the Hat Act of 1732 which probited the sale of American hats abroad or to any other colony. There was the Molasses Act of 1733 which placed a prohibitive tax on American trade in sugar, rum, and molasses with the French West Indies.

Fortunately, these and other restrictive acts were not vigorously enforced until after the end of the French and Indian War of 1763. Had it not been for this failure, American trade with the West Indies would have been destroyed, and trade in wool, hats, and other items between the Colonies and abroad would have been ruined.

In 1767, the British Parliament passed the Townshend Revenue Act. This act—ostensibly for the purpose of raising revenues—imposed numerous specific duties on imports to the Colonies from Great Britain and which the American colonists had to pay. Among these duties, the following may be of interest: 4 shillings, 8 pence on every hundredweight of crown, plate, flint, and white glass; 1 shilling, 2 pence per hundredweight of green glass; 2 shillings for every hundredweight of red lead; 1 shilling, 2 pence for every hundredweight of white lead; 2 shillings for every hundredweight of painters' colors; 3 pence for every pound of tea, which led to the celebrated Boston Tea Party; 12 shillings for every ream of paper, usually called or known by the name of Atlas fine, to name a few items.

AMERICAN GLASS INDUSTRY PROTECTED FOR 188 YEARS

I digress for a moment here, Mr. President, to point out that the American glass industry, which has come before our committees of Congress to plead for tariff protection in this year, as in other years—has been the beneficiary of a tariff on foreign products since the year 1767—or for 188 years. When, oh when, will the American glass industry be able to stand on its own two feet? Initially, the industry argued that it needed protection to establish itself—that it was an infant industry. In 1955, the same industry is here again, arguing now that it is unable to compete with cheap foreign labor. In the early days, when their labor costs were low, they argued for tariffs to protect them as an infant industry against the more efficient, higher labor-cost industries abroad.

We do not know and we cannot say how much the American consumer of glassware and glass products has paid in taxes on imports and higher prices on domestic glass to subsidize this industry in the last 188 years. I have been able to calculate, roughly, that in 1951—if one adds up the duty paid by Americans for imports of handblown glassware, earthenware, chinaware, and optical instruments of glass—just to take a very few items which compete with the domestic glass industry—the American consumer paid at least $20 million in higher prices for the products of this kind which he bought from abroad. At the present rate of duty, American consumers, therefore, can expect to pay at least $20 million a year in duties in the next few years for these items. Will the industry be as successful in the next 188 years as it has been in the past 188 years in keeping these duties on imports? If so, the subsidy to the American glass and pottery industry will amount to at least $3.7 billions of dollars in that period.

That figure—$20 million a year—is the amount of money which the American consumer will pay in higher prices for a few selected items of glassware and pottery from foreign sources if that industry is able to keep the tariff for its protection.

But we must add to this amount the higher prices which American consumers pay for American glass products as a result of the tariff—as the industry can command a price virtually equal to the foreign price plus the tariff. So I have only calculated the amount which the American consumer paid in the way of taxes for foreign-made glass products.

The value of the domestic production in 1951 of these items—handblown glassware, earthenware, chinaware, and optical instruments, to take the same few selected items—was approximately $336.8 million. The average of the tariff on these items was 36 percent. In other words, because of the tariff, the American industry could raise its prices to the American consumer virtually 36 percent of the value of its production. This would amount to about $123 million which is, roughly, the extra amount of money the consumer paid for these items and which was pocketed by the American producers. Therefore, not only did the consumers pay $20 million in higher prices for foreign glassware in 1951, but also an extra $123 million in higher prices for the domestic product.

Therefore, when these particular industries come to us for protection we must say, "What will it cost the American people to subsidize this industry?" How much less purchasing power will the American worker have if he pays a subsidy for his daily needs to that industry? How many fewer items will his paycheck buy if he must pay 20 or 40 or 60 percent more for an item than he should pay in order to subsidize an inefficient industry? Who, Mr. President, is fighting for the consumer interest in this tariff fight? And who is fighting for the nonprotected American industries who must pay higher wages, and therefore increase their costs, if they are to guarantee a decent standard of living to their employees, whose pay checks go less far because of the tax they pay for protected items?

These are the issues before us; and the glass industry, which has been protected for 188 years, has with the best intentions in the world forced the masses of the people of this country to pay more in order to keep their protected industry afloat. Would not the fresh breezes of competition help them? Is it too much to suggest that this industry might be more efficient and more competitive today if, in the past, they had been required to compete with foreign products, to improve their methods of production, and to lower their costs—all of which might have come about except for this cushion provided them by the protective tariff?

AMERICAN REVOLUTION RESULT OF RESTRICTIVE BRITISH TRADE POLICIES

Now I should like to return from this digression to the point I was making, namely, that British restrictive acts on the subject of tariffs and trade led, in great part, to the American Revolution.

The Townshend Act, which included the tariff on glass, led to American reprisals—to nonimportation agreements on the part of American merchants. One of these, the Boston nonimportation agreement of 1768, reduced imports from England by one-half in the years 1768 and 1769.

When in 1773 the East India Co. was given a monopoly on the American tea trade, our forefathers reacted, first by the New York Sons of Liberty Resolution on Tea and by the Boston Tea Party of December 16, 1773. The British retaliated with the infamous series of "intolerable acts" in 1774 which challenged the fundamental liberties of the subject. These led, in turn, to a series of resolutions against the Boston Port Act by New York City in 1774 and the Virginia House of Burgesses in the same year, and to the calling of the First Continental Congress on October 14, 1774. In the Declaration of Independence itself Jefferson lists as a specific grievance against the Crown and Parliament the cutting off of American trade with all parts of the world.

In other words, Mr. President, the American Revolution was the result, in large part, of the reaction of American colonists to British restrictions on trade, and the British intolerable acts which were passed to enforce those restrictions on trade against the will of free men. The nature of those restrictions, and the philosophy and the theory behind them, was for the protection of British industry, an attempt at self-sufficiency, and the desire to avoid competition from foreign or colonial sources. I put it to you and the Senate, Mr. President, that the British trade and tariff policies of the 18th century, which led to the American Revolution, are not unlike those which protectionists wish America to follow in the middle of the 20th century.

THE TARIFF AND THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

Under the Articles of Confederation following the American Revolution, the barriers to domestic trade between the States led to the reexamination of the Articles. The Articles were inadequate for, among other things, they allowed the individual States to erect trade barriers against each other much as nations erect them against each other today. The Annapolis convention, the predecessor of the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution itself, was called by Virginia for the purpose of considering "the trade of the United States." The commercial and industrial interests, led by Alexander Hamilton, had replaced the dominant position held by Jefferson and the liberals during the Revolution. Nonetheless, even they could see that free trade among the members of the Confederation was essential to American prosperity and their own best interests.

The Constitution of the United States, to the great good fortune of us all, gave Congress the power to regulate trade among the several States. This prohibited within the United States the barriers to trade and commerce which so burden the free flow of trade between countries. The Constitution also prohibits a tax or bounty on exports, and it gives Congress—not the States—the power to lay tariffs on imports.

If the protectionists who have swamped Congress in the last year with their pleas for special privilege were to follow their logic to its full conclusion they would, in all sincerity, advocate the repeal of that part of article I, section 10, of the American Constitution which prohibits the erection of trade barriers by the States. They advocate quotas on imports, higher tariffs to equalize production costs, and subsidies by way of tariffs against cheap foreign labor. If we need tariffs and quotas to protect America against Japanese textiles, or residual oil, why does Maine not need a tariff to protect her against California and Florida oranges—in order to equalize the costs of production? Maine producers of oranges—and they could be produced under glass in hot houses—would gain a tariff on California oranges. This would raise the price of California oranges sold in Maine to the production costs in Maine. Why does New York not need a tariff against Illinois and Iowa corn to protect her farmers against the competition from the States where corn can be grown cheaply and in abundance, thus raising the cost of Illinois and Iowa corn to what it costs to grow it in New York? Should Minnesota not try to grow bananas in hot houses by putting up a tariff against bananas from elsewhere?

We see this as economic suicide within our country for at least two reasons. First, the very basis of trade is that owing to differing geography, climate, weather, skills, and natural resources, each area and each region of our country can specialize in the production of a few products which it trades for the products of other areas which have differing resources, skills, soils, abilities, climate, and geography. If the protectionists followed their logic to the bitter end, every county in the United States would erect trade barriers against neighboring counties, and every town and hamlet would tax the product of its neighboring town to protect local producers and equalize production costs.

As early as 1776, Adam Smith in his Wealth of Nations, showed how silly the argument of imposing tariffs to equalize production costs at home and abroad really is. He wrote that—

> By means of glasses, hot beds and hot walls, very good grapes can be raised in Scotland, and very good wine can be made of them at about 30 times the expense for which at least equally good (grapes and wine) can be brought from foreign countries.

Yet, in 1904, a century and a quarter later, the Republican Party platform had this to say:

> The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

And again in 1908 the Republican platform said:

> In all protective legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

In many cases, Mr. President, the economic doctrines of the Republican Party parallel those of Adam Smith and the 18th century. But here, Mr. President, is an issue on which the Republican Party parades doctrines which even Adam Smith himself rejected over a century

and a half ago. In fact, such an argument—to equalize the domestic and foreign costs of production by way of flexible tariff adjustments—was made on the floor of the Senate on April 1 of this year by one of the leading Republican protectionist Members of the Senate.

Second, the reason we avoid such folly within our country is that the citizens of the towns, counties, and States involved would be paying through the nose, by way of higher prices, for oranges and bananas grown in hothouses in Maine and Minnesota than they now pay for oranges and bananas from Florida, California, and the Caribbean.

These, Mr. President, are simple, elementary facts of trade. Yet the protectionists want the people of the United States to pay through the nose for high-cost domestic products that can be produced more cheaply elsewhere. We should invest our resources in the industries and products in which our geography, our climate, and our skills give us a positive advantage over others. And we should trade these items in which we have an advantage for the products of other countries which they can produce more cheaply than can we.

I may say, in this connection, it was the same Adam Smith who said that the division of labor is limited by the extent of the market; the wider the market, the more minute the division of labor. It would not be possible to have the efficient automobile factories of Detroit if those factories were confined in their sales to the State of Michigan. It is because automobiles have a nationwide market, and therefore a large output, that the industry can carry out the minute division of labor, upon which a large part of its efficiency rests.

I may also say that in the battle for advantages in international trade there are comparative advantages as well. Country A may have superiority in producing both articles X and Y over country B, but it may have so much greater superiority in producing article X that it pays it to concentrate on X and allow itself to be supplied with article Y by country B. Then both sides will profit from such an arrangement.

In the same vein, I knew a country lawyer who was the best lawyer in his area, and also the best stenographer and typist; but it paid him to concentrate on being a lawyer and on letting someone else do the typing and the stenography at $10 a day.

This elementary principle of the division of labor and the specialization of labor was appreciated by the Founding Fathers in determining what trade policies there should be between the States of the Union. It is a fact which in the international field yet remains unappreciated by too many of our people; it is unappreciated by a majority of the Republican Party, by a majority of our industries, but, I hope, by only a minority of the Senate.

I may say that all the advantages which are obtained from an internal specialization within a country and internal free trade are also available on a wider scale if there exists international trade between countries.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE TARIFF

When the Constitution was finally ratified and the new Government under Washington was begun, we all know that Hamilton and Jefferson were members of the Cabinet, and that the quarrels between them soon led to the first political parties in our history. We Democrats very proudly trace our history back to Thomas Jefferson. Our Republican friends, although they all too often act as if their party were the only true repository of patriotism, have no such enduring institution and can trace their history back just over 100 years, and followed then in a somewhat jagged line of succession. They are the "junior" party in the country. Nonetheless I believe that both we Democrats and our Republican friends agree that while Jefferson embodied the ideals of the Democratic Party, Hamilton, if not a Republican in name, embodied the basic principles upon which that party tends to act.

Jefferson, a liberal and humane man, represented the interests of the masses of the people against the dominant group of commercial and trading interests whose views Hamilton interpreted, reflected, and verbalized so well. Hamilton and the Federalists preferred the upper classes to the people, and feared political democracy.

Hamilton himself once said, in responding to a toast at a New York dinner, that "The people, the people is a great beast," and although the 18th-century views of the Federalist on the question of trade between and among the States seem enlightened by comparison with the views of some 20th-century interest groups, their class interests were reflected in our policies on foreign trade.

The first tariff in our history was that of 1789. It was conceived, ostensibly, as a "tariff for revenue only," although there is an obvious contradiction in that phrase which has darkened our legislative halls from the beginning of our Nation.

We see that the phrase, "tariff for revenue only," has in it an obvious internal contradiction. The purpose of a tariff is to keep foreign goods out. If it is successful as a tariff in its purpose of keeping foreign goods out, it cannot be useful in raising revenues. Conversely, if it raises large revenues it is obviously a failure as a tariff, for it allows foreign goods to come in in large quantities. For over 150 years, since Hamilton's time, the protectionists have attempted to sell the country on the idea of a "tariff for revenue only." It is an obvious contradiction in terms. It is an attempt to make the unpalatable palatable. It is an effort on the part of the protectionists to have it both ways.

The tariff of 1789 imposed an ad valorem duty of 5 percent on nonenumerated articles, and specific duties, generally in excess of that amount, on such items as glass, hemp, cordage, nails, and iron manufactures. A drawback of 10 percent was allowed for goods shipped in vessels of the American merchant marine, and other items, such as a tax of 50 cents a ton on vessels of foreign countries in American ports, were features of this first tariff act.

In 1791 Hamilton presented his famous Report on Manufactures, which few men have read, but which almost all who have studied history by means of textbooks rather than reading the original sources, hold strong opinions about. Hamilton's Report was a powerful intellectual feat. At few times in our history have the forces of the rich and well born had such a powerful and able man to verbalize their instinctive reactions. According to the late Prof. Frank W. Taussig, America's greatest tariff historian, the "Report remains the strongest presentation of the case for protection which has been made by any American statesman."

In that document, Hamilton argued for protection on grounds of the need for American self-sufficiency. He advocated the home market. He called for protection for infant industries. And he argued, finally, that any increase in domestic prices which come from protection would be offset by the increase in production—an argument which ignored the fact that a protected industry generally operates in a market characterized by restricted competition.

Of course, we hear the same arguments today. Perhaps the kindest thing we may say about the protectionists is that their arguments are the best arguments of the 18th century and are at least 164 years out of date—perhaps I should say 125 years out of date.

Although rates on nonspecific imports were raised to about 7½ percent in 1792, Hamilton's arguments for protection were not fulfilled until the tariff of 1816, many years after his death in 1804, at the hands of Aaron Burr. Thus, notwithstanding Hamilton's advocacy of protection, the first American tariff, for the most part, was intended to produce revenue, rather than for protection of domestic manufacturers.

Two points may be noticed in passing. The first is that in addition to Hamilton's advocacy of protection, it is in the Report on Manufactures that we find Hamilton's disdain for the weak and the poor in his comments on the place of women and children in industrial establishments. His famous statement that "it is worthy of particular remark that, in general, women and children are rendered more useful, and the latter more early useful, by manufacturing establishments than they would otherwise be" is to be found in the report.

This attachment to protection, coupled with a disdain for labor, is not an outdated factor in our history. It is curious to note that those who have voted, time and time and time again, against every act for the improvement of the conditions of labor, invoke the fair name of labor on behalf of their own restrictive tariff policies. Like Hamilton then, the protectionists today, have little real interest in the welfare of labor.

Here, Mr. President, I should like to skip a century and cite a modern example in support of this assertion. I should like to compare the vote of Republican protectionists on the Reciprocal Trade Act extension with their vote on bills which concern the real interests of labor.

My assertion is that while they invoke the fair name of labor in support of protection, they vote against labor bills in general whenever they have the opportunity. Let us take the votes on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Acts in 1937 and 1945, and compare them with the votes—occurring rather close together—on the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Taft Hartley Act of 1947. Let us put their claims of supporting the interest of labor to the test—the acid test of how they voted.

In 1937, there was a rollcall vote on the trade agreement extension. How did the parties vote? In the House, the Democratic vote was 278 for and 11 against. The Republican vote was 3 for the act and 81 against—almost a unanimous vote. At that time there were not many Republicans in the Congress. In other words, Mr. President, 96 percent of the Democrats voting favored the act and 96 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

In the Senate, 56 Democrats voted for the trade bill, and 9 were opposed; while no Republicans voted for it, and 14 Republicans opposed it. In other words, 86 percent of the Democrats voting favored the bill, and 100 percent of the Republicans voting opposed it. In fact, in the entire Congress there were only 3 Republican votes for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1937.

On the vote on extension of the act in 1945—another key vote—in the House, 205 Democrats supported it, and 12 opposed; while only 33 Republicans supported it, and 140 opposed. The Democrats voted 94 percent for its extension, and 6 percent against; while only 18 percent of the Republicans favored the bill, and 82 percent of those voting opposed it.

In the Senate, there were 54 Democrats for, and 5 Democrats against—or 90 percent in favor; while 15 Republicans voted for the act, and 16 opposed, or less than 50 percent in its favor. The Republicans in both the House and the Senate provided only 48 of the 293 votes in favor of extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

These key votes were on issues and during debates in which the Republicans moaned and wailed for protection as beneficial to the interest of labor. But how did they vote in 1938 and 1947 on the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Taft-Hartley Act—the first opportunities to vote for labor, after the votes on these Reciprocal Trade Acts? Did they bleed for labor? Did they jump at the opportunity to provide a minimum wage starting at 25 cents an hour and in 5 years going to 40 cents an hour under the Fair Labor Standards Act, for the workingman whose good name they used in trying to defeat the trade acts? Were they interested in establishing a floor of 25 to 40 cents an hour for the American worker?

Well, here is the vote. In the House of Representatives, only 31 Republicans voted for the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and 48 voted against it—or 61 percent were against the act and 39 percent were for it.

In the House, the Democrats voted 247 to 41 for the act—or 86 percent of those voting voted in favor, and 14 percent voted against. In the Senate, 2 Republicans voted for, and 13 against—or 87 percent against; and 51 Democrats voted for, and 15 against—or 78 percent of the Democrats voted for this prolabor bill.

On the Taft-Hartley Act, not considered by labor as friendly legislation—the Republicans in the Senate, who in the previous session had invoked labor's name against freer trade, voted 94 percent for the Taft-Hartley Act, or 47 to 3 in its favor. One of the three dissenters has since joined the ranks of the Democratic Party. And they voted 48 to 3 to override the President's veto. In the Senate, half of the Democrats voting were against the bill.

In the House, the Republicans voted 215 to 22 in favor of the act, or 91 percent in its favor, while the Democrats voted 93 to 84 for passage—or 53 percent in its favor. In the House, the Democrats provided 80 percent of the vote against the Taft-Hartley Act, and in the Senate, almost 90 percent of the votes against its passage. I may say that the northern Democrats stood almost as one in opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act, and also in favor of reciprocal trade.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to conclude that, historically speaking, protectionists used to be antilabor, and that their pleas for protection based on their so-called interest in the welfare of labor are not, in fact, supported by their votes when the real interests of labor are at stake.

The second point I want to make is that protection, itself, is against the interests of our working people. Most of the protected industries are cheap-labor industries, and, until very recently, nonunion or company-union industries. It is true that some of them have been organized in recent years; but for how many years did the protectionists point with pride at their American labor, agonize over the harm to come from the imports of foreign products, and then, as in the textile industry, hire women and children at the lowest possible wages, and welcome each new wave of immigrants who arrived in this country to replace the previous wave of immigrants who had been hired for almost nothing. The protected industries, Mr. President, have never been the high-wage industries.

Obviously, the protectionists cannot have the welfare of labor at heart for, first, the effect of a protective tariff is to increase the profits by monopoly markets—thus increasing prices, and incidentally drawing in the less efficient firms with higher production costs; and second, the workers have less purchasing power for it is they who must pay higher prices for protected products—thus their wages buy less than they otherwise would, creating a lower standard of living.

THE PERIOD 1800 TO 1816

America's foreign trade policy from 1800 to 1816 was based, not on economic principles, but on questions of expediency. It was an attempt to keep American interests alive while the British and French concluded the Napoleonic Wars. Until 1808, the effect of the war between England and France—often described as the War Between the Elephant and the Whale—was to present America with a great opportunity. McMaster wrote that "Almost the whole carrying trade of Europe was in their—American—hands"; and a recent writer has said that while the great commercial nations were fighting one another for the carrying trade of the world, America ran away with the bone.

Our prosperity was short-lived, and our foreign commerce dropped disastrously after 1807. Napoleon enforced his continental system by the Berlin and Milan decrees, and the British countered with their various orders in council. Between 1808 and 1815, this isolation from the rest of the world had the same effect as protection. When the War of 1812 was concluded in 1815, a number of America's domestic manufacturers had been started—especially textiles, owing to the domestic wartime demands for goods not then obtainable abroad. We turned from a trading nation to one whose primary interests were in promoting domestic manufactures. From 1815 to 1914, except for the 14-year period between the Walker tariff of 1846 and the Civil War, America remained isolationist in economic as well as in political and diplomatic affairs.

FROM 1816 TO THE CIVIL WAR

The tariff of 1816, the first truly "protective tariff" in our history, was supported by those from almost all regions and from all parties, in order, it was argued, to stimulate "infant industries."

However, the result, in part, was a steady decline in our foreign commerce from the time of the tariff of 1816 to 1833. In 1816, America entered an era of good feeling, and a one-party system. I think we should take due note of what happened under that one-party system. It was to be crushed by the reaction to the personality of John Quincy Adams and the split over the tariff of 1824, and the Tariff of Abominations in 1828.

For 20 years, roughly speaking, after 1816, the tariff became more and more protectionist. In fact, the period from 1816 to the Civil War can be divided into two parts. In the first period, up to the 1830's, the tariff rose year by year under Whig, New England, and Middle Atlantic State dominance of the Congress. That increase in tariffs was led by the increases in the case of textiles and in the case of iron.

The second period, that from the compromise tariff of 1833 to the Civil War, was, except for the Whig tariff of 1842, one of declining rates. The latter period included, also, the Walker Tariff of 1846, one of the most enlightened pieces of legislation we Democrats have passed, and which ushered in a period of prosperity for America unparalleled in relative terms until the 20th century.

Meanwhile, the Congress passed the tariff of 1824—a protectionist measure. The Middle States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee received greater representation in Congress, as a result of the census of 1820.

Their protectionist pressures resulted in higher duties on iron, lead, wool, and cotton goods. Of course, the manufacturing centers of New England were in the forefront, in wanting high tariffs on both wool and cotton. Then, as today, the wool interests were among the leaders of protection. Then, as today, they were split along lines of personal self-interest and divided among themselves. The woolen textile trades desired duty-free wool for their manufacturing establishments, but a high tariff on woolen goods. The wool growers, of course, wanted a high tariff against wool as a raw material. The textile trades, then as today, cried for protection for their infant industry, unable to compete with foreign products. When, Mr. President, are these infant industries going to be weaned. Must they still "sup" at the public trough? The wool growers, the ironmasters, and the textile trades of New England and the Middle Atlantic States, made the passage of this protectionist measure possible.

It was in the debate on the tariff of 1824 that Henry Clay, the real founder of the Whig Party, pronounced his American policy and his American system, which were to plague the country and our politics for generations. It was from the time of this debate, too, that the tariff issue became a major one in party politics.

The tariff of 1824 raised the average rate from a low of 5 percent in 1789 and 20 percent in 1816 to 40 percent in 1824. From then on, the forces of protection grew and grew and were triumphant down to the present day, except for three Democratic freer trade tariffs—under Polk in 1846, under Woodrow Wilson in 1913, and under Franklin Delano Roosevelt from 1934 to 1945.

The next tariff to follow that of 1824, the tariff of 1828, was inextricably bound up with party politics, and was passed in a flurry of log-rolling and political maneuvering, probably without precedent in our history to that date, which gained for it the infamous title "the Tariff of Abominations."

Jackson had the support of the South and some of the West who, in the main were free traders. Adams and his party, supported by Clay, were protectionists. In an attempt to win some of the votes from the now more important Middle States, a bill was introduced to increase duties on manufactured goods and raw materials. The tactics were to force the duties so high that in the end the bill might be defeated, thus satisfying the protectionists by jacking up the rates, and the free traders by voting the bill down in the final vote. These tactics backfired, as such log-rolling tactics generally backfire, and in the end the bill was passed.

To the great good credit of the South, the representatives from that section voted solidly against the bill, as did two-thirds of the New England Congressmen. But, a third of the New England Congressmen, representing manufacturers, mainly textiles, combined with the Middle States to gain its passage.

Jackson was elected, but the country was saddled with the most infamous tariff in our history. The average rate was now 44 percent. In rebellion against the act, Calhoun enunciated the Nullification Doctrine. Although I believe that the South was wrong in its stand on slavery, it certainly had a genuine grievance against the Tariff of Abominations which led to the Nullification Doctrine.

Here, then, is a clear example of how the tariff issue and protection, pushed to their extremes, began the processes of division which helped to lead to the Civil War. I have shown that the tariff issue, protection, and restriction were major causes of the American Revolution. Here we find it again, inextricably bound up with the forces which divided our country and led to war and fratricide among our peoples. Although it may be something of an exaggeration, it has nevertheless been said by competent historians that the tariff was as important in causing the War Between the States as was the issue of slavery. Extremes beget extremes; and the South's grievance against the attempt of northern industrial domination was as genuine in this period as it was later, in one of the blackest pages of our domestic history, the period of reconstruction.

The last, almost deathbed breath of protection before the Civil War was the Whig tariff of 1842. The Whigs, of course, were predecessors of the present-day Republicans, and their attitudes on the tariff was as protectionist then as the Republicans are protectionist now. I do not desire to turn this speech into an objective history of the Civil War from the southern point of view, for there were, of course, many issues which led to that unhappy event.

Among the issues and causes of the war were the extreme position taken by a few, but highly vocal, men in the South on the slavery question. Surely they were wrong in that. But, there were extremists in the North. Apart from many sincere advocates of abolition, there was always lurking behind them the dead hand of northern industrialists and northern manufacturers. The aims of these industrialists before the Civil War were frustrated at every turn, owing to the Democratic majorities in Congress and a succession of Democratic Presidents from Jackson to Buchanan, 1828 to 1860. Only two Whigs, William Henry Harrison and Zachary Taylor, were elected in 32 years, and both died in office, after serving only a short time.

After the war, the Republicans emasculated Lincoln's humane plan for reconstruction. They captured the Presidency. They rigged the Congress by preventing southern representation. They established the Freedman's Bureau. Finally, they waved the bloody shirt to preserve their minority control over the processes of Government. I believe that the unwillingness of the protectionists to accept the will of the people, as expressed by the elected Congresses and Presidents before the Civil War—on such issues as trade, tariff, the cross-country railroad, and banking and currency—looms large as a factor creating the extremes which made the conflict inevitable.

What were the conditions which the protectionists so disliked? They were conditions of prosperity, of freer trade, and the protection of the consumers and the masses of the people which resulted from the trade policies of the Democratic administration of James K. Polk, 1845 to 1849, and the great freer trade tariff of 1846, named the Walker tariff, after Robert J. Walker, Polk's Secretary of the Treasury.

There are always conflicting claims between protectionists and free traders as to the causes of prosperity and depression, both pushing forward their pet theories as a cause of prosperity and the other side's pet theories as the cause of depression. Yet, no such exact measurement can be made. Nonetheless, it can be said, and it has been said by America's greatest tariff historian, the late Prof. Frank Taussig, that—

> Although a direct connection cannot be traced, he who is convinced on grounds of general reasoning and of general experience, that the principles of free trade are sound and that protective duties are harmful, can fairly deduce the conclusion that the low tariffs of 1846 and 1857 contributed, so far as they went, to general prosperity.

He continues:

> When the act of 1846 was passed, the protectionists predicted disaster; but disaster came not, either for the country at large or for the cotton industry.

In a footnote, in his Tariff History of the United States, Taussig quotes Abbott Lawrence, one of the leading Massachusetts industrialists, who predicted, when the tariff of 1846 was passed, that a general crash "will take place in the space of 18 months from the time this experimental bill goes into operation; not a specie-paying bank doing business will be found in the United States."

So said this New England protectionist and Whig. I put it to you, Mr. President, that there is an example of Whig, Republican, protectionist "doom and gloom" which far exceeds any statements by Democrats which Leonard Hall can dig from his files.

But a general crash did not take place and, in fact, the country entered a period of expansion and prosperity seldom paralleled in our history.

A few figures quoted by Percy Ashley in his Modern Tariff History will suffice to show the great expansion and prosperity which occurred in the years between 1840 and 1860. One should recall that these years were accompanied not only by the freer trade policies of the Walker tariff in 1846, but the repeal of the Corn laws in England in the same year, the end of the last vestiges of the navigation acts in England in 1849, and the free-trade tariff in 1857. England went from a protectionist basis to one of almost complete free trade. I say that because of the freer trade policy in America, which coincided with similar policies in England, and the successes of the Democratic Party in America and of the Liberal Party in England, under Cobden and Bright, the period from 1846 to 1860 was one which has rightly been referred to as a "golden age."

Let us look at some figures compiled by Ashley from the Statistical Abstracts of the United States.

Between 1840 and 1860 our population almost doubled—from 17 million to 31.4 million people.

There was a 4-percent increase in the proportion of our people living in cities of over 8,000 people—from 12.5 to 16.1 percent in these 20 years.

The quantity of wheat produced increased from 85 million bushels in 1840 to 173 million bushels in 1860. In other words, our production doubled, because America could now sell in European markets, as a result of American and British free-trade tariffs.

Corn production rose from 377 million bushels to 839 million bushels in the same period, or by 2¼ times.

Cotton produced increased from 1.3 million bales in 1840 to 4.5 million in 1860, or by 3½ times, an amount not reached again until 1877.

The value of our manufactured products was $1 billion in 1850 and $1.88 billion in 1860, an increase of 88 percent. Much of this was owing to new inventions and better transportation to markets, yet the stimulus of trade had a marked effect on this rise.

Coal output, which was 1.8 million tons in 1840, increased to 6.2 million tons in 1850 and to 13 million tons in 1860, or by 7¼ times.

The production of pig iron rose 3 to 4 times in the period—from 287,000 tons in 1840 to 821,000 in 1860—and that was before the introduction of Kelley's or Bessemer's process in the United States.

Steel-rail production increased 9 times between 1849 and 1860—from 24,000 tons in 1849 to 205,000 tons in 1860.

Cotton spindles used in the United States were estimated at 2.3 million in 1840 and rose to 4 million in 1850 and to 5.2 million in 1860—an increase of 126 percent.

Foreign trade underwent great expansion. In the 10 years from 1847 to 1857—the years of the Walker tariff—our exports doubled, rising from approximately $163 million to $306 million and our imports increased from $127.5 million to $363 million.

And, Mr. President, in spite of the lower rates of duty—and it is well to note this interesting and important fact—our customs revenue which, under the Whig protective tariff of 1842, reached a high of $27.5 million, increased to $64 million by 1856 under the lower duty Walker tariff. Lower tariffs mean more revenues, cheaper products for consumers, and greater prosperity.

Some tariff historians, largely, I fear, in deference to the manufacturing interests who dominate the boards of trustees of their colleges and universities, and who attempt to write so-called objective facts and to avoid interpretation—which make textbooks such dull reading—have said that the effect of the tariffs on this prosperity and expansion was only small. I beg to claim for the Walker tariff of 1846 and the tariff of 1857, the seed of our prosperity and expansion in those pre-Civil War years.

I can assure you that had circumstances been different, the protectionists would have been quick to say it resulted from the lower tariffs—as, in fact, they did say after the panics of 1837 and 1857—and have said on every occasion when it fitted their interests to do so.

I am reminded of the reply of the victorious general who was asked if he had won the battle. His reply:

> It is difficult to say, but I'm the one who would have been blamed if we had lost.

So, Mr. President, we Democrats do not say that our tariff policies in this period were altogether the cause—or the sole cause—of prosperity and expansion—but we can say if there had been depression and contraction, our tariff policy would have been blamed.

CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM TARIFF HISTORY TO THE CIVIL WAR

Well, then, Mr. President, what conclusions can we draw from our tariff history from the founding of our country to the Civil War?

We can conclude that because a tariff is a tax on consumers—like a sales tax—that the issue has divided us between those who support the consumer and the general interest, on the one hand, and those who support the restrictive and particular interest, on the other.

We can conclude that the extreme protectionist policies practiced by England—what was then called the mercantile system—led to rebellion in the American colonies and the American Revolution. In other words, our people rebelled against the same trade policies in 1776 which the protectionists wish to shackle us with today.

Further, we note that numerous articles like lead, glass, wool, iron, and textiles have been protected since the earliest days of our country—and are still unable to stand on their own two feet. After 164 years they are back again, with their palms out, asking for subsidies. They got them first with the cry of "protect the infant industries." When will these infants be weaned?

It is also apparent that protectionist policies, as practiced by the individual States under the Articles of Confederation, were restrictive, chaotic, and unproductive of the general good, and that opposition to them led, almost directly, to the establishment of our Constitution.

It is also true that because conservative leaders of manufacturing and the monied classes were dominant at the time of the Constitution, and had replaced Jefferson and the liberal leadership of the Revolution, our Constitution, while containing an enlightened policy on commerce between and among the States, fails to apply that policy to our foreign trade. And the one great free-trade article in the Constitution, that which prohibits a tax or duty on exports, was written into our Constitution at the express demand of the free-trade South.

We note, too, that Alexander Hamilton, the first great protectionist, and the ablest advocate of the interest of the monied classes, combined, as protectionists still do today, restrictive trade policies with a disdain for the welfare of the workingman and the interests of the people as a whole.

We can conclude, too, that general economic decline accompanied periods of protection—as that from 1816 to 1833—and that periods of economic growth, expansion, and prosperity were accompanied by enlightened trade policies such as those under the Walker tariff of 1846.

It is clear to us, also, that our 2-party system had its origins in the conflicts over the tariff and protection in 1824 and 1828. They led to the division of our people between Democrats and Whigs, the latter the direct predecessor of the present-day Republicans.

Just as the 2-party system grew out of the tariff conflicts of 1824 and 1928, so did the first division between North and South, which led, 30 years later, to the War Between the States.

It is clear, Mr. President, that those who live by slogans like "competition" and who wrap themselves in the shibboleths of terms like "free enterprise" and "rugged individualism" are the first to seek a tariff subsidy, to avoid competition, and to seek protection and restriction when their own interests are at stake.

Finally, Mr. President, it is fair to assert, that where the tariff was concerned, the Democratic Party was the party of freer trade, fewer restrictions, and enlightened and progressive policies while the Republicans were the party, as they are today, of protection, restriction, and narrow nationalistic interests where foreign trade is concerned.

These are the lessons of our tariff history before the Civil War. With few exceptions they are the principles to be drawn from our tariff history since the Civil War. That chapter, Mr. President, I wish to describe at some length now.

LINCOLN AND THE TARIFF

Just as the protectionists, Mr. President, invoke the fair name of labor in their own protective interest, while voting against the interests of labor on almost every other issue, so too have they attempted to tie, year after year, the name of the Great Emancipator with their cause. Meanwhile, in those qualities which really describe the martyred President—qualities which one of our great Lincoln historians, J. G. Randall, ascribed to him—his passion for humanity, his avoidance of rashness, his tolerance for others, his enthusiasm for democracy, and his awareness of social needs—are those which the protectionists who invoke his name have avoided in abundance. They have exploited the consumer. They have opposed progress. They have been apathetic to human needs. It mars the sacred name of the wartime President to hear the protectionists invoke his life and qualities in defense of their narrow, restrictive, selfish interests.

Not only do they invoke his name, but many statements ascribed to him by protectionists are false, untrue, and manufactured from the air. I refer, in particular, to the most famous of them all, used on the floor of the Senate as late as February 28 of this year. I refer to the remark which protectionists have ascribed to Lincoln that when asked whether we should build foundries to manufacture steel rails in this country

or buy them from England, he is said to have replied—and I give the putative quotation:

If we purchase a ton of steel rails from England for $20, then we have the rails and England has the money; but if we buy a ton of steel rails from an American for $25, America has both the rails and the money.

There are only a few things wrong with this quotation. First, Lincoln never uttered it. Second, the protectionists as often as not substitute the word "coat" for "steel rails," and he is said to have said the same words about many other items. They change the item to suit their case. Third, the remark was actually made, many years after Lincoln's death, by Robert Ingersoll. I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks today, there be printed in the RECORD as Exhibit I, an article by Frank W. Taussig called Abraham Lincoln on the Tariff: A Myth, from the Quarterly Journal of Economics, volume XXVIII, pages 814–820, 1914, and 2 shorter additions in subsequent editions of the Journal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. This article should bury this old chestnut once and for all, and I hope that in years to come, we in the Senate may not have to listen to this old quotation ascribed to Lincoln, which Professor Taussig proved some 41 years ago Lincoln never uttered.

THE MORRILL TARIFFS OF THE CIVIL WAR

After the enlightened "free trade" tariffs of 1846 and 1857, which led to great economic prosperity and expansion, America was saddled, by the Republican Party, with the so-called Morrill war tariffs which shaped our economic policies right down to the time of the first World War. These protectionist policies were to lead to the most shameful period in our history. It was a period of corruption, debauchment, and flagrant abuse of the public trust. It was the work, in large part, of the protectionists.

I may say that the seeds for that were sown in the Republican National Convention in 1860. In many respects it was a remarkable convention, even though it did nominate a great American for the Presidency, namely, Abraham Lincoln. Even though it advocated humane measures, including homestead legislation, one feature of the program was the apparent implicit pledge which was given to the manufacturing interests of New England and Pennsylvania that if they accepted Lincoln as the candidate and if they were strongly in favor of the Republicans, the Republicans would put in a high protective tariff.

During the Civil War there were three major pieces of tariff legislation—the acts of 1861, 1862, and 1864. All were proposed and passed through the efforts of Representative Morrill, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and one of the strongest protectionists, with the possible exception of McKinley, in our history. In addition, hardly a month passed during the Civil War, that rates and duties were not raised by individual legislation.

It was a period in which every selfish interest appearing before Congress was given its way and sometimes given more protection, even than it asked for. Rates were raised from an average of 30 percent to 47 percent, although the average does not give a proper view of increases for specific items. The effect, in part, was to launch this country on a period of permanent deflation—from 1872 to the turn of the century—when economic conditions for the people got worse and worse, the banking and financial interests got richer and richer, and the "robber barons" and the new rising industrialists captured the country and the Government and used it to promote their own interests. This was a result, in large part, of protection.

It all started when in the session of 1859–60 the first Morrill tariff was passed by the House ostensibly to put tariff rates back to the 1846 level from the new low levels of the 1857 tariff—but really to gain Pennsylvania for the Republican Party in the 1860 election. It did not pass the Senate until the session of 1860–61. Iron and wool were the main products benefited. Specific duties were substituted for ad valorem and the rates increased to an average of 35 percent. One of the old tricks of the protectionists was pulled in this bill. They claimed that the specific rates substituted were the equivalent of the ad valorem duties in 1846, but in fact they were much higher. On any number of occasions this same type of fraud has been perpetrated by the protectionists.

The 1862 Morrill Act raised the rates to an average of 37 percent, and was imposed ostensibly to offset the internal excise taxes levied on specific commodities to pay for the war. Thus, manufacturers whose products were taxed during the war were given at least an equal subsidy by way of the increased tariff—thus loading on the consumer a double jeopardy for payment of the war. They paid once by higher prices for items because of the excise taxes, and they paid again by way of higher prices because the increased tariff was loaded on the final sales price of the product. That war, in the North at least, was paid for by consumers through inflation, through the issuance of cheap money greenbacks, and by way of excise taxes and tariff duties, while the bankers and the moneyed interests were compensated for the excises and promised gold in return for the greenbacks they used to buy bonds.

The same purpose was served by the Morrill tariff of 1864. According to Taussig the stated purpose of the act was to "put domestic producers in the same situation, so far as foreign competition was concerned as if the internal taxes had not been raised."

Thus, the war was used as an excuse for protection. Almost every producer who appeared before Congress got what he wanted—and sometimes even higher rates than he asked for, and, as Taussig comments:

Schemes for moneymaking were incorporated in it (the 1864 bill) and were hardly questioned by Congress. When more enlightened and unselfish views began to make their way, these (abuses and excessive duties) had obtained * * * too strong a hold to be easily shaken off.

Taussig sums up the effect of the war tariffs in this way:

The war had in many ways a bracing and ennobling influence on our national life; but its immediate effect on business affairs, and on all legislation affecting moneyed interests, was demoralizing. The line between public duty and private interest was often lost sight of by legislators. Great fortunes were made by changes in legislation urged and brought about by those who were benefited by them; and the country has seen with sorrow that the honor and honesty of public men did not remain undefiled.

So we see that the selfishness of the protectionists resulted in yet another evil in the history of our country—that of helping to debauch the morality of our national life. The effect of protection was to corrupt, to infect, and to pollute the moral tone of American life—and I say that if the protectionists gain their way this week—if we give in to the claims of the selfish interests for amendments to this bill, the door will be opened once again to corruption, infection, and pollution.

What party was responsible for protection and for the corruption of our national life? I have a record of the vote on the Morrill tariff of 1861, taken in the House before the rebellion, and the Morrill tariff of 1864, when the southern Representatives were gone. Of those who voted "yea" on the act of 1861, a vote taken in the House in 1860, 89 of 105 yeas were Whig and Republican votes, 7 were from Democrats, and the others scattered among a group of minor parties. Of the 64 nays, 59 were from Democrats. In the Senate, the 25 "yeas" included 22 Whigs and Republicans, 1 Democrat, and 2 Free Soil votes. The 14 "Nays" were from 13 Democrats and 1 Whig.

On the vote for the Tariff of 1864, of the 82 "yeas" in the House of Representatives the Republicans and their satellite parties, provided 73 of those votes against 9 Democratic votes. In the Senate, all but 1 of the 22 votes for protection were from Republicans and their allies. The 26 opposition votes in the House were made up of 23 Democratic votes, and in the Senate all 5 votes against the Tariff of 1864 were Democratic votes.

It is clear then, that the beginning of modern protectionist policies can clearly be laid at the feet of the Republican Party. It is clear from their representation and votes in Congress that they have been the party of protection from the very time they gained office down to the present day.

FROM THE CIVIL WAR TO M'KINLEY PROTECTION

During the period following the Civil War the tariff issue again played a big part in our political life. First of all, industry got another windfall. The internal excise taxes placed on their products were removed so that by 1872 no important ones remained. Yet the higher tariff rates, imposed during the war to compensate the protectionists for the excise taxes they paid—or more properly, passed on to the consumer—remained on the books. Now, they were in an even better position than during the war when

their taxes were offset by the tariff subsidy. Now they paid no tax but kept the subsidy. Even Morrill himself thought that there might be some reduction in the extreme tariff rates. But, they were retained at the war-time levels.

While agriculture suffered depression from 1867 to the turn of the century, the excess revenues in the Treasury from the War Tariffs amounted to $100 million in the years 1870–72. Agitation was so great from southern and western representatives to lower the tariff that a strong bill was reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee to create a permanent reduction in the war duties. But, the Senate countered with a bill—backed by the protectionist interest and particularly one John L. Hayes, Secretary of the Wool Manufacturers Association and later—1882—President of the Tariff Commission—to reduce duties by only 10 percent. In this the protectionists were successful.

Then, as now, a Republican administration—Garfield-Arthur—followed the practice of appointing to membership of Government commissions, whose trust it is to represent the public interest, men who have a background, training, and a vested interest in the very industries and subjects which they are supposed to regulate or pronounce judgment about. This is the way the Republican Party has acted historically. And I am compelled to say that present-day policies like the oil giveaway, the dividend exemption, accelerated amortization, the commission appointees, the economic policies of deflation and hard money, the promotion of mergers, and the constant compromise with protectionists, are all policies of the Eisenhower administration which, certainly compare in kind if not in extent—in the case of oil, to a greater extent—with those of the series of Republican administrations from Grant to McKinley and again under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

It should be noted further that although there was a reduction in 1872 the reductions were made on items not produced in the United States so that the protected industries remained protected. Our Mr. Hayes called the act one which resulted in "A reduction of over $50 million, and yet taking only a shaving off from the protection duties." And even these reductions were restored, in 1875, at the protectionists' behest.

The effect of the reduction was meaningless. First, they were restored in 1875. Second, as duties now averaged 47 percent and most of them were specific—such as 5 cents a yard for cotton tissues—the rates were even higher than they seemed. The reason is that the Republican Party pursued a policy of permanent deflation from 1867 to 1896. Thus while the duty, from 1861 to 1872, rose from 1 cent to 5 cents a yard on an item like cotton tissues—raw cotton fell to its prewar price. The effect of the act of 1872, even though it lowered duties by an average of 10 percent, was to increase rates when one considers the change in price levels.

In the year 1883 there was a reduction in the average level of the tariff from 47 percent to 42 percent, but according to Taussig:

> Looking at the tariff system as a whole, it retained, substantially unchanged, the high level of duties reached during and after the Civil War.

It was over this bill, however, that we have an example of parliamentary intrigue and trickery—I will not call it more—by the protectionists. The House of Representatives was less protectionist than the Senate. By a maneuver the protectionists, who were unsuccessful with a tariff bill in the House, in the Senate tacked on their tariff bill as an amendment to a revenue bill from the House. The bill was then sent to a conference committee, where the rates were increased. Representative Morrison, a freetrader from Illinois, explained this maneuver in the following terms:

> The office and duty of a conference committee is to adjust the differences between two disagreeing Houses. This House had decided that bar-iron of the middle class should pay $20 a ton; the Senate that it was to pay $20.16 a ton. The gentlemen of the conference committee reconciled this difference—how? By raising bar-iron above both House and Senate to $22.40. The Tariff Commission reported that the tariff on iron ore should be 50 cents a ton. The Senate said it should be 50 cents a ton. The House said it should be 50 cents a ton. Gentlemen of the conference committee reconciled the agreement of the House, Senate, and the Tariff Commission into a disagreement, and made the duty on iron ore 75 cents a ton. The gentlemen of the conference did a similar service for the great corporation of corporations, the Iron & Steel Association, by giving it a tax of $17 on steel rails, which the House had fixed at $15 and the Senate at $15.68 per ton. (Taussig, History, p. 233. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1883–84, p. 2786.)

That was the lower-duty tariff of 1883.

M'KINLEY PROTECTION RESULTS IN DEPRESSION AND TRUST MOVEMENT

From 1888 to the end of the century, tariffs, trusts, and the silver controversy were the chief political issues of the day. President Cleveland, in his third annual message to Congress in 1887, called the tariff a "vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and devoted his entire message to tariff reform. The election of 1888 was fought on the issue and the Republican electoral victory led to the McKinley tariff of 1890.

So far as the popular vote was concerned, Grover Cleveland had a plurality, as Tilden had a plurality in 1876. Harrison had the electoral vote. The Democratic Party was really the majority party from 1876 to 1896. Not satisfied to accept their victory as a mandate to keep the existing level of unnecessary protection, the Republicans construed their victory as a mandate to raise the rates. The average level was now increased to 50 percent.

The purpose of the McKinley Tariff Act was to make protection permanent. In their aim at economic isolation the Republicans no longer argued the tariff on grounds of protecting "infant industries" but frankly supported it as a permanent commercial policy.

The effect was political and economic reaction which swept the Republicans from office and contributed to the depression of 1893–94. In 1894, the Democrats passed the Wilson Act which lowered duties by 20 percent and freed raw materials, especially wool, from import duties.

The Republican Party claimed that the depression of 1893 was caused by the Tariff Act of 1894, which has always seemed to me to be a strained piece of reasoning.

Mr. President, in the city of Chicago, William Jennings Bryan was nominated by the Democratic Party for the Presidency after one of the most remarkable orations in the history of the Nation. The party was then in the same situation in which it finds itself today. Mr. Bryan made a tremendous campaign, and during the summer and early fall it looked as though he were winning. But the chairman of the Republican National Committee was Marcus Alonzo Hanna, who had sponsored William McKinley and was in charge of his campaign. He sent agents out to get large campaign contributions. No one knows how much money was contributed to the campaign of 1896, but it is indicated that Hanna sent word that they were to "fry the fat" out of the manufacturers. The manufacturers of Pennsylvania and other States were called upon and they furnished money to help defeat Bryan in the November elections. After the elections were won, the contributors were paid off. The Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 was passed.

I grew up in the State of Maine, in a small woolen-mill town, and it was stated that in that town as in other towns the owners and managers of the woolen mills called the workers together on the Saturday before election and told them that if they voted the Democratic ticket and if the Democrats won, the woolen mills would be closed down and the people would be out of work. The implication was clearly made that the ballot was not a thoroughly secret ballot, and that it would be known how the voters voted, and that if they had a lively view for their own self-interest they would vote the Republican ticket. That was a common experience. The people of New England never forgot that.

With the election of McKinley in 1896 over the issue of gold and hard money, the Republicans reverted to their old ways, compensated the supporters from whom Mark Hanna had gained funds and passed the Dingley Act of 1897, which raised tariffs to 57 percent—the highest in our history to that date. The major effect of this tariff was to promote trusts and mergers, which has been one of the worst consequences of protection.

THE TARIFF AND THE TRUSTS

The post Civil War protectionist policies certainly gave impetus to the rise of the trust movement, although there were a number of other factors responsible. These included the rise of large-scale manufacturing, the control of politics by industrialists, the protection business gained from the extreme interpretation of the 5th and 14th Amendments by the Supreme Court to protect property rights, and the profits which investment firms made from the mergers. It is well to remember that J. P. Morgan

& Co. pocketed $62 million in the deal which established U. S. Steel.

But certainly among the reasons for the trust movement was protection and the tariff. In fact, H. O. Havermeyer, the president of the sugar trust, stated that "the mother of all trusts is the customs tariff." One finds that the list of major American trusts and monopolies was almost identical with the list of protected industries—iron and steel, sugar, tobacco, steel rails, petroleum, lead, copper, beef, salt, matches, whisky, tin cans, locomotives, glassware, rubber goods, and leather, to name a few.

Mr. President, in the cartoons of that period, the Senate Chamber was depicted as an assembly of representatives of the trusts. I have seen cartoons of that period in which Senators were labeled as representatives of the steel trust, of the express companies, and of tobacco interests. I have seen them labeled as "sugar" Senators, "petroleum" Senators, and "copper" Senators. I do not know whether any of them were labeled as "whisky" Senators. But certainly they were regarded as being on the floor merely the embodiments of the trust interests which sent so many to this body.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator imagine that any of the evils of which he speaks can be avoided, when Congress delegates the power to make agreements in secret to privately appointed individuals, who will carry on their negotiations in secret, and who will make known to all the countries of the world what is being done through the trade agreements with the United States before Congress is given that information in full daylight?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I can say is that in the period in which tariffs were made by the legislative bodies, special groups brought terrific pressure to bear on Congress. General interest is always weak, so with the exception of the Underwood tariff of 1913, almost all the tariffs made by Congress were in the upward direction; while, to the contrary, the reduction in tariffs began in 1934, when that great American leader, Cordell Hull, took the lead in establishing reciprocal tariffs.

If trusts were a problem before 1897, they were an even greater problem afterwards. The Dingley tariff preceded, if it did not lead to, the greatest flurry of industrial combination in our history to that date. A few figures may be illuminating. In the census of 1900, it was estimated that there were 185 industrial combinations. Although they made up only one-half of 1 percent of the number of industrial corporations, they owned 15 percent of the capital and produced 14 percent of all manufactured products in the country. And the iron and steel trust produced one-half of the gross value of the products produced by all the industrial combinations.

By 1904, it is estimated that the number of combinations and trusts had grown to 318. They had capital assets of $7.2 billion, a third of which were controlled by 7 corporations. Further, 5,300 individual plants had been consolidated into these 318 combinations. According to the economist, H. P. Seager, author of Trust and Corporation Problems, by 1904 the trusts controlled fully two-fifths of the manufacturing capital of the country.

Therefore, we have yet another item to add to the bill of particulars against excessive tariffs and protection—namely, that tariffs gave aid to the trust movement even if it exaggerates their influence to call them the mother of trusts and that the highest tariff in our history, that of 1897 under McKinley, aided and abetted, if it did not lead to, a trust movement unprecedented before that time.

THE PAYNE-ALDRICH ACT OF 1909

In 1909, the Republicans under Taft, aware of the discontent of the Middle Western farm groups and the great public indignation over the growth of the tariff and of trusts, passed the Payne-Aldrich Act.

I may say that in the State of Iowa a movement had developed against the protective tariff, on the very proper ground that by preventing European countries from selling to us, it prevented European countries from buying from us, and therefore shut off the export of our farm goods.

A young Lochinvar by the name of Albert B. Cummins started a campaign for lower tariffs, and was joined by the silver-tongued Jonathan Dolliver. They advanced the idea that there should be lower tariffs in order to stimulate the export of American farm products.

A historic battle was fought in the Senate and the House, but the Republican Old Guard passed the Payne-Aldrich Act, which attempted to satisfy the public clamor for lowered rates, but which, in fact, "brought no essential change in our tariff system," according to Taussig.

It did abolish the duties on hides, but it raised them on cotton, silk, and a large number of smaller items, and kept effective protection for trusts like the iron and steel industry. When pressed, some of our Republican friends who have had some training in economic affairs and whose consciences are sensitive to charges of favoritism to industry, cite this act as an example of their progressive tariff policies. But, as Taussig says, "This act as finally passed brought no real breach in the tariff wall, and no downward revision of any serious consequence." He adds that "In the Senate, things went in star-chamber fashion, and the familiar process of logrolling and manipulation was once again to be seen." In fact, the failure of the act to lower the schedules protecting the trusts was a major factor in the split of the Republican Party into two wings and the rise of the Progressive Party in 1912.

President Taft, in a rear platform address in Winona, Minn., gave his approval to the Payne-Aldrich tariff, and touched off a revolt in the prairies.

DEMOCRATS REVERSE PROTECTIONIST POLICY

The issue of the 1910 election was the tariff. The Democrats won a decisive victory and carried the House by 228 to 165. However, popular election of Senators had to await the passage of the 17th amendment in 1913, and Republican control of the Senate until the 63d Congress of 1913–15 kept reform tariff legislation from the books.

In the 1912 election, the Democrats carried the Presidency and both Houses of Congress, to complement their victory in 1910. The result was the first complete reversal of tariff policy since the protectionists gained the day in the 1860's. The Underwood Act was passed in 1913, greatly reducing rates—to an average of 30 percent—and the Democratic Party launched a program of reform and progress with such legislation and executive action as the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, the establishment of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commissions Act, the repudiation of dollar diplomacy, and Wilson's veto of the literacy test for immigrants. The Underwood tariff, which took gigantic strides toward freer trade, was a cornerstone of progressive and enlightened policy as were the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934 and the Walker tariff of 1846. One cannot avoid the conclusion, from the history of our tariff legislation, that freer trade is connected with reform and progress, and that protection has held sway during periods of reaction, retreat, and trust building.

The Underwood Act lowered duties on more than a hundred items, and most important on such items as food, textiles, iron, and steel. To offset the loss in revenue, Wilson established the graduated income tax, which substituted a fair and equitable method of taxation—that of taxing people according to their means—for the unjust method of taxation by tariff, which hits the consumer and raises the prices of the workingman.

TARIFFS OF THE TWENTIES

America entered another period of protection, reaction, and isolation in the 1920's. As in other periods of protection, this too was a period of business and industrial domination, the rise of trusts and monopolies, the abandonment of the consumer, a great farm depression, stock-market speculation, and scandals and corruption.

The two major pieces of tariff legislation were the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922 and the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy Act of 1930. There was also the Emergency tariff of 1921. When the war was over and the Republicans captured the White House, they entered on a period of "normalcy." The first effect was a major farm slump in 1920–21, and the Republicans, whose policies helped partially to bring it on, used the slump as an excuse for protection. The emergency tariff of 1921 imposed heavy duties on imports of agricultural products, but the aid to farmers was negligible, because farmers continued in a slump and depression throughout the twenties.

In 1922, the Republicans passed the Fordney-McCumber Act which raised duties to the level of the old Payne-Aldrich Act. Then came the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy Act of 1930 which raised rates another 20 percent. In the 1922 act, the President was given authority to raise or lower duties by 50 percent—to "equalize production costs." Of the 37 times when this authority was used, it was used in 32 instances to raise duties. Few protectionists then

complained of the unconstitutionality of the President's power to raise or lower duties by 50 percent. It has only been since the Reciprocal Trade Act gave the President authority to lower duties, primarily, that the protectionists have seen any constitutional issue in this grant of power to the President.

Thus the Republicans in the 1920's took us back to extreme protection. When the protectionists and selfish interests gain command in matters of trade, one can count on their gaining power over other policies of government. What were some of the results of this period?

At the end of the twenties, monopoly was more widespread than in 1900. The Republicans welcomed the advent of holding companies like that of Sam Insull. The Federal Power Commission was packed with big business representatives. The League of Nations was repudiated. Immigration was restricted. There were Teapot Dome, the Veterans' Administration scandals, and the machinations of the Ohio gang. There was the speculative boom, the collapse of the stock market, and the great depression.

These scandals and policies were not the direct result of protection and high tariffs but, throughout our history, whenever protectionists are supreme, one tends to see a decline in public morality, the capture of the instruments of government by the rich and well born, and an absence of compassion for the people. These conditions had prevailed under Hamilton, in the period of protection from 1816 to 1830, from 1860 to the turn of the century, and during the 1920's—all periods of protection.

And I may say, Mr. President, that the tariff of 1930, put through by the Republicans, known as the Hawley-Smoot-Grundy tariff, was an extraordinary affair. I happened to be one who was largely responsible for drafting a statement which pointed out what was going to happen if that tariff bill was enacted into law, and in the statement which I prepared, a copy of which I hold before me, which I have not seen for many years, we said that such a tariff "would operate, in general, to increase the prices which domestic consumers would have to pay. By raising prices, they would encourage concerns with higher costs to undertake production thus compelling the consumer to subsidize waste and inefficiency in industry."

At the same time we pointed out it would help to shut off our export market, because "countries cannot permanently buy from us unless they are permitted to sell to us, and the more we restrict the importation of goods from them by means of ever higher tariffs, the more we reduce the possibility of our exporting to them."

We pointed out that the vast majority of farmers would lose as consumers, by paying higher prices, for the products which they would buy, and as producers, because their ability to sell their products would be restricted by the barriers placed in the way of foreigners who wished to sell manufactured goods to us.

We pointed out that our exporting industries, such as copper, which was then an exporting industry, automobiles, agricultural machinery, typewriters, and the like, would be affected fully as much as farming and that if such tariffs were imposed other countries would follow suit and impose retaliatory tariffs.

We obtained the signatures of 1,028 economists asking that the President veto the bill which is an unusual occurrence itself, because my colleagues know the witticism that if all the economists in the country were laid end to end, they would not reach a conclusion. But in this instance we had unanimity among the economists of the country, asking for a veto of the Hawley-Smoot-Grundy bill. Nevertheless, President Hoover signed the bill.

All the predictions we made came true. Instead of the tariff building up trade, trade fell off. Other countries did impose retaliatory tariffs. England adopted the policy of "imperial preferences." France and Germany raised their tariffs. The world entered a period of economic nationalism. American prosperity, which had been badly shaken, plunged deeper into a depression.

It is always ungracious to point to the past and say, "I told you so," but if events ever vindicated anyone, I submit they vindicated the statement which I drafted in the spring of 1930.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement signed by the 1,028 economists asking the President to veto the tariff bill of 1930, together with the names of the signers, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

THE HISTORY OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE ACTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1932 the country elected Franklin Roosevelt and in 1934 the Congress passed the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—as an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930. It delegated to the President, for a 3-year period, the power to conclude agreements with other nations without specific congressional approval. It limited his power to reduce tariffs to 50 percent of existing duties on January 1, 1934. Each agreement, of course, was subject to possible termination at the end of the 3-year period if the Congress failed to extend the authority.

Congress did extend that authority in 1937, 1940, and 1943 without significant amendments, and in 1945 after the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt in 1944, it extended the authority and gave the President the further authority to lower rates by 50 percent of the existing duties as of January 1, 1945. Thus, any item which had been reduced by 50 percent in the period 1934–45 was subject to another possible reduction of 50 percent—or a 75 percent reduction in all—for concession from other countries. I wish to emphasize that they were not granted without return. In return for those concessions, we required equivalent, corresponding reductions on the part of other countries.

Mr. President, in a few moments I shall file tables to indicate the concessions which we obtained from other countries in return for the concessions which we had made.

In the period 1934–45, the United States concluded trade agreements with 29 countries. However, in the years from 1844 to 1934—or the 90 years preceding the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—the United States was able to negotiate and ratify only 3 reciprocity treaties under the general treatymaking power. At the same time, there were at least 11 major failures in which treaties were either rejected by the Senate, were never submitted to the Senate, or on which the Senate failed to act.

Therefore, it has only been under the delegation of power to the President that reciprocity has been possible, and without it America's hands would be tied in negotiating trade agreements if past history is any measure of the future.

As the staff papers of the Randall Commission make clear, 1945 was the high water mark of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Since that time, except for the 2-year extension by the Democrats in 1949, the act has been so modified by peril-point and escape-clause provisions, and by President Eisenhower's tacit agreement with the protectionists in his own party that he would not negotiate any major agreements, that the act may now be as important as a protectionist device as it is as legislation for freer trade.

There were several important consequences which followed from the original act of 1934.

First, of course, is the fact that it made the lowering of tariff barriers by reciprocity possible. The experience of the previous 90 years had been disastrous.

Second, it avoided the logrolling sessions which the Congress went through at every period of tariff revision preceding the 1934 act. Now, instead of every Congressman trading a vote for higher tariffs on a product from his colleagues' district for a vote for a higher tariff on a product from his own district, nations sat down around a table and we offered a lower duty on one of our imports for a concession from another country for a lower duty on one of our exports. And, under the unconditional, most-favored-nation policy, such reciprocal concessions were granted by all other countries with whom we had agreements, and with whom the individual party we negotiated with had agreements.

In other words, we substituted for logrolling among Congressmen for higher duties, logrolling among nations for lower duties. That has been the effect of the act.

Third, Mr. President, our trade, under the Reciprocal Trade Act and its extension greatly expanded between 1934 and 1948. Our exports, for example, rose in value from $2.2 billions in 1935 to $14.2 billions in 1947. Over $11 billions of that trade in 1947 was with countries with whom we had agreements under the trade act.

Madam President, I have already asked unanimous consent to have inserted in my remarks at this point tables from part IV of the report by the United States Tariff Commission on our trade-agree-

ment program from June 1934 to April 1948 entitled "Trade Agreement Concessions Obtained by the United States." These tables show the extent to which our trade increased under the Trade Agreements Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Without objection, the tables will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*United States domestic exports to trade-agreement countries, by groups, and to non-trade-agreement countries, average, 1935–39, and selected years, 1935–47*

Destination	1935	1937	1939	Average, 1935–39	1947 [1]
	Value (million dollars)				
All countries, total	2,243.1	3,298.9	3,123.3	2,828.3	14,278.3
Agreement countries	1,624.3	2,482.9	2,424.2	2,124.3	11,699.1
Countries with which the United States had agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948	1,395.9	2,143.1	2,109.8	1,834.4	9,854.7
Participating at Geneva (see table 2)	1,142.9	1,689.5	1,644.2	1,461.1	6,770.2
Not participating at Geneva (see table 4)	253.0	453.6	465.6	373.3	3,084.5
Countries party to the Geneva agreement [2]	1,371.3	2,029.3	1,958.6	1,751.0	8,614.6
Agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948 [2]	1,142.9	1,689.5	1,644.2	1,461.1	6,770.2
No agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948 (see table 3)	228.4	339.8	314.4	289.9	1,844.4
Nonagreement countries (see table 5)	618.8	816.0	699.1	704.0	2,579.2
	Percent of total				
All countries, total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agreement countries	72.4	75.3	77.6	75.1	81.9
Countries with which the United States had agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948	62.2	65.0	67.5	64.9	69.0
Participating at Geneva	50.9	51.2	52.6	51.7	47.4
Not participating at Geneva	11.3	13.8	14.9	13.2	21.6
Countries party to the Geneva agreement [2]	61.1	61.5	62.7	61.9	60.3
Agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948 [2]	50.9	51.2	52.6	51.7	47.4
No agreements in effect before Jan. 1, 1948	10.2	10.3	10.1	10.2	12.9
Nonagreement countries	27.6	24.7	22.4	24.9	18.1

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes countries listed in table 2 (data totaled above) and those listed in table 3 (data totaled below).

TABLE 2.—*United States domestic exports to countries having previous trade agreements with the United States which are parties to the Geneva agreement, average 1935–39 and selected years 1935 to 1947*

[In millions of dollars]

Destination	1935	1937	1939	Average, 1935–39	1947 [1]
Belgium-Luxembourg:					
Metropolitan areas	56.7	94.7	64.2	70.1	520.0
Dependencies	1.1	2.3	2.5	1.9	50.0
Brazil	43.4	68.3	79.9	60.4	640.6
Canada	308.2	491.5	468.9	418.1	2,012.0
Ceylon [2]	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.4	47.1
Cuba	59.2	90.8	80.8	74.6	485.5
France:					
Metropolitan area	112.4	161.1	180.2	142.5	807.1
Dependencies	10.8	16.9	17.4	14.8	151.2
Netherlands:					
Metropolitan area	48.5	88.6	96.6	76.4	378.9
Dependencies	25.7	59.8	74.5	51.9	177.5
United Kingdom:					
Metropolitan area	426.3	529.6	499.0	480.8	1,092.9
Dependencies	49.3	84.2	78.6	68.2	407.4
Total, countries listed	1,142.9	1,689.5	1,644.2	1,461.1	6,770.2

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Trade covered by pre-Geneva agreement with the United Kingdom.

TABLE 3.—*United States domestic exports to countries participating in the Geneva agreement with which the United States had no previous agreement, average 1935–39 and selected years 1935 to 1947*

[In millions of dollars]

Destination	1935	1937	1939	Average, 1935–39	1947 [1]
Australia	56.8	73.4	61.3	63.7	234.7
Burma	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Chile	14.8	23.7	26.6	21.0	124.9
China	38.0	49.5	55.5	44.9	352.6
Czechoslovakia	3.2	13.0	3.7	10.2	48.6
India and Pakistan [3]	31.2	43.6	46.8	36.8	405.3
Lebanon and Syria	2.4	2.5	3.2	2.5	43.0
New Zealand	15.6	23.8	16.5	19.8	76.6
Norway	13.6	22.0	31.8	21.0	146.4
Southern Rhodesia	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Union of South Africa	52.8	88.3	69.0	70.0	412.3
Total, countries listed	228.4	339.8	314.4	289.9	1,844.4

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Not separately reported before 1938; statistics included with India throughout.
[3] Statistics include Burma.
[4] Not separately reported in earlier years; included in "United Kingdom dependencies" (table 2) throughout. The amount is small.

TABLE 4.—*United States domestic exports to countries which are not parties to the Geneva agreement but with which the United States has trade agreements, average 1935–39 and selected years, 1935 to 1947*

[In millions of dollars]

Destination	1935	1937	1939	Average, 1935–39	1947 [1]
Argentina	49.2	93.3	70.6	71.4	678.1
Colombia	21.3	38.7	50.6	35.6	216.7
Costa Rica	2.3	4.4	9.7	5.0	34.9
Ecuador	2.8	5.0	5.8	4.0	39.9
El Salvador	2.8	3.6	4.1	3.4	28.4
Finland	6.0	12.2	13.2	10.2	59.2
Guatemala	3.9	7.4	8.5	6.2	41.2
Haiti	3.2	4.0	5.1	4.0	25.1
Honduras	5.6	5.5	5.8	5.6	29.8
Iceland	.1	.2	.4	.2	15.7
Iran	4.3	5.5	4.4	5.7	33.9
Mexico	64.5	105.8	80.8	77.0	616.5
Paraguay	.7	.7	.7	.6	7.7
Peru	12.0	18.9	18.8	15.9	91.1
Sweden	38.0	64.3	94.2	60.6	395.1
Switzerland	7.4	9.4	17.9	10.5	190.0
Turkey	4.3	14.9	8.3	9.4	81.0
Uruguay	6.2	13.1	5.1	7.6	75.2
Venezuela	18.4	46.2	61.6	40.4	425.0
Total, countries listed	253.0	453.6	465.6	373.3	3,084.5

[1] Preliminary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Fourth, Madam President, not only did our trade increase, but we also gained great concessions from other countries. It is often said, and was said many times in the House debate on H. R. 1, that reciprocity has been a 1-way street. This, of course, is not borne out by the facts. I have in my hand tables from the same publication by the Tariff Commission which show the rise in exports from America to countries who gave concessions to us under the Reciprocal Trade Act. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—*Major United States export products: United States exports to all countries and imports into agreement countries from the United States in 1939 of items on which concessions have been obtained under trade agreements through 1948*

[In thousands of dollars]

Commodity or class of commodities	United States exports, 1939 [1]	Imports into agreement countries from the United States on which commitments were made [2]				
		Total	Kind of commitment			
			Binding of free status	Binding of duty against increase	Reduction in duty	Other commitments [3]
Agricultural:						
Pork	20,184	16,483	893	3,038	4,023	8,529
Lard	20,222	19,379	730	47	18,602	----------
Dairy products	7,136	2,893	68	1,857	948	20
Barley	3,345	3,826	176	3,517	130	3
Corn	19,802	1,975	----------	----------	1,783	192
Rice	9,187	8,139	868	682	6,588	1
Wheat	36,815	37,310	15,727	3,999	16,216	1,368
Wheat flour	24,574	19,063	3,043	9,620	6,400	----------
Oil cake and oil-cake meal	9,021	3,313	2,757	----------	58	498
Fresh vegetables:						
Potatoes	2,252	1,267	25	----------	1,233	9
Other	5,522	4,558	----------	23	4,356	179
Canned vegetables:						
Asparagus	1,609	1,239	----------	275	964	----------
Other	2,857	558	----------	57	476	25
Grapefruit	1,749	1,222	----------	55	1,166	1
Lemons	2,186	2,097	1,272	576	249	----------
Oranges	11,265	10,670	136	3,778	6,756	----------
Fresh apples	10,592	13,241	398	2,751	9,246	846
Fresh grapes	2,184	2,226	199	737	1,290	----------
Fresh pears	3,284	5,435	349	1,025	3,974	87
Raisins	7,010	6,184	50	257	5,877	----------
Dried apples	1,894	1,657	258	27	1,372	----------
Dried apricots	3,697	2,910	266	13	2,631	----------
Dried prunes	7,067	6,530	525	322	5,683	----------
Canned fruits	25,061	23,953	----------	921	22,877	155
Soybeans	10,603	779	----------	290	489	----------
Leaf tobacco, unmanufactured	76,826	67,228	174	17,363	2,735	46,956
Raw cotton and linters	242,965	138,356	126,432	10,867	1,057	----------
Nonagricultural						
Salmon, fresh, salted or canned	7,275	5,911	----------	20	5,891	----------
Sardines, canned	3,870	1,484	----------	526	958	----------
Leather	13,042	7,455	191	2,376	4,333	555
Automobile tires and tubes	17,689	6,954	71	3,775	3,108	----------
Cigarettes	12,646	1,562	----------	388	509	665
Cotton cloth	36,549	12,506	----------	1,367	5,383	5,756
Lumber	39,314	37,674	6,820	15,686	14,818	350
Paper and manufactures	31,737	13,376	486	3,316	9,173	401
Coal	62,698	32,271	940	----------	31,331	----------
Coke	3,873	1,875	53	1,797	25	----------
Crude petroleum	92,790	30,928	27,126	1,996	1,499	307
Petroleum products:						
Lubricating oils and greases	95,373	30,288	24	6,054	7,978	16,232
Other	194,958	34,352	1,852	13,358	5,038	14,104
Sulfur	11,682	7,974	7,112	783	75	4
Iron and steel mill products	235,674	54,351	849	29,547	19,787	4,168

[1] From Foreign Commerce and Navigation, U. S. Department of Commerce.

[2] Statistics on imports into Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Uruguay, Venezuela, and French dependencies were not available in a form suitable for tabulating and United States statistics of exports to these countries were used as measures of the trade covered by their concessions.

[3] Includes imports subject to commitments as to monopoly or quantitative controls, commitments of British countries as to margin of preference unaccompanied by commitments as to rate of duty, and commitments as to duties which are reduced by indeterminate amounts and as to duties which may be increased within specified limits.

TABLE 8.—*Major United States export products: United States exports to all countries and imports into agreement countries from the United States in 1939 of items on which concessions have been obtained under trade agreements through 1948*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Commodity or class of commodities	United States exports, 1939	Imports into agreement countries from the United States on which commitments were made				
		Total	Kind of commitment			
			Binding of free status	Binding of duty against increase	Reduction in duty	Other commitments
Nonagricultural—Continued						
Aluminum and manufactures	23,703	7,988	375	6,117	1,344	152
Copper and manufactures	97,185	20,286	16,991	2,144	514	637
Batteries	6,457	1,239		869	370	
Refrigerators	18,140	10,606	330	4,467	5,809	
Radios and apparatus	22,177	16,511		9,108	6,777	566
Industrial machinery	289,896	135,358	8,857	68,374	51,939	6,188
Office appliances	29,166	20,908		5,910	14,633	365
Agricultural machinery	20,518	17,659	3,330	9,164	5,165	
Tractors and parts, including agricultural tractors	47,989	32,792	15,728	7,262	6,941	2,861
Automobiles	253,722	166,188	169	77,726	67,793	20,500
Aircraft and parts	117,806	55,324	9,905	41,157	3,402	860
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	22,317	7,092	365	2,931	3,771	25
Pigments, paints, and varnishes	22,762	11,897	600	7,339	3,929	29
Fertilizers and fertilizer materials	16,991	4,830	4,580		167	83
Photographic goods	19,064	12,640	350	8,370	3,471	449

TABLE 9.—*Major United States export products: Imports from the United States in 1939 of items on which the United States has obtained reductions in foreign import duties under trade agreements, by degree of the reduction*

[In thousands of dollars]

Commodity or class of commodities	Total	Degree (percent) of reduction in duty					
		100	76 to 99	51 to 75	36 to 50	25 to 35	Less than 25
Agricultural:							
Pork	4,023	291	3	2,750	859	62	58
Lard	18,602	11,505	3,486		1,727	968	916
Dairy products	948	82	8	136	181	389	152
Barley	130						130
Corn	1,783			1,783			
Rice	6,588				11	766	5,811
Wheat	16,216	14,544		329	1,343		
Wheat flour	6,400			250	6,046	104	
Oil cake and oil-cake meal	58		54			4	
Fresh vegetables:							
Potatoes	1,233	576		519		102	36
Other	4,356	135		3,614	125	408	74
Canned vegetables:							
Asparagus	964		29	2	600	282	51
Other	476	2	76	16	233	98	51
Grapefruit	1,166	1,148			13	5	
Lemons	249			25		97	127
Oranges	6,756	5,609	2	75		1,070	
Fresh apples	9,246	6,137		401	2,349	311	48
Fresh grapes	1,290		804	53	224	209	
Fresh pears	3,974	3		34	1,102	2,834	1
Raisins	5,877	431	4	2	401	1,947	3,092
Dried apples	1,372	210	18	16	95	303	730
Dried apricots	2,631			4	504	758	1,365
Dried prunes	5,683	748	19	1,470	504	2,067	875
Canned fruits	22,877	2,613	108	444	608	4,850	14,254
Soybeans	489		152			346	11
Leaf tobacco, unmanufactured	2,735				1,969	68	698
Raw cotton and linters	1,057			862	195		
Nonagricultural:							
Salmon, fresh, salted or canned	5,891	231	1	300	4,961	266	132
Sardines, canned	958	4	15	12	43	58	826
Leather	4,333			227	1,260	833	2,013
Automobile tires and tubes	3,108			66	219	576	2,247
Cigarettes	509			142	162	113	92
Cotton cloth	5,383				2,611	1,901	871
Lumber	14,818	15		7,680	2,530	152	4,441
Paper and manufactures	9,173	9	3	415	798	4,852	3,096
Coal	31,331	13,478			100	17,753	
Coke	25					25	
Crude petroleum	1,499					1,499	
Petroleum products:							
Lubricating oils and greases	7,978	1		198	1,061	3,545	3,173
Other	5,038	121	237	204	572	538	3,366
Sulfur	75				75		
Iron and steel mill products	19,787	401	11	593	1,455	11,486	5,841
Aluminum and manufactures	1,344			329		1,000	15
Copper and manufactures	514		8	141	256	48	61
Batteries	370			90	112	72	96
Refrigerators	5,809			286	999	2,382	2,142
Radios and apparatus	6,777			354	445	3,584	2,394
Industrial machinery	51,939	1,129	127	9,289	11,422	25,360	4,612
Office appliances	14,633	386		1,355	3,539	4,817	4,536
Agricultural machinery	5,165	4,594			530	41	
Tractors and parts including agricultural tractors	6,941	1,483		2,110	1,079	498	1,771
Automobiles	67,793		880	7,268	22,059	11,283	26,303
Aircraft and parts	3,402				2,935	403	64
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	3,771	8	1		1,198	355	2,209
Pigments, paints, and varnishes	3,929	513		23	513	673	2,207
Fertilizer and fertilizer materials	167				73		94
Photographic goods	3,471	204	2	539	1,479	881	366

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, among other things, these tables show that of the great increase in exports, the great proportion was to countries which had given us concessions. For example, of the $20 millions of pork products exported in 1939, over $16 millions was exported and gained entry to the other country under concessions which we had gained from them. The same is true of many other items, such as lard, dairy products, barley, corn, rice, wheat, and a long list of fruits. The same is true of tobacco and raw cotton. One also notes that great concessions were made to us on such items of our export trade as refrigerators, radios, iron and steel products, paints, tractors, other agriculture machinery, to note just a few of the items. Thus, Madam President, reciprocity has been a two-way street, and our farms and industries have benefited very greatly under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In 1948, as a result of the election of 1946, the Republican 80th Congress was in power. They were afraid to do away with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—that is, they lacked the convictions they were supposed to have, and which they proclaimed they would repeal in party platform after dreary party platform, but they did amend the act. It was in that year that the peril-point provision was written into the bill.

And the peril point has been a serious danger which has distinctly limited the possibilities of reciprocal trade. In 1949 we Democrats repealed the 1948 bill and the peril-point provisions and extended for another 2 years the original act. But in the 1950 election our majority was greatly reduced, the protectionists were stronger, the peril-point provisions were reintroduced, and the restrictions, by means of the escape clause, were made tighter. A less stringent escape clause had been in effect since 1943, when the Executive agreed to include it in all future trade agreements. In 1947 there was an Executive order to that effect. Under it, the United States or a foreign country could break an agreement which seriously injured a domestic industry in either country.

The new escape clause, that which operates today, allows a domestic industry to make application to the Tariff Commission for a finding that it has been seriously injured. If such a finding is made, the President is authorized, though not required, to take action.

As the staff papers of the Randall Commission clearly state:

> No important trade agreement activity took place under either the act as modified by the 80th Congress or under the extension of 1951.

I may add that none has yet taken place since the Eisenhower administration has taken power—that is, in the last 2½ years.

In 1953, President Eisenhower asked for a 1-year extension of the act in existing form, to allow for the Randall Commission study. After exhaustive study, the Commission came up with a watered-down version of the act, in order to gain the adherence of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and Representative DAN REED, of New York. I would say that in those negotiations my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinios, Mr. Randall, was a country boy who was taken into camp by the machinations and the adroit ability of the senior Republican members of the committee. He thought he would get their consent if he watered down the provisions. So he watered them down and down and down, in the hope that finally they would sign the report—only to find that at the last minute they scuttled away and disappeared, withdrew their support of the measure, and, instead, came out in opposition to it. After they got it watered down and compromised, Messrs. REED and MILLIKIN refused to go along. The President then recommended a 3-year extension of the new version, which at best had symbolic significance. But somewhere in the dark of the night, the protectionists got to him; and he shifted his ground, and allowed that perhaps 1 year would be all right. So, last year, we got another 1-year extension.

Now we have a new recommendation. We are asked to extend the act for 3 years; but the President's authority to negotiate agreements has been limited to 5 percent a year, in each of 3 years, or a 15 percent maximum, if he uses the authority, instead of the 50 percent allowed at present. If he fails to use the authority on any particular item in any one year, that authority is revoked.

How little this authority actually is, may be seen by taking a few examples. If the existing rate on a commodity were now 50 percent, the authority makes it possible to reduce the rate to 47.5 percent in any one year. If the rate were 25 percent, the maximum authority to reduce it in any one year would make the new rate 23.75 percent. If the rate were 20 percent—about the average of existing rates—the maximum reduction in any one year would be 1 percent, or from 20 percent to 19 percent; and in the next year, from 19 to 18.

Madam President, I may say that the race to get the system under way will be such that only about two reductions can be made, because there is a long, tortuous task along which an agreement has to go before it can finally be approved.

That is why this bill is largely symbolic, except in the case of Japan.

Madam President, rate reductions of these magnitudes are not going to hurt anyone. If an industry cannot adjust to them, it must me a terribly inefficient industry.

Now the President's bill—this watered down, namby-pamby bill—is before us. It is so innocuous that many must search their consciences to determine whether we are voting for protection or for freer trade. The original conception of the Trade Act is in danger. It is in danger for at least three reasons.

The first reason is that last year the President lacked driving force. The 1-year extension gave the protectionists an opportunity to organize; and organize they have. As a result, Congress has been flooded with protection lobbyists—all with their hands out. This protectionist fervor is typical of other periods in our history when the Republicans have controlled Congress or the administration. The President's failure to make a fight last year has brought with it two things: First, we now have an even more watered-down version of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act than the 1948 bill, and it was the low-water mark; and second, the protectionists have had an extra year to deluge us and to arouse their forces. Leadership from the White House might have avoided this. I recall the leadership Woodrow Wilson gave in 1913, when the tariff lobby was here en masse. The statement President Wilson made at that time is worth quoting, as an example of how a President can obtain his program. This is what Wilson said in 1913, and it had the salutary effect of scattering the lobbyists and passing the Underwood tariff:

> I think that the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations of the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment of not only public men but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill.
>
> It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and to overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it.
>
> The Government in all its branches ought to be relieved from this intolerable burden and this constant interruption to the calm progress of debate. I know that in this I am speaking for the Members of the two Houses who would rejoice as much as I would to be released from this unbearable situation.

That, Madam President, is how a President of the United States can lead in gaining approval of his legislative program. I suggest that Wilson's words are as applicable today as they were in 1913.

The second reason why reciprocity is in trouble is that this year the President has failed to give leadership. How many among his party's representatives in the Senate really have their hearts in reciprocity? Who on that side is leading the fight for freer trade? The answer is that what leadership there has been, has been from us Democrats. The reason is that the Republicans, constitutionally, are against freer trade. The bill has been watered down in committee to meet the objections of the President's own party, whose real views are represented by their vigorous attempts in the past to rid us of reciprocity and by their policies, such as those they proclaimed in their 1936 platform—"We will repeal the present reciprocal trade law."

The third reason why the bill we now have is little more than a token and a symbol of the original act is that a large

number of areas in the United States—144, at least—are now areas of substantial or very substantial labor surplus, where unemployment exceeds 6 percent, 12 percent, and in some cases 20 percent. One will note that in the House the 80-odd Democratic votes against H. R. 1 were, almost entirely, from Representatives from these areas, where the administration has turned a deaf ear to their needs.

In our history the issue of the tariff has created constant division. Protection was in part responsible for the rebellion of the colonists against England, the two-party system, not necessarily a bad thing at all, the division which lead to civil war between South and North, the rise of trusts and monopolies, the bringing on of recessions and depressions, and the lowering of the moral tone of our Government when protectionists were in power.

Furthermore, historically the Republican Party has been the champion of protection, and the Democrats have opposed it.

The debate today and the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act are another step in our tariff history.

Madam President, I have traced the history of our tariff so that Members may think twice before they vote to include in H. R. 1 any restrictive amendments, before they allow it to be watered down, or before they give in to protectionist pressures—for to do so would put us back once again on the road which in the protectionist periods of the past has led to so many sins.

ARTHUR KROCK'S COMMENTS ON THE HOUSE VOTE ON H. R. 1

Writing in the New York Times on Sunday, February 20, 1955, following the debate in the House on H. R. 1 on the preceding Thursday and Friday, Mr. Arthur Krock, the well-known journalist, presented a most unusual and interesting argument. His article is entitled "When Tariff Is Issue Party Lines Vanish," and it is subtitled "Opponents of President's Trade Plan Include High Percentage of Both Democrats and Republicans."

Mr. Krock says, among other things, in the article, that various votes taken in the House "emphasized how close is the bipartisan division in this country over our economic philosophy." He further states that the program of reciprocity, introduced originally by Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt, carried on under Harry Truman, and now adopted by the Eisenhower administration, albeit in a much watered-down form, "is opposed in industrial areas where unemployment is always either a threat or a fact, in farming areas where domestic and world surpluses are produced, and by rigid doctrinaires of the protective-tariff principle that was the guide of the Republican Party and the American Government for decades in the 19th century, and for 30 years in this one." Further, Mr. Krock concludes with the following words:

Since the project envisaged in this legislation is both favored and opposed by a bipartisan group, no issue of Democrat versus Republican is presented.

Madam President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the full text of Mr. Krock's article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 20, 1955]

WHEN TARIFF IS ISSUE PARTY LINES VANISH—OPPONENTS OF PRESIDENT'S TRADE PLAN INCLUDE HIGH PERCENTAGE OF BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS—STATE DELEGATIONS SPLIT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The margin of 1 vote by which, on the crucial test, the House of Representatives (193 to 192) refused to open to emasculating amendments the international tariff bill it adopted Friday emphasized as a generality how close is the bipartisan division in this country over our economic philosophy. But a geographical and intraparty breakdown of the "No" votes, which were cast in favor of opening the bill to crippling modifications, reveals essential details of the dispute over lowering import tariff barriers that are hidden in a mere listing of the totals.

For several reasons the 193–192 vote on the open amendment motion was chosen for this breakdown instead of the 206–199 tally by which the House rejected the proposal to return the bill to committee. But the principal reason is that the commital motion, backed by the high-tariff Republicans, under the leadership of Representative DANIEL A. REED of New York, was an orderly and responsible process. If this had carried, the bill conceivably would have returned to the House with strongly debatable limitations. But if the measure had been opened to indiscriminate amendments it would have gone in rags and tatters to the Senate.

PROCEDURAL ISSUE

The Reed proposal, on which 119 Republicans (80 Democrats joining them) resisted a special plea by the President, was also a test of his leadership, which only 66 Republicans acknowledged. But it had procedural dignity and party history in its favor; the other had neither.

Because of that it is more striking than illuminating to point out, as many have, that a House which cast only 3 votes against giving the President prior approval of a military far-eastern policy involving American lives cast 199 against him on a mere economic issue.

The bill extends for 3 years the President's power to lower most tariffs by 5 percent, and by 50 percent on a few affecting negligible import quantities, without resort to Congress for its approval. It expresses the political-economic philosophy of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull that became the fixed policy of the F. D. Roosevelt and Truman administrations and was adopted by President Eisenhower and his Republican following. The theory behind it is that by lowering the barriers of world trade (1) all nations will have the opportunity to attain a healthy economy, (2) one of the principal causes of wars, both cold and hot, will be eliminated, and (3) trade will be substituted for aid at a saving of many billions annually to the country.

STOUT OPPOSITION SHOWN

The concept is opposed in industrial areas where unemployment is always either a threat or a fact, in farming areas where domestic and world surpluses are produced, and by rigid doctrinaires of the protective tariff principle that was the guide of the Republican Party and the American Government for decades in the 19th century, and for 30 years in this one. A large majority of the members of the National Association of Manufacturers has come to favor the concept, and the same is true of the leaders of many powerful trades unions. But the strength of the opposition still current is very high, as the following circumstances reveal:

President Eisenhower and the Republican House leaders put behind the bill all the political power they could summon, yet 104 Republican Members voted for the emasculating motion. In the name of the Democratic Party and the last 2 Democratic administrations, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the most influential member of his party in the House, urged Democrats to defeat the motion, but 88 of them voted for it just the same.

The following statistics show the origins of the opposition vote by States and parties, the first figure being the number of party members who joined it, the second being the total membership of their party in the various State delegations:

Democrats. Alabama, 7 of 9; California, 4 of 11; Colorado, 2 of 2; Connecticut, 1 of 1; Georgia, 7 of 10; Idaho, 1 of 1; Illinois, 1 of 12; Indiana, 1 of 2; Kentucky, 2 of 6; Massachusetts, 4 of 7; Mississippi, 4 of 6; Montana, 1 of 1; New Jersey, 2 of 6; New York, 1 of 17; North Carolina, 6 of 11; Ohio, 3 of 6; Oklahoma, 4 of 5; Oregon, 1 of 1; Pennsylvania, 13 of 14; Rhode Island, 2 of 2; South Carolina, 4 of 6; Texas, 7 of 21; Virginia, 3 of 8; West Virginia, 6 of 6; Wisconsin, 1 of 3.

Republicans. California, 10 of 19; Colorado, 1 of 2; Connecticut, 4 of 5; Illinois, 6 of 13; Indiana, 3 of 9; Iowa, 2 of 8; Kansas, 4 of 6; Maine, 3 of 3; Maryland, 2 of 3; Massachusetts, 3 of 7; Michigan, 6 of 11; Minnesota, 3 of 4; Missouri, 1 of 2; New Jersey, 5 of 8; New York, 10 of 26; North Carolina, 1 of 1; North Dakota, 1 of 2; Ohio, 10 of 17, Oklahoma, 1 of 1; Oregon, 2 of 3; Pennsylvania, 12 of 16; South Dakota, 1 of 2; Tennessee, 2 of 2; Utah, 2 of 2; Virginia, 1 of 2; Washington, 2 of 6; Wyoming, 1 of 1.

SCOPE OF OPPOSITION

In combination, these tables show that the bipartisan opposition to the President's program not only was nationwide in scope but in a number of State delegations comprised all, or the majority, in a strong percentage. In Alabama, for example, a State unflinchingly loyal to the Democratic Presidents whose policy was extended in this legislation, 7 of the 9 Representatives belonging to that party voted for the crippling motion. The entire Maine delegation, all Republican, was in the same corner. In California all but 9 Republicans left the President, and 4 of the 11 Democrats turned down the intense appeal made by RAYBURN. In Pennsylvania all but 1 Democrat and 12 of the 16 Republicans left the party fold. And so on, in the delegations from States which have an over-whelming majority of the electoral vote of the Nation.

The only State delegations which made no contributions to the opposition were Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, and Louisiana. The total number of Presidential electors in this group is 52. The rest of the country has 479 of the 531 electors whose majority of 266 formally decrees who is to be President.

The statistics with respect to electors are significant only because they illustrate the national dimensions of the difference over foreign economic policy and its active presence in the large, populous States and the principal areas of production. Since the project envisaged in this legislation is both favored and opposed by a bipartisan group, no issue of Democrat versus Republican is presented. And, though the bill is an item in the President's program, the most effective advocate it had in the House was the Democratic Speaker.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, because I found in this article a large number of points which I felt could not be substantiated by a closer look at the facts, I have made an analysis of the vote in the House of Representatives on the decisive issues in the H. R. 1 debate, and I have further obtained from the Library of Congress the decisive rollcalls on all the major tariff acts passed by the Congress since 1861. I have done this for a number of reasons; first, although I was not surprised to see that Mr. Krock states that the protective tariff was the guiding principle of the Republican Party for decades in the 19th century, I was surprised to see his suggestion that the protective-tariff principle has been its guide for only the first 30 years of this century and that recently the leopard had changed its spots. Secondly, I was surprised at the headline which read that, when the tariff is an issue, party lines vanish, and by the concluding statement that "no issue of Democrat versus Republican is presented" by the vote on this debate.

How, as a matter of fact, have the Republicans voted on tariff bills? Madam President, I have a summary of the votes taken on major tariff legislation since the Civil War, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTES ON MAJOR TARIFF LEGISLATION SINCE THE CIVIL WAR

(Unless otherwise indicated, votes are on passage of the bill)

MORRILL TARIFF ACT OF MARCH 2, 1861

H. R. 338, 36th Congress, 2d session. (12 Stat. 178).

House (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 36th Cong., 1st sess. (1860), 2056):

Yeas 105 (84 Republican, 7 Democrat, 1 Douglas Democrat, 1 National American, 5 Whig, 2 Unionist, 5 American).

Nays 64 (53 Democrat, 2 Republican, 1 Independent Democrat, 4 States Rights Democrat, 1 Anti-Lecompton Democrat, 2 Whig, 1 American).

Senate (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 36th Cong., 2d sess. (1861), 1065):

Yeas 25 (20 Republican, 1 Democrat, 2 Whig, 1 Free Soil, 1 Free Soil-Democrat-American).

Nays 14 (13 Democrat, 1 Whig).

NOTE.—Restored rates of 1846.

MORRILL TARIFF ACT OF JULY 30, 1864

H. R. 494, 38th Congress, 1st session. (13 Stat. 202).

House (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 38th Cong., 1st sess. (1864), 2751):

Yeas 82 (64 Republican, 8 Democrat, 3 Emancipationist, 1 Unconditional Union, 2 Unionist, 1 Union Democrat, 2 Whig, 1 Independent Republican).

Nays 26 (21 Democrat, 1 Whig, 2 Union Democrat, 1 Constitutional-Union, 1 Unionist).

Senate (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 38th Cong., 1st sess. (1864), 3053).

Yeas 22 (16 Republican, 1 Democrat, 1 Whig, 1 Free Soil, 1 Union Republican, 1 Unionist, 1 Free Soil-Democrat-American).

Nays 5 (5 Democrat).

M'KINLEY TARIFF ACT OF OCTOBER 1, 1890

H. R. 9416, 51st Congress, 1st session (26 Stat. 567).

House (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5113):

Yeas 164 (163 Republican, 1 Democrat).

Nays 142 (140 Democrat, 1 Republican, 1 Union Laborite).

Senate (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9943):

Yeas 40 (40 Republican).

Nays 29 (29 Democrat).

NOTE.—Increase.

GORMAN-WILSON TARIFF ACT OF AUGUST 27, 1894

H. R. 4864, 53d Congress, 2d session (28 Stat. 509).

House (26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1796):

Yeas 204 (195 Democrat, 6 Prohibitionist, 1 Populist Democrat, 1 Populist, 1 Independent).

Nays 140 (122 Republican, 17 Democrat, 1 Silver).

Senate (26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7136):

Yeas 39 (37 Democrat, 1 Prohibitionist, 1 Independent).

Nays 34 (32 Republican, 1 Democrat, 1 People's).

NOTE.—Reduction. Democrats in control of House. Cleveland did not sign but allowed it to become a law.

DINGLEY TARIFF ACT OF JULY 24, 1897

H. R. 397, 55th Congress, 1st session (30 Stat. 151).

House (30 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 557):

Yeas 205 (199 Republican, 5 Democrat, 1 Populist).

Nays 122 (112 Democrat, 6 Fusion, 3 Populist, 1 People's).

"Present" 21 (3 Democrat, 2 Republican, 9 Populist, 5 Fusion, 2 Silver Democrat).

Senate (30 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2447):

Yeas 38 (36 Republican, 1 Democrat, 1 Silver).

Nays 28 (25 Democrat, 2 Populist, 1 Republican).

NOTE.—Under McKinley. Increase.

PAYNE-ALDRICH TARIFF ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1909

H. R. 1438, 61st Congress, 1st session (36 Stat. 11).

On passage:

House (44 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1301):

Yeas 217 (213 Republican, 4 Democrat).

Nays 161 (160 Democrat, 1 Republican).

"Present" 1 (1 Democrat).

Senate (44 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4316):

Yeas 45 (44 Republican, 1 Democrat).

Nays 34 (24 Democrat, 10 Republican).

On agreeing to the conference report:

House (44 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4755):

Yeas 195 (193 Republican, 2 Democrat).

Nays 183 (163 Democrat, 20 Republican).

Senate (44 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4949):

Yeas 47 (47 Republican).

Nays 31 (24 Democrat, 7 Republican).

NOTE.—Increase.

UNDERWOOD-SIMMONS TARIFF ACT OF OCTOBER 3, 1913

H. R. 3321, 63d Congress, 1st session (38 Stat. 114).

On passage:

House (50 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1386–1387):

Yeas 281 (274 Democrat, 3 Republican, 1 Progressive, 1 Independent, 2 Progressive Republican).

Nays 139 (122 Republican, 5 Democrat, 7 Progressive, 5 Progressive Republican).

"Present" 1 (1 Progressive Republican).

Senate (50 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4617):

Yeas 44 (42 Democrat, 1 Republican, 1 Progressive Republican).

Nays 37 (35 Republican, 2 Democrat).

On agreeing to the conference report:

House (50 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5274):

Yeas 255 (249 Democrat, 3 Republican, 1 Independent, 1 Progressive, 1 Progressive Republican).

Nays 104 (90 Republican, 4 Democrat, 7 Progressive, 3 Progressive Republican).

"Present" 3 (1 Democrat, 1 Republican, 1 Progressive Republican).

Senate (50 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5347):

Yeas 36 (34 Democrat, 1 Progressive Republican, 1 Republican).

Nays 17 (15 Republican, 2 Democrat).

NOTE.—Democratic majority. Reduction.

FORDNEY-M'CUMBER TARIFF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 21, 1922

H. R. 7456, 67th Congress, 2d session (42 Stat. 858).

House (61 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4197):

Yeas 228 (220 Republican, 7 Democrat, 1 Progressive Republican).

Nays 127 (119 Democrat, 7 Republican, 1 Socialist).

"Present" 1 (1 Republican).

Senate (62 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11627):

Yeas 48 (45 Republican, 3 Democrat).

Nays 25 (24 Democrat, 1 Republican).

SMOOT-HAWLEY TARIFF ("FRIENDLY TARIFF") ACT OF JUNE 17, 1930

H. R. 2667, 71st Congress, 2d session (46 Stat. 590).

House (71 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2106):

Yeas 264 (244 Republican, 20 Democrat).

Nays 147 (134 Democrat, 12 Republican, 1 Farmer-Labor).

"Present" 2 (2 Republican).

Senate (72 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6015):

Yeas 53 (46 Republican, 7 Democrat).

Nays 31 (26 Democrat, 5 Republican).

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT, JUNE 12, 1934

H. R. 8687, 73d Congress, 2d session (48 Stat. 943).

House:

Yeas 274 (269 Democrat, 2 Republican, 3 Farmer-Labor).

Nays 111 (99 Republican, 11 Democrat, 1 Farmer-Labor).

Senate:

Yeas 57 (51 Democrat, 3 Republican, 3 other).

Nays 33 (28 Republican, 5 Democrat).

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT EXTENSION ACTS

March 1, 1937

House Joint Resolution 96, 75th Congress, 1st session (50 Stat. 24).

House:

Yeas 285 (278 Democrat, 3 Republican, 3 Farmer-Labor, 1 Progressive).

Nays 101 (81 Republican, 11 Democrat, 7 Progressive, 2 Farmer-Labor).

Senate:

Yeas 58 (56 Democrat, 1 Independent, 1 Progressive).

Nays 24 (14 Republican, 9 Democrat, 1 Farmer-Labor).

April 12, 1940

House Joint Resolution 407, 76th Congress, 3d session (54 Stat. 107).

House:

Yeas 218 (212 Democrat, 5 Republican, 1 American Labor).

Nays 168 (146 Republican, 20 Democrat, 1 Farmer-Labor, 1 Progressive).

Senate:

Yeas 42 (41 Democrat, 1 Independent).

Nays 37 (20 Republican, 15 Democrat, 2 Farmer-Labor).

June 7, 1943

House Joint Resolution 111, 78th Congress, 1st session (57 Stat. 125).

House:

Yeas 343 (194 Democrat, 147 Republican, 1 Progressive, 1 American Labor).

Nays 65 (52 Republican, 11 Democrat, 1 Progressive, 1 Farmer-Labor).

Senate:

Yeas 59 (41 Democrat, 18 Republican).

Nays 23 (14 Republican, 8 Democrat, 1 Progressive).

July 7, 1945

H. R. 3240, 70th Congress, 1st session (59 Stat. 410).

House:

Yeas 239 (205 Democrat, 33 Republican, 1 American Labor).

Nays 153 (140 Republican, 12 Democrat, 1 American Labor).

Senate:

Yeas 54 (38 Democrat, 15 Republican, 1 Progressive).

Nays 21 (16 Republican, 5 Democrat).

June 26, 1948

H. R. 6556, 80th Congress, 2d session (62 Stat. 1053, sec. 2).

House:

Yeas 234 (218 Republican, 16 Democrat).

Nays 149 (142 Democrat, 5 Republican, 2 American Labor).

Senate:

Yeas 70 (47 Republican, 23 Democrat).

Nays 18 (17 Democrat, 1 Republican).

NOTE.—Bill included restrictive peril-point provision.

September 27, 1949

H. R. 1211, 81st Congress, 1st session (63 Stat. 698).

House:

Yeas 319 (234 Democrat, 84 Republican, 1 American Labor).

Nays 69 (63 Republican, 6 Democrat).

Senate:

Yeas 61 (47 Democrat, 14 Republican).

Nays 20 (19 Republican, 1 Democrat).

NOTE.—Repealed 1948 version and eliminated peril point.

June 16, 1951

H. R. 1612, 82d Congress, 1st session (65 Stat. 72).

House:

No rollcall vote taken on passage or conference report.

Senate:

Yeas 72 (38 Democrat, 34 Republican).

Nays 2 (2 Republican).

NOTE.—Reintroduced peril-point and introduced escape-clause provision.

August 7, 1953

H. R. 5495, 83d Congress, 1st session (67 Stat. 472).

House:

Yeas 363 (183 Democrat, 179 Republican, 1 Independent).

Nays 34 (25 Republican, 9 Democrat).

NOTE.—1-year extension to provide commission study.

Senate:

No rollcall vote taken on passage or conference report.

July 1, 1954

H. R. 9474, 83d Congress, 2d session (68 Stat. 360).

House:

Yeas 281 (154 Democrat, 126 Republican, 1 Independent).

Nays 53 (39 Republican, 14 Democrat).

Senate:

Yeas 71 (37 Republican, 34 Democrat).

Nays 3 (2 Republican, 1 Democrat).

NOTE.—1-year extension only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, this summary shows the vote by party on the major bills and decisive rollcalls from 1861 to the 1954 extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I invite my colleagues and readers of the RECORD, to study this summary, and to see how the vote went. It shows that, until recently, Republicans were almost unanimous in favor of protection, against freer trade, and against reciprocity. Democrats were overwhelmingly for freer trade, for reciprocity, and for lower tariffs.

I think it is fair to conclude from this documentation that the Republicans were certainly the party of high tariff and extreme protection to the 1930's. I think it is also fair to conclude that the overwhelming majority of the votes against passage of the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, and extension of that act in 1937, 1940, 1943, and 1945 came from the Republican Party, and hence continued their protectionist policy. In 1948 the decisive rollcall was the vote on the bill which included the peril point provision. These, of course, were supported by the Republicans and opposed by the Democrats, but as the Republicans had the majority in that year, the act was extended with these protectionist amendments. I think it is fair to conclude, therefore, that in that year, the Republican vote for passage was in fact a protectionist vote. In 1949 we Democrats repealed the 1948 extension, and again a very overwhelming majority of votes against extension were from the Republican side.

In 1953 and 1954, as well as this year, this act has been watered down to such an extent that its extension has largely become merely symbolic, with the exception of its application to Japan. So I think that we can conclude that Mr. Krock's thesis, in intimating that somehow the Republicans have lost their protectionist fervor—or fever—since the 1930's, is not borne out by the decisive rollcall on the passage and extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Certainly this was true through 1945, and it appears only less true since that time owing to the indecisive nature of the issues on which votes have been cast.

Now, Madam President, let us turn for a moment to the vote in the House on the extension of H. R. 1 this year. I have made a tabulation of the five votes in the House on H. R. 1, and I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Decisive rollcalls on H. R. 1 in the House of Representatives, Feb. 17–18, 1955

Motion	Effect of vote for H. R. 1				Effect of vote against H. R. 1			
	Democrats		Republicans		Democrats		Republicans	
	Number	Percent [1]	Number	Percent [1]	Number	Percent [1]	Number	Percent [1]
1. Previous question would close debate. Lost, 207 to 178	115	53.5	63	37	100	46.5	107	63
2. Brown amendment against closed rule. Lost, 193 to 191	134	62.7	59	34.7	80	37.3	111	65.3
3. Motion to limit debate and avoid emasculating amendments. Carried, 193 to 192	128	59.3	65	38.5	88	40.7	104	61.5
4. Reed amendment, return bill to committee. Lost, 206 to 199	140	63.6	66	35.6	80	36.4	119	64.4
5. Final passage. Carried, 295 to 110	186	84	109	60	35	16	75	40

[1] Percent is that of party members voting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First of all, Madam President, the House Ways and Means Committee offered a resolution for a closed rule. The first decisive vote in the House was taken on the previous question to limit debate on this resolution. That motion lost 207 to 178. 115 Democrats and 63 Republicans voted "yea" on the previous question, 100 Democrats and 107 Republicans voted "nay." To give percentage figures, the Democrats voted 53.5 percent in favor and 46.5 percent against, while the Republicans split 37 percent for and 63 percent against. Because this vote carried with it more issues than that of protection and antiprotection, it is not clear that the yeas and nays divided along those lines. A great many Democrats voted against it because they were opposed to a closed rule, which did not permit substantive amendments. It is interesting to note, however, that two-thirds of the Republicans voted against limiting debate, which had the effect of keeping alive their hopes that they might later present emasculating amendments.

The second rollcall vote was on an amendment by Mr. BROWN of Ohio, which was lost 193 to 191. It was for the purpose of striking out the closed rule provision of the original resolution. Its passage, Madam President, would have given new hope to the protectionists. On this vote, a vote for was for protection and a vote against was for H. R. 1, except that a few, such as Representative DANIEL REED, the leader of the protectionists in the House, voted against the Brown amendment for procedural reasons rather than for reasons of conscience.

What was the party vote on this issue as it divided along protection and antiprotection lines? The Democrats voted 134 to 80 against the Brown amendment or in support of H. R. 1. The Republicans voted 111 to 59 for the Brown amendment or against H. R. 1. In other words, 63 percent of the Democrats voted in favor of H. R. 1, while only 35 percent of the Republicans voted in favor of H. R. 1, and 65 percent of the Republicans, or two-thirds, and 37 percent of the Democrats, or one-third, essentially cast their ballots against H. R. 1. That shows, therefore, quite a clear-cut issue of Democrat versus Republican, Mr. Krock notwithstanding, in this vote on which two-thirds of the Democrats supported the President, while he was able to muster only one-third of those voting from his own party.

The third decisive roll call, Madam President, on the motion to close debate and avoid opening the bill to emasculating amendments, upon which Mr. Krock bases his major conclusions, was passed 193 to 192. If this motion had been lost it would have allowed each of the protectionist groups, who have been flooding Congress with their selfish demands since the beginning of this session, to offer emansculating amendments for its pet industry. It is from this vote that Mr. Krock deduces that when the tariff is an

issue party lines vanish, and that no issue of Democrat versus Republican is presented.

How did the vote split on party lines on this motion which, had it been defeated, would have allowed a repetition of the log-rolling days of the past? One hundred and twenty-eight Democrats and 65 Republicans voted for the motion, or for H. R. 1, while 104 Republicans and 88 Democrats voted against the motion, or against H. R. 1. Thirty-eight Republicans failed to vote, while only 15 Democrats failed to vote on this issue. Sixty percent of the Democrats and 38 percent of the Republicans supported H. R. 1, while only 40 percent of the Democrats and 62 percent of the Republicans voted to allow emasculating amendments. Again the vote showed the Democrats supporting the bill by a percentage of 60–40, whereas the Republicans opposed the bill by a similar percentage.

A fourth major vote in the House was on the Reed amendment, which would have returned the bill to committee. The division was 206–199. On this vote, 140 Democrats and only 66 Republicans voted against the Reed amendment, or in favor of H. R. 1, while 119 Republicans and 80 Democrats voted for the Reed amendment, or against the passage of H. R. 1 in its original form. In other words, approximately 64 percent of the Democrats and only 35 percent of the Republicans voted for H. R. 1, whereas 65 percent of the Republicans and 36 percent of the Democrats voted against. In this vote, as in the other major decisive votes, we saw the Democrats supporting the President's policy by two-thirds to one-third, and the Republican Party, even after the President's letter to gain support in the House, and even following the excellent speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], could muster only one-third of those voting in support of the President's own program, whereas two-thirds voted against freer trade, H. R. 1, and the President's wishes.

On final passage, by a vote of 295 to 110, 186 Democrats and 109 Republicans supported H. R. 1, whereas 75 Republicans and 35 Democrats voted against. In other words, on final passage 84 percent of the Democrats and only 60 percent of the Republicans supported the President, and 40 percent of the Republicans and only 16 percent of the Democrats opposed.

I fail to see, Madam President, how one can deduce from these votes that party lines vanish on this issue or that no issue of Democrats versus Republicans is presented. In support of his conclusions Mr. Krock lists the origin of the opposition vote on the 193 to 192 vote. He gives it by a breakdown by geography and party. One will note from the breakdown that almost all of the Democratic votes against H. R. 1 were from representatives from the 144 areas of our country which are now classed as areas of substantial or very substantial labor surplus by the Bureau of Employment Security. This is certainly true of the votes of West Virginia, Virginia, of Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania, of Oklahoma, North Carolina, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Massachusetts, Kentucky, southern Illinois, Georgia, Connecticut, and Alabama. It is in these areas with coal, textiles, some durable goods industries, railroad shops, chemicals, lead and zinc mining, and the ordnance works that have suffered severe distress since the present Republican administration came to power. Time after time, in the debate in the House, Members rose to say that they were unable to support H. R. 1 because of the mass unemployment in their districts. Representative STAGGERS, of West Virginia, complained that he was opposed to the closed rule because the President and "those who advocated it have not come forward with one proposal to help the distressed areas of the United States." The same was true of Representative GRAY of southern Illinois where conditions are now not unlike those of the early 1930's. Mr. GRAY, who supports the basic principles of H. R. 1, was unable to support the bill because his area is now classified IV-B by the Department of Labor, because there are 30,000 people unemployed and over 24,000 people who are now receiving surplus food from the Federal Government. His area is a coal mining area, where, like so many others, the administration has turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of their representatives. And at the same time, they have charged that others who inquire about these conditions and bring them to the attention of the administration, are "prophets of gloom and doom."

In fact, a careful tabulation of the Democrat vote against H. R. 1 in the House — the eighty-odd votes — shows that in almost every case those Representatives are from the areas labeled IV–A or IV–B by the Department of Labor.

Why should they be expected to fight for the President's program which he was reluctant to fight for himself? Why should they vote for his act, watered-down as it is, when he has largely turned a cold shoulder to the problems and interests of their districts? Why should they help him when they watch and see the Speaker of the House of Representatives work with might and main to save the President's bill—and that bill could not have been saved without the work of the beloved Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas—only to be charged the next week with "fiscal irresponsibility," and accused of being "demagogic" and of sponsoring a "strictly phony" tax measure, in the chaste words of the Secretary of the Treasury? Is that any way to treat a brave and loyal ally to whom one owes victory in the tariff struggle? In all kindness, that is hardly the way one should behave in war, in politics, or in business or social life.

And we of the Democratic Party, whose individual and collective good names have been attacked by the very administration leaders who now depend upon us for the passage of their weak and watered-down bill—what are we expected to do?

We could hardly be blamed if we yielded to the natural human impulse to let them stew in their own juice. But I do not intend to do so, and I do not believe that the members of my party will do so. I am going to put the interests of the country first and vote for this bill, although I think it has been so weakened that its chief value is symbolic, except for its value to negotiate with Japan.

As I think of the recent conversion of some Republicans to the cause of very limited freer trade bound around with crippling restrictions, I am reminded of our Saviour's story of the Prodigal Son, who left his father's house, wallowed in sin, lost his money, his reputation, and his character. Then when he was down in the very gutter, feeding with lowly animals and indeed sleeping with them, he repented and came back to his father's house. Now we of the Democratic Party as elder brothers would have been glad to receive the erstwhile sinners graciously, to give them a bath, furnish them with clean raiment, put a ring on their finger, and give them a full meal. But it would have been becoming had they, like the Prodigal of old, had said, "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and in Thy sight, and am no longer worthy to be called Thy son. Make me as one of Thy humble servants."

But unfortunately no such repentence has occurred. Instead the newcomers espouse only a partial and a limited virtue, yet demand that they shall be regarded as the long-time practitioners of the good and heap abuse upon their elder brothers who remained faithful during the years of strain, and upon whom the new converts really lean for protection and support. I suggest that our friends should read a new Emily Post on political etiquette and good manners.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which I have prepared to the bill be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

EXHIBIT 1

ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE TARIFF: A MYTH

Those who have followed the campaign literature on the tariff during recent years will have become familiar with a phrase attributed to Abraham Lincoln. The following version is taken from Curtiss's Industrial Development of Nations (1912), a pretentious three-volume publication, in which are collected indiscriminately all sorts of protectionist arguments. Under a portrait of Lincoln this is printed:

"I do not know much about the tariff, but I know this much, when we buy manufactured goods abroad, we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money. When we buy the manufactured goods at home, we get both the goods and the money." [1]

[1] Vol. iii, p. 6. Elsewhere in the book the version is in somewhat different form: "Abraham Lincoln said: 'When an American paid $20 for steel rails to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the $20. But when he paid $20 for the steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the $20.'" Ibid., vol. ii, p. 471.—This obviously is an anachronism, since such a thing as a steel rail was unknown in Lincoln's time.

No reference is given by Curtiss to Lincoln's writings; nor is such a reference given in any place where I have found the phrase quoted. A careful examination of the various editions of Lincoln's published works brings to light nothing that remotely resembles it. There is nothing in either of the two editions of his writings put together by Nicolay and Hay, nor is there anything in the so-called Federal edition. Nicolay and Hay's Life yields nothing of the sort, nor any of the biographies. So with Lincoln's speeches in Congress and his messages to Congress. There is no lack, to be sure, of references to the tariff by Lincoln. He began his political career as a Whig, and remained a protectionist; though during the decade preceding the war his political insight led him to put it aside as an issue on which to appeal to the people. Those who are interested in the history of the tariff controversy may find it worth while to turn to some notes of his, written in 1846–47, containing a sketch of an address on the tariff. Here the main thought is that labor given to transporting a commodity from foreign countries is wasted, if the commodity can be produced within the country with as little labor as elsewhere.[2] This may be an echo of some of Carey's well-known utterances; and it could be made the text for some explanation of the principle of comparative cost. A passage of a similar sort is in an address made at Pittsburgh in 1861, indicating that Lincoln had kept this particular turn of reasoning in mind. But there is not the slightest suggestion of the much-quoted phrase.

Now, what is the history of the phrase?

The very first mention which we have found[3] is in 1894, in the American Economist, a weekly protectionist sheet published in New York. In that periodical for June 29, 1894, the following is given as having been copied from the Independent of Howard, Ill., of June 9, 1894:

"Lincoln's first speech on the tariff question was short and to the point. He said he did not pretend to be learned in political economy, but he thought that he knew enough to know that 'when an American paid $20 for steel to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the $20. But when he paid $20 for the steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the $20.'"

In a later issue (October 26) of the American Economist of that same year, it is stated that another newspaper, the Peoria Journal, protested that the goods and money speech was made at Kewanee; while still another newspaper, the Chicago Record, pointed out that this version was not at all in accord with Herndon's report of Lincoln's first speech.[4]

That the phrase was not current before 1894, at least in its attribution to Lincoln, and probably was not known at all, is indicated by its absence from those collections of opinions of the fathers which form a familiar part of the protectionist stock in trade. It is not to be found in Stebbins' American Protectionist's Manual (1883); though Lincoln is there mentioned as being in favor of a high protective tariff. Nor is it in a tract published in 1892 by the American Iron & Steel Association, under the title The Testimony of the Fathers. The tract contains a choice collection of excerpts from the utterances of Hamilton, Jefferson, Calhoun, Webster, Clay, even Fillmore, and Buchanan; but not a word from Lincoln. Nor is it used with any frequency for some years after its first appearance in 1894. But after 1900 it turns up repeatedly in the file of the American Economist: in 1901, in 1905, twice in 1906, again in 1908.[5] After the very first appearance, the commodity mentioned seems to be invariably rails, sometimes iron rails, sometimes steel rails. Usually, a newspaper is quoted as having used the phrase or reported its use. Thus, in 1905, the following is quoted from the Worcester Telegram:

"Senator Scott, of West Virginia, is scored in some places for quoting President Lincoln in support of the policy of standing pat on the tariff issue, and some of the critics appear to doubt that Lincoln ever used the words attributed to him. The words at least are good enough to have been used by the war President. Senator Scott says: 'President Lincoln once remarked that if we gave $30 a ton for iron rails made in this country we would have both the rails and the money, but if we bought them in England the rails only would be ours, while the Britishers would get the cash.' * * * Neither does it matter * * * whether the rails * * * are iron of the days of Lincoln or the steel of today."

In 1908, again, the then Secretary of the Treasury, Leslie M. Shaw, is quoted in the Economist as having used the quotation in a Boston speech.

The first appearance for express campaign use appears to be in 1904. The phrase is to be found in the Republican Campaign Book of that year. In earlier campaign books, for 1892, 1896, 1900, it does not appear; although in that of 1896 Lincoln is cited as an advocate of protection. Evidently the phrase was not widely known during these earlier years. In the campaign book of 1904, there is an extended quotation from Lincoln's tariff notes of 1846–47 (referred to a moment ago) and then at the close we find:

"On another occasion Mr. Lincoln [is quoted][6] as saying: 'I am not posted on the tariff, but I know that if I give my wife $20 to buy a cloak and she buys one made in free-trade England, we have the cloak, but England has the $20; while if she buys a cloak made in the protected United States, we have the cloak and the $20.'"

Here, it will be observed, "a cloak" appears. In a speech by McCleary, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives, April 22, 1904,[7] "a dress" and "my wife" appear, with the same sum of $20. It may be that the campaign book version of 1904 was taken from McCleary's speech.

In 1910 the phrase appears conspicuously in a booklet entitled "Story of a Tariff," published by the American Protective Tariff League—the organization which publishes the American Economist also. This booklet lauds the tariff of 1909 as the best tariff bill (sic) the Republican Party ever passed, and gives a quantity of extracts from speeches on that measure. On the inside cover page there is printed, in large type, Lincoln's tariff creed, in these words:

"Secretary Stanton once asked Abraham Lincoln what he thought of a protective tariff. Mr. Lincoln replied: 'I don't know much about the tariff, but I do know that if my wife buys her cloak in America, we get the money and the cloak, and that American labor is paid for producing it; if she buys her cloak abroad, we get only the cloak, the other country gets the money, and foreign labor receives the benefit.'"

It will be observed that this is somewhat enriched. American labor and foreign labor are smuggled in; and not only is the wife introduced, but Secretary Stanton also.[8]

Not the least interesting episode in the history of the phrase is its voyage across the water and subsequent return to the United States. In 1908, the American Economist reports that a London correspondent has written:

"An interesting development has been the appeal to Abraham Lincoln * * * as the final authority in an English fiscal controversy. * * * A number of Unionist papers closed the controversy simultaneously by quoting the following extract from a speech made by Lincoln shortly before his death: 'The problem seems to me a simple one. If we adopt free trade it means that we import our goods, in which case the foreigner will have our money and the work, and we his goods. If, however, we adopt a system of protection, or a system of safeguarding our industries and our working classes, thereby manufacturing the good ourselves, the result will be that we shall have the goods, the money, and the employment.'"

It will be observed that here Lincoln is supposed to have made the remark shortly before his death; whereas on its emergence it was supposed to have been made in his first speech.

Very recently the English tariff reformers have utilized it again. They distributed (apparently in the course of 1913) a post card bearing within an ornamental scroll the following printed text:

"I do not know much about the tariff, but I do know this much: when we buy goods abroad, we get the goods, and the foreigner gets the money; when we buy goods made at home, we get both the goods and the money."—Abraham Lincoln.

This naturally led to attack by freetraders in the columns of the Manchester Guardian. The Guardian in turn made its way to this country, and thereupon our loyal protectionists were led to retort that this shallow newspaper "in an unguarded moment recently allowed its finespun theory of free trade to

---

[2] Lincoln's Complete Works (2 vol. edition), vol. 1, p. 90. Cf. p. 679 for the Pittsburgh address.

[3] I say "we," because in the endeavor to trace the phrase to its origin I have had invaluable assistance from Mr. D. M. Matteson, well-known for his thoroughness in research on problems of American history.

[4] Mr. Matteson reports that Howard appeared on the maps until about 1902; since then a village at the same spot, a mere junction point, apparently, is named Lotus on the map. It is in the northwest corner of Champaign County, 40 miles from Lincoln's early home at New Salem. Mr. Matteson adds: "I am forced to the conclusion that the Howard Independent is a myth, or at least a misprint. The postmaster at Lotus writes me that no paper has ever been printed there; and there is no other town in Illinois, so far as I have been able to discover, with which the name Howard is associated. No Howard Independent was published elsewhere in the United States, according to the newspaper directories of 1891, 1894–95, and the last issue."

[5] May 10, 1901; June 9, 1905; February 16 and December 21, 1906; December 18, 1908; December 23, 1910. The set of the American Economist in the Harvard Library is not complete; there may be other references in the missing numbers.

[6] Brackets are mine. The guarded way in which the passage is used would seem to indicate suspicion. It does not appear in the Republican Campaign Handbook of 1908 and of 1912.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 58 Cong. 2d sess. Appendix, p. 246.

[8] In response to an inquiry, Mr. W. F. Wakeman, secretary of the American Protective Tariff League, wrote me on June 28, 1914: "About 5 years ago I took up this subject of what Lincoln really did say on the tariff question and found that the extract as printed is correct. I consulted the family and every possible authority. I will try to run over the original correspondence shortly and give you additional information if desired." But the information, though asked for, has not been supplied. Mr. Wakeman was secretary of the league in 1894, and has been so ever since, except in 1900–1901, when he was appraiser in New York.

come into direct conflict with the protectionist commonsense of Abraham Lincoln." [9]

Finally, the phrase has descended to base uses indeed. In recent issues of New York newspapers, a brand of shoes is advertised as "made from American materials, with home labor and by home capital," and then follows the precise passage quoted a moment ago from the Story of a Tariff of 1910, with the interpolations about American labor and foreign labor, and the reference to Secretary Stanton. The advertisement, however, seems not to have been found advantageous. The advertiser was overwhelmed by a host of inquiries, and made a public reply in which he withdrew behind the shelter of the Protective League and its publications; and he refrained from continuing the advertisement.[10]

It seems certain that the phrase is apocryphal. There is no evidence that Lincoln ever used it. Further seach may show just how it originated. Possibly the claptrap about the "goods and the money" was invented before it was foisted on Lincoln; possibly it was ascribed to him at an earlier date than the first here noted (1894). By dint of repetition it has come to be associated with Lincoln almost as much as the cherry tree is associated with Washington. So crude is the reasoning (if such it can be called), so vulgarly fallacious is the antitheses, that we must hope that it will cease to be invested with the sanction of a venerated name.[11]

F. W. TAUSSIG.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LINCOLN AND THE TARIFF: A SEQUEL

The note which I published in the August issue of this Journal on the tariff phrase attributed to Lincoln (getting "both the goods and the money") has stirred discussion, as is natural with anything that concerns the great President. Some further light upon the origin of the phrase has come in consequence. For most of the information which I am now able to give, I am indebted to Mr. Calvin W. Lewis of Brookline, Mass., who first called attention to some of the clues in contributions to the Boston Transcript signed with a pseudonym, and who has since put at my disposal in the most obliging way the results of his inquiries.

It will be remembered that the earliest appearance of the phrase, so far as Mr. Matteson and myself were able to trace it, was in the American Economist for June 29, 1894, where it was stated to have been copied from the "Howard Independent" of June 9, 1894. The Howard Independent proved a puzzle. Mr. Matteson was able to find no trace of any such newspaper, and concluded that it was "a myth, or at least a misprint." The puzzle was not lessened by the failure of the American Economist to give any explanation. Our note was brought to the attention of the Economist, and some reference has been made in its columns to Lincoln's utterances upon the tariff and to this particular myth; but no attempt was made to verify, or specify further, the source from which the phrase had come. A suspicion could not but arise that the phrase might have been manufactured by the Economist, and that the Howard Independent was a pretense.

That suspicion proves to be quite without foundation. The Howard Independent is not a myth; but, as Mr. Matteson thought possible, it is—a misprint. It appears that there is in Illinois a flourishing town by the name of Harvard, and that a weekly newspaper, the Harvard Independent, has been published there for many years. "Howard Independent" was merely a misprint for "Harvard Independent." Moreover, Mr. Lewis, through correspondence with the present editor of the Harvard Independent, has learned from him that a search in his files brought to light, in the issue of the date stated, June 9, 1894, the identical phrase. It is there, and the American Economist copied it in good faith and with due credit. It is not surprising that the editor of the American Economist, after the lapse of 20 years, should have quite forgotten just how he happened on the phrase, and should now find it as difficult to trace as the rest of us. Any suspicion of fabrication on his part was quite without foundation.

But all this only serves to push the inquiry one step further back. Where did the Harvard Independent get the phrase?

In the works of Robert G. Ingersoll there is an oration upon Lincoln, which bears the date 1894. In it there is a passage [1] which says that Lincoln was "nominated for the legislature and made a speech," and that this speech was in favor of a protective tariff. Ingersoll refers to it shortly after as Lincoln's first speech. After some remarks about the influence of manufactures in "developing the brain" and "giving wings to the imagination," Ingersoll goes on thus:

"It is better for Americans to purchase from Americans, even if the things purchased cost more.

"If we purchase a ton of steel rails from England for $20, then we have the rails and England the money. But if we buy a ton of steel rails from an American for $25, then America has the rails and the money both."

It will be observed that this differs in one significant particular from the phrase attributed to Lincoln. The purchase from the American is supposed to be at a higher price than that from the Englishman—$25 instead of $20; the allegation is that it is more advantageous to buy at home, even at the higher price.

There are other grounds for questioning whether this passage, as it appears in print, was the source of our myth. It is not put by Ingersoll in quotation marks, nor is there any intimation or implication that it is taken from Lincoln. Ingersoll mentions steel rails; if he had wished to imply that the language was Lincoln's, he would hardly have selected an article not known in Lincoln's day. A careless reader might possibly infer this to be a paraphrase or quotation from Lincoln; but only a careless one. More important is the circumstance that internal evidence points to its having been published at a later date than that of the passage in the Harvard Independent (June 1894). Immediately following the two paragraphs just quoted Ingersoll goes on: "Judging from the present universal depression and the recent elections, Lincoln, in his first speech, stood on solid rock and was absolutely right." "Recent elections" must refer to the elections of the autumn of 1894. The elections of 1892 were not favorable for the Republicans, but those of 1894 were. It is the latter only to which Ingersoll could have alluded. The date of the oration in its printed form is clearly later than that of the appearance of the phrase in the Harvard Independent.

Nevertheless, I am disposed to believe that Ingersoll's oration is the fons et origo of the myth. Ingersoll was much in demand as a lecturer and political speaker. For years he orated on the lyceum platform and spoke at political rallies. The oration on Lincoln doubtless was delivered many and many a time before it was put into cold print. The tariff phrase doubtless figured in it, and was likely to stick in the memory of hearers; and it is in this way that the editor of the Harvard Independence probably got hold of it. Hearing it as delivered, with the dramatic emphasis of which Ingersoll was a master, he would not fail to remember it, and at the same time would naturally suppose it to be a quotation from Lincoln, not an epigram of the orator's. The circumstance that the difference in price between English and American rails, which is an important part of Ingersoll's version, does not appear in the Harvard Independent or in other places, is entirely consistent with its having been derived from a vaguely memorized report of spoken words.

In sum, the indications now seem to be that Ingersoll's oration, notwithstanding its having appeared in print at a later date than the first published version of the phrase, is nevertheless its source. It is precisely such as Ingersoll might have invented—epigramatic and fetching. And yet still further search may show that it was derived by Ingersoll himself from some source still more remote. No evidence has been adduced, or is likely to be, that it originated with Lincoln or was ever used by him.

F. W. TAUSSIG.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE LINCOLN TARIFF MYTH FINALLY DISPOSED OF

In two notes published in this Journal, one in August 1914 entitled "Abraham Lincoln on the Tariff: A Myth," and the other in February 1915 entitled "Lincoln and the Tariff: A Sequel," I presented the results of an inquiry on the origin of a phrase about the tariff ascribed to Lincoln.[1] The phrase appeared in various forms. The familiar one was this: "If we purchase a ton of steel rails from England for $20, then we have the rails and England the money. But if we buy a ton of steel rails from an American for $25, then America has the rails and the money both." My conclusion, after following up various clues, was that the phrase originated with Robert G. Ingersoll. Though it did not appear in Ingersoll's published writings until after the date of first ascription to Lincoln, the evidence indicated that it had been used by Ingersoll in his orations and lyceum speeches in such a way as to lead reporters, quite without design on Ingersoll's part, to attribute it to Lincoln.

Complete confirmation of this surmise has recently come to me through the obliging inquiries of Mr. Edward F. O'Neil, of New York. Endeavors of my own to secure information from members of Ingersoll's family had been fruitless. Mr. O'Neil, however,

---

[9] See the Textile Record (Boston), July 1913. I have been able to secure little information about the British episode. The literary secretary of the Tariff Reform League writes me: "We have no post card containing the quotation from Lincoln, nor to the best of my knowledge have we ever issued such a post card. * * * The quotation is, of course, well known to us, and it is quite possible we may have referred to it in our Monthly Notes, though not in any recent years." Another correspondent in England suggests that a branch of the league may have circulated the card.

[10] The advertisement appeared in New York in the Journal of Commerce and the Times, May 1914; perhaps in other newspapers also. The advertiser's answer to inquiries was in the Times of May 18.

[11] Since this note was prepared, my attention has been called to a letter of Mr. Horace White's in the New York Evening Post of April 10, 1914. Mr. White points out that nothing like the oft-cited passage is to be found in Lincoln's writings, and pungently concludes: "My reason for thinking that Lincoln never said this is that he was not a fool."

[1] See vol. III, pp. 127–128, of the Dresden Edition of the Works of Robert G. Ingersoll (New York, 1900). The oration, or lecture, is also reprinted as an introduction to the seventh volume of Lincoln's Collected Writings, edited by Nicolay and Hay (New York, 1905).

[1] Reprinted in the volume of collected essays on Free Trade, the Tariff and Reciprocity (1920).

has communicated with Ingersoll's surviving sister-in-law, Mrs. C. P. Farrell, of New York, and gets from her the unequivocal statement that Ingersoll used the steel rail story as early as 1880. She refers to a speech made in Brooklyn, N. Y., in October 1880, and reported to the New York Herald of October 31 of that year. He used it also in an interview in the Republican of Denver, Colo., on January 17, 1884, and once more in a speech at the Metropolitan Opera House on June 29, 1888. The evidence seems to be complete. Ingersoll was the author of the phrase, and used it frequently. Only by accidental collocation with Lincoln's name did it come to be ascribed to the great President.

EXHIBIT 2

The undersigned American economists and teachers of economics strongly urge that any measure which provides for a general upward revision of tariff rates be denied passage by Congress, or if passed, be vetoed by the President.

We are convinced that increased restrictive duties would be a mistake. They would operate, in general, to increase the prices which domestic consumers would have to pay. By raising prices they would encourage concerns with higher costs to undertake production, thus compelling the consumer to subsidize waste and inefficiency in industry.

At the same time they would force him to pay higher rates of profit to established firms which enjoyed lower production costs. A higher level of duties, such as is contemplated by the Smoot-Hawley bill, would therefore raise the cost of living and injure the great majority of our citizens.

Few people could hope to gain from such a change. Miners, construction, transportation, and public utility workers, professional people, and those employed in banks, hotels, newspaper offices, in the wholesale and retail trades, and scores of other occupations would clearly lose, since they produce no products which could be especially favored by tariff barriers.

The vast majority of farmers also would lose. Their cotton, pork, lard, and wheat are export crops and are sold in the world market. They have no important competition in the home market. They cannot benefit, therefore, from any tariff which is imposed upon the basic commodities which they produce.

PREDICT A DOUBLE LOSS

They would lose through the increased duties on manufactured goods, however, and in a double fashion. First, as consumers they would have to pay still higher prices for the products, made of textiles, chemicals, iron and steel, which they buy. Second, as producers their ability to sell their products would be further restricted by the barriers placed in the way of foreigners who wished to sell manufactured goods to us.

Our export trade, in general, would suffer. Countries cannot permanently buy from us unless they are permitted to sell to us, and the more we restrict the importation of goods from them by means ever higher tariffs, the more we reduce the possibility of our exporting to them.

This applies to such exporting industries as copper, automobiles, agricultural machinery, typewriters and the like fully as much as it does to farming. The difficulties of these industries are likely to be increased still further if we pass a higher tariff.

There are already many evidences that such action would inevitably provoke other countries to pay us back in kind by levying retaliatory duties against our goods. There are few more ironical spectacles than that of the American Government as it seeks, on the one hand, to promote exports through the activity of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, while, on the other hand, by increasing tariffs it makes exportation ever more difficult.

We do not believe that American manufacturers, in general, need higher tariffs. The report of the President's Committee on Recent Economic Changes has shown that industrial efficiency has increased, that costs have fallen, that profits have grown with amazing rapidity since the end of the world war. Already our factories supply our people with over 96 percent of the manufactured goods which they consume, and our producers look to foreign markets to absorb the increasing output of their machines.

Further barriers to trade will serve them not well but ill.

EFFECT ON INVESTMENTS ABROAD

Many of our citizens have invested their money in foreign enterprises. The Department of Commerce has estimated that such investments, entirely aside from the war debts, amounted to between $12,555,000,000 and $14,555,000,000 on January 1, 1929. These investors, too, would suffer if restrictive duties were to be increased, since such action would make it still more difficult for their foreign debtors to pay them the interest due them.

America is now facing the problem of unemployment. The proponents of higher tariffs claim that an increase in rates will give work to the idle. This is not true. We cannot increase employment by restricting trade. American industry, in the present crisis, might well be spared the burden of adjusting itself to higher schedules of duties.

Finally, we would urge our Government to consider the bitterness which a policy of higher tariffs would inevitably inject into our international relations. The United States was ably represented at the World Economic Conference which was held under the auspices of the League of Nations in 1927. This Conference adopted a resolution announcing that the time has come to put an end to the increase in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction.

The higher duties proposed in our pending legislation violate the spirit of this agreement and plainly invite other nations to compete with us in raising further barriers to trade. A tariff war does not furnish good soil for the growth of world peace.

THE SIGNERS

The signers include many economists connected with banks, public utilities, manufacturing industries, merchandising concerns, and other business establishments.

The number signing from leading universities are: Columbia 28, New York University 22, Cornell 18, Harvard 25, Yale 14, Princeton 17, Dartmouth 24, Chicago 26, Wisconsin 23, Pennsylvania 13, California 11, Stanford 7, Illinois 14, Northwestern 9, Minnesota 15, Missouri 15.

ORIGINATORS AND FIRST SIGNERS

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Irving Fisher, professor of economics, Yale University.

Frank D. Graham, professor of economics, Princeton University.

Ernest M. Patterson, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania.

Henry R. Seager, professor of economics, Columbia University.

Frank W. Taussig, professor of economics, Harvard University.

Clair Wilcox, associate professor of economics, Swarthmore College.

ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES

Alabama

University of Alabama—James Halloday.

Arizona

University of Arizona—Robert B. Pettingill.

Arkansas

University of Arkansas—Truman C. Bingham, Walter B. Cole, Kenneth Sharkey, C. C. Fichtner, A. W. Jamison, C. O. Branner, B. M. Gile.

Hendrix Henderson College—Ivan H. Grove, O. T. Gooden.

California

University of California—Ira B. Cross, Gordon S. Watkins, Stuart Daggett, M. M. Knight, Robert A. Brody, E. T. Grether, E. J. Brown, Lonn T. Morgan, Henry F. Grady, E. W. Braun, N. L. Silverstein.

Claremont College—Horace Secrist.

University of Southern California—Reid L. McClung.

University of Redlands—H. C. Tilton, Arthur D. Jacobson.

California Institute of Technology—Horace N. Gilbert.

Mills College—Glenn F. Hoover.

Stanford University—Dean W. E. Hotchkiss, Eliot Jones, Holbrook Working, Helen Cherington Farnsworth, Ada Fay Wyman, L. Elden Smith, Murray S. Wildman.

Pomona College — Kenneth Duncan, George I. Burgess, Norman Ness.

Armstrong College of Business Administration—Frank A. Haring, W. W. Diehl, J. Evan Armstrong, John H. Goff, George A. Letherman, J. Frank Day.

College of the Pacific—Robert C. Root, Luther Sharp, Laura M. Kingsburg.

Pasadena Junior College—Roscoe Lewis Ashley, Earl D. Davis, Leland M. Pryor, Fred G. Young, Louise H. Murdock, Henry P. Melnikow, Louis J. Hopkins, R. F. Berkeley, Walter W. Cooper, Howard S. Noble, L. S. Samra, Philip J. Webster, Claire Soderblom.

Colorado

University of Colorado—Dean Elmore Peterson, Frederick J. Bushee.

Colorado College—A. P. R. Drucker, J. G. Johnson, Edna Rose Groth.

University of Denver—H. W. Hudson.

State Agricultural College—D. N. Donaldson.

Colorado Wesleyan University—Clyde Olin Fisher, K. M. Williamson, Norman J. Ware.

Connecticut

Yale University—Ray B. Westerfield, Fred R. Fairchild, Winthrop M. Daniels, Jerome Davis, C. H. Whelden, Jr., Hudson R. Hastings, Ralph A. Jones, A. Barr, Jr., William W. Werntz, Triston R. Barnes, H. Berolzheimer, Geoffrey Crowther, Francis W. Hopkins.

Connecticut Agricultural College—Albert E. Waugh, Edward H. Gumbart, Cecil G. Tilton.

Trinity College—G. A. Kleene, George A. Suter, Henry W. Farnam, Curtis M. Geer, Charles A. Tuttle.

Delaware

University of Delaware—Claude L. Bonner, Harry S. Gabriel, J. Sidney Gould.

District of Columbia

Horace B. Drury, Frank J. Warne, Herbert O. Rogers, Arthur Sturgis, Boris Stern, Lester D. Johnson, Edith S. Gray, Arthur S. Field, W. H. Rowe, Glen L. Swiggett, John H. Gray, Jesse E. Pope, Harold Van V. Fay, Kurt Schneider, Charles E. Purans, Agnes L. Peterson, C. E. Clement, George B. L. Arner, William G. Elliot 3d, George B. Galloway, R. M. Boeckel.

Brookings Institution—C. C. Hardy, Leverett S. Lyon, Philip G. Wright, Lynn R. Edminister, W. M. Blaisdell, Gustavus A. Weber, Frank Tannenbaum, Freda Baird.

George Washington University—Harold G. Sutton, Richard N. Owens, Belva M. Owens.

American University—Charles F. Marsh, D. A. Kinsman.

Catholic University—The Rev. John A. Ryan.

Florida

Francis M. Williams, H. Clay Armstrong, Isaac W. Bernheim.

Rollins College—Glen E. Carlson, Leland H. Jenks.

University of Florida—Harwood B. Dolbeare, Howard M. Dykman, Rollin S. Atwood, W. T. Hicks, J. G. Eldridge, J. P. Wilson P. C. Saglione, Huber C. Hurst.

Georgia

University of Georgia—Dean R. P. Brooks, Glenn W. Sutton, James B. Summers, Malcolm H. Bryan, John W. Jenkins.

Agnes Scott College—James M. Wright.

Emory University—Edgar H. Johnson, Clark Warburton, Mercer G. Evans.

Idaho

University of Idaho—Irwin Crane.

College of Idaho—Robert Rockwood McCormick.

Illinois

University of Illinois—Merlin H. Hunter, D. H. Hoover, M. A. Weston, D. Philip Locklin, Simon Litman, George U. Sanford, Paul E. Alyer, Paul M. Vanarsdell, Edward Berman, Donald R. Taft, Horace M. Gray, Daniel Barth, Jr., D. M. Dailey, R. F. Smith.

Northwestern University—Earl Dean Howard, Spencer W. Myers, Arthur J. Todd, Charles A. R. Wardwell, A. D. Theobald, Harold A. Frey, Coleman Woodbury, Robert J. Ray, E. W. Morehouse, Helen C. Manchau.

James Milliken University—Jay L. O'Hara.

Monmouth College—J. S. Cleland.

University of Chicago—H. A. Millis, J. Laurence Laughlin, Henry Schultz, Garfield V. Cox, Chester W. Wright, Stuart P. Meech, H. G. Shields, Hazel Kyrk, James L. Palmer, Paul W. Stone, Martin Taitel, Helen R. Jeter, S. H. Nerlove, F. W. Clower, John U. Nef, Howard A. Baker, Charles J. Coe, Sara Landau, Arthur M. Weimer, Hilding B. Jack, Mary V. Covey, Leo McCarthy, May I. Morgan, R. W. Baldwin, Esther Essenshade.

Knox College—R. S. Steiner.

Lewis Institute—Judson F. Lee, P. S. Mata, E. J. Fowler, Carl Vrooman, A. D. Arado, Eugene W. Burgess, Ruth M. Kellogg, S. Leon Levy, Dorothy W. Douglas, Edward Manley, Willard S. Hall, O. David Zimring, E. W. Marcellus, I. W. Mints, Roger T. Vaughan, Everett V. Stonequist, Henry C. Simons, Margaret Grobben, Howard B. Myers, Joseph E. Griffin, Gerard S. Brown, H. S. Irwin, George E. Hooker, John H. Sherman, John B. Woolsey, Harland H. Allen, Lester S. Kellogg.

Indiana

Indiana University—Thomas S. Luck, William C. Cleveland, Guy E. Morrison, James E. Moffat, Edwin J. Kunst.

Butler University—M. G. Bridenstein, Earl R. Beckner, Chester B. Camp, M. F. Gaudian.

Evansville College—Dean Long, Heber P. Walker, Paul G. Cressey.

Goseh College—Roland Yoder.

De Pauw University—William R. Sherman, A. H. Woodworth.

Iowa

University of Iowa—E. B. Reuter, Richard W. Nelson, George W. Mitchell, J. L. Miller, J. E. Partington.

Drake University—David F. Owens, L. E. Hoffman, W. N. Rowlands, Herbert W. Bohlman, Herbert R. Mundhenke.

Iowa State College—Elizabeth Hoyt, John E. Brindley.

Penn College—President H. L. McCracken.

Grinnell College—Laetia M. Conard.

Kansas

University of Kansas—John Ise, Jens P. Jensen, Eugene Maynard, Domenico Gagliardo.

Kansas State Agricultural—Leo Spurrier, J. E. Karnmeyer, T. J. Anderson, Jr.

Kansas Wesleyan—David Dykstro.

Southwestern College—E. R. McCarthy.

Bethel College—Robert G. O. Grovewald, J. F. Moyer, H. W. Guest, W. M. Blach.

Kentucky

University of Kentucky—Edward Weist, James W. Martin, J. Catron Jones, C. A. Pearce, J. Phillip Glenn, Harry Best, Esther Cole, Chester W. Shull, G. W. Patton, John Kimper, Dana G. Card, Saul K. Walz, H. Bruce Price, Walter W. Jennings.

Louisiana

Tulane University—Robert W. Elsasser, J. H. Stallings, National Fertilizer Co.

Maine

John W. Bowers.

Bowdoin College—Walter B. Catlin, Phillips Mason, Morgan B. Cushing, William W. Lockwood Jr., Wilfred H. Crook.

Maryland

Theodore Marburg, Dexter M. Keezer.

Goucher College—Mollie Ray Carroll, Elinor Pancoast.

St. John's College—V. J. Wyckoff.

John Hopkins University—Broadus Mitchell.

Western Maryland College—W. B. Sanders, W. Scott Hall.

Massachusetts

Harvard University—G. B. Roorbach, John D. Black, Carl F. Taeusch, N. S. B. Gras, Albert P. Usher, M. L. McElroy, Lawrence C. Lockley, T. H. Sanders, S. E. Harris, J. E. Dalton, Arthur W. Hanson, Donald H. Davenport, Scott Warren, Malcolm P. McNair, Murray R. Benedict, Albert O. Greef, P. T. Elisworth, James A. Ross Jr., George P. Baker, S. S. Stratton, Robert L. Masson, Edmund P. Learned, Joseph L. Snider, Karl W. Bigelow.

Amherst College—Willard L. Thorp, George R. Taylor, A. K. Eaton.

Williams College—President H. A. Garfield, W. W. McLaren, Albert Sydney Bolles, Walter B. Smith, David Clark, Rosnell H. Whitman.

Wellesley College—Elizabeth Donnan, Lucy W. Killough, Emily Clark Brown, Mary B. Treudley.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology—James C. MacKinnon, B. A. Tresher, Carroll W. Doten.

Tufts College—President John A. Couzens.

Smith College—Frank H. Hankins, Harold U. Faulkner.

Simmons College—Sara S. Stites.

Mount Holyoke College—Alzada Comstock.

Babson Institute—James M. Matthews.

Boston University—Charles T. Andrews.

Northeastern University—Milton J. Schlagenhauf, Julian E. Jackson, B. Gabine.

Clark University—Arthur F. Lucas, S. J. Brandenburg.

Wheaton College—Edith M. White.

Herman F. Arentz, John W. Boldyreff, Dickinson, W. Leavens, Francis G. Goodale, L. H. Hauter, George M. Peterson, Samuel Sigilman, E. M. Winslow, A. S. Kingsmill, Prentice W. Townsley, Gilbert A. Tapley, L. H. L. Smith, John D. Willard, Lauchlin Currye, A. E. Monroe, C. L. McAleer, Arthur M. Moore, Harry Wood, Edward S. Mason, Lucile Eaves.

Michigan

Lawrence H. Seltzer, Arthur E. Erickson, Clifford E. King.

Battle Creek College—W. F. Payne.

Western State Teachers' College—Floyd W. Moore.

University of Michigan—Dean C. F. Griffin, G. S. Peterson, Roy G. Burroughs, Carroll H. May, Robert J. Henry, Ruth M. Engle, Nathaniel H. Engle, C. F. Remer.

Michigan State College—Herman Wyngarden.

Minnesota

Carleton College—J. S. Robinson, O. C. Helwig, Paul R. Fossum, Gordon H. Ward.

University of Minnesota—Roy G. Blakey, Alvin H. Hansen, B. D. Mudgett, O. B. Jesness, R. A. Stevenson, Carl C. Zimmerman, Roland S. Vaile, Peter L. Stagswold, Glen R. Treanor, A. C. Haskin, Arthur W. Marget, O. W. Behrens, Richard L. Kozelka, J. Ross McFayden, John J. Reighard.

Mississippi

Agriculture and Mechanical College—Lewis E. Long.

Missouri

Chester W. Bigelow, S. E. Rigg.

Washington University—G. W. Stephens, J. Ray Cable, Orval Bennett, Ralph Carr Fletcher, Joseph M. Klamow, Joseph J. Senturia.

Westminster College—W. S. Krebs, Frank L. McCluer.

University of Missouri—Harry Gunnison Brown, James Harvey Rogers, Charles A. Elwood, F. L. Thomsen, B. H. Frame, C. H. Hammar, Preston Richard, D. C. Wood, H. C. Hensley, Morris D. Orten, Howard S. Jensen, Arthur S. Ennis, R. E. Curtis, George W. Baughman, O. R. Johnson.

Montana

University of Montana—Mattheas Kast.

Nebraska

Edward L. Taylor, W. G. L. Taylor, D. M. Halley.

Doane College—J. Harold Ennis, J. E. Taylor.

University of Nebraska—J. E. Lerossignol, G. O. Virtue, J. E. Kirshman, Vernon G. Morrison, Oscar R. Martin, J. C. Rankin.

Nevada

University of Nevada—Edward G. Sutherland, M. J. Webster, W. R. Blackhod, Ernest S. Brown.

New Hampshire

George W. Raynes.

University of New Hampshire—Claire W. Swonger, Carroll M. Degler, John D. Hauslein, H. J. Duncan, H. W. Smith.

Dartmouth College—Malcolm Kier, Ray V. Leffler, Robert E. Riegel, Russell D. Kilborne, W. A. Carter, Bruce W. Knight, Everett W. Goodhue, H. V. Olsen, Robert P. Lane, Louis W. Ingram, Archie M. Peisch, Stephen J. Navin, Herman Feldman, H. S. Raushenbush, Stacy May, H. F. R. Shaw, Earl R. Sikes, Lloyd P. Rice, Harry Purdy, J. L. McDonald, Nelson Lee Smith, Arthur Howe, G. Reginald Crosby, W. H. McPherson.

New Jersey

Walter H. Steinhauser, Edmund W. Foote, Augustus Smith, Franklin W. Ryan, Charles W. Lum, A. J. Duncan, Robert L. Smitley, Peter Fireman, Robert F. Foerster.

Princeton University—Frank A. Fetter, Frank Dixon, James J. Smith, Richard A. Lester, Vernon A. Mund, Denzol C. Cline, James M. Garrett, Stanley E. Howard, Donald L. Kemmerer, Frank W. Fetter, J. Douglas Brown, George F. Luthringer, Howard S. Piquet, George W. Modlin, J. W. Blum.

Rutgers University—E. E. Agger, Harry D. Gideons, Thomas W. Holland, E. L. Fisher.

New York

Columbia University—Wesley C. Mitchell, J. M. Clark, J. Russell Smith, James C. Bonbright, R. G. Tugwell, R. M. Maciver, Frederick M. Mills, Paul F. Brissenden, Robert E. Chaddock, Edward L. Thorndyke, Robert L. Hale, K. N. Llewellyn, A. H. Stockder, Edith Elmer Wood, William E. Dunkman, George Fillipetti, Edward J. Allen, Harold F. Clark, E. J. Hutchinson, B. H. Brechart, Addison T. Cutler, George Mitchell, Robert L. Carey, Elizabeth F. Baker, C. C. Williamson, Margaret Eagelson, Ralph H. Blanchard.

New York University—Wilford I. King, Myron W. Watkins, J. D. Magee, Walter E. Spahr, Marue Nedler, Corwin D. Edwards, William E. Atkins, D. W. McConnell, A. A. Frederick, Richard A. Girard, Louis S. Reed, John J. Quigley, Carl Raushenbush, Irving Glass, Lois Maeslenold, Edith Ayres, Arthur Weeburg, Willard Friedman, Loyle A. Morrison, Randolf M. Binder, John H. Prime, John W. Wingatex, Arthur Wubpiez.

Cornell University—Sumner Slighter, Walter F. Wilcox, Morris A. Copeland, Paul T.

Homan, S. S. Garrett, M. Slade Kendrick, James E. Boyle, Paul M. O'Leary, Lewis A. Froman, Harold L. Read, Donald English, Julian L. Woodward, W. Ross Junkin, William R. Leonaro, Leonard P. Adams, John H. Patterson.

Syracuse University—Harvey W. Peck, H. E. Bloe.

Colgate University—Freeman H. Allen, Albert L. Myers, E. Wilson Lyon, Sherman M. Smith, T. H. Robinson, N. J. Padelford, Everett Clair Bancroft, J. Milbourne, Shortliffe.

Vassar College—Mabel Newcomer, Ruth G. Hutchinson, Kathleen C. Jackson, Herbert E. Mills.

University of Buffalo—Niles Carpenter, T. L. Norton, Newlin R. Smith, Raymond Chambers.

Union College—W. M. Bennett, Donald C. Riley, Daniel T. Selks.

Wells College—Mabel A. Magee, Jean S. Davis.

Hobart College—W. A. Hosmer.

Hunter College—Eleanor H. Grady.

University of Rochester—Roth Clausing.

Brookwood Labor College—Daniel J. Saposs.

Taylor Society—H. S. Person, managing director.

The Business Week—Virgil Jordan, editor.

The Annalist—Bernard Ostrolenk, editor.

International Telephone Securities Company—M. C. Porty.

Second International Securities Corp.—Leland R. Robinson.

Social Science Research Council—Meredith B. Givens.

American Electric Railways Association—Leslie Vickers.

Russell Sage Foundation—Mary Van Kleeck.

Tariff board—N. I. Stone, formerly chief statistician.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America—Arthur E. Suffern, Benson Y. Landis.

New York School of Social Work—John A. Fitch.

Clarkson College—Charles Leese.

Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc.—Mary B. Gilson, Murray Latimer, W. Bert, S. Regalo, James W. Zonson, Jeanne C. Barber.

Skidmore College—Coleman B. Cheney.

College of the City of New York—Ernest S. Bradford.

St. Lawrence University—Whitney Coombs.

Alfred University—Paul Rusby.

American Management Association—Mary Rogers Lyndsay, Leona Powell.

American Association for Labor Legislation—George H. Trafton, John B. Andrews. Carl Snyder, Leo Wolman, George Soule, Stuart Chase, Herbert Feis, Edward T. Devine, George P. Auld, Fabian Franklin, Lawson Purdy, Gorton James, Paul W. Paustian, Warren W. Persons, Paul Tuckerman, Charles B. Austin, Donald R. Belcher, H. T. Newcomb, Lester Kirtzleb, A. W. Kattenhous, W. W. Cumberland.

Also, M. L. Jacobson, R. D. Fleming, Dudley M. Irwin, George B. Hill, William Church Osborne, Robert F. Binkled, F. B. Patten, Wendell M. Strong, Ida Craven, Elizabeth Todd, A. D. Noyes, Robert E. Corradini, Samuel M. Dix, W. C. Wishart, Edward E. Hardy, Ernest G. Draper, M. Leo Gitelson, Harold Fields, Henry Israel, Asher Achenstein, F. L. Patton, Stanley B. Hunt, R. L. Wiseman, Shelby M. Harrison, Rufus S. Tucker, John J. Wilie, R. D. Patton, William E. Johnson, Albert W. Russell, Robert T. Hill, D. J. Cowden.

W. D. Gann, Melbourne S. Moyer, Herbert Fordham, Owen Ely, Roger H. Williams, Robert M. Woodbury, May Lerner, Elsie Gluck, Paul Bonwit, Robert D. Kohn, V. Kelley, J. C. Meeder, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, Charles S. Bernheimer, Ephraim A. Karelsen, Henry C. Hasbrouck, Robert Whitten, P. M. Tuttle, F. Lewis Corser.

Also Jeanette Kimball, Francis H. McLean, John M. Glenn, C. J. Fuller, Emily Barrofs Weber, Rich Kramer, Montefiore G. Kahn, Mary A. Prentiss, L. R. Gottlieb, Charles R. Fay, Martin Clark, John P. Munn, Otto S. Whitelock, Victor Morawetz, Clinton Collver, Helen Sumner Woodbury, William Seagle, Helen Sullivan, Bettina Sinclair.

North Carolina

Selma Rogas, C. K. Brown, A. Currie, Maxwell G. Pangle, Carl J. Whelan.

North Carolina State College—Joseph G. Knapp.

University of North Carolina—Dean D. D. Carroll, J. Gilbert Evans, W. F. Ferger, C. T. Murchison, G. T. Schwenning, E. D. Strong.

North Carolina College for Women—Albert S. Keister.

Duke University—R. A. Harvill, J. P. Breedlove, J. H. Shields, William J. H. Colton, Christopher Roberts, E. R. Gray, B. U. Ratchford, Robert S. Smith.

Elon College—Ralph B. Tower.

North Dakota

Dana G. Tinnes, James Forgerson.

University of North Dakota—Dean E. T. Towne, J. Donald Pymm, A. G. Rowlands, Daniel J. Schwieger, J. Periman, Spencer A. Larson, J. J. Rellahan, Roy E. Brown, Carmen G. Blough, E. C. Koch, V. A. Newcomb, Daniel James.

Ohio

Ohio State University—Matthew B. Hammond, Milo Kimball, J. J. Spengler, Clifford I. James, E. L. Bowers, Henry J. Butterman, W. M. Duffas, Louise Stitt, Willford J. Eiteman, Paul N. Lehocyky, N. Gilbert Riddle.

Antioch College—William M. Leiserson, Rudolf Broda, Algo D. Henderson.

Lake Erie College—Olive D. Reddick.

Wooster College—Alvin S. Testlebe, E. E. Cummins.

University of Cincinnati.—Harry Henig.

Miami University.—Warren S. Thompson, P. K. Whelpton, Edwin S. Todd, H. H. Beneke, Henry P. Shearman, C. H. Sandage, Howard White, Howard R. Whinson, John F. Schreiner, Wilfrid G. Richards, Carroll B. Malone, James H. St. John, F. B. Joyner, W. J. M. Neff, J. R. Dennison, J. M. Gersting, Read Bain.

Heidelburg College—Onsian Gruber.

Hiram College—J. E. Smith.

Denison University—Hiram L. Jome, Harold H. Titus, Leo A. Thaake, Charles West, Frederick E. Detweiler.

Western Reserve University—Claude Stimson, O. J. Marsh, Louis O. Foster, C. C. Arbuthnot.

Oberlin University—C. C. Bayard, Paul S. Peirce.

Case School of Applied Science—Frank T. Carleton.

Kenyon College—George M. James.

Municipal University of Akron—W. W. Leigh.

University of the City of Toledo—Clair K. Searles.

Dr. I. M. Rubino, Edward D. Jones, John A. Zangerle, I. W. Appleby, Amy G. Maher, Homer H. Johnson, E. L. Oliver, Thomas M. Wolfe, Grover P. Osborne, Eugene H. Foster.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.—H. L. Flanick, Royal E. Davis.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College—Orman W. Hermann, P. H. Stephens, J. T. Sanders.

University of Tulsa—A. M. Paxson, W. M. Maurer.

University of Oklahoma—Dean Paul L. Vogt, Leonard Logan, Jr., John P. Ewing, Ivar Axelson, N. Grady Sloan.

Northeastern State Teachers College—Dean Sobin C. Percefull.

Oregon

Oregon State College—E. B. Mittelman, F. L. Robinson, Alfred C. Schmidt, Curtis Kelley, Bertha Whillock, Leila Hay, E. E. Farnsworth, J. H. Irvine, H. K. Roberts.

Reed College—Clement Akerman, Blair Stewart.

Pacific University—Harold N. Burt, Harold Harward.

University of Oregon—Vernon G. Sorrell.

Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania—Emory R. Johnson, dean; Raymond T. Bye, Paul F. Gemmill, William C. Schluter, Stuart A. Rice, W. E. Fisher, William N. Loucks, Karl Scholz, Clyde M. Kahler, Raymond T. Bowman, Weldon Hoot, William J. Carson.

Temple University—Russell H. Mack, William J. Douglas, S. S. Hoffer.

Wilson College—Henrietta C. Jennings.

Lehigh University—E. A. Bradford, Elmer C. Bratt.

University of Pittsburgh—Francis D. Tyson, Marion K. McKay, Colston E. Warne, Donald D. Kennedy, Vincent W. Lanfear, Hugh M. Fletcher, P. N. Dean.

Washington and Jefferson—Carl W. Kaiser.

Bryn Mawr College—Hornell Hartz.

Franklin and Marshall—Horace R. Barnes, Edward L. Lancaster, Wesley Gadd, Noel P. Laird, Harold Fischer.

Haverford College—Don C. Barrett, John G. Herndon, Jr.

Pennsylvania State College—Earl V. Dye, W. E. Butt, H. W. Stover.

Drexel Institute—Edwin J. Kaschenbach, A. E. Blackstone, C. L. Nickels, Earl Spargee, W. N. McMullan.

Swarthmore College—Robert C. Brooks, Herbert F. Fraser, Troyer S. Anderson, J. Roland Pennock.

J. Henry Scattergood, Hugo Bilgram, Carl W. Fenninger, Louis N. Robinson, M. S. D'Essipri, Charles L. Serrill, John C. Lowry, Herbert S. Welsh, Raymond Symestvzdt, Alexander Fleischer.

Rhode Island

Brown University—C. C. Bosland, Willard C. Beatty.

Rhode Island State College—Andrew J. Newman.

South Carolina

Furman University—A. G. Griffin.

South Dakota

A. I. Osborne.

Tennessee

E. P. Aldredge.

University of Chattanooga—C. W. Phelps.

Southwestern University—M. H. Townsend, Horace B. Davis.

University of the South—Eugene M. Kayden, William S. Knickenbacker, W. H. MacKellar, J. J. Davis, I. Q. Ware, George W. Nicholson, J. P. Jersey, C. B. Wilmer.

Texas

University of Texas—R. H. Montgomery, A. S. Lang.

A. and M. College—F. B. Clark, G. C. Vaughn, Thomas A. Hamilton.

Southern Methodist University—William F. Hanhart, Donald Scott, Frank K. Rader, Laurence H. Fleck.

Texas Technological College—John C. Granbery, Ormond C. Corry, Harold R. Nissley, B. F. Coldray, Jr.

Utah

Latter Day Saints' College—Feramorz Y. Fox.

Vermont

University of Vermont—George C. Groat, Claude L. Stineford, L. Douglas Meredith.

Virginia

William H. Stauffer.

College of William and Mary—Shirley D. Southworth, A. G. Taylor.

Randolph Macon—Langdon White.

Washington and Lee—Robert H. Tucker, E. E. Ferebee, M. C. Robaugh, M. Odges Phillips, R. G. Lausgobel, Dean G. D. Hancock.

University of Virginia—Wilson Gee, Charles N. Hulvey, G. R. Snavely, Abraham Berglund, A. J. Barlow, E. A. Hiniard, G. S. Starnes, William H. Wendel.

Washington

Arthur B. Young.

University of Washington—Theresa S. McMahon.

State College of Washington—Lawrence Clark.

West Virginia

University of West Virginia—E. H. Vickers, A. J. Dadisman.

Marshall College—C. E. Carpenter.

Wisconsin

Charles E. Brooks, Eldred M. Keayes, Alice E. Belcher, Ethel Wynn, R. Beckwith, J. Roy Blough, A. R. Schnaitter, Mary S. Peterson, William D. Thompson.

Lawrence College—R. H. Lounsburg, W. A. McConacha, M. M. Bober, M. M. Evans.

Beloit College—Lewis Severson, Lloyd U. Ballard, Dwight L. Palmer.

Marquette University—Lyle W. Cooper, William H. Ten Haken, Leo A. Schmidt, Oscar F. Brown, N. J. Hoffman, George W. Knick.

University of Wisconsin—Frederick A. Og, Edward A. Ross, William H. Kiekhofer, Selig Perlman, Alma Bridgman, Elizabeth Brandeis, Arthur Hallahan, Philip G. Fox, H. Rowland English, J. C. Gibson, Stanley Rector, George S. Wehrwein, William A. Scott, Paul A. Rauschenbush, M. G. Glaeser, I. A. Hensey, Arnold Zempel, J. H. Miller, Russell H. Baugh, J. Marvin Peterson, Harold M. Groves, Alfred W. Briggs, Margaret Pryor.

RECESS TO 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1955, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Josef A. Barton, pastor, Czech Moravian Brethren Church, Bellville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord, continue Thy presence with us this day, we beseech Thee. Teach us where we need to be taught. Strengthen us as we need to be strengthened. Chastise us as we need to be chastised. Help us to seek the basic and not the base. May that which we do be fundamental for the welfare of our Nation. May we rather be miserable than to cause misery, is our prayer, as we depend upon Thy infinite grace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POLISH NATIONAL DAY

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today is Polish National Day, celebrating the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, an outstanding document discarding class distinction, abolishing restrictions on the freedom of the individual, and guaranteeing religious tolerance. This was truly the first democratic constitution in Europe and a milestone in the development of parliamentary democracy.

It is significant that the Polish Nation, which led Europe in democratic thought, should today be deprived of its freedom and liberty by an autocratic totalitarianism in the form of Soviet communism.

It is discouraging to note that our own country, which is looked upon to lead the free world in the struggle against Communist oppression, has succumbed to a policy of appeasement, of compromise with evil, and of peaceful coexistence with an enemy who is determined to destroy us at the first opportunity.

Under such circumstances the hopes for restoration of freedom and liberty to the Polish Nation are not bright for the near future. On this day, however, I pray that we may see the light and come to a realization that our future and the future of all the world, including Poland, depends on our ability to stand steadfast upon the principles which have made us the greatest nation on earth. We must realize that every time we appease the Communists, either in Europe or in Asia, by sacrificing principles, we not only lose respect among other free nations, but we bring ourselves closer to the war we are trying to avoid.

When this fact is realized, and when we pursue a course of honor and determination to fight for what is right, we will have a just and lasting peace on earth, and Poland will again be restored to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 164th anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution—under which the Polish Nation obtained the bill of rights that it is now denied.

As we well remember, the Nazi armies advanced over the borders into Poland on September 1, 1939. The valiant Polish people, against overwhelming odds, decided to defend the precious liberties they had won in their constitution of May 3, 1791. Every inch of Polish soil taken was drenched with the blood of patriots who surrendered only when crushed by an inconceivable opposition. Their allies, Britain and France, responding honorably to their mutual-defense obligations, immediately declared war on Germany. Less than 3 weeks later, Polish hopes were temporarily shattered when the Soviet Union joined Germany under the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, and ruthlessly invaded that courageous country from the east.

Subsequent history is well remembered. The Russian Army, once established in Poland, aided the small Communist Party in crushing opposition whenever it arose. Through the secret police, the prison camp, and the other terrors they use so frequently, the Communists have managed to control the freedom-loving people of Poland. Poland is today cut off from the west with which it shares the closest cultural, economic, and religious ties.

The policy of this country toward Poland must be clear and unflinching. We long for the day when a Poland, dedicated to the preservation of human rights and working in brotherly cooperation with her neighbors, can once again be free. We must never depart from this goal.

Recently, irresponsible men in responsible positions in this country have attempted to exploit the yearning for freedom of the Polish people by talking of liberation as if this country were willing or able to remove the Russian yoke from Poland by force of arms. To plunge the world into a thermonuclear catastrophe would leave neither the Polish people nor the people of this country to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

But the fact that the term "liberation" has been abused by the sloganeers does not mean that this country needs to follow its present course of drift, which holds out no ray of hope to Poland or the other enslaved states behind the Iron Curtain.

With the ratification of the arrangements for the rearming of Germany, the West has acquired a position of strength toward Russia. Already, the Russians are ending their 10 years of intransigence on Austria, and are calling for a conference to end the Austrian occupation.

If we let Russia make all the moves and display all the initiative, we will dissipate the position of strength that we have now so laboriously obtained. Could we not now place Russia on the defensive, for a change, if the President were to speak out before the world in a vein that has been recently suggested in this House:

> To the people of Europe, we say this. West German rearmament is underway, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the U. N.

Such a statement, by meeting any legitimate security need of Russia, would put her on the defensive. Her acceptance could make possible a real start toward world disarmament. Her rejection would make crystal clear that it is Russia, and Russia alone, which is the enemy of German unification, Polish liberation, and European federation.

The people of Poland have not given up hope. Is it not time that this country help to keep that hope alive by tabling before the bar of world opinion a proposal that is both hopeful and just?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of the adoption of Poland's great instrument of liberty, their constitution. It is with sadness and disappointment that we must again note the passing of this anniversary without the liberation of the Polish people having been achieved. But we shall note it nonetheless, this national holiday of a homeless government and an oppressed people.

As we are exploring the possibilities of an enduring peace and the harsh realities of coexistence, none of us can forget our long friendship with this gallant nation, and an unpaid debt that goes back as far as our own revolution in which so many sons of Poland bore arms at our sides.

We know in our hearts that coexistence is not the solution to the problems of the world so long as it must be based upon the cruel injustices of the Soviet occupation of Poland and the other free nations engulfed behind the Iron Curtain. We have not forgotten them. We have not turned our backs on their sad plight. And I know that whatever the expediencies of the moment may be so far as official foreign policy is concerned, the American people will never abandon their resolve to free our friends and welcome them once more into the family of independent, sovereign and liberated members of the family of nations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is a highly significant Polish national holiday. And well it should be, for it is the anniversary of the adoption of the great Polish Constitution of 1791. That constitution closely follows our own type of representative government initiated by our Founding Fathers. It inspired and brought order to a people who had cherished the fervent hope of liberty with grim determination against apparent hopeless odds throughout years of desperation.

Poland has long been the battleground of Europe. The heroic stand of the Polish people in the face of tyrants and aggressors on innumerable occasions is an example of courage unparalleled in history.

In September 1939, Hitler and Stalin, very much like the German and Russian rulers of more than a century and a half ago, conspired to divide the remnants of a heroic but defeated Poland. Then, after the close of World War II Soviet treachery destroyed free Poland. Of course, physically, the Polish state and constitution do exist today. But, for all practical purposes, the Communist seizure of Poland has meant the destruction of the free Polish state; for there is no freedom in Poland today, Poland having been reduced to the level of a Soviet satellite.

Any review of Polish history demonstrates the indomitable will of the Polish people who through decades of oppression have with pride and determination held fast to their sense of Polish nationality. Although Soviet Russia's objective is to destroy the historic ideal of a free and democratic Polish republic which lives on in Polish hearts, the cold facts of history prove that try as they may the Communist Russians will never destroy the Polish desire for freedom and democracy.

On this 164th anniversary of the Polish constitution devotion to freedom remains a prime quality of the Polish people, nourished by decades of resistance to oppression. In the path of years of misery and terror the Poles have had one burning desire, to gain their lost liberties. In this, they should have the unstinted aid of all free peoples. We Americans must continue to do everything humanly possible to aid the oppressed and defeated but unconquered people of Poland and the refugees and exiles therefrom residing in other countries. Such an objective is in accordance with our American tradition and the flaming passion for liberty that animates the people of both nations.

Faith in God and freedom never die. I am sure it is only a matter of time, and let us pray it will be soon, when the brave and liberty-loving people of Poland will again regain their complete freedom and independence.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a qurorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Barden	Bolton, Oliver P.	Canfield
Bass, N. H.	Boykin	Carnahan
Beamer	Burnside	Chatham
Becker	Church	Chudoff
Coon	Green, Pa.	Prouty
Crumpacker	Halleck	Quigley
Curtis, Mo.	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Dawson, Ill.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Denton	Kilburn	Richards
Diggs	McCulloch	Roberts
Eberharter	Madden	Rogers, Tex.
Fallon	Miller, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Feighan	Morgan	Teague, Tex.
Frazier	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Friedel	Mumma	Walter
Garmatz	O'Konski	Wolverton
Granahan	Osmers	Zelenko
Gray	Powell	
	Priest	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, May 5, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING OF RESERVE FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 227, Rept. No. 470), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 224) providing for the consideration of H. R. 12, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the children of the United States, it is to be hoped that isolated examples of black-marketeering of Salk vaccine and maliciously cultivated rumors of exploitation and misplaced distribution of the precious biological will not be allowed to stampede the Congress into hasty and ill-considered mandatory Federal controls.

Sunday I debated with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on the program, Between the Lines, telecast from the Dumont Telecenter, 205 East 67th Street, New York City, on the question, Should the Federal Government Control Salk Vaccine?

During this discussion, on which I took the position of opposing rigid Federal controls, I was surprised how little is generally known about the nature of Federal restrictions and responsibilities which already apply in the field of biologics control and, therefore, which already apply to the production and distribution of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine.

The biologics-control law, passed by the Congress in 1902, gave the Research Branch of the Public Health Service control over all biologic products manufactured and distributed in interstate commerce, and those imported or exported. The law was incorporated into the Public Health Service law of 1944, but the modern statute is basically the same as the one passed in 1902.

Let me explain briefly how the provisions of the law are carried out. A manufacturer who wishes to place his product in interstate commerce must, first of all, be licensed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These licenses are issued by the Secretary on the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Before such license is granted his plant and equipment are carefully inspected by a staff member of the Laboratory of Biologics Control, National Institutes of Health. Personnel are also interviewed on background and competence. Now, in addition to this establishment license the manufacturer must also obtain separate licenses for each biological product which he plans to produce.

The other responsibilities involved in administration of the law concern the continuing control maintained over licensed manufacturers and products. These responsibilities may be stated as, first, periodic inspections of plant facilities; second, testing of products; third, release of approved lots; fourth, retesting or rejection of unapproved lots.

What is the history of control of scarce pharmaceutical materials? Only during World War II, when the entire supply of penicillin was purchased for the Armed Forces, was a biological placed under additional mandatory Government control. As soon as the military requirements and the investigational requirements had been satisfied and the supply exceeded that demand, the penicillin was allocated first to hospitals through normal channels of trade, and finally, it was opened without allocation to everyone through the usual distribution channels. Penicillin was discovered in 1929. When did it first reach the American people? In 1930? Certainly not. In 1935? No. In 1939? Not yet. Only after the battlefield demands of World War II had stimulated the production of penicillin could the average man get it. Yet, on April 16, 4 days after the Salk vaccine was announced effective, youngsters in San Diego, Calif., lined up to receive their first shots of the Salk vaccine. Subsequently over half the States, particularly in the early incidence areas of the South, have received supplies for the first shots.

Streptomycin was under voluntary allocation for a period for investigational purposes. The National Research Council received money from the producers, and a committee of the National Research Council distributed streptomycin for purposes of investigation. No one was charged for it. When this investigational program was completed, there was enough material available to have it enter normal professional channels of distribution. During this period many critical materials were under Federal control but there was no clamor for rigid control of the wonder drug from Washington.

When the adrenal cortex preparation, cortisone, was discovered in 1949 and hailed as a boom for those suffering from arthritis, its distribution was handled almost identically like that of streptomycin—an investigation program accompanied by voluntary controls administered by an industry advisory group. Many months passed before there was enough cortisone available for even moderately widespread use, yet the voluntary-control program worked. The material reached the American public through normal professional channels of distribution. During this period there was no clamor for rigid, compulsory control of this scarce drug.

As far as Dr. Chester S. Keefer, special assistant for Health and Medical Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, knows, medical history indicates that there have been no vaccines that have been in short supply because they have, in the past, been developed in a much more leisurely fashion and there was not a universal demand.

Should the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, who daringly gambled $9 million on the success of the vaccine, and the six drug manufacturers who gambled millions more on extensive production facilities be penalized for the breathtaking speed with which the vaccine is being made available to the doctors of America for the general public? It seems to me that the authors of the five House bills and the one Senate bill to control and allocate Salk vaccine must answer several penetrating questions before their proposals are accepted. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that all six bills were offered by Democratic Congressmen.

The first question: Would it be possible to hold hearings and guide such a controversial piece of legislation through subcommittee, committee, and both Houses of Congress; then set up an adequate staff, publish the necessary administrative regulations, and give 30 days' advance notice of such regulations, all this in time to function while there was still a shortage of vaccine? It is estimated that by August 1, 1955, enough vaccine will be produced to immunize every child in this country between the ages of 1 and 9, the most susceptible group. By November 1, 1955, more than enough Salk vaccine will be produced to give 111,400,000 shots to completely immunize the 55,700,000 children and adolescents between the ages of 1 and 19. By the first of next year, 62,950,000 people can be immunized and over 107,900,000 shots will be available for sale through normal professional channels. I say normal professional channels because it must be borne in mind that Salk vaccine is required to be prescribed and administered by a physician and the supplies of the vaccine move in the same channels as all other federally regulated drugs.

The second question which the proponents of adopting mandatory Federal control in place of the existing voluntary controls, which have worked in the past, must answer is this, "Would Federal control of the Salk vaccine advance by even 1 day the date at which any American child would receive his shot?" "Would it produce one extra cubic centimeter of vaccine?" It must be remembered that Dr. Salk precently believes that his vaccine will have long lasting effects. There are many who believe that one immunization may even protect for life. In this case, once those in the age groups where polio strikes have been immunized, the overall market for the vaccine will shrink as it is required only for the new group of infants arriving each year. It takes at least 90 days to produce and test a batch of polio vaccine. Passing a law will not change this factor any more than you could legislate a shorter term of pregnancy.

Why change horses in the middle of the stream? In this instance, 80 million shareholders of the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis, the medical profession and the drug manufacturers have, as a result of a daring gamble, produced a miracle vaccine and a sound plan of distribution in record time. What possible reason exists for substituting compulsory Federal control for the voluntary controls, the National Advisory Committee and the professional channels of distribution which already exist? Do the proponents of this legislation wish to register a lack of confidence in the medical profession, in the drug manufacturers, in the pharamacists of the Nation? Who is it they suspect of potential wrongdoing? Who do they call black-market operator racketeers?—the doctors, the druggists, or the manufacturers?

The fact is indisputable that the most extensive gray markets and black markets of all time have existed in goods rigidly controlled by Federal legislation enforced by Federal agencies. The allegation that 15 adult patients in New York City have been illegally innoculated by 5 physicians is scarcely to be compared to the black markets that existed in New York in tires, coffee, cigarettes, and other rigidly controlled items during the days of patriotic fervor during World War II.

I am proud to have in my congressional district 2 of the 6 pharmaceutical firms who were intrusted by the National Foundation with the manufacture of Salk vaccine, Eli Lilly & Co., and Pitman-Moore Co. These two companies manufacture nearly half of the total output of the vaccine. It is fortunate, for instance, that a company like Eli Lilly decided 4 or 5 years ago to undertake extensive research in the field of tissue culture, a field which offered them no commercial opportunity until they were approached by the National Foundation. These companies and the other 4 have given priority to the vaccine for the National Foundation, which was sold at cost. These companies have a fantastically detailed knowledge of the requirements of the medical personnel of this country, broken down almost to the practice of each individual physician.

Incidentally, Eli Lilly & Co. arranged and financed a closed circuit television program reaching 50,000 physicians meeting in 60 cities in the United States and Canada on the very afternoon of the publication of the Francis report, April 12, featuring Dr. Salk, himself, instructing the doctors of America the technique and plan of vaccination against poliomyelitis. When did the Federal Government ever act with such sureness, speed, and courage?

When Eli Lilly & Co. starts to ship Salk vaccine through professional channels about June 1, their first shipment will probably be consigned to 25,000 out of the 50,000 drug stores in the United States and that overall total of 50,000 includes many outlets which do not employ a pharmacist and, therefore, would not be eligible to receive Salk vaccine. Pitman-Moore has equally diverse distribution through professional channels.

President Eisenhower, Mrs. Hobby, leading medical associations, pharmaceutical groups and the Foundation have expressed themselves as favoring voluntary control which experts predict needs only continue for a very few months. Why not follow their professional advice and be sure that this material, so vital to our children's safety is dispensed by the physician and pharmacist and not the politician.

I would like to express my appreciation to the following persons who provided a great deal of background information for this study of the Salk vaccine program I have made:

Dr. Chester F. Keefer, special assistant for health and medical affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Donald M. Counihan, legislative liaison officer, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Karl Bambach, executive vice president, American Drug Manufacturers.

Kenneth F. Valentine, president, Pitman-Moore Co., Indianapolis, Ind., president-elect, American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

John F. Modrall, director, plant communications, Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Cleon A. Nafe, M. D., Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

James Waggener, secretary, Indiana State Medical Association, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House for a very few minutes, I assure you I shall not trespass upon your time at any length.

As a reading of the rule will disclose, this is an open rule, providing for 4 hours of general debate, after which the bill shall be read under the 5-minute rule for amendment. Any amendment that is germane to the bill may be offered.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is a very controversial measure. I realize that this bill is subject to debate. It is a debatable proposition. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have a farm problem confronting the country is not a debatable issue.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 12 would restore for 1955, 1956, and 1957 the 90 percent parity price supports on 5 basic crops. These five crops are wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts. If H. R. 12 is passed it will repeal the provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which instituted flexible price supports for these crops at 82½ to 90 percent of parity in 1955 and permits the supports to drop as low as 75 percent of parity in 1956 and thereafter.

The minimum level for support of dairy products would be placed at 80 percent of parity, instead of 75 percent as under the present law, and an additional $25 million per year would be authorized for the school-milk program and, finally, the brucellosis-eradication program for dairy herds would be extended until June 30, 1958.

This bill would authorize the wheat producers to hold a referendum in order to decide whether to accept the existing price-support program for wheat or a 2-price program under which wheat consumed domestically as human food would be supported at 100 percent of parity and that wheat going into other domestic uses and into export would sell at world prices.

There are other provisions of the bill that I shall not attempt to discuss at length at this time. Whether 90 percent of parity is the answer to the farm problem, so far as these basic commodities are concerned, I frankly do not know. Neither do I know whether the flexible support price is the answer. Frankly, I doubt if there are many who do know the answer that that proposition poses. But there are certain facts that stare us in the face as we go into the consideration of this legislation.

The average of farm prices is down 22 percent since February 1951.

Farm-operating costs remain near their record high.

Net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below 1947 and 10 percent below 1953. Further declines are in prospect for 1955 and 1956.

The parity ratio at 86 percent in January was the lowest since 1941.

Farm debt is increasing.

The value of agricultural assets has declined $10,500,000,000 since January 1, 1952.

Farmers' purchasing power, in terms of 1935–39 dollars, is the lowest since 1940.

Wheat farmers in 1953 received approximately $2,186,000,000 for their crop.

Under the new farm law enacted by the last Congress, which cut their support price from 90 percent to 82½ percent, and because of curtailments of acreage to reduce wheat surpluses, they will receive for their crop this year, assuming normal yields, only about $1,500,000,000. This will be a reduction of $686 million or about 31 percent in the income from producing wheat.

Cotton farmers received for their 1953 crop $3,007,000,000. Assuming normal yields on their reduced acres this year their income from cotton will be $1,771,000,000. This will be a slash of $1,236,000,000 or about 42 percent down from 1953.

Dairymen and other farmers face similar loss of income.

All this is taking place while other areas of our economy are experiencing unparalleled prosperity.

The purpose of H. R. 12 is, therefore, to attempt to reverse this downward trend or at least to stop it. We repeat that we doubt that this is a complete answer to the farm problem. Personally, we have for many years favored the trial at least of a two-price system whereby the domestic consumption of crops like cotton should be supported at a fair market price while the surplus produced beyond that consumed in this country could be disposed of abroad at the world market price. By this method we could do away with acreage controls and at the same time compete with foreign-produced cotton and regain our world market. But since this idea has not received congressional support and

since we are confronted with a choice of 90 percent of parity or a sliding scale, we are supporting the 90-percent parity version.

We do not see how we can do otherwise when the farm income is threatened with a further decrease; when the inflationary trend is still on and the cost of farm machinery, et cetera, is continuously increasing; and at a time when the same administration advocating the sliding scale is also advocating increasing the minimum wage from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, representing a group of hill cotton farmers, as I do, I do not know how I can say to them that we are going to cut their support price from 90 percent when the rug has already been snatched out from under them under controls. I literally have thousands of small cotton farmers in my State and congressional district who have less than 5 acres of cotton allotted to them to produce a cash crop for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, realizing the gravity of the situation facing my cotton farmers and the other farmers covered in this bill, that I am not so bold as to say that 90 percent parity is the solution, but I do know that in the situation facing my farmers they are entitled to all the protection that this bill offers them. I shall have no recourse but to support the 90 percent parity until the two-price system, which I have suggested, or some other better plan is offered as an alternative.

Therefore, I appeal to the House to adopt this resolution which I have presented to you here today and thus insure the consideration of the bill which is so vital to a very large segment of our population as well as to such a large part of the Nation's economy. For, surely if the farm economy is not prosperous, the rest of the economy of the Nation must become stagnant and unprofitable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has fully explained the rule and there is no need of my elaborating upon it.

Since I can first remember the Congress of the United States has had serious agriculture problems before it. I remember when in high school reading the speeches of Senator Wheeler, of Montana; Senator LaFollette, of Wisconsin; and Senator Norris, of Nebraska; and many others regarding the farm problems of that time. I am sure many Members recall that back in the early twenties the evolving farm problem was the chief reason for the formation of the Progressive Party.

When I first came to Congress in 1933 the farm situation was probably the worst of any time in history, at least I believe farm prices were the worst of any time in my lifetime. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, there have been various farm programs enacted. We recall the plowing under of corn and cotton; we remember the slaughtering and destruction of millions of little pigs. We have tried the rigid price support program, and I think most of us will agree that the two wars we have gone through probably did more to bring about higher farm prices than any other thing. Of course we do not want any more wars.

In January 1953 when Ezra Benson became Secretary of Agriculture he found that under the rigid price support program farm prices had sharply declined since 1951. He found that under the rigid price support program there were about $7 billion in surpluses on the farms, in the warehouses, in ships. In fact they were in about every place one could conceive.

The cost of storing these to the American taxpayer was over $700,000 per day. Many millions of dollars worth of these agricultural products became deteriorated, yes, became completely destroyed each month. He also found that under the rigid price support program there existed literally tens of thousands of low-income farmers.

So, what did the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, do when he was confronted with these three problems that presently exist under the rigid price support program? Let me repeat a reference to the sharp decline in prices since 1951, of over $7 billion of huge surpluses and with thousand of low-income farmers.

Mr. Benson called the outstanding leaders of agriculture to Washington in an attempt to solve the problems. He brought here the leaders of agriculture from both political parties. As a matter of fact, my good friend, Charlie Shuman, head of the National Farm Bureau, is from the State of Illinois and is a registered Democrat.

These outstanding leaders came to Washington and they sat down and made certain recommendations. One was to do away with the rigid price-support program and to replace it with a flexible price-support program. In order to reduce these surpluses that were on hand it was agreed that more should be provided for the school-lunch programs and certain institutions. Foreign shipments were enlarged. There was also a recommendation designed to help the low-income farmer. Last week the President of the United States sent to Congress a mesaage designed to help the low-income farmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And they offered to aid the low-income farmer by providing more money in order to put him further in debt, is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that under the rigid price supports those faults existed. So during the last session there was enacted the flexible price-support program, and although it has been in operation only 4 months, from January 1 of this year, no crops have been harvested under it, so it has not even had a trial.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the membership of the House to give the leaders of agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture the opportunity to try out the flexible price-support program. If that is done I am convinced that many of the problems of the farmers will be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the House Agriculture Committee says:

> Farm income has gone down 22 percent since February 1951; the January parity ratio was the lowest since 1941; the farm debt is increasing.

I want to emphasize that the committee report had a startling omission. It failed to state that these depressing conditions all come about while price supports were rigidly pegged at 90 percent of parity. It was because of this downward trend in prices that the flexible-price law was passed last year.

It requires no particular intelligence to realize that some changes were needed in our agricultural industry, large and small. The small farmer particularly is faced with a real problem. He looks to the Congress for help in his hour of trouble.

Today, one-fourth of the families who live on American farms have incomes of less than $1,000 a year under the rigid support plan.

We all know well that we must have a prosperous agricultural industry if we are to achieve permanent national prosperity.

It was because of the recognized failure of rigid supports that the flexible-price law was enacted. Fixed parity had failed, and corrective measures had to be taken.

Two of our major farm organizations led the fight for the flexible price law. Agriculture economists and others most qualified through their study of the farm problem endorsed the flexible-support law as the most logical way to improve the conditions on the farm.

The 83d Congress passed the flexible-support law which was to become effective with the 1955 harvest. Today, a few months before this new law would have a chance to operate, we are faced with a bill which would nullify this progress—kill this new plan before it has even had a chance.

The flexible-price plan was enacted as a remedy for a sick agriculture. The proponents of the bill before you today must admit that this legislation will bring no remedy, no changes, for it provides nothing but a continuation of the conditions which have brought about hardship to our farmers.

It will continue the same system that depressed farm income, piled up debts, and created the greatest food waste in the Nation's history. The same system in fact has smothered the Nation in growing piles of surpluses that hang over our economy as the sword hung over Damocles.

The problem of how best the Government can support farm prices causes similar honest and sincere disagreements. Some from corn, wheat, and cotton areas apparently feel that all farm problems can be solved by high mandatory price supports. But a full appraisal of the problem would show that even in areas which raise basic commodities, high mandatory price supports are injurious to farmers.

Price supports are often viewed differently in areas where farmers engage principally in dairying, livestock, and poultry production. Many from such localities feel that the principal reason farmers are unable to maintain a proper income level is that feed costs are pegged at a high level by Federal price supports on the principal feed grains.

These farmers feel that the Government is discriminating against them. There are mandatory price supports on the things they have to buy, but not on the things they sell. They realize, of course, that there cannot be mandatory supports on all dairy products, poultry, and meat, which cannot be stored. As these farmers view the problem, the only way to increase their income is to lower their costs by eliminating Federal supports on the feed grains which they have to purchase.

Why, some ask, should the Government provide any farm-price supports at all? Why should not the law of supply and demand control the market price of farm products as it does most manufactured products? This system has produced a tremendous increase in factory workers' earnings in the past few years. Why would not it do the same for farmers? The fundamental problem of farmers, simply stated, is that they produce more of some products than consumers are willing to buy at a fair price.

Manufacturing enterprises avoid getting into this situation by studying market conditions to determine how much of their product can be sold at a specified price and how much of the total demand is being met by other producers. Such studies enable manufacturers to limit their production to the amount that can be sold at a profit.

However, farmers cannot operate in this fashion. Since millions of different farmers are producing the same products, it would be virtually impossible for each of them to tailor his own production to fit his share of the market requirements. Further, an individual farmer who has already made substantial capital investment in his land would be reluctant to leave a portion of it idle simply because there is not a market for all of his production. Even if he did curtail his production, he might only be injuring himself, since other farmers might at the same time be increasing their production.

Since total production would still be greater than consumers' needs, the farmer who had curtailed production would suffer both from a low-unit price and from a decrease in his total production. There are so many factors beyond the control of any individual farmer that he cannot by tailoring his own production keep total supplies at a level where the demand will assure him a fair price.

I am sympathetic to the farmers' situation. I want to help him, but the system of high mandatory price supports on basic farm commodities now proposed is not a solution to the farmers' problem, nor will the present proposal assure farmers of a fair return for their product. It has failed after several years of trial.

To be truly effective farm price supports must be consistent with the economic principle that supply and demand are important factors in determining price. The law of supply and demand is not one that this body can repeal. It is a law which merely describes the intellectual process by which one person decides how much he can get for the product he has to sell; and another person decides how cheaply he can buy the same product.

The proposal before us today seeks to reverse these processes. It would attempt to repeal economic principles by providing a fixed price for certain commodities, regardless of supply and demand. It is this system that has caused mounting surpluses and declining farm prices. It is inconceivable to me that anyone would want more of the same.

The flexible price support system enacted by the last Congress, which is due to become effective at the next harvest, is completely consistent with the human character traits which determine price. Flexible price supports enable the Secretary of Agriculture to offer special inducements to farmers to produce commodities for which there is a good demand, and which will therefore bring a good price in the market. Little or no inducement will be offered to farmers to produce commodities of which there is a large supply but little demand. The normal processes of buyers and sellers would do the rest, and farmers could get a fair price for their products in the market.

The present system of high mandatory price supports on basic commodities has been in effect since January 1, 1950. Has this system served its purpose in helping farmers to obtain fair prices for their products by gearing production to demand? When we view the enormous quantities of basic commodities now stored in warehouses I think it is clear that it has not. For example, under Federal price support programs, accumulations at the end of this crop year will total 970 million bushels of wheat, 825 million bushels of corn, 10.2 million bales of cotton, and 1,700,000,000 pounds of rice.

Now, let us look at the record to see whether the system of mandatory price supports under the law which is still in effect has protected farm income.

Farm prices began to fall in February 1951, 1 year after mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity went into effect. There was a constant decline in the last 2 years of the Truman administration. Between February 1951 and January 1953, when former President Truman left office, farm prices declined 15 percent.

Because of improved methods of handling the farm program, the present administration was able to slacken the rate of decline, but nevertheless farm income has continued to drop. This makes it clear that high mandatory supports have not protected farm prices, and should not be continued.

Despite Federal price supports at 90 percent of parity, last March the average price for corn, including that sold at support prices, was only 74 percent of parity; wheat brought but 84 percent; and rice averaged only 81 percent.

These figures should make it clear that high mandatory price supports have acted as a depressant on farm prices. High mandatory supports do not offer any inducement for farmers to shift production to items which are in greater demand.

Cereal manufacturers, flour millers, feed-mixing companies, and others who buy corn, wheat, and rice in large quantities for future delivery are well aware of the surpluses. They will not bid competitively for the farmers' grain when they know the Government has huge surpluses which will be sold in the open market at 5 percent above current support price. This means that purchasers can bid below support levels without running any risk that, if unsuccessful, they will be forced to pay high prices because of short supply.

In other words, high mandatory supports create such enormous surpluses that purchasers have no incentive to bid far below established prices. While intended to be price floors, mandatory supports in many instances have proved to be price depressants.

The Government is in a dilemma on how to get rid of this surplus stock. If we give the foodstuffs away to worthy poor at home, we badly dent the domestic market. If we dump the grain to Italy or India, we destroy the markets of those countries and disrupt their normal trade.

The present rigid supports force the Government to buy billions of dollars' worth of foodstuff and then to spend additional millions to store it because it cannot even be sold or given away.

We have already enacted a flexible law which harnesses the natural forces of supply and demand to make them produce greater income for our farmers. The proposal before us today is to cancel out this legislation before it has had a chance to prove its merits.

This is indeed a remarkable bill in that it will leave the farmer and the agriculture industry in the same mess they are in today and furthermore will continue to pile up wasteful surpluses.

If we are to help the farmer, the consumer, and the Nation, we must vote against this bill. That is the intelligent vote of those who are interested in aiding all segments of agriculture and securing at fair prices food for the millions of our consuming population.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the small farmer in this Nation today is faced with a real problem. He looks to the Congress of the United States for help in his hour of need. Are we going to give him the help he seeks, or are we going to turn our back on his problems and tell him he must continue under the same system which has brought him to his knees.

Lest the talk of parity, rigid and flexible supports, has confused some nonfarmers, I think one point ought to be made clear at the outset; that is, that farmers, as a class, are not getting rich. Today one-fourth of the families who live on farms in the United States have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Since February of 1951 farm income has

dropped by 22 percent, and the January parity ratio was the lowest in 14 years.

The farmer today receives only a small percent of the consumer's dollar. The rest goes to the processor, transporter, and distributor.

The farmers have had enough of hardship in the midst of prosperity. They have asked for a change.

Last year the 83d Congress faced the problem squarely and enacted into law a flexible-support system which would be effective for the harvest of 1955. This corrective legislation has not yet gone into effect, yet the proponents of this bill are asking that it be stricken from the books before it has been given a chance to alleviate the farmer's problem. The alternative they offer is that we continue the same policy which has created the economic hardship they deplore.

In the few instances where it has been possible to try a flexible type of price support, improvements have been noted almost at once. For example, since dairy price supports were reduced on April 1, 1954, from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent, there has been a real improvement in the dairy situation. Milk production has leveled off, Government purchases of dairy surpluses are sharply down, surplus stocks are moving into use. Despite the reduction of parity to 75 percent, dairymen have been receiving from 80 to 86 percent for all milk.

We have every reason to believe that the flexible supports would be equally successful in other fields.

To support the bill before us now will be to snatch from the farmer the only ray of hope on his horizon. The flexible supports which will become effective this fall have the full support of two of the major national farm organizations.

To pass this bill will be to turn our backs on these two great organizations and the thousands of farmers they represent. It will nullify one of the greatest progressive acts of the 83d Congress, and it will give the farmer nothing. We certainly should be willing to try the flexible support law and not kill it before it is born.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent one of the most productive agricultural districts in the United States. Corn is the principal commodity. The soil is rich and fertile. Not only that, the people who farm it are industrious and progressive.

With corn 1 of the 6 basic commodities under the direct-price-support program, I necessarily speak as the representative of a people who are directly, and quite materially, affected by the kind of price-support program we shall have. In their behalf I rise to say that we are unequivocally opposed to this bill.

At the outset, let us make one thing crystal clear. By this bill it is proposed to discard, even without trial, a flexible price-support program we adopted last year but which has not yet gone into effect, and return to the rigid high-price-support program we have had for some 15 years. We are being asked to extend for 3 years the very same program that has caused agriculture to get into tremendous difficulties. It does not make sense.

During the course of this debate much has been said about the decline in farm income. Any downward trend in farm prices is a matter of great concern to me. And that there has been a downward trend in farm prices and farm income over the last few years no one will deny.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves. Above all else, let us not try to deceive the people we represent. The present level of farm prices and farm income is not due to the flexible price-support program we enacted last year. How could it be? That program has not yet gone into effect and will not go into effect until this coming fall's harvest. We are still operating under the 90-percent rigid price-support program.

We are thus today witnessing a bold—a better word would probably be despicable—political maneuver. The opponents of the flexible price-support program which is not yet in effect, are trying to make it appear that the flexible program caused the decline in farm prices. They use the present level of farm prices and farm income as the reason we should repudiate a program we have not yet tried. The fact is that there has been greater stability of farm prices and farm income these past 2 years than there has been for several years.

I will admit that they are not at the level they should be, and that we want them to be, but that is not the point. The question is what caused this decline in farm prices and the next question is how to reverse it.

The most rapid drop in farm prices took place in 1951 and 1952, following the inflation that took place during the Korean war. Since 1947 the total net income for agriculture has been steadily declining. With the outbreak of the Korean war there was the inevitable demand for agricultural products and with it the rise in prices. When that war stopped there was, as in all parts of our economy, a difficult adjustment in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. During this transition there have been many maladjustments in agriculture and in industry. But the transition has now been made and our economy has been stabilized. The Eisenhower administration deserves great praise for the comparative ease with which the country as a whole made the transition from production for war to production for peace.

With the stabilization of our economy as a whole, agriculture is likewise becoming more stable in prices. Parity is not solely the price of agricultural commodities; it is the relationship between the price of what the farmer sells and what the farmer buys. And it is our determination to make certain that such a relationship between the two is maintained that the farmer gets his rightful share of our national income.

Last January the parity ratio stood at 86, which is 8 points below that of 2 years ago, when the Eisenhower administration assumed office. In the 23 months previous to January 1953, the price-parity ratio had dropped 19 points. What I am making crystal clear here is that politically speaking—and politics is the reason for the farm proposal being here today—there was a marked decline of 19 points in 1951 and 1952 under the New Deal-Fair Deal as against an 8-point decline in 1953 and 1954 under the Eisenhower administration.

It should be obvious that the high price support program which we are being asked by this bill to retain has not proven sound. Despite stepped-up disposal operations and despite restrictions on acreage, the Government's investment in farm commodities has continued to increase. At the end of 1954 the Commodity Credit Corporation had the record high of $7,171 million invested in price supported commodities.

This represents a tremendous cost in dollars. During the last fiscal year the realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of prices and income totaled $962 million. And, perhaps even more important, the mere existence of these tremendous surpluses as a threat to the market depress the normal market price. A vicious circle is thus created, and the farmer is caught in the middle of it.

High rigid price supports, lacking the necessary flexibility to allow adjustment of production with demand, has produced many surplus problems. Take McLean County in my district just as an example: As reported by the Daily Pantagraph in Bloomington, the Commodity Credit Corporation will need something like 3½ million bushels more storage space before it takes over all the 1954 corn crop. In McLean County alone there is already a total of 10 million bushels of corn in CCC steel bins, and I understand there is only a half million bushels of empty space.

That is the type of situation which high rigid price supports create. It encourages production considerably beyond the available market. Farmers are encouraged to produce not alone for consumers but for Government warehouses. And this certainly does not help the farmer in his problem. It only leads to more and more Government restrictions, to less and less acreage allotments, and more and more Government controls. This is something which our free American farmers do not want.

From the experience we have already had with the 90 percent of parity program two points are crystal clear. The record proves it. The 90 percent of parity program failed to protect farm income when conditions changed and farmers faced a need to make adjustments. Instead of helping them make the necessary adjustments, rigid price supports magnified the problem by piling up surpluses which are now depressing prices of corn, cotton, and wheat. The record is clear that the 90 percent of parity program appeared to work when the market demand, bolstered by war and inflation, kept farm prices above the support level.

The idea that mandatory 90 percent of parity price supports have been a blessing to the farmers will not stand examination. It was not price supports that caused farm prices to average 124

percent of parity for 1946 and 113 percent of parity for the 11 years 1942–52. It was the extraordinary demand associated with war and conditions that grew out of war. In war there are no surpluses, and it goes without saying that our farmers, like all good Americans, want peace—not war.

And yet it is proposed here today to continue the 90 percent parity-support program when we well know from actual experience that this program has brought agriculture production completely out of balance. To continue the program inevitably means that action will have to be taken that acreage diverted from wheat and corn is not devoted to the destruction of the markets of unsupported crops.

It is axiomatic that in order to have a sound, prosperous national economy we must have a sound, prosperous agriculture. It is also axiomatic that in order to have a sound, prosperous agriculture the farmers must be able to realize their fair share of our national income.

That is our objective. It has not been attained by the rigid 90-percent price-support program, and it will never be attained under it. That is one of the reasons we adopted the flexible program last year but which has not yet become effective. It is almost beyond understanding why it should be proposed that we return to an unsuccessful program in lieu of the flexible program we have not yet tried.

There is only one type of supports which will promote shifts in production and supply to meet changes in demand. That is flexible price supports. They can produce larger income because they permit larger production.

If we are to protect the farmers, he must be protected not only in price but also in an available market. He must be able to adjust production to consumer demand. And this can only be accomplished if American agriculture is allowed to operate on a flexible, rather than rigid basis.

It should be borne in mind that no price-support program in and of itself represents a solution to the farm problem. In our view the key to a solution is the development of new markets and the finding of new uses for the commodities. On both counts the administration is working most vigorously.

Among other things, the Congress enacted last year in accordance with President Eisenhower's recommendation what is known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Under this program agricultural commodities are exchanged for strategic materials for our defense stockpiling program. In that respect it has a two-fold objective.

In our program to develop and expand foreign markets for our farm surpluses particular attention is being given to underdeveloped and new market areas. And in the administration of the program for the disposal of farm surpluses on foreign markets great care must be, and is being taken, that we do not adversely affect the economies of other agriculture producing countries who are our allies and whom we are striving to help become economically and militarily strong.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that there is no ready, easy, overnight solution to the farm problem. We have had many years of experience with the high rigid price-support program, and we have found it unsuccessful. It was for that reason that we enacted a flexible program designed to become fully effective with this year's harvest. In proposing by this bill that we return to a more or less discredited program I suspect this is nothing more or less than a political maneuver. Instead of courageously facing up to the conclusive facts, instead of really attempting to solve the farm problem, it is here proposed that our action be influenced by political considerations.

I, for one, refuse to play politics with the welfare of my farmers. I repeat what I have so often said here and elsewhere: The farm problem is an economic and not a political matter. A solution to it must be based upon economic and not political considerations. If we take that approach, we will summarily and overwhelmingly defeat this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for permission to speak out of order only because I am deeply concerned with a situation which I feel sincerely is rapidly approaching what we must refer to as critical. I am disturbed because many of my colleagues have sought me out to inquire about the plans of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relative to the distribution—and the most effective use of the Salk vaccine.

At the outset of these brief and necessarily hurried remarks let me remind my colleagues that I have always been in the forefront in expressing my opposition to measures which would bring about the control by the Federal Government of those agencies and institutions which minister to the health of our people. The Federal Government, however, does have a responsibility in relation to the health of all our citizens and as long as this responsibility is kept in the proper perspective I think it is mandatory that we in Congress acknowledge it and take the necessary steps toward discharging that responsibility.

Although the scourge of poliomyelitis has been mounting steadily in our population through the years, it has been only in the relatively recent past that we have seen the slightest glimmer of hope in answer to our prayers for the wherewithal to cope with it.

For over 150 years the disease we know as polio has been known to medical science. Yet, no coherent theory of the disease had been established. Scientists were not sure where the disease came from or how it entered the body; hence, there could be no scientific basis for an effective means of immunization or control.

It was not until 1948 that science really began unraveling the mystery. There have been many eminent doctors and truly great scientists who have contributed much to the discoveries which in our time brought about the vaccine which offers us so much hope for our children and the children of tomorrow. In recent weeks news stories and articles in all sorts of periodicals have recounted the various steps which led to this most important discovery of the Salk vaccine.

I would like to take this brief moment of your time to pay my personal tribute and acknowledge my everlasting gratitude to Dr. John Enders, of Harvard University, whose cultivation of the poliomyelitis virus in tissue cultures gave me the first thrilling feeling that a preventive vaccine could be produced.

As you well know, many people have contributed much—in dimes and in dollars—in an effort to find the cause and a prevention of polio. The money our people gave made many things possible. Scientists and physicians could be specially trained for polio research. Additional scientists were recruited to lend their talents to the never-ending search. Laboratories were established and equipped at great cost to aid in the work which was naturally highly specialized. All this and the glorious results which have been achieved were the result of the contributions of many people—in money, in time, in effort, in scientific knowledge and skill—and in prayer.

We are on the verge of a great development in our history—the immunization of our children against this violent scourge which has broken a thousand hearts. Here, I insist, is an area in which this Federal Government has a firm and clearly defined responsibility.

The medical society of my State of Rhode Island has placed my thoughts in words in proposing a sensible formula for the distribution of this vital polio vaccine.

My hometown newspaper, on May 1, contained an editorial on the subject which is worthy of the consideration of all of us. I sincerely request that you read it. At the close of my remarks I shall ask for permission to insert this editorial in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues.

There are two major problems involved in assuring that every child—every person who is susceptible to polio—gets the benefit of this great vaccine discovery.

The first is the problem of supply. How much vaccine is available now and how much will be ready for use by the peak of the polio season? How soon, within the limits of productive capacity, can shortages be overcome?

The second is the problem of distribution. How can we make sure that available supplies are being properly used? How can we plan for a patient, an orderly, and an equitable distribution pattern, so that the vaccine goes first to the most susceptible groups in the population? How can we maintain public confidence, minimize black or gray market operations, and prevent profiteering or injudicious use of the vaccine? In short, how can be assure the American people

of a calm, rational, and fair distribution of this great boon to health?

This, I submit, is our great responsibility to the American people. It is our best way of keeping faith with them and with Dr. Salk and all the scientists who worked so hard and so long to make this medical miracle possible.

As to the question of supply, it has been estimated, on the basis of data submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the pharmaceutical firms licensed to manufacture the vaccine, that there was enough vaccine available on May 1 to immunize almost 6 million people. All but about 10 percent of this supply is committed to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. This will be used, under the Foundation program, for vaccinating 9 million children in the first and second grades by the close of the school year. This phase of the program, according to project plans, should be completed by July 15.

By August 1, according to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, there should be enough vaccine to immunize all children between the ages of 1 and 9, the most susceptible age groups.

The critical period, therefore, is the next 3 months, the time between now and August 1, when polio traditionally begins to hit its seasonal peak. This is the period when the vaccine will be in extremely short supply and yet when the demand will be greatest.

In considering the question of allocation and distribution of the polio vaccine while it is in short supply, the central problem is the equitable distribution of available supplies so that each State receives its fair share of vaccine regardless of ability of the consumer to pay. Within the States, vaccine must be made available for purchase by tax-supported agencies for use in school and health departments and for private practitioners for use with their patients. Other problems which must be considered are allocations for export, and allocations for the dependents of the Armed Forces and of Federal employees stationed abroad.

Finally, there is the problem of making the vaccine available to those persons who are unable to purchase it and pay for the services of a private physician. Five States have already appropriated funds for purchase of the vaccine and 13 other State legislatures are considering appropriations for this purpose. In addition to this State aid, many national groups have voiced their opinion of the necessity for some form of financial assistance from the Federal Government for low-income families.

These, therefore, in their briefest outline—summarize the problems of supply and distribution of the Salk polio vaccine.

All the discussions I have had—all the information I can obtain on the problems of supply and distribution—lead me to the conclusion that the Federal Government would not have to exercise the authority I propose in the joint resolution I have introduced today for longer than a period of a few months. I feel certain that by the time next winter rolls around the vaccine supply will be closely approaching the demand and we can expect the voluntary controls to take over. Until that time, however, we as guardians of the Nation's welfare have a direct obligation to intitiate immediately a temporary national program insuring equitable allocation and distribution of this precious Salk vaccine.

To that end I have introduced the resolution which, I understand, will be referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I have talked with the chairman of that committee, my dear friend, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, and have been assured by him that the bill would be scheduled for hearing at the earliest possible moment. I plead with you for your sympathetic consideration of this most important problem and I am including in these remarks a copy of the bill for your review and attention:

Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to exercise, for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine

Resolved, etc., That the Congress finds that the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis affords, at this time, the only effective means for preventing that disease, that the demand for the Salk vaccine far exceeds the supply, and that this temporary shortage in the supply of the vaccine has given rise to an emergency health problem which, being national in its scope and nature, requires the exercise for a limited time, as provided in this resolution, of certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of such vaccine.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary")—

(1) shall establish such priorities as he determines necessary to insure that the available supply of the Salk vaccine shall be distributed first to the most susceptible age-group (based on existing medical knowledge) and thereafter to other age-groups in descending order of their susceptibility to such disease, and such priorities, to the extent deemed appropriate by the Secretary, may be established on a regional basis; and

(2) shall establish a price per unit for the Salk vaccine (exclusive of the cost of administering such vaccine) which is fair and equitable to the sellers of such vaccine.

(b) The Secretary, on the basis of priorities established under subsection (a), shall allocate to each State its share of the available supply of the Salk vaccine.

(c) The health department of each State shall establish a program, approved by the Secretary, governing the distribution, sale, and use, in accordance with this resolution and the requirements established under authority thereof, of the Salk vaccine allocated to such State.

SEC. 3. (a) No Salk vaccine shall be sold at a price other than the price established in accordance with section 2 (a) (2).

(b) No Salk vaccine shall be sold in a manner, or upon terms or conditions, in conflict with the applicable program established by the health department of a State pursuant to section 2 (c).

SEC. 4. The supply of Salk vaccine which has been purchased or contracted to be purchased by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis shall not be subject to the provisions of this resolution so long as such supply of vaccine is owned and distributed by such National Foundation.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall issue such regulations and orders as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act (including regulations and orders with respect to the sale and distribution of the Salk vaccine in any State prior to the establishment and approval of a program in such State pursuant to section 2 (c)).

SEC. 6. Whoever willfully does any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by the provisions of this resolution or of any regulation or order issued under this resolution shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 7. As used in this resolution—

(1) the term "health department" means the department, agency, or authority of a State having jurisdiction over public health matters; and

(2) the term "State" includes, in addition to each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any Territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 8. This resolution shall cease to be in effect at the close of May 31, 1956, except that if, prior to that time, the Secretary finds, and makes a public announcement, that the emergency which necessitated the enactment of this resolution no longer exists, then this resolution shall cease to be in effect at the close of the day upon which such public announcement is made.

PLANNING THE ANTIPOLIO INOCULATION PROGRAM FOR RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island's doctors, through their medical society spokesmen, have proposed a sensible formula for local handling of the polio inoculation program.

The recent Washington conference on national aspects of the problem provided for machinery to insure a fair distribution of existing vaccine supplies around the country generally. But the individual States were left to take it from there on the basis of plans laid by local health authorities and doctors. And the Rhode Island Medical Society wasted little time in doing its share toward such planning here.

The doctors recommend that first priority for inoculations be granted to children from 1 to 6, and that those from 7 to 11 be next in line. This would provide protection first where it is most needed as indicated by medical experience in our region. The medical society offers the services of its members without charge to administer the vaccine to children of families on the welfare roles and to the children of others who are unable to pay doctors' fees. And it recommends that the State government purchase the vaccine this year for families unable to afford it for their children.

How the priorities would be enforced, and how distribution of vaccine would be controlled locally remain to be determined, presumably by the State health authorities in cooperation with representatives of the doctors. And it will fall fully to the State to find the money to pay for the vaccine purchased for welfare families and those others who are unable to pay for it themselves. This may prove a fairly costly item in the end, particularly since the proposed need formula is loosely phrased.

But there can be no argument with the medical society's recommendation that "no child in the eligible priority age groups in Rhode Island shall be denied the polio vaccine * * * because of the inability of the parents to pay for either the vaccine or the services of a physician." That is the only right and moral objective to pursue, and the State's doctors have made a useful contribution and an unselfish pledge toward its achievement.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the members of the

committee who have brought to us for discussion House bill 12. I regret I cannot agree with some of its provisions which I feel are contrary to the best interests of this country.

The feeling seems to prevail that the large majority of farmers of this country are in favor of the continuance of a 90-percent parity-support program. I come from Illinois, one of the finest agricultural States in the Union. The Illinois Agricultural Association has taken a position decidedly opposed to many of the features of this resolution.

House bill 12 contains in part the following features:

First. Provides 90-percent mandatory price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco through 1957.

Second. Provides for raising the minimum level at which dairy prices must be supported to 80 percent of parity.

The following excerpts are taken from a letter signed by Mr. Otto Steffey, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association:

In regard to the continuance of 90 percent of parity on basic commodities we have had such a program since the war. It has tended to stimulate production while depressing markets, has led to the greatest surplus situation in the history of the country and, at the same time, it has failed to maintain farm prices. In the light of this unfavorable experience it seems to me that we should give the 1954 Agricultural Act an opportunity to work. You are, of course, aware that nothing has yet been sold under this program.

Concerning 80-percent support on dairy products—

Mr. Steffey continues—

it appears that milk production and demand are currently moving toward a better balance, but we are still in a surplus situation. It would be unwise at this time to take any action which would reverse this trend.

In the interest of a strong and prosperous agriculture in Illinois, I trust you will use your utmost influence to prevent the passage of this bill. This action would be in complete accord with the policy of this organization as established through 1,200 local policy-development meetings held over the State of Illinois during 1954, and adopted by the voting delegates at the annual meeting in November.

The statement that the 90 percent parity feature of the law has only cost this country a small amount of money is entirely erroneous. The peanut industry alone has cost this country $118,083,436. There have been similar losses in the sale of corn and wheat. No one can estimate the ultimate loss to the country when all of the crops held by the Commodity Credit Corporation are finally disposed of. The Government held on January 31, 1955: 619,988,000 bushels of corn and 726,553,000 bushels of wheat in price support inventory. The total cost of storage on all commodities held by the Government for the calendar year 1954 amounted to $258,612,000 or a daily cost of $708,526.

The small amount of loss claimed by adherence to this program is sometimes accounted for in the fact that the receipts which accrue from the processing of sugar are used to offset losses incurred by the farm-support program. This is entirely unjustifiable because sugar is not a part of our price-support program, and if the Government does receive revenue through a levy of one-half cent per pound on the processing of sugar such returns cannot with justice be used to minimize the loss incurred by our parity-support program.

We are faced here with an unusual situation. Farm prices have been declining for a number of years under our 90 percent parity price program. A year ago, the flexible price support idea became a part of this program, but it does not go into effect until the crops from this year are harvested. Any ills which we are experiencing at present cannot be laid at the door of the flexible price-support program because it has not as yet been in operation. The declines in the purchasing power of the farmer have occurred under the 90 percent parity price support program. The flexible price-support program has for its chief purpose an effort to bring demand and supply into balance, and until this is done we can hardly expect anything like the types of farmer prosperity which we experienced during the war. It would seem that, in view of all the circumstances involved, we should vote against House bill 12.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I endorse wholly what the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated. The difficulty that has arisen with the vaccine made by the Cutter Laboratories in California dramatizes the need for some sort of Federal control on all levels, the manufacturing level, the inspection level, and the distribution level with respect to the Salk vaccine.

Just contemplate these figures briefly: By June 1 of this year there will be available about 16 million units of 16 cc. each of this vaccine. The immunization program calls for two shots per child several weeks apart followed up by a third shot. Of these 16 million units the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis will have purchased 9 million, leaving 7 million combination shots of 2 each. These 7 million immunizations will be covered by over 22 million children of age between 1 to 9 years. Even more will bid for these 7 million—more than 22 million children between 1 and 9 years. Children older than 9 will bid. There are 51 million children and teenagers of all ages of 1 to 19 whose parents and loved ones will doubtlessly bid for the available supply of vaccine.

If we had Federal control I am sure there would be no doubt that the vaccine would be properly channelized to those children who are in most desperate need, those who suffer most from the infection, namely, those between the ages of 1 and 9. Within the age bracket of 4 to 9 the virulence is greatest. Unless we have some sort of rigid mandatory control priorities will be disregarded. We cannot rely on voluntary control. Those children who are in most earnest need of the vaccine will have to do without because when you have such a tremendous demand with a small supply, comparatively speaking, justice and honesty and fairness become lost virtues. Frantic parents will get that vaccine and will do all and sundry to get it for their loved ones and their children regardless of need for priority. That is human nature. Therefore, we must have Federal control. Of course, we will not get any more vaccine under Federal control but I am sure that we will have the available vaccine sent along proper necessary and appropriate channels so that the little ones who need it most will be the first beneficiaries.

I herewith submit a news release on the subject dated yesterday:

CELLER ASKS CONGRESS TO ACT ON BILLS FOR FEDERAL CONTROL ON ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

On May 2, Congressman CELLER addressed a letter to Chairman BRENT SPENCE, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on the necessity for Congress to act to provide for Federal control of allocation and priority of antipolio vaccine. Text of the letter follows:

"Hon. BRENT SPENCE,

"Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The disorderly and ineffectual procedures growing out of the adopted voluntary control system of distribution of the antipolio vaccine have the makings of a national tragedy. When the gap between supply and demand is so large as the following figures graphically show, no system of voluntary controls can work when the natural protective instincts of parents are fiercely awakened.

"We have a supply that, as of June 1 of this year, will immunize only 16 million children. Of these 16 million, 9 million will be covered by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis program. Competing for the remaining 7 million immunizations will be 22,827,000 children in the critical age groups of 1 to 9, and a total of 51 million children under 20.

"The administration's decision is to prescribe no priorities and only indirectly to suggest to the States that children aged through 9 deserve priority. I call your attention to an editorial on polio on the first page of the New York Herald Tribune (an administration supporter usually) for Monday, May 2, which most strongly dissents to the administration's system of voluntary control. I quote from this editorial:

" 'Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon. * * * The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. * * * The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of

children to priority is unchallenged. * * * To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential.'

"Hence the responsibility now falls on the Congress to take leadership and provide for Federal control to allocate and establish priorities for the Salk vaccine. Several such bills, including my own, H. R. 5611, are now before your committee. The Congress must act now in view of the administration's failure to grasp the magnitude of this problem, so that provision can be made for the fair and equitable distribution of the available supplies of such vaccine and assurance given that children in critical age groups will obtain priority in receiving the benefits of this vaccine. With a voluntary control system, equitable and fair distribution will become impossible for rural children and for children of the poor who do not come within the NFIF program.

"We have Federal control in the allocation and distribution of nonferrous metals, such as lead, tin, aluminum, titanium, etc. Surely children are more important than lead or aluminum. During the war the distribution of penicillin and other antibiotics was under rigid Federal control. There is Federal intervention authorized by law in the prevention, treatment, and control of venereal diseases, so that, again, we are not lacking in precedent.

"The A. F. of L., the CIO, United Parents Association, National Farmers' Union, and some 40 organizations, favor Federal control.

"May I therefore most respectfully urge that the committee take prompt action on the bills now before you, and I shall be most happy to testify before your committee at any time you make available to me.

"With assurances of esteem, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"EMANUEL CELLER."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 21 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issue that is now presented to the House is in no sense of the word new. I doubt very much if I shall say anything during the course of my remarks which I have not said either on this floor or in some other forum concerning this very important matter. All that I shall say will probably be nothing more nor less than a recapitulation of things that have been said heretofore. But I feel justified in saying some of these things over again today.

At the outset and somewhat in answer to the speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] a little while ago, I want to assure the Members of the House that I am not prompted in the slightest degree by partisan politics in presenting my views on this proposition. As evidence of the fact that this is not a partisan issue, I need only call the attention of Members to the fact that one of the greatest champions of the cause of agriculture I have ever known sees eye-to-eye with me on this measure. I refer to our very distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Not only during the time that I have been chairman of the committee but during the entire time that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] was chairman of our great committee, and during my entire service on that committee every chairman of that committee has tried diligently and constantly to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations. This issue cuts across party lines. Our committee is supported not only by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], but by the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. ANDRESEN], and other very distinguished members of that committee on the minority side. So, let us be done with politics and try to decide here today what is best for our constituents and our country. If I thought that this program was financially burdensome to the taxpayers of America, I could not support it. If I thought that it had contributed substantially to the increased cost of living, I could not support it. But, I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to answer the arguments that will be leveled against this measure and to prove by facts and figures from the Department of Agriculture that the program has not been financially burdensome to the taxpayers and it has not contributed unduly to the increased cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, it is strange that we seem to have forgotten that up until July 1953 our agriculture in America was geared to the fast-moving wheels of war, and the farmers of America were constantly being urged to produce abundant crops, wheat, corn, cotton, and other essential and vital commodities, and in a sudden moment there was a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and there we were with a crop already planted in 1953 and those crops had to be harvested. No one had suggested marketing quotas and acreage allotments on wheat and corn, because we were told, as we were told in World War II, "Food for freedom would win the war." That was the slogan, and we were urged to produce. Now, when we find ourselves with a temporary abundance and our storage warehouses bulging, the poor farmer is singled out by men in high places, and every blustering, blundering bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture has turned against the tillers of the soil. Secretary Benson himself has denounced and ridiculed the farm program throughout the length and breadth of the Nation. A deliberate, willful, wicked, and wanton effort has been made to cause the consumers of America to revolt and turn against the farmer. This is the time in the Congress of our country, the United States, for a fair, frank, fearless, and forthright discussion of the facts and figures. This is no time for fancy, fiction, fallacy, or fraud. The people of America have a right to know the truth. Officials of the Government and some farm leaders have started out to wreck this program. More misleading information has been given to the public about the farm program than on any other proposition ever presented to the people of our country.

Here are some of the fallacies. First, they contend that with 90 percent of parity the farmer was pricing himself out of the market. How can the Secretary of Agriculture say that the farmers are getting more than they should for their work and their produce at a time when the average income of persons living on the farms throughout the country is $918 a year, which is one-half the $1,836 income of persons not living on farms?

In this connection, I need only call your attention to the recent message from the White House pointing out the fact that 1.5 million of our farmers are living on this meager annual income. Mr. Eisenhower has called upon the Congress to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to one sentence that refutes on the one hand what Mr. Benson has said so eloquently on the other. Here is a little bulletin published in the Department, More and Better Foods. What does Mr. Benson say to the consumers of America as he tries to put across this great story in behalf of agriculture? The heading is "Better Living." The first sentence is as follows:

An hour of your labor will now buy more food—and better food—for your family than ever before.

Is that true or is it not true? If that is true—and Mr. Benson says it is, and Mr. Benson, of course, is an honorable man; no one questions his motives or his sincerity—if the consumer is getting more food and better food for his labor than ever before, what right does the consumer have to complain?

The second proposition is that the 90-percent supports are responsible for the surpluses and the great cost to the Government. The 90-percent supports are not responsible for the surpluses that we have produced. This simply is not true. Price supports did not create our surpluses of basic crops. The abundant supplies were created on account of policies of our Government which, at the advent of the Korean conflict, lifted production controls of the farm program and called for all-out production of our major crops. The 90-percent supports were no more responsible for this great output of food and fiber than they were for the production of the vast arsenals of planes and guns and tanks and ships and shells that have not yet been put on the battleline.

Is anyone screaming at the managers of our great industrial plants for producing war materials that were not actually used? I say to you that had the Government not put aside the crop adjustment machinery in the face of a dangerous world situation, we would have no surpluses today. In other words, we did not use the acreage allotments

and marketing quota laws on these basic agricultural commodities in an effort to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demands.

Third, that the recent decline in agricultural income has occurred while 90-percent price supports were in force. That is true. But the loss has come largely through farmers cutting back their production in an adjustment to peacetime needs. Without our farm program, which has held the price line on the basics and other important crops, our agriculture today would be in the depths of a depression menacing the stability of our entire economy.

Fourth, that flexible or sliding-scale supports mean less control and more freedom for farmers. That is another fallacy of Mr. Benson. The same machinery for production adjustments must be used either with 90 percent or flexible price supports in effect. Mr. Benson has not called for the relaxation of one law relating to production adjustments, but, in fact, has sought to impose upon the agriculture of America the most stringent controls in our history. The fact is that he put in his control program on diverted acres, and for some reason which he has never offered to us, of his own accord, he withdrew those drastic controls.

Fifth, that the agricultural program involves unreasonable and burdensome surpluses and costs. Subsidies amounting to billions of dollars have been paid in many areas of industry and business since the beginning of our Government. Only recently has the principle been used to any appreciable extent in behalf of agriculture. Data prepared by a House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1954 indicated subsidies amounting to approximately $45 billion have been paid to business since World War II, a large part of this as business reconversion payments. In contrast, the support of the basic crops through the Commodity Credit Corporation cost the Government only $21 millions in 21 long years. Maybe you gentlemen have not stopped to realize, that the overall program on basic commodities, a rigid price-support program, showed a net profit of more than $13 million when the Republican administration took over. Do not misunderstand me. I am not blaming the Republicans for the losses we have sustained, but it is a fact that when you came to office we had a net profit of over $13 million. Pretty soon the net profit had disappeared, and even now, at the end of 21 years, the program has cost only $21 million. Even up to the present time, with the losses that have been sustained in recent months, the losses on the basic program have been negligible when related to the sustained farm income and the sustained accumulated national income during the same period of time.

How is the consumer faring in all this? In one breath Mr. Benson says the farmer is pricing himself out of his markets, and then he publishes a book down at the Department, which I just called your attention to, in which he says an hour of labor will now buy more food and better food for your family than ever before. The two statements are not compatible, they do not fit one with the other. The fact is that the consumers' greatest ability to purchase food has occurred during the years of the development of the farm program.

If ever there was any doubt about Mr. Benson's attempt to divide farmers, set one group against the another, and to discredit the price-support program, that doubt should be dispelled by his recent deliberate action in sending out misleading information from the Department of Agriculture.

I cite particularly his action of April 10 in issuing a statement on farm income and price supports in which he published maps purporting to show that the basic commodities, including wheat, corn, and cotton, are relatively unimportant to the farm economy. His statement and the accompanying maps constitute a willful effort to set livestock farmers against the producers of feed grains. In this, to suit his purposes, he ignored a finding of his own technical staff that a program of price supports and storage for feed grains is a stabilizing factor to the livestock industry.

Let me point out one other thing. Mr. Benson says that the livestock producers have not had a price-support program and have not wanted one. The truth is we spent more in 2 years supporting the price of livestock than the entire basic program has cost from the very beginning up to this good hour.

On the basis of what he already has done to destroy the program of the basic crops, I should think we may expect Mr. Benson soon to issue other series of maps, 1 set showing how unimportant he considers the marketing agreements law that protects a large part of the dairy industry and many growers of fruits; another set discrediting the sugar act because beet and cane growers are not so numerous as other producers, and still another set emphasizing his idea of the unimportance of the surplus removal program which in recent years has been used to halt a price catastrophe for livestock producers, and for the producers of potatoes and other important crops.

Mr. Benson certainly must consider these market agreements, the sugar act and surplus removal programs unimportant because individually these programs may aid farmers less than the general price-support program which he ridicules so violently, and the Secretary seems unwilling to admit the fact that our coordination of programs has benefitted directly or indirectly 90 to 95 percent of all farmers producing crops and livestock.

No one segment of our economy has been singled out for such lambasting and for such cruel treatment as is now being administered to the farmers of America.

If we here should be foolish enough to repeal, abolish, and abandon the Federal farm program, this Nation would go into an economic tailspin. A prostrate agriculture—as our history shows—means a paralyzed America.

In concluding, I want to say one more thing. I have been villified, denounced, and lambasted all over the country. Every time we have brought a bill out of this committee of ours in years gone by, some city Congressman has asked—what about the consumers? What do the consumers say about this? And we could only answer that we had public hearings and although there are thousands of consumer groups, not a single consumer appeared in our committee room to oppose this program. That was somewhat in the nature of negative testimony. So I did something which I think, perhaps, no other chairman of our committee has ever done, and I did it in good faith to ascertain the views of the consuming public. I invited the labor leaders of America to come to our committee room. I had never met Mr. Walter Reuther nor had I ever made the acquaintance of Mr. George Meany. I have had no contact with the labor leaders. But I thought it was only fair that Congress should know what the industrial workers thought about this proposition. So we invited them. I want to repeat again that Mr. Reuther made one of the best speeches I have ever heard delivered in that committee room and I commend it to every one of you to read. I do not believe that anybody who heard that speech could doubt the man's sincerity for 1 moment. I think he spoke with great sincerity. He is supporting this program vigorously. He said boldly that he was speaking for 6 million members of the CIO. Now multiply that by 4 or 5 and you will embrace the families of all the CIO workers, which would number, perhaps, 20 million to 25 million people. They are consumers. I do not know the membership of the A. F. of L., but I know that Mr. Meany is the president and he is in favor of this legislation. If you will look at the record, you will see that all the organized groups that we know anything about in the consuming centers are now in favor of this legislation. Anyone who wishes to join us now and who has heretofore voted against the proposition, has every reason and justification on earth to do so because we know now from Mr. Benson that the program is not burdensome to the consumer and we know from his facts and figures that it is not expensive to the Government and now we know that the consuming public is supporting us in our efforts to maintain a degree of prosperity throughout the agricultural areas of America.

It has been suggested that I have brought into being some sort of vicious coalition between labor and agriculture. A more ridiculous statement has never been made. I do not have to sponsor a coalition. My labor record in this Congress is just as good as it should be and just as good as it ought to be and just as good as I want it to be. I do not have to consult labor leaders to know what my views are about the minimum wage law. I have voted for every progressive labor law now on the books.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I wonder if the gentleman knows that when farm prices started down in 1948 and fell precipitously 13 points and down to 17 points—I wonder if the gentleman knows what position Mr. Reuther took at that time. For your information and for the information of the membership of this House,

there was no sympathy and no cooperation which I could find expressed by Mr. Reuther when farm prices started down in 1948 because with strikes and threats of strikes and with the power of his organization when the farmers were in trouble and when prices were going down, they raised their wages in 4 years from 1948 to 1952, that is wages in the International Harvester Co. and other companies which were making things for farmers to buy, by 27½ percent with the result that in 1952 at the close of the Truman administration, it cost the farmers as compared with 1948, $4,100,000,000 more to put in his crops and harvest them.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what his views were then, but I commend his present day views to my colleagues and I hope that the gentleman will just read his statement.

Mr. Reuther spoke not only with great sincerity when he presented his views to the members of our committee, but he spoke with great reason and logic, and in a most convincing fashion. He knows that the members of his great organization cannot prosper if agriculture is prostrate. He knows that the farmers of America are industry's best customers. He knows that farm income is essential to the welfare of all the people of America. He has studied the farm program and all phases of it. He has analyzed the price-support program, and he has seen the facts and figures, and he knows the truth about its operations and its costs.

As one who has worked constantly and diligently in the cause of agriculture and in the building of a great national farm program, I take pride in the fact that the program has operated so successfully and so well that it has the approval of the great labor leaders of America, and of the consuming public. It is with great regret that the leaders of the world's largest farm organization have not supported a single bill which your Committee on Agriculture has reported to this House since the beginning of 1949. They have rendered lip service to farmers, but they have offered no constructive program in behalf of those who till the soil. Just what would the industrial workers of America think of Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany if they should advocate the repeal of the minimum wage law and the maximum hour law, and all the other laws which have been enacted in the interest and welfare of those who are now employed in industry? The price-support program means the same thing to agriculture as the minimum wage law means to the laboring men of our country.

This is not the first time that I have been on the firing line. This is not the first time I have been vilified and denounced. I remember that when, in 1943 and 1944, I was fighting in an effort to establish a sane, sensible, and sound credit agency for small farmers, I was accused then of being dominated, controlled, and influenced by the then distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Ed O'Neal. He and I were accused, vilified, and denounced. It was said that we were the tools and instrumentalities of big farmers, and that we were not interested in the welfare of small farmers. Actually, just the contrary was true. I was then, am now, and always have been, interested in the low-income farmers of America, and I am sure that everyone now knows that as a result of the investigation which I conducted in 1944, the Farmers Home Administration was activated, and since that time has served well the credit needs of small farmers. As a result of that investigation, which this House authorized, the Farm Security Administration, the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Offices, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations, were all abolished because all three agencies were engaged in making loans on identical eligibility requirements. The Farmers' Home Administration is an agency of the Government in which all of us may take just pride.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want Members of Congress from the city consuming districts to support us in our efforts to protect the producers of basic commodities. I want the support of labor leaders, industrial workers, and all other persons interested in the general welfare of the people of America, to support not only this bill, but the entire farm program, to the end that it might be continued and strengthened in the years to come.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the passage of H. R. 12 will be a backward step in our efforts to solve the problems of the American farmer.

During the 83d Congress when the flexible price-support program was approved I supported it with the understanding that while it may not be the answer to the farm problem it was worthy of a fair trial.

Since the flexible price-support program does not become operative until the 1955 crops come in it has not been tested and is therefore not responsible for the downward trend in farm prices that began in 1951 or in the last 2 years of the Truman administration when the rigid price support was in full bloom.

I think it should be kept in mind that the rigid farm price-support program was adopted as a wartime necessity to increase farm production during the period of national emergency. From the moment the rigid price-support program became effective the Government began to purchase billions of dollars of commodities until today it has $6½ billion tied up in surplus crops that are stored in bulging Government warehouses with spoilage amounting to thousands of dollars daily. To pay the cost of storing this mountain of surplus commodities it is costing the American taxpayer $700,000 every day.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated previously, I voted for the flexible farm price-support program because, like many other Members of Congress, I was sincere in trying to find a solution to our complex farm problem. I want to repeat again that the flexible price-support program has not yet begun to operate and therefore it should be given a fair trial.

The flexible farm price-support system has had the support of not only the Republican Party but likewise the Democratic Party. The records show that President Truman's 1948 message to Congress and the Democratic platform of that year had called for flexible price supports on a permanent basis.

On September 9, 1948, former Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan issued the following declaration of agricultural policy when he said:

> I should like to point out that for almost 2 years Secretary ANDERSON tried to get the Congress to alleviate the difficulties in the troublesome potato situation. All that was required was a simple adjustment that would make the program flexible.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan continued by saying:

> Mr. ANDERSON, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, urged this in November 1946. He urged it again in January, in May, and in November 1947. He brought it up in February 1948. Again and again he asked Congress to make an adjustment—

Concluded Secretary of Agriculture Brannan.

It may be well to recall that former Secretary of Agriculture ANDERSON is Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON from New Mexico who voted for the flexible price-support program during the 83d Congress and made no apologies for doing so.

Getting back to former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, let me quote from a speech he made June 9, 1948, when he said:

> President Truman in his special message to Congress on May 14 asked for four kinds of action. One of the four recommendations was for flexible farm price supports on a permanent basis.

In commenting on President Truman's recommendation of flexible farm price supports on a permanent basis Secretary of Agriculture Brannan continued by saying:

> As you know our present price supports are quite rigid. This problem has been called to the attention of Congress repeatedly during the last 2 years. Also, the present price-support arrangements are quite temporary. If Congress extends the present arrangement for another year it only postpones the time of decision—

Asserted the then Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

Mr. Chairman, this evidence that I have presented is definite proof that both major political parties have advocated flexible farm price supports. In fact, every Secretary of Agriculture for the past 20 years has urged the adoption of a flexible price-support formula.

Since my election to Congress in 1938 I have watched very closely the agricultural problem in an effort to protect the farmers of my congressional district and of the State of Pennsylvania.

As the rigid price-support program became effective and Government warehouses began to bulge at the seams with surplus commodities my attention was called to the fact that the chief beneficiary of such a wasteful program has been about 2 million owners of large and highly mechanized farming units in the Middle and Far West.

On the other hand, some 3½ million small farmers have received no benefits whatsoever. And may I add at the same

time the consumer taxpayer has footed the bill for unneeded purchases and storage as well as in higher prices for the commodities being held off the markets.

Mr. Chairman, my farmers in the 20th District of Pennsylvania have never received 1 penny's worth of benefit from the mandatory 90 percent rigid price-support program on 5 basic crops; namely, corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, and rice.

As a matter of fact, my farmers are among the 3½ million small farmers of the Nation that have received little or no benefit from the rigid price support formula.

Last year they urged me to vote for the flexible price-support program and to abandon the rigid price supports that resulted in a mountain of surplus crops purchased with the taxpayers' money.

I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 12 because I find that the farmers of my congressional district oppose rigid price supports this year as they did last year.

Believe it or not, I have not received one letter from my congressional district asking me to support legislation that would restore the rigid price support formula.

In my efforts to develop the sentiment on the question of rigid or flexible price supports I contacted key farmers in my congressional district and in addition farm organizations who are active in Pennsylvania.

Let me read to you excerpts from the letters I have received.

Mr. Boyd A. Yarnell, of Bellefonte, Pa., has this to say:

Our organization was set up by people who were in favor with discontinuing all price supports—both rigid and flexible. Prior to forming our organization I spent 2 days spot checking the county and talked to many farmers about their beliefs on this particular subject. I found only one farmer who was in favor of Government controls or supports of any kind. All the others were not only willing but anxious to return to the law of supply and demand. If we must choose between the lesser of two evils it would seem feasible to at least give flexible supports a try as there seems a little sense to them. We have had rigid supports under a Democratic administration for long enough to know what a mess it has made. It would seem only right for the Republicans at least to try this program instead of abandoning it before giving it a trial.

In the referendum held on wheat acreages last fall the farmers in your district, Centre, Clearfield, and Blair Counties, voted 3 to 1 against controls. The figures are available in the ASC office in Harrisburg.

In my own opinion, the controls and supports benefit a small group of farmers who don't need any assistance to start with and which is paid for by many taxpayers who get no such Government assistance.

Mr. George L. Peters of Port Matilda, Pa., has this to say:

In regards to farm price supports, I would say that 75 percent of the farmers of Centre County are against rigid farm price supports. In fact 40 percent would be against any support of controls at all.

Of the 25 percent that favor rigid or high supports, I would say that half of them work in industry, and only farm part time. The majority of them work for all the handouts they can get; the others are Roosevelt New Dealers and expect support—the higher the better.

As you know the poultrymen are not asking for any supports, yet the supports on grain and feeds they buy is working a hardship on them as they are large buyers of grain.

Mr. Chairman, the Pennsylvania State Grange with a membership of over 80,000 farmers in Pennsylvania—5,601 of them living in my congressional district—has this to say:

The Pennsylvania State Grange is opposed to the rigid support programs which we have had in the past.

The rigid price-support programs have fostered production for which there is no demand, thus creating tremendous surpluses now stored in Government warehouses. They have caused the loss of world markets for farm commodities, and any attempt to revise these rigid supports would be ridiculous. They have been given a trial and have brought no solution to the farm problem.

We do not feel that any one piece of legislation or any one program can solve the ills of agriculture, but rather that the problems of the industry must be worked out on a commodity by commodity basis. The Pennsylvania State Grange, in its last 2 annual sessions, has favored a 2-price system for such a crop as wheat, and we would appreciate your supporting legislation that would give the 2-price system a trial.

While agriculture appreciates labor's anxiety over our problems, at the same time we cannot help but feel that any alliance between labor and agriculture is not going to work to the advantage of agriculture.

We appreciate your seeking out our stand on this matter and hope you will see fit to support us.

In addition to membership in the Pennsylvania State Grange many of my farmers belong to the American Farm Bureau Federation which has the following to say in a recent letter to me regarding farm price supports:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing over 1,600,000 farm families in the 48 States and Puerto Rico, has considered the subject of rigid versus flexible price supports quite thoroughly. Farmers belong to Farm Bureau in ever-increasing numbers, year by year, on a voluntary, dues-paying basis, without any kind of a compulsory check-off system. In fact, as of March 31, 1955, our membership was 74,102 higher than at the same period of any time in our history.

In 1947, this organization strongly urged that a flexible price-support program be instituted to take the place of rigid price supports which had been in effect during the war period. This has been our constant position up to the present time. For years farmers have known that the price mechanism must be allowed freedom to function in helping farmers to decide what to produce and in helping consumers to know what to buy.

Cotton and wheat farmers have been severely hurt by foreign countries taking over their markets. Cotton farmers have been hurt by synthetics, both at home and abroad, taking a large percentage of their markets. These losses have hit cotton and wheat farmers directly in the form of drastic acreage cuts. These cuts in the acreages devoted to cotton and wheat have injured other farmers by providing additional subsidized competition against the fruit and vegetable grower, the poultry, dairy, and livestock farmers, as well as other farmers.

Farmers are quite conscious of the fact that markets for their products, and free access to those markets, are essential to a prosperous agriculture. Farmers want to produce abundantly to raise their own standards of living. In return, they want full productivity on the part of industry and labor. They want to see laboring men prosper, as well as the whole community.

Farmers know that undue governmental interference with price which creates surpluses, destroys markets, wastes land, labor, and capital is not in the interest of the general welfare—the farmers and everyone else in the country.

Farmers do not want the prices of their commodities fixed by Government.

We understand that laboring men only want a minimum wage—not wage fixing. Flexible price supports are comparable to minimum wages. They leave room for the farmer to get higher free prices and the laboring man to get higher free wages. Rigid price supports are price fixing.

From the foregoing you can readily understand why the voting delegates to our last annual convention in New York City overwhelmingly voted for flexible price supports and against rigid supports.

Those labor leaders who endorse rigid, high price supports with attendant wasteful surpluses, Government interference in the right of farmers to produce, which lowers the standard of living of laborers as well as farmers, would be more helpful to their membership if they would line up with the overwhelming majority of the farmers who believe in producing what their workers want, at a fair price, based on the actions of free farmers and free laboring men.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat again that the sentiment against rigid farm price supports is overwhelming among the farm population of my congressional district.

Based on the letters I have received, the farmers in my congressional district feel that the flexible price-support program is entitled to a fair trial.

They are insistent that there be no return to the rigid price-support program which failed miserably because it was only designed as a wartime policy and not intended as a peacetime program.

It is for the reasons cited that I oppose H. R. 12.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we are here today involved in a retrial. It is a retrial of the system which, last year, we condemned and sentenced to modification.

The sentence was lighter than justified by the evidence produced against the system, but flexibility within a range of 82½ to 90 percent was, nevertheless, a definite change ordered last year by this House in line with its judgment that we should turn away from a socialist scheme of guaranties and regulations, gradually returning to a free-market system.

As we proceed with this retrial, I think it should be kept in mind that there is no such thing as a permanent half-free and half-slave market. Eventually we must return the industry of agriculture to its position as an important segment of our great free-enterprise system, or we must proceed to create a fixed system in which farm prices are set by Washington and all farmers regimented into tight crop monopolies such as we already have in tobacco production.

With respect to the tobacco program, it can be said that if any such program were ever attempted in the field of industrial production, all the principals would promptly land in jail as violators of both the antitrust laws and the constitutional provisions guaranteeing the freedom of enterprise. It has been fairly easy to perfect this system of state socialism with tobacco. Other crops are more difficult to control, but a continuation of rigid price supports will eventually bring State monopoly to wheat, corn, cotton, and the other basics.

When we finally get all of the basics covered with the production restrictions necessary to the success of the scheme, then the diversion of acres to the production of other crops will ruin the open market for these nonbasics, and ruin all the independent farmers who do not depend upon Government guaranties. Of course, in that case, our grand and glorious Government, imbued with the idea of guaranteeing the welfare of all, will have to greatly increase its list of basics or devise other schemes of rescuing these producers with money it has first taken away from the general taxpayer.

Now, when I mention the general taxpayers' interest in this measure, I would like to remind those who advocate Government rescue for every segment of our economy which happens to be in trouble: First, that the basis of all our wealth is production; second, that the Government has no money to pass out which it has not previously taken away from the people; and third, that all taxes are paid solely by those who work and consume, regardless of the political scheme of collection.

You may know by now that I am aiming to give you some facts about the cost of the price-stabilization program, the principal part of which has been the rigid price support of basic products. We have heard a great deal about the low cost of this program from those who would fool you by reading figures from the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is very deceiving, for CCC books ignore administrative costs and all of the movement of crops for which CCC has been reimbursed by other agencies.

Bernard Baruch once said, and I quote:

> Every man has a right to his opinion, but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts.

Of course, figures do not lie, but figures can be used to misrepresent.

For many years the full costs of the price-stabilization program have not been easy to determine, but the present Secretary of Agriculture has been willing to let them be known. For this, he has been violently criticized for what is called an attempt to alienate from farmers the affections of city people. So far as I am concerned, I think it is time for the general taxpayer, and particularly city consumers, to realize that this is an expensive program.

OFFICIAL FIGURES

Since 1922, the cost of agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income has amounted to $10,340,000,000 and this does not include any loss which is sure to be realized on the seven or eight billion dollars' worth of agricultural products now held in storage by the Government. This loss on present holdings is sure to be enormous, despite all the frantic efforts to move these surpluses through schemes of free distribution which will produce a credit on the CCC books and charges to other programs.

The realized cost of stabilization has been only $8,469,000,000 after crediting the program with tax receipts on sugar amounting to $1,216,000,000 and processing taxes amounting to $900 million. The round figure of $10 billion as a cost of this program is fully justified when you consider that this $2 billion in tax receipts came from the pockets of the consumers.

This $10 billion recorded as the cost of price and income stabilization programs certainly does not include all of the costs that have been incurred by the Federal Government as a direct result of such programs. An additional $12 billion was incurred under Lend-Lease, UNRRA, Mutual Security, and other programs which obscured the shifting of billions of dollars of agricultural commodities out of CCC expenses and charged them to these other programs.

It is impossible to estimate the additional loss CCC would have sustained in buying and holding agricultural products if it had not been so easy to transfer costs to foreign aid. Anybody acquainted with the facts who is interested in fairly evaluating the situation will recognize that the final costs recorded on CCC books are only a fraction of the amount that ultimately shows up in the public debt of the United States Treasury. This debt is standing against farmers as well as everybody else who works and consumes.

Now, I know that the proponents of price supports will say that we are today concerned only with the cost of the price support program by itself, even though price support, as written into this bill, is not the only method of income stabilization used. The scheme of price support, however, is today, after 12 years of trial, the most expensive scheme ever devised, and did, just during the past year, cost over a half billion dollars, without including other operations necessitated by the accumulation of surpluses and without including the sure loss on the enormous surpluses accumulated.

And I am sure that some of the proponents of the price-support scheme will want to defend the scheme as applied to their own pet commodity. You have heard here on the floor that the cotton program has made money because the books of CCC show receipts in excess of expenditures. However, when you add administrative costs of over $2 billion, you will see that the cotton program has cost us $1,581,000,000, even after crediting the account with $247 million in processing taxes paid by consumers.

Wheat is the big sinner in piling up costs and surpluses in storage, but don't you believe that any of the basic commodities have been carried for nothing. The tobacco program is often cited as the ideal. This tight monopoly is the pride and joy of price supporters, and I will admit its costs have been light in comparison to the cost of other programs, but the tobacco program has cost $97 million after crediting it with processing taxes of $68½ million. The real cost to the people of the tobacco program has been $165,500,000.

The overall farm subsidy program stacks up about like this: Either in the form of direct subsidies of production, or purchase programs buying and giving away agricultural products, more than $30 billion has been taken away from the taxpayers and dumped into our agricultural production during the last 22 years.

What do we have to show for it today? Has the bargaining position of farmers in our overall economy been improved?

MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS

To answer the questions, I refer you to the majority report. On page 7 of the majority report you see a listing of the so-called realities that confront us, as follows:

> The average of farm prices is down 22 percent since February 1951.
>
> Farm operating costs remain near their record high.
>
> Net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below 1947 and 10 percent below 1953. Further declines are in prospect for 1955 and 1956.
>
> Farm debt is increasing.
>
> The value of agricultural assets has declined $10,500,000,000 since January 1, 1952.

Now, if these things be true after 12 straight years of the 90-percent support program, what is the matter with the program? What better factual proof would you want in support of the minority thesis that 90 percent supports just do not work for the long time benefit of farmers.

On the next page, they say the reduction of price supports is destroying farmer confidence in the program and this might bring about farmer rejections of this machinery for production adjustments. I can readily agree that farmer confidence in the program is slipping, and rightfully so. But it cannot yet be due to the reduction of price supports because we have not yet tried reduction. Farmers are beginning to see that the whole theory of guaranteeing prices, with the Government as the principal buyer, is wrong and unworkable.

They say there are only two ways to adjust the production of our great agricultural plant. Their way is 90 percent rigid supports. The alternative is to let the prices fall so low that a sufficient number of farmers find their operation so unprofitable that production is reduced and supplies do not accumulate. This, they say, is the philosophy behind the flexible support mechanism.

In this, I think they are right, but I and thousands of other farmers believe that the alternative is better than rigid supports. If we are not ready to completely abandon the free-enterprise system, we must still rely for adjustment of supply and demand on the free competitive price system.

The majority report on page 10 features the appearance of Walter Reuther, CIO president, before our committee in

support of guaranteed rigid prices for agriculture. In an excellent treatise on economics Mr. Reuther stressed what we all know, "that the welfare and destiny of farmers and wage earners are closely interrelated." That is true of all major segments of our society.

Yes, Mr. Reuther was appearing in support of this bill. But please note his answer to this question which I asked him, and I quote:

Mr. Reuther, you have presented an excellent thesis on economics with which I generally agree, a thesis which advocates the full use of efficiency. How, then, can you wholeheartedly endorse a program which piles up $8 billion worth of surpluses in expensive storage and holds it off the market and away from the people?

Mr. Reuther's answer:

Well, obviously, I think I made it very clear that I do not want to create abundance and put it in storage houses. I want to create abundance and get it out to the people.

Now, I ask you, is that consistent with his endorsement of the price-support system?

At another place, Mr. Reuther said:

The CIO will not attempt to tell the farmers what kind of agricultural program they should have to protect their interests.

Supporters of this bill would have you believe that the Government enticed the growers into overproduction by patriotic appeal. They say, on page 12:

The large stores of food and fiber were created in response to Government appeals for ever-increasing production during World War II and on through the Korean conflict.

Now, I know a great many farmers, and I think that my judgment of their motives is as good as any. As a group, farmers are patriotic, but I know they are motivated in their business by the profit incentive just like every other businessman. They increased production during and after the war because they thought they could make money in so doing, and they did make money. On the average, they made big money in both operating profits and capital gains.

After the war markets were over, they knew that adjustments were due and inevitable. In the lines of agriculture where the Government was not guaranteeing a continuance of war prices, adjustments were made and made without disaster. But on the basics, where this Government continued to guarantee high prices, production went wild. They were responding normally, like any other free enterpriser, to the profit opportunity in the production of those things supported by the Government.

Now that we are in a mess, some farmers may cry for a continuance of the guaranties, but they know full well that it is not the proper function of Government in peacetime to distort the free-enterprise system by guaranteeing profits in production.

Now that our warehouses are bulging, some would argue that we should accept abundance as a blessing, but I can tell you that $8 billion worth of overabundance hanging over the free markets is no blessing to producers. And $8 billion worth of abundance lying in expensive storage is no blessing to either taxpayers or consumers.

With unbounded sympathy for the farmers, the majority report points out that the factory employee with an hour's wage can buy twice as much bread as he could 25 years ago, and then they wonder about the wide marketing margins for farm products, pointing out that—

While the price of wheat declined 32 percent, the price of bread advanced 23 percent.

Well, I expect Mr. Reuther could explain to them why industrial wages will buy more today and why there is a bigger spread in price between production and consumption. Mr. Reuther's increase in industrial wages, applying to distribution all along the line, has a great deal to do with this. But Mr. Reuther did not make these gains for labor by creating abundance and oversupply of labor. He is smart enough to know that the inevitable law of supply and demand works in the field of labor as elsewhere in a free economy. Big gains in labor wages have been made during a period of expanding industrial production with labor always a little short, and even during the height of war production there was no relaxation of the 40-hour week or any other measures limiting workers' output.

But, you say, you do not believe in the economic philosophy of scarcity. Well, if you do not believe that a little scarcity is the best tonic for any ailing industry, then you do not understand the free-enterprise system—the system which has exceeded all other known systems in the production of abundance.

On page 17 the majority explain why we need a farm program by saying:

Agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device outside of the aid of Government to pattern its production to market needs. Agriculture must look to Government for some protection in markets where the producers have no voice in the prices of things they bring to sell.

This is the kind of thinking which has gotten us all into this agriculture mess. If they had said, that, for many years Government has not allowed agriculture to use any other device except dependency on the Government, they would have been correct, for Government promotion of agricultural production has kept agricultural markets badly distorted for many, many years.

The argument that the very nature of agricultural production makes the idea of a free market illogical is entirely false. Its nature is very similar to that of any other line of production. The uncontrollable and variable factors seem different, but agriculture has no monopoly on uncontrollable and variable factors, even though the production and marketing cycle of some crops may be longer than in some lines of industry. The basic management problem is the same. Most industrial schedules must be planned and provided for in advance by a length of time which exceeds the growth period of agricultural products. And industry has no arbitrary control over its selling prices. Competition in a free market is just as ruthless in the field of industry as it is in agriculture. In the field of automobile production, the one often cited as the example of easy management control, failures and bankruptcies over the history of the business have greatly exceeded the ratio of failures and bankruptcies in farming. When the free-enterprise system fails to work equitably in general industry and general agriculture, we will have established either industrial monopolies or state socialism.

I am sure every Member of the House has been urged by the CIO to support this bill. The majority report makes much of the point that both the CIO and the AFL urge the restoration of rigid price supports. In reading statements of the labor leaders it is apparent that they have a real concern for the welfare of the farmer. Everyone has an honest interest in the welfare of the farmer. But does it not seem a little strange that the two big labor organizations favor this price support method of insuring the farmers' welfare, when the largest farm organization, composed of millions of farmers who are certainly interested in their own welfare, takes the stand that rigid price supports and Government purchases of surpluses are not the best way of insuring the general welfare?

Mr. Reuther comes before us with generalized support of rigid price supports but does not believe in piling $8 million worth of surplus products up in Government storage. What then, Mr. Reuther, what is the alternative? There is no alternative, since, if under this law we are going to guarantee 90 percent, the Government must proceed to buy and store.

The evil of the price support and acreage restriction method is becoming more apparent every day. The latest reports indicate that farmers are aiming at another big year of production, even bigger than last year.

And the headaches of overproduction seem sure to spread to other crops. With 40 million acres excluded from the production of basic crops, it is very apparent that the markets on nonquota crops are to be ruined by this forced diversion.

This is nothing short of murder for the independent farmers who have been producing crops without Government guaranties. Past history has shown that the producers of the nonquota crops have maintained reasonable adjustment of supply to demand so that prices have been on a level just as favorable as those for the basics. Now, however, with this forced diversion, their markets are sure to be depressed and the whole agricultural economy distorted. This merely illustrates the fact that Government management of our agricultural economy is bound to be bad management, with favoritism to some and injustice to others.

INJUSTICE TO TAXPAYERS

In considering the injustice to taxpayers and consumers, let me give you a few more figures which the proponents of this measure will never give you. These are some of the figures they criticize the Department for divulging, but I assure you that all of the people of the country have a right to know that the cost of storage, just for holding our enormous surpluses off the market during the calendar year 1954, amounted to $350 mil-

lion. Mark off just a few holidays during the year and you have just a round million dollars a day for every day of last year. It is estimated that this year's crop purchases will swell the total investment in surplus goods to $9½ billion. So you can easily figure that next year the storage bill will exceed $1,250,000 a day.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY GO?

There may be some room for argument as to how much the price support and Government purchase programs have cost the taxpayer and there may be some little inaccuracy in determining where the tax money supporting the programs goes. But I am sure that all of you, who are interested in schemes for redistributing the wealth of the country, will be interested in considering the statement of the Commodity Stabilization Service giving the State-by-State distribution of loans made on 1952 crops, together with the statement of the Internal Revenue Service showing the State-by-State payment of Federal taxes.

As you know, the State of New York pays the most—amounting to 18.6 percent of the total for the Nation. New York State pays 20 times the Federal taxes paid by Kansas. But Kansas gets 154 times as much of this loan money. New York pays 20 times as much Federal tax as Iowa. But Iowa gets 100 times as much as New York State in the distribution of these loans. New York State pays 8 times the Federal taxes that North Carolina pays. But North Carolina gets 58 times as much of this loan money as does the State of New York.

Texas, with all of its oil millionaires, pays less than half as much Federal tax as is paid by Pennsylvania; but in the distribution of this Government bounty, Texas collects 75 times as much as Pennsylvania.

Minnesota pays just about half the Federal taxes paid by New Jersey, but, in price supports loans, gets over 90 times as much as New Jersey.

Mississippi has some ardent advocates of rigid supports, but you cannot blame them. Mississippi pays only one-fourteenth as much as Maryland in Federal taxes; but Mississippi takes 20 times as big a piece of this pie as Maryland.

North Carolina deserves second mention, for North Carolina pays less than a third of the taxes paid by Pennsylvania, but gets 75 times as much of this price support money.

I dislike to point out to you the special interests of the various geographical sections of the country in this bill, because already in this House there is entirely too much voting based on sectional interests, but if there ever comes a time when Congressmen should be aware of the interests of their own district in a piece of legislation, it is now, during the consideration of this bill.

Another example will emphasize the point. Delaware pays 12 times as much tax as North Dakota and 11 times the tax of South Dakota. Yet, in distributing that part of the tax money which supports the farm-price program, North Dakota gets almost 80 times as much as Delaware, and South Dakota gets almost 60 times as much as Delaware. This is redistribution of wealth on a grand scale.

INTEREST OF CONSUMER AND TAXPAYER

Farm legislation emerging from the Agriculture Committee has repeatedly provided for a farmer vote or so-called referendum to determine what the farmer wants from the Government. Such votes are touted as being ultra-Democratic. Supposedly, freedom is preserved by giving a producer a choice between two methods of getting the Government to guarantee his own profitable security.

The real fact is that there is nothing democratic about the whole scheme. Giving farmers a choice as to which way they can get the most from the Government is nothing but a socialistic subterfuge. Real democracy would provide that consumers and taxpayers vote, along with the farmers, on these propositions. Real democracy would demand that all affected persons of the country be permitted to vote on the issue.

But how are consumers and general taxpayers affected by Government subsidy and guaranties to food producers. I need not restate the details as to how the general taxpayer in 20 years has dumped about $20 billion into the overall farm subsidy program. About half of this $20 billion is attributable to price supports and Government purchase programs. Do not you think that $1 billion a year in taxation is full justification for the right of the taxpayer to vote on these farm propositions?

And how about the consumer? I know that consumers have shown very little interest in this farm program because they do not understand what has been happening to them. Only in the last year or so, when butter accumulations began to get in the news, have they begun to comprehend what the price-support and Government-purchase programs mean to their food costs.

What the price-support program has cost consumers at the retail stores is beyond calculation. Since a free market has been completely destroyed on the basic crops, no one can determine what a free market would have produced as a price level at retail. But anyone with the slightest understanding of economics can be assured that Government purchase for hoarding has created an artificial price at retail which has cost consumers billions.

Yet, city Congressmen have, in the past, given heavy support to this program, not realizing the significance of it. Several of them have arisen on the floor of this House and, in effect, said that, even though farm production in their districts is limited to window boxes, they still wanted to go along with the program of gifts and profit guaranties to farmers.

Now, however, with the excesses of the farm program glaringly evident, they are beginning to understand the interests of their constituents, for the very good reason that any working consumer can understand the consequences of the Government hoarding and withholding from the market 1 billion pounds of butter, cheese, and dried milk.

I have emphasized that the provisions of this bill are contrary to the principles of free enterprise. That should be self-evident. But nowadays an affirmation of faith in the free-enterprise system brands one as a reactionary. So many people, lost in the maze of our big Government, believe a free market and the law of supply and demand are "something for the birds."

With many, the free play of price as an intelligent force in adjusting production to consumption has lost its significance, so they argue that it becomes necessary for the Government to fix prices and impose restrictions.

They say this is especially true in agriculture, so we must have this bill. Yet the proof is plain that agriculture is responsive to price. The price supported lines have responded with enormous surpluses. Other lines have adjusted and maintained a satisfactory balance.

Examples are numerous if you study the history of poultry, eggs, hogs, fruits and vegetables. Production in agriculture does respond to price. The free enterprise system will work if we give it a chance. But we shall lose the free enterprise system and all the liberties that go with it if we resort further to collective price fixing and political control of production and marketing.

Is there any wonder that the Communist Party, in their latest official pronouncement of policy, emphasized the importance of maintaining rigid price supports on farm products?

Now, mind you, I have no idea that any of the congressional supporters of this bill are even tinged with communism. But it is significant that the extension of rigid price supports fits perfectly into the Communist's openly declared purpose of socializing the American economy by first socializing the farm economy.

Their scheme of dragging down all people to a common economic level and masterminding both production and distribution from Washington embraces wholeheartedly the spirit of this bill. If the Communists had written it, the specified level of supports might be higher and the coverage broader, but, in basic principle, it would be no different. Free enterprise they hate, but subsidies they love, knowing full well that, out of subsidies will eventually come the dictatorial controls they seek.

During the last two sessions of Congress, we have been trying to devise schemes for the disposal—by gift or otherwise—of the enormous surpluses we have accumulated. Then we were dealing with consequences. Today we are dealing with the cause. Our decision on this bill will be a fateful indicator of which economic road we shall travel in the future.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: As I understand the gentleman's statement, he not only is opposed to this bill, but he is opposed to the so-called Benson plan.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I have stated here before that the flexible-price system is less of an evil than the rigid price-support system only by a degree. The only logical price-support system would be one down at the disaster level,

which I would estimate at 55 or 60 percent. It is the only way that will let the free market operate, and we have got to come back to a free market operation, or we will continually be in trouble.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, the gentleman's position would be, then, that the entire price-support law should be repealed?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Gradually it should be reduced to the disaster level.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What would be that level?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Fifty-five or sixty percent. I just estimate it. It must be below the cost of production.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand the gentleman, he says that he thinks this is a socialistic program, but that he would be willing for the price-support level to be fixed at 55 to 60 percent. Do I understand that to mean that the gentleman is willing to be socialistic to the extent of about 55 percent?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. No, sir; it is not socialistic when it is below the point where it influences the free market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I should like to emphasize again the critical condition of our farmers. In the March 25 issue of the U. S. News & World Report there was a most interesting article on this subject. The figures were presented stating that in 1946 farm income was $20 billion, or 12 percent of the national income; in 1948 it was $24 billion, or 11.6 percent of the national income; in 1951 it was $23 billion, or 9.4 percent of the national income; whereas in 1954 farm income was down to $20 billion, or 7.2 percent of the national income. I have read other figures which have indicated that the farm net income last year was about $12 billion or 40 percent less than what the farmers received in their best year, 1947. There are today approximately 21 million people on American farms, and about 31 million more in rural areas who are closely tied to the farm. In 1953, before taxes, 57 percent of our total farm families, or 3.1 million farm families, were making less than $3,000 annually. Eighty-two percent of our total farm families, or 4.5 million, were earning less than $5,000 annually. Just this past year I have been told that 55,000 farm families in the South have been driven from their homes due to cotton acreage restriction, and that 130,000 families make less than $900 per year.

Since 1945, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has shrunk from 54 cents on the dollar to 43 cents. The farmer is squeezed between costs and prices and constantly has to pay more for what he buys, and he gets less for what he sells. I do not believe that any one of us would deny that agriculture is America's No. 1 problem today.

The debate on H. R. 12 should not concern itself with a change in the philosophy of our agricultural legislation which has prevailed during the past 23 years. The chief arguments for discussion in this present legislation are whether or not we shall restore the support prices of the basic commodities to 90 percent of parity, and make mandatory the support price of milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at not less than 80 percent of parity. There are two points of view to be taken on this legislation. The one upheld by the Secretary of Agriculture and many Members of Congress holds that if we substituted a flexible price-support program on these basic commodities we would be rid of our troublesome surplus of agricultural commodities and the farmer would be on the road to better times. The other viewpoint, and the one to which I hold, believes that the reasons for our troublesome surplus lie in the fact that acreage control was not enforced in recent years, and that the pleas for greater production during the war period have caused a surplus in certain agricultural commodities. I believe that the better answer to the problem of this surplus is not in the flexible price supports of the basic commodities, but in stricter acreage control, more extensive use of the surplus to fight the cold war, and to feed Americans at home who are below the minimum dietary standards, continuing conservation programs to take care of the diverted acreage, continuing research on the part of our Agricultural Extension Service and other agencies, and better methods of marketing for the farmer—and above all by continuing to fight for the citizens of this country of low income to see that they get a square deal and are able to buy the necessities of life in ever-increasing abundance.

In supporting H. R. 12, I want to pinpoint the cost of our agricultural program because I know this is one aspect of this great problem that causes all of us concern. I want very emphatically, however, to say at the outset that when we view the cost of all of our farm programs in perspective to the accomplishments of these programs, and to the costs of other activities sponsored by our Government, that the surprise is that the cost has been so low. I sincerely believe that no other program in America has benefited the farmer and the consumer alike at so little cost as has the agricultural program over the past 21 years. Now, let us remember that in H. R. 12 we are talking about the price supports on the basic commodities and I state that the cost of these, and all price-support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation from October 1933 through December 1954, or a period of 21 years was $1,828,864,407. During this period the cost on the basic commodities was $300,109,993. During this period, until December 31, 1954, rice and tobacco had made money for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Now, of the total loss of approximately $1.8 billion, the biggest losses in this total figure were in the nonbasic commodities, such as Irish potatoes which cost $478 million. The cost of the price-support program has not been excessive.

Now I know when you add all the payments that have been made to agriculture for all of the variety of things that have included emergency assistance to Pakistan, payments under the agricultural conservation program, section 32 expenditures totaling $1,745,000,000, and so forth, our total expenditures for agricultural programs for the fiscal years 1932–54 total $8,469,200,000. I quote from page 106 of the Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 135, dated January 1955. Now if we take this total amount, which, mind you, reflects several times again the cost of the program submitted in H. R. 12, we find that a total of $368.2 million a year has been spent for all these programs as we prorate this amount over the 23-year period. But even this sum is not out of proportion when we consider Federal expenditures that have been made for other aspects of our Government.

I know many Americans are worried about the cost of our farm program, and I want to take some time now to point out the costs of other programs of our Government, and I want us first to take as an example the postal deficit. Listed below is the deficit for the past 10 fiscal years as sent to me by the Post Office Department. In 1946, $148.1 million; 1947, $274.8 million; 1948, $343.9 million; 1949, $591.5 million; 1950, $589.5 million; 1951, $551.5 million; 1952, $727 million; 1953, $618.8 million; 1954, $399.1 million; 1955, $313.5 million. It will be noted that the total deficit is $4,357,700,000. In other words, in less than half of the time during which we have had our price-support program, the Post Office Department has had a deficit of nearly two and one-half times of all the losses realized on the price-support program for American agriculture through December 1954.

Let me repeat again that the loss on the price-support program for the basic crops for 21 years has been, according to the best information I can get, approximately $300 million.

I read an interesting article the other day about this post-office deficit, and it indicated that one big publishing company, and I have reference to the Saturday Evening Post, because it does not pay the full cost for the mailing service on its magazines, receives a subsidy of approximately $10 million a year. I have been told that, similarly, Life magazine receives a subsidy of $9 million annually, the Reader's Digest $4 million, and the Chicago Tribune approximately $700,000. Now I realize that this is not the fault of the Post Office Department, but it is the fault of Congress in that we do not raise the postal rates to reduce this deficit. And I want to emphasize the fact that there is no farmer in America who receives a subsidy of $10 million a year from the price-support program. Now I know we have some problems with our price-support program because of the huge farms. In his appearance before our committee, Secretary Benson estimated that about 90 percent of our production in agriculture today comes from approximately 50 per-

cent of our farmers, whereas only about 10 percent comes from the other 50 percent of our farmers. I would like to see our farm program strengthened so that more and more we can fight for better opportunities for the little farmer, the so-called family-sized farmer. Since 1935 the number of farms of 1,000 or more acres has increased 37 percent. These farms now contain a total of 494 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all United States farm lands. But I want to stress again that I do not know of any farmer in America who has been granted in any year any sum of $10 million for price supports on the basic commodities. And I want to emphasize the fact that so far as I know, there has not been recommended to us any effective program to solve better this problem of the little farmer. So I cannot see that a vote against H. R. 12 would be a vote for the little farmer. Rather it would be, in my opinion, to take away from him the main prop that he has in giving him a reasonable return for certain of his agricultural commodities.

Let us take another example. In a recent discussion we had on the floor of the House, it was mentioned that our subsidy to the merchant marine in America amounted to approximately $100 million a year. Now, I am not complaining about the justice of that subsidy. My figures may be slightly in error, but if you will project that amount of $100 million over a period of 21 years, you would get a figure of $2,100 million, or $300 million more than the cost of the support program for all commodities from 1933 through June 1954.

Or, let us look at some other aspects of big business and see the types of subsidies which have been granted to them. Now, mind you, I am not arguing the justice or the injustice of these facts. I am merely pointing out the cost of our farm program in perspective to other great programs of the Federal Government. I am told that $7,300 million was granted to business in accelerated depreciation tax benefits during World War II. Now, tax-amortization certificates in the amount of $29,502 million have been granted to business since 1950, and in that figure we include only the first 3 months of 1954. It is my understanding that of this amount, $17,700 million, or 60 percent, may be written off for income-tax purposes in 60 months. The remainder of the cost not certified for defense purposes can be written off concurrently at normal depreciation.

Compare these figures again, now, with the approximately $1.8 billion over a period of 21 years that price supports on the basic and nonbasic commodities have cost us. Yet so many of the newspapers of the country would have us believe that the farmer is ruining America because of the huge subsidies which he receives. Some of these newspapers gave very little space to the loophole in the 1954 tax law which if it had not been corrected with bipartisan support, would have cost at varying estimates, from $1 billion to $3 billion a year. Under this tax loophole, we read in the daily press, that the Capital Transit Co. here in Washington, would have been freed from paying any 1954 Federal income tax, and Capital Transit Co. further would have been able to take double deductions on such items as employees paid vacations. It would have deducted 1954 vacations, and also 1955 vacations, which were based on work performed in 1954. Now, I am not trying to fix the blame for this oversight, but I am just pointing out that in 1 year's time this loophole, which did not receive too much press attention, could have cost more than the entire price-support program during its complete history.

Or, let us see how Government helps business in other areas. We were told last year when we discussed the atomic energy bill, that the Federal Government has spent approximately $12 billions on research of the atom. Now much of this research was for military purposes, but it all made possible the development of the atom for peacetime uses, and I, for one, am glad that the development of the atom now is in the hands of private initiative and enterprise as far as its peacetime uses are concerned. I anticipate a day not far hence when our public utilities will use the atom to furnish electricity to the Nation. No one, I believe, regrets that part of the $12 billion research which will be directly beneficial to big business, but if we complain about the help which the farmer has been given, I think it nothing but logical to ask, "What is un-American and wrong about the parity payments we have guaranteed to the farmers under certain conditions in order that he might furnish the food and fiber to the Nation?"

Let us take a look at the stock market for a moment and I think we should all be calm as we talk about the problems of the stock market, but I think it perfectly proper that we have a calm discussion about this great American institution. I have been told that the values of stocks have increased by approximately $50 billion during the past 2 years. I do not know what factors have caused this tremendous increase, and even though I look with modesty upon my knowledge about the stock market, after reading the testimony of the many witnesses who have appeared before the Senate committee which recently investigated the stock market, I almost feel inclined to say I am about as much an authority as any of them. I will tell you this very emphatically, though, Mr. Chairman, that I am much more worried about the tremendous advances of our stocks during the past couple of years than I am over the money we are spending on agriculture. And I know further that the real wealth of this Nation is in our natural resources, and in the character of our people. I think the money we have invested in our soil will, through the years, reap much greater dividends for the welfare of this country of ours, and thus indirectly increase the prices of our stocks. I know, also, that the farmer has had spent on all of his programs during the past 23 years just a little more than the value of the stocks reported to have fallen during 1 week of our recent Senate investigation.

From 1937 through 1951 reclamation expenditures have totaled $1,899 million, or more than the cost of all the price-support programs from October 1933 through June 1954. In fact, the Senate has authorized just one reclamation project, which many believe will cost more than the $1,800 million spent for 21 years on our price-support programs.

We are talking now about a great highway program to cost $101 billion, with the Federal Government assuming a $25 billion share. Compare this figure with the $1.8 billion spent on all the price-support programs from October 1933 through December 1954.

What has been the cost of our price-support program in comparison to the aid we have given to foreign governments? If we include the cost of World War II, I have read figures which would indicate $112 billion was the extent of this aid. I have heard it said that we have spent probably $40 billion of that $112 billion since the end of World War II. Let us compare that amount now with the $1.8 billion that the price-support program has cost us until December 1954—let us compare the cost of the price-support program with the $2.8 billion in new funds which were appropriated for mutual security purposes for the last fiscal year, plus an additional $2.5 billion of unobligated funds which has been authorized for use in our current mutual security programs. I voted for some foreign aid because I believed it was for the preservation of our free world. I recognize, also, that some of this money has gone to American farmers, but a small percentage of it only. I can never justify aid of any kind to any portion of the world which is aid to a greater extent than the aid we give to our own people. I cannot as a Member of Congress ever vote for the foreign-aid program and not vote to give the American farmer 90 percent of parity for his basic crops.

In the past 10 years, public assistance grants to States amounted to $12,502,-863,000. Unemployment compensation grants to States under the administration of the Bureau of Employment Security during the past 10 years has cost $2,116 million. Surely these expenditures are justified. No one would deny these sums to the millions of Americans that they have aided. Likewise, I feel that every thoughtful American will realize that the $1.8 billion paid out in the price-support program up until December 1954 for American agriculture has been justified.

We have been told many times, and rightfully we should, that our Government is a big business. I approve of these great activities of the Government in the fields of lending, guaranties, and insurance. The extent of Government operations in these fields is indicated by the fact that the total loans, guaranties, and insurance in contingent liabilities amount to $244 billion as of June 30, 1954. Now to be perfectly fair, a small percentage of this is concerned with aids to agriculture. But mind you, now, only a very small percentage. Let me repeat again that our Government is liable to the extent of $244 billion as a banker

and underwriter with 38 different agencies, and employing 40,000 people. If we ever had a depression in this country and our people could not pay their home loans, and if we would have to pay out tremendous sums for the insurance on our bank deposits—who can accurately foretell the cost? But just because our Government has guaranteed the investment of her citizens to the extent of $244 billion does not mean, I think, in the minds of the most pessimistic that the Federal Government will lose this huge sum of money. And yet those who foretell disaster in the disposition of our surplus commodities, and who are fearful that the $8.5 billion worth of commodities that we have will represent a total loss to the Government, might do well to reflect just how small in comparison that investment really is with other investments that our great Government has. I am not a prophet of doom, and I feel that the Government is sound in embarking on the various ventures in the fields of insurance and housing, but I also believe it is sound for our Government to try to give our farmers a square deal at the market place.

I want to approach this problem of the cost of our price-support program, and especially the cost of the basic commodities, in another manner. You do not hear very much now about the price of coffee. And yet, I do not think any of us have found that the retail price in the market place is as low as it was last year when the prices had their astronomical rise. You will recall that investigations suggested that the increased cost of the coffee was due to some irregularities in the sugar and coffee exchange, and due also to a scarcity scare. Now, the truth of the matter is that we had more coffee last year than ever before. But it was the scare or the worry of a short supply in the minds of many people that caused the retail price of coffee to soar. I wonder what would have happened this past year in the face of the drought conditions that we had over a great part of this Republic if we had not had in stock considerable quantities of the basic commodities. I believe we lost from three-fourths of a billion to $1½ billion in increased coffee prices in this country over a period of a year, or nearly as much as the price-support program of all the commodities cost us in 21 years. If you think that estimate is too high, remember you paid not only more for the coffee in the market place, but you paid twice as much in many restaurants for a cup of coffee. Project, if you will, that same thought if we faced a shortage of wheat, or corn, or cotton, or tobacco, and found ourselves at the mercy of what we might call a scarcity scare. I do not believe enough emphasis has been given to this very important factor of our whole agricultural program. A year's supply, or even a 2 years' supply of basic commodities, even if the American people faced a loss of a great percentage of these commodities, might in the final analysis save us money because we would not be subjected to soaring prices at the market place based on a fear of shortages.

I do not believe that our present farm program is perfect, but I do not believe the mere reduction of the price supports on the basic commodities will help solve any of our problems—and it is in this point of view that I differ with those who oppose H. R. 12. I believe not to adopt H. R. 12 will mean only one sure thing, and that is a further decrease in the income of the farmer which, mind you, has gone from a net income of $13.6 billion in 1952 to $12 billion in 1954. I know that this loss in the purchasing power of the farmer will reflect itself in all business areas in the whole United States. I know, further, that there is a vast movement away from the farm that bodes no good for the future of America. Since 1930, the farm population has shrunk by over 8 million, while the overall population of the Nation has gained by 41 million. Over the last 10 years an average of 77,000 families has made the exodus from farm to city each year. The most conservative estimates indicate that our city labor force has thus been increased by approximately 115,000 workers every year. Now, mind you this, also, that whenever the workers leave the farm, our little towns shrink and disappear. I think we can assume at least 30,000 or 40,000 more workers each year join the 115,000 from the farm to go into the city to seek employment. What are our labor groups going to do with these additional citizens? Factory employment in January 1955 was 1½ million below that of January 1953. In 1955 the factories of this Nation were employing 400,000 less people than they employed in January 1954. And yet at the same time production had increased by some 8 percent. All of our labor leaders are naturally worried about automation, which each year causes thousands and thousands of our laborers to lose jobs.

A farmer does not have to draw unemployment compensation if we can keep him on the farm. Let me stress again, I have had no program suggested to me that would serve better to keep the small farmer on his farm than the splendid programs which have been developed during the past 20 years. Included in that program, of course, is the matter of a parity payment fair to both farmer and consumer. H. R. 12 certainly advocates that principle. I still cling to the Jeffersonian ideal of democracy where the ownership of land is considered an essential on the part of our people. I feel now that if America is to survive, it must have millions of its people on our farms making a comfortable living from the soil—living those lives of independence and sturdy determination which has always been the bulwark of our Nation. I feel that H. R. 12 will be a trend in the right direction; if nothing more it will help restore to the little farmer some measure of confidence in his future that has been lacking. Let us not tear down that program which we have, but rather, let us strengthen it for the better. I realize that our agricultural programs must be resilient, changes must be made, but until I can find a better change for the farmer, I am not willing to abandon the principles set down in H. R. 12. Above all, I do not believe that the cost of our price-support program on our basic commodities has been prohibitive, and I believe in comparison to other great programs of this Government of ours, the cost has been very modest. I hope the Congress will pass H. R. 12 by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The figure of $368 million which the gentleman used, included such expenditures as the school-lunch program?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. And the program of export subsidies, and of gifts of food to rehabilitate the shattered economies of other countries.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Absolutely. And since 1932, section 32 expenditures have been about $1,800,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad the gentleman pinpointed the fact that the cost of these price-support programs, the mandatory programs that we are discussing in H. R. 12 has been just $300 million on the basic crops up until December 1954.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to review our case of the farmer—to quote our distinguished chairman, "There is nothing new to discuss"—unquote. So I will review our position.

During the war years there was a very great need for greater production of food and fiber to feed the war machine. Farmers were guaranteed a profit price on their total production. However, the prices in most instances on the basic commodities were higher than the guaranteed price support. We were furnishing the sinews of war in materials and money to a great many of the foreign countries and they were in turn spending a portion of this money back with us for our farm products.

With the end of hostilities we began to reduce our giving of money in the foreign countries and thus our exports also began to reduce in the same proportion.

As was provided in our law, when our production exceeded our consumption—both domestic and foreign—we should decrease the support price on the basic commodities. It was thought to be a good plan to pay the higher support price for all-out production and thus build up our surpluses. At least it was thought to be a good political-vote-getting plan. Production controls have always been a part of the law but no one wanted to tell the farmer we no longer needed his production and were not going to pay him so much as we had heretofore for his commodities. Oh no, that is not the way to win friends and influence people. The farmers' vote was the difference between success and failure. The result: Due to our fear of trying to bring supply and demand into balance we have continued a wartime practice which has created $8 billion worth of surplus with no market to turn to and with storage costs approximating $1

million every day. The total cost of the program is somewhere between 21 million, the figure used by the proponents of this present legislation, and 10 billion, the figure used by the opponents. It seems that statistics are always used to favor the statisticians. Anyway it is approached, the cost seems to be enormous. The grain-storage facilities alone have been approximately $3 billion.

Assuming that the cost has not been too high, and that our surpluses are not too burdensome, but that another dollar spent for surpluses would be too much, and that we must pursue some other course of action—What will it be? My opponents say to continue the same medicine that brought about our trouble and we of the opposition say that if we are to continue the same medicine it had better be given in smaller dosages.

We who favor the flexible plan feel that the farmer can more readily return to his normal operation as a free citizen to operate his farm without the mandatory supervision of the Government. The proponents of this legislation feel that the farmer is to, from this day hence, be a subject of Government, and look to Government for universal direction of his farm operation, and that the only method to pursue is that of a complete control of the farmers' land with a fixed price of those commodities which are supported by Government. This in olden days was known as a straitjacket and I for one do not believe the farmer with his modern methods of operation is going to fit well in this straitjacket.

I am not the expert farmer that our distinguished chairman is—he has been in Congress and on the agriculture committee some 20-odd years, and I know he has been a champion of the farmer all of these years, and he had alined himself with other good farmers who have the interest of the farmer at heart. Just within the past few weeks our chairman brought before our committee one of his farm friends by the name of Walter Reuther who seemed to be very free in giving his advice to our committee on the problems of the farm industry. I take it from the very complimentary remarks that were offered by our distinguished chairman that his friend is an expert in the farm field. And since our chairman is an expert and can probably get some of the answers from his well-informed friend Walter Reuther, I would like to ask both of them some of the questions that have been bothering me in trying to solve this farm problem. Too, since the chairman is a cotton farmer, I will start by asking some questions about the cotton situation.

First. Does cutting down from 26 to 18 million acres mean an abundance?

Does it increase jobs for the laboring man making cotton-production machinery? Cotton gins? Cotton mills? Cotton - cloth - manufacturing machinery? Dress and clothing workers? Does less cotton being shipped help the cotton-shipping workers? Railroad employees?

We have had millions of bales of synthetics substituted for cotton. Is this in the interest of the United States cotton growers?

Foreign countries prior to World War II exported only 40 percent of the cotton. The United States 60 percent. Under 90-percent price supports foreign countries have taken our markets. Now they supply 70 to 72 percent, and we are only supplying 28 to 30 percent. Does this help the cotton farmers? Does it help the laboring people?

President Roosevelt favored a flexible price-support program. Henry Wallace did while he was Secretary of Agriculture. So did Claude Wickard. So did CLINTON ANDERSON. So did Harry Truman, while he was in office and when he was elected in 1948. Were they against farmers?

Second. Wheat: Does shifting the right to produce wheat from the areas of the country best adapted to produce wheat because of soil and climate to areas less well adapted help farmers? Does it help consumers? Does it help the general welfare? Does it contribute to real or imagined abundance. Bakers want high-gluten wheat. Does it help to have price supports force less production of high-gluten wheat? Does this help farmers? Does this help laborers?

While farmers were being forced to cut down acreage devoted to wheat in this country from 77 million acres to 55 million acres other nations increased wheat acreage 73 million acres. How does this help the American wheat farmer? How does this help the American laborer? Is this the road to a higher living standard?

Third. Income: Farmers' net income in 1947 was 16½ billion. Seven years later, after 7 years of 90-percent rigid-price supports, net income was down to 12⅓ billion. How did this help farmers? How did this help the working men?

Fourth. Diverted acres: Acres taken out of wheat and cotton have been shifted to other production. This provides subsidized competition for other farmers. How does this help the dairy farmer? The poultry farmer? The vegetable grower? The beef producer?

Fifth. Controls: Government controls are forcing farmers to pay penalties. They are keeping farmers who do not have enough land to make a decent living from using their land as they think best. How can this help small farmers? How does this help workers?

Sixth. Taxes: CCC is a funnel through which thousands of millions of dollars have been pumped into agriculture. The cost is well over 6 thousand millions on the basics alone. How does this help the taxpayers? The total on all crops is over $10 billion before taxes are deducted. This does not include $4 billion paid to farmers during the war to maintain price ceilings. This does not include $7 billions used to dispose surpluses through UNRRA, Mutual Security, ECA, and similar disposal programs since 1949. How did these $21 billion help the general taxpayers? The productivity of the American agricultural plant throughout the 48 States is much greater than markets at high artificial prices. Surpluses are piled up in Government warehouses. We can't give it away because other countries feel like it is unfair to their own producers. Markets have been destroyed. Production overbalances consumption. How does this help farmers? Laboring men?

Seventh. Surpluses: Canada, Australia, friends of ours, are deathly afraid we will dump our wheat surpluses on the world market and ruin their wheat producers. Perhaps the Foreign Affairs Committee would like to give us the answer? Egypt, Pakistan, Brazil and other cotton producing countries are afraid we will dump our cotton and undermine their economics. How does this help farmers? Laboring men? Foreign relations? The general welfare? The Russian Government favors rigid high price supports here in America. Their conspirators here in America through the Communist Party favor rigid high price supports. How does this help American farmers?

I would like to read from their own booklet entitled "The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Equal Rights and Democracy, Program of the Communist Party." On page 17 appears this statement:

> An antidepression program requires government protection of homeowners, small farmers and small business from mortgage foreclosures and bankruptcy. It requires a government guaranty of 100 percent price parity and crop insurance for small and middle-sized farmers.

How does this help American laboring men?

When these questions are honestly and clearly answered, I can explain to my farmers why this program is good for them.

Right now, they do not think it is working out too well.

The flexible price support program is now the law of the land and goes into operation on the 1955 crop. It has not had a chance to prove its worth. After weighing the arguments I ask you to give the flexible plan a chance to operate and prove or disprove its worth and vote down the rigid price support program now before us.

I would like for you to take into consideration the facts I have just given and vote against this high rigid price-support bill, H. R. 12.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that our exports of farm products decreased because we are no longer giving that stuff to foreign countries or foreign governments for nothing, and consequently the export market on those basic commodities went down?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. That is exactly true. I am glad my colleague pointed that out.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture was absent from the chamber when the gentleman from Nebraska directed his many interrogations, I would like to answer just a few of those to show the unsound ground on which the gentleman has approached this whole problem.

To start with, he presumed and indicated that Mr. Reuther had come before our committee as a farm expert. Of course, anyone who was present, and

the gentleman from Nebraska was there, knows that Mr. Reuther said he was not a farm expert. The chairman of the committee indicated that he invited Mr. Reuther to appear before the committee as a representative of the consumers. I think that he did make an excellent statement in that capacity.

The gentleman from Nebraska also asked if a cut in production of cotton, for instance, would result in more money being in the envelopes of the workers who make textiles and other things. The gentleman realizes, of course, that we do have a plentiful supply, which is one of the reasons we have this program and why the farmers have agreed to cut down their production in order that we might not have this surplus. As Mr. Reuther said, one of the problems in industry is overproduction and the factories are in a position where they can control or regulate their production, not only of steel but all of the things, into which steel goes.

In connection with this under or overproduction, whichever you want to call it, one statement Mr. Reuther made is to me quite a very important one. He said: "You see, this is where we get in trouble. Take the General Motors Corporation. General Motors in 1954 made, because of the tax laws passed last year, 35 percent more profit after taxation with less production." In other words, your corporations are getting into less production when they find that production is not needed.

The thing that needs to be emphasized is this. A farmer cannot control his production once the seed has been planted, or the animal has been bred. While he is willing to accept acreage controls and marketing quotas, and thus, in effect, pay for the supports which are made available through a price support program, in order to insure adequate production of the food and fiber so necessary for all of the people of this world, quite often at harvest time he finds himself with surpluses, which if thrown on the open market, without a guaranteed price, would bring about economic ruin.

Industrial production on the other hand can be controlled to any figure; it can be speeded up or slowed down to meet the basic law of supply and demand.

The farmer is also willing to comply with this basic law, and in the case of the basic commodities, which can be stored, reduction in acreage can act to meet this need for controlled production from season to season.

The question is a simple one. Shall we support the farmer at 90 percent of parity—or at the 100 percent of parity as was suggested by candidate Eisenhower—or shall we permit this support price to decline to 75 percent, a figure so far below production cost that no farmer can long survive?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill dealing with problems relating to the American farmer. It may be said that producers of cotton, wheat, peanuts, rice, corn, and dairy products are particularly concerned with this legislation, for we are dealing with legislation which will—if it becomes law—bring into being a change in mandatory price-support levels on the commodities which they produce.

But there are others, too, who are deeply interested in this matter, including producers of other farm commodities, consumers, processors, and, in fact, everybody in general, for economic factors relating to the farm are closely interwoven into the fabric of our whole economy.

Let me say at the outset that declining farm income is a problem deserving our closest attention. Precipitous price declines, beginning in 1951 and continuing more gradually through 1953 and 1954, have dropped our national farm income 25 percent below that of 1947; and there has been no accompanying decline in farm costs. This has created an imbalance between agriculture and the remaining portion of our presently strong national economy.

Let me further state that both the proponents and opponents of this legislation are equally interested in a strong agricultural economy, and that upon the shoulders of neither group rests the mantles of complete wisdom or devoted interest in the problems and wellbeing of the American farmer. Those who favor this legislation and those opposed to it are equally interested in a prosperous agriculture.

The issue today before the House resolves itself rather simply into a choice between two areas of thought: One, that the interest of the farmer and consumer can best be served by the assurance of a fixed price in relation to parity and a controlled agricultural production; and the other, that these interests will best be served if such price mechanisms as are administered by Government permit a degree of adjustments.

We have had considerable experience with price stabilizing efforts. Some, seemingly, have been helpful, while others have proven quite harmful. Out of these experiences, we must draw our conclusions in making our decision today.

May I make the observation that in considering our efforts of the thirties—those designed to attain some stability in agriculture, to establish an economic agricultural base, to permit gradual recovery in the late thirties, and to promote rapid expansion and high level income in the forties—may I point out that much success associated with these efforts may well have grown more out of the use of credit than out of the vehicle of price supports of that day. Refinancing of indebtedness, providing for operating capital, and adjusting debt repayment and loans of various types may well have provided the time ingredient so essential to solving the problems of those hectic days.

History shows us that time favored recovery on the farm during those depressed days, because—with the advent of World War II—the farmer was faced with the gigantic chore of feeding the world. Then, as we moved along through the war and into the area of an uncertain peace, our farm legislation was revised to meet these changed conditions.

American agriculture is not static; instead, it is a dynamic segment of American life—and therefore we are constantly striving to wholesomely relate agriculture to the rest of our economy. And it would be well, perhaps, for us to recognize that—because of the sensitive nature of economics—our final objective of complete farm stability may never be fully accomplished. But we must work at it.

Today we stand, or—to use a more accurate figure of speech—we are milling around a fork in the road. Either route we take is for the time being, substantially academic. Both of these routes require that agricultural production be controlled until supply factors are brought into reasonable balance with demand. Unless we succeed in developing broader market outlets, both domestic and foreign, both of these routes will require constant adjustments to create favorable commodity prices and farm income.

Already those supporting one or the other of these routes have assisted in developing legislation to ease the severity of adjustment inherent in the course they have chosen. This is evidenced by acreage adjustments on the one hand and the set-aside provisions on the other.

I am opposed to this bill because it is my conviction that the best interests of agriculture can better be served by price stabilization legislation that permits of some flexibility.

Producers of cotton, wheat, and rice are only recently experiencing the full effects of the acreage cuts inherent in a program of supports at 90 percent of parity. These adjustments are severe. And those acres which are removed from production and, of necessity, put into production of other commodities create a serious problem for other producers who have less to protect them in the price field. There is no doubting that farm income can be cut just as seriously by acreage reductions as by price adjustments.

This bill provides for an increased level of support for dairy products—from 75 to 80 percent of parity. It is my considered opinion that the dairy industry—through its own aggressive efforts and wise use of Government assistance—is striking a reasonable balance economically. Let us not upset what appears to be a workable and equitable situation in the dairy industry.

Milk for the school-lunch program and the brucellosis-eradication program are worthy of consideration. They should, to my way of thinking, be untangled from price support legislation and receive separate and special attention.

I am opposed to H. R. 12.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] read from a party platform. I do not know that I recall the exact wording, but it was substan-

tially that "we favor paying full parity on all farm products to the small and middle-sized farmers." Was that not substantially what they proposed?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. That was the platform of the Communist Party.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. Let me read you this:

> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices on all farm products in the market place.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that the Communist platform?

Mr. POAGE. Oh no; no, no. That is the Republican platform, the platform of the last Republican convention. That is what I am reading. It is almost word for word the same as the Communist platform which the gentleman quoted, but that was the Republican platform that I read to you.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. No, I only have 15 minutes, I cannot yield at this time. I have read you the Republican platform. You do not deny it? That is the one you were elected on. That is your platform. That is what you told the people you were in favor of. And this afternoon you come before this House and try to insinuate that those of us who want to do what your platform says we should do are in league with the Communists.

I deeply regret that any Member of this House should come in here and try to show a connection between the Communist Party on the one hand and those of us on the other hand who try to support the same basic principle that both of the great parties of America announced in the last presidential campaign. So much for this unwarranted insinuation.

I want to discuss some of the other things that have heretofore been mentioned. There was some discussion here earlier today to the effect that we had not given these flexible programs a fair chance to be tried; that the program had been adopted last year and that we had not tried it, so we ought to put it into effect.

I remember some years ago down in my country there was a man who got the idea that his place was being eaten up by mice and that the thing to do to get rid of them was to use some snakes. There was a reptile institute down in San Antonio and he ordered some chicken snakes from this reptile institute. Somehow or other they got the order all mixed up and they sent him a couple of rattlesnakes. Do you think he ought to have given those rattlesnakes a chance to be tried as mousers? He never did. He killed them. He killed them just as quickly as he could get at them because he knew what rattlesnakes would do to him. He did not know whether they were good mousers or not. Maybe rattlesnakes are the best mice eradicators in the world. I do not know and neither did my friend who bought them, because he killed them.

I do not want to pass judgment on this flexible program in all of its details, but I know what it has done to my people, because in spite of the erroneous statement that has been made, we have given this flexible program a trial. We tried it for 23 long years on most farm commodities. There have been but 6 commodities on which we have had firm 90-percent supports. And on those 6 as of February 28, 1953, according to Mr. Benson's own published statement, we had a loss of $326 million, every dollar of which has developed since the present Secretary took office. According to his own statement, the total loss during that same 23 years, the total losses of the same nature, was $3,800,000,000 of which only $300 million was chargeable to the 6 basic commodities that were supported at 90 percent of parity. That means that there was 11 times as much loss on those commodities that were under the flexible program than we suffered on the commodities that were supported on the firm, 90 percent basis. So do not tell me that we have not tried the flexible program. We have tried it and it has darned near killed us. And I am not going to keep it around the place in the hope it may eradicate mice. I am going to get rid of it, if I can, just as that old man killed the rattlesnake because I know what it will do to me. I know what it has done to my people.

I believe it was the distinguished and learned whip of the minority party who got up here and made some sort of statement to the effect that farmers have taken such terrible drops in their prices under the 90-percent program. Let us see what losses we have taken and under what program we took them. Let us remember that we did not have the 90-percent program in effect on most agricultural products.

Let us look at the three groups:

We supported wheat under the 90-percent program; did we not? And in 1952 wheat brought $2.07 a bushel. Two years later wheat brought $2.08 a bushel, up 1 cent, or a gain of about half of 1 percent.

Cotton in 1952 was supported at 90 percent and brought 37 cents and in 1954 it was down to $0.3467, a loss of 2.5 cents, or about 7 percent.

Corn was supported at 90 percent. In 1952 it was $1.53. It dropped to $1.45 2 years later, or about 6 percent.

Let us see what happened under the flexible program which some of our friends think has not been tried. Most of our commodities were under the sliding or flexible program, and that is where we took a real whipping.

Milk was under the flexible or sliding scale. Milk in 1952 brought $4.14 and in 1954 it brought $3.24, or a drop of 90 cents, about 25 percent.

Grain sorghums were on a sliding scale. They dropped from $2.87 to $2.14, down 73 cents, or roughly 22 percent.

Soybeans were sliding. They dropped from $2.71 to $2.54, or 17 cents a bushel during that time. That is what happened under your flexible program.

Under no supports what happened? We did not have any supports underneath cattle and they dropped from $21.40 to $14.60, or around a 27-percent drop, in spite of the beef-purchase program.

Eggs did not have any supports during that period of time and they dropped from 50.3 cents to 32.4 cents, a decline of 17 cents, or something like 32 percent.

Potatoes did not have any support during that period either, and they dropped from $2.10 in 1952 to 93 cents in 1954, a drop of possibly 55 percent during that period of time.

Yet the gentlemen would have this House believe that the 90-percent supports did not do anybody any good. I submit there was not 1 of the commodities under the 90 percent that dropped as much as 10 percent, and yet the flexible commodities fared nearly as badly as those with no support.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman did not mention the fact that, during the last 14 months since the beginning of this psychological warfare for lower price supports on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and the serious consideration of flexible price supports, the total value of hog production in America decreased on an annual basis by $1,700,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. That is right; another flexible support.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I firmly believe that the continuous urging of the Secretary for lower supports upon our basics has reacted against perishables created from these basics.

Mr. POAGE. Where you lacked 90 percent firm support under your prices we have suffered some disastrous drops. But I submit that we have not had that kind of disastrous drop where you maintained 90 percent firm support. You cannot have it and you will not have it. We can peddle that flexible price support medicine, but we have had all we want of it, and we do not want any more of it.

These gentleman have suggested that if you will take this flexible price support you can get rid of production controls. That was the intimation that was given in every speech the Secretary of Agriculture made. He has now said it in plain words, because when he came before our committee and we asked him in so many words he said, "Yes, I will have to have exactly the same controls for 75 percent of parity that I have to have for 90." He was honest when we pinned him down on it.

He left the intimation that he was going to do something about controls, but no Secretary of Agriculture in the history of America has ever laid as heavy a yoke on the neck of the American farmer as the present Secretary has in enforcing production controls under his present flexible program.

Nor will this program in anywise reduce the great surpluses about which some of the distinguished proponents of this bill have come here and moaned at this bench. It will not have a thing in the world to do with surpluses at least until it has starved a lot of farmers off the farm because these 6 basic commodities are produced in large measure only

in areas that are suited only to the growing of those crops. That is why we selected them as basic. Wheat is absolutely basic to Eastern Colorado and you cannot grow tobacco or asparagus no matter how much you would want to. Tobacco is basic to eastern North Carolina and you cannot grow grain sorghums or rice no matter how much you want to and make a living on it. Peanuts are basic to the sandy land of the South. There is no substitute cash crop in the areas where they are grown. Each of these commodities is basic in the area in which it is grown. The farmer cannot change his crops and that is the reason he has not changed. The only way he has of getting a larger amount of money to feed his children is to grow more of the basic commodity, and the Secretary of Agriculture admitted frankly to us that if you took off all controls and supported the price at 75 percent of parity, you would have just as much grown as you would have at 90 percent of parity, and everybody who has followed farm statistics knows that that is the truth.

So you are not going to change anything about either controls or about your surpluses by passing this bill. All you are going to touch is the income of the farmers. That is the only thing you are going to affect. Do not let anybody tell you that those who come in now and who are proposing this flexible program have something new and unheard of. They have the same program that we have been using for 23 years except they propose to give the farmers less. The only difference is one of price, not of principle; but that difference in price may well mean the difference in success and bankruptcy to the farmer. I understood we established this program in order to establish buying power on the farms and yet some of the opponents of this bill can't tell you right now whether they want to leave the farmer 82½ percent of a fair price, or whether they are going to vote with Mr. Benson to cut farm buying power down to 75 percent. They haven't yet had the word from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

I doubt that even the gentleman from Nebraska who preceded me can at this stage tell us whether he is now in favor of his own compromise. Maybe he is coming in now to pull the rug all the way out from under the farmer. Last year he came in and said, "Oh, that would be terrible. You should not go the whole length. Give the farmer 82.5 percent of a fair price for 1 year. Let us just split the difference, boys." And, of course, there were enough who were looking for some excuse to vote against this bill who did split the difference. You may not have that chance now. No, unless you can hear from Mr. Halleck you do not have that chance. You are voting now either for 75 percent which means disaster for the farmers and everybody knows it, or you are voting for 90 percent.

This Congress has never been able to go through with 75 percent for farm prices. There has never been a time in our history when we let the average of farm prices drop as low as 75 percent of parity, that the whole Nation did not suffer a grievous disaster. You had better think about it.

Let us see if you people are going to put this matter squarely before us and actually have a clear cut test of 90 percent or 75 percent. I want to see just what you will do tomorrow. I want to see the nerve of those people who say that they are in favor of cutting the support for farmers. How far are you going to go with it? Are you going to dare to bring about another depression such as we had in the twenties?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania openly and boldly advocated lowering prices to a disastrous level.

Mr. POAGE. Right. I want to tip my hat to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] because he has always come in and fairly and frankly said that he was just opposed to doing anything and that he did not believe in doing anying for the farmers. He says he just did not believe in doing it and by the eternal, he was not going to do it. Let us see if the rest of the opponents of this bill are as frank as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING]. If you will take a stand, I will admire your spirit even if I do not agree with your judgment. Either it is good or it is bad. You are not going to eliminate surpluses by voting against this bill. You are not going to reduce controls. What you are doing is reducing the buying power of the farmers and that is all you are going to do if you beat this bill. It is going to affect everybody in this country and not simply the farmers. It is going to affect all of us because the farmer is the man who puts the money into circulation which buys the products of industry and it is the farmer who produces the wealth which enables us to step our economy up higher and higher every year. It is the farmer who produces the new wealth that the rest of us simply work upon. We take what the farmer has produced. We change it. We make it more valuable. We transport it. We make it more usable, but we never change the fact that the farmer is the man who brings all the new wealth into this country. Do not destroy that farmer's buying power if you want prosperity for yourself and for your people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the provisions of H. R. 12, which would set up a multiple or three-price plan for wheat, will be eliminated from the bill through committee amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. Suffice it to say that I could not, under any circumstances, support the bill with such a provision in it. The dumping of cheap wheat in our corn and grain area would prove demoralizing, to say the least. The effect of such dumping operations would mean lower prices for our corn and feed grains, which naturally would be reflected in lower prices for hogs and cattle. No corn or other feed grain producers can complain if wheat producers wish to compete for feed grain markets on an equal basis, but when the wheat producers are guaranteed a profitable price in a protected market for half their production they are not competing on equal terms in the feed grain market—they are being subsidized by consumers of wheat as food, so that they can sell wheat for feed cheaper. This is unfair and discriminatory competition, and I therefore am glad that the wheat section will be out of the bill.

I am one of those who firmly believes that agriculture is the Nation's basic industry and that the prosperity of our entire economy depends upon the prosperity of the American farmer. Farm income has dropped 18 percent in 4 years and is still on a downward trend. In a recent farm cost report the Department of Agriculture noted a 4-percent decline in the farm parity ratio from the last quarter of 1953 to the last quarter of 1954. It said "almost all" of the decline was due to lower prices farmers received for their crops. The cost of living and of production items the farmer had to buy meanwhile rose about 1 percent during the same period. Farm income may go down another 4 percent this year, judging from all the information I can accumulate on the subject. Strange to say, the farmer is the only individual in our entire economy whose income is going down while the income of every other segment of our economy is going up. In this connection I want to call your attention to the last report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report No. 60 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, dated March 14, 1955. On page 32 of that report you will find the following:

> The basic purpose of agricultural supports is the protection of farm income.

The committee also reiterates a part of the committee statement on agricultural policy of a year ago, as follows:

> With the prospects of an agricultural industry growing less rapidly than the remainder of the economy, the Nation may well grow up to the levels of its present production in the not-to-distant future. Instead of a program of contraction it would seem desirable, therefore, that present policy should be directed to solving surplus problems in the years immediately ahead, scrupulously avoiding all policies which might lead to curtailment of our agricultural productive capacity. On neither a humanistic nor economic basis does it seem wise to limit production or feel unduly concerned over surpluses until all possibilities for expanded markets and increased consumption have been exhausted. We recommend an aggressive policy for discovering added domestic and foreign markets for these surpluses and for future production so far as possible through the discovery of new uses, industrial or otherwise. The nonmarket disposition of surpluses to institutions for the needy, school lunches, and foreign relief should be stepped up.

The farmer is rather unique in our economy. He has nothing to say about the cost of the things he has to buy. Someone else sets the price for his plow, tractor, or combine. Someone else fixes the wages he is required to pay his hired

help, such wages usually being fixed by competition with high wages in the city. Someone else fixes the farmer's taxes, determines the amount of his insurance, and his costs of transportation. Someone else tells him what he has to pay for his feeder cattle and other livestock which is not raised on the farm. In short, the farmer usually pays whatever the seller demands.

On the other side of the picture the farmer has very little, if anything, to say about the price of the things he has to sell. When he takes his cattle to the livestock market at Sioux City or Chicago, he takes what the buyers offer him. If he does not like the price his alternative is to take the cattle back to the farm. Usually he thinks twice before doing this. He takes his cattle to market when they are fat and ready to sell. Keeping them for any length of time thereafter simply is not good business. So it goes when the farmer hauls his grain to the country elevator. Upon delivery he takes what the elevator operator offers him. If he does not like the price he has the privilege of taking the grain back to the farm. The point I want to emphasize is that almost everyone except the farmer himself determines the price of the things he buys and the things he has to sell.

Keeping in mind that the farmer is really in a cost-price squeeze, please remember that he is the same fellow who is being called upon to provide the food and fiber not only for the people of the United States but for many other areas of the world. I have yet to hear anyone advocate that we here in America should reduce our standard of living. We all like to eat "high on the hog." Today the American farmer is feeding 160 million people in the United States alone. It is estimated that at our present rate of growth we will have approximately 175 million people in the United States by the year 1960. We have a hungry world on our hands and from all the information I can gather, the world's population is increasing more rapidly than the world's food supply. This fact should cause us to stop, look, and listen when we discuss the problem of farm surpluses. The growing world population means that if people are to be fed the farmer must produce more agricultural products rather than less in the years that lie ahead. With few exceptions we have already reached the saturation point as far as new farmland is concerned, so if we are to expand production to meet an expanded population we will have to increase the productivity of the land we now have.

We hear much discussion these days about farm surpluses and I frankly admit they do present an aggravating problem in many instances. By and large, however, I would rather have an economy of abundance than an economy of scarcity, world conditions being what they are today. A new war, a poor growing season or a drought might well wipe out the surpluses we have almost overnight. We do not want a burdensome carryover to depress the market but, at the same time, we must have a reserve of farm products adequate enough to meet any emergency which may arise. This truth makes it doubly important that we work out a program of balanced farm production which is realistic in every sense of the word. A program of balanced farm production can only be carried out successfully if the farmer has some assurance of a stable income. If the farmer is to produce the food necessary for world needs and our growing population, he certainly is entitled to some protection for his capital investment and the additional outlay of money needed to meet production goals.

Incidentally, in discussing farm surpluses do not forget that the farmer himself is not to blame for the surplus problem today. The surpluses accumulated because the Federal Government throughout the war years called upon the farmer to produce and to produce. I also want to point out that during the last administration when the Federal Government in the light of growing surpluses could have restricted production under laws now on the statute books, it completely failed and refused to do so.

Throughout the past several years both political parties have endorsed price-support programs for American agriculture. Farm legislation in the Congress has quite generally been enacted on a nonpartisan basis. In fact, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives knows no party lines. It is our objective to legislate for the welfare of the American farmer and our economy in general. We want to do what is right and fair and just without any political considerations whatsoever. Agricultural leaders in this country today are agreed that farm price supports should continue. The only differences arise on the question of methods and programs. Everybody knows that the most extensive programs to stabilize agricultural prices have been in the field of price support through government loans and purchases. Success has been rather satisfactory in the field of the basic commodities. However, our experience with some of the perishable products has caused us a great deal of embarrassment and trouble as well as a lot of money. We want to avoid the mistakes of the past if we can. The basic ideas behind our price-support programs has been the adjustment of production and marketing to the demands of consumers. Some contend there should be no control over the production and marketing of farm products. On the other hand, farmers themselves have not objected too seriously to the imposition of controls when necessary. In discussing controls on production we are prone to forget that compulsory controls cannot be put into force and effect until the question of marketing quotas, for instance, has been submitted to a referendum on the part of the farmers themselves. It should be specifically pointed out that such controls do not go into effect unless two-thirds or more of those voting approve the program. I am quite sure the American farmer would much rather get along without any controls but he well knows that if disastrous price drops are to be avoided he must hold production somewhere in line with demand.

We have been very much remiss in our public relations as between farmers and consumers. In all due respect to the consumers of the country they do not always fully understand farm legislation. They have the impression that the farmer is responsible for the high cost of food and no one is doing very much to dispel that idea. It is my firm conviction that we who are most interested in the farmer's problems can do a much better job of public relations in bringing the facts and the truth to the consuming public.

I would like to point out that food is the biggest bargain of the year 1955. Fewer hours of work buy more food now and better food than ever before. The world should know and certainly the consumer should be advised that out of each dollar the consumer receives as his income only 26 cents is used for food. The other 74 cents can be used for other things. Of the $1 the consumer spends for food farmers get only 45 cents. Thus less than 12 percent of consumer income reaches the farmer.

If farmers gave away their wheat the price of bread would only fall less than 3 cents a loaf. Not only do consumers now get more food for an hour's wage but they get more convenience, wider selections and better quality. The consumer has a wide selection of farm products. He can buy breasts of chicken or he can buy only chicken legs or livers. He can select his vegetables and meats wrapped in individual transparent packages. He can buy his milk in paper cartons with no bottles to return. Few farmers, however, get any of the money that these extra services cost.

Only a part of the food sold over the grocery counter comes from supported farm crops. Much publicity is given to farm subsidies. Some people like to magnify the situation and take great delight in giving misleading information to the country about the cost of our farm programs. Farmers are by no means the only group who have received Federal support at taxpayers' expense. Let us not forget the subsidies to business, the railroads, the airlines, the shipping industry and the subsidy granted to labor by providing a minimum wage. It has been widely publicized that the farm programs cost the Nation over $16 billion. When the figure is broken down it is disclosed that this sum includes the cost of all work of the Department of Agriculture, including research, education, REA, credit and everything else. Expenditures for support of basic farm products are entirely a different matter as already has been pointed out.

Consumers can depend on it that their jobs will disappear if farm returns for foodstuffs fall to nonprofit levels. Agriculture's purchasing power creates high employment as sure as general prosperity helps agricultural sales. Farmers today produce so abundantly that 85 percent of our population can choose other kinds of jobs. If farmers were not so efficient, a lot more people would have to go to work on the farm. This is an efficiency that since before the war has increased farm output by 40 percent, doing the job with 17 percent less labor. There

should be a better understanding between the farmer and the consumer. In the last analysis we are all farmers because we are all so dependent upon the fruits of the soil.

In some respects, the question of farm-price supports on basic agricultural commodities has become more or less of a moot question. It is contended, for instance, that those of us from the corn producing area have nothing to worry about in that the parity on corn is about 87 percent of parity at the present time and may even reach 90 percent. So they say the controversy between the advocates of those who favor a 90-percent support level and those who favor a flexible support level of from 82½ percent to 90 percent, or from 75 percent to 90 percent, are arguing about something which in the last analysis becomes only a matter of small degree. The thing, however, with which we should be concerned is that when the present law providing for an 82½ percent level expires at the end of this year, we will once more be confronted with a 75 to 90 percent provision under the basic law. What the situation will be under such formula for the crop year 1956, or thereafter, especially during a period of further decline in farm prices, is anyone's guess.

No one seriously contends that flexible price supports will alleviate our surplus problem. The most the Secretary of Agriculture has said on this subject is that he thinks the flexible plan will help, but he in no wise contends that it will be a solution of our surplus problem. Neither does anyone seriously contend that rigid controls will not have to be imposed simply because a flexible plan is in force and effect. On the other hand, all agree that our problem is really one of faulty distribution and marketing methods, and we are all agreed that we should dispose of our surplus agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible.

Perhaps, therefore, there is not very much difference between those who support the 90-percent formula and those who contend that the flexible plan is the solution of our farm problem. I dare say agriculture will survive regardless of which plan ultimately remains the basic law of this country. The concern I have is that the flexible scale will eventually result in less income to the American farmer, and I think this is a thing we all want to avoid.

It is my impression that whenever a farmer's income is reduced or whenever he is limited in acreage for the production of his crops, he will augment his income by trying to produce more crops on less acres. This he will do through the use of fertilizer and through more intensive cultivation of the acres left in production. No man is going to sit idly by and see his income reduced if there is anything in the world he can do to avoid it.

To say the least, the question of price supports for basic agricultural commodities is usually a hot subject. The so-called farm problem has been with us for a long time. This legislation will not solve it. The rank and file of our farmers are divided on the subject. The leading farm organizations themselves do not agree. In view of all this uncertainty I do not see how anyone can be a party to further reducing the farmer's income during a period of already declining farm prices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of the House of Representatives both from the viewpoint of the district he represents and from the soundness of his line of reasoning better prepared than the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] to discuss this particular question.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, the greatest threat to our national economy today is the agricultural depression. Times are already hard for the American farmer. They are going to get a lot harder if we do not pass H. R. 12, the bill before us to stabilize price supports on basic commodities. We cannot afford to settle for less than 90 percent of parity, and we must not allow the further depression of milk supports for another year.

The economic plight of the farmers in this country may not be worrying the millionaire leaders in the Republican administration, but, believe me, it is worrying some of the rest of us.

The farmers are being forced to grow less, and at the same time they are being paid less for the crops they do grow. But the cost of things they must buy stays high. That sequence spells financial trouble.

The facts are that farm income is down 28 percent since 1947. Almost a third of that drop has occurred during the past year.

Under the policies of this administration, the farmer's share of our national income is at the lowest point in history.

The farmer's purchasing power is the lowest it has been in 15 years. His per capita income is less than half of other citizens.

Farm mortgage debt is increasing.

Farm foreclosures and forced sales are up 40 percent.

The value of farm assets has dropped $10½ billion in a little over 3 years.

Tens of thousands of beginning farmers and underfinanced farmers are at or beyond the point of insolvency and could not liquidate out if required to do so.

In short, the economic plight of the farmer recalls the twenties when the slump in agriculture was the forerunner of the great slump which engulfed us all.

THE SLUMP IN IDAHO

In Idaho, the farm slump pushed farm income down $55 million, or 15 percent, from 1952 through 1954. Production costs declined only about 2 percent during this period.

Since it is estimated there are more than 40,000 farms in Idaho, this means a decline in receipts of over $1,300 for each Idaho farm.

That is a heavy loss in a small State. Our dairy farmers have been particularly hard hit.

I have just received some revealing figures from Mr. C. M. Carlson, manager of the Dairymen's Co-op Creamery of Boise Valley, at Caldwell, Idaho. This creamery is located in my own home county—Canyon County.

Mr. Carlson reports that the cut in price-support levels on dairy products from 90 to 75 percent in fiscal 1954, resulted in a drop in income to this creamery's milk producers of a little under a million dollars.

And this is only one creamery—only one creamery in one county.

Mr. Carlson estimates that in the two counties embraced in the Boise Valley—Canyon and Ada Counties—the combined loss to dairy farmers on milk production was a little under $2 million. The loss to dairy farmers in the State of Idaho during this period is an estimated $5¾ million.

It is further estimated that since the drop in dairy price supports went into effect, the value of the cow population in Canyon and Ada Counties has declined about $4½ million, and the value of dairy cows in the whole State of Idaho has been reduced almost $20 million.

And let me remind you that what is happening to the dairy industry in Idaho is happening all over the Nation. I do not think we can afford it.

THE WHEAT AND COTTON STORY

The House Agriculture Committee tells me that in 1953, the Nation's wheat farmers received over $2 billion for their crop. Under the farm law enacted by the last Congress, which cut their price support from 90 to 82½ percent of parity, and because of curtailment of acreage to reduce wheat surpluses, it is estimated they will receive only about a billion and a half for their 1955 crop. In other words, the wheat farmer will lose about a half billion dollars this year.

The committee further informs me that the country's cotton farmers received over $3 billion for their 1953 crop. Assuming normal yields on their reduced acres this year, they will receive only about $1¾ billion. This means if the sliding scale and new parity bill is allowed to go into effect, the cotton farmer faces a slash of over 40 percent in his income.

LOWER SUPPORTS MEAN LOWER INCOME

Mr. Chairman, opponents of fixed 90 percent price supports point out that the decline in farm income has developed under the fixed-price support program. This is true. The flexible price support program voted by the last Congress has not yet gone into effect.

However, I cannot see the logic of supplanting a high, fixed price-support program with a lower, flexible price-support program. To me it is inescapable that lower price supports would mean lower farm income. The farmer is already in enough trouble—why make it worse?

Leaders of labor organizations recognized the interrelationship of employment and unemployment to the prosperity of agriculture in an historic appearance before the House Agriculture

Committee when this bill was under consideration. They know that a depression in agriculture directly and quickly affects other industrial activities, because farmers are tremendous consumers of industrial products.

A recent Public Affairs Institute study shows, for example, that farmers use 16.6 percent of all petroleum products, more than any other industry. Farmers use 9 percent of steel, more than the automobile industry. They use over 12 percent of chemicals. They use 20 percent more rubber products each year than is required to put five tires on every new car manufactured.

Bankrupt the farmers of America and you bankrupt the whole American economy.

HIGH SUPPORTS COST LITTLE

It should be clear to all of us, whether we represent a rural or an urban district, that Congress must heed the plight of agriculture. Consumers, businessmen, labor are all affected by the farm decline. Reinstating 90 percent supports will not be a great expense. Twenty years of farm price supports cost the Nation only $1 billion, and the bulk of these funds were lost on nonbasics.

The farmers have reduced their acreage of basic crops. They are—by their own choice and vote—adjusting production to peacetime size. They will balance supplies with need at their own loss. There should be comparatively little ultimate loss in the handling of surpluses during the adjustment period.

DAIRY SUPPORTS

The dairy provision in this bill prevents the Secretary of Agriculture from making any further reduction in dairy price supports. As you all know, about a year ago, Secretary Benson lowered the support of dairy products from 90 to 75 percent of parity—theoretically the lowest he could go. He also lowered the parity base, and as a result the 75 percent of old parity for manufacturing milk became 80 percent of the new parity on a dollars-and-cents basis—and that is the figure which is in effect today.

Because of changing the parity base, the Secretary still has the authority to lower the figure another 5 percent. Passage of this bill would prevent him from doing so.

In my opinion, dairy supports should go to 90 percent of parity. But certainly a Secretary of Agriculture who regards the present agricultural situation as "good" should not have the authority to reduce supports lower than they are right now.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

I am particularly pleased that this bill authorizes an increase from $50 to $75 million in the appropriation authorization for school milk.

The school-lunch, school-milk program is an outstanding example of the right approach to our so-called farm surpluses: their use to improve human health and welfare, rather than nonproduction or waste.

There is no real food surplus in this Nation, nor in the world today. With proper distribution, all the food and fiber man can produce is needed or can be used.

What this Congress should be doing is to find ways to get to the people of America, and around the world, proper foods for good nutrition. We should be considering a domestic food allotment bill, and other measures which will adjust the distributive machinery in this Nation, and around the world, so we can banish want.

Certainly our farmers should not be penalized—and hundreds of thousands of them ruined financially—simply because we are readjusting from defense to peacetime production, or because we have failed to move as swiftly as we should to establish the "freedom from want" held out as a goal in the World War II period.

In all equity to the farm producers of the Nation, price supports should be restored to the 90-percent level. Beyond equity to the farmer, we must face the fact that our total national economy cannot long be sustained at its present level if a large segment of that economy continues to face hard, and still harder times.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the House is again considering legislation which is designed to protect the producers and consumers of this Nation of food and fiber. This is not a new question nor is the decision reached with respect to this piece of legislation—H. R. 12—likely to mark the end of the problem.

Within the past 2 years it has been my endeavor to review the history of agricultural legislation extending over more than a 30-year period. During that period a few basic conclusions seem to have been accepted by about all segments of our economy. They are as follows:

First. Agricultural prosperity is fundamental to the national prosperity;

Second. Agricultural resources must be maintained to insure future well being;

Third. Voluntary or cooperative efforts by farmers are insufficient to gear production efforts to consumer demand;

Fourth. A survival system within agriculture is impractical when other segments of the economy are sustained either directly or indirectly by legal devices.

Fifth. Any effort to maintain farm income must take into consideration market demand and fair prices as well as regular supply to consumers;

Sixth. Programs for price support must be acceptable to farmers and any restriction placed upon production or marketing, be sustained by referendum of the producers of each specific commodity;

Seventh. For certain commodities, an export market is important, not only to the producers of the specific commodity, but also as a part of our international trade pattern; and

Eighth. In considering individual farm price-support programs as well as the whole program, the way should be left open for technological improvements to expand farm markets and increase farm income.

It took many years of debate and trial and error to prove that a voluntary or cooperative system of controls would not work; our predecessors in the Congress in the 1920's reached this conclusion but were opposed by the President and Secretary of Agriculture successfully. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Jardine aided by the then Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, were fundamentally opposed to any effort to regulate the production of agricultural products by legal device.

In their opposition, however, let it be said that they were encouraged by influential farmers who were reluctant to accept controls over their production. Many doubted whether it could be done. It took a devastating depression with all its impact upon the social and even constitutional makeup of our country to cause an about-face on the issue. Today there seems to be general agreement that we should have a program, but there remains differences of opinion as to how it should be implemented.

Mr. HOPE, former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has often said that the farm problem is not a single one, but a total of many in which the various divisions may have even conflicting interests. It is likewise true that it is difficult to devise one treatment which will apply equally well to all divisions. Yet it is impractical, if not impossible to legislate for each individual commodity.

World War II and the Korean conflict created artificial demands for both wheat and cotton, two of the basic commodities of the Nation. The producers of both wheat and cotton are dependent primarily upon their income from the sale of these products or in other words, they are in a one-crop economy.

In both cases, the advent of modern power equipment, better variety and fertility availability and high price incentive stimulated the production. This lasted long enough that the pattern became established, indeed great sections had their farms and equipment capitalized on the basis of the abnormal production and price pattern.

Two other crops, rice and peanuts, which are basic to their area of production, became important too, and were included in the list of so-called basic crops. Of these two, rice also depends for a portion of its market upon export demand. But of all six basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—the big problem has come to be one of fats and oils. This does not apply to wheat, rice, or tobacco, however; these crops except wheat have not become problem crops yet. But cottonseed oil, peanut oil, and a nonbasic but highly important crop, soybeans—soybean oil—are in competition with one another and all are in competition with both corn oil and livestock fats or oils, which are the result of converting corn into a more marketable form. The livestock fats and oils—lard, tallow, butter—also compete with one another as well as vegetable oils and, to a great extent, represent the troublesome phase of the surplus problem.

As if this were not complicated enough, we have witnessed the impact upon the standard foods and fibers of chemically

produced synthetics which are giving the consumers a wider choice and the farmer headaches.

So, we come to the question posed in the legislation before us and, when acted upon, will determine whether we will try to support the various basic farm commodities at 90 percent or allow a range of support at from 75 to 90 percent in 1956 and thereafter. There is sharp division among farmers, among Members of Congress, and consumers, too, as to which will be best in the long run. While I would not question the sincerity of any Member's conviction on this issue, it seems to me that we ought to approach the problem without prejudices or temper.

CORN'S PLACE IN AGRICULTURE

Corn is the most valuable, in terms of dollar value at least, of all crops produced in the United States.

Corn is technically a basic crop and a real basic crop as well. It is the foundation of our livestock industry. While about 80 percent of corn is fed, on the farm or area where it is produced, to livestock, the remaining 20 percent becomes a factor in the processing and industrial phases of our economy.

The on-the-farm value of our annual corn crop is approximately $5 billion.

There are several factors which should be given consideration in determining a long-range price-support program for corn. The following are some of them:

Corn is unique among our farm crops, at least our major ones in this respect.

Very little corn is imported and a very small percentage is exported so that it is not dependent upon an uncertain and varying demand abroad for its use. This fact alone has caused corn to be less of a problem than most of our major farm products.

Any recent increases in acreage of a given commodity, particularly basic ones, have been used as a yardstick to show that the price support was an artificial inducement to production. Let us look at corn acreage and see whether it applies:

Within the past 45 years—since 1909—there have been ups and downs in the corn acreage but the trend has been steadily downward since 1932. The year 1932 was the highest within this period when we had 113 million acres. The depression years were high-acreage years, for it was during this period that farmers were trying to meet their fixed costs by greater and ever greater production. By 1944 the acreage had dropped to 95½ million acres. Since then the acres have continued to drop until 1954 when it was down to 81 million.

Production to meet the needs of the livestock industry has been adequate because of better seed varieties—hybrid—better equipment, and more know-how.

Corn is grown in 44 of the 48 States but 4 States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa—produce half of the average crop.

While about four-fifths or 80 percent of the corn crop is fed to livestock on the farm or immediate area where it is produced, the wide variety of uses gives it considerable flexibility. This flexibility has made for stability both to the corn producer and feeder. However, there is considerable fluctuation from year to year in the consumption of corn.

The corn support and storage program has helped the corn grower by stabilizing the price from year to year. It has helped the feeder by providing a dependable supply. And it has served the ultimate consumer by providing a better and more stable supply of food from livestock sources.

Corn marketing quotas would appear to be impractical. The reason—less than one-fifth of the crop ever goes through a commercial marketing channel. In certain sections of the Corn Belt such as prevails in northwest Indiana corn is grown as a cash crop and sold for commercial use. In these areas the corn acreage can be partially controlled since a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—can be denied unless acreage allotments are observed. Since this is the corn that might glut the commercial market and thus disrupt the market for all the crop, the present system works effectively in actual practice although it might not seem so as a matter of theory.

The present law has been in effect with modifications since 1938, or 16 years. During that period corn has not been a problem.

The program has, however, worked effectively to support the livestock industry and helped to stabilize the farm income of the Middle West.

UP-TO-DATE PARITY

The present basis for parity is the cost during the 1910–14 period of producing corn, translated into modern prices the farmers have to pay. But, there has been substantial improvement in recent years in the method of production. As a consequence the time required to produce a bushel has dropped significantly. More expensive equipment and land is, however, involved.

Taking these factors into consideration the cost has dropped about 10 percent from the old parity formula. This is a factual, not a policy, proposition and was so acknowledged by the committee.

I, therefore, endorse the application of the modern parity formula as it would apply to corn. This would drop the support price in round figures from $1.60 to $1.45 per bushel.

CORN SUPPORTS CANNING CROPS AND FEED GRAINS

Another important service the corn price support program has rendered has seldom been recognized. This was demonstrated to me during our committee hearings.

An official of one of the large canning organizations was testifying. I asked him the question as to the contract price for canning crops with relation to the price of corn. He quite frankly stated that the contract price for canning crops was governed directly by the price of corn.

Since a very large share of the canning crops of the Nation are produced in the Corn Belt, it is understandable why this should happen. If the price of corn is reduced materially, so will the contract price for canning crops. With the price of corn somewhat stabilized, and since it is the predominant portion of our feed grains, it becomes the support indirectly of all feed grains. Oats, for example, will assume a price in proportion to its feeding value as compared with corn.

SUMMATION ON CORN

First. Corn is not an export or import problem.

Second. Corn acreage is steadily going down; corn prices are apparently not stimulating artificial production.

Third. Weather is the greatest determining factor in the production of corn.

Fourth. The use of corn gives it great flexibility, giving the law of supply and demand an ample chance to operate.

Fifth. Due to the fact that four-fifths of the corn crop is used on the farm and never goes into commercial channels, marketing quotas are impractical.

Sixth. Corn has not been a problem crop; in other words, the present law has worked effectively. The most important function of the corn program has been the storage provision. This helped adjust the supply to the demand and leveled the lean and big crops.

Seventh. Modernized parity has been adopted for corn, thereby using an up-to-date figure for the average cost of production.

Eighth. The corn price-support program has helped to support the price of other feed grains as well as canning crops.

The farm program is a difficult problem to solve. Some farmers would have no farm program, being willing to take their chances on survival.

Most of these farmers would prefer to undergo a depression if necessary rather than be subject to control over production. Much as I admire this hardy spirit which has always been typical of the farmers of Indiana, I would be forced to conclude that as long as the Government has provided floors to protect workers and provide wage supports, that agriculture could not survive on a different basis.

Unfortunately, an agricultural economy based on a survival system would eventually be reflected upon the welfare of the soil itself. A farmer would go to almost any length in order to survive, even to the length of mining the soil. So it is not alone a question of what is best for this immediate generation, but we must also consider the future ones.

The ideal farm program will give the maximum protection with a minimum of controls. The corn program has served in such a fashion, but wheat and cotton have developed surplus problems. Until the abnormal surpluses of wheat and cotton are dispersed or consumption increased, the producers of these commodities may expect to have acreage controls or disastrously low prices.

It has been said so often it seems unnecessary to repeat it that the consumer's dollar buys more food today in terms of hours spent earning it than 20 years ago. Even so, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is now less than half. The cost of living has been rising for the last 6 years, while the farmer's prices have not kept pace.

It has been my goal to help pass legislation which will maintain the prosperity of the farmer and thereby the country without placing undue shackles on the farmer himself. It has also been my goal to try to view the problems of all sections of the country with fairness and equality, not just those of my own district or State.

There is a certain amount of responsibility which should be assumed by the farmer too. Most farmers do not want the Government to do something for them; all they ask is that the rules of the game be fair so that they have a fair chance along with all the rest of the workers of our country.

More and more the farm legislation is looking forward toward greater farmer responsibility and greater not less freedom for the individual. Most agree, however, with the President's assertion that such steps as are taken should be gradual ones and not calculated to crash this most important farm economy of ours.

Bringing together the views of all the farmers as well as consumers and translating them into legislation has been a task.

In the legislation we have passed, it is my judgment we have made considerable progress. To be sure it is not going to suit everybody, in fact I sometimes wonder whether it suits very many. As most controversial pieces of legislation it represents a composite of many views. It does not suit me in some respects.

I had hoped that we might consider the individual commodities on an individual basis for each has its own peculiar problems. I had also hoped that we might enact legislation on a long-range basis not just for 1 year. Times and condition change, so we should be prepared to adjust our thinking and plans accordingly. It is my hope that the service I may have rendered to agriculture will be worth while and that we will all join in an effort to keep our country free and prosperous.

The President's endorsement of the recommendations by Secretary Benson for farmers in the low-income bracket is of supplementary nature to the price-support program under consideration by the House. These farms whose gross income is so low—under $1,000—will not be helped very much by supporting the price of commodities they sell, for they sell such a small volume each year. We do not want to drive farmers with medium to high production records into the low-income bracket either.

As of now, it would appear that wheat is the only commodity likely to be supported at less than 82½ percent in 1956 when the law enacted in 1954 drops the support level to 75 percent. The wheat growers have taken a severe cut in acreage; the present estimated crop for 1955—865 million bushels—is about equal to demand according to best estimates. The acreage will have to remain at its present level until the previously accumulated surplus can be reduced to an amount considered as necessary for a safe reserve. This will mean a reduction from about 1 billion to 400 to 500 million bushels.

It is my recommendation that H. R. 12 be rejected since it will not solve the problems of agriculture. Rigid price supports have served an admirable purpose but with changed domestic and world problems it has too much of a tendency to place the producer in a straitjacket and does not allow enough area for farmers to adjust to varying requirements at the market place. It unfortunately is precluding the farmer from an expanding market, a necessary ingredient for participating in the constantly expanding economy of our country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 12, better known as the 90 percent support program bill for agriculture. Ever since coming to Congress, I have fought, supported, and voted for at least 90 percent of parity for agriculture and shall do so again today.

Generally, Mr. Chairman, our economy is good and once again it is expanding after a slight slowdown shortly after the conclusion of the Korean war. Economic growth is being made at a healthy rate. Production is moving upward. Consumer incomes are increasing and still higher average standards of living are in prospect. The construction industry has entered into its 10th year of continuous expansion. World trade is improving—our exports were up 15 percent last year over the previous year.

Generally speaking, the changeover from war to peace is being achieved today with less irritation to our general economy than at any previous postwar period.

Like the overall economy, agriculture, too, is going through a period of readjustment from war to peace. The change for agriculture, however, has been altogether different from that of our general economy and has been exceedingly painful. This is due primarily to the greater difficulty in adjusting agricultural production. Export markets have been disappearing and surpluses have been piling up. These are just a few of the problems facing agriculture.

In addition, agriculture has been caught in a painful and serious price-cost squeeze. Farmers are paying just as much as ever for what they buy and are receiving less and less for what they sell, which is the best argument for the continuation of the 90-percent support program I know of. In discussing parity, we must always remember that parity is nothing else than a formula that determines price that is considered fair to producer and consumer alike. This being true, we should not content ourselves with 90 percent of parity but should continue our fight until full 100 percent of parity is achieved for the American farmer.

Compared with the Korean high, farm commodity prices are off 25 percent, but farming costs have gone down only 2 percent. That is the trouble that agriculture today finds itself in. If operating costs would come down proportionately with farm prices, you would hear no further complaints from agriculture.

The fact that the rapid drop during the last 2 years of the Truman administration, when parity dropped from 113 percent to 94 percent, has been slowed down is commendable. Nevertheless, that is not enough. The trend has been and is in the wrong direction, and if not reversed trouble lies ahead.

I would be less than honest if I did not admit that I do not see much relief in the immediate future from the price-cost squeeze that agriculture finds itself in. There is no indication that the improved general business that today we enjoy will mean much to farmers. Supplies are so large that a moderate rise in demand will be unlikely to push prices up. On the other hand, prospects for industrial wage increases hold the threat of still higher prices ahead for machinery and other farm supplies, thus continuing the present price-cost squeeze.

This drop in parity and farm prices has been of real concern to everyone in Washington. Historically, we know that depressions are farm led and farm fed. You know that if the farmer is not prospering neither will you. Farm prosperity is directly reflected on the main street, in the factory, and in the offices of the professional man.

A drop in farm income affects everyone, and no one can escape the disastrous results that follow. It has been estimated that a $1 billion drop in farm income results in a drop of $240 million in farm spending for buildings and machinery alone. In that connection, I am sure it would startle all of us if we knew just how many millions of nonfarm people are living on the purchasing power of the farmers. In 1952 farmers purchased over 7 million tons of steel—more than is used for a year's output of passenger cars; 16½ billion gallons of crude oil—more than is used by any other industry; 320 million pounds of raw rubber—enough to put tires on over 6 million cars; 15 billion kilowat-hours of electric power—enough to supply Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston for 1 year. There are owned by farmers in this Nation today 4,400,000 tractors, approximately the same number of cars, and over 2,500,000 trucks.

These are facts over which there is no dispute. Difference of opinion arises only when we come to consider how to meet and solve the problems that arise from the facts.

Admittedly, the farm problem is complicated and even our three major farm organizations hold different views.

It seems most unfortunate to me, particularly at a time when our farmers are caught in this serious price-cost squeeze, that so much bitterness should be generated over only one phase of agriculture, namely rigid versus flexible supports.

It is unfortunate because such a controversy involves farm organizations at a time when all should be pulling together.

It is unfortunate because it has led to name-calling, insinuations and smears. We hear that those who are opposed to flexible supports are expedient and dishonest. Advocates of the

flexible program have been called enemies of the farmer, tools of big business, and just plain stupid.

I believe there is plenty of room for honest differences of opinion. The economists differ, farmers differ and Members of Congress differ. I believe that all of them, no matter which side they take, are sincere and honest in their opinions.

Primarily, it is a question of the best way to do a job—of achieving full parity for agriculture. It is possible that both sides are partly right. Perhaps 90 percent would work out best on some commodities and flexible supports would be best for others. It is also possible that some different plan, such as a two-price system, might work best on still other commodities. I am exceedingly sorry that it was necessary for us to eliminate a two-price trial run on wheat. I have always contended that there was considerable merit to the principles contained in the old McNary-Haugen bill, and I hope that some day we can try it out and see how it works. I don't believe you can have one program and impose it on all of agriculture. In other words, I believe that a commodity-to-commodity approach is the best, always remembering that there is only one permanent solution, that is, new markets, new uses, and better distribution.

This controversy is also unfortunate because the proponents of both systems in their exuberance have distorted and misrepresented the facts.

One of these misrepresentations is that the farmer is to blame for the high cost of living, which had the effect of pitting the consumer against the farmer. This is absolutely untrue. Although farm prices have declined 25 percent from their February 1951 peak, the Bureau of Labor statistics show that during the 1947–49 to 1954 period, the index of retail food prices increased 13 percent. Here are a few examples:

In January 1948, the farm price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 a bushel, and the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was 13.8 cents. Today the farm price of wheat has dropped to $2.14 a bushel, yet the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread has increased to 17.5 cents. Thus, while the price of wheat declined 24 percent, the price of bread has advanced 27 percent. The farm value of the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread is 2.8 cents.

In the last half of 1948, the farm value of the corn in a 12-ounce package of corn flakes was 3.3 cents, and the average retail price was 18.1 cents. In the last half of 1954, the farm value of the corn in this package of corn flakes had dropped to 3 cents, while the average retail price of the corn flakes had jumped to 21.9 cents.

Out of each dollar spent by the American housewife for food, 57 cents now goes for processing, marketing and transportation charges. The farmer receives 43 cents. Of this 43 cents, approximately 30 cents goes to purchase tractors, trucks, plows, gasoline, fertilizer and other supplies required by modern farming. Thus the farmer and his family have only about 13 cents out of each consumer dollar for their work and investment. The farmer's share of the consumer dollar has been dropping in recent years while retail food prices have remained near 1952 peak levels.

Here is another way of looking at the same thing. Today the average factory employee can buy more food for an hour's work than at any other period in the history of the country. The farmer has provided well, and the worker can buy 10.4 pounds of bread for an hour's labor today compared with 6.4 pounds in 1949 and only 3.5 pounds in 1914. Today the worker can buy 2 pounds of steak. In 1929 he could buy only 1.2 pounds, and nine-tenths in 1914, and so on down the line of all foods.

It is also contended that our support program is responsible for our present day surpluses. To this I cannot agree. It is true that wheat particularly is in serious trouble. At the beginning of the current marketing year, the total supply of United States wheat was at the all-time record level of 1,862,000,000 bushels. This includes a carryover of 903 million bushels of former-crop wheat, and a 1954 crop estimate of 959 million bushels. This is enough wheat to carry through to the 1956 harvest—meeting all domestic and export requirements until that time, even if not 1 grain of wheat is harvested in 1955.

This condition does present a problem, but it is not a problem caused by the program or the farmer, but rather by the Government and the administration of the program. In 1952 we had approximately 77 million acres of wheat and Charley Brannan, then the Secretary of Agriculture, pleaded with the farmers to plant every acre because they did not know what was going to happen in Korea. We had a large crop in 1952, as you remember, and at the same time we were also losing foreign markets. In 1953 acreage allotments and marketing quotas should have been put into effect. Secretary Brannan did not call for quotas and allotments, instead he asked farmers to plant 72 million acres. This request was exceeded by 6 million acres and we had another big crop. That is why we have this surplus of wheat.

Talking about surplus, I want to make my stand perfectly plain—we should thank God that we live in a land of plenty rather than in a land of scarcity. True, we have around six or seven billion dollars tied up in food and fiber, but what is so bad about that? Maybe in not too distant a future we will thank our lucky stars we have this surplus. To hear some people talk, you would think we were on the verge of bankruptcy because of the investments of CCC in food and fiber, but you never hear a word about the billions of dollars we have invested in manufactured articles. Last February 17, the Defense Department alone had declared surplus property—not needed now or in the future—totaling in value $8,862,638,000, and mind you, this does not include the billions of dollars they have invested in stockpile materials of every kind, nature, and description.

It has also been charged that the cost of the 90-percent support program for basics has been exorbitant and a drain on the United States Treasury. Once again, how misleading this statement is. In checking the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I find that from October 17, 1933, through February 28, 1955, the total cost of the price-support program for basic commodities totaled only $326,405,477, and the cost of the support program during this period for both basic and nonbasic commodities totaled only $1,959,288,930. During this same period the taxpayers shelled out for subsidies to the users of second and third class mail not $2 billion but $4,489,000,000. From 1931 to 1954, we subsidized the airlines to the sum of $627 million and also the shipping industry for $753 million. Thus, we can see, Mr. Chairman, that even though agriculture has received subsidies it is small in comparison to subsidies paid to other segments of our economy and over which there is no public discussion whatsoever.

I do not want to leave the impression that agriculture has been left to shift for itself. We have seen many fine, concrete programs inaugurated which will be of material assistance to our agricultural economy.

One of these steps was the special school milk program authorized by Congress as a provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954. It provided that up to $100 million of funds be used to increase milk consumption by school children during a 2-year period.

Following that directive, the Department set up the special school milk program, and operations began last September. I know in my own State more than 250 schools are taking part in the program and as of today 140 percent more milk is being used by the school children than a year ago at this time.

We have not tapped the full potential of this program as yet. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today authorizes an appropriation of $75 million annually for this purpose instead of the $50 million heretofore appropriated.

Another progressive step taken to benefit agriculture was the so-called durum wheat bill. This law, Public Law 8, 84th Congress, approved by President Eisenhower on February 19, is giving American producers a much needed opening up of the acreage allotments for durum wheat. Farmers in the durum-wheat area will be allowed to increase their production of this wheat up to the maximum acreage of cropland well suited to wheat production without being in violation of their wheat acreage allotments. Durum wheat under the revised acreage allotment program includes hard Amber Durum, Amber Durum, and Durum of the Class II varieties.

Under another program recently announced by the Department of Agriculture, Midwest farmers are being offered an opportunity to "reseal" for another year any 1954-crop grain they may have stored on their farms under a Commodity Credit Corporation loan or purchase agreement. The announcement was made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson early this spring in order to give farmers a chance to build any additional storage facilities that might be needed to do this and still take care of storage for this year's crops.

Grains eligible for reseal in my home State of South Dakota are wheat, corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, and flaxseed.

In a move of great benefit to South Dakota ranchers, the present administration in cooperation with wool growers has developed a new Federal wool program. It is designed to give growers the most effective help they have ever had. It gives them concrete price encouragement, and strengthens the wool industry as a measure of national security.

Secretary Benson has set the incentive price for wool produced this year at 62 cents a pound. This level guarantees a better return to all wool growers this year and is a realistic approach to the distressing production cost problem facing sheepmen. As is fitting, the funds for operating this new incentive program will come from duties collected on wool imports. With this new program and the sympathetic understanding of their problems by the administration, wool growers can look forward to a new era of increasing economic stability.

And now, I would like to tell you a little about the help that America's farmers are receiving from the Farmers Home Administration. This agency makes a number of different loans that help our farmers develop their farms and carry on efficient business-like farming operations. These loans supplement the credit that is available from local banks.

I want to mention first the soil and water conservation loans. This is a new type of credit which enables farmers to finance irrigation systems and carry out soil conservation practices. Many farmers in South Dakota and elsewhere have had to watch their soil blow away or wash away because they did not have the cash on hand to pay for the necessary conservation measures. That day is fading, however. Farmers and ranchers can now borrow from Farmers Home Administration the funds they need to put these practices into effect immediately. Farmers may borrow up to $25,000 for these purposes and repayments are stretched over a number of years.

America's farmers are also using the production and subsistence loans to a good advantage. These loans go to small farmers and are used to help them develop the kind of sound, balanced farm systems that are necessary to success. They also help young farmers get started on their own. The FHA also makes loans to small farmers to help them buy farms and improve the farms they already own.

The agency provides a line of emergency credit, also. In the past few years loans from the Farmers Home Administration have helped more than 4,000 South Dakota farmers keep going after they were hard hit by drought or similar disaster. Another form of emergency credit was provided by the 83d Congress in the form of special livestock loans to help cattlemen feed their foundation herds and maintain their operation.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the 83d Congress deals with the disposal program for surplus agricultural commodities. It is a program overflowing with possibilities, potentialities, and problems. This law provides for the disposal of surplus under several distinct and separate programs and great strides have been taken in some of the phases while others have lagged considerably.

As a result of these legislative enactments combined with a more aggressive sales policy, it is now estimated that we will dispose of more than $2 billion worth of surplus during the fiscal year 1955.

This has not all been easy, in any sense of the word. Two separate committees have been set up to make certain that we do not alienate friendly countries by dumping commodities on the market or drive down world price levels. These disposal programs have been in operation less than a year and a fine job is being done. I feel that such programs are the ultimate answer to our surplus problem.

I have recited many of the fine programs which have been inaugurated to develop a healthy agricultural economy, but the picture is not complete. What we need, to have a whole picture and not just a partial picture, is the 90-percent support program. I hope that this Congress in its wisdom will give this protection to our farmers.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill under consideration.

We must commence with the proposition that the American economy is one great unit and all phases of it must be geared to the general welfare and prosperity of the Nation as a whole. You cannot help the city dweller by destroying the farmer. You cannot help the consumer of our agricultural products by undermining the producer of these products. Nor can you allow a per capita income for the factory worker of $1,836 per year, while the per capita income for the man on the farm from farm operations is only $658. Realism compels us to admit the fact that farming is essential to the prosperity of the industrial workers, the city dwellers and the entire Nation.

I had the honor and the privilege of serving on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee when I was a Member of the 82d Congress. At that time, I advocated better living standards and urged a commensurate salary increase for all postal and civil service employees, in order to enable them to meet the high cost of living. More recently, I supported similar legislation. It has always been my policy to advocate a higher standard of living for all Americans, and it is natural and logical that we give priority to our own people and to their needs.

It is now my honor and privilege to serve on the Agriculture Committee. Frankly, I couldn't tell the difference between buckwheat and cottonseed, or between cornstarch and non-fat-milk powder. You could sell me one as the other. But I do know this, and my experience on the committee has strengthened my conviction, that farmers are human beings like the rest of us with all the human frailties and weaknesses with which we are all endowed in some abundance.

Mr. Chairman, it has not taken me very long to discover that if we ignore the basic needs of our farm population, it will reflect on the rest of us. If they reach a point where they can no longer derive a livelihood on the farm, they will turn toward our cities and seek employment in our factories and commercial enterprises. This additional competition will increase unemployment, cause greater congestion in our already overcrowded dwellings, and add to the growing list on our relief rolls. Surely, their skills and knowledge of farming will serve the country's welfare to a better degree if they can continue in their present occupation, but with greater opportunities for success.

To throw these farm families out on the city streets, denying them the opportunity to derive their livelihood from the soil, and at the same time endangering the economic status of the people in the cities is, to my mind, nothing less than a return to the rules of the jungle.

Mr. Chairman, a great myth has been created in this country which many people seriously believe. I refer to the fallacious thought that if we reduce price supports it will result in important price reductions to the consumer. This is not true. Let me point out that the farm price of the 4 or 5 basic commodities which are supported at 90 percent of parity is only a small part of the retail price which the consumer pays for these products. Here are some illustrations: A loaf of bread sells for about 16 to 18 cents, but of this amount the farmer gets only about 2½ cents for the wheat in that loaf. It is such a small percentage that the price of wheat would have to be cut about 80 cents a bushel in order to obtain a 1-cent reduction in the cost of a loaf of bread. Or take a cotton shirt which retails in the store at $3.95. The cotton which goes into that shirt is worth less than 30 cents, and that is what the farmer gets for it. If you reduce the price of cotton you can readily see how little it would affect the price of the shirt.

In our committee hearings considering H. R. 12, we had the pleasure of listening to CIO President Walter P. Reuther on February 25, 1955. Let me read to you a few paragraphs from Mr. Reuther's statement:

> We also know that most of the price we pay for food does not go to the farmer and that the effect of price supports on the prices we pay is very small. Even if dairymen got their feed grains free, it would mean only about 1 cent a quart savings on milk. The effect of the differences between 75 percent and 90 percent price support levels for corn and wheat on the price of milk has to be measured in fractions of a mill, which means that no savings whatever will be passed on to the consumer.
>
> Aware of the lessons of history, we know that the welfare and destiny of farmers and wage earners are closely interrelated, that each depends upon the prosperity of the one to lift up the living standards of the other. In 1918 when the incomes of agricultural workers reached a new peak, those of industrial workers were not far behind. Contrariwise, when farm incomes skidded to a new low in 1932, the incomes of nonfarm workers followed, while unemployment reached a total of 12 million people. The same common fate was experienced by farm and city workers as their incomes moved up during World War II, downward immediately thereafter, and upward under the impetus of

increased defense production during the Korean war.

Certainly today we must recognize the basic economic fact that in our modern society, the well-being of every group is increasingly dependent on the sustained well-being of all the others.

Mr. Chairman, after considering all the facts, we must reach the inescapable conclusion that the principle of interdependence is particularly true in the relationship between farmers and industrial workers, just as it is equally true that farm prosperity is essential to the prosperity of the entire Nation.

Those of us who come from the industrial areas of the country are extremely interested in keeping our factories humming and our workers working. But how can we, in all justice, maintain this situation as long as the income of farmers remains at a rate of only $665 per year? Farm operating costs remain near their record high, while the net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below that of 1947 and 10 percent below the year 1953. Unless Congress restores the 90 percent of parity price supports, the prospects are that there will be further declines in farm income for the years 1955 and 1956. How can we maintain prosperity in other areas of our economy for very long if there is further deterioration in our farm economy? Surely, the effect of a declining farm economy will make itself felt in our industry and commerce, in our cities and towns.

I believe that the great consuming public in this country today realizes that our high standard of living can be maintained only by fair treatment economically for all Americans. Let me remind my colleagues that our greatest weapon against internal discontent and the threat of communism is a happy and prosperous American Nation.

While I am appealing to my colleagues who come from the cities and the industrial areas to help the farmers in their hour of need, I expect in the future to direct my appeal likewise to our colleagues from the rural areas of our great country for their support of legislation to increase the minimum wage and other measures which will benefit those living in urban areas. This must not be a one-way deal. Farmers, too, must realize that expenses of city families have risen to a record high in recent years, but when wages fail to keep up with the cost of living the city workers and consumers reduce their purchases and consumption of farm products.

And this theory applies to legislators, as well. As soon as legislators rise to the point where their primary concern is the welfare of the country as a whole, as soon as they reach the determination that in proposing legislation they will consider not only the immediate effect of the measure in question upon the area which they represent but the long-range effect on the entire country, only then can they truly be called representatives of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened in the last 2 years because of the change in our price support structure? We have had a drop in farm income of $1.6 billion during this 2-year period. A situation of this kind is neither sound for agriculture nor for the Nation's economy as a whole. According to the Department of Commerce, a $1-billion decline in farm income will result in a decline of $240 million in farm spending for buildings and machinery. Over the past year this drop in farm spending was felt in many parts of the country, and needless to add that its effects are cumulative.

In this connection, it is worth recalling that American farmers normally use more steel per year than the amount of steel used in the production of automobiles; they use more petroleum than any other single industry; they use enough rubber each year to make 24 million tires; and they use enough electricity to supply the combined needs of cities like Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston. These are just a few examples of goods and services consumed by American agriculture—the list can be extended much longer. But the point I am trying to emphasize is that the purchasing power of our farmers must be maintained, if we want to avert a farm-led depression—which is what would happen once the farm economy begins to falter.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the myth that if we reduce price supports it will automatically result in a price reduction for the consumer. Let me point out another myth which is popular with many people in this country. There are those who say that the existing food surpluses are the result of the 90 percent of parity support program, and that these surpluses are harmful to the American economy.

Price supports did not create our surpluses in the basic crops. These abundant supplies were created by policies of our Government which relaxed the production control mechanisms of our farm program at the outbreak of the Korean conflict and called for all-out production of our major crops. It developed that we did not need all that we produced, mainly because our exports of farm commodities dropped 30 percent. The 90-percent support program had been in effect for 10 years prior to 1952, and during that time we accumulated no great surpluses. That we now have on hand more than we currently can consume is no fault of the farmer nor of his program.

I am more interested, however, in the question whether these surpluses are harmful to our economy. In my humble opinion, food is one of our best weapons in the struggle against communism. The production and effective use of these food surpluses as munitions of peace may go a long way toward preserving the peace of the world and the survival of mankind. A bushel of wheat, a case of dried whole milk or a case of macaroni will do a lot more good in most instances in winning the support of hungry people than a 6-inch shell or a machine gun.

Furthermore, maintaining reserves of great stocks of food is a form of consumer insurance which is better than money in the bank. In time of drought or crop failure for other reasons, as well as in the event of war, a favorable bank balance will not feed the hungry. Food reserve should be regarded in the same category of national protection which we have established for certain metals and minerals for purposes of strategic stockpiling. It is important that we should have strategic stockpiling of surplus foods for any eventuality as a protection or our Nation's interests.

In conclusion, I want to touch on one other matter, namely, lowering food prices for the American consumer. I already pointed out that it cannot be done by reducing price supports. There are other ways, and one of these ways is suggested in a bill introduced recently by the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, and myself. This is the so-called terminal markets bill which calls for the improvement and development of modern marketing facilities for the handling of perishable food products in urban areas.

In my own city of New York, where millions of consumers live and work, we have a totally outmoded market located in cramped and unsanitary quarters in downtown Manhattan. The large handling and distribution costs under these conditions and the transportation difficulties add to the high prices of basic foods. The same is undoubtedly true in other cities. Building modern new markets would cut costs and lead to lower prices for such perishable foods as vegetables, poultry, meats, eggs, and dairy products.

One last word. In the last presidential election Candidate Eisenhower and Candidate Stevenson promised strong farm supports. The only difference between the two candidates was that Eisenhower promised more to the farmer than did Stevenson. Eisenhower in his strong bid for the farm vote came out for 100 percent farm supports while Stevenson limited himself to 90 percent.

I say we should not play politics with the farmers any more than we should play politics with the city folks. Our committee did not play politics with this bill because the vote was better than 2 to 1 in favor of it.

I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle not to play politics now. Remember that when you come a knocking at the farmer's door for city legislation, do not be expecting that good old southern hospitality if you pull the rug from under him now on his only program which would guarantee to him the bare necessities of life.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subject before us today is not new. It is exceedingly unlikely that any votes will be changed by anything that is said on the floor this afternoon. However I think it is well to have this discussion of the subject of price supports on the basic commodities because agriculture is a dynamic and changing as well as a growing industry and if we are to understand its problems we must keep our knowledge up to date.

PROBLEM NOW IS DISTRIBUTION AND MARKETING

The fundamental problem of agriculture at this time is better distribution and marketing. We are reminded of this by a recent report from the Department of Agriculture showing that the farmers'

share of the consumers dollar has now dropped to 42 percent, the lowest for many years. Secretary Benson and his associates in the Department of Agriculture are tackling this big, long-range problem. Congress has been giving consideration to it for a long time. But I am sure that no one anticipates that it will be solved this year or next year or even in the next 10 years, although we hope that improvements will be made.

MUST INCREASE PRODUCTION TO KEEP UP WITH INCREASED POPULATION

A still longer range program of course is in the field of production, and it goes to the question of whether with our rapid increase in population American farmers will be able to produce enough to enable our country to continue its high standard of living as far as food and fiber consumption are concerned. Research and education, in the field of production and soil and water conservation are the means which we are now using to meet that problem when it arrives.

IMMEDIATE PROBLEMS

But the immediate problems confronting the American farmer are principally two. First, surpluses of certain storable commodities; and, second, the steady decline in farm income which has taken place for several years past and is still continuing. The legislation before us is admittedly temporary legislation applicable for the present and the following 2 years. It is an effort to deal with the problems of surpluses and farm income. The question is whether on basic commodities price supports for 1955, 1956, and 1957 will be at the rate of 90 percent, or at from 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity for 1955 and from 75 to 90 percent of parity for 1956 and 1957.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS WILL NOT BRING ABOUT ADJUSTMENT IN SUPPLY AND DEMAND

I know that there are defects in a program of 90-percent price supports. But there is not a single criticism of 90 percent supports which cannot be made of flexible supports.

The argument which is most commonly advanced in support of flexible price supports is that this program will bring about an adjustment in production and demand and thus do away with surpluses and controls. This is on the theory, first, that lower price supports will reduce supply, and second, that they will result in increased consumption of the product. As applied to the basic commodities these assumptions simply are not true. The House Committee on Agriculture has been dealing with the matter of flexible price supports for 17 years. Never during that time has any evidence been presented to the committee which would justify an assumption that a reduction in price supports on the basic commodities will result in any substantial reduction in acreage or production, or any lessening of controls.

There has been evidence and plenty of it that an increase in price supports will bring about an increase in production. This is because farmers, if assured of increased prices, will invest in new machinery, will use more fertilizer, and will farm more intensively than would otherwise be the case. To do this requires increased expenditures both in capital investment and operating expenses, but if assured of increased prices farmers will take the risk.

However a decrease in price supports within the limits that anyone has suggested in connection with flexible price supports has not resulted in a reduction in acreage and production. This is due to several reasons. One is that a reduction in production means little if any reduction in operating expenses, they go on just the same. In order to meet them the farmer will attempt to maintain about the same gross income. If prices are lower per unit he feels he must produce more units so the tendency is to increase rather than decrease production.

PRICE REDUCTIONS TO FARMERS WILL NOT INCREASE CONSUMPTION

The other assumption which is equally false as to most basic commodities is that a reduction in the price the farmer receives will bring about an increase in consumption. It simply does not work out that way. In the case of commodities like wheat and cotton the farm price of the raw material has practically no connection with the price of the finished article. There are 2½ cents worth of wheat in a 20-cent loaf of bread and about 35 cents worth of cotton in a $5 cotton shirt. The same thing holds true for tobacco and generally speaking it holds true, but to a lesser extent, for the other three basic commodities.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS HAVE BEEN ON TRIAL FOR 17 YEARS

The plea will be made today that we ought to give flexible price supports a trial. The fact is they have been on trial for the last 17 years.

There is nothing new about flexible price supports either on basic or nonbasic commodities. They were originally set up in the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act on basic commodities at a level of from 52 to 75 percent of parity. They remained flexible until the war period when they were increased to 85 percent of parity first and later to 90 percent under the terms of the Steagall amendment. Under that amendment these rates were in effect through 1948. The 1948 Agricultural Act extended them for the 1949 crop year. The 1949 act provided for flexible price supports on basic commodities from 75 to 90 percent parity. However price supports were continued at 90 percent for several years by action of the Secretary and for 1953 and 1954 by action of Congress.

The 1938 act, in addition to providing for price supports through loans on the basic commodities authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on agricultural commodities including dairy products without fixing any levels or limits at which such loans might be made. The 1948 act provided for mandatory 90-percent loans for the crop year 1949 not only on the basic commodities but on milk and milk products, hogs, chickens, and eggs. The 1949 act in addition to dealing with basic commodities provided for mandatory support for certain commodities including Irish potatoes at from 60 to 90 percent of parity and from 75 to 90 percent of parity in the case of milk products. It also authorized supports not to exceed 90 percent of parity for all other nonbasic commodities, thus setting up a range of flexibility from zero to 90 percent.

There has been no experience under any of the acts either with basic or nonbasic commodities which would justify the conclusion that flexible price supports or low price supports have resulted in any decrease in production or any increase in consumption or any lessening of controls.

INTENTIONS TO PLANT SHOW INCREASE IN SPITE OF LOWERED PRICE SUPPORTS

A current example of the fact that the lowering of price supports under a flexible program does not bring about a reduction in acreage is shown in the intentions to plant as submitted by farmers for 1955. Sometime ago the Department of Agriculture announced that in the case of oats, barley, sorghum grains, soybeans, and flaxseed price supports would be reduced from 85 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity. If the theory that lower price supports bring about lower acreage and production was correct we would expect that this would result in a decreased acreage.

The facts however are directly opposite. In the case of barley the intentions to plant show an increase of 8⅞ percent over the 1954 acreage and 35 percent over the 10-year average; sorghum grains show an increase of 10⅝ percent over 1954 and 65 percent over the 10-year average; oats an increase of eight-tenths of 1 percent over 1954 and 8⅛ percent over the 10-year average; soybeans an increase of 6½ percent over 1954 and 45 percent over the 10-year average; flaxseed showed a decrease of 3⅝ percent over 1954 but an increase of 41 percent over the 10-year average. Here we have a decrease in price supports of about 17 percent followed by a substantial increase in acreage.

REDUCTIONS ON BASIC COMMODITIES DUE TO CONTROL

Of course we are dealing only with basic commodities in this legislation. All of them are under acreage allotments. All of them are under marketing quotas excepting corn. Reductions are being secured. The amount of the reductions would be exactly the same no matter what the level of price supports. It is the control program not the level of price supports which is bringing about the reduction and the controls are the same whether the supports are rigid or flexible. This has always been the case.

MODERNIZED PARITY WILL RESULT IN LOWER SUPPORTS

There are those perhaps who feel that price supports on the basic commodities are too high and that flexible price supports are one way of securing a reduction. Let me say to those that on four of the basic commodities there will be a substantial reduction in price supports during the next 3 years no matter whether the figure is kept at 90 percent or lower. This is because of the shift to modernized parity which will begin to take effect on the basic commodities in 1956. Four commodities will be affected adversely. On the basis of 1954 parity the parity price on cotton will decline 1⅝ cents per pound. The decline on

wheat will be 39 cents per bushel. On corn 22 cents per bushel. On peanuts 2¾ cents per pound. When it is considered that in the case of these commodities it will be necessary to continue tight acreage allotments and marketing quotas for some time in the future or until the surplus is done away with it will be seen that farm income must inevitably continue to decline whether supports are rigid or flexible but of course the decline will be greater if they are flexible.

PASSAGE OF H. R. 12 WILL SLOW UP DECLINE IN FARM INCOME

The passage of this legislation will not entirely prevent that decline but it will ameliorate it. The question today is not controls—it is not the principle of price supports. The question today is will we do something to at least slow up this decline in farm income or will we let it continue to go down, down, down just as it did in the 1920's and end up as then not only in an agricultural depression but in one which affects the entire economy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see the continued effort being made by a substantial number of Members of Congress to restore mandatory 90-percent price supports on basic commodities. Early in the session I introduced a bill to return supports to 90 percent of parity. I want to compliment the Committee on Agriculture on taking such prompt action in reporting out such a bill. I was thoroughly convinced last year that the Congress, under prodding from the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, committed a grievous and what promises to be a costly error in voting to place supports under a flexible system under which supports can go as low as 82½ percent of parity this year and 75 percent next year.

The facts which then existed and proved conclusively in my mind the unsoundness of tampering with a system that has worked successfully still prevail. In fact, all that has happened since Congress adopted the new farm program strengthens the argument for returning to the mandatory 90-percent system.

Costs of the things which the farmer must buy to operate remain at record high levels. The parity ratio—that is the relationship of prices received by farmers to the cost of items he buys—continues to slide downward. Farm prices are weak and tend to decline—not increase. The farmer is caught in a price-cost squeeze which becomes tighter with each passing day and with acreage cut down for the second year in a row.

We have seen farm income decline, while our population increased; we have seen farm income decrease while the interest costs of farm credit have increased; we have seen farm income decrease while the cost of living has increased; and we have seen farm income decrease while wages generally have increased. And what is the administration's cure for the plight of the American farmer? Is it stability in farm income? Is it an incentive to produce the food and fiber which the American and world consumer requires? Is it a program designed to better the standard of living on our farms and provide an inducement to stay the flight of farm labor to the city?

The cure proposed last year was to permit a further decline in farm income by adopting a sliding scale support price program. It seems to me that in view of the conditions which faced American agriculture the adoption of the sliding scale support price program was the equivalent of a doctor recommending a reducing diet for a patient suffering from malnutrition.

There is something tragic in this new approach to a farm price support program. At the very same time this administration is arguing for a system under which farm price supports can only go down, it is urging Congress to increase the minimum wage. Under this administration, it is 90 percent to 75 percent for farmers, but it is 75 cents to 90 cents for labor.

Secretary Benson and spokesmen for those groups supporting his 75 percent to 90 percent flexible price support system are always careful to point out to congressional groups that gadgets placed in the law insure that cotton farmers will continue to receive 90 percent of parity. The set-aside is such a gadget. The Secretary sets aside 3 million bales of cotton. By bookkeeping hocus-pocus, this large amount of cotton is made to disappear when the time comes to computing supply for price support purposes. The sole reason is to insure that farmers continue to get the 90 percent supports.

The farmers of Georgia cannot understand this kind of talk. If the Department of Agriculture believes they are entitled to 90 percent supports, farmers believe it should be written in the law. Farmers do not understand legislative gadgets and gimmicks. They do understand that they are caught in a cost-price squeeze and need 90 percent supports.

This is a matter too important to them—a matter of economic life or death—to leave to the administrative juggling of any one man, and by that they are not critical of the present Secretary of Agriculture. But Secretary Benson has long charged that 90 percent supports have priced cotton out of the foreign markets. Yet, American cotton today is selling at prices competitive with foreign cotton. He has never yet explained how this could happen.

Another argument which has been exploded is that by lowering supports production of cotton can be reduced. This is nonsense. When the price declines, farmers have to raise more cotton to insure that their cash income will be sufficient to pay their operating costs.

The purposes and objectives of the original 90 percent agricultural price-support program were to provide a stability to farm income and to assure production of the food and fiber required for consumption. These purposes and objectives are not mere words; they embody the cornerstone of a fair, equitable agricultural policy, not only for farmers, but for consumers, business, and labor alike. The day has long passed when a major component of our economy, such as agriculture, can be treated as having no effect on the rest of our economy. A fair and equitable agricultural policy assuring stability of reasonable farm income is the equivalent of placing orders for tractors, trucks, combines, and other farm implements and machinery, with corresponding benefits to mineral and metal producers, manufacturing and fabricating industries, transportation, distributors and retailers of goods and equipment, industrial and allied employment, all in addition to assuring needed production for human consumption and apparel.

Secretary Benson admits that farmers are caught in a tightening cost-price squeeze. He apparently believes cotton farmers are entitled to 90-percent supports and has resorted to all sorts of devices to see that it is insured. Would not the logical thing, then, be to restore the system of mandatory 90-percent supports? I believe so, and I am happy to have an opportunity to vote for such a bill at this session of Congress. I am, therefore, supporting and will vote for H. R. 12.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, my firm reliance on the integrity of my associates in the Committee on Agriculture who voted to report the bill now before us does not permit me to join in the widespread accusations that politics is largely in back of the revival of the controversy over rigid versus flexible supports. I am firmly convinced that the supporters of this measure feel that 90 percent of parity is necessary to a stable program. And I give them the credit of having the commonsense and astuteness to have ascertained beforehand that the people they represent are likewise of the belief that a return to the original program is vital to agricultural stability.

My position in the matter is likewise dictated largely by the prevailing sentiment in my congressional district; and the fact that rigid, high-level supports with attendant controls have always been anathema to most of our Pennsylvania farmers makes it extremely easy for me to follow my personal opinion that a rigid program can only result in a lack of stability at the farm level.

The premise upon which my opposition to H. R. 12 is based is set forth exactly in the majority report on the bill which I quote as follows:

> The committee is aware that this legislation—
>
> The pending measure—
>
> is not of itself the complete remedy for all the ills of agriculture, nor will it bring to full realization the objectives set forth above.

And the objectives referred to previously in the same report are identified as maintaining a level of farm income that will enable farmers to conserve and improve the soil.

A litle further along in the majority report, however, we find a frank—and to me an unavoidable—admission of the weakness of the position of the proponents of H. R. 12 when they point out

that farm prices are down 22 percent since February 1951, and I submit that therein is a fatal admission since it concedes that agricultural income has slipped badly during the period in which 90-percent supports were in full force and effect. In other words, our high-support friends are coming to us and asking us to restore a program which the farmers—at least in my district—have already found to be completely ineffective in keeping up farm prices. Indeed it seems, to use the vernacular of the street, that they are now asking us to give them "more of the hair of the dog that bit them."

In making the statement that I am prepared, short of the payment of outright cash subsidies, to support any program that will keep farm income at a high level, I must also state that I am not too much interested in the controversy over how much the program has cost to date. The actual cost of the farm program involves so many administrative items and includes so much giveaway in pursuit of our diplomatic objectives as to make comparisons almost meaningless. And to deny that almost every segment of our economy has been subsidized to some extent is to ignore the true facts in the case. And with that observation we must return to the original issue; namely, that controversy over just how a restoration of 90 percent of parity on basic commodities will restore the earning power of our farm people which fell to its present level during a period when the program we abandoned on January 1 was fully operative.

When we discussed this proposition last year, I observed that there seems to be an inclination among my colleagues in the Committee on Agriculture to dismiss or ignore the fact that Pennsylvania is a great agricultural State and that, in the long run, our stature in the field of agriculture has been maintained with but little reliance on Government incentives. As a matter of fact, my district—consisting of Lancaster and Chester Counties—is the leading agricultural area east of the Mississippi River and is the leading nonirrigated agricultural area in the United States. This preeminence can be pointed up by reference to two commodities in particular; namely, tobacco and mushrooms, in which we lead the entire Nation and in both cases without the benefit of Government subsidies. In the case of tobacco, the growers in Lancaster County voted down quotas in the ratio of 6 to 1—and I like to think that this attitude of self-reliance has set an example in free enterprise for other sections to follow if they can only be weaned from the regimentation which their apparent failure to diversify has brought upon them.

There is, of course, an attempt to prove that the 12,000 farms in the Ninth Pennsylvania District have benefited from the rigid supports that have been maintained under crops grown in other localities, but it will take only a brief examination of the facts to prove that the contrary is the case. As producers of large quantities of fluid milk and poultry products, we have had to pay an inflated price for processed feeds, whereas the end products of our industry have had to compete in a free market. In a similarly striking example we have seen our small wheat-growers placed under the most irksome regulations simply because the commercial wheat States have elected to accept acreage restrictions, which in turn become binding on those farmers who have rejected the entire socialistic philosophy of selling to the Government instead of in the market place.

Any comparison of American agriculture with that of Communist Russia must prove odious, but I cannot refrain from suggesting that what we are seeing in the U. S. S. R., where under the Commissars the government-controlled farms are not producing enough to meet their domestic needs, is a fair warning of what will happen here if we continue to surrender our God-given prerogatives to a socialistic concept of hand-outs and controls.

As I have already tried to emphasize, even to the point of being boringly repetitious, my opposition to a return to rigid 90-percent supports centers largely on the obvious fact that while such supports have been in effect we have seen farm prices slide and surplus-agriculture products mount to where they are unmanageable. And I say that to pin our farm economy to such tenuous support is comparable to throwing a drowning man a rotten rope.

I have two mentors in the field of agriculture, both of whom I hold in deep respect and affectionate regard. They are our former committee chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

In quoting Mr. HOPE I might say that I think he emphasized one important fact in the hearings on H. R. 12 before our committee when he pointed out that our present law, the Agriculture Act of 1954, is basically the same law that has been on the statute books since 1949 with the exception that the operation of its flexible provisions have been deferred throughout 1955 by the inclusion of 1 year's supports of from 82½ percent to 90 percent. And I might further point out that the flexible features were never removed when the present majority was in power but were only postponed, and as a result they have no criteria upon which to base the assumption that a sliding scale will not work.

And now in referring to Secretary Benson I want to quote from his prepared statement which he delivered before our full committee on February 17, last. At that time Mr. Benson said:

> Under the Agriculture Act of 1954, farmers can get price support of 90 percent of parity, but surplus must be kept in line if they are to get it. The responsibility is on the farmers, on their representatives in Congress and their Secretary of Agriculture. If we should give a flat guaranty of 90 percent of parity, as H. R. 12 proposes, we would undercut the incentive to keep supplies in line. If price support is mandatory at 90 percent of parity, acreage allotments could be increased, production controls could be suspended, and CCC inventories could continue their upward climb without affecting the level of price supports. But under the Agriculture Act of 1954, anything that boosts the supply beyond a certain point has the effect of lowering the level of price support.
>
> Many of the difficulties under which we now labor, particularly for wheat, may be traced to the fact that for many years this powerful incentive for helping keep the farm programs in balance has been lacking. If mounting supplies mean lowered price supports, farmers will be less likely to press for increased allotments, legislators will look with greater concern on mounting supplies, and administrators will be guided more by what is sound and less by what is expedient.

And if I may add to the Secretary's sensible conclusions, it brings to the fore a sense of fiscal and legislative responsibility in agriculture matters which heretofore has been deplorably avoided.

The need for a strong and healthy agriculture in this country was never greater than it is at this time, since the direction our farm economy takes may well be an indication of the way our entire free-enterprise system will turn. We have tried a program of rigid controls and a form of regimentation with its penalties and its frustrations, and we are convinced that it can only result in the socialization of this basic industry. We saw our stalwart forebears reject the paternalism and the regimentation of the British king and we fought a bloody civil war within the Union to excise the cancer of human bondage from the vitals of a people who had bound themselves together in a great compact pledging the preservation of individual freedom. The issue before us today is just as clear-cut, and we can either turn to the system of minimum controls upon which our greatness has been built or we can continue down the road that leads to the abyss at the bottom of which lies the wreckage of every socialistic system that has come to curse the human race throughout its long struggle for survival. In the spirit of those who have sacrificed so much to keep us free let us reinstate the farmer in his traditional place in our competitive system with the assurance that he will always have that protection against disaster that every other segment of our economy will always enjoy.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the 90 percent of parity rigid farm price support because it seems to me that this program has been ineffective in maintaining good prices for farm products. It has proved to be expensive and wasteful. The proof lies in the fact that the tremendous drop in farm prices in recent years has occurred while we have had rigid price supports. It seems to me that we should give the flexible support program an opportunity to bring some order out of chaos in the farm program.

The following is typical of letters I have received from farmers in my district on this subject:

> Many of us farmers here in Garrett County are very much concerned over the possible passage of the bill known as H. R. 12. We are opposed to this bill because it provides 90 percent mandatory support of the basic price of farm commodities. It is our opinion that such a high support price will necessitate crop allotments, and would eventually involve us in a complete regimentation of agriculture. It seems to us that some other provisions of this bill, which

provide for the school lunch and the brucellosis program could be provided without this bill. Whereas, we feel that the 90 percent support of basic prices is dangerous, we hope you will oppose this bill.

And another note I received this morning:

The writer learns H. R. 12 soon comes up for vote. Ninety percent parity would adversely effect we farmers' products now without support which are selling for or above parity. Let us not move in reverse. Hope you will vote "no" on this bill.

These letters are from farmers who hold offices in farm organizations in my congressional district. They are typical points of view of farmers who are prominent in both political parties.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, the Third District of Ohio, which district I have the honor to represent here in the Congress, is very largely an urban and the farm program has not been a problem until the last 2 years or so. It has always been my policy to keep in close personal touch with the grassroots opinions of my district and my observations here are the result of a number of conferences I have held.

During the recent Easter recess I held conferences in my district on these farm problems. One of my conferences was with a group of farmers. Another was with some of the most active, well-trained, and experienced men in the farm-management field and they operate thousands of acres of land within a rather large area. The firsthand information I received from these farmers, farm experts, and individual farmers is very helpful to me in the study of all proposed farm legislation.

The problem, of course, is much larger than H. R. 12 which we are considering here today. I am told that a 2½-percent reduction in the costs of farmers is equal to a 10-percent increase in the farmer's net income. We should study that cost problem too.

Many farmers in our area are deeply disturbed because they are not permitted to vote on acreage-allotment programs since they have not had a historic average of 15 acres of wheat. They deeply resent being disqualified and being unable to vote.

Acreage allotments based on history of the farm are easy to administer but they do not reflect good farm and land management. To illustrate this situation, Mr. Chairman, I was told about two farms and I was informed these were good, true, typical illustrations.

One very good farm consisting of 338 acres of good productive land now has a wheat acreage allotment of only 15 acres based on its history.

Another very much less valuable farm of 267 acres, only 70 percent of which is tillable, has a wheat acreage allotment of 22 acres.

Good management programs would include a much larger wheat acreage of the 338-acre farm because of its ability, facilities, and larger per acre investment. Good management of the 267-acre farm could well indicate a reduction in the wheat acreage.

The farm program, Mr. Chairman, is one of a great many considerations. H. R. 12 will not only not solve the problems I have mentioned but it will not solve other problems either.

Mr. Chairman, the supporters of H. R. 12 contend that this legislation is needed to reverse the downward trend in farm income which we have experienced the last several years. This argument would be humorous indeed if we were not dealing with such a serious subject.

Ninety percent of parity price supports for basic commodities have been in effect since early in World War II. They were in effect all during the war, and since the war. They are now in effect on all 1954 crops. Flexible farm price supports go into effect on 1955 crops. But those crops are not yet produced. Therefore, all the deterioration in farm earnings which we have experienced has come under high rigid price supports—the very system H. R. 12 seeks to extend.

The net income of American farmers reached an all-time high of $16.8 billion in 1947. This declined to a little over $12 billion last year. And all of this occurred under high rigid price supports. The 1947 figure came at the end of the postwar adjustment. There is considerable evidence the decline has been arrested.

But the important point is that H. R. 12 would extend the very system that operated during the decline, in an effort to reverse the downturn it caused. This is circular reasoning at its worst.

A similar situation exists with respect to the farm parity index. It declined from a high of 113 in February 1951, to 94 in January 1953, when Ezra Taft Benson became Secretary of Agriculture. This was a total decline of 19 points. In the 26 months since that time, the parity ratio has fluctuated within the narrow range of 8 points, and last month was only 7 points below the figure of 2 years earlier.

This decline in the parity ratio occurred under high rigid price supports for basics. Although the decline has been arrested in the last year or so, high rigid price supports could not turn it upward. This will be done only under market expansion and adjustment of production and consumption which will occur under flexible farm price supports provided in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

No one contends that flexible farm price supports will provide a cure-all for our agricultural problem. But it surely makes no sense to argue that the remedy for today's agricultural distress is another dose of the same system that caused the disease.

This kind of argument is sheer economic nonsense. It is political opportunism at its worst.

Mr. Chairman, this House should reject H. R. 12.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. FJARE].

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our agricultural programs should be developed with the needs of the market in mind. It is neither good government nor good economy to encourage farm production without regard to marketability. The quality of a product is important in any business and it is also important to a healthy and prosperous agriculture. We have seen amazing scientific advances in the development of better agricultural products, but have failed to acknowledge this development in any appreciable degree in our basic farm marketing programs.

Normally the market value of a product is determined by the joint desires of the producer and the consumer. The costs of production and the necessity of a profit on the part of the producer are balanced against the needs and desires of the purchaser and his ability to pay. Price fixing for the protection of the producer must sooner or later result in retarded consumption and as a result retarded production, or else in complete regimentation with the consumer being forced to purchase. I am greatly concerned over the ill effects of either possibility on our American way of life.

High rigid guaranteed supports have caused farmers in much of the wheat belt to grow for the support price instead of the market. They have planted seed that would yield the most bushels per acre, rather than the high quality, high protein, lower yield varieties that flour millers desire. Under these programs the man who has been growing wheat for the market has his production cut back on the same basis as the man who grows wheat for the Government loan.

I think that our farm economy must be geared to a theory of usable abundance. The prime aim of our agricultural economy is naturally to supply an adequate food supply for ourselves first, and then to engage in beneficial world trade with the free nations having a short food supply. Production should not be encouraged for storage, but rather for commerical purposes. High rigid supports, do not offer a realistic approach to the long-term farm problem, because they will continue to encourage non-farmers to engage in the farming profession and produce for storage rather than for consumption. In the long run the man of the soil, who depends upon agriculture for his living, will not be best served by this type of legislation. High price supports undoubtedly serve to temporarily increase the market price of agricultural products, but the benefit, if any, is greatest to the speculator and the large producer who doesn't need it, and the small producer, who needs a larger income, is not materially helped, but rather harmed by the acreage restrictions which are a fundamental part of support programs.

The farmer having a limited acreage is far more concerned with acreage reductions than he is with minor differentials in price. Wheat farming is necessarily a risk, dependent in large part upon the elements, and the risk is greatly increased for the small farmer when his operation is cut to a bare minimum by acreage controls. The situation is particularly true of the wheat growers in my own State of Montana, because while it is historically a producer of the highest quality wheat, wheatland in Montana is not well suited to the production of profitable crops other than wheat.

Production cuts therefore actually endanger the existence of many of our smaller farmers.

Those who advocate a high rigid price support program are loudly proclaiming that farm prices are being wrecked by flexible supports. It just is not so. Flexible price supports do not become operative until the 1955 harvest. Consequently the decline in farm income to this point has resulted from the rigid 90 percent supports for the basic commodities, and in my opinion another dose of the same medicine will not help the farmer.

I would like to see our agricultural program recognize the fact that there is as much difference between the various types and grades of wheat as there is between dairy and beef cattle. All types of wheat are now lumped together, whether they be spring, winter, hard, soft, red, white, high potein, or low protein. We now have a recordbreaking surplus of wheat, but not of all types and grades of wheat. Durum wheat is in very short supply, and this Congress has enacted legislation temporarily easing restrictions on its production. High protein milling wheat is also in tight supply and should be granted special consideration. I would recommend that our farm program take the different types and grades of wheat into consideration in establishing controls. Producers of quality wheat should not be penalized because of an overproduction of wheat that is not desirable to the millers of flour.

I think that each of us has to honestly analyze where we are going under our agricultural programs. Do we intend that Government regulation of this industry shall continue indefinitely, or do we regard our price-support programs as a temporary necessity caused by unstable world conditions of the last 20 years? Do we feel that a regimented farm economy is more desirable, or do we think that in normal times the hope of a profit and individually managed farms and ranches, responding to a market price reflecting supply and demand, is the road to usable abundance? A vote for H. R. 12 is an expression in favor of a continued regimented economy and a vote against the measure is an expression of faith in the ability of the American farmer to eventually solve his own problems in his own way with a minimum of Government control.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of personal reluctance that I assume the role of the only Democrat on the House Agriculture Committee to oppose the passage of H. R. 12 in its present form. I recognize the ability and sincerity of Chairman COOLEY, Congressman POAGE, Congressman HOPE, and other able and sincere advocates, both Republican and Democratic, of this legislation. I recognize the merit of their complaints about some aspects of the administration of the present farm program and the justification of their impatience with Secretary Benson for resting on a mere reduction of price-support levels—I should say practically a continued grant of authority to reduce support levels—as an adequate answer to the farm problem. I am sure they regard H. R. 12 as stopgap legislation to correct a declining price level and conclude that such stopgap is presently necessary.

My difference with them is that I regard this stopgap as worse than the gap insofar as the typical farmer is concerned. I do not assert that a proper program of 90 percent of parity on basic crops could not be worked out. I do say that this shotgun effort without refinement is worse than the present situation.

A multitude of reasons exist for opposing H. R. 12. The first relates to legislative practice. The only aspect of this bill on which hearings were held was the restoration of mandatory 90 percent of parity for five basic crops. This is a poor way to legislate, and the error is not cured by an impending committee amendment to strike the inclusion of a two-price plan for wheat, mainly because its inclusion has seriously injured the prospects of passage of this bill in the House.

There are more basic reasons for my opposition. I am in Congress as a representative of an agricultural area which runs the gamut of commodities produced and producible. Support prices for basic crops are important to my farmers, but these crops constitute only a minority element in the gross agricultural product of the 14th California Congressional District. I am the representative of farmers who prosper or fail on the basis of a proper support program and farmers for whom basic support programs have no impact. I suspect that a majority of my farmers are opposed to 90 percent of parity or basics or any other crops through Government edict although that suspicion does not control my thinking any more than the opposite consideration that support of H. R. 12 is probably official present Democratic Party strategy.

I represent an area of overall highly efficient agriculture but which contains farms of all categories of acreage size and gross and net income. I feel that I am privileged with access to a representative sampling of composite farm opinion. I am persuaded by my own thinking and not by the factor that a position pro or con may be Republican or Democratic policy, Farm Bureau or non-Farm Bureau policy, Grange or non-Grange policy, prolabor or antilabor policy.

I am keeping my eye on the main target justifying my service here—consideration for the typical farmer who lives in my district and either is, or can reasonably be put in the position of, earning an American standard of living on the farm. He is the farmer for whom I have the first and overweening concern.

Nor do I judge from any position that Government activity on behalf of farmers is socialistic. I do not believe that; however, I am convinced that a Federal support-price program, necessary to preserve the well-being of most American farmers, must be in all aspects reasonable and fair and devoid of politics and geographical distinctions. I believe that a support program can become so interlarded with politics and injustices that its capacity for damage should be reduced if the prospects of correcting it are not presently politically feasible. The aggravation of a damage potential caused by such interlarding is, I believe, the proposition posed by H. R. 12.

The political nature of various basic price-support programs, which H. R. 12 does not propose to correct but only to aggravate by restoration of a higher level of parity, is obvious on examination of our commodity support laws.

Tobacco, peanuts, wheat, corn, cotton, and rice all have different ground rules in toto. Parity periods differ. Parity formulas differ. Marketing quotas are the rule for some and acreage quotas for others. The necessity for restriction of production is measured by differing standards and the methods of voting on restriction of production vary. Base periods for dividing quotas among States vary. With respect to some, trends of production are recognized. With respect to cotton there is no recognition of trend as an element of progress. Distinction exists in the breakdown of quotas and acreages to farms and farmers. Some commodity laws are weighted in favor of the landowners—others in favor of the operator—others divide privileges. Other instances of different ground rules could be cited.

Undoubtedly there are rational justifications for some of these differences but the great bulk are irrational and political and wrongfully inconsistent. They represent crass politics and reflect the varying political strengths of geographic areas of the country and choices between dominant elements in the farm picture in various communities. They were politically arrived at and politically administered and are subject to constant political pressure devoid of considerations of true equity. Here is a situation which really needs cleaning up before consideration should be given to restoration of 90 percent of parity. Any law which contains these weaknesses should fall of its own weight and the surpluses which bring most of the inequities into play should not be encouraged by a shotgun return to 90 percent of parity. Our committee is remiss in not bringing forth a real review of laws affecting the various commodities in order that they might be consolidated and rationalized and the Secretary of Agriculture is equally guilty in failing to make such recommendations instead of merely defending a flexible standard of parity—which he has largely failed to put into operation for political reasons—and which only has the merit of being slightly less dangerous than the proposal in H. R. 12.

Parity price support is a necessary ingredient in a farm program but too much parity like too much tobacco or food in the human body converts a pleasant or benign influence into a toxic one.

If the parity level represents a guaranteed profit and there is no limit on participation and the margin of profit on the average increases with the size of operation, farmers who have made a life of farming will have new neighbors or old neighbors expanded to the point of a

caricature of a farmer—a class of financiers and managers and employers of cheap labor. These new or bloated neighbors will make a major contribution to the surpluses which are potential with respect to almost every American crop and will hasten the day of quotas rapidly. On that day of reckoning the manager-financier neighbor suffers a loss of income. The dirt farmer suffers a loss of livelihood either temporary or permanent. This has happened under our 90 percent of parity with the present ground rules for participation. Let me illustrate.

In my opinion Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, who testified in support of this bill, inadvertently demonstrated it. In his principal statement he asked our committee to give careful attention to the welfare of the family farmer who was deliberately being made to suffer by the policies of the Eisenhower administration. He stated that the growing concentration of production in larger farms was the most crucial farm problem facing the Nation and that the farm price support program cannot alone meet the needs of the vast majority of them. At the same time Mr. Reuther presented a verbatim copy of the farm program resolution adopted by the 1954 CIO constitutional convention. There is a declaration in this resolution as follows:

> Any farm program which accelerates the tendency of big-business farm enterprise to drive smaller farmers off the land would once again subject an important group of our fellow Americans to the brutal laws of the jungle, just as the industrial workers of the cities were subjected to this same law before they organized into unions for their mutual protection.
>
> For many years there has been a disturbing trend toward concentration in American agriculture. In 1950 more than half of all farmland in the United States was held in farms of less than 250 acres; today, however, more than half of it is in farms of 500 acres or more and 42 percent of it is in farms of more than 1,000 acres.

In view of the fact that for all practical purposes 90 percent of parity has been in effect from 1950 to the date of said resolution these statistics made me pause to question Mr. Reuther. I asked him if the coincidence of 90 percent of parity with the slippage in small farms during those years did not indicate that 90 percent of parity was the villain. In response to my second statement of the question he replied:

> Well, my answer would be a general one, that we have failed to gear the abundance of farms and the abundance of the factories to the basic unfilled needs of the American people. Until we do that, we have not got an answer.

I suspect that there is a better answer within the confines of our farm laws and that privately Mr. Reuther might agree with me that H. R. 12 is only dope applied to the hurt of the family farmers, which, if applied long enough, will kill the patient by the failure to apply curative medication.

Authoritative studies indicate that since 1935 the number of farms of more than 1,000 acres has increased by 37 percent to the point that they encompass 42.6 percent of all United States farmlands and produce over 50 percent of United States farm income. Since 1935 our present price support ground rules have been substantially continuously in effect with the only change being an increase in support levels and this combination of facts is significant.

Latest census figures indicate that price-support programs are, with the growth in size of farms just noted, becoming instruments for driving out smaller operators with a concurrent concentration of benefits to a constantly declining number of people or with a relative decline in ratio of benefit the largest number of people. These figures indicate that 1.9 percent of the Nation's farmers received more than 25 percent of total price support benefits—9 percent received over 50 percent of the benefits and 91 percent—the overwhelming bulk of our farm families—received less than 50 percent of price-support payments. We should remember that the taxpayers make a major contribution to the cost of such benefits—a cost which will increase because of the loss of a percent of our foreign markets and the increase of the productive potential of our agriculturists in almost every field of production. These costs take the form of Government expenditure for storage and handling and administration and losses suffered on wash sales or outright gifts of commodities impelled by the urgent need of commodity disposal. It is in this respect that the member of a labor union or any citizen is granted the right to inspect the validity of the program. As the proponents urge he has probably broken even or saved money in his role of consumer. For farm area representatives the burning issue is the development and support of a program which helps only those farmers who constitute the traditional backbone of American agriculture and have a reasonable chance of earning an American living on the farm.

It should be noted that 90 percent of parity has been a major contributor to loss of our traditional export markets. Foreign low-cost labor areas with the proper soil, climate and financing can produce almost any American grown farm commodity cheaper. Ninety percent of parity has invited such competition in the production of those commodities with respect to which we are major suppliers of the world market. We have raised the price of our product to the point that they can undersell us with a tremendous margin of profit guaranteed, a secondary price support. The traditional lack of financing in these areas has thus disappeared. In fact American bankers and firms engaged in the processing of American products are contributing directly to such financing at the expense of our Government and our people. The recent report of the Eastland committee very ably supplies this conclusion with respect to cotton production and cotton support levels.

In the light of these facts our committee should have addressed itself to basic proposals for improvement of our support programs before increasing parity levels. The proposals of Representative PATMAN and Senators KEFAUVER, HUMPHREY and SPARKMAN for a program aimed at support where needed should have been considered. They were not.

I would support 90 percent of parity with a proviso that loans and purchases be limited to $75,000 or $100,000 of gross product in the hands of the grower. Such a ceiling would accommodate the great median of farmers raising almost every commodity without extending an invitation to speculators.

Finally I would adress myself in somewhat provincial fashion to those legislators who represent areas which are areas of expansion generally in the field of agriculture or in the growth of a particular commodity. I come from such an area and we seem to be the poor relatives in establishing the ground rules for allocation of production quotas. With respect to a great many commodities we have entered the field with the most efficient production and efficiency is a by-word for Americans. Ironically we are sometimes in the field by reason of the inducement of rewards promised by 90 percent of parity—a program largely promulgated by older producing areas. We were invited in and made our investments and changed our patterns of farming. Simple justice would dictate that we receive equal treatment in all production restrictions which occur. Such has not been the case. Existing laws contain many injustices and constant attempts are made to add others. All our farmers are classified as large farmers and worthy of some lesser consideration. This is simply not true and we must resist any approach which attempts geographic distinctions by some device of definition which excludes our small farmers. We should reserve our support of any program of 90 percent of parity with its probabilities of surpluses and quotas until we are given assurances that we will not shed our blood through the special legislation which has heretofore been sought in quota years in one or the other bodies of the Congress. In that connection I wish to express my thanks to my colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee for probity and fairness in that regard.

The record of the other body has not been as laudable. Inequalities were sought in the cotton quota law. Inequalities were sought and prevailed in emergency rice quota legislation. A bill from the other body now before the House Agriculture Committee would make every area producing crops under quotas pay, in terms of special allotments aggravating surpluses, for national disasters occurring in selected areas of production. We have had none recently in California.

These efforts at inequality—past, present, and probable—are basic in my opposition to extension of 90 percent of parity on basic crops at this time. I am hopeful that these reasons will disappear as we sit down and consider the problems of agriculture, wherever resident, objectively.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON].

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the people in our constituencies have much to do with our jobs. I imagine most of us read the newspapers of our districts.

While reading one from Twin Valley in my district, I came across an item of levity directed at the problem we are now considering. It said:

> Washington can talk all it wants about support prices, but you can't beat marrying a rich widow.

I told this to a visitor and he commented, "We might solve the quicksand parity situation by marrying farmers off to rich widows." I said, "We don't have enough rich widows," which brings us back to the original situation. With serious regard and practical intent, I should like to relate, without interruption, my reasons in support of this bill. We live in a changing environment, a changing world, that requires progress in thought and action to meet the perplexities that arise. Though proposed solutions have been put into operation to alleviate problems in agriculture, which should be given opportunity, let us not be placed in the position of holding them a complete panacea when the past does not credit them complete success. I am thinking, for example, of the sales-advertising program for milk. It is true our problem might be solved by adequate distribution, but sales campaigns in past decades did not accomplish this. Therefore, I feel support at parity prices must be done now, though other factors are at work during the same time, to prevent the hardships on our farmers and the harm to our economy's purchasing power.

Restoration of this bill to replace flexible supports is our most important step to a better farm program to facilitate America as the land of opportunity.

First. Family-type farms have always been our national policy. Land control represented a fundamental break with the past when the brave New World was established. It was the land tenure pattern of Europe, with its serfs, peasants, indentured servants, and landless tenants supporting the landed gentry, from which many fled to build America. The conviction that freeholders working their own land would make up the heart of a democratic society, started the distinctively American landownership system.

Thomas Jefferson in reform laws of Virginia designed to place landholdings into hands of individuals said:

> The small landholders are the most precious part of the State.

Other contemporary Americans agreed. Tory and crown estates in the new nation were parceled out to citizens as small farms, and closed public lands were opened for individual settlement. Americans sought political democracy on the basis of economic democracy, by the opportunity of individual citizens to own productive land.

Before 1800, Congress, in a rage against land speculation, fixed 160 acres as a family-size farm. It picked that figure arbitrarily and as a convenience—because it happened to be a quarter section under a new rectangular national survey. Through years of ensuing debate it stuck to its principle of equal opportunity for all, with land for the many and not just for the few.

The Preemption Act of 1841 was a milestone. It gave the right of 160 acres of vacant western land to the head of a family providing he settled that land. Later to become the homestead law of our Nation, President Lincoln signed this law for family farms—subsidy if you wish—with these words, "I am in favor of settling the land into small parcels so every man can have a home."

Our family-type farm is our most important agricultural unit, economically and socially. If we cannot maintain it as a reasonably profitable form of livelihood, we will start an economic and social prairie fire as in the 1920's.

This principle of a family living on its land was established and developed by our forefathers and remains the virtue of our individuality.

Second. The future of stable farm families depends upon prices higher than the cost of production that gives each family the necessary income to retain livelihood. Four out of five people have left farms in the last 40 years. The exodus is not necessarily bad from this standpoint, that labor has been replaced by machines and techniques. One effect can be bad, and one that can work a terrible havoc on our farming system, is the catastrophe of lower prices for commodities than the farmers' costs of maintaining machines and techniques, plus a fair living standard. Our farmers, on the average, get about 40 percent less for their capital investment and labor than the rewards of capital and labor in other occupations.

If we allow a trend toward lower standard of living and bring further disparity, we will find a trend on our farms to retain a bare subsistence living, which in turn means a cutback on outlay for machines and techniques. The end result will be the dangerous depletion of the fertility of our soil. In my district I have found a decline of implement transactions because of the 40 percent drop in net farm income between 1951 and 1954.

The drop in farm income caused the value of agricultural assets to drop from $170.1 billion on January 1, 1952, to $156.5 billion on January 1, 1955, while 30 leading industrial stocks soared from $175 to $412.97 per share from 1949 to 1955. Our livestock values have declined by 40 percent.

The manpower on our farms must be used. Machinery inventory cannot remain idle—it must be used. Each farmer must work and must put his assets to use or there is no income. Therefore, there must be no decline in overall farm production. Our 5 million farmers have no centralized control of production. What he produces is inelastic—it varies little from year to year. The so-called surplus is as much a blessing now as it was during the days of Joseph in Egypt. A surplus should not, and must not be used as an excuse for crucifying farm families with disaster parity.

A basic change has taken place on our farms, particularly evident since 1935. Costs of producing their crops and livestock now eat up the overwhelming portion of the prices he receives. Forty years ago farmers produced most of their own power in the form of horses and mules and food for them such as corn, oats, and hay. They also then had their own fertilizer.

The farmer's wife churned butter, baked bread and cakes, canned a yearly supply of perishable foods, and in some cases spun and wove.

In those days a farmer earned little cash and needed little. Many of the goods and services needed for production and living came from the farm itself.

Today all this is changed. The farmer buys his power, his fuel, his fertilizer. His wife buys her groceries at the market. The farm family each year spends almost as much for food as the city family.

It takes but simple arithmetic to understand a farmer will be forced off his land if it costs him more than he takes in. Our family farms are products of national policy, long established—changing times require changing methods to retain our national heritage.

Third. It is most imperative that 90-percent supports replace disaster-support levels until we achieve the means for full parity. Our immediate problem is to achieve fair farm income. We must prevent amputation of agriculture from the trunk of our economy. Farm income as a whole does not yield a fair return for the farmer's labor and a fair return for his investment.

If a farmer were to be put on a par with the average manufacturing profits in our country, he would receive not 100-percent parity, but at least 158 percent of parity. This is a conservative estimate. It is based on Government figures of a 10-percent profit after taxes. If 158-percent parity put farmers on par with industry, you can immediately see 90 percent of parity does not put farmers on a par with industry. Our family on a farm is more than just a business, and is more than just its labor, and more than just the crops it cultivates and the animals it nurtures—it is a way of life and an integral part of our Nation's economy.

The most important problem confronting us at the present time, is maintaining farm income—the purchasing power. The farmer is, so to speak, our most prolific consumer. He buys the products of industry—the products of labor; prodigious amounts of steel, petroleum, rubber, electricity, and yes—he pays our Government income tax when he has an adequate income. Without a doubt, farmers pay more taxes than the cost of a good farm program could ever be. Income taxes paid by farmers dropped by 34 percent from 1953 to 1954. Perhaps the greatest contribution our farm family gives our country, is the culture of the freedom-loving, initiative sons and daughters molded in growth.

Our new system of families living on their own farms—and it is new, though it is as old as the birth of our America—is not typical of other countries. Wander as you might—travel as you will—our cult of landownership is new and untarnished. Countries outside America will reflect in your vision, strains of a feudal system or developments from it. Villages of farmers turn out to their fields with hoe and scythe. Though

these citizens of other lands love their plots and give their toil, our farmer raises his family in the midst of his acres, the most efficient in the world. I love my rural district. A glance tells the layout of each farm. There is a satisfaction in driving into a farmyard, to see the farmer board his tractor, drive through his fresh, misty, farmyard grove with noisy chirping birds—perhaps to help his neighbor in the field. His children look out to see who has come—then gleefully call for Mother—a happy down-to-earth greeting as she begs you to come in and relax while she busily puts on the coffeepot or goes out to her chicken coop to gather the eggs from her faithful hens—a daily routine. Such refreshing visits does but invigorate one's respect for our farm way of life—a way of life that should remain as a choice for any individual in our country. A pattern of living in a democracy that requires our attention as legislators in the same way the right of free speech requires our attention daily. Adequate farm income is a task we must accomplish for the economic health and welfare of our country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in a way I am sorry to address you this afternoon. I believe this is about the first time since I have been in the House when I have found it almost a necessity to be on the opposite side of my most congenial and lovable friend, the ranking member and former chairman of our Committee on Agriculture. Of course, I can say the same for my friends on the left-hand side and, therefore, it is difficult for me to oppose this bill, H. R. 12. It is an unusual position to be in. I might say in the beginning of my talk we are all in favor of parity prices for farm products. The question that we must decide—and we are working at it at cross purposes today—is how to bring it about. I think we should be tolerant in that sort of position, and that is exactly what I expect to do.

Coming before the Committee on Agriculture we always have some crop experts, and as you heard discussed, even from the ranks of labor, to tell us how to run our farms. My mother always said, "If you want to know how to raise a family ask a 75-year-old old maid." So, if you want to know how to operate an agricultural program ask the head of a labor union. He could give you some ideas because he has lived off the farmers ever since he has had a union. I do not say literally, but it is up to us to produce the products or else he would not have to ask for 30 cents an hour more, as I noticed in the paper this morning. In a paper which I read it was $3 an hour. My father would turn over and knock the top off his casket if he ever thought a farmer got $3 a day, and they are asking for a 30-cents-an-hour increase.

When we state that 90 percent of parity will bankrupt the country, I have a doubt arise as the farmer would, of course, have to spend or would spend his increased income.

Under the banner of the opposition, if the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to hold all products at 90 percent of parity under the bill that goes into effect January 1, he could do it. The function of price in competitive society is to adjust production to what the market wants and to adjust consumption to what is produced. It is our conviction that the incomes of farmers will be maintained at the highest possible level if we allow opportunity for our price system to perform for agriculture the functions which it alone can adequately perform. That is, to serve as the main balance wheel between supply and demand. That is a fine statement and it cannot be disproved. It is not and it was not supports that caused the price of farm products to average 124 percent of parity for the calendar year 1946, and 113 percent of parity for the period for 11 years, 1942 to 1952. Do not forget that.

It was the extraordinary demand associated with war and the conditions that grew out of war. The war demonstrated the truth of the saying that "There are no surpluses in war."

Wheat exports which had averaged only 63.8 million bushels in the period 1937 to 1941 hit a peak of 504 million bushels in 1948. Cotton exports reached 4.7 million bales in 1948, and 5.8 million bales in 1949, in comparison with a 1937–41 average of 3.5 million bales. Tobacco exports amounted to 451.1 million pounds in 1948, in comparison to 346.8 million pounds in 1937–41. Rice exports reached 9.1 million hundredweight in 1948 in comparison with 3.6 million hundredweight in 1937 to 1941. Other farm exports also reached the high level in this period. By 1949 production in other countries was beginning to recover from the war, with a consequent reduction in the need for our farm products. In other words, they did not buy them at all. In my opinion, that has more to do with what we are talking about on this floor this afternoon than all the arguments for 90 percent of parity and all the arguments in opposition to it.

Exports fell off about 30 percent in the year which began July 1, 1952, and have continued to run a little less than $3 billion per year since that time. Wheat and cotton were particularly hard hit by this fall off in export markets. In the year which ended June 30, 1954, we exported only 219 million bushels of wheat and 3.8 million bales of cotton. If you want to know what is the matter with the market, all you have to do is to look at that.

The idea that 90 percent of parity price support is of great benefit to millions of small farmers likewise will not stand close examination.

I wonder when you hear all this talk about all these figures, if you ever stop to consider—and I checked it up, that one-third of all the farmers in these United States live off the farm. I used to tell my wife when we were living on the homestead that we were making a living off the homestead—5 miles off teaching school; and that is exactly what 1,600,000 farmers are doing today, and yet they are all counted when we begin to count the income of the farmer; they are all counted by the Department of Agriculture when they give these figures. When it comes to working out a farm program for 90 percent parity, I want to ask if you are going to consider one-third of those farmers who live on small farms, but earn their living elsewhere? What is the definition of a small farm? A small farm is one they say that produces from $250 to $1,199 per year. Now, they are working off that farm and yet they are counted in all these statistics. I wonder sometimes when we are ever going to get any judgment on how we work out our statistics.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I would like to, but I have only 2 minutes. I do not see how I can unless the gentleman just wants to extend his remarks.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture has not held any hearings on this 90-percent-parity bill. I quote from a speech made in Florida on April 2 by a Member of the other body in which he commented on the increase of cotton acreage abroad. Here is what he said. I will let you guess where the Senator came from:

> This trend proves the absurdity of the United States attempts to keep world cotton supplies in balance through production controls in this country. It further proves the absolute false premise of any farm policy which prevents a farm commodity from meeting its competition.

How has 90 percent of parity supports solved the problems of low-income farmers? We have just received from the President and the Secretary of Agriculture a message and a series of recommendations which reveal the fact that price supports are of little help to those in real need.

Why, then, is H. R. 12 laid before us? The majority report on H. R. 12 says the purpose of the bill is "to reverse the present recession in agriculture."

This, then, is the reason for asking the House to set aside its action of last summer that still has not gone into effect.

The answer to the story of the gentleman from Texas about the rattlesnake is that the rattlesnake got into the pen too quick before he even had the mice.

This must be the case since we have been supporting prices of the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity since early in World War II.

If agriculture is in such bad shape as the majority report contends, then 90 percent of parity, to my mind, obviously is not the remedy because such difficulties we now have, developed under this program.

The dairy industry, which has price supports on a flexible basis has cut production, increased consumption, reduced surpluses, stepped up promotion, and we think is on its way toward better times.

Beef, which also escaped price supports, has won its way back to the American table. My friend from Texas said let us not have this price support on beef. Beef has been doing pretty good. We may be paying more for it, but at least we have it on our tables.

The American cotton farmers hold the umbrella for the rest of the world.

From 1925 and 1929 to 1950 and 1954, a span of 25 years, American cotton production has declined about 8 percent, while cotton production in the rest of the world has doubled.

Rice farmers find themselves priced out of world markets and our rice exports reduced to a trickle.

Our wheat is priced out of the feed market and hardly a bushel moves into export trade without a Government subsidy, which averages 70 cents a bushel.

Corn farmers thought so little of 90 percent of parity that in 1954 only about 40 percent of them chose to comply with their allotments.

The New York Times carried a story some time ago to the effect that the Commodity Credit Corporation might have to request another increase in its borrowing authority. Last year we increased the limit from $6.75 billion to $8 billion. Later in the year we increased it to $10 billion. There is hope of pulling down the size of our stocks if we go the route of flexible supports. Rigid supports at 90 percent of parity seem to mean bigger and bigger stockpiles, heavier and heavier losses, lower and lower farm prices.

The shift to flexible supports comes just in time to keep 90 percent of parity from collapsing of its own weight. We firmly believe agricultural prices are firming up.

We owe it to agriculture and to the country to give flexible price supports—the Agricultural Act of 1954—a chance to operate. We operated for 10 years after the close of World War II with price supports designed to increase production for that emergency. We should now point our agriculture programs toward peacetime production.

In closing, we are talking about legislation and imagining what is going to happen when the act does not go into effect until the crop year of 1955 is marketed.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, it has been said by other speakers that the chances are no votes will be changed in this debate. However, the record can be set straight.

In the first place, I am deeply concerned about the condition of the farmers throughout the country and, like all of the other speakers, particularly about the farming conditions in Indiana and in the district which I have the privilege to represent. For example, I quote from the Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, April 1955, as follows:

Wheat: March 1954, $2.13; March 1955, $1.98.

Corn: March 1954, $1.43; March 1955, $1.33.

Soybeans: March 1954, $3.28; March 1955, $2.55.

Hogs: March 1954, $25.20; March 1955, $15.50.

Cattle: March 1954, $16.60; March 1955, $17.10.

Chickens: March 1954, 24 cents; March 1955, 27 cents.

Whole milk: March 1954, $3.75; March 1955, $3.75.

This points out the stark fact that there has been a decline in all of the commodities on which there was a rigid price support, and this decline has been continuing for 4 long years. In March of 1954, Secretary Benson invoked the one flexible feature of the existing farm parity price law and applied it to dairy products. Whole milk is the only product that has remained steady. As a small dairy farmer, I am very appreciative of this fact.

The farmers in Indiana have been writing and expressing themselves in favor of a change from this program, which has brought them nothing but declining prices and increased taxes. They refer to the fact that it seems that the only person to whom they could sell was the Federal Government. Since Secretary Benson changed the parity formula on dairy products, butter and other dairy products now are finding their way onto the consumer's table. At the same time, the milk checks that we have been receiving have been increasing. Is not that just good business?

Many farmers have expressed concern over the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its constantly expanded requirements for more money. It was reported recently that the CCC had approximately 72 million bushels of wheat stored in 317 ships at the end of 1954. Recently announced United States Department of Agriculture plans indicated that 105 additional ships will be required on the west coast to store approximately 24 million bushels of this grain.

The cost of the share of every taxpayer in this storage of agriculture products is increasing. The $7.1 billion worth of stored products and commodity loans reported in 1954 amounts to about $44.49 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. A year ago, when stored commodities and loans aggregated $5.7 billion, each person's share then was $35.78.

Perhaps the current argument in Congress brings up an important question. Have the farmers been oversold by politicians on what Government can do for them? I quote from the Better Farming magazine of May 1955:

Corn Belt farmers have been pondering this question. Has the Government been successful in the past in raising farm prices?

Here are average parity ratios since 1910:

1910	107
1911	96
1912	98
1913	101
1914	98
1915	94
1916	103
1917	120
1918	119
1919	110
1920	99
1921	80
1922	87
1923	89
1924	89
1925	95
1926	91
1927	88
1928	91
1929	92
1930	83
1931	67
1932	58
1933	64
1934	75
1935	88
1936	92
1937	93
1938	78
1939	77
1940	81
1941	93
1942	105
1943	113
1944	108
1945	109
1946	113
1947	115
1948	110
1949	100
1950	101
1951	107
1952	100
1953	92
1954	89

Figures, as we interpret them, show wars and droughts have influenced farm prices far more than Government supports.

Figures such as these show that wars and droughts have influenced farm prices far more than Government supports.

For my part, and I believe that I can safely say that the Indiana farmers will agree, we want to see the flexible price support program enacted by the 83d Congress given a chance. It does not go into effect until the 1955 crops are harvested and marketed. We do not want to see a plan or program followed that has brought nothing but declining farm prices and a depressed agricultural situation for the last 4 years. That is the reason that we oppose H. R. 12 which is merely a continuation of this old program which has been both costly to the farmer and expensive to the taxpayer.

These same farmers want to retain the right to produce basic commodities with a minimum of controls which will bring a full parity in the market place. The answer may not lie entirely in legislation. It may lie more in the field of marketing methods, improvement of export conditions, scientific advances and many similar factors. Great progress has been made during the last year in getting at a solution to the dairy problem. The price of milk and butterfat to farmers is at about the same level, and in some cases higher, than it was under the 90 percent price support provision that went out in April 1954. In other words, why should the farmer not have the same right that is enjoyed by other businessmen to sell his products at a price even higher than 90 percent on a parity schedule if he and his associates have the ingenuity, ability and desire to do so. Farming is a big business today. But there are many small farmers and none of the small farmers have benefited from even the rigid price support program which has been in existence. Actually, the benefits have gone to the large farmer and even to the large corporations.

For this reason, a plea is being made not only in behalf of the farmer but also in behalf of the consumer and the laboring man whose child is entitled to good food, and the taxpayer, to discontinue this expensive program and meet the problem in a realistic manner which the farmers want.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, for many years the American farmer could

consider himself fortunate in that his economy and his farm program were not made the objects of partisan politics. In the early days of the great depression farmers were the first to feel the pain of a faltering economy. Democrats and Republicans, in and out of Congress, teamed together in an effort to lift agriculture to its rightful place in our economy. Sundry programs were conceived, enacted, and, from time to time, perfected by amendment. The result was a good farm program, for which there has yet to be submitted a good substitute. It eliminated some of the enormous risks common to the farming enterprise. It assured farmers a fairer share of the Nation's net income. Farming, for the first time, was given a spot in the sunlight at the Federal level.

In the Congress bipartisan spirit and action prevailed. Republicans, who throughout most of those years were in the minority, took great delight in claiming equal credit for enactment of the programs. They pointed with pride to their cooperation and contributions, and rightly so. Farm organizations likewise praised the bipartisan spirit prevailing in the Agriculture Committees and in the Congress. I specifically recall the testimony of a great leader of one of the great farm organizations who warned that once the bipartisanship was broken down farmers would be the victims and the losers. Events of the past 2½ years have proven his prophecy to be so true. Farmers are now the losers of a broken bipartisan approach.

It had its beginning soon after this administration took office. This was quite contrary to their campaign commitments. Then they had nothing but praise for the program and committed themselves to carry on. In fact, they went a step farther and actually promised to up farm prices to 100 percent of parity. In so doing they actually took the farm issue, if one existed, completely out of the presidential campaign.

But as soon as they took over the reins of the Government, they plunged the program deep into partisan politics. There it has since remained.

Their continued criticism is something I am unable to understand unless it is their method to cover up the failure of their own program as well as their inability to properly and capably administer any program.

CRITICISMS AND EXCUSES

Mr. Benson and his subordinates now make two particular points on addressing themselves to the subject of agriculture.

First, they contend that the gargantuan losses sustained by American agriculture during the more than 2 years they have been in power can be laid to the holdover Democratic program which they have had to administer.

Second, they then take the offensive, contending that the farm economy is just all right, that it has leveled off, is now on the upgrade and that "we are moving in the right direction."

The answer to the first contention is, they have not tried to administer the so-called Democratic program. They have done everything in their power to make it a failure and have succeeded in making it just that. No program and no law is any better than its administration. The President himself conceded during his campaign that it was a good program. He solemnly pledged himself to carry it through and actually stood pat on the idea that farmers were entitled to a minimum of 90 percent parity. He even promised to get them more—100 percent. But for some reason after he and his administrators came into power they decided that the program was very bad. Therefore, they have done everything in their power to make it just that way. Who will contend that they have administered the program in a spirit of trying to make it work?

To answer the second argument, that farmers, under their leadership, "are moving in the right direction"—one need only take a look at the terrific decline in net farm income since they acquired control of the Department of Agriculture. During 1953, their first year in office, net farm income dropped from 13.62 billion to 13.27 billion, a loss of $350 million. During their second year, 1954, net farm income dropped from 13.27 billion to 11.98 billion, a loss of $1,300 million from the previous year, a total loss of 1.64 billion under their administration. The trend continues downward in 1955. In the face of this continued decline, staggering as it is, the Secretary, in testimony before our committee a few weeks ago, still contends that "we are moving in the right direction." Now, I ask you, are we?

DIVIDE AND CONQUER

The divide-and-conquer technique utilized by leaders in this administration to put the farmer on a flexible, slip-and-slide support program has been vicious. It was deliberately designed to weaken confidence of consumers in the sincerity of farmers and their willingness to play fair with consumers. Farmers have been held up to ridicule, likened to price gougers and parasites on the Nation's Treasury. Consumers have been led to believe that the price support program has increased the cost of their market basket. They have been led to believe that farmers were reaping unreasonably high profits and that the invocation of a sliding scale flexible price-support program would reduce costs.

Fortunately, most of the consumers have caught up with this argument. Without burdening the record with statistics which prove the point, it is a well-known fact that although farmers' net income has dropped heavily in the past 2 years, not one dime thereof has shown up to the benefit of the consumer in the cost of his food or clothing.

In the beginning the divide-and-conquer tactics had their effect. They paid dividends toward wrecking the program. In fact, they contributed materially to the success of this administration's effort last year to pass the bill lowering the support price on basics to 82½ percent of parity. But now the consumer has had the time to study and think through the claims of the support price flexers. And he has branded them as utterly false, which they are.

Consumers are buying food today cheaper than ever before. Furthermore, there are less hungry people in the country today than ever before, one of the reasons being that food is cheaper and more abundant. Here are the facts to prove it.

Figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1929 the average factory worker could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with an hour's wages. Today the average hour's wage will buy 10.3 pounds.

The average hour's wage would buy 1 pound of butter in 1929 and 2.6 pounds today; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.9 quarts today; 1.4 dozen eggs in 1929 and 2.9 dozen today; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and around 30 pounds today; 4.4 No. 2 cans of tomatoes in 1929 and 10.3 cans today; 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929 and 2 pounds today, and so on down the list.

At this time a 1-pound loaf of bread, by Government figures, sells at an average of 17.5 cents. The farmer gets only 2.8 cents for the wheat that goes into the loaf. In January 1948 the farm price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 per bushel and the average price of bread was 13.8 cents a loaf. In 1954 the farm price of wheat dropped as low as $1.91 per bushel, yet the average price of bread was then 17 cents. Thus, while the price of wheat declined 32 percent, the price of bread advanced 23 percent.

A $4 dress shirt contains less than 30 cents worth of cotton.

The farmer receives now only 42 cents of each dollar the consumer pays for food.

So, it is not true that the price-support program has made costs high to the consumer. Even when the Secretary dropped the support price on milk from 90 to 75 percent of parity no noticeable difference in the price followed to consumers.

PURCHASING POWER OF FARMERS

With the exception of farmers, the purchasing power of almost every segment of our economy is either stabilized or on the upgrade while farmers are feeling the pinch. This was graphically portrayed in a recent edition of the U. S. News & World Report. Therein was displayed a table which showed net weekly earnings or weekly buying power of 20 leading classes of employed people in the United States in 1950, 1954, and their estimated income for 1955. Here are the figures for 10 of the most important of these occupations:

	Buying power in 1950	Buying power in 1954	Estimated 1955 buying power
Average factory worker	$57.19	$59.70	$61.37
Auto worker	69.01	71.54	72.84
Steelworker	64.18	68.14	71.32
Soft-coal miner	66.44	66.84	69.26
Machinery-manufacturing employee	63.92	67.15	67.82
Farm-implement worker	61.61	64.36	65.50
Railroad worker	58.16	62.27	64.41
Schoolteacher	56.63	61.28	64.25
Federal employee	60.74	60.87	63.60
Farm owner	42.10	39.52	37.24

What are the two most remarkable things developed by these statistics?

First. For all of the above occupations, income increased from 1953 to 1954—with one exception, farmers.

Second. For all occupations, income is expected to increase in 1955 with only one exception. What is that exception? Again, farmers, who during this administration have become the "low man on the totem pole."

Still, the agricultural leaders of this administration contend that "'We"—meaning farmers—"are moving in the right direction." If the "right direction" is downward, then the farmer is certainly moving that way. And, unfortunately, the program of the flexers is to expedite the move by dropping supports this year to 82½ percent of parity and next year to 75 percent, which, according to all accepted standards, is 75 percent of a fair price.

CAMPAIGN PROMISES OF 1952

I think it is quite appropriate right here to go back and review the promises of the Republican Party and its candidate for President in 1952.

Republicans during their 1952 campaign made no mention of sliding scale, flexible, or variable price supports. They would not have dared to do so. In fact, they led our farmers to believe that they were not only for the 90-percent support program but might go the Democrats 10 percent better and make it 100-percent supports.

THE GOLDEN PROMISE

Let us see now where Candidate Eisenhower stood less than 2 years ago.

On a fall day in Kasson, Minn., he took the farm program right out of the campaign with his golden promise and here are his exact words:

Here and now, without any "ifs" or "buts" I say to you and I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the amendment to the basic farm act to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair full share of the national income. A fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

Now, I leave it to you, Members of the House, what impression did candidate Eisenhower leave? What impression did he intend to leave? Do you suppose a single farmer who heard that speech once interpreted it to mean that Ike was going to reduce the price supports to 75 percent of parity? Do you once suppose any farmer who heard the speech or read it ever dreamed that Ike was going to sponsor and impress upon him a sliding scale of price supports, which slides only one way, downhill, to 75 percent of a fair price?

The famous Eisenhower speech at Kasson, opening the farm campaign, did not promise flatly the continuation of 90 percent supports after 1954, but first, it used every conceivable oratorical device to give that false impression; second, it made no mention of sliding scale or flexible supports thereafter; and, third, the candidate was accompanied on the plane trip to that historic occasion by the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, and long-time advocate of price supports which really support prices.

For these various reasons, the press and radio of the country were completely misled, a condition in which they remained throughout the campaign. The following collection of headlines which were used by leading newspapers on page 1 in reporting General Eisenhower's Kasson speech makes this obvious:

"Ike Promises To Work for 100 Percent Farm Parity." (Milwaukee Journal, September 6, 1952.)

"Ike's Goal 100 Percent Farm Parity—Eisenhower Guarantees High Prices." (The Telegraph-Herald, Dubuque, Iowa, September 7.)

"Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent of Parity." (The Minneapolis Star, September 6.)

"Ike Favors More Farm Props and 100 Percent Parity." (The Indianapolis News, September 6.)

"Eisenhower Promises Farmers He's Behind Full Parity for Them." (The Lincoln Evening Journal, September 6.)

"Ike Calls for Full Parity on Farm Products." (Madison Capital Times, September 6.)

"Ike Would Up Farm Income." (Milwaukee Sentinel, September 7.)

"Eisenhower Pledges Full Parity Try." (Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, September 7.)

"Ike Offers Plan for Farm Price Boost." (Des Moines Register, September 6.)

"Ike, Adlai Bid for Farm Vote—Both Promise To Continue 90 Percent Support." (Des Moines Register, September 7.)

"Eisenhower Bid for Farm Votes—Tells His Plan for Full Parity." (Illinois State Register, Springfield, September 7.)

"General Backs 100 Percent Parity Price." (Bismarck, N. Dak.) Tribune, September 6.)

"Ike Down Line on Parity Laws." (Wichita Eagle, September 7.)

"General Pledges Price Aid." (St. Paul Dispatch, September 7.)

"Both Ike and Adlai Endorse 90 Percent Farm Supports." (Minneapolis Tribune, September 7.)

After Kasson, there were daily opportunities, of course, to correct the widely-held false impression before farmers relied on it and voted accordingly. And most certainly, General Eisenhower could have declared himself at any time in favor of flexible price supports for after 1954, if he had believed in them and wanted to do so. But we can find no record of his having mentioned the word "flexible" or any of its synonyms during the entire campaign.

But, Candidate Eisenhower did not either start or stop promising in Kasson. In fact, prior to the Kasson speech, to be exact, on September 30, 1952, when he appeared in Columbia, S. C., he said:

I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Search this statement closely. Determine for yourself what impression he intended to and did leave with his listeners. He solemnly planted himself upon the program of 90 percent of parity. He was speaking in a cotton producing State. He wanted their votes. When the returns were in he had come very close to carrying South Carolina, a State which has never before given a Republican candidate even as much as 10 percent of its vote. With the cotton South listening to this speech and believing Ike believed in their program, he did carry several cotton States. Now what is to be the reward of South Carolina and other cotton farmers who heard the speech and voted for him on the strength of it? Cheap cotton, lower income, and a lower standard of living—a poor reward indeed.

Candidate Eisenhower chose an appearance at Brookings, S. Dak., October 4, to summarize his farm views—1 month after the more famous Kasson speech. This time, there was no small print as you will see from this paragraph dealing with price supports:

Quite naturally, in a great region such as this there is more of a special interest in agriculture than there is in some of our other economic forms of life. I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson, in Minnesota, some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back platform speeches I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

Now, did he mean what he said? If not, these quotes will come back to haunt him the rest of his political life. Actually, farmers believed what he said. These emphatic endorsements of the present farm program "without any 'ifs' or 'buts'" actually took the farm issue out of the campaign and resulted in overwhelming Republican victories throughout the Farm Belt. Now that they have won the elections, hold the offices and run the Government, they offer farmers a sliding scale which slides one way only—downhill. How different from the promises of the Republican candidates of 1952.

NO ONE BEING FOOLED

But, Mr. Chairman, no one is being fooled. The people are alert to what is going on. They remember what was said in 1952 and who said it. As evidence hereof let me read two editorials which appeared in midwestern newspapers. The editorial from the Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., reads as follows:

Back in 1952, Candidate Eisenhower made several speeches in the farm regions. Candidate Stevenson of the Democrats was advocating a system of fixed price supports at 90 percent of parity. Candidate Eisenhower matched this and even went so far as to say that the objective should be 100 percent of parity.

Particularly at Brookings—the speech of primary interest to this area—pledged himself to a full support of the fixed price program.

So the House Agriculture Committee, in voting for a bill continuing fixed price supports, did only what Candidate Eisenhower promised the farmers in the campaign of 1952 that he would do.

These are the blunt facts and there's little purpose, politically or otherwise, in ignoring them.

The Republican Party and its candidate for the Presidency went on record in 1952, when they were trying to get the votes of the farmers, in favor of fixed price supports.

Are the farmers to believe now that the Republicans say one thing during a campaign and do something else after they have been elected? Apparently the House Agriculture Committee is ready to respect the

campaign pledge. President Eisenhower should be induced to do likewise.

The editorial from a newspaper published in Hayti, S. Dak., offers even more food for thought—Republican thought, that is. It follows:

President Eisenhower and sympathetic administration leaders worry about the adverse effect of the McCarthy investigations on the GOP, when they should be worrying more about the effect of the betrayal of campaign promises on the farm price issue. At the moment Agriculture Secretary Benson is reported considering urging a veto if fixed price supports pass Congress, which they appear likely to do. If that transpires, after all the fulsome promises of 90 percent and 100 percent parity pledges by the President as a candidate at Kasson, Minn., and at Brookings, the GOP can just about kiss the farm vote goodbye. Even as matters stand, it hangs by a thread, farm voters in general standing by in a wait-and-see frame of mind. Rightly or wrongly, farmers were assured in the election campaign that they would never be let down by the administration, and that promise, or at least a reasonable facsimile, should be kept.

Now, it is not pleasant, Mr. Chairman, to bring criticism on anyone but the facts remain that farmers are not getting from this administration that which was promised them in 1952. I trust that administration leaders will reverse themselves and turn back to their commitments.

NO LESS FREEDOM IN FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS

Secretary Benson and other flexible advocates contend that flexible supports mean less controls and more freedom for farmers. This is a fallacy.

The same machinery for production adjustments must be used with either 90 percent or flexible price supports in effect, unless prices are allowed to drop so low that farmers are squeezed so hard they are unable to get credit or other resources needed to continue producing a crop. Present law, with the flexible supports approved in the Agricultural Act of 1954, requires exactly the same controls that were used under the fixed 90 percent supports for the basic crops. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked for no easing of his control powers but, in fact, has sought the authority to impose in connection with the flexible support program the tightest controls in the history of the farm program, through cross compliance and control over the use of acres diverted from the basic crops.

SURPLUSES

It is also a fallacy that the 90-percent support on basic crops is primarily responsible for the accumulation of existing surpluses and that the flexible would of itself discourage production and solve the surplus problem.

The large stores of food and fiber, which have brought the great economic problems to our farmers, were created not from the 90-percent supports on the basic crops, or from any fault of the farmer, but derive primarily from the vast expansion of our agricultural output in response to Government appeals for ever-increasing production of food and fiber during World War II, and later to meet foreign obligations and the needs anticipated in connection with the Korean conflict.

The output of food and fiber attained a rate more than 40 percent above prewar levels.

A recent decline in farm exports, plus the fact that agricultural production cannot be cut off instantly, plus the decision of the Government to continue production at a high level during the Korean war, have brought on the accumulation of food and fiber in our warehouses in the last 3 years.

As to the contention that lower levels of price support, down to 75 percent on the basics, would discourage production and help solve the surplus problem, information given the committee indicates the contrary is true—that with all farm products in ample supply, farmers as long as they are economically able will maintain or increase their production in an effort to protect their income in the face of falling prices. There is no reason to believe that our surplus problem would be any less had flexible supports been in effect since 1952.

While these and other fallacies have led to wide misunderstanding by city people, and among farmers themselves, they have not obscured the issue that is presented to the Congress.

The decision to be made is whether we force the farmers of America to bear large and unnecessary costs in adjusting our production of food and fiber, with the risk of damage to our whole economy; or whether we accept abundance as a blessing, with its problems to be shared by all the people in a program that seeks economic equality for agriculture and maintains a solid foundation for the well-being and prosperity of all segments of our society.

CONCLUSION

Fortunately, we have the most productive agriculture in the world. Our people are the best fed and the best clothed. We have an abundance of food of the widest variety, the best quality and actually the cheapest. Our farmers have made American agriculture the envy of the civilized world.

Our abundant production is a blessing, not a burden. Russia today with more land and more farmers is unable to feed and clothe its people adequately. As late as the last few weeks, reports have come through that they might send a delegation to America to see and learn how our farmers do such a good job. When and if they do come and observe the wonderful accomplishments of our farm people, would you not drop your head in shame if they were shown the figures revealing that the average annual income of people living on our farms from farm sources is only $658, just about one-third of the annual per capita income of all nonfarmers? Would it not also be more shameful to admit that it will, in all probability, be less this year? And, would it not be even more shameful to admit that we are going to permit a program to come into effect next year—a slide to 75 percent of parity—that will lower it even more?

We have established 100-percent parity as a fair price for our farmers. That should be the minimum, not the maximum. Actually, we should not be content with anything less. The President himself, as a candidate, contended that he would not be satisfied with farmers getting less and he promised to get it. I just wish that he and his agricultural leaders would devote their efforts toward the attainment of such a goal. They forgot so soon after winning the election.

Agriculture is indispensable. There are some things we can do without, but farming is not one of them. People must have food. They must have clothes. Every one of us is dependent upon the land. Its production is essential to a strong healthy nation. Those who till the land must be assured of at least the cost of production plus a fair profit if they are to remain there. The bill before you will keep them there. In turn it will benefit us all.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, experience has proved that rigid 90-percent price supports have been a failure as a peacetime program. H. R. 12 seeks to reenact a farm program which defeats its own ends and which hurts the very people it pretends to help. In my opinion, further extension of high-rigid supports threatens a major collapse of the whole farm program.

We must remember that the American economy is still based upon supply and demand. Any further attempt to build an artificial wall around agriculture—separating it from natural economic forces, will be tantamount to inviting those forces to act as did the trumpets of the Israelites which worked upon the walls of Jericho until "they fell down flat." The alarming developments in farm surpluses signal that we are in the crescendo stage.

I am as anxious to prevent this breakdown as are the majority members of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who seek 90 percent of parity, but we differ sharply on the means of preventing such a collapse. Let us then briefly examine the latest results of the system of high supports.

Every dollar of loss in farm income on the basic crops is a loss under the high, rigid 90 percent price support program which H. R. 12 is designed to perpetuate. The Secretary of Agriculture says not one bale of cotton, not one bushel of wheat, not one hundredweight of rice has been sold or stored under the flexible price support program. High, rigid price supports are the major cause of the 25 percent decline in farm income since 1947. They obviously, therefore, cannot be the cure for the decline in farm income.

The price system is a balance wheel between supply and demand. Destruction of such a balance brings about chaos. The function of price supports is to adjust production to what the market wants, to adjust consumption to what is produced, and to bring about orderly marketing. The abuse of price supports is to destroy the balance between supply and demand by making the Government the bottomless stomach of American agriculture. We see clearly the results of this abuse today under 90 percent rigid supports.

THE ALARMING ACCUMULATION OF SURPLUSES

The rate at which surpluses of basic commodities are moving into Government hands is alarming.

If mandatory rigid price supports at 90 percent were the answer, there would be no problem of surpluses. At the present time, however, the surplus problem is grave. For example, there are 2 bushels of wheat in sight for every bushel that is needed; the carryover is 975 million bushels, and the new wheat crop is estimated at 850 million bushels, which makes a total of 1,825,000,000 bushels. Let us examine wheat production further:

First. Data as of February 15, 1955, show that 43.8 percent of the 1954 wheat crop had been placed under loan.

Second. A large part of the wheat which is now being produced is not the type that the mills prefer, while other types are in short supply. This stimulation of peripheral production points up further the extent to which rigid supports permit flaunting of natural market forces. Not only does the omnipresent stomach of the Government permit overproduction, it also permits the grower to ignore normal demands of quality.

Third. Out of 425 million bushels upon which the Government made loans and purchase agreements for the 1954 crop, only 16 million bushels had been redeemed by February 15, 1955.

Fourth. The carryover of wheat has skyrocketed during the last 3 years from 256 million bushels in 1952 to 903 million bushels in 1954.

The carryover of cotton, August 1, 1954, was 9.7 million bales, which makes a total supply of 23,200,000 bales. This is enough cotton to meet our domestic needs and exports for the next 1¾ years.

The carryover of rice is also a matter of grave concern. Last August it was 7½ million hundredweight, while the 1954 crop was 59 million hundredweight. This gives a total of 66½ million hundredweight, or a supply for 1½ years. According to the Joint Economic Report, 51 percent of the entire 1954 rice crop was under the price-support loan.

It is becomingly increasingly obvious, therefore, that under high rigid price supports in times of peace, the Government becomes the consumer. This I maintain is an abortion of the legitimate and commendable purposes of price supports, and this is another striking example of how governmental functions tend to persist long after the purpose for which they were created has disappeared.

THE COST OF RIGID PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS

We have seen that the piling up of huge surpluses in Government hands is the first threat to the whole farm program. The second and equally important threat to the program is the skyrocketing of costs under high support prices.

The first cost is to the farmer in the form of loss of farm income previously noted. The second cost comes in the form of higher taxes and greater deficits under which all suffer.

The majority report on H. R. 12 minimizes the cost to the Treasury of this program. I quote from this report, pages 15 and 16:

> Those who seek to break down the firm 90-percent supports for these crops have given our citizens the erroneous impression that the firm supports have cost the Nation billions of dollars.
>
> The truth is that the Commodity Credit Corporation by its own records of December 31, 1954, showed a profit to the Government of $13,011,290. On December 31, 1954, losses on the CCC support program for the basic crops amounted to $300,109,993, largely the result of overproduction for anticipated needs in connection with the Korean conflict.

Much to my regret and disappointment our Committee on Agriculture has made public in this Report No. 203 written in defense of H. R. 12, two important inferences, both of which are misleading.

The first misleading inference is that the recorded CCC losses of $300,109,993 are the only losses incurred by the Federal Government in its program of price income supports on basic commodities.

The CCC is a great funnel through which billions of Government dollars are siphoned out of the United States Treasury. Losses are chargeable in the main to other accounts and do not stay on the CCC books. To infer that the recorded CCC losses are the only losses incurred is just as justifiable as holding up a funnel to the light and saying, "It's empty. Nothing has gone through it."

And the second misleading inference is the statement that the program has not cost the Nation billions of dollars.

When I challenged these assertions in the committee hearings, I received permission from the Secretary of Agriculture to insert in the record a complete cost statement. He reports:

> The aggregate realized cost of these programs for the period from 1932 through 1954 was $8,369,200,000 of which $962,500,000 represents costs realized in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The costs of 1954 were almost three times those realized during the fiscal year of 1953.

The Secretary's report does not include the so-called consumer subsidy programs during World War II and the early postwar years, which cost the Federal Government $4¼ billion. This amount constituted income to farmers which they otherwise would not have received. Since most other industries did not get such subsidies, because it would obviously have rendered OPA price ceilings meaningless, these programs were farmer subsidies and not really consumer subsidy programs. Add to this $4,245,000,000 the cost figure published by the Department of $8,369,200,000 and the cost would be $12,614,600,000.

Even this, however, is not the total cost of the farm price and income support program. It does not include the payments made to sugar programs and administrative costs amounting to $905 million. It is true that processing and excise taxes collected on the processing and importation of sugar amounted to $1,216,400 but this money is deposited by the Collector of Internal Revenue in the general moneys of the Treasury. It is not earmarked for payment to growers and undoubtedly would have been collected independently of any support prices. Payments to growers are made by the Department of Agriculture from appropriations made annually by the Congress. It is therefore completely unrealistic to deduct from the tax and excise receipts the payments made to growers and thereby claim that the sugar program has made a profit. This type of analysis serves to hide the cost of the program from the public.

Actually the total net realized cost of farm price and income support programs to the American taxpayer and consumer is not $8,369,200,000 but $13,520,200,000.

The Commodity Stabilization Service of USDA reports under date of April 15, 1955, that the CCC investment of $7.4 billion in surplus commodities has a present value of $3,973,552,000, indicating that unless war or something unforeseen happens losses of this amount will be added to the $13.5 billion figure.

The Department of Agriculture charges the basic commodities with net determined losses of $5,077,100,000 as follows:

Corn	$1,228,200,000
Cotton	1,581,400,000
Peanuts	163,000,000
Rice	35,300,000
Tobacco	97,000,000
Wheat	1,972,200,000
Total	5,077,100,000

These are the realized costs of the basic commodities under high rigid price supports and, contrary to the majority committee report, *they do run into the billions of dollars* and the end is not yet in sight, because the trend is radically upward, as revealed by the fact that losses in 1954 were three times those realized in 1953. Storage costs alone will run $1 million every single day, by June 1.

Therefore, the advocates of high supports do their cause a disservice when they issue misleading claims regarding the cost of the program. Such practices are unfair to those who try to search out the results of the program. In fact, the best way I can describe the misleading tactics of some supporters of 90 percent of parity is to make them analagous to a strategy used by German subs in World War II. When our destroyers tried to search out the subs by radar they would often be thrown off the track by unwittingly tracking a bubble of air which the subs would emit to mislead the destroyer's radar. The German word to describe this clever tactic is "pillenwerfering" or "pill throwing." Fortunately, like our radar men, the American people have learned to distinguish between fact and fancy.

Thirteen and one-half billion dollars is a tremendous sum of money. Yet an expenditure that large would be fully justified if it would stabilize prices and cure the farmers' ills. But instead of solving the farmers' problem, high, rigid support prices have well nigh ruined him. It takes far wealthier and wiser people than we are to nullify the law of supply and demand, or to continue over a period of time to produce more than can be consumed and at the same time sell the products at high prices.

HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS ARE ANTAGONIZING THE PUBLIC

During the past year there has been a transformation in the attitude of the populace toward high, rigid price and income supports in times of peace. The tide of public opinion has already turned against them.

The reasons for this growing hostility toward high, rigid price supports in times of peace are many. There is time in this speech to mention only a few. First among these as we have seen is the fact that surpluses are mounting at an alarming rate under high-support prices. This will cause the program to fall of its own weight just as the experiment with high supports on potatoes did.

Second. The losses and costs to the farmer, the taxpayer, and the public under 90-percent support prices shot up to dizzy heights. Losses within the near future as a result of high supports bid well to be even heavier. The farmer, the taxpayer, and the consuming public will not endure these costs much longer.

Third. These losses have been minimized by statistical juggling, but the truth will come out and when it is fully understood opposition will increase.

Fourth. We are learning that these high supports are not helping the people whom we want to help most. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his special farm message to Congress, January 11, 1954:

> The chief beneficiaries of our price-support policies have been the 2 million larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports.

Fifth. High rigid supports on basic crops effect adversely the growers of nonsupport crops and discriminate against these growers. For example artificially stimulated feed grains react unfavorably on the poultry industry. It is also an injustice to spend such large sums in the support of prices on basic crops which produce only 22 percent of the farm income, and at the same time provide no high support prices on the products of the other 78 percent of our farm income. There is growing opposition to these forms of unfair discrimination.

Sixth. There is growing antagonism among farmers themselves because high prices are of little value to the man who has little or nothing to sell due to drastic reductions in acreage allotments which must accompany high support prices.

Seventh. There is growing resentment toward the waste that comes from artificially stimulating the production of commodities which the public will not buy, and constantly directing new capital into channels where there is already too much capital invested. This threatens with insolvency the farmers who own the present investment.

To continue to attract by incentive payments more production capital into farming than it needs is a sin. It is not the kind of treatment which our regular farmers—I exclude here the "suitcase farmers"—deserve as a reward for their patriotic services during the war.

Eighth. There is growing antagonism because high price supports are pricing our commodities out of the foreign markets to the extent that foreign countries are being required to raise their own products and will not need ours in the future. The permanent loss of foreign markets is proving to be a staggering blow to our farmers.

LOSS OF MARKETS

Ninth. Nonsupported commodities have fared much better than the supported basic commodities in every year except one. In spite of the depression in poultry and eggs last year, the producers would not hear of price supports. They are working themselves out very nicely.

Take the potato situation as a second example. In 1948 when the support price was 90 percent, the market was glutted, the Government lost $223 million; the farmers received $1.52 per bushel; and the last 5 years under price controls they received an average of $1.35. During the years 1951 to 1955 under no price supports, the farmers have averaged $1.59 per bushel; they have limited their production to the amount that can be consumed; there are no surpluses in Government hands and no losses to the taxpayer. Potato growers have testified before Congress that they could not be induced to return to 90 percent supports.

Flexible supports will stabilize the dairy industry if we will only give them some time and a fair chance. In February of this year the householders bought 20 percent more butter than they did in February of 1954. The use of butter in the United States under 90 percent parity was 8.5 pounds per person, while the use in 1955 under flexible supports will be about 9.3 pounds per person. The industry is upon its feet courageously fighting to get its markets back and it is succeeding. It was rapidly losing its markets under 90 percent rigid supports. It is recovering its markets partly because butter has dropped 9 cents per pound to the housewife, and partly on account of a vigorous sales campaign.

The same encouraging trend prevails with respect to fluid milk. In most areas the price has dropped from 1 to 3 cents per quart; more fluid milk is being consumed and much less is going into butter and cheese. Consumption of all dairy products has jumped a remarkable 4 billion pounds and the amount going into Government purchase has been cut almost in half since 90 percent supports were abandoned.

It is true that the producer receives 31 cents less per hundred pounds of milk than under the previous 90 percent supports. This is equal to a drop of about 7 cents per pound of butter; yet, the drop in the price of butter to the housewife has been 9 cents per pound and drop in price of milk has been in the main 1 cent to 3 cents per quart. I am firmly convinced that this loss of 31 cents per hundred pounds of milk to the producer is in the long run not a loss but a good investment because he is recovering his markets and thereby preventing a complete breakdown of his industry.

In the spring of 1952, when hog prices fell to 76 percent of parity, speeches were made in both the House and Senate urging 90 percent price supports on hogs. Had this happened we would have raised more pigs, consumers would have eaten less pork, and large stocks of pork would have flowed into Government hands. If 90 percent supports had been enacted we would have created more problems than we would have solved. We didn't enact 90 percent supports and what happened? Consumers, attracted by lower prices, ate up the surpluses. Per capita consumption of pork increased from 55 to 76 pounds. Producers cut production of pigs 10 percent and prices went up from 105 to 120 percent of parity and stayed there for 2 years. Despite a little current weakness, largely due to unwarranted imports of pork, we have met the pig problem. If imports of pork into our country are curbed, the industry can meet the challenge of the marketplace without high supports.

These are only a few comparisons which show the obvious advantages of flexibility in supports.

What annoys the farmers in my State is the accusations that he is asking for and receiving a "handout from the Government," whereas on the contrary, he is begging us to give the farms back to the farmers and to take agriculture out of politics. He is sick of Federal control and more Federal laws, and especially projected plans which switch back and forth so he never knows where he stands or what to plan.

To summarize, then, we have seen, first, that the misuse of price supports to stimulate unwanted production and to force nearly 50 percent of our basic crops into Government storage is an abortion of the legitimate and commendable purpose of price supports and will ruin our economy if continued; second, that losses under the 90 percent rigid supports have skyrocketed to the extent that they threaten the whole agricultural program; third, that the American consumer, the taxpayer and the farmers themselves resent this plan to subsidize waste and to discriminate in favor of the basic crops when it is becoming increasingly obvious that the nonsupported commodities and those now under flexible supports are and will be better off than the basic crops which have received 90 percent rigid support prices; and, fourth, that to continue to attempt to build up high artificial walls around agriculture is futile and will cause the program to fall of its own weight.

The piling up of more mountains of surpluses and the wasting of more billions of dollars will not solve the farmers' problem; it will merely postpone a day of reckoning and sentence him to become more and more dependent upon the whims of legislation. There is no better time to face reality than now. We must be strong enough to choose the right way even though it be the hard way.

Mr. Chairman, the American farmer's best defense against economic fallacy, loss of income and the creeping controls

of statism lies in the principles advocated by our great Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. I urge my colleagues to defeat H. R. 12 in order that those principles may be allowed to operate.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just finished speaking down here at this microphone is bothered apparently a lot by subsidies. I am not going to argue whether subsidies are right or wrong or whether they are justified or not justified. I want to examine this subsidy proposition for a few minutes. For the past 150 years American business and industry have enjoyed a relatively high protective tariff. When foreign goods were produced and shipped to this country to compete with our manufacturers, a tariff was levied on those goods in order that American manufacturers could still sell their goods a little cheaper than their foreign competitors. In recent years we passed a minimum wage law. We have protected labor in its right to collective bargaining. This was good, as a result, it has continued to raise our standard of living until today we enjoy a higher standard of living than any Nation in the world. Yet, during all the history of America except the last 22 years, the farmer has had no protection. But at all other times, while he bought in a protected market, he sold in an unprotected market. The only reason he was able to survive for such a long period was due to the fact that he was mining the virgin fertility out of his land and selling it and not returning the plant food to the soil. Finally, the result became chaos for the American farmer in the early thirties and was immediately followed by chaos for the entire economy of the country. For the past 20 years, the farmer has had protection for many of his major crops and you all know he has and is receiving much unfavorable publicity. Far and wide through the press and over the radio and from speakers' platforms we hear about the high subsidies that the farmer is receiving. It has been said that the farmers are on a dole and they are sacrificing their liberties for a few paltry dollars and so forth. We have had farm price supports for about 18 years. What has been the actual cost of this price support program to the Federal Government? I am speaking of price supports of our basic commodities. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics sets an overall figure of $1.3 billion for a 20-year period—or slightly over $72 million a year, and if you care to divide the yearly cost by the present population, you will find it has cost about 50 cents per person per year to support farm prices on our basic commodities.

Now let us look at some of the subsidies that Uncle Sam has been paying and about which you hear nothing. The postal deficit has been running about $500 million per year over a 5- or 6-year period. Remember that first-class mail and parcel post are in the black. But this half-billion-dollar deficit comes about because Uncle Sam is delivering catalogs, magazines, and advertising matter for $500 million less than it costs to deliver them. I would consider that a subsidy. The subsidy to our airlines has been running about $80 million a year; that is considerably more than the price supports on our basic commodities has been costing.

The oil, gas, and mining industry has been and still is receiving a depletion allowance running as high as 27½ percent of their gross earnings, while the farmer is receiving no depletion allowance on the soil that he is wearing out in the process of feeding and clothing this Nation.

In the shipping industry we have two kinds of subsidies. The first is a construction subsidy. The Government helps to build the ships. Then we have the operating subsidy to enable the owners to operate the ships which the Government helped them to build. Now, I am not criticizing; I am just stating the facts. This shipping subsidy has been costing the Government a construction subsidy of $40 million yearly, and an operating subsidy of $48 million, or a total of $88 million per year to the shipping industry.

Now let us see what subsidies have been paid to business and industry. I am going to quote:

> Business as such was paid $40,787,864,000 following the end of World War II, in what was known as industrial-reconversion payments, including tax amortization.

This quotation is from a speech by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. First the Government paid industry $14 billion to change from peacetime to wartime goods; then as soon as the war was over, they were paid another $40 billion to change back again. This industrial conversion and reconversion program alone cost the people of the United States of America a grand total of $54 billion, while farm-price supports were costing only $72 million per year, or 50 cents per capita per year. This included tax and plant amortization.

Again, I am not criticizing. Perhaps all this vast subsidy was justified in the interest of national defense, but why do so many people try to make the farmer the only villian in the United States who has or ever did receive a subsidy?

Now, last but by no means least, consider what has been done in the past with the land itself. There is roughly 462 million tillable acres of land in the United States, and between 1850 and 1890, 183 million of those acres were given to the railroads. You can call it a gift, a subsidy, a construction incentive, or what you will, but the fact remains, the Federal Government gave more than one-third of all the farm land in the United States to the railroads. It has been estimated by economists that this land was worth $1.3 billion at the time it was given to the railroads, and I think that estimate is very conservative.

We have been giving away $5 billion per year in foreign aid. Now, if you apply a little simple arithmetic to the above, you will find the American farmer has received about 50 cents out of each $100 that the Federal Government has paid in subsidies; and gentlemen come to this microphone and complain about that.

This very same House that this year voted a raise for themselves and for Federal judges and postal employees, and probably will vote to raise the minimum wage and now try to take away from the American farmer his price supports. That is like going to a man with a broken leg and offering him a rubber crutch. It is like building a home on a flexible foundation. I do not like these flexible things. They all end in bankruptcy.

When industry is ready to have the protective tariff repealed and quit asking the Government for reconversion payments and tax writeoffs, when shipping is ready to compete with the ship lines of the world without Government aid, when magazines, catalog houses, and advertisers are ready to pay as much postage as it costs the Government to deliver their mail, when air lines are ready to operate on their own, without Government help, when the oil industry is ready to forego its depletion allowance, then, and not until then, will I be ready to farm without 90 percent price supports. The American farmer can compete in a free economy if the entire economy is free, but when he is forced to buy the goods and services of a protected economy and sell his food and fiber in a free market, unless he has adequate price supports he is doomed to bankruptcy, and will in the end drag every other segment of the Nation down with him to depression and ruin.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 12.

I am in the rather novel position of being a farmer instead of just representing a lot of farmers; I am both. I am not naive enough to think that either 90 percent of parity or H. R. 12 can solve all the farm problems, but I do believe it will afford some temporary stabilization to our agricultural economy.

Mr. Chairman, I can agree with some statements and conclusions made by the proponents of flexible price supports here today—especially those relative to dairy products. As in the case of all commodities, if there is a potential customer, there is always a potential chance to make an additional sale at an accepted or available price level providing, of course, the commodity is also of acceptable quality. We all know there is still a segment of our population that could and would like to absorb more dairy products, and this group represents potential customers. In this connection, however, in calculating the increase in fluid milk consumption in the recent year we must take into account Federal appropriations for the school lunch program. From these Federal appropriations, in my opinion, the dairy industry has been one of the principal benefactors. This could be interpreted as an indirect support.

The case of wheat is entirely different as there is not a market, domestic at least, that has not been saturated. If

wheat were given away for food purposes I doubt if it would increase the consumption measurably. Therefore, we must accept acreage controls to maintain any supported price comparable to parity. I am willing to concede, to be fair, that reestablishing 90 percent of parity is not going to solve the overall problem but I cannot see that it will aggravate it. In the meantime it will afford a small degree of relief to the cost-price squeeze that has overtaken the average farmer. This cost-price squeeze has been brought about primarily through the reduction of allotted acres rather than lower parity but the combination of the two has placed this same average farmer in most unfortunate circumstances. I do believe that a variable support price regulated by the milling quality of the wheat produced would be a highly desirable formula. However, the administration of such a practice is complicated to the extent that I question how it could operate.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I do not propose that returning to 90 percent of parity will solve the farm problem. I do feel, however, it is the best possible way now available to help stabilize our faltering agricultural economy. I am of the opinion that over a period of years direct commodity support should be replaced with an expanded soil conservation program under which a farmer could earn income for permanent soil building practices in lieu of existing commodity support by the Federal Government. This plan would supplement the farmers' income, decrease commodity production and storage problems and at the same time increase the fertility of the soil for food production that will obviously be needed by generations to come. Such a plan would also build safeguards against water and wind erosion problems and to a large extent stabilize our water shortage and flood problems.

Since such a plan has not been pursued in detail I rise in support of H. R. 12, as amended, as the best possible assistance to agriculture at this time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I was born and reared on a farm, and all of my life has been spent in a rural section.

Under the 90 percent parity formula for the 6 basic crops I have seen the economy of the American farmer develop and to some extent, prosper. I use the word "prosper" advisedly. I do not mean that our farmers have prospered in any way comparable to other businesses in America. I only mean that under the 90 percent of parity law they have improved their lot as against the era when they were fortunate to have a home of any kind, and have some clothes, though they abounded in patches, and to have even these things it was necessary to keep the children out of school so that they could help with the farming operations.

Even under the 90 percent parity provision we have had, we now have approximately 1,250,000 farmers who earn less than $1,500 a year. We must all concede that only in the agricultural field do we find this condition to be true.

The Democrats and Republicans, and I gladly say it took Members of both parties to pass the 90 percent parity provisions for the 6 basic crops, can look with pride upon the results they accomplished. It would seem there would be no argument over the value and utility of the 90 percent of parity law. Nevertheless, we are now confronted with the question: Will we write a 90-percent parity law for the 6 basic crops, or will we retain the flexible, or sliding scale, provisions?

Today, the farmer's income is lower than since 1940. Agriculture products are down, but the stock market is booming. The House Agriculture Committee, in its report in the 83d Congress—1954—says there was a 13-percent decline in net farm income in the preceeding 2 years, though the rest of the economy soared to new heights. Now, that committee says that farm prices are down on an average of 22 percent since 1952, and that the net income is down 28 percent since 1947, and 10 percent below 1953. That committee, also, says that further declines are scheduled for 1955 and 1956. Despite these facts related, the same committee says that the cost of farming continues to increase and that in the past 5 years there has been a 14 percent increase in prices paid by the farmers.

I view with alarm the terrible fact that the farm mortgage debt has nearly doubled since the end of World War II. I wonder if that fact does not impress every Member of this House? I wonder if we know that the farmers' share in the national income dropped from 9.4 percent in 1951 to 7.2 percent in 1954? If we do, surely we will be willing to set up a rigid 90-percent parity support law for the six basic crops, and thereby try to give the farmer a chance to maintain his farming operations.

Mr. Chairman, we had better seriously consider what the plight of agriculture means. I hope we have not forgotten the 1920's, when an industrial and financial boom hid the wretched and almost naked plight of the farmers. There are 20 million farmers in this country, and there are 30 million people in rural areas who are economically dependent upon the farmer. Further, the economy of our country rises and falls upon the ability of agriculture to buy the goods manufactured in our cities. A prosperous and vigorous agriculture economy is indispensable to this Nation.

There was an extensive drought last year over the Farm Belt. In the section I represent it was the worst in our history. This year we were visited with a freeze which caused incalculable damage. The farmers, losing their crops, were told they could get emergency loans to replant, provided they pay 5-percent interest instead of 3 percent, as had been the case in former years.

Reciprocal trade has weighed against the farmers at times. Just recently, though our peanut farmers made a short crop on account of the drought and thereby the surplus peanuts were used, an appeal to the Tariff Commission resulted in foreign peanuts being allowed to come in to reduce the price of peanuts to our farmers. And we need not be fooled, importation of foreign peanuts will continue unless Congress stops it and Congress had better stop it. The American farmer cannot compete against cheap foreign labor, especially where the American taxpayer has given this foreign competition the seeds, fertilizers, tractors, and experts to teach them how to grow those products.

It is a paradox. We are debating a flexible policy for the farmer, which can only mean that the farmer will receive less for his products. If it did not mean that, then there could be no reason for substituting a flexible price-support program. But, while we are debating what kind of program we will give the farmer, we have considered legislation raising the salaries of all Government employees, and most everyone else in the country. It is strange that the farmer has been unable to get a recommendation that he be guaranteed 90 percent of parity for his 6 basic crops. Labor realizes the farmers' condition and recommends that farmers receive more for their products, instead of having the prices of their products lowered for they see the danger signals arising from starving agriculture. Further, we have received a recommendation that price-control laws should be set up as a standby for use in emergency periods. This could mean that the farmer must understand that at no time can he expect higher prices for his products.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to refer to the last few remarks of the gentleman to the effect that this Congress should recognize something that is happening. That is, the necessity of preventing a further slide of farm prices down below that 86-parity-ratio figure. If we do not do something toward encouraging the feeling throughout the Nation that agricultural commodities should go up in price this Congress, through its inactivity, may be a party to a depression.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman is a great friend of the farmers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, yes, our Nation's economy has climbed to a new high, while the farmer's income has fallen to a new low. The small farmer, the backbone of America, is now struggling to stay on his farm and to keep his land. Every year the number of farmers dwindles, and an important part of American life is altered as these farmers are compelled to leave the life they knew and go into new and strange surroundings in the overcrowded cities.

Mr. Chairman, the 90-percent parity support price program is the least we can do for agriculture. I certainly hope that we can pass this bill and that it will become the law or our land again.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, Michigan farmers are opposed to H. R. 12 because it lowers their opportunity to earn a good income. Rigid supports are a failure and Michigan farmers know it. They want to get away from the price-support program that is lowering their income, injuring their markets, and cutting down on their freedom to run their own farms.

Most Michigan farmers are small farmers, by anyone's definition. Many Michigan farmers work in factories part time. Forty-one percent of all farms in Michigan are either residential, part time, or sell less than $1,200 worth of products off of the farm. This is not net profit, it is the total value of everything sold off of the farm—gross income from farming.

Sixty-three thousand farmers of the State are on record opposing rigid supports without regard to supply. This includes a high percentage of small farmers. They know that rigid supports with acreage controls are hurting them instead of helping them.

The average number of acres on a farm is about 100 acres. Put yourself in a Michigan farmer's place. You work in a factory part time. You have a small acreage of ground on which you are trying to raise a family and supplement your factory pay. You are trying to raise hogs, beef cattle, and keep a few dairy cows. What you need is more land to more fully utilize the time of yourself and family. More land will help you spread your machinery and other fixed costs over more units, so that by a bigger volume you can make more money even though the unit price is lower. You look around you at other people who are successful, and what do you see? How are they succeeding—by increasing volume and lowering costs.

The fellow who was getting 40 bushels per acre of corn is now getting 100 bushels and trying for a higher yield. As his production goes up his profit goes up even faster. The fellow who is producing 150 eggs per hen is just breaking even, but when he gets 200 eggs per hen he is making a real profit. Increased volume and lower unit costs allow him to make more profit even at lower prices.

The county agent shows him that similar goals for hogs, beef, and dairy are the way to more income and profit. He knows the county agent is right because every place he sees success, he sees the same formula. His experience in the factory over the years proves to him that increasing volume, lowering costs, lowering prices to widen the market is the route of the successful businessman.

In the face of this, the Government comes around and says "cut down on your wheat production or pay a penalty." The farmer realizes that he knows more about what amounts to a good rotation practice on his farm than the Government clerk. Yet he must pay the penalty or go to jail.

What kind of a deal is this?—cutting down on the farmer who has too small an operation to be profitable—holding up price so that billions of surpluses pile up—increasing taxes, making it tougher and tougher on the consumer—setting up trade barriers between nations at a time when we need allies. In other words, through rigid high price supports we are destroying markets, encouraging substitutes, holding an umbrella over foreign competitors, and taking away the right to produce.

Such a system contradicts everything that the Michigan farmer thinks is sound, and when he is both a farmer and a factory laboring man he is not going to buy such a scheme, no matter who is trying to sell it to him.

Farmers of Michigan do not want rigid supports. They understand the issue. They want to be rewarded for efficiency, thrift, and sound management. They are religious people who not only worship God, but daily practice Christianity by recognizing the worth of the individual. They obey the laws of nature. They obey the natural laws of economics. They know that Congress cannot, without injuring themselves and all society, repeal the laws of God, the laws of nature, or the laws of economics. They know that what is sound for the individual is sound for the Government. They do not want centralized Government control of their daily economic lives. The farmers of Michigan want H. R. 12 defeated.

At this point, I would like to read a letter and resolution I have received from the Michigan Farm Bureau:

MICHIGAN FARM BUREAU,
Lansing, Mich., April 11, 1955.

Michigan Members of Congress:

In compliance with the action of the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau, April 7, I am enclosing copy of the board's action in opposition to H. R. 12. The statement is self-explanatory.

Our directors and farm bureau members are seriously concerned over the outcome of this legislation. They feel strongly that the flexible price supports and other provisions in the Agricultural Act of 1954 must have an opportunity to become effective if agriculture is to survive as a private enterprise. Please note that flexible supports have not yet had an opportunity to function as they do not apply until the crops in 1955 are marketed.

This action by the Michigan Farm Bureau Board is carrying out the farm policy established by the farm bureau delegates from 63 Michigan counties at the last annual meeting. Also representatives from 48 State farm bureaus at the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation approved the flexible support program. Copies of the 1955 policies of both the Michigan Farm Bureau and American Farm Bureau Federation were mailed to you some time ago.

Should you desire further information or explanation please feel free to call on the American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street NW., or telephone Metropolitan 8-6315.

We hope the views of our membership as expressed in this resolution will receive your favorable consideration.

Yours sincerely,

C. L. BRODY,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION

Michigan Members of Congress:

The board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau in session at Lansing, April 7, 1955, unanimously urges Congress to oppose the enactment of H. R. 12. This bill would reestablish 90 percent mandatory price supports on basic commodities and is substantially the same as the proposal which was defeated on a rollcall vote last year.

The enactment of H. R. 12 would completely defeat the purposes of the Agricultural Act of 1954. The act of 1954 established flexible price supports on agricultural commodities effective on 1955 crops. Therefore, the flexible policy and other provisions for restoring agriculture to a free market economy have not yet had an opportunity to function.

The policies embodied in the Agricultural Act of 1954 will greatly facilitate further progress in stabilizing farm prices and farm income. They are designed to provide the maximum freedom of the farmer to produce for the market as determined by the needs of the consumer, rather than forcing him to grow commodities for Government storage at prices dictated by centralized government.

There is no worthwhile future for the farmer and his family in permanently producing crops for which there is no satisfactory market. The continuation of high mandatory support prices for another 3 years, as provided in H. R. 12, will still more firmly fasten government control and dictation on the life of the farmer. It will destroy his freedom and initiative upon which the consumer must depend for an adequate and satisfactory food supply in the future.

Such perpetuation of wartime mandatory supports as provided in H. R. 12 will defeat all constructive efforts to stabilize farm prices and farm income.

Criticism of flexible price supports as the cause of any decline in farm income is unwarranted, as price support levels for crops being marketed up to this time have been under the mandatory high support policies, not under the flexible support program as provided in the act of 1954.

For the above and many other reasons, the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau, in speaking for the Michigan Farm Bureau membership, is strenuously opposed to the enactment of H. R. 12.

We hereby direct that this unanimous action by the board of the Michigan Farm Bureau be forwarded to Michigan Members of Congress and to the Committee on Agriculture.

MICHIGAN FARM BUREAU BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
C. L. BRODY,
Executive Vice President.

As a matter of contrast, I would like to read a letter which was sent to the Michigan delegation by Gov. G. Mennen Williams:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, April 11, 1955.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: It has come to my attention that both Houses of Congress will soon debate the farm price supports issue. This is a subject of great concern to us here in Michigan and I should like to present my views for your consideration.

Since 1952, farm labor income in Michigan has dropped from almost $3,000 to $2,200 a year. This represents a drop of almost 30 percent and it is expected to go down another 4 percent or 5 percent this year. Farm labor income is defined as the income the farmer has left after all expenses, depreciation, family labor and interest at 5 percent have been deducted from gross income.

Such a drop in income for our farmers has meant in the past a consequent severe impact on the rest of our economy. We know that the farm population of our country consumes a significant portion of durable products, particularly steel, rubber, petroleum and other heavy industrial goods. A drop in their income can only mean that

other industries must cut back their production.

The administration's present flexible support system has, in my opinion, been one of the major factors in this decline. Our Michigan dairy industry was the first to feel the effects of the administration program and the results are quite apparent. In 1952 the rate to the farmer per hour of labor in dairy production was $1.66 an hour. By 1954 it had dropped to 90 cents an hour. In 1952 the net profit to the farmer per hundredweight of milk was 55 cents. In 1954 it was minus 36 cents. Quite obviously no producing segment of our economy can continue when it is losing money on a basic commodity.

These facts, I hope will be helpful to you. They certainly indicate that the present system of flexible price supports has had a very adverse effect on the Michigan farmer's chief cash crop. Consequently, I hope you will support a better system.

Sincerely yours,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

I replied to Governor Williams as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1955.

Hon. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor of Michigan,
State Capitol, Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR WILLIAMS: I have your letter of April 11, requesting my support for a better system than the present one of flexible farm-price supports. As you know, this matter may be under consideration by the House of Representatives in the very near future.

I note that you mention the drop in farm labor income since 1952 and your expectation that it will go down further this year. You also speak of the present flexible support system and the alleged effect it has had on the Michigan dairy industry. I am surprised that you advocate a return to a system of high price supports which has been in operation in the past and which by your own admission has been responsible for the drop in Michigan farm labor income. Since the flexible system of price supports on basic commodities is not due to take effect until the 1955 crop season, it cannot be blamed for the losses of farm income in the past. These losses, however, are directly attributable to the former system of high supports which resulted in the accumulation of tremendous farm surpluses. These surpluses kept up the cost of food to the city consumer and acted as deterrent to any strengthening of farm net income.

I am glad to report, however, that figures recently made available to me by the Department of Agriculture show that total per capita income of our farm people improved last year over 1953. I fully expect this improvement to continue this current year unless we should return to the high price support system which was responsible for the drop in the first instance.

I notice you call attention to the effects of the administration program on our dairy industry. I would like to call your attention to a recent report on the Detroit milk market where it is shown that base milk (f. o. b. Detroit) increased in March of this year to $4.11, an increase of 9 cents over February and 11 cents over a year ago. Other milk and condensary prices as well show similar signs of strengthening.

One of the things which has most hurt our Michigan dairy farmer has been the fact that his dairy supports have been covered while he has been forced to purchase his feed at continued high levels. The high support bill, H. R. 12, which you apparently favor, would restore dairy supports to 80 percent of parity but it would also push other supports back to 90 percent and thus the dairy farmer would still be forced to buy feed grains which were supported at a level 10 percent above that on his own produce. I fail to see, therefore, where such supports would be of any benefit to our dairy people.

In other words, Governor, I call your attention to the fact that H. R. 12, the high support bill which you are apparently endorsing, would serve no other purpose than to further increase the production costs of the dairy farmer. There would be no effect on the price of manufactured milk or cheese for the coming year, since manufactured milk will be supported at 80 percent of parity for the marketing year as of last April 1.

I think the administration's dairy support program has been eminently correct since it has resulted in the movement out of storage of more than a billion and a half pounds of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids into channels of use. The fact that total milk production in calendar 1955 should be about the same as last year but that consumption has increased and should be maintained at a high level should act to bring both production and consumption more nearly into balance.

For the above reasons, I intend to vote against H. R. 12, the high price support bill, and for flexible price supports. You might be interested to know that my annual congressional poll of the Eighth District last year resulted in a backing of 67 percent for high price supports. This year such high support backing had dropped to 39 percent. The implications of such a change of heart should not be lost to such an astute observer as yourself.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

In further regard to this subject, I would also like to read you the following letter from Mr. Ward G. Hodge, president of the Michigan Farm Bureau:

MICHIGAN FARM BUREAU,
Lansing, Mich.

To Michigan Members of Congress:

This is my comment as president of the Michigan Farm Bureau on Governor Williams' letter to Michigan Members of Congress regarding the decline in farm income.

Mr. Williams is quoted in the press as saying that "The average farm labor income per farmer since 1952 has dropped 30 percent and is expected to go down another 4 to 5 percent this year."

Mr. Williams is quoted further as saying: "The administration's present flexible support system has, in my opinion, been one of the major factors in this decline. I hope you will support a better system."

I assume that Governor Williams is fully aware that the legislation enacted by the Congress 1 year ago provided for flexible price supports for certain basic farm commodities beginning with those produced during the 1955 crop season.

Of course, none of those crops have been marketed as yet, nor will they be for several months. Hence, the flexible support system which the Governor is reported as condemning and blaming for present agricultural prices is not yet in operation.

The present price level of agricultural commodities has come about during a period when the mandatory 90 percent of parity price program has been in effect. That program of rigid, high supports has prevailed during the entire period when the decline in farm income, mentioned by Governor Williams, has occurred.

Undoubtedly, you are aware that only 13 percent of the cash receipts of Michigan farmers results from the marketing of the basic commodities on which price supports at the 90 percent of parity level have been in effect. Of the cash receipts of Michigan farmers, 53 percent comes from the marketing of commodities which have been entirely nonsupported. Also, it is well to realize that the cash receipts from meat animals, and dairy and poultry products, for which price-supported feeds are an element of cost, are responsible for 59 percent of the total cash farm receipts for our State. The foregoing figures are all for 1953.

Certainly, Governor Williams should keep the record straight and not blame a program which is not—and which has not been operative—for the unfortunate results which occurred under the rigid, 90 percent of parity program which the Governor is quoted as supporting.

Sincerely yours,

WARD G. HODGE,
President.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to point out that of the commodities mentioned by the gentleman as being produced on Michigan farms, not a single one of those is a basic commodity, and none of them are affected by the 90 percent we are talking about.

Mr. BENTLEY. I understand the gentleman's statement, and I appreciate it. But I am trying to bring out the reaction of the Michigan farmers to H. R. 12.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H. R. 12 despite the fact that the bill falls short of my objective with respect to support prices for dairy products. Before I comment on the bill, I wish to thank my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who voted with me on my motion to raise the support price of dairy products above the minimum level reported out in this bill.

In spite of H. R. 12's shortcomings with reference to the minimum support level for dairy products, the bill does represent some gains in other directions for dairy farmers. I shall comment briefly on these aspects of the bill in a moment.

Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture is required to support the price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at such level between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary deems necessary to assure an adequate supply. Since April 1, 1954, the Government has been supporting dairy products at the minimum level of 75 percent of parity as a result of an order by the Secretary of Agriculture.

H. R. 12 moves the minimum support-price level for dairy products up to 80 percent of parity. This is a gain in that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot lower the support level of dairy products to 75 percent of parity. I presume the minimum figure will be the maximum support level for dairy products under the present Secretary of Agriculture. In my opinion, this support level is too low.

Dairy farmers in my area—and this is probably true of many sections outside of the milk-marketing order regions—are receiving about 80 percent of parity at the present time for their milk going to condensing and cheese factories and 76 percent of that going to creameries.

Many of them are slowly going broke with dairy prices at this level while other costs remain high. The Nation's dairy farmers—along with other types of farmers—are in serious trouble. As I see it, the prospects for improvement do not appear too bright.

If you doubt that dairy farmers have had rough sledding, may I call your attention to the economic plight of dairy farmers as summarized very briefly on page 17 of the committee's report which accompanies H. R. 12. The report says in part, and I now quote:

> In 1954, with the sharply lower supports in effect for 9 months, dairy farmers received $193 million less for their total milk sales than in 1953, while consumers paid an estimated $60 million more for dairy products.

Furthermore, several weeks ago the USDA reported that the Nation's dairy farmers have taken a $1.6 billion capital inventory loss on their dairy herds from January 1, 1953 to January 1, 1955. This represents a 33 percent loss on the value of their herds.

For this and other reasons, then, I should like to see the support level on dairy products at or near the level of basic commodities. Some of the basic commodities, it must be remembered, are used to feed dairy and other livestock animals. Feed costs are also an important item in the expense accounts of poultry farmers.

I realize that the 80 percent minimum support level for dairy products in H. R. 12 is given without production controls such as those which apply to the basic commodities with higher support levels. I am also cognizant of the fact that the great majority of Members in Congress will never vote to support dairy products at 90 percent of parity in normal times unless dairy farmers are willing to accept production quotas and follow the same referendum procedures that producers of basic commodities employ to set their quotas.

I have heard it said on numerous occasions that dairy farmers will never accept production controls in order to bring dairy products under basic commodities with a higher support level. I question the validity of this contention because dairy farmers in areas where milk marketing orders are in effect are virtually operating under quotas through a system of blended prices.

While this is not the place to discuss this matter, I should like to point out that dairy farmers should be given an opportunity to voice their opinions as to whether or not they would accept quotas to bring dairy products under basic commodities with a higher support level. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, to make milk and butterfat a basic commodity. I hope the Dairy Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee will hold hearings in various sections of the country to ascertain what the "grassroots" views of dairy farmers are on this issue. If the majority of dairy farmers will not accept production controls, then the issue is resolved and dairy farmers will always receive lower supports without production control. I want to find out the grassroot farmers's view.

There are three other points in H. R. 12 to the advantage of dairy farmers that I wish to discuss. The first one is that H. R. 12 eliminates reference to adequate supply as a consideration on which the support level of dairy products is to be based. The second point is that an additional $25 million a year is authorized for the school-lunch program, and the program is extended for an additional year. The third point is that H. R. 12 extends the brucellosis eradication program in dairy herds until June 30, 1958. This provides for an annual expenditure of $15 million in Federal funds.

Before I conclude my remarks, I wish to say that while the majority of farmers in my district are dairy farmers I am also concerned with the welfare of all farmers. Agriculture, as I shall show in a moment, is an important part of our national economy. The stability and prosperity of the Nation's farmers affects every community in the country. This is one of the basic reasons why I am voting for H. R. 12. I do not subscribe to the philosophy of pitting one group of farmers against another group of agricultural producers. That is what happened in the last session of Congress and the result was a bill that hurt all of the Nation's farmers.

There is no doubt that America's farmers are in serious economic straits, and if the downward trend in farm income is not checked the chain reaction will be felt in other industries. Net farm income in 1954 was 10 percent below that of 1953, and it was 28 percent below that of 1947. The fact that agricultural assets have declined $10.5 billion since January 1, 1952, should make Members of Congress sit up and take notice of what is happening to agriculture. Farmers' purchasing power, in terms of 1935–39 dollars, is the lowest since 1940. The drop in farm income and purchasing power, I believe, has contributed in part to the decline in industrial activity and unemployment in our major metropolitan centers.

If there is any doubt in the minds of House Members from the large metropolitan areas that agriculture is not an important part of the American economy, permit me to cite that agriculture is the largest of the Nation's leading five industries. Here is the gross annual output of the Nation's five leading industries for the year of 1953:

Agriculture	$35,430,000,000
Construction (plant and residential)	26,100,000,000
Oil (estimated refined product)	23,000,000,000
Automobiles	13,984,000,000
Steel	12,433,000,000

You will note that the annual output of agriculture is larger than that of automobile and steel combined. It is as large as steel and oil combined, and almost as large as oil and automobiles combined. In fact, agriculture represents almost 32 percent of the total output of the Nation's five leading industries.

Some of the Nation's great industrial leaders recognize what agriculture means to industry. For example, Clarence Randall, of Inland Steel, told his fellow industrialists at the Congress of American Industry, meeting on December 3, 1954, in New York City—and I now quote:

> Take the question of agricultural surpluses. I think we walked out on that for a long time. * * * You remember the prosperity the farmer had shortly after the war? That prosperity was transferred to the agricultural implement companies. Some of you here tonight wish we had that prosperity back. It was transferred to the steel companies from the implement companies. The farmer was buying every tractor and every piece of equipment he had heard of. The American farmer must export 12 percent of his products. * * * What would happen to the businesses represented in this room if the farmer were cut back 12 percent? We would have hard work to get together for this meeting because it is from that 12 percent that the farmer buys our products.

Well, just for the record, remember that farm income dropped 10 percent in 1954 over the previous year. If what Mr. Randall said is true, and I believe it is, then it is easy to understand why there is some unemployment and reduced industrial output in certain communities. American farmers have not had the money to spend, and this lack of money means that the cash registers of main-street merchants all over rural American have not been ringing as steadily as in previous years. In turn, it means that merchants have not been buying goods from factories, and factories have reduced their hours and working force.

Thus, the farm economy does affect every person in the Nation. This, in essence, is why I am voting for H. R. 12, even though the bill does not contain everything that I believe to be fundamental and essential. Therefore, I earnestly urge my colleagues to vote for H. R. 12, as I believe some of your constituent—regardless of the district you represent—have a definite stake in the agricultural economy of the country.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As one of those who has supported the 90-percent program for the basic commodities, may I state to the gentleman, as I think I have stated before, that certainly I, and I believe most of those who are situated as I am, would be perfectly willing for the dairy farmers to come in and get 90 percent on their products any time they want to accept the same kind of controls we accept on our basic commodities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, on page 31 of the committee report I have stated as concisely as I possibly could my position in regard to H. R. 12. I have come to the same conclusion reached by 10 other members of the House Agriculture Committee, that is that H. R. 12 should be defeated in its present form.

H. R. 12 as reported from the Committee on Agriculture is highly discriminatory to that section of agriculture which has sustained the largest income

drop since World War II. I refer, of course, to the dairy farmer.

Individual members of the majority have talked about the necessity of returning to 90 percent rigid supports for agricultural products. In reporting out this bill in its present form one must conclude that the majority are concerned only with 90-percent supports for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco but not for dairy products.

The support sections of this bill as reported by the committee serve no other purpose than to further increase the production costs of the dairy farmer. This new legislation would not have any effect upon the price of manufactured milk or cheese for the coming year, as the Secretary of Agriculture has announced that manufactured milk will be supported at 80 percent of parity for the marketing year which began April 1, 1955.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin less than 0.75 percent of our agricultural income comes from the production of basic commodities. In the entire State of Wisconsin 1 percent of our total cash agriculture income comes from the so-called basic commodities which are given preferential support treatment by this legislation. In drawing up this legislation the committee has included as basic commodities only cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. I intend to offer an amendment to this bill which provides for equality in the support level established between the so-called basic commodities and dairy products.

Dairy products are supported under a support section which was written into the basic Agricultural Act in 1948. Dairy products have always been supported on a flexible parity system.

Democrat candidates for office in the State of Wisconsin have tried to mislead the dairy farmer in our State into thinking that their party stands for 90-percent supports for dairy products. One has but to look at the record here in Congress to learn that the Democrat Party has never supported 90-percent supports for milk or dairy products. The present support section under which dairy products are now supported was the support section adopted and originally placed on the statute books by the Democrats. The Congress must take the responsibility for determining what level of support dairy products will enjoy in the future. That responsibility rests with the Secretary of Agriculture only in accordance with the laws passed by this Congress. I realize that the Democrats are in control in this Congress, and it will indeed be interesting to see what action is taken on the amendment to insure equality of treatment in this legislation for the dairy farmer.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA].

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, in this continuing debate over farm price supports, it seems to me that the interests of the 142 million Americans who are not farmers is consistently overlooked.

Now, certainly urban residents want farmers to share fairly in the national prosperity. They are not opposed to a realistic farm program which will facilitate more orderly marketing of agricultural crops. They realize that this Nation needs ample supplies of food and fiber for its growth and development. City people generally are not opposed to the principle of farm price supports.

At the same time, they would prefer to see a price-support program which is flexible enough to encourage movement of the production of our farms into channels of consumption, rather than into storage in Government ships and warehouses. As taxpayers, city people have a legitimate interest in the costs of farm programs. They cannot be expected to remain silent when they see the Government pouring billions of dollars of public money into a few commodities which have been selected for support at 90 percent of parity. And they are rightfully disturbed at the current attempt to continue this costly program which has demonstrated its complete inability to cope with our agricultural problems.

It is a matter of record that the commodities which are in greatest difficulty today—pricewise and surpluswise—are those which have been supported rigidly at 90 percent of parity. It should be obvious that a continuation of the program under which these troubles developed will never correct the situation. It will only postpone further the time when we must come to grips with reality.

I have heard it argued here that the level of price support has little relationship to prices consumers pay. It is said that the farmer receives only a few pennies of the retail cost of a loaf of bread; that the cotton farmer's share of the price of a shirt is relatively small. Yet no one will argue that price is not a governing factor in how much wheat and cotton this country exports. Price determines to a considerable extent whether the taxpayer of this country shall buy and store our surpluses or whether these surpluses shall move into channels of consumption at home and abroad.

Moreover, the level of price support for some commodities has a direct and important bearing upon retail food prices. When dairy price supports were reduced from 90 to 75 percent of parity a little more than a year ago, consumers immediately got the benefit of a 9 to 10 cent reduction in the price of a pound of butter. As a result, butter consumption increased by about 9 percent in this country during the last marketing year and Government purchases of dairy products declined sharply. That news should make both dairymen and consumers happy.

Rather than blunder into further price support difficulties, let us give the Agricultural Act of 1954 a fair chance to demonstrate what it can accomplish. Flexible price supports for the basic commodities get their first test when the 1955 crops are harvested some months from now. We know the old program has not worked to the satisfaction of either farmers or consumers. Let us give the new one an honest trial.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I firmly believe we must see to it that American farmers receive their fair share of the national income.

You know there are many things involved in this complex subject of American agriculture and its place in the Nation. We left agriculture out for many years when industry had advantages written into law and when industrial labor was protected by law. Largely as a result, 80 percent of our timber is gone; 40 percent of our fertile land is gone. Farm life had so few returns from the farm share of the national income dollar that farm homes had few conveniences others had. Work hours were longer. It followed that nearly all who could left the farm. Farm population went down steadily from 84 percent to only 13 percent on the farm.

Today, farming is a commercial operation. Farmers either make costs plus a living, or deplete the land, go broke, and move to town like the rest of us. We had the great depression of the twenties, for which many explanations have been offered. At any rate, a drastic break in farm prices led off in that depression which carried all down with it—labor, agriculture, and capitalist. We cannot stand another. Finally, it was determined by the Congress to put protections for agriculture in the law, where the other two major segments were already. Thus, we have the price support system provided by law. You may say you now have a price support law, though actions last year weakened it; but may I remind you that farm income can be ruined by reductions in acreage and the giving away of our foreign markets.

We no longer have the natural resources to waste, which were wasted when "sale at the market place" under world competitive conditions was all that agriculture got.

I believe in free enterprise, but if you analyze the situation you soon find that our free enterprise has been free only under the laws as written by the Congress and by the States. There has been competition as to how these laws were written. It has been said that all anybody wants is a fair advantage—an advantage which he wants others to agree it is fair for him to have. One way to get such advantages declared fair is to pass a law and have the law declare it fair; with the first Congress the fight was on.

Early in our history, industry got protective tariffs written into law; and a good argument could be made for such protection, especially in the early days. They retain most of them today, and they are not going to be repealed. Only about 22 years ago did agriculture begin to receive somewhat equal treatment in law.

Agriculture today operates in an economy where for all practical purposes those advantages to industry and labor are provided by law, and such laws are not going to be repealed. Only recently the President of the United States

asked for a 90 cents an hour minimum wage. Whatever the merits, it can only have the effect of raising farm costs at a time when farm laws are under attack and farm income is going down.

Forty years ago 70 percent of the farm investment was land. Today only 45 percent of the investment is land. The balance is expensive farm machinery, equipment, and needed buildings. These things cost money, and they wear out.

Forty years ago it took a farmer almost 10 years to lose his farm if he made nothing. Today, due to heavy outlay of cash, he can lose it in less than 2 years. A real farmer must be a capitalist as well as a laborer today.

There has been some 13 freight-rate increases since World War II, based on operations of other laws, an 85-percent increase in spread between prices received on the farm and prices to the consumer, a 13-percent increase in farm costs in the past 2 years, with a 12-percent decrease in farm income. These conditions, which largely result from laws, many of them enacted by Congress to provide protection to various segments of our economy, make price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities essential to maintaining some degree of balance in our economy. The fact that price supports are necessary to offset American costs does not remove the necessity that our foreign markets be retained to absorb commodities surplus to our domestic needs, if we are to avoid further curtailments in agricultural production and farm income with the resulting unemployment of thousands upon thousands of American farmers.

LARGE INVESTMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION COMES BECAUSE OF REFUSAL TO SELL

The large holdings of agricultural commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation in recent years is not the result of our price-support program, but rather is due to the Government's refusal to offer to sell our products, once they are in the hands of CCC, competitively on world markets. Yet each time I have challenged this policy of holding our agricultural commodities back, admitted to be our policy by our Department of Agriculture, I have been faced with the fact that such policy reflected the attitude of our State Department and those handling foreign-aid programs, based on what the State Department claimed were political and national defense considerations. That Department has made its decisions, apparently, without any awareness of the effect on agriculture and business in the United States. I believe such policies ruinous to American agriculture and, in the long run, to the Nation.

ECONOMIC LOSS FROM REFUSAL TO SELL

According to the national advisory committee for CARE, composed of such men as Henry A. Bullis, General Mills' chairman of the board; Roy C. Ingersoll, president of Borg-Warner; Ward Melville, Melville Shoe Corp.; H. J. Heinz, and others equally successful, such policy costs the United States $700,000 a day for storage, deprives American railroads of transportation equal to 100 transcontinental freight trains each day for a year, deprives American shipping of the equivalent of the dispatch of 10 oceangoing freighters every day for a year, not to mention the loss of labor and the effect on agriculture itself, being cut back now to absorb surplus commodities. And all this food and fiber has been held back by the Department's policy, set up by our State Department on the fallacious argument that such a course helps needy peoples of the world.

WE NOW HAVE AUTHORITY TO SELL COMPETITIVELY ON WORLD MARKETS

I would point out that the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in section 5 (f) authorizes the corporation to export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities. Under the Charter Act those commodities may be commodities acquired under price-support programs or specifically procured for export purposes.

The Charter Act contains no restrictions on the prices at which commodities may be sold by the corporation. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, does establish minimum prices at which the corporation may sell commodities owned or controlled by it, except in the case of sales for certain specified purposes. Sales for export, however, are specifically exempt from the application of this minimum-price restriction.

Yet the United States Department of Agriculture admitted in hearings before my committee last year that the United States has been following a policy of holding our commodities at prevailing prices, letting other countries undersell and have the markets. Many commodities have not been offered even at prevailing prices.

Foreign countries do have the dollars. However, due to our policy of not offering our commodities these countries simply are not spending as much for agricultural commodities, but are buying other things. Agriculture's share of United States sales has dropped from 28 percent in 1934–38 to 19 percent in 1953. We will spend $3,200,000,000 in support of our military in foreign countries this year.

The price-support system may have caused the corporation to buy those commodities, but the corporation has them because we would not sell them.

This fact is proven in hearings held by our committee when Secretary Benson and Under Secretary Morse were before us.

LARGE HOLDINGS USED TO LOWER PRICE SUPPORTS AND IMPOSE ACREAGE REDUCTIONS

We read about our Secretary of Agriculture and others talking about having invested more than $6 billion in farm commodities, and that is true. We saw the last Congress, where the administration including the Secretary of Agriculture, reduced price-support levels on basic farm commodities from 90 to 82½ percent of parity; the Secretary of Agriculture said "to prevent the holding of such huge supplies of farm commodities."

Dairy-support levels were reduced because of the butter CCC owned. Last year drastic reductions were made in acreages in wheat, cotton, and other crops, and decreased production was ordered. This year still further drastic reductions in acreage were ordered, which is working a tremendous hardship and putting lots of people out of business in the area I come from.

Our hearings, and if you have not read those hearings you should, disclose that, notwithstanding the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has had authority to sell these commodities in world markets for dollars, it simply would not do it. We have held our commodities off world markets and thereby helped to increase foreign production. By way of illustration, since 1945 cotton production in Asia has increased by 3½ million bales and in Africa by more than 1 million bales, not to mention Central America and Europe. I tried to get a change in policy last year. Later in the year we got them to offer some commodities in world trade on a competitive basis, and they sold $453 million worth of them, reducing CCC stocks to a minimum.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

On January 10 we heard the speech of our distinguished President of the United States, in which much was made of the administration's efforts to move the CCC-owned agricultural commodities into foreign trade for foreign currency under Public Law 480. What does Public Law 480 provide? A close reading of that speech will show you that 90 percent of that foreign currency we would receive is not even subject to the control of the Congress. By far the greater part of that foreign currency will be used for economic development in those countries. The last 10 percent of it can be given to them if the President just says the word. What was not in the President's speech is the fact that his administration is trying to give these commodities away under Public Law 480 without even offering them for sale for dollars, under the general authority of the law. The administration's approach would continue to hold an umbrella over world prices.

Representatives of the United States Government are going around over the world trying to give away to foreign countries that which they will not offer for sale, commodities which they have the authority to sell but which they will not sell, all to add to foreign aid.

And all the time foreign production increases, and the American farmer gets his production cut more and more. There is ample evidence of the fact that the Corporation could sell to be found in the experience that they have had with those items which we finally got them to offer for sale on a competitive bid basis last year. Let me read to you a list of those commodities which they will not even offer for sale on a competitive basis: Cotton, cheeses, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, wool, and butter—our investment, $3,700 million.

Secretary Benson says the trade recommended this policy. I know many in the trade do not. In fact, many people in the cotton trade have asked that I determine "who it is who has benefited from increased foreign production, which

is protected by the United States umbrella." In many, many cases, I am told, it is American operators who have moved into production and business in foreign countries; and it is charged by some in the cotton business that many of those same people are now in key spots to advise the United States Department of Agriculture to hold American production off world markets. I expect to have a special investigation to find out these facts with regard to the various commodities. I believe such information will be valuable to the Appropriations Committee.

If it be true that it is not foreigners who have increased cotton production in foreign countries, but American business interests which have moved in to take advantage of the United States umbrella they help to raise over their foreign investments, they have what you might call perfect insurance or assurance of profits. Furthermore, do not try to tell me that we must sell these commodities from one government to another government.

THE REMEDY

All we have to do is announce periodically that given quantities of these commodities will be sold on a competitive-bid basis to American exporters for export. By controlling the quantity offered and the spacing of our offerings we can take into account all factors. My suggestion is not dumping, for United States businessmen would buy and sell in the regular way. We would use the private enterprise system.

Foreign countries do have the dollars, but this shortsighted policy of not selling our commodities competitively on world markets, and thus holding an umbrella over world prices, invites the increased production we are getting in nearly every country which produces such commodities. We are making competitors out of our customers. This failure to use the general authority of law is cutting back the income of our own farmers more and more, so as to leave many of them far below any kind of a reasonable standard of living; and if it is continued it will result in American agriculture being limited to the domestic market. What I charge here is proven by the testimony in the hearings before our committee.

Though actually the President's recommendation for giveaway under Public Law 480 is a form of dumping, contrary to misleading headlines our committee has urged no irresponsible dumping. Our Government has held these commodities so long it has built our holdings up to the extent that we must gradually move back. May I read to you the report of our committee?

COMMITTEE REPORT

In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, actions of the Department to reduce price supports, change parity formulas, and reduce acreage allotments will not cure the problem of the increasing commodity holdings of the Corporation. They believe that this difficulty is due to the failure of the Corporation to discharge its responsibility under its charter to sell its commodities competitively in world markets. Testimony before the committee shows that none of the large stocks of cotton, cheese, corn, rice, seeds, naval stores, tobacco, and wool have been or are being offered for sale on a competitive basis, despite basic authority in law to do so.

The program for moving commodities under Public Law 480, for which much is claimed, actually is a means of giving commodities away in preference to attempting to sell them through normal trade channels. It involves prior clearance from a committee composed primarily of representatives of nonagricultural interests (State, Commerce Departments, etc.) which is a serious hurdle in getting agricultural commodities exported. Also, under the law, the major portions of the local currencies received for commodities shipped abroad will be used for foreign-aid purposes in the countries from which received.

The majority of the committee feels that steps should be taken as early as practicable to begin the movement of these commodities into world markets on a competitive bid basis through American exporters. The committee also feels that an immediate announcement of such change in policy should be made to discourage further increases in foreign production to the detriment of American farmers.

Such an action will eventually make possible reductions in administrative costs of the Corporation. It should also help to correct the present practice of making competitors out of former customers and should benefit foreign consumers who have a real need for products surplus to United States domestic needs.

Further, and most important, it will enable the American farmer to compete with foreign producers and make additional acreage available to relieve undue hardships existing in many areas of the country under present orders.

THE TRAGIC EFFECT

The tragedy of not selling these commodities—cotton, cheese, corn, rice, and so forth—and they could have been sold, is that those same commodities for which there was a market and for which there is authority to sell, were used and counted to cut support levels, to reduce acreage, and restrict American production, to restrict the cotton acreage of American farmers. It was used as an argument to reduce the price-support levels on basic commodities from 92 percent to 82½ percent. It was used to change the parity formula so that it will almost automatically go down to 75 percent within the next several years. All the time the commodities that were used for this purpose could have been sold, and there was authority to sell them. When these fights were up last year, Secretary Benson did not tell the American people he had full authority to sell these commodities, but would not offer them for sale to our traders for use in world trade. The major harm or loss is not the amount of money we have invested in these commodities; it is not the fact that the longer you keep them the more storage we have to pay; but the commodities which we have, which we would not sell, have been used to do these other injuries to the American farmer, leaving thousands of tenants without a means of livelihood in the South and many, many small landowners reduced below the barest minimum essential to a decent living.

VIEWS OF SECRETARY BENSON

The chief difference between the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and myself, on the price-support system, is that I believe price supports are necessary to protect the American farmer against high United States costs largely brought about by other American laws.

Apparently the Secretary, judged by his arguments for the flexible supports, feels that price supports should be a means to help regulate American production. He would increase supports when he wants more production and lower supports when he wants less.

Where I believe the parity formula should be tied to costs as it was under the old parity formula, the Secretary's modern parity, substituted last year, ties parity primarily to the average price the farmer received for his commodities for the 10 preceding years. Under the Secretary's law, as the farmers' prices go down parity goes down though costs may be going up. Under the old formula, as costs went up parity went up.

However, whether you agree with Mr. Benson or with me, neither system will work unless what the farmers produce above domestic needs is offered in world markets on a competitive basis. I repeat:

According to admissions of Mr. Benson and Under Secretary Morse, before our subcommittee last week, billions of dollars worth of cotton, corn, dairy products, wool, and tobacco are not even being offered to the markets of the world for sale on a competitive basis. To prove my point, those commodities we have been able to get the Department to offer have been sold for dollars.

QUANTITY OR VOLUME IS AS ESSENTIAL AS PRICE

Price-support levels are only one factor. The other essential is quantity or volume. If you guarantee a cotton farmer 200 percent of parity and limit him to 3 acres of cotton, his gross income would be less than $1,000 per year. Today acreage curtailment in cotton is reducing thousands of small farmers to less than $1,000 gross per year. Tenant farmers, thousands of them, are being let out entirely. This cutback is to help absorb cotton which the Government has and will not offer for sale competitively: and actually, unintentionally I am sure, amounts to forcing our United States farmers to absorb foreign increases in production.

SMALL FARMERS

Our distinguished President, in speaking to the joint session of the Congress, said the administration had to do something for the small farmers.

Acreage reductions in my section are making many more small farmers for the administration "to do something for." Today, the Government is giving them cheese and butter, mighty good products but tiresome if the only food provided.

Now the President would aid the part-time farmer. In other words, the farmer is such a poor risk now the President urges aid if he has outside income to make him a better credit risk. While those are my words that is what it amounts to.

Incidentally the Government has this cheese and butter because it will not offer it for sale to our exporters on a competitive basis.

We must start moving to prevent further losses in our United States export markets. We must begin offering some quantities on a competitive-bid basis to our own traders for export, or we will

be back to the domestic market on a permanent basis.

I repeat: By controlling the size of our offerings and the spacing between offerings our Department of Agriculture can consider all factors. Such a course is not dumping; but giving away what we will not offer for sale competitively under Public Law 480 is dumping, though there are certain safeguards written into the law.

FARMERS' INCOME DETERMINES CONSERVATION

Why do I stress price supports and markets? Because, however strongly you and the farmers believe in conservation, restoring minerals to the soil, the job will be done only as the farmer's income leaves enough over after taxes and cost to put something back into the soil.

Income over and beyond cost of living to the farmer is essential to the effectiveness of our Soil Conservation Service. Extension Service, and yes, will even control the amount of sales of limestone by members of your association.

WHAT IS THE FARM SITUATION TODAY?

The prices of farm products have declined about 25 percent since February 1951. The cost of farming continues to increase. The net farm income in 1954 was down about 30 percent from 1951.

And the outlook is for still further declines in net farm income in 1955 because of the reduction in acreage of controlled crops and the low prices of nearly all farm products.

In December, the parity ratio dropped to 86, the lowest since 1941.

As a result of the decline in prices of farm products and the drastic drop in net farm income, the value of United States agricultural assets dropped from $170.1 billion on January 1, 1952, to $156.5 billion on January 1, 1955, a loss of $13.6 billion, or 8 percent.

During this past 3-year period the value of farm real estate dropped nearly $9 billion, or about 9 percent. The value of livestock declined $8 billion, or more than 40 percent.

The losses sustained in real estate and livestock were partly offset by small gains in the value of farm machinery, crops on farms, and household furnishings.

What has happened in industry during this period? From January 1949 to January 1955, the value of 30 leading industrial stocks skyrocketed from $175 to $412.97 per share. The total value of industrial stocks increased by $53 billion.

The continuing boom in industry and the spiraling prices on the stock market are reflections of the profits of industry and dividend payments, by industrial enterprises. How much of the advance is the result of speculation or hope of future gain is itself a question for speculation and meditation. And all this adds to costs to American farmers, but the new parity formula is based on the average price the farmer has been receiving, not on the cost of what he buys.

Mr. Fred J. Hurst, director of information, Farm Credit District of New Orleans, says:

The farm mortgage debt has almost doubled since 1945. The estimated dollar volume of farm mortgages recorded during the third quarter of 1954 totaled $380,343,000, which was nearly 2½ times the amount recorded in the third quarter of 1940, and the largest dollar volume recorded during the third quarter of any year since the heavy refinancing year of 1934.

Yet, despite the decline in farm prices and farm income, despite the unfavorable position of agriculture in the national economy, responsible officials continue to lower farm price-support levels. At the same time we hear the official call to the Congress to raise the minimum wage level from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour. We hear the call for increase in salaries for various groups. We see and hear many things happening that would tend to widen rather than narrow the disparity between agriculture and industry.

It is disturbing to note that there seems to be little concern about the plight of agriculture except among farmers themselves and their cooperatives and a limited number of sympathetic farm leaders who know the desperate battle farmers are waging to make ends meet, and who realize the danger to the entire national economy unless the decline in farm income cannot only be arrested but reversed and improved.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a disposition on the part of some agricultural groups, judging by their published statements, to echo the national refrain, to docilely accept the indifferent national attitude toward agriculture, and to consider the farm price situation as something inevitable and permanent. We want to make a plea for a general awakening to the worsening farm situation. We want to sound a warning. Past experience has shown that there is a limit to the beating farmers can take. There is a limit to the depths to which farm income can drop without bankrupting agriculture and without endangering the entire economy. The current 86 percent of parity is a long way from the 100 percent of parity, the fair level goal set for agriculture.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

You may say the farm program is a subsidy program. Collectively, through Government, we spend as much as $6 million on getting one group of magazines distributed. The Government largely supports the distribution of newspapers. We subsidize the airlines; we help build ships, so our shipping can pay the high wages of the American seamen, protected by bargaining power of labor unions, to haul commodities in competition with foreign shipping; and so it is just about in every direction you look. Through Government we have had many advantages termed fair by being enacted into law. Under those conditions we had better be sure we include agricultural income along with the rest, for food, clothing, and shelter are still basic. Whatever the real cost of the farm program would be, our refusal to sell Commodity Credit stocks on a competitive basis multiplies such costs many times over.

I would like to read to you a letter I addressed to Secretary Benson on April 21:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1955.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was pleased to note that the 700,000 bales of Commodity Credit Corporation owned cotton had been offered on the market at domestic prices. Personally, as you know, I have felt that in addition to offering this cotton on the domestic market we also need to offer it in world trade at truly competitive prices, as authorized by the charter of the CCC.

In recent weeks I have heard numerous reports as to the basis on which the Department does not feel it should immediately change its policies. I have read your testimony before the Senate committee, in which you state that there will be no change in existing policies prior to July 31st so as to offer cotton in world trade on truly competitive prices. While I differ with this decision, we have to accept it.

However, may I urge that at the earliest possible date you announce that there will be a change of policy and American cotton will be offered in world trade at truly competitive prices. In addition to other sound reasons, this action will be of great help in retarding further expansion in foreign countries.

I was further pleased to note in your speech at Bakersfield, Calif., you recognized and pointed out the ill effects caused by existing policies. You clearly stated that cotton production is increasing in foreign countries as a result of the United States price umbrella, which our policy is holding over world prices. In that speech you cited the illustration of Central America, where in the last 5 years cotton production has increased some sixfold.

I have before me copy of a speech Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Dr. Palberg delivered, on March 19, to the 44th annual convention of the Texas Cotton Association. In the latter part of that speech he made the following statements:

We are competitive pricewise in the world cotton market only intermittently, in a series of unpredictable interludes. There is no better phrase to describe our position than the phrase used by the cotton industry itself—we are the residual supplier.

* * * * *

There is no question but that our pricing policies have given aid and comfort to our competition.

* * * * *

The United States, which now produces only about 40 percent of the world's cotton, cannot, by regulating its own production, satisfactorily determine prices and quantities for the entire world.

2. The three elements needed for effective selling are quality, merchandising, and a price that meets competition. We cannot, by improving quality and increasing our merchandising efforts, fully compensate for our inability to be competitive pricewise.

* * * * *

I might liken the cotton industry to a stool which needs three legs to stand upright—quality, merchandising, and realistic pricing. It can't stand permanently on just two legs, no matter how strong they're built.

These statements clearly show an awareness on your part of what is happening to us under present policy. And yet this policy is being continued by the Department, notwithstanding the provision contained in the CCC charter for sales in world trade on a truly competitive basis.

You will recall that the State Department has now said that it has no objection to the sale of cotton in world trade on a truly competitive price basis. I hope I am right, when I read these statements, in becoming convinced that you and the Department officials recognize that a change in policy should be made; and you now have only to make the determination as to when.

In connection with changing policies so as to offer our commodities competitively, I am aware of the fears of the domestic textile mills in connection with the imports from foreign countries. There are 2 or 3 ways that domestic mills could be protected.

First, I would like to point out that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, provides:

(a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to * * * materially interfere with * * * any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or production thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission. * * *

"(b) If on the basis of such investigation and report to him * * * the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered * * * for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not * * * interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken."

Also, I would like to point out that section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1952 provides for the control of imports of certain commodities. While cotton or finished cotton goods is not included in the list of commodities, I have every reason to believe that, upon recommendation of the Department of Agriculture being made to the Congress, such cotton goods would be clearly added to the list of commodities where import controls could be made, should domestic textile mills have any need for such protection.

The other solution, which has been pointed out to me, is that the domestic mills be permitted to buy at the world price an amount of cotton equivalent to the amount of raw cotton such mill used to meet its exports.

I would like to respectfully urge again that it is highly imperative that the CCC use existing authority to sell in world trade, at truly competitive prices on a competitive bid basis, to our own traders for export, existing supplies of cotton, as well as cotton to which the Corporation will take title later this year. This should be done under existing law, in my judgment, because the procedure is much more simple than any other approach. It would move this cotton through normal channels and take advantage of the fine sales force of American exporters.

Any program providing for payment of a subsidy would still leave the cotton offered at a pegged price, which would enable our foreign competitors to price just below us, as they are doing now under existing policies. An export subsidy would tend to lower the umbrella, but in no sense would it remove the umbrella over world prices; and for that reason it would not have the desired effect of holding down expansion in foreign countries, which is largely by American financial interests.

The next point I would like to make is that while I feel that a great deal of cotton could easily be sold for American dollars on a competitive-bid basis, whether the amount sold is large or small, it would be of tremendous benefit in preventing further expansion of cotton production in foreign countries. Once we move existing stocks of cotton, section 32 funds might then, through a subsidy arrangement, be one way of meeting the day-to-day problems of the future; but that course would not be nearly so effective toward meeting present problems while expansion in foreign countries is making great strides.

While this letter is directed primarily to cotton, I feel the same policies should be put into effect with regard to other commodities, with perhaps some differences to meet different conditions.

One of the main defects in existing price support programs is not in the level of price supports, in my judgment, but comes from too small a spread between support levels on high qualities and low qualities of the same commodity. If the CCC would begin to move its holdings into world trade on a competitive-bid basis, the real differences between various grades and classes and the various qualities would then show up, and would provide a strong basis for the Congress and the Department to make a proper spread between the various grades and qualities of a given commodity.

As you well know, our losses have largely come from inferior grades of the various commodities, for which there has never been a substantial market at any high price.

Recently I have noted suggestions that American farmers be required to vote for reduced price supports in order to get increased cotton acreage. While, perhaps, it is not so intended, this would amount to putting a gun on the cotton farmers to make them agree with the Department's desire to reduce price supports, in order to get a change in departmental policy.

The Department, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, now has authority to sell the cotton on hand in world trade through our own exporters. As both you and I have pointed out, failure to use that authority has resulted in an umbrella over world prices, with United States cotton acreage moving overseas.

The failure to offer for sale at competitive prices results in such cotton being held and counted to reduce cotton acreage. If cotton on hand is sold, that of itself will help to increase cotton acreage.

To demand that the farmers agree to reduced price supports in order to get the Department of Agriculture to sell is wholly unjustified. The Department, in recent months, has agreed it has authority to sell. It has agreed to the ill effects of not selling. The Department has agreed that it is their determination which prevents sale in world trade at competitive prices.

The price support level is to offset high American cost, and to help assure American farmers a fair share of the national income. To demand that supports be reduced, particularly where departmental officials now admit the bad effects of not selling stocks on hand at truly competitive prices, is wholly untenable and should not be permitted.

I personally believe that the price support level with regard to cotton is essential to offset high American costs. I am convinced that a reduction in the price support level, without other controls, would not tend to reduce the quantity of cotton produced; but actually, in the absence of other controls, more commodities would be planted to offset the monetary loss in price.

May I again respectfully submit that now, since the Department so clearly sees the ill effects of not selling in world trade on a competitive price basis, there is no reasonable basis let for the Department not to change its policy, since it has full authority under the law to sell competitively and thereby correct the situation now existing. As I see it, there are no problems which could come therefrom which could not be met by the Department under existing law, or under such changes in the law as might be essential, if the Department would only so recommend to the Congress.

May I assure you these suggestions and statements are made in complete good faith and because of my firm convictions. I trust you will accept them in the same good faith and that they will have the attention and consideration of the Department.

With very best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Member of Congress.

We must not lose track of the fact that in providing for the caretakers of the soil we protect ourselves.

WHILE THE GOVERNMENT AIDS OTHERS, IT REDUCES EFFORTS AT HOME

While speeches are being made on conservation, funds for soil conservation are being reduced by the President's budget. The conservation job is being pushed back on the individual farmers, when their income is decreasing and their costs are rising. The job is being put back on the States, though those with the greatest problems are least able to pay.

While our President speaks of providing farm commodities to the needy peoples of the world, our own school-lunch program is cut. While we provide money to the world for their economic improvement, the same United States commodities are being held off world markets, to give such markets to operators in foreign countries. While American tenant farmers are being cut back in acreage to the point of being without a means of livelihood and thousands of others are reduced to a gross annual income of less than $1,000, we are promoting the increased production of the same commodities throughout the world—at least 1 million bales per year increase in foreign cotton production—not only by providing an umbrella over world prices, but by grants of American dollars as well.

PROVISION FOR THE FUTURE

It has been said, "The world is never more than 1 year ahead of starvation." In our country we have had great abundance through the years. Now we know we are gaining population at the rate of 3 million a year. We must, in self defense, if we hope to maintain our present high standard of living, see to it that a reasonable part of what is taken out of the land is put back; and that will be done only as income received exceeds cost of production.

Protections for industry and labor are going to continue and since that is true we must see to it that agriculture, the source of all wealth returns to the head table too, for the good of the Nation.

The farmer must have price, but he must have volume as well.

Remember, the only source of real wealth is the land. Your income and the future of our Nation, as well, is tied to the farm income.

If we leave to our children and children's children a fertile land, with timber restored, our soil erosion stopped, and our streams harnessed, with our natural resources intact, they will make it fine. On the other hand, we could leave them all the money in the world but leave the a worn-out land and they will have nothing on which to build. Re-

member, the cost of producing food and fiber on the farm is going to be paid—either by those who use the products of the soil or by the land from which it comes. Forty percent of our land has paid that price in the past. Today with an ever-increasing population, we don't have the land to spare. There will likely be no Marshall plan or foreign aid law like our Public Law 480 if our country should ever be worn out as are most of the old countries of Asia we aid today.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, my farm neighbors are watching the conduct of the Congress. They are interested in the outcome of this bill. They are interested because they believe that this is a decisive point in the history of agricultural legislation. It is a battle of more than the philosophy of rigid versus flexible prices. They know a coalition of those who have been traditionally and historically opposed to price support programs, joined by a small segment of the Congress who actually believe in a flexible program, can defeat this bill. They know that the so-called flexible program means a sliding downward of the price of things they sell.

One result can be a discrediting of a price support program on the part of the Federal Government. We continually hear discussed the term that we must return to the farmer a free market. Implying that if we remove regulations, which the Congress has passed to protect him and his family from the whims of economic society, this will return to him certain inherent rights. I have listened to the debate. I am not certain what is implied by these freedoms so glibly explained by some of my colleagues. Does it mean a freedom that places upon his back a mortgage for lack of income? Is it freedom to deprive his children dental and medical care? Is it freedom to deprive his children of an adequate education? Is it freedom to deprive a mother and housewife of the conveniences of a modern home? Does anyone believe that farmers alone can survive in an economic society in competition with labor and industry, both of which have learned that free enterprise as it is proposed for agriculture only leads to chaos and bankruptcy.

A great President of this United States once said, "This country cannot exist half slave and half free." A farmer cannot exist in a society where he is unprotected in relation to other groups who are protected. I am one of those who believes that a farmer would be in a comparatively good economic position if he existed in a society where all were competing under a so-called free enterprise basis. I believe that this kind of a society exists only in a dream world. Labor and industry are not going to forego the special privileges they enjoy to go on that basis.

Some of my colleagues who talk so glibly about a free enterprise system resist it to the utmost for industry in their areas. If the farmer finds himself priced out of the world market he ought to be told what price he could receive if his products would move into the market.

Every time he pulls a watch from his pocket to look at the time, he knows that he is paying more than the world price because of the protection given the American watch industry. Other commodities he uses are priced above the world market prices because of duties, import quotas, and other schemes for protection. Must he be the only segment of our society to dispose of his commodities on the basis of world prices and purchase the necessities of life on an artificial, legislative, protective price?

My farm neighbors know that the bill today is a step on a road that we are going to take as far as farm legislation is concerned. Either we are going to take a step in the direction of plentiful, bountiful supply of food and fiber in an expanding economy, or we are going to accept a retreat from that viewpoint to lower prices, less security in a declining economy—an economy where a survival of fittest could be termed more of a cat-and-dog fight.

The farmer of this country knows that if this Congress does not find an answer to full protection in an expanding economy that the wooden shoes of peasantry are waiting for him on his doorstep.

It is not a matter of a bill before us being perfect or imperfect. A good piece of legislation can be ruined by poor administration. We certainly have seen it in the conduct of the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson where more money by some $400 million is lost in 2 years than was lost in the preceding 20 years. Farmers are not the only ones who have expanded their production. Industry expanded its production under price assurances and guaranties that paid it handsomely. We hear of the losses of the support price programs of the Department of Agriculture; we hear little of the losses taken by the Defense Department in selling war materials at about 5 cents on the dollar. I have been informed that the Defense Department lost approximately $3½ billion through disposal of materials this last fiscal year. I have been informed that they expect to lose about $2 billion a year for several years to come. Industry and labor are not concerned about this item. I am not concerned because I believe the security of this country to be worth the price we are paying. I do feel that some of my colleagues who are representing districts where industry is protected by this policy might apply the same yardstick to the farmer. I have heard no one imply that these guaranties and assurances to industry are socialism. Why then attempt to pin this label on to the hard-working farmer and his family?

The United States of America is going to be stronger if we have a strong, healthy agricultural economy and if our rural people continue to be the strong sturdy stock that cleared the land and tilled the soil. The same sturdiness that stood behind the stone fences at Lexington and Concord Bridge still flows through the veins of these people and will as long as they have an opportunity to live in a society that gives them an equal opportunity to raise their families in economic equality with other groups. We in the Congress deserve to give them this opportunity to do those things for themselves that they are entitled to do. I hope this Congress chooses the road ahead and does not take the backward step. I have firm faith in the American people and particularly in the American farmer.

We will continue to expand and grow. We will move ahead in building a greater country. I am hopeful that the American farmer will continue to take an active part in that growth. The Congress can provide part of the answer in passing this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] in repeating my support of this legislation in the last session and I will again support this legislation tomorrow in the interest of the many farmers I represent in the Third Congressional District of Minnesota.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (6) of subsection (d) of section 101, of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price for the 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, had come to no resolution thereon.

REREFERENCE OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the following bills: H. R. 2137, H. R. 2872, H. R. 2007, H. R. 694, H. R. 646, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 121).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 1094) to

amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 402. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually by category and amounts specifically set forth to each agency of the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia (including Government-owned corporations), upon a showing of necessity for requiring uniforms, an amount not to exceed $100 multiplied by the number of the employees of such agency who are required by regulation or by law to wear a prescribed uniform in the performance of his or her official duties and who are not being furnished with such uniform. The head of any agency to which any such appropriation is made shall, out of funds made available by such appropriation (1) furnish to each such employee such uniforms at a cost not to exceed $100 per annum, or (2) pay to each such employee an allowance for defraying the expenses of acquisition of such uniforms at such times and in such amounts, not to exceed $100 per annum, as may be prescribed in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to section 404. Where the furnishing of a uniform or the payment of a uniform allowance is authorized under any other provision of law or regulation existing on the date of enactment of this act, the head of the agency may in his discretion continue the furnishing of such uniform or the payment of such allowance under such law or regulation, but where a uniform is furnished or allowance paid under any such law or regulation no uniform shall be furnished or allowance paid under this section.

"'(b) On and after July 1, 1955, no regulation requiring additional categories of employees to wear uniforms shall be enforced unless such employees are furnished uniforms or paid an allowance therefor.

"'(c) Agency heads will, by February 1 of each year, submit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate, respectively, a report covering the number, category, and annual cost of uniforms provided under this section during the previous calendar year, together with a statement providing the same information covering the number, category, and estimated cost of uniforms for which the agency proposed to request funds for the ensuing fiscal year'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain if there are any changes in the language in this bill and the bill previously passed?

Mr. DOWDY. The bill that was passed last year for uniform allowances required that the regulations had to be existing on the date of the enactment of the act, requiring the wearing of the uniform before they could be bought. There were some 25,000 employees who were wearing uniforms under oral regulations. This bill is to remedy that situation. The bill reported by our committee placed some safeguards in it.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CRETELLA. Has this change been discussed in the committee?

Mr. DOWDY. What we are offering in this resolution is the bill that was reported by our committee. Through a cross-up in signals yesterday it was substituted for the words of the Senate bill.

Mr. CRETELLA. We have an executive session of the committee on Thursday. Would it not be well to reconsider this matter at that time?

Mr. DOWDY. Our committee reported this very bill.

Mr. CRETELLA. With the changes?

Mr. DOWDY. The very words here is the bill that was reported by our committee.

Mr. CRETELLA. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand the ranking minority Member is agreeable to this action?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted in the past few weeks some recent developments in commercial air transportation which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. My purpose in doing this is to inform them of these developments and to give whatever encouragement and support this body can to the airlines in this latest attempt on their part to improve their service by solving what I happen to know has been a very troublesome and trying problem to them for many years.

What I want to bring to my colleagues' attention is the problem of dealing with the "no show" passenger. This is the fellow who calls an airline for a reservation, has it confirmed, everything is in order for his flight, and then just never bothers to show up or to call the airline again to cancel his space. Those of us who have traveled very much by air know that every now and again we run into situations in which space is very hard to get and calls for reservations have to be made reasonably well in advance. It seems to me that this is inevitable. The one thing that is not inevitable, however, is the lack of courtesy and consideration for others which is exhibited by the "no show" in tying up a seat which he never uses. This is obviously one of the big reasons for the difficulty which we occasionally experience in getting a reservation on a plane. It is the reason we often have our name on a waiting list for a trying day or two and, further, sometimes have to go out to the airport on a purely stand-by basis in the hope that seats will open at the last minute. In other words, purely out of lack of consideration the "no show" is making your problems and mine, as average passengers, difficult and is, himself, paying no penalty whatsoever. Now, it is perfectly obvious that this is not fair to you and to me. It is also unfair to the airlines because there are occasions when this results in planes going out with a certain number of empty seats although so far as the company knew that flight was completely sold out, and this is of direct interest to us from the point of view of the Government, because the amount of money which an airline can make obviously determines the subsidy needs which may arise.

In short, anything that can be done to overcome this problem and to cure the lack of courtesy and the thoughtlessness on the part of a few travelers should be encouraged.

Now, the reason I come to make these few remarks today is that I have noted the recent decision of the Air Traffic Conference—an organization of the scheduled airlines dealing with traffic and sales matters—to eliminate the reconfirmation rule. This rule was proposed several years ago as a new attempt to deal with the "no show" problem. I may say that I was in hearty sympathy with that attempt, I make no criticism of the airlines either for trying it or abandoning it, and I am just very regretful that it did not solve the problem. The whole trouble was that it turned out to present other difficulties—largely through passengers who had every intention of taking the trip on which they had made reservations just simply forgetting, quite honestly, to reconfirm their space within the time limits which were set for that. I am sure this caused annoyance and irritation in many cases. So, the quite honest attempt to solve the problem just ran into too many unexpected difficulties.

Thus, the problem remains, and my intent today is to let our air transport industry, which has made some very fine progress in recent years, know that it has adherents and backing in whatever new steps it may take cooperatively. I know that various alternatives have been suggested. One of the principal ones has been a penalty charge made against a "no show" passenger. Actually, when I stated above that such "no show" suffered no penalty today, I should have qualified the statement to this extent: On the coach flights of some of the carriers, and perhaps on all of them, the "no show" passenger forfeits 25 percent of the cost of his ticket. It has been suggested from time to time that this penalty should be extended to all flights, and I must say there is some justification for this proposal. At first blush, it may seem quite onerous, but the experience with the coach service has been that the number of "no shows" on those flights has been consistently lower than on first-class flights, and I understand that such a "no show" service charge has worked out very well—without un-

due passenger disgruntlement—on various of the European airlines.

Of course, it is obvious that the imposition of such a charge gives a passenger a strong, added reason to use his ticket, and one of the interesting factors has been that passenger complaints about such a charge seem to have been relatively infrequent. I am told that passenger objections to such a charge are minimal in comparison to the frequent irritations caused by the reconfirmation plan. No doubt this is due in part to the fact that the "no show" service charge affects the fewest passengers; that is, those that actually do not show up. In view of this fact there is every reason to believe that such a program might have good prospects for success.

I do not mean to take the position of a proponent of such a measure, because I simply do not know that much about airline traffic and sales problems, and do not pretend to. All sorts of modifications of such a plan might be suggested. I know that the airlines have considered a number of different ticketing plans for instance, and some very forward-looking ideas have been put forth for actual delivery of the tickets to the customers either by means of mail, Western Union, through a delivery system jointly sponsored by the various airlines serving a given community, and a number of other plans. Actually, it would seem to me that something along those lines might be a great advance in customer service if it is feasible for the airlines in other respects. But the main point I want to make is that I think the industry deserves some commendation for attempting to deal with this matter. I should hate to see the airlines fail to do so, however, and would be very disappointed if they could not agree on some new attempt to correct the situation.

AN AMERICAN PLEDGE

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the spontaneous spiritual renaissance now sweeping this Republic, a number of citizens of Sierra Madre, Calif., have been meeting quietly at the home of Col. Walter Thurber, for the purpose of formulating an American pledge. Composed of men from various religions and both major political parties, the ideals set forth in the pledge will be the basis of several public meetings scheduled for the coming months. A major meeting is planned for the evening of Memorial Day in the city school auditorium.

Others who have worked with Colonel Thurber on it are Charles E. Louk, James Wolfe, Arthur F. Fox, A. E. Morgan, Stanley Schilberg, Graham Patterson, William Bowers, Dr. Milton Valois, David Allen, Dr. Frederick Whitney, Harry Lange, and Tom Schwartz.

In my judgment, the pledge deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if well disseminated, could provide inspiration for millions.

AN AMERICAN PLEDGE

Believing, as did the Founding Fathers of this Republic, in the power of united prayer and the open affirmation of faith in Almighty God, I, as a citizen of Sierra Madre, Calif., join with my neighbors in the following pledge:

1. To encourage the opening with prayer of meetings of organizations with which I am associated.

2. To encourage in the home, daily expressions of gratitude to God through words of grace at the table or in family prayer—or both—in order that our young people may have no misconception as to our devotion to the Divine Creator of the universe.

3. With my neighbors, to avail ourselves of our priceless freedom to join together in prayer, to demonstrate its efficacy as an invulnerable common bond and a potent weapon in a world threatened by the ungodly and destructive forces of communism.

4. To, in all ways, make silent or audible prayer a vital and spontaneous part of my daily program of living as a return to the humility and the basic spiritual ideals which made this Nation strong and great.

We warmly commend our Chief Executive, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, for opening his inaugural address with a prayer of his own composing and for directing that meetings of his Cabinet and Security Council be opened with prayer. Further evidence of our return, as a people, to the basic spiritual concepts of our Founding Fathers is seen in the opening of rooms for prayer and meditation in our National Capitol and in the home office of the United Nations.

On all these things we invoke the blessings of Almighty God.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks regarding this anniversary of free Poland in the RECORD immediately following my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this date of May 3, which I understand is Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday, I gladly rise to join my colleagues and proclaim that the administration's announced hope for peaceful liberation of the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain is as strong as it ever was.

To substantiate this statement, I would like at this time to read a letter dated December 16, 1954, from the State Department which sets forth specifically the policy of this Government and this administration toward the enslaved peoples of East Europe who are now behind the Iron Curtain:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 16, 1954.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Owosso, Mich.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: I refer to your request, in connection with recent developments, concerning the policy of this Government toward the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

During the past 2 years this Government has issued, or subscribed to, a number of public statements indicating that it is not reconciled to the present fate of those peoples; that it will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty confirming or prolonging their subjection to Soviet despotism; and that it seeks by peaceful means conditions permitting these enslaved national groups to recover genuine freedom and independence.

Recently in a speech reviewing United State foreign policy before the 33d annual 4-H Club Congress at Chicago, the Secretary spoke of our efforts in the realistic pursuit of peace and at the same time of our action in many ways to sustain the hope of freedom among the captive peoples. As of particular relevance in this connection, he stated that "the scope of conferences with the Soviet Government is necessarily limited by our attitude toward the captive peoples, for the Soviets know that we will not make any deal which would condone and perpetuate the captivity of men and nations." The principles enunciated in this speech show that our objective remains unchanged, namely, to work in all peaceful ways for the creation of a Europe in which the captive peoples will again enjoy governments as well as social and economic institutions of their own free choice.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this should effectively dispose of the argument that a policy of coexistence is to be or should be adopted by this Government, a policy which would, in effect, tend to confirm the present unhappy situation on the part of the captive peoples. I rejoice that this Government is still committed to a policy of peaceful liberation of the Iron Curtain countries and hope that this will be a bipartisan policy which will be pursued by this Government until the liberation itself becomes a reality rather than a dream.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I also desire to read the text of a letter dated April 15, 1955, and received by me from the Polish American Congress, the outstanding organization of Polish Americans in this country:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1955.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Since the earlier enunciated policy of liberation has been discarded to make room for the fallacious policy of coexistence, the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe need more than ever some expression of the Western World's recognition that the world—to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln—"divided against itself cannot endure half-free and half-slave."

The approaching date of May 3, Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday offers you an excellent opportunity to proclaim from the floor that the exigencies of expediency which have apparently become the basis of the current United States policy, did not take hold of the minds and hearts of the American people of whom you are one of the representatives.

You are hereby being respectfully requested to make a statement on the floor of which you are a Member, on or around May 3, stressing the strong ties of friendship and perpetual alliance—spiritual, if not legal—and sealed in blood, if not by wax—of the American and Polish nations.

The Polish nation deprived of almost half of its territory, enslaved by the occupying Soviet armies and police system, governed by

Soviet officials or their local stooges, cut off from the West with which it has lived in spiritual, religious, and cultural community for over nine centuries—the Polish nation expects words of encouragement from America and expression of opposition to the officially imposed policy of recognition of the puppets of Moscow as representing the "government" of Poland.

Poles behind the Iron Curtain deeply believe in the truth of these words recently printed in the book written by the ex-skipper of the famous Polish liner *Batory*:

"There are some people in the world today—even some who are well meaning, I am sure—who hold that it is possible for nations that are free to coexist in this world of ours with communism. But I do not believe it. It is impossible for freedom to coexist successfully with communism as for an individual to coexist successfully with cancer. For communism is a cancer in the body politic of the world—a malignant growth which, by its very nature, is incapable of remaining static or of coming to be benign. And just as death for the individual is the only end for which cancer is idealy fitted, so the death of liberty is communism's only goal."

Because the Polish nation knows these words to be true, they would deeply appreciate your participation in a debate which would permit them to continue to believe that true America has not sacrificed the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe on the altar of the false idol called coexistence.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish American Congress, Inc.

Coming as I do, Mr. Speaker, from a State and a congressional district in which reside many thousands of Polish American citizens, persons who are loyal to this great country, while at the same time they hold ties to Poland strong in their minds and hearts, I am glad to take this opportunity to assure them, as well as the millions of Polish people now suffering in slavery behind the Iron Curtain, that we have not forgotten the plight of Poland. This Government has not forgotten it. I know that the American people everywhere hope and pray that the day will come soon when Poland will again know the blessings of freedom along with the other enslaved nations now under Communist tyranny and domination.

There are, in this country, many sincere and well-intentioned persons who believe in the value of coexistence with the Soviet Union in the interests of peace. I appreciate the sentiments which guide these people but I do not believe that they are reflecting the true feelings of the majority of the American people. In a recent poll which I conducted in my congressional district, the last question was as follows:

Peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union is possible.

Only 32 percent of those replying answered in the affirmative and 43 percent replied that they did not believe it was possible. The remainder had no opinion.

Therefore, I seriously suggest to those who are urging upon us such a policy of peaceful coexistence with Soviet communism to stop and consider whether they sincerely believe they are reflecting the viewpoints of those whom they represent. When I stand here and say that I honestly believe that we cannot peaceably coexist with Soviet communism, I think I am voicing not only my own opinions but also the opinions of a majority of my own constituents. The fact that this Government is still committed to a policy of peaceful liberation is, I believe, proof that coexistence with communism is officially regarded with that same degree of skepticism which I feel sure is shared by the great majority of the American people.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It is the 164th anniversary of a proud day in the long history of a long-suffering nation. We are once again reminded of how Poland was the first nation in all of Europe to courageously stand up against the Nazi and Russian onslaught, and although knowing that it meant her obliteration, it gave the rest of the free world ample time in which to rearm.

This anniversary is one of the great events in the history of Poland. For it was on May 3, 1791, that Polish political tradition reached the heights of genuine grandeur. It was on that day it was decreed, Poland was to be a nation of laws and not of selfish men. This new Polish Constitution was adopted just 2 years after the forming of the Constitution of the United States. It is similar to ours, inspiring the love of liberty which will always be a Polish trait.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

As early as 1347, Poland established the first complete code of laws of Christian Europe.

In 1413, Poland and Lithuania executed an agreement whose language is sublime and proclaimed for the first time in history the brotherhood of nations.

The security of the person was recognized and safeguarded by law in Poland in 1430, two and a half centuries before England's habeas corpus, and that law, which was constantly broadened, became the nucleus of Poland's unparalleled political and religious liberties.

The great deeds of Polish men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again, particularly in the deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive for over 150 years the fire of freedom which was Poland's first love. So also in the deeds of children who refused to let Poland die in spite of the most concerted efforts to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

No nation on God's earth has been subject to the brutality which has been the unhappy lot of Poland. Poland, the country first to offer resistance to Hitler's aggression, an original signatory of the Declaration of the United Nations on January 2, 1942, an ally of the United States in World War II, has been deprived of her independence and national sovereignty by Soviet Russia. Freedom has been completely suppressed. The army is in the hands of the Soviet lords who run it with the help of several thousand Soviet officers, parading in Polish uniforms but unable to speak the Polish language. The school system, the youth organizations, the trade unions, universities and colleges have been made parts of the Soviet machine. Hundreds of thousands of people have been arrested and deported deep into Russia for as little as expressing, privately, their displeasure with the brutal crushing of Poland's freedom and the suppression of her western, Christian civilization.

The small Communist Party to this day keeps the Polish nation under its heel by means of wholesale arrests, mass deportations, and terrors of all sorts. In this land of traditional freedom, the liberty-loving Poles are tortured in mind and manhandled in body by their totalitarian masters. Devout Christians are not permitted to worship in freedom. They are compelled instead to pay homage of an almost religious nature to the leaders and symbols of the peoples democratic state. Their spiritual enslavement must weigh most heavily upon the consciences of men and women who are known for their devotion to the faith of their fathers.

To the traitors and collaborators who now preside over Poland and listen to the voice of the despots of Moscow, the Polish Constitution is but a scrap of paper. But constitutions born of the will of freedom do not die. They may be temporarily dormant. But those who have sold out to the enemy and the enemy itself will come to know that freedom cannot be crushed for all time. Today, Poland has been transformed into a terroristic totalitarian police state, occupied by the Red army and policed by Soviet-trained secret police. Industry, business, agriculture are being nationalized and Poland has been stripped of much of its material wealth by Russia. How long this will continue, it is difficult to foretell. But history bespeaks the end that evil brings. When the day comes—as it will—that the Polish people are ready to throw off the chains that bind them, I am confident that the free men and women of this great Nation, the United States, will give the spiritual and material assistance necessary to assure the return of Poland to its traditional position of honor among the free nations of the world.

THE MAY 3D CONSTITUTION; AN EXAMPLE OF ENLIGHTENED STATESMANSHIP

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the most striking features of the Polish Constitution of 1791 was what Dr. Robert Howard Lord, a noted American scholar of Polish history, has quite rightly referred to as the "happy blend of liberalism and conservatism."

The Polish experience, which was, in fact, a revolution in that it changed substantially the structure of the Polish state, makes a remarkable contrast with constitutional changes in France. The French Revolution and the events that followed were accompanied by violence, terror, and war. Practically nothing of the past was held sacred; rather it was something to be destroyed. Intoxicated by the heady stimulant of "egalité, fraternité, and liberté," French radicals de-

stroyed the old order of things with reckless abandon, and upon its ruins attempted unsuccessfully to establish a state guided by the principles they proclaimed.

In Poland, however, peace, orderliness, conciliation marked the transformation of the Government from the old to the new. Reforms, many of which were radical, were carried out unaccompanied by violence, terror, and civil disorder. When the Polish Diet accepted the new constitution, all Poland rejoiced, as well she should, at this dawning of a new day of liberty.

The road to constitutional reform in Poland was not, however, an easy one. It took almost 2 years of intense discussion in the Polish Diet before reform could be effected. Contending forces, some holding extreme political views, pressed vigorously their respective points of view in order to protect their own interests. But, ultimately there was virtually general concurrence in the character of reform. To achieve this result nearly all contending factions made some concessions so that common acceptance could be attained.

As a consequence, the constitution itself represented a nice synthesis of liberalism and conservatism. Political principles and constitutional practices dominant in advanced countries at that time were tested to suit Polish needs and applied when desirable. Hence, one finds in the constitution many forms and practices readily seen in our own Constitution as well as in the British system of government. Separation of powers, a bicameral legislature, the elements of cabinet responsibility, the independent judiciary, extension of suffrage, the principle of government derived from the will of the people, and majority rule—all vital parts of the American and British systems—formed a part of the Polish Constitution of May 3.

For the time, these elements in the constitution were advanced, liberal, perhaps to some extent, radical, but Poland accepted them in a spirit of equanimity, although many of the reformers must have had some misgivings for such innovations.

On the other hand, the constitution was conservative. By this I mean that in their reform, such as it was, the Polish statesmen sought to preserve the traditions of the past, of the nation itself, and reconcile these important elements with the needs of the present and future. Property was respected; religious traditions of the nation were preserved; many privileges of the nobility and propertied classes, although modified, were maintained; the institutions of the monarchy, although limited, were strengthened and placed on a more stable basis. Great care was taken to achieve this transition to a more perfect state in an orderly and peaceful manner. No scenes of French terror were duplicated in Poland. There were no guillotine; nor was there a Robespierre.

It is not surprising, therefore, that George Washington, as first President of the American Republic, acclaimed the great step toward democracy which was taken in Poland and praised the Polish King, Stanislas II, for his enlightened leadership. In France, America, England and other parts of the Western World voices were raised in common praise of this peaceful and beneficient "Polish Revolution."

That Poland succeeded in achieving so great a reform was due almost entirely to the genius of the Polish people themselves. For in this great people there are qualities which I, who have countless Polish-American friends not only in my own district but throughout Massachusetts and the Nation at large, have come to know and appreciate firsthand. Patriotic in love of country; courageous in battle when duty calls; jealous of their rights as freemen; resentful of tyranny; resolute in resistance to oppression; quick to anger when wronged but otherwise docile, patient, and gentle of disposition; intensely loyal and faithful to friends, country and God—such are some of the many noble characteristics of this wonderful people.

On this day of national dedication for all freedom-loving Poles, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of our forefathers, the cause of constitutional democracy. Let us refresh ourselves in the same spirit that moved them to such olympian achievements. Only by rededicating ourselves for freedom's sake can we inspire the downtrodden and oppressed. The people of Poland now clutched in the tenacious grip of Communist tyranny deserve the freedom they do not enjoy, and in our duties we would be negligent if we did not tell them that our fondest hope is that one day they shall attain that freedom, as indeed they shall. For all tyranny, however oppressive, however all encompassing, is a degenerate force which being consumed by its own evil doing will die of itself; and when the Communist Leviathan has spent its last energy and when it has at last taken its final breath, all the free world will acclaim the release of Poland and all other nations who now are held captive. And upon that glorious day the crown of thorns now piercing the brow of Poland shall be lifted and in its stead there shall be placed the crown of victory.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 of each year is celebrated here in the United States as Polish Constitution Day. For a great number of years we have, on this day, by appropriate ceremonies, recalled to mind the Polish Constitution which was enacted on May 3, 1791. There are a number of important reasons for this celebration, among them being, first, because so many of the loyal sons and daughters of Poland came here to the United States to help build our great democracy. The contribution they have made to the building of our free way of life is beyond measurement. Secondly, because the history of Poland and the history of the United States has been so tightly tied together by important events of great meaning to all Americans and to all the people of Poland.

When we, under the leadership of Gen. George Washington, were fighting for our national independence, Poland sent us her heroic son, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who, as a professional soldier and great strategist, became one of General Washington's field commanders. The exploits of Kosciusko are known to every schoolchild in America.

Then Poland, after 123 years of partition and alien occupation, rose again as a sovereign nation in 1918. We are proud to say that the United States played an important part in helping Poland win victory in her age-long struggle. President Wilson made it clear by point 13 of his grand program for restoring peace and comity among nations, that Poland was to be free and independent after World War I.

In more recent years, Polish Constitution Day has had a new and fuller meaning to all of us Americans. On this day we recall that World War II started over the right of Poland to be free and independent as against the claims of the Nazis and the Communists that they had a right to divide that sovereign nation. World War II then was fought not only to remove tyranny and despotic dictatorship from the face of the earth, but indeed to assure all nations, large and small, the right to freedom and national independence. The tragedy of World War II which, found Poland under a more despotic and tyrannical occupation than ever before in her history, has caused us on May 3 of each year to restate our national purpose—that Poland must once again be free and independent.

It is a fact of history that Poland has stood between the great culture of western man and the primitive despots of Moscow ever since the beginning of European history. Poland has stood as an outpost of defense for Christian civilization. Poland, by its geographical position, the great faith and heroic nature of its people, confronted with the aggressive character of the Russian, has been a martyr many times in the history of our civilization. Poland has known the cruel occupation of the Russians under the czars. Poland was subjected to the harsh programs of russification under the czars—a program calculated to break the patriotic spirit and sturdy resistance of the Poles. Poland has suffered many tyrannies in the past, but none has been able to break the spirit of its people and the national spirit which has kept alive the culture, the aspirations, and indeed the hopes of a great people.

It would do us well today to recall that the Polish Constitution enacted by the Polish people on May 3, 1791, was inspired, in large measure, by the American Declaration of Independence. Many of its provisions are in spirit, almost identical with those great moral and political principles contained in our founding document. It was no wonder then that the alien occupiers of Poland in 1791 saw in this Constitution a rally point for the revival for the patriotic national spirit of the Poles. We can understand why the alien occupiers at that time took such violent steps to destroy the Polish Constitution and its message to the people. During this struggle, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, with the Polish Constitution as his rally point, led a revolt against the alien occupier. This revolt was put down by overwhelming military strength. Kosciusko soon afterward died of a

broken heart. But the people of Poland fought on to their timeless goal of national independence which they won again in 1918.

Poland today suffers again at the hands of her historic oppressor. That oppressor has grown more violent and despotic while at the same time more clever and deceptive. The false ideology of Marx has been melted into traditional Russian imperialism to bring forth the international conspiracy of communism. Consequently, the ruling clique in Warsaw is completely subservient to Moscow and thereby are traitors to the cause of peace with freedom. Only last week, this Warsaw clique turned down a proposal made by the United States Government that our Atoms-for-Peace exhibit be shown in Warsaw so that the Polish people could see the wonderful developments we have brought about in the field of nuclear energy. All we seek to do through this exhibit is to show what we Americans have been doing to harness nuclear energy for the everlasting benefit of all mankind. Most people of the world already know that we have an overwhelming superiority in the use of nuclear energy as a weapon against dictators—a situation forced upon us by the Communist imperialists of Moscow. The Warsaw clique turned down our proposal in an oral answer rather than by the usual exchange of a note, in the obvious hope that the matter would be dropped quietly. Nevertheless, I am confident that our good friends, the people of Poland, will eventually learn all about what we Americans have been doing with nuclear energy to bring about a better and fuller life for all mankind.

It is therefore fitting that today we renew our pledge to bring about a restoration of freedom and national independence for Poland. We assure the enslaved people of Poland that their alien occupier is the enemy of all mankind and therefore will certainly suffer the reward that God holds for all tyrants and oppressors of mankind. Let us hasten the day when Poland will be free and independent and when we can rejoice with her in a world truly at peace.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in Polish history the late 18th century may be described as a time of troubles, as years of tribulation in the course of which, after three successive partitions of its territory, Poland ceased to exist as a politically independent country. During the critical years of that period the wise leaders of the Polish people realized that action was required to meet the serious external dangers facing their country. Germany, Austria, and Russia were being strengthened by their powerful, ambitious, and aggressive monarchs. And all three of them, individually as well as collectively, had their designs on relatively weak Poland. The Polish leaders, fully conscious of the evil intentions of the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian monarchs, resorted to a number of stratagems through which they hope to strengthen their country internally and also to enhance Poland's prestige externally. With that purpose in mind, they revamped the Government of Poland by drawing up what has come to be known as the constitution of May 1791.

This document was, for the times, a liberal instrument containing many elements of a bill of rights for the Polish Nation. To begin with, the powers of the monarch were curtailed, a government of limited monarchy was provided for, with ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the parliament was broadened, and many of the privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper class were made available to others. The peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Towns were given administrative and judicial autonomy, and were entitled to a certain measure of parliamentary representation. Freedom of conscience was guaranteed and absolute religious toleration was established. All these measures represented genuinely democratic forward steps.

Today as we celebrate the 164th anniversary of that historic document Poland is ensnared by a tyrannous system that makes a mockery of the democratic freedoms it professes to support. According to the Communists Poland is a people's democracy. But the liberties we associate with a genuine democracy are banned, and the people do not control their government. Poland, in a word, is a captive of those conspirators who plan to overturn freedom throughout the world and substitute therefor their own oppressive despotism. But the spirit of freedom is rooted deep in the Polish tradition. The Constitution of 1791 and the place of honor it has in Polish hearts is proof of that. Such a spirit cannot be forever enslaved. Thus, on this day of remembrance we feel confident that the spirit of the 1791 Constitution will soon prevail again in a free and independent Poland.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join with my colleagues today in paying homage to a great nation and a courageous people.

Poland has a long and glorious history which her people do well to celebrate at this time. It is also fitting that we here in the United States should join with them in their celebration. The Polish people have contributed a great deal to this Nation in many and diverse ways. Today, as her citizens celebrate this great day in their history, we, in the United States, should pause and give thought to the debt we owe her citizens who have emigrated to our shores. From the great and direct aid of persons such as Kosciusko and Pulaski, to the polka—that marvelous dance which is both a joy and a physical task and which forces one's admiration for the endurance of the Polish people—their contributions have been both varied and important. We are in their debt for much of our cultural inheritance and we are in their debt for their aid in our industrial development.

Though Poland is under the domination of the Soviet Union at the present time, it is appropriate that those of her citizens who have escaped the yoke of Communist tyranny should celebrate her Constitution Day. It is the hope and prayer of all of us, as it was of Pilsudski and Paderewski, that these brave people one day will be free of the dictatorship which today rules Poland. All tyranny must eventually fall but we, in the United States, must do all within our power to bring freedom to these people. It is certainly the hope of the nations of the Western world that soon Poland will be able to take its seat with the other democratic nations and contribute, once more, as she has so often in the past, to the forward development of mankind.

On this, Poland's great national holiday, we in the United States send her our greetings, our gratitude for her contributions to American development, and our pledge to do all in our power to bring her once again into the light of the free world.

POLAND AND FREEDOM

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, 164 years ago the people of Poland adopted a constitution which expressed, with eloquence and sincerity, an undying love of freedom and an inherent respect for the rights of man. Today that noble document is a source of courage and hope for the more than 26 million Poles held in bondage by their tyrannical Communist overlords. For liberty-loving Americans, this anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution is an opportunity to tell the people of Poland that they have not been forgotten by the free world. We share with them the hope that the spirit of their constitution of 1791 will continue to serve them, not only as a source of strength, but also as an inspiration for a future democratic government when the shackles of Communist despotism have been cast off.

Certainly we in the United States cannot forget the Poles in their days of darkness. They did not forget us when we were 13 weak colonies struggling to free ourselves from British domination. Many Poles joined our ranks in the War for Independence. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko and Gen. Casimir Pulaski were two of the great generals in that war. Indeed, General Pulaski gave his life in the Battle of Savannah. In all the wars which the United States has fought for freedom, Americans of Polish descent have shared in the valiant sacrifices of life and treasure.

We did not forget Poland in the past. Although that great nation had been divided and occupied for 123 years, in 1917 President Wilson pronounced the establishment of an independent Poland as one of his 14 points, and freedom was restored to Poland at the end of the First World War. It is one of the great tragedies of history that the Second World War once again brought tyranny to the Polish people.

As result of the usurpation of the Polish Government by the Communists, the people of Poland live under a regime of terror. Although they continue to cherish their love of freedom, the Poles are punished for any attempt to express this feeling. Their religious leaders are persecuted. Their economic resources are exploited. They have no opportunity to elect officials who would represent their national aspirations.

We in the United States understand that their unhappy status is not theirs by choice. They are held in slavery by one of the largest war machines the world has ever known. However, just as dark years of partition and foreign tyranny in Poland's past have been fol-

lowed by unity and freedom, so in the future liberty will be restored. The people of Poland may take hope in the fact that the people of the United States know that the people of Poland rightfully belong in the community of free nations. They may have faith that we have not forgotten them, and that some day the force of freedom will triumph throughout the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, 1955, marks the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, an occasion which was for some years a day of celebration in Poland, of rejoicing over the liberties which had been hard-won. Those liberties being lost, what are the feelings of the Polish people today?

The United States of America has survived many dangers which might have destroyed her. Had this country succumbed to the British invasion of 1812, had it ceased to exist as a Nation as a result of the War Between the States, had its government been defeated and overthrown in one of the world conflicts of this century, what would be our feelings on the Fourth of July? Would we not mourn the freedom, the dignity we had lost? Would we not look back with longing to the days when we had charted our own course as a nation, regretting the things which were not done, wondering at what point we had erred? How much greater our grief would be had we fallen victims to an oppression which not only crushed out our existence as a nation, but also deprived each of us, as individuals, of that freedom of choice which is essential to our role as children of God.

And yet, in spite of this sense of loss, the Fourth of July would serve as a reminder of the freedom which had been ours. We would glory in the strong and brave words of our Declaration of Independence. Here and there, in spite of the vigilance of our oppression, some heroic countrymen would find a way to remind us that all men are created equal, that the rights of men come from their Creator, not from the state, and that the true purpose of government is to preserve those rights.

Today, behind the Iron Curtain, the people of Poland must be stirring restlessly, at once inspired and tormented by memories and by their certain knowledge that to serve as slave labor and mechanical soldiers in a monstrous assembly line of world domination is not the destiny for which they were intended. They know that the force which has crushed them is evil, that to exist it must destroy every evidence of its essential falsity, and that it cannot permit the existence of nations founded upon the consent of the governed. They know that their conquerors must conquer the world or be destroyed by the truth which cannot forever be kept on the other side of the Iron Curtain. They must shrink with disgust from the thought that their minds and bodies are being made instruments of the destruction of others, that they will be used in time against those friends in whose existence lies their only hope. Is their suffering made greater by the thought that they have been forgotten in the free world, that their subjection has been accepted as final and inevitable?

If this is so, then through openings in the Iron Curtain, maintained by unconquerable men, may the people of Poland learn today that we are no more resigned to their fate than are they. May the Polish people learn Americans are aware that while any nation successfully maintains that human liberties are not God-given and that they may be subverted to the state, American liberty is in danger. The American people assure the people of Poland today that we will not sit complacently by while freedom is destroyed throughout the world, and that we will work and pray unceasingly for the restoration of Poland as a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating Free Poland's Constitution Day and national holiday on May 3. It is particularly appropriate that we commemorate the struggle for a Free Poland at this time when there appears to be so much talk of further compromise and concessions to the Communist conspiracy which today governs the Polish homeland.

The valiant fight of the Polish people for freedom is an inspiration to all of us in the free world. It is also a grim reminder of the fate which may befall all of us if we give the Communists further opportunities to seize other nations of the world. No man who understands what is happening in Poland today can help but recognize that further appeasement of the Reds will lead to disaster.

Today in Poland there are millions of people who are still our friends. They still hope and pray that the day will come when the Soviet empire will collapse and freedom will replace Russian tyranny. We must do everything possible to keep those hopes alive. If we engage in further compromise or concessions to the Communists, we may well destroy forever the chance for future Polish freedom.

It is my hope that the leaders of our Nation will never repeat the tragic mistakes made at Yalta where the Polish Nation was eliminated. I trust that the American people will never allow their leaders to participate again in a Yalta-type agreement.

I salute the valiant Polish people who continue the fight for the freedom of their nation. America will forever be indebted to its citizens of Polish descent who have given so much to the growth and development of our country.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791 AND THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, fundamental to the creation of a liberal democratic constitutional form of government is that the constitutional structure be grounded in the will of the people. Our American Constitution makes it abundantly clear that the American Republic is a Government determined entirely by the will of the people. So it is with the British, French, Italian and other constitutional systems which are genuinely democratic.

To meet this test of democracy the Polish Constitution of 1791 is well qualified. Article V of this great document defines the form of government in the following manner:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on lasting foundation.

Upon this fundamental concept there was constructed a form of constitutional government which, had it been permitted to flourish by Poland's powerful adversaries, would have unquestionably brought Poland at that time to the leading ranks of democratically inspired nations. As Edmund Burke wrote, the Polish Constitution of 1791 "contained the seeds of continuous improvement."

Truly, the constitution of 1791 was an instrument that would have insured for Poland stability and progress toward greater democracy.

It is fitting, therefore, that Poles as well as all freedom-loving people should commemorate the occasion when this constitution was promulgated. Everything ought to be done to keep alive the ideals and inspiration of this great constitutional document. For if ever the democratic ideal no longer holds in the minds, hearts, and aspirations of men a foremost place, the world would then indeed come upon unhappy times.

Let us commemorate this glorious occasion, therefore, that we ourselves may be reminded of our own great constitutional heritage. But most of all, let us commemorate this event so that by our most heartfelt demonstrations we may give hope to the oppressed people of Poland that the ideals and aspirations of their forebears of 1791 may one day again become a reality.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Poland's Constitution Day should be a reminder to people everywhere that Poland is the victim of broken promises. Over the years since the war it has become apparent that friends of Poland were imposed upon in postwar settlements, that promises were made only to be broken. It has become apparent that a more hard-headed policy should have been adopted in dealing with Poland's oppressors.

May lessons from the past be a guide for the future. May the future bring an opportunity to undo the injustices of the past so that Poland may rise again and her constitution day be again one on which to honor a vibrant, living reality.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Poland's Constitution Day on May 3 is a day to be remembered and celebrated by the nations of the Western World and free peoples everywhere.

We must not forget the many friends and relatives of our good Polish friends who are looking forward to freedom and prosperity which we had all looked forward to so hopefully to follow as one of the results of World War II.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, year in and year out we have been stressing the importance of the May 3 Constitution of 1791, emphasizing its democratic character, recalling the almost analogical circumstances of today, and perhaps, the dominant role played by

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who after his return from the United States inspired the leaders of the Polish Assembly to make the constitution as liberal as possible.

There is one aspect of the May 3 constitution which has never been sufficiently stressed and I would venture to say, it has even been overlooked, although it bears much weight on the future outcome of the free world. Since the political circumstances surrounding Poland today are almost the same as those prevailing in the latter part of the 18th century, I believe that we should draw some conclusions and take advice from those great statesmen of the latter part of the 18th century, who were responsible for the drafting of that splendid charter which came into existence 164 years ago. What the advice was and the reasons upon which it is based, is what I would like to speak about.

Out of the 3 leaders mainly responsible for the draft of the May 3 constitution—Hugo Kollataj, Ignacy Potocki, and Stanislaw Malachowski, 2 were closely related to 1 of the first and best educational programs. In fact they were the backbone of the educational committee and mainly responsible for the outcome of program laid down by that committee.

Although Hugo Kollataj and Ignacy Potocki did not have an exact recipe for the restoration of an independent and free Poland, they did believe that one way to achieve this goal was to support a general educational program on a nationwide basis, enforced by one administrative body. That is why the educational committee was created, 9 years prior to the ratification of the constitution of May 3.

Aristotle, the famed Greek philosopher and edcuator, nearly 400 years before Christ, when asked how much educated men are superior to those uneducated, made the following reply, "As living are to the dead." Having this in mind the founders of the constitution of May 3 put all their energy and efforts into building up the educational committee, known as Komisya Edukacyjna. This committee, founded in 1780, was unquestionably the forerunner of any enforced educational program in Europe. It was set up long before education became compulsory in France, Austria, or Prussia and it was the predecessor of the Ministry of Education existing in almost every country.

Thus, Poland became the first country to create a national educational system. Hugo Kollataj went further than that. Realizing that education was being suppressed in Poland under the occupational powers, he suggested the establishment of a Polish national home in Rome where Polish refugees would receive their education and knowledge, in order to return one day to their own country and unfold it to the people.

Today with one of the most brutal occupants in Poland, where history is being twisted to the whims of the Kremlin, and where the young generation has been indoctrinated to the point where they stopped trusting their parents, there still is a remedy; let us take an example from Hugo Kollataj, and Ignacy Potocki, the two who were the spirit of the May 3 constitution; let us help the many refugees scattered all over the globe, not only to survive, but to get the proper education, which is so necessary once they return to their own land and homes, and return they will.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we come again to another observance of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This is also free Poland's national holiday. In Poland itself, the occasion must be observed covertly and in the silence of the hearts of the Polish people, for Poland is still crushed and dominated by a puppet regime controlled by a foreign power. None of the humanitarian and liberation ideals preached by the Soviets are being put into effect in Poland. That is why we have so little faith in their protestations.

Fortunately, free Poles in America and elsewhere in the world are under no such restraint. For them, this is a time when they freely and openly renew their dedication to the sacred purpose that Poland will regain its freedom and will once again thrive in liberty and without constant fear of the secret police. In this noble cause, the people of Poland have the sympathetic support of every Member of this House—yes, their aspirations are shared by freedom-loving people throughout the world.

It has been truthfully said that Communist Russia has no satellite peoples. It has only satellite governments.

Recently the Communist government of Poland rejected a request by the Government of the United States that we be allowed to show in Warsaw exhibits demonstrating the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Knowing the people of Poland, who among us believes that in turning down this request the Government of Poland was speaking for the Polish people? We know, of course, that government was acting on instructions from its Communist masters in Moscow. It could not have been representing the aims and aspirations of the people it ruthlessly dominates through oppression and fear.

An American newspaperwoman who recently visited nations behind the Iron Curtain reported that consumer goods are prohibitively priced by American standards. As an example, she revealed that a 3-ounce cake of chocolate in Warsaw cost the equivalent of $2.

Poland has been the victim of great humiliation and suffering through military conquest several times since the adoption of its Constitution—the charter of Polish liberties—in 1791. Several times she has been crushed by the military might of more powerful nations along her borders. But due to the indomitable spirit of her people and their passion for freedom and self-rule, she has risen before from the ashes of defeat. She will do so again.

The people of Poland today taste the bitter dregs of Communist dictatorship. Everything this regime represents is contrary to the desires of every true son and daughter of Poland.

A nation which has produced men with the courage and determination of Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciusko will one day, in concert with other nations living under the lash of communism, break its shackles and live once more in the pure light of liberty and the fresh air of freedom.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, 1955, marks the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, the constitution which in 1791 put into writing those liberal ideals still cherished by the Polish people today.

Coming as it did, only 2 years after the formation of our own Government, it was an expression of the common love of freedom and respect for the individual which has always constituted a deep bond of friendship between the American and Polish people.

Historically it has been Poland's great misfortune to fall all too often in the path of foreign aggression. Partition and armed occupation have prevented the peaceful development of constitutional government possible in our United States, and today Poland suffers the grim realities of Soviet oppression. Nonetheless, the people of Poland have not abandoned their ideals. Freedom and justice must exist first as concepts in the minds of men. It is in the minds of men that they are kept alive, and no amount of Soviet tyranny may ever accomplish their destruction.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on this day, when we join our Polish friends in commemorating Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday, I would like to express to the people of Poland my own belief that they most certainly—as all people, in fact, on earth—are entitled to live their lives in full human dignity, free of the government slavery that has been imposed upon them. I join my colleagues in looking forward to the day when the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe shall again be free and walk among us as citizens of a free world.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in the House and the free peoples of the world in saluting freedom-loving Poles everywhere. Today is a grim holiday for gallant Poland, now an enslaved cog in the awesome machine Communist dictators have built to conquer the world.

Today is Polish Constitution Day and the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are broadcasting messages through the Iron Curtain to the Poles subjugated by their Red rulers. How best can we tell these Polish patriots that we are determined to add another national holiday to their calendar—one celebrating Poland's overthrow of her Red yoke and her return to the family of free nations.

Our message, I believe, should be twofold.

Amid the continuing crises of the free world's battle against communism, there come periods of comparative calm. The Kremlin occasionally switches the spearhead of its drive for world domination to honeyed words and a seeming spirit of conviviality. There is talk, as there has been during the past few months, of a policy of coexistence.

But we must not be deterred from our dedicated purpose when the dove of peace appears to flutter over Moscow. Though

the grim men who rule Communist thought and action may tinker with their timetable of world conquest, their overall blueprint always is the same. We must not mistake the expedients of the cold war for a change of heart in the Kremlin. There has been no deviation from the long-range goals of Russian communism since the bloody days of 1917. And there will be none until the Kremlin has conquered the world or until it has been smashed by the hundreds of thousands of people which it has harnessed to its machine of destruction.

To the Poles, we must say that so it is too, with the free world. Our guiding blueprint is one of liberation for the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe and the rest of the world. We need no Marx, Lenin, or Stalin, to propound and explain this policy to us. It is engraved in our hearts and minds and we remain unswervingly true to it. We may occasionally argue over tactical strategy but our determination to carry on the long battle against tyranny and enslavement of peoples and nations always remains.

To this reassurance must be added hope.

And it is a hope which the Poles and their Eastern European neighbors know well. It has served them well in the past. Poland has been the main battlefield of most of Europe's great wars of the 19th and 20th centuries. Caught between the imperialist ambitions of great powers, Poland's history is an inspiring one of rising again and again to throw off the chains of a conqueror and reestablishing a democratic government. More than any other nation, Poland stands as the testing ground for the lesson of history that no tyranny can long subdue a freedom-loving people.

The challenge now faced is a greater one than freedom-loving Poles ever have faced before. Certainly it is a greater one than any people can hope to meet alone.

I think it appropriate that on Polish Constitution Day we join other free nations in reaffirming our determination to support the battle for liberation with all our power, leading it when our leadership is needed.

We hope this rededication will be heartening to Poles enslaved under the boot of Communist dictators. It is heartening to us that the gallant Polish peoples, by their unending sacrifice and courage, serve as a symbol of our final goal.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with those of others of my colleagues on the observance of the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

Americans of Polish descent in my district, as well as other districts in the city of Chicago and in the Nation, are gathered in observance of this anniversary.

I number among my closest personal friends many Americans of Polish ancestry. I have found Americans of Polish ancestry to be among the best and most loyal Americans. In this group are some of our best professional and businessmen, most able craftsmen, and excellent laborers. From Chicago, we have two of our most able Congressmen who are Americans of Polish descent—Congressman KLUCZYNSKI and Congressman GORDON.

The Polish people have contributed much to the preservation of American ideals of freedom under God. In the earliest days of our history, Pulaski and Kosciusko left their native Poland to assist our Nation in its fight for independence. During the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and in Korea, Americans of Polish descent have been wounded and killed in the cause of freedom.

I know that Americans of Polish ancestry and the Polish people the world over are celebrating this anniversary with sadness because the Polish nation, inhabited with a people who for centuries have worked, fought, and died for liberty, is still under the yoke of an aggressor who denies the Polish people not only their freedom but attempts to destroy their belief and love of God.

The history of Poland and the Polish people discloses a spirit of independence and a devotion to God that will continue despite the worst persecution and oppression.

On this anniversary of the Polish Constitution, I would like to add my prayers to the Polish peoples' and their American kin-folk that the liberation of their native land is near. Also, I feel that all of us ought on this day to rededicate ourselves with Americans of Polish ancestry to the principle on which our own country was founded—the dignity of man under God, and to let the people in Poland who are still struggling for their freedom know that, although there may be American foreign policymakers who in the interest of what they believe to be political expediency have decided upon a do-nothing attitude as regards the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe, including Poland, the minds and hearts of the American people carry the desire that their policymakers will realize that the liberation of enslaved peoples everywhere is a necessity if the world is ever to maintain the peace for which it has so long suffered.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this commemorative observance of the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Liberty-loving people everywhere unite in the hope that freedom will again be restored to Poland.

The Constitution of May 3 was a historic landmark in the cause of democracy and ranks with our own Declaration of Independence and with England's Magna Carta as one of the great democratic documents of history. Poland was the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic constitution—a constitution seeking to preserve and insure the concept of basic liberty for the people.

Through the years that followed Poland was to know invasion, oppression, and tyranny, but always the Polish spirit rose again and Polish patriots continued the fight for freedom and independence.

It is sad to think that on this memorable day there are no celebrations or festivities in Poland and that some 25 million Poles are now virtual prisoners in their homeland and enjoy none of the freedoms for which they and their ancestors fought so gallantly and fearlessly.

The ties between the United States and Poland have always been close—our own Constitution is but 2 years older than the Polish Constitution, and both are dedicated to the same principle of freedom and human dignity. There are many thousands of Polish-Americans now residing in the United States who have enriched our culture with their contributions to science, literature, and the arts. And who will ever forget the names of Kosciusko and Pulaski, who contributed so much in our own struggle for independence.

Today we would do well to reassure the people of Poland that we have not forgotten them or their valiant fight for freedom and that free men and women everywhere look to the day when Poland will be liberated and will resume its traditional place of honor among the free nations of the world.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks a sad day for the people of Poland. Known as Polish Constitution Day and a national holiday for those of Polish origin who live in the free world, it is observed as a day of remembrance and rededication. It is also a day for renewed hope that Poland will soon be liberated from the Communist yoke, and will once again join the free world as an independent and democratic nation.

May 3, 1791, is a memorable date in Poland's history for it was on that date 164 years ago that the Polish Constitution was adopted. The people of Polish descent are no newcomers to the struggle for liberty. The Polish Constitution of 1791, which has become a landmark in the development of constitutional government, is one of the great documents in the annals of human freedom.

The desire for human rights and social justice, for democracy and religious toleration, is stronger today than it has ever been in the history of mankind. And yet the great paradox of history is the tragic fact that the Polish people, which has brought forth this noble document 164 year ago as a charter of liberty, cannot celebrate its anniversary in a free Poland today.

The Polish nation, which has lived for nine centuries in spiritual, religious, and cultural relationship with the western nations, is now cut off from the West. Its homeland is sealed behind the Iron Curtain where freedom is not tolerated, where human rights are trampled upon, where social justice and religious toleration are unknown, and where democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose.

Those of us who are familiar with the story of Poland's struggle for independence in our own time, know that the American people supported Poland's just cause for national independence. Human liberty suffered a severe blow when Poland's independence was wiped out so ruthlessly, first by the Nazi aggressor, later by the Communist aggressor. For a long time we, in this country, followed a policy of liberation of the enslaved nations of eastern Europe. Of late this policy is being discarded and replaced with a policy of coexistence. This is not only fallacious, but it is also

a dangerous policy because it will destroy every vestige of hope still lingering in the hearts of the enslaved people to become liberated from their oppressors.

Only the hope of attaining their freedom in the future and the moral support of their friends in the United States and the other free countries encourages the people of Poland to continue their struggle against slavery. To them, coexistence means death, the end of all hope for national rebirth.

The people of the United States follow with great sympathy the tragic plight which has befallen the people of Poland, whom we shall always regard as our friend and ally. We are ready to extend to them our fullest moral and spiritual support in their hours of anguish. We hope and pray that their nightmare of oppression and degradation will soon end and Poland will once again rise as a free nation.

On this occasion, I extend my greetings to all Americans of Polish descent and I join with them in their prayers for Poland's restoration. I urge them to do everything possible to help their people in Poland to surmount the great national crisis that confronts them.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans of every race and creed join with those of Polish descent in commemorating the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Adopted in 1791, this was the first written democratic constitution in Europe, and the principles embodied in that great document are similar to those contained in our own Declaration of Independence.

The Polish people had but a short time to practice the beliefs for which they had fought so hard and long. Soon after the signing of the constitution Poland was invaded and partitioned by Prussia, Austria, and Russia, and it was not until 1918 that she regained her independence. This brave nation strove valiantly to protect its freedom, but in 1939 she was attacked by the Nazis and the Russians, and her people to this day remain under the domination of Russia.

We have the highest respect for the courageous people of Poland who are deprived of so many freedoms as a country behind the Iron Curtain, and we have a genuine interest in her welfare. We believe that the mistakes made at Yalta and Teheran are largely responsible for the predicament in which Poland finds herself at present, and we feel that action should be taken to right the wrongs committed on these people who placed their trust in our honor.

Poland is one of our most important allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. We cannot ignore its historic claim to national freedom and independence. I do not believe that it is possible for the free nations of the world to coexist successfully with communism. For two or more nations to coexist there must be a common ground of understanding, based on responsibility, confidence, and respect. The high-minded principles set forth in the Polish Constitution of 1791 are an abomination to the Communists, who would destroy all who are not Communists. They would destroy every principle of life that is religious and good, and bind everyone to the atheistic precepts of Marxism.

We must encourage our Polish friends in their quest for liberation, and assure them of our spiritual and moral support. I salute the noble people of Poland on their national holiday, and wish to express the hope that the day is not far distant when they will resume their rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the Free Poland Constitution, we must review the love of freedom so profound in the Polish people. Fifteen years have passed since Poland has ceased to be free. No people in the world have more ardently propounded a love of freedom while being subjected to such bitter persecution and privation as the people of Poland. The history of Poland is replete with struggle and sacrifice.

As we struggled for freedom, as an infant nation, there was a great Kosciusko who helped us fight; who helped us secure our own liberty against a great power. We in America owe a great debt of gratitude to Poland and to the Americans of Polish extraction who have made a tremendous contribution in their good citizenship.

Today in the hearts of millions of Polish people behind the Iron Curtain and to the millions of our own Polish Americans there still burns that hope of freedom that someday to a proud and heroic people will come a reward of independence restored; an independence which will permit the Polish people to enjoy the dignity of freedom and the right to govern themselves without the dictatorial force of a police state.

On this anniversary of Free Poland's Constitution Day, it is well for us to take stock as to what tangible steps we are taking as a nation to restore democracy to the Central European countries. We have promised hope through the medium of the Voice of America. We have cooperated with the free governments in exile. But we cannot penetrate the Iron Curtain with hairpins.

The fact of the matter is that pressure from within the Iron Curtain is acting as a greater force upon the Iron Curtain countries than the pressures we are exerting from without. People are developing on each side of the Iron Curtain an irrepressible curiosity of learning about the welfare of relatives and friends on the other side. It is contrary to the rules of human social behavior for one group to live without wondering about the welfare of a neighbor.

In addition to these powerful social pressures, there are economic pressures which are forcing the masters of the Iron Curtain countries to give their subjects some promise of at least some restrained communication with the outer world because the desire for truth and knowledge cannot be forever suppressed. During the coming months, I believe that there will be a marked raising of the Iron Curtain. There will be a noticeable relaxation of border tension. There will be more extensive discussion of disarmament, peace, and trade.

The masters of the Iron Curtain countries are having trouble from within. The economics of exclusion are painful. Noncommunication with our happier part of the world is weighing heavily on the people who are suffering the suppression of dictated rule.

We must take concrete steps to keep strong the democracies which surround the Iron Curtain countries; not only from the standpoint of military strength, but from the standpoint of moral integrity. If our civilization is going to prevail over the civilization of dictators, it must do so because it is wholesome, because it is good, and because it is better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to comment briefly on Poland's Constitution Day. The people of Poland are unhappy today. This is understandable because they are living under the crushing regime of totalitarian rulers.

The march into Poland by the Nazis in 1939 touched off the most destructive war mankind has ever known. It is one of the ironies of history that the country in behalf of which this war began now exists in the penumbra of a tyranny as dark as the one by which it was threatened 16 years ago. As far as Poland is concerned, all of the bloodshed of the Second World War proved to be of little avail.

We should recall again and again the principles for which this war was fought as we commemorate Poland's Constitution Day. In 1941 in the Atlantic Charter the United States and Great Britain proclaimed that they desired to see no territorial changes that did not accord with freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; that they wished to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who had been forcibly deprived of them. All of the United Nations, including the Soviet Union, subscribed to these principles in the Declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1942.

Insofar as Poland was concerned, the weight of events was to make a mockery of these noble principles. Taking advantage of its overwhelming military power in that area toward the close of the war the Soviet Union forced a Communist dictatorship upon that unhappy country. It is still burdened with this dictatorship.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 postdated our own by but a few years. It pointed in the direction of a government of, by, and for the people. It marked an important step in the history of Europe and the world toward the democratic freedoms which must, we hope, someday prevail everywhere. Can it be doubted that if the people of Poland could have chosen their own form of government in 1945, or could do so now, under a constitution and under conditions that guaranteed them a free decision that they would not gladly have reentered the ranks of the free countries of Europe?

Let us not forget the Polish and other Eastern European peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Let us not forget those among them who cherish their hopes and work in secret for a rebirth of freedom. Let us remember that each time a demo-

cratic government fails to survive, or is abolished by subversion or force, the threat to our own country is increased. On this commemorative occasion we send greetings to the people of Poland and with it our sincere wishes that the iron forces of totalitarianism will be eventually overthrown.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this day, Poles everywhere are celebrating their national holiday. To them, and to the millions of citizens of other countries who are of Polish ancestry, May 3 is a very special day, dedicated to the commemoration of one of the most glorious moments in the history of the Polish nation.

There is only one country in which no celebrations will be allowed today. I am referring to the land which gave birth to the remarkable constitution of May 3, 1791, the land which is today suffering under the domination of the Communist masters of the Kremlin, the land which for many centuries has been known, and will continue to be known, as Poland.

It is proper, therefore, that we pause today in our legislative tasks, to pay tribute to that brave nation on the 164th anniversary of its democratic constitution of May 3, and to reflect upon its present tragic circumstances. In so doing, we shall be extending to the people of Poland a message of friendship and of encouragement in this dark and sad hour of their history.

Throughout the thousand years of her existence, Poland has been a bulwark of Christianity in Europe, the refuge of all persecuted peoples. She was always the first to embrace under her protecting roof and give shelter to other races, nationalities, and creeds, when they were being expelled and oppressed in their own lands, or by other countries. The principle of toleration has been a notable factor in the Polish tradition.

The parliamentary system has been another deep-rooted and age-old tradition in Poland. From the earliest times, Poles have regarded as legal, justified, and obligatory only that which had been resolved by a decision of the people or their delegates, that is, by way of plebiscite or by a parliament. No wonder, then, that the Poles have been called "a nation of parliaments," and that the Polish nation as such raised to the forefront of its tradition and history not battles or revolutions, but the date of a fundamental reform of its parliamentary system: that of the constitution of May 3, 1791.

The constitution of May 3 was indeed a remarkable document, both with regard to its contents and to the manner in which it was adopted. In form as well as in substance, that constitution was similar to the Constitution of the United States. The manner of its adoption, however, was most striking: while bloody revolutions and rebellions were rampant in other countries, the Poles adopted their famous constitution peacefully, with joy and enthusiasm. The manner of adoption of this document, which astounded the world, was in keeping with the tradition of the Poles who, from the earliest times, have shown respect for the dignity of man, and an unwavering devotion to parliamentary principles.

In observing the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, we cannot avoid thinking about the present tragic state of Poland. We firmly believe, however, that the forcible Communist domination over the Polish nation will not long endure. We look forward to the day when the Polish nation will once again assume its rightful place in the family of free nations of the world. That day will come because the Polish nation has the will to be free, and because we know that justice and lasting peace cannot be attained in a world which is half free, half slave. To this end, we rededicate our efforts.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental rights set forth in the Polish Constitution of 1791 presents a striking contrast to the so-called rights granted to the Polish people now living under Communist domination. An instrumet of government far advanced for its time, this Constitution of 1791 solemnly declared:

> We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly that any person coming into Poland from whatever part of the world, or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to farm and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

Such rights are nonexistent in Communist Poland today. Undoubtedly, the Polish Communist leaders claim that a perfect and entire liberty to all people does exist in Poland today. But such claims are falsehoods to the core. Can one even imagine Communist Poland extending the guarantee of the Constitution of 1791, which stated that "any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world, or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry"?

Freedom does not exist in Poland today as it did in 1791. There is no security of land ownership when a state is guided by an agrarian policy that calls for collectivization. There is no freedom of movement to do as one pleases. There is no choice given the people other than to submit to the absolute authority of the state.

In 1791, the Polish people had taken a great step in the direction of realizing the promise of a democratic constitutional republic. Of this constitution of 1791 Edmund Burke, the noted Anglo-Irish leader and political theorist, declared:

> Humanity must rejoice and glory when it considers the change in Poland.

Except for the tyrant and the despot, humanity did rejoice and glory upon the proclamation of this constitution. And most certainly the Polish people did likewise.

The Polish people today, like their forebears, hold the constitution of 1791 in the highest esteem. They have never forgotten the soul-stirring declaration:

"We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people." Although suppressed by a ruthless and immoral tyrant, the people of Poland will never sacrifice their souls on the altar of communism or submit to the Communist despot. Nor will their aspirations to achieve once more the ideals represented by the constitution of 1791 be destroyed. However great the pressure of propaganda to convince the Polish people that their rulers are benevolent men solicitous for the welfare of Poland, these people will never be deluded. For they know that the hand that rules them today is the same one that pressed the trigger which meant death to the thousands of Polish officers massacred in the Forest of Katyn.

We have heard, in recent years, a lot about coexistence. America has tried it and has found that if you coexist with the Communists on an honorable basis it leads to a betrayal.

The United States is the greatest and strongest nation on earth. In the struggle for peace and freedom we know that success depends on how hard one works, how deeply one sacrifices, and how sincerely one cares. For a nation like the United States which has half of the world's wealth and only 6 percent of the world's population, the conclusion must be obvious that we cannot have too many partners to help us carry the load of combat.

Nevertheless, because of its great status, the United States should not try to force coexistence. We know that we cannot bargain from weakness. We have learned that when we do not have cooperation with our allies, we are inevitably put on the defensive, and the Communists can be on the offensive. You cannot have cooperation if you create distrust of American foreign policy. In the past our timidity has led to indecision and suspicion among our allies.

The Communists have proposed coexistence. Beware; it is a sop. A treaty for Austria and a treaty for the unification of Germany: When? That is the big question. If Communist Russia really means to coexist, let us push now for immediate unification and freedom of Germany, a treaty for authentic Austrian independence, and for free and unfettered elections in Poland and in other nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Of course we can hardly expect all of this; but if they mean what they say, they would agree to these things. However, coexistence to the Communists is just another way for further infiltration, a way of sugar-coating their intents of ultimate abuse.

We are in a strong position today, so let us disregard the lecherous words of the Communists. We must keep an ever-watchful eye on this determined and greatly unrestrained foe. We are inclined to be weak, not in strength but in perception, lacking the ability to grasp the needs of the world and to see into the Communist strategies that are continually being used to keep us frustrated.

I would like to point out at this time something that is going on in Europe regarding the Austrian state treaty, the draft of which the United States basically accepted in Berlin in February 1954. The draft treaty contains one dangerous point which should be taken into consideration today. In order to gain acceptance by the Soviet Union of the Austrian state treaty, our Secretary of State acquiesced last year to a Soviet amendment to article 16. However, since the Soviet Government did not accept the Austrian state treaty at that time, the United States has no legal obligation to agree once again to the Soviet amendment, which is paragraph 5 of article 16.

Article 16 of the Austrian state treaty provides:

> Austria undertakes * * * to take all necesssary measures to complete the voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory * * * to permit the accredited representatives of any allied or associated power (Communist government of Poland is an allied and associated power) to visit freely such camps or centers for the purpose of conferring with its nationals * * * to prohibit in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the allied and associated powers and any activities designed to induce such displaced persons not to return to the countries of which they are nationals * * * to dissolve immediately any committee, center, or other similar organizations existing in those camps and assembly centers that may be found to be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of the allied and associated powers.

Furthermore, paragraph 5 of article 16 provides:

> No relief shall be given by Austria to persons who refuse to return to their native countries * * * (who) are engaged in hostile activities against their countries of origin * * * or are members of organizations and groups which encourage displaced persons not to return to their countries of origin.

If article 16 were followed, it would mean that among others some 3,000 Polish refugees in Austria could be forced back into Communist-controlled Poland. A saving factor is that the draft treaty must be approved by Britain, France, and the United States before it can become operative. We must take advantage of this and do everything in our power to eliminate the refugee provisions from the treaty and thus save 3,000 Polish and 27,000 other displaced persons from the prospective Soviet slavery or death.

Time is of utmost importance in this matter, as the talks between the Western Powers, the Soviets, and Austria on the validation of the Austrian state treaty may commence any day. Immediate action is needed.

It would seem to me that American consent to article 16 runs against the traditions not only of Poland but also of America. This is not only a fight to save Polish and other refugees in Austria, but also a fight to prevent a tremendous Soviet victory and the defeat of the United States in the cold war of ideas and morals. For if the refugee provisions of article 16 of the Austrian treaty is accepted by the United States, our anti-Soviet efforts will become worthless, as our action would do irreparable damage to our reputation as defenders of liberty and human rights.

I hope that our Government will show some backbone and prevail upon the British and French Governments not to accept the refugee provisions of article 16 of the Austrian state treaty.

To the people of Poland on this day of commemoration of liberty and constitutional government, all America expresses the hope that one day the same rights and ideals enshrined in the constitution of 1791 will be realized and that Poland will again be free. Through the various instruments of our Government, particularly the Voice of America, we Americans can make this hope known to the Polish people.

The spirit of freedom will ever reign in the hearts of every Pole; for in that spirit is the hope of the future not only for Poland but the entire world enslaved by communism. And to those of you who may be inclined to doubt this determination, let us take a lesson from history. It took the Greeks 400 years to gain their freedom, and the Armenians are still fighting after 3,000 years of foreign domination. To those of you who talk of betrayal, I say it was a betrayal when a reactionary Congress and President in 1921 failed to act upon a definite commitment to establish a free Armenia.

We Americans of Polish descent are neither blind to what transpired in the past nor from whom to expect help in the future.

Today I introduced a concurrent resolution which calls for the condemnation of the violations committed by the Soviet Government and declares that measures should be taken to inform the peoples of the world of such violations. It is my hope that we can become more united in purpose at home in order that we may have a more effective policy abroad.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to share in the commemoration of the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution—and in Free Poland's national holiday. It is most fitting that we of the Congress of the United States grant due recognition to the historic date of May 3, 1791, a date upon which a democratic constitutional government was born in Poland.

There is no need for me to go into the tragic history of Poland and her ever-constant, never-ceasing, fight against oppression and tyranny, for who among us can forget our own country's struggle for freedom and the heritage of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" left to us by our forefathers.

The bond between liberty-loving peoples is a strong one, and the United States and Poland have long shared that common bond—we, in our Declaration of Independence, and Poland, in her constitution of 1791.

Today, we witness Poland's struggle against the chains of communism and we offer our hopes and our encouragement that her day of triumph is near. Once again, may this anniversary be a joyous one—and may it be a celebration of the liberation of Poland and her restoration of her rightful place among the freedom-loving and independent nations of the world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, the first written constitution in Europe. It is an occasion that has profound significance for Polish people wherever they may be, as well as for the people of these United States and the free world.

For the people of Poland, the significance of the constitution of 1791 lies in the fact that it was both an end and a beginning in the historic progress of their country. It was an end, in the sense that it expressed the determination of the Polish people to rid their country of foreign intriguers and native profiteers on misery. It was a beginning, in the sense that it set the course for what was hoped to be a period of Polish development for many centuries to come, a development of full national independence and democracy.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

Any attempt to recite the many highlights of Poland's great history, particularly to persons of Polish extraction, would certainly be beyond my ability. I cannot, however, avoid recalling that this great event, which we commemorate here today, is but one achievement among many in Poland's great program of promoting human liberties.

As early as 1347 Poland established the first complete code of laws of Christian Europe.

In 1413 Poland and Lithuania executed an agreement whose language is sublime and proclaimed for the first time in history the brotherhood of nations.

The security of the person was recognized and safeguarded by law in Poland in 1430—2½ centuries before England's habeas corpus, and that law which was constantly broadened became the nucleus of Poland's unparalleled political and religious liberties.

Yes, the descendants of those pathfinders in freedom and eqality have cause to be proud of that land which was always a refuge for oppressed peoples—a comfortable shelter for persecuted religions and opinions.

The story of Poland's great has been told and retold. The great deeds of Polish men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again—particularly in the deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive, for over 150 years, the fire of freedom which was Poland's first love. So also in the deeds of children who refused to let Poland die in spite of the most concerted efforts to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

No nation on God's earth has been subject to the brutality which has been the unhappy lot of Poland. Poland the country first to offer resistance to Hitler's aggression, an original signatory of

the Declaration of the United Nations on January 2, 1942, an ally of the United States in World War II, has been deprived of her independence and national sovereignty by Soviet Russia. Freedom has been completely suppressed. The army is in the hands of the Soviet lords who run it with the help of several thousand Soviet officers, parading in Polish uniforms but not speaking the Polish language. The school system, the youth organizations, the trade unions, universities and colleges have been made parts of the Soviet machine. Hundreds of thousands of people have been arrested and deported deep into Russia for as little as expressing privately their displeasure with the brutal crushing of Poland's freedom and the suppression of her western, Christian civilization.

We, in America, cannot help but feel the great sadness bearing on our brothers of Polish descent. That great people who have suffered so much in the cause of liberty and justice—that people who gave to the world great scientists, statesmen, and soldiers—the nation which gave to America, in her hour of need, Kosciusko and Pulaski again feels the tread of the brute—again tastes the bitter tears shed as her sons are made slaves of the Soviet monster—the regime which does not yet know that wherever one Pole goes, there goes Poland—that wherever a Polish patriot's heart beats, there is the pulse that will one day rise up and crush it—crush it so that it shall never rise again to shatter the peace of the world.

The cause of Poland is as sacred today, as when the sons of freedom first took up the sword to avenge that nation's honor. The cause of Poland is a monument to freedom and honor today, just as it was when the people of Poland fought from the garret and the cellar, from the forests and swamps to break the hold of the enemy to whom those brave people died rather than surrender.

Just as the cause of brave Poland involved the honor of free men some 10 years ago, so the cause of brave Poland involves the honor of free men today. Poland and justice are today inseparable—just as they were inseparable at the time of the rape of that unhappy land.

Just as Poland stood for freedom and liberty and justice when Hitler's hordes were rampaging over the greenswards of Europe—so let brave Poland stand for freedom and liberty and justice now that she is captive of the ruthless Soviet.

Let men who cry peace, cry justice—the two are inseparable. Let the voices of honest men everywhere shout their loyalty to the cause of brave Poland and we can have justice. Those who pay lip service to peace yet ignore the plight of our sister country in distress—do a disservice to that goal which they claim to seek.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Polish people mark one of their most important national holidays, the 164th anniversary of the May constitution by the Polish Diet.

In 1791 that document was the instrument which united all forces in Poland because of its liberal and democratic provisions. The freedom of the New World served the Polish people as inspiration, and our own Constitution, newly conceived, was, in some measure, a model for the Polish Constitution, founded on the premise that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." Its guaranties of full protection under the law, the right to acquire land, religious freedom, and a democratic form of government were not unlike those of our Constitution.

The Polish document was short lived. Within a few years Poland was invaded by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and the May constitution lived only in the hearts of the Polish people where it has remained as a symbol of the democracy and the independence they so desire.

The fortunes of war have not been kind to Poland in the intervening years. Once again she finds herself under foreign oppression, and once again she is looking to the New World for help.

The conscience of the free West, and particularly the conscience of the American people, will not permit the abandonment of the Polish people. Our belief in the human right of self-determination is basic and we must bend every effort to achieve that right for the oppressed nations of the world.

We hear a great deal about peaceful coexistence, but if its price is the slavery of the people behind the Iron Curtain, we cannot afford it. The forces of communism which now oppress Poland and the gallant peoples of the other satellite countries threaten the free world. We dare not answer the needs of the enslaved of Europe with indifference or neglect. On this day let us remember one thing: though we in the United States may enjoy all the democratic principles contained in the Polish May constitution, the people for whom that constitution was designed are now deprived of those privileges.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one cannot let this day, May 3, pass without giving thought to its being Poland's Constitution Day, free Poland's national holiday. The Constitution of Poland was adopted but a short time after our own Constitution was adopted in 1789.

Because of its geographic location the peoples of this great nation have been denied the right to enjoy the beloved freedom that the framers of its constitution so intended they enjoy. The spirit of freedom among these people has not died—it is still there, and this spirit will rise again.

We, the citizens of this great Nation of ours, as well as the citizens of all free nations, must unite in our efforts to restore to the Polish people those rights which are proclaimed in their constitution but which have been denied them by dictators.

Let us hope and pray that the day is near when the people of Poland achieve this great objective—the right to live in peace and freedom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today as we are observing the 164th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, there has been ringing in my ears the first line of Poland's national anthem. In the national anthem of no other nation is there such an expression of undying fidelity to the cause of country and of the will of the people to march forward from the darkness of the night into the sunshine of a happier day.

The first line of Poland's national anthem reads: "Poland is not yet lost." All day that line of challenge and hope has been ringing in my ears.

It is a line of challenge, a challenge to me as it is to every Member of the Congress of the United States. Poland is not yet lost, nor ever will she be as long as Polish blood courses through the veins of men and women.

But Poland today is in captivity. This is the Poland whose people are so close to our own in aspiration and in vision. This is the Poland whose sons and daughters have contributed their blood and their sweat to this country from the early days of Jamestown, through the War of Independence and through the sucessive eras that prepared the path for the march of America's destiny.

It is not sufficient for us to leave to the people of Poland, limited as they are by the conditions of their enslavement, to work out the answer to the challenge in the first line of their national anthem. The challenge is to us as much as to the people of Poland. We are as one people and we stand together for a free world in which man can find his dignity and can walk with his God and with his conscience.

I should feel remiss in my obligation as a representative of the American people in this body if I permitted this anniversary of the Polish Constitution to pass by without voicing that which I believe is the sentiment of the American people.

We, as a people and as a nation, do not intend that free Poland shall be lost.

We do not intend that Poland shall long remain in captivity.

We will make no compromise on any front or on any pertinent issue that in any way might sacrifice the interest of the people of Poland.

On the Polish question the only solution that can be accepted by the American people and the American Government is that of unconditional surrender of the claims and of the trespass of the alien power now holding Poland in captivity. Poland must be restored to the people of Poland, and not one vestige left of the power or of the influence of Red Russia.

If the remarks made in the Congress of the United States on this anniversary day have made this perfectly clear to all the world, both the free world and the world of communism, then this occasion has served a good purpose.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, once again the people of Poland, as well as those of Polish ancestry throughout the world, commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution which was adopted in 1791, just 2 years after the adoption of our Constitution of the United States.

This great document formulated a policy of true liberalism for Poland in these words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and

object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

We, in the United States, have great admiration for Poland, a courgeous nation now held under subjugation by Russian tyranny, but a nation whose people are dedicated to the preservation of freedom, and eagerly await an opportunity to restore independence to Poland.

The people of Poland have fought valiantly throughout the ages in their effort to secure Polish freedom, and their present enslavement is the result of the infamous Yalta agreement which swept away their hope for freedom at the end of World War II.

All Americans join with the people of Poland and those of Polish ancestry throughout the world on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day in a prayer for the end of Polish enslavement, and for the reestablishment of Poland as a free nation.

May the people of Poland continue in their struggle against oppression with confidence that justice shall ultimately triumph, and have faith in the destiny of their great homeland which must one day regain its independence as a sovereign nation.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this date marks a great anniversary in man's everlasting struggle against the forces of tyranny and oppression. It was on this day 164 years ago that the Constitution of free Poland was proclaimed, and it has since been recognized as a document of great significance in the heritage of freedom.

It is a privilege and honor to join with my colleagues today in commemorating this historic occasion. Marking this eventful day in history affords the liberty-seeking people of the world an opportunity to rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom and peace.

Today we deplore the fact that the courageous people of Poland are caught beneath the oppressive heel of Soviet dictatorship. I am certain, however, that although force has for the moment obliterated the institutions of freedom and the desire for self-government is still deeply cherished by the Polish people.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, ranks with the other great documents of history like the Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Great things are never accomplished without sacrifice, and the people of Poland have shown their capacity to give of themselves in the cause of liberty and justice. We have confidence that the not-too-distant future holds the long-sought reward for this sacrifice.

The people of Poland and of America have enjoyed decades of friendship. We would assure our Polish friends that on this momentous anniversary we stand firmly behind them in their unyielding aspiration for freedom.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege today to pay tribute to a national holiday which cannot be observed in the homeland of the people we are honoring. This is Polish Constitution Day, commemorating May 3, 1791, when the people of Poland wrote a document which won wide acclaim as an achievement in creative statesmanship. Although Poland was shortly thereafter overrun, when its people again won their freedom they returned to that fine constitution and observed its tenets until the armies of two dictators—Hitler and Stalin—enforced the brutal partition of Poland in 1939. Today, the terrible force of international communism is maintaining that despot rule.

What do the Poles think of their Communist overlords? Any of you who know the Poles and their descendants who are in America today realize that communism is alien to the very nature of a Pole. Despite a fanatic band of traitors who do the bidding of the Russians, the Communist Polish Government has great difficulty finding persons it can trust to leave the country.

Look at a few of the Poles who have defected to the West during the past year:

Andrzei Panufnik, Poland's leading composer in Switzerland in July 1954.

Antoni Klimowicz, a stowaway in London in August 1954.

Krystyna Bujnowska, of the famous Mazowsze dance ensemble in Paris in November 1954.

Twenty-two Polish sailors from the ships *Praca* and *Gottwald* on Formosa.

And so many others. They all tell the same story: That Poland will not be destroyed; that the overwhelming majority of Poles are bitterly anti-Communist, and that they need reassurance from the free world that we have not forgotten them.

Can we ever forget the nation which was first to resist Hitler's aggression and was an original signatory of the Declaration of the United Nations on January 2, 1942? Can we forget that the Polish Constitution—which was adopted only 2 years after our own—was inspired by the same faith in freedom?

Our own freedom was won, and has always been maintained, at great cost and through constant endeavor. Wherever freedom is suppressed, it is a threat to our liberties. We must dedicate this day to the great people of Poland and observe for them this constitution day which sometime in the future they will be able to celebrate again as free people.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when Americans study the history of their revolution, they cannot fail to be impressed by the participation therein of certain foreigners, who were attracted to these shores to fight for liberty. Among these illustrious men none was more valiant, and none was more valuable to the cause of freedom, than two officers from far away Poland, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, and Gen. Casimir Pulaski. The former was to a considerable extent responsible for the defenses of West Point, the latter was our first commander of cavalry, and gave his life for our yet unborn country in 1779.

In serving the cause of freedom, Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski were given expression to the characteristic Polish love of liberty. Indeed, Poland had a long tradition of democracy, a tradition which found its expression in the Polish Constitution of 1791, whose anniversary we celebrate today. That constitution, proclaimed only 2 years after our own beginnings as a nation, was a classic statement of the philosophy which holds that the source of government's power is found in the people. It provided for a bicameral legislature, limited the rights of the king, guaranteed freedom of religion, granted political rights to the common people, and improved the status of the peasants by bringing them under the protection of the law.

Soon thereafter, however, tragedy struck. Poland was partitioned for the second time by the rapacious powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. From 1795 until the end of the First World War, Poland was under hated foreign rule. During all that time, however, she never passively accepted tyranny, but revolted repeatedly. During all that time also, she had the ardent sympathies of the United States, a sympathy repeatedly expressed by many groups in our society.

The new Polish state which arose in the wake of the First World War was confronted with the twin problems of security against external aggression and the provision of an adequate standard of living for her people. She struggled manfully to meet these problems in a world of increasing tension, both economic and political.

Finally, in 1939, Poland was to make the world's first stand for liberty against the onslaughts of the Nazi hordes. But her strength could not avail against the blitzkreig, supplemented as it was by the Soviet stab in the back. In short, Poland suffered a new partition, and one far worse than the old. No people endured more, or resisted more defiantly than the Poles. When the circumstances of war made the Russians our allies, hope rose again in Polish hearts that Poland might yet be free.

To our profound regret, this was not to be. With utter hyprocrisy the Soviet Government failed to carry out its pledge to permit free elections in Poland. Instead it clamped ever tighter the vise in which Poland is held today.

Today all Americans join our brethren of Polish descent in affirming that we cannot believe that this is the final destiny of Poland. We know that in God's good time the hirelings of Moscow who rule today in Warsaw will be deposed. When that time comes, the spirit that will move the Polish people will be the spirit and the tradition of the constitution of 1791.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the 164th anniversary of the establishment of constitutional government in Poland on May 3, 1791. In that constitution the Polish people discarded many class discriminations and made many privileges available to the people. Absolute religious toleration was established on that memorable day, and provision for further reforms from time to time was made.

This is the anniversary of a constitution which marked a notable step forward for liberalism in Europe. We pay tribute to the love of freedom which in-

spired the writing of that great document, which was designed to safeguard Polish liberty and independence.

Unfortunately, the freedoms gained by the Poles in the 1791 constitution were to disappear during the next few years. Seizures of parts of Poland by her neighbors resulted in the subjection of the Poles to the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians. In many instances Polish culture and even the Polish language were erased and replaced by those of Poland's alien rulers. But no matter how heavy the burdens of oppression, the Poles in the decades that followed continued to look forward and to work for freedom and independence. Throughout the 19th century many Polish intellectuals—writers, artists, and patriots—lived abroad. In Western Europe, and especially North America, these patriots saw a different way of life, free from oppression, and free also from discriminations which were present in their native land.

A new Poland was born again in the peace treaty following World War I. President Woodrow Wilson, who was a friend of the Polish patriot Ignace Paderewski, was instrumental in securing the re-creation of this country which for so many years had not enjoyed the right of self-government. In a speech to Congress on January 8, 1918, Woodrow Wilson announced as one of his famous 14 points:

> An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

From 1918 to 1939, Poland as an independent country made considerable progress in advancing the happiness and welfare of its people. It was, however, difficult at first—because the Poles had to undo 123 years of division and foreign domination; the country was in ruin; almost every segment of its new independent life had to be reconstructed—from the unification of the laws to the building of elementary schools for thousands of illiterate peasants.

Between the wars the Poles made noteworthy progress in developing their national economy. Poland ranked third in Europe in coal reserves. Hydraulic power was greater than in Switzerland or Yugoslavia. Mineral assets of potassium, rock salt, zinc, lead, iron ore, and oil were developed. From 1920 to 1937 the population increase was nearly 30 percent. Between 1919 and 1938 nearly 1,400,000 acres of fallow land were brought under cultivation. In 1920 agriculture provided approximately two-thirds of the Nation's income—the other one-third was from industrial production. In 1938 industrial production equaled that of agricultural production. The lumber, food processing, chemical and mining industries all progressed by leaps and bounds. The tiny fishing village of Gydnia in 1919 became the fifth largest port in Europe by 1938.

In the educational field 70 percent of the peasants under Russian domination were illiterate in 1918. But within the next 20 years education made great strides. By 1938, 28,722 elementary schools were attended by 4,851,000 children. The 722 secondary schools had an enrollment of 221,200. Nurseries and kindergartens numbered 1,651. By 1939 there were 6 universities, 21 colleges—2 of these engineering, 314 learned societies, 141 museums, and 10,146 amateur theatrical companies.

However, Poland's progress was abruptly ended in 1939 when she again became a victim of aggression. On September 1 of that year the Nazi hordes poured across the border into Poland. The Poles, jealous of their freedom and willing to die for their rights, chose to defend their beloved homeland in the face of hopeless odds. By virtue of their mutual defense agreements with Poland, Britain and France responded to the Nazi onslaught by declaring war against Germany. Less than 3 weeks later the Soviet Union, united with Germany under the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, stabbed Poland in the back with an invasion from the East. Poland was soon crushed by the blitzkrieg tactics of the Nazi war machine.

But the Poles did not willingly submit to the Nazi occupation. They founded what was practically a complete underground state, consisting of a government, parliament, judiciary, and an army.

After Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, and Soviet Russia joined the Western Powers as an ally, the Poles entered into an understanding with the Russians. By the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941, Poland was to receive territory which had been taken away by the German-Soviet treaties in 1939, and the liberation of Polish citizens held as prisoners of war or otherwise by the Soviet Government was to be effected. At first the understanding with the Communists looked hopeful, but as time went on and since no list of Polish deportees was submitted by the Soviet authorities, serious doubts of Soviet good faith began to arise. Subsequently these doubts were verified as Polish citizens of Jewish faith and of Byelorussian and Ukrainian origin were jailed. Others were conscripted into the Soviet Army. When the Red Army crossed the prewar Polish-Soviet frontier in January 1944, the Polish underground was betrayed by the Soviet hordes. Many of the Poles were liquidated by the invaders. In Lublin alone more than 50,000 persons were arrested between July 1944 and January 1945.

The duplicity of the Soviet Union and their treachery toward their Polish "allies" was shown in a remarkable manner in the case of the Warsaw uprising—lasting 63 days—from August 1, 1944, to October 2, 1944. This uprising was one of the most daring and patriotic feats performed by the Polish people. The Soviets had urged the people of Warsaw to rise up against the Germans and they promised they would assist their fight for liberation. This the Poles did. But the Red Army deliberately did not assist and the Nazi war machine rolled over the people of Warsaw. Two hundred and fifty thousand perished, including 40,000 of the underground. Today the Soviet commander, Marshal Rokossovsky, who carried out this diabolical order from the Kremlin is now "marshal" of Poland, commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, and keyman in the Communist Polish government in Warsaw.

The Yalta Conference of 1945 provided for a coalition government in Poland. But the majority of the cabinet posts were filled with Communists or Communist followers. From 1945 through 1947 they imposed their will on the Polish people. After the January 19, 1947, election, which the Communists manipulated for the success of their own candidates, immediate mass liquidation of democratic elements took place. After 1948 no longer did open opposition exist in Poland. In the elections of 1952 only one ballot existed—a voter went to the polls, took a ballot, put it into a prepared envelope and dropped it into a box. No one was permitted to cross out any candidate's name, add new names, or abstain from voting. It is obvious from such conditions as these that for the present at least the Communists have Poland tightly in their grip.

Yet, as we find this gallant country overrun by the godless, alien philosophy of communism, and trampled under the tyrant's heel, those Poles who are in a position to do so are celebrating the anniversary of one of their first steps toward a democracy, the adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791. There is no doubt that Poland will some day rise again and recover its freedom and independence. It is my earnest hope its resurrection will be hastened by the United States and the American people in every practicable way that they can. In this way we can have the satisfaction of honoring a gallant, unconquerable people, who possess the spirit of truth and freedom and the utmost spiritual integrity.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Poland's contribution to the civilization of the West is considerable and varied. In the realm of the arts and literature, and also in science, the sons and daughters of Poland have been among the most distinguished. Particularly in music, Poland's place among the nations is very high. Polish warriors, statesmen, and martyrs for the cause of freedom have registered inspiring achievements that are known throughout the world. In all of these distinct domains the accomplishments of the Poles are recognized and admired by all of us. But their contribution to the science of government, especially as pioneers in that field in Eastern Europe, more than a century and a half ago is probably not as well known as it should be. For most of the time during the last several centuries the Poles have been governed either by monarchs or have been subjected to unwanted alien governments. But, at the same time, they have had a deep desire for liberty and have striven to introduce truly democratic features into their Government. One of the most significant and remarkable of these attempts was made in 1791. In that year a constitution was drafted and adopted by the Polish Government which, judged by the standard of those days, seemed quite revolutionary. This document, as drafted by men of penetrating intellect

and fervent patriotism, represented a decisive advance over anything of the kind yet attempted in that part of Europe. By this constitution Poland became a limited monarchy. The intricate and incongruous features of the old system were abolished and ministerial responsibility in government was introduced. The towns were allowed to have a certain amount of parliamentary representation and were given administrative autonomy. Personal privileges enjoyed solely by the gentry were made available to the townsmen. Absolute religious toleration was established and religious freedom was guaranteed.

Compared with the long lists of human and political rights which are written into present-day constitutions, some people might not consider the Polish Constitution of 1791 one hundred percent democratic and liberal, but according to the standards of those days it was a genuinely progressive instrument and has been widely acclaimed as such.

Today in celebrating the 104th anniversary of the constitution we pay our respect to the memory of its patroitic and humanitarian drafters and hope that the liberal spirit of that document will soon prevail in a free and independent Poland.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, the Polish Constitution was adopted, and that day is now celebrated as Poland's Constitution Day. It has been said that the Poles have sometime had a large country, sometime a small one, and sometime none at all, but nevertheless, the Polish people always stanchly maintained a strong national loyalty and patriotism.

For this we honor them. We are also grateful to the thousands of Poles and the millions of Polish-Americans who have contributed so much to the growth and strength of these United States.

Count Casimir Pulaski was one of those Polish volunteers who gave his life for American independence. Killed during the siege of Savannah, he had distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine, had endured Valley Forge, and had organized an independent cavalry corps known as Pulaski's Legion. He died to make us free.

Then there was Thaddeus Kosciusko. He left Poland in 1776 to serve in Washington's revolutionary army. Appointed chief engineer in charge of the construction of West Point, he later became adjutant to General Washington. His work in fortifying the battlefield at Saratoga contributed greatly to the American victory in this battle, the turning point of the Revolutionary War. Today, Kosciusko is memorialized in Lafayette Park, oposite the White House, as a hero of American freedom.

It is through men like Pulaski and Kosciusko and thousands of their compatriots, both here and abroad, that the common bonds of liberty, decency, and loyalty bind our country to the Polish people and nation.

Enslavement, oppression, destruction are no strangers to the Poles. But neither are hope, struggle, and victory.

On this day in which Poland again finds itself in subjection, this time under the heel of atheistic communism, we reaffirm our devotion to our common bonds.

This common enemy of America and Free Poland is no simple power-drunk dictator. He is not a military genius merely exploiting his talents. We fight against a vicious ideology which twists and warps the human mind and degenerates human beings.

We oppose the enemy because he is morally wrong; because he denies God, and destroys the dignity and worth of the human soul.

On this Polish Constitution Day, we invite all Poles and all peoples everywhere to make common cause with us against this mortal enemy. The struggle is deep-seated, difficult, and dangerous. But the Poles are accustomed to such. They felt the force of Soviet Russia in 1919, and the power of Adolf Hitler in 1939. But they also experienced the assistance of their democratic brethren in those dark days.

Today we share with them the knowledge that wrong cannot always be on the throne, and that our cause shall prosper because it is fair, just, and right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today is Poland's Constitution Day and Free Poland's national holiday, but the occasion is being commemorated with the gallant Polish Nation in chains.

As a nation the Poles are proud of their great deeds and accomplishments, and they are fully justified in their pride. Not only are they well known as diligent and skillful workers, but they are equally well known as accomplished masters in the arts and the sciences. They are no less famous as brave and courageous warriors for great human causes. The names of all the Poles who have staked their lives for freedom and liberty are too numerous to mention here. Of the many Poles who have taken an active part in struggles for liberty, two that are best known to the people of our country because of their roles in our revolutionary war are Kosciusko and Pulaski.

The Poles have, as individuals as well as a nation, struggled hard for independence and freedom. This was particularly true during the latter decades of the 18th century when they were grievously threatened by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. At that time they remodeled their governmental machinery hoping thereby to increase their power of resistance against the aggressors. It was at that time that the Constitution of 1791 was framed and adopted. This was an important fundamental document in which many of the old abuses of monarchial government were eliminated and a type of limited monarchy was introduced. Parliamentary representation was expanded and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Freedom of conscience as well as religious toleration were established.

Even though the Polish Constitution of 1791 may not be regarded as a perfectly democratic instrument according to the criteria of our day, yet it was at that time far in the vanguard of constitutional development in Eastern Europe. In that respect it was a pioneering document, a landmark in the history of Poland as well as in that of European governmental reform.

Because of international complications and the eventual partition of Poland—in 1795—there was little chance to carry out the provisions of this constitution. Even so, all Poles as well as the friends of Poland regard it as an epoch-making document. I am glad to join in the 164th anniversary of that memorable constitution and express my hope that the spirit and memory of that constitution will afford solace and encouragement to the people of present-day Poland as they pass through the darkness of suffering and tyranny that has fallen upon them. They may be sure that the people of the United States will take every practicable measure to hasten the day when the light of freedom will return again in its full brilliance to their country.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, peace, security, and progress are fundamental objectives which most people of the world seek; but, goals such as these are seldom achieved in their entirety. Certainly among the peoples of the world who have not long enjoyed the fruits of peace and security are the Poles; for since the first partition of Poland in 1772, with the exception of the period between World Wars I and II, the history of Poland has been one marked by oppression and strife.

The constitution of 1791 which all free Poland commemorates today held out to the Poles a great promise for the future. This memorable constitutional document contained elements which would undoubtedly have brought Poland to the threshold of renewed national greatness. But, Russia, then as in so many instances since, intervened and through treacherous means destroyed the Polish hopes for the future.

Much has been said about the tragedy of Poland. And indeed, the modern history of this nation is tragic; for it reveals a long catalog of grievances and oppression. Once a great nation, Poland was reduced by the Russians to a condition of subservience. After the third partition in 1795 the Polish state no longer existed. Only the people remained to carry on the great traditions of Poland. Russia and Poland's two neighbors to the west, Austria and Prussia, shared the spoils of this formerly great state. And for over a century Poland no longer existed as an independent state. Only in the minds and hearts of this oppressed people did the idea of Poland remain strong and virile. World War I brought freedom to Poland; but again at the beginning of the last great war, Poland was despoiled by her powerful neighbors, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Then, at the close of this conflict when all the free world believed that peace, security, and progress would again be the preoccupation of mankind, Poland along with her sister states along the eastern borderlands of Europe were brought forcibly into the Communist empire.

As one views the world scene since 1945 it becomes clear that one principal factor which frustrated the advance of the world toward peace, security, and progress is the activity of the Soviet Union. In every way Soviet Russia wantonly and recklessly dissipated any hope for a world at peace and relieved of

international tensions. Throughout Eastern Europe the Soviets imposed a new and awesome tyranny, and in international affairs they have acted in such a way as to inspire distrust and fear. And today they have advanced a new propaganda theme designed to conceal their real treacherous intentions, a theme entitled "peaceful coexistence." Try as they will the Soviet shift in policy will not divert the attention of America from its attachment to relief for the oppressed; for no tactic of the Communists could ever obliterate the humane impulses of America to see those oppressed peoples freed from the bondage of Soviet tyranny.

This anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 provides a proper occasion for us to rededicate ourselves to the cause of oppressed Poland. To a great extent this cause of Poland is our cause, because it has its roots in a desire for freedom. And, so long as Poland and the other oppressed nations of the world do not enjoy the blessings of liberty, the world itself will never know peace, security, and progress.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. In connection with this anniversary, Gov. G. Mennen Williams has issued a proclamation designating May 3 as Polish Constitution Day. I wish to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD the governor's proclamation, which is as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing.

PROCLAMATION

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

In a day when the democratic ideals of men are undergoing their severest test, it is important that we remember one of the greatest examples of men's will for freedom and liberty. On May 3, 1791, the people of Poland instituted their constitution.

This constitution expressed the Polish people's belief in individual liberty. It contained this statement: "All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people."

Despite the fact that within a few years Poland was completely overrun by foreign troops, this will for independence has been one of the hallmarks of the Polish nation.

Today even though Poland has been subjugated to godless communism, people throughout the world look on the Polish constitution as a symbol of the day when Poland will again be free.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 3, 1955, as Polish Constitution Day in Michigan, and urge all citizens to join with their brethren of Polish descent in remembering the great aspirations expressed in the Polish constitution of 1791, and in paying tribute to the gallant struggle for freedom which Poland has constantly waged.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we Americans who have been free for over a century and three-quarters cannot—indeed we must not—overlook the plight of a nation whose freedom antedates by centuries our own, and who today, although left in the hands of a harsh taskmaster by her erstwhile friends, remains the symbol of man's eternal fight for individual liberty.

The shame of America is that our leaders, without the consent or approval of the American people, sold the valiant Polish Nation into slavery and then at the request of the Soviet slavedriver turned over a score of her most brilliant statesmen who had stood valiantly by our side while we were fighting the Nazis.

Today we hear much of peaceful coexistence as the pious hope of those who seek an easy "out" to a policy which we underwrote at Yalta and Potsdam. We, in our mature judgment, must realize that you cannot exist peacefully with liars and murderers, and the Poles know from centuries of sad experience that you cannot live in peace on the same continent with men in whom there is no honor. Poland, by every right that has been spelled out in Christian ethics, deserves her freedom and will continue to look to total liberation as her goal. Indeed, we insult a valiant ally when we expect her to settle for less.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join with many of my colleagues in observing Poland's Constitution Day.

This is no new subject for me. Well do I recall March 2, 1945, the day after President Roosevelt addressed both Houses of Congress and reported the results of the so-called Yalta Conference. We know, today, that there were many secret agreements made at the several conferences, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt's denial that secret agreements had been made. And so it was on the very next day after his appearance that I was privileged to address this House on the subject Yalta—A Moral Retreat—Poland and Small Nations Crucified.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to repeat what I said on that occasion, I would, however, take the opportunity to point out some statements I made regarding the treatment accorded Poland and other small nations by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.

I said:

The determination by the conferees—

Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill—

to settle the boundary lines of Poland before the question was submitted to the people of Poland constitutes a retreat from high moral ground that we have steadily maintained throughout the war. To say now that free elections are to be held and that Poland will receive a long shore line carved out of Germany is to rob Peter to pay Paul and is a feeble effort to fool the people.

Mr. Speaker, I was referring, of course, to a very important article in the so-called North Atlantic Treaty whereby the great powers pledged that all peoples would have the right of self-determination. This principle was denied the people of Poland and the other small captive nations. I further pointed out that a great mistake had been made at Yalta and one which, if not rectified, would lead to world war III. We know how close to another war we are today. Poland and these small nations had no representation, no spokesman for them at the conferences to which I have referred.

Again, I repeat what I said on that occasion, that there were three cardinal provisions of the Atlantic Charter violated:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Mr. Speaker, at Yalta it seems quite clear today that we acquiesced in every demand made by Russia for concessions in Europe and in Asia. We agreed to the establishment of the Curzon Line as the easternmost boundary line of Poland which was contrary to an agreement made between Poland and Russia subsequent to World War II and which violated the rights of millions of Polish people. We knew that, by that agreement, Russia was to continue to dominate and control Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, all of which was an unlawful grab of those countries in 1940.

We were parties to the unholy crime, notwithstanding the noble pronouncements of our State Department in 1940 to the contrary. Britain and the United States acquiesced foolishly in the demands of Stalin in his selected sphere of influence. This, I repeat again, constitutes the retreat from the high moral ground upon which we had pledged ourselves in the war.

There was little doubt that Poland was crucified at Yalta, and with that crucifixion American idealism was also defeated. Our leaders scorned our American constitutional system and the pledges made in the North Atlantic Charter that no nation, neither Russia, Britain, nor any other country would seek territorial aggrandizement, were flagrantly violated at Yalta.

Mr. Speaker, on this sacred occasion those of us who live today can only pledge that we will exert every influence and every power available to repudiate the moral retreat of our Nation at Yalta, where Poland and the other small nations were crucified.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this annual occasion, May 3, the date of Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday, calls for a renewal of the strong bonds of culture between the American and Polish people. The fate of Poland, the traditional friend of the United States, will always be of primary interest to Americans regardless of ancestry. Freedom has always been the first principle of the Polish political tradition. The Polish struggle to regain her lost freedom through the centuries is a long and familiar story. The world's records know no parallel to the epic resistance of the Pole to efforts of aggressors to enslave, denationalize, and break him. The real

appreciation of the value of the individual and of the worth and dignity of the person makes the Pole loathe equally communism and fascism—any denying of the worth and dignity and freedom of the individual. As history amply illustrates, to the Pole the rights of the individual must be duly regarded by the state.

As embodied in the great democratic Polish Constitution, the state exists to protect and facilitate the life and occupations of the individual, not to use him as cannon fodder and the instrument of dictatorship. To be sure, he is glad to die for his country if need be, but that is his desire for a country he loves—not for a dictator he has to obey.

Today, the Polish struggle for freedom is widespread. It is being waged on the national, social, cultural, and moral levels, where human mind and feeling play often a much greater role than that of bayonet, revolver, prison, or concentration camp. The tradition of individualism constitutes an obstacle to the subordination of Poland to the Communist system which disregards the dignity and freedom of man. The Communists have recently put great stress on the elimination of these Polish national characteristics in their determination to snuff out the spirit of Polish independence. Fortunately, for the free world, that spirit still lives and will continue to live.

What hope can we hold out to these brave and courageous, but long-suffering people? Would that we could be more encouraging—more reassuring. But I think we can say that we recognize and appreciate their courage and their desire for freedom. We certainly will never rest easily, never forget their justifiable and burning desire for freedom until the yoke of Soviet enslavement and brutality has been lifted. The struggle is long and arduous, but never too long or too arduous to give up hope. We look to the day when Poland will again emerge as a strong, free, prosperous, and happy nation. We know the people will never give up their hope; we know they will be ready when the day arrives to throw off their suppressors.

With courage, with perseverance, with faith in freedom, this day will come.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland have the right to know that we of America, who owe so much to those of Polish birth, cherish the thought that a free and sovereign Poland will rise again.

On this day when liberty-loving Poles celebrate their national holiday and the anniversary of their constitution, they should be plainly given the encouragement that may reside in the simple fact that we have not forgotten them.

We of the Western World, who share a common, humane, and democratic tradition with the Polish people, are temporarily separated from direct access to many of them. Violations of solemn agreements by the Soviet Union, whose word we hoped could be trusted, have closed the Poles in the mother country behind the Iron Curtain.

It is impossible that this situation shall forever exist, that the patriotic citizens in Poland proper can be ground into dust, that they can be forced to forget their heritage, to abandon their proud culture.

The national spirit of a brave, free people cannot be destroyed by the tyrant's yoke and the foreign oppressor, even when he uses puppets and quislings from within to execute his will. A wise writer pointed out that after the several partitions of the past "Poland survived as a national entity" although held for a century in a "state of emulsion."

The Polish people today are not less devout in their religion and their national faith, not less courageous and determined, than those who went before them and who recovered Poland's sovereignty and liberty after the First World War.

We of America must have a special consideration, in all truth, for the oppressed in Poland. In our own time of struggle, in the days of our revolution, the Polish people sent Thaddeus Kosciusko, soldier and patriot, whose devotion to liberty and military skill were equally serviceable to General Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Poland's people and the slavery in which they are held by the Soviet Union's violations of faith are not a new theme to me.

More than 8 years ago, on February 12, 1947, I took the floor to warn that in contempt of her own pledged word the U. S. S. R. was attempting to sovietize the Polish people and territory. I stated then, and I repeat today, that this attempt was foredoomed to fail.

I stated then, and I repeat today, that America should never recognize a Soviet-dominated, fraudulent election that purports to reflect the people's will but actually reflects only the demands of the foreign overlords.

I said in 1947, and I most solemnly repeat today, that the leaders of the Soviet Union must recognize there is no hope for lasting peace when they lightly and contemptuously break agreements entered freely in conference.

America must never cease to make this clear to the men of the Kremlin. America must never cease to express, on every occasion, her desire and faith that Poland will once again be free.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the remarks I made to the House on February 12, 1947:

UNITED STATES MUST PROTECT POLAND AGAINST COMMUNISM

(Speech of Hon. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, February 12, 1947)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, America today pays tribute to two great men, Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Others will review the achievements of Lincoln in addresses throughout our great Nation. I take the floor this afternoon in tribute to Kosciusko, Polish soldier and patriot, who became an officer in America's first Army and aided our Founding Fathers in their struggle to make the Colonies an an independent nation.

Two hundred years have failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory, achieved in the cause of freedom. He brought from his native land of Poland a military skill which he placed at the disposal of General Washington for 6 long years. He contributed so much to the success of the American Revolution that when his work was done he returned to Poland carrying with him a vote of thanks of Congress.

Kosciusko's name will live forever—symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression. His name means to the world emancipation from human bondage. It is fitting that on this anniversary of his birth we should think of him—honor the memory of a valiant hero and stanch defender of the ideals of liberty and justice, not only for Poland but for all mankind.

Others came from Poland in those days of trial for the colonists—indicating that over 200 years ago there burned in the hearts of the Polish people that same love for freedom that remains alive today.

The Polish people know oppression—have known it for many centuries. On this anniversary of the birth of one of their great men whose friendship for America helped to relieve her from oppression, it is fitting today to give some thought to the plight of Poland.

America has always befriended the small nations of the world. To Poland we owe a lasting debt of gratitude; first, because it is the land of some of our earliest benefactors; second, because it was brave Poland that first accepted the challenge of Hitler. For her heroism shall Poland be partitioned; shall her Government be made the puppet of a stronger nation whose ideologies are so foreign to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people?

We should have some concern for Poland's welfare, just as Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had concern for America. We cannot follow the happenings in Poland today without coming to the very definite realization that the U. S. S. R. is doing some very questionable things. Russia has taken over the economies of all Central Europe and America must face the ugly fact that the U. S. S. R. in violation of agreements made with her wartime allies, is spreading the tentacles of sovietism over unprotected and unwilling people.

A great Christian people like the Poles will never accept the Godless political or social philosophy of the Soviet. There can be no peace in Europe, or in the world when one people try to force upon another ideologies in which they have no faith.

Our Government cannot ignore and, of course, it has not ignored the attempts to perpetuate a puppet government in Poland. President Truman only a few days ago delivered to the new Polish Ambassador a scathing denunciation of the manner in which the recent Polish elections were held and made it clear that America does not feel that provisions of the agreement between the war Allies have been followed.

America should be unyielding in its protest against the Soviet-influenced election in Poland.

Liberty is slowly bleeding to death in prostrate Poland. Countless thousands of Poles have been victims of political murders or exiled. Through former Secretary of State Byrnes, America has voiced its disapproval of these persecutions.

The fraudulent Polish elections are a warning of eventual Soviet annexation of all Europe by employment of similar methods unless stern and effective measures are adopted by the United Nations.

The flagrant violation of even the meager obligation of holding free elections in Poland, as guaranteed by the Yalta agreement, raises doubt in the United States concerning the sanctity of Russian pledges. These dishonest elections are aimed at the complete enslavement of the Polish Nation.

I have repeatedly stated that the future holds no hope for a lasting peace unless the nations of the world can arrive at mutual understanding. How are we to expect such if one of the great powers holds so lightly agreements made in conference? However, it is done, the Soviets must be brought to

realize that their attempted domination of Europe must be curbed if a way to lasting peace is ever to be found.

Sacred pledges were made by the victorious United Nations at Yalta and at Potsdam guaranteeing freedom and personal security in life and property to all peoples in all lands. Russia was a participant in these conferences. She assumed obligations by agreements concurred in by the United Nations. If the Soviets do not choose to honor these agreements, they leave the world with serious doubt as to their future course.

As a Nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty as we do—America should continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland and all small nations who were given such hope by the Atlantic Charter. America's great weight must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1955, marks 164 years since the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. On May 3 of that year the people of Poland set forth this principle:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation.

But today, in 1955, the Polish people, under Communist dictatorship, have no control over their government. In accordance with Communist philosophy, the power in the state does not originate with or belong to the people, but to the leaders of the Communist Party.

Today, under the Communist-Soviet regime Poland is not a genuinely independent country. Freedom was lost practically from the moment the Red army entered Poland. Nazi oppression was replaced by Communist slavery. The Polish governmental agencies are merely fronts behind which Soviet leaders are the real masters. Whenever possible the Poles oppose the Red regime, but today it is virtually impossible to offer effective resistance in an organized way or on a national scale. In short, Poland is a Communist-captive country.

Although a captive, Poland is certainly neither friendless nor forgotten. Poles in exile, those in the free world, strive constantly to bring encouragement and assistance to their fellow men in Poland. There is a warm friendship between the Poles and the American people. We do not approve the unwilling subordination of Poland to the Communist regime, but rather look forward to the day when the freedom of Poland will be restored. We should let the world know our hope and conviction that with God's help, Poland and the rest of the world under Soviet domination will soon again enjoy the liberties and independence which they anxiously await.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the geography of Poland has played a decisive role in the eventful and tragic history of the unfortunate people of Poland. Being placed squarely on the crossroads of Eastern Europe, and hemmed in by one powerful antagonist in the West and another unfriendly giant in the East has been the basic cause of much Polish misery during the last several centuries. Squeezed between the Germans on the west and the Russians on the east, the Polish people have tried their utmost to live and get along with both of these powerful neighbors but in the end they have fallen victim to their rapaciousness.

The difficulties of the people of Poland with the Russians and the Germans date back many years. Toward the end of the 18th century these brave people attempted to stave off dangers to their country emanating from Prussia and Russia by instituting certain reforms into their governmental machinery. Thereby they hoped to strengthen Poland against impending attacks. Such an attempt, begun by the far-seeing and enlightened Polish patriots, culminated in what is known to us as the constitution of May 1791.

This significant document stands as a landmark in the history of the Polish people. Heretofore the country had a monarchial form of government in which the monarch was assisted by an assembly whose members represented only a fraction of Poland's population. By the stroke of a pen this governmental machinery was transformed. By the provision of this constitution the powers of the monarch were circumscribed, the basis of the legislature was vastly broadened, ministerial responsibility was established, and many class distinctions were eliminated. Administrative and judicial autonomy was given to the towns. Numerous personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the upper classes alone were now extended to all townsmen. The peasantry was placed under the protection of the law, and absolute religious toleration was established. These were the principal novel features in the Polish Constitution of 1791. They marked definite forward steps toward complete political democracy, and in this respect it was a model constitution and one of the very first adopted in Central and Eastern Europe.

Unfortunately, soon after its adoption the international situation deteriorated, which proved fatal to the independence of Poland. In 1793 and then in 1795 Poland was partitioned among its three greedy neighbors and Poland's independence was destroyed. But through the years the memory of the constitution of 1791 has lived on. The ideals and principles it symbolizes have served to sustain the people of Poland in their hours of adversity. This is especially true today when Poland lies suffering under the harsh tyranny of the Communists. In joining in the celebration of the constitution of 1791 I ardently hope that the spirit of that memorable document will continue to inspire the brave people of Poland and to afford them a source of spiritual strength until Poland regains its freedom.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted its constitution and today, although that unfortunate country is in chains, we mark the occasion by honoring the achievements of the past and by hoping for a brighter and better future for that land of faith whose people have always been sublimely dedicated to freedom.

The Polish Constitution did away with class distinction, gave autonomy to the towns, set down the personal privileges of the gentry, established religious toleration and mitigated the excesses of serfdom while moving toward abolition of that obnoxious custom.

The history of Poland bears such proud names as Boleslaw the Mighty, and Wladyslaw the First, and Casimir the Third, known as the Great, who codified the laws and in 1364 founded the great University of Cracow. It is said that he found Poland of wood and left her of stone, a landmark in the progress of education and culture. The historical works of Wincenty Kadlubek tell us much of the glories of Poland. In 1493, while America was a newly discovered wilderness, the first Sejm of all Poland met. From 1575 to 1586 the heroic Stephen Bathory, one of the greatest of Poland's rulers, made his mark as a judicial reformer, as the father of the supreme court and as the founder of the University of Wilno in 1579.

And we come down through the years to the never to be forgotten John Sobieski, who in 1683 stopped the mad rush of the Turks at the gates of Vienna and saved all Europe and western civilization from subjection and slavery by the East.

The constitution of Poland was amended in 1921 and again in 1935. We had the strong and healthy and hopeful Poland of Paderewski and Pilsudski and General Haller, of Sikorski and Stanislaw Nikolajczyk.

Through the centuries the people of Poland have been long-suffering. They have known many despots, felt the scorching breath of countless invaders and seemingly unconquerable aggressors, but Poland has outlived them all and risen time and time again to prove to all the world the courage of her heart and the immortality of her national soul.

No nation has been divided and doomed as many times as Poland. But although they dismembered her land they could not divide her people, they could not smother the fires of patriotism that often burned low, but never died in the Polish heart. As we meet here today in freedom and security, let us honor this nation of heroes. Let us hope that the God, Whom Poland has worshipped and served so faithfully, will grant to her and to her people the liberties for which they yearn, so that they too may find the peace which they so richly deserve. Americans of Polish blood have proven among the strongest of our citizens, strong in loyalty, in charity, in faith and above all in hope at a time when everything seems so hopeless.

This anniversary, recalling as it does the repetitious resurrections of the Polish nation, should make the minions of the Kremlin tremble as they contemplate the ignoble fate of others who have violated Polish soil.

Within Poland there is still the fire of freedom that one day will burst forth to devour these evil men, who boast a temporary triumph. That fire will devour them and their putrid philosophy and light the way for a new and stronger Poland to again take her place among the free nations of the earth.

FACTS FORUM NEWS VERSUS JOHN L. LEWIS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, Facts Forum News is a privately financed undertaking which professes to present impartially, the pros and cons of major issues of the day. Typical of this alleged impartiality is an article about Mr. John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers of America, appearing in the April 1955 issue of this publication.

To the uninitiated, this article over the byline of one J. L. Ewing III, would appear to present an unbiased account of the public career of this foremost labor leader. In fact, it is about as unbiased as the cheering section of the hometown baseball team.

It is my purpose here, to refute Ewing's misstatements and to expose this article for what it is—a scurrilous attack intended to discredit a great man, whose life has been devoted to a single and worthy cause.

The author of this attack has, of course, followed the usual line of damning with faint praise that which he would seek to destroy in the eyes of the public.

Among the encomiums and tributes paid to Mr. Lewis, we find subtly injected a rehash of all the long-discredited charges once hurled against this forceful leader in his valiant efforts to better the lot of those who toil in the coalfields.

As the Representative of the First District of West Virginia, one of the larger coal-producing areas in the country, I have reason to know something about coal, its production, its people, and its problems. The economy of my district and my State depend largely upon the prosperity of the coal industry. I have lived among the coal miners for many years. These men are my friends and my neighbors. I know at firsthand the miserable conditions under which they worked and barely existed before the results of John L. Lewis' leadership were felt; and I also know how much he accomplished for them and for the coal industry. I have therefore no hesitation in branding Mr. Ewing's statements as a malicious compilation of half-truths, untruths, and sly propaganda deliberately concocted to misinform and mislead the American people.

Mr. Ewing states:

John Llewellyn Lewis' policies earned him the hate of many Americans in all walks of life who saw his demands on the coal industry disrupt labor peace time and time again.

I seriously question whether any thinking American citizen aware of the shocking conditions in the coalfields during those early days had anything but sought to alleviate the plight of the miners. On the other hand, it is my belief that the moral indignation of the informed public was directed against those then in control of the coal industry for their exploitation and abuse of its employees.

Discussing the present condition of the coal industry, Mr. Ewing remarks:

It's tragically sick. Many economists through the years have stated that the United Mine Workers' policies would eventually price coal out of the energy market.

Consider the present situation—

Continues this sly propagandist.

In this era of atomic energy and rocket ships, the production of coal is not quite up to the figures * * * at the turn of the century. In 1907, for instance, more bituminous coal was mined than in 1954 * * * there is now a total unemployment of nearly 150,000 workers and those who work average only three days each week. True enough the pay scale of the workers is far greater than was ever dreamed in the old days but could it be that too much of a good thing has resulted in something evil? It can be said that the high price of coal has greatly assisted other power industries in converting the American industrial machine away from coal.

This effort on Mr. Ewing's part to revive the old refrain that a decent wage for coal miners has brought disaster to the coal industry is, of course, completely without any foundation in fact. The following quotation properly refutes his statements. It is from a speech delivered on November 1, 1953, by Mr. Joseph Pursglove, Jr., vice president of the largest coal producer in the world, the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. "Performances of our company's mines in 1952 gave us an average productivity of 10.5 tons per-man-day. This represents an increase of 50 percent over the man-day production record of 1946 before most of these improvements in modernization programs were made.

Wages—

Mr. Pursglove said—

have increased around $5.25 per day since the middle of 1948 and the Welfare Fund payments have increased 30 cents per ton, yet the average price charged for coal f. o. b. the mines, in 1952, was lower than it was four years earlier.

High rail transportation costs are a very real problem for us in coal because we must never stop struggling to keep it competitive with the other fuels which are not saddled with such a burden. Gas moves by pipeline; oil by pipeline, tanker, and rail; water power moves by wires; yet over 80 percent of all coal today must move to market by rail. Today these rates are so high that the average cost of a ton of coal delivered by rail to a great many of our customers is more than double the price of the coal at the mine.

On February 15, 1954, the president of the same Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. said in a speech:

In coal during the last 10 years, in spite of the shrinkage in tonnage—operators made a little money—and poured it back into properties and thus have made tremendous strides in efficiency and in increasing tons per-man-day in an industry where it is progress just to stand still because we also mine the nearest and cheapest first. Right today the coal industry is quoting—prices at the mine lower than they quoted in 1948 in spite of an almost 30 percent increase in wages and supplies and enormous increases in welfare and other benefits. As an example, our utility coal from Northern West Virginia sold at $4.40 per ton in 1948 and is currently being quoted at $4 per ton at the mines.

Mr. John Owens, secretary treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America has made the statement that the national average labor costs for production of a ton of coal currently is $2.25; that some mines—strip—have labor costs as low as $1 a ton but that the dog hole operations, which are high-labor-cost mines, pull the average up.

These are the statements of experts who give utterance to no complaints that the wages paid to coal miners have "priced coal out of the market."

Mr. Ewing III, is correct in at least one of his declarations, that the coal industry is not a healthy industry today. But the causes of this illness have nothing to do with the fact that, thanks to John L. Lewis, the coal miners now receive adequate wages in return for a hard day's work.

Imports of fuel oil have cut deeply into coal's eastern market. Conversion to the use of natural gas and oil burners, and diesel engines have further reduced our domestic demands for coal while the mechanization of many mine operations has cut down on the number of men required to work at the mine. All of these latter factors, representing technological changes, help to account for the present plight of the coal industry and unemployment in the coal fields.

As for the coal miners and the United Mine Workers of America, I believe that it would be the happiest day of John L. Lewis' life, as it would be my own, if tomorrow we knew that every coal miner in West Virginia would no longer have to work underground for a livelihood; that he would be enabled to make a living for himself and his family under the open skies and in God's sunshine.

But until that day arrives, I intend, to the best of my ability, to do everything I can to make his job bearable, his life more contented and his surroundings pleasant. And I think that his Government should be most willing to see that his working conditions are made as safe as possible and the public satisfied that he is paid a wage commensurate with the dangers and the hardships he faces every time he enters a mine.

I have every reason to believe that these are the same goals which John L. Lewis has always sought, and to a great extent achieved, for his devoted followers. I realize that no amount of propaganda circulated by Facts Forum News will swerve their loyalty to their leader. But I am deeply concerned that the record be set straight for those who may have no other means of knowing a really great American citizen than through the intolerant and distorted vision of Facts Forum News.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MUMMA (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary right in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FJARE and to include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST (at the request of Mr. FLYNT) and to include a letter and two editorials.

Mr. CRETELLA (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include an article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and include a letter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $5 million for the legislative branch in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc No. 153); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

753. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter with reference to the case of Nicolai Alexandrovich Kozel (Koiel) V–1784560 involving suspension of deportation and requesting the case be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

754. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

755. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 227. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5297, a bill to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1825. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; with amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2986. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3825. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4359. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5398. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4650. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4909. A bill relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5146. A bill to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 5954. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on gasoline and the retailers excise tax on special fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 5955. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 5956. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5957. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong.), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with any State or political subdivision to share in the cost of criminal law

enforcement within Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5958. A bill to provide for the control of noxious weeds on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H. R. 5959. A bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5960. A bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 5961. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5962. A bill to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5963. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5964. A bill to exempt certain Army and Air Force Reserve officers serving on active duty in professional capacities from discharges on account of length of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5965. A bill to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to allow a deduction under the Federal estate tax for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, and religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5966. A bill to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to allow a deduction under the Federal estate tax for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, and religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5967. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to provide for the payment of closing costs from the proceeds of loans guaranteed, insured, or made by the Veterans' Administration in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5968. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5969. A bill to authorize the President, under certain conditions, to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances for the purpose of protecting and preserving the health of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5970. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5971. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5973. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5974. A bill establishing a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, and authorizing its award initially to Mr. Basil O'Connor and Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 5975. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 5976. A bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5977. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5978. A bill relating to the imposition of a tax on the importation of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5979. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5980. A bill to amend section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of certain life insurance proceeds payable to the surviving children of the insured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5981. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in respect of distributions in kind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5982. A bill to provide that permanent works to protect certain levees from erosion and damage shall be constructed and maintained by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5983. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide authority to establish a system of priorities, allocations, and ceiling prices for Salk poliomyelitis vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5984. A bill to amend the internal revenue laws so as to allow a deduction under the Federal estate tax for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, and religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5985. A bill to amend District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees employed in the legislative branch of the Government from having to register and license their motor vehicles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5986. A bill to provide that any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board may bring action on his claim in a United States district court; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5987. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5988. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5989. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 5990. A bill to repeal certain provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 relating to gratuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5991. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York for use as a clinic for chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 5992. A bill to provide that the transfer of certain trust property and of certain Federal responsibilities, in connection with the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction, shall be delayed until December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to exercise, for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to exercise, for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution condemning the violations committed by the Soviet Government of its agreements with the United States, and declaring that measures should be taken to inform the peoples of the world of such violations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 228. Resolution providing for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of adminis-

tering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives favoring increase of the bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: House resolution of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma calling attention to drought-stricken areas of the State of Oklahoma and requesting aid through the Federal drought emergency feed program and urging that consideration be given by the Oklahoma Representatives in Congress to legislation authorizing long-term, low interest rate loans to drought-stricken farmers in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, senate concurrent resolution by the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to cause to be minted a half dollar commemorating the 50th anniversary of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, senate concurrent resolution by the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, house concurrent resolution of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the President and Congress of the United States relating to legislation designed to limit imports of glass, lead, zinc, and oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 5993. A bill for the relief of William Everett George Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5994. A bill for the relief of Eugene Licht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5995. A bill for the relief of Kazimir Mikulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 5996. A bill for the relief of Leon R. Meyer, Lucile H. Meyer, and Leon R. Meyer as transferee of Meyer Jewelry Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 5997. A bill for the relief of Domenica Scopelliti Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5998. A bill for the relief of Hen Min Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5999. A bill for the relief of Michael Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6000. A bill for the relief of Yoichiro Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 6001. A bill for the relief of Tomas Calle-Cuadrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6002. A bill for the relief of Helena Rapp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 6003. A bill for the relief of Robert Jose Hunter y Montilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6004. A bill for the relief of Nemesio Ramirez Moran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6005. A bill for the relief of Sante Martinoli, Mrs. Giuditta Martinoli, and Maurizio Martinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie A. Dablias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 6007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Gladys (Cordona) Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6008. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Di Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6009. A bill for the relief of Ka Tim Lee, Veng Tang Wong Lee, and William Cleveland Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 6010. A bill for the relief of Tzapik Bagdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6011. A bill for the relief of Ralph Landolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. Res. 229. Resolution providing for sending the bill, H. R. 5630, and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 230. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 1901, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

230. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 54 students at Orange Consolidated School, Black Hawk County, Iowa, favoring legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

231. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke, Mass., urging the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

232. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the department secretary, Auxiliary to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting House Joint Resolution 53, designating November 19 as the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Israel's Seventh Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, April 27 marked the seventh birthday of the State of Israel. I offer my congratulations and warm regards to the citizens of that bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Israel's display of friendship and hope for peace sets a bright example for all freedom-loving nations on earth. She is to be commended for instilling in her society full political, cultural, and religious freedom. Israel has constantly sought to enhance relations with the Arab nations. This declaration of peaceful intentions is a thorn in the side of the Communist tyrants who would feed on dissension in this oil-rich land.

The courageous, industrious citizenry of Israel knows well the horrors of oppression, toil, slavery, and mass murder. For 20 centuries, they and their forefathers have been herded through the lands of Asia and Europe. The end of these privations and a forced nomadic existence become doubly significant on this anniversary of the building of a homeland which shines as a symbol of freedom in the shadows of the Middle East—a homeland raised from the sinews and the strength of these determined people.

As the youngest nation in the world, Israel has made gigantic strides in the development of her country. Since her birth a short 7 years ago, her population has more than doubled, as well as her cultivated and irrigated farmland. She has taken her place with honor as the 57th member of the United Nations.

As years pass, greater things can be expected from the State of Israel. She can look forward to progressive and inspiring leadership as that given by such great men as David Ben-Gurion, President Ben-Zvi, and Moshe Sharett.

From all America and those who have cherished the cause of Zionism, congratulations and best wishes to Israel on her seventh birthday.

Dr. John F. Enders, of Brookline, Contributor to the Research Which Led to the Salk Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the large contribution made by Dr. John F. Enders, of Brookline, Mass., to the research which culminated in the Salk polio vaccine.

Dr. Enders discovered 6 years ago a method of growing polio virus in test

tubes. Previously, scientists had to depend upon experimentation on live animals, principally monkeys, in order to observe the effects of the polio virus. Faced with the problem that the live polio virus, only 1 millionth of an inch in diameter, cannot be seen with the most powerful microscope, Dr. Enders found that its presence, growth, or arrest could be observed by the deterioration or lack of it on non-nervous tissues of monkeys. Thus the great work of John Enders, in effect, put antipolio research on a mass-production basis.

For providing this formidable weapon in the great battle against a dreadful disease, Dr. Enders and 2 of his associates at Harvard Medical School received the 1954 Nobel prize for medicine.

A doctor of philosophy and a doctor of science, a native of West Hartford, and a graduate of Yale College, John Franklin Enders is an individual of whom New England and the world can be justly proud.

Appeal by the American Bicycle Industry for Relief From Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the "escape clause" provision of Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the American bicycle industry appealed to the Tariff Commission on June 1954 for relief from "injury" caused by excessive importations. During September 1954, the Tariff Commission began hearings on the subject and interested parties were able to present their cases to the Commission. At that time I asked the Commission for relief from excessive imports, since the bicycle manufacturers in my district were notifying me that their businesses were suffering because imports were supplanting their products in local markets and that a rising unemployment rate was inevitable. From advices which I have received later from manufacturers and from labor unions, it seems as if the situation is getting progressively worse.

The Tariff Commission has now completed its findings on the case. In studying the facts the Commission had two avenues of action open to it; one, in the event that no injury to the industry was proved, the Commission could make those findings available to the general public immediately; on the other hand, if the possibility of injury is proved, the Commission could present its findings and recommendations concerning relief from excessive imports to the President for his own disposition of the matter.

Under the tariff law the President has 60 days in which to decide whether he would follow the recommendations or not. On this coming May 14 the waiting period of 60 days expires. At that time the President can notify the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee that he does not intend to follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission as regards action on the appeal or he may refer the case back to the Commission for further information. When this latter situation arises—as has occurred to many appeals in the past—the appeal generally dies on the vine, as it were.

On the other hand, the President may follow the recommendations tendered to him by the Tariff Commission and on May 14 he will announce his action and his reasons for such action. This may be either in the form of announcing that tariffs will be increased to a level that will tend to offset the competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign manufacturers or some type of quota may be worked out. The eventuality of a quota being instituted, either a flexible or a straight percentage quota, is unlikely, since up to the present that type of tariff procedure has been avoided in the case of manufacturers and also because it is a cumbersome procedure.

Should the Senate version of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with its national security clause be passed, then the President will be able to set quotas on imports.

Mr. Speaker, since I am vitally concerned with the plight of the unemployed in my district as well as the plight of the small-business man who cannot meet the low prices of foreign bicycles, I wrote a personal letter to the President on Friday, April 29, asking that tariffs be raised on imported bicycles. I insert a copy of this letter as sent to the White House at this time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been advised by the United States Tariff Commission that they have submitted to you their findings and recommendations on an appeal for relief filed by the bicycle industry under the escape clause proceedings of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Since the employment situation in my district is vitally affected by the excessive importation of foreign bicycles, I wish to add my voice to those of others in the industry asking that you give action to positive relief proposals for this segment of our economy.

In 1930 imported bicycles averaged 1.3 percent of the American market. In the immediate postwar years the total gradually rose till by 1953 the percentage was 22.8; by 1954 it had risen to 37; and now during the first 3 months of 1955 the percentage has climbed to well above 50. In 1953 alone more bicycles were imported than the accumulated total of the 20-year period 1931–51.

Foreign bicycle manufacturers thrive because they have an unbeatable price advantage due to low cost of labor and materials, and subsidies, as well as protective legislation in their own countries. In addition our tariffs are so low that foreign exporters derive great benefits by shipping their bicycles to our shores.

Mr. President, I have always felt that the administration of the Trade Agreements Program could be accomplished without causing undue injury to the workers employed in American industry and agriculture. However, it is only a matter of time before the entire domestic bicycle market is lost to foreign imports. Affirmative action by you, Mr. President, is imperative if the bicycle industry is to survive.

In January 1955, in your state of the Union message, you said: "Nothing in our trade program will operate to injure or damage American industry."

Again, on February 17, in your special communication to us in Congress asking that the Trade Agreements Act be continued, you stated: "No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure."

Mr. President, in 1930 the tariff rate was 30 percent ad valorem. The present rate is as low as 7½ percent, and now the request is for even further cuts in this very low tariff.

The Tariff Commission has voluminous statistics to show that our freer trade policy does "injury or damage" to many small plants with thousands of workers. Certainly the American bicycle industry is suffering injury because of the substantial portion of the domestic market being taken over by bicycles imported under our low tariffs.

I am especially concerned because of the acute unemployment in my district caused by the influx of foreign-made bicycles. Because of this interest, I requested our Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, to conduct a special unemployment survey of the Torrington area, Connecticut. This survey was conducted and on April 4, 1955, Secretary Mitchell advised me: "The survey showed that a substantial labor surplus does exist in this area. Accordingly, we are officially classifying the Torrington area in Group IV–A—area of substantial labor surplus." From advices received from manufacturers and labor unions in my district it is evident that this labor surplus has been caused largely because so many workers in the bicycle industry were laid off.

I am vitally concerned because of the realistic approach we must exercise as regards unemployment. Our country is embarking on a freer trade policy and we seem to adopt a strictly doctrinaire position, namely: free trade is sound in theoretical economics, and therefore, free trade should be pursued. What free traders fail to realize is the fact that if limitless imports produce unemployment in our country, the uneconomic effects would eventually result in restrictive tariff on the high side.

Mr. President, the very fact that the Tariff Commission has not made public its findings supports the assumption that positive "injury" to the American bicycle industry has been caused by excessive imports and that recommendations have been made for the alleviation of this "injury." What the Tariff Commission's recommendations are, I do not presume to know, but my personal recommendation would be that tariffs on bicycles should revert to the status of July 1, 1945. In the event that you feel this cannot be done, then I would recommend a flexible quota based on a certain percentage of domestic sales over a 5-year period.

I am submitting this request to you, Mr. President, having regard to your concern for the welfare of our economic structure as a whole and with due expectation that you will give relief to this hard-pressed sector of our economy.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from bicycle and bicycle parts manufacturers from many sections of the United States. The problem of foreign bicycle imports is touching a $200 million industry to such an extent that in the first few months of 1955 fully 50 percent of our domestic market was being taken over by these importations.

It had been suggested in the Randall Commission report that many industries should retrain their workers for similar type of manufactures in cases where their domestic industries are being injured by excessive imports of the type of commodity which they produce.

Anyone knows how difficult that type of program will be. I well remember the case during the war of the gold-mining industry. The War Production Board had advised that no machinery or parts would be available to the gold-mining industry. Workers in that industry should be shifted to similar types of mining or retrained for similar types of employment. Some of you may not know this, but the relocation and the retraining program was an abysmal failure. The men refused to be relocated in other areas, and special efforts were made by the companies to keep the men at their current locations in case the mines opened at sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the fact that the American domestic bicycle industry is not of such minute proportion that its dislocation can be ignored. In our small factory towns the men have lived and brought up their families, bought their homes, and have grown roots, as it were. It is hard to remove men from these small towns. Yet, when their means of livelihood are being undercut they have to do something else to provide food for their families. This they will do, no matter what hardship they undergo. Yet, when the time comes for this type of mechanic to go back into the bicycle industry it will be hard for them to rechange their employment status. Once men leave an industry it is not easy to build up such an industry again.

Mr. Speaker, all this points up the reason to which I am coming now. I am in favor of a reorientation of our foreign-trade program. I believe in the interchange of goods between nations. But the whole trade-agreements program seems to be encumbered at present with such a vast amount of administrative procedures as to make it practically impossible for an industry to get amelioration of its difficulties should excessive imports hurt such an industry. There is the matter of appeals, the holding of hearings, the searching and investigating of reports of injury, the dislocation of labor; the research of possible retraining efforts, a recommendation to the President, a waiting period of 60 days, a possible denial of such appeal or a type of action which might not give relief to the affected domestic industry.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that although the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 has been stigmatized as the highest in United States history, that tariff has now been cut down to such an extent by successful percentage cuts under the renewal of every Trade Agreements Act extension as well as by concessions granted at Geneva, Torquay, Annecy, and now at Geneva again, that to find the exact rate in operation is a difficult matter indeed.

I think the time has come, and I would urgently stress the sooner the better, that we in this Congress initiate a new study for the revision of our basic tariff act. Not only is such a revision overdue but, it is of prime importance to us in Congress that we do not relinquish too much of our authority to any one executive agency. I mean by this that in Congress our ultimate responsibility is to our constituents and yet here, because of a multiplicity of procedures concerning tariff cuts or the reimposition of tariffs, we are unable to give relief to our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, quite a few of us in this Congress have been importuned time and again by our constituents for intervention on their behalf against excessive importations. My feeling is that we should revise our tariff law that our constituents may know that their interests are being protected. I wish to state that I think the time is ripe and a beginning should be made in the restudy and rewriting of our basic tariff law.

Congressional Night at the Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the National Press Club, the largest of its kind in the world, has a very enjoyable annual custom of holding congressional night. It is a pleasant moment of relaxation and fun for Members of Congress. And it is a gracious gesture by Washington newsmen, correspondents, columnists, and commentators—a gesture which we are certain all Members of Congress who have attended appreciate very much.

Last Wednesday night, through the courtesy of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, we heard a prediction of things to come, not by a columnist, but by one of America's top songwriting teams, Lyricist Howard Dietz and Composer Arthur Schwartz. They collaborated on such Broadway hits as the Band Wagon, Inside U. S. A., At Home Abroad, and Revenge With Music. And they wrote such songs as Dancing in the Dark, I Love Louisa, Louisiana Hayride, and You and the Night and the Music.

It is indeed a pleasure and privilege to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, not only an outstanding Member of Congress but also a former illustrious concert singer of great talent, in inserting into the RECORD the latest composition of the famous American popular composers, Mr. Arthur Schwartz and Mr. Howard Dietz.

This composition was especially composed for congressional night at the National Press Club, which was held in the banquet hall of that great association. The composition entitled "You've Got To Be an Actor Today," was personally performed by Mr. Schwartz and was received by the audience with most enthusiastic acclaim. As readers will observe, it is a colorful, satirical treatment of a public career in these advanced days of television and electronics.

The gathering was attended by a large number of Members of Congress led by our distinguished and beloved Speaker, whom we all hail as one of the greatest living Americans, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. From the executive department of the Government, and the United States Senate, we were all greatly honored by the presence and participation of a former Member of the House, whom we all highly esteem as a dear friend and great American and a sterling public servant, the distinguished Vice President of the United States and Presiding Officer of the Senate, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, who demonstrated to the assemblage that, in addition to his other brilliant attainments, he is a gifted and talented piano player. His piece de resistance was, curiously enough, not the Londonderry Air, but a Democratic air heretofore closely associated with our former great President from the State of Missouri, our friend, colleague, and beloved Harry S. Truman. The Vice President demonstrated his great skill and ability as a piano virtuoso to the enjoyment and delight of everyone present.

Our beloved Speaker, not to be outdone by a member of the opposite political faith, not only willingly assumed direction of the Congressional Choraleers, which regaled the gathering with nostalgic melodies, but also, in accordance with his long-established rule, preserved decorum and order during the singing program.

On the whole, it was a great occasion to which we were all deeply indebted to the Press Club and the friends who so kindly invited us to be their guests for this exhilarating event.

To Mr. Arthur Schwartz, great composer and fine gentleman that he is, we are most grateful for the splendid performance he gave us of his world-famed melodies, and for his kind and gracious presence which contributed so greatly to making the evening so enjoyable and unforgettable.

The topical song of the evening, effectively rendered by Mr. Schwartz, follows:

YOU'VE GOT TO BE AN ACTOR TODAY

(By Howard Dietz and Arthur Schwartz)

Politicians nowadays
Have adopted thespian ways
For they have to be performers on TV
Their oratory mingles
With all the commercial jingles
On channels CBS and NBC
In Washington the Republicans
Have appointed Bob Montgomery
To organize the bureau of mummery
The Democrats are working on a plan
To have their candidates directed by Kazan

CHORUS

You've got to be an actor today
Your manner must be affable
Your features photographable
You've got to be good in an audio-video way
Max Factor is a factor today
Powder and paint can make you look like you ain't.
Years ago any candidate could be the people's choice
Even tho he never had a sexy voice
Like Marlon Brando
Vocal education will pay
And down in sunny Florida they say
That the mayor of Tallahassee
Was coached by Raymond Massey
You've got to be an actor today

SECOND CHORUS

You've got to be an actor today
The people who examine you
Appreciate the ham in you
Yot gotta rate high in a Hooper and Nielson way
Your chances of election are fine
If you're the mystery guest on What's My Line
Have you heard that the Ways and Means Committee formed a band
When they played they were panned and they were canned
By Arthur Godfrey
Senators who are anxious to stay
Obey their campaign managers who say:
Don't be noble
Don't be global
Just be like Georgie Gobel
You've got to be an actor today

Avoid Hasty Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the New York Herald Tribune carried a front-page editorial entitled "Washington Must Act." I understand that copies of this issue of the Herald Tribune were distributed to Members' offices. The editorial calls for immediate enactment of legislation giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producer to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions, and absolute priorities according to need. The editorial also calls for severe penalties for violators, both users and the sellers.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has general jurisdiction with regard to public health, I and the committee have, of course, been concerned over the problems created by the initial scarcity of available Salk polio vaccine.

Several weeks before the Francis report and the licensing of the vaccine by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I contacted Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with regard to any plans which the Department might have to provide for allocation of scarce vaccine so that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where it would do the most good. At that time I was advised by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer that no legislative action was required.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a letter dated April 14, 1955, addressed to Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which summarizes briefly the views expressed by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer. The letter also requests the Secretary to review the situation and to advise me whether the Department might feel the need for additional legislation granting the Department power to allocate the vaccine.

This letter will be made a part of my remarks.

I have talked again to Dr. Scheele to inquire whether the Department had reached any conclusion on the question of the need for legislation. Dr. Scheele informs me that the Expert Advisory Committee on the Polio Vaccine is meeting. Dr. Scheele feels that no decision with regard to legislation should be reached until the committee has been in a position to review the situation which has developed. Dr. Scheele expects to report the results of the Advisory Committee's deliberations to Mrs. Hobby, and he promised to keep in touch with me with regard to the situation.

I am making this somewhat lengthy explanation in order to show that this committee has been following closely the situation with regard to the Salk vaccine. I believe it would be a mistake for the Congress to rush into action before those in the executive branch who have a great responsibility in this field have had an opportunity to reevaluate the situation and to determine whether in the public interest efforts at voluntary allocation should be abandoned and mandatory controls based on new legislation should be substituted.

I agree that the American public is entitled to an early decision, but I feel that the American public will best be served if the Public Health Service and its advisors are given an opportunity to collect their thoughts and to make appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

The letter previously referred follows:

APRIL 14, 1955.

HON. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SECRETARY: Several weeks ago reports began to appear in the press concerning an impending shortage of Salk polio vaccine following the generally anticipated positive report on the effectiveness of the vaccine. My attention was called particularly to a resolution adopted by the New York County Medical Society urging the members of the society to cooperate toward the prevention of a black market in the Salk vaccine.

At that time I directed a member of the committee staff to consult with Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with regard to any plans your Department might have (and for which it might need additional powers) to prevent such a black market and to assure that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where, in the opinion of the medical profession, it would do the most good. Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer at that time expressed their personal views that a Federal allocation program would be undesirable. The arguments advanced by them were to the effect that (1) the time element was too short between the anticipated release of the vaccine and the oncoming of the polio season; (2) the supply held by drug houses was likely to be greater than had been stated in the press; (3) the production of the vaccine could be stepped up greatly following a positive report on its potency, and (4) an allocation program for the Salk vaccine would constitute an undesirable precedent.

Following the release of the Francis report and publication of Dr. Salk's views that the vaccine should be allocated so that it will reach the groups where it will do the most good, I personally contacted Dr. Scheele yesterday and requested his views with regard to the desirability of enacting legislation empowering the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to allocate the vaccine. Dr. Scheele again counseled against such steps. In view of his advice, I have decided to refrain from introducing appropriate legislation.

I assume, of course, that Dr. Scheele's and Dr. Keefer's thinking is representative of the Department's thinking in this matter and I am grateful to have the benefit of the Department's advice on this highly complex and emotional issue.

Should you or your associates feel at any time that the situation has changed and that legislation should be introduced granting the Department additional power to allocate the Salk vaccine, I shall be glad to hear further from you.

In the meantime, I shall appreciate receiving information whether the President, your Department, or any other department or agency of the Federal Government at the present time has the power to allocate, if necessary, the Salk vaccine in an appropriate manner.

Sincerely yours,

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman.

The following editorial appeared today in the New York Times:

THE SALK VACCINE

Fortunately, medicine is not practiced statistically. If it were, we would have paid more attention to the common cold and some other infectious diseases than we have paid to poliomyelitis. Yet we cannot ignore statistics when we consider the success of Dr. Salk's vaccine. In fact, it was decided to vaccinate millions of school children this year largely on the basis of a thorough statistical analysis of last year's mass experiment. As a result of that analysis the Salk vaccine is considered effective in from 60 to 90 percent of the cases in which it will be used.

Thus considered, it seems that too much has been made of the 29 cases of paralytic poliomyelitis that have appeared in some 300,000 children who have received the Cutter vaccine, temporarily withdrawn. The vaccine was prepared in accordance with the specifications of the National Health Institute and of Dr. Salk. It has been tested before distribution by the pharmaceutical house that prepared it, as well as by the National Health Institute. Nevertheless Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele is justified in withdrawing it for closer investigation. Paralytic poliomyelitis is so terrifying an affliction that parents throughout the country will approve the withdrawal. All told, several million children have been vaccinated thus far. It is remarkable that out of these millions so few have been stricken. In fact, the few fall well within the 60- to 90-percent figure of efficacy that Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., gave out a few weeks ago in his report. A board of experts, on which Dr. Salk sat, has decided that it is safe to proceed with nationwide vaccination. As for the Cutter preparation, judgment must be withheld. So far there is no evidence of contamination.

All this raises the question of a shortage of vaccine. The drug houses that have been making the vaccine can hardly be charged with negligence. Even before Dr. Francis presented his report some were beginning to enlarge their production facilities, so confident were they of the vaccine's acceptance. By July there will be enough to treat 30 million children—about half the number that ought to be vaccinated. Long before the advent of autumn there should be enough vaccine to meet at least the needs of all children. Tightening controls over distribution will not increase the supply. If there is a black market in the distribution of the vaccine it has not come to light. The physicians who have departed from the "children first" principle and vaccinated

those older than the prescribed age are so few that they are negligible. In a word, this is not a time for hysteria but a time to trust public health authorities and permit them to direct the work of vaccination.

This is the editorial previously referred to from the New York Herald Tribune:

WASHINGTON MUST ACT

The Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts have confirmed the vaccine's general efficacy. The demand is far greater than the supply. Every child in America has a right to its protection.

The serum can only be, and must be, controlled nationally.

Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which deserves great credit for initiative, efficiency and determination, had made contracts for the purchase of vaccine for free administration to children. It is delivering the serum to communities, but has no authority over private distribution of quantities produced in excess of its own contracts, nor can it effectively control community action after the vaccine is in the hands of local health authorities.

State, and localities have improvised their own distribution systems. For the most part, these are based on voluntary allocations and priorities, and are concerned more with the acquisition of and payment for the vaccine than with seeing to it that priorities are absolutely observed. Only on Friday, after it was clear that the voluntary system was breaking down, did New York City place penalties on the unauthorized sale or possession of the Salk serum. This was a purely loval move; the penalties, moreover, are light in view of the great temptation offered by the short supply of the vaccine: $500 fine, a year in jail or both.

The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. The Public Health Service licenses and supervises the manufacture of the Salk vaccine under the National Biologics Control Act. Powers under this act have been exercised in withdrawing the product of the Cutter Laboratories from distribution.

But the law applies only to the source, only to quality. It gives the Federal Government no authority over allocation, over price, over violators of agreements. The administration has relied on voluntary cooperation and on advisory committees.

The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of children to priority is unchallenged.

To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential. There are five requirements for such a law:

1. It must be simple and sweeping, giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions, and absolute priorities according to need.

2. It must provide for the prompt dissemination of fully evaluated information on all medical aspects of the program. Doubts have arisen across the Nation over such matters as "provocation" and the timing of shots in relation to the incidence of polio. Parents are entitled to know what disinterested experts think of these questions as they arise. Their children's lives are at stake.

3. It must be clearly limited in time and subject, so that there will be no doubt that this is an emergency answer to an emergency situation, not a step toward socialized medicine. A year, or at most two, will probably bring supply and demand into balance.

4. It must have teeth. Penalties for violators—both users and sellers—should be harsh, several years in jail, some thousands of dollars in fines, so that there will be no prospect of profit in flouting the law.

5. Finally, and of the utmost importance, the act must be passed immediately and administered vigorously. The emergency is now—not tomorrow or next month. Congress can pass a law through both Houses in a single day, if the need is great enough. It should pass this legislation forthwith. The Government should be prepared to put its execution in the hands of the country's top administrators, experienced in allocations and priorities.

Given such leadership, working in harmony with all interested parties, redtape could be cut, the machinery set in motion, and speedy enforcement assured.

The parents and children of the Nation demand it. The whole world is waiting to see whether the United States will use this great new weapon against polio swiftly, efficiently, and—above all—equitably.

Misgivings of the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at least one thing can be consistently said of the Washington Post, now named the Washington Post and Times Herald; it is consistent and unceasing in its efforts to avoid supporting any thought or program which those who wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights would have logically thought helpful toward either the establishment or the continuance of the independence, the Republic, and the opportunities which they gave us. Unceasingly, at least since it has been my misfortune to see and read it, the Washington Post has advocated policies which are more suitable to bring about the advance of other nations than that of the United States of America.

Almost without exception, in the slant of its news stories and the trend of its editorials, it has been against practically everything which those living in the Midwest at least have deemed vital and necessary toward the preservation of our constitutional form of government, the prosperity, the happiness and contentment of our people.

Over the same period, it has vigorously and without regard for the truth, at practically every conceivable opportunity attacked and opposed those in public office who have expressed themselves in opposition to the surrender of our sovereignty and independence of our Government.

The Post seldom, if ever, while speaking out against what it construes to be a denial of civil rights, while appearing to combat prejudice and hatred, has condemned lawlessness, violence, or reprehensible conduct on the part of politically powerful groups which support its own—the Post's—pet ideas.

Those who direct the policy of the Washington Post, whatever may be the individual personal beliefs or policies, seem to be more deeply concerned with the welfare of people in other lands, with the well-being and the security of other nations than they are with the people of the United States of America or of the Republic itself.

Typical of the methods of the Communist Party and of its socialistic doctrine is an editorial in this morning's Post, captioned "Curious Choice," and which reads as follows:

CURIOUS CHOICE

John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, whom President Eisenhower has designated head of the new International Cooperation Administration to be set up in the State Department, is an able lawyer and administrator who has been executive director of the Hoover Commission. In his new capacity, if he is confirmed by the Senate, he will be in charge of all foreign-aid operations, including the technical-assistance programs. The post demands unusual energy and special organizational gifts, both of which Mr. Hollister has. But it may be asked whether he wholeheartedly believes in the program he is picked to administer and whether he will bring to it the zeal which is required if the Asian part of it is to strike fire. If rumors concerning a preliminary Hoover Commission report on foreign aid can be relied on, Mr. Hollister's chief interest would seem to be to liquidate it as soon as possible.

Mr. Hollister is a former law partner of Senator Taft and a member of the Taft wing of the Republican Party. His choice for this significant post may have been influenced in part by a desire to keep the Taft wing of the party under the Eisenhower banner. If such is the case, it may prove to be as unfortunate as the appointment of Clarence B. Manion, former Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, whose resignation the White House requested when he criticized many Eisenhower programs. Mr. Hollister would make an excellent director of the General Services Administration or some other agency chiefly concerned with economy and efficiency. But the foreign-aid chief should be concerned with social and economic development programs as well as with economy and efficiency. He must be interested in bold experiments designed to raise living standards in the underdeveloped countries. These require the Government to take risks with its money in the interest of long-term and sometimes intangible returns.

We hope that our misgivings about Mr. Hollister, who is a man of ability, experience and patriotism, are ill-founded. But the Senate ought to satisfy itself on these questions before it approves him for a task that is of such importance in our foreign relations. The vigorous continuance of some form of foreign aid to the underdeveloped

areas is an investment in world stability of vital concern to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, being compelled to admit that Mr. Hollister is a qualified, energetic, industrious, sound-thinking American, it views his appointment as head of the International Cooperation Administration with misgivings.

Apparently the appointment of any loyal American with sound business experience and undeviating devotion to the principles enunciated in the Constitution to any job carrying either the authority to determine policy or direct the expenditure of tax dollars is abhorrent to the Post.

Deputy United States Marshal Jobs Should Be Under Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to place the position of deputy United States marshal in the classified—competitive—civil-service system.

During the 82d and 83d Congresses bills were introduced in both Houses to exclude deputy United States marshals from the competitive civil-service system, but in each instance the Congress refused to act upon these bills because they were without merit. In November 1954, however, the United States Civil Service Commission, contrary to the intent of Congress, removed the deputy marshal positions from the competitive civil-service system. In taking this action, the Commission made these jobs subject to political patronage.

In my opinion, it is essential that law-enforcement positions of this type should remain under the regular civil service merit system. Applicants for such positions should be required to qualify in a competitive examination, instead of having to depend on political patronage. In this way, we shall insure continuity of service in a most important adjunct of our judicial system.

My bill provides that those marshals who have acquired competitive civil-service status prior to November 30, 1954, will retain their status under the measure. Deputy marshals appointed to such positions after that date without having taken a qualifying examination will be required to compete within 90 days following the enactment of the bill.

By enactment of my bill, all deputy marshal jobs will be filled through regular civil-service examinations in the future. In this way, we shall be able to restore these positions to the civil service merit system, instead of subjecting them to the inequities of the spoils system.

I trust we can have early committee action on the bill so that it can be brought before the House for consideration and approval.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time since I have been a Member of Congress, I recently mailed questionnaires to the 86,000 boxholders in Nebraska's Fourth Congressional District. The following tabulation shows the results of this poll in (a) the rural areas and (b) the cities:

1. What type farm program do you favor?

	Flexible	*90% parity*	*100% parity*
(a)	59.7%	26.9%	13.4%
(b)	73.0%	19.0%	8.0%

2. Would you favor a bushel quota on wheat?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	66.7%	33.3%
(b)	57.7%	42.3%

3. Would you favor a two-price system on marketing wheat?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	48.4%	51.6%
(b)	45.3%	54.7%

4. Should 18-year-olds vote?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	38.4%	61.6%
(b)	40.9%	59.1%

5. Do you favor present Social Security for farmers?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	58.7%	41.3%
(b)	63.1%	36.9%

6. Your choice for President in the next election—

	Eisenhower	*Stevenson*	*Others*
(a)	73.1%	7.2%	19.7%
(b)	76.3%	7.6%	16.1%

7. Should tariffs be—

	Lowered?	*Raised?*	*Kept as they are?*
(a)	24.8%	20.8%	54.4%
(b)	28.7%	18.3%	53.0%

8. Do you favor the present foreign policy?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	43.5%	56.5%
(b)	48.0%	52.0%

9. Should we grant more or less foreign aid?

	More	*Less*
(a)	9.0%	91.0%
(b)	8.0%	92.0%

10. Should there be Federal aid to education?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	41.8%	58.2%
(b)	44.6%	55.4%

11. Should there be Federal aid for school construction?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	50.2%	49.8%
(b)	55.5%	44.5%

12. Do you favor universal military training?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	49.3%	50.7%
(b)	58.2%	41.8%

13. Do you prefer the present Selective Service System?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	64.6%	35.4%
(b)	67.3%	32.7%

14. Do you favor raising postal rates to meet the cost of service?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	59.1%	40.9%
(b)	65.6%	34.4%

15. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	6.5%	93.5%
(b)	7.3%	92.7%

16. Should Alaska be made a new State?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	77.1%	22.9%
(b)	79.2%	20.8%

17. Should Hawaii be made a new State?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	74.4%	25.6%
(b)	79.9%	20.1%

18. Do you favor a State sales tax?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	43.4%	56.6%
(b)	46.9%	53.1%

The New York Mirror Youth Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest character-building programs of activities for our citizens of tomorrow is the youth program conducted by the New York Mirror, one of the great newspapers of this country. Through this program of 20 different activities, the youth of New York City is learning to assume greater responsibilities of citizenship and sportsmanship.

The youth program was first launched by the Mirror in 1942 and has since then been expanded into a series of year-round activities and events aimed at the spiritual, intellectual, and physical development of our youth. Each year this program is enhanced by the addition of new events and larger numbers of participants. In 1954 these events attracted some 84,000 participants and about 1,100,000 spectators.

The importance of this program is now recognized by many character-building organizations and authorities in the field who also appreciate its value in combating juvenile delinquency. New York City's park department and its board of education are cooperating with the Mirror in sponsoring many of the activities.

A brief listing of the Mirror youth program of events will indicate how much this program has been expanded and the many ways in which youth can be interested in healthy and constructive activities. The program includes:

First. A youth forum, in which hundreds of teenagers from school and youth groups discuss national and international affairs.

Second. A citywide basketball tournament in which teams from the elementary and high schools participate in a series of elimination matches. The championship finals are played in Madison Square Garden. In 1954, 1,872 teams made up of 18,651 players took part.

Third. A marbles tournament for boys and girls attracted 12,360 youthful participants last year.

Fourth. The all-city high-school chorus and symphony orchestra presented its fifth annual concert at Carnegie Hall, sponsored jointly by the Mirror and the board of education.

Fifth. A citywide softball tournament is conducted annually with championships decided in the men's and women's divisions.

Sixth. A handball tourney attracted 6,150 entrants in all 5 boroughs of the city. Awards were made for individual and doubles championships.

Seventh. A little fellas baseball league included 183 teams and 2,562 players last year. A little "world series" decided the city champs.

Eighth. A folk-dance festival was staged on the mall in Central Park, in which 3,500 gaily dressed children from

all parts of the city presented a program of the folk dances of many lands.

Ninth. A sports-editors forum is held annually, attracting some 100 young writers from the high schools who discuss problems of mutual interest.

Tenth. A model flying boat is held each year. The 1954 fair attracted 150,000 spectators and 1,000 entrants.

Eleventh. Swimming classes are conducted in 17 park department pools. Last year 7,126 learners took swimming lessons.

Twelfth. A citywide swim tournament is held annually. In 1954 there were 2,225 entrants in the tournament and some 200,000 spectators.

Thirteenth. Horseshoe pitching tournament attracted 2,725 entrants in the city's parks and throngs of spectators.

Fourteenth. Boy Scout awards are presented to First-Class and Eagle Scouts in recognition of their achievement in citizenship training.

Fifteenth. Junior olympics, an annual event, pits contenders of various age groups in a program track and field sports. In 1954, 2,800 youngsters participated in the junior olympics.

Sixteenth. A golf tournament is conducted all summer long at a dozen city golf courses. Last year, 2,888 participated in this tournament.

Seventeenth. A tennis tournament attracted 3,103 contestants who competed for titles and awards.

Eighteenth. The annual youth festival was held in September in Central Park in the presence of an audience of 50,000. Boys and girls who emerged victorious in the various events sponsored by the youth program were honored publicly by civic and political leaders. Honors were handed out to the winners by stage, screen, radio, television, and sports personalities.

Nineteenth. Annual Christmas Carols Festival was held on the Mall in Central Park in December.

Twentieth. A Winter Carnival is held annually in Central Park for winter sports. Hundreds participate and thousands come to watch.

Mr. Speaker, such is the long list of activities sponsored by the Mirror youth program. Much of the credit for the success of this program is due to two individuals who take a personal interest in the program, Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the New York Mirror and Hinson Stiles, its managing editor. Mr. McCabe is chairman of the youth program executive committee and Mr. Stiles is the administrator. Other members of the committee are William Detlef, W. N. Thomas, and Glenn Neville. The committee has just published a fine brochure, entitled "citizens in the Making," which describes the youth program in detail.

In sending me a copy of the booklet, Mr. Stiles wrote me as follows:

NEW YORK MIRROR,
New York, N. Y., April 22, 1955.

DEAR JUDGE ANFUSO: Another year has slipped by and I am pleased to send you our new brochure of the Mirror's youth program, largest character-building enterprise in the Nation conducted by a newspaper.

The Mirror is particularly happy to have participated with the department of parks, the board of education, and approximately 35 youth organizations in cosponsoring the various events.

This expanded program now embraces 20 separate activities, and during the past year more than 500,000 New York City school children either actively took part in or were spectators at the various projects, which ranged from a youth forum through the field of sports to a high-school concert in Carnegie Hall.

Funds to support this elaborate program were provided by the Mirror and more events and an expansion of present facilities are contemplated.

I hope that the little book will give you a dramatic picture of our investment in "citizens in the making."

Mr. Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the Mirror, joins me in thanking you for your support of the program.

Cordially yours,

HINSON STILES,
Managing Editor.

Mr. Speaker, many of our large and medium-sized cities throughout the country would benefit a great deal by adapting the Mirror youth program to their local needs, and thus help to shape the lives and thoughts of American youth, building muscle and character, and giving them the opportunity to absorb lessons in citizenship which would be of inestimable value in later life.

The Oil Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months, a larger part of the Nation's oil supply came from foreign oil than ever before in our history. It follows, of course, that domestic oil supplied its smallest part of the national oil supply in history.

Yet, domestic capacity to produce oil is at an extremely high level, nearly 2 million barrels per day more than is now being absorbed by the market.

The conclusion is obvious. Domestic oil is being displaced by foreign oil in United States markets. A little more of it is being displaced each day, with the result that the domestic oil industry is being slowly squeezed out of existence.

These are facts fraught with danger. They reflect a situation which is unwise and unhealthy not only for Louisiana, but for the entire Nation.

Unless something is done soon to prevent this displacement of domestic oil in United States markets, the domestic oil producers' incentive to search for new sources of oil will be severely impaired, and the Nation's oil productive capacity will fall far short of our expanding economic and security needs.

The ultimate result of such a policy could well be disaster.

The American consumer has not, and will not, enjoy economic advantages, as a result of the increasing entry, into their country, of foreign oil. As a matter of fact, due to the concentration of foreign oil holdings in the hands of a few companies, the consumer runs a very great risk of being put at a severe long-range economic disadvantage by increased oil imports. Far more important, however, is the detrimental effect that increasing imports are having on our national security. Without accessible oil, our machines of defense would be helpless. It has been amply demonstrated that there is no easy access to foreign oil in wartime. American blood was spilled at sea in World War II to prove this point. I hope that we take whatever steps necessary to prevent this from happening again.

Excessive dependence on foreign oil goes hand in hand with inadequate confidence in the ability of the domestic oil industry. Yet the domestic oil industry has proved itself capable of fueling the Nation's armies to victories in two global wars. It will continue to justify confidence in any future emergency.

Another tremendously important phase of this problem relates to potentially disastrous effect of excessive oil imports on the Nation's economy. All but 18 of our States produce oil. In 1954, more than $6,300,000,000 worth of natural but unused wealth was transformed into actual wealth in the form of crude oil production. Nearly 300,000 people were employed in this country in the production of oil. About 29,000 people were employed in Louisiana. More than $700,000,000 worth of this oil was produced in my State, which ranks third among all States in the production of oil. The loss of this revenue, of this employment, of this wealth, would not be balanced by any practical or foreseeable advantages to the American consumer. It would be both pointless and tragic.

At the earliest opportunity, positive and immeditae legislative steps should be taken to limit oil imports to a reasonable level. It is my opinion that this level should allow the domestic oil industry the opportunity for normal expansion in accordance with demand for oil.

I regret that the importing companies have failed to exhibit the business statesmanship which would have prevented the necessity for taking the legislative route. Their failure to act, however, cannot excuse a similar failure on the part of the Congress.

Now that Congress is studying this problem, I am working for the passage of legislation aimed at solution of the oil imports problem. I believe that such a solution is essential to the welfare of my State and my Nation.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report

of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 82d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in 1 place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record:

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question and result	Vote
1	Jan. 8	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 15	Quorum call	Present.
3	do	H. R. 5715, providing for an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces. On passage (Passed, 270 to 89).	Yea.
4	Jan. 30	Quorum call	Present.
	Feb. 4	H. R. 401, providing that any person not a citizen and regardless of age who serves with the Armed Forces between June 25, 1950, and June 30, 1955, may be naturalized after compliance with the naturalization laws (Passed, voice vote).	Yea.
5	Feb. 5	H. Res. 517, citing Sidney Buchman for contempt of Congress by his refusal to comply with a subpena issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 314 to 0.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 19	H. R. 5893, as amended, authorizing not to exceed $125,000,000 additional for revolving fund for the purpose of making direct loans under Servicemen's Readjustment Act for housing at 4 percent interest rates where such loans are not available from private sources. (Passed, 342 to 0.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		House Resolution 514, directing Secretary of State to transmit to House information relating to any agreements made by the President of United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain during their recent conversations:	
8	do	On motion to table resolution. (Defeated, 184 to 150)	Nay.
9	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 189 to 143)	Yea.
10	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 28	do	Present.
12	Feb. 29	do	Present.
13	Mar. 3	do	Present.
14	do	H. R. 6854, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: On amendment reducing the operating expenses of the Coast Guard by $1,600,000. (Adopted, 191 to 128).	Yea.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5904, Universal Military Training and Service:	
16	do	On adoption of substitute providing that training shall be provided as part of high school curriculum. (Defeated, 155 to 235.)	Nay.
17	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 236 to 162.)	Yea.
18	Mar. 10	S. 2667, establishing daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia for 1952. On amendment exempting all Government offices and departments from the daylight-saving time provisions and keeping them on standard time. (Defeated, 4[illegible] to 240.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 539, providing authorization by the Special Committee To Investigate the Massacre of Polish Soldiers in the Katyn Forest during World War II to hold hearings in Europe:	
19	Mar. 11	On previous question. (Defeated, 164 to 156.)	Yea.
20	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 206 to 115)	Yea.
21	do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2077, transferring from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission the task of investigating loyalty of personnel prior to their being employed by the Government in certain agencies:	
22	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 86 to 233.)	Yea.
23	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 13	do	Present.
25	Mar. 18	do	Present.
		H. R. 6444, omnibus claims bill for the relief of sundry claimants:	
26	do	On amendment striking out title II. (Defeated, 147 to 184.)	Yea.
27	do	On amendment deleting claim of John Fleckstein for compensation due to physical injury received in 1912 while employed in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Canal. (Adopted, 186 to 141.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
29	do	H. Res. 578, providing for consideration of H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for the year ending June 30, 1953. (Adopted, 228 to 133.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
31	do	H. Res. 556, providing $65,000 to send a committee to Europe to investigate the massacre of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest in Russia during World War II. (Adopted, 235 to 114.)	Yea.
32	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices and agencies for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
33	do	On Fisher amendment limiting to 5,000 the number of public housing units to be started in fiscal year 1953. (Adopted, 192 to 168.)	Yea.
34	do	On Coudert amendment reducing by $14 million the funds allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority. (Adopted, 199 to 159.)	Yea.
35	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 26	do	Present.
37	Mar. 27	do	Present.
	do	H. R. 7176, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
38	do	On amendment reducing from $18,816,800 to $18,000,000 for the Bureau of Mines. (Adopted, 192 to 164)	Yea.
39	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
	do	H. R. 7216, making appropriations for government of the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
40	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce by $2,400,000 the Federal Government's appropriation to the District's general fund. (Adopted, 162 to 143.)	Yea.
41	Mar. 31	S. 1415, providing for payment for compulsory labor by, and inhuman treatment of, prisoners of war as well as the relief of certain organizations in the Philippines which aided Americans during World War II. (Passed, 325 to 0.)	Yea.
42	do	H. R. 6661, on motion to suspend the rules and pass bill amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 authorizing the Department of State to expand its building program overseas through the utilization of $90,000,000 of foreign credits owed the United States. (Passed, 240 to 82.)	Yea.
43	do	Quorum call	Present.
44	Apr. 1	do	Present.
45	Apr. 2	do	Present.
46	do	H. Res. 591, providing for consideration of S. 1203, providing for appointment of 23 permanent and 4 temporary circuit and district judges. (Adopted, 192 to 182.)	Nay.
47	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
48	do	H. Res. 561, creating a special committee to conduct an investigation and study of tax-exempt foundations and other comparable organizations. (Adopted, 194 to 158.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7280, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary for the year ending June 30, 1956.	
49	do	On amendment reducing from $43,400,000 to $40,399,000 the amount allowed for salaries and expenses of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Adopted, 193 to 136.)	Yea.
50	do	On amendment limiting, with certain exceptions, the filling of only 25 percent of the vacancies which occur in the offices and bureaus, etc. covered by this bill in 1953. (Adopted, 208 to 114.)	Yea.
51	do	On passage. (Passed, 200 to 55)	Not voting.[1]
52	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
53	do	do	Present.
54	Apr. 8	do	Present.
55	Apr. 9	H. Res. 602, citing Henry W. Grunewald for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 334 to 0)	Yea.
56	do	H. R. 7391, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the year ending June 30, 1953. On amendment limiting to $46 billion the amount to be expended by the military in 1953. (Adopted, 220 to 131.)	Nay.
57	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
58	do	do	Present.
59	Apr. 23	do	Present.
60	do	S. 1203, providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 165 to 150)	Yea.
61	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
62	do	H. Res. 532, directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board. (Adopted, 255 to 88.)	Yea.

[1]Absent. Would have voted "Yes" if present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
63	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
64	Apr. 30	H. R. 6839, modifying and extending the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes. On amendment requiring that all lease-purchase agreements be submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. (Adopted, 178 to 165.)	Yea.
65	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 5	do	Present.
67	do	do	Present.
68	May 8	do	Present.
69	May 13	do	Present.
70	May 15	do	Present.
71	do	S. J. Res. 20, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 247 to 89.)	Yea.
72	do	H. R. 5715, the armed services pay raise bill. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.
73	do	H. R. 4323, amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizing Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements: On recommittal to committee with instructions it be reported back with amendment providing for submission of all lease-purchase agreements involving more than $50,000 to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House and Senate 30 days prior to their execution. (Recommitted, 260 to 75.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, 210 to 114.)	Yea.
75	do	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 16	do	Present.
77	do	S. 677, fixing the personnel strength of the U. S. Marine Corps at not less than 3 full-strength combat divisions and 3 full-strength air wings, and to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (Passed, 253 to 30.)	Yea.
78	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
79	do	H. R. 7800, increasing old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, preserving insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. On suspension of rules and passage. (Defeated, 150 to 140, two-thirds majority required.)	Nay.
80	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
81	May 22	do	Present.
82	May 22	do	Present.
83	May 23	do	Present.
84	do	H. R. 7005, Mutual Security Act. On amendment reducing economic aid funds to $615,300,000. (Adopted, 221 to 137.)	Yea.
85	do	On amendment cutting funds for Asia $111 million and separating the military funds from the point 4 funds. (Adopted, 192 to 165.)	Nay.
86	do	On passage. (Passed, 246 to 109.)	Yea.
87	May 26	H. R. 6811, increasing District of Columbia gas tax: On passage	Nay.
88	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	do	Present.
90	June 2	do	Present.
91	June 5	do	Present.
92	do	H. R. 7656, authorizing educational and training allowances and other benefits comparable to those granted veterans of World War II for veterans of Korean war. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 1.)	Yea.
93	do	Quorum call	Present.
94	do	H. R. 7005, Mutual Security Act. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 230 to 115.)	Yea.
95	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
96	do	S. 97, authorizing the appropriation of $18,200,000 for the construction, operation and maintenance of facilities for generating hydro electric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River, Tenn. On passage. (Passed, 132 to 121.)	Nay.
97	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	do	Present.
99	do	do	Present.
100	June 11	do	Present.
101	do	do	Present.
102	do	H. J. Res. 477, extending certain emergency powers until June 30, 1953. (Adopted, 285 to 69.)	Yea.
103	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
104	do	H. R. 8120, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations in the amount of $2,758,318,000. On passage. (Passed, 332 to 7.)	Yea.
105	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
106	June 17	H. R. 7800, increasing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, preserving insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. (Passed, 361 to 22.)	Yea.
107	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
108	June 19	do	Present.
109	June 20	do	Present.
110	June 25	do	Present.
111	June 26	do	Present.
112	do	H. R. 8210, Defense Production Act of 1950 extending beyond June 30, 1952, program for materials allocation, and price, credit and rent controls: On amendment providing for decontrolling materials by suspending ceiling prices when such materials are selling below ceiling prices, when such materials are in surplus or adequate supply and are not rationed. (Adopted, 210 to 182.)	Yea.
113	do	On amendment guaranteeing the customary percentage mark-ups of individual wholesalers and retailers. (Adopted, 231 to 164.)	Nay.
114	do	On amendment abolishing the Wage Stabilization Board and creating new Board with limited jurisdiction. (Adopted, 256 to 138.)	Yea.
115	do	On amendment requesting the President to invoke the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act in the current labor dispute in the steel industry. (Adopted, 228 to 164.)	Yea.
116	do	On amendment terminating all wage and price controls on July 31, 1952. (Defeated, 151 to 244.)	Nay.
117	do	On amendment terminating all rent control on Sept. 30, 1952, except in critical defense areas or where local governing authorities request its continuance. (Adopted, 225 to 170.)	Yea.
118	do	On passage. (Passed, 211 to 185.)	Nay.
119	do	H. R. 5678, revising and codifying laws relating to immigration, naturalization and nationality. On overriding the President's veto. (Overridden, 278 to 113.)	Yea.
120	do	H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices and agencies for year ending June 30, 1953 (Conference report.) On recommittal to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House limitation of 5,000 public housing units to be started in 1953 instead of the compromise figure of 35,000. (Recommitted, 195 to 181.)	Yea.
121	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
122	do	H. R. 8370, making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1953: On amendment reducing from $3,273,824,750 to $3,128,224,750 the mutual security funds for military assistants. (Adopted, 173 to 167.)	Nay.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
123	do	S. 2594, extending the Defense Production Act. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 194 to 142.)	Nay.
124	June 30	H. Res. 717 citing Arthur McPhaul for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 348 to 0.)	Yea.
125	do	H. Res. 718, citing Saul Grossman for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 349 to 0.)	Yea.
126	do	Quorum call	Present.
127	do	H. R. 8122, continuing the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities. (Passed, 207 to 121.)	Nay.
128	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
129	do	H. Res. 638, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and other comparable organizations exempt from Federal taxation. (Adopted, 247 to 99.)	Nay.
130	do	Quorum call	Present.
131	do	H. R. 7072, appropriating funds for independent offices for fiscal 1953. On recommittal to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House limitation relative to the number of public housing units to be commenced in 1953. (Rejected, 160 to 194.)	Yea.
132	July 3	Quorum call	Present.
133	do	H. R. 7176, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1953: On recommittal of conference report to committee of conference with instructions to reinsert provisions relative to western Minnesota power transmission lines. (Rejected, 49 to 299.)	Nay.
134	do	On amendment appropriating $5,493,750 for administrative expenses of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the trusteeship agreement. (Approved, 345 to 2.)	Yea.
135	do	Quorum call	Present.
136	do	do	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
137	July 3	H. R. 7289, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fisca lyear 1953. On recommittal of conference report to committee of conference with instructions to agree to Senate amendment barring use of appropriations for expenses in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference. (Recommitted, 184 to 157.)	Yea.
138	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
139	...do....	...do...	Present.
140	...do....	Motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 138 to 189.)	Yea.
141	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
142	...do....	H. Res. 695, providing for consideration of H. R. 7888, to create a Joint Congressional Committee of the Budget. (Rejected, 155 to 173.)	Nay.
143	July 4	Quorum call	Present.
144	...do....	S. 3066, amending the defense housing laws. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 295 to 22.)	Yea.
145	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
146	...do....	H. R. 7656, authorizing educational and training allowances and other benefits comparable to those granted veterans of World War II for veterans of Korean war. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 322 to 1.)	Yea.
147	...do....	H. R. 7289, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fiscal year 1953: On motion to recede and concur with Senate amendment deleting language barring use of funds for preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States against a State of the Union. (Rejected, 119 to 181.)	Nay.

Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to authorize the President to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances used for the prevention or treatment of disease, if the prevalence and seriousness of the disease creates an emergent national-health problem.

The President would be authorized to issue a proclamation setting forth such finding and declaring that it is necessary to exercise the powers that would be granted to him, to allocate such medicinal substances, and regulate the use and distribution thereof, to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the protection and preservation of the health of the American people. The President would also have authority to fix price ceilings on such substances.

The President would be able to delegate any power or authority granted to him, to the head of any department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government.

The President or the Congress would have the power to declare the emergency at an end.

The bill contains a penalty provision. Anyone who willfully does any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, under any order or regulation issued by the President, or the head of the department or establishment to whom the power or authority is delegated by the President, would upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, of both. My bill provides that the act would be effective immediately.

Introduction of the bill was prompted by the current situation involving the use of Dr. Salk's serum for the prevention of infantile paralysis.

Newspaper accounts and editorials, as well as telecasts and broadcasts by persons familiar with the matter, clearly demonstrate the need for the bill. It is not intended as a reflection on the medical profession or upon any health department.

In every walk of life there are persons, who will do what is required of them only under compulsion of law. It is because of those few and in order to guarantee equal and fair distribution to those who should be taken care of first that this legislation is required.

I hope the House Banking and Currency Committee will conduct hearings on this bill in the very near future and present it to the House for consideration.

The Weekly Newspaper Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the April 15 issue of the Piggott, Ark., Banner, my good friend, Mr. Laud Payne, in referring to the fact that with the publication of that issue his newspaper would be entering on its 63d year of continuous business in Clay County, Ark., makes some cogent statements in connection with the business of the weekly newspaper.

Writing in his column, Picked Up Here and There, Mr. Payne says:

With the publication of this issue, the Banner enters its 63d year of continuous business in Piggott. This gives this paper one of the longest records in this area of being continuously in business under the same firm name. A lot of people have thought the paper has been continuously owned by the Payne family, but that is not the case. My father, the late Charles Payne, came to work for the Banner when he was a boy, not over 16 years of age. He started as a printer's devil, working for 50 cents a week and board and sleeping on a cot in the back of the office. This was around 1900. He worked almost continuously for the paper until his death in 1940. The only time he was out for any time was during the 8 years he served the county as a public official—county court clerk and sheriff and collector.

During the very bottom of the depression, the early thirties, he purchased the paper, took over as editor. Not too many years later he purchased the present building and we moved over here.

I came to work here in May of 1925—30 years ago.

After my father's death, the Banner became a partnership concern, with my mother, Mrs. Amanda Payne, and I coowners.

During the past 14-plus years, while I have been serving as editor, the only time I have been off duty here for extended times was the 60-day term of the legislature on four occasions.

The history related by Mr. Payne can be matched throughout the Nation, for our so-called country newspaper editors have always been noted for their endeavor and their public service. In addition to the publication of news and the chronicle of life in the community, these fine men and women have given generously of their time in civic affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of the House Mr. Payne's comments regarding the glamour of the newspaper profession. He states:

Unfortunately, operating a country weekly is not at all like it is pictured in the movies or on television. Their stories would leave you to believe that all papers have a large outside staff of reporters, that are on call for any and every event. These stories do not depict the story behind the scene. The backshop activity, where the mechanical work is done is not so glamorous to depict. But it is the workshop and where the money must be made. All of us in the Banner work in the front and back. Not one (and that includes the gals, Mrs. Robbins, and my mother), is excluded from getting "ink in the hair."

So if you don't see us out on the streets too often; don't see us at every accident scene; at every fire; at every social function; it isn't our lack of interest—but lack of time. We try to get the stories in, and have various sources from which we get information.

This is true, the business of operating a weekly newspaper is not the wild and discordant hustle and bustle as pictured in popular print, but the everyday operation of the paper—recording the loss of the community's citizenship, the birth of its future leaders, and the happy news of weddings and anniversaries, the location of new business, and the everyday events that make America—this is the life of our newspapermen on the small weeklies. The editor usually writes most of the news, being the confidant of the civic officials, and he is to be seen up and down the streets of the city with his blunt pencil and fold of copy paper. He may have the help of the pony wire from the wire service and, at best, he may be

opulent enough to have a teletype machine—but, primarily, his news is of the community. He edits the newsletters from the various rural communities surrounding his town, and he thinks it right to leave in the copy local news of a litter of pigs and the visit of a relative from just across the county.

The local newspaper retains the flavor of our historic past for stories in the newspaper reflect the character of the editor and modern objectivity in news is not permitted to make the items impersonal. If they like a man they say so.

The greatest gems of journalism are not found in the large metropolitan papers. The true essence of life in these United States is found in the columns of the weekly newspapers.

The news is gathered and many times set up in type by the same editor. Or, in a pinch, he can still pick up a stick and handset the type and measure out the heads without worrying about a layout man. He is as familiar with the stone in the composing room as he is with his desk in the editor's cubbyhole.

He is the voice of his community. He is the conscience of his community. And he is a bulwark in the Nation.

To the Laud Paynes of this Nation—the editors of our weekly newspapers, I pay tribute, and I congratulate the Piggott Banner on its successful history of service to Clay County. May our Nation remain a free and democratic country where the voice of such editors will continue to be heard and the news of our communities be recorded without censorship or restraint.

On House Concurrent Resolution 154—Industry to the Rockies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a true land of opportunities that place is my native State of Montana. I say that for a variety of reasons, all of which will show that there is no better place in the United States for industries to establish or relocate than in the Treasure State—Montana.

From a hardy, friendly people to a wealth of natural resources, Montana is ideal for industry of all kinds. Strategically located in the Rocky Mountain area, its abundance of treasure stretches from the tall timber in the Rockies down to the depths of the earth for petroleum, copper, and other as yet untapped minerals including uranium for our atomic era. Montana provides a variety since the third largest State, by area, in the Union includes both the Rocky Mountains and a portion of the Pacific Northwest and the rolling land of the Great Plains States.

These few facts are the best evidence that Montana is a land of opportunities. Opportunities always exist in new areas. Since Montana is relatively new, has not been fully developed, has a sparse population and vacant land, it is a paradise for those looking for opportunities.

Montana has a great base of raw materials, minerals, agricultural and forest products. These are present more generously and completely than in any other State. Coupled with these is an enormous amount of power, an intelligent and effective labor supply, adequate transportation, local and national markets, a healthy and enjoyable climate, and a people who love and have faith in their State.

These great potentialities provide a range of opportunity as great as the range of free enterprise itself from one-man businesses to complete industrial operations. Surveys already made have yielded a long and varied list. Technological advancements which are occurring with increasing rapidity, lengthen this list.

A swift backward glance reveals why Montana is what it is today. Its early history is an intermingling of the lonely trading post and settler's cabin, the roaring gold camp, Indians and trappers, the farmer's struggle against the elements, cattle industry, the fabulous war of the copper kings, lawlessness beaten by law and order. These experiences bred a hardy, and later a friendly, people.

Montana's early visitors found the vast eastern plains and the western slope laced by great river systems. Favorable passes provided natural routes through the mountains for the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the trappers, the gold seekers, the permanent settlers, and, finally, the transcontinental railroads.

From the eastern plains, at 2,000-foot altitude, Montana stretches westward over vast range, agricultural, and oil lands. Montana rises gradually from the east to the 5,000-foot level of the foothills, over the peaks of the Rocky Mountains, and then on down the Pacific slope.

The mountain yielded a clue to their fabulous wealth in 1852, and by 1863 settlements had been made, the "miner's gulch" government, a rudimentary law based mostly upon practical experience and fitted to the individual requirements of each gulch, had evolved.

Development of broader aspects of law received an historic boost in 1863 when honest men, harassed by lawlessness and murder, formed the vigilance committee—the storied vigilantes who brought order and safety to Montana in a few months of swift, frontier justice.

When Montana became a State, November 8, 1899, its government developed from the early attempts at law and from governments established in older parts of the Nation. The government was still tempered by a rugged individualistic Montana and was adapted to its needs.

Today Montana has a modern government, similar to those in other States. It is still tempered by Montana conditions but it recognizes its responsibilities toward the State's tremendous resources. It understands that development of these resources must be encouraged and that it is the duty of the government to be liberal with that encouragement. Today Montana is a modern State. Its cities and towns are clean, with modern homes, office buildings, and stores. From a business standpoint these cities compare favorably in retail sales with cities of much larger size in other sections of the country. Population figures show that Montana has experienced a 2.9 percent postwar increase in population. Last year Montana's per capita income ranked seventh in the Nation.

On June 7, 1955, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 154, calling on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make a full and complete study and investigation of the means of obtaining dispersion and relocation of industries and facilities essential to the defense and security of the United States in case of atomic attacks. My resolution, which is identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, introduced by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, specifically refers to the possibilities in the Rocky Mountain area, including Montana, for reducing vulnerability to atomic attack by such dispersal and relocation.

It calls for Federal, State, and local government cooperation in making the study, and also proposes tax incentives and other measures to encourage voluntary dispersion and relocation of such industries and facilities.

The problem of dispersal has been widely recognized and support of action on it has come from a variety of sources.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, has stated he feels speedy action on dispersion of industry is needed "in view of the great threat to our Nation's survival should the great majority of its industries be knocked out in one blow due to extreme concentration along out two seaboards." For that reason a United States Senator, who is also a qualified jet pilot and knows much of the problems of our atomic age, fully supports this resolution. And here are others who have spoken out on this problem, as contained in a recent statement by Senator BARRETT:

In a press conference on April 28, 1955, Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott publicly advocated the dispersal of future airplane and missile factories inland from the heavily populated and overindustrialized areas of the east and west coasts as a means of reducing targets for enemy bombers.

He declared "further expansion or duplication of aircraft production should be moved probably to the Middle West, and the reason for this is twofold. One, from a strategic standpoint it is a safer picture for this country. Second, we believe that it is not wise for any locality to be dependent on a single industry such as military aircraft for too large a percentage of its economy."

Secretary Talbott emphasized that the Air Force did not want new facilities built on the west coast, and would like to have a further dispersement from the coastal areas of this type of industry.

Val Peterson, former Governor of Nebraska and now Chief of Civil Defense Administration, testified before the Senate Interior Committee on the upper Colorado River Basin project and pointed out that the upper Colorado Basin would be an ideal place for the

dispersal of industry in the interests of national defense.

Urging support of the upper Colorado River Basin storage project, Peterson told the Senate Interior Committee that in the further expansion and extension of the Nation's industries "we should look to areas where it would be more difficult to attack."

"Our expanding economy requires new sites for industry. If uranium is a coming source of power, it might be profitable for industry to locate near its source. If the oilshale developments prove out, new industries should be located near the source of this fuel. The entire basin has great coal reserves as well as other minerals and raw materials."

Donald J. Hughes, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists in a letter to President Eisenhower, May 13, 1955, pointed out that economic forces in the Nation already are causing some dispersal, but not enough in proportion to the need. He emphasized that the longer the Nation delays starting an adequate dispersal program the more drastic the program will have to be to meet the danger of intercontinental missiles. The scientists have urged the President to have a special study made of the whole program of dispersal of industry.

Department of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House a bill to abolish the present Federal Civil Defense Administration and to create within the Defense Department a Department of Civil Defense, under the direction of a Secretary appointed by the President.

With an initial allocation of $25 million the new Department would be authorized to prepare on a nationwide scale a comprehensive and effective program of civil defense, to make known to the public to the fullest possible extent, consistent with national security, the facts about the destructive power of the instruments of modern warfare, and to supply itself with an adequate number of personnel, either through the normal voluntary procedure, or, if necessary, by means of the Selective Service System. The bill also gives the President the power to transfer personnel into the Department of Civil Defense in case of a national emergency, as and when proclaimed by the President or the Congress.

There is an immediate, pressing need for such legislation. The civil defense program in the United States at present is utterly inadequate to cope with the danger of enemy attack. The problems of civil defense cannot be effectively separated from the problems of military defense.

The fiscal resources of the individual States and local communities are inadequate to guarantee equal minimum protection to all peoples in the United States, and although the patriotic efforts of part-time volunteer citizens is commendable, the complex requirements of an effective civil defense system call for full time, thoroughly trained personnel recruited on a national scale as in our present military departments.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, open to us, we pray Thee, the gates of the morning, as we bow here at this wayside shrine of Thy grace, for these are troublous times and the margin of our inner strength seems often perilously low. As servants of the Republic we stand in dire need of courage and fortitude and stability. That we may be at our best, grant us the confidence of a quiet heart and a humble mind. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in all the earth: We lift up our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 3, 1955, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

NEMORAN J. PIERRE, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO DISCHARGES, WHEN GRANTED, AND NOTICES

A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO UNCLAIMED MONEYS

A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Nicolai Alexandrovich Kozel (Koiel) from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the President of the United States has placed before Congress the matter of the improvement of the roads, streets, and highways throughout the Nation, giving special emphasis from the standpoint of national defense to the rapid completion of the Interstate System of Highways; and

"Whereas there are now numerous bills pending before the Congress relating to the improvement of the Federal aid systems of highways; and

"Whereas the Interstate System is now recognized by Federal law as including 40,000 miles of highways throughout the United States but at the present time only 37,600 miles have been designated as being on said system, it being understood that that portion of said remaining 2,400 miles which will be allocated to California will comprise circumferential and other connecting routes in metropolitan areas; and

"Whereas that portion of the Interstate System located within California includes highways most seriously deficient from the standpoints of traffic volumes, traffic safety, and structural inadequacy; and

"Whereas the completion of the Interstate System from Federal funds would permit the more rapid correction of the remaining deficiencies on the public streets and highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation for the completion of the Interstate System within the shortest feasible period of time, and that such legis-

lation should recognize the following principles:

"1. That the provisions for the Federal financing of the Interstate System should permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

"2. That the program for improving the Interstate System should not interfere with the orderly allocation of funds for the other Federal aid systems of highways.

"3. That the formula for the allocation of additional funds among the various States for improvement of the Interstate System should be based upon the needs for improvement of that system in the various States, and that such formula should be made definite and certain, so that the various States may plan and construct said Interstate System as rapidly as possible in an orderly manner.

"4. That the provisions requiring States to match Federal funds for the improvement of the Interstate System should not require a greater outlay by the States for such system than was required in amount to match the 1956 allocations for that system under the 1954 Federal Highway Act.

5. That for the preparation of the plans and specifications of projects, their priority, and the handling of the construction work be substantially as has previously been provided under existing Federal aid legislation.

"6. That if credit is to be given to any State by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the Interstate System, the legislation be so drafted that such credits be taken into consideration in computing the allocation formula, so that no delays will result while such credits are being computed; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A resolution adopted by Long Island Council, No. 197, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Francisco Cepero, of Santurse, P. R., praying for a redress of grievances in his claim against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REDEMPTION OF UNUSED DUCK HUNTING STAMPS—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased today to hear from the secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association endorsing legislation for redemption of unused duck-hunting stamps which are stocked by hardware dealers purely as a service to sportsmen, but which at the conclusion of the season may result in considerable losses to these dealers because under existing law there is no refund from the Post Office Department. I believe that the association has made a good point in bringing this issue to the fore.

My State of Wisconsin is a great center of outdoor pursuits, particularly hunting and fishing, and I feel it is only reasonable to ask the Federal Government's cooperation in serving the great United States outdoor movement.

I present Mr. Lewis' letter, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred for prompt and favorable action, I trust, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Stevens Point, Wis., April 25, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: Hardware merchants, that is many of them, sell duck-hunting stamps for the convenience of sportsmen. However, they do so at the financial risk of having purchased stamps from the post office, some of which remain unsold at the end of the hunting season and for which they cannot, under existing law, get refunds.

Many of our members desire to be of service to sportsmen by making it convenient for them to be supplied with the necessary hunting stamps.

We do not believe that they should be penalized for carrying out this useful service.

There has been introduced House bill H. R. 5256 by Congressman O'HARA of Minnesota and referred to the House Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries and Senate bill S. 1658 introduced by Senator THYE, of Minnesota, and referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

These bills provide that "the Postmaster General shall provide by regulations for the redemption on or before the 30th day of June of each fiscal year of any such unused stamps issued for such year which have been sold to retail dealers for resale to their customers and have not been resold by such dealers."

We hope that you will find it possible to support these bills and would appreciate it very much if you contacted members of the respective committees to which such bills were referred.

Yours very truly,

H. A. LEWIS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (without amendment):

S. 1398. A bill to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (Rept. No. 268).

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (without amendment):

S. 1133. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema (Rept. No. 269).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (with amendments):

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation (Rept. No. 270).

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH NATO REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. 267)

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, pursuant to section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, submitted a report on the proposed agreement between the parties of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for cooperation regarding atomic information, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1886. A bill to provide for the retrocession of jurisdiction over Ellis Island, and the conveyance of all interest of the United States in such island, to the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1887. A bill for the relief of Lenora Yenovkian; and

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Cesare Picco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangeline Vega Shockley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1890. A bill to authorize John R. Quigley to construct and maintain a sign, 50 feet by 30 feet, on certain property of the United States in Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1891. A bill to amend section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that in certain cases leaf tobacco shall not be considered an agricultural commodity for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers under subsection (b) (6) of such section; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1892. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Harold D. Robison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) (by request):

S. 1894. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1895. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1896. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1897. A bill for the relief of Gosta Harry Roner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1898. A bill to allow a credit of $7 against the manufacturers' excise tax in the case of ultra high frequency television receiving sets; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1899. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Commission to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF ELLIS ISLAND TO STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the return to the State of New York of jurisdiction over Ellis Island and for the conveyance to the State of all interest of the United States in such island, for the purpose of establishing and operating thereon a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics. An identical bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ST. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a brief statement concerning the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1886) to provide for the retrocession of jurisdiction over Ellis Island, and the conveyance of all interest of the United States in such island, to the State of New York, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR IVES

For many years, the Federal Government has operated an immigration center on Ellis Island in the harbor of New York City for the reception, care, custody, and processing of persons immigrating into the United States. Recently the Federal Government abandoned the use of Ellis Island for these purposes, and we are advised that the properties and facilities are no longer being operated or maintained by the Federal Government and will inevitably become obsolete and valueless for any purpose.

The New York State Legislature, by a concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly, has memorialized the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for chronic alcoholics. The New York State Legislature believes that Ellis Island is ideally suitable for and can be readily converted into a well-equipped clinic which could be operated and maintained by either the State of New York or jointly by both the State and the city of New York.

This bill, if enacted, would permit the establishment of a much-needed facility which could do much to alleviate the serious problem of alcoholism. Therefore, we urge its favorable consideration.

REPEAL OF MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON MOTORCYCLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles. I ask unanimous consent that an explantory statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1896) to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The motorcycle industry in this country is a sick industry. In the 8 years, 1947–54, the industry as a whole showed profits before taxes in only 2 years, 1947 and 1948. In 1954 the entire industry operated at a loss.

If the commonly accepted business test of profits of sales is applied to this industry, the results are appalling: In 1951 it was 1.8 percent; in 1952 it was minus 0.2 percent; in 1953 an insignificant fraction of 1 percent; in 1954 it was minus 2.7 percent. (In industry generally the average profit to sales is around 10 to 12 percent before income taxes.)

In recent years the excise tax on motorcycles and motorcycle accessories and parts has ceased to be a revenue measure and has become a capital levy:

In 1951, when the industrywide profits before income taxes were $318,451, the 3 companies, nevertheless, paid $1,036,744 in excise taxes.

In 1953, when the "profit" before income taxes was $5,027, the industry, nevertheless, was required to pay $1,147,816 in excise taxes.

In 1949, 1952, and 1954 the industry paid a total of $3,326,057 in excise taxes—in the very years when it was operating at a loss.

And in 1954, at a time when every manufacturer operated at a loss, the industry was obliged to pay $1,018,784 in excise taxes.

The dilemma which confronts the motorcycle industry is this: (a) Domestic sales have been shrinking steadily (a 61 percent decline since 1947) but (b) foreign competition is finding the domestic market increasingly attractive—for instance: in 1954 foreign imports were 18,276 units (an increase of 81 percent in 5 years. Compare this figure with 1954 United States production of 23,525 units. Note that foreign imports were only 5,249 units short of the total domestic production).

The domestic industry faces 2 handicaps on foreign imports: (a) There is a built-in favorable price differential of between 25 and 30 percent on foreign motorcycles which the domestic industry cannot overcome because of the lower foreign wage rates; and (b) the excise tax plays directly into the hands of the foreign competition by swelling the domestic retail price to the further sales detriment of the American product.

Elimination of the excise tax would better enable the motorcycle industry to withstand foreign competition. The insignificant loss in excise revenues to the Treasury would be recouped by the larger corporate taxes by the motorcycle industry restored to economic health.

IMPROVEMENT OF AMITE RIVER, LA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1899) to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

For some time it has been apparent that the tremendous industrial development in the vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., had overtaxed the facilities of the area and subjected the residents to the danger of flood damage any time rains of an unusually heavy nature were experienced. In an attempt to determine whether or not a Federal project was economically justified to remedy this condition, the Corps of Engineers was authorized to look into the matter and began a study as far back as 1951. Since that time, with funds authorized by the Congress, public hearings have been held and a detailed survey initiated. That survey is scheduled for completion and submission to the Chief of Engineers through proper channels by the end of May.

Only recently, severe property damage in the Baton Rouge area was averted by the absence of local rains following heavy rains in the drainage area above. This latest threat has demonstrated the complete inability of the Amite River and its tributaries, the Comite River and Bayou Manchac, to handle the flood control and drainage problem of this section of Louisiana without improvement designed to increase their capacity and their ability to carry out flood waters at a more rapid rate.

Due to the limited time schedule that will be available following the further handling of this report by the Chief of Engineers and feeling confident that the report that will be issued by the Chief of Engineers will be a favorable one, I am introducing a bill at this time to provide for the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries as a means of providing needed protection to the residents of Louisiana in the general vicinity of Baton Rouge.

There is no doubt in my mind that this project will be amply justified economically. Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin has advised me that the report will leave the New Orleans district office by the end of this month and that he would handle it with top priority. If it is at all possible, we would like to have the project authorized at this session and hasten the day when the people from this section of Louisiana will be free from this constant flood menace.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN DOMESTIC MINERALS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 4, 1955, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduced the bill (S. 922) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], be added as cosponsors the bill, the next time it is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., wre ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by him before annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Loyalty Day address delivered by him at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day program in Oskosh, Wis., on Saturday, April 30, 1955.

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this week is Mental Health Week, which is being observed in more than 10,000 communities throughout the United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Philippines.

Connecticut was a pioneer in the fight against mental illness. Forty-seven years ago this week the first citizens' group in the world to aid in the cure of mental illness and to educate people on the importance of humanitarian treatment of the mentally ill was organized in my State.

As a United States Senator and as a director of the Connecticut Association for Mental Health, I urge the full support of Connecticut citizens and of citizens all over the United States in the fund-raising campaign being launched this week.

OPENING OF MILWAUKEE CEREBRAL PALSY CLINIC

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 8, there will occur an important event in the life of the Milwaukee community.

At that time will occur the formal dedication and cornerstone laying of a new $350,000 cerebral palsy clinic built by the Milwaukee County Kiwanis Foundation.

I congratulate the men of Kiwanis, the contributors to this fund, the doctors, civic leaders, business, labor, religious, and other groups who have helped so significantly in so many ways this outstanding effort.

The cerebral palsy clinic is one more in a golden link of humanitarian efforts spread across this Nation by the famous organization, United Cerebral Palsy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

No one who has ever seen a youngster (or for that matter, an adult) suffering from cerebral palsy, needs to be told of the importance of the remedial job being done by UCP in research, education, legislation, consultation and many other fields.

Fortunately, more and more progress is being made against cerebral palsy.

CONVENTION LAST NOVEMBER IN WASHINGTON

Last November, the fifth annual convention of UCP was held here in our Nation's Capital. It marked a significant milestone in the growth of this fine organization—UCP.

The convention heard addresses from outstanding medical leaders on various problems involved in prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation. It heard from grassroot leaders of UCP; from Karl K. Van Meter, UCP executive director; from Glidden L. Brooks, M. D.; UCP medical directors and from others.

It is often said that an institution is "but the lengthened shadow of one man." This is particularly true in his instance, for UCP is the lengthened shadow of its devoted president, Founder Leonard Goldenson, president of the American Broadcasting-United Paramount Theaters Co. He, with Mrs. Goldenson, received a well-deserved award for years and years of selfless efforts for the cerebral palsied. Although Mr. Goldenson has now tendered over his seal of the presidency of UCP, his heart and efforts remain with it.

As regards other phases of the fifth convention, it was addressed among others, by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. THYE, who, I am glad to say, subsequently reprinted his comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Entertainment was provided by Mrs. Jane Pickens Langley, UCP secretary and chairman of its entertainment committee who has worked so effectively, particularly on UCP's famous telethons.

An inspiring story of progress and a challenging report of tasks still ahead was related at the convention. Perhaps symbolic of achievements to date was the presentation of a 16 x 20 inch oil portrait of Mr. Goldenson painted by Mr. James D. Ensign of Oakland, Calif. Since Mr. Ensign has, however, been a cerebral palsy victim for 25 years and can move only the lower portion of his body, he achieved the almost unbelievable end product by simply using the toes of his left foot. This is the same Mr. Ensign who, in 1952, painted a faithful portrait of President Eisenhower which now hangs in the White House.

This amazing demonstration of man's conquest of a handicap represents the sort of spirit which has guided UCP so well that within the time period of but these few years, it has become an indispensable aid in the conquest of this affliction.

I am proud that Wisconsin, which has done fine work for UCP, will now be in a position to be a further pace-setter in treatment, thanks to the Milwaukee County Kiwanis Foundation. The new clinic, incidentally, is supported by Easter seal society.

I wish God-speed to the foundation and to UCP throughout the land. Countless parents and young folks throughout the Nation are indebted to it for giving to them hope in the future, hope for a brighter tomorrow.

THE PRAYER OF PARENTS

Many a grateful parent whose children fortunately are completely well, may say, "There but for the grace of God goes my child."

And the determined parents of handicapped children say, "There with the grace of God goes my palsied child, but he or she is going to be given every possible chance."

Fortunately, the fogs are lifting—the fog of ignorance, the fog of misunderstanding of this problem, the fog that leads some people mistakenly to underestimate the normal and in a great many instances, above-normal intelligences and abilities of palsied youngsters and adults.

So, here is wishing this UCP effort continued success in Milwaukee, in the District of Columbia (scene of a fine local chapter), and everywhere else.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to support H. R. 1. I am convinced that the Trade Agreements Act has assisted our general economy, has built up markets all over the world for American products and has given much employment to our workers. Its value to our farming community is of great concern. I feel that the existence of this increased foreign trade has prevented a disastrous economic slump, with all its ramifications.

I am not asking that destructive amendments be placed into the act, and I wish to see an effective and a strong reciprocal trade bill passed by the Senate. In most phases, I feel the committee has done an outstanding job in attempting to harmonize the real difficulties that apply in any such trade bill, dealing with the business of a nation whose production problems are so widespread and so diversified as are those of the United States today.

In considering foreign trade, I feel we all recognize that quality as well as quantity is important. The products of American factories are recognized by all Americans for their quality, their design, their nationally known trade names, and their general acceptability not only to the trade in the United States, but in the world as well.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Act, many high tariffs have been scaled down to permit competition from foreign goods. But in most of these cases in which we

concern ourselves the choice of the product, and its various qualities of trade acceptability insure a good deal of preference for the American product. If this were not true, then American products would not be commanding a premium scale in nearly every country of the world.

However, in the production of raw materials such as oil and lead and zinc, this preference for an American product does not exist either at home or abroad. A barrel of oil or a ton of zinc concentrates is the same the world over. There is no chance that because the product is of American origin, it will enjoy a preference for customers. This is not generally true in regard to manufactured products, and hence the exact comparison exists only as to the delivered price in this country.

It appears to me that one of the chief difficulties in regard to widespread disagreement on the bill relates primarily to raw materials. Our production of agricultural commodities must be protected here at home, and consequently strong powers are maintained to avoid flooding the American market with basic farm products.

This is necessary, since in order to support and maintain a reasonable price for farm products, these basic crops are under acreage allotments which reduce by 20 to 30 percent the number of acres a farmer may plant. It would be suicidal to open the doors to the world for the unlimited importation of these farm commodities when we have restricted production at home and still have ever-growing surpluses. Our strength in national defense depends on a healthy, sound agricultural economy.

The same rule applies in large part to the production of mineral resources. While we feel that imports up to a certain degree can be helpful in maintaining auxiliary supplies, certainly the unlimited importation of these raw materials would eventually weaken our defense capacity at home.

I am glad that the committee included in its amendments a provision giving the President the right, after investigation, to use quotas for such importations when he finds that such imports threaten to impair the national security.

This amendment is to subsection (b), section 7, and reads as follows:

> In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts.
>
> If on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

I feel that in reporting this amendment, the committee itself recognizes the validity of the case made by those of us who testified regarding the danger of excessive imports of petroleum, lead, zinc and other minerals. I wish I could feel that it is strong enough to protect the vital industries so indispensable for our national security and welfare.

It seems to me that while this amendment starts in the right direction, it falls short of giving such industries the assurance they need if they are to plan ahead, and develop production that will be vital to our actual defense needs in the event of all out war.

In the case of petroleum, the proration that exists in almost all the oil-producing States is clear proof that the oil industry has carried out its obligation to develop reserves far beyond our current peacetime needs. In my own State, our production capacity has increased greatly while our allowable production under State proration has steadily decreased. The same is true of almost all of the other 25 oil-producing States.

Thus, as our capacity to produce has been ever on the increase with the additional discovery of known and proven reserves, the allowable takings from oil wells has been decreased.

Last year Oklahoma's production, in spite of advancing productive capacity, was cut back by 16 million barrels from 1953. Our production of 186,349,000 barrels was the lowest since 1950. This was during a period when foreign imports of crude oil increased from 177,714,000 barrels to 239,479,000 barrels—a gain of 60 million barrels over that period.

I have just had word from the State regulatory authority in Oklahoma that production will be cut back again in the month of May by 20 percent from the production for April. This is indeed a serious blow to our entire oil production industry. State conservation regulation is necessary to prevent wastage of oil by the production of more than the pipelines and refineries in the midcontinent area can absorb. Storage above ground is not available, and it is wasteful to allow the wells to run more oil than the facilities in our area can absorb. The general maximum allowed for our wells is now down to 25 barrels by the present order.

I have also just had word that the State of Texas regulatory authorities were also forced to cut the oil production in that State. The cut will be 214,195 barrels a day.

Bear in mind that these reductions are ordered by the State regulatory bodies, and only because there is no market available for the oil supply that is shut in.

The estimates of the maximum efficient rate of production sustainable has been increasing in the United States year after year. This is the rate at which the industry could best produce and recover the maximum amount of our oil reserves.

This has grown from 7,300,000 barrels a day daily average in 1951 to 9,220,000 barrels in 1955. For the year 1956 it is estimated to be 9,720,000 barrels a day. Taking into consideration the natural depletion of existing wells, it shows that our capacity to produce at a sound rate is still on the increase.

The grave danger lies, however, in the fact that because of foreign oil imports this production must be cut back drastically. While in 1954 we had the productive capacity to produce economically 8,945,000 barrels of crude oil and natural gas liquids a day, we were allowed to produce only 7,027,000 barrels because that was all the market could absorb along with that brought in from abroad. Thus the production of 1,918,000 barrels a day was lost. This represented a shut-in of a total of 21.4 percent of our production.

These drastic cutbacks in production of available supply strike at every phase of life in the oil-producing States. They hit employment first as this depression in the oil production industry curtails drilling activities. Now more than 115 drilling rigs are stacked in Oklahoma. Each of these has a normal payroll of $800 a day. Not only is unemployment running at its highest point in recent years in the drilling industry, but the vital and valuable know-how of oil production is being lost as these trained and experienced crews drift off to work in other fields or in other businesses. The normal payroll for Oklahoma oil workers runs to nearly $242 million a year.

Oil pays a substantial share of State taxes in all of the oil-producing States. In Oklahoma the total is approximately $30 million—10 percent of our budget. It supports our schools and our small communities with the tax revenue. Our loss in State revenue this year will exceed $6 million because of curtailed production against the income we received in taxes last year.

Oklahoma will lose $40 million in gross income from oil that has been cutback this year and this loss will affect every branch of our business life. The same is true of almost all the other oil-producing States.

All this is happening while the foreign imports continue to climb year after year—as I have said, a total of more than 60 million barrels from 1950 to 1954. Last year the total annual imports again gained 3 million barrels.

Our objection to the bill is not in the lowering of tariffs—the usual problem in foreign trade. It goes to the allocation of the share of the American market that we can safely permit to be absorbed by imported oil. It would seem to me that the Neely amendment, which seeks to limit imports to a ratio of 10 percent of the domestic demand, offers the best assurance that we can accept foreign oil within safe limits to our own indispensable oil supply at home.

While tariff adjustments upward on lead, zinc, and other minerals might be helpful, they will not assist the United States in solving its problem on oil imports. Because of the vast difference in the high production costs at home and in the rich fields of the Middle East, a tariff would be useless.

Already oil has borne the brunt of tariff adjustments until today, for all practical purposes, it is virtually untaxed, so far as duty is concerned.

But it would be futile to apply tariff relief to the oil problem. The sharing of the market on a definite predetermined basis offers the best opportunity and in this way no increased tariffs are involved.

The proposal would not limit the importation of crude oil to a fixed amount, but the foreign producers would continue to share in increasing degree as the domestic market increased its demands.

But if the American production is to be continued to increase, if our search for oil on our own lands is to continue, something must be done to eliminate the disaster of unregulated and unpredictable imports. No industry can plan ahead in its production, in its search for oil, in its investment, if anytime their investment can be swept away because the ratio of imports is doubled or tripled. The Neely amendment would give us firm assurance that this could not happen.

Under the committee proposal the sole power to impose quotas rests in the hands of the President. What assurance have the producers throughout the 25 oil-producing States that the President will act under this provision, even though the importation of oil is drastically increased?

The members of the committee recognize the danger of this happening, but have stopped far short of giving the industry a chance to feel it has assurance of the 90–10 percent ratio sharing of the American market. Historically, this represents a not-too-great cutback in the imports, but its effect on the health of a vital, growing and expanding domestic oil-production industry would be tremendous.

The committee in including in its report the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy gives approval to the fact that oil imports at least should not exceed their current level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the portion of the President's Advisory Committee report dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.

Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

The committee recommends further that the desirable proportional relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national-defense requirements.

In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into consideration the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign-oil supplies both in peace and war.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we are concerned that, in case the President does not choose to act, the fantastic reserves of the seven major American companies in the Middle East could wreak havoc on the entire domestic oil-production industry.

The President had the power to act in increasing tariffs on lead and zinc. In fact, a unanimous report of the Tariff Commission recommended action under the hardship provisions of the act and suggested that moderate revisions be made in the duties on lead and zinc in order to relieve the hardship and the distressing unemployment in many communities because of the excessive imports.

This unanimous report of the Tariff Commission was turned down and a substitute of purchasing domestic production for stockpiling purposes was instituted. While this has helped to a very small degree, it is far short of the relief this mining industry needed to maintain its employment and production.

Thus, the independent petroleum industry is worried that the provision in the committee amendment will not be utilized in the discretion of the President, and that it may turn out to be only an empty gesture.

When we realize that the vast reserves owned by four American companies in the Middle East total 36 billion barrels—more than the presently known reserves of all the United States—we can realize the peril the independent producers find themselves faced with.

These sands are many, many times deeper and more productive than those usually found in the United States. Because of the great productive capacity of each well, few wells have to be drilled, because these oil companies deal only with the heads of the governments there—not with the hundreds or thousands of small landowners who, under the law, are entitled to have offset wells drilled in each field discovered.

Production costs are far lower and with the advent of bigger and bigger tankers this middle-eastern oil can be landed very cheaply at the eastern ports near our centers of large oil consumption. It would be expecting the impossible to assume that the giant oil companies which have these staggering reserves, and also have availability to cheap water transportation to the center of our market, would want to forego the profits to be made in their operation.

Even if they had such a desire, the antitrust laws would not permit them to combine for self-regulation. One large company increasing its shipments can force the others to match their imports. The pressures also exist from these middle-eastern countries to have ever-increasing amounts of oil exported in order to further strengthen their financial position.

In addition, there are far greater tax advantages accruing to the importing companies from this production. They have only to deal with the central foreign government, while the independents and even the major companies operating in the United States must pay all levies, Federal, State, county, and local taxes.

Finally, Mr. President, it would seem to me that the frequently heard and logical argument for more liberal trade policies, that America has nothing to fear from foreign competition, does not and cannot apply to the present oil situation.

We are not competing with the engineers, the geologists, the petroleum production men of Saudi Arabia or Iraq or Kuwait. We are in fact competing with ourselves.

We are competing with the best and the finest that the domestic oil industry has produced in the way of men, engineers, equipment, capital, and know-how. We are competing with all the great American success stories in finding and producing oil and in getting it to market at the cheapest possible cost.

Every one of these giant companies made its money in American oil, and owes its great success to the fields in this Nation. Now, by transplanting this efficiency and effectiveness into areas where nature has endowed the lands with oil-bearing sands hundreds of feet thick, the problem of America's survival as a major oil producing nation is threatened.

Certainly we should and must accept oil from abroad. But it would seem to me that a ratio must be established somewhere unless we are to see an ever-declining activity at home in this vital defense resource. The Neely Amendment offers a chance to hold this ratio of imports to 10 percent of domestic demand so that our search for undiscovered oil in America can continue to go forward.

In conclusion, let me make reference to one fallacy I have heard many Senators discuss. They say that if we import more and more oil we will save the oil reserves remaining in this Nation.

That theory, Mr. President, is gross oversimplification. Our resources in oil will increase only as they are used. The economic production of our domestic fields means more and more money for additional exploration and search for oil. To rely on heavier and heavier imports of oil would cause a drying up of new sources, and end of exploration and development of new fields.

Thus if imports continue to increase in an ever-increasing flood, we will be caught short at home for a reliable expandable and producible reserve supply for national defense. The more profitable our oil-producing industry is at home, the greater and greater will be the added reserves we discover and develop. There is proof positive that this is true, since despite the great demands made on the domestic petroleum industry to provide oil for World War II and the Korean war, our known reserves of supplies have been ever increasing.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to limit the oil imports in 10 percent of the domestic demand, and again place the oil industry here at home on such a basis that we may always have an available and accessible supply of oil for our uses whether in peace or in war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Nevada is prepared to call up his amendment.

MALONE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE—FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION VERSUS FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 1. I ask that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MALONE to the bill (H. R. 1) is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

"(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

"(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

"(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

"(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

"(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

"RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

"ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"'SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"'(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"'(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"'(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"'(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act.'

"PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"'(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"'(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"'(1) The lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"'(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"'(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"'(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"'(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"'(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"'(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"'(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"'(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"'(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"'(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"'(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"'(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"'(i) For the purpose of this section—

"'(1) the term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"'(2) the term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"'(3) the term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"'(4) the term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a con-

sumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"'(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"'(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

"SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word 'President' and substituting therefor the words 'Tariff Commission.'

"(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry.'

"(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist.'

"STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

"SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final.'

"REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

"SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding the provisions of section 101, title I, of the Customs Smiplification Act of 1954.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 11. This act shall take effect as of June 12, 1955."

H. R. 1 WRONG IN PRINCIPLE—DISRUPTIVE IN EFFECTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to be extended by H. R. 1 sets industry against industry, workingmen's group against workingmen's group, investors against investors. One industry, group, or interest may be preserved while another industry, group, or interest may be traded off and sacrificed for some real or fancied political preferment. That is the policy embodied in the act and bill. It is a policy wrong in principle and disruptive in its effects. The bill which is before the Senate, H. R. 1, will help foreigners and will hurt Americans.

FREE TRADE AND BREAD TO THE UNEMPLOYED

Tuesday's newspapers carried two important stories. One reports President Eisenhower's address before the United States Chamber of Commerce urging further power to reduce duties on imports. The other tells of plans to distribute bread to the unemployed in the Nation's distressed areas.

Mr. President, I think the two stories are related. President Eisenhower, in his address, conceded that the trade program will spell some dislocations and require concessions, some of which will be a bit painful. He says it will connect an increasing and growing, widely shared prosperity at home with international peace. I am quoting Tuesday's Washington Post and Times Herald and Monday's Star.

The other story reports the House Agriculture Committee's approval of "a bill providing for the conversion of surplus grain into flour and cereal for free distribution to needy families in distress areas of the Nation."

FOODS DOLED TO UNEMPLOYED LISTED

I quote several paragraphs from the news article:

Representative PAT JENNINGS, Democrat of Virginia, author of the bill, reported during the committee hearings that families of some unemployed coal miners in his district are not getting enough to eat.

"What are they eating," inquired Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican of Minnesota.

"They're living on free cheese, dried milk, beans, rice, butter, and shortening," JENNINGS replied.

The free flour, cornmeal, and oatmeal would be made available in areas where the Labor Department finds unemployment to be more than 6 percent.

IMPORTS FROM LOW-WAGE NATIONS CAUSE OF HUNGER AND DISTRESS

Of course, as I have pointed out on the Senate floor many times, a primary cause of distress and unemployment in the United States are imports from low-wage foreign nations resulting from the 1934 trade program we are being asked to extend.

THE RUSSIAN WAY

Mr. President, yesterday I discussed the bill which had been introduced by Senators HUMPHREY and KENNEDY to compensate unemployed men who lose their positions through these imports, to compensate investors for the loss of their investments, and to pay transportation of unemployed workers to other areas where they might be able to secure employment.

Mr. President, that is the Russian way; that is not the American way.

H. R. 1 will put more profits into the pockets of foreign producers while Congress considers legislation to put bread into the mouths of unemployed and hungry American families.

Since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was enacted we have had two foreign wars, suffered 1,190,000 casualties, of whom 318,668 were killed, and seem to be on a permanent war economy which has brought our Federal debt to around $280 billion.

We have poured out $100 billion in dollar aid to foreign nations. To this dollar aid we have added American jobs and markets, and H. R. 1 proposes to hand over to foreign nations more of our American jobs and markets in the name of international peace.

CAKE FOR FOREIGNERS; BREADLINES FOR AMERICANS

H. R. 1 will provide cake for foreign producers while America's unemployed eat bread, doled out by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, the 1952 Republican platform pledged that trade agreements "will be entered into and maintained on a basis of true reciprocity and to safeguard our domestic enterprises and the payrolls of our workers against unfair import competition."

REPUBLICAN-DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS 1856 TO 1948

Later in my address I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD a compilation of the Republican platforms from 1856 to 1942, and also the Democratic platforms from 1856 to 1952.

For a century of time the Republican platforms have advocated a duty or tariff to equalize the cost of production between our wage-standard of living and that in the chief competitive nation on each product—for that length of time the Democratic platform has advocated a free trade program.

There is and has been no true reciprocity.

NO SAFEGUARDS TO PAYROLLS AND INVESTMENTS IN H. R. 1

There are no safeguards to domestic enterprises or to the payrolls of our workers against unfair import competition. There are no safeguards in the pending bill. Every decision is to be left to the Executive. Any questions with reference to the peril point, the escape clause, or import quotas, are to be left to the decision of one man, who will delegate authority to the State Department, which is comprised of those who have been free traders from the start, and one-economic-worlders for 22 years.

POWER DELEGATED TO GATT 3,000 MILES AWAY

From there where is the power delegated? It is handed over to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, 3,000 miles away, where the representatives of 33 nations sit with the representative of the United States of America and decide on multilateral trade agreements which will destroy the American workingman and the American investor.

A CENTURY-OLD POLICY ABANDONED

The Republican principle of safeguarding industries, payrolls, and investments, a key principle of the party for a century of time, will simply have been abandoned if Congress passes this bill.

Abraham Lincoln's 1860 platform and the 1952 Republican platform will have been abandoned.

President Lincoln's platform—and the Republican platform of 1860—read:

That while providing revenue for the support of the general Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.

CONGRESS TO THE PRESIDENT TO GENEVA GATT

There was nothing said about placing the authority in the hands of one man, who would thus be enabled to trade or to bargain away any part of the domestic economy, or to dry up any part of the United States of America for a foreign political consideration.

That is exactly what H. R. 1 implies, and that is what its sponsors would like to do.

LINCOLN'S 1860 PLATFORM

We commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence.

THE HOAX OF "RECIPROCAL TRADE" AND "TRADE, NOT AID"

That was the Lincoln platform. Subsequent platforms renewed that pledge, until the hoax of so-called reciprocal trade was invented by London bankers, just as the slogan "trade, not aid" was invented in 1952 by Mr. R. A. Butler, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain. That is just one more catch phrase which has been foisted upon the American people and the Republicans in Congress. The term "reciprocal trade" is a fiction. There has never been reciprocal trade, and there never will be, so long as American industries and workers are manipulated as pawns in the game of international politics.

FREE TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Today the foreign trade policy seems to be this: "It is going to hurt, but it will be all right in the end."

Some industries are to be taken to the woodshed and whipped, but it will make our foreign friends happy, and making them happy will advance international peace. That is the theory, and it is a ridiculous theory, as history has proved.

At least this administration is being honest about it, which cannot be said for its predecessors.

Secretary of State Dulles told the Senate Finance Committee on March 15, 1955:

I do not think you can have imports without some damage, and if your rule is that you will not have imports or tariff reductions or sustain them if there is any damage to anybody, then I think it is unworkable.

MR. DULLES VERSUS 1952 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

I commended Mr. Dulles upon the frankness of his testimony. Mr. Dulles was honest about it, but what he saw is not what the 1952 Republican platform says. It says that our domestic enterprises and the payrolls of our workers are to be safeguarded against unfair import competition.

Such a circumstances would be "unworkable," according to Mr. Dulles. I prefer the Republican platform.

H. R. 1 FOREIGN POLICY BILL, NOT TRADE BILL

H. R. 1 is not a trade bill; it is a foreign policy bill, and was so construed by Mr. Dulles in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, who feared "international repercussions" and "grave" consequences if safeguards were added to the bill. No safeguards of any consequence have been added.

Industries have been hurt and industries will be hurt by this bill and its principal administration proponents admit it.

For nearly 5 weeks the Senate Finance Committee heard testimony from industry and labor spokesmen who cited specific statistics and information on how they are being hurt. Similar testimony was offered before the Ways and Means Committee.

This bill disregards all of their testimony and data. The attitude seems to be they need not worry about what happens to them or their employees. Whatever happens, the Government will give them bread, or at least cornmeal.

FOREIGN NATIONS NEVER RECIPROCATE

The Republican platform said that any trade agreements entered into would be maintained on a basis of reciprocity. Let us see how our foreign friends have reciprocated.

Thirty-two of them have raised their tariffs on products from the United States. They will be found listed in my minority report on H. R. 1.

Sixty-eight require import licenses on American products generally, and 9 others on some products, or a total of 77.

Thirty-eight require exchange permits.

FOREIGN TRADE BARRIERS DOCUMENTED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of foreign control regulations applying to imports from the United States, prepared by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the Department of Commerce, and published in the Department's Foreign Commerce Weekly of February 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN CONTROL REGULATIONS APPLYING TO IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES

The following tabulation of import and exchange permits required in foreign countries, prepared by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce as an aid to exporters, has been revised as of January 1, 1955.

These regulations apply primarily to goods of United States origin and to other goods payable in United States dollars.

In many countries foreign goods may not be imported unless they are covered by import licenses, which must be obtained by the importer. In some cases the import licenses must be granted before the order for goods is placed. In various countries the importer also is required to obtain an exchange permit before payment for the import may be made.

United States exporters therefore are advised to make certain before shipping that the importer has obtained the required permit. Exporters should insist on being informed as to the identifying number or symbol of the document.

More detailed information on licensing and exchange controls may be obtained from the field offices of the United States Department of Commerce. Publications covering licensing and exchange controls of individual countries also are available from the field offices at a nominal charge.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Afghanistan	No; but a declaration or customs permit must be obtained from border officials.	No; but permission to remit foreign exchange to exporters abroad must be obtained from the Government bank.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	Yes	Yes.
Arabian Peninsula areas:		
Saudi Arabia	No; except for International Wheat Agreement (IWA) shipments.	No; except for IWA shipments.
Aden, Bahrein, Qatar, Trucial Oman	Yes	Yes.
Kuwait, Muscat, and Oman, Yemen	No	No.
Argentina	No; except for certain products subject to import quota	Yes; permit granted only for listed products. Application should be filed prior to confirmation of purchase order.
Australia	Yes	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Austria	Yes; for most commodities	Yes.
Belgium-Luxembourg	Yes; either a regular import license or a declaration license	No separate permit required.
Belgian Congo	Yes; combination import license and exchange authorization is required for all imports except shipments valued at $100 or less, provided goods are not intended for resale.	Yes.
Bolivia	Yes; copy of permit or its number must be given to consul to obtain legalization of documents.	No; import license authorizes purchase of exchange but is not a guaranty that exchange will be granted.
Brazil	Yes	No; exchange for imports is sold at auction.
British colonies, not specified elsewhere [1]	Yes	Yes; import license generally assures release of foreign exchange.

[1] Includes Bermuda, British West Indies, British East Africa, British West Africa, British Guiana, British Honduras, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and minor colonies, protectorates, and trusteeship territories.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Bulgaria	Yes	Import license automatically assures foreign exchange.
Burma	Yes; except for Government imports	Yes.
Cambodia	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Canada	No; except for a few commodities	No.
Ceylon	Yes; either a general license for commodities under open general license. or an individual license for other commodities.	Yes.
Chile	Yes; must be obtained prior to shipment of goods and copy must be sent to exporter.	Yes; in form of notation on import license.
Colombia	Import license takes the form of registry certificate issued without quota or other form o restrictions. In addition, certain food products and raw materials are subject to a prior import license from the Ministries of Agriculture and Development.	No; registry certificate carries the right to foreign exchange.
Costa Rica	No	Yes; for imports with official exchange. No permit required for imports with free-market exchange.
Cuba	No; except for wheat and wheat flour, rice, tires and tubes, red and pink beans, potatoes, condensed milk, and butter.	No.
Czechoslovakia	Yes	Import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange.
Denmark	Yes: with few exceptions	Yes; for goods subject to license, copy of license with customs certification of importation takes place of exchange license.
Dominican Republic	No: except for wheat and wheat flour, rice, fertilizers, radio transmission apparatus.	No; but all applications for foreign exchange require Government approval, which is granted automatically for bona fide commercial transactions.
Ecuador	Yes; one copy must be presented in order to obtain consular legalization of prescribed documents.	No; import license carries the right to foreign exchange (Central Bank of Ecuador).
Egypt	Yes; unlicensed imports are subject to confiscation	Yes.
El Salvador	No	No.
Ethiopia	No: except on products subject to export license in country of origin.	Yes.
Finland	Yes	No separate permit required; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
France	Yes; obtainable for essentials only	No separate permit required; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
French oversea territories, not elsewhere specified, except French Somaliland.	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
French Somaliland	No	No.
Germany, Federal Republic (including Western Berlin).	Yes; also procurement authorization except for items on dollar import free list.	Yes; import and payments license combined on 1 document.
Germany, Soviet-occupied zone	Yes; the Government monopolies for foreign trade are the only importers.	Yes.
Greece	No; except for a few luxury items	No; but applications for foreign exchange must be approved by the authorities who determine whether imports will be financed by procurement authorizations of the Foreign Operations Administration or by the dollar resources of the Bank of Greece.
Guatemala	No; except for wheat and wheat flour, strong boxes, and certain safety vault doors.	No.
Haiti	No; except for wheat quota imports and tobacco products	No.
Hashemite Jordan Kingdom	Yes	Yes.
Honduras	No; except for alcohol	No.
Hong Kong	Yes; for dutiable, strategic, or short supply goods	No.
Hungary	Yes	Yes.
Iceland	Yes; except for items on special conditional free list and a limited number of staples.	Yes; except for special conditional free list imports.
India	Yes; either a general license for commodities under open general license, or an individual license for other commodities.	Yes; however, foreign exchange is automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Indonesia	Yes	No separate permit required; combined import license-foreign exchange permit necessary.
Iran	Yes; but only to release goods from Customs; prospective imports must come within annual or supplemental quotas.	Yes.
Iraq	Yes; goods exported before license is obtained are confiscated	Yes; permits are obtained through licensed dealers.
Ireland	For a few products only	Yes.
Israel	Yes	Yes; import license usually carries right to foreign exchange.
Italy	Yes; from Italian Exchange Office except for list A goods (mostly industrial raw materials which require only bank benestare).	No separate permit required.
Japan	Yes	Some commodities as announced by Japanese Government from time to time, require allocation certificate; in other cases import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Korea, Republic of	Yes	Application for import license must be accompanied by certificate from Bank of Korea stating that applicant has sufficient foreign exchange cover on deposit.
Laos	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Lebanon	Yes	No.
Liberia	No; except for arms, ammunition, used clothing, pharmaceuticals, and rice.	No.
Malaya, Federation of	Yes; only certain items may be imported directly from hard-currency sources. Licenses to import nonsterling area goods via Hong Kong are issued provided certain exchange regulations are observed.	Yes; for direct imports. For imports from hard-currency areas via Hong Kong, no permit is necessary, but payment must be made in a sterling-area currency and shipment effected on a bill of lading issued in Hong Kong.
Mexico	Yes; for an extensive list of articles	No.
Morocco:		
French Zone	Yes; with exception of goods imported "sans devise," i. e., shipments financed by importer with his own funds held abroad.	Yes; except for goods imported "sans devise."
Spanish Zone	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Tangier (International Zone)	No	No.
Netherlands	Yes	No separate permit required.
Netherlands West Indies	No; except for certain luxury items	Yes.
New Zealand	Yes	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Nicaragua	Yes	No; import permit authorizes purchase of exchange.
Norway	Yes	No; foreign exchange is automatically made available in currency specified in import license.
Pakistan	Yes	Yes; however, foreign exchange is automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Panama	No; except for tomato paste, tanned cattle hides, wheat flour, baby chicks, hatching eggs; a few items are, however, subject to quota restrictions.	No.
Paraguay	No	Yes.
Peru	No	No.
Philippines, Republic of the	No	No permit as such; exchange allocated to importers semi-annualy for each of 5 classes of imports. Letters of credit opened against allocation considered as exchange licenses.
Poland	Yes	Yes.
Portugal, including the Azores and Madeira	Yes	Yes.
Portuguese Colonies	Yes	Yes.
Rumania	Yes	Yes.
Singapore	Yes; only certain items may be imported directly from hard-currency sources. Licenses to import nonsterling area goods via Hong Kong are issued provided certain exchange regulations are observed.	Yes; for direct imports. For imports from hard-currency areas via Hong Kong no permit is necessary, but payment must be made in a sterling area currency and shipment effected on a bill of lading issued in Hong Kong.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Spain, including the Canary Islands	Yes; limited largely to essential raw materials	Yes; special exchange rates are fixed for many import products.
Spanish Colonies	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Surinam	Yes	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Sweden	No; on majority of goods imported from United States; import license still required on such commodities as automobiles, coal, and certain agricultural products.	No separate permit required. Foreign exchange, including dollar exchange, is automatically made available if the import license specifies payment in such currency, and if the license is registered with a foreign exchange bank within 2 months after issuance.
Switzerland	Import licenses are required for certain agricultural products, various industrial raw materials, and some types of vehicles and machinery. Also, special import authorizations must be obtained for most animals and fowl, shellfish, and bees, beeswax, and honeycombs.	No.
Syria	Yes; for hard-currency imports	No.
Taiwan (Formosa)	Yes	No.
Thailand	Yes; except none for mining supplies	No; but a certificate of payment issued by Bank of Thailand or authorized bank of company is required.
Turkey	Yes	One application suffices for both import permit and exchange control purposes.
Union of South Africa, including Southwest Africa, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland.	Yes; with exception of few specified goods, all imports are subject to license. Imports from all countries of a long list of unessential items are subject to special licensing restrictions.	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange up to amount expressed in local currency in relevant import license.
United Kingdom	Yes; except some foodstuffs, raw materials, fertilizers, etc	Yes; granted automatically following issuance of import license.
Uruguay	Yes	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
U. S. S. R.	Yes; importing Government agencies are responsible for securing own permit.	Yes; all exchange is allocated by U. S. S. R. State Bank upon receipt of import license.
Venezuela	No; except for approximately 25 tariff items	No.
Vietnam	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Yugoslavia	No; individual import license abolished July 1, 1952; since that time only licensed import firms are allowed to carry on import operations.	No; but Government maintains strict control over foreign exchange allocations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, almost every trading nation on earth is imposing barriers to products from the United States, some nations, such as Great Britain, barring American goods entirely if like products are manufactured in their own country. But simultaneously, these countries are greedy for passage of H. R. 1, so they can unload their low-wage products on the United States. What American markets do these countries want?

The Wall Street Journal of February 2, 1955, gives a very informative answer in an article written by Washington correspondent Ray Cromley. The page 1, column 1, news article is headed "Europe Will Ask Many Cuts if Congress Hands Eisenhower New Powers—British Mention Whisky and Woolens—French Talk of Lace and Roquefort Cheese."

Apparently, Mr. President, we must drink more British whisky as the price of international peace.

Mr. Cromley's article begins:

> Europe's trade-hungry bureaucrats can hardly wait for Congress to vote President Eisenhower new tariff-cutting powers.

British, French, and Italian officials, he reports, already are drawing up new lists of United States duties they want cut.

Continuing with Mr. Cromley's Washington dispatch:

> At the British Embassy, trade experts mention the whisky, woolens, and cutlery industries that would be helped by lower United States tariffs.
>
> The Italians bring up synthetic textiles and Italian handicrafts like embroideries and hand-decorated china.
>
> The Frenchmen here wave their arms and talk about Roquefort cheese, laces from Lyons, candied cherries, and stockings.
>
> They're not alone. A commercial official at the German Embassy says: "We don't have a list yet. But be sure we'll have one ready, and a long one."
>
> A Belgian official here argues against fiddling with individual tariff cuts: He plugs for an across-the-board slash of United States duties on imports. But he notes that Belgium feels the need for United States tariff cuts on some important Belgian goods: crystalware, carpets, lace, shotguns, diamonds, and some metal products.
>
> Netherlands officials say their people are even now pushing in Geneva to get another big tariff-cutting conference going; the probable date—sometime this fall, say in October or November.
>
> If a new big tariff confab does get under way this fall, it will find these countries and 20 to 30 more all sniping at United States tariffs, and all armed with the argument—appealing to Mr. Eisenhower—that if we let them sell more here we can cut down on our aid abroad.
>
> Mr. Eisenhower's key officials in the State Department are already sold on the idea that United States tariffs must be cut further, and cut as drastically as the law will allow. The law would allow quite a bit if H. R. 1 passes Congress.

Mr. President, this is going to be a fine bill for the British whiskymakers, her manufacturers of woolens, and her cutlery craftsmen, but it is not a good bill for workers and investors in these industries in the United States. H. R. 1 spells injury and disaster to Americans, who in return for our largess to foreign producers are to be given handouts of oatmeal, cornmeal, and bread.

H. R. 1 will be a fine bill for French lacemakers and cheesemakers, but a bad bill for lacemakers and cheese producers in the United States.

H. R. 1 will be a fine bill for Italian manufacturers of textiles and china, but it is a bad bill for the unemployed textile workers of New England and the South, or the chinaware craftsmen in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and California.

H. R. 1 will be fine for the Belgian carpet and crystalware industry, but a bad bill for their American counterparts.

H. R. 1 is a bill to help foreigners by hurting Americans.

Mr. Cromley, in the article previously referred to, also discusses the probable tariff concessions to Japan—textiles, chinaware and pottery, fish, toys, sewing machines, and other goods.

Wages in Japan average 19 cents an hour. That is 19 cents more an hour than American workers will receive who are displaced by imports from Japan, but the American workers will be given bread or cornmeal, if legislation approved by the House Agriculture Committee is approved.

Europe's trade-hungry bureaucrats can hardly wait for Congress to vote President Eisenhower's new tariff-cutting powers, as Mr. Cromley puts it, but after the United States has waited for 22 years for Europe to cut some of its rates, here are the tariffs applied on some American products by some of those nations:

Automobiles: India, 63 percent; United Kingdom, 33⅓ percent; Japan, 30 to 40 percent; France, 15 to 30 percent.

Cotton manufacturers: United Kingdom, 15 to 30 percent; Germany, up to 30 percent; Italy, 15 to 25 percent; Indonesia, 18 to 30 percent; Canada, 15 to 27½ percent.

Grains: France, 15 to 30 percent; Germany, 15 to 20 percent; Norway, 22 percent; Sweden, 10 to 15 percent.

Machinery: Britain, 10 to 25 percent, when it can be imported at all, which is seldom; France, up to 30 percent; Italy, 5 to 40 percent; Japan, 15 to 30 percent.

Synthetic textiles: France, 20 to 35 percent; Italy, 25 percent; Belgium, 24 percent; Japan, 50 percent.

Labor rates in the 1952–53 period averaged $1.79—these are hourly rates—in the United States; 57 cents in Switzerland; 47 cents in the United Kingdom; 46 cents in France; 44 cents in West Germany; 35 cents in Italy; and, as stated before, 19 cents in Japan.

There is no idea of merely leveling the cost of production rates in this country. Those countries prohibit the imports of any products of the kind they manufacture, while we in America are talking about cutting wages to enable employers to stay in business.

H. R. 1 will not increase the wage rates in foreign countries, but will exert pressure on American industries to reduce American wage rates to the foreign level.

It will do this by forcing American wage earners to compete against the products of low-wage, foreign labor in

our own American market, and if they cannot so compete their only recourse—if H. R. 1 is enacted—will be to go on Secretary Benson's breadline.

H. R. 1—BONUS BILL FOR FOREIGN COMPETITORS

Mr. President, H. R. 1 is a bonus bill for foreign producers. It grants a 15-percent tariff bonus over a period of 3 years at the expense of American wage earners, investors, and taxpayers. There is not a solitary thing that any foreign producer need do to earn this handsome bonus. The bonus is to be given at the sacrifice of American jobs and investments. The foreign producer who is to get this bonus, if H. R. 1 is passed, gives nothing in return.

M'KINLEY'S FAMOUS SPEECH ON TARIFFS QUOTED

As a great President and a great Republican once pointed out in these Halls of Congress:

The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own.

He is not amenable to our laws. There are resulting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship.

He pays no taxes.

He performs no civil duties. He is subject to no demands for military service.

He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations.

He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and the glory of the Nation.

Why should he enjoy unrestrained, equal privileges and profits in our markets with our own producers, our labor, and our taxpayers?

That great Republican was William McKinley, 25th President of the United States, who followed in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. McKinley made his famous tariff speech many years before the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. When he spoke, the issue was whether foreign producers should enjoy equal privilege with our own.

FOREIGN PRODUCERS TODAY GIVEN PREFERENCE OVER AMERICANS

But today it is no longer a matter of equal privilege. Since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, foreign producers have enjoyed every advantage and every preference over our own producers in the markets of America, while retaining their own. Through quotas, imports, higher tariffs, and many other subterfuges, including the manipulation of the price of their own money, in terms of the United States dollar, foreign producers have been subsidized. Both their industries and their profits are guaranteed by American aid and American trade concessions.

Today, the foreign producer is king, while the American producer is forgotten. So has the principle of fair and equal competition, embodied in our tariff laws prior to 1934, been forgotten.

PROTESTS POUR IN FROM STATE LEGISLATURES, PATRIOTS

Abandonment of this historic principle has evoked resolutions of protest from State legislatures, political organizations, patriotic organizations, industry associations, and labor unions.

The American Mining Congress adopted such a resolution at its last national convention. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the resolution on tariffs adopted by the American Mining Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN TRADE

At the annual convention of the American Mining Congress held at San Francisco, Calif., September 20–24, 1954, the following declaration of policy was made on tariffs:

"TARIFFS

"Experience has shown that we cannot depend on foreign ore reserves as a source of supply in an emergency, however important it may be to import some metals and minerals to supplement domestic production and to fill our stockpile with materials in which we are deficient. World political conditions, as well as hazards of possible air and submarine warfare, support this conclusion.

"We recommend, therefore, that Congress exercise its authority over tariffs to be administered for the welfare of the American people and provide reasonable tariff protection. In this connection we commend the United States Tariff Commission for its careful study and complete report to the Congress as well as its recommendations to the President on the industry's application for increased lead and zinc duties.

"We commend the Members of the United States Congress who worked tirelessly to secure the approval of the Tariff Commission's recommendation. It is regrettable that the President did not see fit to accept the Commission's recommendations. His alternative program, while having certain desirable features, is at best a stopgap solution and does not offer any real long-range cure to the problem of the domestic mining industry.

"We favor the enactment of an excise tax on imports of lead and zinc, as well as other metals and minerals with similar problems, which may be suspended whenever prices are at an economic level that will permit the domestic mining industry to maintain an adequate mobilization base for national security.

"Since the executive department of the Government has not seen fit over the past years to adhere to the purposes of the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, we favor removing the authority of the executive department to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations and favor the placing of such responsibility for approving or disapproving the recommendations in the hands of the Congress where the constitutional authority rests. We also favor allowing the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, to expire on June 12, 1955.

"The United Nations has established a Commission for International Commodity Trade. This Commission is empowered to recommend agreements to member countries such as those provided in chapter VI of the Habana Charter, which was rejected by the Congress of the United States. We commend the State Department for its vigorous opposition to the formation and constitution of this new United Nations Commission. The powers of this Commission are far greater than those of the now disbanded International Materials Conference, which we strongly opposed. We have not changed our position with respect to international commodity agreements, and, accordingly, we oppose any United States participation in this new United Nations Commission, or in any new international commodity agreements which may be sponsored by the Organization of American States."

DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION CONDEMN FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on April 22, 1955, the Daughters of the American Revolution, at their 64th continental congress, meeting at Constitution Hall in this city, adopted a resolution condemning the trade-agreements program as an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of the Government upon the constitutional responsibility of Congress, and urging termination of the program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the resolution referred to, adopted less than 2 weeks ago by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Their being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Whereas the reciprocal trade-agreements program represents an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of our Government upon the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas as a result of reduction of tariffs under the reciprocal trade-agreements program various industries important to our healthy economy and strong national defense have been injured or forced out of business with consequent injury to and loss of jobs by the American workingmen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) to expire June 12, 1955, and upon its expiration, the Congress should assume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission.

NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE ASKS 1934 TRADE ACT EXPIRE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Nevada State Legislature at its recent session memorialized the Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1955, "so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the Constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods."

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this important resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1955, so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada is aware of the fact that the selective so-called free trade policy, adopted by the State Department of the United States under the provisions of the trade agreements act of 1934, is lowering the American living standard through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline of the demand for minerals, agricultural products and other commodities produced in the State of Nevada; and

Whereas the indiscriminate lowering of import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential between the costs of production

due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and foreign competitive nations, has a demoralizing effect on the mining and agricultural markets of this country and thereby causes unemployment and loss of labor; and

Whereas the State of Nevada is in a particularly vulnerable position in attempting to compete with foreign sweatshop labor because the products produced in Nevada, such as livestock, wool, tungsten, lead, zinc, copper, magnesite, chemicals, manganese, mercury, silicon, and many others, are readily importable at a lower cost from sources outside of this country under the so-called reciprocal trade act, all to the great detriment and economic hardship of this State; and

Whereas many mining companies in the State of Nevada are practically shut down and almost all of the zinc miners are out of work and the cattle industry is being endangered because our ranchers cannot compete with the importation of hides, beef or live cattle from Argentina or Mexico; and

Whereas the haphazard lowering of the floor under wages and investments represented by the tariffs and import fees destroys American workingmen and shifts their jobs to foreign soil; and, as a result, many of our mines, mills and factories have been closed and our farm production saved only by subsidies; and

Whereas those industries which depend upon the power of Hoover Dam and Davis Dam are in danger because similar products are being imported at a price less than production costs in this State; and

Whereas the Nevada wool industry has found it impossible to compete with the importation of wool from Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere; and, for the first time, the wool industry of Nevada is only being saved from destruction by the use of subsidies; and

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living that world trade should only be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and based on the principle that foreign products produced by underpaid labor should not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standard of our workers, farmers, and miners; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the constitution of the United States requires that Congress should lay duties, imposts, and excises and regulate foreign commerce, but the Congress of the United States has abrogated its constitutional duties by virtue of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 by transferring the duty of fixing tariffs to the executive department of the Government which has, in turn, carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce; and

Whereas the free trade policies fostered by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act have resulted in our dependence upon foreign nations across one or both major oceans for many of the materials and minerals which we would need to fight a war and to prepare our own defense and thus stifled the initiative to explore, develop and produce such needed materials in our own country; and after having become dependent on foreign sources for critical materials the foreign countries have been able to cause us great embarrassment by manipulation of export permits and fees so that we must bow to their demands and submit to international blackmail; and

Whereas the United States has in the last several decades only been able to prosper because of war or the threat of war and under this cover of war the industrially inexperienced State Department has been wrecking the national economy by the simple expedient of tampering with tariff or import fees so as to open the door to foreign commodities, which in turn prevents the flow of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation even in time of emergency since investors know that when the emergency is over their investment will be destroyed through foreign sweatshop labor competition; and

Whereas it is mandatory to the future economical growth and development of this country, and Nevada in particular, that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act be allowed to expire on June 12, 1955, so that Congress can immediately recover its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the adjustment of tariffs and import fees, and with such an expiration of the act the so-called trade agreements already made and in effect will in no way be affected but will continue in effect for their full terms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the legislature of the State of Nevada most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to stop the dreadful deterrent to American economic well-being and the lowering of our standard of living and that it return to its traditional and constitutional method of fixing tariffs based on the principle of protecting American industry, agriculture, and commerce by allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire by its own force and limitation on June 12, 1955; and be it further

Resolved, That until the expiration of the agreement, the Department of State should exercise its powers in fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution until such time as the responsibility for regulating foreign commerce be vested where it belongs, in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States after June 12, 1955, should set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized and experienced tariff commission functioning much in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission so that the market for foreign goods in this country would be based on a fair and reasonable competition with our own agricultural, industrial and mining production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada, be promptly transmitted by him to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, and to the United States Senators and Congressman from Nevada.

NEVADA-IDAHO LEGISLATURES JOINED IN PREVIOUS PROTEST

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, previously the Legislature of the State of Nevada and the Legislature of the State of Idaho at their 1953 sessions each adopted joint resolutions deploring the effects of the administration's free-trade program on their metal-mining industries, and charged that "propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in the have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, be abandoned."

Both State legislatures also memorialized the Congress to replace the trade-agreements program with a sliding scale stabilization import tax to protect our national economy, develop our natural resources, and in the interest of national security.

I ask unanimous consent that there be placed at this point in the RECORD the two resolutions referred to above.

There being no objection, the two resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA RESOLUTION

Following is a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Nevada during its 1953 session:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

"Whereas the base-metal-mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the domestic lead-and-zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Nevada, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Nevada but not produced in Nevada; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production of metals and minerals to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each Member of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

IDAHO RESOLUTION

The Legislature of the State of Idaho, at its last session, held during this administration, adopted Senate Joint Memorial 7, protesting foreign dumping and policies destructive to the American mining industry.

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas the base mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries creating an unemployment situation for a large number of the American metal miners; and

"Whereas the domestic lead-and-zinc miner has suffered from the effects of cur-

rency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Idaho as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Idaho but not produced in Idaho; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it jointly

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Governor of the State of Idaho concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge, and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

This senate joint memorial passed the Senate on the 21st day of February 1953.

EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

NEVADA REPUBLICANS SEEK END OF 1934 TRADE ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, last year's State convention of the Republican Party of Nevada adopted a resolution urging expiration of the Trade Agreements Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEVADA REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

At the State convention of the Republican Party, held in Las Vegas, Nev., February 5–6, 1954, the following resolution relating to foreign trade was adopted:

"Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that 'the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts and excises' (tariffs or import fees) and 'to regulate foreign commerce'; and

"Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June of 1954."

NEVADA WOMEN OPPOSE H. R. 1

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Silver State Republican Women's Club of Washoe County, Nev., after following closely the debates over H. R. 1 and extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, last month adopted resolutions decrying the "crippling effect of the executive branch" of the functions and duties of the legislative branch.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Silver State Republican Women's Club of Washoe County be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF SILVER STATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB OF WASHOE COUNTY

Whereas there is presently pending before the Senate of the United States the proposal to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years beyond its present expiration date; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the members of Silver State Republican Women's Club, in the debate centered around the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, that it is not in the best interests of the United States to extend this act; and

Whereas up to 1934 the Tariff Commission of the legislative branch of our Government had been empowered to set tariffs and establish trade relationships; and

Whereas it is believed that the legislative branch of our Government should be empowered to act without the crippling effect of the executive branch: Be it therefore

Resolved, That advice be immediately forwarded to our senior Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, commending and supporting him for his steadfast and valiant stand in the debate in the Senate of the United States on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act; be it further

Resolved, That advice be immediately forwarded to junior Senator ALAN BIBLE, informing him of the views of the members of Silver State Republican Women's Club on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act and requesting Senator BIBLE to give favorable consideration to such views, which oppose the extension of said act beyond its present expiration date; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators GEORGE W. MALONE and ALAN BIBLE and to Congressman CLIFF YOUNG.

SILVER STATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB,
MRS. MABLE HAVENS, *President.*
MRS. VIRGINIA WHITE,
MRS. ETHEL ZIMMER,
MISS RAMONA BROCKLISS,
Members of Resolutions Committee.

NEVADA YOUNG REPUBLICANS ASK RETURN TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Young Republicans of Nevada, at their annual convention held in Ely, Nev., on February 26 and 27, 1955, adopted resolutions quoting article I, section 8 of the Constitution, noted that Congress, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, transferred its responsibility over foreign trade to the executive branch, and called for expiration of the act and a return to constitutional principles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this resolution adopted by the Young Republicans of Nevada.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises" (tariffs or import fees), and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June of 1955.

CALIFORNIA RESOLUTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of California in 1953 memorialized Congress to return to the constitutional and traditional method of fixing tariffs, based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and declared that the executive department of the Government, under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, "has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce."

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, 1953 session:

"Joint resolution concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs

"Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only on a basis which will not endanger the living standards of the American working man and the American farmer and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

"Whereas promotion of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced to that in the depressed areas of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshops curtain; and

"Whereas while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and canned beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically high-lighted the problem with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all of the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs on foreign commerce entering

the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government, which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standard of living for all American citizens created thereby; and be it further

"Resolved, That until Congress so acts, the executive department of the Government exercises its powers of fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

1955 UTAH LEGISLATURE SCORES TRADE-AGREEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the great State of Utah, dedicated to fundamental American principles, and concerned with the welfare of all its people, is officially opposed to H. R. 1 and to any extension of the trade-agreements program. The Legislature of the State of Utah by formal resolution has memorialized the Congress of the United States to reverse the destructive operation of the trade-agreements program by substituting legislation to afford adequate protection to her stricken industries. Utah's Governor, J. Bracken Lee, promptly signed the resolution following its adoption.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the State of Utah.

UTAH RESOLUTION

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to afford adequate protection for domestic industry in the field of international trade

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

Whereas the lead-zinc mining industry of the United States has for the 3 years past sought adequate protection from excessive imports from low-wage foreign countries; and

Whereas metal production, employment, and related business in the producing communities has been seriously curtailed and is threatened with further curtailment; and

Whereas definite relief for the lead-zinc industry was unanimously recommended by the United States Tariff Commission in accordance with the escape-clause provisions of that act, which recommendation was preceded by a thorough investigation made by the Commission upon the request of the industry, the Congress, and administration officials; and

Whereas the stockpiling plan was provided for the lead-zinc industry by the President, on the insistence of the State Department, in lieu of the recommended tariff relief; and

Whereas the stockpiling measure has not been successful in materially lessening excessive importation of lead-zinc, or in increasing metal price to a level consistent with the Nation's general economic level, or in reviving the vital function of exploration and development of new mines, or in preventing the progressive decline of production and employment of domestic mines; and

Whereas the lead-zinc situation is simply an example of the serious difficulty which any domestic industry might experience under the present Trade Agreements Act or the extension thereof as proposed in H. R. 1 of the present Congress; and

Whereas the policies and practices in the field of international trade which have resulted in such harm to the domestic lead-zinc industry and to the domestic economy present a threat to all domestic industry involved in international trade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That since the executive department of the Government has not seen fit over the past years to adhere to the purposes of the escape clause and peril-point provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, we favor removing the authority of the executive department to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations and favor the placing of such responsibility for approving or disapproving the recommendations in the hands of the Congress where the constitutional authority and responsibility is vested. We further favor allowing the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, to expire on June 12, 1955.

We favor the enactment of an excise tax on imports of lead and zinc, as well as other metals and minerals threatened with the same problems, similar to the excise tax law effective on copper imports, which tax may be suspended whenever domestic prices are at an economic level. Such an excise tax would permit the domestic mining industry to: Maintain an adequate "mobilization base" for national security; compete with metal imports produced in low-wage foreign countries; return to its former status of employment and production; retain its skilled mining and metallurgical personnel, and engage in the necessary exploration and development work vitally necessary to future availability of metals; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Utah be and is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this concurrent memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

NEVADA MINING BOARD HITS TRADE ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada also calls for expiration of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. I ask unanimous consent that its resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ADVISORY MINING BOARD OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

The following resolution proposed by the Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada:

"Whereas there is now an active campaign sponsored by certain foreign countries and American citizens who consume these minerals, under the slogan "trade, not aid" to convince Congress that we should continue to give foreign aid in the form of free trade rather than direct aid even though our mines close; and

"Whereas the means of accomplishing this is through a continuation of so-called reciprocal trade agreements, which past experience has shown to be the cause of unemployment in the mining industry; and

"Whereas the political party in power in Nevada has pledged itself to protect American labor and industry from unfair foreign competition by establishing the principle of flexible import fees: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are opposed to any extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and ask that Congress again assume the responsibility of protecting the American workman and investor against unfair competition from abroad. We do favor the establishment in this country of a market for goods of foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition which will protect workers and investors against foreign low wages and low standards of living, and maintain a healthy domestic mining industry. Equalization of the difference between wages and standards of living here and abroad can best be accomplished by the adoption, by Congress of the flexible import free principle; be it further

"Resolved, That the above resolution is a recommendation to Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, and we ask that he forward a copy of this resolution to Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN, and Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG."

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.
ROY A. HARDY,
Chairman, Advisory Mining Board.
LOUIS D. GORDON,
Secretary, Nevada Mining Association.

TRADE ACT EXPIRATION ASKED BY COLORADO MINING ASSOCIATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Colorado Mining Association, at its recent convention, held on February 3 to 5, 1955, in Denver, Colo., passed the following forthright resolution:

We favor the termination of the Trade Agreements Act. We oppose the participation of this Nation in any international trade organization whose purpose is to control the flow of raw materials.

AMERICAN LEGION IN NEVADA MANDATES AGAINST TRADE ACT

Mr. President, the American Legion, department of Nevada, adopted a similar resolution at its 36th annual department convention, held last August. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 12A, DEPARTMENT OF NEVADA

"Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman, the American farmer, and the miner, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

"Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that 'The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect—duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees)' and 'to regulate foreign commerce'; and

"Whereas the Congress transferred this constitution responsibility to the executive

branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—which transferred such responsibility to the Executive—to expire in June of 1955."

Unanimously adopted by the 36th annual department convention of the American Legion at Ely, Nev., August 5–7, 1954.

UTAH MINING CONGRESS ACCUSES ADMINISTRATION OF IGNORING MINERS, FARMERS, WORKERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, at the last meeting of the Utah Mining Congress, delegates and members adopted a strongly worded resolution opposing extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and accusing the executive branch of our Government of ignoring the workers, miners, farmers, and producers of America. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE, 1955

We oppose extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, beyond its termination date of June 12, 1955. The peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the act, designed by the Congress to afford protection for American workers, miners, farmers, or producers, have been willfully ignored by the executive department in several specific cases which were reported favorable for upward tariff adjustments by the Tariff Commission.

The State Department has used the act to progressively weaken tariff protection, particularly on raw materials, and to increasingly involve the matter of domestic tariff control in international trade organizations. Present domestic tariff policy is controlled largely by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), a foster child of the State Department which was developed following refusal of the United States Congress to approve the International Trade Organization.

Refusal to extend the Trade Agreements Act would serve to restore to the Congress their constitutional power and responsibility relating to tariff and trade regulation.

We have in the past strongly opposed the United States becoming involved in international trade organizations which were designed to regulate production, prices, and distribution of raw materials and goods. We joined vigorously in the campaign to withdraw United States support from the International Materials Conference, successfully sponsored by Senator Ferguson.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council has recently proposed another such organization under the title of the United Nations Commission on Internatinal Commodity Trade. The new organization would examine further, as a matter of urgency, the possibilities of establishing a parity relationship between the prices of primary commodities and manufactured goods.

The United States was elected to membership of this group on November 23, 1954, despite the fact that in response to an invitation made April 30, 1954, to comment on the new organization, the United States Government expressed opposition to the establishment of this Commission.

United States membership is vital to establishment of the Commission on International Commodity Trade and therefore strong pressure is being used to get the United States to accept the membership despite her stated objections. Acceptance by the United States would give life to the Commission and would involve the United States in its schemes.

We strongly oppose the United States Government accepting membership and concur wholly with the reasons given by her in opposing the organization to date. The first meeting of the Commission is scheduled for January 17, 1955, and it is therefore directed that a statement of our opposition to United States acceptance of membership be directed forthwith to Utah's congressional delegation, the State Department, and the President.

TRADE ACT ENDANGERS LIVING STANDARDS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Pioche Chamber of Commerce, of Pioche, Lincoln County, Nev., has adopted a resolution on foreign trade, citing the Constitution, and condemning the trade agreements program as endangering the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—which transferred such responsibility to the President—to expire June 12, 1955.

PIOCHE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Pioche, Lincoln County, Nev.
L. M. MORRIS, *President.*

PATRIOTIC SOCIETY LASHES TRADE ACT, GATT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, at their 28th annual rendezvous held in Washington on April 12, 1955, adopted a resolution on the regulation of foreign commerce in which they accused the executive branch of unwarranted encroachment on the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of this significant resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program represents an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of our Government upon the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas a new Organization for International Trade Cooperation to replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) has been signed as a trade treaty by a United States representative in Geneva in which the United States has 1 vote among 33 nations, and through this organization the resources of the United States will be foreign controlled: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company urge the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) to expire June 12, 1955, and upon its expiration the Congress should resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission, acting in the national interest.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF WOMEN DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY,
MRS. LLOYD DEWITT SMITH,
National President.
GROSSE POINT, MICH.

FREE TRADE BOONDOGGLE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have other resolutions, adopted by earnest and patriotic American citizens, calling for an end of this free-trade boondoggle.

The American working people and investors do not want it. The working men and women of the Nation do not want it. The investors in American enterprise do not want it.

The farmers, who understand what it holds for them, particularly through the machinations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, 3,000 miles from the United States, do not want it.

GATT NOT DISAPPROVED

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. The bill refers to the fact that we do not approve GATT. Does that mean that GATT has been officially disapproved.

PRESIDENT CAN ABOLISH JOBS AND INVESTMENTS UNDER H. R. 1

Mr. MALONE. It does not. The testimony of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was very forthright. I congratulated him several times on the forthrightness and honesty of his testimony. He stated that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred to the President the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade and to regulate the domestic economy—the right to manipulate tariffs and import fees in the interest of what he may decide to be the overall interest of the United States, regardless of whether it hurt one industry, or did away with jobs in certain industries—gave the President the right to establish any organization he chose through which to operate, including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Dulles was very frank and emphatic in his testimony that the President—in utter disregard to the constitutional provisions—was the only person qualified to decide what was and was not to the best interest of the United States. His statement was contemptuous of the ability of the Senate or of the

House to decide, because he said they could not be trusted with the necessary inside information.

H. R. 1 EXTENDS THE AUTHORITY OF GATT

Mr. JENNER. The fact that the bill states that we do not approve GATT does not disapprove it. It is still in effect; and the extension of the act only revives the basic law enacted in 1934. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

FOREIGN NATIONS' TARIFFS HIGHER THAN OUR OWN

Mr. JENNER. From the standpoint of tariff barriers, with relation to the tariffs of other countries—and I am not speaking of cartels, favored-nation clauses, and so forth, but straight tariffs—how does the United States Government rank with the rest of the world in the matter of tariff barriers?

Mr. MALONE. It is much lower.

Mr. JENNER. How does it rank with reference to England?

Mr. MALONE. It is much lower than England.

Mr. JENNER. How does it compare with France?

Mr. MALONE. It is lower than France.

Mr. JENNER. Is it lower than Italy?

Mr. MALONE. It is lower than Italy.

Mr. JENNER. How about Germany?

REGULATIONS MAY PREVENT IMPORTS

Mr. MALONE Germany is just getting around to fixing its tariffs. However, practically all the countries I have mentioned have import quotas and exchange quotas, and absolutely prevent the importation of anything which they manufacture, in this way: One must go to a government official to obtain an exchange quota, which means securing the money of the other country to purchase what he desires to import.

The official involved is a government official. He receives his orders from someone else. He may stall for days, weeks, and months, and probably the applicant for the quota finally gives up. If he succeeds in getting an exchange quota, he then goes to some other joker in the government to obtain an import permit. That official may stall for days, weeks, and months, if the officials of that government do not wish the product imported. So the applicant finally gives up, in a hopeless situation, and lets it go.

WAGES AND TARIFFS—UNITED STATES VERSUS FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Senator yesterday heard me read a list of wages and tariffs applied by most of the countries about which the distinguished Senator from Indiana has inquired. Wages are anywhere from one-tenth to one-third of our wages, and tariffs are anywhere from 10 to 50 or 100 percent higher.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT DID NOT BRING PEACE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. JENNER. As I recall from reading the early debate on the original passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the main appeal was not for trade, necessarily, or fairness. It was for peace, was it not?

Mr. MALONE. Its purpose was peace, and to improve the economy of this Nation.

Mr. JENNER. That act was passed in 1934.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JENNER. When I look at the condition of the world today, and consider the events of the intervening period, including World War II, the Korean war, and the cold war which is going on today, I ask the Senator if he would say that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which has been extended time and again, has had any effect on the peace of the world.

FIGHT FOR FOREIGN TRADE BREEDS WAR

Mr. MALONE. Many persons experienced in historical research are emphatic that foreign trade breeds war. Of course, our history during the past 22 years proves that to be so.

Mr. JENNER. We have heard all the slogans—"Trade, not aid," and so forth. We have poured out to the rest of the world billions of dollars. Are we not trying by this bill to stop the artificial gap caused by the fact that European nations have lost their colonial system? By our dollars, we have done nothing against communism. As a matter of fact, we have fattened communism. The Communists now control a third of the world and dominate the lives of 800 million people. They can have many more millions any weekend they wish. But the European colonial system has been broken up. Are we not trying to fill in the gap by lowering our tariff barriers and opening our markets to foreign countries so that they can artificially survive for a while longer?

OUR WORLD PACTS GUARANTEE INTEGRITY OF OLD WORLD POLITICAL SYSTEMS

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has placed his finger on the sore spot. When we signed the Atlantic Pact—and I could quote at length from the reprints of my debates in 1948—we guaranteed the integrity of the colonial system throughout the world.

I stood flatfooted on the floor of the Senate, as a freshman Senator and debated with the great Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan. I said to him at that time:

If we sign the Atlantic Pact we shall be guaranteeing the integrity of the colonial system throughout the world.

He replied:

No.

I said:

I will explain. We are agreeing to go to war when the colonial nations, England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and others, go to war. We have no control over how they get into war.

How do they get into war? By defending their colonial systems. After 1948 the record is clear. Every time one of them got into a war, or war was threatened, what was the purpose? The purpose was to save one of their colonial systems.

I was in Indochina in 1948, and traveled widely over the area. We were supporting France in her colonial slavery system in Indochina, and we still are.

Mr. JENNER. With one qualification. We have acquiesced in giving away half of it to the Communists.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct, because our hand was called.

NO ONE ON OUR SIDE

We did not have an Indochinese with us—either with France or with America—in connection with that deal, simply because they did not know very much about communism, but they thoroughly understood what a continuation of the colonial slavery system meant, and they were having no more of it even if resistance to it killed them all. Therefore they were for anyone who would stage an uprising against France, and they opposed anyone who, like us, reluctantly supported France in her colonial slavery system. That was what we were and are doing.

OATH TO DEFEND CONSTITUTION

Mr. JENNER. We took an oath as Senators. Can the Senator explain to me how we are living up to that oath when, by this piece of legislation, we are delegating to the executive branch of Government the authority given to us by the Constitution? Is not that an unconstitutional act? Is not that a violation of our oath as Senators and Representatives of the people of the United States?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that this is the ninth year I have served in the Senate. I came here the same year the distinguished Senator from Indiana arrived in the Senate. We were both freshmen together. Almost immediately we were plunged into this administration fight to continue the distribution of our markets among the foreign low-wage-standard-of-living nations.

The whole program is designed to distribute the wealth of this Nation among the countries of the world to average the living standards—which means materially lowering our own.

This is done first by distributing our markets throughout the world through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which has come up for extension every 3 years until 1951 when we cut the extension to 2 years, then in 1953 to 1 year.

Second, it is by taking from our taxpayers billions of dollars without any quid pro quo, without any return. The foreign nations will string along as long as we write the checks. When we run out of money they will back away. The whole thing has degenerated into a blackmail scheme. We are now at their mercy. They say, "We will retaliate if you try to protect your own workingmen and investors."

THE WRITERS OF THE CONSTITUTION HAD BEEN THROUGH THE MILL

Now I come to the Senator's question. Those old patriarchs of Americanism, Washington, Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others, had been through all that any human being could possibly go through and live. They had been pushed around by experts. They had been pushed around by the King of Eng-

land and by the lords of England who owned land on this continent—kings and lords who had no restriction at all on their power, and who had at their fingertips the regulation of the domestic economy and the foreign trade and the fixing of the foreign policy. All power was vested in one executive.

Our Founding Fathers were so fed up with it, and so, covered by scars, they resolved that it would never again happen to this Nation.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND FOREIGN TRADE POINTEDLY SEPARATED FROM FOREIGN POLICY

They pointedly separated the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade from the fixing of the foreign policy; so that no one ever again could trade sectors of the country's domestic economy for some fancied foreign policy that some one man might conclude would be good for the Nation.

Therefore, article I, section 8, of the Constitution states specifically that the Congress of the United States, the legislative branch of the Government, shall adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs or import fees. The Founding Fathers provided that the Congress shall regulate the national economy and that it shall regulate foreign trade. They then stipulated in article II, section 2 of the Constitution that the President must negotiate and fix foreign policy.

Abraham Lincoln said that these duties or tariffs, in addition to raising revenues, should be regulated on a basis of the development of the whole country. Those are not the exact words, but I have read the exact words into the RECORD earlier today. We have followed that policy, as a Republican Party, for more than a century of time. This is the first time that we have had a Republican President who advocates the abandonment of that policy—and advocates the remaking of the industrial map of the United States in the image of the one economic world.

I do not blame the President, I wish to say at this point, he believes he is right, he has integrity. However, he has been wrongly advised. He is being advised by the economic one-worlders. The international lawyers and the American companies and corporations who are big enough and of such a nature that they can go behind the low-wage curtain and establish industries using the low-cost labor and send the stuff into the American markets.

THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

We have three branches of government set up by the Constitution.

The President, representing the executive branch, is not supposed to push the legislative branch around, and we are not supposed to push the Executive around. He is our President and we are his Congress—each should respect the other and discharge our duties in accordance with the Constitution.

Mr. JENNER. However, it is our constitutional duty not to delegate this power and authority to the Executive. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. Congress amended the Constitution in 1934 by a simple act of Congress. Our Republican President is asking us to continue the violation.

Mr. JENNER. When we do that we violate our oath as Senators. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely correct. The executive branch of our Government as represented by Mr. Dulles showed utter contempt for the legislative branch in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. JENNER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MALONE. I want to say further that under article II, section 2, of the Constitution, the President is given the authority to regulate foreign policy, but under article I, section 8, Congress is charged with the responsibility of regulating the domestic economy and foreign trade.

In 1934 Congress deliberately and, by a simple act of Congress, amended the Constitution of the United States, and put the power in the hands of the Executive to trade any sector of the American economy or markets to foreign countries for a fancied political advantage. That is what that act does. He may remake the industrial map of the Nation in the image of one economic world, regardless of any unemployment and loss of investments it may cause.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

H. R. 1 CONTINUES GATT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, H. R. 1, if enacted, will continue GATT. I saw a dispatch in this morning's Washington paper that GATT is not continued because of changes in the bill. The article I read indicates a complete lack of understanding on the part of the newspaper or a deliberate misstatement.

I should like to think it is the former. In accordance with Mr. Dulles' statement before the Senate Finance Committee, H. R. 1 continues the President's authority to continue GATT which was organized by the State Department in the beginning.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIZED TRADE

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva is international socialized trade. That is what it is.

INTERNATIONAL SUCKER POKER GAME

As I have said before many times on the floor of the Senate and in committee, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade also is an international sucker poker game. That is what it is.

It is a sucker game with 33 foreign nations sitting down and waiting for the sucker with the markets to sit in. It is just like the kind of sucker poker game anyone can find in any town in America, where the players are waiting for the sucker with the money to take a hand.

If he does not sit in, the game breaks up. There is no game because he has the only new money. If he sits down, there is a game.

The foreign nations are waiting to hear if the act is to be continued. If it is continued, the game will continue. If it not continued, the game will break up. If the act is not continued, there will be no General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, because there will be no new markets in the pot. No new markets for them to divide between them.

A DICTIONARY DEFINITION

My edition of Webster's New International Dictionary defines "socialism" as:

> A political and economic theory of social reorganization, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities, to the end that competition shall give way to cooperation and that the opportunities of life and rewards of labor shall be equitably apportioned.

That is a somewhat flattering definition but it is the dictionary definition.

The authors of my edition of Webster's had not gotten around to defining GATT, but if they had, their definition of socalism would fit GATT perfectly.

GATT CONTROLS TRADE—ECONOMY ON A WORLD BASIS

The essential feature of GATT is governmental control of economic activities on the international level, by 34 nations, including monarchies and Communist Czechoslovakia.

Governmental control of our own economic activities was turned over to the Executive by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and has been reassigned by the Executive branch to GATT under a presidential proclamation issued by President Truman on December 16, 1947.

The Constitution placed control of our economic activities in the hands of the people to be exercised through their elected representatives in Congress, and entrusted no part of it to the Executive. That was in the spirit of American free enterprise and continued throughout our history until 1934.

NEW DEAL FOSTERED SOCIALISM

A Socialist-Democrat administration in 1934 took control over our economic activities away from the people and placed it in the Executive.

They did it so that competition would end, and the opportunities of life and rewards of labor would be equitably apportioned. This was socialism by its own definition, but domestic socialism.

GATT is international socialism.

Under GATT 34 nations are exercising governmental control over the economic activities of most of the world, activities which embrace 80 percent of the total world trade.

The purpose is to do away with competition under a global arrangement of GATT's own devising, and to equalize the economy and living standards of 34 nations.

That is the only answer to the dollar shortage hoax which is being perpetrated on the American people, and foreign countries will talk about it until they are living the way we are living, or until we are living the way they are living—more likely the latter. When we have established an average living standard throughout the world, we will then have our own dollar shortage.

UNITED STATES HANDCUFFED TO GATT UNTIL TRADE ACT EXPIRES

This is being progressively accomplished by dragging down the United States to a world level.

The State Department says participation of the United States in GATT is

under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

That is a matter for Supreme Court determination.

But until such a determination is obtained, participation in GATT is certain so long as the Trade Agreements Act is on the statute books and H. R. 1 would keep it on the statute books until June 12, 1958.

In other words H. R. 1 will keep us in the International Socialistic Organization known as GATT, which meets only in secret and only on foreign soil.

GATT DESTROYS LIBERTIES OF PEOPLE

A recent British publication had this to say about GATT:

What GATT has done has been to force countries which would normally rely for protection on tariffs, to rely instead on quotas and licenses.

In other words, where the governments of these countries would have been content to discourage people from buying goods from abroad which were coming in in such quantities as to be harmful to their economies, they are now forced into a position where they have to dictate to people what they can and cannot buy. GATT does not only not bring free trade: It also causes interference in individual freedom.

Not, of course, that that worries the internationalists, who are themselves great lovers of dictatorial methods. Indeed, internationalism, even in theory, cannot work without a system of controls so elaborate that the measure of individual liberty it would allow would dwindle virtually to nothing.

That, as I said before, is from a British publication, which I do not entirely agree with.

But I do agree that GATT has forced countries, including our own, which would normally rely for protection on tariffs to rely instead on quotas.

GATT WARS ON UNITED STATES FARM QUOTAS

We have quotas now to protect certain of our farm commodities, and the State Department is having to wage a continuing battle in GATT to protect these quotas.

Even when this superinternational socialistic agency does magnanimously grant a waiver to the United States on quotas, it demands concessions, promises, and pledges from our negotiators at Geneva.

An example is the recent GATT decision to grant a waiver to the United States in connection with import restrictions imposed under section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this decision by GATT.

There being no objection the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISION TO GRANT A WAIVER TO THE UNITED STATES IN CONNECTION WITH IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED UNDER SECTION 22 OF THE UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

Having received the request of the United States Government for a waiver of the provisions of article II and article XI of the general agreement with respect to certain actions by the United States Government required by the provisions of section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "section 22") which are not authorized by the agreement,

Having also received the statement of the United States:

(a) That there exist in the United States governmental agricultural programs (including program or operations which provide price assistance for certain domestic agricultural products and which operate to limit the production or market supply, or to regulate or control the quality or prices of domestic agricultural products) which from time to time result in domestic prices being maintained at a level in excess of the prices at which imports of the like products can be made available for consumption in the United States and that under such conditions imports may be attracted into the United States in abnormally large quantities or in such manner as to have adverse effects on such programs or operations unless the inflow of such imports is regulated in some manner;

(b) That the Congress of the United States therefore enacted section 22 which requires that restrictions in the form either of fees or of quantitative limitations must be imposed on imports whenever the President of the United States finds, after investigation, that such products are being or are practically certain to be imported in such quantities and under such conditions as to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken by the United States Department of Agriculture or any agency under its direction with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof, with respect to which such a program is being undertaken, and has required the President not to accept any international obligation which would be inconsistent with the requirements of the section.

(c) That import restrictions can be imposed under section 22 only when the President finds that imports are having or are practically certain to have the effects for which section 22 action is required, and then, except as provided by law in emergency situations, only after investigation by the United States Tariff Commission, after due notice and opportunity for hearings have been given to interested parties; that while import restrictions may be imposed in emergency situations before an investigation by the Tariff Commission, the continuance of such restrictions is subject to the decision of the President as soon as the Commission has completed an immediate investigation; and that fees imposed under section 22 cannot exceed 50 percent ad valorem and any quantitative limitation of imports under that section cannot be such as to reduce the quantity of imports of the product below 50 percent of the quantity entered during a representative period as determined by the President; and that except in the case of those products where it is impracticable to limit production or marketings or the United States Government is without legislative authority to do so, the products on which section 20 controls are now in effect are subject to limitation upon domestic marketing which in turn affect production;

Noting:

(a) That, to help solve the problem of surpluses of products for which section 22 import quotas now are in effect, the United States Government has taken positive steps aimed at reducing 1955 crops supplies by lowering support price levels or by imposing marketing quotas at minimum levels permitted by legislation; and that it is the intention of the United States Government to continue to seek a solution of the problem of surpluses of agricultural commodities;

(b) The assurance of the United States Government that it will discuss proposals under section 22 with all countries having a substantial interest prior to taking action, and will give prompt consideration to any representatives made to it;

(c) That it is the intention of the United States Government promptly to terminate any restrictions imposed when it finds that circumstances requiring the action no longer exist, and to modify restrictions whenever changed circumstances warrant such modification;

The contracting parties:

Decide, pursuant to paragraph 5 (a) of article XXV of the general agreement and in consideration of the assurances recorded above, that subject to the conditions and procedures set out hereunder the obligations of the United States under the provisions of articles II and XI of the general agreement are waived to the extent necessary to prevent a conflict with such provisions of the general agreement in the case of action required to be taken by the Government of the United States under section 22. The text of section 22 is annexed to this decision;

Declare that this decision shall not preclude the right of affected contracting parties to have recourse to the appropriate provisions of article XXIII; and

Declare, further, that in deciding as aforesaid, they regret that circumstances make it necessary for the United States to continue to apply import restrictions which, in certain cases, adversely affect the trade of a number of contracting parties, impair concessions granted by the United States and thus impede the attainment of the objectives of the general agreement.

CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES

1. Upon request of any contracting party which considers that its interests are seriously prejudiced by reason of any import restriction imposed under section 22, whether or not covered by this decision, the United States will promptly undertake a review to determine whether there has been a change in circumstances which would require such restrictions to be modified or terminated. In the event the review shows such a change, the United States will institute an investigation in the manner provided by section 22.

2. Should the President of the United States acting in pursuance of section 22 cause an investigation to be made to determine whether any existing import restriction should be modified, terminated or extended, or whether restrictions should be imposed on the import of any additional product, the United States will notify the contracting parties and, in accordance with article XXII of the general agreement, accord to any contracting party which considers that its interests would be prejudiced the fullest notice and opportunity, consistent with the legislative requirements of the United States, for representations and consultation.

3. The United States will give due consideration to any representations submitted to it including:

(a) When investigating whether any existing import restriction should be modified, terminated or extended, representations that a greater volume of imports than is permitted under the import restriction would not have the effects required to be corrected by section 22, including representations that the volume of imports that would have entered in the absence of governmental agricultural programs would not have such effects.

(b) When investigating with respect to import restrictions on additional products, representations with regard to:

(i) The effect of imports of any product upon any program or operation undertaken by the United States Department of Agriculture or any agency under its direction, or upon the domestic production of any agricultural commodity or product thereof for

which such a program or operation is undertaken, including representations that the volume of imports which would have entered in the absence of governmental agricultural programs will not have the effects required to be corrected by section 22;

(ii) The representative period to be used for the determination of any quota.

(c) Representations by any contracting party that the portion of a total quota allotted or proposed to be allotted to it is inequitable because of circumstances that operated to reduce imports from that contracting party of the product concerned during the past representative period on which such import quota is based.

4. As soon as the President has made his decision following any investigation the United States will notify the contracting parties and those contracting parties which have made representations or entered into consultations. If the decision imposes restrictions on additional products or extends or intensifies existing restrictions the notification by the United States will include particulars of such restrictions and the reasons for them (regardless of whether the restriction is consistent with the general agreement). At the time of such notification the provisions of the general agreement are waived to the extent necessary to permit such restrictions to be applied under the general agreement, subject to the review herein provided and, as declared above, without prejudice to the right of the affected contracting parties to have recourse to the appropriate provisions of article XXIII.

5. The United States will remove or relax each restriction permitted under this waiver as soon as it finds that the circumstances requiring such restriction no longer exist or have changed so as no longer to require its imposition in its existing form.

6. The contracting parties will make an annual review of any action taken by the United States under this decision. For each such review the United States will furnish a report to the contracting parties showing any modification or removal of restrictions effected since the previous report, the restrictions in effect under section 22, and the reasons why such restrictions (regardless of whether covered by this waiver) continue to be applied and any steps it has taken with a view to a solution of the problem of surpluses of agricultural commodities.

ANNEX TO THE DECISION: SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT (OF 1933), AS REENACTED AND AMENDED

Section 22. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, 74th Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify (7 U. S. C. 624 (a)).

(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a) of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine. In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President with regard to any article or articles that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the President may take immediate action under this section without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, such action to continue in effect pending the report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission and action thereon by the President (7 U. S. C. 624 (b)).

(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, 74th Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States (7 U. S. C. 624 (c)).

(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section (7 U. S. C. 624 (d)).

(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final (7 U. S. C. 624 (e)).

(f) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section (7 U. S. C. 624 (f)).

PUBLIC LAW 50, 82D CONGRESS, SECTION 8 (A)

In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission with regard to any agricultural commodity that due to the perishability of the commodity a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, or under the provisions of section 7 of this act to determine the facts and make recommendations to the President for such relief under those provisions as may be appropriate. The President may take immediate action, however, without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission if in his judgment the emergency requires such action. In any case the report and findings of the Tariff Commission and the decision of the President shall be made at the earliest possible date, and in any event not more than 25 calendar days after the submission of the case to the Tariff Commission.

Commodities for which import controls are now in effect pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended

A. QUOTAS

1. Cotton and cotton products—annual quotas currently are in effect for these items:

	Pounds
(a) Long-staple cotton (1⅛ in. or longer but less than 1 11/16 in.)	45,656,420
(b) Short-staple cotton (other than than harsh, under 1⅛ in.)	14,516,882
(c) Harsh or rough (under ¾ inch)	70,000,000
(d) Cotton waste	5,482,509

2. Wheat and wheat products:

(a) Wheat	bushels	800,000
(b) Wheat products (flour semolina, crushed or cracked wheat, and similar wheat products)	pounds	4,000,000

3. Manufactured dairy products (initial controls effective July 1, 1953)—annual quotas have been established for these items:

	Pounds
Butter	707,000
Dried whole milk	7,000
Dried buttermilk	496,000
Dried cream	500
Dried skim milk	1,807,000
Malted milk and compounds or mixtures of or substitutes for milk or cream	6,000
Cheddar cheese [1]	2,780,100
Edam and Gouda cheese	4,600,200
Blue mold cheese [2]	4,167,000
Designated Italian-type cheese [3]	9,200,100

4. Peanuts: Annual global quota of 1,709,000 pounds shelled basis, July 1–June 30.

5. Oats,[4] hulled or unhulled and unhulled ground oats (initial controls effective Dec. 23, 1953): Imports are limited to 40 million bushels during the period October 1, 1954–September 30, 1955.

6. Rye,[4] rye flour and meal (initial controls effective Apr. 1, 1954): Imports are limited to 186 million pounds in the period July 1, 1954–June 30, 1955.

7. Barley,[4] hulled or unhulled, including roller barley, ground barley, and barely malt (initial controls effective Oct. 1, 1954): Imports are limited to 27,500,000 bushels in the period October 1, 1954–September 30, 1955.

---

[1] Cheddar cheese and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing or processed from cheddar cheese.

[2] Blue mold (except Stilton) cheese and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, blue mold cheese.

[3] Italian-type cheeses made from cows' milk in original loaves (Romano made from cows' milk, Reggiano, Parmesano, Provolone, Procotelle, and Sbrinz).

[4] Seed approved for planting pursuant to the Federal Seed Act is not subject to control.

B. FEES

8. Filberts: During the period October 1, 1954–September 30, 1955, a fee of 10 cents per pound on imports in excess of 6 million pounds.

9. Almonds: [5] During the period October 1, 1954–September 30, 1955, a fee of 10 cents per pound on imports in excess of 5 million pounds.

10. Flax seed: [5] 50 percent ad valorem.

11. Linseed oil: [5] 50 percent ad valorem.

12. Peanut oil: [5] Ad valorem fee of 25 percent on imports in excess of 80 million pounds.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, as I stated in my minority views in the Senate Finance Committee report on H. R. 1, all of these spineless pledges and commitments by the State Department leave the American farmer behind the eight ball and beholden to the whims of his foreign competitors. That is not the American system.

H. R. 1 will leave other major elements of America's economy, the workers and investors in our resources and industries, behind the eight-ball also, potential victims of avarice and manipulation at the hands of GATT, an international agency for the propagation of economic socialism.

REJECT H. R. 1 AND WITHDRAW FROM GATT

The Senate of the United States should reject H. R. 1.

The Government of the United States should promptly withdraw from GATT before more harm is done to our American system of free enterprise.

Rejection of H. R. 1 will restore our trade and commerce to fundamental principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Withdrawal from GATT will restore our economic independence and liberate us from the chains of international socialistic GATT.

The decision, Mr. President and distinguished colleagues in the Senate of the United States, is in your hands.

PARTY PLATFORMS ON FOREIGN TRADE DOCUMENTED

Mr President, there may be some debate and some misunderstanding as to the source of these free trade ideas and what the people of the United States, through their political parties, have stood for and campaigned for over the years. In 1949 I debated this subject on the Senate floor at some length, in connection with this same subject and as a result documented the Republican platforms and the Democratic platforms from 1856 to 1948. I ask unanimous consent to have these documented platforms of both parties from 1856 to 1952 included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the platforms were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON TARIFFS FROM 1856 TO 1948

1856 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1860 PLATFORM

Plank 12: "That, while providing revenue for the support of the general Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts, as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country."

1864 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1868 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1872 PLATFORM

Plank 7: "The annual revenue, after paying current expenditures, pensions, and the interest on the public debt, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal, and that revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote, the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country."

1876 PLATFORM

Plank 8: "The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country."

1880 PLATFORM

Plank 5: "We reaffirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor."

1884 PLATFORM

"We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not 'for revenue only,' but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

"Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic Party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest."

Protection to American industries

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests, except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor, and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily indorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican Representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

Duties on wool

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic Party to place wool on the free list, and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry throughout the United States.

The internal revenue

The Republican Party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes, and by such revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which cannot be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system, at the joint behests of the whisky trusts and the agents of foreign manufacturers.

1892 PLATFORM

The principle of protection

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which cannot be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the Tariff Act of 1890.

We denounce the efforts of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives to destroy our tariff laws piecemeal, as manifested by their attacks upon wool, lead, and lead ores, the chief products of a number of States, and we ask the people for their judgment thereon.

Triumph of reciprocity

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

1896 PLATFORM

Tariff

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden of revenue on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workingman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm, and makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and price; it diffuses general thrift, and founds the strength of all on the strength of each. In its reasonable application it is just, fair to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism.

We denounce the present Democratic tariff as sectional, injurious to the public credit, and destructive to business enterprise. We demand such an equitable tariff on foreign imports which have come into competition with American products as will not only furnish adequate revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government, but will protect American labor from degradation to the wage level of other lands. We are not pledged to any particular schedules. The question of rates is a practical question to be governed by the conditions of time and of production; the ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection and development of American labor and industry. The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants rest.

Reciprocity

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with

[5] Not a listed item in schedule XX.

other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessaries of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which gain open markets for us in return for our open market to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade, and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade, and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Sugar

We condemn the present administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican Party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than $100 million annually.

Wool and woolens

To all our products— to those of the mine and the fields as well as to those of the shop and the factory; to hemp, to wool, the products of the great industry of sheep husbandry, as well as to the finished woolens of the mills—we promise the most ample protection.

Merchant marine

We favor restoring the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign-carrying trade, so that American ships—the product of American labor, employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and manned, officered, and owned by Americans—may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

1900 PLATFORM

Protection policy reaffirmed

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting the home market, competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates—higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government, and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world.

Reciprocity favored

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

1904 PLATFORM

The protective tariff

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican Party. The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection, and, therefore, rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration, but this work cannot safely be committed to any other hands than those of the Republican Party. To entrust it to the Democratic Party is to invite disaster. Whether, as in 1892, the Democratic Party declares the protective tariff unconstitutional, or whether it demand tariff reform or tariff revision, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system.

However specious the name, the purpose is ever the same. A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

To a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can be safely entrusted. When the only free-trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

1908 PLATFORM

Tariff revision promised

The Republican Party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of these schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor establishment of a maximum and minimum rate to be administered by the President under the limitation fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet the discrimination by foreign countries against American goods entering our markets, and the minimum representing the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and the purpose of Republican policy being not only to preserve without excessive duties the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

Philippine tariff

Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in a free interchange of products with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests.

1912 PLATFORM

The tariff policy

We reaffirm our belief in a protective tariff. The Republican tariff policy has been of the greatest benefit to the country, developing our resources, diversifying our industries, and protecting our workingmen against competition with cheaper labor abroad, thus establishing for our wage earners the American standard of living. The protective tariff is so woven into the fabric of our industrial and agricultural life that to substitute for it a tariff for revenue only would destroy many industries and throw millions of our people out of employment. The products of the farm and of the mind should receive the same measure of protection as other products of American labor.

We hold that the import duties should be high enough, while yielding a sufficient revenue, to protect adequately American industries and wages. Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced. Readjustment should be made from time to time to conform to changing conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry. To accomplish this correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an expert commission, as the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent reports of the Tariff Board has demonstrated.

Tariff Board endorsed

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this Board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

We condemn the Democratic tariff bills passed by the House of Representatives of the 62d Congress as sectional, as injurious to the public credit, and as destructive of business enterprise.

1916 PLATFORM

Tariff

The Republican Party stands now, as always, in the fullest sense for the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American labor and does not regard an antidumping provision as an adequate substitute.

Such protection should be reasonable in amount but sufficient to protect adequately American industries and American labor and so adjusted as to prevent undue exactions by monopolies or trusts. It should, moreover, give special attention to securing the industrial independence of the United States as in the case of dyestuffs.

Through wise tariff and industrial legislation our industries can be so organized that they will become not only a commercial bulwark but a powerful aid to national defense.

The Underwood Tariff Act is a complete failure in every respect. Under its administration imports have enormously increased in spite of the fact that intercourse with foreign countries has been largely cut off by reason of the war, while the revenues of which we stand in such dire need have been greatly reduced.

Under the normal conditions which prevailed prior to the war it was clearly demonstrated that this act deprived the American producer and the American wage earner of that protection which enabled them to meet their foreign competitors, and but for the adventitious conditions created by the war, would long since have paralyzed all forms of American industry and deprived American labor of its just reward.

It has not in the least degree reduced the cost of living, which has constantly advanced from the date of its enactment. The welfare of our people demands its repeal and the substitution of a measure which in peace as well as in war will produce ample revenue and give reasonable protection to all forms of American production in mine, forest, field, and factory.

We favor the creation of a tariff commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

1920 PLATFORM

International trade and tariff

The uncertain and unsettled condition of internal balances, the abnormal economic and trade situation of the world, and the impossibility of forecasting accurately even the near future, preclude the formulation of a definite program to meet conditions a year hence. But the Republican Party reaffirms its belief in the protective principle and pledges itself to a revision of the tariff

as soon as conditions shall make it necessary for the preservation of the home market for American labor, agriculture, and industry.

1924 PLATFORM

The tariff

We affirm our belief in the protective tariff to extend needed protection to our productive industries. We believe in protection as a national policy with equal regard to all sections and to agriculture and industry. It is only by adherence to this policy that the interests of the consumers can be safeguarded and American agriculture, American labor, and American manufacturers be assured a return sufficient to perpetuate American standards of life.

A protective tariff is designed to support the high American economic level of life for the average family and to prevent a lowering to the levels of economic life prevailing in other lands. It is the history of the Nation that the protective system has ever justified itself by promoting industrial activity and employment, enormously increasing our purchasing power, restoring confidence, and bringing increased prosperity to all.

The tariff protection to our industry works for increased consumption of domestic agricultural products by an employed population instead of one unable to purchase the necessities of life. Without the strict maintenance of the tariff principle our farmers will need always to compete with cheap lands and cheap labor abroad, and with lower standards of living.

The enormous value of the protective principle has once more been demonstrated by the effects of the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 and the Tariff Act of 1922.

We believe that the power of the President to decrease or increase any rate of duty in the tariff act furnishes a safeguard against excessive duties and against too low customs charges, and affords ample opportunity for tariff duties to be adjusted after a hearing that they may cover the actual differences in the cost of production in the United States and the principal competing countries of the world.

1928 PLATFORM

Tariff

We reaffirm our belief in the protective tariff as a fundamental and essential principle of the economic life of this Nation. While certain provisions of the present law require revision in the light of changes in the world competitive situation since its enactment, the record of the United States since 1922 clearly shows that the fundamental protective principle of the law has been fully justified. It has stimulated the development of our natural resources, provided fuller employment at higher wages through the promotion of industrial activity, assured thereby the continuance of the farmer's major market, and further raised the standards of living and general comfort and well-being of our people. The great expansion in the wealth of our Nation during the past 50 years, and particularly in the past decade, could not have been accomplished without a protective tariff system designed to promote the vital interests of all classes.

Nor have these manifest benefits been restricted to any particular section of the country. They are enjoyed throughout the land either directly or indirectly. Their stimulus has been felt in industries, farming sections, trade circles, and communities in every quarter. However, we realize that there are certain industries which cannot now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination and where necessary a revision of these schedules to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

Adherence to that policy is essential for the continued prosperity of the country. Under it the standard of living of the American people has been raised to the highest levels ever known. Its example has been eagerly followed by the rest of the world whose experts have repeatedly reported with approval the relationship of this policy to our prosperity, with the resultant emulation of that example by other nations.

A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it. Agriculture derives large benefits not only directly from the protective duties levied on competitive farm products of foreign origin but also, indirectly, from the increase in the purchasing power of the American workmen employed in industries similarly protected. These benefits extend also to persons engaged in trade, transportation, and other activities.

The Tariff Act of 1922 has justified itself in the expansion of our foreign trade during the past 5 years. Our domestic exports have increased from $3,800,000,000 in 1922 to $4,800,000,000 in 1927. During the same period imports have increased from $3,100,000,000 to $4,400,000,000. Contrary to the prophesies of its critics, the present tariff law has not hampered the natural growth in the exportation of the products of American agriculture, industry, and mining, nor has it restricted the importation of foreign commodities which this country can utilize without jeopardizing its economic structure.

The United States is the largest customer in the world today. If we were not prosperous and able to buy, the rest of the world also would suffer. It is inconceivable that American labor will ever consent to the abolition of protection, which would bring the American standard of living down to the level of that in Europe, or that the people in this country were curtailed and its market at home, if not destroyed, at least seriously impaired.

1932 PLATFORM

The tariff

The Republican Party has always been the stanch supporter of the American system of a protective tariff. It believes that the home market, built up under that policy, the greatest and richest market in the world, belongs first to American agriculture, industry, and labor. No pretext can justify the surrender of that market to such competition as would destroy our farms, mines, and factories, and lower the standard of living which we have established for our workers.

Because many foreign countries have recently abandoned the gold standard, as a result of which the costs of many commodities produced in such countries have, at least for the time being, fallen materially in terms of American currency, adequate tariff protection is today particularly essential to the welfare of the American people. The Tariff Commission should promptly investigate individual commodities so affected by currency depreciation, and report to the President any increase in duties found necessary to equalize domestic with foreign costs of production.

To fix the duties on some thousands of commodities, subject to highly complex conditions, is necessarily a difficult technical task. It is unavoidable that some of the rates established by legislation should, even at the time of their enactment, be too low or too high. Moreover, a subsequent change in costs or other conditions may render obsolete a rate that was before appropriate. The Republican Party has, therefore, long supported the policy of a flexible tariff, giving power to the President, after investigation by an impartial commission and in accordance with prescribed principles, to modify the rates named by the Congress.

We commend the President's veto of the measure, sponsored by Democratic Congressmen, which would have transferred from the President to the Congress the authority to put into effect the findings of the Tariff Commission. Approval of the measure would have returned tariffmaking to politics and destroyed the progress made during 10 years of effort to lift it out of logrolling methods. We pledge the Republican Party to a policy which will retain the gains made and enlarge the present scope of greater progress.

We favor the extension of the general Republican principle of tariff protection to our natural-resource industries, including the products of our farms, forests, mines, and oil wells, with compensatory duties on the manufactured and refined products thereof.

1936 PLATFORM

Tariff

Nearly 60 percent of all imports into the United States are now free of duty. The other 40 percent of imports complete directly with the product of our industry. We would keep on the free list all products not grown or produced in the United States in commercial quantities. As to all commodities that commercially compete with our farms, our forests, our mines, our fisheries, our oil wells, our labor, and our industries, sufficient protection should be maintained at all times to defend the American farmer and the American wage earner from the destructive competition emanating from the subsidies of foreign governments and the imports from low-wage and depreciated-currency countries.

We will repeal the present reciprocal-trade-agreement law. It is futile and dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and farmer.

We will restore the principle of the flexible tariff in order to meet changing economic conditions here and abroad and broaden by careful definition the powers of the Tariff Commission in order to extend this policy along nonpartisan lines.

We will adjust tariffs with a view to promoting international trade, the stabilization of currencies, and the attainment of a proper balance between agriculture and industry.

We condemn the secret negotiation of reciprocal trade treaties without public hearing or legislative approval.

1940 PLATFORM

Tariff and reciprocal trade

We are threatened by unfair competition in world markets and by the invasion of our home markets, especially by the products of State-controlled foreign economies.

We believe in tariff protection for agriculture, labor, and industry, as essential to our American standard of living. The measure of the protection shall be determined by scientific methods with due regard to the interest of the consumer.

We shall explore every possibility of reopening the channels of international trade through negotiations so conducted as to produce genuine reciprocity and expand our exports.

We condemn the manner in which the so-called reciprocal trade agreements of the New Deal have been put into effect without adequate hearings, with undue haste, without proper consideration of our domestic producers, and without congressional approval. These defects we shall correct.

1944 PLATFORM

Foreign trade

We assure American farmers, livestock producers, workers, and industry that we will establish and maintain a fair protective tariff on competitive products so that the standards of living of our people shall not be im-

paired through the importation of commodities produced abroad by labor or producers functioning upon lower standards than our own.

If the postwar world is to be properly organized, a great extension of world trade will be necessary to repair the wastes of war and build an enduring peace. The Republican Party, always remembering that its primary obligation, which must be fulfilled, is to our own workers, our own farmers, and our own industry, pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress.

1948 PLATFORM

At all times safeguarding our own industry and agriculture, and under efficient administrative procedures for the legitimate consideration of domestic needs, we shall support the system of reciprocal trade and encourage international commerce.

1952 PLATFORM

The 1952 platform of the Republican Party, adopted at the Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., on July 10, declared this policy on foreign trade:

"We favor the expansion of mutually advantageous world trade.

"To further this objective we shall press for the elimination of discriminatory practices against our exports such as preferential tariffs, monetary license restrictions, and other arbitrary devices. Our reciprocal trade agreements will be entered into and maintained on a basis of true reciprocity and to safeguard our domestic enterprises and the payrolls of our workers against unfair foreign competition."

THE POSITION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON TARIFFS FROM 1856 TO 1948

1856 PLATFORM

Resolved, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and, by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

1860 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1864 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1868 PLATFORM

Plank 6: "And a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports."

1872 PLATFORM

Plank 6: "And recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their congressional districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation."

1876 PLATFORM

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising, revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufacturers at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be only for revenue.

1880 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1884 PLATFORM

The Democratic Party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the customhouse have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the customhouse taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We, therefore, denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government, economically administered.

1888 PLATFORM

Tariff reform

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic Party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment. Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic Party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

Reduction of revenue

Resolved, That this convention hereby endorses and recommends the early passage of the bill for the reduction of the revenue now pending in the House of Representatives.

1892 PLATFORM

Tariff legislation

SEC. 3. We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we endorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficient results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic Party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been 10 reductions of the wages of the laboring men to 1 increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that, after 30 years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real-estate mortgage debt of over $2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging $165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural-exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

Reciprocity

SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarge foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products, and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

1896 PLATFORM

Tariff resolution

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered. We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law, which has twice been condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and depriced the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court, there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that Court for nearly 100 years, that Court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment, which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the Court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expense of the Government.

1900 PLATFORM

The free list as a remedy

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

The Dingley tariff law

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

1904 PLATFORM

Tariff legislation

The Democratic Party has been and will continue to be the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous prevention of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the Government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations, by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican Party.

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government, economically administered, and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

1908 PLATFORM

Tariff

We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform, now offered by the Republican Party, as a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question; but the people cannot safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican Party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief is postponed until after the coming election—an election to succeed in which the Republican Party must have that same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress as to correct the admittedly existing tariff inequities.

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Existing duties have given the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

1912 PLATFORM

Tariff reform

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of Government honestly and economically administered.

The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. It is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers. It raises the cost of the necessaries of life to them, but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in the protected markets. In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries. We denounce the Republican pretense on that subject and assert that American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high, and in many cases prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

We denounce the action of President Taft in vetoing the bills to reduce the tariff in the cotton, woolen, metal, and chemical schedules and the farmer's free-list bill, all of which were designed to give immediate relief to the masses from the exactions of the trusts.

The Republican Party, while promising tariff revision, has shown by its tariff legislation that such revision is not to be in the people's interest; and having been faithless to its pledges of 1908, it should no longer enjoy the confidence of the Nation. We appeal to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only.

1916 PLATFORM

Tariff

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government economically administered and unreservedly indorse the Underwood tariff law as truly exemplifying that doctrine. We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's production and trade. The events of the last 2 years have brought about many momentous changes. In some respects their effects are yet conjectural and wait to be disclosed, particularly in regard to our foreign trade.

Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations, are bringing about economic changes more varied and far-reaching than the world has even before experienced. In order to ascertain just what those changes may be, the Democratic Congress is providing for a nonpartisan tariff commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports or with regard to the changed and changing conditions under which our trade is carried on. We cordially endorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests or upon information provided largely if not exclusively, by them.

1920 PLATFORM

The tariff

We reaffirm the traditional policy of the Democratic Party in favor of a tariff for revenue only and we confirm the policy of basing tariff revisions upon the intelligent research of a nonpartisan commission, rather than upon the demands of selfish interests, temporarily held in abeyance.

1924 PLATFORM

Tariff and taxation

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act is the most unjust, unscientific, and dishonest tariff tax measure ever enacted in our history. It is class legislation, which defrauds all the people for the benefit of a few; it heavily increases the cost of living, penalizes agriculture, corrupts the Government, fosters paternalism, and, in the long run, does not benefit the very interests for which it was enacted.

We denounce the Republican tariff laws which are written in great part in aid of monopolies and thus prevent that reasonable exchange of commodities which would enable foreign countries to buy our surplus agricultural and manufactured products with resultant benefit to the toilers and producers of America. Trade interchange, on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating, is a time-honored doctrine of Democratic faith. We declare our party's position to be in favor of a tax on commodities entering the customhouses that will promote effective competition, protect against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue to support the Government.

The greatest contributing factor in the increase and unbalancing of prices is unscientific taxation. After having increased taxation and the cost of living by $2 billion, under the Fordney-McCumber tariff, all that the Republican Party could suggest in the way of relief was a cut of $300 million in direct taxes; and that was to be given principally to those with the largest incomes. Although there was no evidence of a lack of capital for investment to meet the present

requirements of all legitimate industrial enterprises, and although the farmers and general consumers were bearing the brunt of tariff favors already granted to special interests, the administration was unable to devise any plan except one to grant further aid to the few. Fortunately this plan of the administration failed, and, under Democratic leadership aided by progressive Republicans, a more equitable one was adopted, which reduces direct taxes by about $450 million.

1928 PLATFORM

Tariff

The Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

(a) The maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.

(b) Increasing the purchasing power of wages and income by the reduction of those monopolistic and extortionate tariff rates bestowed in payment of political debts.

(c) Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Wilson conception of a fact-finding Tariff Commission, quasi-judicial and free from the Executive domination which has destroyed the usefulness of the present Commission.

(d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of Government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

(e) Safeguarding the public against monopoly created by special tariff favors.

(f) Equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of the tariff among all.

Wage earner, farmer, stockman, producer, and legitimate business in general have everything to gain from a Democratic tariff based on justice to all.

1932 PLATFORM

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference, reciprocal tariff agreements with other nations, and an international economic conference designed to restore international trade and facilitate exchange.

We condemn the Hawley-Smoot tariff law, the prohibitive rates of which have resulted in retaliatory action by more than 40 countries, created international economic hostilities, destroyed international trade, driven our factories into foreign countries, robbed the American farmer of his foreign markets, and increased the cost of production.

1936 PLATFORM

Foreign policy

We shall continue to foster the increase in our foreign trade which has been achieved by this administration; to seek by mutual agreement the lowering of those tariff barriers, quotas, and embargoes which have been raised against our exports of agricultural and industrial products; but continue as in the past to give adequate protection to our farmers and manufacturers against unfair competition or the dumping on our shores of commodities and goods produced abroad by cheap labor or subsidized by foreign governments.

1940 PLATFORM

We shall * * * observe and advocate international respect for the rights of others and for treaty obligations; cultivate foreign trade through desirable trade agreements; and foster economic collaboration with the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

1944 PLATFORM

V. We shall uphold the good-neighbor policy, and extend the trade policies initiated by the present administration.

1948 PLATFORM

We pledge ourselves to restore the reciprocal trade agreements program formulated in 1934 by the Secretary of State Cordell Hull and operated successfully for 14 years, until crippled by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Further, we strongly endorse our country's adherence to the International Trade Organization.

1952 PLATFORM

At the 1952 Democratic National Convention the party included the following plank in its platform:

"EXPANDING WORLD TRADE

"The Democratic Party has always stood for expanding trade among free nations. We reassert that stand today. We vigorously oppose any restrictive policies which would weaken the highly successful reciprocal trade program fathered by Cordell Hull.

"Since 1934 the United States has taken the lead in fostering the expansion and liberalization of world trade.

"Our own economy requires expanded export markets for our manufactured and agricultural products and a greater supply of the essential imported raw materials. At the same time, our friends throughout the world will have opportunity to earn their own way to higher living standards with lessened dependence on our aid."

TARIFF HISTORY, 1780–1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in addition to the documentation of the political platforms, I compiled a short tariff history of the United States, a definition of tariffs, and the period through which the tariff policy had passed.

It may be very interesting to my colleagues of the Senate if they have the time to review it.

At least I predict that it will become interesting to them in the very near future—when it becomes crystal clear as to the real objectives of the foreign low-wage standard of living of nations of the world in their designs on our markets.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the tariff history of the United States to which I have referred, which appears at pages 56 to 58 of the reprint of my debates of 1949.

There being no objection, the tariff history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHORT TARIFF HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

I. DEFINITION OF TARIFFS

There are two basically different kinds of tariffs:

(a) Revenue tariffs.

(b) Protective tariffs.

A revenue tariff is one which is levied on imports with the objective of raising the maximum revenue for the support of the Government. To maximize revenue it is necessary to have large imports which require low tariff rates.

A protective tariff is one which is designed to protect domestic manufactures, or mining, or agriculture from imports from abroad. The more protective a tariff is, the more it will keep out imports. A tariff which is 100 percent protective will keep out all imports. Hence, a completely protected tariff will yield no revenue to the government since there will be no imports.

II. HISTORY OF UNITED STATES TARIFFS FROM 1780 TO 1949

A short survey of tariff history of the United States can be best described by dividing it into seven periods.

A. The period 1780 to 1789 (American Government under the Articles of Confederation).

B. The period 1789 to 1816 (interval from the establishment of the United States under the Constitution to the end of the War of 1812).

C. The period 1816 to 1861 (interval from the end of the War of 1812 to the beginning of the Civil War).

D. The period 1861 to 1913 (interval from the Civil War to Woodrow Wilson's free-trade program).

E. The period 1913 to 1921 (interval of free-trade tariffs under Woodrow Wilson and the Democrats).

F. The period 1921 to 1934 (interval of protective tariffs under Republican administration).

G. The period 1934 to 1949 (interval of trade agreements and free trade).

The principal development during each of these seven periods will be described in order.

A. Confederation period, 1780–89

When the 13 American Colonies declared their independence from England, they formed a provisional Government in 1776 known as the Confederation Government which provided for a Continental Congress. The new Government operated under the Articles of Confederation which were finally ratified in 1781.

Under the Confederation Government, the individual States levied numerous tariffs, many of which were definitely protective tariffs.

During the period from 1780 to 1789 Pennsylvania enacted 15 tariff acts; Virginia, 12; Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland, 7 each; Connecticut, 6; and the other States a lesser number.

The tariffs levied in the Middle Atlantic and New England States were protective tariffs or for purposes of retaliation, while those of the Southern States were chiefly revenue tariffs.

B. Period from 1789 to 1816

With the establishment of the United States Government in 1789, control over foreign commerce was reserved to the Federal Government so that the individual States lost their power to levy import duties. The new Congress under the Constitution met for the first time on March 4, 1789, and its first act was to levy a tariff primarily for revenue purposes.

During the period from 1789 to 1816 numerous tariff acts were passed, but the first time a definite protective tariff system was passed was in 1816, after the close of the War of 1812. It was designed to protect the infant manufacturing industries that had sprung up during the war from a flood of cheap postwar manufactured products from England.

The revenue tariff passed in 1789 provided for import duties ranging from 5 percent to 15 percent, with no commodities on the free list. A 5-percent duty was levied on all commodities not otherwise enumerated.

From 1789 to the beginning of the War of 1812, Congress passed 13 tariff laws, raising duties on some commodities to secure higher revenues and placing other commodities on the free list.

The average level of tariffs from 1791 to 1812, found by dividing the duties collected by the value of the dutiable imports each year, ranged from 11.2 percent in 1795 to 37.2 percent in 1808. The level of tariffs for each year from 1791 to 1812 is as follows:

Rate of duty on dutiable imports

Year:	*Percent*
1791	15.34
1792	11.54
1793	14.68
1794	17.10
1795	11.21
1796	12.02
1797	15.60

Rate of duty on dutiable imports—Con.

Year:	Percent
1798	19.99
1799	19.70
1800	17.42
1801	16.61
1802	30.67
1803	20.52
1804	22.76
1805	19.19
1806	21.22
1807	20.09
1808	37.22
1809	18.80
1810	14.07
1811	35.62
1812	13.07

The average level of tariffs for the 10-year period from 1791 to 1800 was just under 15 percent (14.89 percent) while for the 10-year period 1801 to 1810 it was 21.4 percent.

It is of great interest to note that during the first two decades of the Republic the tariff level ranged from 15 to 21 percent, a period when tariffs were primarily for revenue and not for protection. This was the free-trade period in American tariff history. Yet last year, 1948, the average tariffs on dutiable imports were only 13.7 percent, an amount lower than during the first 25 years of our history. It can truly be said that today America is a free-trade country, with the lowest level of tariffs in its history, with tariffs lower than the revenue tariffs of 150 years ago.

C. Tariffs from 1816 to 1861

The 45-year period from 1816 to the Civil War in 1861 was marked by the inauguration of a protective-tariff system in 1816 just after the close of the War of 1812. Increasing protection was given manufactures for the next 15 to 20 years, after which the level of protective tariffs showed a downward trend to 1861.

The upward trend of protective tariffs to 1830 and the trend toward lower protective tariffs from 1830 to 1860 is indicated in the average tariff level by 10-year periods from 1810 to 1860. These were as follows:

Duties collected as a percent of the value of dutiable imports

10-year period:	Percent
1811–20	24.06
1821–30	37.47
1831–40	31.22
1841–50	27.01
1851–60	24.06

While protective tariffs when averaged for 10-year periods varied from a low of 24 percent to a high of 37 percent, the range for individual years was much greater. In 1830 the tariff level was 47.59 percent and was in excess of 40 percent for the years 1826, 1828, 1829, 1833, and 1835. For the 10 years ending in 1845, with the exception of one year, the tariff level was never less than 25 percent and never over 30 percent. From a level of 30 percent in 1845 the tariff declined gradually during the next 15 years to a level of only 19 and a fraction percent for the years 1859, 1860, and 1861. This was the lowest tariff level reached until 1920 when the Wilsonian free trade tariff took effect at the end of World War I.

The principal tariff acts passed between 1816 and 1861 were the acts of 1816, 1824, 1828, 1833, 1842, 1846, and 1857. The first three of these acts (1816, 1824, and 1828) raised tariffs and gave a high degree of protection to cotton and woolen goods and to some kinds of iron. In the tariff of 1828, for example, tariffs on woolen goods reached 100 percent ad valorem.

Beginning with the tariff act of 1833, protective duties were lowered in each successive tariff act with the exception of the 1842 act which raised tariffs for the 4-year period from 1842 to 1846. The Walker Tariff Act of 1846 and the Tariff Act of 1857 brought about substantial reductions in tariffs, the average tariff level falling from 29.2 percent in 1846 to 19.1 percent in 1861.

It was during the congressional battles over the tariff acts of 1828 and 1833 that the split between the South and the North over protective tariffs became acute, the South favoring tariffs for revenue only and the North favoring high tariffs to protect manufacturers which were rapidly expanding in the Northern States.

D. Tariffs from 1861 to 1913

The 53-year period from the beginning of the Civil War to the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson in 1913 was a period when the Republican Party was in power almost all of the time and when the tariffs were maintained consistently at a protectionist level. The annual level of the tariff by 10-year periods from 1860 to 1913 never fell below 40 percent and never rose much above 40 percent, although the level nearly reached 50 percent from 1898 to 1904. The average annual tariff level by decades during this period was as follows:

Tariff level (annual average)

10-year period:	Percent
1861–70	44.62
1871–80	41.95
1881–90	44.53
1891–1900	46.73
1901–10	45.20

During the Civil War period from 1861 to 1865 a series of tariff acts was passed, the net effect of which was to raise the level of tariffs from 19.1 percent in 1861 to 53.1 percent in 1865. Tariffs were raised for three reasons: To increase revenues to help finance the war; to provide additional protection for manufacturing; and to impose countervailing duties to equal the internal-revenue taxes levied on various manufactured products as a means of helping to finance the war.

During the first few years after the war ended in 1865 tariffs were lowered on various commodities, such as coffee, tea, sugar, spices, etc., but these were revenue tariffs. At the same time tariff duties on woolens and other manufactured goods of certain kinds were increased. The net effect was to maintain the protective tariff general level above 40 percent, or over twice that when the war began.

The election of Grover Cleveland on the Democratic ticket in 1892 led to the passage of the Wilson Tariff Act (named for the Congressman who introduced the bill) in 1894. Some duties were reduced under the 1894 act, but the net effect on the general level of tariffs was slight.

When the Republicans came back into power with the election of McKinley in 1896, they quickly passed a new tariff act on July 24, 1897, known as the Dingley Act. This act provided for substantial increases in protective-tariff duties on many commodities so that for the next 7 years the average tariff level was about 50 percent. This was the peak level of protective tariffs for a 7-consecutive-year period throughout our entire history.

This 7-year period of high protective tariffs averaging about 50 percent came to an end with the year 1904. For this year the tariff level was 49 percent and gradually sank year by year to a level of 40 percent for the year 1913.

Brief mention should be made of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act passed in 1909 by the Republicans under President Taft. Both major parties in the election of 1908 adopted a plank in their platform favoring a downward revision of the tariff. This tariff act provided for reductions in tariffs on 584 items and for increases on 300 items, many of which were on cotton goods of various types. The net effect of this tariff was to bring about a slight decrease in the tariff level from 1909 to 1913. The tariff level fell from 43 percent in 1909 to 40 percent in 1913.

E. Tariffs from 1913 to 1921

In the election campaign of 1912 the Republican Party came out boldly in its platform in favor of protective tariffs, while the Democratic Party platform came out flatly opposed to all protective tariffs and stated it believed in tariffs for revenue only. In fact the Democratic platform went so far as to assert the following:

"We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue."

Because of the split in the Republican Party occasioned by Teddy Roosevelt's formation of the Bull Moose Party, the Democrats won the election and Woodrow Wilson became President on March 4, 1913.

The first thing Congress did after Wilson's inauguration was to take up the question of revision of the tariffs and on October 3, 1913, the Underwood Tariff Act was passed. The Underwood tariff reduced tariffs on many commodities and eliminated tariffs entirely on a large number of commodities, placing them on the free list.

Under the Underwood tariff the following commodities were deprived of all tariffs and placed on the free list: Raw wool; metals; agricultural products including live cattle, meats, wheat, corn, flax, tea, hemp; and numerous manufactures including boots, shoes, gunpowder, woodpulp, and print paper.

The full economic effects of these drastic reductions in tariffs could not be measured during the immediate years that followed because 9 months after the passage of the act, World War I broke out in Europe. The war greatly increased the demand for United States exports and greatly reduced imports from Europe at the same time that imports increased from other continents. But even so a pronounced drop in the tariff level occurred between 1914 and 1918 which became even greater in the 2 years following the war. The tariff level by years from 1913 to 1920 was as follows:

	Percent
1913	40.1
1914	37.6
1915	33.4
1916	30.7
1917	27.2
1918	24.4
1919	21.3
1920	16.4

These levels of tariff just described are the ratio between the value of duties collected and the value of dutiable imports. If the value of imports on the free list are included, the tariff level for 1921 was only 6.4 percent compared with 17.7 percent for 1913.

It is of interest to note that the level of protective tariffs fell over 50 percent in 5 years and fell 33 percent during the 2-year period 1918 to 1920. It is also significant to note that a slump in prices and widespread unemployment accompanied these rapid reductions in protective tariffs.

So disastrous had become the fall in prices and unemployment in 1920, particularly the fall in agricultural prices, that an emergency tariff was rushed through May 28, 1921. The return of the Republican Party to power in the Presidential election in November 1920 paved the way for new tariff legislation providing for adequate protective tariffs.

F. Tariffs from 1921 to 1934

During the 14-year period from 1921 to 1934 three important tariff acts were passed; the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930.

The Emergency Tariff Act of 1921

The Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 was rushed through primarily for three reasons. In the first place, it was to satisfy the wide-

spread demand of American farmers for protection from imports of foreign agricultural products. In the second place, it was to prevent the dumping of foreign-produced goods in the United States at prices below the foreigners' cost of production. Finally, in the third place, it was to provide for the protection of American producers against the devaluation of foreign currencies, a device which was widespread after World War I as a means of circumventing protective tariffs of other countries.

The tremendous slump in farm prices following loss of foreign markets threatened the American farmer with competition from foreign agricultural producers and was the principal reason for rushing through the tariff legislation in 1921. Protective duties were levied on imports of wheat, flax seed, corn, beans, peanuts, potatoes, onions, rice, peanut, cottonseed, and soya bean oils, cattle, sheep, and fresh or frozen meats. The import duty levied on wheat was 35 cents per bushel, on corn 15 cents per bushel, on potatoes 25 cents per bushel, on beans 2 cents per pound, and sheep $2 per head, on fresh or frozen meats 2 cents per pound, on peanuts 3 cents per pound, on rice 2 cents per pound, on cattle 30 percent ad valorem, and meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for, 25 percent ad valorem. Protective duties were also levied on cotton, wool, sugar, butter, cheese, milk, tobacco, apples, cherries, and other products.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922

The emergency act of 1921 was superseded the following year by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922.

Since the passage of the Underwood Tariff Act in 1913 drastic changes in the economic conditions in the United States and other countries had occurred as a result of World War I and the conditions which followed the war. These changes in conditions in world production and trade required a reappraisal of American tariff policy. In general the tariff adjustments of 1922 took the form of higher duties. The enactment of higher import duties in 1922 may be attributed to the following five causes:

1. Fear of excessive imports following the cessation of hostilities and the return to more normal conditions.

2. The demand for higher duties by a number of industries, especially chemical and mineral, newly created or greatly expanded as a result of the extraordinary demands made upon them by the shutting off of foreign sources of supply during the war.

3. The increased competition encountered by staple agricultural products resulting from overproduction in domestic areas under the stimulus of war conditions and the return to production of low-cost areas developed during the war as well as by the return to production in various war areas.

4. The demand that industries producing material essential to war be encouraged.

5. Changes in economic conditions resulting from depreciation of currency in many European countries and from the depression of 1921.

The professed general objective of the 1922 tariff act was to restore import duties to approximately the level prevailing before the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913. In the majority of schedules this was actually done although in individual cases duties were lowered while in other cases they were raised above the 1913 level. For example duties were raised on chemicals, oils, and paints from 22 percent to 29 percent ad valorem, on metals and manufactures of metals, from 24 percent to 33 percent ad valorem, and on wood and manufactures of wood, from 13 percent to 24 percent. On the other hand, import duties on tobacco and manufactures of tobacco were reduced from 83 percent to 54 percent, while duties on spirits, wines, and other beverages were reduced from 90 percent to 39 percent ad valorem. The net effect of all the changes can be seen by comparing the ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable imports for the year 1914 and the year 1926, 4 years after the passage of the act. In 1926 import duties collected averaged 39 percent of the value of all dutiable imports compared with 38 percent for the year 1914. For the entire period from the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act, September 22, 1922, to the passage of the Hawley-Smoot law, June 18, 1930, the average import duties were 38.5 percent of the value of all dutiable imports.

Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff from 1909 to 1913 import duties were 40.8 percent of the value of dutiable imports. Hence, it will be seen that the protective tariffs under the Republicans during the decade following World War I were lower than the tariffs prior to the First World War. Furthermore, during the decade of the 1920's a larger percent of our imports came in free of any duties than during the prewar period, 1909 to 1913. During the decade of the 1920's 64 percent of all our imports came in free of duty while only 53 percent of all imports came in free of duty during the period 1909 to 1913.

Flexible Tariff Provisions

The Tariff Act of 1922 also provided, in section 315, for a system of flexible tariffs in order to equalize foreign and domestic costs of production. The President was authorized to increase or decrease existing rates of duties by not more than 50 percent after investigation by the Tariff Commission. Very few changes, however, were made under this authorization prior to 1934 and, in these cases where the President exerted his power, it was usually to raise duties.

Another important provision of the act of 1922 was that contained in section 316, which provided for additional duties, or in extreme cases, that imports might be completely prohibited, if a foreign country engaged in unfair competition.

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 was passed primarily in order to provide still greater protection for the American farmer against competitive imports of oil, fats, dairy products, hides, skins, and numerous other agricultural products. The purpose was to preserve the home market in these commodities for the American farmer. Furthermore, certain other industries were experiencing increased competition from imports of foreign goods and demanded more protection. Some increases in import duties on industrial products were, also, made to compensate for the higher duties upon raw materials which were provided by the 1930 act.

The net effect of the various tariff changes in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was to raise the average import-duty level over the 1922 act from 38 percent to 41 percent ad valorem. Since, however, the period from 1930 through 1933 was one of depression and declining prices and, since many duties were specific, the net effect was to raise the average level on tariffs considerably above 41 percent. The average amount of import duties collected as a percentage of the value of all dutiable imports reached 59.1 percent for the year 1932, but by 1935, as prices rose, had dropped back to 42.9 percent.

The Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 continued the flexible tariff provisions of the 1922 act, which authorized the President to increase or decrease the duties by as much as 50 percent on recommendation of the Tariff Commission. One change was made, however. The power of the Tariff Commission was strengthened and the President was no longer given the power to alter the actual rate recommended.

The Revenue Acts of 1932 and 1934

In 1932 an amendment was attached to a revenue act providing for the imposition of duties on petroleum, petroleum products, coal, lumber, and copper. In 1934 similar action was taken with respect to whale and fish oils. These new duties were classed as import taxes and were not considered as import duties subject to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Conclusions, 1920–34 Period

In conclusion, it may be stated that the level of protective tariffs under the Republicans from 1922 to 1930 was slightly lower than the level which prevailed from 1880 to 1913. Under the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 the level of tariff rates was slightly increased but the actual effect was a substantial temporary increase in the tariff level because of the rapid fall in prices from 1930 to 1933. With the return of rising prices, which began in 1932, the protective-tariff level started to decline and in 1936 fell to 39.2 percent. This is a level approximately equal to that during the 1920's under the Fordney-McCumber Act. Not enough trade agreements had been signed by 1936 under the terms of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to noticeably affect the tariff level. During 1934 and 1935 only 9 trade agreements had been signed and in every case but one were with small countries such as Belgium, Cuba, Haiti, and Honduras.

G. Tariffs from 1934 to 1949

Despite the fact that there have been no new tariff acts since the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Act in 1930, we must regard the period from June 1934 to the present as a separate one in the tariff history of the United States. On the 12th of June 1934 Congress passed an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, the so-called Trade Agreements Act. With this amendment Congress authorized the President to negotiate and enter into foreign-trade agreements. To give the President bargaining power he was authorized to raise or lower tariffs a maximum of 50 percent of the rates of the Tariff Act of 1930. The ostensible reason for surrendering the legislative function in regard to making tariffs was the desire to assist in the then existing emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic employment, and the present economic depression, etc.

In advocating this means of reducing tariffs, the Roosevelt administration lived up to its commitments in the Democratic Party platform of the 1932 election, when the party had pledged reduction of tariffs. The act had been passed primarily as an emergency measure, and under the terms of the act its duration was to be 3 years. However, under this authority the administration reduced tariffs to the lowest level in United States history, and several extensions of the act continued it far beyond the point when it could have had any justification as an emergency measure. In 1937 and 1940 the act was extended for 3 years each, and in 1943 for 2 years only. In 1945 it was extended for another 3 years, and the President was again entitled to raise or lower the rates of duty by a maximum of 50 percent of the rates in force on January 1, 1945. In other words, those products which had suffered a reduction by 50 percent of the rate under the 1930 act by virtue of the first Trade Agreements Act, could again be affected by a further reduction of 50 percent. Thus, on a good number of products the reduction of duties reached 75 percent of the rates provided for under the Tariff Act of 1930. In 1948 the Trade Agreements Act was continued for 1 year only, with a few changes, the most important being the provision for peril-point studies by the Tariff Commission.

Under the Trade Agreements Act trade agreements with 42 nations are in effect today. Twenty-three of these agreements were negotiated in one great tariff-cutting festival at Geneva, Switzerland, where 23 nations bartered and horse traded with each other for tariff reductions.

At the present time in Annecy, France, the GATT nations have again met to discuss the results of the first Geneva agreements on tariffs and trade, and to negotiate with 13 more nations on further tariff cuts.

The agreements entered into under the Trade Agreements Act are executive agreements and as such are not subject to congressional approval. The function of legislating on tariffs was surrendered to the President under the 1934 act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the New Deal free trade program has had some strange bedfellows in the past, men like Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, V. Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, and Victor Perlo.

Details of their participation in the program were given in Mr. David Senter's column, published in the Baltimore News-Post and other Hearst newspapers on Monday, May 2, 1955, under the heading "Washington Window: The Free Trade Program Debate."

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article above referred to.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON WINDOW: THE FREE TRADE PROGRAM DEBATE

(By David Sentner)

Soviet spies and Communists in top Government posts (so labeled in congressional testimony) had much to do with the creation of the free-trade program which will be debated this week in the Senate.

Alger Hiss was chairman of the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade and personally plugged for renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1948 just before the heat was turned on over his connection with the pumpkin papers.

And GATT, academically known as the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, which will get its lumps as an internationalist Socialist scheme from opponents on the Senate floor, grew out of proposals developed in 1944 and 1945 by an interdepartmental committee headed by a State Department official.

The official members of the committee from the Treasury Department included Harry Dexter White and Frank Coe, White's assistant.

Later, the Treasury Department records show Harold Glasser, Assistant Director of Monetary Research, was among the small group who aided in developing the proposals.

Harry Dexter White was flatly labeled a Soviet spy by Attorney General Brownell who insisted the FBI had repeatedly warned appropriate officials concerning White's espionage activities.

Coe was a member of a Communist cell in Government, according to the testimony of former spy queen Elizabeth Bentley.

The Russian-born Glasser was named by Miss Bentley as a member of the Red espionage ring, headed by Victor Perlo, operating in Government.

White, Coe, and Glasser had key roles in developing the plan for an international trade organization of the U. N. Coe headed the Treasury contingent with Glasser in the No. 2 spot. Glasser's alternate was Victor Perlo.

The whole reciprocal trade program and GATT, according to Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, was aimed "to cut the United States down and build other countries up, including Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

"It was promoted by free traders, one-worlders and Soviet spies," MALONE charges.

MALONE revealed that the Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuel Economics, which he heads, turned up letters and memorandum of Harry Dexter White. "This data," MALONE said, "exposed White's efforts to destroy the American mining industry, particularly as it related to strategic minerals, without which we could not fight a war or expand our peacetime economy."

MALONE maintained that with certain Iron Curtain nations members, the Communist bloc is in a position to get inside trade information on American industry.

GATT, although a twin of the international trade agreements legislation, has never been submitted to or approved by Congress, he pointed out.

The State Department maintains the complicated postwar problems of international trade are being solved through the reciprocal trade program and GATT.

MALONE insists that there has been no expansion, in general, of American agricultural products as the result of the program.

He cites reduced exports in cotton, tobacco, butter, rye, oats and other farm commodities.

He grants that wheat shows a slight export gain but attributes this to it being subsidized by the Government.

In the midst of the imminent hullabaloo from both sides of the aisle in the Senate this week over renewal of the reciprocal trade program, let us face one soft-pedaled fact:

Congress let go its inherent authority over tariff control and turned this power over to the State Department because it was glad to get rid of a hot potato—meaning the incessant pressures from constituents to protect this industry and that product.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Nevada has used his hour. Is the next hour subject to the control of the majority leader?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada should be defeated. It was rejected by the Finance Committee by an almost unanimous vote. In my opinion, it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

AMENDMENT CONFORMS TO CONSTITUTION OF UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute—Calendar 242—now before this body conforms to the Constitution of the United States.

AMERICANS EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

Under this amendment the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would proceed to adjust the duties or tariffs on each product on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—giving the American workingmen and investors equal access to their own markets.

Mr. President, my amendments directs the Tariff Commission, as an agent of Congress in arriving at the proper duties or tariffs on a fair and reasonable competitive basis "to develop and promote a well balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture" to consider:

First. Manipulation of the price of their money in terms of the dollar for trade advantage by a foreign country.

Second. Subsidies for exports of any character.

Third. Set quantitative limits—quotas.

Fourth. Consider the declared landed duty paid customs cost—and the offered-for-sale price.

Fifth. Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Tariff Commission either upon its own motion, application of any person or group—a congressional committee or of the President.

However, full public hearings must be held and then may become effective within 90 days, provided that any order must be submitted to Congress and will then become effective if not disapproved in whole or in part by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days.

Mr. President, through the adoption of this amendment the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade will revert to the Congress of the United States in accordance with the Constitution of the United States—and the policy which we followed as a nation for nearly a century of time resulting in the highest standard of living in all of the history of the world.

And Mr. President, the workingmen and investors of this Nation will be back in business with equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) Tariff Commission findings made pursuant to this section shall be final and conclusive as to the existence of, or threat of, serious injury to a domestic industry."

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the escape clause provisions of the trade-agreements law were intended by the Congress to provide a mechanism whereby domestic industry and labor would be protected from serious injury or threatened serious injury from increased imports into

the United States as a result, in whole or in part, of reductions in the tariff duties fixed by the Congress.

The manner in which this provision has been applied has largely nullified this congressional intention. Specific amendment of the law seems necessary in order to prevent further obstruction of the congressional will.

Of some 51 investigations completed by the Tariff Commission under the escape-clause provision of the present law, reports in 15 cases have gone to the White House for action by the President.

Of these 15 cases, the findings of the Commission of injury or threatened injury were unanimous in 7 cases. In 5 cases, a majority of the Commission reported injury or threatened injury, and in the remaining 3, the Commission divided equally, 3 to 3.

In only 5 of the 12 cases where the Commission unanimously or by majority vote found injury or threatened injury did the President act in accordance with the Commission's findings and recommendations.

In the remaining 7 cases, 3 of which were unanimous findings, the President refused to adopt and follow the Commission's findings and recommendations, basing his action on disagreement with the Commission's findings of fact or on factors which had not entered into the consideration and deliberation of the Commission.

In the 3 cases where the Commission divided equally in submitting its recommendations the President refused to make any increase in existing tariff duties. In each of these 3 cases, significantly, its original report was referred back to the Commission by the President for further investigation and report, an action which is believed to be not contemplated by the existing law.

Escape clause proceedings before the Tariff Commission are lengthy and involve exhaustive field investigations and public hearings at which all interested parties are given full opportunity to present all available facts in support of or against the claim of injury or threatened injury. Testimony is under oath, and full and complete cross-examination to test the verity and completeness thereof is permitted.

A domestic industry has no appeal from the findings of fact of the Tariff Commission and no further forum in which to pursue its case.

In practice, the President apparently has followed the opinions of his own advisers, but from statements issued by the President these rejections frequently have been based on evidence not presented in the proceedings before the Tariff Commission and which no interested party had any opportunity to rebut or otherwise explain, or perhaps on the basis of evidence produced by a foreign government or a foreign industry and channeled through the State Department outside of the public proceedings and beyond the public forum contemplated by the law.

A study of all of the cases in which the President has refused to adopt and follow findings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission establishes that in each instance he has conducted an inquiry separately and independently from that made by the Tariff Commission, that in the course of such inquiries no opportunity was given, at least to any domestic industry, to furnish additional evidence or rebut the evidence or interpretations of facts suggested by the Presidential advisers.

Such investigations and rejections of the Commission's findings completely nullify and negate the original intention of the Congress in prescribing criteria to govern escape-clause proceedings. The law does not seem to contemplate nor warrant this type of second guessing.

The Finance Committee has recommended an amendment to the statute which would authorize emergency action by the President on certification from the Director of Defense Mobilization in any case where an article is being imported in such quantities as to threaten or impair the national security. This amendment is laudable but seems to be a procedure entirely outside the escape-clause provisions and does not meet a situation here outlined arising from refusal by the President to adopt Tariff Commission findings of injury under such escape-clause cases.

If the Congress is firm and sincere in its intention that the power which it has delegated to make reductions in United States tariff duties shall not be permitted to seriously injure or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry, then no condition should be permitted to continue which would impair or nullify that intent. The amendment suggested will insure that the will of the Congress that serious injury or threatened serious injury shall not be permitted to result from reductions in tariff duties, will be given full force and effect.

I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado such time as he may desire.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am very much chagrined to have to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland. The amendment would completely eliminate the President so far as his responsibility under the reciprocal trade system is concerned. That is what the amendment really would accomplish.

The administration is opposed to the amendment. I could not find any substantial sentiment in the committee to support an amendment of this kind. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BEALL. I dislike to go against my own leader in the committee. Therefore, in view of the fact that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] have considered such an amendment, and I have now expressed my own opinion about it, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland withdraws his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agreed yesterday with the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming to yield him 20 minutes on the bill. Would it be agreeable to the Senator to take that time now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am willing to accommodate myself to the wishes of the majority leader. I understood that it was the intention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to offer an amendment at this time. Will the Senator from Minnesota be present?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, several amendments are at the desk. I understand the Senator from Minnesota has an amendment he plans to call up. I also understand the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has 4 amendments he intends to call up. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has 2 amendments, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has 1 amendment.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Wyoming. Senators who have amendments pending should be notified that if they want to have their amendments considered, they should be present to call them up; otherwise, it will be necessary to proceed with the consideration of the bill.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming 20 minutes on the bill. I hope that in the meantime other Senators will find it possible to come to the Chamber, and, if they have sufficient interest in their amendments, that they will call them up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Texas for his consideration.

My auditors will note from the sound of my voice that my vocal cords are not in good order. I hope it will not be necessary for me to take all the time which has been allotted to me.

I shall present later in the day an amendment which will provide that no trade agreement negotiated by the President shall become effective until it has been submitted to both Houses of Congress and by them approved. It is my firm belief that we shall be surrendering the constitutional power of Congress if we do otherwise.

Much as I dislike to read speeches, I must do so today because of the condition of my voice. I have therefore tried to commit to writing some of the arguments which may be presented to Members of the Senate with respect to the vital need of preserving the constitutional power of Congress to write the laws imposing duties on imports, and regulating foreign and interstate commerce.

CONGRESS IS COMMITTING SUICIDE

Congress is committing suicide, though unwittingly, because it is delegating to the executive branch of the Government the power to represent the people of the whole Nation, the people of every State and of every community. The power is being delegated not to elective officers, but to officers who are appointed at the

pleasure of the President, and who conduct in secret their sessions dealing with the vital problem of international trade.

The public is deceived if it believes that the bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act is a measure to protect the national security or even to facilitate international trade. The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of executive government.

Congress is slowly dealing away its powers as a popular legislative body at the very time when popular government throughout the world stands upon the very brink of destruction. The lawmakers of the people cannot continue to delegate their power, and at the same time imagine that they are preserving free government.

The Constitution left to us by the Founders was designed to establish a government of the people. The government we shall have, if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is extended for another 3 years, will be in the pattern of totalitarian tyrannies, the very tyrannies we denounce in the persuasive tones of Jacob, while we are destroying the legislative powers of the only government on earth which can now preserve freedom for mankind.

THE GOVERNMENT IS BEING TRANSFORMED

Our form of government is being transformed before our eyes, and we shall not like it when it has been accomplished, because Senators and Representatives will have surrendered their constitutional power to shape the economic laws under which the citizens who elected them must live.

We are told that these trade agreements will be made by the President. That is merely a polite deception, if deception can ever be polite. The agreements will not be made by the President.

I say that with every emphasis I can command. In spite of the testimony of the Secretary of State, in spite of everything that has been said, these trade agreements will not be made by the President of the United States. They will not be made by any persons elected by the people of this country, nor by any person appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to discharge duties imposed upon them by law. These treaties—I call them treaties, because in truth they are treaties—will be made by anonymous experts drawn from eight departments and the Tariff Commission, under the leadership of the State Department, to shape in secret the trade policy of our people.

The decisions will not be made by management, by labor, or by the participants in trade and commerce, but by Government employees who vote in only seven States of the Union. Colorado, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Utah, and Virginia are the only States represented on the Trade Agreements Committee.

It took me considerable time to find out the names of the individuals who constitute the committee and who do the actual work in making trade agreements.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator knows I am under a time limitation.

Mr. MALONE. I shall take only a short time. I agree thoroughly with what the Senator is saying. Could the Senator imagine any elected representative of the people in the Senate or the House of Representatives trading one sector of the economy of America for a fancied foreign policy advantage?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot imagine such a thing; but I think it would be done under the bill.

Mr. MALONE. But it would not be done by the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish now to recite the names of the individuals who will do the work:

Carl D. Corse, Chairman; Chief of Trade Agreements and Trades Division, State Department.

Miss M. Margaret McCoy, secretary of the committee, State Department.

Gerald E. Tichenor, Deputy Assistant, Administration of Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture.

Robert E. Simpson, Director, Office of Economic Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce.

Prentice N. Dean, Associate Chief, Foreign Economic Defense Affairs Division, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Miss Katharine Jacobson, trade and tariff liaison officer, Office of Trade, Investment and Monetary Affairs, Foreign Operations Administration.

Harry Shooshan, international activities assistant, Technical Review Staff, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior.

Philip Arnow, Associate Director, Office of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.

Edgar B. Brossard, Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.

George H. Willis, Director, Office of International Finance, Department of the Treasury.

Mr. President and Senators, these are the individuals, they and their substitutes, and not the President, to whom this power is being delegated. No one of them, so far as I have been able to discover, has ever faced the electorate of the States in which they claim their residence, but they, not the President, will make the agreements which will be known to foreign governments long before they are made known to Congress, which has the constitutional power to levy the duties and imposts with which these experts are to deal.

I do not challenge the ability, the integrity, or the honor of these experts, but I say they do not represent free government. They represent executive government. They do not represent the people. They are expert theorists who have never received any authority from the people of the United States except to such an extent as they may be civil-service appointees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator realize I am under a time limitation? However, I shall be glad to answer a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I gather from the Senator's remarks that he is saying we are delegating our authority to a group whom the people of the United States have no way of controlling at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. The Constitution of the United States provided that each State should have two Senators in this body. Why? So that they would be here watching what was going on, and protecting the interests of their own States and the national interest. Yet it is lightly proposed that we delegate this duty to others whom we do not know.

THIS IS NOT THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

Our Constitution was framed by men who wanted to deprive the King of the power to force through Parliament the laws by which they should be governed. The leaders of the American Revolution wanted a government in which the people should draw their own laws through a legislative assembly of their own choosing. They wanted a government in which these laws should be drawn in public and debated in public, but the Finance Committee of the Senate asks us to enact a statute by which we shall delegate to the President the power to redelegate the constitutional authority of Congress to experts operating behind closed doors.

This is not the American system of government. If we know a thing about what is happening in the world, we must be aware that popular government is being taken over by executive authority on every continent.

If we despise communism it is because it is a dictatorship and its laws are written behind closed doors. If we despise fascism, it is because that also is a dictatorship and the people have nothing to say about their government.

In Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, and here in the United States, too, executive power is invading the prerogatives of the legislative body.

In 1937, When President Roosevelt sent to Congress a bill which I believed would allow the President to invade the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, I did not hesitate to fight it. When the first trade-agreements bill was proposed in 1934, I did not hesitate to demand, as I demand now by my amendment, that the agreements should not become effective until approved by the Congress.

Let nobody think that the danger is slight. It is not. It is serious. It is more serious and more imminent than we realize. It is hanging over us.

HOW THE CHANGE BEGAN

It has been developing for more than 60 years. But, because this delegation of congressional power was first granted 21 years ago, and because the delegation of congessional power to fix railroad rates was first granted in 1887, we are face to face with a habit which inevitably will lead to the death of free legislative assemblies unless we stop it now.

We have created the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and a score of other quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative bodies to which we have conveyed the detailed powers of Congress to deal with legislative matters. But we were always careful in these grants of power to prescribe the standards on the

basis of which such commissions would be compelled to act. We were careful to refrain from making a grant involving the determination of general policy. In this instance, however, we are granting the President of the United States discretion to frame the policy with respect to international trade without he knowledge of Congress, which alone has the right to speak for the people.

It is easy to see how this has come about. The Government has grown larger and larger because the problems confronting it have become more numerous, more intricate, and more worldwide in scope. National business has done away with old frontiers; and the legislative demands upon Congress have become so great that some of its powers had to be delegated under careful safeguards.

The Government has grown so great that everyone knows the responsibilities of enforcing the law are beyond the physical capacity of the Chief Executive and the time within which he has to work, namely, the 24-hour day which applies to everyone. So for 25 years the White House has been expanding, just as Government boards and commissions have been expanding. There are more anonymous legislators and executives behind the White House doors than any committee of Congress has even counted. Mr. President, a reading of the appropriation bills will disclose how the executive employees in the White House have grown in number. Many of them are discharging duties which the Congress assigned to other officials. For example, the President has in his Cabinet an Attorney General, who is at the head of the Department of Justice. In every department of the Government there are lawyers; their employment has been authorized by the Congress, and they are paid by appropriations made by the Congress. But the President also has in the White House his own personal counsel, to pass upon the problems which come to the President for decision. This personal counsel appointed by the President is not confirmed by the Senate. Yet he deals with the great, vital problems with which the country now is faced.

A few years ago, with the thought that it would be a measure of economy, we adopted Reorganization Plan No. 12 of the Hoover Commission, by which the chairmen of several boards and commissions were given the housekeeping authority of their legislative agencies. Now these chairmen have, in most cases, become the pipelines through which the White House—and by this I do not mean the President; I mean the anonymous aids and assistants by whom he has been surrounded—convey to the quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agencies of Government the policies they are to follow in the judgment of cases and in the determination of rates and routes.

SECRECY SUPPORTS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

Every lobbyist in Washington and every Senator and Representative in Congress knows that is the way the power of the White House is exercised to direct legislative policy in secret; and both branches of Congress are being stripped of the power vested in them by the Constitution.

Thus there has been created the method by which special privileges for the few, the big business organizations, are granted, to the detriment of equal rights for all. The members of the executive, the members of quasi-judicial bodies, the boards and commissions that rule our economic life, all have taken the oath to support and defend the Constitution. But so long as Congress continues to delegate away its powers under the Constitution, so long as it is willing to stand by while boards and commissions and presidential committees meet in secret session and perform the duties of Congress, so long must we be prepared to have a government of special privilege, not a Government of the people. Popular government is not free from error; but when popular government is conducted publicly, as conceived by the framers of the Constitution, special privilege has much smaller chance of gaining its greedy objectives. That is why the legislative power must be exercised in the light of public knowledge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming on the bill has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, this country is being transformed into an executive government, and Congress blandly and calmly cuts its own throat, although every Member thereof has taken his oath to support a Constitution which provides in the simplest of simple words, in the first section of the first article, that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

But, Mr. President, the legislative power of fixing duties and imposts is, by means of the pending bill and its predecessors, delegated away from the constitutional authority, and is vested in the Executive, at a time when all through the world dictatorial power in the executive is arising to destroy free government, such as the American system which we were sent here to represent and to defend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was kind enough to answer several questions put to him by me. I appreciate his courtesy. However, I noticed that the RECORD, as printed, shows an answer to my last question which I did not understand to have been given, and which I do not believe the senior Senator from Colorado intended.

I should like to repeat the question, noting that the Senator from Colorado is on the floor.

The question is set forth on page 5299 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, 1955; and I ask the Senator from Colorado to comment on it, after I repeat it. The question is this—and I now address it again to the senior Senator from Colorado:

> At least it is the intention of the Committee on Finance that this amendment—

We were talking about section 7 (b)—

> shall be used to protect us in the matter of oil imports and the importation of other commodities which are necessary to our national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am very sorry if my answer was not as clear and specific as it should have been, when we had our exchange the other day.

I wish to say that was the intention of the Senate Finance Committee. That was the purpose of writing the amendment and of adopting it in the committee.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Did the committee hear evidence to the effect that an increase of oil imports above the 1954 ratio between imports and domestic production would endanger the national security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The committee heard such evidence.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Colorado remember any evidence to the contrary?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, certain excerpts from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 232, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The committee believes that this amendment will provide a means for assistance to the various national defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented.
>
> The White House issued on February 26, 1955, a report based on a study by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy which indicates the importance of a strong domestic petroleum industry. That report states with regard to crude oil imports and residual fuel oil imports:
>
> "An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.
>
> "Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.
>
> "The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed

significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

"In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

"The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

"The committee recommends further that the desirable proportionate relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national-defense requirements.

"In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into consideration the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign oil supplies both in peace and war."

Although no similar study is presently available for fluorspar or lead and zinc the committee feels that the Director of Defense Mobilization will be cognizant of the serious situation existing in those industries.

Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for yielding to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 30, I sent to the desk, to be printed and lie on the table, amendments intended to be proposed by me, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], to the bill which now is pending. Those amendments are identified as "3-30-55-C." I do not ask to have the amendments read at this time, but I wish to have them identified, and I now call them up. The amendments were considered by the committee, but I wish to have them before the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendments proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY, for himself and Mr. KENNEDY, are as follows:

After the enacting clause insert "Title I."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That this" and insert "Section 1. This."

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Trade Adjustment Act of 1955.'

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) It is recognized that the maintenance of a sound domestic economy and healthy international relations requires that the United States engage in trade among the free nations of the world. Further, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 reflects the congressional desire that the President be authorized to negotiate with the other countries of the world with a view to lowering trade barriers. The Congress has also recognized, in enacting the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, that there are situations in which the reduction of trade barriers, although redounding to the benefit of the Nation as a whole, may have serious adverse effects on particular domestic industries. These provisions provide mechanisms for determining at what point reductions in trade barriers, either in prospect or already accomplished, will have such adverse effects. They provide no method by which greater prosperity and security for the Nation as a whole can be secured by the reduction of trade barriers, while avoiding or ameliorating the economic losses which particular communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals may suffer in the adjustment of their productive activities which may be made necessary by such reduction. It is the purpose of this title to resolve this problem by providing assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in the adjustment of their productive activity to the economic conditions created by the national trade policy. It is not the purpose of this title to provide a permanent subsidy, but rather to provide the means by which those affected by lowered trade barriers may be assisted in the period of their adjustment.

"(b) It is the intention of Congress that, in determining eligibility for the assistance provided for under this title, the title shall be construed liberally and that any doubt regarding eligibility shall be resolved in favor of the applicant.

"ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

"SEC. 203. The President shall appoint a 5-member board to be known as the Trade Adjustment Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), 1 member of which he shall designate as Chairman. The members of the Board shall be appointed from among the officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government and shall serve without compensation in addition to that otherwise received as officers or employees in the executive branch of the Government, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board.

"SEC. 204. For the purposes of performing its duties, the Board is authorized to—

"(a) hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, and to take such testimony, as the Board may deem advisable;

"(b) secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this section; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Board upon request made by the Chairman;

"(c) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take testimony, to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Any member of the Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The Board is authorized to exercise any of the powers conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 21 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, and subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to witnesses before the Board; and

"(d) establish such rules, regulations and procedures as may be appropriate to permit the Board to perform the functions prescribed in this title.

"SEC. 205. (a) Whenever the President, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by section 212 of this title, shall determine to invoke the provisions of this title with reference to any article as to which a modification in the rate of duty or other import restriction, or any other concession, has been found either to threaten or to have caused serious injury to a domestic industry, he shall notify the Board of his decision.

"(b) After the notification by the President provided for above, the Board shall, upon application by any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees, determine whether the applicant is eligible, or represents persons eligible, to receive the benefits provided for in this title. If the Board shall determine that any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees is eligible for the benefits provided for in this title, or represents persons so eligible, it shall issue a certificate describing the community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, or employees found eligible which shall conclusively establish for a period of 18 months or such shorter period as the Board may determine that the described persons are eligible for the benefits provided for in this title. Such certificates shall state the period for which they are valid and shall automatically expire at the end of such period. Upon application, the Board shall have authority to renew any certificates of eligibility for successive periods of 18 months, or less, upon a showing that such renewal is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title. The Board shall also have authority on its own motion, or upon the motion of any interested person, to cancel any such certificate of eligibility if it finds the continued existence of such certificate is not necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title.

"(c) The following may be determined by the Board to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title:

"(1) Any business enterprise engaged in the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with an article with reference to which this title shall have been invoked.

"(2) Any unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this title.

"(3) Any community a substantial number of the residents of which are individuals who are eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this title.

"(4) Any industrial development corporation organized for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title.

"In determining whether a particular business enterprise is eligible for the benefits provided for in this title, the Board shall consider what portion of the total production of such enterprise consists of the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with the article with reference to which this title shall have been invoked. In deter-

mining whether any such enterprise or any community or industrial development corporation is eligible for such benefits the Board shall also consider whether such enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation has developed satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this title.

"(d) As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'industrial development corporation' includes any body organized and operated by private citizens for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community through industrial development, the training or retraining of employees, or through any other means.

"(2) The term 'employee' includes an unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title.

"ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS

"SEC. 206. Information and Advice: Any business enterprise found to be eligible by the Board for assistance under this title may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice which might be of assistance in the development of more efficient methods of production and in the development of new lines of production. Similarly, any community or industrial development corporation found eligible for assistance under this title may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for such information and advice as will enable it to develop a more balanced and diversified economy.

"SEC. 207. Loans: Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended—

"(a) by striking out the word 'and' at the end of subsection (d);

"(b) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the word 'and'; and

"(c) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(f) to make such loans as the administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to business enterprises and communities, either in their corporate capacity or as represented through industrial development corporations or similar agencies, for the adjustment by such business enterprises and communities to economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made by the administration to any business enterprise or community unless the Trade Adjustment Board, as established under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955, shall have certified to the administration that such business enterprise or community is eligible for benefits under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954: *And provided further,* That the requirements of paragraphs (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable to the loans authorized to be made under this subsection.'

"SEC. 208. Unemployment compensation: (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall on behalf of the United States enter into an agreement with any State in which an enterprise or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under this title, is located, under which the State, as agent of the United States, will make supplementary payments of compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this section.

"(2) Supplementary payments of unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the Board under section 205 of this title to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this title.

"(3) If the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual under the law of the State in which he is eligible to receive unemployment compensation is less than 66⅔ percent of his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, then the amount of supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual under this section for a week of total unemployment shall be an amount equal to the amount by which 66⅔ percent of such average weekly wage exceeds the amount paid to the individual under the unemployment compensation law of the State (including payments made by reason of dependents).

"(4) In any case where an unemployed individual receiving supplementary compensation under this section is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, compensation in an amount equal to the rate of State unemployment compensation and any supplementary compensation under this section which he was receiving immediately prior to the time he was no longer entitled to receive such rate. In order to remain eligible for compensation under this paragraph, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment under this paragraph. The total period during which an unemployed individual may receive benefits under this section shall not exceed 52 weeks.

"(5) The amount of the Federal supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual for a week of partial unemployment shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the aggregate he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment compensation law of the State.

"(6) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1955.

"(b) Whenever the Board, either upon application of an interested party or upon its own motion, determines that unemployment among individuals found by the Board to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this title is no longer attributable to the trade policy of the United States, no further payments shall be made under this section to such individuals with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring after the date of such determination by the Board, or occurring during any period for which there is not in effect a certification under section 205 describing such individuals.

"(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

"(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

"(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

"(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

"(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of

the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

"SEC. 209. Training and transportation. (a) The Secretary shall—

"(1) prescribe and provide suitable training for unemployed individuals eligible for the benefits of this title who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation;

"(2) utilize and extend all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilize the facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(3) by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that (1) no job opportunity for an unemployed individual found eligible for the benefits of this title exists within his own current labor-market area, (2) a job opportunity for such individual equivalent to his former employment is available at a place in the United States outside of his current labor-market area, (3) such individual agrees to take the job opportunity outside of his labor-market area, and (4) the acceptance of such employment would be in the best interest of the United States, then the Secretary is authorized to make available to such individual at Government expense, facilities for the movement of such individual, his dependents and his household effects to a location designated by such individual and approved by the Secretary, by using Government or commercial means of transportation.

SEC. 210. Retirement. (a) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any individual, 60 years or older, included within a certificate of eligibility issued by the Board is unemployed as a result of the national trade policy of the United States and is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

"(b) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'RETIREMENT AGE

"'(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term "retirement age" means age 65.

"'(2) In the case of an individual who is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unemployed by reason of the trade policy of the United States and unable to find employment because of advanced age, the term "retirement age" means age 60.'

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect with respect to payments made for months beginning more than 1 month after the date this title is enacted.

"SEC. 211. Accelerated amortization: (a) Section 168 (e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding after the words 'necessary in the interest of national defense during the emergency period', the words 'or necessary for the development of new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise or of a more balanced economy in an eligible community'; and by adding after the words 'attributable to defense purposes' the words 'or the national trade policy of the United States, as the case may be.'

"(b) Section 168 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding the following:

"'(3) Eligible business enterprise, community: As used in this section the terms "eligible business enterprise" and "eligible community" refer to business enterprises or communities holding certificates of eligibility under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954.'

"SEC. 212. Section 7 (c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may (1) make such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry, or (2) notify the Trade Adjustment Board, created under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955, that he has invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955 with respect to such industry. If the President does not take either of such actions within 60 days, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, imposed such quotas, or invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955.'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my amendment and to discuss H. R. 1 as reported by the committee. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider in this session. What we do here will affect the future course of events as surely as anything that happens in the Formosa Strait or in Indochina. What we have not done here for 2 years now has already had serious consequences for us in world affairs.

I recall the President's saying to us slightly more than a year ago, "That precious intangible, the initiative, is becoming ours." Yet, in this vital area of foreign policy, in our foreign economic policy, the initiative has not been ours. We have been immobilized. We have slumbered while the Communists have negotiated trade agreements.

In 1953 we were told to wait for the report of the President's Commission so we would know how to proceed in these matters. We waited. We voted reluctantly for a mere 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and took rueful note of the pledge of the Secretary of State that no new agreements would be negotiated under it. He was faithful to that pledge. The authority granted the President under that act lay unused—no agreements were negotiated.

Last year we got the report of the Randall Commission. It did not ask much. It was not all that some of us had hoped for. It merely shored up the defenses against those who would tear down our foreign trade policy completely.

But, again, we were asked to wait. The opposition of some of the President's own party was too much. He agreed to put off till another year the proposals of his Commission. Some of us, supposedly in the opposition, tried to save the President's program for him, but when he capitulated we had to go along and settle for another 1-year extension.

Again nothing happened. No action was taken under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The world's leading trade power had no trade policy. But what were the Communists doing during those 2 years? Did they say, in all good sportsmanship, "We appreciate the delicate sensibilities of your domestic policies. We will hold up a bit and give you a chance to catch your breath"? No, Mr. President; we may have a team on this side, but the Communists are not playing our game. They went ahead—they opened up full force with their trade offensive. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pointed out in his excellent speech last week, in the first year of our hibernation the Russians concluded agreements with 15 of our allies and the Communist Chinese with 13. Last year, in the second year of our hibernation, the countries in the Soviet sphere made 30 new trade agreements with nations of the free world.

We have had a good sleep. We should be thoroughly refreshed. What we forgot, in looking for Communists under the bed, was that they are out in the world market, negotiating trade agreements. In trade, that precious intangible, the initiative has become theirs.

I know I am talking about trade policy now as if it were an integral part of our foreign policy. I have heard high-tariff advocates complain, "Why must you confuse these things—why can you not keep economics and foreign policy separate?" I wish we could. It would make everything much simpler. But wishing will not make it so. The Communists have stepped up their use of trade as a weapon in their offensive against us. In considering foreign economic policy, we must take into account the world situation. Foreign economic policy is an integral part of our foreign policy.

Our people and the people of the world eagerly look for relaxation of tensions in the struggle between democracy and communism. Experts tell us that the relaxation and the negotiations leading up to that relaxation may soon be upon us, but, Mr. President, I ask the question, Are we prepared to make full use of the opportunity which the pending negotiations may very well give us?

Those who welcome a respite in the cold and hot war do so in the hope of gaining time. Everywhere people yearn for time—but time to do what? Will we use the time wisely? Time is important only if it is used and used properly. If we waste the time by relaxing, sitting back, and forgetting the stakes and forgetting about the real struggle between the free world and the slave world, then we shall be forfeiting our responsibility to ourselves and to our ideals.

If, however, we recognize the time as a God-given blessing, an opportunity to strengthen ourselves and our allies, then time can help us. There is no more important area of activity that we can engage in in an effort to use the time

wisely than the area of international trade activity. This is why:

The Communists have always looked for trade wars within the free world; they have always viewed the free world as an economic unit which they should attempt at all costs to divide. This point of view dates from the period of the Russian revolution, when communism acquired a basis of power in the world.

It had its beginning in Lenin's "Imperialism," written shortly before the revolution. In that work Lenin set forth the view that capitalism had reached the stage of monopoly and finance capitalism. In this stage, he said, domestic markets become saturated, and giant trusts seek to divide world markets among themselves. He predicted that the great capitalist powers would inevitably quarrel over world markets, and that wars would inevitably follow. Communists have thus looked upon both World Wars as capitalist wars and as wars which further break down the system of free enterprise, weaken the free part of the world, and prepare the way for world communism.

Stalin himself has always followed this theory. He wrote that "the free world was one entire capitalist system, the various nations of which are interdependent." Capitalism, for Stalin, existed on a world scale, and this thinking conditioned all his strategy.

In the light of this background, it is not so difficult to understand the recent Communist peace offensive. In April of 1952 the Communists held their much-publicized International Economic Conference in Moscow. At this conference they made every effort to bid for trade with the Western World, and to wean away from the Western World those nations which had cast their economic and trading lot with the United States.

In October of 1952, the Russian Communist Party held its 19th party congress. It was for this congress that Stalin himself produced his first major theoretical work in several years—a work which hinted broadly at a coming change in Soviet foreign policy.

Stalin made two main points. The first was that war between communism and capitalism was not inevitable—immediately, at least. Communism could still look for competition for markets between the capitalist nations, and for the trade wars and shooting wars which follow this competition, according to the Marxist theory. Stalin also stated that the economic war waged by the West upon the Iron Curtain countries had in fact brought the Communist world closer together, and, he said, expanded their economies.

Stalin's second point followed from the first—Soviet foreign policy, he said, should seek to aggravate the economic differences of the Western World in order to split off certain areas from it. The areas which Stalin mentioned specifically were Western Europe and Japan. Soviet foreign policy, he said, should seek to isolate the United States from its allies. This policy has been rigidly adhered to—with, I regret to say, some success.

It is clear, Mr. President, that the Soviets look upon economic warfare as one of the prime weapons in their arsenal to be used fully during the period of negotiations and apparent relaxation.

Mr. President, we need a program to counter this economic warfare. Our reciprocal trade program is our weapon against the Communist world. But I suggest that we take this program out of the museum and put it into the market place. I suggest that we take it out from under the bushel and reveal it to the world. We have talked reciprocal trade, we have passed bills about reciprocal trade, but we have always had to compromise any measure designed to effectively promote a broadening of the trade program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that the pending bill in its present form, with all the weakening amendments which have been attached, is an effective and adequate reciprocal trade bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall direct myself to some of the amendments of the bill. I feel that we could have had a real economic secret weapon, so to speak, which would have had devastating power in terms of an economic offensive in this world. I am afraid that we have reduced its potency and in many ways weakened its effectiveness by some of the amendments which have been attached to the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that it is now practically worthless, with the exception, possibly, of the 50-percent reduction which may be made in duties on goods coming from Japan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Illinois that it is not the kind of bill I had hoped the Senate would pass.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What has become of the proud, new, bold program designed to expand foreign trade—the program about which the administration has been talking?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois knows that the administration is great on words and slightly reluctant on performance. The publicity is excellent, but the follow-through is not as firm and direct as the dramatics which are used to describe it.

Mr. President, we need a program to counter the economic warfare that is going on. The lesson of Soviet economic policy for the West is that the problems of free enterprise are truly international—that our security and survival depend upon our working out solutions for these problems together with the other nations of the free world.

Mr. President, it has always amazed me that some of those who are the strongest advocates of free enterprise at home are at times the weakest advocates of an international policy which will fortify and strengthen free enterprise throughout the free nations of the world. It requires a kind of international understanding which, I regret to say, is all but lacking in some quarters.

One way in which we can strengthen free enterprise is through a more liberal trade policy. If we close our doors to trade, the nations of Western Europe may have to turn to the east for markets, food, and raw materials. If we close our doors to trade, the nations of Asia—in whom we have invested millions in foreign aid, and on whom we depend for strength on the borders of communism—may have to turn to their Soviet neighbor for trade, and they will then be swallowed up.

Let us further remember that those nations which have to depend upon trade with the Soviet will have to conduct much of their trade through their governments. Eventually this means government controls, and eventually government ownership. How better could the Soviet subvert free enterprise? And how can we better make free enterprise thrive than to open our doors to trade?

Free enterprise, from the days of Adam Smith, has always been international. The United States, as the leading business nation of the world, and as the political leader of the free world, should recognize the fact.

During this period of the Soviet peace offensive our foreign trade policy is an absolutely vital aspect of our entire security program. I ask that it be treated as such, and not as an adjunct or as a sort of addendum to the security program of this Nation. The trade policy of our country is as vital to its security as is its military policy or diplomatic policy. It is impossible to separate them. They need to be so regarded. An adequate foreign trade policy and adequate provision for our military defense should be the twin arms of our foreign policy. This is so because the two main arms of Soviet policy are economic warfare, and vast military expansion. We must counter the Soviet at these points.

If we had had as much dedication to a sound international economic policy as we have had to military preparedness, I am sure we would have made greater progress in our struggle against the totalitarian powers. We must counter the Soviets at all points.

It was a source of great regret to me that when the Randall Commission did bring in its report, economic policy was viewed by the Commission as something unique and separate from the rest of our foreign policy. There was no attempt in the report to assess our major objectives in the cold war, and then to look at our foreign economic policy in the light of those objectives.

Let us consider just one of the most grave and urgent of these problems, which lies at the juncture of our foreign policy and our trade policy. Japan has already been mentioned here. The junior Senator from Tennessee discussed our trade relations with Japan with great insight in his speech of last week, which I commend to the Senate.

I think we can all agree on both the gravity and the urgency of the Japanese trade situation. Japan must still import 20 to 25 percent of the food her people consume.

Here, if I may, I should like to quote from an article Mr. John D. Rockefeller, 3d, wrote for Foreign Affairs of last July. Mr. Rockefeller, Senators will remember, served with the Dulles mission to Japan

and as an advisor on the Japanese Peace Treaty. He wrote:

The Japanese economy today is in difficulties, and they are increasing. While there are many encouraging elements in the situation, a continuation of present trends cannot go on indefinitely without serious consequences. Thus time is a real factor in the situation.

Mr. Rockefeller continued:

Japan's foreign trade is the lifeblood of her economy. Her economic viability depends upon her being able to export a sufficient volume of goods and services to provide the foreign exchange needed to buy essential imports. To accomplish this she must both increase the volume of her exports and attempt to balance her trade within each of the several currency areas. Since Japan is one of the most important buyers of the world, it is not unreasonable to suggest that if the Japanese market is to continue and grow, those who trade with Japan must buy substantially from her as well as sell heavily to her.

Mr. Rockefeller states that Japan's immediate problem entails an increase of $1 billion of exports a year. This is not to mention what the future problem will be as the Japanese population increases and at the same time the Japanese seek to raise their standard of living.

I am not suggesting that Japan's trade problem is solely ours or that we alone can take action to alleviate it. The other leading trade nations of the world must cooperate in reducing trade barriers and in promoting trade throughout the free world. Otherwise, the pressures to trade with the Communists will be more than Japan can withstand.

Mr. President, it is rather regretful that we have not given due consideration to the very obvious fact that the Japanese people are already negotiating with the Soviet Union and with the Chinese Reds an elaborate trade program. Once that is consummated, if it should be culminated by a successful agreement, it will make our relationships with Japan that much more difficult. It has always amazed me how we can become so greatly concerned with small and limited problems, and so little concerned with such an important problem as our relationships with Japan.

I wish to emphasize the fact that our relationships with Japan are not only political; they are essentially economic. The Japanese people cannot live alone on their islands. They must trade. They will trade, Mr. President. The question is, With whom will they trade?

Let us make no mistake about it, no amount of pious statements from our leadership in America or from our friends and allies can solve the difficult economic problems which face the more than 80 million people of Japan. They will either trade with the free nations and with the nations of the world that are yet underdeveloped, or they will trade with the Iron Curtain countries.

Once they trade with those nations, the political pattern will be established. It seems to me that we ought to emphasize that fact much more than we are doing at the present time.

I am afraid we are frittering away our whole security policy by our lack of willingness to act decisively and affirmatively, or by our lack of real interest in what is going on in the economies of the so-called friendly nations with whom we have associated ourselves, and to whom we have granted billions of dollars in aid.

Is it not interesting that in the instance of Japan we have poured into that country billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, and yet, once having done that, we fail to recognize that we must either continue that kind of charity, gift, and grant, or work out for ourselves and with other nations of the world a trade policy which will permit the Japanese people to live, to eat, and to grow? I warn the Senate that a nation such as Japan does not die quietly, and it will not do so peacefully. It will make every effort to live, and if the door of economic opportunity is closed to Japan by us, she will seek another door. That door will be into the great areas of the Soviet and the Communist satellite states. Once that door is opened, Mr. President, then not only will commerce go on between those countries, but political relationships will come about, and we shall find ourselves in the years to come with terrible problems menacing our security.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of that. I regret that there seems to be a lack of statesmanship which focuses attention upon these complex problems. The answer is not the H-bomb. That will not solve anything. It will only dissolve humanity.

If we are going to have to do the hard thinking and the hard planning, we should be forwarding an effective trade policy, as the Senator from Illinois has justly pointed out, not a policy that is even now watered down, weakened, and circumscribed to such a point that we may very well have lost the impact which is necessary to do the job.

I might add here, Mr. President, that it is encouraging, in this regard, to note that the Japanese are seeking to meet this problem with our assistance by a program to expand trade in free Asia. It was announced on Saturday they would propose such a program at the conference of free Asian nations opening in Simla, India on May 9. According to the New York Times the Japanese plan would use a portion of the United States regional aid fund to improve the facilities by which each country of the region can produce materials that the other nations of free Asia want to buy.

This is an encouraging note. But only this morning I heard on the CBS World News Round-up a report from Tokyo. A Chinese Communist trade delegation has been in Japan arranging increased trade with Japanese businessmen. The reporter pointed out that only our ban on trade in strategic goods prevents an all-out expansion of trade with Communist China. There is every indication in that direction.

The days of massive economic aid are over. But our expenditures for military assistance to other countries still give those countries the dollars they need to trade with us. The dollar gap is still there; we are still transfusing the needed dollars into the patient. But as the military aid tapers off—as we intend it to—then the dollar gap will be out in the open again for all to see.

And let us not forget that when the other countries of the free world do not have the dollars to buy from us, they are not the only ones who suffer. Our industries suffer too. We export more than we import. If we do not lower our tariffs so that other countries can sell to us, how will they be able to buy from us?

We need a stable, long-term program that will let the other countries of the world know they can count on our foreign-trade policy, that will encourage them to try to build up trade with us and at the same time liberalize their own trade laws to stimulate free world trade.

As I indicated last year, I do not think that the proposals of the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy provided such a program. Among other proposals, the Commission recommended that the President's previous authority to cut tariffs to 50 percent of their 1945 level be replaced by authority to reduce tariffs progressively by 15 percent over a 3-year period. It is this recommendation that has been embodied in the bill before us, H. R. 1.

In proposing this, the Commission actually took a backward step, for there were still many articles on which the Presidential authority to reduce tariffs by 50 percent of the 1945 level had not been used. Also, a 15-percent cut in tariffs over a 3-year period is not much of a cut anyway. For one thing, if agreements are not negotiated during the first year of the act, then there will only be a 10-percent range left to negotiate. And it may well take more than a year to negotiate new tariff agreements.

For another thing, while 15 percent sounds like a lot, it is really not much. Under this provision a 20-percent tariff could be lowered to 17 percent. What a concession. While one of the purposes of our trade policy is to free the channels of world trade by using the negotiating power of our large, domestic market to bring this about, this provision gives us no negotiating power at all.

Finally, the Commission recommended merely a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It did not say whether there was any reason to believe that this would encourage foreign producers to trade with the United States. Selling in the American market often requires a large investment in advertising, in retooling, and redesigning. It seems doubtful—combined with the hazards of peril point and the escape clause—that foreign exporters will be willing to make that investment when the Trade Agreements Act is to come up again for renewal in 3 years.

So, there are the proposals of the President's Commission that serve as a basis of H. R. 1. As I have indicated, last year I found them disappointing, and I have not mellowed a great deal in my feeling for them in the year past. But they are something, anyway. They are more than we had to vote for last year or the year before. I am anxious to vote for them. Though it is a moderate program,

it is better than nothing. But I wish to point out the contrast between the program and the statements which the administration makes.

The American people have been led by the President, the Secretary of State, and others, to believe that we are entering upon a bold, progressive, broad, comprehensive world-trade program. The truth is that that is merely propaganda; it is only talk. The program itself is indeed modest, and it is indeed anything but bold and forward looking.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that one of the difficulties in our program is that certain industries bear almost all the competition from foreign sources while other industries bear none.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct, and in a moment or two I shall come to that point. There is a national trade policy involved which we consider necessary for our national security. But sometimes the burden falls upon a limited number of individuals, firms, or industries. I feel that there must be something done to ameliorate those circumstances.

Mr. LONG. In the case of some industries, foreign imports amount to as much as 50 percent of the domestic market. In the case of some other industries there are no importations of foreign products whatever. There are more than 600 articles which do not come into the United States at all. We should at least provide a quota, perhaps 5 or 10 percent in order that such foreign articles may come into the American market to compete with domestic articles. That would help to keep American industry on its toes in competing with foreign products. Otherwise the 600 articles which are not being imported will probably not be imported in the future, either. The Senator knows that the provision, which was in the bill which would permit a 50 percent reduction in tariff duties on such articles has been eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is more of a token expression than a realistic program. When an article is not even imported, to provide for a reduction in the tariff on it is at best psychological and not economic.

Mr. LONG. It would be more practical and would make better sense to provide that if an article is not being imported at all, perhaps a quota may be provided, a certain percentage, without any tariff whatever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would stimulate competition.

Mr. LONG. That would spread the burden of foreign trade, rather than to have a few industries take the whole brunt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for the contribution he had made to the discussion.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota upon his very fine and convincing analysis of the situation. I assure him that I am thoroughly in sympathy and agreement with his thesis that our foreign trade must be developed. I strongly support the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I hope that the Senator from Minnesota will allocate to me about 3 minutes in order to express my views.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that if we protect certain industries which are individually badly hurt, we will further the entire principle of world trade.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York. In a moment I shall discuss the amendment in detail, because I feel that the amendment, which was really conceived by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, and by Representative WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, is a basic, long-term answer to some of the difficulties we face. I was privileged to be invited to be a cosponsor of the amendment this year because of the illness of the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I was actually the main sponsor, but in his behalf.

Mr. President, I said this was a moderate program, but it is better than nothing. I am ready to support it. In fact, I am more anxious to vote for the pending bill than I was for the bill last year, but I am afraid some of its virtue has disappeared already.

Let us look at the trade policy which the President recommended, or supposedly recommended.

First of all, the escape clause has been compounded to further discourage international trade. It is done in three parts: first, an amendment that ends the 60 days of silence after the Tariff Commission has made its recommendations except under the escape clause to the President. Under the amendment, the findings and recommendations will be made public and published immediately. We all know what this means in terms of the pressure that will be brought on the President in making his decision. I would not get exercised over this addition by itself, but let us consider the other two amendments.

I should like to read the amendment, as the wording presents something of a problem:

> Increased imports, either actual or relative shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

The wording is somewhat vague, but that is not unusual when the object is to disguise something. This undoubtedly was purposely made vague. But we have here, I believe, to be fixed into law, the so-called share-the-market doctrine.

The Commission need only find that "increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury" to an industry. This means that a domestic product could be increasing its sales, but if an imported product were increasing its sales at a faster rate, the escape clause could be invoked. The industry would not even have to be really injured. In fact, it could do quite well.

If it is thriving, how can it be injured? The import only needs to "contribute materially to threaten serious injury"—that is, be in successful competition with the domestic product.

Let me read what President Truman had to say about this doctrine. He wrote to the chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee in 1952, explaining why he had turned down a recommendation of the Tariff Commission. President Truman said:

> Because of the dangerous precedent which would be involved in accepting this share doctrine as the determinant of serious injury, I should like to emphasize its far-reaching implications. Serious injury, by any definition, means a loss to someone. Declining production, lower employment, lower wages, lower returns, or losses in capital invested—any of these things might indicate some degree of injury. But the share doctrine goes much further. In fact, it finds that serious injury exists when the domestic industry fails to gain something it never had, even though the industry may be prospering by all the customary standards of levels of production, profits, wages, and employment.

That was the President of the United States speaking to Congress, pointing out the dangers which are implicit in the very amendment now incorporated in the bill.

So, here we are being asked to amend the escape clause to protect robust, healthy industry that has suffered no real injury—when the industry has failed to gain something it never had. Should this be the intent of our tariff policy? Will this encourage trade in the spirit of the Trade Agreements Act we have under consideration? I think not.

But that is not all, Mr. President. There is one more amendment yet to go. This third change in the escape clause instructs the Commission to distinguish between different operations of any business to determine injury. That is, if a business is flourishing in a number of different products, but one single item is threatened by competition from an import, then invoke the escape clause. Here again, we are not concerned with fledgling industry struggling to get its footing established. We are protecting an enterprise with a number of vigorous, fast-selling products, but one item that may not be doing quite so well as a competitor from abroad. Here we have a case where the enterprise could well afford to improve its product or adjust its operation slightly, but we are asked to write into the law protection on an item-by-item basis. Think, also, what this will mean to the Tariff Commission. What a tremendous burden. Such a commodity provision opens the door for petitions to the Tariff Commission on all sorts of individual products. The Commission no longer will be concerned with investigating to determine injury to an entire industry. It must under the bill make its determination on individual commodities.

It should also be pointed out, that this itemization of the escape clause will have another undesirable effect. It will freeze the industry involved in production of a noncompetitive product. Once the business has applied for tariff concessions or had them granted, it will continue to produce the same product without attempting to improve it. The healthy effects of competition will be lost. There will be no attempt at improving a product so protected.

I would suggest that we have here, Mr. President, in these three amendments, modifications of the escape clause that could ultimately destroy the reciprocal trade agreements program. In fact, they raise serious questions about our continued good faith in regard to the trade agreements to which we have already agreed.

Let us not overlook the psychological effects of such measures. We must not forget that the other nations of the world will take what we do here as indicating our future course in world trade.

Our trade agreements program from 1934 to 1947 led the way toward liberalizing world trade. If we now weaken our program we sound the alarm bell that we may be reversing our direction entirely. Other nations will respond out of fear, and we may see a breaking down of the liberal trade community which has been building up so laboriously since 1934.

It is not my purpose this afternoon to discuss all the committee amendments, but I wish to comment on the amendment that was reached as a compromise—the Byrd-Millikin compromise. This amendment gives the President authority to place import quotas on any articles that threaten to impair the national security.

National security is something we are all in favor of, and I am sure we will all support this amendment. In fact, I am so much in favor of national security that I would like to see the amendment extended to insure national security even more. The provision as it stands would place a quota on any import that threatens to impair national security. This protects us against an overabundance of imports.

But there is another danger to national security—a scarcity of some imports. The report of the Commission on the Nation's natural resources alerted us to these shortages of strategic materials. I suggest we might extend this excellent amendment to encourage the import of these scarce items. In fact, I have had such an amendment printed, and at the conclusion of these remarks I shall call for a vote on it. I suggest that we vote for the needs of the tariff program, the real economic needs.

Is it not logical to state that whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization finds a strategic material in short supply in the United States, he could so advise the President? The President would then be authorized to lower or suspend the tariff on the scarce commodity so that the national security would not be threatened.

I am not insensitive to the problems of domestic industry and American workers. I am well aware of the motivations that lie behind various amendments for import quotas and higher tariffs on specific commodities. They are entirely honorable motivations. We should be concerned about those industries or communities that are suffering cutbacks in production or localized depression. There will be differences of opinion as to whether these problems are always brought about directly by tariff concessions. But the problems are there. Even if they are not always directly attributable to tariff cuts and imports, they are sometimes thought to be; and what people think to be the truth has a very controlling influence on their decisions. This is a political fact that many of us have to live with. We cannot ignore the pleas of a stricken industry or community for tariff protection, whether the injury from imports is real or merely imagined.

I ask those of my colleagues who are present in the Chamber to listen to me while I discuss the proposal to take into consideration the real needs of industries, communities, business, and labor, which are affected, or at least feel they are affected, by a reduced tariff policy.

At the same time, we have a larger responsibility. We must consider the overall national security. This means, as I have suggested, thinking of the foreign policy consequences of our foreign trade policy. It means also thinking of all those other industries and individuals in our country whose prosperity depends on exports. They can be hurt as much by increasing tariffs and a lessening of world trade as others might be by lowering of tariffs. And we are told that the number involved in our export trade is larger than those affected by imports. So we have a responsibility here, too.

This is a thorny dilemma. It has been debated here, in one form or another, for many years. The arguments are always pretty much the same, and the sides are drawn just as rigidly between the "free-traders" and "the protectionists."

Sometimes we get the feeling, in listening to this debate, that it has all been said before, and we are doomed to hear it all said again, over and over, ad infinitum. Only the voices change; the arguments remain the same. In substance there is great merit to that conclusion, because we are considering an economic policy with which many people have disagreed for generations. Therefore, we are bound to hear the same arguments.

The dilemma persists, for most of us are torn between our responsibility in world affairs, and our genuine concern for those industries and communities adversely affected by our trade policy.

Make no mistake about it, some communities and industries will be adversely affected. I think we have to be honest about this matter. The question is, Who is to pay the price? Are individual industries to pay a disproportionate price for a broad national policy, or are we to try to spread over the entire Nation the cost of such a policy, which is vital to our national security? Is there not something we can do? Why do we stand here and say nothing can be done, or write language into the bill which will mean all things to all people, and generally will mean something to a clever attorney who knows how to press a point, and split an infinitive, and split a law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Bell Commission advocated compensation for industries and labor adversely affected by reductions in tariffs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is correct. I believe the Commission made a specific recommendation along that line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But that recommendation was rejected by the Randall Commission, the only member voting in favor of it being Mr. David McDonald, head of the United Steelworkers of America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The Randall Commission rejected the very salutory and what I thought was the very sensible proposal of the Bell Commission. It is to that recommendation that attention is called in the Kennedy-Humphrey bill which I have proposed as an amendment to the pending bill.

Can we not in some way solve this ancient dilemma and find a third way? A way that recognizes our responsibility for leadership in world trade and yet is not without conscience for those persons and businesses who bear the injuries of our lowered tariff policies?

Is it fair for us to ask those few, who are injured in some way, to bear the burden of our world trade responsibilities? Is this not a responsibility for us all to share?

I think that these questions can all be answered, Mr. President. I think we can now see the way to solving that ancient dilemma.

If our foreign trade policy requires that some industries and some communities suffer the competition of increased imports, then that injury should be shared by all. And by sharing it, we can minimize the damage and privation that any one segment of our economy might suffer.

I am speaking of the trade adjustments program, Mr. President, represented by the amendment I have called up. In its idea lies the long-term solution of our trade and tariff dilemma.

It was introduced in the last session, but too late for any action. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and Representative HARRISON WILLIAMS introduced a bill which embodied features of an adjustment program that had been suggested in the report of the Randall Commission by Mr. David McDonald, and, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] pointed out, by the Bell Commission, which preceded the Randall Commission.

This proposed legislation has been introduced again in this session by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself in the Senate and by Representatives WILLIAMS and EBERHARTER in the House. I have submitted it both as a Trade Adjustment Act, known as Senate bill 751, and also as amendments to H. R. 1. Let us consider what this proposal will do and how it can solve

our dilemma between encouraging free world trade and protecting our own people and industries.

The trade adjustment program would provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in adjusting to the economic conditions brought about by our trade policy. This is not a subsidy; it is not permanent assistance to enable industries or communities to hobble along. It is assistance to help them over a difficult period of readjustment. My colleagues will see that in the nature of the assistance, it helps industries, and individuals, and communities to help themselves find new solutions to their economic difficulties.

This would be done through the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This is how it would work. When the Tariff Commission recommends to the President that an industry has been injured by tariff concessions, presently he can raise the tariff, impose trade quotas, or take no action at all. Under our amendment, if the President took no action at all he could then notify the Board set up under this act.

The Board would then determine whether the benefits applying under my amendment, or the Trade Adjustment Act, which I proposed as a separate bill, should be extended to any community, business enterprise, industrial development corporation, individual employee, or organization representing employees. These benefits would be limited to a period of 18 months or less unless renewed, after further inquiry and further decision on the part of the President and the Trade Adjustment Board.

What would these benefits be? In what way would this assistance work to help industries and communities to help themselves? Broadly speaking, this assistance would be extended to businesses, to help them develop more efficient methods of production or new lines of production. It would be extended to community or industrial development corporations to assist them in bringing new industry to their area, or developing new production or industry to bring about a more balanced and diversified economy. It would go out to individuals who found themselves unemployed and either needed retraining to enable them to seek new employment or needed assistance in moving to another community where their skills could be employed.

What would be the nature of this assistance? I have spoken about it in rather broad terms. It would include information and advice to industry or community development corporations. Easier tax provisions for building new plants would be allowed and new industries would be encouraged to move to eligible communities. Loans would be extended to eligible businesses under the Small Business Act.

For individual workers who were displaced because of a free-trade policy which may have taken their jobs away, there would be an extension of unemployment compensation, and retraining and assistance in moving to new communities already mentioned. There would also be benefits for those unable to find employment because of advanced age, and I may say this is a very serious matter, Mr. President. If an industry should be compelled to slow down its operations or to close because of an adjustment in a tariff which permitted an increase in imports to the detriment of the industry, we should remember that in that industry there will be employees 61, 62, 63, or 64 years of age, who may find it difficult to obtain jobs in other areas. For those unable, because of their advanced age, to find employment, the retirement age for social-security benefits would be moved up to 60.

Mr. President, the provisions of our amendments are extremely moderate. I recognize that in an area of this sort, one must move with caution and conservatism.

The purpose of the amendments is to find a new approach to the difficulties which arise because of a broadened foreign trade policy which the Nation needs. Certainly the Nation needs it, even though some individuals may be penalized because of it.

Mr. President, as I have said, this suggestion is not intended as a final, perfected mechanism; it is not the last word. But there is something more than the germ of an idea here. This is a proposal worthy of support and acceptance. It is not a partisan proposal, for it should appeal to the free-trade advocate and protectionist alike—to those who feel the need to lower our tariff barriers, in order to encourage world trade, and those who are concerned that lower tariffs will injure industry here at home.

Those who want lower tariffs should welcome this proposal, for they do not want our domestic industry injured. And those who are concerned about some particular industry or community, should find in this program a way to assist individual enterprise suffering depression, while still promoting the overall national interest by increasing free-world trade.

This readjustment-assistance idea recognizes the great source of magic in American enterprise, namely, our ability to meet changing conditions and to adapt our productive and individual capacities, so as to regain strength and grow with new vigor. We have seen this adaptability in action during war, when our industry made a changeover far greater than anything which would be called for in a program such as this one. We see it every day, in the constant change and adaption our businesses display in meeting competition or accepting the changes of new products or new technological improvement.

There is no doubt that we can use this great adaptability of American industry to meet this problem of injury from imports. The need for such assistance is clear when we recognize that our responsibility to these industries and communities arises out of our national trade policy.

Here is a constructive solution to the old dilemma.

Mr. President, it will do the Members of this body no good to close their eyes to the economic realities and the difficulties which will arise when we adopt a trade policy. There will be some casualties and some difficulties, temporarily. I repeat that they will be temporary. What we need in this case is a mechanism, namely, the friendly, helping hand of the Government which makes the trade policy. The Government should help those who need help to adjust themselves to the policy.

The proposal we make is that the help will be given, not by gift, but by counsel, advice, long-term loans, reasonable rates of interest, and tax concessions to industries which are dislocated, just as during the recent war the Government gave tax concessions or adjustments to industries which were disrupted as a result of the war.

I repeat that the Senate will be derelict in the performance of its responsibility to thousands and thousands of persons in the Nation and to hundreds of American institutions if it does not take into consideration the full impact of a world-trade policy, along the lines which are being discussed here. I hope we shall see it within our wisdom and our sense of good judgment to try to establish, somewhere in the Government, an office or agency or area of interest which will work with those who have had to pay a disproportionate share of the cost for a much-needed trade policy in our fight against Communist aggression throughout the world.

Mr. President, I commend these amendments to the attention of the Senate. I realize that the amendments were brought up in the committee, and that the committee did not accept them. But, Mr. President, that does not mean that the amendments do not have merit. It simply means that too much attention is being expended upon individual commodities, individual items, and individual industries. Certainly, Mr. President, if we begin to amend a tariff law on that basis, there will be no end to it; the old logrolling will be back in full force, and there will be no sawmill big enough to handle the volume of that business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is very generous minded; but, even so, did it ever occur to him that the reason why some persons, at least, oppose the proposal to provide compensation to industries which are injured by reductions in tariffs is that if there were such a provision, one of the potent arguments against reducing tariffs would be removed; and they do not want to be deprived of that argument.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that I appreciate his considering me to be a charitable person, but I am not so charitable or foolish as not to know that what he has said is the truth. Of course, if this tariff-adjustments feature were adopted as an amendment to the pending bill or if it were written into an entirely new law, it would do a great deal to remove the basis of the argument of those who always are opposed to a freer trade policy, because in that case we would be doing what many a State already has done.

Let me point out that many States have established assistance agencies to help dislocated industries in their particular areas. So this proposal is nothing new. What we now propose was done extensively in World War II; the Federal Government did it, for there was a realization that it was vital to the national security that such persons or institutions be given help, so they would not be casualties on the economic front.

But now we come to a foreign-trade policy; and the easy answer is to write broad legislation, with one or two amendments to take care of only certain persons. However, I wish to know what the bill contains to take care of the many persons who could not be heard and the thousands of workers who would be temporarily displaced. I am not so much concerned about a person who has sufficient financial resources to tide him over for 2 or 3 years, but I am concerned about the individual or businessman who may find the loss of a year's business or employment literally devastating to his financial position or his occupation.

Mr. President, here is not merely the alternative of raising tariffs and hurting trade, or lowering tariffs and hurting some industry. This program would offer the President a positive alternative to the present sterile possibilities of the escape clause. Here is a proposal which will give us the benefits of increased trade and the continued vigor of all our industries and every segment of our economy. I commend it to the Senate, for the careful attention of its Members.

Mr. President, I conclude by urging that we consider the Trade Adjustment Act as a means whereby we can bring forth, in this session, a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, strengthened, not weakened, and worthy of our position of leadership in the free world.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that a nation which is dedicated to the doctrine of private property and to the institutions of free enterprise and the economic philosophy of competition, all of it filled with the democratic feeling of compassion and fair play and justice, would do well, as it legislates in this vital area of foreign trade, to take into consideration the impact of national policy upon individuals, and also to take into consideration the importance of a sensible national policy in the international arena. Mr. President, we can do both. We can have good international policy and foreign trade, and also decent and human national policy in terms of American industry and workers if we will it and if we are willing to settle down to the job of doing it. I regret exceedingly that the committee, in its wisdom, did not see the necessity of adopting such a program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], 3 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I shall, of course, support House bill 1, and will oppose all crippling amendments.

However, for many weeks I have been exposed, as has every other Member of this body, to the pleas and arguments of certain industries and individuals claiming to have been injured by this Nation's reciprocal trade agreements program. I have listened to their statements attentively and with much concern.

Having sat as a member of the Subcommittee on Unemployment since March, I have been able, independently, to determine the actual effect of foreign competition on certain industries in the American economy.

While I could not do this job exhaustively because of the incomplete nature of the available statistics and the lack of time, I have been able to come to the conclusion that some few industries in this country have suffered as a result of foreign competition. I might add, however, that the list of these particular industries is considerably smaller than the opponents of the reciprocal trade program have led us to believe.

Mr. President, I have long been motivated in my attitude toward political and economic problems by the principle of equality of sacrifice. This principle is not being served when men and women are being thrown out of work, and when communities in certain instances are rendered economic ghost-towns—all through no fault of either the individual or the community, but as a result of a national policy.

These individuals, these communities, these industries, which are proven victims of a trade program that most Americans support as of great value to our Nation and to the free world—have a right to expect the assistance of the Federal Government, to supplement State and local aid, in adjusting to their economic problems. We must do everything possible to provide assistance.

To refuse to provide such assistance to them would, in the end, undermine our liberal trade program. To ignore the genuine needs of some of our citizens for economic aid is morally wrong and economically unwise.

The relief provided in the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment should be, at one and the same time, effective to cope with the problem of adjustment, and specific enough to employ recognized Federal functions to assist those individuals, communities, and industries adversely affected by a reduction of trade barriers. It seems to me that this proposal is one of the most important that has been made for the purpose of safeguarding the real interests of all the American people in expanded trade.

Legislation to be of enduring value must take into consideration, not only the interests of the majority benefited by it, but also the problems of the minority which may be adversely affected. By adopting this amendment as a part of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and then approving the bill as amended, Congress will be serving both purposes ably and well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the precise amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was before the Commission headed by Mr. Randall. That Commission consisted of 5 Senators, 5 Members of the House, and 5 Presidental appointees from among the citizenship at large.

After very thorough consideration had been given to the amendment, the vote against it was 14 to 1. No one was for it except the man who proposed it. It was considered impracticable. If put into operation it would involve the multiplication of government bureaus and the creation of new machinery. It would involve placing Federal agents in every community of the United States. It was considered that the harm would greatly outweigh the good.

I hope the amendment will be decisively defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment was considered by the Committee on Finance and rejected by an overwhelming majority. I do not consider the amendment necessary at this time. There already exist various laws which provide for the retraining and relocation of workers and assistance to industries. Those laws could be used. Further experience in the use of the existing devices is essential before a judgment can be made as to whether something additional is needed. Before the proposal made in this amendments could be supported further study would be essential.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has given consideration to the question of hearings upon this particular amendment, which, as the Senator knows, I submitted also in the form of a bill, for the purpose of separate consideration. Is the Senator at liberty to give any expression as to whether or not his intentions are along the lines I have indicated?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment proposed by the Senator was fully considered by the Committee on Finance, as the Senator knows. It was also considered by the Randall Commission, of which the Senator from Virginia happens to be a member.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was also considered by the Bell Commission, and recommended favorably.

Mr. BYRD. That is true. The Randall Commission rejected it almost unanimously, and the Senate Committee on Finance rejected it by a considerable majority. I do not recall what the vote was. It was rejected by a voice vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My point was whether or not, at a later date, within the means and the time of the Senate Committee on Finance, the distinguished chairman might see fit to hold hearings upon the proposal which I have intro-

duced in the form of a bill. Does the Senator care to indicate whether or not a staff study should be made and hearings held in order that we might at least look into the merits of the proposal, rather than merely to say that it is not needed?

I point out most respectfully that the Bell Commission was one of the most eminent commissions ever appointed by the Government. The Randall Commission was equally eminent. Those Commissions disagreed as to the merits of the proposal. Therefore, I suggest to my colleagues that it merits thoughtful consideration by the responsible committee, rather than consideration in connection with an overall tariff bill, when insufficient time is available for proper consideration.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator introduces proposed legislation on the subject, it will receive full consideration by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] exhausted his time on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has exhausted his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remaining time, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe that on such an important question as this there should be a yea-and-nay vote. While I understand that certain commitments have been made, in good faith, not to have a yea-and-nay vote, and while Senators who made the commitments are honoring them implicitly, inasmuch as I was not a party to any such agreement, I do not regard myself as being bound by it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	McNamara	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair identify the amendment which is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is identified as 3-30-55-C, offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Chair to say it is a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It adds a new title to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it is not a substitute for the provision of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am pleased to state that I shall vote for the pending bill, H. R. 1, to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program.

In my judgment the bill has been written in such a fashion that it can achieve its various goals at home and abroad without harm to the basic objectives of our country.

There are some who feel that last-minute compromises which are being written into the bill, nullify it. I, for one, respectfully disagree. I feel that the amendments which will go to conference will go a long way toward achieving these goals: (a) Notifying the free world that the United States does not propose to return to the days of economic isolation; (b) notifying the people of our own country that we have followed a rule of right reason to afford them protection in those individual instances where a flood of foreign imports, produced at very low wages, could do considerable harm to domestic manufacture, agriculture, and employment.

Down through the years I have always favored the reciprocal trade agreements program in principle. I believe that trade is, and must remain, a two-way street. Nations abroad cannot buy from us unless they sell to us. The cause of world peace and prosperity cannot be served if each nation builds little Chinese walls against the other.

At the same time, I observe certain limitations in the reciprocal trade-agreements program. It is not a panacea. It cannot be waved like a magic wand over our domestic and foreign problems. Inequities can result. They result from many causes:

1. In the first instance the United States, with but rare exceptions, has been far more faithful in observing the principle of reciprocity than certain other countries.

2. We have held to the letter and spirit of our agreements, but other lands have imposed all sorts of restrictions on United States imports. They have done this through devious devices such as limiting the availability of foreign exchange, imposing quotas, setting nuisance regulations, and the like.

Reciprocity must be a two-way street, but often it has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

3. Then, in certain instances, there has been genuine harm inflicted on certain industries. The United States motorcycle industry has practically been wrecked by foreign imports. United States dairying, which at times has witnessed tremendous surpluses in our land, has also found this amazing paradox. At the very time when we were trying to increase farm income by reasonable parity support, foreign farm products have rushed into our country at lower than our own farm parity support.

Now, I should like to say just a word about my own State.

Wisconsin has traditionally been approximately one-half industrial and one-half agricultural in its production, although in recent years the balance has tipped heavily in favor of industry.

There are a great many companies in Wisconsin which depend crucially on the export trade. Wisconsin products, notably Wisconsin machinery, can be found in the far corners of the earth. It is high-grade, quality product, produced by skilled workmen.

So, too, Wisconsin agricultural products, notably nonfat dry milk solids, have been shipped in tremendous amounts abroad.

On the other hand, numerous manufactured products and dairy items have put Wisconsin producers at a severe disadvantage at times.

In these instances I have taken up this problem with the Tariff Commission, with the State Department, and with the White House. I have had to appeal on several instances for the invocation of the escape clause and peril point procedures. I have not always felt that the provisions which we wrote into the law were faithfully executed as Congress intended them. I have felt that they could bear strengthening, but not, I must say, at the price of destroying the reciprocal trade agreements program as a whole.

What I am basically advocating, therefore, is that the rule of reason prevail. I am advocating that the individual circumstances of the various industries be weighed carefully.

I do not hold with those who dogmatically assert that what we must do is wipe out tariffs. Actually, we need tariffs in a great many instances. And actually, too, the United States is a low tariff country. We have been more sinned against than sinner, insofar as tariff restrictions are concerned.

At the same time, I would oppose those who want to build the gates too high or to wipe out the President's ability to negotiate reasonable tariff agreements.

I feel my responsibility particularly keenly, because as senior minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I know what we do and say on the trade issue, speaks far more eloquently to innumerable countries than our words and deeds on a great many other subjects. The eyes of the world are upon us.

I do not want the world to say of us that we turned our backs on them economically.

But neither do I want the world to say of us that we were so foolish as to believe that our own citizens could be ignored. The American market is the greatest in the world. It belongs primarily to American producers. But that does not mean that fair, reasonable foreign competition is not welcome.

Actually, to my way of thinking, in spite of all the complaints of foreign sources about our tariffs, they can compete with us if they will modernize their own industry and if they will develop their own markets abroad. There is too much yearning exclusively for the "green pastures" in this country. There is too much of a tendency to ignore the fact that Europe, for example, is hobbled with cartels. It is hobbled with restrictive practices, with high-cost, low-production, high-priced manufacturers in highly protected markets. If Europe repaired its own shortcomings, if Europe increased trade among the Western European nations themselves, it would be far better off, than it would be by simply directing its fire and criticism at the American Government and the American tariffs.

This, then, is my sentiment. I shall vote for the bill, and I shall vote for it in good conscience and in consistency with the record which I have compiled here in the Senate in serving my State and Nation since January 1939.

The following are some illustrations of the deep concern felt among many communities of my State regarding the specific impact of particular foreign porducts. These represent the grassroots of Wisconsin, and they are entitled to be heeded.

These are Americans speaking for American plants, American businesses, and American jobs. They will not be ignored by me, and I trust they will not be ignored by the Congress. They are entitled to our most earnest and sympathetic attention.

MARINETTE & MENOMINEE
TRADES & LABOR COUNCIL,
Marinette, Wis., February 4, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The central labor body and its affiliates are very much opposed to the legislation pertaining to further tariff cuts.

Our jobs in the glove industry as well as the whole textile industry of the United States are in danger if further tariff cuts are permitted.

We would appreciate your support in opposing any legislation pertaining to tariff cuts and ask your help so that such authority to grant further tariff cuts be withheld from the President.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH LEBOUTON,
Chairman, Legislative Committee,
M. & M. Trades & Labor Council.

ZWICKER KNITTING MILLS,
Appleton, Wis., April 5, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator, United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Senators BRIDGES and PASTORE have introduced an amendment to H. R. 1 which will strengthen the escape clause provision and safeguard defense industries.

You know how important this is to so many of us in Appleton. We believe that this amendment will allow us to operate at a break-even level, at least, and will also provide a market for importers.

Our aim at Zwicker Knitting Mills has not been to capture an entire market for ourselves. When we appeared before the Tariff Commission, we asked for two-thirds of the market with the other one-third being open to imports. We do object to a law which allows low-wage countries to capture an entire industry without recourse.

Please give this your fullest consideration. We need your help.

Sincerely,
ROBERT W. ZWICKER.

MARINETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Marinette, Wis., February 7, 1955.

Recommendations approved by the board of directors of the Marinette, Wis., Chamber of Commerce, February 5, 1955:

"Whereas the Marinette, Wis., Chamber of Commerce agrees in principle with President Eisenhower's views on foreign trade, we urge the President and the Congress to establish tariffs specifically protective to the glove and textile industries of the United States.

"If the 84th Congress abolishes tariffs favorable to the glove and textile industries, there will be a serious threat to the continued employment of upwards of 500 employees of two industries in our city of some 14,000 inhabitants. For years the glove and textile industries have been marginal operations and we believe the industries are doomed without protective tariffs against goods produced in low-wage countries.

"The Marinette Chamber of Commerce also recommends the extension of the Recriprocal Trade Agreement with Venezuela. We feel it is important to continue the present high level of trade with Venezuela because of mutual benefits to the economies of both nations."

GEORGE S. ROBBINS,
Executive Secretary.

THE MERRILL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Merrill, Wis., January 28, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has been brought to the attention of the Merrill Chamber of Commerce, that America's foreign-trade policy has been given number one priority on the congressional calendar during this session of Congress; also that this present bill, H. R. 1, that is now being introduced will give the President the right to reduce duties as they exist by a minimum of 5 percent each year for the next 3 years.

Right now there is a large surge of Japanese imports in the United States and in one category of our industry alone Japan has taken over 37 percent of our glove market. To compete with Japan's labor rate, their machine, and equipment as efficient as ours, and raw materials at our market value, we would have to be 10 to 12 times more efficient than they are.

Since Merrill is among those cities with industry manufacturing of gloves; we would be directly jeopardized by reduced tariff.

We urge your support in maintaining this tariff protection.

Thank you,
Sincerely,
LEONARD C. HACKBARTH,
Secretary.

DULUTH, MINN., *April 29, 1955.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support in the Senate and Finance Committee for an amendment to H. R. 1 changing tariff classification of hardboard.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PULP,
SULPHITE, AND PAPER MILL WORKERS, LOCAL NO. 776,
NIELS H. HEDVALL, *President.*

WEBER VENEER & PLYWOOD CO.,
Shawano, Wis., March 9, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As there are a number of hardwood plywood plants in Wisconsin that are concerned about the startling amount of foreign plywood imported into this country, the matter of a protective tariff has no doubt been called to your attention before.

According to the latest reports, imported plywoods are now supplying 41.1 percent of the American hardwood plywood markets. In 11 months of 1954, plywood imports amounted to 383.6 million square feet and the total for 1954 is estimated at 440 million square feet, or an increase over 1951 of 600 percent. This volume of imports cannot continue without having some drastic effect on the American plywood industry.

United States Embassy reports from Tokyo show the average wage in Japanese plywood plants is about 11 cents an hour, as compared to an average of over $1 per hour in American plywood plants. In view of this alarming situation, we urge you to support all legislation favorable toward receiving some relief in this matter of low-priced plywood imports.

In support of the application for relief from low-priced imported plywood, there will be representatives from 29 plywood companies in attendance at the Tariff Commission hearing on March 22, 1955.

Yours very truly,
CLARENCE R. WEBER,
Managing Partner.

FEBRUARY 8, 1955.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: The legislative and national affairs committee of the Stevens Point, Wis., Chamber of Commerce unanimously opposes any reduction of tariffs on fishing tackle.

This is the fishing tackle capital of the world and our economy would be seriously threatened if the tariff was lowered on foreign made fishing tackle. Our plants could not compete with the foreign plants because of their low labor costs. Our items are predominantly handmade by skilled workers whose wage rate is many times the wage rate in foreign countries. Our people would be thrown out of work and hardships would befall our working population and our entire community.

We urge your support on this matter.

Sincerely,
ROBERT A. FISHER,
Chairman, Legislative and National Affairs Committee.

HANSEN GLOVE CORP.,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 31, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As you perhaps know we operate factories in Kiel, Merrill, and Clintonville, Wis., where we manufacture ladies' fabric gloves. This is one of the commodities on the list which will be considered for tariff reductions at the Geneva Conference in February.

Recently bill H. R. 1 has been introduced which would permit the President to reduce all tariffs in existence at July 1, 1955, 5 percent per year for the next 3 years. The effect of this bill would be accumulative inasmuch as any reduction made under it would be in addition to any adjustments made by the Geneva Conference.

Already Japan has taken about 37 percent of our cotton fabric glove market. We are competing with a foreign industry in which the average wage is 11.6 cents per hour. You can readily see the diastrous effect which would be caused by the granting of any additional advantage to these foreign countries through reduced tariffs. It would be a definite threat to our industry and to the jobs of the many people we employ.

Very truly yours,
J. C. BARTH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the bill which the Senate is considering will be a good bill if it results in an increase in the number of jobs and the volume of trade in the United States, as well as in other countries. That will be the test. Will it increase trade? Will it increase jobs? Jobs mean trade, and trade means jobs.

We in the United States should be interested in more jobs for more people, and I know we are. We likewise should be interested in more jobs in foreign countries, and particularly we should be interested in doing something to help them create more jobs, to make more products, which the people within those countries can sell to each other.

We in the United States cannot buy everything the world makes. Neither can any other country buy everything we make. Therefore, if we are going to build up the trade of the world and the trade between nations, other nations of the world will have to find ways and means of creating more jobs and making more things to sell among themselves—not to export, but to sell among themselves.

That is one of the things, Mr. President, in which I am vitally interested. I am vitally interested in more jobs and more trade not only in the United States, but in every nation of the world.

If the proposed legislation will create more jobs and more trade, it will be very successful. I admit that I am not wise enough to know whether it will or will not. I see merit on both sides. I shall support the bill in the hope that it will create more jobs and more trade.

With reference to the amendment offered by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], it may well be that if the bill shall result in much unemployment in the United States, we may have to do something such as the Senator advocates. But I think the Senate properly rejected the amendment, because no one knows at the moment just what effect the bill will have upon jobs and business in the United States.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment, but I shall not do so. My amendment would have provided that the standard for tariffs be based upon the cost of the actual wages which go into a given unit, taking into consideration, of course, the cost of living in different countries, the productivity of the worker, and even his tools. I shall not offer such an amendment because I do not think it would have a possibility of acceptance. I think that perhaps some day, if the trade agreements legislation does not work satisfactorily, if it does not create more jobs and develop more trade, it may well be necessary to establish some kind of yardstick which will base tariffs upon the amount, or cost, of labor which goes into a given unit.

I want the world to know that I am interested in three things: More jobs, more trade, and the maintenance of a high standard of living in the United States. These factors are important in order to preserve the great buying power which the laboring men of the United States have because of their high wages.

In the United States a great market exists for goods. The reason we have such a market is that the American people receive high wages. We have high productivity. Our people have jobs, which result in trade and industry. The fact that our people have money means the maintenance of our markets. I am interested in the maintenance of those markets. I believe every seller, whether he be an American seller or one from a foreign nation, should be deeply interested in maintaining the American market. We cannot have an American market unless our people are working and are receiving good wages.

What will the bill do? Will it create more jobs and more trade? Will it increase the standard of living of the American people? Will it increase the wages of the American worker? At the same time, will it create more jobs in foreign countries, and will the industries in those countries likewise increase the wages of their workers? Furthermore, will the bill enable manufacturers in foreign countries to produce more goods within their own countries, thereby creating more jobs for their own workers and enabling them to sell more things among themselves?

I shall support the proposed legislation on the basis of my hope that it will create more jobs and more trade. If it does not, something can be done about it later. I am hopeful that the bill will accomplish the objective of providing more trade in the United States, although I am not too certain or so positive as are many persons that that will be done.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I spoke, and said I had intended to submit an amendment which I had had printed on March 4, but decided not to submit it. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be made a part of the remarks I made earlier today.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. No action shall be taken pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), to decrease the duty or grant any other concession on any product of any foreign industry which does not have a wage level at least as high as the wage level required by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Paragraph 1513 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "toy marbles," and by inserting after "70 percent ad valorem" the following: "; toy glass marbles, 35 percent ad valorem, based on the American selling price as defined in section 402 (g)." The foregoing amendment shall become effective as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the passage of this act.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, there are seven glass marble factories in the United States. Six of these are in West Virginia. The seventh is in Illinois.

Upon hearings on unemployment recently held by a Senate subcommittee of which it was my privilege to be the chairman, it was conclusively proved that these six West Virginia factories are in process of liquidation and that unless they are promptly afforded protection, they will, on or before the first day of next July, close down forever. The sole cause of the proposed closing is the irresistible competition of Japanese marbles which are now being sold throughout the country for less than the labor cost of making them in the United States.

The amendment before the Senate, if enacted into law, would afford these factories sufficient protection to save them from their impending annihilation.

Senators, in imagination, please put yourselves in the place of the distressed owners and employees of these factories, and then vote on the amendment before you in accordance with the Golden Rule. By doing this, you will help to preserve for the present and future generations of our children the exhilarating pleasure of playing one of the most typical of all American games with marbles made in their own native land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no request for time on this side, I yield back the remainder of the time and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The amendment was rejected.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE HONORABLE P. PIBULSONGGRAM, PRIME MINISTER OF THAILAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, in order that opportunity may be afforded to receive the Prime Minister of Thailand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a committee to escort the guest of the Senate into the Chamber.

At 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Prime Minister of Thailand, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Chamber, and was greeted with prolonged applause.

The Prime Minister took the seat assigned to him immediately in front of the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate and guests in the gallery: It is my great privilege to present to the Senate the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Thailand. The Prime Minister is one of the great leaders of the free world, and he comes from a land of the free.

The Prime Minister of Thailand. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRIME MINISTER. Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

I am greatly honored by the cordial welcome you have extended to me and for this opportunity of meeting the Members of such an eminent body of legislators, charged by the Constitution and the people of the United States with important responsibilities concerning both domestic and foreign affairs.

May I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to convey to you and through you, sir, the warm greetings from the Government and people of Thailand to the people of the United States, and my deep gratitude for the gracious and kind welcome I have received from the American people.

We, in Thailand, are still young in the parliamentary form of goverment which we have had for only 25 years, but our love of freedom is rooted in our history and traditions and is as strong as the love of liberty which has made the United States the great Nation it is today.

I have had the pleasure of personally meeting a number of United States Senators who have been to my country, but I have long had the desire to visit the United States Senate whose wise guidance in matters of foreign policy, which is of particular concern to Thailand and other countries, is of supreme importance during this period of world tensions.

Thailand is proud to have stood with the United Nations and the United States in Korea against aggression, and is proud to be a partner, even though a small one, in the efforts being made by the United States to bring about a lasting period of peace. I believe peace can be achieved through collective strength mustered, not for purposes of aggression or interference in the internal affairs of other nations, but to preserve justice and liberty.

The danger with which we are confronted is real, for not only are the peace and security of Asia, and indeed the world, threatened, but more important than that, their very life and freedom. The people of Thailand shall continue to persevere with all their strength and energy, in the course we have taken, for we believe freedom, democracy, and righteousness will ultimately prevail.

Thank you once again for your friendly welcome. I extend to each one of you a cordial invitation to visit Thailand.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Prime Minister, we appreciate your paying us the honor of this visit. I am sure the Members of the Senate and our guests in the galleries will be interested to know that in addition to the distinguished visitor who is on the floor of the Senate, there is another distinguished visitor in the gallery who is a leader in humanitarian and philanthropic activities. I refer to the wife of the Prime Minister. I wonder if she will stand and give us an opportunity to see her.

[The wife of the Prime Minister rose from her seat in the gallery, and was greeted with applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Prime Minister, it is our custom to give all the Members of the Senate an opportunity to meet personally a distinguished visitor. The Senate will remain in recess in order to give an opportunity to Senators to greet you personally.

The majority leader and the minority leader will escort you to the floor of the Senate so that they may introduce you to the Members of the Senate.

Thereupon the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] escorted the Prime Minister to the well of the Senate and presented him to the Members of the Senate.

At 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 5–3–55–I and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is hereby repealed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would eliminate the peril point provision which was inserted in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1948 by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress.

When the Democratic Party came back into power in 1949, following the sweeping victory which it had at the polls, we eliminated the peril point provision.

In 1950, the margin of superiority of the Democratic Party in the Senate and House was greatly narrowed, and in 1951 a compromise was effected, under which the Reciprocal Trade Act was renewed, but as a concession to get the bill through the peril point provision was put into effect.

It is a very interesting fact that up to the present day the peril point provision has been instrumental in preventing any tariff reductions. I read from the staff papers of the Randall report, page 268, the language referring primarily to the peril point provision:

This version of the act made it more difficult for the President to negotiate reductions in tariff duties. In fact, no important trade agreement activity took place under either the act as modified by the 80th Congress or under the Extension Act of 1951. Some of the proponents of the trade agreements program, in fact, maintain that it is not likely that any action could be taken under the Trade Agreements Act in its modified form. They maintain that the Trade Agreements Act, in its present form, is more important as protectionist, than as trade-liberalizing, legislation.

Mr. President, we should make up our minds whether we really want the liberalization of trade or whether we do not want it. Obvious attempts have been made to cover up that issue, and to prevent any clear-cut decision by this body.

I should like to point out that my party, historically, has always stood for freer trade, for greater commercial intercourse between nations. This has been the almost unanimous opinion of my party, and it has been grounded on solid principles. In the first place, we believe—and it is true—that the wider the area of trade, the greater the opportunity for each area to specialize in the products which it can produce best. The internal prosperity of this country is founded on that very fact. Last night I attempted to give some illustrations to that effect.

What is true internally is true as between nations. The broader the area of trade, the greater the opportunity for the nations to specialize, with the result that all countries benefit from each country's specializing in those commodities which it can produce most efficiently.

In the second place, as Adam Smith observed long ago, the wider the market, the more minute can be the division of labor. The automobile factories of Detroit, if they were limited to selling their goods in Michigan, would be small and relatively inefficient. It is because they have a nationwide market that they can subdivide the manufacturing processes minutely and get increased production, efficiency and lowered costs.

Mr. President, the wider the markets are made, the more minute can be the division of labor, the greater can be the application of capital to the particular process, and the lower will be the cost of production.

We in the State of Illinois are very proud of the productive efficiency of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., the greatest earth moving company in the world. Its efficiency is dependent almost entirely upon the large volume of bulldozers and other earth-moving machinery which it can sell. Shut off its foreign trade—and that is a considerable portion of its market—and its productive efficiency would be crippled, its costs would be raised, and the income of its workers, indeed the income of the American people, would be decreased.

So, Mr. President, the wider the area of trade, the more minute the division of labor, the lower the costs, and the greater our national income.

There is even a third advantage, and this is particularly applicable to the United States. Even if we can produce a wide variety of articles more effectively in each and every instance than can foreign countries, it will still pay us to concentrate on those articles in

which our comparative advantage is greatest.

I mentioned last night that I knew of a country lawyer who was the best attorney in his county and also the best stenographer and the best typist; but he concentrates on the practice of law, from which he can make approximately $60 a day, hires a typist and stenographer less efficient than he and pays her $10 a day. Thus he gains from following the law of comparative advantage.

So, Mr. President, the arguments in favor of broader trade are irrefutable and sound. My party has always recognized them. We led the fight through the 19th century for the reduction of tariffs. The greatest expansion of prosperity our country enjoyed took place from 1846 to 1860, under the Walker tariff of 1846 and the tariff of 1857. We battled for such a policy under Grover Cleveland. We carried it into effect under Woodrow Wilson. But then there followed the postwar reaction, and the high tariff laws of 1922 and 1930 were enacted. Those tariff laws diminished our foreign trade and decreased the prosperity of the Nation.

Then, with the advent to power of the Democratic Party in 1933, we passed, under the leadership of Cordell Hull, the reciprocal trade measure of 1934, and since that time tariffs have been reduced, trade has expanded, and the country has not been injured. We have enjoyed the greatest period of prosperity in our history, and we have helped to cement the free nations of the world together in those bonds of trade which underlie all political alliances.

But this policy has been threatened from time to time by protectionist sentiment, carefully engineered and skillfully led. We Democrats were delighted when President Eisenhower announced that he was in favor of freer trade between nations and that he thought the peace of the world might well depend on broader trade. We welcome these converts. We desire no monopoly on good ideas. We do not wish to hug them to our own bosoms alone. We are glad to share them; and we welcome into full fellowship the converts we have made, and extend to them our respect and our love.

But, Mr. President, our good President fell into trouble. He encountered the protectionists of his own party, who worked on him as Samson was worked on by Delilah. They began to cut his hair, and as his hair was cut, his strength diminished, until finally he had almost a crew cut—even less than that—and his strength disappeared. The administration timidly asked for an extension of the act for 1 year.

Then the Randall Commission was appointed, and inside that Randall Commission some extraordinary things went on. Mr. Randall is a distiguished and a very fine citizen of the city of Chicago. I am sure he believed in the cause of freer trade, but I think the high protectionists worked on him and watered his program down little by little. Apparently he succumbed to the Delilah haircutters who operated on him as they had on the President. He was hoping he could induce them to go along with him, and that he could liberalize them. But what happened, Mr. President? He watered down his claims. All he recommended was a 15-percent reduction in tariff duties in 3 years, or 5 percent a year. It is doubtful whether the full reduction would take place in that time.

We should realize, Mr. President, that a total reduction of existing duties of 15 percent, but merely 5 percent a year, means that if we started off with a tariff of 20 percent, the most it could be reduced would be only 1 percent the first year, another 1 percent the second year, and another 1 percent the third year, if there were a third year. So if there should be a third year—and there is some doubt that there will be—at most, tariff duties could be reduced only to 17 percent.

It is also true—and this is the most constructive feature of the original proposal—that Japan, which had been excluded from the 50-percent provision of the 1945 act, would be made eligible for that provision, and nations which made concessions to Japan could also obtain a 50-percent cut in the duties on their items.

Mr. President, I have heard Japan denounced; but it should be obvious to all of us that Japan and India will determine, in large degree, whether Asia goes Communist. The President has said Japan is the bastion of our defenses. The economic connection of Japan is with Asia. Japan's relationship to Asia is very similar to Great Britain's relationship to the continent of Europe. Both of them are islands lying off the main continental mass, and having few natural resources of their own. Japan's natural complement is China, from which Japan can obtain both coal and iron, and to which she could send, in turn, cotton textiles and machinery.

At the present time, China is in the hands of the Communists. We are properly trying to shut off trade from and with China. But the gravitational pull of China upon Japan is terrific. I hope we can prevent Japan from trading with China, but we can do so only if we provide Japan with alternative markets. Frankly, I think this is the most constructive, and perhaps the only really constructive, feature of the pending bill.

But, Mr. President, the Delilahs not only operated on the President and on the Randall Commission, but now from the Senate Finance Committee we have a series of other crippling amendments. I think some of our good friends should hire out as tariff barbers and haircutters, to deprive the low-tariff movement of its strength. They have made a number of crippling amendments.

In the first place, roughly 1,000 articles not imported into the United States in any appreciable quantity would, under the House version of the bill, be given appreciable decreases in duty. Under the House version, the duties on those commodities could be cut by 50 percent. However, that provision has been eliminated from the Senate version of the bill. Mr. President, some may ask, "If they are imported in negligible quantities, what effect would a reduction of tariffs have upon them?" In some cases, however, they are imported in negligible quantities because the tariff is so high; and to maintain the tariff at its present height would mean that those commodities would continue to be imported in only negligible quantities. In addition, many other features have been introduced.

For instance, the Tariff Commission would be made an Inspector General over the President of the United States. Mr. President, we know that field soldiers always are distressed when they hear that the Inspector General is coming around. The Tariff Commission would now be put in the position of a walking strawboss over the President; it would be instructed to watch what he does. On pages 11 and 12 of the act before us we find that the Tariff Commission is to keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties contained in tariff agreements entered into by the President, and at least once a year is to submit to the Congress a factual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program. I do not know that I disagree in theory with that provision; but its practical effect would be that the President would always have the hot breath of the Tariff Commission and the protectionist interests blowing down his neck.

Then the escape clause is tightened still further. All of us know that the peril point can be invoked prior to the negotiation of a trade agreement. But the escape clause is put into effect after our trade agreement has been negotiated.

By section 5, the Tariff Commission would be required to make immediately public its findings and recommendations on escape clause applications to the President, and would be required to cause a summary to be published in the Federal Register. That provision seems innocent enough; but its effect will be to throw upon the President the marshaled forces of those who want specific protection and who are opposed to any reduction in tariffs. That provision would add to the number of Delilah barbers who are ready to cut the strength of the trade agreements, reciprocal-trade program.

Then, even though the domestic producers in an industry found their sales rising, year by year, they still would be able to invoke the escape clause, if they were obtaining a smaller relative share of the total sales.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would it not be true that in a situation such as that of the textile industry, whose real difficulty comes from the domestic competition of nylon, orlon, dacron, and similar fibers which have been invented, the escape-clause action could be invoked on the theory that one-half of 1 percent of imports entering the country had a material effect upon the industry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana is completely correct. The phrase "material effect" can be used to hurt the cause of reciprocal trade.

Mr. LONG. In other words, even though foreign competition might constitute only a minor problem for the domestic industry, and then only with regard to one line of the commodities the industry is producing, and even though with regard to all other lines it was producing, the industry might be showing very sizable and handsome profits, nevertheless, it would be in order to invoke the escape clause, on the theory that, with regard to one line of commodities being produced, foreign competition was a material cause of decreased sales. Is not that true?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. LONG. Not because such competition would be a great or important cause of injury to the particular industry, but because it would be a material cause with regard to one commodity, although the industry as a whole was showing a handsome profit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The phrase used is whether "such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

An injury is interpreted, not merely as an absolute decrease in sales, but as a relative decrease. And a slight effect or threatened effect could be regarded as a material contribution.

Let me illustrate that point. Suppose 100,000 units of a commodity were produced in the United States, and suppose 20,000 units were imported. Suppose the United States production rose to 110,000, but suppose the imports increased to 30,000; 30,000 represents an increase of 10,000 over the original imports of 20,000; and the increase is greater, in proportion to the original imports of 20,000 than the increase of 10,000, in proportion to the original domestic production of 100,000. So, even though there had been an increase of 10,000 in the domestic production, the escape clause could be invoked, and the imports would be said to have contributed materially to injury.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I seek only information as to the Senator's theory of the case. What checks, if any, does he propose to place upon the President in fixing tariff policy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say that, in general, I am a strong defender of legislative powers, and do not believe in delegating unlimited power to the Executive. Nevertheless, we in Congress are peculiarly subject to the pressures of special interests, which are highly organized and highly financed, and which can exert crushing weight.

The general interest being diffused, is of necessity weak and relatively voiceless. I think this is one of the troubles with modern democracy, which, incidentally, Mr. Walter Lippmann develops at some length in his recent book, "The Public Philosophy." Therefore, modern legislatures have found it very difficult to protect themselves from special interest groups. This is particularly the case in view of the fact that we, as representatives of specific districts or specific States, must of necessity represent our States and our districts.

Whatever the faults of the President may be, the President is elected by the people as a whole, and he is supposed to represent the Nation as a whole. So personally I should like to go back to the original Cordell Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, without the peril-point provision, but with the provision that, since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act must be renewed every 3 years, at the end of 3 years we could, by a yea-and-nay vote, decide whether or not to continue the policy.

What I think we are seeing now is that, after the first rush of enthusiasm for the Hull policy and for the alleged Eisenhower policy has passed, the shock troops of special interests are coming in and sweeping us off our feet. We are adulterating the measure until it is neither fish nor fowl, and only worthy to be spewed out of the mouths of sincere believers in reciprocal trade.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think his theory of the case resolves itself into giving the President of the United States, for a 3-year period, unchecked powers to fix tariffs according to his discretion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say that the President would be subject to the 3-year renewal of the act. Also, every 4 years the party of the President comes up for election.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that under this program it would be the Secretary of State who would be the primary adviser to the President with regard to tariff policies?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think the record of Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State has been one which inspires confidence in his ability to resist pressures?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that I prefer not to be personal in my comments.

Mr. MORSE. But we have a situation confronting us——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think we had a fine Secretary under Harry Truman, one who never received his just due from the American people, and who is beginning to look better and better in comparison with what has happened since then.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully to my friend from Illinois, whom I love very dearly, that unless my ears betray me, I am listening to an argument for personal government in the administration of the trade policy of the United States. I insist that we ought to go back to the constitutional system of checks and balances. It is a pretty sound way of protecting all the people of the country. I do not intend to vote to give any President, Democrat or Republican, the kind of power the Senator from Illinois is proposing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say in reply to my good friend from Oregon that I believe in democratic government—and, to use the Senator's own phrase, constitutional liberalism—as much as he does.

Last night, at about the same hour of the day when the Senator from Oregon usually takes the floor, I reviewed at some length the history of American tariff policies. I pointed out that from the tariff of 1816 on, with the exception of the Walker tariff, the Underwood tariff, and the Cordell Hull program, special interests have swept Congress off its feet every time; and I submit that until we show more intestinal fortitude, I have confidence that the principles of broader trade will be better served by a man who represents the United States as a whole than by representatives who, of necessity, are forced to represent the specific interests of their States or districts.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully to the Senator from Illinois that I am familiar with his review of American tariff policies. I disagree with his conclusion on item after item, and I shall reply to him at some length later this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall welcome the Senator's reply. The Senator from Oregon and I disagree so seldom that it is like a touch of savour so to speak, to find this element of disagreement. It takes some of the monotony out of life when the Senator from Oregon and I differ.

Mr. KERR rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma and I agree less often, so I welcome a question from him. Incidentally, I do not know why it is that Democrats must always fight with Democrats.

Mr. KERR. I will say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is one of the best answers I know of to that question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one can get the better of the Senator from Oklahoma in an exchange of witticisms, and I should not have been so unwary as to try.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

I will say to him that I know of no one whose kind words I cherish more. Nor is there anyone better able to express himself in terms of dramatic realism than is the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator has been discussing the question of delegating to the President the tariffmaking powers imposed upon the Congress by the Constitution. When the Secretary of State was before the Finance Committee, the Senator from Oklahoma addressed some questions to him as to the authority of the President to delegate to others powers which the Congress would be and has been delegating to the President by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts. The Senator from Oklahoma asked the Secretary of State to what degree the President could delegate such authority. The Secretary of State, in his purpose to make it dramatically clear how far-reaching the President's powers of redelegating that authority were, made a statement which is inaccurately set forth in the record. I shall state both versions of it. He stated that the President of the United States, if he so desired, could delegate all his authority in that regard to his office boy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But he would not wish to do so.

Mr. KERR. I think perhaps the statement of the Secretary of State was justi-

fied on the basis of the policies which have been pursued by the President. I think he not only can do so, but has done so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe the United States is in danger of having a Caligula for President. I think it was the Roman emperor, Caligula, who decorated his horse and invested it with authority. I do not believe we need fear that power will be delegated to an office boy.

Mr. KERR. As I remember the Roman emperor to whom the Senator has referred delegated the authority which he gave to the whole horse.

Mr. BARKLEY. That involves a question of extremities.

Mr. KERR. But the Senator from Oklahoma made no reference to which extremity he referred.

I asked the Secretary of State to give us the names of the men to whom the President had delegated the authority. I read from the hearings:

Secretary DULLES. Senator, the President can give powers to an office boy, anybody—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can, but would not.

Mr. KERR. I asked another question, and the Secretary made this statement:

I cannot tell you to whom the President delegated his authority.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he can tell the Senate the name of any one of the negotiators to whom the President has delegated this authority, which the Senator from Illinois is now asking Congress to delegate unfettered to the President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this an examination the Senator is putting me through?

Mr. KERR. Something of that kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not pretend that I have my lesson perfectly.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator have it imperfectly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; very imperfectly. However, I believe that authority has been delegated to the Assistant Secretary of State, Samuel C. Waugh, who is in charge of economic affairs, and a very good banker.

Mr. KERR. I should like to say to the Senator that according to the testimony of Mr. Dulles the only authority delegated to Mr. Waugh was to sign agreements. I asked the Senator if he knew the names of any men to whom the authority to negotiate agreements had been delegated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Normally speaking, I should not think that Mr. Waugh would sign agreements with which he did not agree.

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of State stated that Mr. Waugh signed as the delegated representative of the President to sign agreements, not to negotiate them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that I passed the examination.

Mr. KERR. I take it that the Senator has demonstrated that which has always been the position of many who are asking Congress to delegate their authority in the matter of the regulation of foreign trade and commerce, namely, that the Senator does not know to whom the authority will in the end be delegated, or by whom. I challenge the Senator, if I have not correctly stated the situation, to tell us now or tomorrow or next week to whom the authority has been or will be delegated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from Oklahoma that he has also served in the Armed Forces; and he knows that orders are passed down the line from general to chief of staff to colonel to battalion commander to captain to lieutenant to platoon sergeant to sergeant to corporal to private. Must the general know the name of the corporal in order to have his order carried out? The order is given. The question is whether it is carried out. It is not necessary to be able to identify the particular man with two stripes on his sleeve, or even the pfc, or even the poor private, who carries out the order.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that statement. I wish to remind him that the Constitution of the United States does not provide for a program under which Congress can delegate to generals, to colonels, to corporals, to privates, or to latrine guards the authority and responsibilities placed by the Constitution upon Members of Congress as the people's representatives. I thank the Senator for illustrating to what extent the authority will be delegated and redelegated and redelegated, until it is lost sight of in the interminable maze of individuals in the Department of State who will exercise the authority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Until it is finally carried out with celerity and efficiency.

Mr. KERR. I challenge the Senator to show that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish first to reply to my friend from Oklahoma. Does the Senator maintain that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is unconstitutional?

Mr. KERR. I have not made that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the Senator's argument.

Mr. KERR. I have not made that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has stated it was a delegation of power and that it was an unconstitutional delegation of power. The judge of whether it was unconstitutional is the Supreme Court. Has the Supreme Court ever declared the act to be unconstitutional? I ask the Senator from Oklahoma to reply to that question.

Mr. KERR. The Supreme Court of the United States has not so declared. Now I shall ask the Senator from Illinois this question: Upon whom does the Constitution place the responsibility to regulate international trade and commerce?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Primarily upon the President of the United States, I would think.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that is an example of the Senator's lack of information. If the President already has the authority, why would the Senator from Illinois be asking Congress to give the authority to the President?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Constitution, in its definition of powers, charge the Executive with the conduct of foreign affairs, with the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. KERR. I should like to read to the Senator what the Constitution provides on that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While the Senator is looking up the Constitution I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KERR. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois is allergic to the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am not allergic to the Constitution. That statement is unworthy of the sportsmanship of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Then, I withdraw the statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has asked me whether or not the granting of power to the President to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements is in violation of the Constitution. In his opinion, it is. Although I do not pretend to be a constitutional expert, I say it is not.

I point out to my very good friend from Oklahoma that Congress is given the power to regulate commerce among the several States, and also among Indian tribes, I believe, but it did not exercise that power in the case of railroad rates. Congress instead delegated that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the constitutionality of the Interstate Commerce Act has been upheld.

Furthermore, Congress delegated its powers with respect to unfair competition to the Federal Trade Commission, and the constitutionality of the Federal Trade Commission Act has been upheld.

In the case of foreign trade, the Supreme Court has held in, I believe, the Curtiss-Wright export case, involving the Chaco war, that the field of foreign trade is one peculiarly adapted to the delegation of powers by Congress.

So I submit that the Senator from Oklahoma is laboring under a grave misapprehension. He is indulging in a Euclidian argument which has a position but no magnitude.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the quick study with respect to the delegation of legislative power, which the Senator from Illinois has made during the recess a while ago, has he not discovered that such delegations of power are upheld only when Congress has prescribed definite standards? In this instance the point of constitutionality here hinges entirely upon whether any standards are provided in the bill. When the time comes for me to offer my amendment, which provides for the approval of Congress, I shall undertake to show that there are no standards in the bill, and that not a single Member of the Senate who will vote for the bill today can have the slightest idea of how many commodities are to be dealt with and how they will be dealt with. We are conveying

away constitutional legislative power to effect a policy in international trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand a copy of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as amended. Standards are prescribed in sections 4, 5, 6, and 8 which would seem to me to be sufficiently specific, so that an improper delegation of authority cannot be made.

If my good friends, the Senators from Oklahoma and Wyoming, doubt the constitutionality of the law, why not start a suit? So far as I am aware, the act has been in effect for 20 years, and the Supreme Court never has declared it to be unconstitutional. So it is extraordinary to have two Senators, able as they are, now rising to declare unconstitutional a measure which has existed for 20 years and has never been overruled.

It is very easy for us in the Senate to think that we are great constitutional lawyers. I do not pretend to be a constitutional lawyer, but I submit that if it is constitutional for Congress to delegate specific powers in the fields of the regulation of railway rates, of unfair trade practices, and of foreign affairs, in which field the President, under the Constitution, is made primarily responsible, then it is particularly appropriate to do so in this instance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Appropriate in what way?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To negotiate treaties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Are these treaties?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are executive agreements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a new invention of those who have decided that it would be appropriate for the executive branch of the Government to take over the legislative power, and to do so by way of agreement to delegate power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is very interesting. In 1922, under the Fordney-McCumber Act, the President was given the power to raise tariffs and to lower them. I heard no objection in the next 12 years that that was an improper delegation of power. Why? It is interesting to observe that in 32 out of 37 cases the Presidents—and Republican Presidents they were—raised the tariffs. That was not said to be an improper delegation of power.

I notice that there has been written into the bill an amendment which gives to the Office of Defense Mobilization and the President the power to impose quotas. If Senators are opposed to the delegation of authority to reduce tariffs, why are they in favor of giving to the President the power to impose quotas? I ask for consistency from my friends.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted with the action of the Senator from Illinois and the way in which he has comported himself in responding to my remarks. I have noticed with a great deal of interest his going to the Constitution several times, presumably to read something, but I have not yet heard him read anything from the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me read from article II, the second paragraph of section 2, of the Constitution. Does the Senator from Oklahoma have that before him?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Article II defines the powers of the President, and the second paragraph of section 2 reads as follows:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors.

And so forth.

Mr. KERR. May I ask the Senator from Illinois in what way that language affects the bill which is now before the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say that the reciprocal trade agreements are executive agreements. The Senator from Oklahoma may be a supporter of the Bricker amendment; I am not. In fact, I think I heard the Senator from Oklahoma last year make one of the eloquent speeches against the Bricker amendment. Does my memory play me false?

Mr. KERR. It does. I must say to the Senator from Illinois that at times I find his memory of events almost as inaccurate as I do his conclusions based on neither reading nor memory.

But the Senator has referred to article II, section 2, of the Constitution, and I have asked him what connection that has with the proposed legislation.

The Senator has read from the Constitution the provision that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. An executive agreement is a subspecies of treaty.

Mr. KERR. But the Constitution also says:

> Provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Will the Senator from Illinois name a single one of the executive agreements, as he designates them, which has ever been concurred in by action of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me see if I understand the Senator's argument.

Mr. KERR. I am asking the Senator a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to understand the argument of the Senator. Does he contend that the reciprocal trade agreements act is unconstitutional?

Mr. KERR. I have not so stated, despite the fact that the Senator from Illinois twice has said that I have said that, which I have not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the only inference I can draw from the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Cannot the Senator from Illinois answer a question without drawing an inference?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is pleasant to draw inferences if they are correct.

Mr. KERR. I am happy to be the inspirer of the pleasant reaction in the mind of my great friend from Illinois. If he does not want to answer my question, then I may say to him that it is wise to draw inferences.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think few Members of the Senate are experts in constitutional law. I merely want to say that more than a century of history has indicated that Congress, when it considered tariff schedules on individual commodities, was subject to terrific special-interest pressures, which made it very difficult for Congress to legislate in the general interest.

As a result, legislative government was brought into a considerable degree of disrepute, and it became evident that if there were to be reductions in tariffs which, in the interests of prosperity and international peace, were necessary, Congress would have to insulate itself to some degree from the pressures which beat in upon us on individual schedules. Therefore, as a measure of self-protection against the terrific pressures, Congress delegated those powers to the President. I submit that wisdom has been justified by its children, since in the 15 years the Hull program operated, there resulted reductions in tariffs and an expansion of prosperity, the free world did get together, and yet Congress, every 3 years, had the power to exercise its veto.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield, but I also realize that my time is running out, and I should like to complete the substantive portions of my statement.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to desist, if the Senator does not care to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Any relationship between the bill which it is sought to pass today and the Hull reciprocal-trade-agreements program is purely coincidental.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say this is a very much poorer measure than was the Hull proposal, but I was attempting to demonstrate that not only was this measure a compromise by the Randall Commission, and a compromise by the administration in the drafting of the bill, but it was compromised seriously in the Finance Committee, which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma ornaments.

Mr. KERR. The reciprocal trade agreement program of Cordell Hull was conceived to be an instrumentality to promote reciprocal trade. He recognized that the delegation by the Congress of the authority to the President as placing upon the President a responsibility and a sacred trust, namely, so to act in connection with foreign trade and commerce as to promote it on a reciprocal, two-way basis. Now, if the Senator would care to inform himself, he would find that the record is filled with statements of the present Secretary of State, and that the press has been filled with statements of the President, in which they have clearly stated and repeated that their concept of the pending legislation is that its purpose is to implement the President's responsibility in connection with the conduct of foreign affairs—totally disassociated from the basic concept of the Hull reciprocal trade program, which was to promote reciprocal trade on a two-way basis.

I desire to clear up one more matter, and then I shall be through, and I thank the Senator for the time accorded me. The questions which the Senator from Oklahoma was addressing to the Senator from Illinois were not limited either to the power of Congress to delegate its authority to the President or to the extent to which that had been done; but my questions were directed primarily to finding out, which I did, how little the Senator from Illinois, and, for that matter, most of the others of us, know about the identities of the persons who, in the final analysis, will be the recipients from the President, or from some of his assistants, of the power and authority which we are about to delegate with such casualness and such indifference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his very complimentary references.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield? I do not know how much time he has, and I do not want to impinge on his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am always glad to yield to the first Senator of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, I do not go back that far. [Laughter.] I thank the Senator for such an unusual compliment.

The same section of the Constitution which authorizes the Congress to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes—which is now only academic—authorizes the Congress to levy duties and imposts, and perform other acts in the regulation of commerce. It is under that same authority, is it not, that Congress established the Interstate Commerce Commission? It realized back in 1887, 100 years after the authority was given to Congress by the Constitution, that it could not regulate all the details, practices, rates, and other important matters in interstate and foreign commerce. Congress, therefore, established the Interstate Commerce Commission, and delegated to it the power and the authority given to Congress under the Constitution, because Congress realized it could not attend to all the details. We do not know who all the examiners are who go forth over this country——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma will tell us who are the examiners of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may be allowed to reply, I will say we do not know who they are. Many of us in the Senate do not know who the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are, and yet we long ago accepted that Commission as a proper body to receive the delegation of congressional authority, and the Supreme Court over and over again has established the legality of such delegation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress also established the Federal Trade Commission under the same authority, to help enforce the antitrust laws, and to prescribe rules for the regulation of commerce among the States and among foreign nations, but particularly among the States.

We went from there to the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has to do in part with the regulation of interstate commerce, so that the people of the country might have some forum to which to go to ascertain the validity of securities in which they might invest their money.

We established the Federal Communications Commission as one of our regulatory bodies, to regulate a certain form of commerce.

We established the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate airplanes and air travel all over the country.

All those commissions and bodies were established under the same authority of the Constitution.

We do not know who the agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission are. We do not know them by name. I doubt if any Senator could name all the members of that Commission. I doubt if they could name all the members of the Federal Communications Commission, or of the Federal Trade Commission, or of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Certainly they could not name the examiners who go forth over the country to investigate and make reports so that the various agencies may perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

Does the Senator from Illinois see any difference between the establishment of those regulatory agencies and the delegation to them by the Congress of the power and authority to perform duties in regulating commerce which Congress, evidently, cannot perform, and the delegation of the power to fix tariffs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois wishes to thank the Senator from Kentucky for stating with greater copiousness the principal point which the Senator from Illinois was laboring, and I marvel that such an intelligent man as the Senator from Oklahoma does not see the point.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The statement has been made that there is nothing reciprocal about a trade agreement. If the Senator will refer to pages 1261 and 1262 of the hearings, he will see that I asked Secretary Dulles what our imports and exports were. Secretary Dulles testified that, excluding all military and similar kinds of aid, and taking the actual trade, our exports in 1954, which was the last full year, were $11,390,000,000, and that our imports were $10 billion. In other words, we were more than 10 percent ahead. That sounds like reciprocal trade to me, except we are getting the better of it and to the extent of 10 percent. How can people trade with us if they cannot get dollars with which to trade? Who in America would want to get guilders or lira if they could get dollars?

If we are going to trade with other nations, they have to be able to sell to us some of their products, so they can have funds with which to trade with us. Does not that make sense?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It certainly does make sense.

Mr. President, last night, at a late hour, I placed in the RECORD various tables, which are to be found on pages 5432–5434. The tables show the specific concessions we have been able to obtain for the concessions we have made. There is no greater libel than the charge that reciprocal trade is a one-way street. We have obtained concessions in return for the concessions we have given.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that, as of the present time, we have a favorable balance of trade—that is to say, in the ordinary sense? We have been trading with other countries, and we have had a favorable balance of trade for so long a time that we now have most of the gold in the world buried at Fort Knox, Kentucky; and the other nations cannot pay us with gold, because they do not have enough of it.

Can the Senator from Illinois suggest some way, other than by giving the other nations an opportunity to trade with us, by which to make it possible for them to pay us for the things they would like to purchase from us?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I cannot. The only way to build up our exports is to build up our imports. The argument that we should build up exports, but should not permit imports, is obviously self-defeating, when applied broadly. Ultimately, the payments must balance or be equal. Our whole export market—and this is of great importance—depends upon this program.

For instance, let us consider the South. I desire to pay tribute to the South. In the past the South has had more sense on this subject than has any other section of the country. I do not know that that is because of greater intelligence on the part of the South, but it is because the South has been a large exporter of cotton, tobacco, and rice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think I have yielded at least half of my time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may be allowed 5 minutes in which to conclude his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Did the Chair state that the time of the Senator from Illinois on the amendment had expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did so state.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma requested unanimous consent that the Senator

from Illinois be allowed 5 minutes in which to conclude his presentation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if agreeable to the Senator from Oklahoma, I will yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois. I am fearful that if we begin to make requests for additional time, we shall become involved in considerable difficulty.

Mr. KERR. Then, Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas to yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, so as to allow him to conclude his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, the pending bill was a weak one when it was introduced. The Finance Committee has now eliminated the provision for a cut of 50 percent on so-called negligible items, some of which are negligible only because the tariff is high, but they could be made appreciable if the tariff were reduced.

The Finance Committee also has eliminated the provision giving the right to reduce the duties charged to Japan this spring; and the committee also has eliminated the provision giving the President the right to go to the next lower figure, in order to get an even percentage.

The bill, as it now is before the Senate, requires the Tariff Commission to report annually to Congress on trade agreements, and really makes the Tariff Commission the Inspector General over the President. The bill requires the Tariff Commission to make findings under the escape clause, and to have them published as they are submitted to the President.

Then there is the extraordinary provision which redefines "domestic industry," so as to allow a specific commodity definition of injury, even when the entire industry is prospering.

The last paragraph gives the Office of Defense Mobilization the power to recommend to the President, and gives the President the power to put import quotas into effect. I suspect that certain Members believe they have received assurances that if they will vote for this bill, an import quota will be imposed on oil or that, at the very least, the imports will be frozen at the existing percentage, if not reduced to 10 percent, as I understand the Senator from West Virginia desires.

What has happened in the case of fluorspar, lead, and zinc, I do not know. But the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with his beaming benevolence which reassures all of us, said on Monday that he thought these industries would be adequately taken care of; and I think those who have looked into his benevolent face have concluded that oil, coal, fluorspar, zinc, and lead will have quotas imposed upon them. Whether such a "deal" was made, I do not know. But the Senator from Colorado has not denied it, and a great many persons are following him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what is this "deal" that the Senator from Illinois is imagining? He said there was a "deal," and said I did not deny it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said the Senator from Colorado had assured questioners, on Monday—and particularly the junior Senator from Texas—that they need not fear that the powers proposed to be granted to the President would not be exercised. He indicated that in all probability they would be exercised to protect oil and coal from importations of residual fuels from Venezuela; and the Senator from Colorado went on to deliver a eulogy about fluorspar, lead, and zinc, the products of his beautiful mountain State.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what is the Senator from Illinois bellyaching about? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not bellyaching. I am merely saying that this bill is being put through on a tacit agreement between the administration and the protectionists, and under it each side can claim a victory. The administration can say that its low-tariff program has been put into effect. The administration can get the publicity; and the boys from Madison Avenue will write it up. But the protectionists will get the bacon.

I want to warn the honest Republican low-tariff supporters on the other side of the aisle—and I pay all respect to them—that when they go for a ride with the Senator from Colorado, they had better remember the limerick:

> There was a young lady of Niger,
> Who went for a ride on a tiger.
> They returned from the ride
> With the lady inside,
> And a smile on the face of the tiger.

Mr. President, see the Senator from Colorado smile. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I recommend to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that they take a ride with me. I assure them they will never get anywhere by taking a ride with the senior Senator from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois; and the time of the Senator from Illinois on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may now be a quorum call without having the time required therefor charged to either side. The Senator from Illinois has consumed all the time available to him on his amendment, but Senators who desire to answer him have not used any of the time available to them on the amendment.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to have a quorum call had, in order to give all Senators an opportunity to hear those on the other side of the pending question, I make the request that the roll be called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to have a quorum present; but I should like even more to have a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to my amendment. Of course I should like to have a quorum present to hear the Senators who will speak on the other side of the pending question.

I am willing to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum if a sufficient number of Senators will second my request for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have submitted my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call has been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair or the clerk state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is hereby repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In view of the provisions of the unanimous consent agreement, I believe the time in opposition to the amendment should be controlled by the distinguished minority leader. Therefore, I suggest that the Chair look to him to yield time during the remaining hour of debate on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have listened intently to the Senator from Illinois. In the earlier part of his remarks he referred to Mr. Clarence Randall, the chairman of the so-called Randall Commission, and he said that Mr. Randall had been, as the Senator put it, watered down by the groups which, the Senator said, exerted pressure upon him during the life of the Commission.

Mr. President, I had the honor to be a member of the Randall Commission. I was 1 of the 5 Senators who were appointed to serve on the Commission; and I should like at this time to pay tribute to Mr. Clarence Randall for the manner in which he performed his duties as chairman of the Commission, which was a very difficult task indeed.

I never saw a man who was less subject to pressure or who so ably presided over a group of men of experience and affairs, and of diverse convictions, who were called upon to consider the important subject of foreign trade.

I wish to make it clear that in my view, Mr. Randall, as chairman of the Randall Commission, rendered a very great service to the United States.

I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. The peril point and escape clause provisions of the act are, in my view, absolutely essential to its proper operation and administration.

I recall very well that in the deliberations of the Randall Commission in 1953, it was I who proposed that the escape clause and peril point provisions of the act be made a part of the recommendations of the Randall Commission. As I recall, there was no opposition, eventually, to including that recommendation in the report to Congress.

The Senator from Illinois has spoken about pressure groups as though there was only one pressure group, and that is the group which favors tariff protection. As a member of the Commission, and as a Senator, I wish to say that I believe the pressure groups among those who wish to do away with tariffs are just about as strong as, if not stronger than, the groups which have upheld tariffs as an essential factor in building up domestic industry and safeguarding jobs and the American standard of living.

Certainly the pressure groups for free trade include the great farm organizations which represent the wheat farmers and grain farmers and cotton interests. The automobile industry also has exerted very great pressure.

Therefore, when we talk about pressure groups, we must remember that they represent a two-way street. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he consider whether the pressures from the so-called freer trade elements are not just as great as the pressures from those who hold the view that to a large degree the industrial development of this country has been based on some element of tariff protection.

In the development of the act since 1934 the peril-point and escape-clause provisions have become of basic importance.

Therefore, I urge the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois by a very decisive vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, one industry which has been faced with very difficult competition since the end of World War II is the domestic mining industry producing lead and zinc. I believe the experience of that industry and the manner in which the President has faced its problems will illustrate by indirection, at least, the value of maintaining the peril-point and escape-clause provisions.

Under the escape-clause procedure which is now a part of the law the President received a recommendation, unanimously approved by the members of the Tariff Commission, which indicated that the lead and zinc industry had been injured, suggested that the President take appropriate action.

One of the means open to the President, of course, was the restoration of the tariff cut that had been instituted under those provisions of the law. However, we should not believe that that was the only means open to the President.

Instead of restoring the tariff under the normal procedure, the President chose another interesting solution to the problem. That solution was based upon an administrative program, the heart of which was stockpiling.

Today I received a letter from the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who is responsible for the operation of the stockpiling program. I should like to read the letter to the Senate. It is dated today, and reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

HON. WALLACE BENNETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Pursuant to our recent discussions on lead and zinc, I believe that a brief report on the current situation, as well as an indication of possible Government procurement action over the next few years with regard to these two metals, would be helpful and informative to you.

As you know, on August 20, 1954, the President indicated that the Government was in a position to purchase up to 200,000 tons of newly mined domestic lead and up to 300,000 tons of newly mined domestic zinc in fiscal year 1955 in order to assist in maintaining the domestic mobilization base for these two important metals which are essential for defense purposes. This procurement under the long-term stockpile program was in conformity with the minerals policy recommended to the President by his special Cabinet Committee on Mineral Policy, of which the long-term stockpile objective concept was approved by the President initially in March 1954.

I ask Senators to note those two dates: March 1954 and August 1954. I continue to read the letter:

This program has contributed in a vital way to a significant improvement in the prices of the 2 metals to the point that lead is now 2½ cents per pound above the low point of February 1954 and in recent months offers of this metal for the stockpile have declined substantially below the offers of a few months ago. The price of zinc is currently 2¾ cents per pound above the low point of 1954 and in recent months offers for the stockpile have likewise declined.

An additional heartening element in the situation for the two metals is that smelter stocks which had been excessively high in mid-1954 have declined substantially. At the present time lead smelter stocks are approximately 60,000 tons compared to about 97,000 tons on June 1, 1954, and zinc smelter stocks are approximately 90,000 tons, compared to 210,000 tons on June 1, 1954.

The closing down of domestic lead-zinc mines has virtually ceased, and in certain areas some mines previously closed have reopened. Moreover, information from abroad indicates that demand for these two metals in world markets is strong, and United States imports for consumption have not increased.

This is the heart of the letter, Mr. President, and I ask all my colleagues to listen carefully, particularly those who are interested in lead and zinc:

The present status of the strategic stockpile indicates that the Government will be in a position to continue to acquire both lead and zinc toward long-term stockpile objectives in 1955, and, it would appear, throughout 1956.

In other words, the Government will continue the stockpiling program for another 20 months. I continue reading from the letter:

In the meantime we are continuing to exert every effort through other appropriate actions and programs that can, in any way, contribute to a bettering of the domestic lead-zinc situation.

I repeat that statement:

In the meantime we are continuing to exert every effort through other appropriate actions and programs that can, in any way, contribute to a bettering of the domestic lead-zinc situation.

I trust that the above information will be reassuring to you in view of your and our concern with the maintenance of a strong, vigorous, and efficient domestic mineral industry, which is essential as a component of

our wartime mobilization base and also essential to the long-term economic development of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Mr. Flemming is the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, I think it will be interesting to analyze that letter briefly.

The program which began in March and was really put into high gear in August had some interesting effects. When it was announced in March, the price of zinc went up from 9.4 cents to 10.2 cents, and in August it went up from 11 cents to 11.4 cents. It is now 12 cents, and at no time has that price slipped back.

The lead price, which was 12.8 cents in February of 1954, jumped to 13.9 cents on the March announcement, and from 14.1 cents to 14.6 cents after the August announcement. It is now 15 cents. The combined prices of these two metals are approximately 23 percent higher than when the President made his announcement, and the prices have never slipped back.

One of the interesting and important effects of this program has been the reduction in the domestic stock. Surpluses overhung the market and tended to depress it. If we had had a tariff solution to the problem we might have slowed up the volume of imports, but that would not have had any substantial effect on the overhanging domestic stock.

I pointed out how the amount has dropped. A part of it has been absorbed by the stockpile, and the fact that the stockpile program was in effect has made it possible for this very substantial change, which puts a firm foundation under the present market prices for the minerals.

There are some interesting figures with respect to imports. Taking a 3-month running average, we discovered that in the case of zinc at the beginning of 1954 the averages for the 3 months before March were 49,000 tons a month; April, 48,000 tons; May, 48,000 tons; June, 47,000 tons. In the 5 months from October through February of this year they have averaged between 49,000 and 54,000 tons.

In other words, the net effect of the program has been to level off the rate of imports.

During the period of 3 months when we were waiting for the President to make his decision, the outside producers felt there might be tariffs and they crowded all the lead and zinc into the country they could get in, and in those months the rate of imports climbed, in the case of zinc, as high as 54,000 tons. There is approximately the same record with respect to lead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these schedules may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the schedules were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Zinc statistics for 1954 and 1955, by months

[Quantities in short tons]

	United States mine production	Imports, by source [1]							Secondary production	United States consumption of slab zinc	Smelter stocks of slab zinc	Average price, cents per pound
		Total	Canada	Mexico	Peru	Bolivia	Belgian Congo	Other countries				
Total, 1954	465,245	(605,610)	(256,720)	(183,989)	(99,976)	(11,324)	(13,896)	(39,705)	(83,394)	(872,030)	----------	----------
1954—January	39,637	49,150	13,068	14,498	10,651	4,977	717	5,245	6,881	65,844	198,712	9.8
February	39,398	40,812	14,707	13,550	8,396	1,730	413	2,016	6,206	64,178	199,994	9.4
March	42,248	57,470	24,682	14,761	10,266	3,494	772	3,495	6,969	73,639	201,100	9.7
April	39,915	46,615	19,978	14,477	5,015	688	1,791	3,666	6,810	71,655	200,740	10.2
May	40,008	42,176	19,480	12,431	7,566	71	524	2,104	6,874	70,342	209,828	10.3
June	40,391	53,022	24,730	16,646	8,353	637	1,218	1,438	6,917	74,315	201,124	11.0
July	38,445	54,154	30,896	10,576	8,195	74	----------	4,413	6,833	62,964	198,027	11.0
August	38,141	56,103	23,104	16,290	12,253	101	524	3,821	7,462	73,179	193,253	11.0
September	34,178	49,477	16,317	18,629	8,920	77	2,624	2,910	8,241	73,266	175,505	11.4
October	35,511	49,079	15,747	18,868	8,185	68	1,284	4,927	8,369	79,195	152,137	11.5
November	38,338	49,729	21,374	17,003	5,831	66	1,312	4,143	7,804	82,111	134,658	11.5
December	39,035	58,902	32,491	16,305	4,960	53	2,717	2,376	8,028	81,742	124,077	11.5
1955—January	41,205	53,773	23,449	15,551	10,438	----------	149	4,186	8,364	85,119	117,152	11.5
February	38,917	45,660	21,298	13,769	6,284	117	1,061	3,131	7,706	80,202	96,165	11.5
March	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	90,837	11.5
April	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[2] 12.0

[1] Exports of zinc are only of minor importance. In all of 1954 they were only 25,000 tons.

[2] Price as of Apr. 20, 1955.

Secondary: Exports, 16,689 for 1954; imports, 1,000 for 1954.

Lead statistics for 1954 and 1955, by months

[Quantities in short tons]

	United States mine production	Imports by source [1]									Secondary [2] production	United States consumption	Smelter stocks of refined lead (end of month)	Average price, cents per pound
		Total	Canada	Mexico	Peru	Bolivia	Australia	Yugoslavia	Union of South Africa	Other countries				
Total, 1954	(318,985)	(437,722)	(100,497)	(70,859)	(58,797)	(13,522)	(80,002)	(38,464)	(35,506)	(40,075)	(480,000)	(1,095,000)	----------	----------
1954—January	24,946	25,226	8,576	3,296	2,354	1,760	1,933	430	1,976	4,901	31,702	90,700	77,805	13.3
February	27,624	31,436	6,326	3,852	4,800	474	6,981	2,301	2,278	4,424	32,731	83,200	83,183	12.8
March	29,531	34,261	9,747	6,637	2,714	2,020	560	5,172	3,866	3,545	36,536	93,200	88,942	12.9
April	26,900	40,317	8,079	9,189	4,939	775	8,197	----------	3,078	6,060	35,222	93,700	88,464	13.9
May	25,404	42,195	8,320	8,354	6,290	680	7,817	3,767	3,392	3,575	34,999	91,700	97,420	14.0
June	26,253	41,818	11,542	6,343	5,296	1,468	3,791	5,646	1,475	6,257	33,229	96,000	94,828	14.1
July	25,364	42,888	12,910	6,400	5,208	1,127	9,407	4,471	1,932	1,433	32,953	82,000	80,820	14.0
August	27,066	38,499	8,047	10,990	5,787	1,246	3,407	3,175	5,106	741	33,009	97,000	72,150	14.1
September	25,001	47,344	6,176	5,750	7,417	774	16,581	3,417	3,320	3,909	33,851	95,000	79,190	14.6
October	25,755	38,537	7,229	5,394	5,987	1,233	8,462	3,306	3,541	3,445	35,725	91,000	80,650	15.0
November	26,911	24,824	6,966	2,160	3,898	1,304	4,782	1,903	2,571	1,240	32,094	91,000	79,814	15.0
December	28,230	31,405	7,554	2,244	4,238	661	8,185	4,876	2,971	676	34,718	91,000	77,829	15.0
1955—January	27,347	21,106	4,407	3,072	3,853	----------	5,451	----------	3,880	443	35,947	93,000	84,882	15.0
February	26,581	33,633	8,450	3,776	6,798	2,400	3,760	2,480	3,336	2,633	32,742	86,000	64,938	15.0
March	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	15.0
April	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[3] 15.0

[1] Lead exports are negligible. In all of 1954 they were only 609 tons.

[2] Secondary: Imports, 1954, 5,655; exports, 1954, 3,894.

[3] Price as of Apr. 20, 1955.

Zinc imports: 3-month running averages

[In thousands of short tons]

	Imports	3-month running average
1954—January	49	
February	41	49
March	57	
April	47	48
May	42	48+
June	53	47
July	54	50−
August	56	54+
September	49	53
October	49	51+
November	50	49+
December	59	53+
1955—January	54	54
February	46	53

Lead imports: 3-month running averages

[In thousands of short tons]

	Imports	3-month running average
1954—January	25	
February	31	30
March	34	
April	40	35
May	42	37
June	42	42
July	43	43
August	38	41
September	47	43
October	39	42
November	25	37
December	31	32
1955—January	21	27
February	34	29

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the announcement, which is a virtual guaranty, that the stockpiling program will continue for the next 20 months, represents a very great change in the previous policies of the administration. Never before has it committed itself to the purchase of a particular product for stockpiling. But experience of the administration with lead and zinc during the past 8 or 9 months justifies it in feeling that it is safe in making this kind of a proposition to the industry, namely, that it will continue to support the price without being called upon to make any unreasonable investment.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I place great reliance on the words of the letter which set forth that the Government is continuing to exert every effort through other appropriate actions and programs that can in any way contribute to a bettering of the domestic lead-zinc situation.

This has been given added meaning by section 11 (b) of the bill as it was reported by the Finance Committee, which increases the power of the Office of Defense Mobilization to act quickly in the case of materials essential to the national defense and security.

I discussed the effect of this provision with Mr. Flemming. He pointed out that lead and zinc are already classified as materials essential to the national security, and, therefore, with this particular section left in the bill he will have this greater power in discussing the problems with the Department of State, among other agencies, to make sure that these vital industries shall not be further injured.

It is very interesting, Mr. President, to note that if the President had taken the tariff route to the solution of this problem the greatest increase he could have made in the tariff on zinc would have been 1.4 cents a pound. Under this program it has gone up 2¾ cents a pound.

On lead the greatest increase would have been 1.487 cents a pound. Lead has gone up 2.5 cents a pound.

We have not interfered seriously with our relations with our neighbors to the north and south, and yet we have been able to supply a much firmer foundation for our domestic industry.

In the committee I proposed an amendment which would have placed an import tax on importations of zinc and lead. In the case of zinc there would be a tax of 2 cents whenever the price dropped below 13 cents. In the case of lead there would be a tax of 2 cents whenever the price dropped below 15 cents.

The chief virtue was that the program was flexible, so that it could be called into action when it seemed to be needed. On the other hand, it seems to me, after reviewing the situation, that the President's present program—and I should like to remind Senators that it was called into being as the result of an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission—is actually more effective than would be the program which I originally proposed.

The stockpiling program is flexible. It can be called into action very quickly whenever it is needed. When its support is not needed, it can easily be discontinued.

There are a number of other programs which are in operation already for the benefit of these and other mineral industries. There is the Defense Minerals Exploration program. It is interesting to note that thus far——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that this project has developed 723 separate programs, of which 161 refer to lead and zinc alone, and 44 to lead, zinc, and copper. There are approximately 200 exploration programs to discover more resources of these metals in the United States. Twenty-one million dollars has been spent by the Federal Government in the overall defense minerals exploration project. Of that amount, $9 million, or approximately half, has been spent for lead, zinc, and copper.

I am certain that Senators are familiar with the fact that the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines are working constantly to improve the methods of mining and the methods of discovering ore, and also the methods of extracting the ore.

On August 20, 1954, President Eisenhower directed the Secretary of State to take action which would make sure that foreign nations would not take unfair advantage of the United States Government stockpile buying program. It can be expected that he will keep a steady pressure on foreign countries in this regard, and the new power given ODM by the bill provides an additional authority which foreign producers cannot fail to recognize as being a potent weapon behind Mr. Dulles' requests for cooperation in limiting shipments of lead and zinc to the United States.

Such measures already have been taken, and the result, in part, is the comparative leveling off of imports of both these metals. This will have a cumulative beneficial effect on the entire domestic industry.

When we consider these programs in conjunction with the continuation of the stockpiling program, which is now assured for another 20 months, I think we can be certain that, as a result of the escape-clause procedure, the President has been able to develop a program which will be of substantial benefit to an industry which is vital to our national security.

I was willing to withdraw my amendment, which would have provided for the excise import tax, in the face of the demonstrated determination of the President, through his administrative powers, to protect our vital industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Utah will recall that during the consideration of the bill in the Committee on Finance, I offered an amendment dealing with the mineral known as fluorspar, which is mined in western Kentucky, southern Illinois, Colorado, and Utah. There was a time when southern Illinois and western Kentucky had a monopoly on the production of this mineral, which is essential in the production of aluminum, steel, and other hard metals.

Discoveries of this metal in Mexico and Canada have brought about a situation whereby at this time approximately 62½ percent of our domestic consumption is imported. This results in a terrific impact upon our domestic fluorspar industry. It is not a large industry, as industries go, but it is an essential industry.

When the amendment in the bill was offered as a substitute for all the commodity amendments, including lead, zinc, fluorspar, and other commodities, I voted, as the Senator from Utah may recall, against the substitution of that amendment for all the others. But when it was agreed to as a substitute, I voted for it as a part of the bill.

Did the Senator from Utah have any conversation with the Defense Mobilizer in regard to the commodity of which I am speaking, or did he limit his conversation or correspondence to zinc and lead? Inasmuch as his State is interested in the fluorspar industry, small as it may be, does the Senator have any assurance from the Defense Mobilizer that the same sort of treatment will be accorded this mineral, which is so essential to the national defense?

Last August the Committee on Finance asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and report upon the status of this industry. The Commission has not yet done so. I am, of course, concerned about it, because although the industry is a small one, it is one of the most essential industries to the national defense, in the entire mineral field.

What can the Senator from Utah say by way of reassurance to those who are interested in this commodity, in regard to the action of the Defense Mobilizer and the President as it may affect the defense requirements of the Government in that field?

Mr. BENNETT. I did not speak with the officials in the ODM in as much detail with regard to fluorspar, but these comments were made: First, lead and zinc are officially in the hands of the ODM as a result of the escape clause provision and a reference from the President. If section 7 (b) is enacted, then it will be possible for the fluorspar industry to go directly to the ODM. If it can establish its essentiality, I think there is every likelihood that some such pattern as that which has been adopted for lead and zinc will be adopted for fluorspar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts yield an additional 2 minutes of his time, so that I may pursue this colloquy with the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Utah have any doubt that the fluorspar industry can establish its essentiality, in view of the unanimous testimony to the effect that fluorspar is an indispensable ingredient in the manufacture of hard substances such as steel and aluminum?

Mr. BENNETT. I have no doubt; but, of course, I am not the one to whom the application for consideration must come.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. BENNETT. My friends at ODM told me, with a smile, that they were sure that as soon as the bill had been enacted, there would be 500 or 600 industries knocking on their door for consideration. I do not think it would take ODM very long to determine that the fluorspar industry is one which must be protected. The ODM protected lead and zinc under a program built basically around the stockpiling.

As I understand the bill, the ODM will have at their command the entire scope of tariffs, quotas, restrictions, stockpiling, and any other variation of these programs in order to protect a particular industry, and to meet its particular needs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the smile referred to by the Senator will not turn into a grin or a smirk.

Mr. BENNETT. No; the smile indicated, I think, that those men were bracing themselves somewhat in anticipation of the impact they knew would hit them as soon as the bill had been passed. In fact, it was suggested that if the bill should be passed, I had better be prepared to receive requests for larger appropriations for ODM, so that they could deliver the kind of material which will be needed to take care of the program.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield 1 minute to me, so that I may comment on the subject just discussed by the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Apropos the remarks made by the Senator from Kentucky, I doubt whether there is an industry in the United States that has been so devastated as has been the fluorspar industry. To be sure, it is a small industry. I think its normal complement is probably 3,000 persons.

I have contemplated submitting an amendment for their relief; but after talking with Arthur Flemming and getting his assurances that he intends to assign top-flight men to the work and that he will expedite every application which is made, I think I am content to abide with the result and to see what will happen.

I emphasize the fact that I know of no other industry which has been so devastated by imports from Spain, Canada, Mexico, and elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the shipments this year are roughly about 23 percent of the normal shipments and production on the 1950 basis.

While the fluorspar industry is a small one, it deserves, as even every other industry deserves, the solicitude and consideration of Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the immediate question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to abolish the peril-point provision of the reciprocal trade law.

First, the matter was never even suggested before the Senate Committee on Finance. No such thought was advanced there, and it was never considered. The bill was reported preserving the peril-point provision and the escape clause.

I may say also that the companion bill, which has not been presented by the Senator from Illinois, would abolish the escape clause.

The only way in which we can have a reciprocal trade law that will safeguard American producers from injury is via the escape clause and via the peril point. The peril point serves one-half of the problem. The point is that we shall not make agreements which show in advance that they will go beyond the point which our industries could bear without injury.

The peril point provision is complemented by the escape clause, so that if certain industries should be injured, if the judgment given was insecure and bad when a certain agreement was made, such industries could escape from it.

Those are the two provisions in the whole act which prevent American industry from being injured and destroyed. I think it would be cataclysmic to eliminate either one of the provisions, or one of them at a time. To eliminate the peril point would put an undue burden on the escape clause procedure. There would be too many actions under the escape clause provision. To eliminate the escape clause but retain the peril point provision would leave us with a sterile procedure to protect ourselves.

I earnestly hope the amendment will be decisively defeated. The procedure has been part of our law for many years. I think it has been uinversally regarded as a good part of the law. In any event, there has to be something on the statute books—and this is it—to safeguard American industry from injury.

The fact that we have decided there shall be no injury to our industry is no longer a political question.

I earnestly urge my associates to defeat the amendment decisively.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Much as I admire the Senator from Illinois, I feel compelled to vote against the amendment. When the Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934, it contained no peril point provision. In the extension of 1951, the peril point provision was included, and it has been a part of the law since.

My honest opinion is that we would not be able now to pass any sort of bill without the peril point provision in it, and if the pending amendment should be adopted and the peril point provision should be stricken from the bill, the bill itself would in all likelihood not pass.

Whatever one may think of the peril point provision, I believe it is better to pass the bill with that provision retained than to strike it out and run the risk of the bill not passing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should be adopted, I think the bill would fail, go back to the committee, and we would have no reciprocal trade bill passed this year. That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bender	Butler
Allott	Bennett	Byrd
Anderson	Bible	Capehart
Barkley	Bricker	Carlson
Barrett	Bridges	Case, N. J.
Beall	Bush	Case, S. Dak.

Clements	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Cotton	Jenner	Pastore
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Dirksen	Kefauver	Purtell
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Duff	Kilgore	Russell
Dworshak	Knowland	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Scott
Ervin	Lehman	Smathers
Flanders	Long	Smith, Maine
Frear	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Malone	Sparkman
George	Martin, Iowa	Stennis
Goldwater	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Thurmond
Green	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McNamara	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Welker
Hill	Monroney	Wiley
Holland	Morse	Williams
Hruska	Mundt	Young
Humphrey	Neely	
Ives	Neuberger	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I announce, further, that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 82, as follows:

YEAS—9

Douglas	Gore	Kefauver
Eastland	Hill	McNamara
Fulbright	Humphrey	Sparkman

NAYS—82

Aiken	Frear	Morse
Allott	George	Mundt
Anderson	Goldwater	Neely
Barkley	Green	Neuberger
Barrett	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bender	Holland	Payne
Bennett	Hruska	Potter
Bible	Ives	Purtell
Bricker	Jackson	Robertson
Bridges	Jenner	Russell
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kerr	Scott
Capehart	Kilgore	Smathers
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Stennis
Clements	Lehman	Symington
Cotton	Long	Thurmond
Curtis	Magnuson	Thye
Daniel	Malone	Watkins
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Duff	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young
Ervin	Millikin	
Flanders	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—5

Chavez	Kennedy	Murray
Hennings	Mansfield	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "a new subsection, as follows," and to insert "the following."

On page 14, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks.

On page 14, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

"(c) The total quantity of crude petroleum and petroleum products (including oil for supplies for vessels at United States ports but excluding oil for manufacture and reexport) which may be imported into the United States in any calendar quarter of any year shall not exceed 10 percent of the total domestic petroleum demand (as determined by the U. S. Bureau of Mines) for the corresponding quarter of the previous year: *Provided*, That the total quantity of residual fuel oil which may be imported into the United States for consumption therein in any calendar quarter of any year shall not exceed 10 percent of the domestic demand for residual fuel oil (as determined by the U. S. Bureau of Mines) for the corresponding quarter of the previous year: *Provided further*, That the quotas established under this subsection may be suspended by the President during any period in which he finds that fuel supplies are inadequate to meet current national consumption.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall be effective notwithstanding the authority granted in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or any foreign trade agreement to which the United States is a party."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the eulogies on the glories of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and the millennium which the hopelessly deluded expect it to usher in, have been heard with more patience than pleasure, more charity than credulity and more despondency than hope.

A distinguished son of Pilgrim parents, upon presenting himself to the conference which was to determine whether he was qualified to be a Congregational clergyman, was asked the orthodox question, "Are you willing to be saved by consenting to be damned for the glory of God?" The candidate replied: "No, Mr. Moderator; but I am perfectly willing that you should be." I am equally willing that our Utopian free trade dreamers—all and singular—may impoverish themselves to their hearts' content in order to increase the lush prosperity of Venezuela and a few giant cartel oil importing companies. But it is my irrevocable determination to do everything in my power to prevent the cartelists, the Utopians and all other economic dunderheads from bankrupting the capital, pauperizing the labor and generally distressing the people of West Virginia and the Nation for the benefit of any other land on earth.

The justification for my determination was demonstrated, or at least indicated by an illustration which I submitted to the Senate earlier today. Its subject was the Nation's seven glass marble factories, six of which are situated in West Virginia. As pointed out in that illustration, these six factories are in process of liquidation, and will, on or before the first day of next July, close down forever. The sole cause of the impending destruction of this once prosperous and profitable business is the irresistible competition of Japanese marbles, which are now being sold throughout this country for less than the labor cost of making them in the United States.

Before a Senate subcommittee on unemployment, of which it was my privilege to be the chairman, it was recently proved that the wage of one glassworker in the United States is equivalent to that of nine glassworkers in Japan. Common sense proclaims from the housetop that in these circumstances it would be as impossible for us successfully to compete with Japanese marbles or any other Japanese glassware as it would be for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, or for a leopard to change its spots.

From a vast flood of imported oil which the pending amendment is designed justly and appropriately to reduce, the coal, independent oil and railroad industries of the Nation are, after the manner of the glass marble industry, suffering impoverishing losses and irreparable injuries—some of which will presently be made so plain that the wayfaring man will not misunderstand them, the thoughtful man will not disregard them, and the patriotic man will not continue to endure them in silent submission.

A fervent hope of obtaining indispensable Republican support for the amendment impels me to remind the Senators on the other side of the aisle of their party's venerable position on tariff and protection, as frequently, uniformly and vigorously proclaimed by its national conventions. Distinguished Republicans, please harken to the following from your platform of 1860, the one on which Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States:

"While providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts, as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country."

Thus was christened the Republican tariff babe which, after its maturity, rendered seventy-five years of honorable and successful service, and which is now about to be put to death by the present occupant of the White House and his adherents on Capitol Hill.

The Republican platform of 1888 contains the following:

"We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party." (Obviously meaning Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Party.)

Next consider the ringing language of the Republican platform of 1896:

"We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry."

The vote on the pending amendment will show how many Republican Senators still loyally stand by their formerly cherished protective "bulwark" and how many of them have ignominiously deserted to the Eisenhower free trade bull.

The 1900 Republican platform protection assurance is in these words:

"We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained."

Four decades later the Republican Party vigilantly learned of the peril of unfair competition, and consequently in its 1940 platform it commendably declared:

"We are threatened by unfair competition in world markets and by the invasion of our home markets, especially by the products of state-controlled foreign economies."

Let those Senators, who still profess allegiance to the "Grand Old Party", heed the distressing fact that no threat of unfair competition to American industry fifteen years ago was half as alarming as the reality of the present devastating competition of imported oil with our languishing coal industry, or of the cutthroat competition of imported pottery, glassware and clothespins with similar commodities made in the fullness of profusion and perfection by American labor for American employers who pay the highest wages in the world.

It is my hope that a sufficient number of those present will support the request which will later be made for the ayes and noes on my amendment, in order that today's RECORD may show how much of the historic Republicanism of the great Lincoln, the prudent McKinley, and the crusading Theodore Roosevelt still survives, and how much of it the Eisenhower administration has banished to the limbo from which there is no return.

During the debate some Democratic Senators have unfortunately gone farther on the road toward tariff annihilation than Grover Cleveland, William L. Wilson or their disciples ever went. But still more unfortunately Republican Senators are now outrunning our fleetest-footed Democratic statesmen in the mad race toward the Eisenhower free trade abyss.

The most amazing and insolvable riddle of the age is stated in the question, "What justification or excuse is there for the shameful desertion by Republican Senators of the 'Grand Old Party's' fundamental principle of protection, upon which it kept itself in power for record-breaking periods during the past ninety-four years?"

In the absence of explanation, light, more lurid than lustrous, may be shed on this protective apostasy by means of comparing the Republican statesmanship of the present with that of the authors of the various Republican platform pledges which have been read to the Senate this afternoon.

Please consider those who are now clamoring for the surrender by the Congress of the power to determine tariff rates to one who did not know whether he was a Republican or a Democrat until he was 59 years old; to the most extravagantly overpublicized man the world has ever seen; the man who now—

Bestrides the narrow world
Like a Colossus; while petty men
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about
To find themselves dishonorable (party) graves.

A momentary view of the Republican Party, in its present appalling decadence, must impel thoughtful men to cry out to it:

Ancient of days! (followers of Lincoln) where,
Where are thy men of might? thy grand in soul?
Gone—glimmering through the dream of things that were:
First in the race that led to Glory's goal,
They won, and passed away—is this the whole?
A schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour!
The warrior's weapon and the sophist's stole
Are sought in vain, and o'er each mouldering tower,
Dim with the mist of years, gray flits the shade of power.

My dear Republican friends, please mark this prediction. Those of you who vote against the pending amendment designed to relieve and protect tens of thousands of impoverished, jobless men, suffering women and hungry little children will be voting to bury the Republican Party in a grave so wide and dark and deep that Gabriel will never resurrect it with his trumpet.

Mr. President, the sole and simple purpose of the amendment before the Senate is to exterminate an unemployment cancer. Let me speak from testimony recently presented to a Senate subcommittee of which it was my privilege to be the chairman. It held many hearings on unemployment since the first of March. More than 50 witnesses testified. On-the-spot investigations were made in Altoona, Pa., Pikeville, Ky., and Williamson, W. Va. What did we find in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? Witness after witness testified that the unemployment distress in the coal fields of that State was worse in March 1955 than it was at any time during the period from 1929 to 1933, commonly known as the Hoover depression.

We found that in Pennsylvania 9 7/10 percent of all the people are now existing on surplus food commodities supplied by the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I warn my good friend from West Virginia to be very careful in what he says, because if he keeps repeating figures like that, Mr. Leonard W. Hall will accuse him of being a prophet of gloom and doom.

Mr. NEELY. Let me assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that nothing that either Mr. Hall or the one-party press has said or may say will deter me from expressing my opinion of the agonizing conditions which now exist in every coal-producing area in the United States.

(At this point Mr. NEELY yielded, to enable the Senate to greet the Honorable Joe J. Foss, Governor of the State of South Dakota. The proceedings in connection with the Governor's visit appear at another point in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. NEELY. Until 3 months ago West Virginia had the deplorable reputation of having more unemployment distressed areas than any other State in the Union. But recently Kentucky moved ahead of West Virginia in the unemployment parade, and more than 13 percent of all the people of the "Blue Grass" State were at the time of our Pikeville hearing keeping their souls and bodies together with the doles granted them by the Federal Government.

One of the Kentucky witnesses, a miner who is the father of fifteen children, testified concerning his long-continued unemployment and the impossibility of finding work. But he philosophically and heroically said that perhaps he should not complain because one of his near neighbors had, in addition to being pauperized by enforced idleness, been robbed by death of his only child. The heartbroken father carried his dead baby in his arms to a humanitarian undertaker who, without money or price, appropriately performed the last sad services for the little one who had gone from the scene of her destitution and suffering to her long home.

Thirty-three miles from Pikeville, at Williamson, W. Va., another unemployment hearing was held. The distress there was similar to that found in Kentucky and Pennsylvania. Newspapers had lost some of their most desirable advertisers; every species of business dependent upon miners' wages was depressed. There we were again told that the suffering caused by unemployment was greater than it had been at any time between 1929 and 1933. But Williamson is only one of many places in West Virginia where poverty and anguish caused by enforced idleness are greater than human beings should ever be compelled to endure.

The year preceding the beginning of the Eisenhower administration the number of West Virginians who, because of unemployment or any other reason, were certified as eligible for surplus Federal food products averaged fewer than 12,000 a month. But a short time after General Eisenhower's inauguration, the 12,000 rose to 30,000 a month. Thereafter the number progressively increased until last month when those dependent upon surplus Government food supplies in West Virginia had increased to the astronomical number of two hundred fifty-three thousand.

Mr. President, according to undisputed testimony before our subcommittee, the agonizing unemployment in the coal fields of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky and 16 or 17 other States in the Union has been caused largely by imported residual and other fuel oil.

At the present rate of importation, this year's flood of foreign fuel oil will displace a quantity of American coal so vast that it would require a freight train more than 7,000 miles long to transport it. A fourth of the distress caused by the nonproduction of this coal was suffered by West Virginia, which for a third of a

century has been the greatest coal-producing State in the Union.

Imported oil is depriving our domestic oil industry of hundreds of millions of dollars a year. In the mining regions, merchants, butchers, bakers, grocers, and all others engaged in commercial or industrial enterprises are suffering heavy losses. Those attributable to imported oil during the present year are conservatively estimated as follows: The coal operators will lose $165 million; the railroads $94 million; coal miners $84 million; railroad workers $47 million; and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies will lose $43 million in taxes.

If you think there is no unemployment agony in this country, go to the West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky coal fields and see the ghost towns which were once the homes of prosperity and happiness; see the modern breadlines, and the crowds waiting for their Government doles; hear the harrowing stories of men vainly begging for work, women without sufficient clothing to wear to church, and children crying for bread.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it the Senator is referring to the distribution of surplus food.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which is limited, is it not, to virtually dairy products and some vegetables?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the administration has refused to process surplus wheat into flour to be made into bread, so that, in effect, it has denied bread to those who are unemployed, and has said, "Let them eat cheese instead."

Mr. NEELY. That is a fact. When the Senators vote on the pending amendment let them remember what the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just said about bread.

And let them not forget Woodrow Wilson's reminder that the very first supplication of the Lord's Prayer is "Give us this day our daily bread." Bread is now, as it always has been and always will be, indispensable to civilized women, children and men.

Let it be understood, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the amendment is not designed to prohibit the importation of crude and residual oil, but simply to provide reasonable limits to the amount of such oil that can be dumped upon our shores.

Mr. President, there have been three notable floods in the history of the world. The first was the deluge. Noah warned that it would occur, had enough sense to build an ark, by means of which he, his wife and six other members of his family were saved. All others then on earth, having foolishly failed to provide for their safety, were buried alive in watery graves.

The next most shocking flood was that which occurred on the thirty-first of May, 1889, at Johnstown, Pennsylvania. A few minutes before this tragedy occurred, John G. Parke, a railroad engineer immortalized himself by galloping down the Conemaugh Valley, shouting at the top of his voice: "The dam is breaking away. Run to the hills."

The people ignored their impending danger. A few minutes later 2,000 persons were hurled into eternity, and more than twelve million dollars worth of property was destroyed, as the result of failure to heed a timely warning.

The third great flood is the present one of imported residual and fuel oil. In terms of human suffering and financial loss, this oil flood defies accurate or even approximate appraisal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator from West Virginia know that that situation is prevalent not only in the States he has named? I have received resolutions adopted by various chambers of commerce in North Dakota, a State which has large lignite coal fields. The situation in that region is very similar to the one described by the Senator as existing in West Virginia.

I want the Senator from West Virginia to know that I shall support his amendment. I hope we may have a yea and nay vote on it and that it will be agreed to, because it is certainly needed to relieve the condition he has so ably described.

Mr. NEELY. Let me thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. In all the years I have known him, he has never failed to improve an opportunity to vote for humanity. Today he has, as usual, taken his stand with those who are fighting for the unemployed men, the destitute women and the hungry children of the stricken industrial areas of the nation.

When we vote on the pending amendment, let us remember not the billion-dollar corporations that are making vast sums out of their oil-dumping operations; not Venezuela which is now one of the most prosperous countries in the world; not some fabulously oil-rich Asiatic land ten thousand miles away. No, let us, on the next roll call, patriotically remember our own country, and faithfully serve our own people by voting to relieve their unemployment, their poverty and their distress. This day we can not serve both God and mammon. But by voting for the Creator's suffering humanity we can and will serve our God.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GOVERNOR FOSS, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

During the delivery of Mr. NEELY'S speech,

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me briefly?

Mr. NEELY. I yield briefly to the able Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am sure Senators will be interested to know that there is on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Governor of South Dakota. So far as I am aware, he is the only governor of a State who is the holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor. I refer to the gentleman who is sitting at my right. Gov. Joe Foss was the first ace of World War II, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his achievements as a combat flier and leader of squadrons in the United States Marine Corps in the tough touch-and-go early battles of World War II in the southwest Pacific.

As Senators know, the Medal of Honor is our highest citation and is awarded in the name of Congress to a person who, in action involving actual combat with the enemy, or in the line of his profession, distinguishes himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life over and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to his mission. This is the first visit of Governor Foss to Washington since he became Governor of South Dakota.

Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD the official citation by which Governor Foss was awarded the Medal of Honor. I may say that he also has been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross of the Navy. His citation for the Medal of Honor reads as follows:

JOSEPH JACOB FOSS, CAPTAIN, USMCR

(Born April 17, 1915, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Appointed from South Dakota. Other Navy awards: Distinguished Flying Cross.)

"For outstanding heroism and courage, above and beyond the call of duty as executive officer of Marine Fighting Squadron 121, First Marine Aircraft Wing, at Guadalcanal. Engaging in almost daily combat with the enemy from October 9 to November 19, 1942, Captain Foss personally shot down 23 Japanese planes and damaged others so severely that their destruction was extremely probable. In addition, during this period, he successfully led a large number of escort missions, skillfully covering reconnaissance, bombing and photographic planes as well as surface craft. On January 15, 1943, he added three more enemy planes to his already brilliant successes for a record of aerial combat achievement unsurpassed in this war. Boldly searching out an approaching enemy force on January 25, Captain Foss led his 8 F4F Marine planes and 4 Army P-38's into action and, undaunted by tremendously superior numbers, intercepted and struck with such force that 4 Japanese fighters were shot down and the bombers were turned back without releasing a single bomb. His remarkable flying skill, inspiring leadership, and indomitable fighting spirit were distinctive factors in the defense of strategic American positions on Guadalcanal."

I am sure Members of the Senate wish me to say that we are honored to have such a distinguished holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor as the guest of the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me so that I might introduce the Governor of South Dakota.

Mr. NEELY. Let me welcome the distinguished Medal of Honor Governor of South Dakota to the Senate Chamber.

Governor, we sincerely thank you for the great service you have rendered your country. We hope that you will come to see us often and stay with us long. But, with deep regret, I am compelled to observe that you will not find any Senators on the other side of the aisle who will ever get a Medal of Honor for being Lincoln Republicans or perpetuating the Lincolnian philosophy. Indeed, there

are manifest reasons for believing that a majority of those on the other side of the aisle will, by their vote on the pending amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, completely disentitle themselves to membership in the great political party, which the illustrious Lincoln once made priceless to the nation, and an inspiration to the world. [Laughter.]

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. The amendment is consistent with the principle of reciprocal trade. It is designed to make certain that the reciprocal trade policy will be a great benefit to friendly nations in the free world, but will not become a penalty, a burden, or a discrimination against domestic industry.

I think as we regard the so-called Neely amendment, we should recognize that the same principle applies not only to the importation of crude oil and residual oil, to the detriment of local producers of coal and oil, but that it applies also, with equal force, to the lead and zinc industry, to the fluorspar industry, and to other industries engaged in the production of resources at home which contribute to our own economy, which are necessary national defense items in time of war, and which cannot compete with cheap foreign products.

In the limited time available to me, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a few basic facts. First, 7 companies throughout the world, of which 5 are American, control or own 90 percent of the known oil reserves of the free world. Five of those companies, American companies, find themselves in the position that about 85 percent of their reserves are foreign-owned reserves and 15 percent are domestic-owned reserves.

The importation of oil, Mr. President, is being carried on at this time, and increasing rapidly for the following reasons: It costs on the average about $1.75 to $2.50 a barrel to find and produce oil in the continental United States. It costs less than 25 cents a barrel to find and produce oil in the Middle East and put it on board a tanker. And in that area, Mr. President, is contained about 80 percent of the known oil reserves of the free world.

What does that mean? The average well in the Middle East, costing no more than the average well in the United States, whether it be in Texas, North Dakota, Arkansas, or West Virginia, produces an average of 10,000 barrels a day, under proration, or partly shut in. The average well in Oklahoma produces 7 barrels a day. The average well in the United States, either because of partial depletion or low initial production or proration, produces less than 12 barrels a day.

What chance is there in wide open competition for the American producer who has to pay from $1.75 to $2.50 a barrel to find and produce his oil, when the average producer in the Middle East can put his oil on a tanker at from 20 to 25 cents a barrel?

The opponents of this amendment say that the amendment added to the bill by the Finance Committee of the Senate is effective. It is based on a report of the President's Cabinet Fuels Committee. That Cabinet committee report is in the record and is part of the committee report on the bill. It is the opinion of that Cabinet committee that any appreciable increase in the rate of imports above the rate last year would impair the national defense.

We have been told that, under the amendment reported by the committee and attached to the bill, a cooperative program will be worked out; that either the importers will agree or the administration will put in motion machinery to compel the limitation of imports on the basis of last year's importations.

Mr. President, representatives of the companies who do the importing said on the witness stand that they knew of no way to bring about effective limitations on imports in the absence of legislation, and the record bears that out, because already, in the first quarter of this year, importations were running from 20 to 25 percent above those of a year ago, and in many weeks in the first quarter the daily importation was as much as 40 percent above what it was a year ago.

How can an agreement or a proposal or a request be depended upon when it is implemented or put into effect during the time legislation is under consideration to bring it about by action of the Congress?

Moreover, when was it appropriate or wise to depend upon persons beyond the reach of the Congress or the administration to put into effect by agreement that which was required for the national defense when it is the bounden constitutional duty of the Congress of the United States by legislation to provide the requirements with respect to commodities involving, and necessary to, the national defense?

My great friend from Illinois made a powerful speech today, in which he set forth that the Congress should delegate this duty to the President because the Congress has not the guts to meet its constitutional duty; that Congress cannot stand the pressure, and it should delegate the authority to the President of the United States. Who would then have to withstand the pressure? The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

I must say that, Republican though he be, I respect his integrity; but the only men who have had more to say about his instability than those on this side of the aisle have been Senators on the other side of the aisle. They did not wait for former President Harry Truman to come to Washington and refer to the foreign policy of our Government as being based on trickery. Right here on the floor of the Senate I heard an interchange a few weeks ago between the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. They stated to the Senate, to the United States, and to the world that they were shocked and astounded at the instability of the Secretary of State. He had said on a certain Monday that under no circumstances would the papers on the Yalta Conference be released, because the release of such papers would impair the security of our Nation and our relationship with our allies. At that very moment, it later developed, he was in the process of leaking a copy of those papers and that report to a great newspaper.

The Senator from California and the Senator from New Hampshire said they were shocked. The Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Montana said they were astounded at such irresponsibility in high places, Mr. President. Yet, it is proposed in the Senate to transfer and delegate the authority and responsibility of the Congress to John Foster Dulles, because we have not the intestinal fortitude to withstand pressure.

A week ago Saturday, I believe it was, the Department of State announced to the world that under no circumstances would this Government consult or negotiate with Chou En-lai, of Red China, unless our cherished ally Chiang Kai-shek was present. That news went around the world, but the echoes of it had not ceased to reverberate before John Foster Dulles, after a little pressure and a few cheers at a National Press Club address delivered by the great dean of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], said we would meet Chou En-lai anywhere and negotiate with him alone.

Pressure? There is not a page employed by the Senate who has not more fortitude to withstand pressure than has John Foster Dulles. Yet we are asked to let the future welfare and employment of tens of thousands of coal miners, of lead and zinc miners, of oil field workers, and, indeed, the welfare of the economy of half the States of the Union, be dependent upon the ability of John Foster Dulles to withstand pressure.

Go tell the coal miners of Kentucky they have nothing to worry about, for the great John Foster Dulles will stand like Horatius at the bridge and defend them. Of course, it would be the first time that he ever did, but tell them to let him do it now.

Mr. President, I believe in reciprocal trade. I believe in it as a two-way street. I believe in it as carrying out the function and responsibility of the Congress of the United States.

The President and Mr. Dulles have said this trade program is now an instrumentality of peace; and I think it should be used as such by the Congress. But I wish to state that in the hands of

the present administrators, this program is an instrumentality of profits. Let Senators examine the profit-and-loss statements of the five importing oil companies. Together, last year they made approximately $1 billion, after taxes; and 75 percent of that profit was made upon oil imported into the United States, at the expense of the domestic market.

We are told, "You have to create purchasing power for Venezuela."

Mr. President, we do not seek to impair Venezuela's opportunity to import. We simply do not wish to permit her to take up all the increase and to continue to push out of business the domestic companies which are supplying the present market for our coal and for our oil products.

With reference to purchasing power, I wish to say that every dollar's worth we add to the purchasing power of Venezuela, we take from Kentucky or Virginia or West Virginia or Oklahoma or Texas or North Dakota or some of the other States which produce oil or coal. We do not create new purchasing power when we transfer it from a domestic producer to a foreign producer. We simply transfer it 100 percent, and hope we shall get back a considerable percentage.

Mr. President, that provision of the bill is inadequate, both from the standpoint of the health of our domestic economy and from the standpoint of our national security.

I wish to ask Senators where this country would be in case of a war, if we had pinched back both the domestic coal industry and the domestic oil industry in order to build a great oil industry in the Middle East or in Venezuela, if we then found that we could not reach either of those areas. In that case, the rationing of gasoline which occurred in the United States during World War II would not be a circumstance to what would be the result if we should continue the policy of letting foreign imports, produced at 25 cents a barrel, displace and push back a great portion of our own reserves, and cause them to be lost forever—with the result that an abundant supply of new reserves would not be developed in the United States.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of having the Congress meet its responsibility, from the standpoint of the basic concept of reciprocal trade, the Neely amendment should be adopted. It would not prohibit importations. Under the Neely amendment, there would still be imported into the United States between $2 million and $2,500,000 worth of foreign crude oil and residual oil a day, but it would be held on a basis which would permit our own economy—both in the case of the oil-producing States and in the case of the coal-producing States—to continue to improve and expand.

It would permit the continuation of the reciprocal trade program on a basis of equality; and it would do that—and in my judgment, Mr. President, nothing else would do it—in such a way that the domestic industries of those great producers would be built up to a point where they not only would have a profitable contribution to make to our economy in time of peace, but would make our country impregnable, from the standpoint of having an abundant supply of these irreplaceable and natural and necessary fuels, in case of war.

Mr. President, the Neely amendment should be adopted.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from West Virginia has approximately 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield that time to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I think it is important, as we consider this bill, as we must, as it periodically comes up for renewal to consider the domestic economy and how it is affected through our past experience under the Trade Agreements Act. We must examine its effect on all sections of the country.

Yesterday, I had word from my own State that our oil production for May is being cut back by 20 percent. That will mean a vast amount of unemployment and loss of income. It is significant that every State which produces oil—and some 25 of the States of the United States do produce oil—is under prorationing.

According to the State conservation laws, the State regulatory bodies tell the oil producers how much oil they can produce. Many of the domestic pipelines and refineries are owned by the major oil companies, to whom independents sell their oil. These major companies are also the large importers. Four major oil companies have in their reserves in the Middle East—some 36 billion barrels—more oil than remains in the known reserves in the United States. The major companies must undergo the same prorationing that the small independent producer does at home. But on their imports they are not under any prorationing on importations into the United States from their vast reserves abroad.

My distinguished senior colleague has told the Senate of the greatly decreased cost at which oil can be produced from the 100- or 200-foot sands in the Middle East, where there will be one well to every several miles, whereas our own producers, particularly the independents, must drill wells usually on every 40 acres, under the so-called offset rule.

My colleagues also know that the companies operating in the Middle East have to pay only one tax, and that tax goes to the chief of state of the Middle East, whereas every one of our domestic independent producers has to pay, on its production of oil, taxes to the Federal Government and to the State governments and to the county governments and to the municipal governments.

Mr. President, if we are to have a severe proration at home—and we are, by State law—then it seems to me we cannot permit a vague, indefinite and ever-increasing amount to be imported into the United States, without any limitations whatsoever.

As the pending bill now stands, if the Neely amendment is not adopted, we shall not be troubled by 13.4 percent imports, which today are causing trouble in the coalfields and the oilfields. Instead, Mr. President, if 13.4 percent imports were all right before, then, under the new law, there would be nothing to prevent the figure from reaching 20 percent or 30 percent or 50 percent. Certainly I believe Congress should consider some point at which we should say that any further importations of this vital natural resource will destroy the healthy domestic petroleum industry that we must have for our national defense.

In reaching for a solution, the committee—and I wish to compliment the committee on what it has done—has attempted to provide that our domestic industries should be allowed to ask for the imposition of quotas when imports endanger our security. Thus, under the committee amendment the President would have the right to impose quotas, if he found that the imports were damaging the security of the Nation.

On the other hand, under the former law he could not do that; he could only impose tariffs or raise tariffs to relieve hardships.

We do not want a tariff on oil; we simply wish to share the market. We feel that the ratio of 90 percent domestic oil to 10 percent foreign oil is about the historic ratio upon which our foreign-trade program has been built up; and certainly this figure would not damage foreign trade. But the committee proposal merely gives the right to the President to apply quotas. No one can be sure that this authority would ever be used.

The 90 percent–10 percent ratio should be adopted by law.

The domestic producers are not really competing with foreign industry or foreign capital. Instead, Mr. President, our domestic producers are competing with ourselves. All the importing companies are financed with money made out of the production of oil in the United States. The American know-how and the great American success story have been applied to the production of oil from the foreign sands. The great major domestic companies which are importing oil are, in the case of the foreign fields, producing from sands which nature has endowed with great quantities of oil—sands which are many time more productive than our domestic oil-producing fields.

Since the committee has recognized the vast importance of a sound economy here at home, in the case of oil production and lead and zinc and other strategic materials, and since the President's fuels committee has recommended that any increase above the present importations would be highly dangerous, it seems to me we should not stop where the President's committee has stopped. We should not say that the President may do this if he wishes.

I believe that it is the duty of the Congress—which must always consider our defense activities and our security and our economy—to fix a definite ratio in this bill on the basis of sharing this market. Certainly that would not work

a hardship on the importers, who then would have a right to import 10 percent of our domestic demand.

By that arrangement we would give our great domestic oil industry a chance to plan for a sound future and to make its investments and to have a certainty that the imports would not be increased each year, and further to jeopardize the great, healthy domestic production industry we have had in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader yield time for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, there is a unanimous-consent agreement that a quorum call will not be in order except preceding a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless time is yielded for a quorum call, it cannot be had.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that the able Senator from Massachusetts yield whatever time he wishes to yield. The Senator from North Dakota is protected. When the time is exhausted, the Senator can suggest the absence of a quorum prior to the vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding me time on this amendment.

I find myself somewhat embarrassed personally by the situation which calls forth this amendment. I desire to be as frank with the Senate as I try to be with my constituents, and I shall do so in the brief remarks I shall make on the amendment.

I do not suppose that anyone would deny that coal is an indispensable commodity in connection with our defense in time of war. During World War I, when German submarines infested the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, it became almost impossible to ship oil from the oilfields of the Southwest around through the gulf and up the Atlantic to the refineries on the eastern coast, and coal became an indispensable commodity in powering factories to turn out our munitions and implements of war. That situation gave rise to a rather artificial expansion of the production of coal throughout the country. That was true in Kentucky. When the war was over and we entered into the economic abyss between the end of World War I and the beginning of World War II, Congress enacted a coal law known as the Guffey Coal Act, which stimulated the production of coal and gave employment to coal miners.

Then World War II came along, again we found our shipping on the Atlantic coast, in the Atlantic Ocean, and in the gulf, endangered, and again coal became an indispensable commodity for the protection of our institutions and the prosecution of the war.

The war ended, and, because of the necessities of the situation, again there was an enlargement and an expansion of the production of coal in the United States.

I suppose it is possible to conceive that that might happen again. Considering the identity of our enemies in the world, no one can foresee when and under what circumstances we might again be required to fall back upon the production of coal as an absolutely indispensable commodity in the protection of our institutions, in the powering of our factories, and in the production of munitions and implements of war. We all hope and pray that there will never be another war, and that we may never be compelled again to resort to arms to protect our institutions and defend our country and what it represents. But we have no assurance of that, and every day we are in imminent danger of such a war.

Under those circumstances, I suppose that the Defense Mobilizer would have no hestiation in certifying to the President that coal is an indispensable commodity in connection with our defense in time of war. Whether he would, I do not know. I do not know whether he would say that, while coal is an indispensable commodity, it is only in part an indispensable commodity, and that the deficiency in it may be supplied from other quarters.

I do not know, and I would not predict, that the Neely amendment would be the solution to all the problems and troubles of the coal industry, or that it would substantially affect the situation in the coal fields.

Last year I spoke all over eastern Kentucky, in the coal-mining region. I spoke in one county-seat town where 2,500 people were gathered. As I walked through the courthouse door the county judge who had control of the distribution of surplus food commodities told me that at that moment there were 300 heads of households standing in line to receive a pittance of support from surplus food commodities.

Every one of those 300 men, and other hundreds who, day by day, and week by week, did the same thing, had the profound conviction that their unemployment was due to the importation of residual oil into this country. They may be mistaken about that. If all the importation of oil were shut off tomorrow, I could not guarantee that coal mines in West Virginia, Kentucky, or Pennsylvania would be opened; but those people feel that that situation is responsible for their unemployment.

I rode from Middlesboro, Ky., in an automobile to Harlan, which is one of the centers of the coal industry of eastern Kentucky. The United States Steel Corp. owns the entire town of Lynch, a community of 9,000 people. Every house in it, every schoolhouse, and every mine is operated by the United States Steel Corp. They are known as captive mines. The steel corporation mines its own coal and ships it to its steel plants. Aside from that one institution operated by the United States Steel Corp., there was hardly a mine in operation in the entire county.

I drove for 25 or 30 miles, from Middlesboro to Harlan. Every sidetrack on the railroad was crowded with empty coal cars which had been standing 6 months or a year without a lump of coal in them.

I have been through that community and I have seen the distress. The people living there are honest American people. They do not want to be on a dole. I suppose that in the mountains of eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia will be found the purest Anglo-Saxon blood to be found anywhere in the United States, because they have lived there from generation to generation.

They are honest, law-abiding, taxpaying, God-fearing people, and it injures their pride to be required to depend on charity. They do not wish to be required to do so; yet when a man leaves his front porch in the morning with 4 or 5 children tugging at his coattails and asking him to bring bread home at nightfall, we are bound to know and feel that, to that person, the situation is tragic. I have great sympathy for those people.

Last Labor Day I spoke at Pikeville, referred to by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Fifteen or twenty thousand people were gathered there. I discussed the coal situation and the fuel situation generally. I declared myself in favor of a program being organized and instituted by the Government of the United States, dealing with all fuels—a fuel policy and a fuel program, to protect oil, gas, and coal products, so that in no war hereafter would we be required to be relegated to one particular fuel product in order that we might defend our country and our institutions.

I did not say at that time that I would vote for the Neely amendment. At that time no Neely amendment had been proposed. I would infinitely prefer that the proposition would come up on some other bill besides the one to which it has been offered. I would have preferred, and I prefer now, that the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act be simple and uncomplicated by commodity amendments.

In the committee I offered an amendment on fluorspar. While it is a small industry, 62½ percent of the domestic consumption is being brought in from abroad. The mines in our country are being closed.

When the motion was made in committee to eliminate commodity amendments entirely from the bill and to consolidate them all in a different kind of amendment, I voted against the motion, because I felt that each one of the commodities ought to stand on its own merits. When, however, the motion carried, and it became a question of adopting the amendment that was in the bill or having nothing at all, I voted for the amendment.

I am not very happy about the situation, I may say frankly.

In the past 5 or 6 years the production of coal in the United States has decreased by about 200 million tons per

year. All the oil we have imported amounts to about 245 million barrels per year. About 131 million barrels represent residual oil.

I am not sure whether the statement I am about to make is accurate, but I have made inquiry and have been told that 4½ barrels of oil are equal to 1 ton of coal in fuel product.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the statement which has been made to me be true, of the 200 million tons of coal production that we have lost in this country, 30 million tons can be traced to the substitution of oil for coal.

If we were to stop all imports of oil tomorrow, I do not know how many consumers who now use oil would revert to coal. But it is a rather strange anomaly that one of the consumers who has completely reverted from coal to oil came before the committee and advocated the adoption of the Neely amendment. I refer to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad. Every engine of that railroad, which operates in the coal regions, is dieselized and uses oil instead of coal. I do not know whether the C. & O. Railroad would go back to the use of coal. I do not know whether any of the consumers who now use oil instead of coal would go back to coal.

I have no way of prophesying what would happen. However, at least the men and women in West Virginia and in Kentucky who are hungry believe that they are out of their jobs because of the use of oil.

I hold out no false hope to them. I do not know whether the Neely amendment will mean the opening of a single mine of even so much as a week's work for all the miners in the United States. I do not know. I make no prediction.

I wrote to a very dear friend of mine in the coal business that I was going to vote for the Neely amendment, but that I was under no delusion myself as to how much it might help in the coalfields.

Mr. President, in view of my statement and in view of the distress that I know exists, I feel myself morally obligated to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, and I intend to vote for it.

However, I would not be frank with my friends in the Senate or with my friends in Kentucky if I did not express some doubt whether it is a complete solution of the problem of the coal industry or of the coal miners.

So, with some misgivings, and with the greatest respect for my friend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the author of the amendment, and for my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and for all other Senators, who will vote one way or another on the bill, I feel myself personally obligated as between my head and my heart—if there is such a division—to vote with my heart today, even though in some respects my head may doubt the conclusion of my heart.

I hope if the amendment is adopted, or, if it is not adopted, that those in authority will find some way under the act to bring relief to those who suffer from the economic disaster and debacle which has afflicted a great portion of my State and other States that produce coal.

I thank the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for yielding time to me so that I might express my frank opinion on the amendment and the reason why I believe I should vote for it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a Senator from New England, I prepared a brief statement in opposition to the amendment, and I had planned to make it at this time. In view of the hour, I suspect that I might do more damage than good to my case if I took the time of the Senate to make my remarks. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD as a statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COTTON

The adoption of the proposed Neely amendment would have a crippling effect upon the entire trade agreements program. The purpose of the Trade Agreements Act, as stated therein, is to expand foreign markets for the products of the United States. To this end the President is given authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof granting concessions to certain imported commodities, such as modification of existing duties and other import restrictions or the imposition of additional import restrictions, for the purpose of making foreign markets available to American industry by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States. The act itself provides reasonable limitation of the authority granted and provides a method whereby any industry which is found to be injured by any concession granted by a trade agreement can obtain relief. The Neely amendment, on the other hand, imposes further barriers against the importation of crude petroleum and petroleum products. This would be telling the free world that this country does not really believe in the lowering of trade barriers and would go far toward defeating the inherent purposes of the trade-agreements program.

The proposed amendments to the Trade Agreements Act are repugnant to other provisions of the act, particularly those dealing with the escape clause. If the independent oil producers or the coal industry is being injured by the importation of petroleum and petroleum products, and they are not, there is no reason they should not seek relief under the escape-clause provisions of the act. It is noteworthy that neither has sought this avenue of relief as yet. It is reasonable to assume that they cannot make out a case on its merits and therefore have resorted to political pressure to gain their desired end. It would appear to be more consistent that the escape clause provisions either be eliminated and the Congress reserve unto itself the right to grant relief from excessive imports or, on the other hand, these industries should be requested to seek relief under the escape-clause provisions. There is no greater reason for the Congress specifically to restrict oil imports than to grant similar specific relief to dozens of other industries who are claiming doom and destruction unless something is done to restrict competing imported commodities.

Under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, the United States has granted concessions on crude oil and residual oil in two international agreements, the trade agreement with Venezuela and the multilateral agreement commonly referred to as the GATT agreement. Both of these contracts, or trade agreements, contain escape-clause provisions similar to those contained in the Trade Agreements Act and, in addition thereto, contain certain procedural requirements which must be met before the rights of escape can be invoked. To impose the quota provisions of the proposed amendment would be in violation of the sacred obligations of these two international contracts.

It would seem to be axiomatic that before the Congress would undertake any general trade bill to legislate the quantities of an individual commodity which can be imported into this country, there would have to be an extremely strong case for such action, and certainly one which would be convincing to a responsible group of Cabinet members such as constituted the recent Cabinet Advisory Committee on Industry. This committee, in its recent report, specifically stated that it did not believe there should be any quotas on the importation of oil by legislative action at this time.

So far as the domestic oil-producing industry is concerned, there is nothing in the record which would indicate such injury from imports as to warrant the drastic interference with freedom of trade and competition which is proposed in this amendment.

In January of this year Mr. William M. Vaughey, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, stated that "our domestic industry has survived and prospered and remained strong and virile * * *," and no one cognizant of the facts is in a position to dispute this statement. In 1954, more oil wells were drilled than ever before and more money was expended in the search for oil than ever before. Oil production in this country is currently at a higher level than at any time in our history. With the exception of a few brief months after World War I, the price of crude oil is higher than it has ever been.

Every pertinent index shows that the domestic oil-producing industry is operating at or near its all-time peak and that it is prosperous. The industry itself reports that its immediate prospects are good. In addition, the long-range United States demand trend for oil is strongly upward and the relatively small production cutback in 1954 appears to have been temporary, just as was the more severe cutback of 1949. The slight decrease in production in 1954 from 1953 was not caused by increased imports, but through the liquidation of excessive stocks.

On the financial side, a recent survey by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. of overall industry capital spending plans for 1955 provides for an outstanding example of the domestic oil industry's vigor. While United States industry as a whole expects a small reduction, the oil industry is one of the very few which expects to increase its capital outlays. In the postwar period, capital investments by the oil industry in the United States have totaled some $30 billion, an average rate of $3.3 billion. Plans for 1955 include estimated capital expenditures of $4.9 billion. This is an indication of vigor—not ill health—in an industry.

Is this the kind of hardship which would warrant an embargo being erected against those who would like to utilize oil from other areas of the world in a way which would unquestionably benefit world trade and the domestic consumer?

It must be borne in mind that over the years oil consumption in this country has increased more rapidly than have our proven oil reserves; and that oil is becoming steadily more difficult and expensive to find in the United States and, therefore, if we are, at reasonable prices, to meet the future expected demand for enormous quantities of oil in the United States, we must look forward to a gradual increase in supplies from other parts of the world where oil is more plentiful relative to demand. It is significant that, while the United States accounts for 60 percent of the free world's oil consumption, it has only 21 percent of its discovered reserves, and undoubtedly far less than that of the undiscovered reserves.

That the coal industry has difficulties there can be no doubt but its plight is not due to oil imports.

That coal is a vital natural resource that adds to the industrial strength of this Nation is an obvious fact, but the touchstone of our economy, our national system, is competition and the real competitor of the coal industry is not foreign oil but a healthy, dynamic, research-minded domestic oil and natural-gas industry.

For example, in the period 1946 to 1952, total uses of fuel energy in the United States (exclusive of gasoline) increased by about 16 percent. If coal had been our only source of energy, this would have represented an increase of 163 million tons. Yet during that period consumption of bituminous coal decreased by 82 million tons. The use of natural gas increased by the equivalent of 159 million tons of coal, diesel fuel the equivalent of 12 million tons (much of it to the railroads), and other fuels (home-heating oil, hydroelectric power, etc.) the equivalent of 60 million tons.

The use of heavy fuel oil increased the equivalent of 14 million tons of coal during this period—an increase which was substantially the same proportion as the increase in the Nation's total energy use.

Another area in which coal has lost market in recent years is in the export field. Notwithstanding these losses, coal exports during the 8-year period 1946–53 have amounted to 392 million tons. Bearing in mind the recognized reciprocal aspect of foreign trade, coal producers can hardly expect to retain this export market while urging that heavy fuel-oil imports be shut out. Actually, the export-import balance during this period was much in favor of coal, since heavy fuel-oil imports of 177 million tons on a heat equivalent basis are less than one-half of the coal exports. For the year 1953 alone, total coal exports amounted to 37 million tons which on a heat equivalent basis was 4 million tons greater than the total volume of heavy fuel-oil imports.

Diesel locomotives deliver from 5 to 10 times more useful power per heat unit than steam locomotives. It follows that on a heat content basis, use of a given quantity of diesel fuel displaces a far larger quantity of coal or heavy fuel oil. The decline in use of coal by railroads between 1946 and 1953 amounted to 83 percent of the total decline in the United States use of coal during this period.

The coal industry has indicated that imports are largely responsible for current unemployment. A review of the record will not support this claim. Between 1946 and 1953 bituminous coal production was reduced by 77 million tons principally because of the almost complete dieselization of American railroads and the large increase in natural gas consumption in the United States. This loss in volume alone is estimated to have reduced coal mining working forces by 57,400 men (1946 productivity rate). In addition, technological improvements within the bituminous coal industry, typical of American industry, have increased the individual production of these miners. Output per man-hour has increased by 30 percent between 1946 and 1953. If we assumed that this improvement had not been achieved and that the output per man was the same in 1953 as in 1946, 45,900 additional miners would be employed. Thus the loss in volume mainly to domestic natural gas and light, domestic distillate oil, and the increase in coal industry efficiency was directly responsible for reducing the coal working force by about 103,000 men. This loss can in no sense be attributed to heavy fuel oil imports, which if completely eliminated, would increase coal consumption by a maximum of 11.6 million tons annually, equivalent to an additional 45 minutes of work per week for the average number of miners employed in 1953. The relatively small advantage to coal resulting from the elimination of imports must be weighed against the alternate harmful effects on many thousands of heavy fuel consumers and the friendly countries set up to furnish heavy fuel oil supplies.

If all imports of residual fuel oil were eliminated, the benefit to the coal industry would be relatively negligible. A survey made by one larger marketer on the east coast indicates that the maximum convertibility from such oil to coal would not exceed 10 to 12 million tons per year. On the other hand, any serious reduction in the importation of residual fuel oil would create a shortage of fuel in the New England States, including my own State of New Hampshire, bordering on a crisis.

The simple truth is the coal industry has been swept up by a tornado of technological advances that have kept coal output from following the rising surge of total fuel uses. Since the First World War, for example, the navies of the world have turned entirely to oil fuel. Merchant fleets have followed this trend. Heavy oil has so many advantages for marine transportation that it is inconceivable the United States Navy or owners of merchant fleets would go back to coal-burning ships.

While top engineers and salesmen in the coal industry were meeting in Pittsburgh, on April 15, 1955, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in an editorial said:

"Coal is the Nation's sickest big industry. Demand has nose-dived since the end of World War II. Production last year was down 40 percent from 1947. Gas and oil have taken over much of coal's household market. Diesel has replaced coal on most of the Nation's major railroads. Oil is muscling in on a big preserve of coal's, the electric power industry.

"Coal men, in management and labor, have reacted to all this in an expected way. They want Uncle Sam to stifle their competition. They've been demanding that a strict quota be put on imports of residual oil. They want to check imports of natural gas from Canada and Mexico. They want favored treatment for coal in the placing of Government orders. And the like.

"But the cure for a languishing industry is not to impose handicaps on the industry's competition. Our economy just doesn't work that way. A strict quota on imports of residual oil, for example, would play hob with thousands of householders and industries that have converted to this fuel. It would also play hob with manufacturers and workers who do a huge business with oil-exporting countries. In 1953, for example, America sold over half a billion dollars worth of products to Venezuela, which Venezuela in turn paid for almost entirely out of her oil exports."

There are words of wisdom in this editorial coming from one of our greatest industrial and coal-mining regions.

In the face of what is called ruinous oil imports the indications are that the industry is on the upgrade. The recent increases in coal demand have been reflected in increased optimism among the coal operators. This is shown by the following account from the Wall Street Journal of November 19, 1954, of the 37th annual convention of the National Coal Association held in Pittsburgh:

"With scattered exceptions, they were the cheeriest bunch of representatives of a sick industry that you'd ever want to see. Business in bituminous has started a comeback and there was scarcely an operator at the convention who hadn't noticed it. Many felt that the turn has finally come.

" 'I think we have turned the point,' said R. E. Salvati, president of Island Creek Coal Co.

" 'There's a new optimism,' said M. L. Patton (vice president of Truax-Traer Coal Co. 'And it's splendid psychology to know that we're lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps.'

"Coal-company analysts pretty much agree that a new growth trend will take hold about 1957 or 1958 and that if the industry can hold fairly steady or increase slightly until then, it will be out of the woods.

"Coal's great shakeout, severe as it has been on individual miners and operators, is bringing some blessings to the survivors. Most of the producers that have been knocked out in the past few years have been marginal operators who get in the business in times of boom.

"But the biggest immediate lift to coal operators is the rising level of general business. Coal burned by electric utilities, now the coal industry's biggest customer, is rising steadily. Steelmaking has risen spectacularly since Labor Day. Coal exports through normal commercial channels have taken a turn for the better.

"Some well-equipped mines in the southern fields are operating 5 to 6 days weekly, and at that, according to Appalachian Coals, Inc., 'are having difficulty in taking care of current demands.'

"Production at Imperial Coal Corp. (central Pennsylvania) is up 'better than 20 percent' over the year's low in April, said Charles A. Owen, chairman of the board. He said 'we're much happier.'

"Hooper Love said there has been a 'general improvement' in business. West Kentucky's production in October was 6 to 7 percent above September, and the improvement is continuing in November.

"J. D. A. Morrow, president of Joy Manufacturing Co., leading maker of mining machinery, said he has found evidence of a turn upward in coal in the significant increase in orders for machinery, particularly high production models that achieve greatest cost savings.

"J. S. Routh, president of Routh Coal Export Corp., thinks 'generally the corner has been turned.' "

Another group that has appeared to be active in support of the Neely amendment is the railroads engaged in transporting coal from the mines to markets. The railroad industry argues that the importation of foreign oil (particularly heavy residuals that are used as fuel in industrial plants and the like) has reduced the sale of bituminous coal to the point where the railroads are in serious straits through loss of freight revenues. The coal industry is, of course, one of the railroads' biggest customers. The record, however, indicates that the railroad industry, which was once the biggest single customer of the coal industry, is now not much of a customer at all.

In testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, Walter J. Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., said in reply to a question, "You weren't and aren't as sorry as I was to swing over (from coal to diesel fuel). But it was economically impossible to operate the railroad any other way." He went on to say, "I am speaking for the railroads generally, and I have studied as a general thing the traffic trends of those other railroads, and when I present the stand I have, I am reasonably sure that I am presenting almost a hundred percent, if not a

hundred percent, the position of the railroad industry."

The facts would seem to back him up. The preference of railroads for diesel power is indicated by the fact that in 1951, when the Nation's locomotive builders had orders for 4,074 locomotives, 4,038 of that number were diesel, 14 electric, and only 22 steam. The great shift by railroads to diesels represents one of the main losses of market outlet for the coal industry since. The effect of the increased use of railroad diesel fuel in 1952 as compared with 1946 was actually to reduce railroad needs for coal and heavy fuel oil by around 90 million tons. Obviously, this trend is going to continue at an accelerated pace as more diesel locomotives are delivered.

What I have said demonstrates that oil imports have not materially injured the domestic oil industry, the coal industry, or our railroads. This same conclusion has been reached by other responsible, unbiased investigators.

The Cabinet Fuels Policy Committee, after making a study into the Nation's energy supplies and resources policy, recommended no legislative restrictions on imports of either crude oil or heavy fuel oil but recommended that imports of these commodities be kept at or below the respective proportions they bore to domestic production in 1954 by voluntary, individual action of the importers.

The House Ways and Means Committee, after extensive hearings, recommended the passage of H. R. 1 without crippling amendments imposing quotas on specific commodities, including oil, though it was vigorously importuned to recommend the imposition of such quotas.

Let us now take a look at the other side of the picture. What effect would the imposition of quotas on oil have on the domestic economy and on the trade agreements program? In the first place, the independent oil merchants who supply the greater portion of the fuel-oil market would lose a considerable portion of their market to other fuels, not through competition, as in the American tradition, but through congressional fiat. Consumers would be required to convert from heavy oil to other fuels and many of them would be physically unable to make the conversion. Because of the small quantities of heavy fuel oil produced by refineries in the United States, the demand for this fuel can only be supplied by supplementing the domestic supply with imports. The impact would be particularly felt in my section of the country. In testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 8, 1955, Mr. John P. Birmingham, president of White Fuel Corp., of South Boston, Mass., said:

"In 1953, New England consumed 65 million barrels of heavy fuel oil. Approximately 65 percent of this oil was imported directly from the Caribbean area. If the bituminous-coal interests could have their way, the probable application of the 10-percent formula would be to force about two-thirds of the heavy fuel oil consumers to convert to coal while the remaining one-third would be permitted to use oil.

"Thousands of present heavy-oil consumers, particularly small factories, hospitals, apartment houses, schools, housing projects, et cetera, would be physically unable to convert to coal. For instance, the housing project in the city of Boston alone, housing some 20,000 veterans and their families, would be unable to convert to coal without investing staggering sums of money. For that matter, fewer than 2 percent of our customers at the present time have dual fuel facilities.

"I have a tabulation of my fuel corporation's business here, and we find that 87 percent of all our customers use heavy fuel oil for space heating entirely. Five percent use it for space heating primarily, and 7 percent use heavy oil for processing purposes primarily.

"Of 837 buildings and plants, only 14 have alternate facilities to burn other fuels, and only 9 of these 14 have a hundred percent capacity on the alternate fuel.

"We feel that everybody involved would suffer, except the coal marketers, who today are demanding governmental assistance to lower coal import tariffs abroad and restrictions for importation of competitive fuels at home and at the same time have themselves become one of the largest factors in the marketing of imported heavy fuel oil in this New England area. They enjoy a unique position. They have an important share of the heavy fuel-oil market in New England, using imported fuel oils almost exclusively. They also sell coal and, meanwhile, they are working diligently to reduce the consumer's choice of fuels to one, namely, bituminous coal.

"In other words, they can't lose, only the consumer would lose. If restrictions on oil are imposed, they win big profits on coal; if imposition of restrictions fail, they still have their heavy fuel-oil business, which they have built through imports.

"In February 1948, when a mild shortage of heavy fuel oil developed, the posted price of heavy fuel oil rose $1.33 per barrel over the posted price during the same period in 1947. While there was no apparent bituminous coal shortage during this same period, it is interesting to note that the posted price of bituminous coal on cars at Boston advanced by $3 a ton.

"It would not be too difficult to imagine what would happen to both coal and oil prices if Government were to force a 40-million-barrel shortage of heavy oil on New England to placate the coal producers and marketers. But even using the price reaction of 1948, namely, an advance of $1 on oil and $3 a ton on bitumious coal, New England's fuel bill would be increased by the staggering sum of $85 million per year."

Oil imports constitute a main route by which dollars enter international trade. In the year 1952, for example, American companies spent $691 million for purchases of oil from other countries, not counting the direct dollar investment of these companies abroad.

Dollars spent abroad to buy oil, like all other dollars spent abroad, eventually come back to our country. Some of them come as investments and bank deposits, but most are spent here for United States goods and services.

This reciprocal character of international trade is illustrated by the record of Venezuela's sales and purchases. Venezuela is the largest seller of oil to the United States. In 1952 Venezuelan exports of oil to this country had a value of $334 million. At the same time, Venezuelan purchases from our country amounted to $500 million. Included in these purchases were industrial machinery, automobiles, iron and steel-mill products, dairy products, raw and manufactured cotton, and grains. The Venezuelan Chamber of Commerce of the United States said in 1951, "The demands for United States goods have been so varied that during the last 2 years every State in the Union has exported some kind of product to Venezuela."

Legislative quotas limiting oil imports into the United States would have immediate and sharp effects on Venezuela's economy. Further, such legislation would directly violate the trade treaty between that nation and our own.

Erecting bars to oil imports would have repercussions worldwide. It would invite retaliatory trade bars on the part of other nations. It would throw grave doubt on the sincerity of America's desire to strengthen the free world against communism. It would represent a backward step in all this country's efforts to date toward healthier world trade.

I cannot close my remarks without calling your attention to a most enlightening document released by the State Department recently which points out 10 important reasons why legislative restrictions on oil imports are not necessary and should not be adopted at this time. The 10 reasons are:

"1. The policy of our Government and a basic principle of our society is in general to permit freedom of enterprise and competition to iron out difficulties and provide protection to the various elements in our economic society, including both producers and consumers. There is little or no evidence that either the domestic crude-oil industry or the coal industry have suffered from imports of crude oil and residual oil as to justify departure from these principles. * * *

"2. Voluntary individuals action by the oil-importing companies should be given a thorough trial. For the first time (by the Cabinet Committee report) a clear-cut goal has been set. Because of the quick availability of official monthly crude-oil production and oil import data, everyone interested in the oil-import problem can easily ascertain the facts. There is no reason to doubt the effectiveness of public pressure on the importing companies, under the circumstances, to hold imports of both crude oil and residual fuel oil in proper balance. * * *

"3. Legislation of the type proposed as an amendment to H. R. 1 by Senator NEELY would involve the setting of fixed import quotas. Such a specific formula would not be consistent with the basic fact that we are dealing with a dynamic situation that requires constant reappraisal. A fixed formula would be very difficult to change even if the industrial expansion of the country and the changing economic and national defense requirements made necessary a modification of the 1954 balance. The present healthy condition of the domestic crude-oil industry shows clearly that the increased imports of petroleum over the last few years have not been harmful. The problems of the coal industry have been caused almost entirely by factors wholly unrelated to our oil imports. Moreover, in 1954 the oil-importing companies recognized the problem of maintaining a proper balance between total supply and total demand. They did not significantly increase their oil imports in 1954 in comparison with 1953.

"4. In determining what is the proper balance between oil imports and domestic crude oil production it is necessary to look at the status of the oil industry in countries whose oil will be required by the United States and the other free-world countries in the event of national emergency. This requires a frequent review of the trends of oil exploration and oilfield development, the trends of production and of proven reserves. United States oil imports are a vital factor in determining the availability of foreign oil for purposes of national security. Our policy of permitting private enterprise free play in handling foreign oil developments and of permitting the private business decisions of individuals to work out the balance between imports and domestic production has assured the United States and our allies of adequate supplies of oil under conditions of both peace and war. The enactment of restrictive oil import legislation might play havoc with this aspect of our national security preparations.

The support of our allies whose oil we import is sorely needed in the cold war. Our security plans are not realistic unless we count on foreign oil.

"5. To place restrictions on oil imports might require further legislation and administrative action of a type not normally justified except in war emergency and not at all required under our voluntary import system. Restrictions on crude oil imports would involve questions of allocating import permits and squeezing back imports from some countries in order to make room for

imports from others. A case in point is Canada, where a costly pipeline has recently been built across the mountains to supply much needed oil to our Pacific Northwest. Under our voluntary import system this oil can readily be fitted into our total oil picture, without embarrassment to us and without hard feelings and reprisals against us by other countries; whereas if legislative restrictions were imposed on oil imports, the United States Government would have to invoke a country quota system and bear the onus for having imposed it.

"6. Legislative restrictions on residual fuel oil imports such as those proposed by the coal industry might well result in such shortages and increased prices that end use controls, allocations, and price controls might have to be provided, particularly in the States along the Middle Atlantic and North Atlantic seaboard, in order that consumers might be reasonably protected.

"7. Legislative restrictions on oil imports will harm the American producer of export goods and services. For every dollar of reduction in income from the sale of oil to the United States, we must calculate a dollar's reduction in our exports. This would hit our own producers, manufacturers, and basic industry with considerable force. This is incontestable in the cases of Canada and Venezuela, two of our best customers for products of farm and factory.

"8. Special note should be taken of the harmful effects of the proposed amendment on Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is engaged in a vigorous effort to expand its domestic industry which will require increased consumption of petroleum. The island now imports considerable quantities of residual fuel oil from the NWI and is building a refinery to be supplied with crude oil from Caribbean sources. The import restrictions of the proposed amendment could well do serious harm to these developments by increasing the cost and restricting access to petroleum supplies.

"9. It has been asserted that the coal industry needs help to enable it to meet potential defense requirements. A review of the facts indicates that the coal industry is now in a position to meet the needs of an emergency.

"10. American investments abroad are important to our domestic economy and our foreign relations. Nearly a third of these investments are in oil, and the proposed amendment might well jeopardize the security of these investments, thus hurting the Americans who have chosen to put their savings in these enterprises."

I am opposed to this amendment which I believe is unsound in principle. In frankness I must say I oppose it also because of its effect on New England.

The mills and small industrial plants of my State and other New England States are deeply dependent upon residual oil. I ask the Senate to consider our situation. Our section does not have the advantage of low-cost electrical power. We have no TVA's, no Grand Coulee Dams. We could not have them if we wished, or if the Federal Government were willing to build them for us, because 200 years ago towns and cities were settled all along New England's rivers so that today we could not have the full power potentialities of these rivers developed without flooding and obliterating our largest cities.

Our section does not have the advantage of easy access to the coal fields. It is natural perhaps, that our colleagues from Pennsylvania and West Virginia should desire to shut out the competition of foreign oil, but I ask you to remember that New England, which is the home of some of the oldest and finest small industries in the Nation, is a long way from the coal fields, and that the price of coal plus its transportation is nearly prohibitive. It will not add to the market of our friends from the coal-mining States to stop the wheels of industry in New England, nor will it enhance the welfare of the Nation as a whole to stifle industry in its outlying segments and cause further concentration in regions adjacent to the coal mines.

We of New England beseech you not to deliver this crushing blow at our small industries and business enterprises. We have asked little from Uncle Sam. We are willing to try to work out our own destiny, and accept cheerfully the prospect that the Federal Government is not going to do much for us. We are deeply concerned, however, at the prospect of what the Federal Government might do to us.

However, I base my argument on more than sectional reasons. Sound reasoning and unbiased conclusions from known facts demonstrate that the tremendous harm to our whole domestic economy and our export trade greatly outweighs the small amount, if any, good that would result to a few industries by the imposition of quotas on oil. I urge your support of H. R. 1 without this crippling amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding to me for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared concerning the amendment, and setting forth my opposition to it, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The chairman and the members of the Senate Finance Committee deserve the highest commendation for their thoughtful and reasonable approach to the Nation's trade policy during the consideration of H. R. 1. While retaining those provisions of the bill which would serve to increase free world trade, the committee has recommended several amendments that will go a long way toward offering reasonable protection to those of our industries which are vulnerable to import competition. It is a bill which will forward the President's enlightened trade policy, and for that reason I believe it deserves the support of the Congress. It is an essential part of this Nation's economic and political leadership of the free world.

We now have before us an amendment to H. R. 1 introduced by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] which would set a specific quota on oil imports. Not only is the proposed amendment contrary to the interests of our national security, but it would, in addition, do great economic harm to millions of American consumers.

Proponents of this amendment contend that it will insure a healthy and vigorous domestic oil industry. They say, as well, that it will give a badly needed boost to the ailing coal industry. Both statements have little basis in fact.

The domestic oil industry has enjoyed a remarkable degree of prosperity since the end of World War II and is now operating near its alltime peak. Except for a few minor setbacks, production and prices have risen steadily since 1948, even in the face of increasing imports. United States demand for oil is still showing a steady upward trend. Furthermore, a study conducted by Oil Forum and published in its issue of July 1954 showed that from 1949 to 1954 crude-oil production by independent producers increased at a more rapid rate than that of the major oil companies. The 46 small independents showed by far the greatest gain in production. For the past 20 years the domestic oil industry has been increasing its output on the average of almost 5 percent a year. This adds up to a picture of a healthy and vigorous industry.

Protecting our national security by offering protection to our domestic oil industry is a worthy objective. However, this amendment would injure, not protect, the national security. The Oil and Gas Journal pointed this out in an article and editorial in its March 21, 1955, issue. The 10-percent-quota scheme, it said, is not in the best interests of the petroleum industry. It said that the joker in the Neely amendment is the 10-percent limitation on residual-oil imports within the overall 10-percent limitation on all oils. Residual fuel oil would stand three-fourths of the reduction and crude oil only one-fourth, or about 66,000 barrels daily. The heavy reduction in residual imports will naturally cause the price of residual to rise sharply. And, as the Journal points out, conditions in the domestic industry are such that domestic producers will not be tempted to switch production to residual oils, in spite of the domestic shortage and higher prices which would result. In effect, residual imports do not compete with domestically produced oils.

Everyone agrees that a vigorous coal industry is important to our economic stability and to our national security. But oil imports have been a very minor factor in causing the dislocation of the coal industry. The greatest cause has been the growth of the natural-gas industry and the dieselization of the railroads.

Based on an index with 0 as the 1946 base, use of natural gas rose 171 points by 1953, diesel and distillate fuel oil 69 points, and heavy fuel only 21 points. It is clear that natural gas was the most important factor contributing to the 101-point drop in the use of coal during this same period.

Restrictions on residual oil imports would increase coal consumption only slightly. Most institutions or businesses now using oil have no facilities to use coal. Conversion is an expensive process which many would not be willing or able to undertake. In addition, some of those who would convert because of the higher price of residual fuel oil would certainly turn to natural gas or light heating oil. What, then, the coal industry supports is legislation which would do serious harm to hundreds of schools, hospitals, churches, office buildings, and factories, while providing little or no relief to itself.

Therefore, besides the fact that the amendment would not accomplish what it sets out to accomplish, it would have the dangerous effect of pushing up fuel prices for millions of consumers and injuring our national security.

Our petroleum reserves were reduced during World War II and the Korean War. In 1954 proven reserves of crude oil in the United States stood at 29½ billion barrels, with natural gas liquefied, a form of petroleum, at slightly more than 5 billion barrels. Our demand for all oils in 1954, however, was more than 3 billion barrels. And our needs are growing every year.

Foreign oil is important to our security. We should make every reasonable attempt to draw on our foreign sources now, saving our own reserves for an emergency in which foreign oil might be less readily available than it is today.

A limit on oil imports would also harm those Americans who have chosen to put their savings in oil investments abroad. Our oil investments in all areas of the world in 1954 amounted to nearly $5 billion. To reduce imports by American firms who have invested abroad would do great economic harm to these companies, as well as to the individual investor. It would serve to discourage further investment, which could result in a drying up of our important foreign oil sources.

A fixed formula such as is contained in the Neely amendment fails to recognize that we are dealing with a fluid, ever-changing situation. Our industrial and military requirements are constantly growing and, in the future, may grow more quickly than we now visualize. Even the severity of winter changes our oil requirements considerably. But, in spite of changes in need, the fixed 10 percent formula will remain a towering barrier to the natural workings of supply and demand factors.

The President's Advisory Commission on Energy Supplies and Resources has recommended a voluntary quota system, with imports being maintained roughly at the 1954 level. This system should be given a chance to work. Not only would it enable us to maintain flexibility in our imports, adjusting them to our requirements, but it would also eliminate the necessity of imposing country quotas and other restrictive devices which would only lead to ill will and retaliation on the part of our foreign friends.

It is the only sensible policy to follow when we are dealing with a situation that requires constant reappraisal. Our foreign sources of oil, the good will of our friends, our own exports, American investments, the well-being of the American consumer—all of these are at stake in this question. We should not sacrifice all that is good in our present system for the extremely dubious benefits that the Neely amendment might bring to the domestic oil and coal industries. Our national security and the needs of the American consumer demand that the Neely amendment be defeated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the minority leader in yielding to me at this time. I intend to vote for the amendment. Perhaps it is not exactly what I would hope to have in the way of an amendment to deal with this subject, and perhaps the residual fuel situation may be such that the proposed amendment may not be the cure-all it is hoped it will be. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for the amendment and to support it, in the hope that it may be adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the major reasons stressed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and for the detailed reasons which I shall set forth at a later hour in support of one of my own amendments, I wish the RECORD to show that I shall vote for the Neely amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my views on the Neely amendment and on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

The future of our domestic oil industry is of vital importance to the economic and military strength of our Nation.

Oil is one of the bulwarks of our national defense. It is the lifeblood of our Armed Forces in action—on land, on the sea, and in the air. It is one of the most powerful supports of our great industrial production.

In the event of another world conflict our hope of victory will depend on American oil. Without a strong domestic oil industry we will have no assurance of oil supplies adequate to meet our Nation's military, industrial, and civilian needs in time of emergency. We know from our experience in World War II that we cannot rely on foreign oil for security.

It therefore seems to me beyond all question that a healthy and expanding domestic oil industry is a fundamental defense requirement so long as armed aggression threatens to shatter the uncertain peace that now prevails in the world.

It also seems to me beyond all question that decisive, corrective steps must be taken to protect the American oil industry from destructive foreign competition.

The American people are the largest users of petroleum in the world. But in spite of the enormous market created by American demand, the independent oil producers of the United States are facing a desperate situation.

They are struggling to keep their heads above water in the face of an ever-growing flood of imported oil. Many of these independent producers are in the small-business category. For them it is a struggle for survival.

They find themselves unable to operate on a reasonably profitable basis against the increasing competition from cheaply produced foreign imports.

Since 1946 the national consumption of crude oil has increased more than 40 percent while the volume of oil imports has increased 140 percent.

In the first quarter of this year the increase was 21 percent over the comparable period of last year. In the first 4 weeks ending April 16 the increase advanced to 26 percent over the same period of last year. There is every indication that the importing companies intend to make further substantial increases in their imports to the further detriment of domestic producers.

Conservation programs in the oil producing States are based principally on market demand. They restrict the amount of oil domestic producers are allowed to place in the American market. But no such restrictions apply to the foreign producer or importer.

Production cut backs by State regulatory bodies have brought operations down to only 15 days a month largely because foreign imports have cut down market demand for domestic production.

The producers who are subject to conservation statutes in the various oil-producing States average less than 20 barrels a day from all the oil wells in this country. They are compelled to compete with the production of wells in the Middle East that produce more than 6,000 barrels a day.

The Middle East oil producers are not subject to conservation controls. Their production is not restricted. They are not required to meet minimum-wage standards. They are not required to shoulder any of the other burdens that are imposed upon the American producer.

The oil industry found some measure of encouragement in the report and recommendation of the President's Committee on Energies, Supplies, and Resources Policy. That committee recognized that excessive imports of oil could endanger the military and civilian supplies and the reserves necessary for national defense. Its report further stated that this would diminish incentives for the exploration and discovery of new sources of domestic petroleum.

The President's committee proposed that oil imports be curtailed by voluntary action of the importing companies. It is a fact that some of the importers tried to bring about voluntary restrictions but the effort failed to bring about the desired result. It appears that voluntary restrictions simply will not work. If oil imports are to be restrained for the protection of the domestic industry and for reasons of national security, it must be by action of Congress or the President under powers delegated to the executive branch of the Government by Congress.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the essential need for continued exploration to make more oil available for peace or war. America owes a great debt to the wildcatter who takes great risks in the search for new oil fields. If foreign oil dries up the market for the domestic product, there will be no incentive for the wildcatter to put his energy, initiative, and enterprise into the search for oil. That would be a calamity.

I do not minimize the importance of foreign trade to the economy of the United States.

I recognize the importance of preserving friendly relations with the free nations of the world that need our help to resist the inroads of communism.

I believe we should do all in our power to encourage the full and fair interchange of goods among the free nations to bring them closer together in friendship and understanding.

But I believe that the maintenance of a strong and sound economy in the United States should always be our first and foremost objective.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as the other coal-producing States unrestricted importation of residual oil has caused severe unemployment among miners, railroad workers, and others. It has caused serious injury to the coal industry. It has had a disastrous effect upon local communities in the coal-mining areas.

Residual oil last year displaced 30 million tons of American coal.

In December 1954 the American coal-mining industry had over 143,000 persons unemployed with thousands of others working part time.

In the anthracite region of Pennsylvania alone the total payroll has dropped a total of $50 million in the past 3 years.

When the coal industry is adversely affected the damage spreads through many other industries such as timber, steel, machinery, explosives, and the railroads.

The production of coal is a national-defense industry. It should be protected against competition that would destroy its usefulness in time of national peril.

Regardless of dangers I have discussed, I intend to support this bill because I believe it has within it provisions sufficiently strong to bring imports and domestic production into line with the needs of the national economy and national defense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time remains on the side of the proponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the proponents has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement I have prepared concerning the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

Last year when this legislation was on the Senate floor I warned that excessive oil imports were threatening the domestic petroleum industry and the national security. I said then that importing-oil companies themselves should solve the problem by voluntary reduction of their imports. Industrial statesmanship by American importing companies could have solved the problem, but it was not practiced by a sufficient number of the companies concerned.

This year the President's Cabinet Advisory Committee on Fuels and Energy Supplies reported that imports in excess of the 1954 ratio would endanger the national security.

Instead of reducing imports to 1954 levels, the major companies owning foreign oil have increased total crude imports for the first quarter of 1955 about 20 percent over the first quarter of 1954. As a partial result of these excessive imports, Texas production has been reduced to 16 days per month, and independent producers, who own no foreign oil, and the State tax revenues are suffering great losses.

Under these circumstances I testified before the Senate Finance Committee in favor of this amendment, and I shall vote for it today. However, I do not wish my vote to be considered as indicating any doubt about the assurances that have been made on the floor that administration officials will use section 7 (b), the committee substitute for the Neely amendment, to keep oil imports from exceeding the 1954 ratio. It is evident that the substitute will be adopted. I sincerely hope that it will work to protect not only our domestic oil industry but the national security, as intended by the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I also voted for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that the senior Senator from Kansas voted for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I request that the RECORD show that I voted for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that I voted for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted for the Neely amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted against the Neely amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I desire the RECORD to show that I voted for the Neely amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand it was contemplated that the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would proceed next with his amendment, and that I would follow him. Under those circumstances I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 5–3–55/F, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

"SEC. . No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties or other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement; and no notice of termination under section 2 (b) of the act of June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352 (b)), shall take effect with respect to any foreign trade agreement, or any amendatory or supplementary agreement, hereafter entered into under such section 350, until the Congress by law has specifically approved such notice of termination."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret very much that I am laboring under a severe handicap in the use of my voice. I have some important things to say to the Senate. I am glad there is so large an audience now present.

I do not know that I have ever stood upon the floor of the Senate and made a more important plea to the Members of this body than the one which I shall now attempt to make. I may be unable to say all I should like to say; but I believe that if Senators had sat through the debate, as I have sat through it, they would realize that the Members of the Senate who have spoken in favor of the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance are at complete odds in their conception of what it will do.

In this morning's New York Times I read a statement by one Senator that he expected the bill, if it passed and became a law, to be enforced by the administration in such a way as to bring about a reduction of imports into the United States. Then I heard an eloquent address, based on historical statements, delivered upon the floor, in which the argument was made that the bill would reduce tariffs and increase imports. Both Senators doubtless were altogether honest in the views they expressed.

Another Senator said on the floor that Congress will have to watch carefully the enforcement of the law; but he has done nothing to make it possible for Congress to do so.

The amendment which I have called up is a simple amendment. It will not destroy the desires of the proponents of either of those contending views. It will allow the President and those who are his assistants, those to whom he may delegate the legislative power of Congress, to negotiate trade agreements; but it will require, and this only, that before the agreements can become effective, they must be filed with and approved by Congress.

Senators who have not read the bill or the amendment will say that the junior Senator from Wyoming now wants to put the Senate and House back into the old days of logrolling tariff bills. What those bills were, I cannot testify from personal experience, because I was not here when any of them were enacted. I do not care to cast any aspersions upon any Member of the Senate or upon any previous Congress. I am only saying what I believe Senators know to be the incontrovertible truth.

The power to levy duties and tariffs was placed by the Constitution in Congress. It may be said that Congress can no longer perform this function because it involves too much detail. My amendment has no relation to that situation. My amendment is so broad that both Houses of Congress would have to vote a trade agreement up or down as a whole, without submitting amendments or without trying to make changes.

I ask any Senator who supports the bill why, under such circumstances, he would refuse to allow Congress, of which he is a Member, to examine the work which will be done by the persons to whom authority will be delegated.

The Secretary of State in his testimony before the Committee on Finance, which I read into the RECORD yesterday, said there was only one person in the country who was capable of negotiating trade agreements and who knew what ought to be done, and that person was the President of the United States. Of course, the Secretary could not have meant that literally, because it is obviously impossible for the President to conduct the negotiations.

As has already been pointed out, it was an able gentleman from Nebraska, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economics, Mr. Waugh, who went to Geneva and signed the trade agreement with 34 nations. It was not the President who did that. The discussions took place at Geneva.

My amendment reads as follows:

No foreign-trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties or other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign-trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement; and no notice of termination under section 2 (b) of the act of June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352 (b)), shall take effect with respect to any foreign-trade agreement, or any amendatory or supplementary agreement, hereafter entered into under such section 350, until the Congress by law has specifically approved such notice of termination.

The only purpose of the amendment is to make it possible for the Congress to look at the work which has been done by the persons to whom you, my colleagues, delegate this power, and by whom it is redelegated, and then determine whether or not in the judgment of Congress, it ought to be made the law of the land.

Mr. President, how can any person feel that what I ask is a thing which should not be done? Is there a Senator in this Chamber who fails to realize that the United States, and all the nations of the world, at this very moment, are hanging on the very brink of disaster?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming were adopted and the Congress did not take any action under the amendment. What would be the result?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Congress did not take any action, Congress would not have approved the agreement, and it would not become effective.

Mr. WATKINS. It would be in the same category as any treaty which would not have been approved by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; and if either House voted against it, the agreement would have no effect.

If it were desirable to make action by Congress compulsory, I would have no objection to that.

What I am trying to seek is to have this Congress, of which I am a Member, and of which all my colleagues are Members, have the opportunity to look at the legislative work that is being done in its name.

Do my colleagues doubt that these are critical periods? If they do, let me ask them to glance at the messages which have been sent to this body in the last few days from the White House. First we have the message on foreign aid. Three and a half billion dollars for foreign aid. Is it possible to conceive that, while the executive believes we must extend foreign aid to the free nations of the world in the amount of $3½ billion, this is a time to negotiate trade agreements as though we were dealing with self-supporting nations, without need of aid from the Treasury of the United States, which is now running a deficit? The Secretary of the Treasury wonders day by day how he is going to balance the budget.

The chairman of the Finance Committee comes on this floor day after day with reports which are carefully worked out, in his attempt to reduce unnecessary expenditures. Yet, in the face of the conditions we face, and with the President recommending Federal aid for foreign nations in the amount of $3½ billion, it is proposed that we give the President complete discretionary authority to negotiate trade agreements.

I have in my hand the message which the President sent to Congress on the 2d of May. This is his message recommending the establishment of the International Finance Corporation, to which the United States will have to contribute a subscription of capital stock in the amount of $35,168,000.

I ask my colleagues to listen while I read the second paragraph of this message:

These actions—

The actions which he has outlined for building up the free world, with which objectives I am in complete agreement; but "these actions" as he has described them can be set forth in his language, in this way:

These actions—such as extension of the Trade Agreements Act, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—

That is an organization consisting of 34 nations. Thirty-two nations have signed the agreement, and two have not joined it. Those two nations are Czechoslovakia and the United States of America. The other 32 countries have joined it. Our representatives, the same representatives to whom it is now proposed the Senate delegate this power of Congress, have negotiated the agreement with respect to the Organization for Trade Cooperation, upon which the Senate will presently be asked to vote—

simplification and improvement of customs valuation procedures—

The President says that is necessary—

increased tourist allowances.

I think these are subsidies, I will say to the chairman of the Finance Committee. Tourist allowances we must give in order to build up the business of foreign nations.

Changes in the law concerning the taxation of income from foreign sources and further developments in tax treaties designed to encourage private investment abroad.

Of course, it is fine to encourage private investment abroad, but are we going to participate in this huge program of expenditure and of action by taking the first step which, in this crisis, grants to the President of the United States, in name only—in reality to anonymous individuals whom we do not know—the power to make trade treaties affecting the commodities of our respective States?

The Senator from Colorado, the leading minority member of the Committee on Finance, asked the Secretary of State, when he was before the committee, whether the bill, as he presented it, would not bring disaster upon some businesses. The only answer of the Secretary of State to the Senator from Colorado was, "Why, the Government of the United States sends soldiers out to die." But the obvious answer to that was that when the United States drafts men, it does it in public, not behind closed doors, and we do it because it is our duty. But we are asked to send businesses down the road to disaster, and to let it be done by somebody else in secret.

What are we thinking about? In this great crisis of civilization, how can we, the strongest free nation in the world, devoted to the theory of popular government, be willing to give up the very basis of popular government, merely because someone says, "Oh, Congress cannot do this work, and the national security is involved."

Mr. President, certainly the national security is involved if the Senate lets this power pass out of its hands. When the dome above the Capitol crashes, government of the people, by the people, and for the people will be gone.

When we turn over the powers of Congress to the executive departments or to the President of the United States, however genial, kindly, or able he may be, we are abandoning the Constitution of the United States and we are saying to our constituents who sent us here, "Mea culpa, mea culpa; I am unable to perform the duty I asked you to entrust me with when I requested your votes."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the President's message dated April 14, 1955, urging that the Congress approve United States membership in an organization for trade cooperation. Let me read to the Senate—and I hope the Senator from Virginia will pardon me for saying it—the shilly-shally language of the amendment proposed by the great Finance Committee with respect to this world organization, which will have an assembly of its own, and will have an executive board which will tell us where its site will be. It may be in Geneva; it may be in Bandung; we do not know. I shall read what the Finance Committee has said about it, in trying to do the best it could do, if the bill should be passed, without doing something which would obviously be wrong. I read now from page 3, beginning in line 8:

Provided, That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask my colleague a question with reference to that language. As I understand, some of the countries which belong to GATT contend that by reason of the authority inherent in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the organization which has been established, commonly known as GATT, presently possesses the power to bind the United States not to increase any of the tariffs presently in force or to make any change which would be disadvantageous to them in our law affecting imports.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That claim has been made, and I think it can be substantiated. But I do not say that conclusively.

However, I will say and I should like to call the attention of my colleague to the statement—that on page 2, in line 21 of the bill, as reported by the committee, there is language, adopted by the House, which provides the first power which under this bill would be granted to the President. That language is as follows:

(A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof.

It does not say "bilaterally." It does not say "collectively"—just as the amendment I read a moment ago does not say "approved" and does not say "disapproved."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARRETT. Since it is contended that we are already bound, it seems to me, that in order to disavow any such construction, we would have to take a positive position that the passage of this bill shall not be construed to indicate the approval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, rather than to take a noncommittal stand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the proposal for the new organization for trade cooperation, or whatever the correct name may be—at the moment I have forgotten the exact title——

Mr. BARRETT. It is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The proposal has been sent to us, and I expect that the Finance Committee will hold some sessions on it. But the moment the committee goes into those sessions, all the pressure which has been brought upon the Republican Members of the Finance Committee to forego stating their convictions about this matter and to forego expressing their doubts, will again be brought to bear upon them, in an attempt to get them to agree to a substitute for the original Neely amendment—a substitute which would put the entire matter, not in the hands of the President, but in the hands of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, to whom are we delegating the power? Furthermore, all the power so delegated will be discretionary.

Mr. BARRETT. Question arises as to whether we may be authorizing the delegation of the powers granted to the Congress, not to the executive branch of our Government, but to decision by a group of nations operating as the GATT organization.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Individuals who have been sent all over the world, but have never appeared before the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee, are performing the duty of Members of Congress in that respect.

I remember an occasion in 1933, after the first trade-agreement act was passed in 1930, at which time I was not a Member of the Senate—I did not become a Member until 1933—when I went with a number of other western Senators, Senators from Colorado and Texas, among other Western States, to a meeting of the Committee on Reciprocal Trade Information. The meeting was held in one of the Government buildings in Washington. As I saw those Senators, members of powerful committees created by the Senate to discharge constitutional powers, stand before those figureheads—which is all they were, because they never opened their mouths—and plead for the action those Senators should have been debating upon this floor, I turned upon my heel, took my hat, and returned to my office in the Senate Office Building, because I felt that such a procedure was wholly and completely in derogation of the great dignity of this body.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What the Senator from Wyoming has said recalls to my mind the fact that in 1940, when I was special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was a Member of the Senate, Senator Ed Johnson, now the Governor of Colorado, sent me to the same board, to hold the board in session until he could get there to plead the case of one of the minerals produced in his State. That nearly broke my heart, because when he arrived there, the distinguished Senator from Colorado went before that little committee of nonentities, as the Senator from Wyoming has just said, with his hat in his hand; but the members of the board paid no more attention to him than they would have paid if a yellow dog had come through the door.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the way to abandon self-government. If we are going to lead the peoples of the world to freedom, how can we do it by giving up our right to govern ourselves and the people who sent us here? We may make mistakes, we will make mistakes, but the mistakes we make are made in the open, where everyone can see them.

It is said that in times past Members of this body and Members of the House have yielded to corrupt influences. I have been a Member of this body for 20 years, and I have yet to see the slightest indication of any lack of integrity on the part of any Member of this body. Sometimes I do not agree with their views, I will say to the Senator from Nevada, but we all know that Members of this body respect the disagreement of others with their views.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Committee on Finance, listened to my testimony on this amendment before the committee, and he was very kind in his references to the arguments which I made. But I could tell from his smile that he did not have much faith that I would succeed in what I was trying to do.

I offered this amendment in the first instance as long ago as 1934, and that year we came within 6 votes of having the amendment adopted. Some Members of this body, including the great Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, went before the committee, and stood on the floor of the Senate and argued that trade agreements are treaties and should be ratified, as the Constitution provides treaties should be ratified. It was a persuasive argument. Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, offered the amendment to require ratification. The amendment was voted down, because the experts in the State Department, the theorists in the State Department, who had never faced an electorate in their life, felt that the time had come to get rid of toying with the Senate of the United States.

I remember reading a book by Belisarius, in which it was said that Justinian, the great Roman emperor of the eastern empire, complained at the fact that he had to go before the graybeards in the Senate to get permission to move an army. Justinian was an emperor, and the Roman senate was a body representing the ancient Roman ideal of self government.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the same experts are still in the Department. Many of the same ones who were there in 1934 are still there. They belong to the second, third, and fourth echelons, and they are still giving the same advice.

If the OTC, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which amends the GATT regulations, comes before the Congress—and I am advised that it has been brought before the House—and we approve it, we approve GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, meeting at Geneva; but if we do not approve it, we do not disapprove GATT. It will continue. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is great danger that it may.

Mr. MALONE. I am certain that it would.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will pardon me if I say to him that I promised the majority leader when I took the floor that I would speak for 20 minutes. From the way he is shifting about in his chair, I think probably I have spoken already for 21 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I shall try to keep my agreement.

I plead with Senators to make certain that no trade agreements shall be proclaimed and made effective solely by the President of the United States, because I say to Senators that the governments of the other parties to these agreements will know, and their people will know, the result; and unless the Senate votes for the amendment which I have offered, Senators will be voting to say not only that the people of the United States will not know, as soon as the nation with which we have agreed, but that they will not know as soon as all the nations under the favored-nation clause will know.

Take the case of Japan. The Finance Committee struck out an amendment dealing with Japan. That was a sop to Senators who represent textile-producing States, States producing cotton and other yarns which go into the manufacture of clothing, because of the fear of competition from Japan. Does anyone fail to know what the situation is in Asia? Does anyone doubt that the President, the Department of Defense, Members of Congress, and, more importantly, the people of the United States, are wondering whether or not we are to have war in Asia? We hear about Formosa, about Quemoy and the Matsus, and about the Tachen Islands, which we have already compelled Chiang Kai-shek to leave. We know that the Red Chinese Communists have violated the armistice which was declared at Panmunjom. We know that they have built their airfields in North Korea. We know that they have received almost 400 jet fighter planes from Russia. We know that the people of Japan, if they are to live, must trade somewhere. If we forbid them to trade with Red China and then deny them an opportunity to trade with the United States, what are we doing to aid in the solution of this great world problem?

This problem has not been thought through. The greatest problem in the world is the loss of government by the people. If my amendment is defeated today, the vote will be a vote by the Senate of the United States to undermine government by the people, because we represent the people. They sent us here.

I could go through the bill page by page and pick out amendment after amendment.

Let me make one more reference and then I shall yield the floor. I read from the famous substitute for the Neely amendment. It is on page 13 of the bill at line 22. It is subparagraph (b) of section 7:

(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall—

Take action? No—

shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts.

Mr. President, how can we accept such language as a substitute for the language we want? If we pass the bill as it comes to us from the committee, without the amendment I have offered, which requires that Congress shall know what is being done in its name before it becomes effective, then I say to the Senate democratic government—and I spell it with a small "d"—and popular government is trembling upon the very brink of disaster.

I will close by saying that the bill itself is a conjury of contradictions. It starts out on page 2 with this declaration of purpose. Senators who want to cut down imports and those who want to reduce tariffs should listen to what is proposed:

(a) (1) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United Sates in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other important restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

I turn to page 3, subparagraph (2) of paragraph (B):

(2) No proclamation pursuant to paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall be made—

(A) Increasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945.

There follow other limitations.

No member of the committee and no Member of the Senate knows what will be done if the bill becomes law. We have a very different situation from the one that existed back in 1930 and 1934, after the economic collapse of 1929. Then we were trying to walk in one direction. Now we are trying to walk in another direction. Now we are trying to avoid war. Now we are trying to establish peace. Now we are trying, by appropriating billions of dollars of our citizens, to build up foreign nations so that they may be economically strong. Yet we pretend to believe that this is a measure which will build up trade and promote trade and commerce and national security. We are following slogans. We are not acting with our brains.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, because of the fact that no yea-and-nay vote was taken on the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted for the amendment.

At the same time I wish the RECORD to show also that inasmuch as the word "reciprocal" has been in my humble opinion prostituted in the whole discussion of trade treaties, unless the pending bill is amended, I expect to vote against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am very sorry to have to disagree with the interesting remarks of my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If the Senator's amendment were adopted it would be equivalent to a sudden end of the reciprocal trade system, for some very obvious reasons.

Congress, under its constitutional powers, cannot negotiate with foreign countries. If there is to be a reciprocal trade act, negotiations with foreign countries must necessarily be carried on by the Executive.

The executive department could not get any agreements with foreign countries for reciprocal trade if every agreement which was made had to be brought back to Congress and had to go through the tortuous determination of whether it would be acceptable to Congress. Under those circumstances, no nation would want to trade with the United States, and perhaps no nation would be justified in trading with the United States. There would be too much uncertainty involved. We would be held up to ridicule by the other countries with which we would want to make favorable trade agreements under the reciprocal trade system.

Mr. President, can anyone imagine the kind of situation that would be created?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Colorado mean to say that because we live in a totalitarian world we must do as the totalitarian countries do?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I did not mean to say that. I mean to say that we

should not do as the totalitarian countries do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that many of the nations with whom we have made trade agreements require the submission of agreements to their parliaments before they can become effective?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That may be true in some countries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why should we deny that system to ourselves?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have a constitutional situation which is somewhat different from that of any other country.

Under the Constitution, Congress cannot carry on negotiations with foreign countries. We must use the executive department for that purpose. The executive department could never count on any assurance coming from Congress, no matter how high an opinion, or whatever opinion it might have of Congress. Our agents going throughout the world, in trying to make trade agreements, could only say, "We are making this agreement with the understanding that it must go back to Congress. We cannot assure you whether the agreement will be satisfactory to Congress or whether it will be modified, or what will happen to it."

The result would be uncertainty in world relations. I cannot imagine anything that would do more to promote uncertainty in our trade affairs throughout the world. I think it would be utterly devastating. There could not be a single agreement made with assurance that it would stand. It would throw our whole world trade into the air. It would be either a part of the sky or anchored to the world, and no one would know of what our world trade consisted.

Let us consider that we have made an agreement, through what would be left under the reciprocal trade system, and it is brought back to the Congress. There is no difference, in real effect, between that and having a restoration of the old statutory tariff system. We might as well make agreements in advance and make them by statutory enactment as we used to do.

Mr. President, I never shall forget that once, when talking with Arthur Vandenberg, he said, "Gene, if we were going back to that system, I would resign from the Senate in 24 hours."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield as much time as the Senator from Colorado may require.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, Senator Vandenberg, and others who were in the Senate in the same period, realized what utter confusion there was, even in that day, in trying to operate a statutory system of tariffs without consultation with other countries, without knowing what the effect would be, without knowing how our trade affairs would be balanced or unbalanced.

The amendment, I respectfully suggest, is perhaps the most crippling amendment that has been proposed to the Senate. I do not say that in a mean way, but to indicate that the amendment would destroy the rational system of trade with the rest of the world.

Supposing an agreement were made with a dozen countries and the agreement were brought back to the Congress. Those who entered into the agreement with us thought they were going to do something to help their own trade, the world's trade, and to better their condition. Then we would start to work on it in the Congress. It would be referred to committees, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. We would start a hearing on every item in the agreement. We could not approve it without having a hearing on every item. There would be hundreds and hundreds of witnesses. Goodness only knows what would happen to the agreement. It would be a miracle if it were approved completely. It might be disapproved, or there might be a suggestion that this, that, or the other thing be done.

As I have said, Congress cannot do its own negotiating. Under our Constitution, that has to be done through the State Department. A certain amount of delicacy is involved in our trade relations. We must work in a sound and rational way in the world in which we are living. We are not in a position to erect a wall and say, "Here are our moats; cross them if you can, and we will cross yours." We must get along with the world on the basis of friendship. I do not mean we should not uphold the rights of the United States, but we must consider the rights of other peoples and be decent and just in our dealings with them. If whatever is agreed upon must have the approval of the Congress, we cannot assure other nations what the Congress will do. Another nation may say, "What kind of a country are you? How do you conduct your affairs? You cannot even make an agreement on trade. The only thing you can do is to go back to statutory tariff making, which does not take into consideration at all the wishes of other countries."

That is our alternative. By voting for the amendment we shall be voting for a return to statutory tariff making.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator name a single country, other than the United States, where an executive agreement does not have to go back to the parliament for approval?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot say that there are more than one or how many there are.

Mr. LANGER. There are not any. If Canada enters into an agreement it must be approved by the Canadian Parliament. If France enters into an agreement, it must be approved by the Parliament of France. All executive agreements and treaties must be acted upon by the ruling body.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat to the distinguished Senator that we would have to stop bargaining for trade agreements over the whole face of the world because no nation would bargain with us since any agreement might become utterly ineffective, and we could not guarantee to keep the agreement. I do not know how often the bargaining we have done with other nations has been repudiated by them.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the Senate decisively vote down the amendment, because if it should be agreed to it would be against the reciprocal trade system and for a restoration of statutory tariffs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to say that he yields back the remainder of his time. And I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as 5–3–55–D.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 14, after the word "paragraph", it is proposed to insert "and the provisions of paragraph (6)."

Page 9, line 6, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 9, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) No proclamation made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall take effect until after the expiration of 90 days of continuous session of the Congress following transmittal of the proclamation to the Congress. Such proclamation shall be transmitted to both Houses of Congress on the same day and to each House while it is in session. If, within 90 days of continuous session of the Congress following the receipt of such proclamation, either House of the Congress has passed a resolution stating in substance that that House does not approve the action of the President, then the proclamation shall not take effect and the foreign trade agreement shall be inoperative. For the purposes of this paragraph—

(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(B) in the computation of the 90-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to move that the action taken upon the rejection of my amendment be reconsidered. The reason why I make that motion is because I was in conference with my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming, about a matter wholly concerned with the people of Wyoming.

I have talked on numerous occasions with the distinguished Senator from Texas about my amendment, on which I thought it was understood that I was to have an opportunity to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. Therefore, I wish to move to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had no understanding with the Senator from Wyoming that he was to have an opportunity to exercise his rights as a Senator. The Senator told me that he wanted to speak for 20 minutes. I asked him if, at the conclusion of his speech, he wanted to yield back his time, provided I would yield back mine. He told me that that was what he wanted to do.

When the debate on the amendment had been concluded, I looked over the Chamber, trying to locate the Senator. I could not find him. I then went to the cloakroom, where I was notified that he was talking with his colleague.

I asked the Senator if he still wanted to yield back his time, on the condition that I would yield back mine. He told me that he did.

I rose and addressed the Chair in, I thought, a sufficiently loud-enough voice for every Senator to hear me. I stated that the Senator from Wyoming had authorized me to yield back his time, and that I was authorized to yield back the time I controlled. After the time had been yielded back, I did not control the situation. It was a matter for each individual Senator. It was a matter for the Chair and the Senate finally.

But I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming. If a sufficient number of Senators wish to have the roll called, I shall ask unanimous consent that the Chair accept the request or the demand by the Senator from Wyoming for the yeas and nays; and if a sufficient number of Senators second the request, the roll will be called.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas is very kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is the time for the procedure suggested to be taken from the time of the Senator from Oregon? [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. That would be all right with me, Mr. President, because I could offer more amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not encouraging such action at the moment; but if the Senator from Oregon will yield, the Chair will put to the Senate the request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Wyoming be permitted to ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

First, it will be necessary to have reconsidered the vote by which the amendment was rejected. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was rejected will be reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of my brief speech in support of my amendment I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] upon his very brilliant speech this afternoon on constitutional law and on our constitutional system of the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances.

Earlier today I engaged in an interesting colloquy with my very dear friend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with whom I find myself in complete disagreement on the matter of constitutional checks and balances in respect to the proposed legislation. I called his attention to the fact that 2 or 3 years ago he made a very sound observation with regard to a truism, namely, that a liberal need not be a wastrel. I would have the Senator from Illinois reflect today upon the fact that a liberal also should be a constitutionalist.

I wish to say a few words in support of my amendment, which really is correlated to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, but with a difference in procedure in order to accomplish the same end. I wish to say something about it in support of constitutionalism, because I speak most respectfully when I say that I think under the procedure of the pending bill the Senate is straying far from the very important constitutional safeguards which we owe to the people of the United States, whom we represent.

I think it is well, from time to time, just to finger the Constitution; to turn its pages and reflect again upon what our duties as Senators are; to ponder anew the meaning of our system of separation of powers and the meaning of our system of checks and balances; and also to keep in mind some of the very elementary principles of constitutional law.

So I would have the Members of the Senate take a look at article I, section 8, of the Constitution. We have heard the great words of our organic law many times in our lifetime, but never too often. This section points out that:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Not a word is said in that article, or anywhere else in the Constitution, about delegating the constitutional power to lay and collect duties and imposts. This does not happen to be one of the powers that can be delegated. It is a legislative function, and it cannot be delegated.

Yet as I listened to some of the speeches in the debate, I was astounded, because some of the speeches have forced me to the conclusion that there are Senators who seem to be laboring under the mistaken notion that the legislative power of Congress can be delegated. It cannot be delegated. All that Congress can delegate is administrative power. The Supreme Court decisions on the subject matter are as long as our arms.

In effect, what the Senate is doing today, under the bill, under the pretense of delegating administrative power, is to violate article I, section 8, of the Constitution. We are in fact going beyond the delegation of administrative power.

I turn now to article II, section 3, which refers to the powers of the President of the United States. I read:

> He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

That article does not say that the President shall make the laws or lay the tariffs. Not a syllable in that section of the Constitution justifies the inference that Congress has the authority to delegate to the President the power to make tariffs.

The phraseology can be as it is in the bill, with all the language that is wanted, which seeks to give to the American people the impression that Congress is not attempting to delegate legislative power; but the fact remains that in practice, under this kind of law, that is exactly what the President will end up by doing.

So, as I have for several years past—this is not a new position for the senior Senator from Oregon—I am raising my voice again by proposing to write into the reciprocal trade law some constitutional checks upon the President of the United States, by providing for a procedure whereby Congress will have the mandatory duty to check the President, not at its whim; and if Senators will read my amendment, they will find that I do exactly that.

My good friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], persuasive and plausible as he is, engaged, I think, in a very unsound argument when he told us that foreign countries will not negotiate with the United States if we do not give the President the power of finality in regard to reciprocal trade agreements. The Senator from Colorado's saying so does not make it true. The fact is that the United States is constantly negotiating a great many understandings with other countries in the field of foreign relations. Those countries know full well the residuary power of the Congress to check the President of the United States.

I say most respectfully that I think it is pure nonsense to argue in the Senate that if we do not give the President the unchecked power, we cannot walk into the reciprocal trade agreement conference in Geneva and negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with foreign powers.

I will tell you what I think our duty is, Mr. President. Our duty is to teach some of these countries with whom we negotiate in Geneva the importance of a system of democratic processes. It is important for us to teach them what a

system of constitutional checks and balances really means. It is important for them to have an understanding that the President of the United States does not sit in the White House as a dictator over the welfare of the American people, but that he sits in the White House of the United States, subject to the constitutional checks of the Congress of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, in my judgment, places a clear constitutional duty upon the Congress of the United States to write into this law some constitutional checks upon the President of the United States. And I am not at all moved by the scarecrow arguments of the Senator from Colorado to the effect that if we do not yield this important constitutional duty on our part here this afternoon, we are not going to be able to negotiate any reciprocal trade agreement.

I am at a loss to understand the argument, because what the Senator from Colorado is arguing this afternoon is that we should yield our power of check to a greater extent than it is yielded in Canada or Great Britain. I repeat, Canada and Great Britain place greater checks on their negotiators than we do in the United States.

As was pointed out this afternoon, I wish to say we are talking about protecting a government by the people. There are Members of Congress who go around the country talking about our system of checks and balances, but I fear that they talk in political clichés, because the test of whether they believe in it is how they vote in the Senate toward retaining the constitutional checks upon the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I will tell you what I think we are doing this afternoon with this approach to the pending bill. We are creating votes for the Bricker amendment, and I am opposed to the Bricker amendment because, in my judgment, the Bricker amendment interferes with the President's foreign policy power. But you see, Mr. President, what has been done here by a sort of semantic sleight-of-hand performance. We are trying to give the American people the impression that these reciprocal trade agreements are primarily a function of foreign policy. They do not happen to be that at all; that is secondary. The primary function in regard to entering into trade agreements falls under article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, namely, the delegated power of the Congress of the United States over duties, or, in other words, over tariffs.

There is another fallacy set forth by the proponents of the bill, to the effect that we cannot have a reciprocal trade agreement unless Congress is read out of the act. I have come to the conclusion that we are not going to have a sound reciprocal trade program, we are not going to have true reciprocity, unless Congress is more jealous in protecting the authority given to it by the Constitution of the United States to fix duties.

That is why for a good many years past I have argued, as I am arguing this afternoon, for some effective exercise by the Congress of the United States upon the negotiators of so-called reciprocal trade agreements, but which for the most part so far have lacked, in fact, very much reciprocity.

In the course of the debate, there has been considerable argument that the commissions which Congress has set up under various laws it has passed, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and various agricultural commissions, are precedents for what is proposed in the pending bill. Of course, the fallacy in that argument is that we are dealing here with a specific constitutional function delegated to the Congress of the United States. It was true in decades gone by that tariff rates were written on the floor of the United States Senate, and on the floor of the House of Representatives. It became clear that the Congress would not be able to do much else if it did not stop writing tariff rates on the floor of the Congress.

So what did Congress do? It passed broad legislation. But the Supreme Court has held time and time again that, with sufficient standards and criteria laid out, so that the legislative function of the Congress was fulfilled in the field of tariffs, all the Tariff Commission had to do was to administer those standards and apply them to specific economic problems as they arose in connection with various items of production and numerous other factors of the American economy. When the Tariff Commission was so functioning it acted administratively, not legislatively.

As Members of the Senate know, some of those cases had very close lines of distinction drawn by the Supreme Court as between legislative and executive power. But where the laws had been sustained, they were upheld upon the general theory that the Congress set forth standards in the bill sufficiently specific so that all the Commission had to do was apply those principles to a given situation under the law, after a hearing duly called.

The argument by analogy made in the debate this afternoon about the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board is foreign and irrelevant to the point I am making. Under the Constitution, this happens to be a delegated authority, and it is mandatory, in my judgment, for the Congress to fix the duties, and Congress cannot delegate that power to the President of the United States.

There is no question, in my judgment, in the matter of constitutional theory, that we can delegate an administrative function to the President of the United States; but if Congress delegates to the President of the United States an administrative function involving a legislative duty of the Congress, the President is not the Chief Executive in that particular function; he is really an administrative officer of the Congress. In that case he is not functioning as the Commander in Chief, nor under article II of the Constitution, in respect to executive power. In such instances the President becomes the one person in our Government to participate in those particular negotiations—but as our administrative officer, not as President of the United States. Nor does he then carry out a foreign policy.

That function does not involve a question of the President's being, under the Constitution, the one who has charge of foreign affairs. He would be carrying out an administrative function with respect to a constitutional power of the Congess of the United States to fix duties—in other words, to fix tariffs.

I am not going to be one in this body who in effect seeks to transfer to the President of the United States the power to make tariffs.

Mr. President, I believe in reciprocal trade. There has been another false assumption in the debate that I wish to answer, at least for my own benefit. It is that one cannot believe in reciprocal trade and cannot support reciprocal trade unless he writes Congress out of the act. I do not accept that thesis at all. To the contrary, I am satisfied that we will get reciprocal trade if Congress and the President work cooperatively on such agreements. I think in that argument one of the primary essentials is that the President of the United States should inform the Congress what those agreements are before they become final and binding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that in the 90 years from 1844 to 1934 only 3 minor reciprocal trade agreements were consummated, namely, between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland, in 1854; between the United States and Hawaii, in 1875; and between the United States and Cuba, in 1902; and that, on the other hand, the following agreements were unsuccessful: with the German Zollverein, in 1844; with Hawaii, in 1855; with Hawaii, in 1867; with Canada, in 1875; with Mexico, in 1883; with Spain, Cuba, and Portugal, in 1884; with the Dominican Republic, in 1884; with Newfoundland, in 1888; again with Newfoundland, in 1890; again with Newfoundland, in 1902; and with Canada, in 1911? Will the Senator from Oregon take note that in the case of our neighbor to the north, Canada, we tried by treaty for almost 75 years to obtain an agreement with her, and we never were able to consummate one through the process of a treaty ratified by the Senate and approved by both countries?

So, although the Senator from Oregon is a profound constitutional lawyer, yet, Mr. President, in his desire for legal nicety, what he is doing is to pass a death sentence upon any effective program of reciprocity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois amuses me. How easy it is to set up several premises and then to draw a conclusion that has nothing at all to do with them. That is exactly what he has done.

I am surprised at the Senator from Illinois, who seems to think that one is engaging in constitutional niceties; but all the Senator from Illinois does is point out to me that one can be a liberal without being a constitutionalist in every case.

Before the Senator from Illinois entered the Chamber, Mr. President, I reflected upon a statement he made several years ago, namely, that in order to be a liberal, one does not need to be a wastrel. But I say to him that he had better be a constitutionalist, because his entire argument this afternoon has been away from the Constitution, and he has attempted to throw out the window the entire system of checks and balances. In making that approach, he is attempting to imitate the totalitarians; now he wants to throw out the window the entire group of powers granted to Congress in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. Mr. President, let the Senator from Illinois read that part of the Constitution again and again. He needs to read it, and then he needs to study some of the Supreme Court decisions regarding what those provisions mean.

But what the Senator from Illinois is proposing here, today, I say most respectfully, is that we attempt to delegate to the President of the United States the congressional power to fix tariffs, imposts, and duties. Mr. President, we should not do that. I do not accept the argument of the Senator from Illinois that we, the representatives of the American people, cannot cooperate with the President in negotiating a reciprocal trade agreement.

Let me tell the Senator from Illinois why I think that what he has said in his references to the period of years during which practically no such agreements were entered into by the United States, is true. The reason is that in that period of time the people of the United States did not favor such agreements. But today a great change has occurred; today, in my judgment, such agreements happen to be the will of the people. But they do not want us to carry them out contrary to constitutional provisions. They believe that we, as their representatives, should help work out such agreements, and should be a party to them. But the President would deprive us of being a party to them.

Time and time again, many of us, including the Senator from Illinois, do not even know what these agreements are. In fact, the people of foreign countries know about them long before we do.

What I am pleading for, in the course of my debate with the Senator from Illinois, is that he join with me, as I am willing to join with him, in fighting for a program of reciprocal trade agreements. But I have confidence in the representatives of the people who want such agreements. I have confidence that we can succeed in having such fair agreements put through the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By the treatymaking power?

Mr. MORSE. But I am not willing to give to the President the dictatorial power that the Senator from Illinois is willing to give him. I am not willing to make any President the kind of dictator over the economic life of the people that the Senator from Illinois apparently is willing to make him, by surrendering congressional powers. I am not willing to surrender the congressional powers under article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, to Dwight Eisenhower or to any other President; and I have so argued here on the floor of the Senate for many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon proposing, therefore, that before any agreement can be effective, it must be ratified by the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I am proposing that after the President approves an agreement—either at Geneva or wherever else such agreements are negotiated—a period of 90 days shall elapse, while the Congress is in session; and the agreement shall not become effective if, during the period of 90 days, either House by resolution directs that the treaty shall not go into effect. That will be a constitutional check.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will be a check, all right.

Mr. MORSE. And it is one that is sorely needed.

I am not in favor of giving the President of the United States the power to participate, through a representative in Geneva, in entering into an agreement affecting a segment of American industry, while the Congress of the United States sits helpless.

But in the debate we have reached the point where, if one of us raises his voice against a proposed reciprocal trade policy, it is said that he does not believe in reciprocal trade. Mr. President, I do believe in reciprocal trade, but I insist that we work out reciprocal trade agreements under the Constitution. I do not understand why the Senator from Illinois assumes the premise that the Congress must be gotten out of the picture before we can have a reciprocal trade agreement. The people of my State are in favor of such agreements, but they are also in favor of having them worked out under the framework of the Constitution. That is what I propose to do. Under article II of the Constitution, which provides that the President shall execute the laws enacted by Congress, I am not going to seek to delegate to the President the power, in effect, to write laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is quite well aware of the fact that when the specific duties and tariffs were passed by Congress, the result, in nearly every instance, was that the industries which demanded protection simply swamped the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. But in those early days there was not a Tariff Commission, either. It was established later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there was a Tariff Commission in 1882.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, but I refer to the period before then.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And some of the worst tariff bills were passed shortly after that time. I think one of the worst was the McKinley bill. The McKinley bill, the Dingley bill, the Fordney bill, and the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy bill constitute a chamber of horrors. In Madam Tussards' Chamber of Horrors they would rate very high.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Illinois a question concerning the two periods of American history about which we find ourselves in such complete disagreement, insofar as interpretation is concerned. Prior to the establishment of the Tariff Commission, the tariff bills were written on the floors of the two Houses of Congress. In my judgment, American history shows that in that period of time the overwhelming majority of the American people were protectionists.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I challenge that opinion. The Democratic Party was extremely strong from 1876 to 1896 and was dominant from 1912 to 1920.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would expect the Senator from Illinois to challenge it. But the fact is that during that period the American people returned to the Congress, term after term, men who ran before the people on platforms for high protection; and they were elected and reelected.

I believe in representative government, and I believe that the victories of the protectionists came under representative government; those men ran in their campaigns on the tariff issue, and were elected. They served in Congress, and were elected and reelected; and that situation in regard to tariffs existed for a number of decades.

Then something began to happen; there began to be a shift in public opinion. More and more persons started coming over to the so-called free trade approach, although free trade in those days was quite different from free trade as we now understand it. But there was ashift in public opinion in the Nation.

So it was decided that some expert help should be obtained, at least in administration; and the Tariff Commission was set up as an agent of the Congress. Congress then simply laid down general criteria or standards for the Tariff Commission to apply. But still, even as of then, the so-called high-tariff point of view was the prevalent point of view throughout the country.

There is a third period to which I call the Senator's attention, and we are living in it. Now I think the American people recognize that we cannot live unto ourselves alone economically. I think the American people now recognize that we are doomed economically if we try to go along in this century on the basis of any program of economic isolationism. Therefore, we now have support—thanks to Roosevelt and Truman—for the ideal of a reciprocal-trade program. I am for the ideal, but I refuse to accept the assumption of my friend from Illinois that we cannot practice that ideal unless we delegate all our powers to the President of the United States. The people expect us to do our job on reciprocal trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am afraid my good friend from Oregon represents an ambivalence in the mind of the American people when he says that he is for reciprocal trade. Nearly everyone gives verbal adherence to that doctrine now, but in practice we find a very large percentage using every practical means

they can to stymie it. When we reach an extreme case, ambivalence becomes schizophrenia. I am not suggesting that the Senator from Oregon has progressed or degenerated to that point, but I do say that he is ambivalent. He reminds me of the character in Stephen Leacock's short story, who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions. On the one hand, he is for reciprocal trade. On the other hand, he is for putting shackles on reciprocal trade. As Mr. Dooley once described Theodore Roosevelt as saying, "On the one hand I am for smashing the trusts. On the other hand, not so fast."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my friend from Illinois that I have not been deluded, as I respectfully say his argument shows he is, by executive power. There is no great virtue in executive power. Unchecked power exercised by the executive is a tremendous danger to free government in this country today; and the Senator from Illinois, as a great liberal—he is a great liberal—should remember that he, like the Senator from Oregon, is entitled to his fair share of mistakes. On this question I think the Senator from Illinois is making one of his bad ones.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have made mistakes before. It is quite possible that I may make mistakes in the future.

Mr. MORSE. So have I made mistakes. But I do not think I make a mistake when I hold firm to the principle that the Congress of the United States should not relinquish its powers. I cannot erase from the Constitution article I, section 8.

Let me mention something else the Senator from Illinois is overlooking in the third period. First, we had the period before the Tariff Commission, then the period of the Tariff Commission without the reciprocal trade program, and now we have a reciprocal trade agreements statute on the books. We are seeking only some amendments to it. This statute really gives the stamp of approval to the ideal of a reciprocal trade program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A platonic ideal, in effect, without any relationship to reality.

Mr. MORSE. The people are for it; but the people have already had some sad experiences under it. They have seen how reciprocal trade has been used to the great disadvantage of our country in certain instances.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In what instances?

Mr. MORSE. In connection with agriculture. Today American agriculture has already suffered in some segments from a reciprocal trade program. This afternoon, before I finish, I shall offer amendments to seek to give greater protection to certain segments of American agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. American agriculture, so far as wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice are concerned, needs an export market; and we cannot get an export market for those products unless we take imports, under some reciprocal trade arrangement.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know why we must economically erode some farms in order to build up others. What we are doing is supporting a program of economic erosion for some segments of agriculture, on the theory that it might help some other segments of agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again I say to my good friend that I supported the Kennedy-Humphrey amendment. I am sorry that only four hands were raised in the Senate when a request was made for a yea-and-nay vote on it. I would have welcomed the opportunity to record my vote on it, because it provided that those injured by low tariffs could be compensated. I believe that is a social cost. However, we should not allow an incidental social cost to blind us to the general benefits.

Mr. MORSE. When I can agree with the Senator from Illinois I am happy to do so. I would have been glad to raise my hand in support of a request for the yeas and nays on the Humphrey amendment if it had not been for the fact that I was testifying before a committee at the time in support of a bill.

I wish to come back to the particular point of difference between the Senator from Illinois and myself. I listened to him point out his arguments in language which caused me to form the conclusion that he seems to think that the Congress of the United States is really the enemy of the public interest when it comes to the matter of fixing duties, and that the people cannot look to the Congress to protect their interest. That I wish to deny with all the emphasis of which I am capable, because I think the Senator from Illinois does a great injustice to the Congress when he takes such a position, and I think he casts an unwarranted reflection on the intelligence of the American people.

The American people trust us, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, and we have a duty to carry out that delegated authority. In my judgment, we cannot escape the conclusion that under the proposal which the Senator from Illinois is supporting, without a check on the President, we would be delegating to him a function which the Congress ought to exercise in cooperation with him, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

That is my position on this question, and on my amendment. I wish the Senator from Illinois would give some attention to the wording of the amendment. Under the terms of the amendment not a single reciprocal trade negotiation at Geneva would be stopped. The representatives of the various nations could go ahead and negotiate. When they were through negotiating our representatives would have to make it clear, as the Canadian and British representatives must make clear, that they do not act with finality, but that they must come back, under our Constitution, and subject the proposed agreement to constitutional processes.

In my judgment, article I, section 8 of the Constitution is a clear mandate upon the Congress of the United States not to delegate to the President, either in his executive capacity or in a special capacity as an administrative officer of the Congress of the United States, the power to settle a trade agreement in Geneva with finality.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I am satisfied that with the kind of check I am suggesting no tariffs would be written on the floor of the Senate. I am satisfied that with the check I am suggesting there would be no difference in the processes of negotiating trade agreements at Geneva. The difference would be that the President of the United States would let us in on the act. The President of the United States would tell us what the agreement was about. The President of the United States would have to inform us as to the terms of the agreement, and we would have 90 days within which to take a look at it. If we thought the President had done a good job through his emissaries at Geneva, we would do nothing, and the agreement would automatically become law at the end of 90 days.

What is wrong with a waiting period of 90 days? Why must the agreement be final in Geneva when the signatures are signed to the agreement? Why not wait for 90 days? Does the Senator from Illinois think for a moment that it is not true that the procedure we have worked out under the reciprocal trade program places the presumption in favor of the President when he negotiates an agreement? Under the terms of my amendment such presumption would remain just as strong. I think a clear case would have to be made in either branch of the Congress to show that the President should be overruled in connection with a particular trade agreement. Prediction is always risky, of course, but I am willing to venture the conjecture that if my amendment were adopted, the Senator from Illinois would find very few trade agreements changed or rejected by the Congress.

Let me tell the Senator from Illinois what I think would be the situation. I believe that my amendment would serve clear notice on our negotiators that they had better see to it that they negotiate a real reciprocal agreement, and that they do not do irreparable damage to some segment of American industry. I think the taxpayers of the country are entitled to such protection from our representatives at Geneva.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

I think it is a very good thing to teach the totalitarian governments in Europe this kind of checking system in a democracy. We should teach them that the President of the United States really does not sit in the White House as an economic dictator, which I say most respectfully the Senator from Illinois would make him out to be, if we do not put a check on the President as well as on the Senator from Illinois.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Oregon will not place too painful a check on me.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no. It will be a check of love and affection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon if he is acquainted with the writings of Jonathan Swift?

Mr. MORSE. I am not a student of them, as is the Senator from Illinois, but I have spent many hours reading them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator read Gulliver's Travels?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember Gulliver's voyage to the country of Lilliput, the land of the pygmies? Gulliver fell asleep and woke up to find that the pygmies had bound him with little threads, each of which was minute, but, taken in their totality, they prevented him from moving.

Now, the Senator from Oregon may not be a pygmy. I do not think he is, but he is playing the part of a Lilliputian in trying to bind the Gulliver of freer trade with restriction after restriction after restriction, to prevent a reduction in tariffs. If the Senator from Oregon has not read Gulliver recently, I would suggest that he read it tonight before he goes to bed. If he does so he will see how accurately it describes his conduct and behavior.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to my friend from Illinois that his kind of argument, based on analogy, always has the delightful feature that it may be turned back on him. It is the American people who are being bound in this matter by the kind of giant power the Senator from Illinois wants to give to the President of the United States. It is not a pygmy power, but a giant power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator from Oregon is saying that I am taking a voyage in Brobdingnag, the land of the giants, instead of in Lilliput.

Mr. MORSE. I am saying that the Senator from Illinois is seeking to give the President of the United States an arbitrary and capricious power I do not believe the Senate should relinquish to him. The Senator would give the President unchecked power. I would check the President's power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We already have the peril point and escape clause provisions.

Mr. MORSE. I have voted for those provisions. However, as I have stated in years gone by, the record will show that they are ineffective checks. The real check is the kind of check that I am proposing this afternoon, or the even stronger check which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] proposed. I believe mine is the weaker of the two checks. However, I believe it is adequate. We should have a waiting period of 90 days, while Congress is in session, so that we may take a look at an agreement. Then if there is cause to ask for a change, we should proceed to debate it. If one House of Congress says to the President, "We do not think this is in the public interest," he has no final say with regard to that agreement, and he must try again.

Mr. President, I have made my major point on this particular amendment. I said that I did not intend to talk at great length on the amendment. I am glad that I was able to engage in the interesting colloquy with the Senator from Illinois, because as a lawyer I always enjoy an argument with an economist. However, when it comes to asking economists for expert advice, I am almost a little amused when economists set themselves up as constitutional lawyers, of a sort of sea captain type.

I respectfully say to the Senator from Illinois that as an economist he ought to spend some time reading the Constitution of the United States and the Supreme Court decisions that interpret it, instead of Gulliver's Travels. If he did that, he would have a better understanding of article I, section 8, than he has demonstrated today on the floor of the Senate. If he did so, he would know that we cannot delegate, under the Constitution, legislative powers, and he ought to join with me in insisting that we check the President of the United States and work out reciprocal trade agreements cooperatively with the President of the United States.

In closing I wish to say I am proud again to join with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the brilliant constitutional argument he made this afternoon. It was a refresher course in constitutional law for the Senator from Illinois, who sorely needed it in this debate. I submit my amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. First I wish to say that I listened with great profit to the discussion between those two lovebirds, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois.

Do I understand that the Senator from Oregon claims that the legislation we contemplate here is unconstitutional if it is passed in the form in which it is now before the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I say that I believe the legislation has the effect of delegating a legislative power. However, because the United States Supreme Court, in the close cases to which I have referred, held that if Congress so frames a law that it seems to be delegating an administrative power, the law probably will be sustained as a delegation of an administrative power.

However, we should not engage in a kind of intellectual sleight of hand. We should recognize what we are doing. What we are really doing is passing to the President of the United States, to all intents and purposes, the power of finality over the matter of fixing duties.

Mr. WILEY. We know that Secretary of State Hull entered into a great many agreements.

In *Field* v. *Clark*, decided in 1892, this type of legislation was sustained against the objection that it attempted an unconstitutional delegation "of both legislative and treatymaking powers."

I am reading from page 442 of the Constitution of the United States of America, Annotated, with the printing of which I have had something to do.

My second question is——

Mr. MORSE. Let us pause there for a moment. I am familiar with the decision the Senator has referred to.

There is nothing unconstitutional about a reciprocal trade-agreement program, provided we follow constitutional checks. In my judgment we ought to make doubly sure that we do not delegate in effect any legislative power. We are delegating it in effect. I believe the people we represent have a right to expect us to exercise the duty of seeing to it that the President's agreements are reviewed by Congress.

Mr. WILEY. I understand that. The point I was making—and I want to make it clear—is that I understood the first point the Senator from Oregon has made is that it is unconstitutional because it is delegating legislative power.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no.

Mr. WILEY. The Supreme Court held just the opposite. In a later case, *Altman & Co.* v. *the United States* (224 U. S. 583), decided 20 years later, a collateral question was passed upon.

I shall read further from the Constitution, Annotated:

This was whether an act of Congress which gave the Federal circuit courts of appeal jurisdiction of cases in which "the validity or construction of any treaty, * * * was drawn in question" embraced a case involving a trade agreement which had been made under the sanction of the Tariff Act of 1897. Said the Court: "While it may be true that this commercial agreement, made under authority of the Tariff Act of 1897, paragraph 3, was not a treaty possessing the dignity of one requiring ratification by the Senate of the United States, it was an international compact, negotiated between the representatives of two sovereign nations and made in the name and on behalf of the contracting countries, and dealing with important commercial relations between the two countries, and was proclaimed by the President.

If not technically a treaty requiring ratification, nevertheless it was a compact authorized by the Congress of the United States, negotiated and proclaimed under the authority of its President.

We think such a compact is a treaty under the Circuit Court of Appeals Act, and, where its construction is directly involved, as it is here, there is a right of review by direct appeal to this Court.

My second question——

Mr. MORSE. Let us pause on that question. The decision itself, as the Senator has pointed out, involves a transaction that was authorized by Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Surely, but——

Mr. MORSE. And on that basis reciprocal trade agreements are approved——

Mr. WILEY. Under the Tariff Act of that date.

Mr. MORSE. Within the policy of Congress. That was my thesis. If the Senator from Wisconsin had listened—and the RECORD will speak for itself tomorrow—I pointed out that the reciprocal trade agreement program has been sustained on that basis, namely, that the persons responsible for it are carrying out an administrative act, not a legislative act.

Then I pointed out to the Senate that what we are in effect doing, however—and I referred to it as a sort of sleight of hand—is transferring the tariff-making powers to the President of the United States.

I am willing to do that on an administrative basis, provided we place a check on the President. I am willing to do it if we recognize that he is doing it as an administrative officer of Congress, not as President of the United States acting under article II of the Constitution.

I repeat that part of the argument. When the President enters into reciprocal trade agreements, as far as these trade agreements are concerned, he is really functioning as an administrative officer of Congress, not as the Chief Executive, with powers under article II.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield further, I think it was on that latter point that I felt I had noticed something I had not noticed before. It related to the advisability, not the legality, of putting into operation that check. That is the very point the Senator from Oregon has made which I believe bears looking into, in view of the fact that in this decision the Supreme Court has definitely found that it is correct and legal for the legislative branch to delegate, under the tariff laws, the power that is now included in the present bill.

Mr. MORSE. Oh no, no. No Supreme Court decision has held anything like that. There is no Supreme Court decision on the present bill. The Supreme Court has not passed on the present bill. What the Senator is doing is arguing, by way of analogy, that the terms of the acts are the same.

I am too good a lawyer to accept that kind of citation of precedent. When we call on the President of the United States under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, to carry out an administrative function, I raise the question whether, in effect, we are not, in the name of giving him an administrative function, giving him the power to go further than that. I would put a check on him. That is all I am asking.

Mr. WILEY. I understand the Senator, but I think he could be mistaken about it, when there is in this volume which was prepared by a distinguished lawyer, this language:

> In *Field* v. *Clark* this type of legislation was sustained against the objection that it attempted an unconstitutional delegation of both legislative and treaty-making powers.

That is the point I have in mind.

Mr. MORSE. It delegated administrative power. It was, therefore, constitutional. I referred to those cases. There are many in addition to the Clark case. But unless the Court can find there has been a delegation of administrative power, it would be unconstitutional. Let me point out to the Senator that we cannot find the answer by hiding behind this facade of administrative function when we know that what is happening is that the President of the United States is writing tariffs.

Mr. WILEY. Does the present bill contemplate delegating legislative power?

Mr. MORSE. I think it will get by the Supreme Court.

Mr. WILEY. Please answer the question, yes or no.

Mr. MORSE. Do not interrupt me until I am through. I think the Supreme Court would sustain the present bill on the same ground on which it sustained the Clark case when it found an administrative function. How does that relieve the Senator of his responsibility to protect the people of Wisconsin in regard to their tariff rights? I do not think we should exercise that kind of a function in the Senate of the United States. I think we should be fighting for the application of the check which the Senator so eloquently talks about regarding our glorious system of checks and balances under the Constitution. Here is a chance for the Senator from Wisconsin to put his nice-sounding speeches into effect by voting for my amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for his "plug." Is not the whole argument, based upon what he has stated, the advisability of putting into effect what he calls a check-and-balance system; and is it not also true that others have the right to contemplate and think whether or not that check-and-balance system would not put us out of business? Have we not a perfect check and balance when any agreement which has been entered into could be abrogated by a joint resolution at any time, by the joint action of the two Houses? That is my question.

Mr. MORSE. It is a very interesting question, because the Senator from Wisconsin knows the answer to it. He knows that the joint resolution procedure is not going to be resorted to by the Congress. If we give the President the power we are giving him in this bill and do not provide for the check procedure, no check is going to be exercised against him by a joint resolution. We do not know the terms of a great many of the reciprocal trade agreements which have already been entered into.

I wish to say to the Senator that he will find me fighting shoulder to shoulder with him in opposition to the Bricker amendment when it comes before the Senate. But what the Senator is saying now is helping to make votes for the Bricker amendment. I wish to make it necessary for the President of the United States to notify us as to what is in the agreements negotiated at Geneva. The farmers in my State, the cherry growers, the apple growers, the pear growers, do not like some of the provisions in this bill, because we do not have a check. The President has not notified us as to what is in the agreements. That kind of a check should be put in so that we may know what the President is doing.

What the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Illinois are arguing for is a strengthening of Government by secrecy. There is no substitute for public disclosures on these matters. The American people are entitled to know the contents of these agreements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has let the pear, the peach, the apricot, the filbert, and the walnut out of the basket, and I think they loom larger in the Senator's mind than does the constitutional argument. He is making an argument for the walnuts, the apricots, the peaches, and the other products over which I have heard him weep. I have often, in the past heard him talk about the soft lambs in this body——

Mr. MORSE. We won that case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One could almost hear the bleating of the ewes as the Senator spoke of the soft lambs. Is he now going to desert the soft lambs?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have now what I think is the final non sequitur from the Senator from Illinois in his argument, because he is saying that different segments of our economy which have been done irreparable damage by unwise agreement at Geneva are not entitled to a constitutional check upon the President of the United States. Apparently he believes the President should be allowed to go ahead in secrecy, and not let us in on the act to prevent a wrong from being done.

We won the case on soft lambs. It did not involve reciprocal trade. It involved a bad Agriculture Department policy. We won it on the domestic front.

We have no right to accept the Senator's major thesis that in order to prevent injustice being done to the farmers of my State we should give the President of the United States greater powers to operate in secrecy. Whenever a reciprocal trade agreement comes before us the Senator will find me fighting for it, even though it may do some minor damage to some segment of the economy in my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Peaches, apples, walnuts, apricots, and cherries?

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of a fair reciprocal trade agreement dealing with apricots and cherries I shall go along, but not with many hundreds of acres of trees being uprooted in the past several years without a single dollar of compensation to the farmers who have lost those orchards.

What is wrong with protecting segments of our economy from a confiscation policy of the President of the United States which the great liberal from Illinois is defending on the floor of the Senate this afternoon? I am going to check him. We may win this fight next year or the year after. We shall win it once the American people come to understand the unsoundness of the position which the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator from Colorado have taken on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays. I think the Senator from Oregon is entitled to the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. I join in that request.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the acting majority leader wish to use all his remaining time?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield back such time as has been unused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to use his remaining time?

Mr. MORSE. I am desirous of developing a quorum, to see if a yea-and-nay vote cannot be had on my amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Frear	Millikin
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Barkley	Goldwater	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate, because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 73, as follows:

YEAS—13

Dworshak	Langer	Russell
Jenner	Magnuson	Scott
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Young
Kerr	Neely	
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—73

Aiken	Case, N. J.	Green
Allott	Case, S. Dak.	Hayden
Anderson	Clements	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Cotton	Hill
Barrett	Curtis	Holland
Beall	Daniel	Hruska
Bender	Dirksen	Humphrey
Bennett	Douglas	Ives
Bible	Duff	Jackson
Bricker	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Bridges	Ellender	Kefauver
Bush	Ervin	Knowland
Butler	Flanders	Lehman
Byrd	Frear	Long
Capehart	Fulbright	Malone
Carlson	Goldwater	Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.	Payne	Stennis
McCarthy	Potter	Symington
McClellan	Purtell	Thurmond
McNamara	Robertson	Thye
Millikin	Saltonstall	Watkins
Monroney	Smathers	Welker
Mundt	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Neuberger	Smith, N. J.	
Pastore	Sparkman	

NOT VOTING—10

Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
George	Kuchel	Williams
Gore	Mansfield	
Hennings	Murray	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment identified as "E"; and I have a perfecting amendment which I should like to have the clerk incorporate in the amendment.

My perfecting amendment or modification is as follows:

On page 2, in line 3, strike out the words "either House of" and insert the word "the" before the word "Congress"; and in the same line, before the word "resolution" insert the word "concurrent."

In line 4, before the word "opinion," strike out "the" and insert "its"; and in the same line, after the word "opinion", strike out the words "of that House."

Mr. President, I send the corrected or modified amendment to the desk, and ask that the amendment, as it now stands, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Subsection (c) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364) is amended by adding "(1)" after "(c)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In any case where the President makes a report, as provided in paragraph (1), he shall also transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives a message stating his reasons for not taking action on the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. The message shall be submitted to both Houses of Congress on the same day and to each House while it is in session. If, within 90 days of continuous session of the Congress following the receipt of such message, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that in its opinion the recommendations of the Tariff Commission should be carried out, then the President shall take action to carry out such recommendations. For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the 90-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak for only 2 or 3 minutes on the amendment.

I submit the amendment, and request its approval, for the same reasons I advanced in support of the previous amendment, namely, the importance of providing a check upon the President of the United States, for I believe we should write into this law checks upon the President, rather than give him power to the degree of finality which otherwise we would give him over the fixing of duties.

So, Mr. President, I submit the amendment, and request its adoption. The amendment merely provides that after the Tariff Commission makes its report to the President, and after the President files his report with the Congress, it shall remain before the Congress for a period of 90 days, before becoming final; and during that period the Congress shall have the power, through concurrent resolution, to reject the position taken by the President.

Mr. President, we must keep in mind the fact that the Tariff Commission is our administrative child. We should review its findings. I do not believe we should accept as automatically as we would under the present procedure, the position or procedure of the President.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the time available to me on the amendment.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has requested me to state, and to have the RECORD show, that he is opposed to any individual amendments to the bill, and that he is in favor of the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.]

The nays appear to have it; and the nays have it, and the amendment, as modified, is rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment—my last one—which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, in line 10, after the word "articles", it is proposed to insert "or raw materials or other components of such products or articles, respectively; and evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury to any readily determinable segment of such producing organizations shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products or articles."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in support of the amendment I wish to read a very brief statement:

On February 4 and March 11, I discussed the difficulties confronting fruitgrowers in Oregon and in other parts of the Nation with respect to their efforts to be heard in Tariff Commission proceedings. Growers of cherries, grapes, mint, and comparable products find the doors of the Tariff Commission closed to them when they seek to be heard in escape-clause and peril-point proceedings under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. We have heard a great deal about the peril-point and escape-clause proceedings, Mr. President, but the fact is that in actual administration they do not provide the

relief that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has sought in his arguments on this subject to lead the Senate to believe is afforded.

As the situation was described by a prominent member of the Cherry Growers Association, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, earlier this year, we find the following to be the case:

> The Tariff Commission in several escape-clause proceedings under section 7 of the present act, involving imports of finished products, has held that the term "domestic industry" as used in the act includes only the domestic manufacturers of the finished product involved, and does not include or cover growers, fishermen, or other producers of the raw material or components from which the finished product is prepared.
>
> The sweet-cherry industry of the United States, comprising the growers, handlers, and first processers of the fresh fruit, specifically has been denied status under the present escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. In 1952, in an escape-clause proceeding brought by glacé-cherry manufacturers, the Tariff Commission majority ruled that the cherry growers and the briners who grow and prepare the cherries used by the domestic glacé-cherry manufacturers are not a part of the domestic industry producing products like or directly competitive to imported glacé cherries, and that, therefore, any injury which the imports might cause to the growers and briners would be immaterial in determining whether or not the domestic industry was injured.

That results, Mr. President, in unfair discrimination against the farmers who are engaged in these particular fields of agricultural production.

These people—most of them farmers or individuals in the so-called small business category—are entitled to their day in court before the Tariff Commission. If they are not permitted to be heard, and to be heard in the very near future, the fruit growers and businessmen in many nonagricultural groups, such as fishermen and miners, will be faced with a restrictive interpretation in these cases as an accomplished fact.

The amendment I am offering today will, if enacted, accomplish two worthwhile results:

First. It will give these important segments of our agricultural and industrial economy the standing which they need so that they may be heard and have their claims for relief considered by the Tariff Commission.

Second. It will clear up any possible question of their right to be heard by the Commission because it states specifically that evidence of serious injury or threat of injury to the segment of an industry shall be considered evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury to the industry itself.

I recognize that the committee amendment gives to these segments of our economy standing, if the particular article which they produce is involved. But it is important that they, as producers of the raw materials, have standing before the Commission when the article under investigation is the finished produce processed from such raw materials.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would such a producing group or individual producer be permitted to present arguments before the Department of Agriculture, the Department, in turn, to represent such group or individual before the Tariff Commission? I think the Senator has raised a pertinent question.

Mr. MORSE. The processors and producers with whom I have talked tell me that they get no assistance from the Agriculture Department, and that the only way they know, from sad experience, that they can be protected is to have their day in court, before the Tariff Commission itself.

All I am asking for is a fair procedure. The Senator from Minnesota, as a result of his service with me in the Senate, knows what a stickler I am for fair procedure, which guarantees to Americans their day in court. All I am asking is that these farmer groups and small processors, small-business men, be allowed to present their case before the Tariff Commission, and not have the very narrow interpretation of the present law operate against them, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, the question I asked the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] when he had completed the explanation and presentation of the bill to the Senate, was whether provision had been made for the proper presentation of a cause before the Tariff Commission. He stated emphatically that the procedure had been simplified. He stated that the President could impose quotas, and that the situation with respect to the delay which had been experienced under the previous administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act had been greatly improved by the terms of the pending bill.

When I heard the Senator from Oregon, who is a distinguished lawyer, present the argument in behalf of the producer, I recognized that a serious and very important question was involved. I realized that if the cherrygrower, the applegrower, or any other type of individual grower, or growers as a group, did not have the opportunity to plead their case, the situation was serious from the standpoint of possible injury because of undue importations. I am very desirous of having the question thoroughly explored.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that the producers and growers are completely dissatisfied with the so-called improvements of the bill, because there is nothing in the bill as it stands at present which gives them, beyond any doubt, the right to go before the Tariff Commission and present their case. We should not require them to go through any agency of the Government. They ought to have their own day in court, and I think it is most unfair not to provide that day in court by way of procedure under the bill.

In closing, Mr. President, our Government cannot stand by idly and watch any segment of our agricultural or domestic economy drift into economic shoals without ever having given them an opportunity to present their cases to the Government at the Tariff Commission level. In too many instances they are denied the opportunity to make the case they would like to make and their relationships to the rest of our economy are so important that they have the right to be heard by an appropriate Government agency on facts that may relate to their survival.

That is all they are asking for, under my amendment. They are asking to be heard before the body which must make the first recommendation. They are asking the opportunity to be cross-examined by that body on the basis of the evidence they present. As a lawyer and a constitutional liberal I cannot bring myself to vote against a proposal on their part which seeks to give them what this amendment seeks to give them, namely, their day before the Tariff Commission. Therefore I urge serious consideration of this amendment, which affects so many farmers and small-business men across the length and breadth of our Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presented such an amendment to the committee, and the committee attempted to reach the objective stated by the Senator from Oregon, but apparently the language is somewhat unfortunate. I had intended to ask the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a series of questions which would probably clear up the legislative intent and interpret the word "growing" in the bill. Of course, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would clear up the question entirely. I was hoping that we might save time if the Senator from Virginia would take the amendment to conference and clear it up, because it is my understanding that the committee fully intended to do exactly what has been suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the basis of advice from the staff, I think I am prepared to answer the question of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me interrupt long enough to say to the Senator from Washington that I shall be delighted to have him join as a cosponsor of my amendment. I did not know that the Senator from Washington had offered such an amendment in the committee. I should be delighted to have the Senator's name added to my amendment as a cosponsor, if he cares to have the RECORD so show.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

The difficulty stems from the fact that in a case involving the cherry growers, the cherry growers found themselves out of court. They had no opportunity to get into court.

Mr. MORSE. Some other growers are also involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some other growers are also involved. The committee attempted to correct the situation, but I think possibly there might be some misinterpretation of the language. I think the better way would be for the committee to take this amendment to

conference and draft language consistent with the intent of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington cares to have his question answered, I am prepared to answer it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that. I did not know that the Senator from Texas was prepared to speak for the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was prompted by the fact that the cherry growers found themselves out of court in a case involving their interest. As the Senator from Oregon points out, many other growers are involved. Approximately 50 percent of the cherry crop goes into glazed cherries or other processed cherries. In 1952 the growers appeared before the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff Commission took a restricted view of what constituted domestic industry. In effect, it ruled the growers out of court. This difficulty involves many other growers.

Mr. MORSE. Another example of such a processed product is apple candy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The amendment was designed to give the growers their day in court, by making the definition of a domestic industry include producers of a raw product which is processed into a like or directly competitive product.

I read subsection (e) of section 6, on page 13 of the bill:

(e) As used in this act, the terms "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" and "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles" mean that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than 1 industry, or more than 1 readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.

In other words, reading subsection (e) in its entirety, I have the impression that, under the committee's new language, the cherry growers, for example, could have their day in court, because 50 percent of their product goes into glazed cherries, or other processed cherries. Excessive imports would be injurious to such growers.

I ask the Senator from Texas whether or not my understanding of the language is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been informed by counsel on the floor that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had carefully considered the statement made by the Senator from Washington, and if the Senator from Virginia were present on the floor, he would answer the question of the Senator from Washington in the affirmative, namely, that his statement is correct. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would clear up what the Senator from Oregon has discussed, because it involves many other problems.

Mr. MORSE. I respectfully say that I do not believe it clears it up. When we are dealing with a procedural program, the only way in which it can be cleared up is by writing the procedural guaranty into the legislation. That is exactly what my amendment would do. I see no reason why the committee should not accept the amendment and take it to conference. In conference the amendment can be considered. The committee on conference may be able to treat it in their conference report, and to write language which would make it more certain that any discussion on the floor could make it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have not only the discussion, which fortifies the amendment, but also the amendment. However, in lieu thereof, I do hope that the discussion on the floor will be helpful. I should like to associate myself with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, because it involves a very serious situation in the Pacific Northwest, and in all fruitgrowing areas of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. May I have the attention of the Senator from Texas? I am trying to live up to our gentleman's understanding that I would present my case as briefly as I can, consistent with the rights of the people involved. Do I understand the Senator from Texas is not in a position to take the amendment to conference? As I interpret the feeling of the Senate this evening, it seems to be that this matter ought to be cleared up. If the subject is taken to conference, and the conferees find that the position I take bears up, as I am sure it will bear up, then the conferees can bring it out of conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that we will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would have been all right the other way. I looked at it quite thoroughly today, but it is definitely clear now. I am sure that was the intention of the committee when the amendment was presented to the committee. I am sure the committee will prevail in conference, and the whole matter will be cleared up.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for bringing this subject before the Senate. I attended some of the conferences——

Mr. MORSE. And my colleague was very helpful in those conferences.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It was agreed that our fruit growers as primary processors had been grievously discriminated against—compared with other primary processors—in their ability to present their case to the Tariff Commission. For that reason I wish to associate myself with the views expressed so ably by my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I do sincerely thank the Senator from Texas for his cooperation on this matter and also the cooperation he has extended to me all afternoon as we have proceeded with the discussion of this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I reciprocate the Senator's sentiments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Apropos the question affecting agricultural products that has been raised by the Senator from Oregon, I should like to ask whether section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, remains in the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in case the pending bill is passed. Does section 22 remain in the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that section 22 is contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act. We are not doing anything to repeal section 22 of that act, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of where the section may be found, I should like to be sure that section 22 is left unimpaired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I so understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader. Does section 8 (a) of the last extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act remain in the act in case it is extended today? That section applies to perishable agricultural commodities, and applies a quick and peremptory course of action for the relief of perishable agricultural commodities which are threatened by foreign imports, in certain cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed by the staff—I do not have the exact information to supply to the Senator from Florida, because the chairman of the committee is at dinner—that the answer is no; it does not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Section 8 (a) is not left in the act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not. The staff informs me that it was amended to meet a temporary situation, and that section 8 (a) is still the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the answer of the distinguished Senator from Texas is that section 8 (a) is still in the law. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If that is the question the Senator is asking; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am asking that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The chairman of the committee has returned to the Chamber. I should like to ask him whether section 8 (a) of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as extended, remains in the law if the pending measure is passed.

Mr. BYRD. I am informed by the staff that that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank both distinguished Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5–3–55–J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, beginning with line 9, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 15, page 13, as follows:

SEC. 5. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (a)), is amended to read as follows: "The Tariff Commission shall immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.".

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

(b) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) As used in this act, the terms 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products' and 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles' means that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than 1 industry, or more than 1 readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the discussion on the reciprocal trade bill in the Senate pretty clearly indicates that the controversy over the tariff has taken a new phase.

For almost a century the struggle was whether we should have a protective tariff or a low tariff; whether the aim should be to protect American industry at whatever cost, or whether we should try to expand trade and gain the attendant advantages.

The proponents on each side were frank and open in their position. Henry Clay did not disguise the fact that he stood for protection. The great Democratic leaders of the century, John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina; Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi; Oscar Underwood, of Alabama; Cordell Hull, of Tennessee; and, yes, a little known Representative from my State who did heroic service, William R. Morrison, frankly argued for freer trade.

The issues were out in the open.

Senator Aldrich, Senator Smoot, Representative Fordney, Senator McCumber, Senator Grundy, and Representative Hawley were advocates of protection.

The issues met head on. A choice had to be made.

Now we seem to be in a period in which everyone gives lip service to the cause of reciprocal trade, but many, by clauses and reservations and amendments, seek in effect to prevent freer trade from coming into effect.

That is the extraordinary situation which we have in the Senate.

I must confess that I thought we were, in a sense, in an Alice-in-Wonderland world when my good friend, the brilliant senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] made his eloquent defense of reciprocal trade. That, indeed, seemed to me to be an extraordinary occurrence.

What is the point of this, Mr. President? Verbal adherence is given to the idea of reciprocal trade. The President says he believes in it. The Secretary of the Treasury, who succeeded Mark A. Hanna in his company, says he believes in it. The leaders of the Republican Party now say they believe in it. It is really quite extraordinary, Mr. President. But it is also interesting that at the same time some of them actively propose restrictions which, in practice, would tend to prevent freer trade from actually occurring.

We should not exaggerate the importance of this bill. To my mind, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is far more important than is this bill; and I almost feel the Senator from Colorado whetting his mighty broad ax as he gets ready to plunge it into the skull of GATT.

Mr. President, there is also the question of the extraordinary complications which now surround the tariff, the interminable delays in finding out what the tariff is going to be, the multiplication of redtape which discourages importers and strangles trade. All this is in the background. To my mind, a simplification of customs procedures which would permit classification of duties and articles into a few simple categories with given percentages and which would prescribe on what basis of value the tariff should be computed, would do far more for the cause of freer trade than does the bill presently before the Senate.

But this administration, Mr. President, has not prepared such a bill; or if it has prepared such a bill, it has not submitted it. So I find myself bemused at the situation which we face. The real issue is kept in the background, but a great verbal show is made that we are carrying forward a program of reducing tariffs and expanding trade so that this administration can go before the people and say, "Yes, we believe in freer trade." And the Madison Avenue boys can scatter their propaganda and advertise it over the country. But it is all froth and little substance.

Mr. President, that is the real practical situation, and those of us who have any insight into what is happening know that is so.

Mr. President, in my colloquy with my good friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I referred to the fact that many members of the public and of the Congress, with the best intentions in the world, are both for reciprocal trade and against it, at the same time. They are for it as a verbal matter, but when it touches cherries or soft lambs or walnuts or apricots or fish or wool or cheese or gingham or chemicals or bicycles, to mention an industry in my own State, they employ every means to prevent reciprocal trade from being effective. I think our good friends who take this position are honest, but as I said, they suffer from what the highbrows call ambivalence, which is to say that they are on both sides of the question at the same time. They like to run with the hounds and also be chased as a hare at the same time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has pointed out that they are for reciprocal trade, but they want a special exemption for bicycles. They would also like special protection for walnuts. There is really no conflict, because the reciprocity is between the bicycle man and the walnut man. One says, "You help me maintain my bowl of cherries for the evening, and I will help you obtain a sack of walnuts for the weekend." That is the reciprocity to which the Senator from Illinois refers.

I wish to associate myself with him in his reference to the alacrity with which the administration leaders speak up for reciprocal trade. They have had a conversion which makes me wonder whether the last principles and traditions of the Republican Party have been frittered away. There was a day when good, solid men stood here and advocated protection for infant industries, even though those infants had grown slightly out of their breeches. They are still for infant industry, breeches or no breeches, but they do not want to see anything really happen which would destroy the wonderful illusion they present in theory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is all very amusing, but I do not like to have cherries brought into the discussion as a divertisement. The Senator from Oregon and I were merely trying to allow those who grow cherries to be able to appear in court like representatives of any other industry. We do not know whether there will be any tariff. I am sure the Senator from Illinois has always advocated that everyone should have his day in court. The Senator can discuss bicycles, cheese, and all the other items he desires, but please leave out cherries. The cherry growers are merely trying to get their day in court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator mind if I mention lead, zinc, coal, oil, wool, and sugar?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now we are getting down to the meat of the tree nuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have gotten into a position where many pretend to be for reciprocal trade but are really not willing to carry it through to its logical conclusion. This is what I term ambivalence, being both for a proposition and against it at the same time, being both "yes" and "no." The psychiatrists have a word for the most pronounced cases of ambivalence, namely, schizophrenia, or split personality, one part of the personality going off in one direction and the other part of the per-

sonality going off in another direction. These are the most advanced cases of inconsistency, and they are not wholly absent from the discussion of this subject.

Mr. President, I think we should get down to fundamentals. Due to the Republicans we have bound reciprocal trade around with so many restrictions that it has been crippled in the past few years. Since the peril point and the escape clauses became a part of the law, no new agreements have been really negotiated.

Instead of removing these restrictions, instead of making it more possible to have broader trade, the committee has fastened still further restrictions into the bill; and it is these further restrictions in connection with the escape clause which I am trying to remove.

My amendment would strike out three further restrictions upon the escape clause which the committee has added to the bill. It would strike out section 5, on page 12, which directs not only that the Tariff Commission shall report to the President, but also shall make public its findings and recommendations, and print them. The amendment also would strike out section 6 (a), which contains some extremely interesting language. One can read it over and over again, compare it with the existing language, and still wonder what it means.

But I think I know what it means. It means that whereas now one can get a duty reduction removed if he proves that the reduction has directly injured his industry, in the future it can be removed if the injury is either actual or relative. Notice this language: "whether it has contributed materially to the serious injury or to the threat of serious injury to such industry."

Note the words "contributed materially." It does not have to be the primary cause; it does not have to be the predominant cause, of any injury; it simply has to be a material cause, a partial cause; and it may be only a threatened injury.

Under this provision, once the President has negotiated an agreement, and even once it is in effect, every industry in the country can run to the Tariff Commission.

My amendment would also strike out subsection (e), on page 13, which provides that it is not necessary to prove a contribution to a material injury or a threat of injury to an industry as a whole. There need be injury or threatened to only a minute part of the product of an industry, and an exemption can be claimed on that ground as well. The industry as a whole can prosper; but if there is one minute section of the industry which is hurt, then that industry can go to the Tariff Commission, the Tariff Commission can make its findings—and it has to publish its findings—and the heat can be turned on the President.

I do not wish to repeat an analogy I used before in a discussion with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; but this situation is very similar to what happened to Gulliver, when he strayed into the country of Lilliput and found himself bound by a large number of small threads, each of which was individually weak, but which collectively bound him hand and foot.

Now the enemies of reciprocal trade, instead of opposing reciprocal trade openly, have put the threads around the principle of freer trade, to make it impossible to function or, perhaps I should say, to make it difficult to function.

Then there is the club over GATT; and there is also retained the extraordinary complexity of our customs procedure. So the principle of freer trade is in the prisonhouse, and it will be very difficult to get it out.

But the administration has its slogan. It has the title to H. R. 1. Its high-powered advertising men can go forth over the country and say, "See, we have brought you freer trade." They can get advertising; the protectionists can get protection; everybody will be happy; and Congress will vote for the bill. We will go through this pious performance as though something great and fundamental had been effected.

The amendment I propose aims to strike out the three added restrictions. It would return the bill to the form, insofar as these provisions are concerned in which it passed the House. It would return the bill to the form in which the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, and the very able Representative from Tennessee, JERE COOPER, steered it through the House.

Mr. President, instead of adding to the difficulties, let us go back to the House version of the bill.

I now yield 15 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

No proposed legislation that comes before Congress at this session can command greater priority than H. R. 1. Extension of the Trade Agreements Act in itself would be legislation of considerable importance. For this legislation initiated in 1934 by my distinguished fellow Tennessean, the Honorable Cordell Hull, has served us well. In its original conception the trade agreement system was designed to assist in sweeping away the cobwebs of trade restrictions that had grown up as a result of the great depression. Judge Hull's vision was one of loosening the bonds of world trade so that production, employment, and standards of living throughout the world would be increased.

There can be no question that the trade agreements program made a significant contribution to that end. It helped support and sustain the economic recovery of the late thirties and added to the strength that was necessary to the successful prosecution of the war against totalitarian tyranny.

The extension of the Trade Agreement Act of 1945 was the last occasion on which additional authority was granted to the President with which to negotiate reductions in duties. On that occasion we were motivated by considerations that were not unlike those that gave birth to the Trade Agreements Act. Here again our concern was that of adding strength and substance to the economies of the free world. By the extension of 1945 we committed ourselves to fostering and participating in the economic growth of the free world community.

To be sure, the basic problems that faced the economies of our allies were problems of reconstruction from the fundamental economic disturbances that were brought on by the war. Trade can only follow production, and our concern was primarily in enhancing production and economic growth. Yet we knew that in a period of basic readjustment there would be a tendency for our allies to take protective steps through their trade policy which would be designed to protect their domestic market and to conserve foreign exchange.

We were interested in preventing the growth of trade restrictions such as those that grew up after the disaster of the great depression. To do that, we extended the trade-agreements program of 1945 and gave the President the authority to reduce tariffs by 50 percent below the level obtaining on January 1 of that year.

In 1947 the United States negotiated with the major trading nations of the world the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; an agreement on tariffs, as the name itself implies, as well as on trade rules. Through this agreement we have sought to maintain, even through the arduous days of the postwar reconstruction, the adherence to a liberal and nondiscriminatory world-trading system. We knew full well that only with economic recovery, particularly in Western Europe, would it be possible to accomplish a reconstruction in world trade, but we also knew that economic recovery was bound to come and that we had to preserve the gains which had already been made in world trade and to lay the groundwork for future achievements.

The extension of the Trade Agreements Act this year, therefore, has special meaning. For 2 years, the free-world economy has given evidence of growth and stability. What we had so devoutly hoped for when we initiated the Marshall plan has in great measure been realized. Production has been restored. Domestic inflation has been defeated, and world currencies enjoy a measure of strength they had not enjoyed in a good many years.

With this return to economic health, it becomes vitally important that we move ahead now to make the progress in expanding world trade that is so vital to continued health. The importance of enacting H. R. 1 is further heighted by the fact that it represents the first increase in the authority of the President to reduce tariffs since 1945, and only the third such increase in authority in the history of the Trade Agreements Act. It must be conceded that this increase in authority is very modest, and that the bill as a whole contains provision that make this increase in authority all the more modest.

I should like to refer to this aspect of H. R. 1 in greater detail in a few minutes, but I do wish to emphasize that, modest as this authority is, we have delayed too

long in granting it to the Executive. For 2 years we have backed and filled instead of moving forward. Where boldness was required, we were hesitant. Surely today we cannot afford to do anything less than to pass H. R. 1 without reservations and without cavil.

And yet I feel obliged to express my fears to my colleagues in the Senate that the bill reported out by the Senate Finance Committee entails compromises and modifications that seriously impair this modest extension and grant of authority. These compromises and amendments are products of fear and not boldness. They are not becoming to our position of leadership. They are inconsistent with our position as a great creditor nation. They are the expression of timidity and fear in the face of all the evidence that we are the most enterprising, productive, and competitive country in the world.

There has been, in the last few years, a gradual undercutting of the authority of the Trade Agreements Act. First the escape clause, then the peril-point amendment. The pressures for the protection of special interest groups have worked assiduously in the direction of gradually modifying the authority contained in the act. As a result, when the Trade Agreements Act was scheduled for extension in 1953 it was extended in that year, and in the succeeding year, for only a 1-year period. When the bill finally came to the Congress it embodied and continued in force all the previous amendments which were designed to be protective of those domestic producers who feared foreign competition. Not only that, but as I have said already, the increase in authority that it contained was very modest.

It is my feeling, in view of these considerations, that were H. R. 1 enacted with additional amendments, we would be in danger of having a hollow shell of the trade policy, without any real substance to that policy. My concern for the status of the bill, as reported out by the Finance Committee, is that the amendments proposed come close to undercutting the modest positive grant of authority contained in the bill.

These amendments are of two kinds. There are, first, amendments that reduce the authority of the President which was contained in the House version of the bill. In this category are the so-called textile amendments, which in fact, apply to a great many other imported items. By virtue of these amendments, the modest 15 percent tariff reduction authority of H. R. 1 will not be able to be used for those items which will receive greater than 15-percent duty cuts in the trade agreement negotiations currently being undertaken with Japan and several other countries, on the one hand, and the bilateral trade agreement currently being undertaken with Switzerland, on the other. The effect of this amendment will be to preclude the use of the authority of H. R. 1 for those items which are of considerable importance in the trade of Japan and Switzerland, as well as in the trade of a great many other countries of the world.

We may find in the next 3 years that there will be occasions when we may want to participate with Japan and with other countries in a multilateral trade agreement, and we may find that the President does not have sufficient authority under the Trade Agreements Act to negotiate effectively a trade agreement.

The other amendment which involves a reduction in the authority of the President is that amendment which removes the previous authority of the President to reduce the duties by 50 percent of the January 1, 1945, level on those items which are not being imported into the United States at all, or which are being imported in negligible quantities. I fail to understand why that amendment should have been considered. I am told that it too is a textile amendment; that the cotton textile industry regards imports of cotton textiles to be negligible, and therefore that these imports would be subject to this authority. But there are several aspects of this contention which I find inconsistent with the facts.

If, in fact, imports of cotton textiles are presently negligible, how is it that the cotton textile industry can argue that they are being inundated and swamped by competitive imports? Secondly, the authority to reduce duties on these so-called negligible imports by 50 percent is nothing more than an extension of existing authority; that is, the authority originally granted on January 1, 1945. This is the same authority which will be used up in part in the current trade agreement negotiations with Japan and other countries. This is the same authority which has been used in the previous trade agreements undertaken since 1945. In those trade agreements over 90 percent of our imports of cotton manufactures received some duty cut, and, on the average, this duty reduction was 30 percent. Thus, only 20 percent remains to be used in the current negotiations with Japan. To the extent that some of the 20 percent is used upon in these negotiations, only that which is left can be used to reduce the duty on negligible imports.

On balance, it would seem to me that the textile industry has very little to fear from this provision; and yet, from the point of view of our national trade policy, it seems to me that we have much to gain by retaining this provision. There are, I understand, something on the order of 500 dutiable items where there are no imports, and about 600 that are imported in negligible quantities. In a great many of these instances, I would assume that there are no imports because their duty is prohibitive. This amendment would thus fail to provide the President with some special authority greater than the 15 percent authority he has under H. R. 1 to reduce the duty on these items.

By accepting this amendment we are in danger of foregoing the opportunity of telling the rest of the world that we, the great United States, are prepared to give the foreign producer at least a fighting chance to sell those items in our market, which, for one reason or another, he has not been able to sell at all in the past, or that he has sold in only negligible quantities.

Most disturbing of all to me are the amendments to H. R. 1 which would modify the standards and criteria of the escape clause, which is the subject of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois. I have long felt that an escape clause procedure should be available for use only in those instances when severe and undue hardship or injury results to an American producer as a result of an increase in imports. The whole spirit of our trade agreements program is one of gradual reduction in duties, reductions that would bring about an increase in imports which would be equally gradual and would provide adequate time for any adjustment that may be necessary in domestic industry. Sometimes, however, foresight in effecting a duty reduction has proven to be wrong, and as a result of a tariff reduction there may result a substantial, unsual, and unexpected increase in imports which causes serious injury to a domestic producer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, under these circumstances I can understand that the duty reduction which has been granted should be modified, if it is in the total national interest to do so.

What has disturbed me, however, has been the effort to broaden the escape clause and to make it an umbrella for protection against all sorts of injury, whether serious or not, whether due to imports or not. The amendments offered by the Finance Committee to the escape clause seem to me to broaden excessively the notion of injury. They would have the effect of increasing immeasurably the number of petitions to the Tariff Commission for the use of the escape clause, the number of cases in which the Tariff Commission would be obliged to find injury, the pressures on the President to invoke the escape clause, and consequently the number of instances in which tariff concessions previously made as part of international agreement would be modified or withdrawn. Since these new tests of the escape clause would make it virtually possible for almost any producer to claim injury if competitive imports were coming into this country, the logical outcome of these amendments, if carried to the extreme, would be to cut off all competitive imports, and they would result in the abrogation of trade agreements entered into with other countries. Our trading partners could resort to no other course than to withdraw concessions they have given us. To the extent that the higher duties resulting under the escape clause resulted in a reduction of imports into the United States, foreign countries would find themselves with sharply reduced dollar earnings. The only result could be a decline in our exports. Thus, the basic objective of the Trade Agreements Act, namely, to ex-

pand the market for American exports, stands in danger of being defeated.

Let us look a little more closely at the two amendments to the escape clause reported by the Finance Committee. What is it that they propose to do that could have such dire results?

The first committee amendment has the effect of fixing into law the so-called share of the market criterion. This criterion says that if the domestic industry finds that the percentage share of the market that it enjoys has declined, that constitutes injury to that industry; even though its own production, sales, and profits have been increasing, if it does not retain its percentage share of the total domestic market, it has been injured. This is tantamount to saying that serious injury exists when the domestic industry fails to gain something it has never had. That is a very dangerous doctrine indeed. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, it would remedy that defect.

The same committee amendment also establishes that the injury is due to imports if the imports have "contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry." Thus, imports may not be the prime cause, or even one of the important causes of injury; but if there are competitive imports, then this amendment fixes into law the test that mere existence of imports can be regarded as the cause of injury, regardless of whether, in fact, they are the cause.

Under the amendment, I believe it would be possible for an industry which makes, for instance, 10 products, purposely to withdraw one of the products from the market, on the claim that it could not compete with a foreign producer; and thereafter, after securing an adjustment under this committee amendment, regardless of how much profit it might be making on the other items it manufactured, it could secure a tariff reduction on the one particular product, and later could resume manufacturing all of them, but at a greater profit.

The second committee amendment redefines the meaning of the term "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products," which is contained in the existing escape clause. The redefinition takes the form of saying that any part or subdivision of an industry shall be regarded as an industry. Any minor segment of a producing organization which produces a particular product shall be regarded as an industry. Not only does this violate the commonsense interpretation of the meaning of the word "industry," but it permits the use of the escape clause to protect every minor, individual product produced by an industry, regardless of how important that product is in the total production of that industry, and regardless of how profitable or how successful the overall position of that industry or that firm is.

Even the minor adjustments in our economy which could not, under any sensible test of injury, be injurious to domestic producers would be precluded from taking place so long as some competitive imports were lurking in the background.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for H. R. 1 when it comes to final vote in this Chamber, but I shall do so with great reservations and trepidation, because I feel that as it now stands it is totally inadequate as an instrument of national policy. The bill before us is a watered-down version of a modest piece of legislation. The bill now before us is a product of weakness and compromise, where national policy requires boldness and vision.

Mr. President, the bill can be improved by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. In the effort to keep our trade program in line with the situation in which we must have it if we are to exercise our proper influence, economicwise, among the nations of the world, by means of trade, I believe that we must at least agree to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 22 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the past several days we have heard several notable speeches in the Senate on the reciprocal trade bill. I wish to compliment especially the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on his speech of April 25, and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on his speech of May 3. Both speeches are strong statements of the true facts about foreign trade. I do not propose to repeat at this time their statements of those facts. The case is clear, as it has been for a century and a half, or perhaps I should say as it has been since the day when man first began to trade an arrowhead for a stone ax.

Mr. President, I must say that some of the debate we have heard today has made me feel as if I were in the well-known land of Alice in Wonderland. When I heard with my own ears and saw with my own eyes the distinguished, illustrious, and notable senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] defend the reciprocal-trade program, I did not know what to think. Certainly the situation which has developed in the Senate is an amazing one.

I do not think the pending bill is a good one, Mr. President, but it is the only one with which we can deal at this time. Therefore, I must, in the final analysis, support it.

I believe that the amendment submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will go a long way toward improving the bill and making it, at least to some extent, a real contribution to reciprocal trading.

Mr. President, recently I came across an article entitled "Fallacies of the Tariff," written by W. M. Curtiss. The article, which appeared in the January issue of Freedom and Union, demonstrates in an understandable manner the stupidity of high tariffs for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALLACIES OF THE TARIFF

(By W. M. Curtiss)

More than a century ago, Frederic Bastiat, a French economist and an ardent opponent of protectionism, drew on Daniel Defoe's immortal classic, Robinson Crusoe, to illustrate the evils of trade restrictions:

"You remember how Robinson Crusoe managed to make a plank when he had no saw."

"Yes; he felled a tree, and then, cutting the trunk right and left with his hatchet, he reduced it to the thickness of a board."

"And that cost him much labor?"

"Fifteen whole days' work."

"And what did he live on during that time?"

"He had provisions."

"What happened to the hatchet?"

"It was blunted by the work."

"Yes; but you perhaps do not know this: that at the moment when Robinson was beginning the work he perceived a plank thrown by the tide upon the seashore."

"Happy accident. He, of course, ran to appropriate it?"

"That was his first impulse; but he stopped short, and began to reason thus with himself:

" 'If I get this plank, it will cost me only the trouble of carrying it, and the time needed to descend and remount the cliff. But if I form a plank with my hatchet, first of all, it will procure me 15 days' employment; then my hatchet will get blunt, which will furnish me with the additional employment of sharpening it; then I shall consume my stock of provisions, which will be a third source of employment in replacing them. Now, labor is wealth. It is clear that I should ruin myself by getting the plank. I must protect my personal labor; and, now that I think of it, I can even increase that labor by throwing back the plank into the sea.' "

"But this reasoning was absurd."

"No doubt. It is nevertheless the reasoning of every nation which protects itself by prohibition. It throws back the plank which is offered in exchange for a small amount of labor in order to exert a greater amount of labor. Even in the labor of the customhouse officials it discovers a gain. That gain is represented by the pains which Robinson takes to render back to the waves the gift which they had offered him. Consider the nation as a collective being, and you will not find between its reasoning and that of Robinson an atom of difference."

"Did Robinson not see that he could devote the time saved to something else?"

"What else?"

"As long as a man has wants to satisfy and time at his disposal, there is always something to be done. I am not bound to specify the kind of labor he would in such a case undertake."

"I see clearly what labor he could have escaped."

"And I maintain that Robinson, with incredible blindness, confounded the labor with its result, the end with the means, and I am going to prove to you * * *."

"There is no need. Here we have the system of restriction or prohibition in its simplest form. If it appear to you absurd when so put, it is because the two capacities of producer and consumer are in this case mixed up in the same individual."

"Let us pass on, therefore, to a more complicated example."

"With all my heart. Some time afterward, Robinson, having met with Friday, they united their labor in a common work. In the morning they hunted for 6 hours, and brought home 4 baskets of game. In the evening they worked in the garden for 6 hours and obtained 4 baskets of vegetables."

"One day a canoe touched at the island. A good-looking foreigner landed, and was admitted to the table of our two recluses. He tasted and commended very much the produce of the garden, and before taking leave of his entertainers, spoke as follows:

" 'Generous islanders, I inhabit a country where game is much more plentiful than here, but where horticulture is quite unknown. It would be an easy matter to bring you every evening 4 baskets of game, if you will give me in exchange 2 baskets of vegetables.'

"At these words Robinson and Friday retired to consult, and the debate that took place is too interesting not to be reported in extenso.

"Friday: 'What do you think of it?'

"Robinson: 'If we close with the proposal, we are ruined.'

"Friday: 'Are you sure of that? Let us consider.'

"Robinson: 'The case is clear. Crushed by competition, our hunting as a branch of industry is annihilated.'

"Friday: 'What matters it, if we have the game?'

"Robinson: 'Theory! It will no longer be the product of our labor.'

"Friday: 'I beg your pardon, sir; for in order to have game we must part with vegetables.'

"Robinson: 'Then, what shall we gain?'

"Friday: 'The four baskets of game cost us 6 hours' work. The foreigner gives us them in exchange for two baskets of vegetables, which cost us only 3 hours' work. This places 3 hours at our disposal'."

TWO VIEWS

"Robinson: 'Say, rather, which are subtracted from our exertions. There is our loss. Labor is wealth, and if we lose a fourth part of our time we shall be less rich by a fourth.'

"Friday: 'You are greatly mistaken, my good friend. We shall have as much game, and the same quantity of vegetables, and 3 hours at our disposal into the bargain. This is progress, or there is no such thing in the world.'

"Robinson: 'You lose yourself in generalities! What should we make of these 3 hours?'

"Friday: 'We would do something else.'

"Robinson: 'Ah! I understand you. You cannot come to particulars. Something else, something else—that is easily said.'

"Friday: 'We can fish, we can ornament our cottage, we can read the Bible.'

"Robinson: 'Utopia. Is there any certainty that we should do either the one or the other?'

"Friday: 'Very well, if we have no wants to satisfy we can rest. Is repose nothing?'

"Robinson: 'But while we repose we may die of hunger.'

"Friday: 'My dear friend, you have got into a vicious circle. I speak of a repose which will subtract nothing from our supply of game and vegetables. You always forget that by means of our foreign trade nine hours' labor will give us the same quantity of provisions that we obtain at present with 12.'

"Robinson: 'It is very evident, Friday, that you have not been educated in Europe, and that you have never read the Moniteur Industriel. If you had, it would have taught you this: that all time saved is sheer loss. The important thing is not to eat or consume, but to work. All that we consume, if it is not the direct produce of our labor, goes for nothing. Do you want to know whether you are rich? Never consider the enjoyments you obtain, but the labor you undergo. This is what the Moniteur Industriel would teach you. For myself, who have no pretensions to be a theorist, the only thing I look at is the loss of our hunting.'

"Friday: 'What a strange turning upside down of ideas. But * * *'

"Robinson: 'No buts. Moreover, there are political reasons for rejecting the interested offers of the perfidious foreigner.'

"Friday: 'Political reasons.'

"Robinson: 'Yes, he only makes us these offers because they are advantageous to him.'

"Friday: 'So much the better, since they are for our advantage likewise.'

"Robinson: 'Then by this traffic we should place ourselves in a situation of dependence upon him.'

"Friday: 'And he would place himself in dependence on us. We should have need of his game, and he of our vegetables, and we should live on terms of friendship.'

"Robinson: 'System. Do you want me to shut your mouth?'

"Friday: 'We shall see about that. I have as yet heard no good reason.'

"Robinson: 'Suppose the foreigner learns to cultivate a garden, and that his island should prove more fertile than ours. Do you see the consequence?'

"Friday: 'Yes; our relations with the foreigner would cease. He would take from us no more vegetables, since he could have them at home with less labor. He would bring us no more game, since we should have nothing to give him in exchange, and we should then be in precisely the situation that you wish us in now.'

"Robinson: 'Improvident savage. You don't see that after having annihilated our hunting by inundating us with game, he would annihilate our gardening by inundating us with vegetables.'

"Friday: 'But this would only last so long as we were in a situation to give him something else; that is to say, so long as we found something else which we could produce with economy of labor for ourselves.'

"Robinson: 'Something else, something else. You always come back to that. You are at sea, my good friend Friday; there is nothing practical in your views'."

THE DEBATE ENDS

"The debate was long prolonged, and, as often happens, each remained wedded to his own opinion. But Robinson possessing a great influence over Friday, his opinion prevailed, and when the foreigner arrived to demand a reply, Robinson said to him:

"Stranger, in order to induce us to accept your proposal, we must be assured of two things: The first is, that your island is no better stocked with game than ours, for we want to fight only with equal weapons. The second is that you will lose by the bargain. For, as in every exchange there is necessarily a gaining and a losing party, we should be dupes, if you were not the loser. What have you got to say?'

" 'Nothing,' replied the foreigner; and, bursting out laughing, he regained his canoe." [1]

Bastiat's keen analysis of what he called "protectionism" is as much needed today as it was then. Contained in his skillful amplification of Robinson Crusoe are simple illustrations of most of the arguments for and against tariffs that have been and are still being used by the leaders, political and otherwise, of every nation.

Tariffs are discussed here, not because of their current importance relative to other restrictions, but because they have persisted so long in the face of well-reasoned opposition. It is probable that if the effects of tariffs were clearly understood, a better understanding of the various other trade restrictions might evolve because the same basic fallacies seem to underlie them all. Tariffs are a form of price control. One who defends tariffs cannot logically oppose Government control of prices and profits, marital allocations, subsidies, and other violations of the free-market principle.

MORAL ISSUE

Basically, the issue of tariffs and other trade restrictions is a moral one. This is not to deny that it is also an economic issue. It is merely a matter of emphasis. Unless economic principles are in harmony with good moral principles, they are not good economics.

Government grows strong and dictatorial by the granting of special favors. Trade restrictions are just another of the handouts which a government can grant, thereby increasing its power over individuals—to the detriment of all.

The point of view set forth in this discussion argues neither for nationalism (isolationism) nor for internationalism. Both of these terms imply a kind of design by government. And both, when implemented by governmental design—force—have very serious consequences. Instead of aiming for either of these objectives, we would argue merely to allow individuals to trade freely with one another, when and where they wish—with a minimum of governmental interference.

The moral basis for free trade rests on the assumption that an individual has the right to the product of his own labor—stealing is bad because ownership is good. This involves property rights. Property rights are human rights, and to try to distinguish between them is merely to play with words—and on emotions.

The right to own property involves the right to use it, to keep it, to give it away, or to exchange it. Unless this is possible, one does not own property. To lay obstacles in the path of ownership, use, or exchange of property is a violation of the human right to own property.

BAD ECONOMICS

Economists from Adam Smith down to the present have quite generally agreed that tariffs are bad economics. And it is not difficult to discover why:

1. Tariffs and other trade restrictions contribute to scarcity rather than to abundance. We are sometimes fooled by the introduction of money into trade; but basically, it is the abundance of goods and services, widely distributed, that contributes to a high level of material well-being. A person who offers money in a trade is generally thought to be a buyer or consumer. But how does one acquire the money in the first place except by producing something for sale? Each one has something to offer in exchange for what he wants. Why is one party the seller any more than the other?

2. A voluntary exchange of goods or services between two individuals results in a benefit to each party. To say that only the seller benefits is a fallacy. Why is it so commonly believed that you confer a favor upon a person by buying what he offers you? When you offer your money to a grocery clerk for a purchase, he usually says, "Thank you." Why isn't it just as appropriate for the customer to say, "Thank you" for the services rendered by the store?

3. There is ample evidence that a high level of living in any country cannot be achieved without a high degree of division of labor—specialization. Instead of a person's being a jack of all trades, he is the master of one. This calls for a high degree of cooperative effort and exchange. Production

[1] Frederic Bastiat, Social Fallacies (Santa Ana, Calif.: Register Publishing Co., Ltd., 1944), pp. 202–6. Translated by Patrick James Stirling. (First published in the Journal des Economistes, France, 1844.)

by this process rests on the principle of comparative advantage, of production where conditions are most favorable. Ludwig von Mises, in his book Human Action, says:

"All that a tariff can achieve is to divert production from those locations in which the output per unit of input is higher to locations in which it is lower. It does not increase production; it curtails it. * * *

"Government does not have the power to encourage one branch of production except by curtailing other branches. It withdraws the factors of production from those branches in which the unhampered market would employ them and directs them into other branches. * * * It may subsidize openly or disguise the subsidy in enacting tariffs and thus forcing its subjects to defray the costs.

"While Government has no power to make people more prosperous by interference with business, it certainly does have the power to make them less satisfied by restriction of production."

4. A fallacy of protectionists is that employment, of itself, is a worthy economic objective. Employment, however, is merely a means to an end, and the end is production for consumption. No doubt, employment was high during the building of the Great Wall of China or the Pyramids of Egypt. A dictator can always achieve full employment. Hitler did it in Germany, and we had our leaf-raking projects.

But under freedom, freedom to produce and to trade voluntarily, men will have just as much employment as they desire. Actually, tariffs have nothing to do with employment. Employment can be high or low, with or without such trade restrictions. Tariffs do not create better jobs for individuals. They simply tend to keep people working at jobs which are less productive of useful goods and services than they would be under free trade.

5. Protectionists have claimed that wage levels can be maintained or increased by shutting out imports from areas with low real wages. Wage levels are determined by the productivity of labor. This, in turn, is determined by the investment of capital in the tools of production.

The products we import are more valuable to us than our exports; otherwise the trade would not be made. Rather than produce the imported product here, our own labor is released to produce something we are better fitted to produce.

6. Failure to recognize that satisfaction of desires is the sole purpose and end of production has led protectionists to support tariffs, subsidies, and other measures. Had we consistently failed in this recognition, we would now be subsidizing 80 percent of our population in agricultural pursuits, as well as in the manufacture of buggy whips and candles. Economic progress cannot take place under such a system.

The removal of tariffs restores justice to consumers—to millions and millions of consumers. The fact that it may seem to result in a temporary inconvenience for a few producers is merely the correction of an injustice previously established.

Aside from their many economic disadvantages, trade restrictions are most devastating in their effect on the relations between nations.

In an address in New York on June 9, 1952, Sir Miles Thomas, chairman of the British Overseas Airways Corp., said that some British manufacturers were disturbed by the tendency of some United States manufacturers of competitive or related items to seek home protection against foreign competition. He went on to say:

"The very essence of our being, the very survival of the free nations of the world—must depend upon a two-way flow of goods and services. If you place a brake on that you inevitably discriminate against your own future as well as ours. Forgive me if I so far forget myself as your guest * * * if I ask you whether you prefer to have the dollars supplied by an already overloaded taxpayer or by a satisfied consumer.

"Surely it is by the reduction rather than the increase of international trade barriers that the cause of peace can best be preserved."

Trading, when engaged in by individuals, is a peaceful, friendly project. When controlled by governments it provides opportunity for favoritism, intrigue, and a display of power politics. It cannot lead to other than animosity, suspicion, and unfriendly relations.

We pretend, on the one hand, to favor a united friendly Europe. But at the same time, we encourage trade restrictions and controls of all sorts. For example, we promote in Europe a government-controlled and operated cartel for certain basic industries. Chaos and strife are certain to result, whereas the promotion of free trade between individuals and firms of all nations would go far toward bringing about the peace we seek.

UNITED STATES COULD LEAD

In his recent book The Trade of Nations, Michael A. Heilprin said:

"It is the thesis of this book that world trade based on the operations of free markets and on the personal enterprise of free men fosters the cause of international understanding, while trade straitjacketed by governmental controls and subject to authoritarian dictation from the top becomes a servant of nationalism and an abundant source of ill will, friction, and conflict."

Free trade is such a simple solution for so many of the world's ills. It doesn't require endless hours of debate in the United Nations, or the International Labor Organization, or the Food and Agriculture Organization, or any other worldwide debating society. It requires only that one nation see the light and remove its restrictions. The results will be immediate and widespread.

It isn't necessary for all nations to agree jointly and simultaneously to remove restrictions. If only one nation does it, some good is accomplished—both for itself and for its customers. A great nation, such as the United States, could do it and thus set an example for others to follow. It would not be meddling in the affairs of other nations; it would merely be looking after the best interests of its own citizens. And instead of being resentful, other nations would be eternally grateful.

If goods do not cross frontiers, armies will.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to direct attention especially to the statement, appearing in the article, that:

Trade restrictions are just another of the handouts which a government can grant.

As the Senator from Illinois has so clearly proved, tariffs for special interests were among the first handouts given by our Government to the protectionists. Other groups of our citizens have been forced—in self-defense, and in order to survive—to seek subsidies by other means.

Since the beginning of organized human society, struggles for special privileges by individuals or groups have occurred. I need not remind this body that ambition, greed, and avarice are rather common characteristics of our species. The ability of a well-organized minority to mislead, confuse, and exploit the unorganized majority is not a new phenomenon in human affairs. However, I think I am bound to say that I do not believe one can find in all history an example of greater or more unjustifiable exploitation than the one perpetrated upon the American people by the Republican Party of this Nation for the past 100 years.

Mr. President, in his speech to the Senate on April 25, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] referred to the vicious role being played here by the tariff lobby, and said:

Behind the clamor against the reciprocal-trade program is one of the best organized, most insidious lobbies Washington has ever had to contend with. It is the high-tariff lobby, and it has been around a long time.

This lobby is now using every means at its disposal to befuddle, mislead, and frighten American workers and consumers to the end that they may be brought to bring overwhelming pressures upon their congressional representatives and so secure the legislation that it wants.

In my own case, I have received more letters during the past month opposing reciprocal trade than I had received in the previous 10 years in which I had been a Member of the Senate. Most of this correspondence arises because of two or three new textile mills in my State, the workers in which have been obviously misled.

These lobbies appear whenever there is a trade bill before Congress, and since they seem to have a continuing life, I think it might be enlightening to recall some of the events of the infamous tariff lobby in 1929.

I think it is pertinent to go back to 1929 because of the present lobbies, operated under the Republican administration just preceding the present one. What happened then is the best guide to what is happening now.

I may say that under the leadership of one of my distinguished predecessors, Senator Caraway, a congressional inquiry into lobbying activities was conducted. That is a further reason why I think it is the best historical precedent for what we expect to find today.

I grant, of course, that the managers of the lobby have learned from the bitter experience of 20 years of being out of power to be more subtle, to disguise their maneuvers better, and to permit some of their spokesmen to mouth sweet generalities.

For example, one of the principal obstacles to trade today is the complexity of customs regulations rather than the monetary rate of the duty. This is more difficult for opponents of special privilege to understand and to attack.

However much the technique has been refined, the basic objectives and the spirit of the protectionists are the same as those of 1929.

Among those who appeared before the committee in 1929 was Mr. Joseph R. Grundy, of Pennsylvania. A prince of lobbyists, Mr. Grundy did not soil his dignity or his labor with excuses or evasions. He spoke with frankness and indignation and in so doing he expressed the point of view not only of the tariff lobby but also a large part of the Republican Party. I now quote from the

official record of investigation of lobbying in 1929:

Senator BORAH. Mr. Grundy, I take it that the object of your coming to Washington and opening headquarters was your interest in the tariff bill?

Mr. GRUNDY. The interest of the Republican Party in carrying out its platform adopted at Kansas City; yes.

Senator BORAH. That was the outstanding thing——

Mr. GRUNDY. The resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania delegation went on:

"Adequate protection by duties on imports to overcome the difference in costs of production here and abroad is a fundamental principle of the Republican tariff policy.

"Whenever this American system has been in operation a home market has been created and maintained as the basis of a purchasing power due to full employment with higher wages, resulting in general prosperity to all sections and all classes. This has brought the development and progress of our country to a higher level and our people to a higher standard of living than elsewhere known. We have owned more homes, better furnishings, and with more comforts and conveniences than are found in any part of the earth * * *.

"We eat more and better food, wear better clothes, and have more joys and pleasure of life than any other people. We have the largest incomes, the greatest savings, carry the most insurance, and have enough surplus to be the most liberal spenders for every necessity and luxury.

"For the most part, since the passage of the Morrill Protective Act of 1861, we have advanced under successive protective tariffs to the highest position of wealth and strength, retarded only by periods of practical free trade under Cleveland and Wilson, compelling a return to protection to retrieve our losses."

It was all right for the Pennsylvania Republican Party, eulogizing the Republican tariff policy, to talk about this policy bringing "our country to a higher level and our people to a higher standard of living than elsewhere known." None of this bears the slightest relationship to the truth and indeed is a shameful distortion of the truth.

A few years before Mr. Grundy appeared to praise the protectionist policy that had made Pennsylvania and other industrial States rich, the per capita wealth of the 10 great cotton States was only $1,635, and that of Mississippi was $1,216. But the per capita wealth of the other 38 States of the Union was $3,313, or more than double that of the cotton States. In 1932 my State of Arkansas paid only $216,000 Federal individual income taxes, and our neighboring State of Mississippi paid only $134,000. At about this time Mr. Alfred Sloan, then president of General Motors, voluntarily reduced his salary from $500,000 to $340,000 a year. He took a cut of $160,000 in his salary. This cut, mind you, was nearly $30,000 more than the individual income taxes paid by 2 million people in the State of Mississippi. This is a sample of the heavenly prosperity brought to us by the Republican policy of high tariffs.

Continuing, Senator Walsh asked Mr. Grundy some questions:

Senator WALSH. Mr. Grundy, in a statement which you prepared for us the other day, you furnished certain tables in which comparison was made between the State of Pennsylvania and various other States groups together. I find "Total value of all property in the States of Arizona, Arkansas, South Dakota, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, and Wisconsin."

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. At a later date I find the amount of wages paid in Pennsylvania and the number of wage earners employed as compared with the same group of States.

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Likewise the value of the products of these States, compared with the value of the products of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. The income tax and corporation tax paid by those States with the income tax and corporation tax paid by the State of Pennsylvania. Will you just explain to us what you think that has to do with the tariff, and just what your purpose was in instituting that comparison?

Mr. GRUNDY. May I be frank with you on this?

Senator WALSH. Oh, entirely so. We hope you will.

Mr. GRUNDY. Frankly, when you come to analyze what they mean to the national life of the country, they haven't got any chips in the game at all.

Senator CARAWAY. They found that out long ago.

Mr. GRUNDY. If it was not for an unfortunate provision in the Constitution that gives each State two Senators—I say "unfortunate" because it was a great compromise that got our Constitution through—they probably would not be heard of at all.

Now, for these men that represent so little in the national economy, to find fault and obstruct and try to destroy a policy which has been responsible for building up these great reservoirs of taxation that have been for the great benefit and advancement of the country, it seems it is almost a tragedy to mankind.

If this was a problem that had to do with junior Red Cross work for backward States or something like that, they would have a right to get into that game, but when it comes to this great fundamental policy that has made this country what it is and has produced this great revenue, those seven States that have about 2.66 percent of the taxes of this country and put up all this holler against the States which pay about 64 percent of the revenues of this country, there is something wrong down here somewhere.

Senator CARAWAY. Is it your view, then, that wealth ought to select Senators?

Mr. GRUNDY. I did not say "wealth," but the general interest that goes with tremendous weight of population.

Senator CARAWAY. You mean the rich people ought to have the Senate?

Mr. GRUNDY. No; I don't want the rich to control anything. I want everybody to control, but this is the only way you can bring this thing home to the people.

Senator CARAWAY. Yet I understood you to say you thought it was a tragedy that the smaller States had 2 Senators.

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir—no; not that they should have elected 2 Senators, but that they should use their power to try to destroy what has been for the greatest good of the country.

Senator CARAWAY. I understand you now that they should not have a vote when the tariff laws are enacted?

Mr. GRUNDY. I do not want to say they should not have a vote, but they should not throw a monkey wrench into the machinery every minute of the 24 hours of the day.

Senator CARAWAY. They should not be allowed to talk?

Mr. GRUNDY. I don't want to say that.

Senator CARAWAY. What do you want them to do now?

Mr. GRUNDY. They should talk darned small.

Senator CARAWAY. They should not have as much to say as Pennsylvania, for instance?

Mr. GRUNDY. Honestly not; no, sir. I don't think the Senators from Georgia ought to be putting up the roar they do. I think especially the Senators from Mississippi ought not to put up a roar. I might go down the line with many others from these Western States as well.

Senator Blaine pointed out to the witness how high tariffs affect the farmers.

Senator BLAINE. * * * I observe that aluminum—all that is produced in America—is produced by the Aluminum Company of America, and it produces about one-third of the total world production. If the tariff on aluminum is effective * * * the tariff tax would be $19 million.

You appreciate that the products of aluminum go into the cost, the operating farm cost of milk containers, cream containers, cream separators, and a large variety of farm implements and utensils made of aluminum products.

The farmer uses scythes, sickles, grasshooks, and cornknives. The annual tariff tax on that is $240,000. They bear a tariff rate of 30 percent.

Let us take another item. Shovels, spades, and scoops, a large part of the production is used upon the farm, and that tariff tax, if it is effective, is $4,600,000 a year. They bear a rate of 30 percent ad valorem.

"Internal-combustion engines." Those are gas engines. Those bear a tariff rate of 31.24 percent. The farmer uses internal-combustion engines to a very large extent, and the tariff tax on that, if it is effective, is $36,740,000 a year. * * *

Now we will take miscellaneous machinery, of which the farmer uses a large quantity. The tariff tax on that, if effective, is $7,240,000 a year. Pliers, pincers, and nippers. The tariff tax now is 60 percent and they propose to raise it to 75 percent. That is a tax upon the farmer. Take saddle and harness hardware, used largely on the farm. The tariff tax is 47.6 percent. That tax represents $2,980,000 a year.

Take the little item of chains; a very common article upon the farm. The ad valorem equivalent on that is now 28.61 percent and it is proposed to raise that to 38.36 percent, which will yield a tariff tax, if effective, of $8,640,000 a year. Woven wire, galvanized wire fencing, and wire for bailing, practically all of which is used upon the farm. The tariff tax is 17.67 per cent.

Senator WALSH. I wanted to ask you whether it ever occurred to you that the great wealth of the State of Pennsylvania has come in no small part from the energy and enterprise of the people out West who opened up that country and gave a market for your products.

Now likewise, about these enormous income taxes that the State of Pennsylvania pays, a good share of which is paid by Pennsylvania manufacturers. Did it ever occur to you that they add to their price their taxes?

Mr. GRUNDY. No. Never.

Senator WALSH. Never?

Mr. GRUNDY. No. Well, I may qualify that. The products of Pennsylvania are sold in a competitive market, and, of course, if there is to be a tax, it is like any other tax—it is part of overhead expense.

Senator WALSH. Each competitor puts that into his overhead expense, does he not?

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. So that, as a matter of fact, the consumer in my State has helped you to make this splendid showing of income taxes paid by the State of Pennsylvania, has he not?

Mr. GRUNDY. To the extent that he purchases Pennsylvania products; yes.

Senator Caraway, of Arkansas, then sought to show the connection between Mr. Grundy's tariff lobbying and the politics that, in part, lay behind it.

Senator CARAWAY. How much of your time have you spent down here in Washington, interested in tariffs?

Mr. GRUNDY. A large part, whenever there has been a tariff bill up for consideration, since the Dingley tariff bill in 1897.

Senator CARAWAY. What were you doing here?

Mr. GRUNDY. Endeavoring to have a protective tariff law enacted.

Senator CARAWAY. How many Senate committees have you been before with reference to raising money for elections?

Mr. GRUNDY. In 1924 and 1926.

Senator CARAWAY. And in 1924 how much did you say that you had raised for the election of Mr. Coolidge?

Mr. GRUNDY. * * * I think we raised $700,000.

Senator CARAWAY. * * * That all came from people interested in tariffs?

Mr. GRUNDY. In part.

Senator CARAWAY. In large part?

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator CARAWAY. What was the necessity for your staying here, Mr. Grundy * * * when the tariff bills were pending?

Mr. GRUNDY. Because I was interested in it.

Senator CARAWAY. I know, but what services were you rendering? Were you seeing Members of Congress of both Houses? You saw them personally? And talked with them?

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes.

Senator CARAWAY. Do you think that you got results from those talks?

Mr. GRUNDY. The results that were finally achieved were satisfactory. * * * I did my best to see the results we thought satisfactory were enacted.

Senator CARAWAY. You think that there are tariff rates now reflected in the tariff law that your activities put there?

Mr. GRUNDY. Well, I am pleased to say, yes.

Senator CARAWAY. Who pays your expenses down here?

Mr. GRUNDY. Why, I do.

Senator CARAWAY. It is a work of love on your part?

Mr. GRUNDY. Not a work of love. I feel I have some obligations in this proposition.

Senator CARAWAY. They put up the campaign expenses, and they ought to get results for their money. Is that the obligation that rested on you—to see that they got their money's worth? * * * They put up the money and they ought to get the legislation they bought and paid for?

Mr. GRUNDY. If that platform (of the Republican Party) was put into the law, they would get their money back.

Senator CARAWAY. They would get their money back?

Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir.

Senator CARAWAY. And you were down here to see that they got their money back?

Mr. GRUNDY. I was helping in every way that I could.

Senator CARAWAY. * * * You think that it was entirely proper, for a man who was on the payroll of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association, to come down here and be placed on the payroll of the Government as a clerk to a committee, by which means he got into the secret meetings of the Finance Committee. You think that is proper?

Mr. GRUNDY. I don't think there was any impropriety in what happened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 7 additional minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Grundy, a prince of lobbyists, and one of the most powerful men in the counsels of the Republican Party for 50 years, did not see any impropriety in the action that led the Senate to censure Senator Hiram Bingham. His testimony is revelatory of the tariff lobby mentality.

We have seen here an example of shocking amorality and greed on the part of a principal Republican leader and tariff lobbyist. But this is not all the story. One is confronted also with a comprehensive ignorance and blindness on the part of distinguished Republican leaders that once led this Nation to economic catastrophe.

Let us go back now to 1932. A speaker is on a platform in Des Moines, Iowa, and he is addressing an audience of hard-pressed, desperate farmers. They were getting shockingly low prices for their products and were facing wholesale evictions from their lands. The men addressing them was former President Herbert Hoover.

What did he propose to do to relieve farmers? Raise tariff rates on farm products?

The very basis of safety—

He said—

to American agriculture, is the protective tariff on American farm products. The Republican Party originated and proposes to maintain the protective tariff on agricultural products. We will even widen that tariff further when necessary to protect agriculture. Ninety percent of your market is at home, and I propose to reserve this market to American farmers.

One stands amazed by such remarks.

The foreign price of wheat was then 20 cents a bushel.

It took 15 cents more to carry the wheat to Chicago.

The duty on wheat was 42 cents a bushel. This duty was double the value of wheat on the farm and more than the value of the wheat at Chicago.

But, said Mr. Hoover, the way to help the wheat farmer is to give him a high tariff on wheat.

By way of pointing up this magnificent nonsense, in 1932 we did not import enough wheat to fill a cavity in the Nation's tooth. During that year we imported 2,041 bushels of wheat, valued at $1,546.

A comprehensively ignorant American President is, fortunately, somewhat in the nature of a rarity in our history. Mr. Hoover was not among this group. On the contrary, Mr. Hoover is a well-informed man. It is, therefore, the more surprising to find him saying that the 90 percent of the farmers' market was at home.

Thus in the period 1926–30 we exported the following proportions of the total production of some of our major crops:

	Percent
Cotton	59
Prunes	50
Tobacco	34
Raisins	54
Lard	31
Rye	30
Rice	24
Apples	20
Wheat	18

The great farm market might have been at home for such items as honey, garlic, parsley and, guinea eggs, but it certainly was not at home to the extent of 90 percent for the major farm and orchard products which are the backbone of our agriculture. Thus about the time that Mr. Hoover was speaking more than one-half of the total crop acreage of the United States was planted to wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco, all of which were crops largely dependent for their economic health upon export.

One element in the current picture which confuses us and makes a clear-cut decision on the question of tariffs so difficult is the fact that an occasional Republican and an occasional Republican publication will speak out for the national rather than the special interests.

In its April 1955 issue Fortune magazine, for example, expresses itself in the following terms:

The tariff is the great American anachronism. It is a direct levy on American consumers, no more, but not less, than any other indiscriminate tax. It is a hidden subsidy to inefficient producers at the expense of the more efficient. It is a way of interfering with the "normal division of labor," which within the boundaries of the United States is taken for granted, and which has done so much to build the wealth of the Western World. Finally, the tariff is a form of economic warfare that inevitably leads on to much worse restrictions.

Fortune also makes a comment that it might be useful for it to din into the ears of leaders of the Republican Party, whom it so blindly supports. The words are these:

The trouble with capitalism is not that it leads on to "exploitation," as the Communists claim, but that it has not been sufficiently tried.

Liberalized tariffs are one of capitalism's most effective devices, and if capitalism in this phase has not been sufficiently tried, the fault lies squarely in the hands of the Republican Party, and at the hands of the Republican President, who seems committed to the policy, but who does not seem to be committed in his own mind or in his own heart to fight for it. If the President's trade program was recently saved in the House of Representatives it was not because the President got out and fought for it and led his troops amid the dust and shock of battle. The fact is that he remained coolly in the White House while the struggle was going on—a general above the battle. The bill was carried by a narrow margin only because the Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, a lifelong devoted Democrat, fought for it with all the power at his disposal and went down into the well of the House and made one of his rare speeches and so carried the day.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill. I should like to see both parties at long last join in recognizing the validity of, and applying gradually on a wider scale, the principles which have worked so well within our country.

I confess that I do not regard this bill, with all its compromises and weaknesses, as a very good bill, but obviously

it is the best we will have an opportunity to vote on at this session. Therefore, in spite of its imperfections and shortcomings, I hope the Senate today by a large majority will pass the bill.

I believe it will give considerable discretion to the Executive. If the Executive is determined to liberalize and promote trade relations with the free world, he will have an opportunity to do it, although I recognize that the bill also contains pitfalls and restrictions which, if not avoided by the Executive, can lead to further curtailment of our international trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the members of the Tariff Commission have been at odds with each other on two points:

First. Must imports be the sole cause of injury to an industry?

Second. What is an industry?

These are questions which only Congress can answer. They have never stopped plaguing the Tariff Commission and causing difficulty in arriving at decisions, and have frequently been the cause of split decisions. They should be made clear one way or another. They should be made clear by Congress, because it has the authority to do it.

The committee considered the proposed amendments. It considered whether any contributing factor other than imports, no matter how small, prevents an injured industry from getting relief. The committee wisely decided that imports need not be the sole cause of the injury. It wisely decided that if imports contribute materially to the injury, then help can be given.

The committee decided wisely that, for the purpose of the escape clause, an industry need not be considered a great sprawling octupus producing many different items. Some concerns produce only 1, 2, or 3 items. The same items may be produced by great concerns making many items, and such concerns could afford to lose money or cease to produce one item.

The small-business man could not take such losses. Under the decision that the whole industry must show an overall loss and be operating in the red before help could be given, the small-business man who produced only a few items could be completely wiped out, but no help would be forthcoming.

On the question whether there had to be a loss to the whole industry before relief could be given, the Tariff Commission split 3 to 3.

One group said the wood screws industry did not exist, but was merely a small part of a huge metalworking industry. In answer to that argument, the other group—and I am reading from the Wood Screws decision—stated:

> Such an interpretation of this "domestic industry" phrase in the "escape clause" law would practically nullify the "escape clause" provision in trade agreements as a possible remedy of serious injury, and in effect would almost, if not entirely, void the "escape clause" provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. One by one each small "domestic industry" could be severely injured and put out of business because of imports and section 7 would be inoperative as a remedy—and we believe Congress intended section 7 to be a remedy.

Mr. President, I suggest that the amendments reported by the committee are moderate, and are as clear as legislative language can make them.

I cannot see why they should cause any considerable increase in the number of cases before the Commission. Injured industries have been making appeals and will continue to make appeals. The improvements proposed by the committee will not change the past practices of firms and industries to appeal when they feel they are being hurt. They are good amendments. They are necesary amendments, and should be retained.

Mr. President, I am glad again to emphasize that the administration is in favor of the whole bill as amended by the Senate committee, and these amendments were approved by a sizable vote in the Senate committee.

I suggest that the amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois be decisively defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the Senator used all his time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Millikin
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bender	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bridges	Ives	Purtell
Bush	Jackson	Robertson
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	
Flanders	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—21

Anderson	Hill	Lehman
Barkley	Humphrey	Long
Clements	Jackson	McNamara
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smathers
Hayden	Kilgore	Sparkman

NAYS—67

Aiken	Ervin	Neely
Allott	Flanders	Neuberger
Barrett	Frear	Pastore
Beall	Goldwater	Payne
Bender	Green	Potter
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bible	Holland	Robertson
Bricker	Hruska	Russell
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Bush	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler	Kerr	Scott
Byrd	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Langer	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Magnuson	Symington
Case, S. Dak.	Malone	Thurmond
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Daniel	McCarthy	Welker
Dirksen	McClellan	Wiley
Duff	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Morse	
Ellender	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Hennings	Murray
George	Kennedy	Williams
Gore	Mansfield	

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] 6 minutes on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly today in support of H. R. 1, as now before the Senate.

The reciprocal trade-agreements program, which H. R. 1 will extend for 3 years, has been the mainstay of our foreign trade policy for 20 years, during which it has often been reviewed by the Senate. I have been a Member of this body for only 4 months, so I do not presume that I shall be able to add much to the knowledge of Senators who have shared in the formulation of this legislation over the years. But I do think that I can fairly tell the Senate that, by and large, the people of Oregon support

the continuation of the reciprocal trade program.

OREGON FAVORS LIBERAL FOREIGN POLICIES

The reciprocal trade program, Mr. President, was one of the issues in the Senatorial campaign in Oregon last year. We remember that it was a group of Democrats, for whom the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was one of the chief spokesmen, who led the fight to save the President's foreign-trade program during the last, Republican-controlled, session of Congress, against the opposition of many of the President's own party, including my opponent in Oregon.

During the campaign I told the people of Oregon that I would support President Eisenhower's request for continuation of the liberal foreign-trade program, which had proved itself during two decades of experience. My opponent had opposed the President's reciprocal trade program. I might say, parenthetically, that this did not, of course, deprive him of the President's support in the election. But I think it is fair to state that on this, as on other aspects of our foreign relations, the issues were clearly drawn. In my judgment, the people of Oregon throughout the campaign showed their support for enlightened, bipartisan foreign policies, whether they were initiated by Democrats or continued by a Republican President.

Mr. President, the reciprocal trade program is one of these enlightened policies.

Perhaps there was a time when we could regard controls over imports and exports as primarily an adjunct of domestic economic policy—or even as a means of raising revenue. But we have learned that we can no longer afford the luxury of manipulating, by such controls, an exclusive domestic market without regard to the impact of our policies on the rest of the world. Our foreign-trade policies have become one of the most decisive factors in our international relations.

The most critical problem confronting our Nation—and which will continue to confront our Nation and all nations, for many years to come—is the maintenance of world peace. I believe we cannot have a peaceful world without a healthy and expanding world economy. We certainly cannot hope to have unity and strength in the free world without strong and expanding economies in the free democracies. Much of that economic strength must depend on commerce and trade within the free world.

HIGH TARIFFS WILL NOT PROTECT NATIONAL PROSPERITY

I was a student in college during the depths of the depression in the early 1930's—just before Secretary of State Cordell Hull's reciprocal trade program first replaced the protectionism of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs. I shall never forget my illustrious professor of economics, Dr. James H. Gilbert, of the University of Oregon, telling our class how we had suffered the most terrible depression in history—with its mass unemployment and widespread human misery—at a time of the highest protective tariffs in American history.

In the face of the facts, we cannot accept the simple, pleasant myth that we can assure the prosperity of domestic producers by erecting high tariff barriers—that we can protect our economy by excluding the competition of imports, so that American consumers will have to buy at the domestic producer's price. I am not a trained economist, but I know that economics is not that simple. I know that the high protection of the Smoot-Hawley tariff did not protect Oregon lumber mills from accumulating vast supplies of good, strong timber, and farmers from the accumulation of mountains of wheat, without a market, foreign or domestic, which could consume the supply.

It is of the utmost importance, Mr. President, that our own economy remain healthy and strong—and, I might add, our own concern that it remain so is thoroughly shared by the very nations with whom we have the closest political and economic ties. But it is a sorry illusion, and a dangerous one, that higher protective tariff walls will assure the health or strength of our economy.

There is always the tendency for each of us to think of himself in his role in some process of production. This is understandable, Mr. President; and so each Senator, I am sure, has heard from citizens of his State who feel that the competition of imports threatens an industry in which they share, whether as workers, owners, or suppliers of materials or services. Yet we should be careful not to confuse the competitive position of specific industries with the health and strength of the Nation as a whole.

Let us not lose sight of some basic facts:

Tariffs are merely a means of keeping prices artificially higher than they would otherwise be. The cost of protecting the domestic producer is thus borne by the consumer. Comparable products which may be available for import at competitive prices are, at least to some extent, excluded. Perhaps it may be suggested that one interest which is rarely mentioned—the interest of consumers—is also entitled to some consideration.

AMERICAN EXPORT TRADE ALSO IMPORTANT

But, Mr. President, to the same extent that high, protective tariffs exclude imports, they also reduce the ability of the world to buy American exports. This elementary fact has been so thoroughly discussed by other able Senators who have spoken on H. R. 1 that I shall not elaborate it again. Let us merely point out the conclusion to be drawn:

A high protective tariff does not protect the national economy. It merely shifts domestic resources in favor of some protected industries and away from those dependent on export markets. While the continued prosperity of local industries may be essential to many communities, it thus does not follow that tariff protection contributes to the prosperity of the Nation as a whole.

It would be a serious mistake to forget the importance of our international trade to our own economy. In 20 years, it has risen in unison with the expansion of our national economy. According to the New York Times, in 1934, the year before the reciprocal trade program was first put into operation, American imports amounted to $1,707,000,000, exports to $1,988,000,000. In 1953, after two decades under the program, our imports were $10,873,000,000, and our exports had risen to $15,747,000,000. Other sources may lead to somewhat different totals. But I think it is significant not only that our present trade program permits international trade at a level which would surely be impossible if we had retained the Smoot-Hawley tariff, but also that along with the increase in imports, on which the protectionists always focus attention, our exports have increased and still exceed our imports in value. These exports contribute to prosperity in every State, including Oregon.

Mr. President, America can sell abroad only to the extent that it buys from abroad. Trade is a two-way street. Our export markets are important to our own economy, particularly to our American agriculture and to other segments which produce more than we consume here at home. Many of those products, agricultural as well as industrial, are produced in Oregon. If we forget that only imports can pay for our exports, we forget the basic rule of international trade.

TRADE ESSENTIAL TO UNITY OF FREE WORLD

Although our foreign trade is important, Mr. President, imports from abroad are still only a small fraction of our total consumption. Yet the American market is of vital and crucial importance to many of our friends and allies.

We often hear some of our orators cry out against any efforts of these nations to trade behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. How patriotic such oratory can sound. These same persons are among those who lend their oratorical talents to the attack on President Eisenhower's trade program.

If the nations of the free world—and those which we seek to draw more firmly into the free world—seek to trade with their Communist neighbors, they are threatened with loss of American aid and support, or even worse; yet they cannot trade with use if we interpose protective tariffs and quotas whenever imports rise. What are they to do? Are the people of such a nation—of Japan, for example—to sit and starve in misery? Some of the opponents of reciprocal trade seem to envision a world in which our allies would trade only with other peaceful, liberty-loving nations, and never, never ship a potentially competitive product into the United States. I think they want us to wait for the millenium.

But we have faced the necessity of developing, not economic nationalism, as in the 1930's, but rather economic interdependence for the political unity of the free world. Should the Senate change our direction and risk repetition of the disastrous experience of 20 years ago?

EFFECT ON LOCAL INDUSTRIES DESERVES CONSIDERATION

Mr. President, I too have heard from people in Oregon who fear the results of lower tariffs, and I too am concerned about the impact of imports on particular local industries. It has been pointed

out before, but it is worth emphasizing once more, that H. R. 1 is permissive only. It authorizes the President to continue the program of reciprocal negotiations with other nations for selective tariff cuts, but it does not direct him to lower any particular duty. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out, it can hardly be said that the President has overworked the authority given him in earlier extensions of this latitude.

AID TO DISLOCATED INDUSTRIES IS PLEDGED

But beyond that, Mr. President, I shall be glad to support a program by which all of us will share the burden that may be thrown upon particular industries or communities by the withdrawal of tariff protection upon which they had come to rely. Different programs of that type have been proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], by Members of the House, and by other national leaders. I back those programs to aid dislocated industries and trades.

Industries sometimes face hardships through changing conditions, through technological progress, through downswings in the economy, through competition right here at home. But if injury can be traced directly to the results of the foreign trade policies which have been adopted in the belief that they are necessary in the total national interest, I think the whole Nation can also assume some of the responsibility for helping the workers, owners, and communities dependent on that industry to make the adjustment necessitated by the Nation's trade policies.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think it has been demonstrated that what our national welfare demands is more trade, not less trade. I hope that the authority to continue the reciprocal-trade program, which the passage of H. R. 1 will provide, will be wisely used to attain that objective. I support President Eisenhower in his reciprocal trade program. In so doing, I am keeping a positive pledge which I made to the people of Oregon during the senatorial campaign of 1954. It was a nonpartisan pledge, and I am honoring that pledge today on the Senate floor.

I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

ANY EXTENSION TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT SHOULD EXPIRE AFTER 1 YEAR—JUNE 12, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I move that section 2 of H. R. 1 be amended by striking the date, June 30, 1958, on line 9, page 1, of the printed bill and substituting therein the date June 12, 1956.

The purpose of my amendment is to limit the extension of the Trade Agreements Act to 1 year following its present expiration date of June 12, 1955.

Section 2 would then read:

SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), is hereby extended from June 12, 1955, until at the close of June 12, 1956.

The act would then expire on June 12, 1956.

Section 2, if unamended, will extend the life of this highly controversial act beyond the life of the present Congress, and possibly beyond the life of this administration.

This Congress should not commit the Government of the United States to a foreign-trade program beyond the life of the 84th Congress. Therefore, I ask the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, on line 9, page 1.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

CONFINE APPLICATION OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT TO THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if H. R. 1, extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, should pass, the application of the act should be confined to the Western Hemisphere.

CAN BE DEFENDED AND MADE SELF-SUFFICIENT

Mr. President, the Western Hemisphere can be defended and can be made self sufficient in the production of the critical materials, which we need to fight a war or to live in peace.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that H. R. 1, section 3, page 2, be amended to add the words "in the Western Hemisphere" wherever the words "foreign market", "foreign country", or "foreign governments" appear; and that section 3 (B) on page 3 be amended to include the words "in the Western Hemisphere" following the words "foreign trade agreements" and "foreign trade agreement" in lines 19 and 21.

Section 3 (a), on page 2, line 4, would be amended by adding after the word "markets", the words "in the Western Hemisphere."

On line 17, page 2, after the word "country", the words "in the Western Hemisphere" would be added.

On page 2, line 22, after the word "governments", the words "in the Western Hemisphere" would be added.

Section 3 (B), on page 3, would be changed, so that on line 19, after the word "agreements" the words "in the Western Hemisphere" would be added.

On line 21, page 3, after the word "agreement", the words "in the Western Hemisphere" would be added.

Section 3 (a) (1) and section 3 (a) (1) A and B would then read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets in the Western Hemisphere for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other important restrictions of the United States or any foreign country in the Western Hemisphere are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

"(A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments in the Western Hemisphere or instrumentalities thereof: *Provided*, That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"(B) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements in the Western Hemisphere, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement in the Western Hemisphere that the President has entered into hereunder."

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I have yielded.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT CONFINED TO WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. RUSSELL. Do I understand the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to confine any agreements made to countries in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. MALONE. That is true, because the Western Hemisphere can be defended and made self-sufficient in the production of all the critical materials necessary to fight a war or live in peace.

Further, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, if we have any trade future it is in South and Central America and in Canada—it is not in old Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's amendment would limit the power of the President to negotiate agreements with any countries in Europe or Asia. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. It makes no sense to divide our markets with the manufacturing and processing nations of Europe since anything they sell us we simply produce that much less for the most part, and they never have kept the spirit of any so-called trade agreement made with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Nevada to section 3 of the bill, on pages 2 and 3.

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had prepared a brief statement which I

wished to deliver before the debate on the bill was closed, but the hour is late, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I am deeply concerned about the problems created for vital industries of my State of Utah by the threat of excessive imports. All of the important industries discussed here today—coal, oil, lead, zinc, and fluorspar are produced in Utah—and all are necessary to the national security.

There is no President on whom the responsibility for national security has rested more definitely than it does on President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Because of his demonstrated excellence in the military field and his sincere devotion to his country's safety and welfare, we have never had a President to whom these vital problems could be more surely trusted.

I am not sure that he will not jeopardize any essential domestic industry in his efforts to develop our foreign relations. He has already demonstrated that in his program for the lead-zinc industry, which I presented to the Senate earlier today. At the same time, and by the same example, he has shown that he needs—and will wisely use—a wider list of possible solutions than those represented by tariffs and quotas. This bill gives him such a latitude.

I am sure that the people of Utah share my feeling of confidence in our great President. I know they want him to have every opportunity to solve these problems in that way which he believes will contribute also to improved foreign relations. And I know he would be the first to ask for new programs if these do not succeed.

As a member of the Finance Committee I participated in the sincere attempts to work out this bill. Therefore I am supporting it—hoping it will prove adequate—knowing that we can correct it if it does not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had prepared a statement on the merits of the bill. Rather than read it, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. President, on February 25, I submitted proposed amendments in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 1 to the Senate, and on March 16, I appeared before the Senate Finance Committee for the purpose of urging the committee to adopt these proposed amendments.

On both occasions, I reviewed the history of the tariff-making procedure of the United States, and, as I stated on both occasions, this careful review led me to the conclusion that with the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the Congress began the gradual disintegration of its control, except in theory, over the tariff-making procedure. That is still my opinion and firm conviction.

I favor most of the amendments adopted by the Finance Committee which I believe improve the bill. In a moment I shall discuss these amendments more in detail, but before doing so, I wish to make some general observations with respect to our trade and tariff policy.

First, I want to make it plain that H. R. 1, which constitutes the essence of the so-called trade, not aid, program, is not a panacea for the economic ills of the world. Why? Because the United States is not now a high-tariff country. Our average tariff rate, as measured by the percentage of customs receipts to total imports, is the lowest that it has been in this century. There are indeed few nations whose record is as good on this basis of calculation. As Dr. Jacob Viner, professor of economics, Princeton University, told the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which I am a member:

"In the past 20 years, there have been substantial reductions in our tariff rates, and, because of inflation, there has been also a substantial reduction of the ad valorem equivalents of the specific duties of our tariff" (hearings, p. 991).

Now, H. R. 1 is based upon the concept of reciprocity, which Webster defines with respect to international trade as being "that relation or policy as to trade, or other interests between countries under which special advantages are granted by one side in consideration of special advantages granted by the other."

Pursuance of this theme, President Eisenhower concluded, in his address on April 26 at the Associated Press luncheon in New York City, is absolutely essential if we are to "hasten the achievement of both our great goals—peace among the nations; a widely shared prosperity at home."

But what does the record show with respect to reciprocity by foreign countries? Are they actively engaged in the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other trade business? A 6-month review of clippings from the publication Foreign Commerce Weekly raises considerable doubt that other nations are as actively engaged in reducing trade barriers as is the United States.

During this period the following 24 countries increased or imposed tariffs or other trade barriers upon imports from the United States; Australia, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, El Salvador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Great Britain, India, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Republic of China and South Africa.

Only last Monday, the date we began debate upon H. R. 1, the following notices appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the Department of Commerce:

"PAKISTAN ACTS TO AID PLASTICS INDUSTRY

"The Government of Pakistan has adopted measures assuring protection to the local plastics industry for 3 years, ending March 1958. Additional duties have been levied on various plastic items. These and total duties, shown in parentheses, in percent ad valorem, are as follows:

"Ceiling roses and pendant holders made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 5 (50).

"Switches, excluding switchboards, made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 24 (60).

"Plugs and cutouts made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 14 (50).

"To assure local industry that existing duties will not be lowered in the next 3 years, the tariff classifications of a number of products have been changed from 'revenue' to 'protective.' These include combs, hair slides, and grips made of plastic material; complete fountain pens; ball-point pens; bangles made of plastic material; all kinds of brushes; and soapboxes, buttons, and conical tubes made of plastic material.

"Other measures have also been taken to assist the industry."

"PHILIPPINES PUTS BAN ON READY-MIXED PAINT

"The Central Bank of the Philippines has banned import of ready-mixed paints by canceling allocations of foreign exchange assigned importers of this commodity.

"Simultaneously, ready-mixed paints were reclassified by the bank from the nonessential consumer goods category to the unclassified category—a change which in effect suspends imports of the commodity, inasmuch as foreign exchange is not allocated for import of goods in the latter category."

This is a far cry from the two-way trade, which President Eisenhower characterized in his address last week to the Associated Press as being "a broad avenue by which all men and nations of good will can travel toward a golden era of peace and plenty."

Yet, low-tariff advocates, in their endeavor to sell the American public a so-called liberal trade policy, have made the tariff policy of the United States virtually a scapegoat for the economic troubles of the world. It is, in my opinion, about time that the nations of the world put a halt to the wholly unjustified practice of making the United States the world's economic whipping boy.

It is evident, since United States tariff rates are already at extremely low levels, that further reductions cannot possibly have the great stimulating effect which many proponents of H. R. 1 claim will be the case. The world's economic ills will not be solved, or even appreciably relieved, by any conceivable tariff action which may be taken by the United States.

This statement is amply supported by evidence given by experts to the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, as well as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. For example, Willard L. Thorp, former Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs under President Truman, and now director, Merrill Center for Economics, Amherst College, put it this way to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

"I cannot feel that there would be major changes that would create a great volume of trade. The American economy will be one in which 90 percent, shall we say, of our goods and services will be produced within the United States" (hearings, p. 883).

Dr. Jacob Viner was even more adamant in stating to the joint committee that "the amount of change that complete free trade would make in the American economy is not very large. I fear that the amount of gain the American economy can make out of free trade has fairly narrow limits. I fear it only in this sense: The amount of good we can do to the rest of the world through free trade is limited, and the amount of good we can get for ourselves from that avenue, as against the benefits we can get from other avenues of good government, is also limited" (hearings, p. 969).

But although lower United States tariff schedules are not a panacea for the world's economic difficulties, they can very easily be the demise of many of our domestic industries, which primarily due to higher labor costs, just cannot compete with foreign imports enjoying cheaper labor and water transportation costs.

A great number of these domestic industries are engaged in the production of raw materials, such as our metals, petroleum and agricultural products, which must be processed. Yet it is exactly these types of commodities which make up the vast bulk of our imports. In this connection, Mr. Nathaniel Knowles, Jr., Acting Deputy Director, Bureau of Foreign Comerce, Department of Commerce, told the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that "some 70 percent of our exports consist of manufactured goods shipped in substantially the forms in which they are finally utilized abroad. * * * Our imports, in contrast to our exports, consist preponderantly of raw materials and crude foodstuff requiring extensive further processing before entering into consumption channels. * * * Less than one-fifth of our imports enter the country as substantially finished products" (hearings, p. 930).

Now, with these facts in mind, it is not difficult to see why the export-minded segments of our economy not only do not fear lower tariff rates on imports but actually favor them. First, foreign imports provide a

cheap source of raw materials. Second, with our great advantage in the techniques of industrial production, they have little to fear from competitive imports.

As Dr. Arthur Upgren, dean, Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, Princeton University, told the Joint Committee on the Economic Report a few weeks ago:

"The barrier to a great inflow in imports is largely the $160 billion investment of American plant in new industry.

"With that huge investment American industry would generally meet the price conditions which would be imposed by tariff reduction. What I am saying here is that the proposal of trade, not aid, about a year or two ago, could not have accomplished but a very small amount of the achievement that was dramatized by the visit of two members of the British Cabinet. This was important, but we should not try to persuade the American people that we can do so much more than is possible" (hearings, p. 891).

Actually, one is led to suspect that this drive for a so-called trade, not aid, program is an argument that has been advanced not because it will cure the economic ills of the world, but because it serves better the interests of the export-minded segments of our domestic economy. Commodities which enjoy an appreciable export market, it would appear, are in a far better position to be considered for tariff reductions under the trade agreements program than are our raw material industries. This would probably include, for example, automobiles and special high-grade-production machine tools. Yet the protection afforded to the steel and automobile industries by way of comparison with lead and zinc, a raw material, is relatively much greater.

Simultaneously, however, with the reduction of United States tariff rates, to about half of what they were in 1930 by the Executive under the trade-agreements program, there arose a growing volume of protest from certain segments of American industry. The complaints have charged that such negotiated agreements contained tariff and other concessions which resulted not only in American producers losing domestic markets but also in the demise of American industries. And as the years have gone by this conflict has grown and magnified, producing in its wake voluminous but conflicting opinions and literature on the subject of trade agreements.

As I indicated in my remarks to the Senate on January 25, 1954, I am in general agreement with President Eisenhower's statement in his special message on foreign economic policy to the effect that all nations should mutually undertake the lowering of unjustified barriers to trade "on a mutual basis so that the benefits can be shared by all." But, as I said on that occasion, the "all" who share in those benefits must include those efficient domestic industries which are operating in the face of ruinous and disadvantageous competitive conditions with foreign imports. Our experience to date, however, seems to indicate that certain revisions in the trade-agreements program are necessary if these two objectives are to be realized.

An analysis of escape-clause applications and their administrative disposal will make this quite clear. The escape clause, as you undoubtedly know was not an original part of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Rather, it was the product of extensive liberality in granting tariff and other concessions by the executive branch under the trade-agreements program and the result of increasing protest by American industries adversely affected by excessive imports. The function of the escape clause is, of course, to compromise the conflict which arises between the need and desirability of freer international trade and the need for protecting defense and certain other industries fundamental to the economies of certain sections of the United States, the customs and traditions of our people, and for maintaining safeguards which protect wages, industry, and agriculture.

The early trade agreements negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 contained no general means of providing realistic relief if a particular concession proved unexpectedly injurious to a domestic industry. Although escape clauses had been contained in bilateral-trade agreements since 1941 and in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade since 1947, it remained for the Congress, because of the difficulty of foreseeing the contingencies that might arise, to make the inclusion of an escape clause in new trade agreements a statutory requirement. This was accomplished in 1951 by the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The facts, however, indicate that the executive branch of the Federal Government and the United States Tariff Commission have not, in general, interpreted and administered the escape-clause provisions as the Congress so intended. First, it is interesting to note that of 56 applications, which were filed during the period 1948–54, the Commission recommended relief in only 12 instances, all but 2 of which involved only products of minor importance.

But why only 12 favorable applications? In part, because the Congress has failed to establish definite criteria for the Commission to follow in arriving at decisions. But primarily it is because the Commission in considering the effect of increased imports on production, profits, and employment has consistently held that an industry is deemed to include, for purposes of escape-clause relief, all the operations of the constituent firm making the application, rather than only those operations that are directly related to the production of the product identified in the escape-clause application.

This interpretation has directly served to nullify the intent of the Congress to give needed tariff relief.

Second, how close has the President followed what we must presume to be the expert recommendations of the Tariff Commission? Of the 12 favorable Commission recommendations I mentioned a few moments ago, 7 were unanimous decisions and 1 was a 3-to-2 decision.

Yet, in only five instances did the President follow the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission. These 5 favorable actions by the President involved the following 4 products, which the Commission unanimously believed needed relief. They included: (a) Women's fur felt hats and hat bodies; (b) hatter's fur; (c) dried figs; (d) alsike clover seed.

The other product—watches, movements, and parts (second investigation)—involved a favorable recommendation decided by a 4-to-2 vote of the Commission.

In three other cases the President refused to grant relief even though by unanimous vote the Tariff Commission had recommended such action. These even included a decision with respect to lead and zinc which are strategic raw materials and which the Office of Defense Mobilization believes is an industry we must preserve. Likewise, he refused to grant relief with respect to three 4-to-2 decisions and one 3-to-2 decision of the Tariff Commission.

In these cases, despite the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, an expert body, the President held to the contrary, for reasons which seemed satisfactory to him, that serious injury to the domestic industry had not been established. This record has convinced me that the executive branch has consistently and deliberately ignored the intent of the Congress in its administration of the escape clause provisions. Congress intended that mechanism to be used by the executive branch to grant relief to domestic industries injured by the excessive importation of competing commodities due to tariff or other concessions obtained by foreign competitors through trade agreements which we had concluded with their governments.

Because the facts simply indicate to me that the intent of the Congress has been ignored, I appeared before the Finance Committee in mid-March to offer for their consideration a series of amendments to H. R. 1, which I believed essential to the welfare of this country. I am indeed happy to note that the Finance Committee has accepted most of those amendments in substance which briefly are as follows:

First, section 3 (a) while authorizing the President to enter into foreign trade agreements, provides that the enactment of H. R. 1 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This matter, therefore, will be deleted at a future date on its own merit, if any, as should be the case.

Second, section 3 (d) requires the President to submit to the Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. It also directs the Tariff Commission to keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Executive, and to submit to the Congress at least once a year a factual report on the operation of the trade agreements program.

Third, section 6 (a) provides, as a criteria for escape-clause action, that increased imports, either actual or relative, are to be considered by the Tariff Commission in escape-clause proceedings, as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury, or the threat of serious injury, to the industry making application for relief.

Fourth, section 6 (b) provides that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than 1 such industry, or more than 1 such segment of a single industry, the Tariff Commission shall distinguish or separate, so far as practicable, the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining import injury, and that for purposes of recommending relief the domestic industry shall be held to include only those operations that relate directly to the production of the products under investigation.

In addition, it is interesting to note that section 7 of H. R. 1 as reported by the Finance Committee provides that whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President. Then if the President agrees that there is reason for such a belief, he will cause an immediate investigation to be made to ascertain the facts. If the investigation substantiates the existence of such facts, then he is authorized to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

Whether this so-called vital industry amendment becomes a reality or not depends upon the sincerity with which it is administered by the President and his staff. Because of this fact, I want to briefly review the lead and zinc experience to date and then to make some specific observations with respect to what my course of action will be unless this vital industry is given immediate assistance.

During the Korean war, foreign production of lead and zinc was greatly increased

through the support of American aid and by comparatively high domestic prices during a period when domestic production was restricted by price controls. After the war as a result, excess foreign lead and zinc supplies have continued to flow into our domestic markets at prices well below the average cost of domestic production.

Mr. Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead and Zinc Committee, told the Finance Committee, during the course of its hearings on H. R. 1, that "such action has made marginal mines out of once prosperous properties." In the spring of 1953, the mining industry was advised to seek relief through the escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act rather than by legislative means.

The Senate Finance Committee, as well as the House Ways and Means Committee, were sufficiently impressed with the problems of the lead and zinc mining industry at that time to direct the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to the respective resolutions of July 27, 1953, and July 29, 1953, to initiate a general investigation of the industry, including the effect of imports of lead and zinc on the domestic prices and employment.

On May 21, 1954, the Tariff Commission unanimously reported to the President that the importation of lead and zinc was in such quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. In order to correct the problems, the Tariff Commission recommended that "* * * the rates of duty 50 percent above the rates existing on January 1, 1945 * * * be imposed for an indefinite period."

The President, however, for what were sufficient reasons to him, did not follow the expert recommendations of the Tariff Commission. Instead, on August 20, 1954, the Government initiated a long-term stockpiling program for lead and zinc. And although, by this action, the President recognized in effect that the excessive importation of lead and zinc had injured the mining industry, the results to date indicate that it has not appreciably improved the situation.

Since August 1954, the price of zinc has advanced only 1 cent, from 11 cents per pound to the April quotation of 12 cents. Why? Primarily, because unlimited imports of zinc and slab zinc have continued to flow into this country. As Mr. Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead and Zinc Committee, told the Finance Committee:

"For the year 1954 on an average of 41,460 tons of zinc a month from foreign ores in addition to an average of 13,444 tons of imported slab zinc, a total of 54,904 tons, entered United States consumption while the output of the mines at home was dropping to an average of 38,750 tons.

"Excessive imports of foreign ores have been taking over a larger proportion of United States smelter production at the expense of the Nation's mines. Domestic mine output of zinc consequently has been reduced to less than 39,000 tons a month from an average of 60,000 tons a month in early 1952. Smelter production of zinc is at an all-time high while mine output of lead and zinc is the smallest since the depression years, 1931–34."

That stockpiling has not accomplished the purpose it was intended to achieve, is evident from the testimony given by the Office of Defense Mobilization on March 29, 1955, before the subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Interior Committee. In response to a question by Representative ASPINALL as to whether the American mining industry was in a better position today to furnish strategic materials and metals in case of an international conflict than a year ago, an official spokesman of Office of Defense Mobilization replied that while such was the case with respect to some industries, the lead and zinc industry was on the brink of going to the wall and that something had to be done to prop it up.

To the extent that stockpiling does increase the domestic price of lead and zinc, it seems to serve as a magnet in attracting foreign imports in much the same way as the rigid 90 percent farm price support program has attracted the importation of agricultural commodities. But whereas the American farmer can rely on section 22 to limit imports, the lead and zinc industry has only had the escape clause provision, which the executive branch has declined to invoke.

Now, personally I believe that the Congress should at this time return to itself a larger share of the direct responsibility for our tariff-making policy in those areas of intense conflict which has been generated by the trade agreements program. Specifically, I refer to an amendment I proposed on the occasion of my mid-March appearance before the Senate Finance Committee.

This amendment would have made findings of the Tariff Commission final with respect to recommendations for relief under an escape clause proceeding, unless either House of the Congress by an affirmative vote of a majority of its Members passed a resolution stating that it did not favor the plan.

However, I have decided after considerable thought and study not to offer this amendment. I shall instead vote for H. R. 1 with the Committee amendments if adopted, because:

1. I hope and believe President Eisenhower will take quick and affirmative action under the so-called "vital industry" amendment with respect to lead and zinc and other commodities if impartial studies show that they need relief, as has been ably demonstrated in the case of lead and zinc, by the expert findings of the Tariff Commission and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

2. I hope and believe that the members of the Finance Committee will keep an alert and active check upon the the administration of this amendment by the executive branch as the remarks of many of its members here during the debates on H. R. 1 have indicated.

But I do take this occasion to serve notice not only upon the Senate but also the Executive branch, that unless affirmative and effective action is taken to protect vital American industries, I shall join with other Members of the Congress in an effort to enact into law the objectives of the amendment I proposed to the Finance Committee, which will return to the Congress effective control over the tariff-making procedure and specifically will make the escape clause provisions effective.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received from the American Farm Bureau Federation expressing the views of the federation on H. R. 1.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1955.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation urgently requests your suport for H. R. 1, as recommended by Senate Finance Committee. Extension of Trade Agreements Act will help maintain economic strength of free world and assist in expansion of markets so necessary to welfare of American farmers.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Finance Committee has reported H. R. 1, with highly important amendments, on which I shall comment briefly.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and I felt that H. R. 1 required certain changes to preserve the reciprocal and selective principles of the trade agreement program, to achieve the intended protection of American labor and industry from destructive imports, and to eliminate certain new features which appeared to us to be inconsistent with sound legislation. Our intended amendments to this end were ordered printed and referred to the Finance Committee on March 30.

Of the 6 important amendments which we proposed, and 3 in which we joined with 15 other Senators, a total of 9 amendments, 8 were accepted, specifically:

First. The Congress' present policies with respect to GATT were preserved; and there is removed any approval by implication of arrangements entered into without the knowledge and consent of Congress.

Second. The so-called basket clause was eliminated so as to place tariff adjustments, up or down, on the selective basis which the President had requested.

Third. Safeguards for national defense industries were written into the bill.

Fourth. The definition of injury was strengthened to make it clearly the intent of the Congress that an injured industry could not be denied due recourse through technicalities.

Fifth. The definition of an industry was clarified so as to permit companies or segments of industries to receive the due recourse now often denied them.

Sixth. For rate reduction purposes, January 1, 1955 was substituted for July 1, 1955.

Seventh. The special provision for reducing tariffs on negligible import items, was stricken out.

Eighth. The provision that American concessions might be exchanged for third-country concessions for Japanese goods, was stricken out.

Only one important proposal made by us—namely, that the findings of the Tariff Commission be made more binding than is now the case—failed of adoption.

It is, of course, gratifying to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that the amendments which we proposed, which are very important to our section of the country and, we believe, to the country generally, were incorporated in the bill as reported by the Finance Committee. On behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island and myself, I wish to thank the committee for its action.

Mr. President, it is, of course, gratifying that the Finance Committee has concurred in our views and has adopted so much of our amendatory provisions. However, the important point is not our sponsorship, but, rather, the necessity for and effect of these amendments.

Before commenting on specific amendments, I should like to make clear that the amendments are not crippling

amendments. On the contrary, they make H. R. 1 more, not less, consistent with our foreign-trade policies. For example, they restore certain statutory language which has been in our trade-agreement law since its inception. They also restore and strengthen certain more recent provisions which experience has shown to be necessary.

The report of the Finance Committee contains this accurate, one-sentence summary:

The bill as reported by the committee continues the trade-agreements program and strengthens the safeguards against serious injury to the country's economy.

The first changes I should like to mention are on page 2, in lines 22–25, and on page 3, in lines 1–14, of the bill. These changes delete new matter, and restore provisions of existing law respecting authority to enter into foreign trade agreements, and restore the provision rebutting any inference that the trade agreement extension is to be construed as approving or disapproving GATT.

In my letter of April 15 to the chairman of the Finance Committee, I pointed out why these changes should be made. I stated:

H. R. 1, as it passed the House, includes in its proposed amendment to section 350 (a) language never before included. It specifically authorizes the execution of trade agreements containing "provisions relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters related to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this section similar to any of the foregoing." This language appears to have been taken directly from GATT and can only be intended as an implied approval of things which have been or may be done under the aegis of GATT, or any similar organization, in spite of express disclaimers as to GATT, made by Congress in past renewals of the Trade Agreements Act. * * *

H. R. 1 as it passed the House, specifically disclaims congressional approval or disapproval of the "organizational" provisions of GATT. Past disclaimers have never been limited to the organizational provisions only. They covered substantive provisions as well.

A second series of changes—to be found on pages 12 and 13 of the bill—are with respect to proof of serious injury to domestic industry. These are of great importance in securing effective protection.

As pointed out in my letter to the chairman of the Finance Committee:

Despite the fact that "increased imports" are listed in section 7 (b) of the Extension Act of 1951 as only one of the factors to be considered by the Commission in determining whether a domestic industry has been injured, a group of Tariff Commissioners has interpreted section 7 (b) as requiring a finding that increased imports are the sole cause of the injury. In the clothespin decision of October 6, 1954, three commissioners based their determination on the conclusion that section 7 (a) "literally" means that "increased imports must in and of themselves be found to be the cause of threat of serious injury before a recommendation for 'escape' action can be justified." The report further says:

Obviously, therefore, the extent of the increased imports must be of such scope and intensity as to be in and of themselves responsible for serious injury (report, p. 35).

This interpretation has apparently been adopted by the President since in many cases where he has rejected Tariff Commission recommendations for relief he has emphasized the fact that increased imports were not the sole cause of the injury to the industry.

Accordingly, it was necessary to have the clarifying amendment that—

Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

As I also stated in my letter:

The term "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products," as used in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, has given rise to a number of interpretations in cases presented to the Tariff Commission, and has possibly prevented certain industries from using the escape clause procedure even though they have been injured by concessions. Where an industry produces a large number of items, only one of which is affected by a concession, the Commission has been reluctant to find the existence of injury unless it could be shown that losses on the affected item were so great as to offset profits which the industry may have made in the production of other items.

Accordingly, the adoption of clarifying amendments is necessary, if the intention of Congress is to be preserved, and if domestic products are to be saved from destructive competition.

The testimony before the committee is replete with examples of the fatal effect of foreign competition on various important products, and particularly on new-product development. Accordingly, it was vitally important to include the amendment to be found on page 13 of the bill, which provides that:

(e) As used in this act, the terms "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" and "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles" means that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.

The defense amendment on pages 13 and 14 of H. R. 1 is likewise highly important.

As I stated in my letter to the committee:

Section 2 of the Extension Act of 1954 provides that no action may be taken to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements. This is a highly desirable provision but is applicable only to future reductions in import duties. It is of no value in correcting a condition which has arisen because of an existing concession. Lines 9 through 18 on page 4 of the Bridges-Pastore amendments extend this provision to require the President to withdraw or modify past tariff concessions necessary to prevent injury to domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

It will be noted that it provides:

(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

Thus, the defense amendment would apply to trade concessions affecting national defense, whenever negotiated, and would provide for action to whatever extent a situation may warrant.

The principal amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island and myself which was not accepted by the committee contemplated that findings of injury by the Tariff Commission should be binding, and that the President should act accordingly to protect the industry involved, in the absence of overriding factors of national security. I am disturbed by the fact that the staff of the President have frequently disregarded findings by a Commission established by the Congress.

I am disturbed that they have done this, although there is no statutory authority for such action, which frequently can be arbitrary. Something should be done to restrict the actions of those whom the senior Senator from Georgia has referred to as "lovable visionaries." Something should be done to bring practical administration to our trade program. I have no desire to tie the hands of our President in his endeavors, but I do not believe impractical dreamers in the State Department or the executive agencies should be permitted to overrule findings of fact based on extended hearings. If the language on this point in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island and me is unacceptable, then, as a minimum, findings by the Tariff Commission as to injury should be made final, leaving it to the President to determine what, if any, action he may see fit to take in the light of other factors.

We in New England recognize that foreign trade is a two-way street. Trade looms large in our economic history. A great majority of people throughout the United States recognize that granting an extension of trade-agreement authority is of key importance at this time, in view of the general situation.

I feel certain that all the safeguarding amendments I have described are consistent with sound trade-agreement principles, and that they go no further than is necessary in carrying out these principles.

To keep the record clear, I call attention to the primary authority of what the President desires, in contrast to what

would result from some of the intricate provisions of H. R. 1, except for amendments I have mentioned.

If unamended, H. R. 1 would go far beyond the provisions of H. R. 9474, of the 83d Congress; and with modifications of that bill, as suggested by the President, as I stated in my letter:

The President's letter of February 17, 1955, to the House of Representatives in support of H. R. 1, calls for selective consideration of tariffs, avoidance of serious injury to any United States industry, and an approach which would always keep in mind the welfare of United States industry domestically (as well as the world problems). These factors indicate that the major changes in H. R. 1 and administration policies as previously announced may have been made by the "lovable visionaries" in the State Department without adequate explanation or information to those who have been supporting the bill as written.

I believe that the amendments I have referred to would make H. R. 1 more, not less, responsive to the desire for a sound and realistic continuance of the trade-agreements program.

I feel most deeply that the President does not desire, and the Congress will not enact, legislation which might result in selective destruction of important areas of our domestic industry, and in weakening our economy and our industrial and military potential. I submit that the amendments I have discussed are vital safeguards of American labor and industry, and are consistent, rather than inconsistent, with the furtherance of our reciprocal international trade on an effective and realistic basis.

I believe that these safeguards coincide with the President's philosophy, as expressed in his letter of February 17, 1955, to the minority leader of the House, in which letter the President stated:

Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women * * * No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure.

Accordingly, Mr. President, it is my belief that H. R. 1 will be adopted with these amendments, and that they will be agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Representative MARTIN by President Eisenhower, under date of February 17.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 17, 1955.

The Honorable JOE MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I was concerned to learn from you that there are Members of the Congress who are not wholly familiar with my philosophy respecting H. R. 1 and with my concept of the administration of this program. I send you this letter to eliminate any misunderstanding that may exist.

This point I should like especially to emphasize: Few programs will contribute more fundamentally to the long-term security of our country than the foreign-economic program submitted to the Congress on January 10. This program, built around H. R. 1, will powerfully reinforce the military and economic strength of our own country and is of the greatest importance to the well-being of the free world. The program underlies much of our military effort abroad and promises our people ultimate relief from burdensome foreign-assistance programs now essential to free-world security. It recognizes the creditor status of America in the world and assures leadership of our people in the easing of unjustifiable trade barriers which today weaken all who are joined in opposition to the advance of communism. These considerations underlie my earnest advocacy of H. R. 1. I deeply believe that the national interest calls for enactment of this measure.

I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our workingmen and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril-point and escape-clause safeguards in the legislation.

I want to say further that this same philosophy of administration will govern our actions in the trade negotiations which are to begin next week at Geneva.

You are aware, of course, that by law this program will be gradual in application. A key provision of the bill limits to 5 percent of existing tariff rates the annual reduction in these rates permissible over a 3-year period, and unused authority will not carry forward from year to year. You know, too, that this program will be selective in application, for across-the-board revisions of tariff rates would poorly serve our Nation's interests. The differing circumstances of each industry must be, and will be, carefully considered. The program, moreover, provides for reciprocity, and in the program's administration the principle of true reciprocity will be faithfully applied. Americans cannot alone solve all world-trade difficulties; the cooperation of our friends abroad is essential. With such cooperation, this program provides the means for doing our part to help emancipate free-world commerce from the shackles now holding back its full development.

For the reasons I have here outlined, I hope that H. R. 1, which is so important to every American citizen and to the free world, will receive the wholehearted support of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, had I been present this afternoon when a division vote was taken on the Neely amendment, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for his analysis of the bill from the viewpoint of New England.

As I stated on Monday, I believe that the bill in its present form will make it possible to enter into reciprocal-trade agreements, and at the same time allow our New England industries to go forward. I hope the peril point and escape clauses will permit the bicycle industry of Massachusetts and any other industries which may suffer to obtain adequate relief. At present, the New England bicycle industry is experiencing serious difficulties because of excessive imports. The provisions of the bill under which proper relief may be afforded must be conscientiously and persistently administered.

Mr. President, I hope the bill as it is now constituted will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a brief statement by myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS OF NEBRASKA

I have had an opportunity during many years in the Congress to work very closely with the formulation of our reciprocal-trade program. I believe, as do my colleagues, that trade which is economically advantageous to the United States is a very sound objective. However, we have witnessed the United States during 20-odd years of trade regulations make firm concessions to nations desiring our trade and receive, in return, only paper concessions. Alternatives, such as the well-known balance of payments, plus certain customs controls and licensing practices have made it most difficult for American exporters to obtain the same degree of good faith which we have extended, under our agreements, to foreign exporters.

As I view the bill reported by the Senate committee, language has been incorporated to remedy many of our past mistakes. A firm bargaining attitude on the part of American representatives at trade meetings, plus a careful policing under the terms of the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee, can keep us on a par with foreign nations seeking our trade.

I come from an agricultural State and know that every effort must be made to find markets for an abundance of agricultural products. I realize, that at the same time, the American farmer and the American wage earner must be fully protected from foreign production which is unfairly competitive due to low-wage scale and other local circumstances. As I point out, I view the bill before us as having incorporated more of the means of self-protection than the previous acts. I will urge upon appropriate committees and executive agencies a very careful surveillance on future trade. If the powers granted by the committee bill are not prudently exercised, I feel that extensions beyond the term proposed by this legislation will take a vastly different shape.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have given long and careful thought to how I should vote on H. R. 1, providing for extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

This bill has been approved by the Senate committee charged with studying its provisions. This is a very able committee whose members are unusually well informed and hard working.

I am, nevertheless, reluctantly obliged to vote against the bill. Later, I shall give my specific objections to it; but they are applications of two principles which have guided me in my votes on many issues.

First. The bill delegates to the executive branch the legislative authority of the Congress. I am compelled in conscience to vote against any bills which give to the President or any subordinate of the executive branch the powers specifically assigned to Congress by the Constitution.

Second. The bill continues the practice of meshing American governmental actions into international superagencies which operate above our laws and above the Constitution. I am compelled in conscience to vote against any bill which increases or even perpetuates machinery to make our Government into a spoke in the wheel of world government.

Specifically my objections are as follows:

First. The bill transfers to the President the power to lay and collect tariffs and regulate our commerce with foreign nations, which power the Constitution gives solely to Congress.

Second. The bill permits the President to transfer his authority to subordinates. This is exercise of the legislative power by appointed officials who have received no mandate from the people. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is to be congratulated on the fine presentation he made this afternoon of this very point.

Third. The bill permits the President or his subordinates to transfer this delegated power to international agencies such as GATT. This means that Congress would be a party to subjecting American citizens and American commerce to decisions made by international officials, who not only have no mandate from our voters, but are not subject in any way to our Constitution and our laws.

Fourth. The power of the President to transfer his delegated authority to international agencies is by this bill not only continued but actually increased.

Fifth. The international regulations and administrative machinery of GATT to which we may be committed have never been submitted to Congress for approval or rejection.

Sixth. The bill as drawn commits the next Congress, not yet elected, to this abrogation of its powers and duties under the Constitution. This deprives our people of their right to change our policies in a future election.

Seventh. The bill permits three successive reductions in our tariffs, amounting to 15 percent, although we have been steadily lowering tariffs for years, and now have tariffs lower than most other nations of the world.

Eighth. Other countries have not reciprocated by lowering the barriers to American goods. They maintain barriers against American goods through exchange controls and other machinery devices, which have actually increased since we began the program of reciprocal trade agreements.

Ninth. Mr. President, as was pointed out this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and other distinguished Members of the Senate, the bill would disastrously affect certain industrial and geographical areas, causing economic slum areas in the United States, for the workers, and for businesses dependent upon local industrial activity.

Tenth. The bill would circumvent congressional authority to limit importation of farm products. It would enable the executive branch or foreign governments to negate our farm legislation.

Eleventh. The bill would tend to shift trade in materials which may be vital in war, to areas near the Communist world, over a long and dangerous haul, if war broke out. The bill neglects possible trade with areas in this hemisphere where the haul in wartime would be shorter or less exposed.

Twelfth. The bill is not a trade bill. It is a foreign-policy program. It represents the growing tendency of the State Department to exercise power over Cabinet departments and governmental areas which should be equal to, not subordinate to, State Department officials and their recommendations.

Thirteenth. This State Department policy rests on a basic fallacy in interpreting world economic problems. The markets for Western Europe were in Eastern Europe and in Asia. The Soviet Union struck at Europe, by amputating its markets. Our foreign-policy makers tried, first, to fill the gap by giving billions of dollars to Europe as mutual aid. When that program failed, they tried to cover the failure by the slogan, "trade, not aid." At best, it will help Europe enter well-supplied markets, by lowering the standard of living of American workers. But there is no evidence that this sacrifice of American living standards would solve the real problem, which is the opening of the natural outlets for European manufacturers. Those outlets are the unindustrialized nations of central Europe and Asia.

Fourteenth. The same difficulty applies to Japan. Japan's economic life was badly shattered by permitting the fall of China and parts of Indochina to the Communists. This program would fill the gap by increasing Japanese imports to this highly industrialized area. The lowering of the American standard of living and the growth of economic slums in this country would do practically nothing to replace the natural trade between industrial Japan and an unindustrialized Asia.

Fifteenth. This State Department policy puts forward another, even more dangerous, fallacy in its claim that lowering American tariffs and standards of living will lead to peace.

The way to test this program, Mr. President, is to look at the record. This program was initiated in the early thirties, with a plea that it would increase world trade and strengthen peace. Let us ask what has happened to peace since Mr. Hull first tried to lead the United States down the road of one-sided self-sacrifice for the sake of peace. Has there ever been a time in history when we had less peace?

The doctrine of tariff reductions did nothing to stop the war plans of Mussolini or of Hitler. It did nothing to soften the militancy of the Communist government. It did nothing to change British reliance on social welfare panaceas imported from the continent, instead of old-fashioned British commercial enterprise. It did nothing to halt Japan's pursuit of military self-sufficiency. Japan sold us cheap goods and hoarded our scrap iron, to make the bullets she fired at the Chinese, and later at us.

Since 1945, the State Department's economic policy has been directed with increasing fervor to lowering the American standard of living so European nations could live on gifts. It spent billions to shore up the economy of Europe at our expense, without once studying the basic problem. Have we had peace? Has our sacrifice helped Europe or the United States to end its spending on armaments, its preparation for atomic war?

H. R. 1 is a bill to perpetuate the dream world of false economics which we entered on in 1933, and to strengthen the dangerous reality of international control, which we have submitted to with diminishing resistance since World War II accustomed us to the straitjacket.

I do not know when the Congress will cast aside this rosy illusion of politically managed trade and this dangerous superstructure of international controls. I know the people are waking up. I know the Congress will soon see where we are going. I know these controls and this political management of trade will be ended. Though only a few votes may be registered on our side today, I am confident the wisdom of our people and our Congress will soon free us from this false doctrine. I know we shall turn back to the road of private enterprise and nonpolitical trade on which our greatness rests.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

PRESIDENT MAY TRADE ANY SECTOR OF THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Indiana understand that under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as proposed to be extended by House bill H. R. 1, the President may trade any sector of the domestic economy for an international political arrangement?

Mr. JENNER. I do. That is another reason why I am voting against it.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION IS FINAL

Mr. MALONE. A further question if the Senator will yield. Regardless of any amendment which may have been placed in the bill—H. R. 1—extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, is it not fully un-

derstood that the judgment of the President, or of the official to whom this power is delegated, is final, regardless of any peril point, escape clause, or any other safeguard?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly correct. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] brought it out very clearly today. We are sitting here tonight whittling away the powers of the Congress, and actually violating our oaths as Senators.

AMENDED THE CONSTITUTION BY SIMPLE ACT OF CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. One further question if the Senator will yield. Does the Senator understand that through this bill—H. R. 1—we are extending an act—the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—which tied the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade, and the fixing of foreign policy, when, as a matter of fact, the Constitution of the United States definitely and pointedly separated the two by placing in the hands of the legislative branch, in article I, section 8, the adjustment of the duties, excises, and imposts which we call tariffs, the regulation of the domestic economy and of foreign trade; and in article II, section 2, placed in the Executive the power to regulate foreign policy?

I ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if the Congress did not, through the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, amend the Constitution of the United States by a simple act of Congress and transfer to the President their constitutional responsibility to regulate the domestic economy and foreign trade?

Mr. JENNER. I believe that has been made perfectly clear; but, so far as the constitutional duties of this body are concerned, I think we might as well have before us the Almanac, and let Senators read that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, may we have another minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Indiana.

REFUSE OTC AND GATT GOES ON

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator understand that, while there has been discussion in the newspapers to the effect that the question of the organization under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva is coming before the Congress, as a matter of fact, what has been introduced in the House is a bill which would reorganize GATT, under the new name of the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC—and that if we approve the Organization for Trade Cooperation we approve the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—but that if we refuse to approve OTC, GATT will go on as before since, as the Secretary of State testified before the Senate Finance Committee, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act itself authorized the formation of GATT, and H. R. 1 extends that authority.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct, because it is in the original law.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I wish to express my great satisfaction in seeing today the amazing shift of support to the "peril point" provision—a provision defeated not too many years ago. We peril-point advocates welcome the new converts to our side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the act which we are asked to extend has proved disastrous to the farmers of the Nation. I see nothing in the measure which we are considering which would help the farmers. On the contrary, in my opinion it would hurt them.

My reasons are pretty well set forth in the hearings held before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on importations of rye and barley. The reasons for my voting against this measure are clearly indicated therein. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the hearing may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript of hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTATIONS OF RYE AND BARLEY

(Wednesday, September 23, 1953)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 2:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator LANGER.

Also present: Thomas B. Collins, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. You may proceed, Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS. Senator LANGER, this is a hearing called to develop information relative to the importation of Canadian rye into the United States.

Our chairman has specifically requested the staff to obtain some information regarding the necessity of having a permit to import rye into the United States, and, if there are such permits, to ascertain what Government department issues the permit and the firms that have received permits within the last year or so, and the quantities of rye that have been imported by these firms using the permits.

Mr. Chairman, we have with us Mr. Walter A. Davidson of the Federal Feed Act Division of the Department of Agriculture, who is familiar with the importation of seed rye. I think that Mr. Davidson can give information that would be helpful on this subject that we are studying.

We also have present Mr. Douglas Bagnell, who is with the Commodity Exchange Authority here in Washington, D. C.

STATEMENTS OF WALTER A. DAVIDSON, FEDERAL SEED ACT DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; AND DOUGLAS BAGNELL, COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be delighted to hear from you, Mr. Davidson.

Mr. COLLINS. You might cover first of all, Mr. Davidson, whether there is any need today for a permit to import rye into the United States. My understanding is that since there are no controls on rye at the present time and no quotas, therefore there is no necessity for a permit, as such?

Mr. DAVIDSON. That is right.

So far as the word "permit" is understood to be something comparable to the permits now issued for the importation of seed wheat beyond the quotas that are established, there is no permit required for rye. The only thing that is required for importations of seed rye are those that come by reason of the Federal Seed Act, requiring importations of seed to meet certain standards of quality. Samples of the rye and other seed that are offered for importation are tested and, if the seed meets the certain standard of quality laid down in the act, then a notice, as we call it, which may be construed as a permit also, is sent to the customs officials, and a copy sent to the importer, notifying him that the seed meets the requirements for importation and may come in, or fails to meet the requirements and is refused admission.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, last, there were only 16,000 pounds of rye offered for importation and admitted under the Federal Seed Act.

The CHAIRMAN. What about other kinds of rye, aside from seed?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would not have any information on that.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted that information.

Mr. COLLINS. We will hear from Mr. Bagnell, Senator, on that phase.

Mr. DAVIDSON. So the quantity that has come in for seeding purposes has been, according to these records, rather small in the past.

Now, since the 1st of September of this year we have had roughly 200,000 pounds that were offered for importation intended for planting purposes. There were none during July and August. So apparently the volume this year will be larger than it was last year. We are a little inclined to think that there have been some importations in small quantities in the past not declared, even though used for seeding purposes, and therefore not reflected in these figures.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, as far as importation of other types of rye, other than seed rye, inasmuch as there are no controls whatsoever, it can be imported without any necessity for a permit?

Mr. DAVIDSON. So far as I am able to determine, that is correct.

Mr. COLLINS. Could you give us for the record, as long as you are acquainted with the importation of seed rye, the names of the persons who imported it by permit or under the Federal Seed Act for fiscal 1951 and 1952?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I do not have those readily available to me now, but the largest proportion of it was imported, as I recall, by Northrup King & Co., a seed company in Minneapolis, Minn., and another quantity by Klineworth, at Carrington, N. Dak. Other importations were in rather small amounts.

The importation since September 1 has come primarily through ports in New York State, and they have gone to seed dealers in Buffalo, primarily, including Arthur R. Cohn, Eastern States Farmers Exchange, and I think there was one for Sanford Feed Co. I believe that is all; just those three firms in Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Davidson, I understand that there is a duty of 6 cents per bushel for the importation of both seed rye and feed rye. Is that the current duty, as far as you know?

Mr. DAVIDSON. That is something, of course, that the folks in customs are better acquainted with than I am, but it is my understanding that it is 6 cents per bushel of 56 pounds, regardless of whether it is for seed or feed or other purposes.

Mr. COLLINS. I would like to read a comment from today's Wall Street Journal, September 23, 1953:

"Traders received reports that over the weekend 350,000 bushels of Canadian rye were

shipped to South Chicago, and 70,000 bushels cleared for Buffalo. In addition, 660,000 bushels of Canadian oats cleared for Buffalo. This news caused selling of oats and rye futures on the Chicago Board of Trade."

I would also like to make this information a part of the record: That a recent dispatch from Ottawa stated that the carryover of the Canadian rye crop was 16.4 million bushels as against 8.1 million of the year before.

Is there anything else, Mr. Davidson, that your Department would have on this matter of seed rye that would be helpful to the committee?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I do not think of anything now.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have any questions, Senator LANGER?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Douglas Bagnell of the Commodity Exchange Authority, Washington, D. C.

I wonder, Mr. Bagnell, if you could explain for the record your position with the CEA, and describe your duties generally?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes. My position is Chief, Compliance and Trade Practice Division, CEA, having to do with enforcement of the law.

The objective of the Commodity Exchange Act is to prevent manipulation in futures markets on the Chicago Board of Trade, the New York Cotton Exchange, and other markets dealing in commodity futures.

We are one of the bureaus of the Department, and are charged with that responsibility.

Shall I go into this rye situation?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, please, if you will.

Mr. BAGNELL. Going first into the importing angle that Mr. Davidson just talked about, I did bring some figures on the volume of imports in recent years, and down to a fairly current date.

I have a table here that shows the imports for the years beginning July 1, 1942, up to 1953. This shows a considerable variation in volume.

The biggest year was 1943–44, when about 8 million bushels came in. The smallest was 1947–48 when practically none came in.

In the current year, in which I imagine you are most interested, there has been about 5½ million bushels brought in through July of this year. That includes the seed rye, such as Mr. Davidson mentioned, and all other rye.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have anything to show how that would compare with the importation of a year ago?

Mr. BAGNELL. It is about 3 or 4 times as much. A year ago there was 1,300,000, and this year about 5,500,000. If you would like this table, it could be put into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the table will be put into the record.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Rye: Imports as grain into the United States from Canada, 1942–43 to 1952–53

[Thousands of bushels]

Year Beginning July—	Amount
1942–43	1,490
1943–44	8,314
1944–45	4,145
1945–46	1,996
1946–47	1,641
1947–48	41
1948–49	6,794
1949–50	9,007
1950–51	3,045
1951–52	1,342
1952–53	5,564

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Mr. BAGNELL. Then, subsequent to July 1 of this year—I have the figures through September 10—just about 10 days ago, and that shows that for July, August, and that much of September, about 2,300,000 bushels has been brought in. In other words, in about 2½ months, almost half as much has been brought in as during the whole last year, which was a pretty big year.

So, I have those figures, if you wish to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. We will put them into the record.

(The table referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Rye: Imports as grain into the United States from Canada

BY MONTHS, JULY 1951 TO JUNE 1953 [1]

[Bushels]

Month	1951–52	1952–53
July	591,592	7,254
August	39,440	382,506
September	48,090	78,378
October	6,174	95,130
November	2,639	42,742
December	147,258	1,031,867
January	12,707	470,984
February	54,221	0
March	135,736	416,946
April	23,840	1,524,475
May	280,217	991,389
June	0	522,394
Total	1,341,914	5,564,065

WEEKLY FROM JUNE 1953 [2]

Weeks ended—	Thousands of bushels
July 2, 1953	0
July 9, 1953	32
July 16, 1953	247
July 23, 1953	70
July 31, 1953	159
Aug. 6, 1953	30
Aug. 13, 1953	329
Aug. 20, 1953	277
Aug. 27, 1953	162
Sept. 3, 1953	290
Sept. 10, 1953	760

[1] Source: Bureau of the Census.
[2] Source: Grain Branch, PMA.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you see any connection, Mr. Bagnell, between the greatly increased importation of Canadian rye into this country, as shown by your figures, the increase this year over last year, and the fact that today rye is about 90 cents a bushel cheaper than it was a year ago? Is there a connection in the importation of this Canadian rye? Is it driving the price of our domestic rye down and causing the American farmer who is producing this rye to lose out in his fight to try to keep his production up and get a full return on his crop?

Mr. BAGNELL. I would not like to qualify as an economist, but from my observation of the commodity markets, I would say that an import figure of that type certainly would have a bearish effect on American prices.

It does not seem to me that you can very well reach any other conclusion.

The total volume of rye produced in this country, as I am sure you gentlemen know, is ranging from 20 million to 25 million bushels, and the imports are running roughly 20 and 25 percent of our total crop. So it would seem to me that it would certainly increase our supply, and anything that increases supply tends to put prices downward.

On the question of price, I have made some comparative tabulations. I do not have these in form to put into the record because I did not know what you wanted until this morning, but these are futures prices in Chicago and Winnipeg, and, as you know, the price of a cash commodity throughout the country hinges pretty much on future prices. Generally, a farmer who sells his rye in North Dakota to the local elevator will have them look at the board and tell him "We will pay so much above or below Chicago rye."

I find that on January 1 of this year Chicago futures were selling at about $1.90, and Winnipeg about $1.79 or $1.80.

In other words, Chicago was about 12 cents a bushel over Winnipeg. I do not need to tell you that Chicago has gone down since then. Those figures were January 1.

As of the current date, Chicago futures were selling about $1.04 to $1.05, having gone down about 85 cents or 86 cents.

Winnipeg was selling for about $1.04 also. In other words, now they are on about an even basis, Chicago not only having weakened about 86 cents, but also having weakened about 12 cents in relation to Winnipeg.

Winnipeg has been a firmer market although it has declined in price also.

Those are current prices, of about $1, compared to about $2 a year ago, at the same time.

Pursuant to your suggestion this morning, we have looked at this—and had previously looked at it—from the angle of possible manipulation in the futures markets.

To prove manipulation we have to show that someone is intentionally operating in a manner for the purpose of putting prices down. That is, if a man legitimately buys a commodity and brings it into this country and there is no law to prevent him from buying it, even though that increase puts the price down we cannot say that that is manipulation, any more than if a man brings a lot of shoes into Washington, and brings the price of shoes down. That is just an increase in supply, not manipulation.

Looking at it from that angle, we do not see anything that I believe could be successfully prosecuted as a manipulation case. There is no prohibition against bringing rye into the country, and the people who are bringing it in and are selling Chicago futures as a hedge against the cash rye are doing what you would normally expect an astute businessman to do. They see a chance to make a profit and they bring it in.

So, from the point of view of manipulation, we do not see it.

I will say that we have not investigated the rye imports as thoroughly as we have imports of oats. As you know, we did make a rather exhaustive investigation of that and, as a result, have filed charges against one of the largest importers, and also recommended criminal prosecution.

We thought that we had—and still think that we have—a case of manipulation there. We do not see the same picture in rye, although a more exhaustive investigation might change our minds, but I do not think it would.

Mr. COLLINS. As of the present moment, you do not think there could be any comparable manipulation in the rye market, comparable to the manipulation that you found in the oats market?

Mr. BAGNELL. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. It is pretty rough on the farmers raising rye in this country; is it not?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, sir, I would say that that is a fair statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the President take any action?

Mr. BAGNELL. As I understand it, Senator—and again, I am not an expert on this, the procedure has to be that the Department has to find that the imports are having an effect on their price-support program and, as I understand that, that means that there has to be enough rye turned in to the Government by farmers, under the price-support program, to jeopardize the price-support program.

In other words, under the law, they cannot simply look at price and say that prices have gone down so we have to invoke this restriction. They have to be able to establish that that decrease in prices has resulted in farmers putting so much stuff under the price-support program that it is about to jeopardize that program.

I have some figures from PMA which indicate that the deliveries to CCC under the price-support program have been very small, that they were only 81,000 bushels delivered under that program in 1952 and 1953; only 1,000 in 1951 and 1952; and 7,000 in 1950 and 1951.

If the CCC did find that so much rye was being turned over to them that it was jeopardizing their program, they then would recommend to the President that he direct the Tariff Commission to hold hearings and determine whether section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act should be invoked to prohibit or limit importations. They are going through this procedure right now on oats, I might say.

If the Tariff Commission found that it was justified to limit imports, they would so report to the President, and then the President could, as he saw fit, apply their recommendations.

In the case of oats, last May the Department recommended a limitation of 23 million bushels, I believe, per year. That is now in the hands of the Tariff Commission. They have had hearings, and I presume will report something to the President on it in due course. But, in direct answer to your question, Senator, the President could not just directly do anything, as I understand it, without going through this procedure.

There was one other factor in connection with these imports, that is, that deliveries of rye on the Chicago Board of Trade have been considerably heavier this year than average, and those deliveries do have a tendency to lower the prices.

The people who sell short in the futures market can either deliver the commodity or buy back their short contracts. If they buy back their short contracts, it usually means that there is not too much of the commodity around, and futures prices usually remain pretty strong. If, however, they actually deliver the commodity on the market, it is likely to be a depressing factor, and in September of this year, this particular month, on the first day of the month, there was 1 million bushels of rye delivered on September contracts, which would generally be accepted in the trade as a bearish factor.

There has been a total of about 2,250,000 bushels delivered altogether in September.

Last May there were about 4 million bushels, and in July, nearly 4 million bushels delivered.

Those figures are running, I would say, about double the same thing last year. There have been almost double the deliveries on futures deliveries this year than last.

Mr. COLLINS. Speaking of futures, December rye futures were quoted yesterday as $1.10 per bushel in Chicago, $1.1625 in Minneapolis, and $1,0425 in Canadian money in Winnipeg.

When you figure that there is a tariff of 6 cents a bushel on Canadian rye, and add the transportation, loading and unloading costs, insurance and other handling, which must be added to make the final price, how do people find it economical and feasible to ship rye from Canada to Chicago if the price spread between Winnipeg and Chicago is about 6 cents per bushel?

Mr. BAGNELL. I would like to answer that by describing the similar situation in oats, because I have not looked into the rye market carefully, but I think that the same principle prevails.

We calculated that Chicago would have to be 8 or 10 cents a bushel over Winnipeg in order to economically bring oats in and deliver them in the Chicago market.

Now, I do notice that in recent months, Winnipeg was about 9 or as much as 15 cents under Chicago.

For example, back in May it was 15 cents under and in August it was 9 cents under. Thus recently I would say that it might have been economically feasible to have bought oats in Winnipeg and delivered them to the Chicago market. When it gets down to the present basis of almost even, which it was about the middle of September, I do not think that it is feasible to do that.

I am not suggesting that this is happening in rye, but stating that it did happen in oats.

We found situations where people were short in the Chicago futures market and we charged that by delivering oats on that market they put the futures price down and were able to make a profit on their short and speculative operations in futures which would more than compensate them for a possible loss in bringing in oats. That is manipulation, and that is what we are charging in the oats market. As I say, we do not see that same picture in rye.

The CHAIRMAN. How much rye does the country need for its own use?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, historically here, Senator, it looks like our total domestic disappearance—and that includes food, feed, seed, and alcohol, runs roughly 20 million bushels a year. It varies a little from 19, 22, 21, but I would say roughly 20 million bushels, and we have also exported about 4 million to 5 million bushels in recent years. So we apparently can normally take care of roughly 25 million bushels, 20 million for use and probably 5 million for export.

However, I understand that the export market is very poor at this time, that the European demand, according to Canadian rye experts, is pretty slack.

The CHAIRMAN. Then this rye coming in here is going to be excess rye?

Mr. BAGNELL. It certainly looks like it now, to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Since these farmers have voted on this quota of wheatland, reducing it all the way from 20 to 30 percent, it will mean that very much more rye is going to be planted in the United States this year than for several years last past. Is that not true?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, I have no direct contact with that end of the game, Senator, but it sounds reasonable to me, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you go through the country and see field after field of rye now, and the farmers are compelled to use the land for something, and are planting rye. With this Canadian rye coming in, it is going to depress the price still more; is it not?

Mr. BAGNELL. I think that any sizable imports will tend to put the price down.

Mr. COLLINS. In addition, if I may interrupt, I understand that the official Canadian export crop report points to 29.7 million bushels this year compared to 24.6 million bushels a year ago.

When you couple that with the 16.4 carryover, this tremendous store of Canadian rye over in Canada, if the present rate of imports on Canadian rye keeps up this country will just be flooded with that Canadian rye.

Mr. BAGNELL. And you have the apparent drying up of the European demand, the export demand. The stocks of rye right now in the country are pretty large. We find that in Chicago there is in the various terminal markets about 5 million bushels on hand as compared to about 3⅓ million a year ago, and we find that this Canadian rye in this country, either on ships afloat or in bond in this country, is about 600,000 bushels. That is not so large, but it is about 100,000 more than it was a year ago.

The total North American commercial stocks, and that means stocks in position to be sold commercially, runs nearly 19 million bushels against about 13 million a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Witness, what is your suggestion? How can we protect these farmers and insure them getting a decent price?

Mr. BAGNELL. I do not believe, Senator, that my field of activity is broad enough for me to make a suggestion on that. My work is limited almost altogether to the question of the futures markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is there in the Department of Agriculture who can tell us that?

Mr. BAGNELL. I would imagine that the Chief of the Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, could do that.

If I wanted to get anything on that, I would probably contact first Mr. Gordon, who is Chief of the Production and Marketing Administration. I think that he has people who would be able to give you a much more valuable suggestion on that than I could.

Mr. COLLINS. But, as far as any investigation, or any cursory look-see into this rye situation from your agency's standpoint, your agency being more or less the policing body, as far as trading in commodities is concerned, you do not find that there might be any comparable situation in the rye market today as there has been in the oats market?

Mr. BAGNELL. That is right. I do not see anything which I think comparable to what happened in oats.

The CHAIRMAN. What about flax? Do you know anything about that?

Mr. BAGNELL. No, sir; I do not have the figures on that here at all. That is, on the question of imports. You were interested in imports?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BAGNELL. No, sir; I do not have anything on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you have Mr. Gordon here tomorrow afternoon, and anybody else who may be necessary, to get at this rye situation?

I want to thank you gentlemen very, very much indeed. The people are concerned about this situation.

Mr. BAGNELL. The price has shown drastic movements since July. It has gone down about 30 cents in less than 2 months, and is down over 80 cents since the first of the year, and is just about half of what it was last year. I can readily imagine that they are not happy.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not happy, and the things that they have to buy are priced right up where they were. The price of a combine, for example, has not gone down.

Mr. BAGNELL. I am sure that Mr. Gordon can send somebody.

(Whereupon, at 3 p. m., the committee recessed to a time to be fixed tomorrow afternoon, September 24, 1953.)

(Thursday, September 24, 1953)

The subcommittee met at 2:40 p. m., in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, Senator WILLIAM LANGER (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator LANGER.

Also present: Thomas B. Collins, subcommittee council; James Miller and Miss Eleanor Guthridge, professional staff members.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. COLLINS. Senator, we have from the Department of Agriculture Mr. Murray Thompson, Mr. A. R. DeFelice, Mr. Tom Walker, and Mr. Ray Suppes. We have Mr. Hendrickson from the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Collins.

STATEMENTS OF MURRAY THOMPSON, OFFICE OF PRICE, PRODUCTION, AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION; A. R. DE FELICE, SOLICITOR'S OFFICE; TOM WALKER, GRAIN BRANCH; AND RAY SUPPES, GRAIN BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman.

This is a hearing continued from yesterday, looking into the matter of importations of Canadian rye and its possible effect upon the American market and the American farmer.

The committee is desirous of going into the background to see what, if any, reason is

behind these increased importations and what ultimate effect will come out of this.

The CHAIRMAN. I think these gentlemen ought to have read the testimony of Mr. Bagnell. Do you have it here?

Mr. COLLINS. I was talking with one of the gentlemen from the Department, and they had talked to Mr. Bagnell this morning, and they are pretty generally familiar with the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with it?

Mr. SUPPES. We are familiar with it in a general way; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. You may proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. I wonder if we could have, starting off as a preliminary background, from either Mr. Walker or Mr. Thompson, from the Department, an explanation as to how the rye program works from the time the Department sets the price-support level until the time the Government takes over the rye or the farmer redeems it.

I think that would more or less lay the groundwork, Mr. Walker, and give us an explanation of the picture.

Mr. WALKER. The price-support program operates, I might say briefly, in this manner: We establish loan rates for farm loans and for warehouse loans, and terminal loan rates.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me. You are one of the lawyers in this case, Miss Guthridge. Do you not want to get closer and get this record?

Mr. Miller, you had better get up here, too.

Mr. WALKER. Generally, these price-support loan rates are announced ahead of planting time. Upon the harvest of the commodity, the producer can go to his local county PMA committee and apply for a loan at the announced loan rate for that particular county where the rye is produced, or he can indicate that he would like to get price-support insurance—I might call it that—by signing a purchase agreement with the Commodity Credit, in which the Commodity Credit agrees that at time of delivery of the rye they will take it over at that particular rate, which is the same as the loan rate.

At delivery time, if the prices are lower than the loan rate to such an extent that the producer can profit by turning the rye over to the Commodity Credit, he will deliver that rye and the Commodity Credit is obligated to take it.

Briefly, that is about the way the price-support program operates, not only for rye but for the other commodities.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the present loan rate?

Mr. WALKER. The loan rate for the 1953 crop?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. $1.43. I believe that is correct. I want to verify the figure.

Yes, $1.43 is the average for the United States.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the present support price?

Mr. WALKER. That is the present support price.

Mr. COLLINS. I see.

Mr. WALKER. That is the average for the United States. It varies by States, and it will vary by terminals. I believe the Minneapolis terminal loan rate is $1.64 per bushel.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the average current market price?

Mr. WALKER. The current market prices are down to around—you are talking about the cash market, not futures? The average for September 23 is $1.12 per bushel at Minneapolis.

Mr. COLLINS. What was it roughly the same time a year ago, do you recall, or do you have the figures?

Mr. WALKER. Not on that same date, but we can give it to you. September 17 a year ago at Minneapolis it was $1.83 to $1.86. The cash price ranged between those two figures. In other words, the current price of rye is low, relatively speaking, compared to last year.

Mr. COLLINS. To what do you attribute the difference in price between last year at roughly $1.83 and, say, September 17 when it was $1.12?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I may, in answering that question I would like to give some background on the supplies and requirements of rye.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and take all the time you want. There is no hurry at all about this. Go into it as thoroughly as you want to go into it.

Mr. WALKER. We have here what we call a balance sheet of the supplies and requirements for rye, in which we show the supplies, carryover stocks, plus the production, plus the imports. Then the utilization of rye for food purposes, for industrial purposes, if any, and for feed, and seed. Then the amount of rye for export.

For those various items, utilization is shown.

This is a table of data which you may want to include in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show it is included.

(The table referred to was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. WALKER. This table shows for 1947–51 the average for the 5-year period ending with the 1951–52 marketing year. It shows the same data for the 1951–52 marketing year, the 1952–53 marketing year, the 1953–54 marketing year, which we are now in, and then a projection into 1954–55, which, of course, is all it is, just a projection. Up to that point we have some rather firm estimates on the supplies and requirements of rye.

For this particular marketing year, 1953–54, in which we have the depressed prices on rye, our crop is estimated at 17½ million bushels in the United States. We had a carryover supply on July 1 of 6.3 million bushels. We have estimated a little more than 6 million bushels will be imported.

The CHAIRMAN. Will be imported?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the testimony yesterday, nearly that much already has been imported.

Mr. WALKER. Not quite. We will touch on that in just a moment, if you will permit me, Senator.

That indicates a total supply of around 30 million bushels of rye, as compared to a total supply last year, when the price was higher, of 25 million bushels. Our total supply is indicated to be higher than last year, which of itself may or may not affect the price of rye.

The demand for rye apparently will be about the same as for last year. With a larger supply indicated, that might have a bearing on the lower prices.

However, the total supplies of rye as we now have in the United States do not represent the only factor affecting price. If we look at the supplies of rye in Canada, we find that last year's crop, as far as we know, is a record high for all time in the production of rye in Canada; that the carryover stocks were 16 million bushels, or about twice their domestic requirements of rye in Canada.

With a total supply in Canada of about 45½ to 46 million bushels of rye, which is a record high as far as we know, there is, you might say, an overhanging influence of those supplies so nearby, that might have an effect upon our domestic prices of rye.

I have some figures here on the imports of rye from Canada, if you will bear with me just a minute. The imports of rye from Canada, July 1, 1953, through September 10, 1953, amounted to 2,326,000 bushels, or about four times as great as the same period a year ago, when 579,000 bushels were imported.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total amount imported so far this year?

Mr. WALKER. For this marketing year, 2,326,000 bushels.

The CHAIRMAN. From January 1?

Mr. WALKER. From January 1, I do not have that figure. We can get it for you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we have it, Mr. Collins?

Mr. COLLINS. I think so.

Mr. WALKER. What I am giving here is on a marketing-year basis.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it this year so far?

Mr. COLLINS. 1951–52, we imported 1,342,000 bushels; 1952–53, 5,564,000 bushels.

Mr. WALKER. That is on a calendar-year basis?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I believe that is 1952–53 crop year that you gave.

The CHAIRMAN. We are taking it from January 1.

Mr. COLLINS. These are the figures furnished us yesterday by the Commodity Exchange Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER. The figures I am giving here represent from the beginning of the 1953–54 marketing year, that is from the 1st of July.

So these imports coming in at about four times the rate of last year may have contributed to the depressed price conditions.

To summarize the answer to your original question—why are the prices today so much lower than they were a year ago—you might say our supply situation has improved some over the supplies we had for last year and that our imports are greater. The requirements are about the same and the general economic conditions affecting farm prices themselves would have some effect. The general decline in farm prices would radiate into rye as a commodity and would have some effect on it.

The CHAIRMAN. What this committee is interested in, Mr. Walker, is this: The farmers of this country borrowed for the quarter on wheat. There was supposed to be 20 percent when we first discussed it. As a matter of fact, it was approximately 30 percent last year. A farmer with 300 acres of land who seeded only one-third of it to wheat suddenly finds he has a lot of land that he has to seed to something else.

As you travel through Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, as I did last year, everywhere you go you will find rye. Maybe it is only 40 acres, maybe it is 100 or 125, but the amount seeded out of the entire area is seeded chiefly because of the fact of the quota on wheat acreage, you see.

Undoubtedly supplies are going to be much greater if they are having a good crop because they have a higher acreage.

What the committee wants to determine is whether or not this price, which may be naturally lower if you got a good crop of rye last year because of the greater acreage, is going to be further depressed by the importation of 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 million bushels of rye from Canada.

Mr. WALKER. You want my opinion on that?

The CHAIRMAN. I want your opinion on it.

Mr. WALKER. I don't think there is any doubt but that the production of rye will increase; and if we have greater domestic supplies, and then we add onto our domestic supplies the importations of unwanted rye, you might say, or rye that is not urgently needed, naturally, it will depress prices—I don't think there is any doubt about it—below where they would otherwise go.

The CHAIRMAN. It would depress the price to the producer?

Mr. WALKER. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me for interrupting. Go ahead.

Mr. WALKER. That is quite all right. I think that is my answer to his question.

Mr. COLLINS. In that very same connection, and thinking in terms of this period July 1, 1953, through September 10, the importa-

tions in that period were, roughly, four times over a year ago. There is no way of telling whether that trend will continue throughout the rest of the year at 4 times the importations of a year ago, but assuming that they did, and further assuming that the price-support price is $1.43 a bushel on rye today—is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. That is today; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Get the Wall Street Journal article which you had here yesterday. It says we imported 350,000 bushels in 1 day.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We read that into the record.

Mr. COLLINS. I know the one you are referring to, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call it to Mr. Walker's attention.

Will you please read to Mr. Walker the part that is important. It is the part that is marked.

Mr. COLLINS. The Wall Street Journal of September 23:

"Traders received reports that over the weekend 350,000 bushels of Canadian rye were shipped to South Chicago and 70,000 bushels cleared for Buffalo. In addition, 660,000 bushels of Canadian oats cleared for Buffalo. This news caused selling of rye and oats futures on the Chicago Board of Trade."

Mr. WALKER. So it does affect the price.

Mr. COLLINS. May I continue now, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed; yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Assuming that you have this increased importation from Canada of Canadian rye, plus the domestic production, and the price of rye being depressed and the support price being maintained at $1.43, if the price of rye on the market at Chicago is, say, $1.10, knowing that they could not get a good price for their rye, what would the domestic producers naturally do? Put it into Government loans?

Mr. WALKER. That is correct; yes. That is evidenced by this year's operation under the price-support program. As of August 15, I believe this report shows, there were some 133,000 bushels of rye placed under price support; whereas last year, as of the same time, there were only about thirteen or fourteen thousand bushels. There is about 10 times as much activity going on right now in the rye-support program as we had last year when the prices were above the price-support level.

So if you have greater production, and if you have these imports coming in at the current rate, you will naturally have prices below the price-support level, and with such a situation existing you will have increased activity under your price-support program.

If these prices do not recover by the time of delivery date, that is, by the time these loans mature, then the CCC itself would become the owner of most of the rye that is placed under price support.

Mr. COLLINS. In that connection, has the Department given any thought to the need for recommending controls on rye?

Mr. WALKER. The importation of rye, as well as barley and other commodities—I am assuming you refer to the imposition of import controls under section 22.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. We have been watching it on rye and barley and, of course, on oats we have already recommended that import controls be imposed under section 22. All we have been doing so far in connection with rye is that we have been watching these imports. We have been getting material on it and keeping our data up to date. But as yet we have not prepared any recommendations as to whether we do or do not impose import restrictions under section 22.

Mr. COLLINS. I notice the language in section 22 reads:

"Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with any program."

Because of the words "practically certain," in relation to these increased importations of rye the Department probably would want to give some consideration to a study of this, I would assume.

Mr. WALKER. I agree with you there that the Department will need to give some consideration to it. Our chief concern in that connection is whether it interferes with our price support operations. If the importation of rye is going to interfere materially with our price support programs, then a thorough investigation must be made to determine whether import restrictions should be imposed.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the information given in the testimony yesterday, it was said the average crop was 25 million bushels, and already you have over 5 million bushels of foreign rye, which is over 20 percent. He said yesterday over 20 percent has already come in. How are you going to protect the farmer of this country who is going to raise more domestic rye, apparently—and you concede that—than ever before?

Mr. WALKER. I wouldn't go so far as to say we will raise more than we ever did before. Our domestic production of rye is at a relatively low level. We used to produce considerably more rye than we expect will be produced next year, but at that time we were using rye for feed in quantities equaling 20 million a year, and we were producing crops of 40 to 50 million bushels a year. I don't remember exactly the figure, but that can be supplied.

So, coming back to your question, I think the Department will necessarily have to take some steps to investigate the effects of these imports and whether they will likely materially interfere with price support programs. If the decision is reached that they will likely interfere with price support programs to such an extent as to warrant the imposition of import restrictions, then I think the Secretary would follow through on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Rye already has dropped 80 cents a bushel.

Mr. WALKER. That is about right.

The CHAIRMAN. So there must have been some interference to some extent, wouldn't you say?

Mr. WALKER. That drop was from a level that was considerably higher than the price support level. You see, $1.83 to $1.86 a year is compared with the price support on the 1952 crop.

Mr. SUPPES. National average, $1.42, just a cent less.

Mr. WALKER. $1.42.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how many trips you take, but if you will take a trip through the Northwest, you will find those farmers up there thoroughly dissatisfied. They tell me what they buy is approximately as high as it ever was. For example, they mentioned Massey-Harris combines which come in from Canada cost $5,500. They have not gone down at all, they tell me, since the war. They take up the farm machinery and the things the farmer has to buy, and they turn to me and say, "Senator, cattle prices have gone all to pieces," putting it crudely. They are down 50 percent, as you know, in some instances. They say, "Wheat has gone down, barley has gone down, oats have gone down. What in Heaven's name are we going to do since we have this quota on the amount of wheat we can raise?"

It is quite severe. I know farmers who have 160 acres and are allowed to raise only 31 acres of wheat. They say, "We have to put it in barley, flax, or oats. If these prices are going to continue to sag also, how in Heaven's name are we going to exist?"

I am trying to find out the answer from you gentlemen, because you are the experts.

Mr. WALKER. If the need arises, we certainly must impose restrictions under section 22, which would be following through with the tools that are at hand to stabilize prices.

The CHAIRMAN. How long will it take you to make that investigation on rye?

Mr. WALKER. That would take probably a month.

The CHAIRMAN. In the meantime, if rye keeps coming in at the rate the Wall Street Journal says, it will make quite a lot of rye.

Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS. You mean in connection with section 22. Wouldn't that entail hearings before the Tariff Commission, also?

Mr. WALKER. It would if it was recommended to the President.

Mr. COLLINS. By the Secretary.

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. I wonder if you could give for the record, if you have the information available, who are the main consumers, firstly, of this rye that is imported.

Do you know the percentages that go into feed and into distilling?

Mr. WALKER. We don't know the proportions that go into various domestic uses, but we do know something about where it comes into the country, like the Buffalo entry for the eastern area, and Chicago, and so forth. We have a table of information on that.

Of the imports last year, 79 percent of the rye came into Chicago, about 9 percent into the Buffalo area, and about 10 percent into the Duluth-Superior area at the head of the Great Lakes.

But as to the ultimate end use which is made of this rye, I am assuming it would be about the same as our domestic rye.

Mr. COLLINS. What about domestic rye?

Mr. WALKER. Our estimates of the amount used for food is about 5 million bushels; the amount that is fed is about 6 to 7 million bushels; and the amount that goes into industrial purposes, principally the manufacture of alcohol, liquors, rye whiskies, and what-not, runs from about three to six million bushels. The average for the 1947–51 period was 6 million; for 1952–53 it was down to about 3 million. We expect about 5 million to be used in this marketing year that we are in now for industrial purposes.

Then for seed purposes, we have about 5 million that is used annually.

I would assume that the rye that was imported would follow about that pattern of distribution into our domestic consumption.

Mr. COLLINS. Is there anything to show the competition between the imported rye and the domestic rye?

Mr. WALKER. Not that I know of.

Mr. COLLINS. There is no way of getting into that, as far as figures? To put it another way, is there competition between domestic rye and imported rye?

Mr. WALKER. Naturally, there is competition, between the two, because they are used for the same purposes. There would be competition.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder, Mr. Hendrickson, what is your idea on this entire matter?

STATEMENT OF ROY HENDRICKSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am Roy Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

We have felt that rye, barley, and oats, the three of them, have to be dealt with pretty much in the same category. They are produced very much in the same territory. It is a very sensitive problem, and has been for a long while.

We have felt that section 22 simply has been rendered inoperative in connection with these commodities, contrary to the apparent intent of Congress going away back to the earliest enactments of section 22, which go away back into the thirties. Section 22 was

reenacted in 1948, and it was very clear, it seems to me, and it seems to many, that section 22, the use of import quotas, was intended to be called into use when you face situations not only such as we have right now, but which we have had for several years.

There have been many petitions to the Department of Agriculture, including those made by my organization, asking for action under this; and in that connection, only one has thus far been taken, and that is that an investigation was made in connection with oats. The President sent it on to the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff Commission held hearings some time ago, at which we had an opportunity to testify along with the Department, and their decision is still pending.

I want to express appreciation for your taking an interest in this, because it affects not only farmers in North Dakota but many thousands of farmers in nearby States. This is an extremely serious problem.

Take barley alone—there really isn't any difference. When you speak of the situation with respect to wheat lands taken out of production, the only real difference, I would say, between barley and rye lies in the fact that there are certain lands, so-called thin land, which is suited for rye and practically nothing else, for that kind of production.

But here we find barley coming in here up to September 10, or thereabouts, at the rate of 8 million bushels this year, since July 1, as compared with 2 million bushels for that same period a year ago. That is four times the rate.

Out in your country, particularly in North Dakota—it is true in Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and certain other States—barley is raised not to turn over to the CCC, which places its support price on the basis of the feed value of barley. Barley is produced to try to meet the premium malting market. That premium malting market has been pretty well taken away from the United States farmer now, with the United States farmer facing a situation where the barley comes in from Canada in very large quantities; and is handled there, by the way, as well as oats and wheat, by the Dominion Wheat Board up there, so they are in a position to sell at whatever price they need to to move it in. The tariffs, as you well know, have been cut sharply in connection with this.

I might just point out how far they have been brought down. The barley tariff is now 7½ cents a bushel. It was once 20 cents. This is a result of the GATT and other agreements.

In that connection, while I am mentioning tariffs let me bring out a point there that I think is very interesting. The barley tariff is 7½ cents a bushel. It takes about 1 bushel of barley to make 1 barrel of beer. Let's see what the tariff on beer is. The tariff on beer per barrel is $3.875. In other words, if we are going to have a reduction in tariffs, let's have it all along the way, not simply on a commodity that is being produced out in the Northwest area.

In connection with oats, the rate at which that is coming in so far this year, starting July 1, until September 10, was about the same rate as last year, about 13 million bushels. Last year we finally got in, for the marketing year ended last June 30, 68.6 million. I think that is the preliminary.

Mr. SUPPES. Final.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The final figures.

Here we have barley stepping away up; and rye, as you have well pointed out, has increased tremendously.

Where is the American farmer going to market this stuff today, with it coming in because of these low tariffs? He is going to turn it over to the CCC to the extent he can find space, but it isn't so easy to find space to qualify, oftentimes, for these loans.

I want to emphasize what you said. You are going to find this problem, which has been important for several years, it is much more important now and it is going to be doubly important next year because of the diversion of a good deal of this land which otherwise would go into wheat, into these crops.

Are these crops important? I would like to quote from President Eisenhower's speech which he made at Casson, Minn., last fall, in which he listed a number of promises or pledges to the farmers, which were very seriously taken and appreciated. His No. 4 promise reads as follows—it is a short paragraph, and I will read it, if you will permit me:

"4. We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms which are our producers of perishable foods and yield a rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmers, crops such oats, barley, rye, and soybeans, should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops."

That is a very important point.

At this last session of Congress, I think there were several bills introduced proposing that oats, barley, and rye be treated like the others. They are not treated like the others.

For instance, you had a shift from the old parity formula to a new parity formula, modified somewhat by what they call transitional parity. Actually, I think the parity prices listed for barley and rye are roughly 20 percent under the old parity. They have been reduced at the rate of 5 percent a year.

When we speak of 85 percent of parity price supports, you are speaking of 85 percent of 80 percent of the old parity.

I want to point out one other factor which I think is significant here. Unfortunately, I didn't get a chance to make a checkup on the rail rates to the head of the lakes from the Canadian producing areas on the one side of the border, and from North Dakota, Montana, and so on, on the other side of the border; but these rates for oats would be representative, I think, of rye, or of barley, for that matter.

Let's take two points. We will take towns that are right across from each other. We will take to the head of the lakes, Duluth-Superior on the United States side, and Fort William and Port Arthur on the Canadian side. From Northgate, N. Dak., to haul 100 pounds of oats down to the head of the lakes costs 47.3 cents. From Northgate to Saskatchewan, separated, I believe, by only a street, there is no emergency charge or tax. They have not had freight increases. I want to convert this to bushels. In the United States the figure would be 15.14 cents per bushel. In Canada, for exactly the same weight of oats, it would be just a trifle over 6 cents, the freight rate to get it into position for marketing.

The same is true of various other points, and I am sure it is true of rye.

So, in other words, the transportation advantage or saving to the Canadian side to get it to the head of the lakes in position to ship, is such that it more than offsets the existing tariffs on these commodities.

I can't tell you exactly when they last had a freight increase in Canada, but at the Tariff Commission hearing I had the opportunity to cross-examine Jock McIver, who is chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board, who testified there. I really thought they had some kind of increase during the war period, and so on, but I got back to 1940 and they have had no increase since before 1940 on their freight rates; and, of course, we have had a very, very large number and substantial freight rate increases.

I think it is important, however, that your tariff, whatever protection that is supposed to be, is more than offset by this transportation saving that they achieve from Fort William and Port Arthur on to Chicago. The rates between Duluth-Superior and Fort William and Port Arthur are quite comparable. They have a tremendous advantage there.

In conclusion, I simply can't avoid going back to our feeling that there has been a lamentable absence of the use of this very legislative tool that is put into the hands of the Department and the Government in the form of section 22 in connection with this. It seems silly to me to spend Government money here to provide price supports on commodities, and have the Government take them over when, with a quota, the domestic supply in the case of rye wasn't too much out of line with demand, and it would have worked out rather well. So our price supports are being permitted to serve as a magnet for the Canadian producer. That, it seems to me, is very unfair to our producers and not in the interests of the Government, and quite contrary to the spirit and purpose of section 22.

That is all, Senator. I thank you very much. I would be glad to try to answer any questions.

Mr. COLLINS. You feel that both as to barley and rye, the Department ought to take some action under section 22?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. We have been hopeful for a long while that action might be taken in the case of rye and barley, and I don't know what accounts for the inactivity. It is too bad, because I don't see that there is any real difference between them and oats.

Mr. COLLINS. Did you have a comment?

Mr. SUPPES. I might bring out the fact, in defense of the Department of Agriculture for not acting quicker, that the price of rye during the current year has averaged each month above the support level until May, and that BAE seasonal average price received by farmers for rye during the past year was $1.73 compared with the support level of $1.42. The previous year, 1951–52, the seasonal average price received by farmers was $1.52, compared with the support level of $1.30; and in 1950–51, the average received by farmers was $1.31 compared with the average support level of $1.28.

Mr. COLLINS. In that connection, you wouldn't have any figures to show how much rye last year went under loan, and contrast that with how much rye this year, so far, has gone under loan?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes. In 1952 when our production was the lowest on record and our supplies likewise were far less than our domestic needs, so that we had to import some rye, several million bushels, in order even to meet our needs, the farmers placed only 186,000 bushels—just a mere vestpocketful, you might say—under price support. That was equal to only 1.2 percent of the crop. So they weren't in too desperate need of price support. They delivered only 81,000 bushels to the CCC. The year before, they delivered only 1,000 bushels. The year before that 7,000 bushels.

So I think a word in defense of the Department of Agriculture for not moving in this direction up until now is in order.

Mr. COLLINS. But there is some feeling or there might be some certainty that with the continued depressed price of the rye and increased imports from Canada, there is a strong possibility, is there not, of farmers placing a lot——

Mr. SUPPES. I am not in a position to say there is not a threat to the future. It certainly will demand watching.

Mr. COLLINS. Speaking of the level of support on rye, what are the factors that the Department takes into consideration in determining the level of support?

Mr. SUPPES. Maybe you had better take that one, Tom.

Mr. WALKER. I don't know whether I am exactly prepared on the rye to give you the details of the factors taken into account in establishing the loan rate. However, generally in establishing loan rates for rye, barley,

grain sorghums, those nonbasic commodities, they take into account the equivalent feed value as compared to corn, and the price-support rate that is in effect for corn. The final decision as to the loan rate, price-support rate, is, of course, in the hands of the CCC Board. After they take into consideration the factors just named, and other information as to the need for the commodity or the participation by producers in the price-support programs, they then as a Board determine what that rate is.

Mr. COLLINS. I would like to get your comment on a quote from a letter that Senator LANGER has received. This is in connection with barley, but I think you might be able to give us just your thought on this. I quote:

"The facts of the matter are, that practically all barley here in the Red River Valley that can get under cover, or that the elevators will store, is going under loan. The farmers are getting anywhere from 35 cents down to 15 cents a bushel more under the loan program than our markets afford. In other words, the American taxpayer is subsidizing the Canadian exporters of barley."

Do you have any thought on that, any of you gentlemen?

Mr. WALKER. I don't know.

Murray, do you have any comments on that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I was looking up some more factors in connection with your question.

Mr. COLLINS. Would you like me to read it over again?

Mr. THOMPSON. Maybe I should add a little to Mr. Walker's comment.

Mr. COLLINS. Surely, and then we will go to this.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the Agricultural Act of 1949, Congress has listed eight factors which the Commodity Credit Board are to take into consideration when they are setting the price support for any nonbasic commodity.

Mr. COLLINS. What are those, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. THOMPSON. Our lawyer wanted me to cite the place in the law. I am not used to thinking of those things. It is section 401 (b).

The first factor is the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor.

The second factor is the price level at which other commodities are being supported.

This is the one that Mr. Walker was talking about: In the case of feed grains, the feed values of such other grains in relation to corn.

The availability of funds; the perishability of the commodity; the importance of the commodity to agriculture and the national economy; the ability to dispose of stock acquired through price-support operations; the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

Those all have to be considered.

Mr. COLLINS. Those are all factors that go into the determination?

Mr. THOMPSON. As Mr. Walker said, it is particularly important in the case of feed grains to compare the feed value of those grains with corn.

Mr. COLLINS. Now let me read this, Mr. Thompson:

"The facts of the matter are, that practically all barley here in the Red River Valley that can get under cover, or that the elevators will store, is going under loan. The farmers are getting anywheres from 35 cents down to 15 cents a bushel more under the loan program than our markets afford. In other words, the American taxpayer is subsidizing the Canadian exporters of barley."

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. COLLINS. This was September 15.

Mr. THOMPSON. The first part of it, I would certainly agree with. The last sentence, I don't believe I should comment on.

The CHAIRMAN. This is from a very outstanding grain man in my State.

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't think I should comment on the last sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no objection to telling you who he is. It is Mr. R. F. Gunkelman, Fargo, N. Dak. They have been in business there for a great many years, wholesale grain, seed, feed, and agricultural chemicals. He is an outstanding expert. You have heard of him, have you not, Mr. Hendrickson?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I just got this letter, and would be glad to have you read all of it if you wish. I have no objection to putting it all in the record. Do you want to read it all?

Mr. THOMPSON. We can read it in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

R. F. GUNKELMAN & SONS,
Fargo, N. Dak., September 15, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Earlier in the year, I wrote a number of letters with reference to the importation of Canadian barley. From what information we have, it seems that the Tariff Commission and some officials in the Department of Commerce were opposed to the restriction of Canadian imports of barley. I read some comments made by different officials that this importation had little bearing on the price that the American farmer was getting for his product. It has always seemed to me that some of these officials of both the Tariff Commission and the other departments that are interested in agriculture certainly have never made a study of the situation, or are only interested in seeing that our American breweries buy cheap barley.

Now let us look at the present situation. I will quote you from a paragraph taken from a letter written to our company by one of the largest handlers of barley in Minneapolis:

"It is just too bad that the Government allows this Canadian barley to come in and fill up the Milwaukee elevators, and as a result people like Froedtert Malting, who ordinarily would be shipping quite a bit of barley down there, are held back due to plugged conditions, and, of course, that backs up in our Minneapolis market also."

The facts of the matter are that practically all barley here in the Red River Valley that can get under cover, or that the elevators will store, is going under loan. The farmers are getting anywhere from 35 cents down to 15 cents a bushel more under the loan program than our markets afford. In other words, the American taxpayer is subsidizing the Canadian exporters of barley. In our own elevators we are plugged to the roof with barley. We have recently rented a large number of Government bins and have filled these up with barley, so that our farmers can get the higher price under the loan than the market will afford them. Yesterday the Minneapolis market had 385 cars of barley, of which a considerable number went to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This would be very light receipts if we were not competing with the Canadian market, our markets would be advancing; but Canada is simply flooding the Northwest with barley through the Duluth port. Much of this barley comes by lake from Fort William to Duluth, and is then shipped by rail to Milwaukee, Chicago, and St. Louis. In my opinion, this whole program is most asinine inasmuch as the Tariff Commission on one side allows the importation of barley, and on the other we subsidize our farmers with a loan program that will eventually pile up tremendous quantities of barley, both in the country and in the terminals.

I am fully aware of the fact that you are in touch with this situation, and that you have been doing all you could to influence the Tariff Commission to at least increase the tariff on barley if they will not to some extent embargo Canadian imports. I trust that you will continue to do everything you can to help protect the interests of our Northwest farmers.

Best personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,
R. F. GUNKELMAN, Sr.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Senator, might I call your attention to one thing. You may be familiar with it. Last spring, April 23 and May 8, there were hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, which are contained in this, on the subject of the imports, at which time Mr. M. W. Thatcher, who is general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and president of our federation, and a number of technical assistants, testified in some detail, both with respect to oats, barley, rye, and so-called wheat unfit for human consumption, which is also a somewhat separate problem but a very substantial problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Of which Senator WELKER, of Idaho, is in charge.

Do you have that testimony with you?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. I have several copies that I brought along for your convenience. Here are several more if you need them.

This was before the Committee on Agriculture. Then you had before Senator WELKER'S subcommittee, hearings on the unfit wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. And the Senate took action on it and passed a bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. Although the bill as finally passed, I might say, was not satisfactory. It was amended.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand it was amended.

We will make these hearings a part of the record.

(The hearings referred to were filed for the information of the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. I have just a few more thoughts on which I want to get some views from the experts of the Department.

One is this: I understand that in the year 1947 and the year 1948, rye sold for $1 a bushel more in Canada than in the United States, and during that period American farmers started to go over into Canada and attempted to sell their rye over there and get the increased price, and Canada stopped that practice of American farmers going over there and getting the benefit of the increased price on rye.

I haven't been able to locate much on that, and I was wondering if you could comment, and what is the background of that?

Mr. SUPPES. In 1947–48, we were still in deep trouble, with controls on our exports and allocations, and scraping together every bushel we could in the United States to ship to hungry countries abroad. Canada was doing likewise, but she didn't have an export control on her rye, nor an import control, either. We had both at that time. We had barely enough rye to take care of our own needs, with very little surplus for export at that time. Prices were sky high, the highest in many years, in 1947–48.

Mr. COLLINS. Over $4 a bushel.

Mr. SUPPES. $3.50 and $4 in this country. There was an avid demand for any grain, rye or anything else, back in those years, compared with now when there is none, you might say, for rye. So American rye moved up through Canada and was transshipped to Europe, where they had ready buyers willing to pay any price for it. There was a profit of around $1 a bushel in the transaction.

It reached the point where our Government officials met with the Canadian officials and

asked them to restrict imports from the United States, and they complied. For a period of some 8 months, as I recall, there was a complete embargo on shipments to Canada, and that ended that type of thing.

Mr. COLLINS. Then actually, I wanted to find out whether that was an action taken purely on the part of Canada that stopped——

Mr. SUPPES. No, it was at our request.

Mr. COLLINS. During that period, 1947-49, from figures supplied, I understand that that year we imported from Canada 41,000 bushels of rye.

Mr. SUPPES. Yes. Canada restricted shipments to the United States at that time because she gave higher priority to England and their European markets, and she didn't have anywhere near enough to fill the needs.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have the information we wanted, Mr. Collins.

Is there someone else here who wants to say anything in connection with this?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, Senator. We have one more, Mr. Delos James, of the National Grange.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to hear you, Mr. James.

STATEMENT OF DELOS JAMES, DIRECTOR, AGRICULTURE-INDUSTRY RELATIONS, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. JAMES. I haven't anything further to add than what Mr. HENDRICKSON said. I would O. K. his testimony and agree fully with it.

There is no doubt but that it is a very serious matter, not only with regard to rye and oats, but it applies to a lot of other commodities, too—almonds, walnuts, filberts, butter, cheese, and so forth. We have been affected very adversely over the years with this kind of procedure.

The aim to establish a better reciprocal-trade basis between other countries and the United States is proving rather serious for the American farmer. He is the one who is taking the loss in many cases.

In other words, we provide the market for these cheaper products from so many other countries.

It was intended in the beginning, under section 22 and another provision, which I think was eliminated in the last Congress—I have been trying to recall it, which made it possible for the Government to act quickly in a case like this.

The supporters of reciprocal trade, lowering tariffs, and so forth, I think in the last Congress got a change brought about so that it prolonged the procedure in order to get action, and by the time we can get action on this in all probability the damage will have been done. The damage is done right now to a large degree.

As you brought out, Senator, from your own observations of what the situation is among the farmers up there, which is true in other parts of the country, here we are taking acreage out of 1 crop and wanting to put acreage into another crop or 2 or 3 other crops. Yet here is the foreign producer coming in and taking our market, so that when our fellows come in next year with rye and barley, and so forth, there will be a big surplus in our storage places and in excess of our market requirements. It is a mighty serious matter. I hope that in some way immediate action can be brought about.

I haven't studied the matter quite enough. I didn't realize fully what was coming up this afternoon. I am substituting for Dr. Sanders. Yet I have kept a rather interested eye on this problem for a long time, and have been before the Tariff Commision and before some of the committees here with regard to protection for not exactly an agricultural commodity, but a food product where we are suffering from a similar situation of a little different character.

But still, this fine American market is being taken away by foreign producers with a lower standard of living, willing to sell at a cheaper price. All they needed to do was to send a little bit in here, and down goes the price on our domestic production.

It has had a very extensive and devastating effect on our own agricultural production. I don't see how we can go on with this kind of program over the years and support the market for the whole world, for any of these producers who want to dump their excess supplies in here when we don't need them.

I hope that something can be done immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard from the discussion that they say it is going to take 30 days.

Mr. JAMES. I don't see why it is necessary for it to take 30 days. I think there is a provision in the present act that the President can act, and then a study can be made. That is, these imports can be stopped. Maybe I am mistaken.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Senator, a procedure of that sort was recommended by Secretary Benson, but I am not sure it found expression in the new law.

I would like to add one point, and that is this: Sometimes people blame the Tariff Commission. Actually, the Tariff Commission can't act until it is recommended that it investigate.

For instance, in the case of flaxseed, there was very much this same problem. When it was recommended to the Tariff Commission, the Tariff Commission held a hearing, and we are protected adequately for the time being in that case.

But it seems very difficult to get a recommendation out of the Department of Agriculture to the President, and from the President over to the Tariff Commission on these matters, so much so that we who deal with section 22 a good deal call it "section 22 months," because it takes about that long to get going.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything else?

Mr. THOMPSON. Since section 22 action on butter, cheese, filberts, and almonds has been mentioned, I have a statement here which you might want in the record, which shows that when section 104 was dropped, section 22 action has been taken by the President on butter and cheese, and the Tariff Commission is now conducting an investigation on fiber and walnuts. I thought perhaps you would like that in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We will put it in the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

"1. Agricultural commodities on which section 22 action has been taken by the President: Cotton and cotton waste; wheat and wheat products; almonds and filberts.

"Dairy products: Butter; dried whole milk; dried buttermilk; dried cream; dried skimmed milk; malted milk, and compounds or mixtures of or substitutes for milk or cream; cheddar cheese, and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, cheddar cheese; edam and Gouda cheese; blue-mold (except Stilton) cheese, and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, blue-mold cheese; Italian-type cheeses, made from cow's milk, in original loaves.

"Flaxseed and linseed oil; peanuts and peanut oil.

"2. Agricultural commodities on which section 22 action is under consideration by the United States Tariff Commission: Wool, edible tree nuts, oats."

The CHAIRMAN. When do you gentlemen want another meeting with this committee? Could you look the matter up more thoroughly within a week?

Mr. WALKER. That would be at your pleasure, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to do it as rapidly as we can, but I do not want to hurry you. I want to give you plenty of time to make your investigation.

Mr. THOMPSON. Could we call you back on that?

The CHAIRMAN. Surely, you may call me back.

We will adjourn, subject to the call of the Chair. You call me any time. All we want to do is to get together around the table and work for the benefit of the farmers of this country. That is my sole interest. I think we are all agreed on that. Anything this committee can do to help will certainly be done.

Thank you very, very much, gentlemen.

Mr. SUPPES. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I gave you 6 or 8 tables that you may keep and make a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Will you see that that is done, Mr. Collins?

Mr. COLLINS. I will, Senator.

(The tables referred to were filed with the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The committee will now adjourn, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p. m., the hearing was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(Monday, November 30, 1953)

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator WILLIAM LANGER (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators LANGER and WELKER.

Also present: Thomas B. Collins, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

This is a continuation of the meeting we had on September 23 and 24. Will you read this statement, please?

Mr. COLLINS. We have a statement here which, under the authority of the chairman, we will make a part of the record. It is a statement submitted by the National Farmers Union on United States policy respecting agricultural exports and imports and effects, with particular reference to imports of rye, oats, and barley from Canada.

Mr. Chairman, we make this a part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to read it.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. BAKER, ASSISTANT TO PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION (AS READ BY THOMAS B. COLLINS, SUBCOMMITTEE COUNSEL)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, we have followed these hearings with considerable interest and shall continue to do so. We appreciate the opportunity you are giving me today to present our views on this important and significant subject.

The value of exports of farm commodities was 30 percent lower in the marketing year ending in June of 1953 than the previous year. The physical volume of exports of farm commodities dropped slightly more. Wheat, cotton, and tobacco are the major commodities affected, but many others, including grain sorghum and apples, are involved.

The outlook is currently for a further decrease rather than an increase in agricultural exports from the United States owing to the failure of the nations of the free world to establish the international institutions required to stabilize and encourage greater international exchange. This has resulted in increasing foreign production of these commodities, a rising interest rate both in this country and in other nations, and is compounded by prospective reduced United States expenditures for foreign economic assistance.

This development places a downward pressure on United States prices of those farm commodities, a part of the supply of which must seek a foreign market. Prices received by United States farmers for most such commodities are now well below the parity level; some are resting on the price-support level or below.

During the past several years the United States has exported from $2 billion to $11

billion more than we have imported. In 1952 the export advantage was in the neighborhood of $4.5 billion.

The net export balance that must be covered in 1953–54 by a further reduction in United States exports, or by increasing imports, increased United States economic aid, private or governmental and increased private foreign investment will be at least $5 billion. Of this, roughly one-third may be made up by private investments and donations.

The shock of such reductions on farm commodity exports could be somewhat cushioned by the creation of a Foreign Trading Division in Commodity Credit Corporation, when, and if, such legislation is enacted.

However, really significant major increases in exports of United States farm commodities can only be encouraged by raising foreign purchasing power through establishment of international commodity agreements and clearinghouses in conjunction with the World Bank and the United Nations. This would allow increased United States imports and United States assisted foreign economic development and reduced United States sales prices.

At the same time that United States farm exports have been dropping increased imports of farm products such as rye, oats, barley, and feed wheat have acted to further depress the United States market.

Considering these problems, the Farmers Union position regarding appropriate solutions can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Of primary and basic importance is this: Regardless of the administrative machinery used or the secondary economic principles adopted, the returns to family farm production of all commodities should be supported by the Federal Government at 100 percent of parity with standby authority to use acreage limitations and marketing restrictions only where required to prevent wastage of resources. Production restrictions should not be placed upon any important food commodity at any point below the total of domestic consumer needs plus normal exports plus an adequate safety reserve, plus a reserve for use in implementation of our foreign policy. We consider this economically feasible, justifiable in the general public interest, and morally right. We believe it wise and prudent to make provision for the creation and maintenance of an adequate safety reserve, domestically and internationally in the free world, of storable farm commodities and the storable products of perishable farm commodities. Moreover, we believe that world conditions as wall as domestic population trends require a policy of abundant rather than scarce farm production to meet genuine domestic consumer demand, normal exports, plus an added quantity to be available to implement the foreign policy.

(a) If this goal cannot be immediately attained for political reasons, we favor the following alternatives of descending desirability in the order named:

(1) 90 percent of parity supports for all commodities with acreage limitations or marketing restrictions only to prevent wastage of resources.

(2) 100 percent of parity supports for selected major commodities with necessary standby production restrictions.

(3) 90 percent of parity supports for selected major commodities with necessary standby production restrictions.

(4) Extension for additional years of existing price-support laws.

(b) We believe that increased exports of farm commodities and appropriate and intelligent policies respecting imports of farm products in competition with domestic production are fully possible and feasible within this framework.

2. Administrative machinery: The International Wheat Agreement, Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, and section 22, diversions, are in operation. They have proved to be workable and, within their scope, successful. Parenthetically, let me pause here to commend the statesmanlike work performed by Senator LANGER as chairman of the special committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that shoved through to successful attainment the extension of the International Wheat Agreement. The International Wheat Agreement, Reciprocal Trade Act, and section 22 should be continued in operation until something better can be created to replace them. However, these are but partial palliatives to the total problem. We recommend the following in descending order of desirability. If more desirable devices toward the top of the list cannot be created, then certainly we should adopt those lower on the list pending later adoption of improved structures.

(a) Democratic world economic union.

(b) International Raw Materials Reserve.

(c) International Food Reserve.

(d) Additional international commodity agreements coupled with each of the above.

(e) Bilateral governmental barter on basis of negotiated agreements.

(f) Complete reliance upon cartel-dominated private trade with reduced tariffs on unilateral basis.

3. Secondary economic principles: These affect domestic consumers, foreign agricultural producers, and foreign buyers of United States agricultural exports. They also have a direct bearing on United States foreign policy generally. They relate to the methods used to implement the domestic farm price-support program and to handle or control exports and imports of farm commodities.

(a) With regard to exports: We favor the foreign sale of exports at a price at, or below, what might be termed the world price, with the difference between world price and the domestic support price made up by the United States Treasury, preferably by means of parity payments to producers, or if that is not done, through export subsidies.

(b) With respect to the so-called supplementary or competing imports: We favor adoption of import policies for farm commodities that compete with domestic farm production that will give United States consumers the maximum supply at minimum price consistent with 100 percent parity returns to family farmers. Specifically, we consider the following combinations in descending order of desirability. However, we feel that nonfarmers as well as farm people have a right and responsibility to help decide these issues. If nonfarmers do not prefer the alternatives we have placed at the top of the list, then by all means let us adopt one of those nearer to the bottom.

(1) United States support-price programs carried out by means of parity payments to producers with no quota or tariff restrictions on imports.

(2) United States support-price programs carried out by means of parity payments to producers with quota or tariff restrictions on imports.

(3) United States support-price programs carried out by supply-diversion methods with imports eliminated at prices less than 100 percent of the parity.

(4) United States support-price programs carried out by supply diversion methods with all imports of competing farm commodities restricted or subject to high tariff duties.

We believe that continuation of a relatively high level of United States foreign economic and technical assistance to other countries is desirable, not only to maintain exports of United States farm commodities but also as a means of speeding up democratic world economic development and closer democratic world economic integration in the fight against communism.

We see no reason why other domestic producers of exported and imported commodities should not be accorded the same treatment we have recommended in the farm sphere. We feel that in certain instances, particularly in case of metals, minerals, petroleum, and other irreplaceable natural resources it would be better public policy for the Government to buy up reserves and capital investment of domestic private owners and allow imports to come in unrestricted.

Moreover, we favor simplification of customs procedures, negotiated tariff reduction consistent with the principles I have enumerated, and very greatly increased attention to and action in international economic planning.

With respect to customs procedures we feel that existing laws should be enforced strictly in accordance with the letter and spirit of those laws. Violators should be fully prosecuted.

Your committee may be interested in hearing these policy resolutions that were adopted recently in the North Dakota Farmers Union convention.

From the program adopted at North Dakota Farmers Union convention:

"Long-range reciprocal and multination trade agreements that will encourage trade with other nations on a fair exchange basis. Farmers Union broadly supports this principle and urges its maintenance and renewal. Other legislation affecting international trade should be made consistent with these principles with adequate provision to insure parity return to United States farm producers and give preference in allocation of import licenses to United States farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives.

"9. Canadian imports: Pending enactment of full parity legislation that will safeguard United States family-farm producers through deficiency payments or otherwise, we urge that the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States take action immediately to limit imports of any farm commodity at a time when the price received by family farmers for that commodity is less than 100 percent of parity."

We feel that existing law gives entirely sufficient dscretion and authority to officials of the executive branch to make the needed adjustments as mentioned above. If that is not the case, we urge enactment of appropriate legislation.

By all means, dishonesty and crooked dealing in imported farm commodities should be stamped out and violators brought to trial. Executive branch officials who are lax or tardy in this regard should be disciplined.

The CHAIRMAN. That is signed by Mr. John Baker?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I wonder if we could place in record without reading a copy of your letter of September 25 to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, and Secretary Benson's reply, dated October 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Put them into the record.

(The letters referred to follow:)

SEPTEMBER 25, 1953.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Producers of oats, barley, and rye are deeply disturbed about the downward course of prices for their products, due chiefly to the increasing flood of imports of these three important commodities from Canada.

The fact that there are now in effect for the 1954 crop restrictions on the acreage of wheat will naturally result in an increase in the acreage of oats, barley, and rye. Thus, the problem of a downward price trend for these commodities is certain to continue unless prompt and appropriate action is taken. Such action is possible, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

It is realized that you did recommend to the President the institution of appropriate

action looking toward an import quota on oats and that after a public hearing action is now awaited from the United States Tariff Commission.

Similar action is needed at once in the case of barley and rye, and it is hoped that you will institute action in the case of these two commodities, and that early action by the Commission in the case of oats can be obtained.

According to the Department of Agriculture's agricultural prices released on August 28, on August 15 the average price being received by farmers for barley was 81 percent of parity; on rye, 68 percent of parity; and on oats, 81 percent of parity. In this case, parity is the new or modernized parity, which is approximately 20 percent lower than old parity for these commodities.

The average price received by farmers on August 15, according to the same report, was $1.10 per bushel for barley; $1.15 per bushel for rye; and $0.717 per bushel for oats. For producers in many surplus-producing areas, including my State of North Dakota, the actual price to farmers was below the national average.

These prices were below the price supports being offered by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the absence of import quotas the farmer is forced to use price supports, while the demand for his gain is met by imports in part.

Data from your Department's Grain Market News and Technical Report for September 18 shows an alarming increase in the imports since July 1, 1953, especially of rye and barley.

This report, on page 6, shows that from July 1, 1953, through September 10, 1953, we imported 2,326,000 bushels of rye compared with 579,000 bushels for about the same period last year.

We imported 7,924,000 bushels of barley from July 1, 1953, through September 10, 1953, compared with 1,951,000 bushels from July 1, 1952, through September 11, 1952.

In the case of oats, we apparently are embarked upon a course of imports which will once more mean a new record or near record of around 70 million to 75 million bushels for the year. From July 1 through September 10, 1953, we had imported 13,130,000 bushels of oats, and I am reliably informed by grain men, noting the trend of events, that the rate of oats imports will tend to increase in the months ahead.

You are, of course, familiar with the fact that the tariffs on these commodities have been so reduced by trade agreements as to serve as no significant limiting factor on imports. The tariff on rye, which was 15 cents under the 1930 Tariff Act, has been reduced to 6 cents, the tariff on oats from 16 cents down to 4 cents, and the tariff on barley from 20 cents to 7½ cents.

It is interesting to note in that connection that the tariff on beer is $3.875 per barrel, and that about 1 bushel of barley is required in the manufacture of a barrel of beer.

These tariffs are more than offset by lower transportation costs in Canada, where there has been no increase in freight rates since before 1940, while we have had numerous increases in those rates here. For instance, from Northgate, N. Dak., the freight cost to the head of the lakes, Duluth-Superior, is 15.14 cents per bushel, while from Northgate, Saskatchewan, just across the street from Northgate, N. Dak., the freight to the Canadian head of the lakes, Fort William-Port Arthur, is 6.08 cents per 32-pound bushel.

Thus, with a tariff on oats of 4 cents per bushel, Canada has available at the head of the lakes an advantage of more than 5 cents.

Lake shipping rates from the Canadian and United States head of the lakes to such points in the United States as Chicago and Buffalo are virtually the same.

Added to this advantage are substantially lower production costs in Canada.

We have appropriated limitations on the imports of cereal wheat, cotton, flaxseed, and a number of other commodities. Just why the producers of oats, barley, and rye should be discriminated against is difficult to understand.

These producers were greatly impressed by the statement made by President Eisenhower, when he was a candidate for office, in his September 6, 1952, speech at Kasson, Minn. You may recall this statement from that address:

"As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops."

Doubtless he had in mind their treatment both from the standpoint of price supports and protection against the destruction of their prices by an undue flood of imports.

Section 22 has been enacted and reenacted by Congress, on a number of occasions, and thoroughly discussed and debated. Many Members of Congress from the farm States are greatly disappointed in the failure to employ this congressional authority in the administration of farm-commodity programs. It is very difficult to explain to a producer barley, rye, oats, and a number of other commodities why action is not taken by the administration pursuant to the spirit and intent of section 22.

In recent visits to my home State and to nearby States, farmers have repeatedly called my attention to this situation. They are aware that our price supports are most valuable but that, unless supplemented with import quotas, these supports serve as a magnet to attract in imports with the result that more of their commodity goes under price support than would otherwise be true, at a far greater cost to the Treasury than would be necessary.

It is very unpleasant for them to see their markets lost. In the case of barley, there is a particularly important consideration. It is this—that, while barley-support prices are based on the feed value of barley, many farmers seek to produce a quality barley aimed at obtaining premiums for their commodity from maltsters. These premiums have fallen sharply, and Canadian barley has preempted to a very large extent the premium market.

It is very difficult for farmers in the Central Northwest to make sales of barley, rye, or oats east of Chicago. The eastern market, which the western farmers long supplied with feed grains, has almost completely disappeared.

It seems to me that very prompt relief could be supplied because shipments from Canada are apparently increasing and, if action is not taken soon, it will be another case of locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

In recent days, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, acting on a large number of complaints, I have conducted hearings in which I have obtained a great many facts from subordinates in your Department and in testimony from persons familiar with the situation. In view of the testimony given to our committee, it may be necessary to inquire whether the situations described above have arisen in violation of 15 United States Code 72.

There are steps which, of course, we can take in Congress to deal with this situation, but it is obvious that section 22 provides an adequate approach, if it is utilized, and that this situation requires prompt administrative action and cannot await the reconvening of Congress, now scheduled for January.

It is both a challenge and an opportunity for you to serve American agriculture.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is in reply to your letter of September 25 indicating that the producers are disturbed by the downward course of prices of oats, rye, and barley, due, in their opinion, to the increasing imports from Canada, and recommending that section 22 action be initiated to control imports of barley and rye in a manner similar to that underway for oats. The representatives of our Production and Marketing Administration who discussed the question of rye imports with you on September 24 also have informed me of your desire that the Department undertake an investigation on rye and barley pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

You will be interested to know that such an investigation already is underway in this Department. As a matter of fact, for some time we have been reviewing the entire question of feed-grain imports from Canada and their impact upon our price-support programs.

The purpose of our investigation is to determine whether there are sufficient grounds for us to advise the President that there is need for the Tariff Commission to make an appropriate investigation under section 22. Under the provisions of section 22, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to advise the President whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that a commodity such as barley or rye is being or practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render ineffective or materially interfere with any price support or other program for the commodity concerned.

As we have stated on many occasions, section 22 provides a satisfactory approach whenever imports come in under such conditions and in such quantities as to interfere with our price-support programs.

Every effort is being made to expedite the Department's investigation of barley and rye under section 22.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. We have with us today Mr. Howard Gordon, Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Services, accompanied by Mr. Tom Walker, Grain Branch, Department of Agriculture; Mr. Murray Thompson, Office of Price Production and Marketing Administration; Mr. Ray Suppes, Grain Branch; Mr. Douglas Bagnell, Director of Compliance, CEA, Department of Agriculture; and Mr. Delos James, appearing for the National Grange.

The CHAIRMAN. I also have a letter here from the Farm Bureau. Will you just file that? That will be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU,
Fargo, N. Dak., November 25, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. Donnelly has referred your letter of November 10 to me for attention.

Mr. Donnelly was compelled to leave for another meeting immediately following our annual meeting and due to another REA meeting in Florida later on will make it impossible for him to attend your hearing at Washington on November 30.

The reason for the delay is that he thought for a while that perhaps he could make it.

He asked however that for your information we should enclose a statement that was made by a group of farmers on June 26, which definitely requested that more con-

sideration and quicker action was needed in determining the large importation especially of oats, rye, and barley which directly affect us in North Dakota.

Sincerely,

G. J. STAFNE,
Secretary.

WHAT THEY SAID

(A summary of opinion collected at 60 public meetings for farmers in North Dakota, June 6–26, 1953. Opinions herein do not necessarily represent policies of the North Dakota Farm Bureau but serve as step one in the policy development program of the Bureau, 1953–54)

SOME CONCLUSIONS DRAWN AT FINAL MEETING, CARRINGTON, N. DAK., JUNE 26, 1953, BY DELEGATES FROM EACH OF THE 60 PUBLIC MEETINGS

1. Continue experimental Federal crop insurance program with adequate but not profit coverage.

2. Study feasibility of creating commercial wheat areas by classification.

3. Increase 1954 wheat acreage to 66 million but not increase permissible carry-over. Retain traditional history bases.

4. Liberalize farm storage programs, get more information on them to the public.

5. Restrict ACP payments to permanent type practices.

6. Leave use of diverted acres up to managerial discretion of farmer.

7. Study the two-price system for wheat and provide information to counties.

8. Approve signing of reciprocal trade agreements, but give USDA authority immediately to enact section 22 in case of disrupting imports of agricultural commodities. The Secretary should have the right to set up embargoes on price supported commodities whenever the price goes below parity, and explain his position later to the Tariff Commission and the President; and further, when imports are permitted, the Secretary should so regulate them as to make for an orderly marketing process.

9. Continue as amended the Agriculture Act of 1949, with six basic crops set at 90 percent of parity, until something better is found.

SUMMARY OF 60 MEETINGS

1. Are the present agricultural imports detrimental to American farmers; and if not, should the Reciprocal Trade Agreement system be continued?

In analysis of the meetings there was near unanimous agreement that some form of mutual trade between nations has to exist—that nations have to import in order to export. In only 1 or 2 summaries was there complete rejection of the concept of trade in agricultural commodities, with a trend to thinking that production "only for the American market" be maintained. Usually this opinion was accompanied with the thought that United States industry enjoys more favorable positions in the tariff picture and that no agricultural concessions be made until "substantial industrial tariff reductions are accomplished."

There was general agreement that the quantity of foreign agricultural commodities shipped in was not as important as to the timing—the "when" of the shipment. There was feeling that the delicate United States market, sensitive to changes, has been disrupted even with a small import quantity.

One exception to the above statement was the case of rye. We are admitting too much rye, according to some.

The following recommendations were made in many meetings:

(a) Approve signing of Reciprocal Trade Agreements, but give USDA authority immediately to enact section 22 in case of disrupting imports of agricultural commodities. The Secretary should have the right to set up embargoes and explain his position later to the Tariff Commission and the President. (b) Set up quotas for the importing nations at the beginning of the year, or crop year. In most cases it was felt this could be done. Then set monthly quotas, to permit orderly arrival on the United States market of the foreign commodity. It was felt that this method would permit introduction of grain in present amounts to the United States commodity market without any disruption whatsoever.

Minority report: In several meetings the following recommendation was made: Where a price support program is in effect on an American product, imports of that product should be immediately suspended, with the embargo remaining in effect as long as that commodity is being supported through a Government program.

In meetings where the subject was considered, there was condemnation of the situation which permitted gain marked "Unfit for human consumption" to get into the United States market channels and to be sold, either with or without blending.

2. Do you favor the same level of price support for all commodities? If not, what crops should receive higher levels of support?

In discussions, there was general agreement that all grain crops grown in North Dakota should get an "equal weight" in any program set up. There was, however, less agreement on what that weight or level should be.

There was agreement that full parity of income for the American farmer compared with the rest of the economy was the ultimate goal of all and this led in some meetings to an analysis of parity as a fair yardstick for the United States farmer today. Some questioning of the validity of parity as a fair yardstick was heard. Some farmers pointed out that certain commodities (carrots were mentioned in one meeting) could be produced profitably at much less than 100 percent of parity, and that higher supports would lead quickly to overproduction.

It was generally agreed in several meetings that the production of wheat required a high price guaranty and this resulted in recommendation that research be made on increasing efficiency of processing and distribution of agricultural products. One meeting recommended: "We urge a comprehensive study of our agricultural marketing system as soon as possible."

One meeting was specific on the subject of designating crops to be given higher levels of supports, including spring wheat, rye, oats, corn, flax, and barley.

Summaries of the meetings revealed considerable opinion in favor of the present support levels, to be maintained "until something better is found and proven to our satisfaction." This approval included the division of storable and nonstorable crops as well as the present support level of each commodity. The use of section 32 funds to purchase perishables from time to time in the periods of market glut and to dispose of those through welfare, school-lunch programs, etc., was approved and there was general feeling that this method was working.

At one meeting, the following recommendation was proposed: "That full parity (100-percent parity price) be offered for any commodity under a production-control program, including allotments or quotas or both." It was indicated that this 100-percent support was not to be the ceiling, but in case where the market demand pushed the price higher, the farmer would be allowed to benefit.

Several meetings registered their disfavor of variable supports as follows:

1. It is too late. Too many farmers are now producing wheat and will continue to produce it.

2. In any contest to move wheat acreages out of production through the price method, producers in the northern United States will lose to southern producers who move to market first and who have higher per-acre production.

3. There does not seem to be any possibility of getting the integration necessary to make variable supports function. Variable or flexible supports appear to have a chance of working only if the entire agricultural economy is operating under them, with price and cost ratios interrelated. Furthermore, the urban economy must be related to reflect similar flexibility. There does not seem to be any such elasticity in the American economy today.

There was agreement that increases in wheat production have not occurred in North Dakota, or in the spring and durum areas, and that North Dakota's wheat product has never deserved the name "surplus." In most cases the grain has been sold and used at some time in the crop year. A fair division of the national acreages should then be made, based on the traditional production of North Dakota, on the quality and marketing demand.

There was concern that the acreage allotments take consideration of this fact and agreement that wheat is being produced for the loan and not for use. Some damage is being done to certain areas, it was suggested, by this unnatural shift, such as fruitgrowers shifting to wheat as a result of the high supports. Reference was made to Michigan and Ohio in one meeting.

Minority report: In some meetings there was strong support of a 100 percent of parity price support by the Government on all commodities being produced in America. One meeting limited the full 100-percent parity support to milling wheats, oats, barley, flax, and rye. In discussion, the 100-percent support was also extended to livestock. Support for this approach was encouraged by the following statements:

1. Such a program would have to be accompanied by close marketing controls, but such curbs would not be serious for farmers, but in the American tradition of "fairness to all." The controls would serve to limit the larger producers and give the smaller producer better opportunity.

2. Where the 100-percent level of support "across the board" prevailed, the farmer will adhere to his traditional and normal operation and not be forced to shift to unnatural operation in order to get a good income. There will be farming operation in the best tradition of the area and with the best conservation approach to the soil.

3. Surplus in many commodities, instead of in a relative few, will be prevented by the production controls indicated above.

In at least one meeting the following suggestion was made: Set up a program of flexible supports, with no production controls, but with the support ranging between 90 percent and 110 percent of parity. The general amount of permissible backlog of commodities on hand should be raised to accommodate the increased production resulting from the support levels.

One meeting also recommended that feed crops should not be given a lesser weight in any support program developed by the Government.

3. To what extent will you accept production controls in order to get a satisfactory price support level?

There was almost unanimous agreement in the meeting summaries that farmers will vote "aye" on the referendum to establish quotas in 1954.

Farmers generally regard these as "a last resort" and showed no enthusiasm for the control program in their comments. But it was agreed that the situation seemed to call for "last resort" action (see question 9). This

action should not be delayed any longer, due to the effect of the visible surplus on the United States market.

In at least one meeting it was expressed that farmers will accept controls firm enough to cut supplies to the point where parity will be maintained in the marketplace, through demand.

The majority of the meetings seemed to favor reduction of acreages in 2 years rather than in 1 year, by limiting the 1954 cut to 15 percent of the present acreage or 66 million acres. Concern was expressed about making sure that foreign imports of wheat do not flood the United States market in the face of United States reductions, next year. In at least one meeting it was predicted flatly that Canadian wheat imports will increase heavily with ways found to avoid quotas at the border.

There was mixed opinion on limiting those who will come under the quotas, by raising minimum requirements to 25 acres or 400 bushels. Some felt that it was true that the small producer would vote the program out in order to avoid redtape. Others felt the small producer would not even vote, due to the lack of interest. Still others felt that releasing about two-thirds of the Nation's wheat growers from the quota would free enough to risk continued overproduction of wheat.

One recommendation for approval of the control program said it was "inevitable due to a failure of farmers and USDA to work on the marketing and world export problems, which are positive approaches to the matter."

Only a very few producers questioned the length of time that controls will be applied or pointed out that voting the quotas out would be increasingly difficult from year to year. There was mixed opinion on the matter of how production controls will affect the smaller producer, compared to the large. Some said the larger producer will be able to take the restrictions more easily than the small. Some said the controls will benefit the smaller family-type farmer more than the larger by (1) permitting better conservation practices. The smaller producer will not have to strain his operation and overplant in order to compensate for lowering supports; (2) giving the smaller producer less cuts, particularly if size, operating efficiency, and soil are considered.

In general, there was plenty of indication that North Dakota wheat men will vote in any referendum for controls, with the alternative being unthinkable at the present time, and with present conditions. The level of the wheat market and the fluctuations during the period of the public hearings contributed in great measure to this.

Acceptance of controls was predicated on several things, including the method of establishing the allotments. (See question 4, below.)

4. What can we do to simplify the control machinery if it is needed? Here are a few suggestions that have been proposed:

(a) Allotments on a percentage of tillable acreage basis, adjusting the base to geographical areas and to average yields.

(b) Bushel allotments rather than acreage allotments.

(c) Retention of allotment, not based on actual planting from year to year, but assigned to the farm on a more or less permanent basis.

(A) Tillable acreage basis: There was general apprehension among audiences concerning the way in which the controls will be applied.

In meetings held in the eastern part of the State there was strong support of this method, as against a straight historical bases method, or even a combination of bases and tillable acreages method. The feeling was that the historical bases method would cause many inequities.

Opinion was expressed that if the 1953 history had been removed from calculations and announcement made, there would have been less scare planting of wheat. Additions to wheat acres were made in 1953 after carryovers and forecasts were announced. The exact amount was not estimated by producers, but all agree such planting had been made.

In western meetings choice between acres and histories was about 50–50. Opinion of those against the former was as follows: (1) Land would have to be classified to make tillable acres work; (2) the method is more advantageous to diversified farmers; (3) the method forces wheat plantings.

Also in western meetings support for bushelage allotments was about 75 percent in favor. Reasons were one of simplification, ever-normal granary, absence of controls, etc.

At least one meeting recommended that a family-sized farm, 480 acres or less, be eliminated from the allotment and quota system.

Another recommendation was that graduated allotments be effected, so that each farm would be allowed 100 acres which would be exempt. The next 100 acres would be cut 15 to 20 percent. Anything over 400 acres would be cut 50 percent.

Another recommendation was as follows: "For the State of North Dakota 25 percent of the tillable acres on any farm should be allotted for the production of wheat. We look with disfavor on the method of wheat acreage allotment on a percentage basis (compared with past wheat acreages). This could mean poor farming practice on many farms. In addition to allotments, farmers would also have marketing quotas, the latter to be based on home consumption and foreign markets."

"All additional wheat raised above the quotas will be stored in the farmer's name, either in farm storage or public warehouse, and at no time can he seed more than his marketing quota in any one year."

The above-suggested program is meant to be accompanied by a 90 percent of parity support on wheat. For any other grain supported under the 1952 CCC loan and purchase agreement, support will be set at not less than 90 percent with no acreage allotments or marketing quotas.

In addition to the above 25-percent limitation on wheat, an additional 25 percent of the tillable acres will be taken out of production and used in soil-building practices under a farm-rotation plan, with the conservation worked out by the local PMA committees.

(B) Bushel allotments: There was considerable interest in bushel allotments as opposed to acreage allotments and controls. Some familiarity with the method was indicated through the Canadian system. Reasons included the freedom from controls, ability to store or feed, and simplification of the administration.

Those in opposition to bushelage controls called them "a long way down the control road" and pointed out they penalize a good farmer and are curtailment of the present efficient systems of farm production. The method results in the sale of allotments rather than the sale of land in the real-estate exchanges.

A leveling off of production and marketing would follow, they claim, with no incentive to develop good farming methods and increase efficiency.

(C) Allotments retained, without required plantings: At many meetings, there was interest in how planting requirements might be eliminated so that a producer would not have to continue to plant certain acreages to maintain the allotment. If a farmer could protect his allotment without planting he would have greater freedom and be more willing to practice good conservation methods.

Minority report: Some producers regard controls as unacceptable, hard to get rid of, and damaging to the farmer. It gets increasingly difficult to vote against controls, they claim, because the alternatives get increasingly unthinkable as the controls continue. It was pointed out that production curbs are negative approaches to the problems of world markets and distribution and provide propaganda for the Communists who are appealing to the hungry of the world with promises of food.

Controls spread like a disease, they point out, and controls on grains are followed by more controls on other farm commodities. Reference was also made to the Canadian method as an example of tough controls, and it was pointed out that the simplicity of the bushelage method made it easy for the Government to tighten the control at will.

"Canada is the graveyard of old machines, unpainted buildings, and full bins," it was said by one producer. The value of wheat in Canada as loan collateral has diminished steadily, it was said, and despite the control in effect by the Crown, Canada has a carryover of 250 million bushels this year.

"We are interested in income," some farmers said, and to reduce the bushels by controls cuts the income more rapidly than a reduction in price. A 100-percent parity of income is further from accomplishment under the control route, it was said.

As an example, if flexible supports had prevailed the current price would have been 80 percent of parity, which on 1,000 bushels would have netted about $2,000. With a reduction of 20 percent on 1,000 bushels, income would be $240 less for the year. This would be only a 20-acre cut at a 10-bushel average. Added expense on this acreage would be small, if you have the machinery and operate yourself.

This departure away from parity of income under a control system is even greater for the North Dakota farmer than for other parts of the Nation, because of the tradition of wheat growing in this State, it is pointed out.

Controls for durum: In areas of high production of amber durum, attention centered on the future of durum under the control program.

Considerable dismay was registered at announcements from Washington that a special program was going to be set up for durum or that durum would be taken out of the control program.

Such a method would result in disaster for the durum industry, it was felt, since there would be heavy durum plantings all over the Nation as controls were placed on other varieties.

Alternatives recommended by producers included:

(1) Take durum out of the allotment program, in order to meet demand, but drop supports to 50 percent of parity.

(2) Give durum a special program for 1954 but limit marketing cards to those who have a durum history during the past 3 years.

(3) Give durum a special program for 1954 but make a geographical area or areas in which the program is effective. This in effect would be a commercial durum area.

(4) Leave durum in the acreage allotment and quota program, but there should be no acreage cuts next year. Assignments of allotments should be based on the 3-year history now collected by PMA.

(5) Leave durum in the program and reductions will be made by producers in the hard wheats they plant. In the durum triangle producers have about 75 percent durum, 25 percent other wheats. In other fringe areas of the triangle, percentage is about 50–50, leaving room for cutting.

5. Should a commercial wheat area be established similar to the commercial corn zone or is it too late?

There was considerable interest in the idea of commercial wheat zone or zones but also doubt that it could be installed over what is sure to be heavy opposition from other parts of the Nation.

As long as other areas have built up heavy wheat histories and some work done on improving quality and building markets, it was felt that a commercial hard wheat area would be very difficult to establish. However, the idea has a great deal of merit and intrigues North Dakota producers.

One suggestion: Wheat should be classified and different prices be allowed for different classes rather than by grades. Another: A milling wheat area, based on quality.

6. Would you approve a two-price system for wheat, keeping the wheat used domestically for humans at about parity and the export at the world price?

A summary of the reports indicates that the two-price system is regarded by North Dakota wheat producers as the No. 1 alternative to the control program, particularly for wheat.

Questions, pro and con, raised by producers included:

(a) Will a loan system at parity level also be maintained with the program?

(b) What methods will be used to insure purchase by millers of the parity-price domestic wheat?

(c) Won't the program fail unless the parity-level support is given only to family-sized units?

(d) Under a two-price method a graduated scale for producers should be set up: 40 acres on the first 160, 30 on the second 160, and so on.

(e) Under such a program, farmers themselves should take the lead in locating foreign markets, stimulating sales, and otherwise moving wheat to market, foreign and domestic.

(f) Will a two-price system work without bushel or acreage allotments?

(g) If many two-price programs have the feature of farmer financing, how will these collections be made?

Means of holding onto some of the world market, that some meetings requested that a plan be prepared and presented to counties before annual meeting time.

In most cases the International Wheat Agreement was recognized as a type of two-price system and identified as such. It was questioned how a two-price program would function in relation with IWA.

Minority report: Most meetings were attended by at least 1 producer who felt that the 2-price program would work unfavorably for the wheat man. He questioned the establishment of a Government pool and felt that the percentage of domestic to foreign wheat could change unfavorably to the farmer. Also that the assumption of near parity for domestic wheat was perhaps optimistic. It was felt that the two-price could soon become a multiple price, with many different prices and that the cutrate price to overseas markets could result in giveaway, dumping, and waste. "We are giving away not our wheat, but our soil conservation and fertility when we engage in such a program," one producer said.

7. In the event there is curtailment of the wheat acreage allotment, how should the diverted acres be handled?

There was agreement at most meetings that problems in other crops will arise, once wheat acreages are taken out of production. Some wheat producers will also find it easier to shift to other crops than producers in certain parts of the Nation.

Generally speaking, farmers want to retain managerial decision over the diverted acres. It was felt that if USDA recommended cover crops, soil-building programs, etc., farmers would in the main comply. Western meetings favored USDA control, as a rule.

It was admitted that diverted lists prepared by USDA, listing crops to which farmers could not switch, might follow any control program. But producers wish to retain control of any acres taken out of production.

A grass program, with the Government paying a set sum per acre on an annual basis was discussed at some meetings. It was felt that any annual payment representing a higher-than-normal interest return would result in the introduction of heavy capital investments in farm real estate from nonagricultural sources, including insurance firms, industrial trust funds, etc.

One suggestion was made as follows: Diverted land should be seeded to grass with an adequate payment but this seeded grassland should not be used to increase livestock. The payment should cover taxes and interest on the investment. As an example, a man having a 50-head herd could use his diverted acres to build up his pasture reserve, but could not increase his herd number beyond a normal increase.

Generally speaking, there was a trend to the idea of putting marginal land back into grass, but agreement that the word "marginal" has changed in meaning. Acres should be left out of production, if the purposes of the controls are to be accomplished. The control program can hurt North Dakotans more than certain other wheat States, it was claimed.

8. Would this group approve a Government program to put the idea of quality into the wheat loans and purchases, so that the amount of the loan was based on the quality for human use of the wheat?

The quality of wheat was very appealing to most producers attending these meetings. It was felt that quality was the missing ingredient in the support program of the Government and that if it could be introduced it would benefit everyone.

Reference was made at some meetings to a recent statement by Dean Walster, NDAC, calling for farmers to insist on the quality feature, similar to the tobacco programs. "Farmers must stand up on their hind legs and demand this feature," Walster was quoted.

A classification of wheat for human consumption will help in taking the dogbiscuit element out of the wheat program and restore many acres to their traditional uses, it was felt.

NDAC has for many years, stressed quality approach to Dakota production. This has been done by recommending quality varieties, stressing quality rather than quantity, and carrying this approach into flour milling and baking. This approach is not now paying off for the North Dakota farmer.

In addition, there have been events which have destroyed the quality reputation of the Dakota farmers' wheat. These include blending and other processing and handling methods which have distorted the high level of the original product.

In general, there was fair agreement on this question. In at least one meeting, however, a producer pointed out that in a year of low production, a quality measurement of Dakota wheat could result in lower payments to farmers.

9. Should we delay the allotments and quotas for another year by increasing the amount we can carry over as reserve without having quotas called?

In general there was a feeling that any attempt to delay the production control would be merely delaying the inevitable. This opinion was sharpened during the series of hearings, as the June 10 crop forecast was received and as USDA made more definite announcements of the referendum.

There was agreement that surplus, in whatever position are price depressing, and that with or without Government support, big surpluses depress the market. Moreover, the storage problem must be considered, too. The bill to increase the carryover by 100 percent was questioned as being adequate to even then avoid the peril point where quotas would have to be called.

Minority report: Several of the meetings brought about the following approach to the surplus problem:

There really is no surplus. The world has hungry people and no surplus exists where there are hungry people. The problem is one of distribution. We should give the surplus away as best we can, limiting the gifts to the free world if possible.

Our legal surpluses are woefully inadequate and antiquated. The world is in such turmoil that our visible backlogs should be at least twice the legal size. Such surpluses would be a deterrent to any aggressor.

One producer claimed that the surplus announcements were part of a plan to drive down the wheat price and that the quotas would never be applied. He felt that the quotas if announced, would never be enforced by USDA.

At the same meeting, there was an informal opinion that the quotas would never hold up legally and could be successfully challenged in the courts, and probably would be challenged.

10. Do you favor ACP payments for anything other than permanent practices?

There was general agreement through the meeting series that the payments for annual practices (mostly summer fallow) were bad, useless, foolish, humiliating, waste of money, etc. Very little in favor of the annual payments was heard.

This firm opinion was bolstered by a feeling that the money being spent for annual practices could better be used for research, including rusts, diseases, insects, marketing, processing, and storage.

Also, funds could be used for more permanent practices, such as drainage, shelterbelt, conservation to grass on marginal land and for research in irrigation, etc.

Recommendations included the following:

(a) Stripcropping the first time should be considered a permanent practice.

(b) A permanent practice that fails should be paid for a second time. (Such as grassing a runoff.)

Farmers said they will summer fallow at the right time without the four-bits.

Minority report.—At least three meetings, the ACP payments, of whatever type, were defended, either as necessary to soil conservation or as additional subsidies which are badly needed by farmers caught in the squeeze.

The opinion was expressed that farmers will not summer fallow at the right time or in the right manner without the incentive payment.

Other opinions expressed by the minority groups:

(a) If the payments are limited to permanent practices, some counties cannot qualify for many of them and so will lose the allotment to some other county or State.

(b) Any ACP program should give the new farmer or the veteran the same break that farmers have received during the past 10 years. The education feature of the annual practices should be made available to the new farmer.

(c) The diverted acre problem calls for more ACP payments, rather than less.

In at least one county resentment was expressed against the control exercised by the State PMA committee over expenditures by the county committee of ACP funds. The following recommendation was approved: *Resolved,* That this county committee be given free control of the county ACP fund, with power to distribute it as the county

committee sees fit. (Passed unanimously.) It was also pointed out that the local committees would have a say.

11. Do you favor or oppose a Federal sales tax?

Wherever there was time to discuss this question, rural opinion was heavily against a sales tax. In isolated cases the sales-tax method was favored but it was also added that farmers should not be taxed on their tools—referring to machinery or vehicles or any other tool with which farmers produce.

12. Do you approve of the present crop-insurance program of the Government or do you have suggestions for changes and improvements?

Generally, there was opinion throughout the meetings that the experimentation in the program should continue and further studies made. It was also agreed that there are a lot of loopholes that need to be adjusted.

Interest was shown in the multiple contract as being tested in certain Dakota counties. Where the multiple contract is in effect applications are numerous and satisfaction greater.

Opinions included:

"We favor higher protection with higher premium."

"Program is good in principle but poor in practice."

"Program causes some carelessness in farming. Program should be more flexible where better farmers get benefit. Good practice should result in lower premium after 4 and not 7 years."

"Contracts should be based on each quarter section. Eliminate the 10 percent no-harvest penalty."

"The name of the program is misleading and causes urban people to regard it as another subsidy program. Name should indicate that farmers pay premiums."

"Program should be based on 100 percent of average crop, should cover all crops. Separate contracts for each 160 acres."

"Premiums should be based on individual rather than on neighborhood or regional schedules."

Other subjects discussed at the meeting included: Farm Bureau plan for bartering surpluses to friendly nations through mutual aid, the storage problem and difficulty of securing any Government bins; gift of wheat to Pakistan; the Government plan to provide insurance protection for exporters who are dealing with foreign customers and whose stocks are in danger of expropriation, etc.

IMPORTATIONS OF RYE AND BARLEY

STATEMENTS OF HOWARD GORDON, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE; TOM WALKER, GRAIN BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; MURRAY THOMPSON, OFFICE OF PRICE PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; RAY SUPPES, GRAIN BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; DOUGLAS BAGNELL, DIRECTOR OF COMPLIANCE, COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; AND DELOS JAMES, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. COLLINS. You gentlemen will recall that we held hearings here on September 23 and 24, to secure some information as to what is the effect of these unusually large Canadian imports of rye which have been flooding the American market, and from what we understand, depressing the price of rye and consequently reducing the return to the domestic producers.

I wonder if Mr. Gordon and his assistants could bring us up to date with figures since our last hearing under date of September 24.

In that connection, I wonder if Mr. Gordon could give us any information from the investigation which is presently being conducted pursuant to Secretary Benson's direction that these importations of Canadian rye have affected our present price-support program.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of figures, I would like to have some of the staff here give you those. The investigation which was made with respect to the effect of Canadian imports of rye has been completed. A docket has been prepared and acted upon by the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is now ready for transmission to the President, according to the procedure which is provided for under section 22. It probably will reach the President some time next week.

That is the situation as it now stands.

Now with respect to the actual figures, I think you would prefer to get those from the men who made them up.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Suppes, why don't you pick up and carry on.

Mr. SUPPES. We have prepared a little fact sheet here, Senator, that gives a high spot picture. We can look at those facts and figures and see if you want to go deeper.

Here are a bunch of statistical tables that will answer almost any question that might arise pertaining to production, prices, and so forth.

Mr. COLLINS. Could we start off this way, Mr. Suppes: At our last hearing, we have for the record the amount of rye that has been imported for the crop years up to 1952–53. Could you start and take July 1, 1953, and give us the amount of rye that has been brought in since July 1 up to the closest date, to today, so that we will have some basis for comparison?

Mr. SUPPES. If you will look at the bottom of the sheet, you will see July 1 to November 18, the latest data, 5.4 million bushels have come into the United States as actual imports and cleared customs. In addition to that, some 3.6 million bushels has moved into the country but not yet cleared customs and we call it afloat or in bond. So that is a total of 9 million bushels that has moved in 4½ months.

Mr. COLLINS. So that as of November 19 there has been brought in, since July 1, 9 million bushels of Canadian rye?

Mr. SUPPES. It would be more accurate to say that 5.4 has been brought in, but an additional 3.6 has moved across the lakes and is in a position to move through customs. It is conceivable that some of that might be reexported and not be United States imports, but it is not likely.

Mr. COLLINS. It is in bond. Does that mean that if it is outside of Chicago this morning and in bond, it could be dumped on the Chicago market tomorrow morning?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; it could move through customs at any time, or it could go back to Canada, or it could go abroad, to Europe or some place. But it is likely to stay in the United States. It might be in bond for 3 to 6 months before it becomes an import.

Mr. COLLINS. Isn't it natural to expect that if they put it in bond and bring it to Chicago or Buffalo, that it is going to be dumped on the American market?

Mr. SUPPES. Eventually. Just before the lakes freeze, there is a big rush to get the maximum movement across the lake. This type of thing happens every year, where we have a big bulge in imports in November and December.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand that just last week there were roughly 2 million bushels brought in. Would that 2 million bushels that came in last week be a part of the 3.6 million bushels that is in bond and afloat?

Mr. SUPPES. That is based on Canadian reports and we have no way of knowing exactly how much of that 2 million shows up in our figures here, how much has been picked up as in bond figures. I would guess maybe half of that 2 million is in our figures and maybe half of it is in addition to our figures. We have no way of knowing.

Mr. COLLINS. According to your chart here, there is 9 million bushels that either has been brought in already or is in a position to be brought in, as compared with the same period——

Mr. SUPPES. A year ago, 1.3.

Mr. COLLINS. Roughly, 9 to 1.

Mr. SUPPES And I mean up to the same time. During the entire previous year, 1952–53, 5.7 millions were imported.

Mr. COLLINS. So this appears to be the largest year on record as far as Canadian imports are concerned, speaking of rye?

Mr. SUPPES. I believe that is true.

Mr. COLLINS. What effect will this have on the price-support program?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, it undoubtedly will have a depressing effect on prices. These imports are more than half of our entire production for 1953.

Mr. COLLINS. Have you made any computations or have you tried to project this figure up to the end of the year?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, we have done some rough projecting for our own purposes, in setting up the CCC budget and so forth. Nothing official or nothing for publication. We are surprised at the size of the imports. They are bigger than we thought they would be. If they keep on at this rate, it will be unprecedented, of course, and astonishing.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it is unprecedented now, this tremendous increase over other years.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you testified at the last meeting that a certain amount was brought in from January to July. Do you happen to recollect how much that was?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, our year is a crop year, Senator. We practically never think in terms other than that.

The CHAIRMAN. I remember that, but do you have any recollection of what you brought in?

Mr. SUPPES. No; but I would guess it is around 3 million bushels.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my recollection. We have the figures here somewhere.

Mr. SUPPES. This set of mimeographed tables I gave you will probably show that. It is on table 9.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a little over 3 million bushels.

Mr. SUPPES. It starts in with 471,000, and the biggest month was April, 1.5 million. About 4 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Could we have your personal opinion as to how much more you think will be brought in by January?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, no, sir; I don't think my personal opinion would be worth much.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be purely a guess?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Do you mean by January 1 or July 1?

The CHAIRMAN. January 1.

Mr. SUPPES. Do you mean between now and January? That is just a month and a third or so.

Mr. COLLINS. Isn't it reasonable to believe that these imports will continue up until the time that the lakes actually freeze over? As long as the water is open they can still bring in this rye. If 2 million bushels came in last week, isn't it reasonable to assume that that much might come in this week?

Mr. SUPPES. I don't know that we can assume that. The lakes will freeze any time now. Maybe early in December they will freeze. The ships wouldn't hazard another round trip, probably, from now on.

Mr. GORDON. I know the Canadians don't expect a movement after the 1st of December.

Mr. COLLINS. Would you have any figures available or have you made any study, in view of the unprecedented amount of rye that has been brought in, as to how it will affect our price-support program? Do you have any information or have you made any study as to how much will go under loan this year?

Mr. SUPPES. This little fact sheet shows how much already has gone under loan.

Mr. COLLINS. What table is that?

Mr. SUPPES. This fact sheet, this typed thing. It is item 3. You will note that 2.4 million bushels as of October 1 or 13.7 percent of our crop, already has moved under loan, and they have until January 31, the farmers do, to avail themselves of their price-support privileges. That is about 20 times as much as moved under loan during the same period last year, which was insignificant last year. The CCC has had very little price-support activity for several years.

Mr. COLLINS. And these figures, of course, will be subject to change or variation up until the final amount of rye has been brought in?

Mr. SUPPES. Up until January 31.

Mr. COLLINS. That is, once the lake has been closed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I believe the record should show that we imported 9 million bushels in 1949–50. We have been talking about it as though this was by far larger than any other imports. It may be when the year is over.

Mr. SUPPES. You have the same table on the bottom of the mimeographs.

Mr. THOMPSON. Twenty years ago we imported 12 million, but of course that was in the 1930's, when we needed it.

Mr. WALKER. That is for the entire year.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right. I just wanted the record to show that.

Mr. COLLINS. But you will agree that this is a large importation?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. And there has been a consequent effect upon our price-support program and the domestic price that the farmer is going to get for his rye.

Mr. SUPPES. There is no doubt about it in our minds. You might take a hurried glance at the graph at the bottom of the mimeographed group. Do you see those three lines at the top? They show the price. One is the Minneapolis terminal price, the middle one is the national average, and the bottom one is the North Dakota price, by months, for the last 2 years. And for the first couple of months of this year, too.

The horizontal lines, about the middle of the page, are the equivalent price-support levels. The bottom graph shows imports. You can see the relationship over at the right side of the graph, where imports have gone up and price has gone down.

Mr. COLLINS. Would you translate this graph into figures so we will have that in the record, Mr. Suppes?

Mr. SUPPES. We have a table that shows the figures which I have already given you. I think that is called Rye, United States price-support program and price analysis.

I believe this statement has not been brought up to date, though, to include the current year's activities.

Mr. COLLINS. Where is that, Mr. Suppes?

Mr. SUPPES. In my group it is the third one from the top. That is the whole history of price-support operations, and it gives the national average price received by farmers, the price-support level, and the amount of activity in price-support operations. However, that doesn't carry you right up into the present year of today, because we are still in a state of flux as to the amount that farmers will place under price support. We haven't shown 1953–54 prices in this table yet, but we did show them in the graph.

Mr. COLLINS. The present price support is $1.43?

Mr. SUPPES. That is right. And you can see that the national average price pushed down through the price-support level in May, and is continuing on downward. It has flattened out and risen a little bit in the last few weeks. That does not show on this graph.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the cash price, the latest, in relation to today's support rate, at Chicago?

Mr. SUPPES. Minneapolis, of course, is your principal terminal market. $1.64 is the support price for No. 2 rye or better.

Mr. WALKER. That is the support rate.

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; the support rate, and $1.57 is what we would call the effective support rate, whereas the price on November 19 was $1.19 to $1.25, or about 40 cents below support.

Mr. COLLINS. That is as of November 19?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have a comparable figure for November 19 a year ago?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; I believe so. It is $1.96 to $1.99, up pretty close to $2. So it has dropped from about $2 to about $1.20.

Mr. COLLINS. About 80 cents?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. From these figures it is reasonable to assume, then, that if the present cash price of rye continues at approximately $1.19 to $1.20, farmers are going to put most of their production under loan?

Mr. SUPPES. At least that part which will move to market, which will leave the farm, will tend to gravitate under the price-support program and ultimately in Government hands.

Mr. COLLINS. From that, then, there is no doubt but what these large importations have had a great effect on our price-support program?

Mr. SUPPES. We would say so.

Mr. COLLINS. Have you given for the record the total amount of rye that has been placed under loan compared with the corresponding period of last year?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; I mentioned that a few minutes ago. It is item 3 in this fact sheet, 2.4 million bushels as of the middle of October. It will be about 2 weeks from now before we will know the amount placed under support as of the middle of November. There is quite a lag in these figures. That is about 20 times as much as of the same date a year ago.

Mr. GORDON. Of course, there wasn't any need for it a year ago.

Mr. SUPPES. No; prices were very handsome a year ago, up around a hundred percent of parity.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the acreage this year as compared to last year?

Mr. SUPPES. Acreage? It is roughly the same with 1,375,000 harvested in 1953 compared to 1,385,000 the year before.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you any figures anywhere showing how much is planted this year for next year?

Mr. WALKER. No; they are not available. They won't be available until the December crop report.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know if it will be much larger?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; that is because of the diversions under the allotment programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you not say that in some of the States it doubled? Have you any information at all on it?

Mr. SUPPES. No; I wouldn't think it would go quite that strong. Would you, Tom?

Mr. WALKER. I doubt it. However, there is room for a lot of expansion in the acreage of rye, due to the wheat acreage allotments program in South Dakota and North Dakota, and we are expecting a considerable increase in the rye acreage especially in those States. This December crop report that we are talking about, which will show an indication or intention to plant, will include all rye that is seeded, and in a large part of the country rye is seeded for cover crops and for winter pasture and is not seeded with the intent of harvesting. That report itself will not indicate the amount for harvest as grain. But we can expect that the total acreage for harvest as grain could go up a third or 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. I just came from North and South Dakota and Minnesota, and I noticed much more rye this year than last year.

Mr. WALKER. They are seeded for grain.

Mr. SUPPES. They normally harvest as grain about half the rye that is planted in the United States. In late years they planted about 3½ million acres and harvested about half of it as grain.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. Does Canada have any program of governmental acreage or crop control similar to ours?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, not similar to ours. Mr. Gastineau—this is Robert Gastineau. Can you give them a picture of the Canadian system of supporting the price and marketing of rye?

Mr. GASTINEAU. The Canadian system in the case of rye does not involve any restrictions or controls on either acreage or price. The only restriction there is is on the delivery quota for rye, which is established at the beginning of each season by the Canadian Wheat Board. That is a little different than their programs on wheat, oats, and barley. Rye is marketed through their regular commercial channels and it is outside of the administration of the Canadian Wheat Board except that it is included in the initial delivery quota that is established by the Board for deliveries from farmers.

Mr. COLLINS. Along that line, does Canada have any minimum or maximum quota as far as exporting rye, for instance, or is it a free market?

Mr. GASTINEAU. No; there is no minimum or maximum quota.

Mr. COLLINS. I think maybe Mr. Walker or Mr. Suppes can answer this question. The last 2 or 3 years it appears that our domestic production of rye, oats, and barley has been on the decrease, and correspondingly I understand that the Canadian production of these 3 grains has been on the increase. If that is so, and with these unusually large importations into the United States, does it follow that Canada is moving into our market and displacing our domestic producers?

Mr. WALKER. Both acreage and production of rye has been on the decline for several years in the United States, with last year being a continuation of that decline with still less acreage than the preceding year, whereas in Canada the acreage and production has been on the upgrade. In fact, the total supplies of rye in Canada for this marketing year is estimated now at about 45,700,000 bushels. That is a record high; 29.3 of that is production and 16.4 is the carryover, and that 16.4—probably Bob can check me on this—is also a record for carryovers in Canada.

Mr. SUPPES. There is a slight correction. Canadians came out the other day with a new crop report. The rye crop went down from 29.3 to 28.2, and the supplies went down from 45.7 to 44.6.

Mr. COLLINS. Still the largest on record, though?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. Domestically Canada uses about 7 million bushels of rye annually, which would leave the difference between his 44.6 and about 7 million that is available in Canada for carryover and export.

Mr. COLLINS. About 33 million bushels in round numbers.

Mr. WALKER. It would be higher than that. It is about 38 million, if my arithmetic is correct. It is 7 from 44.6. It would be just a little less than 38 million bushels available for carryover or export. If you would assume that Canada would, say, maintain that carryover of 16.4, which is enormously large for Canada, then you would have the difference or about 22 million that is available for export, and that compares with actual exports last year of 9.2—that is total, now, to all destinations—and the highest during the war, or just the postwar years, of

around 10 million bushels. So you would say that they have about double the amount available for export of the highest that they have been exporting since the war.

Mr. COLLINS. And our domestic production runs between 20 and 24 million, doesn't it?

Mr. WALKER. Our domestic production? This year it was only 17.5. The year before that it was about 20, wasn't it?

Mr. SUPPES. No; about 16 million bushels.

Mr. WALKER. Excuse me. Generally we think of rye production in this country as around 20 million bushels. Of course it used to be much higher, up around 45 to 50 million. But as we pointed out a moment ago on your questions, we have been on a decline in production and have gotten down to less than 20 million now.

Mr. COLLINS. Is there any relationship between these Canadian importations over the years and the decrease of rye produced by our American farmers?

Mr. SUPPES. No; I would say not.

Mr. COLLINS. How do you explain that?

Mr. SUPPES. Other causes, other than imports, have caused farmers to produce less rye. That has been going on for decades, 30 or 40 years. Rye has been going out of favor as a crop. The principal reason, in the last 15 or 20 years, is that wheat has been a more profitable and certain and safe crop for them, so they have turned to wheat.

Mr. COLLINS. If they reduce the acreage on wheat due to the allotments won't that force farmers in the West to shift their wheat to rye?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. And rye, as of those figures you gave a little while ago, is 80 cents a bushel under what it was a year ago. There doesn't appear to be much incentive for planting rye.

Mr. SUPPES. In desperation they will do it, though. Up on the north plains there are not many crops that they can turn to, but rye is one.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the normal domestic supply? What I am trying to get at is, do we raise enough rye for our own needs or are we dependent to some extent on these Canadian importations?

Mr. SUPPES. Frankly, for several years we have been dependent to some extent on imports. We have not produced enough to meet our own needs.

Mr. COLLINS. What would you say the needs are for this year?

Mr. SUPPES. 1953–54?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SUPPES. Well, we are estimating that our domestic disappearance will probably be about 23 million bushels. That is in the light of the big imports, however. If it weren't for the big imports we would be feeding less, and using less industrially and so forth. Our exports will continue very small, probably less than a million. But for the sake of argument we can say 23 million might disappear in the United States this year. Well, we produced 17.5 million and we carried over last summer 6.3. So that is 23.8 that is our domestic supply.

As we have pointed out, some 9 or 10 million has already come in. If we will assume imports are 10, that means we have about 34 of supplies, then, for the current year, and as we said, we will use about 23 of that. That means, on that basis, that the carryover next summer will be up around 11 million. But that is very guessy. Of course imports may be higher. Your question was how much will we need or consume?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. I was trying to relate that with Canada having roughly 44 million bushels over there, including their carryover, and our domestic need runs anywhere from 20 to 24 million. That excess rye that is imported, where does that go in this country? It appears to be over our needs.

Mr. SUPPES. Well, it will go into the hands of private grain men and speculators and indirectly to the Government, through the price-support program.

Mr. WALKER. No; Canadian rye will not go to the Government. It means that with those imports from Canada there will be more of our domestic rye that will go into price support and eventually into the hands of CCC, but Canadian rye imports will never go into the hands of the Government.

Mr. COLLINS. Doesn't it mean simply this, that we are getting this excess rye from Canada that is displacing our domestic rye and forcing our domestic producers to put their rye under loan?

Mr. SUPPES. That is right.

Mr. COLLINS. And it is because of that difference in the price, between the cash price and the support price?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Would you have any way of arriving, in terms of cash figures, at what this is going to cost our Government?

Mr. SUPPES. No.

Mr. COLLINS. In effect, it is subsidizing the Canadian producers, isn't it, at the expense of our taxpayers?

Mr. SUPPES. Indirectly; yes.

Mr. WALKER. It is rather difficult to determine as of the present whether any losses may be sustained by CCC on the takeover of any rye from the 1953 crop that goes on price support. In the past CCC has been rather fortunate with rye. You have to visualize the situations that may develop in the future. If something should occur that would force prices of rye back up above the price-support level, then CCC could dispose of its rye without very much loss, if any.

Mr. COLLINS. It could go the other way, too.

Mr. WALKER. But if the prices remain as they are now, considerably below your price-support levels, and then the occasion arises that this rye owned by CCC as a result of the takeover from price-support operations were to have to be marketed because of going out of condition, for instance, then there would be a considerable loss sustained.

Mr. SUPPES. Or if the Government has to hold it several years, the storage would accumulate.

The CHAIRMAN. It would run into the loss of millions of dollars, won't it?

Mr. SUPPES. Several million. It could.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have any information as to what our present storage facilities are, assuming that in the light of these Canadian imports there might be a rather large amount of rye going under loan? At the present time, does the Government have enough storage facilities to take care of this anticipated crop going under loan?

Mr. WALKER. If you think in terms of rye alone, yes, there is sufficient storage. There is much more than adequate facilities. But if the wheat supplies occupy that storage, then there might be a tightening of storage. But it would be the wheat that would be blocking the rye out of the storage, rather than the small amount of rye, because that is very small compared to wheat. Otherwise your storage facilities would be adequate.

Mr. SUPPES. You can say that the imports are aggravating the storage situation.

Mr. COLLINS. You gentlemen will agree, will you not, that in view of these importations there is a serious problem and possibly a serious effect upon our price-support program?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes, sir. We cannot help but agree to that.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have any further comment, Mr. Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. No, I don't think so. Of course as has been brought out, the rye supplies among the grain crops is a very minor crop, from the standpoint of overall production and so forth, and when you compare it with our other crops, it doesn't present the problem that you have on wheat and oats.

Mr. COLLINS. How about oats and barley, is there a similar situation existing?

Mr. GORDON. Not on barley.

Mr. COLLINS. How about oats?

Mr. GORDON. Your barley situation is not nearly so bad as on rye. Of course, action has already been taken under section 22 on oats. But the rye does present a very clear-cut case for section 22 action, and we are proceeding in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say it does not apply to barley?

Mr. GORDON. The conditions on barley don't compare at all with rye.

The CHAIRMAN. The present indication is that the barley situation is out of control, too.

Mr. SUPPES. It is not as clearcut under the provisions of section 22 as rye.

Mr. GORDON. As either oats or rye. We would be rather pressed to make a case on barley.

Mr. SUPPES. One of the reasons, Senator, is that the great majority of the imports of barley are the malting types, which bring premium prices, and malting barley is above price support in the country today, and the price-support program does not make provisions for premiums on malting types. So we are in a complex picture there on barley. It would be more difficult to make a clearcut case.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you watching the barley situation pretty carefully?

Mr. SUPPES. We are indeed.

Mr. GORDON. We are, very closely.

Mr. COLLINS. Could we shift now to another phase of this, Mr. Chairman? We have Mr. Douglas Bagnell of the Commodities Exchange Authority, the Director of Compliance. Mr. Bagnell appeared before our committee on September 23, and at the conclusion of that hearing he advised us that he was going to make a further investigation into the activities existing on the Chicago Board of Trade as far as trading in rye. I wonder if you could more or less bring us up to date, Mr. Bagnell, having in mind the investigation that you have made since our last hearing and if there is information that you can give the committee at this time.

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir.

I might say first we have 1 week's figures on rye shipped from Canada, I think subsequent to those that Mr. Suppes just had, through November 25. Apparently last week, about 2,200,000 cleared Canada for the United States, and as Mr. Suppes points out, there are 2 sets of figures, 1 covering the stuff as it leaves Canada and 1 as it gets into the United States. We have found that these last-minute shipments frequently come in and are held-in-bond, in winter storage, and winter sorage in boats, we found that particularly of oats in Chicago, and then unloaded next year.

According to our figures, roughly 11 million bushels has cleared Canada. How much has checked through customs I do not have. But I think Mr. Suppes pointed out about 5,400,000 has as of the 19th.

The latest comparison we have of Canadian futures prices, or Chicago futures prices, was as of last Friday. The prices on the Chicago Board of Trade are running about 12 to 14 cents a bushel above the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. The December futures, for example, is about $1.18 in Chicago, and $1.06 in Winnipeg. There is about 12 cents premium on the Chicago futures there.

Mr. COLLINS. Can you explain, if you will pardon the interruption, how importers buying this Canadian grain at Winnipeg and bringing it into the Chicago market and selling it on the board of trade, with the price spread between Winnipeg and Chicago. Aren't they bringing this rye in at a loss?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, a 12 to 14 cent spread which is what exists now is a pretty close margin. We figure it costs about that to bring the rye in, when you figure the freight,

duty, handling charges and so forth. We figure Winnipeg would have to be about roughly 13 to 14 cents under Chicago to bring any profit. There is a little bit of guessing in that, in that some of the rye that comes into Chicago is sold at a premium, some of it can be mixed up a bit and make plump rye, which would bring a 2½-cent premium, and some of it might even bring higher premiums than that, under special circumstances.

So it is hard to say definitely exactly what the price relationship has to be. But certainly during the larger part of this summer, the situation has been such that I don't see how it could have been imported profitably just on the face of it.

Of course there is another angle to that. If the importer happens to be short, and the Chicago futures market goes down as a result of these imports, he can cover his short position at a profit which may more than compensate for the loss in the actual importations. We had a situation in oats which was gone into in considerable detail, where we are contending that that was done. Oats were imported in 1951–52 year under circumstances that we said show a loss. But the importer had a very large short position in the Chicago futures market, and our contention—this is just in the process of litigation now, we haven't proven anything—our contention is that that was done for the purpose of bringing about a price relationship that would show a speculative profit.

Mr. COLLINS. Could the same thing be happening in rye?

Mr. BAGNELL. It could. One impact of this thing is the delivery of rye on the futures contracts on the Chicago Board of Trade. That has perhaps a most direct effect on futures prices when heavy deliveries are made, particularly when there is a glut of the commodity already. We find that so far this year there has been about 10⅓ million bushels of rye delivered on futures in Chicago, and we still have December to go. December is usually the heavy delivery month and if it holds true again this year there will be perhaps a total of 13 or 14 million bushels delivered, which is roughly double the deliveries for 1951 and 1952, for each of those years.

In other words, we feel that the importations and delivery of this rye on the market has a present effect on the futures price and unquestionably the cash price is hinged to some extent to the futures price.

Mr. COLLINS. Doesn't it seem a little unusual where this rye is imported from Canada, brought from Winnipeg by rail or by boat to Chicago, and disposed of on the Chicago exchange at a loss?

That is a little unusual for these importers to bring this in and expect to sell that at a loss.

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, I don't know. I would say it is entirely unprecedented. As I say, we have the same situation in oats. It is a thing that needs an answer. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COLLINS. And it needs some investigation.

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, we have concentrated our activities on the oats situation mainly because we felt it was more acute last year and our facilities were pretty well stretched out covering that. We have a hearing beginning on that the day after tomorrow here in Washington.

Mr. COLLINS. Is that in connection with section 6 (b)?

Mr. BAGNELL. Of the Commodity Exchange Act, yes sir; section 6 (b).

Mr. COLLINS. On the oats situation that you went into, have you found that your CEA has enough statutory authority to properly survey and police the commodities exchange market? You have had this experience in oats now. Do you feel that your agency has enough authority to put a stop to this condition existing or that you apparently found, of manipulation?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, we do not have anything of a cease-and-desist order under which we can step in and make anybody stop, summarily. Our procedure has to be this, we have to file a complaint against the individual, charging him with manipulation, or exceeding the speculation limit, or whatever we say he is doing. Then that is subject to a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act, and the hearing usually is considerably delayed, for various reasons, like any legal procedure. After the hearing, if we have established our case, the Secretary issues an order denying this party further use of the futures markets for some specific period of time. That order is appealable to the Circuit Court of Appeals. So it may readily be 1, 2, or 3 years—in fact, 1 year would be very quick. It may run into 3 or 4 years before our order becomes effective.

Senator YOUNG brought up that question some months ago with us in connection with this oats matter, and asked us what should be done. We didn't have any very ready answer for it. If we are given the power to seek an injunction in Federal court, that might expedite the matter. Senator YOUNG introduced a bill, I believe it is S. 1990, which would give us power to go into court and seek an injunction. The Department has recommended it favorably. That bill would also give us subpena power under which we can bring suspected manipulators in under oath and examine them. That is also included.

I don't know any way, though, that we could ever expect to get power to step in and cure these things overnight, because I don't think the Department would want, and I don't believe Congress would want to give us, power to take away millions of dollars, perhaps in property rights without a hearing. So we have to look toward the long-term objective of putting people out of the market who do this sort of thing, and endeavoring to demonstrate that it is unprofitable enough so that too many people will not try to do it.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the other laws apply?

Mr. BAGNELL. That would be under the antitrust section, Senator. I think there is legislation now pending on that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be up to the Attorney General?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know whether any proceedings are pending in that?

Mr. BAGNELL. No, sir. I might mention, though, that we have asked the Attorney General to institute proceedings in this oats case, in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act proceedings, and that is now being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any criminal proceedings at all during the last 20 years?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir. We got judgments against egg manipulators under the antitrust law, a few months ago. It is pending in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. How long ago was that?

Mr. BAGNELL. We got that indictment in January, I believe. It is still on the docket.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it been tried during the last year?

Mr. BAGNELL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only case you can give us during the last 20 years, this egg case?

Mr. BAGNELL. It is the only one I know of offhand; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of anybody at all during the last 20 years who has been sent to jail for manipulating?

Mr. BAGNELL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The present statute doesn't seem to cover it, then?

Mr. BAGNELL. I am afraid there is a tendency to take a calculated risk, by some of them.

Mr. COLLINS. I wonder if you could tell us this: This rye that is coming in, do you know whether that is brought in by many individual importers or by 1 or 2 or 3 or a small number as against a lot of small importers? What is the situation regarding the importing of this rye?

Mr. BAGNELL. It is brought in by a few large operators.

The CHAIRMAN. How many, would you say?

Mr. BAGNELL. I would say that 90 percent of it was being covered by two importers.

The CHAIRMAN. Two?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Senator, in connection with your question to Mr. Bagnell about whether there has been any violation of the antidumping provision of the Revenue Act of 1916, I would like to make a part of the record a letter from Warren Olney, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. COLLINS. November 24, 1953. Would you like it read for the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Read it.

Mr. COLLINS (reading):

"Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR: Your letter to the Attorney General dated November 13, 1953, with respect to the activities of Cargill, Inc., in the importation of grain from Canada has been referred to me. This letter is in reply to those matters which deal with violations of the Commodity Exchange Act.

"The case is based upon the report received from the Department of Agriculture, which is mentioned in your letter, together with such further implementing information which has been furnished this Department. The charges involve the exceeding of speculative limits, the filing of false or deceptive reports with the Commodity Exchange Authority, and the manipulation or attempted manipulation of the price of oat futures on the Chicago Board of Trade. From the standpoint of criminal prosecution the case presents legal problems, and as a practical matter is believed to depend upon whether there is sufficient evidence to establish manipulation.

"The case has recently been submitted to the United States attorney at St. Paul for his consideration and recommendation. Criminal prosecution will be instituted providing we determine that the evidence warrants such action.

"Your letter also refers to violations of the antidumping provisions of the Revenue Act of 1916, and to violations of the antitrust law. The inquiry with respect to these matters is receiving attention, and it is expected that you will receive a further reply shortly.

"Sincerely,
"WARREN OLNEY III,
"Assistant Attorney General."

The CHAIRMAN. Has the Attorney General been in close communication with you on these matters?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir; we are in close communication with him.

Mr. COLLINS. Under the CEA Act, Mr. Bagnell, I understand that your agency checks on the trading practices of traders on the commodity exchange in Chicago?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Could you tell us what are the trading limits or speculative limits applying on the commodity exchange today?

Mr. BAGNELL. The speculative limits on rye is 500,000 bushels. That is the most that can

be held speculatively by any one person or firm. On the other grains, it is 2 million bushels.

Mr. COLLINS. That 500,000 bushels, as far as rye is concerned, is that any one transaction or for a stated period?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, it is the total amount any one person may trade in on one business day or may hold in the form of open contracts at the end of the business day. In other words, if a person goes in and buys 500,000 bushels of December rye today, he has reached the trading limit today, and tonight he will be long 500,000 bushels of December rye which has reached the position limit, so he is through, speculatively.

Now, that limit does not apply to hedging transactions. For example, if a person has in his elevator 5 million bushels of actual rye, he may sell 5 million bushels of futures. That is a hedge, and the speculative limit does not apply. We have charged in this case that you mentioned there a moment ago that the respondents in this action sold on the Chicago Board of Trade under the guise of hedging when they actually did not own the oats on the other side of the market, that it was not a hedge. That is part of the essential part of this case.

Mr. COLLINS. Have you, as a part of this investigation since the last hearing, been following the transactions in rye on the Chicago Board of Trade, particularly with a view of determining whether various traders or importers are keeping within their speculative limits?

Mr. BAGNELL. We have.

Mr. COLLINS. Have there been any developments that you can give to the committee, or any findings?

Mr. BAGNELL. I would prefer not to do that.

Mr. COLLINS. I wouldn't want to press for any information along that line.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are watching it?

Mr. BAGNELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. I believe that is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you a question on that letter. You heard that letter read by Mr. Baker. Have you any comments to make on it?

Mr. GORDON. That deals with the overall matter of price-support legislation which, of course, is under discussion at the present time and which is being worked on by various committees and so forth. I don't think at this time we would have any comments.

The CHAIRMAN. Who in your department has charge of drawing up legislation that you want?

Mr. GORDON. That would be done in the Secretary's office.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you gentlemen have any suggestions to make on legislation that would help?

Mr. GORDON. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. It would have to go through the Secretary?

Mr. GORDON. The Secretary is working through various advisory committees, and it finally comes to the National Agricultural Advisory Commission which is supposed to whip the material into shape. That is in process at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Collins, are you and your associates working in drafting some legislation, are you?

Mr. COLLINS. We haven't started yet, Senator. We wanted to get the background from the Department of Agriculture, these fellows here, too, on the needs for any information.

Mr. Bagnell, do you feel that the present CEA Act is sufficient for you to curb practices?

Mr. BAGNELL. Well, as I mentioned a minute ago, we believe Senator Young's bill will be a help to us. We have at various times introduced proposed legislation to amend the act. I would not be in a position to make any recommendations, of course.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, we also have Mr. Delos James from the National Grange. Do you have any statement, Mr. James, or would you care to make any comments on the testimony that the committee has received this morning?

Mr. JAMES. It appears to me that the situation has been pretty well covered. The important facts have been brought out. I think there is a remedy for this, if the remedy would be applied, or had been applied when it should have been. That is, long ago when these imports began to reach a rather dangerous point by causing a depressing effect on our market. I should hope that we weren't helpless that we didn't have any remedy to correct this problem after we have gone to the extent of trying to assist the American producer in obtaining a decent price.

In other words, what our support loans were intended to do was to avoid serious effects on the domestic producer by way of depressed prices.

Mr. COLLINS. By the remedy, do you mean section 22?

Mr. JAMES. Well, that hasn't been brought out, it seems to me, Mr. Collins. We do have a remedy, don't we, for this kind of a thing? The question in my mind, all along since the September hearings, and even before, not only with regard to rye but with regard to other products, walnuts, and filberts, and things like that, butter and cheese, laws that were passed, the legislation that was enacted, was enacted with a view of protecting these commodities that were threatened by imports that would interfere with our price-support program.

That is the National Grange's position. While we place great emphasis on the matter of foreign trade and the foreign market as an outlet for our surplus products, still the Grange also is committed in support of a program that protects our own market or our own commodities from destructive competition from abroad. So here is a case that is perfectly clear, it seems to me. It has been going on for quite some time, and I don't think it is the first year that it has happened. But the damage will have been done, all of this rye will have come in here, even before the lakes freeze over, and so far as this year's crop goes, if action was taken right now it wouldn't correct much, if any, of the damage that has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. We tried to stop it by having hearings in September.

Mr. JAMES. I want to commend you for taking the initiative, or taking action in September. It was a good move. This is a constructive move.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to have been on the job months ago. It certainly is their job to protect themselves against loss. They are going to have loss, I think, in millions of dollars on this rye situation.

Mr. JAMES. Senator, I don't think the Commodity Credit Corporation is entirely the one that is responsible, because in some other cases, as I recall, they have taken action, that is, they have made recommendations, but it has been held up farther along the line somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. We are trying to find out where it is held up.

Mr. JAMES. That is good.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that they have nearly a record amount of products at hand right now. It is over $4 million, as I understand it.

Mr. JAMES. We have the remedy. Why isn't that remedy applied? Where is the barrier? What is the thing that gets in the way and stops us?

The CHAIRMAN. These gentlemen ought to be able to tell us, and we are trying to find out.

Mr. JAMES. It is beyond their hands, I think. But still there is the long delay before any final decision is made. The damage is done. After the cow has kicked the bucket, what is the use of tying her?

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any specific recommendations for legislation?

Mr. JAMES. None other than what I have implied. Unless we use the tools we have to adjust a matter like this, and if that won't do, let's find out why and what new tool or device has to be designed to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee wants to find out if we can who is to blame and why something hasn't been done. The problem is to fix the responsibility squarely on the person that is to blame. That is the purpose of the hearing.

Mr. JAMES. I wouldn't know just where to spot it, but maybe somebody does know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think somebody may know and won't tell?

Mr. JAMES. I guess they would tell if they are asked to tell, and if they knew exactly. Maybe it can't be spotted exactly. I am in the dark on that point, too.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think is the reason why this thing wasn't taken care of?

Mr. BAGNELL. I am not exactly in the position to answer that. We are in the position of a policeman; we can't arrest a man if he is not speeding. We can't arrest him if he just looks like he is going to speed. After we arrest him, he has all the rights of appeal and I assure you we are very frustrated and have been for many years over the delay that we are faced with in trying to get these things to a conclusion. The average case we have takes well over 2 years, if it is of any consequence. If it is of any consequence it goes through the Supreme Court, and under the existing legislation a person can continue to do exactly what he was doing for that whole period of time.

So, frankly, I don't know what the answer is. As I stated, I don't believe Congress would ever tell the Secretary of Agriculture or the Administrator of the Commodity Exchange Act that he could go out and just tell a firm "You must quit today," with no hearing and no right of appeal. These markets move so fast that if they take advantage of all the delay that they can bring about, the thing is long since forgotten before the order is ultimately effective.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand your testimony, then, the various delays are too long, too much time is given for appeal and that sort of thing, and time should be cut shorter.

Mr. BAGNELL. I don't know whether it should or not, Senator. There you are getting into the question of how summarily can you deprive a man of his rights.

The CHAIRMAN. You can give a man 10 days, 2 months, or 6 months.

Mr. BAGNELL. That is the sort of thing that we are groping for, some procedure under which we can give a man due process and still not have this interminable delay. That is what I think some of the others are interested in, that is, Senator Young, in his suggestion for an injunction procedure. Even that cannot be done overnight. You have to go into a court and persuade some judge to give you an injunction.

The CHAIRMAN. The District judge can give them 10 days. Would something like that help out here?

Mr. BAGNELL. It would be a lot shorter than what we have now.

Mr. JAMES. May I ask a question? That would be with regard to the trading on the exchange, wouldn't it?

Mr. BAGNELL. That would mean that the person against whom the action was taken could no longer use the facilities of the exchanges. I might say that all of these imports that are of any consequence do use the machinery of the exchanges, and I don't think could be done without the use of that machinery.

Mr. JAMES. But even if things were going along all right on the exchanges, these products could come in, that is, rye could still come in at the lower price, at a price below the loan, and still do the harm that is being done. So the remedy is beyond that part of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Not if you get a temporary restraint or an injunction proceeding.

Mr. JAMES. That would restrain only one trader.

The CHAIRMAN. He says two firms are bringing it in.

Mr. JAMES. If one was evading the law?

Mr. BAGNELL. We would have to demonstrate that the imports were for the purpose of manipulation.

Mr. JAMES. All?

Mr. BAGNELL. No; the imports being done by Joe Doaks.

Mr. JAMES. But six others could go ahead.

Mr. BAGNELL. This wouldn't stop any unless it was shown that they were manipulating.

The CHAIRMAN. We would stop if it was shown they were manipulating.

Mr. JAMES. Yes. But it seems to me that these commodities are coming in, and somebody is bringing them in, and they are depressing the price. Take the matter to the Tariff Commission for a study. The Tariff Commission makes a recommendation that a tariff should be imposed, or some duty. Then the Secretary of Agriculture has to make the recommendation to the President, doesn't he? Then what happens? The Tariff Commission has not studied this rye situation, have they?

Mr. SUPPES. The thing is in process. It is still within the Department.

Mr. JAMES. In the Tariff Commission?

Mr. SUPPES. In the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JAMES. It passed the Tariff Commission?

Mr. WALKER. No. The procedure there is that the Secretary submits it to the President with a recommendation and the President in turn submits it to the Tariff Commission and the Tariff Commission moves it to hearing and then returns it to the President.

Mr. JAMES. The Tariff Commission has not acted yet?

Mr. WALKER. The rye docket has not reached the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SUPPES. It is in an interim stage.

The CHAIRMAN. We are in the same shape as in September.

What has happened since September?

Mr. SUPPES. We have developed a lot of facts and figures and the case has been written up.

The CHAIRMAN. But the rye has been coming in just the same during those months?

Mr. SUPPES. Yes. Shipments have been abnormally high.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no more questions, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Have either of you gentlemen any comments to make?

Mr. SUPPES. Well, I would like to say we have not sat still since last September. It takes several weeks to develop all the facts and figures, to find out where you are, and where you are going.

Mr. GORDON. And as I indicated, we are already past that, through the Board, and ready for submission to the Tariff Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am certainly very grateful to you gentlemen for coming over this morning. Thank you very, very much. I hope we can proceed faster with this thing and hope to really get some action.

Mr. SUPPES. I think we all feel the same way about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for coming over.

(Tuesday, January 19, 1954)

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator William LANGER (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators LANGER and DIRKSEN.

Also present: Thomas B. Collins, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

You may proceed, Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you. Senators, this is a hearing this morning called by our subcommittee to look into the importation of barley and its consequent effect upon the American market. We have as our first witness this morning Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Pierce Butler here from St. Paul?

STATEMENT OF ROY F. HENDRICKSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, sir; he could not be here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. He wired me and said he was going to be here.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to bring my information together in a statement here, and I will run through it as briefly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. It is understood that any one of these four gentlemen can interrupt you at any time, and Senator DIRKSEN can interrupt you, and ask you any questions they want. The hearing is very informal.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes, sir.

United States producers of barley, particularly of the malting premium varieties produced in the Central Northwest, have largely lost their market to imports from Canada.

The import duty of 7½ cents a bushel is more than offset by lower railroad rates in Canada, which are approximately 39.5 percent of the United States freight rail rates.

Furthermore, Canadian prices of barley remain at levels somewhat under the United States support prices for barley. This may well be by design. The marketing of barley in Canada is a Government monopoly. The program is administered by the Canadian Wheat Board, which has, and exercises, the authority to limit or expand at will the quantities delivered from (a) farms to local elevators, (b) from local elevators to terminal points, and (c) the selling of barley in store at Port Arthur or Port William at Winnipeg either for cash or under future contracts. It has effective control of the supply offered to the market on any day, week, or month. This means it can influence the price effectively.

The result is that a larger and larger share of the United States domestic market for barley suitable for malting or pearling has been transferred to Canada, despite more than adequate supplies of barley of the required varieties and types in the United States. Canada simply prices its barley below the United States level and preempts the market.

The basic data relating to barley are outlined below so as to provide a comprehensive picture of the situation.

Senator DIRKSEN. May I ask at that point, does the Canadian Government subsidize the production of barley?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. So far as I know it is not a direct subsidy. There might be said to be a subsidy in this, that of the two railroad systems up there, the one is owned by the Government and the other has been heavily subsidized by the Government, so perhaps that railroad rate which is unusually low in relationship to ours might be said to reflect a subsidy.

Mr. GASTINEAU. For the Senator's information, from year to year, Canada does establish an initial payment to producers which is usually well below the market price at the beginning of the marketing season. To that extent they do guarantee a price.

Senator DIRKSEN. A floor that they set?

Mr. GASTINEAU. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Production in 1953 and carryover. Production of barley in the United States in 1953 totaled 241 million bushels, about 7 percent more than the revised 1952 production estimate of 226 million bushels. Average increased, and the yield was high, the average per acre being 28.2 bushels, exceeded only once in 1915.

The carryover of old barley, as of July 1, last was estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at 51 million bushels.

Production outlook for 1954: There is expected to be a substantial expansion of barley acreage planted in the spring of 1954, due in large part to the wheat acreage allotments.

The Crop Reporting Board estimated that fall rye plantings were increased by 22 percent over the previous year; it is very likely that the increase in barley acreage will be even larger because of the adaptability of barley production to large areas of land and the opportunity for spring planting in areas where fall planting is difficult by reason of climatic conditions.

The United States Department of Agriculture, on page 10 of The Feed Situation, released October 22, 1953, estimated the United States barley carryover as of next July 1 at 50 million bushels. Because of larger imports, the figure could well run higher. No barley shortage is in sight.

Imports of barley: From July 1, 1953, until December 30, there were imported from Canada 21,760,000 bushels of barley compared with 12,876,000 bushels for the same period in 1952.

It is estimated that more than 4 million bushels have been placed in Great Lakes vessels for winter storage, which will be delivered to the principal United States malting centers, Milwaukee and Chicago, when lake navigation reopens this spring.

Senator DIRKSEN. Is that storage barley already sold to the United States consumers?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The belief is that even more than that has been sold.

Senator DIRKSEN. But it is in the hands of United States consumers?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No. Many of those lake vessels tie up in the wintertime and serve as warehouses during that period. They do make forward sales, not necessarily identifying the particular carrier, but it is believed that the way this 4 million is located that it is destined to come in and that actual forward sales are even larger than that 4 million.

Although exact data are not available, it is commonly believed in the barley trade that very large sales of Canadian barley to the United States have been contracted and that the import movement will be extraordinarily high during April, May, and June, setting a new record for export to the United States of barley for manufacturing purposes. Imports of at least 35 million bushels to 40 million bushels by next July 1 are in prospect.

The high points in imports of barley from Canada to the United States occurred during the war years 1942, 1943, and 1944 when record large quantities were brought into this country by the Government in connection with the expanded livestock-production program during the war period. This was an abnormal situation, and not proper for comparison.

Since World War II, imports from Canada have steadily moved upward, being year by year as follows: 1945 marketing year, 5,647,000 bushels; 1946, 4,063,000 bushels; 1947, 973,000 bushels; 1948, 10,366,000 bushels; 1949, 15,321,000 bushels; 1950, 11,119,000

bushels; 1951, 11 million bushels; 1952, 25 million bushels.

United States support prices: For the 1953 crop, United States support prices were announced by the United States Department of Agriculture at 85 percent of transitional parity which, on the basis of Minneapolis, the principal domestic market for malting varieties of barley were: For No. 2 barley or better, $1.44; for No. 3 barley, $1.43; for No. 4 barley, $1.38; and for No. 5 barley, $1.34.

These prices are based on the feed value of barley related to the feed value of corn and oats and do not take account of the malting premiums which over a period of 10 years have averaged around 30 cents a bushel for the varieties and qualities which United States farmers, particularly in the Dakotas, Montana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, have sought to produce to meet the needs of the malting industry.

For the 1954 crop Secretary Benson in October announced a support price of 85 percent of transitional parity. This rate will be approximately 9 cents a bushel less than last year as a result of transitional parity, a provision associated with the new parity formula by Congress. This provided, starting January 1, 1950, for a reduction of 5 percent in the effective parity price for barley each year as a gradual transition was made from the use of the old parity formula to the modernized parity formula in computing parity, and, consequently, support prices for barley.

Encouragement to producers: For some years past State and county extension workers have encouraged farmers in the States mentioned with their soil and climatic conditions to produce premium malting and pearling barley qualities to plant the varieties and types of barley to meet specifically the needs of the malting and other food-manufacturing industries in the United States.

A center of research, supported by the United States Department of Agriculture, a number of State experiment stations, and the malting industry, has been maintained at Madison, Wis.

Much of this effort by farmers have now come to nought by reason of the flow of Canadian barley to our domestic markets at prices below the United States support price, while United States premium barleys move in large volume into storage under price supports.

Barley placed under support prices: Up to December 15, 32,226,000 bushels of barley had been placed under the support program, an unusually high volume.

Senator DIRKSEN. Is that by purchase or loans?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Purchase agreements and loans, the loans being the heaviest.

For North Dakota alone, the rate at which barley was placed under the support program up to December 15 was five times greater than last year.

Mr. COLLINS. Would you have any figures which would show that Canadian barley has displaced the American barley, and forced the American barley to go under loan?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is obvious that because the greater volume goes under loan, that is where the United States barley is going. At least one of the members, the Farmers Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, has been a large servicing agent for barley for years, and talking to their chief specialist on barley, I was informed that the volume of sales he is making, and I suppose it is true of others in a similar position, he estimates to be only around 15 to 20 percent of what he calls a normal year. In other words, very little is moving through because they simply cannot find outlets at all, except for feed, and the farmer chooses to put it under support. He can put it under support until January 31, and while it is pretty hard to guess, doubtless this figure of 32 million bushels which went under support may be only one-half of what will go under support.

Senator DIRKSEN. You mentioned North Dakota. What is the situation in Minnesota and Wisconsin?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. My understanding is that in Minnesota the rate is substantially higher, but not quite as high as in North Dakota. Perhaps the Department people have figures on that. I do not know.

Senator DIRKSEN. Very well. We can add that later.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. Because support-price loans or purchase agreements can be obtained until the end of January, it is expected that the final figure will be very much larger; that, while the major markets for barley in this country are preempted by Canadian imports, CCC will prove to be the chief market for United States producers of malting grades of barley.

This is undesirable because of the cost to the Government and also because the purposes of the congressional price-support programs are in part defeated by making them serve as magnets for imports.

The use of section 22: There is available, as a result of congressional enactment, a procedure to meet this situation. This is incorporated in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, considered at great length by Congress on several occasions.

Section 22 in effect provides that when it is believed that a commodity, such as barley in this case, is being imported and is practically certain to continue to be imported into the United States, and thereafter, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the price-support operations undertaken by the United States Department of Agriculture with respect to that commodity or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from the domestically produced commodity, an import quota can be placed in effect.

The procedure requires that, first of all, an investigation be made by the United States Department of Agriculture; that, if the danger from imports is found to exist, the Secretary of Agriculture is then authorized to advise the President of his belief; and that the President may then direct an investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission.

Senator DIRKSEN. There has to be a finding under section 22?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. Has such a finding ever been made?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To my knowledge no such finding has been made unless something has been done by the Department. No recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President has been forthcoming thus far, to my knowledge.

Mr. SUPPES. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Such investigations have been made in the past for a number of commodities, including cereal wheat, cotton, and oats. One is now underway in connection with rye. The Tariff Commission then reports its findings and recommendations to the President.

This remedy seems particularly appropriate for the barley situation where the tariff has been reduced one half since 1930 to the present rate of 7½ cents a bushel and where the price-support program is now being forced to carry the burden of providing the principal outlet for producers of malting premium barley while the domestic needs are being increasingly met by imports from Canada under a system of marketing which is, in effect, a Government monopoly there. We do not dispute the right of Canada to organize its marketing system in any way it desires, but the consequences of the system on the United States market can no longer be ignored.

Senator DIRKSEN. You emphasize malting premium barley.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. Do your remarks address themselves also to feed barley?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To a much lesser extent, because you have a somewhat different situation there. There are areas right out here in Virginia where I happen to operate a dairy. We produce barley, but not a malting type. We produce a variety strictly for feed. That is true, for instance, today in California, which for recent years has been the biggest barley-producing State, even running above North Dakota. But that is mostly feed variety. Interestingly there has been an outlet for export to Korea, where they used barley for human food.

Qualities and quantities are sufficient. The United States producer has many times in the past proven capable of meeting all or practically all of the domestic requirements for malting and pearling types of barley.

Indeed, there have been situations in the past where the Commodity Credit Corporation has acquired considerable quantities of barley at the feed price and later sold into the malting market at substantial premiums the barley required by the domestic malting industry, at a profit to the CCC.

It is not logical, however, to expect United States producers to ignore the price-support opportunity at the present time because Canada is offering, and has offered, premium barleys delivered Chicago and Milwaukee at prices which are below the support price for those points taking the higher United States freight costs into account.

That the United States barley is of a quality and quantity sufficient to meet the needs of malting barley is well demonstrated by one of the largest brewing companies, the Pabst Brewing Co., which makes most of its own malt and which follows a policy of buying its barley supplies from United States producers. This is a blue ribbon exception to the policy of most malsters. United States producers are profoundly appreciative.

This company is one of the few in the industry who apparently appreciate the fact that, while the tariff on barley is 7½ cents a bushel, and it taxes approximately one bushel of barley to make a barrel of beer, the tariff on beer is $3.875 per barrel.

Freight rate advantages: The present rail freight rate, under the rates established by the Interstate Commerce Commission, including a 12 percent emergency charge and the 3 percent Federal transportation tax, from Noyes, Minn., or Pembina, N. Dak., to Duluth or Superior is 38.07 cents per hundredweight compared to the freight rate from a corresponding station of the Canadian side (Emerson, Manitoba) of 15 cents to Port Arthur or Fort William.

Senator DIRKSEN. Does that 12 percent emergency charge always attach?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As far as grain is concerned, we call it a surcharge. It is a temporary rate increase which is being continued in effect. It always applied to grain.

A study of rate comparisons in the United States indicates that to move grain, including barley, from various competing points the Canadian rate is approximately 39.5 percent of the United States rate. There is no doubt this reflects the fact that there have been no freight-rate increases in Canada since prior to 1940, while since that time there have been increases of approximately 75 percent so far as the grain transportation costs are concerned in the United States.

Thus, the Canadian shipper at Emerson, Manitoba, can move barley to Port Arthur or Fort William, transfer the cargo to lake vessels, pay the duty of 7½ cents on entry into the United States at Milwaukee or Chicago, and still have an advantage of a net return several cents above the United States producers.

Senator DIRKSEN. What would the figure be in cents? Your difference in the illustration is 23 cents on freight rates, and you have 7½ cents for your duty.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have worked this out in table 1, Senator.

Senator DIRKSEN. Then just go right on through with your statement.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Table 1, which is attached to this statement, makes comparisons for a number of points in Canada with adjacent points in the United States. You will notice that the rail rate from Port Arthur to Fort William for a 48-pound bushel is 7.2 cents. The transfer charge to get it through into a boat is 3 cents. The lake freight is normally figured at about 9 cents from Port Arthur or Fort William to Milwaukee or Chicago. That adds up to 19.2 cents in freight. The duty is 7.5 cents. That brings the landed cost to 26.7 cents.

Now, Noyes, Minn., is right across the border and there is no advantage in going down to Duluth, Superior, and transferring for that short haul, and your rail rates are competitive with that. So all the rail from Noyes, Minn., to Milwaukee, is 29.62. We find that type of comparison. I have a great number of points carrying it down further.

Taking the last one on the page you have Morden, Manitoba, where it runs 19.2 cents in freight, 26.7 in all, and Walhalla, N. Dak., which is very famous as a center for unusually fine barley, the rate is 29.09. In other words, they pay the duty and still have an advantage.

Senator DIRKSEN. About 3 cents, is it not?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is right. Table 2 compares the rates for a number of points in the United States and Canada to the Lakehead in each county, and employing the rates on a 100-pound basis. That supports the evidence I have to the effect that the Canadian rate is approximately 39½ percent of the United States rate.

Comparative prices: There has been a sharp decline in the movement of malting and pearling barleys from United States producers to United States manufacturers for several years, directly reflecting the increase in imports from Canada. This movement has dropped off to a small trickle this year, with one member of this federation—the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul—which has in the past marketed large quantities of barley for its farmer patrons in the Dakotas, Montana, and Minnesota, finding very small outlets this year compared with any past year in its long history of serving the farmers.

The choice varieties, such as Montcalm and Kindred, produced as a result of encouragement of maltsters and of State and county extension workers by producers in the Central Northwest, are either going under price-support programs or being fed on the farms, while the same varieties are coming in from Canada to preempt the domestic market.

In the case of pearling barley used for the manufacture of soups and sirups, a variety which is grown in western North Dakota and eastern Montana—Compana—finds exactly the same resistance because of being underpriced by Canadian imported barley.

It is true that Canada has a large surplus of barley, not only at the great terminals of Port Arthur-Fort William but also backed up in the local elevators and on farms. This simply means that, unless some defense is erected, the quantities offered to the United States domestic market will increase, at an even lower price if that becomes necessary. Meanwhile, the United States producer will find more and more resistance to moving his premium barleys into consumption and must sacrifice malting barley by placing it under the price-support program at the feed value and losing forever the premium he should be entitled to.

Further, this Canadian price can be "rigged" by adjusting the rate at which the Canadian Wheat Board orders forward its barley. Its manifest interest, in view of the large surpluses of grain in Canada, is to find outlets, and quickly, by underbidding competition.

Its procedure of bringing forward to market step by step the barley at whatever speed it chooses to do so in effect determines the supply-and-demand situation, thus raising or lowering the price at will. It has the earmarks of a dumping operation so far as the movement into the United States is concerned.

If the remedial action pursuant to the authority established under section 22 is not taken in this instance, then we are compelled to urge that this committee undertake an investigation to determine to what extent this movement comes in conflict with United States laws intended to provide protection to our people from surplus dumping activities undertaken by other governments or individuals. It is, I believe, the appropriate committee to undertake such an investigation and to indicate any legislative remedy that may be appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the letter on the rye investigation that the Attorney General wrote us on the antidumping provisions?

Mr. COLLINS. It is in the file, Senator; I will get it while we start with the next witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. We will insert in the record at this point tables 1 and 2 mentioned by Mr. Hendrickson in his testimony and the letters referring to violations of the antitrust laws.

(The letters and tables are as follows:)

DECEMBER 21, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Attorney General has requested me to reply to your letter to him of November 13, 1953, relating to Cargill, Inc., insofar as the antitrust laws are concerned.

The Antitrust Division has had this matter under consideration and has taken preliminary action for the purpose of determining whether or not there is justification for more formal proceedings. Two of our field offices have been giving attention to the subject.

Please be assured that, if our investigation indicates any probable violation of the antitrust laws, appropriate legal proceedings will be instituted.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY N. BARNES,
Assistant Attorney General.

NOVEMBER 13, 1953.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Testimony received by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, as well as numerous complaints transmitted to me by American farm groups, reveal a shocking disregard of the best interests of American agriculture by certain large importers of Canadian grains.

During the last 3 years large quantities of Canadian oats and rye were brought into the United States and sold in the Chicago market at actual losses to the importers and at prices substantially below the Canadian market value for such oats and rye when the costs of importation are added. These Canadian importations and sales at losses in American markets were part of a gigantic scheme to artificially depress Chicago futures prices and thus create for the importers huge and arbitrary profits on speculatively short futures positions maintained in the Chicago market.

These Canadian oats and rye were brought into Chicago when unneeded and unwanted at strategically sensitive market periods with the intent and purpose of creating the maximum market price effect. The lowering of Chicago oats futures and rye futures prices resulted in a lowering of prices received by the farmers for their oats and rye. Price pressure exerted on oats and rye served to weaken prices for other grains.

The American farmer has been substantially injured. Heavy Canadian importations have forced domestic prices far below parity and even below Government price-support levels. The Government itself, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, will undoubtedly suffer large losses. Testimony of Department of Agriculture officials indicate that much larger quantities of oats and rye are going under the Government loan this year as compared with the same period in 1952. At present prices farmers have no incentive to redeem their loans. Eventual losses on the large quantity of grain which the Government will thus acquire and add to its surplus stocks could be enormous.

We have been advised that these importations of Canadian oats and rye and sales below Canadian market value for the purpose of distorting and manipulating Chicago futures prices violate at least three Federal statutes:

1. The antidumping provisions of the Revenue Act of 1916 (15 U. S. C. sec. 72).
2. The antitrust laws.
3. The antimanipulation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U. S. C., sec. 13).

The Department of Agriculture prepared a report entitled "Investigation of Importation of Oats From Canada, 1951–52," dated October 15, 1952. This report found that Cargill, Inc., the largest grain firm in the United States, had imported Canadian oats into Chicago, and sold such oats at a loss and had by such activity, manipulated Chicago oats futures prices downward. This report was filed with your Department of Justice with a request for appropriate legal action. A year has passed and no action has as yet been taken.

Here is a problem that requires the mustering of all administrative forces. By stopping illegal and manipulative Canadian importations, our agricultural price policy will be strengthened. The American farmer will be given protection from unconscionable market operators.

The question of foreign trade, as such, is not here involved. The importations of Canadian oats and rye in the past, and currently, are being brought into the United States at losses—and dumped in markets where surpluses exist—in order to accomplish arbitrary market-price influences. This cannot be considered a part of honest foreign trade.

May I respectfully request that you immediately instruct your Department of Justice to complete its investigations of this problem and, if the facts are as alleged, initiate criminal proceedings for violations of the Antidumping Act, Antitrust Act, and Commodity Exchange Act. This must be done at the earliest possible moment to aid our present farm-support program.

Will you please advise me of what action is being taken?

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—*Barley*

(This table compares the transportation and other costs, including import duty, of landing a bushel of barley at Milwaukee from selected Canadian points and from adjacent points in the United States which have all-rail transportation to the same consuming center, Milwaukee-Chicago. Rates are in cents per 48-pound bushel.)

	Rail to Port Arthur-Fort William	FOB BING Port Arthur-Fort William	Lake, Port Arthur-Fort William to Milwaukee, Wis.	Total rail and lake to Milwaukee, Wis.
Emerson, Manitoba	7.2	3	[1] 9	19.20
Duty				7.50
Total				26.70
Noyes, Minn., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				29.62
Gretna, Manitoba	7.2	3	[1] 9	19.20
Duty				7.50
Total				26.70
Neche, N. Dak., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				29.62
Northgate, Sask.	9.12	3	[1] 9	21.12
Duty				7.50
Total				28.63
Northgate, N. Dak., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				34.06
North Portal, Sask.	9.12	3	[1] 9	21.12
Duty				7.50
Total				28.62
Portal, N. Dak., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				34.06
Lyleton, Manitoba	8.64	3	[1] 9	20.34
Duty				7.50
Total				27.84
Antler, N. Dak., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				34.05
Morden, Manitoba	7.20	3	[1] 9	19.20
Duty				7.50
Total				26.70
Walhalla, N. Dak., all rail to Milwaukee, Wis.				29.09

[1] Approximate.

TABLE 2.—*Grain: Comparative rates via United States railway to Duluth-Superior on the 1 hand, and via Canadian railroads to Port Arthur-Fort William on the other hand, points of origin being separated only by international border*

To Duluth-Superior			To Port Arthur-Fort William		
Station on American side	Rate per hundredweight	Rate per hundredweight, including 12 percent emergency charge and 3 percent tax	Corresponding station on Canadian side	Rate per hundredweight; no emergency charge or tax	Canadian rate as a percent of United States rate
From—			From—		
Noyes, Minn.; Pembina, N. Dak.	33	38.07	Emerson, Manitoba	15	39.4
Neche, N. Dak.	33	38.07	Gretna, Manitoba	15	39.4
Northgate, N. Dak.	41	47.30	Northgate, Saskatchewan	19	39.5
Portal, N. Dak.	41	47.30	North Portal, Saskatchewan	19	39.5

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not have any questions right now. As far as the facts that are presented there, I think that is a pretty accurate statement, Mr. Hendrickson. I compliment you on it. We do not quarrel with the basic facts presented there.

Would you like for me to comment on this?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, surely.

Mr. DAVIS. First, let me say that we are now, and have been for a number of months, in a period in respect to our agricultural production and marketing in which we are confronted more and more with a buyers' market and we are confronted in our support programs more and more with the question of imports at prices undermining our support program. Section 22 has been in the law for over 15 years, and since last January when we came into office there have been more cases referred to the Tariff Commission than there were in the total 15 years or more before.

The point I am making is that we are aware of this kind of a problem, and we have had this barley situation under study since last spring. We have had a number of meetings on it.

With respect to section 22, really you come down to one point which is your test as to whether you can apply section 22, and that is this: Is there or is there not interference or threat of interference with the effectiveness of the support program? That is the only issue that really is involved in the application of section 22. We have decided that there was interference in the case of oats. We decided that a number of months ago in a hearing and recommended a hearing before the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff Commission recommended that action be taken.

Action was taken, as you know, with respect to Canada first by agreement, and then later it was extended to other areas of the world. It was a rather complicated picture.

Senator DIRKSEN. That was the imposition of a quota on oats?

Mr. DAVIS. On the rest of the countries other than Canada.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. We also decided some weeks ago that there was interference in the case of rye, and hearings have been held. The Tariff Commission has completed the hearings, and they have notified the public that anybody has until February 1 to file briefs. In the case of barley, we have not felt that there was actually a case to date.

The support program on barley is fundamentally a support program on feed barley or barley at feed price level, the idea being that malting barley in the years when we do have good malting barley and that varies by year—some years we have quite a lot of good malting barley, and some years it is less, depending on the season—will carry a premium, and as long as that premium places it above the feed price, it will go into the market for malting purposes. It is only in the case of a year when the supply of that kind of barley is so great that there is not adequate premium to put it above the support prices that it will be placed under loan.

One fact that was not brought out in the statement of Mr. Hendrickson is this, that at the beginning of this year we had one of the lowest carryovers of barley we ever had. So we did not start this year with a large carryover. Our 1947 to 1951 average stocks on hand, July 1, was 76.3 million bushels. This year it was down to 51.4 million bushels.

Senator DIRKSEN. What do you regard as a normal carryover?

Mr. DAVIS. Somewhere around 70 to 75 million bushels; and we were about 25 million below that at the beginning of this year. So there was not, as is true of wheat, a large carryover at the beginning of the year.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would like to ask this: Do you happen to have the breakdown of the carryover figure as between the malting varieties and the feed varieties because my impression is that the carryover from the malting varieties is rather high, while the carryover from the feed varieties was relatively low.

Mr. DAVIS. I think we are looking at this question of whether or not there is interference in terms of the kind of support program that is operating this current year and it is basically a feed price support program. While what you say is probably true, even so I do not think it is a material fact in determining whether or not there is interference with the program that is in operation this year because this is basically a feed price-support program.

You have raised a question there which is another question, I think, with respect to malting barley, but I think looking at it in the framework that exists now that we have to ask ourselves, is this present support program being interfered with by imports. Therefore, I think this carryover figure of 51 is the one we pretty much have to look at.

As we see the picture, we have a changing situation in barley. It is changing week by week. There are a number of factors that are not in the picture with great weight yet, but we are aware of them. One of them is the acreage controls on wheat and probably that is going to mean a greater shift to barley in another year. I think we have to look at that one. But there again you cannot actually go before the Tariff Commission and say there is right now interference on that kind of ground, either.

The CHAIRMAN. Why can't you do that?

Mr. DAVIS. Because there is not any actual threat of this year's program.

The CHAIRMAN. But here is a farmer that has 160 acres of land, and he can only raise wheat on 30 acres of it. I know of a quarter section that happens to have that. The Tariff Commission made up of human beings knows that the farmer has to seed rye in the fall or barley in the spring and certainly should consider that. There are going to be millions of acres of barley seeded in Wisconsin and North and South Dakota.

Mr. DAVIS. I think we will be in a position to appraise that when the intention-to-plant report comes out in March and we can take that factor into consideration, and we will have tangible evidence of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you not be in the same position then that you are in right now? Eleven million bushels of rye came in and we have raised only 23 million to compete, so there are 11 bushels of rye from Canada to compete with our 23. Certainly the Tariff Commission ought to realize that barley is going to be seeded.

Mr. DAVIS. The point I am making is this, that we are approaching what seems to us like a period where while the case we have not felt to date is strong enough so that we are justified in going to the Tariff Commission, it may well be that situation soon will be different. It is changing and we

are now beginning to look at the new year. We may very well within a reasonable time ask the Tariff Commission to investigate the barley situation. I do not know. But it has not looked to us like we had a strong enough case to go before the Tariff Commission and win up to date.

Our estimate is that we will finish this year with a carryover of 60 million bushels total of barley.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. You thereby have increased that estimate by 10 million bushels in the last 2 months.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. That anticipates 35 million imports, which is the figure you used.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. We started this year with 51 million bushels carryover, and it looks like we will end it with about 60 million left over, and the 5-year average is around 75 million bushels. All of those are figures that have to be taken into consideration in weighing whether or not we have a case to present before the Tariff Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you not overlooking the fact that most of that barley is harvested in the Northwest after July 1?

Mr. SUPPES. No, we are not overlooking that fact. That is normal.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you are putting that over to next year?

Mr. SUPPES. The marketing year begins Juy 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The poor devil of a farmer is going to find himself in August with a lot of barley on hand and unable to get a good price for it.

Mr. DAVIS. He will have this year's production, if the weather is good, which may be higher than last year, because of the diverted acres. We will have a relatively low carryover supply in this country in the beginning of 1954–55. Of course, with the support program on the basis of feed, barely has to be looked at, I think, in connection with corn and oats and rye and all of these other factors, too, and that we have tried to do.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am a little surprised at one thing, let me say frankly, at your indifference with respect to the loss of this barley market. The production of this malting barley has been a very important activity in the country and State extension services for years. It is a very important source of income as far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. DAVIS. It is not a matter of indifference. It is a matter of uncertainty.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. You mean to say that you are afraid that the processors of malt in this country may run short of supplies?

Mr. DAVIS. No. We are faced with the question, Is there or is there not interference with the support program as it is set up? We have not felt that there was a case. Mr. Suppes here is more familiar with these figures than I am.

Mr. SUPPES. Despite the sizable imports, they may be 35 or 40, as you say—there are already 25 to 26 to date this year—our supplies this year are relatively low. They are just about as low as they were the year before, which is away below average. That is one of the weak spots in this picture in finalizing our recommendation at this time. That is also despite the fact that our exports are shrinking away from us. Despite all these things, our supplies are rather on the low side for barley and our carryover next summer is going to be rather on the low side.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Sixty million bushels.

Mr. SUPPES. 75 or 80 would be a more comfortable carryover.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Of course, out of a carryover a very big percentage is going to be in the hands of the CCC at considerable cost to the Government.

Mr. SUPPES. That is one of our uncertainties. It is true that 32 million has been put under support, and considerable more may be put under by January 1. We do not know today how much farmers are going to deliver. Prices would not have to increase very much more for the farmers to redeem their loans.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is not one single chance of the prices strengthening with the tremendous quantities which are backed up in Canada, which are available at all times at prices just below whatever the price is here, and as a result of a monopoly situation in Canada.

Mr. SUPPES. That is one of the depressing factors, the backlog in Canada.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is a dumping program.

Mr. SUPPES. That is right. The stage is set for possible trouble in the future. The only way we differ is concerning the absolute certainty at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Cannot there be something done now to prevent that dumping?

Mr. SUPPES. The only procedure that we know of is through section 22.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only way we can do it?

Mr. SUPPES. That does not always move slow, however. Sometimes that procedure is quite slow; it takes 2 or 3 months. Sometimes it takes only 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. COLLINS. Did not Secretary Benson, when he was testifying before the Agriculture Committee last April, concede that there were some defects in section 22, and it ought to be amended to speed up the process?

Mr. SUPPES. I cannot say for that.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right, and it was amended to give the President extraordinary powers pending a hearing.

Mr. COLLINS. To act in an emergency.

Mr. DAVIS. He can act during a period pending the investigation by the Tariff Commission if he feels that the situation warrants it. So far he has not used that power, but it was provided last summer.

Mr. COLLINS. Is this barley still coming in as of today, or is it held up or slowed up because of the lakes freezing over?

Mr. SUPPES. It is slowing down because of the lakes being frozen. The majority of it normally moves by water.

Mr. COLLINS. What is the latest figure you have, Mr. Suppes, for the total amount that has come in from Canada since July 1, up to as close a date to today as possible, and comparing that with the same period last year?

Mr. SUPPES. Estimating November and December, we think about 25.8 million bushels have come in.

Mr. COLLINS. How does that compare with last year?

Mr. SUPPES. Last year, 14.4 during the same 6 months, and the year before, 8.7.

Mr. COLLINS. So it is well over a 50-percent increase this year over last year.

Mr. SUPPES. Nearly double. In addition to this 25.8 there is about 2 million bushels in bond, most of which has come from Canada.

Mr. COLLINS. And as soon as the lakes open up, that could come in immediately.

Mr. SUPPES. They are already here in bond, and they could be released tomorrow or 3 months from now. We do not know. So you might say the total is a round 28 million. That is more than you thought.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am plenty optimistic about the quantities coming in.

Mr. COLLINS. This has a very definite effect on our price-support program, does it not?

Mr. SUPPES. There is no question but that it is a depressing factor. We do not attempt to argue that.

Mr. COLLINS. And there might be need of invoking section 22?

Mr. SUPPES. There very well might be.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. In these proceedings, the Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of proving a case before the Tariff Commission along with help from the trade. But we initiate the case, and then we have the responsibility as far as the agencies of Government are concerned of trying to prove the case. The long and short of it is up to now we have not felt that the case was sufficiently strong that we could prove it.

Mr. COLLINS. It is not on all fours with the rye situation.

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. SUPPES. That was an open-and-shut case.

Mr. DAVIS. It is being reviewed almost day by day. These are some of the men that are reviewing it; that is, this committee within the Department.

Mr. SUPPES. We can assure you that we are watching it, and we have every intention of moving as soon as conditions justify under the law.

Mr. COLLINS. These imports that are coming in, are they all feed barley, or is there some malting barley?

Mr. SUPPES. The great majority is malting barley. We think 70 or 80 percent. You asked awhile ago as to what the figures are of the malting barley carryover. We never have had them. In the first place, you cannot define malting barley. Malting barley is not malting barley until a maltster buys it and uses it for malting. He can use low or high grade, depending on supply and prices.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. However, it is easy to indicate the supplies by origins and classify it as malting or nonmalting barley. For instance, most barleys originating in North Dakota or Minnesota would fall in the category of malting barley. It is raised for those premiums.

Mr. SUPPES. About half of all the barley that goes to market from farms is used for malting purposes. It is a very big factor in our farming and malting industries.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. What I find difficult to comprehend is how much evidence is necessary to make a case in connection with section 22. The mere intention to plant will certainly show an increase in barley acreage that is equal percentagewise to rye, if not greater. It is only natural that is to be expected. It takes so long for action to come about. Even on oats this year, the hearings were held before the Tariff Commission in July, and the Tariff Commission had a report in September, to be sure, but before any action was finally taken under the Tariff Commission recommendations, another record quantity of oats had come into the country. I just have the feeling that we are going to have the barley producer in this country in one terrible tragic situation throughout the harvesting and early marketing season next year because his market will again have been turned over to Canada. The market he will have will be the price-support program.

Mr. DAVIS. In answer to your question, I think we have had about 15 or 17 years of experience under section 22, and I think the record pretty well demonstrates that you have to have a pretty strong case in order to get the desired finding by the Tariff Commission, and then if you want action——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Of course, we feel we have a very strong case at the present time, particularly anticipating this acreage increase that we are going to have. We will have barley rolling out of our ears next fall with no place to go except CCC price support, and every bushel that goes there tends to cost the Government money and tends to defeat the purpose of price support.

The CHAIRMAN. And the newspapers come out, who are opposed to the farmer, and tell about the great loss on the part of the CCC and the great subsidy to the farmer.

Mr. SUPPES. The CCC has lost very little money on the barley support program to date. That is one of the weak spots in this armor. It has had to take over very little barley in the last 4 years. It owns only about 450,000 bushels of barley today. We have weighed

the pros and cons and we feel at this moment our case is not quite watertight.

Mr. COLLINS. What would you have to have, Mr. Suppes, to make a strong case as far as barley is concerned?

Mr. SUPPES. We would have to know with some certainty what our 1954 production is going to be.

Mr. COLLINS. Production is 1 point.

Mr. SUPPES. We are almost certain that there is going to be a 25-percent expansion in seeded acres but we do not know what the growing weather is going to be. There might be a big crop failure in barley. We, at the Department of Agriculture, have to confine ourselves to the terms of section 22. We have to be practically certain that there will be material interference with the program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture. We cannot go outside of those terms.

Mr. COLLINS. But you can take into consideration what you feel are unusually heavy importations. That is part of the picture.

Mr. SUPPES. We are well aware of the heavy importations. But we say despite that our supplies are rather short this year.

Mr. DAVIS. We own only half a million bushels. The carryover at the beginning of this year was low. The carryover at the end of this year is going to be lower than the average. While it is true that the acreage may be up and then if the weather is good we will have a heavy production, in another year we will probably be in serious trouble, but we are 4 or 5 or 6 months from the time when those imports will be actually coming forth. We cannot as of January make a case on that basis according to the experience that we have had in making these kinds of cases. That is about the long and short of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Cannot the farmers be protected? If there is a shortage in the crop, certainly Canada will always be glad to send their barley here. They have it there and have no other place to send it.

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; they have. The majority of their outlets are other than the United States. It is not like rye or oats where there is virtually only one outlet, the United States. Three-fourths of their outlets for barley are in countries other than the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I think there is a tendency as you view this matter in the Department to overlook one of the secondary provisions of section 22, which has also as a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to take account of this fact of where you are threatened with reducing substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestically produced commodities. This market for malting and pearling barley is about 75 percent taken over by the Canadian product. What do they have to do before we invoke that particular provision? Does it have to be 90 or 100 percent?

Mr. SUPPES. We will readily grant——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I think you are viewing this as a feed problem. The areas we are talking about are malting barley. I know why you do not have a support price on malting barley. It is impossible to work one. You cannot do it because there is no standard to measure by. It is a fact, and a glaring fact, that the barley being used in the malting and food industry is practically all coming from Canada today. Therefore, our percentage of that market is gone.

Mr. SUPPES. We use about 90 million bushels of barley for malting. Of the 35 million that come in, we will say that three-fourths of it will be malting, so 22 million will be malting. So you might say 20 out of 90 million is very probably Canadian barley in the malting industry this year.

In previous years it has been 5 to 10 percent.

Another one of our blind spots we might emphasize or repeat—we have already said it—is that even though farmers have placed large amounts of barley under price support, they might still redeem and not deliver. That has happened many years in the past on various commodities. Farmers play safe and avail themselves of their price-support privileges and the market goes up and they are able to redeem and not deliver. The spread between price support and national average farm price today is only 9 cents. The effective spread is only about 5 cents. So theoretically if the market goes up only 6 or 7 cents, farmers would be in a position to redeem. Undoubtedly much of this large amount under support would be redeemed in the light of our rather tight supplies and our rather tight carryover before the new crop hits us.

Mr. COLLINS. Speaking of placing barley under loan, Mr. Suppes, suppose you have out in North Dakota or Minnesota, a farmer who is raising barley for malting purposes—high quality malting barley. He finds that he cannot get his price at the market.

Mr. SUPPES. You mean cannot get the usual premium of 40 or 50 cents over feed prices?

Mr. COLLINS. When he puts that under loan, he gets the feed price?

Mr. SUPPES. That is true, and unfortunately true.

Mr. COLLINS. So therefore that is an inequity in forcing that farmer who is raising high quality barley when he finds that he has to put it under loan at the barley-feed price.

Mr. DAVIS. What you say is true, and I would not quarrel with the fact you are bringing out, but you see the question we are dealing with here under section 22, are the imports interfering with the support program? That does not quite include the point you are making. We do not argue that the point you are making should not be taken into consideration and does not have merit.

Mr. COLLINS. But there is an inequity present and how can you cure it?

Mr. SUPPES. That is true. The support program is not rendering the service we wish it were. Under the section 22, we are still not "practically certain" that the program conducted by the Department will be materially interfered with.

Mr. COLLINS. But you are keeping your eye on it.

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; we are. We think we may be headed for trouble. If we have average weather and things work out normally, we are headed for trouble.

Mr. DAVIS. As I see it, Mr. Chairman, our difference is not one of philosophy or feeling for the farmer; it is just a question of whether or not a case exists now to warrant action under section 22. We feel we must have a pretty strong case when we go before the Tariff Commission, as experience has shown. The stronger the case, the quicker you can usually get action. We are approaching a situation that is getting worse. I think it is accurate to say as time goes on and we face a new year, it is one we want to watch and we are going to watch. But up to now we have not felt that we had a case strong enough to win within the framework of operations of section 22. That about summarizes it.

Mr. SUPPES. I might say, Senator, we have given you a copy of all our statistics brought up to date. So you are free to keep that as a part of the record, and use it in addressing any questions to us that you see fit, now or hereafter.

Mr. DAVIS. We are glad to have this chance to come up and explore this with you.

The CHAIRMAN. It does seem too bad that it is so hard to convince the Tariff Commission. I kind of wish you fellows were the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SUPPES. We will have our first crop outlook report in March. We will not have the first actual crop report until July. But we will have many reports from the field that will indicate weather conditions and probable yield. I would say by April or May we will have a pretty clear picture of what we are heading into.

Mr. COLLINS. Just about the time the lakes open up.

Mr. SUPPES. Yes; about the middle of April.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all. I want to thank you gentlemen for coming up. I am delighted to know you are watching the situation so carefully.

Mr. SUPPES. We will keep in touch with you, Senator, and advise you of any significant changes.

(Thereupon at 11 a. m. the hearing was concluded.)

(The following communication is made a part of the printed record:)

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D .C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Owing to the pressure of other duties and commitments it was impossible for me to attend the hearing of your committee on barley imports. However, I do want our views to be considered by your committee and by the general public.

I note that the Department of Agriculture has refused to give this problem sufficient consideration at this time to initiate any move to urge the Tariff Commission to study the problem or to take any action relative to it. With farmers receiving only 83 percent of rollback parity for their barley, this delay and waiting to complete further studies in the Department of Agriculture is without justification. One can but wonder, in view of the recent administration recommendation favoring the sliding scale, if maybe the Department is not planning to wait to move on the barley situation until after the price drops below 75 percent of parity.

It is my understanding that barley imports from Canada are twice as high this year as last. Farmers are putting four times as much barley under the loan this year as last. Even then, however, the Canadian imports and the failure of the administration to solve the storage problem are requiring farmers to accept less than the legal support level for their barley sales. On the face of it these delays in referring the import problem to the Tariff Commission as required by section 22 of the agricultural adjustment law and failure and delay in connection with the storage program appear to be a deliberate attempt to put the sliding scale into operation in the absence of legislative authority to do so.

The parity price of barley is now calculated on the new rollback formula. This means that when deliberate or ineffectual actions by the Secretary of Agriculture allows the price of barley to fall below 100 percent of parity, this lower market price becomes a permanent part of the price record which goes into the calculation of the moving average. This means that a price in 1953–54 of only 83 percent of parity for barley will cause a progressive lowering of the barley parity price itself each year for 10 long years.

I urge your committee to make a full investigation of this condition. The appropriate means of curing these problems is the enactment of a law that will support the prices of barley to American family farm producers at 100 percent of parity with the international exchange of barley governed under a negotiated international agreement similar to the International Wheat Agreement, in the extension of which last year you played such an important part. Such nego-

tiated international commodity agreements should be buttressed by the establishment of a negotiated international raw materials reserve or pool similar to the setup that would be provided by enactment of the international food reserve resolution that you and 23 other Senators introduced last year.

The farmers of this or no other country should be required to carry the full burden of international good will. Through negotiated international agreements entered into and administered with intelligence and cooperation these problems can be solved satisfactorily to all concerned.

In the absence of such intelligent international action, the only course open to American family farmers and their friends in the Congress is to demand that no imports of barley be allowed to enter the United States at any time when the domestic price to American farmers is less than 100 percent of parity.

I thank you for this opportunity to make known our views on this important problem in this way. I request that you insert this letter in the record of your hearings.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BAKER,
Assistant to the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I ask what time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has 65 minutes remaining, and the minority leader has 96 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—75

Aiken	Bricker	Case, N. J.
Allott	Bridges	Case, S. Dak.
Anderson	Bush	Clements
Barkley	Butler	Cotton
Beall	Byrd	Curtis
Bender	Capehart	Daniel
Bennett	Carlson	Dirksen
Douglas	Jackson	Payne
Duff	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Eastland	Kefauver	Purtell
Ellender	Knowland	Robertson
Ervin	Kuchel	Russell
Flanders	Lehman	Saltonstall
Frear	Long	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Magnuson	Scott
Goldwater	Martin, Iowa	Smathers
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Smith, Maine
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	McNamara	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Stennis
Hill	Monroney	Symington
Holland	Morse	Thurmond
Hruska	Mundt	Thye
Humphrey	Neuberger	Watkins
Ives	Pastore	Wiley

NAYS—13

Barrett	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Bible	Kilgore	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	Young
Jenner	Malone	
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Kennedy	Murray
George	Mansfield	Williams
Hennings	McCarthy	

So the bill (H. R. 1) was passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask that it be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, (1) That the bill (H. R. 1) be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

(2) That in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes, including changes in section, subsection, paragraph, etc., numbers and letters and cross-references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 264, H. R. 5085, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. HUMPHREY, by unanimous consent, introduced the following bills, which were read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa); and

S. 1901. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Andreas Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1902. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea and nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED ECONOMY ACT OF 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1902) to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I have today introduced for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Economy Act of 1955. It is a bill which I have submitted to the Senate since the 81st Congress. We have now had time for serious and careful study by the Congress and I hope it can be enacted in this session.

The bill is designed to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea and nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto.

I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one of the provisions incorporated in my bill would establish a Presidential item veto. Such an item veto is essential in an over-all program for economy. It can act as an effective barrier against logrolling and legislative riders and thus curtail the needless porkbarrel items from being included in the appropriation bills.

An item veto is standard practice in 39 States. Congress itself has approved this plan in the past in authorizing the chief executive of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico to veto individual items in appropriation bills. This proposal is designed to establish that provision within constitutional limitations.

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has introduced a constitutional amendment to accomplish this objective which we share. I welcome the Senator's proposed amendment and would be pleased to support it if that seemed the most effective way to attain our objective. There are constitutional questions that are raised by this effort. The late distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, had come to the conclusion that a legislative proposal along the lines suggested in my bill would be constitutional and proper. It is in that spirit that I introduce the bill, but I am perfectly prepared to accept a constitutional amendment if that proves to be most effective.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks an article from the New York Times of March 4, 1955, written by the distinguished Washington commentator, Mr. Arthur Krock.

(See exhibit A.)

The Economy Act of 1955 also calls for the establishment of a consolidated cash budget. The consolidated cash budget is the only way in which the national fiscal picture can be presented to the American people truly and accurately. It shows the actual flow of money between the Government and the people. It would be a true measure of the impact of the budget on our economy in that it would eliminate from the budget payments and receipts from Federal trust funds. I urge that our Government provide the American people with a realistic basis for relating the budget to the economic environment so as to permit intelligent debate on the budget by adopting the consolidated cash budget. I am pleased that this proposal has in the past strongly been supported by the Committee for Economic Development.

A third provision of my bill is designed to separate operating from capital expenditures of the budget. Every business concern makes such a distinction clear in its fiscal operation. The Hoover Commission proposed as one of its central recommendations that these two forms of expenditures be separated in our budget.

Basic to the fiscal operations of our Government must be the ability of Congress intelligently, carefully, and perseveringly to scrutinize the budget requests that come from the executive branch. We have been in the past derelict in our responsibility in meeting that objective. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of the bill, as presented by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], which would create the Joint Committee on the Budget, and which would provide adequate staff to check carefully every budget item so that the Congress can carry out its responsibilities more carefully. In addition to that proposal, however, it is also necessary that Congress schedule its legislative action on appropriations more carefully. This is the fourth proposal in my bill.

The Economy Act of 1955 provides for the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate to work with the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to establish and then to adhere to a specific schedule for handling appropriation measures. In recent years appropriation measures have rarely been enacted in time for the beginning of the fiscal year. The uncertainties and waste arising from this delay should be avoided.

The last essential program in my bill provides for yea-and-nay votes on appropriation measures. There is a great deal of talk about economy, but that talk is not always accompanied by consistent action. The voters in a democracy have a right to know how their representatives have been acting on crucial appropriation measures. The Economy Act of 1955 is an effective way for Members of Congress to be counted on issues affecting economy. It would provide actual yea-and-nay votes on all appropriation measures.

I make a plea for earnest legislation consideration of the bill. The present budget practices of the Federal Government are more than 30 years old. They need to be revitalized to bring about efficient economy in Government. Our Government's antiquated budget should be placed on a businesslike basis. We need to streamline our budget machinery and thus provide a constructive and nonpolitical approach to the problem of our economy. We need to provide the facts to the American people, so that they can legislate economy intelligently and constructively.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of March 4, 1955]

IN THE NATION—ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO GRANT THE ITEM VETO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has revived the old effort to give authority to the President to disapprove particular items in revenue bills instead of, as now, being obliged to veto or approve them in toto. He has proposed an entirely new formula which may find favor for the general objective which hitherto it has lacked.

Previously the plan advanced was to write into the Constitution unrestricted "item veto" power for the President. Under the Byrd proposal, Congress is authorized to grant or withhold it in any appropriation bill it passes. Congress could specify the sections open to separate veto, maintaining the same right to override a Presidential veto of items as it now has with respect to measures as a whole. If the Byrd amendment were now a part of the Constitution such riders as the Rayburn $20-per-head-tax deduction on the bill to extend corporate and excise-tax rates would be within the President's veto power. So would be the more frequent type of riders that, in contrast to the Rayburn proposal passed by the House, are not even faintly germane.

The item veto authority over appropriation bills is already possessed by the governors of three-fourths of the States. Several governors have the alternative power of reducing an item. In some States, they can veto items in legislation of any kind. To Senator Vandenberg, who was an advocate of this Federal reform, President Roosevelt wrote, September 24, 1937: "During my 4 years as Governor of New York, I came to the conclusion that the right to veto items in general appropriation acts met with general favor on the part of the legislature and the public."

TWO ROOSEVELTS AND DOUGLAS

He was replying to a letter in which Vandenberg made this observation:

"Legislative riders on tax and appropriation bills * * * rob the Executive of legitimate and essential freedom of action in dealing with this legislation. * * * I do not see how there can be effective Executive action upon an appropriation bill unless it can be considered by the President in its separate factors."

President Roosevelt replied that Congress already had the machinery to suppress "the evil of intermingling wise and unwise expenditures, or tax provisions * * * like that of riders," and "if there were a public opinion * * * strong enough to carry a constitutional amendment [to the purpose] it ought to be reflected in the action of Congress." But in 1953 his son, Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., came out for direct action. On May 14 he served notice that, each time an appropriation bill was before the House, he would propose item veto authority for the President. He quoted Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, as estimating that the lack of this authority costs "about $4 billions a year of the taxpayers' money."

The Roosevelt, Jr., motion was ruled out of order by the Chair on the ground that it sought to impose legislation on an appropriation bill. That ruling made it additionally clear that an amendment to the Constitution was required for the purpose. But all amendment texts proved vulnerable to the charge that they would dangerously expand the Executive province, enable him to reward and punish areas and individuals politically, and remove from Congress one of the vital checks and balances derived from the Constitution. By his new formula Senator BYRD hopes to blunt the edge of that point by minimizing its cause.

THE CRITICS ANSWERED

Other objections have been raised which, with BYRD's answers, follow:

A constitutional amendment is dangerous because, if a President abused the prerogative granted, the harm would be done before the amendment could be repealed. (Answer) Since the item veto authority under the Byrd amendment would be granted by statute, it could be as quickly suspended or repealed, and by joint resolution, which is not subject to Presidential veto.

An amendment text, even with the above safeguard, could probably not be made acceptable to Congress. This is because amendments must be brief and that precludes the essential definitions of terms like "items" and "provisions." (Answer) The Byrd text leaves all these definitions to Congress; also the occasions when they are to be applied.

"The Federal budget has been in the red 23 out of 26 years," said BYRD in support of his plan. "The Federal debt is at its peacetime peak of $280 billions. Contingent debt of the Federal Government is approximately $250 billions. * * * A balanced budget is not in sight. This is a device to attain constructive and responsible economy * * * and I believe it to be properly safeguarded in the form I have presented."

Constitutional amendments must travel a rugged, uphill path before they can obtain the two-thirds of Congress required to submit them to the States and the subsequent approval of two-thirds legislative majorities in three-fourths of the States. But not many of Democratic origin can claim the support of so rare a party alliance as that of BYRD, DOUGLAS, and ROOSEVELT, Jr.

PROPOSED CRAZY HORSE MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself and six of my colleagues from neighboring States, the Senators from Minnesota [Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], and the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], I introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to establish a Crazy Horse Memorial Commission and to provide ways and means whereby the Government can assist in the completion of this great mountain monument in tribute to the American Indian. Representative E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, today introduced an identical bill in the House.

Korczak Ziolkowski, one of America's great sculptors, has devoted many years to the carving of this tremendous likeness of that outstanding Sioux Indian leader, Crazy Horse. Much progress has been made on this work of art, which will comprise the largest monument in history carved to the likeness of a human being.

This great project, located in the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota, provides an opportunity at long last for all Americans to pay tribute to a great and courageous race—the American Indian.

The inevitable onward march of civilization forced the American Indian from his happy hunting grounds and his ancient campsites. Pushing ever westward in a hurry, our white settlers steadily drove the Indian onto less and less attractive lands. Treaties were broken or misinterpreted. Firearms and firewater were used to help bring conquest to these courageous defenders of their homeland.

Even today we are late, we are slow, and we are small in our efforts to rectify earlier wrongs and to gear our American Indians profitably and equitably into today's civilization which they have come to accept and to applaud.

In World War I, Indian scouts did much to help our Armed Forces overseas. In World War II and in the Korean war, they fought valiantly in support of the forces of the free. There was an Indian lad at that memorable occasion at Iwo Jima.

In the last two of these wars, the Sioux Indians contributed a greater percentage of their youth to the wars than any other race.

Mr. President, I recall seeing one day in Trafalgar Square in London a statute erected to the memory of George Washington. I stopped and pondered approvingly over the manner in which time erases enmities and solidifies the feelings of people. How fitting it is, therefore, that America is now resolved to pay a tribute in this mountain monument to a great Indian leader and to a great Indian race.

This Crazy Horse monument will bear testimony to all the world of our determination to deal fairly—and I hope generously—with our Indian friends who have for too long been too much neglected in this country which was taken from them in the only aggressive wars in which we have ever engaged.

In the mountain fastnesses of the Black Hills in the general area where the Indian last resisted the forward advance of civilization, it is my hope that this monument to the memory of Crazy Horse, carved in symbolic tribute to the early owners of America, may help inspire us all to maintain our aversion to aggressive wars and to de-ote ourselves to the solution of our Indian problems until both economically and educationally our Indian friends can claim their rightful place among us as free and happy equals enjoying fully the manifest blessings of our way of life and of today's America.

ADDITIONAL ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him to students attending the Southern California Christian College.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Speech delivered by Senator MAGNUSON before the Airport Operators Council in Seattle, Wash., April 27, 1955.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article written by Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and published in the April 7, 1955, issue of the Reporter magazine.

EMPLOYMENT OF RESERVE OFFICERS AND MEN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, along with these remarks, an excerpt from the May 2 edition of Babson's Washington Forecast.

In this article, the editors of Babson's service point out that they believe it is good business and good patriotism for businessmen to hire reservists. Babson's April 18 edition contained remarks which advised businessmen they could avoid difficulties by not hiring reservists at this time.

On April 25 I called this to the attention of the Senate. I now ask that this article from the latest edition, which corrects the impression conveyed in the April 18 edition, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend the editors for making this correction.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIRING RESERVISTS

We received criticism from one source concerning our April 18 article on the employment of reserve officers and men.

This source interpreted our story as one which advised businessmen not to hire reservists.

In the event that any other readers may have similarly misinterpreted that article, we wish to clarify our position completely—and to point out that we have repeatedly advised clients that employment of reservists is not only good patriotism, but good business.

Regular clients will remember that we said in a previous Washington letter:

"Reserve service is proof of the capacity to assume responsibility, proof of foresight, and proof of stability—all vital employee qualifications. You can hurt yourself—and your country—by refusing to hire these young men."

In our story of April 18, we invited interested clients to write for a supplementary letter on reserve matters, published on the same day.

We said in that supplement. "Employers should not penalize them (reservists) because they are called upon to serve their country."

The mistaken impression was the result of misinterpretation of one word in our April 18 story.

We trust that this sets the record straight. (From Babson's Washington Forecast, May 2, 1955.)

DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise at this time to pay public tribute and give public recognition to a distinguished American, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder and president of the Townsend Plan for National Insurance. I do so this week because this is the week in which two to three thousand representative delegates from Townsend groups all over the Nation are convening for their 15th national convention in the Municipal Auditorium at St. Petersburg, Fla.

As they meet and review their program to improve the conditions of the elderly and incapacitated citizens they do so in the full recognition of a tremendous service to the Nation which has been performed by their president, Dr. Townsend, who is now 88 years of age. Through his efforts, Dr. Townsend has helped develop the consciousness of America to its responsibilities to its senior citizens. Much of the progress we have made in that objective and to the objective of abolishing poverty in the United States is progress which he, his associates and his organization have helped make possible.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, yesterday I was unable to be present in the Chamber during the morning hour, but I have prepared a statement concerning Polish Constitution Day, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR W. A. PURTELL

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Men and women of every nationality with faith in democratic institutions join today with those of Polish ancestry in commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May. It is entirely fitting that we pause a moment in this great democratic body to pay tribute to a document that stands beside the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence as a landmark in humanity's struggle for liberty.

Today is the 164th anniversary of the day in 1791 when the statesmen of Poland signed a constitution that inaugurated significant reforms in Poland's government. Although a monarchy, all power in civil society was stated to be derived from the will of the people. The principle of ministerial responsibility was established. the exclusive prerogatives of the nobility were reduced, since it was provided that townsmen could acquire rank of nobility and property, become officers, and hold office in the civil service and church. The peasants were placed under the protection of law, laying the groundwork for the complete abolition of serfdom 4 years later.

Equally impressive as the scope of the reforms was the bloodless manner in which they were inaugurated. The great English orator, Edmund Burke, whose eloquent appeal for justice on behalf of the American Colonies we all remember, commented on the Polish undertaking:

"We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed: a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties * * * not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation * * *.

The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, an unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men."

But while free men rejoiced at the founding of a democratic state in Eastern Europe, the autocratic monarch of Russia became alarmed at the liberal Polish ideas. Russian troops invaded Poland and the small army of gallant defenders held out 3 months against great odds before they went down in defeat. With the Russian victory, the constitution of May 3 was, of course, abolished.

But short-lived as the constitution was, its influence refused to die. Its spirit has moved the Polish people to valiant deeds in defense of their freedom and independence. We can never forget their valor when Nazi troops cynically marched into their homeland in 1939. Tragically, the defeat of Nazi Germany brought to Poland, instead of liberation, a new type of enslavement. The Soviet Union, in imposing its ideology on the reluctant Polish people, ruthlessly liquidates political opposition and relentlessly persecutes religion. But still the brave hearts of the Polish people cling to the ideals of liberty and independence established so dramatically over 160 years ago. The constitution of 1791 remains an inspiration in these dark hours.

It is my fervent prayer that the day will not be far off when Poland will shake off the shackles of Communist tyranny and be free to pursue her own destiny alongside of the nations of the West whose cultural, religious, and political heritage she shares.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to give notice to the Senate at this time that should we conclude consideration of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill tomorrow and have time available for the consideration of other bills, the following bills may be considered, though not necessarily in the order given:

Order No. 209, S. 1516, to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free-mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

Order No. 217, S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Order No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Order No. 236, Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States.

Order No. 237, Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana.

Order No. 238, Senate Resolution 94, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Order No. 239, Senate Joint Resolution 18, to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Order No. 240, Senate Resolution 33, for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission.

Order No. 241, Senate Resolution 92, providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Order No. 246, S. 654, to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes.

Order No. 248, S. 743, to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes.

Order No. 249, S. 732, to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes.

Order No. 250, S. 748, to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired.

Order No. 253, S. 53, to enable the State of Arizona, and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use of such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States.

Order No. 255, S. 1507, to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

Order No. 257, S. 727, to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

Order No. 259, S. 391, to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Order No. 261, H. R. 1816, to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters.

Order No. 262, H. R. 2581, to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

Order No. 263, S. 266, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.), to the State of Wyoming.

Order No. 265, S. 1488, relating to the payment of money orders.

I doubt, Mr. President, that we shall be able to give consideration to all those bills and resolutions. I have conferred with the able minority leader, and I have not intentionally listed any measure which has not been cleared. If by mistake any such bill has been included, I shall certainly not move its consideration.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all mercy and pardoning grace, may our prayer at the morning hour of this day be one of contrition and of confession of our many sins, our faults, and our failures.

We penitently confess that we are frequently more concerned about coming to Thee for help in a situation that is too much for us and badly wrong than we are for holding fellowship with Thee and proclaiming Thy glory.

We beseech Thee that our spiritual revival and resurgence of faith and return to Thee may not be because we are afraid and at our wits' end, but may it be because we have been inspired by a deeper love for Thee and a nobler appreciation of Thy greatness and goodness.

Grant that our longings and prayers for universal peace and an end of war may not only be due to our hatred of bloodshed and suffering and destruction of property and disturbance of business, but, above all, may it be because we feel the tragedy of spirit that is unbrotherly and un-Christlike and contrary to Thy divine love and righteousness.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIEMINSKI, for 3 days, due to a death in the family.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 231, Rept. 480) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment

under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Bolton, Oliver P.	Eberharter	Powell
Canfield	Frazier	Prouty
Carlyle	Gray	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Heselton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Denton	Kilburn	Roberts
Diggs	McCulloch	St. George
Dingell	Mumma	Walter
	Osmers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that when the Committee rose on yesterday all general debate had been completed and the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. Section 1 is now open for amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: On page 1, after line 2, insert the following new section:

"That (a) section 101 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'and peanuts' in each place it appears therein. Section 408 (c) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'

"(b) (1) Part VI of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (relating to marketing quotas for peanuts), is hereby repealed.

"(2) Section 301 (b) (1) (B) of such act is amended by striking out 'cotton, rice, or peanuts' and inserting 'cotton or rice.'

"(3) Section 301 (b) (3) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'corn, rice, and peanuts' and inserting 'corn and rice.'

"(4) Section 301 (b) (6) (C) of such act is hereby repealed.

"(5) Section 301 (b) (10) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'wheat, and peanuts' and inserting 'and wheat'; and by striking out '20 percent in the case of wheat; and 15 percent in the case of peanuts' and inserting 'and 20 percent in the case of wheat.'

"(6) Section 301 (b) (13) (B) of such act is amended by striking out 'or peanuts' in each place it appears in the first sentence; and by striking out the second sentence.

"(7) Section 301 (b) (13) (E) of such act is amended by striking out 'cotton, or peanuts' in the first two places it appears and inserting 'for cotton'; by striking out 'corn, cotton, or peanuts' in each place it appears and inserting 'corn or cotton'; and by striking out the sentence which begins as follows: 'For 1942, the normal yield for any farm, in the case of peanuts.'

"(8) Section 301 (b) (16) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'rice, and peanuts' and inserting 'and rice.'

"(9) Section 361 of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'

"(10) Sections 371 (a) and)71 (b) of such act are each amended by striking out 'peanuts.'

"(11) The first sentence of section 373 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows: 'This subsection shall apply to warehousemen, processors, and common carriers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco, and all ginners of cotton, all persons engaged in the business of purchasing corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco from producers, and all persons engaged in the business of redrying, prizing, or stemming tobacco for producers.' Section 373 (b) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'

"(12) Section 374 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'

"(13) Section 375 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'"

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate peanuts from the so-called list of basic agricultural commodities, and remove acreage restrictions on the production of peanuts.

Under the present peanut price support program supply and demand are not allowed to function. As a result the program has cost the Government over $118 million since 1946 with huge surpluses in most years, but a chronic shortage this year.

If my amendment is adopted, peanuts would receive the same treatment which is accorded most commodities on which price support operations are maintained. The price support program would be maintained at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, who would specify support levels anywhere up to 90 percent of parity. Without high mandatory supports acreage restrictions could be removed, production would be increased, and all segments of the industry, including the farmer, sheller, and end user, should prosper.

Overall peanut usage for edible purposes has been reduced from 738 million pounds in 1944 to 573 million pounds in 1953, because of this uneconomic program. I know some of you may say that the high usage occurred in war years when other products were not available and that naturally these markets were lost for peanut products when again competitive products became available. I say to you that there are commodities which gained increased sales during war years but managed to maintain their sales over competitive products in later years, because they offered a real value to the public. There is no better example than the way oleomargarine has maintained its market that it gained during World War II. When peanuts and peanut products represent a good value to the public, peanut sales will increase.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I want to compliment the gentleman on his logical reasoning. I am happy to say that I am going to support his amendment. I do not think peanuts are more of a basic commodity than lima beans or grapefruit or anything else. I hope, if the gentleman's amendment fails here, that someone will offer a motion to recommit, to send the bill back to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to remove peanuts from the list of basic commodities.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I think his amendment should be supported. I personally would be very happy to support it. I hope the gentleman will be in favor of the entire flexible-support program and against the high-price-support program, if the gentleman cares to comment on that.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. Will the gentleman tell the Members what the peanut program has cost the Government this year?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I do not have the exact figure. It has cost the Federal Government over the years $118 million, which I believe is the highest cost the Government has been faced with in the support of any of these basic commodities.

The confectionery industry, which is an important user of peanuts, has reduced its usage almost one-half in the past 10 years. A peanut candy bar sells for a nickel. If peanut prices were at a reasonable level, more peanuts could be put in the bar even though probably it would still be sold for a nickel, but the value to the public would be greater. Usage and sales should increase and the farmer as well as the user should prosper from increased sales.

We have seen over the years, and I know myself, that a nickel peanut bar, which is manufactured in my district, has shrunk so much in size in the last 10 years that it almost looks like a penny bar of candy instead of a nickel bar.

The peanut situation this year deserves special comment. Prices are at unprecedented levels because of a shortage situation existing, and it has been necessary to authorize imports of 51 million pounds of peanuts. Indications are that this import quota will be more than

doubled before the new crop becomes available. If the amendment which I am now offering had been in effect, the present shortage situation and the need for importing peanuts would not have occurred.

Support my amendment and you will save the Government a tremendous amount of money, and make possible the growth of an industry which in recent years has been decreasing in importance.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is nothing new about this amendment. We have had the same amendment before the House on former occasions.

The evidence before our committee indicated that if you were to lower the price of peanuts from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity, the end users would not reduce the price of the candy bar by 1 mill. The only result of this amendment is to increase the enormous profits of the end users of peanuts. In doing that you will bankrupt and ruin the producers of peanuts. I say that because I know just what will happen. I know what has happened in the past when we had no control on the acreage of peanuts.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the point he is discussing with respect to the price of peanuts?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The fact is that when we shift to the new parity, which we are doing in 1956, that will mean that in about 4 years' time, at 5 percent a year, the parity price on peanuts will drop 20 percent. So if there are those who think that the cost of peanuts is too high under the program and who are thinking of voting for this amendment on that account, they should take into consideration the fact that the parity price on peanuts, and consequently the support price, at whatever level, is going to go down by 20 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That is in the course of the coming years.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman follow up that absurd analogy which he gave about the candy bar and say just how many peanuts are in a candy bar and how much chocolate and how much sugar? The gentleman wanted to leave the impression that peanuts are all that are in candy bars.

Mr. COOLEY. No; that is right. Of course, I understand that peanuts are really the cheapest commodity that goes into a candy bar.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Speaking about the change in parity, I know of an old-line candy company that have been putting out a peanut bar who in the last year, because they could not furnish the same type of bar that they have in the past, have had to lay off permanently, until this law is changed, 25 percent of the people they had employed for a number of years.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me just say this. If that is the situation, that is no criticism of the law. It is a criticism which you should direct at the Secretary of Agriculture. I say that for this reason—all right, you may laugh about it, but Mr. Benson has complete authority—he is the only one man in America who has the authority to impose acreage allotments and marketing quotas and to fix acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The farmers have no voice in that. Here are telegrams—all of them are from the users, the end users of peanuts and not from the farmers and farm organizations. They, too, say there is a shortage, but let me tell you this and I am not trying to blame Mr. Benson, but I am saying that he fixed his quotas, perhaps, too low, but he has the authority now to increase them. Just this morning within the last few hours, he increased the farm acreage allotments 7½ percent. Further, the Tariff Commission, after conducting lengthy hearings, permitted peanuts to come into this country, or rather they increased the quotas of imports from 1,700,000 pounds to 51 million pounds. That is a substantial increase. They are peanuts that our farmers could produce, wanted to produce and were prepared to produce. But, let us not indict the program. Let us not destroy the program and the income and the purchasing power of a large segment of our agricultural economy just to increase the profits of the candy manufacturers. That is all there is to it. It is just that simple.

Mr. VURSELL. Is not the purpose of this amendment, as I understand it read, to give the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority?

Mr. COOLEY. No, if that is so then even the author of the amendment does not understand it. I certainly did not so understand it. I understand he is trying to take peanuts out as a basic commodity and to take them completely out from under the controls of acreage allotment and the marketing quota law. If I am in error, I trust that the author will correct me.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I thought the amendment was to increase the size of the candy bar and not to increase the size of the profits.

Mr. COOLEY. No, it is not that at all. The evidence was that if we were to reduce the price to 75 percent of parity that that would not reduce the price of the candy bar to the schoolchildren and those who use candy bars. I trust that the author of the amendment, who is present, will correct me if I am in error. My understanding is that he wants to do away with all controls and acreage allotments and marketing quotas. If that is true, within 1 year we will have peanuts running out of our ears and the peanut farmers will be bankrupt. Why should we be deprived of this control law? Mr. Benson has not advocated its repeal. I am not saying that because of politics, but he, after all, he is your Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the committee had 4 hours of debate on the bill already and some of the rest of us have not had a chance to speak, I will temporarily have to object. Later on in the day, I will not object to such requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are some Members on the floor of this House who worship this high rigid price support that was placed on 10 years ago as an incentive for greater production, which some of us think should be held to the flexible provision in the general debate that has been had here, because we think when you have overproduction because of an incentive voted 10 years ago, it would be time to at least partially reduce that incentive. While I know there are some Members who worship this high rigid price support, I did not know that they would be willing to carry it to the point where they would deny the children of America the amount of peanuts they wanted to eat, whether blended with candy or not. I did not know that they would go to the point where they would deprive children of the proper size candy peanut bar that they have been getting heretofore.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield at this time.

The facts are that you have got a proposition here where the consumer is being penalized with high prices for a less volume of peanuts. The Government is being penalized at the same time $118 million since 1946 to date in supporting peanuts as a basic crop. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] commented a minute ago, it would be more justifiable to have rigid support prices on many food products, which are now under support prices, than to have this one-half of one percent of our agricultural production held under a 90 percent rigid support price. It is the most ridiculous thing I have seen up to date. It is indefensible.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman from North Carolina has made some reference to candy people making a profit, and that if this amendment is agreed to the peanut people will be ruined. The latest information I have with regard to that is that the price of peanuts is 28 cents a pound. I believe that is over 10 cents a pound more than last year. So I would say, from the figures I have, the candy people are making nothing more than a reasonable profit. I would say that when a commodity, whether it be peanuts or lima

beans or grapefruit, jumps up 30 percent, probably the greatest profit exists along those fields.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield at this time.

Now, are we going to say that we shall have a small favored group that is to continue to throw production out of balance to the point where we have a shortage of peanuts now? The consumer has been losing; the Government has been losing $118 million or more in the past few years. Are we going to say to this great expanding economy of ours that if we allow peanuts to be grown without any restrictions or limitations in acreage, hundreds of millions of people of this country who like peanuts will not consume all that is produced. We know that in the end it will give the little peanut farmers of the country an opportunity to make more money than under the present rigid price support.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman from South Carolina or North Carolina and his coworker, Mr. Reuther, would not force the price of farm machinery so high the plight of the peanut farmer would not be so bad.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I wish the gentleman would get his States right.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is discussing the lowly peanut, the candy bar, rigid and flexible price supports, but as a matter of fact is he not against any agricultural program?

Mr. VURSELL. No; I am for the entire agricultural program. I voted some years ago for 90 percent. I voted for flexible supports last year, and I will so vote on this bill. I want to help the farmer by continuing the flexible price supports to let him get back on his feet and regain his freedom.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here is a candy bar I just purchased within the last 5 minutes. This is the only peanut bar you can buy in the cloakroom. This peanut bar weighs, according to its wrapper, 1⅛ ounces. You can make more than 14 bars out of 1 pound of peanuts if you made them all out of peanuts. As a matter of fact it has not got very many peanuts in it. Look inside. It has peanuts all over the outside but on the inside nothing but corn syrup. I do not know what corn syrup costs but I suppose it is less than peanuts. I do know we support peanuts at approximately 11 cents a pound. That means that if the bar were 100 percent peanuts it would cost less than three-fourths of 1 cent.

When the gentleman talks about 28 cents a pound he either is not familiar with the law or he does not know a thing in the world about the present market.

Peanuts. We never supported peanuts at 28 cents a pound.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield, evidently the gentleman is not hearing very well this morning. I did not say that.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad the gentleman did not say we supported peanuts at 28 cents per pound, because we never have so supported them. What did disturb me was the implication that the 90 percent program caused peanuts to sell for 28 cents. I am reminding you that peanuts were and are supported at approximately 11 cents a pound. Made up into a candy bar such as this the product sells for 85 cents a pound. I just bought this bar at the rate of 85 cents a pound. The peanuts in it cost 11 cents a pound.

As I figure it the candy man cannot be making more than 800 percent. Eight hundred percent is all the candy man can be making. Apparently there are Members who feel that is not enough. They say that 11 cents is too much for the farmer, but that 85 cents is not enough for the candy manufacturers.

Those peanut growers are the poorest people in our agriculture; you know it and I know it. When we use the phrase "Nothing but peanuts," we use it contemptuously because we look upon peanuts as an emblem of poverty. The poorest land in the South is devoted to peanuts, and the poorest people grow the peanuts.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. And before we adopted this program peanuts were selling as low as 1½ cents a pound.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. More than that these poor people suffered the greatest catastrophe they have suffered in a generation this last year. We had the worst drought last year that ever affected the peanut-growing area both in Texas and in the eastern part of the belt; these little people suffered a tremendous catastrophe. I personally went into a little home out in OMAR BURLESON'S district last fall. I saw the checks that came in from peanuts; the man worked all year long, and it was not one of the smallest farms either, it was a farm of 150 acres. He got $169 for his entire year's work, and he had a family to feed on that pittance. He was ruined by the drought. But it was that same drought that raised the price of peanuts. That drought raised the price of peanuts, not the law, not anything that this Congress has done, but the disaster that the good Lord sent to those people brought about a scarcity of peanuts, and our Government immediately looking after the welfare of the candy manufacturers opened the doors and admitted 51,000 tons of peanuts into this country.

You talk about what you are doing for the farmers. Surely, we are not here to cut this little man struggling along trying to make a living on $169 a year for himself and family.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point of order is this: The gentleman speaking in a very loud voice looks across over this way and in debate uses the "you ought to do this, you ought to do that." I object to being lectured to as being contrary to the rules of parliamentary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. POAGE. I will try to look over the gentleman from Michigan and see some of the other gentlemen over there because I know I could not change him. I do believe there are men here who do not honestly agree with him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is violating the rules when he refers to the gentleman from Michigan in that way. The word "you" applies to all Members of the House and cannot be used in debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there are Members of this House who are sincerely interested in the welfare of little people this world over. You say you are, and I use the word "you."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order and I ask that the rules of the House be enforced in that respect.

Mr. POAGE. Have my words taken down. Will you not do that much for me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is addressing me?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman proceed in order under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair trusts that the gentleman from Texas will proceed under the rules of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that I use the words "you all" and I will use that phrase. I wonder if that would be objectionable? I ask you all as friends of the small people to see to it that we do not destroy a program that has meant more to more little people than any other farm program we have. And never forget this amendment is intended to destroy this entire program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if during the war we were not crushing edible peanuts into oil for war purposes and if that is not the time when we sustained these losses?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. The Government was paying for them then on the edible basis and using them for war purposes. The Government had to take the loss, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a stout heart and deep conviction that I enter this

battle over the lowly peanut. I certainly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I supported the amendment last year to remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities. I will go further and say that I think that they should not have been so included in the first place.

In answer to the question just asked by the previous speaker, I am appealing for the little people of this country who pay taxes. I can see nothing more ridiculous than this program costing the American taxpayers $118 million to protect a product which represents just forty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent of the agricultural output of this country. Of course, I have respect for the elements that are involved in the raising of peanuts. I have respect for those who do raise peanuts effectively and economically, but I repeat, I can see nothing more ridiculous than to include among the basic commodities one which is so small a part of our agricultural economy.

I am further surprised when I hear those who would support peanuts at high parity, attacking the candy industry. When I was being brought up in a minor business I was always taught to respect my good customers. I think that the Members here who are trying to protect the peanut growers are forgetting that the candymakers of this country are about their best customers.

Incidentally, and if I may say so not too lightly, there would, of course, be more peanuts in the candy bar at which the last speaker poked so much fun, if supports were removed and peanuts consequently sold at a lesser price. It cannot be denied as regard the use of peanuts that the candy industry is a very good customer of the peanut grower, but in the period from 1943 to now has had to cut its purchase of peanuts by half on account of increased price. I am sure that those of you who in principle believe in expanding trade and in expanding opportunities would agree that an expanding market due to a lower cost of peanuts would benefit the peanut industry, too.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. Certainly I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wonder if the gentlewoman forgets the fact that the farm people of the country and their children are also good customers of the candy industry.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am certainly sure that that is true, but I point out that candy is not only a delightful product but also a source of food. And I go back to my original premise that to protect forty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent of our agricultural production in a way that raises peanuts out of the price at which they can be put into candy is poor for the peanut industry and poor for the families supported by the peanut industry. I hold no brief for the candy industry as such. I speak for the American taxpayers. I speak for the users of peanuts. I speak for the actual ultimate benefit of the growers of peanuts.

If anybody questions the present price of 28 cents a pound for peanuts, they should consult the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan, who has not fed them to the squirrels lately over at the Capitol grounds, because in this very neighborhood she has to pay 28 cents a pound.

I think this is the time that we ought to approach this whole question with less passion, with more understanding, and with a desire to help the peanut raiser and the peanut user. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think it might well be said for the benefit of some Members of the House who were not here when the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Pace, was a Member that the only reason peanuts ever got into the bill as a basic commodity with support was the fact that Mr. Pace got it in there almost singlehandedly. There was no reason for it, and we should get them out at the present time.

Mrs. CHURCH. I have never known how they got in, but I certainly say that they should be out.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about the candy manufacturers and we have heard about the children who cannot buy candy, and now we hear about the squirrels. I thought probably that squirrel episode had been ended.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask whether or not reference to squirrels violates any of the rules of the House, particularly with reference to any Members of the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand the gentleman to indicate that there were some squirrels in the other body?

Mr. GRANT. Let us forget the other body and talk about what is before us here today.

When the gentleman from Pennsylvania presented his amendment, I asked him, when he was talking about what this had cost the taxpayers of the country, how much this program had cost the taxpayers this year. What did he say? He did not have the figures. That is a fact. He did not have the figures, because it did not cost anything. If there had been one feature in our farm program where the farmers have put their house in order, it is the peanut farmers of the country. They have reduced and reduced and reduced down to the point where it is hard to make a living with peanuts.

Now we hear talk about the candy manufacturers. Our colleague from Illinois mentioned the fact that the children cannot buy a peanut bar. Well, I would like to talk for a few minutes about the man who is raising these peanuts. That man down on the farm who has reduced his acreage, as it has been reduced in no other crop, has gone along, and we have heard year in and year out here on this floor that the program is costing too much, that we had too many peanuts. That is what you said last year and now this year, the same speakers come back and say we do not have enough peanuts. Enough has been said about 90 percent of parity and about the flexible program and about who is supporting this program. I think the American Farm Bureau recognizes the important part that peanuts play in the economy of this Nation. That great organization wants to keep peanuts as one of the basic commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to yield to my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. MCMILLAN, in order that he may read a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Peanuts, I should like to make this statement.

Congress in 1942 designated peanuts as a basic commodity. During the debate on the Agricultural Act of 1954 an effort was made to strike peanuts as a basic commodity and as you know, the Congress rejected this proposal.

Peanuts have been in relatively short supply. We are now importing peanuts in order to fulfill domestic needs. The Department of Agriculture probably will announce in the next day or two an increase in the acreage of peanuts for 1955 in order to meet estimated consumer demand. Farmers in most of the peanut areas have already made their plans for planting and in some cases are in the process of planting now. They have made these plans on the basis of congressional determination that peanuts are to be treated as a basic commodity, and would be supported in accordance with the Agricultural Act of 1954. With a short supply, the Secretary of Agriculture will support peanuts in 1955 at 90 percent of parity.

I believe it extremely unfair to the peanut producers for the Congress at this late date of May 1955 to even consider striking peanuts as a basic commodity.

I have just received the following telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> It would be grossly unfair to the producers of peanuts for the Congress to strike peanuts as a basic commodity since farmers have already made plans for production in 1955.
>
> JOHN C. LYNN,
> *Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.*

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for that contribution.

I might say to my colleagues that this getting up and crying crocodile tears for the candy manufacturers and for the children who are not able to buy candy, is to be regretted. I think we have the greatest value in the 5-cent peanut bar that we have in any candy today. While everything else is going up, up, and up, that candy bar has been held at the minimum price of 5 cents. You can bet your last dollar that the candy manufacturers are pretty well represented here. As I came into the hall, I saw

one of their lobbyists out there. That is perfectly all right for them to lobby to keep peanuts down. But I want to say that we people who represent the districts where peanuts are grown are asking only in fairness that the price support on peanuts as a basic commodity be continued.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I was interested in the telegram that was just read by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], in which it was asked that peanuts be kept on the list of basic commodities under rigid supports. I have a telegram from the president of the Agricultural Association of Illinois who requests that all crops be removed from the basic commodity list. The telegram read by the gentleman from South Carolina comes from the State where peanuts are grown in large quantities, but there are other parts of the United States where the agricultural associations are not in favor of continuing this commodity on the basic list.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may correct the statement that he made?

Mr. McVEY. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. The telegram came to me from the American Farm Bureau here in Washington, not from my State.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It seems peculiar to me that the backers of peanuts quote the Farm Bureau in support of their position and then go directly against the Farm Bureau in their support of rigid prices.

Mr. McVEY. We have been told that the loss by the Government in its efforts to support peanuts as one of the basic crops has amounted to $118,083,436. It is true that loss has not been incurred during the past year, but has been sustained between July 1, 1946, and February 28, 1955. There has been a shortage in the peanut crop last year, but this has not been true of all years.

Although peanuts are not one of our major crops in this country the amount of loss sustained in their support compares very favorably with the amount sustained in the case of corn or wheat. Peanuts account for less than one-half of 1 percent of our national farm income. On a relative basis, therefore, the peanut price-support program is one of the most extravagant expenditures of our Government. The price-support program for peanuts has produced surpluses in some years and shortages in others. As late as July 1954 the Government held large stocks which were crushed and sold for oil at substantial losses. Because of this situation Government acreage allotments were reduced to a minimum. This reduction in Government acreage allotments along with the drought in the year 1954 severely reduced the crop, and a shortage developed which has been disadvantageous to both growers of peanuts and consumers of this product.

My attention has been invited to a statement issued by the publication entitled "Peanut News" under date of May 21, 1954. This article in the Peanut News contained the following summary of problems created by the manner in which the peanut industry is being administered under the crop-support program:

> Growers will lose because they will have fewer peanuts; shellers and crushers will lose because they will have fewer peanuts; brokers will lose because the higher price will reduce the market; manufacturers will lose because their sales will be reduced and because they will have to pay more for the peanuts they buy; consumers will lose because they will have to pay a higher price for peanut products, and taxpayers will lose because the Government will get stuck with a greater surplus.

If the analysis of the peanut situation as presented by Peanut News is correct, it would seem that the remedy for a problem of this character will not be solved by the continuation of peanuts as one of the six basic crops. Because of the uneconomic program both to growers and consumers of this product, overall peanut usage has dropped tremendously in recent years. Manufacturers who are important users of this product have reduced the amount they use from 209 million pounds in 1943 to 118 million pounds in 1953. It is believed that the confectionary industry would resume the use of peanuts on a much larger scale if growers of peanuts were not hampered in a manner that produced shortages in the industry, and if they could be produced on a realistic and economic basis.

Much of the complaint we have heard with regard to the price-support program is due to the situation in regard to a few commodities such as potatoes, eggs, butter, and peanuts. The conditions in these industries have caused the entire program to be looked upon with disfavor. There has not been a full public awareness of the sad story with regard to the peanut industry. It is hoped that when the public does become cognizant of the facts concerning the peanut situation it will loudly protest the continuation of this industry as a part of the price-support program.

It is believed, in the light of these facts, that peanuts should be eliminated as a basic commodity and placed in the category of a nonbasic commodity without acreage restrictions. If this is done, it should be only a course of time until supply and demand will be brought into balance. Under such a program the situation described in Peanut News, to which I have referred, would be eliminated, and both sales and usage would then increase. It is a pleasure to support this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we may not be able to agree on limiting debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment be limited to 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and those in support of this bill had all day yesterday to debate this bill. Why not let us alone and let us talk ourselves out, which we will do much more quickly than if an attempt to limit us is made. Just let us go on. Otherwise we will have to put the vote over until tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that peanuts were not even mentioned yesterday. This is an amendment which we did not anticipate. It is an amendment which was not considered in committee. We do not know anything about the views of the Secretary of Agriculture about the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are 15 or more Members on their feet at the present time seeking recognition.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand that. If the gentleman wants to object, the gentleman has the right to do so. I am just trying to move on with the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not be as liberal with those of us who want to speak on it as with those who are to receive subsidies?

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman want to speak on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want to be obstructive or start a filibuster but I do say this: If you are to try to shut us off, some of us will try to get the time we want, and one way or another we will get it.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not trying to shut you off. The gentleman can object. I will ask for an hour and 15 minutes or an hour and a half. It does not make any difference to me. I just want to close debate some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on the amendment close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. DORN of New York), the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. MULTER.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the matter of farm price supports is not only important to farmers; it is of great concern to city people as well.

Both wage earners and housewives have a stake in what we do with the bill pending before the House today. And I can tell you that my mail shows that they know it and are watching what we do.

Taxes have been cut, and we hope they will be cut more, but they are still heavy. Anyone, regardless of his income, who sees billions of dollars of taxpayers'

money tied up in surpluses in warehouses, refrigerators, and elevators, is going to oppose the program that causes this waste. Any housewife who knows the amount of her husband's pay check that goes to pay the cost of feeding and clothing her hungry, vigorous, growing children, is going to resent it if she knows that part of the money she spends goes to pay artificially high prices, or if she has to buy less of the good, basic, nourishing foods because a Government program has priced them out of her market.

We city people believe that farmers have a right to a farm program. But it has got to be a fair one. It has got to be realistic, or sooner or later the cities are going to rebel.

We would do well to remember what happened when the potato program went wild. During that program potato prices were kept high; but even with high prices the housewife could not buy good potatoes. The good potatoes were going to the Government to be stained blue and then fed to livestock.

City people helped to pay the half-billion-dollar cost of the potato fiasco. They do not want any more programs like it.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to rise in opposition to my many distinguished friends and colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture. I think most of them know I have followed their recommendations, particularly the recommendations of the distinguished chairman of the committee, in years gone by, and I intend to do it again today, in the main. I hope this amendment will prevail. Whether it prevails or not, I am going to support the committee's recommendations on this bill for rigid price supports because I think that is what is best for the farmer and best for the country.

At the same time, I am firmly of the opinion that peanuts are not a basic commodity and should be excluded from the act. There has been some heat generated here as to who was being represented by whom. Of course, the gentleman representing the peanut farmers should make their case here, and the gentlemen representing the manufacturers and the industrialists and the consumers should also make their case, and it should be done without heat and solely based on the facts.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. Does not the gentleman speak for the candy-consuming public of America, really the children of America, in supporting this amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Not only the candy-consuming public, but also the peanut-consuming public. Bear in mind that Ebbets Field is in our great Borough of Brooklyn, where more roasted peanuts are eaten than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. DORN of New York. Have you not found year after year in attending the games and watching Brooklyn win game after game that the peanuts you get in that bag are getting fewer and fewer until at the present time there are just about 12 peanuts in that little peanut bag for which you pay 10 cents.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DORN of New York. I want to go on record in support of this amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, most of the members of this great Committee on Agriculture have supported me and my colleagues on housing and minimum wage legislation and on other bills, which are of peculiar and particular interest to our districts and we appreciate their support. We say this, the instant amendment is of just as much interest to us as it is to the peanut farmer. We do not want to hurt the peanut farmer, but something is radically wrong with the program. I do not go along with the distinguished chairman when he says it is not the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think his administration is bad. One hundred and nine million dollars was lost on the peanut program up to July 1, 1954. In the following eight months, ending February 28 this year, there was another $9 million loss on this program. Since that time the Tariff Commission has opened the doors to allow a substantial increase in the importation of peanuts into the country. Whereas a year ago shelled peanuts were selling at 18½ cents a pound they are now selling at 28 cents a pound. The candy manufacturer is not making any 800 percent profit. The difference may be 800 percent but I doubt it, between the cost of the peanuts and the candy bar. If you assume that the candy manufacturer gets for nothing the corn syrup and the sugar and the other ingredients and the paper and the labor and the printing and the cartons and the transportation to and from his place and the advertising, then maybe there is a spread of 800 percent. So I say I doubt there is any such differential.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thought we had come to an understanding with you Brooklyn people that you would pay us 10 cents a bag for peanuts and we would continue to pay $75 for a $15 suit of clothes.

Mr. MULTER. No, no. I would not let you do that. Let me go out with you and help you with your shopping. I will get you a $75 suit for less than $75. I will not let you pay $75 for a $15 suit of clothes.

Mr. FORRESTER. But the trouble is we do not have you here all the time to do that.

Mr. MULTER. Let us get back to the peanuts.

I am firmly convinced that there are many things about the farm program that can be improved. Some improvement can be brought about by legislation; much improvement can be brought about by proper administration. I think eventually we will come around to adopting the Brannan plan for all farm products just as we have already adopted it as to wool, and are well on the way to adopting it as to dairy products. The operation of the farm program with reference to the dairy products is as scandalous as the potato program.

While we all agree that the farmer needs help and should be helped to remain prosperous as the keystone of our American economy, we must not require the consumer to pay for such help twice, first with his taxes that are used to pay the support prices, and then by paying for the products at high prices in the market place. In my opinion a part of the farm program which gives the farmer a black eye is including peanuts as a basic commodity.

I do not go along with those who say that since peanuts are grown in only a small part of the country peanut farmers are not entitled to our help. I think every part of our country, no matter how small, that is in need of help should be helped. That goes for the miners in West Virginia and in the West, as well as for the farmers of any particular area.

At the same time we must examine and find out what is wrong with the programs, such as the peanut program, which accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of the national farm income, and yet accounts for a bigger loss than the butter program has caused, and for almost as much loss as is caused by each of the wheat and corn programs.

As of April 30, 1954, losses on corn amounted to more than $120 million and on wheat to more than $117 million, and on peanuts to more than $109 million. The peanut program loss must be compared with a loss of almost $70 million for the butter program in the same period.

There must be something radically wrong with the peanut program. In most of the other programs while the demand has not kept up with the supply, consumption of the particular product has, nevertheless, increased, although not enough to use up the entire surpluses.

The situation is different with peanuts, however. There we find that the consumption of peanuts has, over the years, decreased, and in large part we believe that is due to the high cost of peanuts. The overall usage of peanuts from 1944 to 1952 has dropped by almost 200 million pounds.

The confectionery industry alone used over 209 million pounds in 1943, and in 1952 that industry used only 120 million pounds. It is my firm conviction there is no more reason for having peanuts considered a basic commodity than there would be to consider raisins, cocoa beans, or citrus fruits basic commodities. Certainly the dairy products are more basic than peanuts.

I appreciate the contribution made to the war effort by the peanut farmers and I would be the last one in the world to cause them any harm. I do believe, however, that the program as presently written into the law is wrong and needs correction.

The processors and manufacturing enterprises that use peanuts and the consuming public are all in agreement that the peanut farmer is entitled to a price which will give him the complete return of his investment, plus a fair profit, which will give to him a decent standard of living.

At the same time the only way the peanut farmer can be maintained is to

increase consumption both by the processor and manufacturer, as well as by the eating consumer. Treating peanuts as a basic commodity has not solved the problem. Let us now try to get together and work out a proper solution that will bring about the desirable result of saving the taxpayer's money, giving the farmer what he is entitled to, and increasing the consumption of the product.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great many times that there is no use in reducing Government contributions to anybody or to any group of people because it does not reduce the price to the consumer or the cost of the product. Yet we have seen that the reductions in the Government budgets in the last 2 years have actually and definitely helped in keeping the cost of living level for the last 4 consecutive months by halting the inflationary process.

What has not been brought out in the discussion of the amount that this program cost, $118 million, a large amount, is the fact that that money is given for the support of a product which accounts for only one-half of 1 percent of the national farm income. Actually, the savings from elimination of this costly program will be great enough to support the school-lunch program for more than 2 years. A great many of you who are in favor of that school-lunch program, as I am, can finance it for more than 2 years by denying price supports to a commodity which ought not to be supported at this time.

What has also been lost sight of is the number of bites taken out of the candy bar by the local, State, and Federal Governments before the producer can get it to Ebbet's Field or to its ultimate destination. In my State, in addition to the Federal tax, in addition to the price support, which accounts for almost double the increase in a single year in the cost of peanuts, the candymaker pays in Philadelphia under the present costly city administration a gross profits tax, he pays a mercantile license tax, and a 1 percent wage tax. Now, the most discriminatory and irresponsible tax ever proposed in Pennsylvania comes along from Governor Leader. These new taxes will add additional taxes levied on the candy bar in the form of a 2 percent income tax and 5 percent on the capital investment of the candymaker. It is no wonder there are so few peanuts in a candy bar with everybody taking them out.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN), the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. O'NEILL.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I think the people of America would be greatly alarmed and upset if they ever could realize that over the period of years from January 1946 to February 1955 it has cost the American taxpayer $118 million to support the price of peanuts.

At times I wonder how peanuts ever came to rate being called a basic commodity. It has no more right to be called such than cranberries or carnations.

My State, Massachusetts, is not an agricultural State, yet we are the largest cranberry growers and the largest growers of carnations in the world. Should we be under the basic commodities? We are not interested; we do not want to be under parity, and I do not think the peanut growers should be under the basic parities. As a matter of fact I think it is about time we retrenched on this agriculture program. What has it amounted to over the years? Peanuts comprise .44 percent, or less than one-half of 1 percent of the agricultural production of the United States and yet it cost us $118 million over a period of about 12 years.

The particular area I represent in Boston, Cambridge, and Somerville, is the world's largest candy manufacturing district, and pride compels me to say also that it produces the finest candy. We have there about 15,000 people employed in the manufacture of candy. I am talking about the people who are engaged in making candy, about 15,000 employees.

I am aware of the Embargo Act, I am aware of the embargo protection of peanuts, as I am also aware of what is taking place before the Tariff Commission the past year. I also am aware of the fact that we are allowing 51 million pounds of peanut imports at the present time.

But I also realize this, that in the particular area I represent, the candy industry, because of the high cost of peanuts, have lost about 5 percent of their business.

There are only two other places in the world where peanuts are grown, one is in the Philippines and the other is in India. The English import their peanuts from India and the Philippines. They make chocolate-covered candy bars with peanuts in them; consequently they ship the candy bars at a cheap price to this country.

English imports have caused 5 percent unemployment in the candy industry and a 5-percent loss of this business in my area alone. This means 750 men and women in Greater Boston alone are out of jobs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to reiterate the argument of the gentleman for it is eminently sound, and that is exactly the situation in my area. Loss of employment in the candy business in my area has amounted to about that percentage and has been brought about by the very factors brought out by the able gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to thank the gentleman from New York and others who appreciate what the situation is and hope they will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I think the gentleman is making a very strong case for his particular area, but in order that the Members may get the full significance of the situation I wish he would repeat his figures as to the number of people thrown out of employment in the candy-making industry.

Mr. O'NEILL. As I said, that particular industry in my area employs 15,000 people. They have lost 5 percent of their business because of the high price of peanuts. Further pursuing the equation, it results that approximately 750 people have lost employment in the particular district I represent. I realize that Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, and other sections of this great Nation also have candy-manufacturing problems.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I have done some research on that very problem myself and my figures come out about as those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, 5 percent seems to be about the proportion all over the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, from the argument advanced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] there might be drawn the conclusion there were no Members of the House other than the gentleman from Texas who had any sympathy or kindly feeling for people who were in the lower income groups or who were unfortunate. If I desired to cry all over the place about individuals or groups in my district, I might refer to those people who work on the lowlands, on their knees, weeding celery, onions, carrots or cabbage, or I might talk about the folks who spray their fruit trees, harvest the berries or pick the cherries, and tell you how little they get as the result of their labor. But that in a way, is quite beside the point, although if peanuts are to be on the list of basic commodities why not the other farm products which I have just mentioned?

Mr. Chairman, listen to this argument made by our good friend from Texas. He held up that peanut bar and he said he paid a nickel for it. I just went out and bought one. He said that peanuts cost so much, but he did not give the cost of the other ingredients. Then he said, and listen to this, that the manufacturer made a profit of 800 percent. When I went out and bought my peanut bar just 75 feet from where he purchased his I asked the young lady out there who sells them, the efficient, kindly, always pleasant daughter of our longtime faithful friend Ben "What is

your profit on a 5-cent bar?" She said, "Two cents." So there goes two-fifths at least of the manufacturer's 800 percent. Had I used the computing methods of our colleague I would have come up with a loss.

If the gentleman from Texas cannot give us any better argument than that, and any better figures, any nearer approach to the facts than the ones he gave us, why should we accept his statements?

Mr. GROSS. Was the candy bar you bought made in Britain or the United States?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. From the quality of it I think it was made here. It was the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we realize the real effect of this amendment? We hear much about the cost of peanuts, we hear much about the cost of the program. I think we ought to get settled first on the program. It was getting on fine before World War II. However, during World War II it developed that the Government of the United States needed peanut oil. It begged and pleaded with our peanut farmers to increase the production of peanuts. Peanuts, of course, could not be produced at a fair profit for oil purposes only. If the Government desired oil it had to subsidize the production of peanuts, the Government would have to pay the edible price for peanuts for oil. That cost considerable money.

Then when the war was over in 1946 the Government had to retrench and there had been a gradual retrenchment from that time to this. You will find that the great cost of this program came from the war effort and should not be charged to the peanut farmers of America.

The program we have now is designed to give protection to the peanut producers. If there is a shortage of peanuts today it is no fault of the producers. It is either the fault of the miscalculation of those charged with the administration of the program or it is due to the elements. There was a drastic shortage this year because of the drought. But the producers and the in-users got together before the Tariff Commission and agreed to the importation of peanuts so that the needs and the demands of the trade would be met.

We realize that there was a shortage. But the Secretary of Agriculture has just announced an increase of 7.5 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, while I may not be an agricultural expert, I think, however, I know enough about the law to realize that even though peanuts could be removed under this amendment as one of the basic commodities, it does not necessarily follow that price supports will fail, because under the law, if my understanding is correct, the Secretary of Agriculture can have price supports on any crop.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to remove peanuts as one of the so-called basic farm crops. It is my understanding that some of my colleagues from Virginia and North Carolina and Texas only last week personally went to the Department of Agriculture and appealed to officials of the Department to increase peanut acreage allotments in the Virginia, North Carolina, and Texas areas. I mention this to illustrate that even in at least some of the peanut-producing States the producers themselves recognize the need for increased acreage allotments. In September 1954, the farmers knew of the impending peanut crop shortage, yet they could not get permission to plant additional acreage.

I hope that these same Members of Congress who last week personally went to the Department of Agriculture to obtain increases in the acreage allotments will today support this amendment, which would provide for unrestricted production.

I recognize, as do they, the need for increased acreage, but I contend that it is unsound economics and poor business policy for our Government to increase acreage without removing the high mandatory support. The cost of the peanut program has been over $118 million.

Therefore, I urge support of this amendment which would remove the acreage restrictions, and would also remove the high mandatory support prices.

Any program that has cost $118 million, which has brought about declining usage, kept prices very high, resulted in huge surpluses in most years but a severe shortage in the current year, is an unsound program and ought to be changed. This amendment would accomplish that and should bring about a healthy situation in the entire peanut producing, shelling, and consuming industries.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does not the gentleman realize that the farmers are the greatest consumers of any group in the country, even greater than the city dwellers?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I cannot quite agree with the gentleman's statement, because I guess that only about one-eighth of the people live on farms and seven-eighths are city dwellers, therefore, the city dwellers are by far the greatest consuming group.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. What I meant was per capita consumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, this fight to remove peanuts from the group of basic commodities is almost as old as our price support program. Year after year the candy manufacturers and some other end users of peanuts have been coming to this Congress asking that an amendment similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania be adopted. Now, to many people in America, farm people, peanuts not only are a basic crop; it is the only crop that those people can grow. If you knock the price out from under their product, peanuts, it can mean only one thing as I see it, and that is bankruptcy for many of them. Several years ago an amendment offered to take peanuts from the basic group of commodities also included rice. Now, my prediction is that if this amendment prevails, next year or the year after there will be an amendment offered to take wheat out of the group of basic commodities; the next year, rice. It is the most effective way to kill our program of price supports. I think a majority of the Members of this House approve the price support program. We may differ in some detail.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. While the gentleman is suggesting what might be taken out, he might also think of sugar, because the same lobby fighting the peanut bill will be fighting the sugar bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. HOPE. Many of them are interested in sugar.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think this is the beginning of a determined effort to break the price support program, and if those of us who are interested in the welfare of the farmers of America do not stick together, they can whip any group of us singly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has stated that we are importing some 50 million pounds of peanuts from foreign countries; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Where are those peanuts coming from?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not quite sure where they are coming from; but it became necessary to import these 50 million pounds because of the drought which Mr. Benson could not foresee. No one questions Mr. Benson's motives in fixing the quotas and acreage allotments for 1954 nor for 1955. As reported in the debate this morning, he has increased the acreage allotment 7.5 percent. I know that Mr. Benson is anxious to see that the domestic market is adequately supplied, it is not an indictment of the program, because Mr. Benson fixed his goals too low.

Mr. GROSS. Are those imports coming in under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And some of them are coming from India, I assume.

Mr. COOLEY. And probably Africa.

Mr. GROSS. From which we have had little or no support in the war against communism. Let me ask the gentleman another question. It has been developed here that we are importing candy from Great Britain. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me the pay scale of labor in the candy-making industry in Great Britain as compared with the pay scale of those making candy in this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. But we are getting candy from Great Britain; is that not true?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not certain about that.

Mr. GROSS. And we have in the past given them billions of dollars to support their economy, and we are giving them support now; is not that true?

Mr. COOLEY. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. So now we are going to take it out of the hides of the American farmer and out of the hides of American labor, because Britain is shipping readmade candy into this country.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not have any reason to doubt the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised to hear some of the people who are advocating this amendment on the floor of the House who are supposedly great proponents and supporters of American labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the membership of the House that I think the faith of our great Government is at stake at this moment. Under a law enacted by Congress the Secretary issued his necessary proclamation imposing acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The peanut producers have accepted the Secretary's advice. They have reduced their acreage. They are trying to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demand and to comply with the letter and the spirit of the law. To bring that about, Congress authorized the Secretary to fix the price-support level.

Under the present program for 1955, the Secretary could have lowered that price to 82.5 percent of parity. But instead of doing that, he has maintained the support level at 90 percent of parity. After having made that contract, that agreement with the farmers of America we are now asked to break faith with the Secretary of Agriculture and to put him in a position where he will be powerless to control the acreage. And to carry out the contract.

Under the law, the Secretary is morally and legally bound to pay the price support that he has promised to pay. If the House adopts this amendment, farmers can double their acreage of peanuts, bring in a huge crop and then Mr. Benson must put the money on the line and support unlimited production of peanuts, something which the peanut producers have never advocated and something that I have never proposed.

Let us be serious about this. Are we going out and help a lot of profit-making candy manufacturers and, in our efforts, break faith with a great segment of our agricultural economy and embarrass the Secretary of Agriculture who belongs to the minority party, who has not been before our committee to ask that this drastic action be taken?

Why should we take this action today and break faith with all parties involved?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, many aspects of this matter have been discussed by previous speakers, but it seems to me that there is one which has not been sufficiently emphasized. I believe that this amendment ought to be supported because it would be of direct and appreciable benefit to those who are the consumers in this Nation of ours. That has been touched upon, but perhaps not a sufficient point has been made of it. If peanuts are a little lower in price to the public, certainly more of them will be used. More of them will be put into candy bars, as has been pointed out, more of them will find their way into the hands of consumers at baseball games and elsewhere. The demand will be increased. More peanuts will be used. By that very fact it follows logically that there will be a greater demand made upon the supplies which can be produced by the farmers who grow peanuts. So it seems to me that we will be benefiting both segments of our population by adopting this amendment, since we will be putting more of this good food into the hands of those who use it, and at the same time we will be creating a greater demand so that the farmers who produce them will then have a larger market and accordingly will be assured of a fair price for them.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment ought to be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was permitted to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. ABERNETHY.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, in the time I have been in this House, about 13 years, I have always found that when the House understands an amendment it attempts to do the right thing.

This is the most lengthy amendment ever proposed to any bill our committee has brought to the House in my experience. It came wholly by surprise. It was not proposed or offered in the committee. I doubt seriously whether anyone actually understands it. I do not know who drafted it. I am reasonably sure the author did not. Assuming it will do what he says, let us examine and determine the effect of it.

Price supports on peanuts for the 1955 crop have been fixed. It has just been said by the gentleman who preceded me that this would result in a cheaper price for peanuts. It will not. The Secretary has already announced that the price support on the 1955 crop will be what—not 75 percent of parity, not 80 percent of parity, not 85 percent of parity, but 90 percent of parity. That is final. It is a closed deal. The contract has been signed, sealed, and delivered.

The Secretary has already fixed the acreage allotments. But you are making an attempt, whether you know it or not, to take off the acreage allotments. You will be authorizing the planting of unlimited acreage. If you do take off the acreage allotments you will transpose the program from one of soundness to one of utter unsoundness. By doing so you will fill every peanut warehouse in this country with surplus peanuts, at what price? At 90 percent of parity.

When you vote on this amendment you should ask yourself this question: The price has been fixed; since it has been fixed, would it be more sensible, would it be more reasonable, to vote for an amendment which actually will not change the retail price but which will fill the warehouses with peanuts at a high price; or would it be better for me to leave it where the Secretary fixed it, at 90 percent of parity, with acreage fixed at a production level at which peanuts will move into the market and not into the warehouse? That is all there is to it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What is 90 percent of parity on peanuts today, that is, the number of cents?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I cannot answer the gentleman. There is not a peanut produced commercially in my district. I do not have any commercial peanut farmers.

Mr. Benson and the peanut growers had a conference about the situation in the months gone by. They have reached an agreement among themselves as to what the level of production should be—I mean the number of acres. They have agreed and the acreage has been allotted. The price has been fixed. There is still no surplus. In fact, there is a shortage. There was a slight shortage last year because of the drought. Now if you adopt this amendment, there will not be enough warehouses in the State of Georgia to take care of the peanuts that will be produced this year. At what price? Ninety percent of parity. Who is going to buy them? Only Uncle Sam will be the buyer and you will have contributed to one of the problems we have all tried to solve; that is, surplus production.

Mr. MASON. Ninety percent of parity would be a good deal less than 28 cents a pound.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Ninety percent of parity, as I understand it, would only be about 11 cents a pound. That is all it would be.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the average. But if you fix price supports at 90 percent on unlimited production, which this amendment would do for 1955, what are you going to do with the peanuts? The candy manufacturers are all sitting up there in the gallery. I have seen several of them today. They testified before our committee last year. They will not get peanuts a penny cheaper during 1955 under this amendment. They will still have to buy peanuts supported at a price of 90 percent of parity. If anyone challenges that statement, I wish he would rise and do so.

Mr. MASON. I will challenge that statement because they will be buying peanuts if there is an abundant supply at a good deal less than 28 cents and still be paying more than 90 percent of parity.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I point out to my friend that the farmers' price on peanuts on the average is 11 cents, which is 90 percent of parity. Now who but the Government is going to take all of these peanuts produced from unlimited acreages. These folks, the candy manufacturers are not going to take them. They cannot use that many peanuts. It would be impossible for them to do so. Who is going to buy them—that is the question. Let us not fill the warehouses of this country with peanuts. That is just what this amendment would do.

In all sincerity I do not believe the House wants to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] who has preceded he has really touch on a fundamental issue involved in the debate on this amendment. There is no question but that this is an effort to hack away at the foundation of the entire farm program. I would not indulge in a generality and make a blanket accusation that every Member of this House who supports this amendment, does so for the purpose of wrecking the entire farm program or that he is opposed to it. I do state, however, that many of those who have spoken have indicated enough for a fair mind to conclude that they oppose any phase of a farm program and that the lowly peanut is not the only crop or commodity involved.

It is certainly not my purpose to play one segment of our economy against another for any ulterior motive. I regret to see injected in this debate any inference that one economy of the country is entitled to preferential treatment at the expense of another, but that is the tack taken by those who would destroy the price-support system for peanuts by removing peanuts as one of the six basic commodities.

Since that is the attack by those who have expressed such great concern for the candy manufacturers and the confectioners, let me remind you that if the farmers of this country are subsidized, and particularly the peanut farmers about whom we are talking at the moment, compare this pittance with the tremendous tax writeoff given the huge corporations of this country.

As every Member of this body is aware, billions are involved in tax writeoffs for plant expansion over a period of 5 years. I checked into this matter more than 2 years ago and found this writeoff to be about $18 billion. That was in a period of approximately 2 years. Today it is probably more than double. It seems it is very difficult to get any accurate estimate of it, but I have heard the figure of around $40 billion.

Those who want to see peanuts removed as a basic commodity repeat over and over again that the loss in the peanut program has been $118 million. They leave the impression that the loss has only just occurred and fail to emphasize that it has been over the entire period of years since the inception of the program. They also fail to recognize the fact that during the war our Government insisted on the greatest possible volume of peanuts and encouraged the farmer to increase his yield. The peanut farmer responded with every effort at his disposal. He purchased new and expensive machinery to plant and harvest his peanut crop. Many went in debt for this purpose, but the conditions at that time existing did not continue and he finds himself today in the position he was in before this situation came into being. He is in the same condition, except considerably worse off in some respects because of his investment, which he cannot now use to the fullest advantage.

Let me make it clear that I have no criticism of what it takes to expand plant facilities which may be needed in our national defense. Hence, I say that, just as it was necessary for the peanut farmer to produce the greatest possible amount of peanuts for the war effort, so it is necessary according to the experts for the great corporations' operating plants which may be devoted to a war effort, to have certain tax advantages. But let no one forget and let no one ignore that the situation is analogous except in the amount of money involved. In this respect there is no comparison between $118 million over a long period of years and the sum of billions of dollars over a period of 5 years.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Is it not a fact that the oil produced from peanuts was a vital product in the war effort?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is entirely correct. Peanut oil was used to great advantage and necessity in the manufacture of munitions.

Under the program at that time the Government purchased peanuts at the edible price and not at the oil-crushing price, which was lower, because it was an emergency and necessary for them to do so. This, as it has been pointed out by other speakers here today, accounts in the greater part for the $118 million figure held up by the proponents of this amendment as the staggering loss on peanuts under price supports.

Charge it where you will and criticize it as you may, but remember it is today when you are doing it and not at the time when we were fighting for our lives.

Mr. IKARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Something has been said here regarding increased cost to the end users of peanuts and peanut products. This expensive machinery to which you refer was manufactured in the industrial areas. Did not our farmers contribute to the economy of industry in purchasing this equipment?

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for making that point. Certainly the farmers of the South and Southwest are the real customers of our industrial East and Northeast in practically all manufactured products. Not only do they buy their tractors and plows, their hoes and their rakes, manufactured mostly in the Midwest and the North, but they buy their automobiles, their radios, and fly swatters, or whatever it may be, from the same areas.

If the farmer prospers, so prospers the entire country. When the farmer suffers disaster, when his prices are depressed and he does not prosper fairly, inevitably the entire economy of the Nation suffers. If that is not true and if it does not come to pass under conditions which you recommend here today, then it will be a reversal of all historic trends heretofore definitely proved.

I urge and beg the Members of this House not to accept this amendment. Those of you from the city areas are victims of false propaganda if you believe for 1 minute that the end users of peanuts and peanut products are going to benefit by removing peanuts as a basic commodity. I think I am correct, and if I should be in error, I stand here subject to challenge, but I believe the record of testimony before the Committee on Agriculture will bear out that certain representatives of the candy-manufacturing industry have admitted under cross-questioning, that if peanuts were given to the manufacturer, the size of the candy bar would not be increased, nor the price decreased. Yet, they appeal to you in the name of schoolchildren that the consumer must be protected from the high prices demanded by peanut farmers, who are struggling for their very existence. You would truly have to know the story from the time a costly peanut seed was placed in the ground until it was finally consumed by a schoolchild in the city of Chicago, to really know how completely absurd is such a contention.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURLESON. I gladly yield.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Is it not a fact that our peanut farmers have voluntarily agreed to certain reductions in acreage in order to guarantee a sound support-price program?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. Last year representatives of peanut growers appeared before the Agriculture Committees of Congress and said they were willing and desirous of reducing their acreage by 5 percent per year over a period of several years in order to bring supply in line with demand. The farmer wants a sound program. He wants to be on solid ground and he wants to make a decent living. If this amendment should pass he will have the ground cut from under him and he cannot make a decent living raising peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will not be agreed to. In 1941, the last year before World War II, peanut farmers grew 1,610,000 acres of peanuts. Shortly after the war started the Government began asking farmers to expand their peanut production, and by the latter part of the war the peanut farmers of America were planting about 3½ million acres of peanuts, or more than twice as many acres

as they had been planting prior to the war. At the end of the war large quantities of peanuts which had been purchased for war purposes were in the hands of the Government. These had to be crushed and sold on the oil market at the oil price, which was about 50 percent of the price paid for edible peanuts. As a result, the Government sustained losses on peanut production, just as it sustained losses on ships, planes, guns, and other things that were ordered but not delivered until after the war had closed.

We have also heard about the shortage of peanuts last year. That shortage was due to the drought and not to the price-support program. In nearly every peanut-producing county in the United States last year the farmers suffered one of the severest droughts in the recorded history of those counties. That is why peanuts were imported into this country this year, and that is the main reason why the Department has increased the allotment this year.

Now peanut farmers have adjusted production in line with demand. This program is no longer an expense to the taxpayer. The program is working well and should not be disturbed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Much has been said about the cost of peanuts to the consumer and the cost of peanuts to the Government. Practically everything has been said to explain the origin of the program, the cost of the program, and what the program has done. There are other things that go into the cost of the manufacture of confections, which of course might be the cause of complaint about the high price. The cost of peanuts to the Government, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] told you, is correct. The $118 million loss was due to the fact that representatives of the Government went about the country encouraging people to increase their acreage so as to produce oils and fats, not only for ourselves during the war but for our allies, and we expanded the acreage of peanuts accordingly. That brought about the $118 million cost that is so often spoken of. The cost to the consumer today is not the farmer's cost. The farmer is getting 11 to 12 cents a pound for peanuts. The difference is the cost of handling between the farmer and the consumer. The cost of marketing, the cost of transportation, the cost of cleaning and preparing and shipping to the candy makers, and so forth—all of those costs which are exactly 100 percent more than the farmer gets, is the cost that the consumer must pay. Certainly the same thing applies to bread and wheat. So the same amendment might be offered to strike wheat from this program as a basic commodity.

I hope the House will seriously consider this and strike down the amendment.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I think many of the significant arguments against this amendment have been made but there has been little time for elaboration upon any of them.

There are a few observations and comments which I want to make within the short time allotted to me. I was not here when peanuts were inserted into the Agriculture Adjustment Act and made a basic agricultural commodity. Consequently, I do not know what the arguments were pro and con. However, based upon my knowledge of the importance of peanuts to the peanut farmers, particularly those who produce no other major crop, I am convinced of the justification for having made them a basic commodity. Today peanuts are a basic agricultural commodity to thousands upon thousands of farmers living and producing peanuts in the peanut growing areas of this country.

This amendment is a dagger pointed at the very heart of thousands of these people and to the peanut farmers of my congressional district in particular. Of the 168,813 acres of peanuts allotted to and grown in North Carolina during the current year, 95,924 acres are grown in my congressional district and approximately 95,000 acres of the acreage grown in my congressional district is grown in four of its counties. It is, therefore, easy to see how basic peanuts are to my people. For many of these farmers, peanuts are the only source of income and for many others it is their primary source of income.

The peanut producers of my district accepted this program originally reluctantly because they too wanted to produce an abundance of peanuts, thinking that they would get more in return. But they were finally convinced of the importance of our farm program to their livelihoods, and the peanut producers, like the producers of other basic agricultural commodities, soon appreciated the fact that they too must cooperate in an effort to balance supply with demand and thereby enable them to get as nearly as possible a fair return upon their labors and upon their investment. Somehow I have doubts that the importance of this farm program to their livelihood is truly understood and appreciated in this House.

This amendment is a dagger pointed also at our entire farm program. It is, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and others, have so well said, the opening wedge; it is the first step in an effort to destroy a farm program which has provided for the farm families of America not a fair price but 90 percent of a fair price. This program has helped to bring prosperity to every other segment of our economy while the producers under the program are still among the lowest income people of America.

Comment has been made about the importance of satisfying the appetites of children for peanuts and the necessity of making an abundance of peanuts—and oversupply if necessary—available for their consumption in support of this "dagger" amendment. I must say in answer to those comments that there are thousands of children, mothers, and fathers and other loved ones living on this good earth of ours in the peanut growing areas of this country who are absolutely dependent upon the income they receive from this basic agricultural commodity, peanuts, for their very livelihood—their food, their clothing, and their shelter. It is basic to their way of life and to their future security as they till the soil which Almighty God has so graciously provided for them.

As I said last year when the same group pointed this same dagger at the heart of my people, the struggle of the peanut farmers for a place in the sun with other basic commodities has been a long and hard one. Most of us here recall 2 cents per pound peanuts in 1931 and 1½ cents per pound peanuts in 1932. Most assuredly no one here is interested in going back to those times and yet I sometimes wonder if there are not many who do not care. During my first session of Congress and during this, the first year of my second session, I have heard expressions of deep concern for the little men of America and especially the small farmers. Particularly have I heard this from many representatives of the administration which presently controls the executive branch of the Government and many of those Representatives are in the Congress of the United States.

I will not say that their actions have not in some instances been helpful to the masses of our people, but I must frankly say I have not seen what I would call a sincere demonstration and practice by them of the sermons they preached to the American people before the 1952 elections.

I am amazed that the minority leadership of this House has silently given its support to the use of this dagger amendment which could destroy the very lifeblood of thousands upon thousands of the lowest-income people in America. I say this because all of us recall very vividly the campaign oratory and commitments which preceded the election of a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1952.

Without entering into an argument as to whether or not the Chief Executive committed himself to 90 percent of parity for basic agricultural commodities or 100 percent of parity, is there any denial of the fact that in all of his utterances concerning a farm program, he committed himself to support as basic the commodities, including peanuts, which are now set forth in the Agricultural Adjustment Act as basic, and therefore entitled to parity price supports provided in the act. Never in all of my experience have I observed, and seen with my own eyes so many broken promises and commitments. Those to my left in particular who are supporting this amendment to strike peanuts from the law as a basic commodity are breaking faith not only with the peanut growers of America, but with the Chief Executive in the White House and his Secretary of Agriculture, who have always, as I understand it, approved the continuation of peanuts as a basic commodity.

I wish I had time to tell you of the 100 and more ways in which peanuts are basic not only to producers, but to the general health and welfare of the people of America.

An outstanding American scientist by the name of George Washington Carver, demonstrated the truth of this assertion during the course of his great life.

Apparently, those of this administration who are going along with this amendment are not very much concerned about the commitments of the present Republican administration. Unfortunately, many have permitted themselves to be trapped by those who have endeavored to aline the consumer against the producer, the city family against the farm family, and vice versa. In my opinion, this has been done repeatedly. It is unfortunate that men cannot have deep and abiding convictions and express them without trying to increase the already unnecessarily existing prejudices and jealousies among the various groups in America.

A peanut is a small item when you look at it, but it has within it the ingredients for the good health of its consumers, as well as the livelihood of its producers.

I know of no other group of farmers in America in recent years who have indicated a greater willingness to cooperate with their Government to balance supply with demand than have the peanut growers who have repeatedly overwhelmingly voted for production controls in support of our overall basic farm program.

Last year at a time when they felt that their production had already been cut to the bone, when they were fearful of losing this program, they consented, through their elected representatives—and I must say it was reluctant—to additional reductions over a period of several years in order to bring the supply more nearly in line with demand. With unfavorable weather conditions, such as the drought, conditions have changed however, and importation of peanuts in larger quantities has been authorized by the President. Just today the Secretary of Agriculture, increased the acreage allotment of all peanut growers by 7.5 percent.

If this amendment carries, and peanuts are stricken from the law as a basic agricultural commodity, we will be breaking faith with the peanut farmers of America who have already planted and are in the process of planting their acreage in keeping with their agreement with our Government. In addition, since we are already bound by that agreement, we will encourage unlimited production of peanuts and thereby fill the storehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation with guaranteed prices of 90 percent of parity. And yet, much of what I have heard since I have been in Congress has dealt with our surpluses of certain agricultural commodities. Our peanut farmers have become accustomed to the program. They have made, and will continue to make, their plans in keeping with the program. It is an integral part of the entire farm program. When we destroy one part of the program we lay the groundwork for its entire destruction. If we pass this amendment we will destroy the confidence of the American farmers in the entire farm program. Regardless of what commodity he may grow, he can have little hope for help in the future. I urge the Members of this House to withdraw the dagger pointing at the heart of so many little people, by defeating this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the move to cut peanuts out of the list of basic commodities is just repetition of one which we have faced periodically over the last several years. It is a move of one certain element in this body to take away from the poor and give to the rich.

Those who have spoken in favor of the amendment have cried out piteously in behalf of the little children who buy the candy bars. I think that if they looked into their hearts they would admit at least to themselves that they have not heard the plea of one single child, but rather the insistent demands of the candy manufacturers.

If the amendment carries and as a result the price of peanuts is beaten down to half of its present figure or even a fourth of it, the youngster who buys the candy bar will not get that bar for 1 cent less. All he will do is pay the price of sugar, chocolate, and milk for the additional peanuts which the bar will contain.

This move is just as selfish today as it was in the preceding sessions when it was proposed by the same old crowd and for the same old reasons. If you pass this amendment you will put a lot of peanut farmers out of business in my district, and you will benefit no one but the candy manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, it is with exceeding regret, so far as I am concerned, that debate on this important matter is limited to any extent whatsoever. I am here before you today and have only 4½ minutes, and would not have had that had it not been for the generosity of the gentleman from Texas who yielded me his time; yet, Mr. Chairman, I am here trying to represent my people and to represent them on the most important matter that could possibly come to them short of war.

If the peanut program in this country is not basic there is not one thing in this country that is basic. I know that there are some Members who do not understand our problem, but I know that human nature is kind if given all the facts. In matters like this, of course, sometimes we become a little irritated and we lose our tempers, but nothing has ever been gained by that. What I want to do is to try to appeal to you from my heart and soul and say to you that I am speaking on behalf of 15 million people who earn their living growing peanuts or doing business with peanut growers.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We do not grow any peanuts in my district, but can the gentleman tell me whether or not the peanut growers have already planted their crops?

Mr. FORRESTER. Of course they have and they have made their plans under this program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It seems to me it would be very unwise to take this out as a basic crop this year, the crop having already been planted.

Mr. FORRESTER. It certainly would be. It would be disastrous to them. The crop has already been planted and certainly it would be disastrous to our people. My colleague is absolutely right as usual. The gentleman has always been a true friend of the farmer and particularly the small farmer.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It would be unfair to let these peanut growers lose what they have already planted?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes, of course it would.

Mr. Chairman, they are talking about something basic, then you say that the children up in some sections of this country cannot buy peanut candy or the 5-cent bar. Surely upon reflection, you know that anyone who says that is wrong. The truth of the matter is that the children of the country today are getting more candy and more luxuries than ever before in the history of this country.

I am trying to talk to you about 15 million people whose prosperity and livelihood are hanging in the balance today. There are 3½ million people in the State of Georgia whose economy is heavily dependent upon agriculture, and if you deprive them of this program you are going to reap disaster upon those 3½ million people. That is true of the entire peanut area.

I want to talk to you about our children who need some clothes. Oh, yes, we have prospered some, but we have children in school who need clothes, they need school books, they need cod liver oil, they need the other finer things of life which you people want them to have.

It is true that this program has cost the people $118 million, but that is just chicken change when you realize you have saved the economy of the peanut belt. I have a little secret I want to tell you. Eastern candy manufacturers who are fighting so hard here today against the peanut program know that we have so adjusted this program that it is never going to cost the Government one cent any more. They realize it is now or never, and they intend to defeat us now. They are not interested in little children. They are interested only in dollars, extra dollars, though wrung from rural children. A sad commentary on private enterprise.

As a matter of fact, down in Georgia in the peanut area we have suffered a terrible drought. Our farmers are broke. Do not kid yourselves about that, they are broke. Then we had a freeze, which is one of the worst things that happened to the people down there in my entire recollection. We are depending on our peanut crop. If we do not get a peanut crop and get fair prices we are ruined.

I know this argument does not appeal to the eastern candy manufacturer who has turned out in droves to lobby us today and is doing everything they can to wax fat at the expense of our people, but I do hope it makes sense to you, and moves you to vote in the interest of 15 million Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, regret that the time is limited so that we cannot go into this subject fully and completely. Involved in this amendment is the whole price-support program.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to condemn anyone here. The candy manufacturers want cheap supplies, though they do not promise to pass on to the consumer any savings they might have from reduced peanut prices. It is always quite natural for people to try to secure cheap raw materials or to buy cheap, as they are doing. I suspect it is increased profits they are really interested in. If we here today could have the income, as individuals, that we do have and if the cost of living was like it used to be, we would be well off. It just will not work that way. We are dealing with people when we deal with the farm program. When virtually everything else is protected we cannot leave the farmers' prices or income out without bankrupting him. We left the farmer out until about 20 years ago.

During the period of history of this country when we were leaving agricultural commodities without protection, we were providing minimum wages and protective tariffs for others; and we exhausted one-half of the natural resources of the country. We wore the land out. The farmer's lot was a hard one. The price support program was passed in an effort to assure at least some fair return to the farmer. I think all will agree that only under the farm program have agricultural people been able to live somewhat like others.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, involved here is not peanuts as such. Involved here is a segment of the American people with low incomes, whose livelihood depends upon the growing of peanuts, and a fair return for them. If we do not pass this bill, we make bad matters worse. We would thereby injure the farmer without in any way helping the consumer. The difference to the farmer would be a reduction in his present low income of about 16 percent, but to the purchaser of a bar of candy it would mean only about one mill and there is nothing to show such mill would be passed on to the consumer. You know it would not be.

Farm program opponents are making headway to destroy it. May I say this. Already those farmers, or many of them producing perishable commodities, since section 32 funds are used to support and export their products, believe they have no interest in retaining firm supports on basic commodities. And yet they will later find that agricultural programs even for them will stand or fall with the whole farm program.

If farmers growing peanuts are then separated by this amendment from other farm commodities, then wheat, cotton and the rest will feel the effects, too.

The farm program is essential to the welfare of the Nation. Only by a reasonable income can the farmer put back into the soil a share of what he takes out. His income today is terribly low. The President says we must do something for him. There are only two real ways to help, to increase his acreage and to increase his price. To justify increasing production, we must sell; and the Department of Agriculture won't sell. Then when we try to help even a little bit with price, the administration is here opposing that.

President Eisenhower says we must help the small farmers. These are small farmers with an average of less than $1,500 gross per year income. Now is the time to at least hold what they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out of this bill now under consideration peanuts as a basic commodity. I am hopeful that if peanuts are removed from the provisions of this bill that relief will enure to the benefit of the candy manufacturing industry and the children of the United States. I am led to believe that one of the reasons that there has been a substantial reduction in the candy-manufacturing business and reduction in the number of employees is due largely to this peanut program with respect to price supports and quotas for peanuts as a basic commodity. Many of us have been assured that with the passage of this amendment that the candy industry will be in a position to purchase at better prices, and that the selling of the commodity, such as peanut candy bar, will be priced accordingly. Many of us have been advised that at the present time the ordinary peanut bar contains a very small quantity of peanuts due to present legislation and that with the elimination of peanuts as a basic commodity, the manufacturers could produce a much better peanut bar and still sell it at a very reasonable price.

Another reason for my support of the amendment is that the Commodity Credit Corporation has sustained losses of $118,083,436 in its operation of the peanut price-support program from July 1, 1946, to February 28, 1955, and that on a dollar-for-dollar basis the peanut price-support program has been one of the most costly maintained by the Government.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the peanut accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of national farm income and is one of the most extravagant expenditures of our Government. We are reliably informed that this program has placed prices at high levels and has produced surpluses in most years which has made necessary these large purchases and eventually great losses by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We are told that up to last July the Government retained large stocks which were being sold for oil at substantial losses and because of the expense to the Government acreage allotments have been reduced to a minimum. Someone has said that this peanut price-support program on one end either produces surpluses at a gigantic expense or on the other end results in shortages necessitating the importing of peanuts from some of our neighboring countries.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that peanuts will be eliminated from this bill as a basic commodity and placed in the category of a nonbasic commodity without acreage restrictions so that peanuts could be purchased at lower prices and the end user could give the consumer a better commodity for his money, which no doubt would increase the use of peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe most of you will agree, after listening to the debate and the arguments for and against this amendment, that there is no justification whatsoever for continuing peanuts as a basic commodity. I do not think there is any more justification for peanuts being considered a basic commodity than fish, for instance, or soybeans, or fruit. I do not see the people from New England or the coastline of the Gulf of Mexico or the Pacific Coast coming in here and saying, "We want this commodity included," a commodity which probably has a bigger income and probably more labor involved than in the peanut industry. So, I say that the people here who are opposed to this amendment are asking for favoritism; they are asking for special privilege. Here is an industry that has less than one-half of 1 percent of the agricultural income coming in here and asking for this special privilege when there are many other industries and agricultural products which have larger incomes that are not considered basic commodities.

Now, why should we, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, continue to give away the taxpayers' money? So far we have already given away $118 million. Now, what is the situation? Someone mentioned the fact that millions and millions of candy bars were coming in from England. They are being sold here cheaper than our American candy people can sell their products for. Why? Because England buys her peanuts from India and Africa, where they have cheap wages, and then manufactures them into candies and sends them over here, while our farmers, through the rigid price-support programs, are not raising enough peanuts so that it becomes necessary to ship in from other countries to the extent of 51 million pounds.

Mr. Chairman, I say in conclusion that I hope the amendment carries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the

time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, when this matter was debated last year, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who was at that time chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, called the attention of the House to a message by President Eisenhower and quoted from that message, and in speaking about the peanut program, the President said "this program, which has experienced some difficulties in adjusting supplies to demand at the supported price can operate successfully with certain changes." Further, he said that the Agricultural Act of 1949 became effective for peanuts on January 1, 1955. Then further the gentleman from Kansas pointed out that the other recommendation that the President made was to shift to modernized parity.

Without burdening the House by going into details with reference to modernized parity, I only call the attention of the Committee to the statement of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. CLIFFORD HOPE, with reference to modernized parity; and modernized parity will be applicable next year.

Let me say this to all of those who are thinking of voting for this amendment: What they are about to do is to embarrass this administration and to break faith with the farmers. I had a member of our staff communicate with officials of the Department of Agriculture, and it is reported to us that even if this amendment is adopted, and even if we do away with acreage allotments and marketing quotas, the Secretary of Agriculture is legally and morally bound to support the acreage allotments on peanuts during the current year, 1955.

Why do a vain and foolish thing? Why not leave this matter until next year? Why was not this amendment submitted to our committee? Why deprive Mr. Benson and his associates of an opportunity to express their views on the peanut program?

I beg the Committee to defeat this amendment. Let us consider it in committee in the orderly and ordinary way instead of coming in now and striking down a law which the President of the United States says can operate under modernized parity.

I urge the membership of the House to vote down this amendment. By voting for the amendment, they are turning down the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. CLIFFORD HOPE, in whom, I am sure, all of us have confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] for 2 minutes.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, this is my third year, and this is the second time I have been in the well of the House to speak. I think this is a very selfish amendment. I was reared in a rural community. I have farmed for 40 years. I have furnished fertilizer and supplies and seed to these small peanut farmers. I have counties in my district where 86 percent of the entire income comes from peanuts.

They talk about $118 million that we have lost in this program. I was chairman of the PMA committee during the war years. There was not a week when we did not get a telegram from the Secretary of Agriculture asking us to go out and get the farmers to increase their use of fertilizer and increase their yields in order to produce oils and fats not only for America but for the rest of the free world.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILCHER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I wanted to mention this one further fact which is that Secretary Benson advocated and sponsored this program just as it is now being operated. A vote for this amendment is a vote to repudiate his leadership as expressed in our committee room.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am for the farmers of America. It does not make any difference to me whether the farmer is a dairy farmer in Minnesota or a wheat farmer in North Dakota. This is all a farm program. As to the price of peanuts, we talk about 11 cents and 12 cents a pound to the farmer. The average yield is about 800 pounds per acre. That is $88. Those women and children have to take those peanuts, pick them by hand and pile them on a row and then pray that it does not rain before tomorrow. They pick them up by hand and wrap them around a stack and pray that it will not rain much for 30 days until they have dried out. It costs $30 per ton to separate the peanut from the vine before he can sell them.

Many times they are damaged and have to be sold for oil stock at half price. I am sorry I do not have but 2 minutes, but I could talk for 1 hour on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not a fact that the reason we call this crop a basic commodity is not because of the volume of peanuts—somebody has made the point that there was a small volume of peanuts—but that to those people who live by the cultivation of peanuts, peanuts are just as basic as wheat, as cotton, as corn, or any other commodity is to the people who depend on these larger crops?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. That seems to be indicated.

Mr. POAGE. I hope the Members of this House, when they vote on this, will recognize that they are affecting the very livelihood of a great many people, just as truly as if they were voting on the biggest crops in America, because the man who relies on peanuts to feed and clothe his family is just as dependent upon those peanuts as is the man who is growing wheat or cattle or any other commodity. Is it not a fact that there is a vast number of people engaged in growing peanuts, and that every man, woman, and child who is growing peanuts lives on the production of those peanuts?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of talk here about the children of America. It is a shame that in order to try to defeat a sound agricultural program that has been working well, one that is not costing the taxpayers of America a single dollar today, they have brought in the candy-eating children of America.

I think it is much more important that the heads of the families are able to buy the very necessities of life from the money they receive from the peanut crop than it is for the children to have a piece of candy, which they will get anyway.

I know we used to eat peanut candy when I was a little boy. We made it out of 'lasses and peanuts. I like peanuts and peanut candy. I think some of the Members of the House have eaten the same kind of candy. I believe the children of America today can continue to get plenty of peanut candy and at the same time retain a very valuable and important part of the overall farm program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that although Mr. Benson came to our committee room with all of his associates, not a single one of them advocated any change in the present peanut program?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This program has not been brought up for change by the Secretary of Agriculture or any of his advisers before our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that he was asked the direct question if he had any further recommendation to make with regard to the peanut program and he said "No."

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to remove peanuts as a basic commodity from the agricultural-support program.

Americans do not like controls except in the face of overwhelming necessity. Americans do not like overregulation and governmental straitjackets. They remember the wise advice of the great President Jefferson, that if the Government must say when to sow and when to reap, the people will go hungry.

Mr. Chairman, there is no surplus of peanuts. On the contrary there is a

shortage. Under such conditions it does not make sense to continue peanuts in the support program as a basic commodity. They should never have been put there in the first place. This amendment should at long last be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POAGE and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 186, noes 150.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, some of us have thought for a long time that to bring in this legislation before us at this time was a mistake. I think the further we go the more apparent that will become.

Generally speaking, we have had in the Congress bipartisan consideration of farm legislation. During the more than 20 years I have served here I have supported most of the agricultural bills that have come along. There was only one that I opposed and that was back in 1938. I supported some when we were in the majority and I have supported many more when we were in the minority. Through all of these years some have raised the question as to why we have any farm program at all. I think we should have before us constantly the idea that we need a farm program that will insure a continuing supply of food and fiber.

We all recognize that if the agricultural economy goes down the whole economy goes down with it, and so we have had these programs from time to time; and I think, generally speaking, the people of the country approve of the program.

However, I think it is also necessary for us to keep in mind that the program we have for agriculture, as for any other segment of the economy, must be reasonable and it must be demonstrated that it is effective.

During the war we adopted the provision for 90 percent of parity. It was a war measure, designed to encourage production for war needs.

I never heard anyone contend when we wrote in the 90 percent high, rigid supports as a wartime operation that we were in any way committed to continue that sort of system in peacetime.

It is some 10 years since World War II ended. Whatever you call the Korean conflict, it is nearly 2 years since that was over; so in contemplation of that the last Congress, following through in the methods that have heretofore been used in the Congress, wrote a new farm program. This program was not materially new in many respects, but it did make one change, providing for a gradual departure from the rigid 90 percent. As one who had something to do with this 82½-percent interim this year I say that we were putting into effect the graduality about which the President wrote in his messages to us.

So the problem now is fundamental, as I understand the controversy in this bill: Shall we see what happens under the 82½-percent formula or shall we go back to the rigid system that I say beyond any question has begun to develop all manner of difficulties and troubles that should be apparent to all of us.

What are some of those troubles? First, let me call attention to a Senate report recently released by a subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi, Senator EASTLAND. The report said this:

> The primary cause of the present deplorable condition in which the American cotton farmer finds himself is the present farm program of the United States. Support prices for cotton were set at an arbitrary figure of 90 percent of parity by law without regard to market conditions or world price. This has caused the accumulation of large stocks of American cotton in the hands of and under the support program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

What are the other difficulties, difficulties that we must face? Not the least is the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns $7,500 million of surplus commodities. It will cost us this year $1 million a day to store those commodities.

We developed a good disposal program; it is operating fairly effectively—some complain about it, but we are doing our best to get rid of the surplus. Meanwhile, everyone knows that as long as there are excessive surpluses, without regard to any action we may take, they are a constant depressant on the market price for the farmer.

Secondly, we have had price declines in agriculture. But let us bear this in mind: In February 1951 prices were at 115 percent of the parity index; in January 1953 they were at 94 percent, and now they are at 97 percent. All of that decline has come about under the present law which provides the rigid 90-percent support price.

Where else are we in trouble? We have in recent years lost a tremendous amount of the foreign market for agricultural products. I say that has depressed the price in the market place at home more than any other factor. We must do something to regain those markets. This program which we presently support is designed to do just that thing. The farmers of this country know that the loss of their foreign markets is hurting them tremendously. They are interested through their organizations in doing something to recapture those foreign markets and that, again, is what our program seeks to do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the program interfere with the disposal program the gentleman is talking about? By limiting production does that interfere with the disposal program?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I do not think so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let us go out and dispose of it then.

Mr. HALLECK. It should be disposed of. But if you have 82½ percent instead of 90 percent, many more of these commodities will move in the foreign markets. That is what the Senate committee report indicates and I think it is right.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not agree with the gentleman's logic.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have been increasing the acreage allotments under the program. Why have we done that? Because, as has been properly pointed out, if you decrease the acreages too far the small farmer cannot make a living with the amount he is able to produce. Does that not indicate something needs to be done?

What else? The flexible principle has been endorsed by both political parties. The principle was supported in the Democratic platform in 1948, and in the Republican platform of that same year. Furthermore, the President we had before the one now in office in a message to Congress in 1948, and I refer to President Truman, said:

> Now we must look ahead to a farm price-support policy geared to our improved farm economy. Many shifts in production will have to be made, and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner. This will require authority to make prompt adjustments in support levels in line with current and prospective supply-and-demand conditions. It will also require flexibility in the choice of methods or programs that are designed to be most effective for individual commodities, that avoid waste, and that help bring about needed adjustments in production, distribution, and consumption.

That was President Truman's comment in 1948.

Today at his press conference President Eisenhower was asked about the farm legislation now before the Congress and he had this to say:

> Last year we finally had passed a farm bill. It is good legislation. But it has not yet had an opportunity to be in effect. It will not

go into effect until the crops of the 1955 year begin to come to market. So all of the farm squeeze which has taken place, and it has taken place, has been under the old law, the 90 percent rigid parity price supports.

Mr. Chairman, every Secretary of Agriculture in the last 20 years has supported the principle of flexible supports. The Congress adopted it last year. Why all this turnabout?

There is undoubtedly a little politics around the edges, but as I have said many times, coming from Indiana, I do not have an allergy for politics. But we have seen a little politics around here. This is too important a matter for that. We ought to do the right thing. I have heard it kicked around some days ago that there was to be a big trade, it was referred to as a deal, between some of my city friends on my right and some of my good southern friends and other friends also on my right. They were going to trade 90 percent parity for the $1.25 minimum-wage law. We will have to meet the minimum-wage proposition when it gets here.

Maybe we should pay a little more attention to the Farm Bureau, to those people who are leaders in the farm organizations of our country.

Finally, may I say this, that we are in trouble under this present farm program. I do not see how anyone can deny it. We have come up with this new arrangement that, I will say, perhaps not the best brains in the country, but certainly a considerable number of the best brains in the country, believe is a fair answer. I join with the President in pleading with you to give this 82.5 percent a chance to work this year. If by the end of this year or in January next year you do not like it, if it has not worked, you think something else ought to be done, then let us do it. There will be plenty of time. Even as here today in May you are now talking about reimposing the 90-percent rigid-support price, you will have plenty of time to look at it. All I ask you to do is to support and stand by the program that was written last year, a gradual program designed to make some beginning in an effort to meet these difficulties that confronted us.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with the membership to support the motion to recommit which will be made against this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want first to congratulate the Agriculture Committee on reporting this bill providing for a return to 90 percent of parity for basic commodities. Particularly do I congratulate the committee since this action has been taken in the face of tremendous opposition from Secretary Benson, Department of Agriculture, and this administration.

I intend to vote for 90 percent of parity. I prefer to vote for 100 percent, but I will be satisfied with 90 percent if that is the best we can do.

The prosperity and stability of American agriculture is one of the most important domestic problems. What is good for agriculture is good for every segment of our national economy. We all know what happens to industry, to storekeepers, to professional men, to laborers when the bottom drops out of agriculture. It has happened to us before. It could happen again. None of us would want to go back to those days. Just why is it so important to other segments of our economy that we have a prosperous and stable agriculture economy? It is very simple. Our American farmers are great purchasers of the output of American business and industry. They are probably the greatest single market of our manufactured goods. It would startle you to know how many millions of nonfarm people live on the purchasing power of farmers. If we are going to keep our factories humming, if we are going to keep our plants busy turning out goods and products for our markets, if we want to keep our stores and merchants and all the other businesses prospering, we are going to have to give some serious thought to trying to bolster up the sagging farm economy. We must do something to protect farm economy. Any farm program which protects purchasing power of farmers is a means of protecting our national purchasing power since there is a direct ratio of national income to farm income.

We need to give some serious thought to farm problems and farm economy for other reasons. Our population is increasing by leaps and bounds. We need our farm workers and farm owners to stay on the farm. But unless the financial rewards are improved, the farm population is going to continue to move to cities and towns in increasing numbers. The American farmer has to make enough to meet his production costs and make a small profit like other businessmen or he will let farm operations go down, deplete the soil fertility and give up like thousands of others have done.

Farmers today are in trouble and their trouble is real. Under the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies, the farmers' share of our national income is at the lowest point in history. The price of farm products continues to decline. Farmers are caught in a terrible financial price squeeze. While new records are being set each day in other segments of our economy, farm income continues to lag and drop. Farmers are receiving less and less for what they sell and are paying more and more for the things they buy. That is the problem facing agriculture today.

In a recent survey of 20 occupations—a survey made by economic experts—the weekly buying power of farmers was at the bottom of the list. For all 20 occupations, income was expected to increase in 1955, with only one exception. And what was that exception? It was the farmer. His income was down.

The farmer's purchasing power is the lowest it has been in 15 years. Farm mortgage debt is increasing. Farm foreclosures and forced sales are up 40 percent. All this is taking place while the stock market is constantly surging upward and while other areas of our economy are experiencing unparalleled prosperity. Farm prices are down an average of 22 percent since 1952; net income for farmers is down 28 percent since 1947; and is down 10 percent below 1953. Further declines are expected for 1955 and 1956.

We hear a lot about the unfairness of price supports for farm products. Farmers have been pictured as one of the largest economic groups in the Nation to benefit from Government subsidies. The truth is that the cost of our farm price support program has been small compared to the cost of subsidies to other groups. During the past 20 years our parity program for the 6 basic crops has amounted to $130 million. During this same period Government aid to business amounted to $4½ billion. Do you ever hear anything about that? The cost of consumer subsidies amounted to $2 billion during the same years. Do you ever hear anything about that? I do not begrudge these expenditures in the interest of business and industry. I mention them only to refute the charges that American farmers are the only recipients of Government aid.

We hear a lot about the surpluses of food and fiber which we have on hand. Let me point out that these surpluses were not created from our past support program or from any fault of the farmer. Instead, they are derived mainly from the vast expansion of our agriculture in response to Government appeals for ever-increasing production during World War II, during the Korean conflict, and to carry out our foreign commitments. Actually, our surpluses have proved to be a great benefit for us. Today hundreds of thousands of families in our Nation—many of them in my own State of Alabama—are drawing upon these surpluses to fill their daily needs of foods. These are the unfortunates who are faced with temporary unemployment and hardship. Our surpluses are being used in other ways to benefit our people. Children in school receive better balanced diets at a price they can afford because of the surplus foods available to the school-lunch program. The surpluses have become a vital weapon in the cold war. We can send surpluses to those who are starving in nations under the threat of spreading communism. I, for one, am thankful that we have had an abundance on hand. I am thankful that we have been blessed with more than we can use for ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind you that the people of our country were completely misled during the 1952 campaign by statements which Mr. Eisenhower made in a number of speeches regarding his farm policy. Before his election, you will recell Mr. Eisenhower's well-known remarks that agriculture is entitled not merely to 90 percent of parity but full parity. At no time during the presidential campaign did Candidate Eisenhower ever make mention of flexible supports; at no time did he mention sliding scales. The President and his Agriculture Department, under Secretary Benson, have completely ignored their campaign promises to American farmers. They have consistently belittled our past farm program and have circulated false figures, misleading statements, and erroneous information about the 90-percent-support program. Farmers are not getting what was promised to them in 1952. Since Secretary Benson became head of the Agriculture Department, farm conditions have grown

steadily worse. Any Secretary with the true interest of agriculture at heart would have taken steps to boost farm income. Instead, Mr. Benson has undertaken a program of reduced farm income.

One of the strong pleas that supporters of the flexible and sliding scale have put forth is that it will mean reduced production. This is not the case at all. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in our history to show that a reduction in supports might lead to less production by farmers. In fact, past experience shows that when farm prices fall farmers tend to overcome loss in income by planting more and more acres. This they do to maintain their income. Sliding supports could, in fact, result in greater production.

Mr. Chairman, we should be considering farm problems today from the standpoint of economic welfare of farmers and the Nation as a whole. We should be seeking means of increasing farm income and abating farm recession.

A return to 90 percent of parity will give some measure of protection and assistance to our farm economy. It will not solve all our problems, but it will certainly give some measure of security to our farm population. In the interest of the farmers of the Nation and of our whole economy, I hope the House will stand firm and support the Agriculture Committee in the 90-percent-of-parity proposal.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I regret very deeply that the House has just adopted the amendment removing peanuts from the list of basic farm commodities for price-support purposes. I think this action was very unwise. Of course, peanuts are a basic crop. In many areas of Alabama and Georgia peanuts are the principal crop. They are commercially grown in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Later we shall probably have an opportunity to cast a record vote on whether peanuts shall be stricken from the list of the basic farm commodities as prescribed by law. I hope the House of Representatives will at that time reverse today's decision on peanuts. Now is the time when farm legislation needs to be bolstered and strengthened, not destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I am not only for restoring peanuts to the basic 6 crops of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice, I am for restoring the 90-percent parity price supports for all these crops that were taken away last year by action of the Congress, with the approval and at the urging of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and President Eisenhower.

I want to keep the record clear, so far as I am concerned. Since I have been in Congress I have never voted for less than 90-percent parity support prices for our basic crops. I can foresee no set of circumstances that would cause me to vote for support prices of less than 90 percent. I wish it were possible that the farmer could get 100-percent parity prices. I look forward to that day.

There has been so much said and written about our accumulation of surplus food and fiber under our farm program that I think it is time that the American people were told the truth that for the past 21 years it has cost our Government, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, exactly $21 million to operate this program. In the face of the costs of every other Government service, how on earth can we complain about this program that for the past 21 years has averaged costing the American taxpayer $1 million a year to support the prices of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts? In other words, it has cost each citizen about 15 cents, less than 1 cent each year.

Some of those Members of this body who cry loudest for what they call the cause of the consumer are forgetting that the average income of all the persons living on America's farms is $918, which happens to be exactly one-half the $1,836 average annual income of persons not living on farms. One hour's wages will today buy more food, and better food, than at any time in the history of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one of those who sought to set class against class. I do not want to see the farmer set against the consumer. The interests of the two are not in conflict. I regret that there has been those in recent years who have tried to stir up the consumer against the farmer.

Where did we get our surpluses? We got them because during the Korean war we took off acreage controls and quota restrictions on all crops. We appealed to the American farmer to produce food and fiber for ourselves and for the free world. It is to the eternal credit of the farmer that he met every production goal which his Government set for him.

When the Korean war was over our backlog of farm crops was more than we needed temporarily. But I call your attention to the fact that the backlog of industrial production in many, many items was likewise more than we needed. What did we do with our oversupply of industrial items? Very simply, we sold them as surplus property for about 10 to 15 percent of what they cost, and little or nothing was ever said about it.

Mr. Chairman, even now, in the face of all the propaganda to the contrary, I am not worried about our surplus farm commodities. Of course, I wish there was some way that we could sell them for such a price that the Government would realize no loss on them. But, in the meantime, I am not worried. These surplus farm commodities will serve us in mighty good stead in the event we are drawn into another war. The old saying that an army moves upon its stomach is just as true today as when first uttered. The newest weapons, whether atomic, hydrogen, or cobalt do not change that fact.

There are parts of this country today that are beset with depression as real as that of the thirties. The coal-mining areas of the United States are almost without exception in the grip of the unemployment and its attendant misery. I have the privilege to represent in this body an area that has large deposits of coal. I have seen the hunger and the despair in the coalfields. Also, Mr. Chairman, I have seen the benefits that our surplus farm commodities have brought to the unemployed people of the coal-producing counties. I wonder what would have happened had we not had these surplus commodities to sustain life.

I have seen the results of 4 years of drought following one upon the heels of the other in the congressional district which I am privileged to represent. I have seen these surplus agricultural commodities distributed to keep alive hope and the will to try again. They have given the farmer strength which stimulated him to again pit his wits, his effort, his will, his strength against all the uncertainties of nature, and continue the age-old occupation of tilling the soil.

In these situations I am glad that our country has had some food to distribute to its people. I hope the day may never come when we do not have the food our country needs. I hope the day may never come when we do not have sufficient surplus foods for any emergency.

We hear a lot of talk these days about the free-enterprise system. I am for the free-enterprise system. I want to see it continued. The roots of its strength are in the farms of America. Mr. Chairman there is more free enterprise today on our country's 6 million farms than is to be found in any other segment of our entire economy. If we want to keep the free-enterprise system we must keep a strong and healthy farm economy.

We must not allow the recession that now envelops agricultural America to grow into a depression. The last depression this country saw started on the farm. Our next depression will start on America's farms. We must keep a strong farm economy.

We should return immediately to 90 percent parity support prices for our basic farm commodities. The new system of sliding scale supports which the Congress voted last year have not yet gone into effect. I hope they never will go into effect. We hold the power to prevent them from going into effect.

If we return to 90 percent parity support prices we will have taken a long step toward the prevention of depression on our farms, toward the prevention of a nationwide depression.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this matter further. There is much yet to be said. Tomorrow I shall attempt to obtain more time in which to go into the entire question further. Those who vote against this bill to reestablish 90 percent parity support prices for America's cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco are taking a gamble with the future farm income that I do not care to take. It is one that I will not take.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there are several things that we need to consider in connection with the farm bill. Price supports for farm commodities were written into the law by this Congress only about 20 years ago. The price

support program was the result of a bipartisan effort, because all saw the need. It was an effort in this country of ours under dire necessity to give some degree of protection to those engaged in taking care of this country and in growing farm commodities. The Congress realized then and we need to realize now, that by law, we provide bargaining rights and minimum wages for labor. We give to the railroads and to business interests the right to reflect, in the rates that they charge, the costs of operation plus a profit. We protect many other industries. About 20 years ago it was recognized that we had to give some protection to those that were engaged in farming, to see that the high cost of other things that were used in our life, most of them protected by law, did not result in a continuing wasting away of our soil and natural resources and the destruction of our farmers. Price supports are tied to the effort to see that a reasonable share of the national income goes to those engaged in agriculture.

In that same law providing price supports for farm commodities, while we supported these commodities at a certain level and would reflect such price in domestic sales, it was provided that they be sold in the world markets at competitive prices. Our CCC losses and, yes, our reductions in acreage have come largely because we would not sell. I do not know a single case—and this is supported by the testimony of even the Department of Agriculture, including the Secretary—there is not a place in the farm-support program where the major cost has not been storage and carrying charges accumulated during periods when we did not offer the commodities for sale in world trade at truly competitive prices, as authorized and contemplated by law. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to sell all these commodities in world trade and to make the price right. It is because we would not make our sales prices competitive that we have held American commodities in our own hands and paid this high storage. When offered in world trade most commodities have been offered at a higher price than would move them, all by decision of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. That shortsighted policy has resulted in the high cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation operation. The Department now recognizes the effect of this policy. The Secretary of Agriculture only recently said that foreign production was increasing under our convenient price umbrella. But Mr. Benson said he would not change his policies prior to July 31.

Assistant Secretary Paarlberg in a speech March 18, said the following:

> We are competitive pricewise in the world cotton market only intermittently, in a series of unpredictable interludes. There is no better phrase to describe our position than the phrase used by the cotton industry itself—we are the residual supplier.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There is no question but that our pricing policies have given aid and comfort to our competition.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The United States, which now produces only about 40 percent of the world's cotton, cannot, by regulating its own production, satisfactorily determine prices and quantities for the entire world.
>
> 2. The three elements needed for effective selling are quality, merchandising, and a price that meets competition. We cannot, by improving quality and increasing our merchandising efforts, fully compensate for our inability to be competitive pricewise.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I might liken the cotton industry to a stool which needs three legs to stand upright—quality, merchandising, and realistic pricing. It can't stand permanently on just two legs, no matter how strong they're built.
>
> These statements clearly show an awerness on your part of what is happening to us under present policy. And yet this policy is being continued by the Department, notwithstanding the provision contained in the CCC charter for sales in world trade on a truly competitive basis.

And yet Mr. Benson and the Department have authority now to make the prices competitive. Acreage, and the amount or volume of farm production, is tied to the movement of commodities. It is tied to the supply on hand and the supply that we sell.

The Department, by its own decision, in effect has agreed to hold what it has and not sell, for if you do not make the price competitive you do not sell. And then they count those commodities and reduce the farmer's acreage down, down, down. I say to you that the report that was issued by the subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee in the Senate quoted by the minority leader is erroneous. It is true as the minority leader says, the senior Senator from my State was chairman of that subcommittee. However, in my judgment he and the majority of his subcommittee are wrong.

There is no justification for calling on the farmers to vote for lower support prices just to get the department to sell for increased acreage must come from sales.

Support levels and acreage are two different things. Acreage depends upon the movement of cotton, the sale of cotton, and the sale of other farm commodities. Only in the sale and movement of these commodities can you increase acreage; and the Department will not sell because it will not use its authority to offer competitively in world trade. But to say to the American farmer that he has to agree to take a lower support price, before the Secretary will sell, is demanding a contribution from the farmer in order to get a change in policy by the Department. Price supports, in turn, are based upon efforts under the law to assure some fair return to the farmer.

Only a few weeks ago it was pointed out that the farmers of America have an annual income of less than one-half the income the rest of the population has in this country. The records show that in the next year farm income will fall by more than $1 billion. The national income in the same period will increase by more than $20 billion.

And yet under those conditions we are asked to have the farmer agree to accept even less of the national income. Why? In order to get the Department of Agriculture to change its policy. Its present policy is to hold and not sell. They have the authority to sell and they admit the ill effects of holding our commodities above world competitive prices, by which we provide an umbrella for the rest of the world; and believe me, our American investors are taking full advantage of such policy. They are expanding their production in foreign countries. Why? Not because of high supports in the United States, because if you supported at 125 percent of parity, the Secretary of Agriculture could sell competitively in world markets. And if you reduced price supports to 50 percent of parity you would be in the same predicament we face now, as long as the policy of not selling competitively which is now in existence, continues.

Mr. Benson says he is not going to change his policy before July 31. He says that it is ruining us, but he says he will not change it. He is not going to offer these commodities competitively. You say perhaps we could not sell them. Well, we got them last year to offer some minor commodities for sale in world trade on a competitive basis. What happened? We sold them for dollars, 453 million American dollars. Foreign countries do have the dollars. They do not buy in our market, because we hold our prices above foreign prices, but not because of your support law. Your support fixes the amount of payment for these commodities that goes to your farmers, but in no way restricts the price at which we can sell in foreign markets.

In trying to help in this pitiful situation, your President pointed out only a week or so ago that many, many farmers have less than a reasonable income on which to live, pointing out that the Congress needed to do something to relieve those small farmers. But here we find his administration, with his approval, reducing their income. It will help little to have more county agents or to lend the farmer more money if he cannot sell for a reasonable price. The pile-up of commodities in the hands of the CCC was and is unnecessary. I will say that I agree with the President as to the deplorable condition of many farmers; however, I differ with the recommendations of our President and of this administration to help the small farmer. I say that to give him a little more credit, if he has some outside income, will not help him much; to give him another county agent and to do some more research is not going to help him too much. You may differ with me on that, but I know you do not help the farmer when you reduce his prices at a time when his income is so pitifully low as to get recognition of his plight by the President of the United States and secures a recommendation for cure, even though such cure will not cure.

I say to you that the farmer's income now is far too low. I say that you should sustain the former law, to give him at least, for that which he grows, 90 percent—of what? Of the average comparative income in the base period 1909–1914. Is that too much at this time when Mr. Benson told me: "Yes, I am for the increase to 90 cents an hour in the minimum wage"?

I am not attacking that here. I say to you that if by law you are going to give protection to labor in its bargaining rights, if by law you are going to give them assurance of a minimum hourly wage, if by law you are going to have protective tariffs and give the right to monopolies and others to include in their prices the costs that go into their production, plus a profit, certainly you must keep something in the law that says that a fair share of the national income shall go to the American farmer. And when this administration and the President recognize that fair share is not going to them today, you do not cure the farmer's problem by reducing his prices so that even less would go to him in this and subsequent years.

May I repeat, you say to the American farmer: "If you want more acreage and more production, if you want your commodities to move in world trade, we are not going to change the policy of this administration and of this Department of Agriculture unless you agree to take less price for what you grow."

The only argument I can see for Mr. Benson's approach, and I give him the right to his opinion, is that somehow, somewhere, he thinks a farmer could live and let his prices go down to where they were competitive worldwide, but we know he cannot do that when his costs are fixed by other things beyond his control.

Let me repeat, more than $4 billion worth of commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation has, have not and are not now offered for sale in world markets for dollars; yet the authority exists. There is no excuse for paying out this money in storage costs when we could sell the commodities for dollars. Do not tell me they do not want to sell them because they would take losses or because they do not want to lose money; because at the same time they would not sell, they are running around over the world trying to give them away and paying $700,000 per day storage. Certainly you lose more by giving something away than if you sell it for dollars in world trade.

The farmers' share of the national income in 1946 was 12 percent. In 1948 it had dropped to 11.6 percent, in 1951 to 9.4 percent, and in 1954 to 7.2 percent of the national income. The outlook is that it will drop even further this year.

During that period profits and dividends of American business have gone from $8.3 billions to $17.8 billions last year, and a probable increase of $19.6 billions this year is in sight.

Mr. Chairman, with the administration recommending legislation to add to the farmers' costs, there are only two ways for the farmer to be helped under present conditions, first, to increase his volume, second, increase his price—for volume times price less cost is the farmer's income.

The administration is recommending increased costs.

Volume is dependent on selling his production, and on that the Secretary of Agriculture would not offer $4 billions worth of commodities on hand for sale competitively, as authorized by law, but counts the commodities to reduce acreage and thereby reduce volume.

All that is left is price and now we find our friend, the majority leader, opposing our efforts to at least help a little on price.

The farmers' plight is becoming serious on the farm. I think it is serious at the White House and at the Department of Agriculture. It looks like it is becoming serious in the Congress.

Remember, a break in farm income has led the way to every depression. Sooner or later the farm situation will be reflected throughout the country.

All farmers and farm groups are interested in the whole farm program, but the businessmen, organized labor, and all the rest have a real stake in his welfare, too. I hope they will realize it before we have another 1929.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday when I addressed this House I made reference to the fact that in my opinion there was a lot of politics behind this farm proposal. The chairman of the committee, my warm friend [Mr. COOLEY], took me to task about such a statement, leaving the impression that I did not know what I was talking about.

A little investigation on my part brought out a very revealing thing which I think the House should know as proof of the politics behind this bill. I refer particularly to the testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture by one Mr. Walter Reuther.

I think the Members of the House should know about the extraordinary action of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives in order to get before the country the views of Mr. Reuther and his organization on this bill.

I hold in my hand a Government document officially labeled a "committee print," entitled "Price Support Program, Basic Commodities," dated March 15, 1955. This, of course, was sent all over the country. I have here two letters from people who have violently objected to the fact that this has been sent to them under a frank as a committee document.

Under the usual procedure of this House a committee report accompanying a bill that is printed amounts to 2,300 and the committee hearings printed number 1,000. If there is a demand for more hearings and more reports, we authorize an additional 1,000 or 2,000. Congress oftentimes takes action on an exceedingly meritorious case where there is public demand to have 5,000 more of a report or hearings printed.

But here we have something unusual. I hold in my hand this committee print on the price-support program on basic commodities, embodying solely the testimony of the CIO and A. F. of L. How many of them do you think were printed? 57,000. It was done at the action of some member of the committee or of the staff of the House Committee on Agriculture, in either case by the authority of the committee as a committee print for use of the committee.

I made it my business to check with the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture—six members, in fact, and not a single one of them knew any committee action had been taken, and this is required by committee rules or at least comity in a matter of this character. Not a Republican member was consulted about it. Yet someone from the Committee on Agriculture took the time and got the money from somebody else and paid in cash, $571-something, for these unusual prints of CIO and A. F. of L. testimony, without the action or agreement of the Republican members of the committee.

On top of that, to the best of my information—and I have tried hard to get accurate information—I learned that something like 20,000 or more of these were sent downtown and addressed by one of the great labor organizations of this country, and then returned and franked out to people all over this country.

This is a farm bill. This legislation directly affects the farmers. The committee heard many representatives of farm organizations as spokesmen for the people directly affected. If I recall correctly, the hearings amount to something like 400 pages of testimony.

Now mind you, of all this testimony, including that from representatives of farmers themselves on a farm bill, the only part reprinted is that of Walter Reuther, president of the CIO and the comments of George Meany, president of the A. F. of L. However much these two distinguished gentlemen may know about the farm problem, are we to believe that they know much more than the farmers themselves and their representatives? Is that the reason why their testimony, and only their testimony, was printed as a committee document for distribution? Or is it, as I said yesterday, that this bill is nothing more than despicable politics?

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that we have here in this proposal what may be called a political conspiracy simply for political power. And in this conspiracy the farmer is the victim. The sole objective of this bill is to try to gain political power, to try to embarrass the Eisenhower administration, if possible. I resent it, not so much for those reasons, as the fact that it is being done at the expense of the farmers I represent, and many of us represent, who are faced with the problem of surpluses and depressed prices because of these surpluses.

So I call this to your attention only to try to indicate to you that I knew what I was talking about yesterday when I made the statement that politics was involved in bringing up this bill at this particular time. That is not what I would call the proper procedure of a committee of the House of Representatives, and particularly on the part of a committee which is supposed to look after the welfare of agriculture.

I suppose, if I judge the committee action properly, there is nothing more unusual about this than if the Committee on Education and Labor were to

authorize the reprint of thousands of copies of testimony of some member of a farm organization on the question of factory wages or fair labor practices, and at the same time the testimony of those factory workers or their leaders completely ignored. It does not make sense. It is obvious on its face that this is pure politics, and, as I said yesterday, not just bold politics but despicable politics.

I still stand on the statement I made yesterday that political considerations, not economic, bring this bill before us. It is borne out by the extraordinary acts of procedure of some members of the Committee on Agriculture by its direction or authority in ignoring what the farm representatives said and giving special attention to what labor leaders said.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. How do you regard that as partisan politics when this report came out of our committee by a vote of more than 2 to 1? I can say to this House that the older Members on the minority side supported the majority views and supported this report. Now what you are complaining about is that Mr. Walter Reuther came into the committee room and was audacious enough and bold enough to freely and frankly express his views which are not in accord with the gentleman's views.

Mr. ARENDS. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. COOLEY. What are you complaining about?

Mr. ARENDS. I am not complaining about that. Walter Reuther has the right to come in there and be a witness as well as anybody else.

Mr. COOLEY. Why did you not come before the committee? You have never been there to testify for or against this bill.

Mr. ARENDS. The thing I am trying to say to the gentleman is that by some kind of committee action 57,000 copies of his testimony, and only his, have been reprinted as a committee document without the sanction of or even consultation with the Republican members of the committee, so far as I can ascertain. And they were franked out at taxpayers' expense throughout the country. Let me ask my good friend from North Carolina, in all fairness, would it not have been proper, if only as a matter of comity, to ask the Republican members to approve this as a committee decision? That is always done in the Committee on Armed Services, on which I serve.

Mr. COOLEY. The Republicans on that committee could have had reprints made and they could have mailed them out. Mr. Reuther mailed out this very expensive pamphlet and I guess the gentleman objects to that.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me ask you whether that is proper procedure in the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, to get information out to the people of the country.

Mr. ARENDS. Any one member of the committee can go over without committee action and order 57,000 reprints?

Mr. COOLEY. Or 157,000—there is no limit to what you can get. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. ARENDS. I think I have proved my point.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is just trying some politics himself. That is what he is trying to do.

Mr. ARENDS. There is nothing personal about this except that I feel I have proved my point that politics became involved in this.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has proven the point that he objects to the people of the country knowing about the views of the labor leaders of the country.

Mr. ARENDS. No; Mr. Reuther could send his testimony out. That is his business if he wants to do that. I am talking about 57,000 copies being sent out of the Committee on Agriculture by one man on the committee without the sanction of the full committee and the fact that what the committee reprinted was only the views of one particular group—the labor leaders—and no effort was made, certainly not this extraordinary effort—to get to the country the views of the farmers who are the ones most concerned and most directly, and very materially affected—the farmers themselves.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct my remarks in the nature of a reply to some of the remarks which were made by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. To start with, he began his talk on the wrong premise when he kept referring to the high, rigid, support prices. How anyone can say that 90 percent of parity or that 90 percent of a fair price is a high price is beyond me. I maintain that 90 percent of parity is not conducive to overproduction of any agricultural product. I will agree that at times there have been, in my opinion, possibly some errors made in figuring parity. In the bill that we passed last year, we provided for a new modernized parity and I think that parity is a thing that has to be reappraised from time to time. But I say that the farmers of America who are called upon to produce and who have produced are entitled to at least a part of the same kind of consideration that we have extended to other segments of our society. We speak about the farm price support program being a part of the wartime economy. Yet the same program that is now enjoyed, for instance, in the shipping industry and by the maritime people has been in force ever since this Nation was founded and we are still contributing to them. The airplane industry, we know, still enjoys subsidies despite the fact that apparently they are getting along all right, and yet I noticed in the paper just yesterday that we are subsidizing the airlines to the extent of $40 million this year.

I do not want to leave the impression that the farmer is entitled to a subsidy just because we subsidize so many of the other segments of our society. However, we should not and cannot overlook the fact that the farmer is not only contributing his tax dollar to this subsidy of other phases of our economy, but his costs are being kept up because of the special treatment which we have accorded to industry, labor, and business in general.

If we were operating in an economy where there was no minimum wage and hour law, in which our transportation industry was not subsidized and protected from competition; in which our large newspapers and magazines were not subsidized by the Post Office Department to the tune of many millions of dollars each year; and where the large radio and television chains are enjoying valuable exclusive franchises in the form of licenses for which they pay not one red dime—not even the cost of maintaining the FCC which regulates this industry—yes, if we were operating in the free economy and under the free-enterprise system of which we hear the opponents of this legislation speak long and loud, the farmer will take his chances and I have no fears about how he would come out in such a system.

I am not asking for special preferred treatment for the farmers of my area. I am only asking that when they have the good fortune to produce in excess of the current demand, that instead of being forced to accept distress prices which result from a surplus supply that the Government hold this surplus of basic storable commodities until such time as the supply can be brought into balance with demand, reducing his acreage and likewise his production in succeeding years. If he is forced to accept less than 90 percent of parity, the farmer is faced with a loss which in many cases may mean ruin or bankruptcy.

We know that the farmer is not interested in getting something that he is not entitled to. I want to ask any one of you on this floor today if you think it is unreasonable to ask that the farmer be supported on his basic commodities to the tune of 90 percent of a fair price, and in return for that he is willing to adjust his acreage, to adjust his production, to bring it in line with supply and demand.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] spoke at great length about this program interfering with the disposal program. I think anyone who gives any thought at all to this question knows that we could continue to dispose of these surpluses, and the support program will not interfere with it one iota.

The gentleman also spoke about letting this bill which was passed last year be given a trial. Actually, if we do, next January 1 we know that 75 percent is going into effect. If we wait for that we will find that many of our farmers will be completely broke and bankrupt, and without any purchasing power, and the whole country will feel that very keenly.

Speaking of politics, if I were interested in this from a political standpoint I would say let it go into effect, and then wait until we have a recession, a depression, or whatever you wish to call it; wait until the farmers are broke, and then see what happens. I think that we who represent agricultural districts are going to be negligent in our duty if we allow this session to expire without trying to cor-

rect our mistakes of last year, and restore 90 percent supports on the basic storable commodities.

One other thing which I think should be mentioned. My friend went back to 1948, but I want to ask him and every other person on this floor if during the campaign of 1952, when we were electing a President of the United States, either major political party went to the voters and promised anything less than 90 percent of parity during that campaign? The President was elected on the promise that he was going to have nothing less than 90 percent, and he hoped we would have 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 12. I represent, as many Members do on this floor, a district which is almost entirely agricultural in its economy. My farmers are willing to look over the edge of the immediate dollar to the economy of agriculture in the long pull and, therefore, to the good of the economy of this country in the long pull.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government sits today on top of the greatest hoard of food and fiber in the history of the world. The bins and warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation provide a residual but seemingly insatiable market for a wide variety of food and fiber no one else seems to want very badly. The ability of the CCC to buy, and still to keep on buying, is so extensive that it staggers the imagination. When its storage bins become filled, still more space is provided. When it begins to run out of money, either its notes are canceled or its borrowing authority is extended.

The CCC is today America's largest nonfinancial corporation, with over $7 billion invested in commodities owned or in commodity loans. It is as large as General Motors and Ford combined. It has statutory borrowing authorization up to $10 billion. Prospects are that before this fiscal year is over total CCC commitments will pass the $8 billion mark.

Gentlemen, this unbelievable situation has developed under high, rigid price supports. This vast quantity of food and fiber has been channeled into Government ownership under the very system the backers of H. R. 12 would perpetuate for 3 more years.

Government warehouses are becoming so completely filled, and the "public-owned" surplus has become so obvious, that there is increasing danger of political pressure to divert some of that surplus back into distribution channels again. Then the problem of clogged distribution channels would really become acute. The passage of H. R. 12 would clog distribution channels still further.

The problem underlying the general supply situation is essentially one of price, not one of production or one of consumption. This is particularly true in the case of some of our perishable products, like dairy products. A very modest shift in consumption patterns, which could be induced, in part at least, by price stimuli, would go far toward balancing consumption with production. Look what happened to milk consumption on the slight impetus of encouraging everyone to drink at least one glass every day.

As we sit here today the Government either owns or has under loan over 1 billion bushels of wheat, 900 million bushels of corn, 8 million bales of cotton, 260 million pounds of butter, 340 million pounds of cheese, and so on. And yet the United States Government neither eats food nor wears fiber. Government really has little use for the stuff.

The backers of H. R. 12 would add still further to this hoard of food and fiber.

We have gotten ourselves into this incredible mess primarily because many of our people believed, or at least hoped, an act of Congress could brush aside fundamental demand and supply relationships. We set out to legislate price at artificial levels, without effective measures to maintain consumption rates or to curb production increases. We made price an economic throttle, and provided no substitute regulation, other than governmental controls. In most cases these proved to be too late and too lenient.

American agriculture is shackled with some of the most stringent production and marketing controls in its history. The spreading imposition of production and marketing curbs necessitated by the old high rigid price-support legislation, still in effect on 1954 produced crops, has brought many farmers and processors face to face with the hard economic fact that high rigid price supports and rigid controls are the Siamese twins of agricultural policy.

Our wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco farmers are being cut back until it really hurts. And the resulting situation is not palatable, to state it mildly. Nor is it any more tasteful to the Department of Agriculture.

I look forward eagerly, as you also do, to the day when production and consumption will be more nearly in adjustment, and when fair prices can once again perform their historic function in a market relatively free from governmental interference. I am convinced the Agricultural Act of 1954 with its provisions for flexible farm price supports on basic commodities, is a substantial step toward attainment of that goal.

We now have before us H. R. 12, which would extend for 3 more years high rigid price supports on our basic commodities, and also raise the level of dairy price supports from 75 percent to 80 percent of parity. This would in effect prolong the system of governmental interference in agricultural pricing and marketing which is bankrupting agriculture itself. The proponents of this legislation would sacrifice agriculture on the altar of political expediency, even before we have an opportunity to give the more sensible economic provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954 a chance to try themselves.

The object of the sacrifice is not to please the Goddess of the Harvest, but rather to curry favor with the Goddess of Victory in the 1956 elections. Agriculture is becoming a pawn on a chessboard of national politics.

Well-informed farmers will be reluctant to continue sacrificing their freedom to produce and to market what they choose and where they choose, for the illusion of income security wrapped up in current legislation before the Congress. This would only perpetuate for 3 more years the system of strangling controls which have already restricted the operations of many farmers to the point that they find it impossible to make a decent living on their 20 acres of wheat, 2 acres of cotton, or seven-tenths acre of tobacco.

It is likely that a more moderate level of price supports than has prevailed since the war would not have produced so great a Government-owned surplus as we now have. Until early in World War II basic commodities were supported at prices ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity. And parity was much lower then than now. But having tasted the brew of 90 percent supports during and following the war, some politicians find it difficult to practice temperance now, even though the hangover of price-depressing surpluses is producing a splitting headache.

We need to return more decision making in agriculture to the individual manager on his own farm or to the individual food processor, and to reduce the direct participation of Government in price making and marketing.

One of the overriding factors in the current agricultural situation is the mountain of foodstuffs held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is easily within the power of that body to influence farm commodity markets rather violently both in the short run and in the long run. Even so small a thing as an ill-timed remark by one of its officers may send the market up or down several cents. It is impossible to find in the United States a dozen men with sufficient wisdom to make without error the kind of decisions faced by the Board of Directors of CCC. These are decisions that should be made by millions of Americans, expressing preferences through a competitive price system, regulated by Government but not dominated by Government.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of preserving a free and prosperous American agriculture, we must defeat H. R. 12.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] referred to the fact that there were certain farmers in America who were willing to try to get along without the benefits of this kind of legislation. I am sure the gentleman is right. There are farmers in America who have not been dependent upon basic crops, and who have not been dependent upon this kind of price support, but those farmers in California and farmers in other areas who grow these specialty crops and who rely upon marketing agreements whereby they restrict the amount that they sell in the market are just as dependent upon legislation as are the farmers of the Great Plains or the farmers of the Deep

South. Those people would be broke today as they were a generation or so ago were it not for the fact that the Federal Government has moved in and given them the advantage of these marketing agreements.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is also true, is it not, that 30 percent of the customs receipts which this country gets is now primarily set aside to the folks in the perishable food line and these funds are now being used at a time when the Secretary of Agriculture will not sell basic commodities competitively in the world market, he is using this 30 percent of our customs receipts to pay subsidies to move perishable commodities.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Mississippi is so right. Under what is known as section 32 the Secretary of Agriculture is today subsidizing the very crops, subsidizing the movement into the market of the very crops that are grown in southern California, yet the gentleman piously says: "My farmers do not need any of this thing and we are willing to do without it, so we want nothing to do with a program which will benefit somebody else."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might point out, too, that this 30 percent of the customs receipts comes to the Government from letting foreign commodities in here to compete against the rest of our agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. The peanuts come in, the grain comes in, the cotton comes in, and enters into competition with our farmers who are growing basic crops; these products come in and our farmers have to compete with them, and this tariff money is used to take care of these people who say, "Why, we do not want any control, we do not want any support prices; all we want is for the Government to give us a clear legal monopoly by law which we could not have if it were not for the law."

I am not complaining about that; I have supported marketing agreements. I think they have a place in our economy, but I am suggesting that all agriculture is tied in together, and the farmers from California have not become so great that they can overlook the welfare of everybody else.

I would like to suggest to the Members of this House, who a while ago in their solicitude over the candy manufacturers, let themselves be trapped—and there were about 50 or 60 Members of this House who let themselves be trapped—into voting to destroy the peanut growers that the great majority of those who vote for your amendment are already committed to vote against this bill. When they kill this bill where does that leave you and your amendment? Have you not simply played into the enemy's hands? And what of the peanut grower, he is one of the important links; that is what he is. He may be a little link way down in the chain, but break that link and you break the whole chain. You let yourselves be trapped. You have endangered the whole support program. You have not helped your candy manufacturers.

The gentleman from Indiana, able operator that he always is, as he was last year, as he is today, well foresaw that he had better not let this matter of price support on the basic commodities come to a fair, square vote of 90 percent as against 75 percent. He has never let you vote on a straight issue of 90 percent or 75 percent, and he is not going to. I say he is an able operator. He knows, just as you and I know, that this House is not going to get a square, clear vote on the issue. He has seen to that. I do not know of anyone who opposes this bill except 1 or 2, including my colleague from Pennsylvania, who are willing to have a clear, square vote and make an outright determination of whether you want 90 percent or 75 percent; and a great many of you let yourselves right into the trap to enable the opposition to avoid a clearcut vote.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said by my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of H. R. 12, which has as its purpose the reestablishment of price supports on basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity. If the Nation needed further evidence of the fact that the principle of guaranteed prices for farm commodities is supported by able and informed Congressmen of both political parties, it has had ample proof today. This is particularly so in light of the unqualified support given this measure by the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] and the equally distinguished former Republican chairman of that committee who is now the ranking minority member [Mr. HOPE], as well as my Minnesota colleague, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, who is known throughout the Nation for his service to the dairy farmer. These 3 gentlemen have been leaders in the fight for the farmers of our Nation for nearly 30 years and I am proud to have joined with them over many years in fighting for a square deal for the farmers of America. Flexible price supports, with a support floor of 75 percent of parity, obviously is not a square deal.

There is so much at issue here today. The future well-being of American agriculture—even of our whole economy—hangs in the balance. The price ratio in agriculture is now a little beyond 86 percent, compared to the 113 percent of parity prevailing in 1951. It is true that it fell some 19 points prior to the time that our President took office, but that is no comfort to farmers and those who look to them for business. The main point that discourages and dismays me is the fact that the price ratio has further declined an additional 8 percent since Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture, and evidently no promise of a reversal of this trend is in sight today.

When our farm commodities get down around the 86 percent of parity level, where the price is now, the storm signals are up on our economy.

This present condition in farm prices reminds me of what happened in the late twenties. Everything was up except agricultural prices, everything looked rosy, but you all know what happened. We tailspinned into the greatest depression that this great Nation of ours had ever known. We saw the bankruptcy of hundreds of thousands of our farmers and the effects of that particular bankrupt period did not leave us until we entered the period of World War II in 1941. I remember when I sealed my corn in 1938 for 54 cents a bushel that I had to wait until the war clouds came on in 1941 and 1942 before I could get 90 cents a bushel for that corn.

Let me refer you to what the greatest agricultural leader and expert in this House said yesterday. I refer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who in conjunction with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and others whose judgment I respect, represent to me the best source of information as to what is best for agriculture.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] said yesterday:

> The passage of this legislation will not entirely prevent that decline but it will ameliorate it. The question today is not controls—it is not the principle of price supports. The question today is: Will we do something to at least slow up this decline in farm income or will we let it continue to go down, down, down just as it did in the 1920's and end up as then not only in an agricultural depression but in one which affects the entire economy?

WHY ARE FARM PRICES STILL FALLING?

Many reasons have been advanced, Mr. Chairman, for the persistent decline in farm prices. Most of the answers advanced by so-called authorities are so theoretical or their authors are so biased as to make them unworthy of mention. However, I would say to those who sincerely advance the proposition that rigid supports at 90 percent of parity on our storable commodities are the cause of the decline; that this argument, in my opinion, is not substantiated by the facts. The unfortunate truth is that their discussion and their constant urging of the flexible price support program has had a most adverse effect upon the market. To illustrate, if an announcement were made by responsible authorities that the price of shoes was to be increased 10 percent, millions of pairs would be sold before the increase took effect. On the other hand, if it were announced that a price reduction of 10 percent would soon be effected, people would either wait to buy their shoes or insist on immediate reductions before they would buy. This is precisely what has happened and is happening today in our agricultural economy.

I sincerely regret that circumstances compel me to take a position of such complete disagreement with our Secretary of Agriculture on this issue. But the fact remains that despite his bril-

liant performance in other important fields, such as research, extension, and education, the Secretary has failed at almost every justifiable opportunity to use the powers and influence of his Office to stabilize farm prices and reverse the downward trend. The poultry market of last fall is a good example of this statement. When action was needed, that action was not forthcoming. The poultry and egg producers suffered.

In the course of my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture—more recently as ranking minority member—and in other contacts with Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, I have come to know and respect his great qualities of integrity and strength of character. There can be no question of the sincerity of his position in this issue. It must, therefore, be assumed that he is either misguided, misinformed, or simply, in my opinion, is not basically in sympathy with the essentiality of price supports beneath agricultural commodities.

THE EFFECT OF LOWER PRICE THINKING

When the Secretary first began to be taken seriously by the Congress of the United States—when we first realized the futility of our hopes that he could be convinced that he was wrong—the price of hogs in my area of Minnesota was $24 a hundredweight. Today it is about $16. I mention hogs because they are not and have not been subject to mandatory price supports. I mention them because there are not great quantities of pork products stored in warehouses by CCC as is the case of wheat, corn, and cotton. Why then, if the rigid price supports have not applied in this instance and vast quantities of pork are not in storage hanging over the market—two of the fundamental reasons advanced by the Secretary for falling farm prices—why, Mr. Chairman, have hog prices fallen so disastrously? Surely, this is contrary to the Secretary's pronounced opinion.

The only valid answer I can find is that this psychology of pushing prices further down by law and regulation has had a far-reaching effect upon the entire agricultural market. As a result, this price-reduction philosophy has cost the hog producers in the last 14 months the huge sum of $1,750,000,000 alone. Is that beneficial to the farmers of America? Is it beneficial to anyone? The cost of living index has not dropped appreciably so not even the consumers benefited from these tragic losses to our farmers.

As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] pointed out yesterday, the corn and the wheat and the cotton farmers have already taken a reduction—even if H. R. 12 and its 90-percent price level is agreed to—for the simple reason that the modernized parity formula is coming into effect next January 1. At best, the price of corn at support level automatically goes down 22 cents a bushel; the price of wheat will decline 39 cents a bushel, even if we maintain a 90 percent as we are attempting to do in this bill. Drop the price level of corn, and hogs, beef, poultry, and such products follow it downward eventually. This is a proven maxim and any feeder of livestock knows that the price level of his products tends to maintain a direct relationship with feed grain prices.

SEVENTH DISTRICT FACES HUGE LOSS ON CORN ALONE

Many arguments, most of them theoretical, have been advanced in opposition to our efforts to continue reasonable price supports under basic storeables at 90 percent of parity. I shall undertake to present our side of the case in practical, factual terms. In so doing I shall direct my remarks to the situation in my State and the district I represent, leaving to those from other sections of the country the discussion of their peculiar problems.

I am talking about millions of income dollars, Mr. Chairman, not just percentages of parity or the flexible application thereof. I am talking about income dollars to feed and clothe farm people; dollars to at least maintain if not advance the standard of living of farm families; dollars to pay operating expenses and retire mortgages; dollars to sustain essential businesses and make jobs throughout our Nation. I am not talking about surplus or excess income—I am talking about modest incomes that keep families together and educate children, dollars already spread too thinly with little opportunity to spread any further in a Nation expanding its economy as it should.

Agriculture is Minnesota's top industry. Most of our commercial and industrial economy is directly or indirectly dependent upon our No. 1 industry—agriculture. As I shall undertake to illustrate, trends in our agricultural economy are immediately reflected in our business economy. There is not a merchant, banker, or other businessman in our State—and particularly in my seventh district—who does not look to the farms for a large measure of his business transactions. They, too, have a vital stake in this issue of according to the farmer his rightful and earned share of the national income.

Referring to the 1950 census reports, we find that Minnesota farmers in 1949 harvested almost 208 million bushels of corn. At the 1954 support price of about $1.52 per bushel—90 percent of parity—this corn had a value of more than $315 million, regardless of how that corn was disposed of. If the Secretary should be permitted to reduce supports to 75 percent of modernized parity—and he seemingly insists he must have that authority—it would cost Minnesota farmers and Minnesota businessmen $83 million in farm income on corn alone, based on a drop of 40 cents a bushel below last year's support level.

My district, the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota a commercial corn-producing area, would be especially hard hit. We produce more than one-third of the corn harvested in Minnesota, with about 81,831,270 bushels harvested in 1949 according to the census reports. If the support price was reduced 40 cents a bushel—the difference between the support price of $1.52 on the 1954 crop of 90 percent of parity and the support price of about $1.12 at 75 percent of modernized parity—this would represent a loss in corn or feed equivalent value of about $33 million for our district. Let me give you a listing of the annual income loss on corn alone—or products produced from corn—that could be visited upon each of the 19 counties in my district. Based on corn-harvest reports in the 1950 census, the value of that corn at present 90 percent of parity, and its value at 75 percent of modernized parity, each county could suffer the following annual loss of income:

County:	*Loss in corn or equivalent feed value*
Big Stone	$662,592
Chippewa	2,029,465
Douglas	498,422
Grant	664,220
Kandiyohi	1,896,142
Lac qui Parle	2,132,980
Lincoln	1,171,143
Lyon	2,560,974
Murray	2,435,572
Nobles	2,725,264
Pipestone	1,269,331
Pope	679,329
Redwood	2,997,069
Renville	3,172,518
Rock	1,676,304
Stevens	1,118,874
Swift	1,678,257
Traverse	786,479
Yellow Medicine	2,677,480
7th District	32,792,508

Please note that the total of almost $33 million represents prospective income loss for corn or its products alone in the Seventh District. Couple this with the additional losses which could occur in flax, oats, and barley, compound it by acreage reductions, and you can see nothing but economic disaster at the worst and hardship at the best if the advocates of flexible price supports should succeed in driving farm prices down to an unprofitable level.

FARMERS' AVERAGE INCOME SMALL

And what do these figures mean in terms of the total farm economy? Let us take a representative county in the Seventh District. According to the 1950 Census, the 3,000 commercial farms in that county represent an average investment of $30,000 for land, building, and equipment. The average value of all farm products sold from each farm was about $8,300, while the estimated average operating expense were about $4,300. This left an average gross return of around $4,000 per farm. Allowing an average return of 6 percent on capital investment—considered a minimum in industry—of $1,800, this leaves the average farmer and his family a gross return of $2,200 for labor management, risk, and so forth.

To those who think the farmers have been doing too well under price supports, I would like to ask them how they and their families would like to work the long, arduous hours farmers do for a return of $2,200 a year? But think if you will what could happen to this return if price supports on corn were reduced to 75 percent. The average farm in this country would have its corn, hog, poultry, and beef income reduced by $1,000, which would leave only a total return of about $3,000 or a return of $1,200 for labor and management if a 6-percent return is allowed for capital

investment or retirement of mortgage indebtedness.

I have listened with sympathy and understanding, Mr. Chairman, to our colleagues from other sections of the country as they reported the economic difficulties and needs of their constituents. I have likewise been sympathetic to the pleas of others for essential flood control and similar projects calling for the expenditure of millions of appropriated dollars in their districts. Now I am pleading for sorely needed income for my people—income already drastically reduced by falling farm prices and faced with the prospect of still further reductions if we fail in our efforts to reverse the trend.

Farmers alone are not going to suffer. This is spendable income I am talking about. It is money that is used to buy the necessities of life. If we allow further reductions, there will not be a merchant in the Seventh District who will not see business fall off, nor will there be a wholesaler or manufacturer who will not see his orders from those merchants reduced or canceled. Low farm prices are the ingredients from which depressions are spawned. The effects of such prices are the seeds of economic disaster for our beloved country. The 1932 depression should amply prove this to any reasonable person.

WHY PRICE SUPPORTS ARE JUSTIFIED

Agriculture is, in simplest terms, a combination of labor and small business. Each farmer is an independent businessman, and he and his family provide the bulk of the labor necessary to conduct that business. He both buys and sells at the prices quoted by others. The people with whom he does business in both respects are dependent upon profits for their success. The plain and simple truth is that in a free economy, men in business for profit will buy what they need at the lowest possible price and sell it at the highest. If left entirely to their own devices, they will pay the farmer as little as possible for his products and charge him as much for theirs as the market will bear. In keeping with the free-enterprise system, we are not asking for undue restraints on the prices the farmer must pay; but we are asking, and justifiably so, that he be given at least a minimum measure for protection on the prices he receives for that which he and his family produce.

There are those who say that price supports at 75 percent of parity are good, but that at 90 percent they are evil. My position is that if justice is to prevail in this, the land of the just, price supports at 90 percent of parity are so much more equitable as to leave no room for argument. Since the issue is not one of price supports but rather one of degree or level, then justice demands supports at a more reasonable or equitable rate.

There is much more at issue than a simple matter of price-support formulas, percentages of parity, rigidity or flexibility. It is a matter of economic life and death for hundreds of thousands of farmers. It is a matter of economic health or stagnation for thousands of small-business men who look to farmers for their incomes. It is a matter of preventing the collapse of one segment of our Nation, with ensuing damages to all others.

At the present time rural America has approximately 80 percent of the buying power it had in the 5-year period 1946–50. This dislocation cannot go on indefinitely. Farm production and income represent the primary source of new wealth, national income, and capital profits. Industrial production and commercial transactions cannot expand beyond the foundation of our new wealth production, except through a continuation of deficit spending on the part of our Federal Government and in our capital investments. This would imperil the future financial stability of our Nation.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY ESSENTIAL

We talk of a balanced budget. We hope that this goal may be attained in the forseeable future. But it is my considered opinion that Congress cannot balance the Federal budget nor can our economy know real stability unless and until farm products and other raw materials are at parity. No doubt this economic principle prompted the President to take the stand he did at Kasson, Minn., and at Brookings, S. Dak., in support of the continuance of price supports at 90 percent of parity. He, however, later followed the advice of Secretary Benson and other flexible support advocates rather than follow the advice of more experienced leaders like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and most of the farm Congressmen from the Midwest.

Farming today is a complex operation. The conduct and management of a farm today is as different from a generation ago as the automobile is from the horse and buggy. Thousands upon thousands of farmers have geared their financing to a prosperous agriculture, and if we allow their income to be seriously reduced their entire financial structure will be faced with collapse. Countless young veterans returned hopefully from war to make their lives and living on the soil. Like their urban brothers, they turned to long-term financing and small initial investments to buy their homes, their land, and their equipment. But unlike the more fortunate veterans in other endeavors who see nothing but rising wages and standards of living in the offing, these farmer veterans are today faced with possible loss not only of their land and their investments of toil and treasure but also of the way of life they fought to attain. We must redeem our pledges of a better tomorrow to these young men and women.

BALANCE OF FARM PROGRAM IS GOOD

Aside from this urgent problem of falling farm prices and the need for firm price supports, we today have the finest farm program in the history of American agriculture. There are several reasons for my personal pride in this accomplishment. Under the present administration of the United States Department of Agriculture we are reaching the fulfillment of many years of hopeful planning. As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee, and as its chairman for the past 2 years, I have helped the Department to dramatically expand its research and educational programs. Taking first things first, we have increased appropriations for research and have expanded important areas of research. The Department, working in close cooperation with the land-grant colleges, is moving forward on a variety of research projects and programs which will mean so much to both producers and consumers.

But research alone is not enough: the results of this work must be applied where needed in the treatment of the soil, the production of plants and animals, and the marketing of such products at best advantage. By expanding the Extension Service through increased appropriations, new knowledge and new techniques will be brought to the men and women on the land itself. County agents, burdened in the past with so much to be done and so little to do it with, will have new means to advance and extend good farming practices. The great programs for our young farm people like the 4–H Clubs, FFA, and others will be given new impetus, and more farm boys and girls will enjoy greater opportunities to enjoy real farm life.

Rural electrification, together with the recent rural telephone program, are adequately financed by appropriated funds and loan authorizations to bring these benefits to more of rural America. We know that the day is not far off when virtually every farm in the United States will have available to it low cost, dependable electric power, and trustworthy telephone service. REA has always had my unqualified support, and I think my personal pride in the success of this program is justified. Next week I will once again lead 20 of our REA cooperatives in an effort to extend the transmission line from the Missouri River into the Seventh District and Minnesota.

Our Soil Conservation Service has been encouraged by my committee and by the Congress to press forward with its programs of conservation. We have been successful in our efforts to thwart moves to unjustifiably reduce the staff and funds of this agency which has done so much to conserve our land and water resources. As an important adjunct to this activity, we have seen the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program grow in a few years' time from a modest effort into one of the major conservation activities of the Department. Two of these projects are under way or will be shortly in the Seventh District. There is probably no better example of Federal-State-local cooperation than is evidenced by these watershed projects.

Adequate funds have been made available for the Farmers Home Administration to continue its program of credit assistance for farmers. Efforts have been made, and will no doubt be made again, to reduce the staff and curtail the loan operations of this important agency, but I am optimistic in the belief that we will be able to sustain it so long as it continues to serve the useful purpose in the future that it has in the past. It has meant much not only to our people long engaged in farming; it has meant the difference between success

and failure for our returning veterans and many others.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our farm programs are the best that we have ever had. If we can today by our affirmative action pass a bill which will halt and possibly reverse this tragic downward trend in farm prices, then I believe that those of us who have fought the farmers' battles in Congress for years past can face our constituents with the certain knowledge that we have not only done our best but that we have gained victories which cannot be successfully challenged. I am proud of the part I have played in the development and operation of these fine programs.

OUR SURPLUSES A BLESSING

Although I hope I have made my position clear in that I believe price supports at a reasonable level provide the economic cornerstone upon which our agricultural stability may be anchored, the impression cannot be left that price supports alone will solve all of our problems. Quite the contrary. It is of equal importance that other essential programs be advanced to implement the price-support program and make the best possible use of its benefits.

Much has been said about the so-called surplus production accumulating in storage facilities throughout the land. Critics of our farm program have pointed to this stockpile of food and fiber as a horrible example of the evil of price supports, and have tried to use it as a lever or wedge to force upon us a greater evil—flexible and reduced price supports. To me, this abundance is but another example of the great blessings of providence upon America.

If you had had the opportunity, as my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture had year before last, to see the starving millions of people throughout the world—in Pakistan, in India, in the Arab world and particularly around the Israeli border—you would thank God for His kindness and mercy. You would think, as I think, in terms of the best use to make of this blessing rather than means of destroying it. You would see our stacks of grain as food for hungry stomachs; you would see bales of cotton as clothes for unclad people.

Three years ago my subcommittee cited the grave need for strengthening our foreign agricultural service and brought to the attention of the House the urgent necessity for a sound, practical program for the disposition of some of our surpluses abroad. The Congress confirmed our judgment and approved the transfer of our agricultural attachés from the State Department to the Department of Agriculture to provide the latter a more direct means of expanding and coordinating our export sales program. This expanded sales effort will benefit both the countries to whom we sell our food and fiber and our own domestic economy. We know from recent events in Russia that food shortages represent a far greater problem than any surpluses of too much food about which some of our people complain.

We also recognized the need for better diet among our own people. My subcommittee has consistently recommended that the necessary surplus foods be taken from our storehouses and channeled into our great school lunch program to the thousands upon thousands of children who would not otherwise have at least one balanced meal per day. Along these same lines, we propose that these stocks be drawn upon to implement and improve the diet of our aged and otherwise helpless people. We believe that no deserving person in this land should be without adequate food, and that such people should be enabled to obtain it without loss of dignity or self-respect.

SURPLUSES TEMPORARY

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, we propose first that the best possible use be made of our bountiful production to raise the standards of living both at home and abroad. We know that within a fews years—perhaps 10 years or less—our present production will be no more than enough for our own domestic needs. If drought or other natural disasters should intervene to a significant degree, that time could be foreshortened.

In recognition of the temporary problem of production in excess of immediate consumption, I have proposed that at least 30 million acres of the Nation's cropland be taken out of production on a temporary basis to create what I call a soil fertility bank. The principles of this plan are gaining increasing support from responsible farm and conservation organizations.

Two years ago I introduced a bill providing that such land taken out of production be leased on a voluntary basis at a rental approximating $10 per acre, depending upon its normal productivity. Our soil resources are irreplaceable. It is, therefore, absolutely essential to our survival as a prosperous people in the years ahead that these resources be preserved for future generations. My soil bank of fertility program would accomplish both the temporary necessary reduction of production and the conservation of our soil and water resources for future needs.

These are but a few of the programs we are advancing for the benefit not only of our farmers and our Nation as a whole, but also for the good of mankind throughout the world. Give us this economic cornerstone of fair price supports to place us on a par with other segments of our industry and we will make the most of our blessings.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I commend the gentleman wholeheartedly for the fight he is making for the American farmer. I know of no man on this floor who has fought harder for the American farmer than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to him, regardless of political considerations, he has always been steadfast for the American farmer. I do commend him wholeheartedly.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has been one of the finest, most intelligent, and effective friends the farmer has had on this floor. Every time we have farm legislation before us, he is here speaking for the farmer, regardless of politics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for their kind references to my work here in Congress. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I listened to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] with great interest, when he said:

> We have a tough job ahead of us and we are trying to solve it.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, we do have a tough job here, but in my opinion the solution for the problem does not lie in beating down the price the farmers receive for their agricultural commodities. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

TAIL-WAGGING-THE-DOG THEORY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve with that great statesman from Illinois, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, as a member, and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

As I have listened to the debate on H. R. 12, some of the facts considered by this Committee have come to mind. Also, I have been thinking of an exchange with Mr. Benson and Mr. Morse in their appearance before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee on February 7, 1955.

When Mr. Benson was asked about a speech before editors at St. Petersburg, Fla., concerning this question raised by the editors—Does not the national income depend largely on our farm income?—he replied:

> No, that is the tail-wagging-the-dog-theory.

Mr. WHITTEN asked Mr. Morse if he subscribed to this theory. Mr. Morse replied:

> I believe it is sound according to the economists and we look to economists for answers to economic questions.

Now, I do not profess to have the answer to what is wrong with the sore spots in the United States economy, but prudence directs that we not look upon agriculture as the tail of the dog as Mr. Benson and Mr. Morse do. Very frankly, I am convinced that agriculture is the main part of the dog.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMICS REPORTS FACTS

To support this position, I want to cite some of the facts which are stated in the supplemental views of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

When the President's economic report was transmitted to the Congress the agricultural parity ratio was at its lowest point since 1941. Along with this adverse effect on farmers, let us look at the unemployment situation. In January 1955, it amounted to 3.3 million, and in February 1955, to 3.4 million. With farmers' purchasing power down—how can that help the unemployment situation?

Can either further drastically cut farm income help reduce the number of unemployed? We know it cannot.

Income of farmers has declined from $14.2 billion in 1952 to $12.2 billion in 1953, and to a seasonally adjusted figure of about $11.1 billion in the fourth quarter of 1954. According to figures adjusted recently by the Department of Agriculture, farmers' income was down to a new low for the year 1954—$12 billion. Moreover, there has been a continuing decline in the ratio of the per capita income of the farm population from the farm sources to the per capita income of the nonfarm population from nonfarm sources. Wholesale prices of farm products averaged 107.0 in 1952, the average in 1953 was 97.0, the average in February 1955 was 93.1; and April 5, 1955, it was 92.7. All during that time the prices we were compelled to pay were going up.

With 40 major and 100 minor areas with 6 percent or more of the covered workers unemployed, the problem of distress areas weigh heavily on the economy. Coal, textile, and some sections of the durable-goods industries are affected most. Increased farmer income would help all such industries. Farmers are heavy consumers of agricultural durable goods and textiles. They support the coal industry indirectly through purchases of goods in which coal is involved in the manufacturing process.

I am disturbed, even if Mr. Benson and Mr. Morse are not, by the drag which reduced farm income places on the economy as a whole. In my opinion, the failure of the President's economic report to analyze the implications of continued conditions which result in a failure of a large and important segment of our population to share in the rise in our standards of living is a very serious omission.

SMALL BUSINESS ALSO SQUEEZED

The squeeze on agriculture has resulted in a squeeze on small business. That is another of the problems which the President's economic report failed to take account of, or to recommend positive corrective action.

In view of this dark and dismal effect of a depressed United States agriculture on the total United States economy, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in supplemental views, made recommendations to appropriate legislative committees. Since these recommendations related to the action of the House Agricultural Committee, I would like to cite a part of the committee recommendations:

The basic purpose of agricultural supports is the protection of farm income. It seems desirable to move in the direction of permitting farm prices to reflect the supply-demand situation in the market while at the same time moving to institute a system of farm-income protection which will protect the family-size farm and the small farms of our country by a system of income payments made whenever declining farm prices threaten an inequitable reduction in the standards of living of these farm families. The large, wealthy farms, or corporate farms do not have the same pressing claim upon the Government's protection. Consideration might be given, therefore, to putting some ceiling on Government benefits per farm. This ceiling should be high enough to protect standards of living earned by farm families by their own efforts but not high enough to guarantee the total incomes of large farms able to stand market fluctuations.

These recommendations were made in recognition of the need for increasing farmers' share of the national income and at the same time protecting our historic family farm pattern of agriculture. H. R. 12 does not solve all the problems concerned in the recommendations. But it does, in my opinion, recognize the squeeze family farmers are in today, and it sets in motion a program, tried, tested, and proven for a long number of years prior to Mr. Benson's sliding scale.

I commend the House Agricultural Committee for the promptness with which they took action to repeal the sliding scale. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support H. R. 12.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the only major segment of our economy not sharing in the general prosperity of the Nation is our agricultural industry. After 12 years on trial, we find that the 90-percent rigid price-support program is failing—and failing at a staggering cost. Now we are being asked by proponents of H. R. 12 to extend this program. It just does not make sense.

The present program is unfair. It is expensive. It benefits most those who need it least. It promotes waste. It encourages bad farming practices. It is imposing self-regimentation on our farmers. It threatens to ruin their markets abroad. It works a hardship on all taxpayers.

The unfairness of this program is apparent. Only 22 percent of the farm income comes from the basic crops supported by the Government. Our farmers who represent the remaining 78 percent do not receive this assistance. In fact, to the extent that they must purchase artificially supported crops, they are penalized.

Its expense is staggering. When the bookkeeping is unjuggled, we find that this program has cost the taxpayers more than $13 billion.

Perhaps the most damaging argument against this rigid price-support program is the waste to promoters. Any program that takes money from the housewife's food budget to purchase commodities at a price she cannot afford to pay and then stores them at her expense until they deteriorate is—to understate the matter—open to serious question.

Our newly emerging dust bowls are ample evidence of the effect of this high-support program on our greatest national resource—our farm soil. Marginal lands have been plowed over and planted in wheat because the planter has been assured—should they produce—that he would have a market for his wheat no matter how substandard it might be. We are now reaping a harvest of dust and dismay.

In face of our mountainous surpluses, the farmer has no choice but to vote to curtail acreage. This penalizes the efficient farmer who must lose acreage because of marginal lands brought into production solely to sell wheat to the Government.

The artificial price structure is ruining our foreign agricultural market. Foreign production and wheat acreage continues to increase while we are forced to cut acreage at home. The loss of these markets may be permanent.

It is not fair to the taxpayer, including the farmer, to continue a program which is costing $700,000 per day in storage charges alone.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, as one who is sincerely endeavoring to seek a solution to some of our farm difficulties, I took a poll of the 17th Ohio District trying to learn just what our farmers and our people are recommending. The following were the questions and the replies received:

Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?

One hundred percent price support and rigid crop control: Yes, 8 percent; no, 92 percent.

Flexible price support and medium crop control: Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

No price support and no crop control: Yes, 30 percent; no, 70 percent.

This clearly demonstrates to me, Mr. Chairman, that my constituents are thoroughly familiar with the fact that the 90-percent parity program has been the cause of tremendous farm surpluses which is now costing us approximately $1 million per day for storage and maintenance services. My farmers are also of the definite opinion they want a minimum of Federal controls and are looking forward to the time when they can live as free citizens without Government interference. I am sure they realize, Mr. Chairman, that the so-called Eisenhower farm program, which was passed in 1954, only begins gradually to take effect with the harvest of 1955. Controls and surpluses to which our people are objecting are not caused by the farm bill of 1954, which was a flexible parity program, but was, and is, the definite result of the previous administration's farm program that called for 90-percent parity.

Mr. Chairman, the following wire which I received this morning from the

Farm Bureau Federation—I think covers the subject very thoroughly:

We recommend defeat of H. R. 12. Rigid price supports have contributed to present difficult marketing situation for many farm products by stimulating production in excess of consumer demand, by loss of foreign and domestic markets, and the creation of costly income depressing surpluses. Production controls are reducing farm income. The 1954 law which only begins to gradually take effect with the harvest of 1955 crops should be allowed a chance to help adjust production and increase consumption.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the RECORD today will show who was responsible for the existing surpluses. If this bill is passed, which cancels the flexible program before it is given an opportunity to be tried, the New Dealers of this Congress must assume the responsibility.

If the New Dealers are going to continue to force rigid controls upon the farmers under the guise that they the farmers desire it, then they should be reasonable and allow all farmers to vote on the referendum. It is unfair that all farmers should be forced to abide by the decision of a referendum vote when all farmers are not given the right and opportunity to voice their views by ballot.

If this legislation is passed, I fear we are headed for another program which was recommended and put into effect by Henry Wallace when we killed the little pigs and plowed under the wheat. Why not establish a program that will ultimately allow us to get rid of controls, Mr. Chairman, so that the farmers of today will be able to make an honest living and not be dictated to by some bureaucrat who in many instances knows nothing about farm problems.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), Mr. BASS of Tennessee was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, immediately upon being elected to the Congress, my greatest desire was to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representative. I achieved that ambition and have been most happy in service on that committee. The first bill I introduced was identical to H. R. 12, the 90 percent parity bill we are discussing today.

In making a speech before a farm group in eastern Maryland about a month ago, I made this statement, "the great Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives was the most nonpartisan body in the House." I told those good people that I felt the agricultural legislation, the farm legislation of America, was handled in the House of Representatives with less partisanship than any other legislation.

On the floor of the House today I must retract that statement I made to those good people. Regarding the proceedings on the floor I find today this piece of legislation, that is so important not only to the agricultural part of the economy but to the entire economy of our Nation, has taken a strict party line. I see the big guns of the Republican Party come down the aisle and speak in an effort to defeat this legislation which will promote the well-being of our great Nation. Yes, I know it is a move on the part of the Republican Party to decrease the farm income of America. The leaders of the Republican Party are doing that, not the good element of that party who are interested in the welfare of the farmer.

I do not know what the vote on this bill will be in the House today. I believe that the great issue concerning the farm people of America is destined to be settled by the people of America, by the electorate in 1956. Yes, the people of America were fooled in 1952 when the leaders of the Republican Party put in their platform that they were for 100 percent of parity for the farmers. Then they were fooled again when the leader of that party went out before the people of America and said "I guarantee you that you will retain your 90 percent of parity."

The farm people are not going to be misled in 1956 when the two great political parties come to battle again over who occupies the White House and who will have the leadership of the legislative branch of this Government. I believe the eyes of America are centered upon this very body today, to see exactly what the two parties of America intend to do for the great farm people.

Yes, I can say to you today, Mr. Chairman, without any fear of contradiction, that the farm people of America are the very group upon whose shoulders rests the main burden of our entire economy. The very minute that we let the farm economy slip, we find that farm income is at the bottom of the list of income in America. We have seen it slip $1.2 billion in the last year. If this bill fails to pass today, guaranteeing farmers a price support of 90 percent of parity, we shall face a decline in farm income of at least $5 billion in the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, our economy cannot stand that.

I would like to approach you for just a moment on exactly what parity is. Let us ask ourselves this question: What is parity? Parity is simply a fair price, based on cost of production and cost of living.

I apologize to the farm people of America because I do not have the opportunity of standing on this floor today and speaking in behalf of and voting for full parity, for 100 percent of fairness. I apologize to them because I am only going to be given the opportunity of giving them nine-tenths of what is right and what is just and what is fair.

I cannot understand for the life of me how any man can face the electorate in America today and say, "I went in the well of the House of Representatives and recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture not give my people more than three-fourths of what is right." Yes, and thank God that I am going to have the privilege today of casting a vote for giving the people nine-tenths, at least, of what is fair. I only wish I had the privilege of giving them 100 percent of what is fair.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the cost of this program discussed here today. If we have a sick child in our home we do not call the doctor and say, "Doctor, how much are you going to charge to come and treat my child?" We say, "Doctor, please come, and send your bill later."

Mr. Chairman, when we are faced with a declining income of $1,200,000,000 in 1 year and a certain decline of $5 billion in the next 2 years we might well say that our farm economy is ill, and when we call to the "doctor," the price-support program to come and take care of this "illness" of ours, a declining economy to guarantee not only that segment of our economy, the farm people, but also the people in industry throughout America who realize that if the farmer is broke they are also hurting, then, Mr. Chairman, the cost becomes very nominal.

I do not think the cost should enter into any part of it as long as we are maintaining a strong economy for our Nation, because when defense programs come on the floor of the House of Representatives we do not get up here and worry about exactly what the cost of it is. No, because we know that this Nation of ours must be defended, must be protected against any outside or inside attack.

The very breeding ground of comcomunism, the breeding ground of the things that will destroy democracy in America, is poverty. The first element of poverty starts with the farm people of America, as we have seen in cycle after cycle, time after time.

I plead with you, Mr. Chairman, that this bill today be passed, this bill which will give our farmers at least nine-tenths of what is fair and just.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Tennessee on a very excellent statement. As a representative of the richest agricultural district in the Nation, from the central part of the State of California, I should like to say that my people are interested in this bill. They are not ready and willing to take the chance of seeing prices slide to the point where they will go bankrupt. They are certainly interested in maintaining 90 percent of parity. As one Californian in this House I am anxious today to see this proposed legislation become law.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a folder or bulletin or would-be newspaper or whatever you call it from Washington, D. C., by the name of—on the headline anyway, "Wayne Darrow's Washington Farmletter." It comes to my desk and I am sure it has to yours. It is one of the farm letters that comes regularly, and from my conversations with many Members of the House, I have not been able to find out for sure whether it is New Deal or Democratic or Republican. I do not think anyone

ever called him a Republican. I would just like to read what he said on April 30. I am afraid some Members missed it. This will answer some of the arguments which have been made better than I can. Here is what he says:

Secretary Benson, like Ike before him, has cracked the solid South.

You heard some of the crackling just a while ago on the Democratic side of the aisle.

He continues:

A southern-dominated Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on cotton surplus disposal recommended Thursday lower cotton price supports, increased acreage, and stepped-up exports—even if subsidized.

It's the first time southern leaders have turned against 90 percent of parity supports in Congress. Only Senator YOUNG, Republican, North Dakota, refused to sign the report. It was approved by Senators EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi; HOLLAND, Democrat, Florida; SCOTT, Democrat, North Carolina, and SCHOEPPEL, Republican, Kansas.

Like Benson, report says we've priced ourselves out of markets. Says United States supports have held a price umbrella over rest of the cotton world, and stimulated synthetic fiber production. Says also that United States technical assistance program has created new competition.

Mr. Chairman, the strongest argument that has been made for the 90 percent rigid parity formula is that it has protected the farmers' income and is necessary to insure that the net income of farm operators will not go any lower. Ninety percent of parity is, according to the supporters of H. R. 12, the one factor that has kept the farm income at high levels.

It is interesting to look at the figures for realized net income of farm operators for the years 1943 through 1954 as presented to our committee on February 23 of this year by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

Year	Realized net income of farm operators	Comment
	Million dollars	
1943	11,540	War.
1944	11,970	Do.
1945	12,286	Do.
1946	14,193	End of price controls.
1947	16,774	Alltime high.
1948	15,604	Down.
1949	13,593	Do.
1950	12,362	Down 26 percent from 1947.
1951	14,540	Up 17.6 percent (Korea).
1952	13,626	Down.
1953	13,275	Do.
1954	12,500	Down 14 percent from 1951; down 25 percent from 1947.

It can be clearly seen from the figures in the table that the 90 percent of parity program worked only so long as market demand bolstered by war and inflation kept farm prices above the support level. As soon as a period of readjustment occurs the farm income drops precipitously even with the 90-percent formula in effect. It is not the parity that controls the farmers income. In fact, 90 percent of parity in periods when demand drops, instead of helping farmers make needed adjustments, magnifies the problem by encouraging them to pile up surpluses which now hold the price of cotton, corn, and wheat down.

Ninety percent of parity not only will not guarantee the farmer a higher income, but will bring with it rigid acreage controls which are burdensome and unwelcome to most farmers. If the 90-percent formula is rigidly adhered to it will mean that nearly one-third of the acres now in wheat, cotton, corn, and rice will be diverted to other crops because under the law strict acreage controls must be instituted before the 90-percent formula takes effect.

From the information given to the committee by the Farm Bureau, the following table shows the number of acres that would be diverted in these four crops under the provisions of H. R. 12:

Crop	1953 seeded acres	1955 allotment	Reduction from 1953 acreage to 1955 allotment (diverted acres)
Wheat	78,789,000	55,000,000	23,789,000
Cotton:			
Upland	25,151,400	18,113,208	7,038,192
American-Egyptian	92,600	46,154	46,446
Corn, commercial area only	57,007,000	49,842,697	7,164,303
Rice	2,181,000	1,859,099	321,901
Total, 4 crops	163,221,000	124,861,158	38,359,842

The acreage allotments and marketing quotas that would be applied to price supported basic crops to curb the growth of price-depressing surpluses will not solve our current problems. To the extent these controls actually reduce production, they will reduce the individual farmers opportunity to get income through volume production.

The policy of allowing producers of controlled crops to use their diverted acres for the production of other commodities means that part of our surplus problem is being transferred from one group of commodities to another. It accentuates the problem instead of solving it.

Let me say this. I did not support the peanut amendment. I supported the peanut growers who I know from the hearings before our committee have one heck of a time trying to live. The reason I did not support it is because peanuts are suffering from 90 percent of parity. There is no way for a peanut grower to drop his peanut acreage low enough to comply with law and make a living.

Listen to these figures. Ninety percent of parity will take out of cultivation if followed to its ultimate end 1 out of 4 or 1 out of 5 of every acre of land now under basic crop production in the United States. This cannot be disputed. As I said to you yesterday, when you include 31 percent of farm operators whose principle income is made, not on the farm but at other occupations, you confuse the real facts of per capita farm income.

The inclusion of this group in farm income statistics lowers the average and confuses the uninformed with regard to what our farm problems really are. Many of the remarks you have been listening to today paint a distorted and an unnatural picture of the actual farm income.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that H. R. 12 covers such a multitude of problems. Had it come before us as a straight price-support measure, it could have been debated on its merits.

As it is, it includes numerous provisions, some desirable and some not, but with the claim that it will be virtually all things to all men. According to the committee report, this bill is designed to reverse the present recession in agriculture; prevent a major breakdown of the farm program, whatever that means; protect urban workers against unemployment, assure continued abundance of food and fiber; provide for the national defense; and conserve the soil. That is quite a large order.

In fact, according to its sponsors, the bill will do just about everything but rid the world of communism, and one section of the report suggests it will help us do even that.

I cannot tell you how relieved I was when I came to that section of the report. Virtually everything we do here in this House these days is for the purpose of protecting us against communism. I thought for one wild, carefree moment as I studied the report that the Agriculture Committee was going to ask us to approve this bill simply because it would be good for American agriculture. It was such a refreshing idea that I was almost ready to buy it; and then I came to page 18 of the report, and found that, after all, one reason we are supposed to approve this bill is that if we do not the Communists will get us. We must take care of the disturbing and urgent conditions afflicting American agriculture, because look what is happening to the Russians.

Mr. Chairman, if the bill would achieve the laudable objectives which the committee has outlined, I would be for it. I do not think it will do so. So far from it, I think it will increase our farm problems, rather than solve them. I believe it will lead to greater surpluses, greater foreign competition, greater Government control of agriculture, greater instability of our farm economy, and therefore greater threats to our entire economy. If I may borrow a phrase from our former Speaker, it is predicated on the fallacious theory that if a little aspirin is good, a lot of aspirin will be wonderful.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the evidence is overwhelming that a lot of aspirin in the form of high price supports for our ailing agricultural economy will only delay its recovery and may permanently cripple it.

There is one thing that may be said about our agricultural economy: It is now so complex, so laced with governmental regulations and controls, and so interrelated with other aspects of our economy that it is virtually impossible to say with certainty what is cause and what is effect. This is especially true of

the price-supported basic commodities. We do know, however, that during the years when the basics and certain other commodities have been supported at 90 percent of parity we have:

First. Accumulated the greatest surpluses in history.

Second. Priced some commodities out of the market, and thus encouraged substitutes.

Third. Encouraged competitive production of food and fiber abroad, so that we face diminishing export markets.

Fourth. Made necessary the imposition of straitjacket controls on acreage, to the great detriment of the small farmer.

Fifth. Caused the diversion of millions of acres to other crops, and thus depressed their markets.

Sixth. Encouraged, in some instances, the production of commodities of inferior quality, which cannot be sold, at the expense of desirable commodities for which markets exist.

Seventh. Brought in to cultivation marginal land which should never have been put to the plow, except, perhaps, in a national emergency.

If, despite all of these adverse results, high, rigid price supports did, in fact, assure abundance, security, conservation of the soil and all the other things their sponsors claim, they would be worth the price—even though the price is high. But the record bears out no such claim. It shows that in every year except one, since 1940, the average prices received by producers of nonbasic commodities have been higher than the average prices received by producers of basic commodities. In other words, the farmers operating in a relatively free market have done as well or better than those who have leaned on the crutch of price supports.

In the light of this record, Mr. Chairman, prudence and intelligence suggest that high price supports are not the medicine needed for our ailing agricultural economy. We have tried that medicine. It has only made the patient worse. Last year the Congress prescribed a different treatment—in the form of flexible supports. Mr. Chairman, the new treatment has not even been tried thus far. Flexible supports will not go into effect until this year's crops are harvested. When they do go into effect, it will be months, possibly even several seasons, before we can accurately determine their effect.

We should at least try them out. I am personally convinced that what American agriculture needs is not economic benzedrine, but fresh air, sunshine, and a freer market.

For these reasons, I shall vote against this bill; with the hope, however, that some of its desirable features may come back to us, to be debated and voted upon in their own right and on their own merits, and not as sugar-coating on a very dubious pill.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly about a subject that is not directly related to this bill. It is not directly related for the reason that the so-called two-price system for wheat will be withdrawn by the amendment that is recommended by the committee. However, this does not solve the wheat problem. But I want to take a few minutes today to analyze with you, if I may, just exactly what the wheat problem is and what its implication is for the rest of our agricultural economy.

As most of you know, our production during most of those flush years was about 1,100,000,000 bushels. Today the market demand for wheat is about 850 million bushels and the expected production this year is almost in line with the demand, an anticipated 865 million bushels. We have, however, a billion bushels in surplus. Ordinarily, we think that 4 or 5 hundred million bushels is a safe reserve, and that that is in excess of the figure I have quoted as surplus. There is not one wheat-producing section. There are four such sections. They produce different types of wheat for different uses. The most important and the largest segment is that in which we find Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado. They produce hard winter wheat that is used principally for bread. In the area in which I live, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan, we produce a soft red winter wheat that is used almost entirely for pastry purposes. Then along the Canadian border, North Dakota, Montana, and that section, we produce spring wheat. Then in the Pacific Northwest, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, a soft spring white wheat.

Those are the four different segments in the whole wheat-producing pattern. Today I have information from the Department of Agriculture as to the approximate carryover, the breakdown of this 1 billion bushels, and the type of wheat that is represented in this 1 billion-bushel carryover.

From the hard winter wheat section, that is, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado, there are 650 million bushels. From the hard spring wheat area, 180 million bushels. From the Northwest, the soft white spring wheat area, 110 million bushels; and from my area, 60 million bushels, making a grand total of approximately 1 billion bushels.

Obviously, the area that is in difficulty is Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado. You might say, "Well, if your wheat is not in difficulty, why are you so concerned about the Kansas area?" I am concerned for two reasons.

First of all, I am very sympathetic with their problem, and I know it is a very complicated problem.

They themselves are trying to work out an equitable solution for it.

I am concerned for another reason, because I am from the corn and hog section; and let me say incidentally, the statement is often made that only 22 percent of farm income is derived from supported commodities, but the fact is overlooked that most of the corn is marketed through livestock. Livestock and livestock products account for over 60 percent of the farm income of the country. Ten of the 12 States in terms of agricultural income in this country are from that area where there is great peril because of surplus wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARVEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, if we do not all put our shoulder to the wheel and help work out an equitable solution for this particular problem I can say to those of you from the Midwest—and you are intimately and vitally concerned—that it will spill over into our area in the form of feed wheat, and if this surplus is dumped into the feed-grain hopper which up until now has been in virtual balance you will be in great danger of breaking the back of our price-support program for feed grains. It will have the further effect ultimately of breaking the back of the livestock program because our feed-grain support program has been used as a built-in governor to support the price of livestock.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] prompts me to impose further upon the membership of this House. Mr. ARENDS complained very vociferously because, in a manner which was very appropriate, I authorized the printing of the testimony of some of the witnesses who appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and statements of other important persons who made their views known to the members of our committee concerning the very important matter now under consideration. I am perfectly willing and I am prepared to accept my share of the responsibility. I do not know how many copies of the pamphlet were printed. Neither do I know exactly how many Members mailed the pamphlets and used their congressional franks in doing so, but I am positive that no one member of our committee has been guilty of any impropriety in the distribution of these pamphlets. I am quite certain that many of the pamphlets went out under my frank. I am advised that many members of the committee mailed this pamphlet under their own franks and that both Democrats and Republicans mailed out hundreds and perhaps thousands of the pamphlets. I am certain that one Republican member of the committee who has spoken in opposition to this bill acquired and paid for and mailed out the little pamphlet which seems to have caused so much trouble.

The pamphlet has caused trouble in the minds of some of the politicians who seem to abhor the thought that our committee could report legislation which might meet with the approbation and approval of the leaders of organized labor.

I take full responsibility for having invited Mr. Walter Reuther and Mr. George Meany and other representatives of organized labor to appear in our committee room and to express their views freely and frankly concerning this program which now seems to be so controversial. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, although I am perhaps the first chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture who has been bold enough or audacious enough to try to ascertain the views of

the consumers of America, the industrial workers of our great country, and the labor leaders of America, I still do not think that there is anything strange about what I have done. Is there anything evil, unholy, vicious, sinister or un-American about having the leaders of organized labor to express their views concerning farm legislation?

I realize that we have just heard an expression by a Member of Congress from Indiana. I am aware of the fact that I have been accused of spearheading an unholy alliance between the farmers and the industrial workers of America, not by the gentleman from Indiana, but by those who feel perfectly free to criticize the honest efforts of honest men. Out in Indiana even the members of the Farm Bureau proved themselves to be just as bold and just as audacious as I was. Here in the great publication Successful Farming is an article which has been called to my attention. The caption is "What We're Doing to Make Friends for Farmers." I shall not bore you by attempting to read the entire article, but I want to call your attention to this one statement: "an important area of the public relations responsibility that many people forget. They invited labor representatives to a township Farm Bureau dinner and meeting. Officials from eight labor unions attended."

It has been, in a rather subtle and sinister fashion, suggested that I have been guilty of a great wrong. Something evil, vile, and vicious because I wanted to know the views of the labor leaders of America concerning this very important problem which we now have under consideration. The inference is that Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, and George Meany, president of AFL, are suffering from some sort of leprosy and are so unclean and so vile and so un-American that honest Members of Congress dare not even touch their hands when greeting them into a committee room where they have been invited. Is Walter Reuther so unclean that I should dare not touch his hand in friendship? Should he be despised and shunned because he has been brave and courageous enough and honest enough to express with sincerity his views concerning this problem which affects the welfare and happiness of all the people of our country? Those who make such suggestions should be ashamed of themselves. These labor leaders who came to speak their minds about this legislation represent those who toil in the mines and factories and workshops of America. Yes, they represent the consuming public in a very large way and they know that if agriculture is prostrate, industry cannot prosper.

Some people are so proud and some are so arrogant and some are so blind that they do not seem to understand that the working men and women of America are making a contribution to the welfare and prosperity of our Nation. There are those who look upon labor leaders as some sort of an evil influence. Why should we invite labor leaders to come to our committee room? Just for one purpose, and that was to ascertain their views and the views of consumers to the end that we could stand here and appeal to those of you who represent great metropolitan areas, those of you who live in industrial centers to vote in favor of the bill our committee has presented. You can make fun of Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany, but you cannot minimize their importance. I challenge any of you to come into our committee room and to do a better job in behalf of the farmers of America than they did when they gave us the benefit of their views. Mr. Reuther spoke with great sincerity and in clear, cogent, and sincere fashion, and I am delighted to be able to report to you that now this program we are presenting has the support of these men—these leaders—who represent the consumers in the industrial areas of our great country. These labor leaders have "nailed to the cross" these wild and woolly arguments to the effect that city consumers are revolting against the farmers of America. Again, I commend their statements to your careful consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COOLEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman it was a proper thing to hear these representatives of labor. I would go one step further. I would have suggested to Mr. Reuther that he let some of the farmers come to his organization. In my district, the rank and file will let me in their meetings, but the international representatives of the AFL and CIO will not.

Mr. COOLEY. We asked Mr. Reuther, "What have you done to bring the farm story to the industrial workers of America?" and he brought out expensive pamphlets that were circulated around the country telling the story.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have been waiting since 11 o'clock, and I intend to wait until the end of debate to speak on this pamphlet proposition, and the pictures.

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain the gentleman will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is one with the gentleman's picture and his.

Mr. COOLEY. They also had pictures of some of the outstanding and distinguished Republican members of our committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. You cannot make fun of me for shaking hands with Mr. Reuther.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not making any fun at all.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not ashamed of that. Maybe you look upon him as something to be despised but I do not. I did not know the man, I had never met him before he came to the committee room and I extended him every courtesy and am glad he came and spoke to us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You cannot charge me with despising him. I will comment on his testimony and his teachings though before the day is over.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not ashamed of the fact that I invited him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do not have to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman did not misunderstand my remarks, I am sure, when I said there is nothing personal, nothing vicious, or anything wrong or unethical was done except, I said, an extraordinary procedure was being followed. I cannot find any place from my inquiry among Members of Congress, even those who have been here longer than I have, where the text of one individual man's testimony was taken and sent out in a committee print, sent out with the sanction of the full committee.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not one man's testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee), Mr. COOLEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think if you will check the record, you will find Mr. George Meany's statement in there, representing himself as president of the AFL, I think you will find something from the clothing workers. I had no more to do with that than to authorize its being printed and being made available to other members of the committee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is it not a fact that it is the policy of the committees of this Congress to have committee hearings printed and sent out?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Mr. Reuther presented positive proof to the committee that he was in good faith and sincerely trying to get across to the consumers of America the agricultural story.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. On many occasions heretofore, Members of the House have complained that our committee has not ascertained the views of the consumers of America concerning the price-support program. This prompted me to try to ascertain the views of the leaders from the industrial workers of America. We now have positive testimony from labor leaders who represent great consumer groups, and yet, many Members seem not to be satisfied with the proof we have offered. But for the support of Members of Congress from city districts, how could we even hope to have a farm program? Many of you seem to be horrified by the very thought that Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany expressed views favorable to the position which our committee has taken by vote of more than 2 to 1. Perhaps some of you do not even want industrial workers to vote for you in your campaigns for Congress. I am

certain some of you do not want Congressmen from industrial districts to vote for this farm bill. You have a perfect right to your own views. I have always been anxious to present to this House farm legislation which I thought would meet with the approval of all segments of our economy. I know that the leadership of the minority is now desperately trying to save face—anything to gain favor. But let me remind you of the fact that in your desperation you are trying to destroy a program which the real leadership of your party has been unwilling to even attack in bold and forthright fashion. I asked your Secretary of Agriculture, when he was before our committee, if he was advocating the repeal of a single law which we had enacted in the last 20 years in the interest of the farmers of America, and his answer to my question was "No." Your Secretary of Agriculture is not willing to advocate the repeal of a single one of the laws which he has tried to lead the country to believe have resulted in regimenting and controlling the activities of American farmers. All he wants to do is to plow under, to starve out, and to bankrupt the little farmers of America, and turn over the agriculture of our country to the farmers who have been able to mechanize their farming operations, and to bring in mass production. It really would be interesting to hear a debate between Mr. Walter Reuther and Mr. Ezra Benson. Yes; it would really be good to hear a debate between Mr. Reuther and the president of the largest farm organization in the world, but I am certain that neither debate could possibly be arranged. I thank you for permitting me to impose further upon your patience.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the people in my district want a sensible farm program. The average housewife—whose inventory of food in the refrigerator and on the kitchen shelves probably amounts to a surprisingly large investment—may not realize it, but she also has a sizable investment in the $7.5 billion worth of farm commodities which Commodity Credit Corporation either owns outright or may reasonably expect to acquire under the loan program.

Today CCC owns nearly $4.5 billion worth of food and fiber. Loans are outstanding on additional commodities valued at about $3 billion.

This means that the average family of four has about $185 invested in farm price support operations today. As taxpayers, Americans are also contributing to the $1 million a day cost of storing these surplus commodities.

The Government owns outright nearly 900 million bushels of wheat—more than enough to meet our domestic needs, plus foreseeable exports, for an entire year. Wheat holdings are likely to climb to approximately 1 billion bushels as CCC completes its take-over of 1954 crop wheat still under loan. This supply is on hand, it should be noted, at a time when we are moving toward the harvest of a new crop which may also be large enough to meet our full needs for an entire year.

This means that the average American family of four owns, through CCC, 25 bushels of wheat, costing about $66. The average family also owns, through CCC, some 15 bushels of corn, acquired at a cost of about $25. Americans own sizeable supplies of a variety of other farm commodities, including cotton, wool, dairy products, feed grains, oilseed, rice, rosin, and turpentine.

The only thing that can be said about these surpluses with any degree of certainty is that they will probably increase in size during the months ahead as CCC takes over sizable quantities of corn and cotton from the 1954 crops.

It should be noted that these vast accumulations have come about largely in connection with the commodities that the Government has been supporting at 90 percent of parity. It must be clear that if this unrealistic program is extended further, we will pile up even greater surpluses of farm crops which we can neither sell, eat, nor wear.

Such a course represents economic nonsense. We have now on the books the Agricultural Act of 1954, which is designed to bring supplies into better balance with current demands. This act has had no trial at all thus far. The flexible price support provisions do not even become effective until the 1955 crops begin moving to market some months hence. Yet we are asked to scrap this law, without any sort of trial, in favor of a discredited program which has brought financial headaches to farmers, consumers, and Government alike.

We have already delayed too long in getting our farm program back on a sensible course. We cannot afford further delay now.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, we cannot help but be impressed by the committee report. It has established beyond doubt that the farmer's plight is a serious one and that steps must be taken to help him at once. It is surprising, therefore, to note that the same committee report which has so ably presented the distress of the farmer recommends that nothing be done to assist him. In fact, the bill before us today, if enacted into law, would destroy the only attempt Congress has made to alleviate the farmer's hardship before it has had an opportunity to go into effect.

There are other Members who are much better qualified to speak for the farmer than I am, and I am sure that they have availed themselves of this opportunity. We must not overlook, however, the fact that less than 14 percent of the population of this country are farmers. The other 86 percent represent the consumers, who also have a real stake in the issue before us today.

It is these consumers who must pay the billions of dollars required for our Government to buy up unwieldy surpluses, to store them and to dispose of them after they have spoiled. It is these consumers who must pay higher prices for inferior food products because of artificially imposed price supports.

Every housewife can remember the fiasco when potato prices went wild because of high supports and housewives were forced to pay exorbitant prices for low-grade potatoes while paying taxes to support the purchase of top-grade potatoes which were fed to cattle or stored until they spoiled.

The consumer wants no repetition of this experience. The farmer wants no continuation of a system which has already driven many good farmers off their land. The consumer, the farmer—and, in fact, the very essence of the report given by this committee—demand that the Agriculture Act of 1954 be allowed to go into effect. To pass this measure on the floor today will be but to continue the abuses which have brought about today's crisis. This measure in the best interests of all concerned must be defeated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, had come to no resolution thereon.

DESIGNATION OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the Prime Minister of Thailand into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

VISIT TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HONORABLE P. PIBULSONGGRAM, PRIME MINISTER OF THAILAND

During the recess the following occurred:

The Doorkeeper announced the Honorable P. Pibulsonggram, the Prime Minister of Thailand.

The Prime Minister of Thailand, escorted by the committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, I deem it a high privilege, and it is a great pleasure, to present to you the representative of a great and a friendly people, the Prime Minister of Thailand. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I greatly appreciate the kind welcome you have extended to me. This opportunity of meeting the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives is one I shall long remember and cherish, for you are the chosen Representatives of the people of the United States, carrying out important and heavy responsibilities under the Constitution of your country.

In Thailand, we have been a constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary form of government only since 1932. To make this change from the past has not been easy or simple. Nevertheless, we are striving to achieve ultimately a fully representative government directly responsible to the people.

I want to say to you that the spirit of freedom is strong among the Thai people [applause], and we shall steadfastly continue to preserve that spirit, for we believe righteousness and freedom of mankind will ultimately prevail. [Applause.] I think it is our love of liberty that makes the Thai people so greatly admire the United States, who, we feel, is the champion of the weak and small nations seeking national independence and their rightful place in the society of nations.

It was our love of freedom and our friendship for the United States which caused us to send our young soldiers to Korea to fight shoulder to shoulder with the forces of the United States and the United Nations. [Applause.] For these same reasons we stand with your country against any further aggression, but we are a peace-loving nation and, like the United States, have pledged ourselves to work for lasting world peace. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Speaker and honorable Members, may I convey to you and through you the warm and sincere greetings and good wishes of the Thai people to the people of the United States, as well as my deep gratitude for the kindness and gracious welcome I have received from the American people.

I wish to conclude by extending to each one of you a cordial invitation to visit Thailand. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the Prime Minister will be glad to stand in the well of the House and greet the Members.

The Prime Minister of Thailand stood in the well of the House and received Members of the House of Representatives.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to inquire about the program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts about the program. I understand we meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock and that the bill H. R. 12 will be the first order of business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and then we will take up the military manpower bill.

Mr. MARTIN. We should be able to finish this bill in a couple of hours if we give some sort of dispatch to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should think we ought to be able to dispose of it.

Mr. MARTIN. And the purpose is to finish the other bill tomorrow and then take a recess until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand the postal pay bill will be called up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the conference report on the postal pay bill will be considered. We will also take up the statehood bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will debate continue tonight on H. R. 12 until those of us who desire to speak are heard?

The SPEAKER. We are not going back into the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not today? What about tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow we meet at 10 o'clock.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In the event that the National Reserve bill is not finished tomorrow will its consideration be continued on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The hope is that we can finish it tomorrow.

Mr. GAVIN. But what if we are not able to finish it tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think we ought to consider that. We expect to finish it tomorrow.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. It is only half past 3. Can we not finish H. R. 12 this afternoon?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I said, we are going to adjourn over until tomorrow and meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock in order to finish it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. If my time has not expired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is giving the gentleman a long minute.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It might shorten proceedings if a few of us who have waited around here from early morning could be heard. We are willing to wait longer. We have been waiting since 11 o'clock for an opportunity to be heard on the bill in which we are all interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will have all the time tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want all the time tomorrow; I only want 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will have his opportunity tomorrow; I am sure of that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the copper extension bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Taft-Hartley Act has been law since 1947. When that legislation was passed, it replaced that great and honest labor law, the Wagner Act.

Ever since its passage, the Taft-Hartley Act has created a storm of debate concerning its so-called merits and its obvious inequities.

Among these inequities, the notorious section 14 (b) stands out as a glaring example of the true nature of the Taft-Hartley Act. That section provides for Federal sanction of the so-called State right-to-work laws. The antiunion, antilabor character of that provision is manifest. The State laws which have resulted from section 14 (b) have been vigorously condemned by civic organizations and eminent churchmen of all

faiths. They have rightly been called immoral.

These alleged civil-rights laws have been exposed for what they are and the American Civil Liberties Union has clearly stated that there are no civil liberties grounds upon which these statutes can be supported.

We have heard much talk about repeal and revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Almost everyone has paid lip service to this cause. The time has long since passed when mere oratory will suffice. Repeal of section 14 (b) and a return to the sound principles of the Wagner Act is past due.

Several Congressmen and Senators have proposed legislation similar to that which I introduced today, to bring about the necessary changes. I am proud to join with men such as the Congressman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in sponsoring this legislation. It is my earnest hope that we will shortly act upon these proposals and correct the vicious, irresponsible, and un-American provisions of the present National Labor Relations Act.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on May 11, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to speak today in commemoration of the anniversary of the enacting of the Constitution of the State of Poland. This day is celebrated by the Polish people and by all people of Polish extraction in the same manner as we observe our own great Independence Day. It is their national holiday and should be an occasion for rejoicing. However, the sad plight of this brave nation today is more a cause for sorrow than for joy. We join with the Polish people in recalling to mind the glories of past days and we unite with them in pledging that Poland will once again be a free nation, fulfilling its destiny as a power among its sister European states and the states of the free world.

Today marks the 164th anniversary of the establishment in Poland of individual freedom and equal justice for all. Yet, since that May 3 in 1791 there have not been many years in which Poland has been free. It was shortly thereafter that the second and third partitions of Poland took place. During the century that followed, Polish devotees of the principles of democracy took up arms many times in an effort to reestablish the political system set up in their constitution. They were not successful until after the First World War when the Republic of Poland came into existence. In just 21 short years much progress was made and Poland was a major country of Europe in 1939 when it once again became the battleground of a worldwide conflict. It has known no peace since that day and at the present time suffers the added indignity of being made to carry its brave, honorable name under the banner of its Communist oppressors.

We know, nevertheless, that the Polish people have not forgotten the sweetness of freedom. Despite their continued existence under a totalitarian and atheistic system of government completely alien to their traditions, we may be sure that hope still burns in their hearts. Uprisings and revolts, organized and unorganized, have been reported to us through intelligence sources as well as by escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. The Soviet terrorists have even had to curb their insidious attempts to substitute a worship of the state for a worship of God. The historically Christian traditions of Poland, dating from the 10th century cannot be wiped out in just a few short years of enslavement.

We who are blessed with life in a free, democratic nation have a duty in justice and in charity to our friends who are not so fortunate. We must keep alive the spark of liberty. We must assure our Polish compatriots by deeds, not words, that the greatest bulwark of freedom in the world today, the United States, will stop at nothing to assist them in regaining this freedom for themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. HENDERSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. MCDOWELL in two instances.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KRUEGER.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STEED, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), on account of official business.

Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), indefinitely, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

756. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

757. A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66, entitled 'Unclaimed Moneys,' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

758. A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14, entitled 'Discharges, When Granted,' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision (b) of section 58, entitled 'Notices,' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

759. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

760. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

761. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of order suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

762. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a list of projects for the development of class IV or larger airports included in the current revision of the national airport plan, which, may be undertaken during fiscal years 1956 and 1957, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress, as amended by Public Law 445, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 231. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2126, a bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5881. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. First intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to Federal Catalog Progress Report (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Report on the proposed agreement for cooperation with NATO regarding atomic information; without amendment (Rept. No. 484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5695. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6012. A bill to place in the classified (competitive) civil service the position of deputy United States marshal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6013. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 6014. A bill to grant tax relief to members of the Armed Forces of the United States held by a Communist government authority or missing in action from a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6015. A bill to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 6016. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Ordnance Service Command Shop A of Newark, Ohio, to the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 6017. A bill to provide that certain Reserve officers who performed active service during World War I shall receive retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of their basic pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 6018. A bill to extend to members of the Air National Guard, the National Guard, and their survivors certain benefits presently available to certain other members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces and their survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 6019. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6020. A bill to provide for the retrocession of jurisdiction over Ellis Island, and the conveyance of all interest of the United States in such island, to the State of New York; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6021. A bill to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of infantile-paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 6022. A bill to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6023. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to assure to employees and employers in industries affecting commerce the right to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6024. A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6025. A bill to amend the shipping laws to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 6026. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, with respect to locating Reserve air units at airports not handling heavy commercial air traffic; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 6027. A bill to authorize the withholding from the salaries of Government employees of amounts for certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6028. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide for the most effective use and distribution of infantile-paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to provide for the most effective use and distribution of infantile-paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 232. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to revision of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 233. Resolution requesting the President to establish a mission for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 234. Resolution expressing the will of the American people with respect to the abolition of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 6029. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Evelyn Varon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE (by request):

H. R. 6031. A bill for the relief of Antonio P. Whitmoyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6032. A bill for the relief of Konrad Veem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of Jose Jesus Chacon-Raya, also known as Joe Chacon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6034. A bill for the relief of Enrique Zaragoza-Bermejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 6035. A bill for the relief of Jose Gomes Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 6036. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florentine Kintzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 6037. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 6038. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Balantzyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 6039. A bill for the relief of William E. Heilmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

233. By Mr. MUMMA: Resolution of Associated Pennsylvania Constructors, Harrisburg, Pa., opposing any law, regulation, or other device which would directly or indirectly authorize or permit the Federal Government, or any agency thereof, to determine, establish, and direct the specific rates of pay and hours of work for laborers and mechanics employed on highway construction projects being prosecuted under the authority and direction of any State or political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

234. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by the Racine Taxpayers Association, Racine, Wis., opposing any legislation calling for Federal aid to localities for school-construction needs. The association feels school problems are of local concern and can be handled and solved best by local communities without Federal assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

235. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, Council 222, Knights of Columbus, Seneca Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. Also, petition of the grand knight, Long Island Council, No. 197, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Importance of Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech I made today before the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on the subject: Is it important to balance the budget?

As I see it, balancing the budget without resorting to legerdemain or unsound bookkeeping methods is certainly in the category of our No. 1 problems.

Beginning with 1792, the first fiscal year of our Federal Government, and through 1916, Federal deficits were casual and usually paid off in succeeding years. In this 124-year period there were 43 deficit years and 81 surplus years. As late as July 1, 1914, the interest-bearing debt was less than $1 billion.

In Andrew Jackson's administration the public debt was paid off in toto, an achievement in which President Jackson expressed great pride.

It can be said for this first 124 years in the life of our Republic we were on a pay-as-you-go basis. In that period I think it can be accurately said that we laid the foundation for our strength today as the greatest nation in all the world.

Then, in 1917, 1918, and 1919, World War I deficits aggregated $13 billion. Heavy current taxation in those years paid much of the war cost.

The next 11 years, from 1919 to 1931, were surplus years, and the war debt was reduced.

In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt came into office, and the most outstanding plank in his platform was to reduce Federal expenditures by 25 percent and to keep the budget in balance. He accused Mr. Hoover of "throwing discretion to the winds and indulging in an orgy of waste and extravagance." Mr. Hoover spent $4 billion in his last year, and the record shows that this spendthrift Hoover was the only President to leave office with fewer Federal employees than when he came in.

Mr. Roosevelt added more than $200 billion to the public debt during his administrations.

I took my oath as a Senator the same day Mr. Roosevelt took his as President—March 4, 1933. The first bill I voted on was the legislation recommended by President Roosevelt to redeem his economy pledge by reducing all expenditures 15 percent—a difference of 10 percent less than his original promise, it is true—but I thought this was a substantial redemption of a campaign pledge, as such things go, and I enthusiastically supported him.

The title of the bill was "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government." Our debt was then about $16 billion. This economy program was shortlived—about 6 months—and the spending then began to steadily and rapidly increase.

Mr. Roosevelt presented 13 budgets and in every peacetime budget he promised a balance between income and outgo for the next year, but it turned out that next year never came. He was in the red all the way, and in every year of his administration a substantial deficit was added to the public debt.

There were eight Truman budgets. Three were in the black—those for fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1951. Two resulted from war contract cancellations following the end of World War II and the third resulted from increased taxes for the Korean war before the war bills started coming due. Five Truman budgets were in the red.

Mr. Eisenhower has presented two budgets—both in the red but on a declining ratio. The Eisenhower deficit estimates for fiscal years 1955 and 1956 aggregate $7 billion as compared to the last Truman budget which alone contemplated a $9 billion deficit.

The cold facts are that for 21 years out of the last 24 years we have spent more than we have collected. In these 24 years we have balanced the budget in only 3; and these were more by accident than by design.

We must recognize that we have abandoned the sound fiscal policies strictly adhered to by all political parties and all Presidents for considerably more than a century of our existence. It is true that during these 21 deficit years we were engaged in World War II for 4 years and in the Korean war for 2 years. Yet, in the years when the pay-as-you-go system prevailed we also had quite a few wars.

It is the quarter of a century of deficit spending which now makes balancing the budget so imperative. Young men and women, born in 1930, have lived in the red virtually all their lives. Our acceptance of deficit spending for so long a period has weakened public resistance to the evils of this practice. Bad habits are hard to change.

Will the deficits become permanent and continue to pile debt upon debt until real disaster comes? If we cannot balance the budget in this day of our greatest dollar income, when taxes are near their peak, and when we are at peace, I ask, when can we?

It is disturbing these days to hear some economists argue the budget should not be balanced and that we should not begin to pay on the debt because, they allege, it will adversely affect business conditions. Have we yielded so far to the blandishments of Federal subsidies and Government support that we have forgotten our Nation is great because of individual effort as contrasted to state paternalism?

Today the direct debt of the Federal Government is $280 billion. Our debt is equivalent to the assessed value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value in the United States.

I think no one can deny we are mortgaged to the hilt. If we add to this Federal debt the debts of the States and localities, we have an amount in excess of $300 billion in direct public obligations.

This is 5 times as much as the total public debts in 1939. While public debt has increased fivefold since 1939 the gross national product—the output of our factories, farms, etc.—increased less than fourfold. When debt increases at a pace faster than the increase in the value of all goods and services, the currency is diluted with consequent shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar.

But the direct debts I have mentioned are not all of our obligations. In addition, we have contingent liabilities totaling $250 billion which the Federal Government has guaranteed, insured, and otherwise assumed on a contingent basis. No one can predict to what extent this contingent liability will result in losses which must be paid by the Federal Government.

For example, $40 billion of this contingent liability is in some 40 Federal housing programs, and from recent disclosures of graft and windfall profits in the various public-housing programs, it is evident that a substantial percentage of these contingent liabilities eventually may become a draft on the Treasury.

In addition to the $280 billion in direct Federal debt, and the $250 billion in contingent liabilities, we have on our hands a social-security system guaranteed by the Federal Government involving many millions of our citizens, which is no longer actuarily sound.

The ultimate cost of this system to the Treasury is still unestimated, but the fact remains that when the income from premiums imposed upon those who are covered in the system is no longer sufficient or available to pay the benefits, then regular tax revenue collected from those in and out of the system will be used to finance the deficiency.

EVILS OF DEFICIT SPENDING

Here are some of the evils of deficit spending:

The debt today is the debt incurred by this generation, but tomorrow it will be debt on our children and grandchildren, and it will be for them to pay, both the interest and the principal.

It is possible and in fact probable that before this astronomical debt is paid off, if it ever is, the interest charge will exceed the principal.

Protracted deficit spending means cheapening the dollar. Secretary Humphrey testified before the Finance Committee that the greatest single factor in cheapening the American dollar has been deficit spending.

Since I have been in the Senate, interest alone on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $75 billion. At present rates, on the Federal debt at its present level, interest on it in the next 20 years will cost taxpayers upwards of $150 billion.

Since 1940 the Federal Government has borrowed and spent a quarter of a trillion dollars more than we have collected in taxes.

Year by year, nearly in direct ratio to deficit spending, the purchasing value of the dollar has declined. Beginning with a 100-cent dollar in 1940, the value of the dollar had declined to 52 cents in 1954.

As proof of the fact that deficit spending is directly responsible for cheapening the dollar, let me mention that in 1942, when we spent $19 billion in excess of revenue, the dollar in that 1 year declined 10 cents in value.

In 1943, another big deficit year, the dollar lost 5 cents more in value, and another 9 cents in 1946. From 1940 through 1952, an era of heavy deficit spending the dollar lost 48 cents in value, or nearly 4 cents each year, and it is still slipping but in much lesser degree.

Some may regard these facts and figures lightly, but the loss of half the purchasing power of its money in 13 years should be a serious warning to any nation.

Cheapened money is inflation. Inflation is a dangerous game. It robs creditors, it steals pensions, wages, and fixed income. Once started, it is exceedingly difficult to control. This inflation has been partially checked but the value of the dollar dropped slightly again in the past year. It would not take

much to start up this dangerous inflation again.

Public debt is not like private debt. If private debt is not paid off, it can be ended by liquidation, but if public debt is not paid off with taxes, liquidation takes the form of disastrous inflation or national repudiation. Either is destructive of our form of government.

Today the interest on the Federal debt takes more than 10 percent of our total Federal tax revenue. Without the tremendous cost of this debt our annual tax bill could be reduced 10 percent across the board.

The interest charge would be greater if much of the debt was not short-termed with lower interest rates. Should this debt be long-termed at the 3¼ percent paid on recent 30-year bonds, the interest would be nearly 15 percent of the Federal income. No business enterprise could survive such heavy interest out of its gross income.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES

Since 1934 Federal grants to States have expanded enormously in both cost and functions. They slip in like mice and soon grow to the size of elephants. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the control and authority of the States.

Nothing is more true than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs exactly the manner in which the funds are expended, even though the States partially contribute to the project. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy with grants compel the States to do things they did not want to do.

Growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was $126 million covering 18 programs. Now Federal grants total $3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost.

These are the figures to date. As to additional grants for the future, President Eisenhower, in his address on the state of the Union, proposed to open up three Pandora's boxes of new Federal "handouts" to the States.

The proposals by the President, if adopted by Congress, would be the greatest increase in grants to States yet undertaken and the longest step yet to Federal paternalism.

Under the administration's road proposal a "dummy" corporation, without assets and without income, would issue bonds for $21 billion, and Washington would take control of 40,000 miles of the best roads in the 48 States.

By legerdemain this $21 billion in Federal agency bonds would be declared as not Federal debt and would be excluded from the debt limitation fixed by Congress.

The interest would be $11.5 billion, or 55 percent of the funds borrowed.

It was proposed to pay the principal of these bonds and the interest on them with permanent indefinite appropriations, which would remove the corporation from annual appropriation control by Congress.

The proposal would abolish the policy established in 1916—39 years ago—requiring States to match Federal funds for roads.

The scheme was predicated upon pledging federally imposed gasoline taxes over a period of 30 years for the repayment of the bonds and the interest.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, recently appointed by President Eisenhower, said of this proposal:

"We (the General Accounting Office) feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable, because * * * the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States. * * * It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financial arrangements which might have the effect of obscuring financial facts of the Government's debt position."

Comptroller General Campbell also questioned the legality of the proposal.

We all want good roads. The people are willing to pay for good roads, but it is certainly not necessary practically to destroy the fiscal bookkeeping of our country in order to finance our road system.

These bonds would, of course, be a general obligation of the Government. There is no banker in this audience who would buy bonds of such a dummy Federal corporation without the guaranty of the Federal Government.

Should the gasoline tax be dedicated 30 years in advance for the payment of bonds issued to build roads, then, by the same line of reasoning, other taxes could be dedicated for other specific purposes. If this were carried far enough there would be no funds for the more unglamorous but essential functions.

The second of the three administration State-aid proposals involved about $8 billion in direct appropriations and contingent liabilities for payments, grants, loans, and guaranties to States for school construction. The last bastion of States rights and individual liberty lies in the education of our children.

Federal appropriations to public schools followed by the inevitable Federal control will strike a fatal blow at the grassroots of our democracy.

I do not believe that there is a State or locality in the Union that cannot provide for the cost of its public school system if there is the will to do so.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of the President's third proposal. It was for a so-called Federal health payment program. It would be certain to cost millions of dollars annually and it could easily be the beginning of socialized medicine.

NO SUCH THING AS A FEDERAL GRANT

It is well for everyone to understand that there is no such thing as a Federal grant. All of the money comes from citizens in the States. The money goes to Washington and there it is subject to deductions for Federal administration. This money then goes back to the States less deductions, and the Federal Government tells us how to spend our own money.

Proposals have been advocated changing our budgetary system. The Secretary of the Treasury has not approved these proposals and I am certain he will not. But there are two budgetary proposals which recur with persistency, and I want to warn you of them.

First, there is the proposal for a cash budget. Those who advocate the cash budget are suggesting that the Government pay its routine bills with savings of the citizens who have entrusted protection of their old age and unemployment to the guardianship of the Federal Government. These trust funds were established from premiums paid by participants in social security, unemployment insurance, bank deposit insurance programs, etc. Not a cent of these funds belongs to the Government.

Second, some are advocating a capital budget which means that so-called capital expenditures should not be considered as current expenditures in the budget.

Those who advocate the so-called capital budget must start out with the fallacious assumption that the Government is in business to make a profit on its citizens. To my knowledge the Federal Government has never made a bona fide profit on any Government operation.

They must assume that debt contracted by a Federal agency is not a debt of the Federal Government and a burden on all of the taxpayers.

I am an old-fashioned person who believes that a debt is a debt just as much in the atomic age as it was in the horse and buggy days.

A capital budget must assume that Government manufacturing plants, such as atomic energy installations, are in commercial production for a profit, and that Government stockpiles are longtime investments for profit instead of precautions against emergencies when they would be completely expendable with no financial return.

Likewise, it must assume that the agriculture surplus program is primarily a long range investment deal instead of a prop for annual farm income to be used when needed on a year-by-year basis.

While the vastness and complexity of the Federal Government of the United States necessarily makes budgeting difficult, the so-called conventional budget currently in use offers the best approach to orderly financing with fullest disclosure.

What is needed for a better fiscal system is fuller disclosure of Federal expenditures and responsibility for them—not less, as inevitably would be the case with so-called cash and capital budgets.

With full disclosure of the Federal expenditure situation, the American people then would have an opportunity to decide whether they wanted to recapture control and bring the rate of spending into balance with the rate of taxing and thus reduce the tremendous Federal debt burden we are now bearing.

To recapture control we must first reduce unexpended balances in appropriations already made and rescind those which are nonessential. When we started this fiscal year unexpended balances in appopriations already made totaled about $100 billion, including $78 billion in appropriations enacted in prior years and $20 billion in authority to spend directly out of the public debt.

The situation is made even worse by the procedure under which Congress acts on appropriation bills. Not only has Congress lost control over the annual rate of expenditure, but once the President's budget is submitted in January, Congress never again sees it as a whole until after the appropriations are enacted. The first thing Congress does is to split the appropriation requests of the President into a dozen or more bills. Then it proceeds to consider them separately over a period of 6 months or more. In the consideration of these bills attention is given only to appropriations, and these may be spent over a period of years. An appropriation enacted in a year when revenue is high may actually be spent in a year when revenue is low. There is never an opportunity in Congress, in action on appropriation bills, to consider them in terms of annual expenditures in view of estimated revenue.

To correct such an intolerable situation, along with 48 other Senators, I have introduced legislation providing for a single appropriation bill which would set forth not only requested appropriations for the future but also unexpended balances available in prior appropriations. This resolution has three times passed the Senate but has not yet been acted on by the House.

It provides further that Congress write into the consolidated appropriation bill limitations on expenditures in the ensuing year from each appropriation. And beyond this it provides that in determining the expenditure limitations all proper consideration should be given the anticipated revenue, the cash position of the Treasury and the level of our Federal debt.

By this process, the Congress and the public would have the means of knowing our fiscal position and the facilities would be provided for balancing the budget with reduction in taxes and debt.

Along with this, I have introduced legislation giving the President the authority to veto items within appropriation bills, thus according him a double check on log-rolling which most of the governors in this country have used for years without abuse.

In short, I advocate one budget with full disclosure as to our expenditures, which

fixes responsibility not only for the expenditures but also the administration of expenditure programs; I advocate a single appropriation bill in which Congress not only authorizes expenditures but controls them in a manner that can be considered in view of revenue. A budget is not a budget unless it has two sides, expenditure and income. And finally, I advocate an item veto for the President, who is elected to his office by all of the people.

With these provisions, I believe the budget can be balanced, the debt can be reduced and taxes can be lowered.

If, by budgetary and legislative procedure, we could recapture control of expenditures from the bureaucratic agencies, there are obvious places where they could be substantially reduced and eliminated without impairment of any essential function.

President Eisenhower has made a good start. The Truman budget for fiscal year 1953 totaled $74.3 billion. Estimates of the Eisenhower budget currently under consideration total $62.4 billion—a reduction of nearly $12 billion. Our tax income is $60 billion. Our deficits are decreasing, but we are not yet on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Most of the reduction has been in the military, and this is largely incident to the end of the Korean war.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, for whom I have great admiration, and the able Budget Director, Mr. Hughes, are working diligently and making substantial progress toward sounder budgetary procedure and the elimination of waste in expenditures.

We are still practically at the peak of expenditures for domestic-civilian programs and proposals for more are coming forth in a steady stream.

In fact, expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian programs now total $24 billion, and this is more than 3 times the total cost of these programs in 1940, when we started the World War II buildup.

Even this is not the whole story on domestic-civilian expenditures, because these figures do not reflect the liabilities of the tremendous loan insurance and guarantee programs.

Nonessentials in these programs must be eliminated and this clearly can be done, as Mr. Hoover and his two fine Commissions on Government Organization have demonstrated in nearly 500 recommendations to date—some of which have been adopted, while others still await action.

With the pressure for more and more Government which seems to characterize our times, I am convinced that such constant examination of Government as the Hoover Commission surveys has become a continuing necessity.

With budgetary disclosures and congressional control, under current circumstances and conditions, we should reject all new proposals for Federal spending innovations.

In fact, the budget for fiscal year 1956, beginning next July 1, could be reduced $5 billion by eliminating expenditures contemplated under new legislation and by eliminating increases in items under existing legislation. I would oppose all new proposals to invade the responsibilities of States, localities, and individuals and start immediately to liquidate many of the programs already in existence.

Beyond this, I would eliminate as rapidly as possible all foreign economic aid, and I would get military expenditures quickly in hand through control of unexpended balances.

So far we have spent nearly $40 billion for foreign economic assistance. And at this late date, after 10 years of post-war foreign aid, the President has proposed to increase foreign-aid expenditures in the coming year by nearly 10 percent, and he has asked Congress for new foreign-aid appropriations in amounts nearly 25 percent higher than were enacted during the past year.

We are still employing 562,158 civilians overseas. These people are employed all over the world, including 64 in Cambodia.

This foreign aid has got to stop sometime, and so far as I am concerned the time to stop so-called economic aid is past due.

No one favors a reduction of our present burdensome taxes more than I do. I sit on both sides of the table. As an individual, I pay substantial taxes on my business operations. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I have the opportunity to hear testimony of those who protest exorbitant taxation.

But as anxious as I am as an individual for tax reduction, I am opposed patriotically to tax reduction which requires us to borrow and add to the public debt. It seems to me to be a certain road to financial suicide to continue to reduce taxes and then to borrow the money to make good this loss in revenue.

As things are now shaping up, there will be keen competition between the two political parties for tax reduction in the political year of 1956. If we reduce expenditures this is all well and good but, under political pressure, we should not yield to reducing taxes and still further unbalance the budget. Tax reduction should never be made a political football.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I opposed the $20-tax reduction to each individual as passed by the House of Representatives this year. This would have occasioned a loss of $2.3 billion to the Treasury, all of which would be added to the debt. It would have given a tax relief of only about 7 cents a day to each taxpayer and would have removed 5 million taxpayers completely from the tax rolls.

To borrow money to reduce taxes is not, in fact, a tax reduction. It is merely a postponement of the collection of taxes as, sooner or later, the taxes thus reduced will have to be paid with interest. There is only one sound way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce spending first.

At home we can get along without Federal usurpation of individual, local, and State responsibilities, and we can get along without Federal competition in business whether it be hotels, furs, rum, clothing, fertilizer, or other things.

The Bible says if thine eye offend they pluck it out. I say if the Federal Government should not engage in such activities, we should first stop new invasions and then gradually, if not abruptly, eliminate the old intrusions. When we do these things we shall balance the budget, for lower taxes and reduced debt. There will be no further need for trick budgets and debt-ceiling evasions and hiding taxes. The Government will be honest in itself, and honest with the people.

A balanced budget could be in sight if (a) we do not increase spending, and (b) we do not reduce taxes. Assuming no further cut in taxes, only a 4-percent reduction in spending, in terms of the President's budget, would bring us to that highly desirable goal.

High Level Garrison Reservoir Gains Widespread Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the widespread support for a 1,850-foot operating level for Garrison Dam Reservoir in North Dakota.

The dam is built, the project is more than 80 percent complete. But because of the opposition of a few people in a limited area the final stages are being held up. These people feel that their fears and their personal wishes are superior to the authority that Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Engineers when the dam was designed and built.

This objection has not been important until now when the reservoir is filling; when the first power will come off the generators. The upstream land must be acquired; the protective works must be built. Orderly progress calls for this work in fiscal 1956.

Congress has been asked by the majority of the people of the State not to further restrict this construction. The rural electric cooperatives—all of them in the State, have sent resolutions protesting this curtailment of hydropower; the Upper Midwest Power Forum, with 400 co-ops represented are against any curtailment of the reservoir capacity. The president of the Mississippi Valley Association, Wilbur Jones, of Omaha, says:

> Congressional approval of this restriction would be a clear-cut example of the welfare of millions being sacrificed to the desires of a few.

The county commissioners of all counties east of the Missouri River by resolution are in favor of the full operating capacity of the dam. Likewise 43 cities in the State; the State legislature; the Farmers Union; 43 civic organizations and groups have publicly declared their support of the high operating level.

Other States along the river have an interest in the increased hydropower, the flood control, and irrigation benefits that a high pool level will mean.

Following are the organizations; counties, and city governmental groups that have sent resolutions to me:

REA CO-OP RESOLUTIONS FAVORING 1,850-FOOT LEVEL ON GARRISON POOL

1. North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Bismarck, N. Dak.
2. Capital Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc., Minot (representing eight co-ops).
4. Kem Electric Cooperative, Inc., Linton.
5. Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Grand Forks.
6. Slope Electric Cooperative, Inc., New England.
7. South Dakota Rural Electric Association, Leola, S. Dak.
8. Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks (representing 10 co-ops).

LIST OF CIVIC AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING 1,850-FOOT LEVEL FOR GARRISON DAM

1. Anamoose Civic Club, Anamoose.
2. Bismarck Chamber of Commerce, Bismarck.
3. Cando Commercial Club, Cando.
4. Carrington Kiwanis Club, Carrington.
5. Cooperstown Commercial Club, Cooperstown.
6. Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce, Devils Lake.
7. Drake Commercial Club, Drake.
8. Drake Volunteer Fire Dept., Drake.
9. Esmond Commercial Club, Esmond.

10. VFW Post, No. 4251—Benson Co., Esmond.
11. Fargo Chamber of Commerce, Fargo.
12. Greater North Dakota Association, Fargo.
13. Fessenden Civic & Commerce Association, Fessenden.
14. South Cottonwood Farmers Union Local No. 48, Fessenden (53 members).
15. Wells County Livestock Association, Fessenden.
16. Grafton Chamber of Commerce, Grafton.
17. Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce, Grand Forks.
18. Minnesota Dairy Company, Grand Forks.
19. Civic & Commerce Association, Harvey.
20. Harvey Co-op Creamery Association, Harvey.
21. Harvey Kiwanis Club, Harvey.
22. Harvey Volunteer Fire Dept., Harvey.
23. Hillsboro Civic & Commerce Association, Hillsboro.
24. Jamestown Chamber of Commerce, Jamestown.
25. Leeds Civic Club, Leeds.
26. McVille Commercial Club, McVille.
27. Wells County Farmers Union, Maddock.
28. Mayville Civic Club, Mayville.
29. Minnewaukan Commercial Club, Minnewaukan.
30. Minot Chamber of Commerce, Minot.
31. Central Irrigation Development Committee, New Rockford.
32. New Rockford Civic Association, New Rockford.
33. Northwood Commercial Club, Northwood.
34. Sheyenne Commercial Club, Sheyenne.
35. Turtle Lake Commercial Club, Turtle Lake.
36. Upham Commercial Club, Upham.
37. Valley City Chamber of Commerce, Valley City.
38. Velva Sportsmen's Club, Velva.
39. Sheyenne Valley Rod and Gun Club, Warwick.
40. North Dakota Farm Bureau, Fargo.
41. James River Valley Development Association, Huron, S. Dak.
42. North Dakota State Legislature, Bismarck.
43. North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, State Capitol Building, Bismarck.

LIST OF NORTH DAKOTA COUNTIES WHO HAVE SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS FAVORING 1,850-FOOT POOL LEVEL

1. Adams (population 4,910).
2. Barnes (population 16,884).
3. Benson (population 10,675).
4. Bottineau (population 12,140).
5. Burleigh (population 25,673).
6. Cass (population 58,877).
7. Dickey (population 9,121).
8. Eddy (population 5,372).
9. Emmons (population 9,715).
10. Grand Forks (population 39,443).
11. LaMoure (population 9,498).
12. Mountrail (population 9,418).
13. Nelson.
14. Pierce (population 8,326).
15. Ramsey (population 14,373).
16. Ransom (population 14,373).
17. Renville (population 5,405).
18. Richland (population 19,865).
19. Sargent (population 7,616).
20. Sheridan.
21. Slope (population 2,315).
22. Stutsman.
23. Steele (population 5,145).
24. Traill (population 11,359).
25. Towner (population 6,360).
26. Ward (population 34,782).
27. Wells (population 10,417).

CITIES SUPPORTING THE 1,850-FOOT LEVEL OF THE GARRISON DAM, N. DAK.

1. Anamoose, N. Dak.
2. Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Bottineau, N. Dak.
4. Carrington, N. Dak.
5. Casselton, N. Dak.
6. Cavalier, N. Dak.
7. Cooperstown, N. Dak.
8. Devils Lake, N. Dak.
9. Drake, N. Dak.
10. Drayton, N. Dak.
11. Edgeley, N. Dak.
12. Esmond, N. Dak.
13. Fargo, N. Dak.
14. Grand Forks, N. Dak.
15. Harvey, N. Dak.
16. Hazen, N. Dak.
17. Hillsboro, N. Dak.
18. Jamestown, N. Dak.
19. Kramer, N. Dak.
20. Lakota, N. Dak.
21. LaMoure, N. Dak.
22. Larimore, N. Dak.
23. Lidgerwood, N. Dak.
24. Lisbon, N. Dak.
25. McClusky, N. Dak.
26. Maddock, N. Dak.
27. Mandan, N. Dak.
28. Mayville, N. Dak.
29. Minnewaukan, N. Dak.
30. Minot, N. Dak.
31. New Rockford, N. Dak.
32. Northwood, N. Dak.
33. Oakes, N. Dak.
34. Park River, N. Dak.
35. Pembina, N. Dak.
36. Richardton, N. Dak.
37. Rugby, N. Dak.
38. Streeter, N. Dak.
39. Towner, N. Dak.
40. Turtle Lake, N. Dak.
41. Underwood, N. Dak.
42. Valley City, N. Dak.
43. Wahpeton, N. Dak.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in reaching my decision to support H. R. 12, I have given serious consideration to all aspects of the farm problem. I do not claim that the passage of this legislation will result in solving the difficult problem of overproduction of food, nor that it will result in higher prices for farm products. My criticism of the present policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson are based upon information compiled by his own Department of Agriculture as they affect our farm families today in the State of Delaware.

It appears that the Republican administration is leading the Delaware farmer down the road to lower income even faster than the farmers of the country as a whole.

For 20 years we heard from the Republican Party stories of how the Democrats were destroying the economy of the country and how they were particularly bringing "socialistic" ruin to the farmers. Yet under the years of Democratic administration cash income of the American farmer rose to heights that never before had been reached. There was a real increase in the farmer's purchasing power that made him a prosperous consumer for the production of our factories.

I am severely disturbed by the latest figures on the cash income of farmers in the State of Delaware released by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It seems to me that farm income is dropping in my State and in the Nation as a whole at a rate that gives genuine cause for alarm.

Secretary Benson reports that in the first 2 months of 1955 cash income of Delaware farmers had further declined $2,226,000—a quarter of a million dollars a week. If this disastrous decline in Delaware farm income is not halted, it will mean a cash loss of a million dollars a month, or $12 million for the calendar year ending January 1, 1956.

Figures recently released by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1954 Delaware farm income fell from $103,411,000 in 1953 to $93,708,000—a loss of $9,703,000. These figures indicate that a continuation of the present policies of the Republican Administration will cost Delaware farmers $21 million by January 1, 1956, representing the last two calendar years.

Secretary Benson's farm income report shows that farm income as a whole throughout our Nation was $4,452,000,000 the first 2 months of this year, a drop of $251 million from the same 2-month period of last year. That is a quarter of a billion dollars out of the pockets of America's farmers in just 2 months. There has been no corresponding reduction in their costs of operation in this period. The Department itself admits that most of this drop has had to come out of the farmers' earnings.

But in 1953 when the so-called friends of the farmers were in power, the "friends" who had been telling them how bad the alleged policies of the Democratic Party were, the farmers' income immediately began to decline. It dropped to $31,413,000,000. Last year's farm receipts were down to $29,954,000,000. This year, according to the early indications, the drop will be even further.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture this week issued a report called The Agricultural Outlook Digest.

I quote from this report:

> With prices a little lower, and marketings nearly as large, cash receipts from farm marketings are expected to be lower in 1954. The net income realized by farm operators will be down in 1955, perhaps by as much as 5 percent.

Why should this be if the economy is prosperous, if income in the country as a whole will be about the level of last year? Why should the farmer's income be cut still further than it already has?

Secretary Benson's Department supplies the answer. I quote from the Outlook Digest:

> Consumer income after taxes so far this year has been running about 3 percent above the same period of 1954. About one-fourth continues to be spent for food. But a little less of the consumer's food dollar is going to

the farmer—42 cents in the first quarter compared with 45 cents a year earlier.

And, they might have added, compared with a high of 56 cents that was reached under Democratic administration.

So there is your answer as to why the farmer is going to take another 5 percent cut in his income this year—under the most optimistic circumstances—and as to why the farmers in Delaware may take a cut much deeper than that. The farmer is getting only 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. The middleman is getting 58 cents. A year ago it was a 45–55 split. The farmer gets only 42 cents for all the work of planting the crop, raising it, harvesting it, and hauling it to market. The middleman, who takes his crops at that point and puts them on the consumer's table, gets 58 cents out of the dollar.

To make these statistics specific let me cite just one more recent report by Secretary Benson. In his annual report on the production of chickens and eggs, he informs us that Delaware broilermen raised 69,620,000 birds last year, an increase of more than 1 million over the previous year. Weight of these birds was 216 million pounds, a gain of 4 million pounds. But the income received from sale of these birds was $48,816,000 compared with $55,803,000 in 1953.

One million more birds, 4 million more pounds of succulent Delaware broiler meat, and $7 million less income. Most of that drop had to come out of Delaware broilermen's net income. Their costs of production were down a little, but not that much.

So there is the picture in Delaware as in the country as a whole, farm income dropping further every month from an already discouraging level that has been reached under the Republican administration. Farmers will have at least 5 percent less income this year than last. Other people's incomes will be up 3 percent, if we may believe the administration's forecast. The farmer's share is a little less than it was, just 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. We see no signs of distress on the part of Secretary Benson or his associates about this situation. They raise no cry of alarm.

A bulletin compiled by the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, dated March 26, 1955, states that—

> Farm prices have declined 7 percent from 1949 to 1954, and in this same period retail food prices have increased 13 percent.

This unprecedented change in producer-consumer prices has taken place under what was promised as an administration pledge to 100 percent parity for the farmers and more food at cheaper prices for the housewife. What a farce these promises have turned out to be. An expensive lesson for the farmers and housewives but perhaps it will be one well learned.

The present policies of the Republican administration with respect to farm prices must be changed by act of Congress. I shall vote for a return to the policies which under 20 years of Democratic administration brought the greatest era of prosperity to not only the American farmer, but to all segments of our economy—farmer, industrialist, businessman and laborer—thus resulting in the greatest consumer buying power the world has ever known. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote for 90 percent of parity and in so doing exercise my responsibility to safeguard the economic well-being of my constituents.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 164th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, and on this occasion I want to pay a justly deserved tribute to the great people of Poland. It is most fitting that we, here in the United States House of Representatives, pause for a moment to contemplate the plight of the brave men and women of Poland now held prisoners behind communism's curtain of repression and brutality.

The constitution adopted 164 years ago demonstrated the faith in democracy and the basic freedoms which characterizes the people of Poland. Their faith has never wavered, despite the continuing ordeals they have undergone throughout the years.

Tragedy begets tragedy. The significance of this statement is readily seen when one recalls the suppression, the dismemberment and the partition of Poland throughout the centuries. In their long history, the people of Poland have had little opportunity to enjoy their inalienable right of freedom. Yet, their devotion to that cause remains paramount.

Today, from behind the iron curtain, we hear reports of heroic action on the part of these people who refuse to bend to the oppressors' demands, and who refuse to accept slavery as a normal state of mankind. The process of freedom is very slow, and although today we do not hear of any violent revolutions, there are definite actions on the part of the people and the Government of this country which are small tokens of assurance to the Polish people, and people of other nations, that are now being denied their God-given right of freedom. These tributes today, I sincerely hope will reach the hungry ears of all freedom loving people everywhere, for it is often said that the fires of freedom burn hottest among the oppressed. Lip service is not enough, however. We, who enjoy full freedom should redouble our efforts to restore Poland to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Acts of impunity and incidents of disdain are everincreasing. These incidents will grow and multiply until the Polish people will once again shake themselves loose of these parasitic aggressors and regain their rights and the freedom to which all God-fearing people are entitled. Such incidents will become more frequent until atheistic communism is a thing of the past, and once again the Polish people are free to worship their own God—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

It is not within the order of things that wrong shall triumph over that which is right. The day of freedom for that brave country will soon be at hand. The day that every Pole has visualized since the proclamation of their now dormant constitution will return.

Mr. Speaker, in this world beset with atomic hypertension, and with the imminent threat of global warfare let us take heart as we look to the courageousness of our Polish brethren. Let us redouble our efforts for peace in the world and the restoration of liberty and self-government to Poland and other freedom-loving nations now under Communist rule.

Justice for Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning justice for the island of Cyprus:

JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS

Last December the United Nations General Assembly voted to postpone indefinitely any further consideration of the Cyprus question. The United States delegation supported the move. Unfortunately, this indefinite postponement has not made the problem melt away, and while it exists, the ill feeling it generates between the NATO partners, Greece and Great Britain, will continue to complicate western unity and give comfort to the Communists.

House Concurrent Resolution 26, introduced on January 6, puts us squarely on the side of justice; it declares that Congress favors the United States delegation to the United Nations taking "all possible steps expeditiously to bring about consideration by the United Nations of the question of self-determination of the population of Cyprus." I wholeheartedly support this positive stand. Cypriots ask only their God-given right to determine for themselves under which flag they wish to live. They should not be denied the rights that many of them, as well as Americans, defended on the battlefield.

For many years residents of Cyprus have been pleading for reunion with Greece. They have good reason: The great majority, or about 80 percent of citizens of Cyprus, are Greek, that is, Greek in language, Greek in church, Greek in culture. Although the island has been governed throughout the ages by a succession of foreign powers, Cypriots have clung to their Hellenic ties. Centuries of domination by Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Romans, and Turks could not eradicate the Hellenic inclinations of the people of Cyprus. The present occupying power, Great Britain, first got a foothold on the island in 1878 under an agreement with Turkey

to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russia, but Cyprus remained a Turkish possession. Great Britain formally annexed Cyprus in 1914 when at war with Turkey. The ensuing 4 decades of British rule no more erased Cypriot yearning for reunion with Greece than had previous occupations. Over the years various appeals made to England to permit union with Greece were to no avail. As late as 1950 in a plebiscite organized by the Archbishop of Cyprus, the vote showed that 95.7 percent of the 215,000 voters favored union with Greece.

The British have sought our support in denying self-determination to Cyprus on the grounds that the island is vital to safeguarding Mediterranean bases. The strategic value of the island is undeniable. But Western defense will not be affected by a transfer of sovereignty. Greece is a vital partner of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and has already demonstrated how valiant it can be against the Communist threat. It seems to me, also, that the base could be better maintained if the surrounding population were friendly citizens of Greece rather than hostile subjects of Britain.

It behooves the United States to boldly uphold those principles of freedom and independence for which Cypriots cry out. Although the island is small and the population only a little more than 500,000, it is unworthy of our traditions to turn a deaf ear to Cypriot pleas. To continue to ignore Cypriot aspirations would be a mockery of the ideals we cherish. Let us, then, support House Concurrent Resolution 26 so that we may hasten the day when justice is done in Cyprus.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1955, the people of Poland, long oppressed by the Nazis and now enslaved by the Communists, cry out for freedom. Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday is a symbol and rallying point of her people. A day that signifies an unrelenting search for independence—an independence lost when the Russian Army under the pretext of freeing Poland in reality destroyed her independence.

The Polish people oppose the Communists at every turn and in every way they can. Such opposition is certainly to be encouraged and the people supported in their efforts to be free. The Poles cannot, of course, object in an organized way on a national level, but they can be given the comfort and assistance of the free world. The Polish-Americans of our great country are their greatest source of encouragement and by their example may do much eventually to assist them in their quest for liberation.

The need for a free and independent Poland was recognized by former President Woodrow Wilson when he made it one of his famous 14 points announced in January 1917. Our present Government recognizes this goal and should do everything it can to attain it. The warm friendship of the Polish people for Americans is evident and this mutual admiration is the strongest link in the chain of freedom that will some day replace the yoke of communism.

Upon the occasion of the celebration of this important day in the lives of the Polish people, I wish to add my congratulations and my sincere desire to assist in achieving their complete independence.

Loyalty Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day program in Oshkosh, Wis., on Saturday, April 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGER OF "SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY"

I am pleased to address this great patriotic occasion.

This is the climax of a great and unforgettable day here in Oshkosh.

Today, the people of this industrious area have participated in and have themselves been thrilled by an inspiring demonstration of Americanism.

You have seen in the musical units, the impressive floats, the marching uniformed heroes—a living symbol of the real strength of America.

TRIBUTE TO VFW

It is particularly a delight to appear here under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, among other outstanding groups.

Certainly, there is no group in our Nation which is more entitled to hold aloft the banner of American patriotism today and any other day—than is that group of men who served this Nation on the field of battle—in foreign lands, on foreign seas and in foreign skies.

You gentlemen of the VFW and your wives and children and other loved ones know directly what it is to give your all for your country.

Today you are reaffirming your own fervent dedication to America. And everyone here, taking inspiration from what you have personally achieved previously on the battlefield, and what you are doing today joins in this rededication.

In Washington, it has been a pleasure to cooperate with the Veterans of Foreign Wars national office in securing observance throughout the Nation of May Day—Loyalty Day.

This day is but one of a great many achievements which are well credited to the outstanding record of the VFW. That record is part and parcel of the overall American saga—a saga which dates from Lexington and Concord onward through Belleau Wood and the Argonne Forest and Normandy and Inchon. It is the saga of sacrifice which has helped make America the strongest, the freest, soundest nation in the world today.

LOYALTY FROM WITHIN

Now, although we here today have concentrated on the outward evidences of patriotism—with the Star Spangled Banner flying before us, we know that the real meaning of loyalty is the meaning from within.

Loyalty is a quality of mind, an attitude of heart. Loyalty is the unseen flag which waves silently within us. It is the national anthem on our lips, even though it is not being sung at that very moment.

Loyalty is gratitude for the most priceless blessings that any people have ever enjoyed. Loyalty is the determination that this magnificent heritage which is ours, shall not be bartered away or dissipated, but rather that it shall pass on—in fact—to succeeding generations.

Loyalty is something that you cannot force; it either exists spontaneously or it does not exist. Either men and women really believe in their country; either they would honorably live and, if necessary, die for it; or they have doubts about their country and a feeling that there is some superior system—some totalitarian system.

Fortunately, the number of individuals with such doubts is relatively few, and yet I shall speak to you today on those in our land who are loyal but do not live their loyalty. They sincerely love their country, but they do not lift their hands and their hearts for it, and so their loyalty becomes an idle thing which lacks real meaning because it is not applied.

LOYALTY WEAKENED BY INDIFFERENCE

It is a loyalty weakened by ignorance and indifference.

Ignorance of what?

Indifference to what?

Ignorance of the problems and the dangers and the challenges of our time.

Now, let us turn to the dangers, first of all.

THREE DANGERS TO US

There are, as I see it, three great dangers to us today. They are:

1. The foreign threat of international communism — the menace of aggressive Soviet imperialism;

2. The menace of subversive activity right here at home; and, finally,

3. There is a menace which I shall call the threat of subversive inactivity.

THE MENACE OF RED IMPERIALISM

Now, you are all familiar with the first phase of the threat—the danger of Soviet imperialism—which already controls one-third of the world's people and one-fourth of the world's land surface.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the largest ground forces in the world at its command: The 175-division Red army; the massed millions of Red China; the half-million men of the Soviet satellites in eastern Europe.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the second largest navy in the world, including the largest of all U-boat fleets and the largest air force in the world.

You are aware that the Soviet Union is proceeding at full speed for the development of a program of intercontinental guided and ballistic missiles.

The ballistic missiles in particular may be able, in a matter of years, to reach the city of Oshkosh at a speed of 10,000 miles per hour. Thus, possibly in half an hour, after being fired from a Red launching site, they could explode with nuclear warheads right in our midst.

Against intercontinental ballistic missiles, flying at supersonic speed, there is today no known defense. Not even the Nike guided missiles, which today ring Milwaukee and other major cities, are defense against the ballistic missiles which may be produced in a matter of years. Why? Because the

intercontinental ballistic missile is like a bullet.

It would not be guided by electronics and so it probably could not be jammed by electronics. It would simply be fired like a bullet or an artillery shell and once it were to start, it might not be stopped except by hitting something.

This, then, is an example of danger of Soviet imperialism.

But there is a danger more immediately confronting us.

BEWARE OF RED CHINA'S WORDS

Today, our eyes are principally directed against the menace of aggressive Red China. For weeks and months, the Peking radio has been shouting boastfully of its intention to use force to capture the key island of Formosa.

The United States, in solemn treaty and by near unanimous resolution of its Congress, is soundly determined to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas. Why? Because they are bulwarks of our chain of defense.

Then, at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia came the indication from Chinese Red Premier, Chou En-lai, that he was willing to talk over the attainment of peace in the Formosa Straits.

Because we want peace, we hope that he means what he said. However, the past Communist record is full of such chronic treachery, such double-crossing, so many repeated reversals that we must remain wary and vigilant. The Reds blow hot, and the Reds blow cold. They talk peace one day and war the next day, and peace the third day. Obviously, we can never place real confidence in their words. The only thing which speaks is their deeds.

Let them therefore agree to an immediate cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. Let them release the unjustly imprisoned United States airmen, and other American prisoners. Let them prove their words. Let them not try to use Formosa peace talks as a cover for aggression elsewhere—as in Southeast Asia.

And let us not be gullible. Let us not be naive.

Let us not of course assume that peace in the Formosa Straits is impossible and that nothing can be done to prevent a United States-Red Chinese collision. But at the same time, let us not go to the opposite extreme of assuming that the Chinese Red dragon is overnight going to change its fundamental, imperialistic character.

Vigilance requires us to be as wise as serpents and as gentle as doves.

The loyal American is the vigilant American. He is loyal in support of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, in whose hands lie one of the heaviest responsibilities which has ever been conferred on an American President.

THE DANGER OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

But, now, I want to turn to the second danger to which I earlier referred. It is the danger of Soviet-directed subversive activity here at home. It is the danger of the Alger Hisses, the Judith Coplons, the Klaus Fuchs, the Julius and Ethel Rosenbergs, and other traitors in the midst of the free world.

John Edgar Hoover, able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has estimated that there are 22,000 members of the United States Communist Party today.

This means 22,000 agents of Soviet imperialism, 22,000 individuals whose loyalty is first to the Soviet Union—first, last, and always to the Soviet Union.

Moreover, the estimate has been that for every member of the Communist Party, there are up to 10 fellow travelers.

They are ready, willing, and eager to do the Communist Party work, but they are not willing to be identified outright with the Red conspiracy.

They are, however, just as much a menace, if not more so, than the active Reds.

And let me point out that there are uncounted numbers in what might be called the Communist reserve. They have never been identified directly or indirectly with the Communist conspiracy, even as fellow travelers.

These are really the top servants of the party. They have been instructed absolutely to avoid all contact with Communist publications, individuals, or groups. They are entirely held in reserve for top-secret work and for the most critical future occasions. These are the sort of secret agents who might even slip through a security-screening system, because their record might show no subversive affiliation in the past.

Against the domestic menace of Communists, fellow travelers, and secret Red reservists, I, for one, have introduced numerous anti-Communist bills in this Congress, as in previous Congresses.

One of my bills is to increase the penalties for seditious conspiracy. Still another bill is to strengthen the statute for immediate registration of foreign agents who have been trained in espionage, sabotage, and similar efforts.

I hope these bills will be enacted in the 84th Congress.

THE MENACE OF SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY

But finally now, my friends, I want to refer to a third threat, and this is one which may not have occurred to some people.

I refer to the threat of subversive inactivity.

What do I mean by that?

I refer to the type of do-nothing, think-nothing, sense-nothing American citizen who nonetheless feels he is loyal to our country. He says he loves America and everything it stands for. He does despise communism and all things totalitarian.

But this type of American is unwittingly subversive, because of his sheer inactivity.

Unlike active Americans such as you in this fine audience, the type of person I am describing just doesn't bother about his civic responsibilities. He won't stir himself except for his own selfish needs.

He probably doesn't vote. He doesn't have an interest in government. He never shows up at public meetings. He doesn't inform himself. He doesn't take any interest in his neighborhood or in his community or in his church.

He doesn't know the names of his public officials. He doesn't work in his Parent-Teacher Association. He doesn't look after proper thinking and behavior by his youngsters. He doesn't know much about the world.

He is only interested in making a living for himself, but not in making a real life.

Now, preoccupation with one's personal problems may be understandable because, after all, each of us gets tied up now and then in personal affairs.

Let us be frank and admit that all of us at times may be somewhat remiss in doing our share as active citizens. No one is perfect. All of us can achieve still more in service of our country. But I am not talking about occasional oversights or missing a few responsibilities now and then. I'm talking about the man who chronically doesn't care at all. This type of care-nothing, do-nothing individual does his country no good, does himself no good, because he is unwilling to take active steps to protect his country.

By his inactivity, he unwittingly weakens America, weakens its fiber, its vigilance, leaves it and its institution unprotected.

And so, I say, my friends, let us reduce the ranks of this man I have described as unwittingly subversive. Let us all recognize that we can become even better Americans like the heroes whom you and I have seen with pride today—the heroes of our battlefields.

The man who is truly loyal to America is the man who fights as well on the battlefield of peace. He tries to take an active role in government, to the extent that he can. He is a constructive citizen. He is a churchgoer and religion really is a force in his life. He tries to do his part to make his community the finest possible community in which he and his family can grow and thrive. He encourages good influences in his neighborhood—wholesome sports and recreation.

He keeps himself informed about what is going on in his country and in his world. He casts an intelligent ballot. He listens to public speeches. He reads and listens to the news carefully. He doesn't accept anybody's synthetic thinking. He thinks for himself. He is not afraid to trace ideas down to their lair, instead of merely thinking superficially.

This is the sort of patriot we need—the man who fulfills his American role in the finest sense of the term.

CONCLUSION

We can all strive to be like this man. We can all improve. And seeing this wonderful audience today assures me that Oshkosh will never be found lagging in doing its part.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today. It is a pleasure to join with you in this rededication to all that we hold dear. Rededication is the loyalty from within.

It is thanks to efforts such as your own that we will keep our country strong and free. Thus, forever more, freemen everywhere can look to this land for that standard to which, in the words of the father of our country: "The wise and the honest may repair."

Trans World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess of Congress it was my good fortune to go on the "press flight" which Trans World Airlines scheduled to introduce to the public its great new airplanes, the super-G Constellations. On this 10-day trip we visited 3 countries—Ireland, Egypt, and Spain. Of course, we saw many interesting places and people. But the most interesting and encouraging experience that I had was to come to understand what an outstanding job of building international goodwill this great corporation, TWA, was doing in the three countries we visited. I found that not only was the company respected and admired for its efficient operations, but that by its employment and other policies as well as the attitude of its American employees, TWA was doing much to build goodwill for the United States of America.

At a time when there are so many reasons to be concerned by difficult problems in the field of foreign policy, it is truly a pleasure to be able to report that an American enterprise on its own initiative and following a policy of intelligent and enlightened self-interest is doing a real job of improving international understanding.

Austrian-Russian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days there has been considerable publicity given to the four-power Austrian treaty negotiations. It appears that our State Department in its overly zealous desire to secure any type of peace treaty is altering the time honored position of the United States of the protection of oppressed peoples. The United States is about to allow the repatriation of thousands of Russian Nationals who have found asylum from Communist terror in the free zones of Austria. The American people are entitled to an explanation and to a statement of the position of our Department of State concerning article 16 of the Austrian Treaty. They are entitled to know, whether before the United States approves this treaty, the more than 30,000 Russian refugees now living in Austria will be protected, and will not be forced to return to Russia to face the hangman's noose.

Article 16 of the Austrian Treaty provides for the repatriation of all displaced persons now living in Austria; for free visitation to displaced person camps or centers by Soviet representatives for the purpose of coercing such persons into returning to Russia; it prohibits in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the U. S. S. R. and any activities designed to induce such persons not to return to Russia; it dissolves any organizations existing in such camps which may be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of Soviet Russia; and it refuses relief or aid to those persons who refuse to return to Russia.

If article 16 is allowed to remain in this treaty, the United States will be a party to the massacre of thousands of persons whose only crime is a love of freedom. Our State Department must assure the American people of its firm stand against article 16.

I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 3, 1955, which I believe clearly summarizes the effect of article 16 of the Austrian Treaty:

THIRTY THOUSAND LIVES

"The Austrian treaty negotiations are a case study for the free world. They can be a lesson for those who still trust the Soviet word. * * *

"They are a story of broken pledges on one hand and frustrated hopes on the other * * * an illustration of the methods employed by the Soviet Union to exploit other people and other nations."

Until a month ago that was the State Department's description of 10 years' futile efforts to negotiate an Austrian treaty with the Soviets.

Those 10 years of Soviet duplicity should not be forgotten unless the Soviets at the current negotiations in Vienna give startling and positive proof of genuine change.

An early test of Soviet intentions—Whether they want an honest, decent treaty or have only another propaganda gimmick up their sleeves—could be made on Article 16 of the draft treaty. It may affect the lives of 30,000 refugees in Austria—refugees from communism—and other thousands who may in the future get through the Iron Curtain.

Article 16 compels Austria "to take all necessary measure to complete voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory"; to enter bilateral negotiations with Iron Curtain countries for their repatriation; to permit Soviet officials to "visit freely" refugee camps; to prohibit propaganda against the allies, meaning Russia. It also prohibits Austria from giving any relief "to persons who refuse to return to their native countries."

There are many legal arguments claiming this article is obsolete and would not apply to refugees now in Austria. They seem to forget the Soviet ability to twist agreements to their own diabolical uses. There is one certain way to protect these refugees—delete the article from the treaty.

Some argue that it is a harmless article because it refers only to "voluntary repatriation" and therefore, could not be used to force people to return home. But they overlook the tricks the Soviets play on words.

We have signed many agreements and treaties with the Soviets calling for "free elections." But we learned, too late, that in Communist language "free elections" mean rigged elections. Likewise with "democratic" governments, which turned out to mean Communist governments, and "independent" states, by which the Soviets meant satellite states.

What is the Soviet definition of "voluntary repatriation"? Experience should have taught us that it is forced repatriation.

The United States and other Western allies engaged at the close of the war with the Soviets in forced deportation, forced expulsion, and forced repatriation of people. It was a shameful practice then. It would be even more shameful now to be hoodwinked into loosely written treaty articles which would raise any doubts about our opposition to such practices.

Article 16 in the draft treaty must go.

For 10 years the Soviets have ruthlessly exploited the Austrian Nation and people. We understand Austria's overwhelming desire to get rid of the Red army. But a treaty which includes articles like No. 16, which deny Austria full sovereignty, would merely legalize the Soviet right to continue exploitation she has been carrying on illegally for 10 years.

Dillon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the Civil Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to urge that the committee amend the pending appropriations to include funds for the Dillon Dam. At this time, I should like to call the attention to the Members of this House to the situation which exists with respect to this worthy flood-control project. I believe those Members whose congressional districts are periodically visited by flood disasters in the Ohio and lower Mississippi Valleys may be particularly interested in this issue. My remarks are as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the occasion for my appearing before this committee this morning is to appraise the membership of the status of one of the important flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers, which is a part of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers.

The particular project to which I refer is known as the Dillon Dam or Reservoir, located on the Licking River, in the 15th District of Ohio, at a point 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers near Zanesville. The project was authorized in section 4 of Public Law 761 of the 75th Congress, enacted on June 28, 1938.

Work was commenced on this project in 1946, and after an expenditure of $9,189,800 it now stands at about one-third of completion. Approximately $17,900,000 is yet required to complete the project. Active construction work on the project was suspended several years ago, and since the suspension the area has been permitted to erode and deteriorate.

The purpose of my appearance here this morning is to recommend to the committee that the appropriation bill under consideration at this time be amended to include provision for this project—at least to the extent of the $2 million figure last sought by the Corps of Engineers to provide for continued construction for the ensuing fiscal year.

In support of my urgent recommendation, I would prefer to direct the committee's attention to the need for the project, rather than to the dimensions and detail of the dam and reservoir. The plans have been in existence for a great number of years and are contained in the planning report, Dillon Reservoir project, Licking River, Ohio, Ohio River Basin, prepared by the Huntington, W. Va., district office of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in January 1954. The project and its jurisdiction have already received the approval of the Congress many years ago. This approval was endorsed in succeeding years through the provision of funds aggregating $9 million in authorizations for construction.

Those questions having been disposed of in the past, my purpose today is to point out the compelling need which lies behind the project. If any of the members here have witnessed the devastating effects of a flood along the Ohio or Mississippi River, they are aware of the waste, the death, and the destruction which are regularly visited upon this area. It is not difficult to understand that the waters which create those flood conditions do not originate with the major rivers, but come from the waters of smaller streams many miles away. The floods cannot be controlled by dikes or dams along these major streams. Control must come from upstream along the tributaries draining the area where the floods originate.

In 1938 the Flood Control Act was passed to provide a comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. An integral part of this plan included safeguards for the people and property of Zanesville, McConnelsville, Marietta and the other communities along the Muskingum River. Through the control of the rampaging Muskingum, a large measure of protection could

be achieved for those who live in the major river valleys below. Congress then saw the validity and need for the plans contained in the legislation and authorized sufficient funds to build the dams and reservoirs to help hold back the floods and relieve the burden of the Ohio River at peak times. Fourteen dams were constructed on other tributaries of the Muskingum River. Dillon is 15th and the last link to complete the control program. It was designed to hold the Licking River, a major tributary of the Muskingum. The Licking River forms 29 percent of the uncontrolled watershed area. Until it is finished, the Muskingum is still rambunctious. The floods continue to have their devastating effect along the 77.6 miles from the city of Zanesville to the mouth of the Muskingum at Marietta, inundating, destroying, killing, and wasting. Industries and homes in the communities feel the periodic effect of the floods. Had the Dillon Dam been completed this last link in the control pattern would prevent this regular and unnecessary visitation of disaster and havoc in the river valley.

I readily understand that it is indeed difficult for this committee and the Corps of Engineers to make a decision as to the relative merits of the projects to be considered. In a plan so widespread in its effect as this one for the flood control of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers, each individual reservoir is doubtlessly a worthy one. But I must respectfully point out that with Dillon, it is not a question now of making a decision. That decision was made by Congress in 1946 when construction was begun and by succeeding Congresses which voted approval of the more than $9 million that has been expended. After that great sum of money had been expended, after approximately 800 landowners have been faced with the prospect of displacement and have abandoned any long-range plans with respect to the use of their properties, the Congress has failed to authorize additional funds to complete the project. The temporary halt occasioned by the Korean conflict has begun a permanent deferment of Dillon. As a result, $9 million of the taxpayers' money has been spent with no benefit realized. No benefit will be realized from the investment until the project is completed. Instead of sorely needed flood control, costly confusion on a broad scale has resulted. Eight hundred landowners along the Licking River do not know whether to plant corn, fertilize, build fences, improve their buildings or to await the condemnation proceedings they have expected for so long. Meanwhile, work costing $9 million is deteriorating and depreciating by erosion and rust and the destruction of periodic floods continues inexorably. The expenditures have had the same futile effect as though we had flung them into the raging, muddy floodwaters of the Muskingum.

Mr. Chairman, I know you will be the first to raise your voice against such a glaring waste of Federal funds—the tax money of your constituents and mine. The Corps of Engineers has justified the expenditure, but there is no benefit from an uncompleted project.

Here are cold facts with regard to the Dillon project, in addition to the compelling ones of the previous approval by the Corps of Engineers and of the Congress. Dillon would reduce the crest of the 1913 flood by 4 feet at Zanesville, a city of more than 40,000 people, and would have reduced the peak flow into the Ohio River by 32,000 cubic feet per second. Control of those 32,000 cubic feet per second, now, one-third completed at Dillon, would play an important part in controlling the flood level at Ironton, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, and Cairo. Dillon would raise the controlled drainage area of the Muskingum watershed from 62 to 73 percent. The present completed reservoirs have reduced the frequency of damaging floods, but Dillon would reduce this frequency to once in 50 years. No flood of record subsequent to 1913 would have inundated, even the low-lying areas, had Dillon been completed.

The reasons of 1938 when the plan was authorized and the reasons in 1946 when the first money was spent are still valid and compelling reasons for the completion of the dam today. The need was imperative then. It is imperative now. In fact, there are new and additional reasons along the banks of the Muskingum and Ohio Rivers. These valleys have assumed new importance industrially with the completion of the new $40 million power project at Beverly which, combined with the Philo powerplant, provide a tremendous source of electric power. These installations have, in turn, spurred industrial interest from all over the Nation and new industries are going up all along the rivers to use the electric power generated there. The coal and chemicals to supply and supplement the huge atomic-energy project in southern Ohio and to carry into effect America's new program for the decentralization of industry are a significant segment of our national defense planning in which the Dillon Dam is a valuable key.

Mr. Chairman, with these as my reasons, I urge and earnestly request that this subcommittee recommend the amendment of the present appropriation bill to include a sufficient amount for the Dillon Reservoir project to permit construction to be carried out in the ensuing fiscal year.

The Need for an Adequate National System of Civil Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on April 27, 1955, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting speech before the Airport Operators Council in Seattle, Wash., concerning the need for an adequate national system of civil airports. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE AIRPORT OPERATORS' COUNCIL, SEATTLE, WASH., APRIL 27, 1955

I can see no reason for telling this audience how pleased I am that you invited me to be your speaker tonight. Give a Senator the opportunity of coming home, add to that the opportunity to make a speech, and arrange that his home is the State of Washington, and you have made him happy. I know you can see how good I feel over the whole business.

You know, we deal in superlatives on the Senate floor—sometimes. My Kentucky colleagues have a poem they quote now and then which is loaded with superlatives, and I often feel like rewriting it for my State. They say "Moonlight falls the softest in Kentucky, and summer days come oftenest, in Kentucky."

Well, I doubt that, it's just an example of exaggerated State pride.

But I do know that here in Washington we have the biggest, most beautiful dogwood blossoms in the whole land. And none of you has ever seen a city with more perfect reasons for picture windows than my home town of Seattle.

That same Kentucky poem has some final lines that I think all of us here will deny. I've heard some of your discussions and I know now that every one of you face problems much greater than those faced by the other fellow. But Kentucky says:

"Mountains tower grandest, politicians are
the blandest,
And politics the damnedest in Kentucky."

Now we all know that isn't true. I'll stack the great Northwest up against any other part of the country, politics, airports, aviation developments, and all.

Of course, you cannot take a sectional view of aviation. This industry is nationwide; yes, worldwide—too big in scope for us to narrow our vision. Each of you can be most interested in your special airport, but you will agree that your airport's most important aspect is its relation with the rest of the world.

Not long ago, speaking on transportation, before State officials of the western States, I pointed at a few of the special conditions that obtain in these States in relation to transportation. I said that airplanes are contemptuous of distance and terrain obstacles, and that—along with the great distances we have out here—makes air transportation especially valuable to us. The results are good loads for the air carriers, and widespread use of the airplane in agriculture and business.

The CAA estimates that owners of 35,070 planes, 57 percent of all that flew in 1953, reported that they did some business flying in that year. That is not surprising to us here in the West. Every day we see ranchers, farmers, contractors, oil-well operators, doctors, merchants, and salesmen using their personal planes to cover great distances and transact business. This business use of what we might call the private plane is growing steadily—rising from 29 percent right after the war to 57 percent in 1953. The personal airplane is doing what the personal automobile has been doing—a promising development, I think.

The airplane is doing great things in agriculture out here, too. At least five new planes, new in design and structure now are being produced for the aerial applicator—a very practical and businesslike example of how firmly this use of the airplane is established in this Nation's food- and fiber-producing business. The CAA estimates that every person in the United States eats, touches, or wears something every day of the year that an agricultural airplane has treated beforehand.

So we have a great stake in the airplane out here where our business transportation needs are great and our crops include food, forests, fruits, and forage crops.

And thus, it follows, we have a great stake in airports. Growth of aviation depends always on adequate airports.

I would commend you men for the progress you have made with your airports. You share a great part in the progress we have made in air transportation. You helped produce the record volume of nearly 35 million air passengers in 1954, and the safety record of eight-tenths passenger fatalities per 100 million passenger-miles. Without fine airports, properly run, neither of these records would have been possible.

But we must again refrain from taking a narrow view in aviation. Yours are the large airports—but what of the small one?

The CAA has prepared three interesting charts which show most graphically how interdependent all airports are in this country. One chart is centered on Los Angeles, and the cities and towns of the rest of the country are represented by dots of various size indicating how many passengers flew from those places to Los Angeles. You would

expect many people to fly from Chicago or New Orleans to Los Angeles, but what about traffic from the smaller towns? All the figures surprised me. From Presque Isle, Maine, 800 passengers flew to Los Angeles; from Savannah, 500; from Spokane, 10,000; from Kokomo, Ind., 500; from Des Moines, 5,000; and from Huron, S. Dak., 600.

A second chart showed, with the same surprising results, the traffic from big and little places all over the country to New York.

These two charts show, for instance, that people in Scottsbluff or North Platte, Neb., are interested in there being adequate airport facilities in New York, Los Angeles, and for that matter in all major cities. Likewise, the people in both New York and Los Angeles are interested in adequate airport facilities in Scottsbluff and North Platte.

The third chart showed another aspect of today's aviation in which you are actively interested. The CAA checked on the business flying of the J. I. Case Manufacturing Co., and drew lines on a map to show where the executive planes of the company flew. Despite the fact that Case has but three planes, and many companies have five times that many, they covered practically the entire country in this 1 year of business flying—using 395 airports.

These charts point up, impressively, a point which you already know—that the importance of any airport must be measured in its relation to every other airport. How would you like to be the proud owner of the only telephone in the United States? Or how long would you hold the job of manager of the only airport in the United States?

Airports, as such, mean no more to me than to the average air traveler or citizen, but I have worked long and hard in Congress to bring about a more intelligent and more productive attitude toward the problem. For that matter, I worked hard for the airport here in Seattle.

I can assure you the Congress recognizes the full importance of the airport program. Its record of legislation and appropriation has been commendable and has reflected the conviction that Federal aid is an essential.

Niggardly Federal assistance in airport development to meet the facility demands of skyrocketing air transportation and interference with Federal commissions in carrying out the expressed will of Congress are two of the most important handicaps we are faced with.

We have before our present Congress a request for $101 billion for highway construction—but we have also a request for only $11 million for the entire airport system of the United States. This will hardly provide one airport like the Seattle-Tacoma Airport.

It is true that the need for a nationwide system of superhighways is actual and pressing. That this system should be provided with borrowed money and to 11 roads is a matter for Congress to decide. You are going to have a lot of trouble persuading Wyoming and Montana, for example, to pay their share of such a system. But we need the roads to keep pace with our national growth.

We also need airports. Just as much—if not more than highways. They provide the key to the most essential facility of our national defense. What is more—with our new jet planes we must have large airports and only a few municipalities can provide these.

Unfortunately, the desires of Congress are subverted by actions of the executive branch of Government, and I believe this has been the case in the airport program. The Civil Aeronautics Act and the Federal Aid to Airports Act calls for "the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aviation."

The whole intent of this policy can be changed, however, when the criteria for allowing Federal aid to airports is arbitrarily set by some official in the executive department. I am becoming more and more convinced that Congress should determine these criteria. It would seem to be the only way in which its wishes can be directed and insured, and the actual intent of its legislation carried out.

In particular, I disliked the exclusion of such items as airport buildings, roads, parking areas and fences, all of which were authorized by the original Airport Act. Nor do I favor the criteria under which the program now is operating—of 30 based airplanes or 3,000 enplaned airline passengers for the airport to be eligible for Federal aid. This criteria can exclude whole classes of airports, which are important in our national system. I know you men recognize that your fine big airports would be decreased in value if we did not have the thousands of smaller airports that serve the people of this country along with you, and send traffic to your fields.

I do, however, look for a change in the administration of this program. When the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate questioned Mr. Louis S. Rothschild before approving his appointment as Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation, we learned that he had a different attitude toward his duties than his predecessor. Mr. Rothschild told us he considered his new post to be one that is concerned with policy matters and should not be an administrative function in any sense of the word. The Secretary of Commerce had previously written me that he conceived of the job of Undersecretary for Transportation in exactly that light—a position of policy supervision, and not of administration. In spite of that we saw continued interference with the CAA and the CAB in their administrative actions. I was especially pleased to hear Mr. Rothschild say that such agencies as the CAA and CAB "have their own powers which should be carried out without leadership or interference from anyone."

I think the CAA and the CAB are in for much more peace of mind and productive effort in carrying through their good work than they have enjoyed heretofore. As I did in the hearings, I want publicly again to commend Fred B. Lee, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, for the good job he has been doing under difficult situations.

Let me review the history of the Federal aid to airports program to illustrate these difficulties. Congress originally authorized $500 million for a period of 7 years, with not to exceed $100 million to be appropriated in any 1 year. Now, Congress does not intend that the exact sum of money authorized shall be appropriated and used, but exercises its best judgment year after year in annual appropriations. But note how these appropriations have varied: In 1947, the largest appropriation was made, $45 million; followed by annual appropriations of $32,500,000; $40 million; $39,500,000; $24,200,000; $18,700,000; and $14,321,154 in 1953. Then, the new administration, in its passion for economy, asked for nothing in fiscal 1954, and our airport development stood by for a year while a committee studied the whole philosophy of Federal aid to airports. That committee, in effect, said to the administration, "Go on as you were with Federal aid, with some changes." Then in 1955, we were asked for $22 million to help with the rather small program we now have under way. And for next year, the administration has asked for $11 million.

I would greatly appreciate hearing the views of you men on this matter. Is the Federal Government going about its job intelligently in producing an adequate national system of airports? Is it committed to a sensible, long range policy?

The contrast between our attitude toward highways and airports is disturbing. The administration has asked for $101 billion for roads and $11 million for airports. But the contrast is greater than that. We establish a carefully considered policy in Federal aid to roads that extends 5 years into the future. With airports, we make jittery jumps from year to year, our appropriations ranging from zero dollars to $45 million in Federal aid. It would seem perfectly sensible to me to treat these two forms of transportation with the same intelligent approach.

This would make for much greater stability in the planning done by airport owners. They face the problem of stage planning in almost every case, and some assurance of Federal participation in these heavy expenses would be beneficial to the whole air transportation industry and to the people who need its services.

Of course, we're outgrowing highways and they have to be replaced, but the same argument holds true for air traffic.

Take Seattle as an example. In 1945, we had 221,426 passengers taking off from Seattle-Tacoma Airport and Boeing Field on passenger planes. Last year, this passenger traffic had doubled that figure, reaching 422,618. Of course, a lot of that traffic was generated on the far-eastern schedule of Northwest Airlines and reflects the Hawaiian service, too.

But it also points up why the CAA has Seattle-Tacoma Airport down for $310,560 in the Federal aid to airport program to acquire 80 acres of land to clear the approach to the field. And King County Airport—or Boeing Field is in the Federal aid program for $136,000 to reconstruct a 10,000-foot runway. These Federal funds will be matched locally.

In a matter as important as this, we have to know where we are going.

Congress knew what it wanted and where it was going when it authorized Federal money for aid to airports. For full development of aviation, we must have an adequate national system of civil airports. And I believe Congress feels we have received good value in the airport system so far produced. Since 1947 when the present airport program started, a total of $236,221,154 in Federal money has been shared with the States to carry through 2,641 projects on 1,204 airports. It is not possible to estimate the value of these airports to the Nation. Presence of an airport has saved the lives of military fliers and their expensive planes in emergencies. New businesses have grown up at airports. Business has accepted the airport as a necessity, and we have classic examples like that of Hickory, N. C., which was selected instead of a nearby town for location of a big manufacturing concern, merely because it had a good airport and the rival city had none. All this in addition to the amazing records broken every year by the scheduled and nonscheduled air carriers.

I do not begrudge Federal money spent in this way. We labor for the future when we build and improve our airports, and it is a future almost too broad and promising for us to imagine.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record

during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

The record includes all roilcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	...do	Election of Speaker (MARTIN, 220; RAYBURN, 201)	MARTIN.
3	Feb. 3	H. R. 1979, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before Apr. 1, 1955. (Passed, 389 to 5.)	Yea.
4	...do	S. 243, providing for an Under Secretary of State for Administration. (Passed, 341 to 18.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3053, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953:	
5	Feb. 19	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for VA medical, hospital, and domiciliary services from $10 million to $20 million. (Rejected, 180 to 201.)	Nay.
6	...do	On passage. (Passed, 369 to 2.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 24	H. Res. 119, providing $300,000 for expenses of House Un-American Activities Committee. (Adopted, 315 to 2.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 25	H. R. 2332, requiring an annual review of military personnel requirements: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 370 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 160, amending the National Housing Act by increasing FHA's title I loan insurance authorization by $500,000,000 and providing for repayment of the $8,300,000 Government investment in this fund to Treasury on or after July 1, 1953:	
9	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions to fix interest rate at not to exceed 6 percent per annum on unpaid balance. (Rejected, 70 to 290.)	Nay.
10	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3575, admitting Hawaii to statehood:	
11	...do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 182 to 227.)	Nay.
12	...do	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 138.)	Yea.
13	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
14	...do	...do	Present.
15	...do	...do	Present.
16	Mar. 18	...do	Present.
17	...do	H. J. Res. 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall take effect 10 days after date of enactment of this joint resolution. (Adopted, 291 to 85.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3053, the 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (conference report):	
18	Mar. 19	On motion to agree to an amendment decreasing borrowing authority for rural electrification program from $50,000,000 to $35,000,000 and increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 (instead of to $40,000,000 as proposed by Senate). (Rejected, 165 to 191.)	Yea.
19	...do	On motion to agree to amendment increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000. (Rejected, 171 to 174.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries:	
21	Apr. 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 106 to 283.)	Nay.
22	...do	On passage. (Passed, 285 to 108.)	Yea.
23	Apr. 15	H. R. 3480, extending for 3 years the period during which Mexican agricultural workers may be made available for employment in this country. (Passed, 259 to 87.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4004, providing for national banks to furnish lists of stockholders to the Comptroller of Currency upon request in lieu of annual filing:	
24	...do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 79 to 239.)	Nay.
25	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 22	...do	Present.
		H. R. 4663, making appropriations for Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954 (1st independent offices):	
27	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions to authorize the start of 35,000 units of public housing in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. (Rejected, 157 to 245.)	Nay.
28	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
29	...do	H. R. 1432, providing price support at 90 percent of parity for 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco. (Defeated, 110 to 212.)	Nay.
		S. 1419, authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District:	
30	Apr. 27	On amendment allowing the Commissioners to institute daylight saving time each year. (Adopted, 250 to 99.)	Yea.
31	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4828, making appropriations for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954:	
	...do	On amendments:	
		To provide an additional $50,000 for expenses of planning in connection with the Southeastern Power area. (Adopted.)	Nay.
32	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase by $3,586,000 the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration and to increase from $38,300,000 to $42,728,000 funds for Bonneville Power Administration. (Rejected, 167 to 212.)	Nay.
		H. R. 4974, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954:	
33	May 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete the sections authorizing the Secretarys of the 3 departments to terminate the employment of any employee whenever they deem such termination necessary in the interests of the United States. (Adopted, 181 to 168.)	Nay.
34	...do	On passage. (Passed, 344 to 5.)	Yea.
35	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	...do	H. R. 5134, amending the Submerged Lands Act and establishing title of Federal Government and its right to develop resources in submerged lands in the Continental Shelf. (Passed, 309 to 91.)	Yea.
37	...do	H. Res. 232, providing for House agreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries. (Adopted, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
38	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
39	May 19	...do	Present.
40	May 20	...do	Present.
		H. R. 5227, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954:	
41	...do	On amendment reducing from $195,000,000 to $140,000,000 the funds provided for soil conservation payments. (Rejected, 196 to 201.)	Yea.
42	...do	On passage. (Passed, 384 to 12.)	Nay.
43	May 25	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 5246, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies for fiscal year 1954:	
44	May 26	On amendment increasing from $60,500,000 to $66,500,000 the funds allocated for payments to school districts in federally impacted areas. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Nay.
45	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to increase by $25,000,000 the amount allocated for construction of hospitals. (Rejected, 197 to 203.)	Nay.
46	...do	On passage. (Passed, 395 to 2.)	Yea.
47	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
48	June 3	...do	Present.
49	...do	H. Res. 236, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, simplifying operations of the Department of Agriculture and adapting its administration to regional, State, and local conditions: On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of bill (in effect, to force consideration of the unfavorable resolution by the House). (Rejected, 128 to 261.)	Nay.
50	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
51	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
52	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions not to increase membership of the U. S. Tariff Commission from 6 to 7. (Rejected, 185 to 215.)	Nay.
53	...do	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 35.)	Yea.
54	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5690, 2d independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954:	
55	June 18	On motion to agree to amendment deleting language authorizing the VA to investigate non-service-connected veterans statements of inability to pay for treatment or hospitalization. (Adopted, 217 to 180.)	Nay.
56	...do	On passage. (Passed, 394 to 2.)	Yea.
57	...do	H. Res. 292, providing for consideration of H. R. 5710, extending the Mutual Security Act for 1 year. (Adopted, 340 to 35.)	Yea.
58	...do	Quorum call	Present.
59	June 19	...do	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 5710, providing 1 year extension of the Mutual Security Act:	
60	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 280 to 41.)	Yea.
61	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 23	...do...	Present.
63	...do....	H. R. 5659, providing price-support wheat for Pakistan. (Passed, 310 to 75.)	Yea.
64	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
65	June 25	...do...	Present
		H. R. 5728, authorizing disposal of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities:	
66	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 58 to 317.)	Nay.
67	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 27	...do...	Present.
69	...do....	H. Res. 295, disapproving of Reorganization Plan No. 6 relating to Department o. Defense. (Rejected, 108 to 235.)	Nay.
70	June 27	H. R. 4654, excluding top department and agency officials from provisions of law permitting lump-sum payments for annual leave. On adoption of conference report (which, in addition, repealed requirement that employees use annual earned leave by Jan. 30 of next calendar year). (Adopted, 269 to 65.)	Nay.
71	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
72	June 30	...do...	Present.
73	July 1	...do...	Present.
74	July 2	...do...	Present.
		H. R. 5969, Department of Defense Appropriation for 1954:	
75	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase Air Force funds by $1,175,000,000. (Requested, 161 to 230.)	Nay.
76	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 386 to 0)	Yea.
77	July 7	Quorum call	Present.
78	...do....	...do...	Present.
79	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5173, providing for return to States of all Federal unemployment tax collections in excess of amount sufficient to pay administrative costs and to maintain $200 million reserve in Federal unemployment account:	
80	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit use of excess taxes to payment of unemployment compensation and to provide for delaying repayment of advances to States. (Defeated, 93 to 292.)	Nay.
81	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
82	...do....	H. R. 6054, amending act of Apr. 6, 1949, to provide for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen in drought areas. (Passed, 387 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4351, providing for the development of private power facilities on Niagara River:	
83	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 130 to 254.)	Nay.
84	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 262 to 120.)	Yea.
85	July 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5898, extending until Dec. 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess profits tax shall be effective:	
86	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to substitute the provisions of H. R. 6100, permitting companies formed after 1947 to choose any 3 years as the "base" years in figuring the tax. (Rejected, 127 to 275.)	Nay.
87	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 325 to 77.)	Yea.
88	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
89	...do....	H. R. 5710, extending the mutual security program for fiscal year 1954: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 221 to 109.)	Yea.
90	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.	
91	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for international information and educational activities (Voice of America) from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 and to remove language providing for reduction of employees. (Rejected, 154 to 244.)	Nay.
92	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
93	July 17	H. Res. 262, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8, providing for reorganization of foreign information functions and the creation of a new agency to be known as the U. S. Information Agency: On adoption. (Rejected, 11 to 310.)	Nay.
94	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4974, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year 1954:	
95	July 21	On motion to agree to amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to the U. N. as the representative of China. (Passed, 379 to 0.)	Yea.
96	...do....	On motion to agree to amendment providing additional $12,500,000 for Federal aid to airports. (Rejected, 160 to 230.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4663, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954:	
97	...do....	On motion to agree to an amendment limiting to 20,000 the number of public housing units to be started in 1954 and barring any future commitments for such housing. (Passed, 239 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5376, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1954:	
98	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to agree to Senate amendment adding $2,200,000 to the $278,670,000 recommended by the conferees for flood-control construction projects. (Rejected, 137 to 252.)	Nay.
99	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6391, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1954:	
100	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 288 to 115.)	Yea.
101	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
102	...do....	H. Res. 347, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act: On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 183.)	Nay.
103	...do....	H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act and certain other provisions of law to provide adequate protection for American workers, miners, farmers, and producers: On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 242 to 161.)	Yea.
104	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5141, creating Small Business Administration to take over lending functions of RFC in this field and to consolidate other activities in behalf of small business:	
105	July 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 161 to 226.)	Nay.
106	...do....	H. Res. 217, creating a special committee to conduct investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation. (Adopted, 209 to 163.)	Nay
107	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
108	...do....	...do...	Present.
109	...do....	H. Res. 353, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6481, authorizing admittance of 240,000 special-quota immigrants: On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 152.)	Yea.
110	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6481, authorizing the admittance of 217,000 special quota immigrants:	
111	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 186 to 222.)	Nay.
112	...do....	On passage. (Passed 221 to 185.)	Yea.
113	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6016, authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States:	
114	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 114 to 321.)	Nay.
115	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6391, making appropriations for the Mutual Security Administration for fiscal year 1954:	
116	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to insist on disagreement with Senate amendment which added $211,000,000 aid for Europe. (Rejected, 192 to 200.)	Nay.
117	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Yea.
118	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6672, increasing the statutory debt limit of the United States from $275,000,000,000 to $290,000,000,000:	
119	...do....	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit the increase to the period of Aug. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1954. (Rejected, 173 to 225.)	Nay.
120	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 239 to 158.)	Yea.
121	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
122	...do....	H. Res. 361, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6413, permitting withholding by the Federal Government from wages of Federal employees certain taxes imposed by municipalities: On adoption. (Adopted, 192 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1954:	
123	Aug. 3	On amendment authorizing dismissal of certain employees of U. S. Information Agency. (Adopted, 147 to 139.)	N. V.

Statement by Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, on Deepening of Delaware River Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to accommodate the growing foreign and domestic commerce that utilizes the Delaware River requires an immedate appropriation of $25 million to commence the 4-year program that such development will require.

I include as part of my remarks the statement I presented to the House Appropriation Committee at the hearing held today in connection with the matter.

It reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, REPRESENTING THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF $25 MILLION APPROPRIATION TO COMMENCE WORK ON DEEPENING OF DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Appropriation Committee, we are very appreciative of the opportunity you have given to us to appear before your committee and present the facts and figures that, in our opinion, amply justify the inclusion of a $25 million appropriation at this time for the deepening of the Delaware River Channel.

The deepening of the upper Delaware River Channel has been found economically justified by the business, industrial, maritime, State, and municipal interests of the entire Delaware River area. It has the enthusiastic and aggressive support of each of these.

There is no area in the entire Nation that gives promise of greater expansion than the area within the Delaware River Valley. Industrial, commercial, and maritime interests have made, and are now making, large investments amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars to promote economic expansion of the entire district served by the Delaware River. The importance of this contribution to our national wealth and our national security cannot be disputed.

The Delaware River is the main artery of commerce, foreign and domestic, that serves an industrial and farming area not exceeded by any other river in the entire Nation. At the present time its insufficiency of depth is a great handicap in fulfilling its complete usefulness. The traffic on the Delaware River is seriously hampered by this condition and if it is not speedily corrected the injury wrought upon the commerce of the entire area will be incalculable. Furthermore, we must not overlook the further fact that the Delaware Valley lies in the heart of an area in which there is taking place a rapid industrial and commercial expansion that will require service of ocean-going vessels of a draft in excess of 35 feet.

The resultant financial gain to the United States Treasury is a further justification for an adequate appropriation to deepen the Delaware River Channel. The following figures show that it is just ordinary good business for the Federal Government to invest in the Delaware River:

(a) Customs receipts alone bring $52 million a year into the United States Treasury. Since 1936, the Federal Government has spent a little over $100 million on our Delaware River Channel—but since 1900, it has collected almost $1.5 billion in customs revenue—or a return of $14 for every $1 invested.

(b) Every day the Delaware River carries 700,000 barrels of crude oil to feed our great petroleum refineries. With an adequate channel, the large modern tanker can deliver crude oil at least 60 cents per ton cheaper than the smaller tanker which our Government built during World War II. The Navy's Military Sea Transport Service is now asking Congress to authorize the building of 20 such large modern tankers because of their defense value. The yearly saving in transportation costs of $20 million—for just this one item of our Delaware commerce—will mean a Federal tax revenue of $10 million.

(c) The Delaware River will handle for the steel industry an estimated 15 million tons of imported iron ores. If we calculate conservatively that the large ore carrier will bring this ore to our dock for 50 cents per ton less than the cost of using smaller ships, the benefit to the Federal Treasury will be almost $4 million in additional taxes.

(d) Prosperity in our three-State Delaware Valley area depends upon an adequate Delaware River channel. With such a channel, we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal revenue from business and individual taxes. In the last fiscal year, Pennsylvania and New Jersey alone contributed over $7 billion in internal-revenue collections of all kinds—better than 10 percent of all tax revenues.

In conclusion, I wish to make reference to the strange suggestion that comes to us from the Chief of Army Engineers, namely that local interests pay half the cost of increasing the depth of the Delaware River. This contribution has been estimated at $18 million.

The Chief of Army Engineers admits that the deepening of the channel as proposed would unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region. But he makes the qualifying observation that the use of channel depths greater than 35 feet will be confined to a single company.

In answer to this suggestion, I reply: Why should an industry be compelled to contribute directly to the cost of a public improvement which benefits not only that industry but a whole region, as the 40-foot channel undeniably would? Even if a private enterprise is willing to shoulder such a charge, should the Government want it to? Would there not be corollary questions of the industry's rights in the improvement it is helping to finance, and of tax deductions? Should an industrial firm whose tax payments help produce public improvements be required also to pay directly for such projects?

If a 40-foot Delaware Channel is in the public interest, as it appears to be, it should be treated as a public improvement, built with public funds—not as part of a corporate investment.

Furthermore, to adopt a policy of required local participation in cost of river and harbor improvements creates a situation that would not only be novel and unique in the Government policy that has heretofore prevailed, but the results could conceivably prove most disastrous by curtailing future expansion of our principal ports and rivers.

Questions immediately arise as to not only the lack of justification for such a policy but also as how such a policy could ever be practically applied in its application. For instance:

1. What is meant by "local interests"? Is this to mean "local industrial interests," "local commercial interests," "local maritime or shipping interests," or "local, State, or municipal interests"?

2. If industrial, commercial, or shipping interests are intended, then would it be applicable to the presently existing interests or would it contemplate also contributions from future interests of a similar character? If so, then how would it be applied as between present and future interests?

It can be readily seen that it would be unfair and unjust to apply it only to existing interests as against future interests that would equally benefit, and most objectionable of all considerations, that would naturally grow out of such a policy would be the tendency of new interests to avoid placing their industries or other interests along the Delaware River. Thus it would have a tendency to stifle future development of the whole Delaware River Valley.

3. Furthermore, if such a policy should be adopted as to the Delaware River, then it would be the application of a policy that runs counter to our river development policy since our beginning as a Nation, and in all fairness, would require the application of the same policy to all our rivers and harbors and thus create a situation that would prove most detrimental to port developments throughout our Nation.

Thus I wish to record my objection to the proposal of the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that local interests be required to contribute in cash to the United States one-half of the actual additional cost of construction of the recommended improvement of the 40-foot channel in excess of the cost of a 35-foot channel, and I respectfully urge the committee to report favorably legislation for an adequate amount that will enable this great improvement to be started at the earliest possible day.

Naval Veterans of 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of a letter I have sent to the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Spanish War of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, concerning House Joint Resolution 151.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Spanish War, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am pleased to endorse House Joint Resolution 151, introduced by Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, which was the subject of recent hearings by your subcommittee. A good friend and constituent of mine, Capt. Laurence H. Parker, of Fiskdale, Mass., treasurer-in-chief, Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, has brought to my attention the provisions of this measure and I am hopeful that the subcommittee can take favorable action.

House Joint Resolution 151 seeks to correct an injustice to the naval veterans of the Spanish-American War by placing them on the same basis as those veterans who served in the Army insofar as pension benefits are concerned. With the passage of the years, only some 20 or so surviving naval veterans and widows would benefit from the passage of this legislation.

The naval veterans of 1898 and their dependents are not being accorded the same treatment granted through law to the Army veterans. At present, no pension is allowed the widow of a naval veteran of the combat area, who had as much as 89 days of actual service, whereas a widow of an Army volunteer, with no duty in the combat zone and only 60 days of actual service, receives a full pension. This discrepancy apparently results from the fact that furlough time can be included by Army veterans in the computation of service time while this particular provision of the pension laws has not been extended to the naval veterans.

House Joint Resolution 151 will correct this inequity and I will be thankful for your help in bringing this legislation before the full membership of the House. It would also be a favor to me if you would include this letter in the record when House Joint Resolution 151 is before the full committee for consideration.

With thanks and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Does the Hatch Act Go Too Far?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post an editorial cites a case now pending on appeal in a Federal district court in Vermont which involves the Hatch Act and the rights of an American citizen to freedom of speech.

This case, now known as the Simpson case, involves one, W. Arthur Simpson, who is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare. His job involves administering State funds plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

In October of 1951 Mr. Simpson wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald in which he stated his own personal choice of Senator Robert Taft as Republican candidate for President.

Because Mr. Simpson dared to express his personal opinion as to which candidate he believed to be best suited for nomination by his party for President, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against him charging him with violation of the Hatch Political Activities Act. The basis of this charge was that Mr. Simpson had violated the law in writing his letter.

The State of Vermont was ordered by the Federal commission to fire Arthur Simpson, but refused, and in an effort to force compliance with its order, the Civil Service Commission then told the State of Vermont that the Federal Government would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this point Vermont appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier where the case is still pending.

This, in my opinion, is a case bordering on the ridiculous when the Federal Government will invoke the Hatch Act against a citizen who expresses his personal opinion, and signs his name as a private citizen.

The man or woman who enters Government service, either at the Federal or State level, does not renounce all citizenship rights as an individual upon taking such office.

But it would appear this is the view taken by those who administer the Hatch Act, if a man's discharge is ordered for expressing a personal opinion, and an attempt made to force the State to comply with the order by the withholding of welfare aid.

If this is an example of the extent to which those charged with administration of the Hatch Act intend to go in denying the rights of free speech and expression of personal opinion to employees of Federal and State Governments, then I think it is high time we took a long look at the Hatch Act, and consider proper amendments to it, or, perhaps, its repeal, and replacement with better legislation in which the civil rights of Government employees will be protected adequately.

I am fully aware of the importance of keeping Federal employees out of politics. However, the Hatch Act was not enacted to deny to Federal employees the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

Freedom of speech is a privilege which every American cherishes. And so long as a man expresses his own opinion as a private individual, he should be protected in this right. Nor should he live in fear that his job will be taken from him if he exercises this basic right of citizenship.

In the totalitarian state men must live in silence, fearful that any expression of personal opinion not in accord with the will of the government in power will result in immediate retaliation.

Robert Simpson exercised his right guaranteed under the Constitution to express his personal opinion on a matter of importance to him as an American citizen. As a result, the Federal Government ordered his removal from his State position, thus expanding Federal power within a State. When the State refused to comply with this order, the Federal Government attempted to bring pressure to bear on the State government by withholding Federal-aid funds.

This is a situation that cannot be tolerated in the United States. And we should not delay in taking appropriate action to safeguard the right of free speech to every American, regardless of whether he is employed in government service or in private business.

The following article from the Post states the case of W. Arthur Simpson, a citizen in public service who dared express his personal opinion as to a candidate for public office, and was faced with dismissal from office after more than a third of a century of distinguished service for the State of Vermont:

IT'S HARD TO SEE A "LETTER TO THE EDITOR" AS REALLY IMMORAL POLITICAL ACTIVITY

When W. Arthur Simpson, a Vermont State employee, sat down to write a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald back in October 1951 he had no idea that this exercise of an ancient and honorable American privilege would eventually land him smack in the middle of a State rights fight to determine how much authority over its own affairs a State must surrender in exchange for Federal aid.

Mr. Simpson, a Republican, is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare, a job that involves administering State funds, plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. In the preconvention discussion of the best possible Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Simpson favored Senator Robert Taft. He wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald saying that while he didn't think Robert Taft was the only alternative, "he at least has the virtue of being honest, forceful, a fighter, and a successful campaigner." Surely Mr. Simpson's views should have no more to do with his fitness to hold his job than if he had come out for Senator KEFAUVER.

However, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against the Vermont social-welfare head, charging that he had violated the Hatch Political Activities Act by writing the letter, and by presiding at a session of the Republican State convention in 1950. The Commission did this even though published Federal Security Agency rules and the laws of the State of Vermont seemed to Mr. Simpson to exempt him from the Hatch Act on the ground that he was putting in most of his time for his State, and not for the Federal Government.

The Federal Commission ordered Vermont to fire Arthur Simpson. Vermont refused. The Civil Service Commission then told Vermont that Uncle Sam would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this, the Vermonters appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier, where the case is now pending.

Incidentally, Mr. Simpson has worked for his State quite a while, apparently without trouble. In April 1953 the Vermont Legislature adopted a resolution praising him for distinguished service over more than a third of a century, citing him as a "gracious neighbor and public administrator," and concluding, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Other States are up in arms about what was done to this Vermont Republican, and the expansion of Federal power which it implies. New Hampshire has joined Vermont in the court battle. Indiana, where four State employees have been charged with political activity, seems about to follow suit, with Hoosier Gov. George Craig leading an effort to persuade other States to support a bill by Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Indiana Republican, which would make the Hatch Act apply only to Federal employees.

Lawyers for the State of Vermont urge persuasively that the Federal Government's idea that the Hatch Act applies to anybody who works even part time for a State agency receiving Federal funds could logically involve a State employee serving 1 day or members of any State board or commission financed by $1 of Federal funds. Such a person couldn't write a letter to the editor on a political matter, even if he didn't write in his official capacity. (Mr. Simpson signed only his name, didn't use his official title.)

Conceding that the Hatch Act was wisely intended to keep Federal employees out of politics, it is certainly doubtful that Congress intended to extend its prohibitions to every

State office that gets a nickel of Federal money or to mere expression of preference for candidates for office. If that is what Congress did intend, a vote on the Beamer resolution provides an opportunity to make the intention plain. In the meantime a vote of thanks is due the Vermont, New Hampshire, and Indiana rebels for bringing the whole thing to light.

The Simpson case may go against them, now that the Federal camel has thrust its head legally into so many local tents. If it does, it will be time for a lot of Americans to get into politics in earnest and reverse the trend by which Federal control of State affairs is assumed as the price of Federal aid. If the Simpson case causes the citizenry to look these Federal gift horses in the mouth, there's nothing wrong with that.

America's Summons to Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, in the city of Los Angeles I was highly honored to speak to a distinguished group of citizens and award-winning students attending the Southern California Christian colleges. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SUMMONS TO RESPONSIBILITY

I am highly honored to speak to each of you tonight. I congratulate the Forest Lawn Foundation on the civic service which it performs in this educational undertaking, and I congratulate, too, the award winners in this 1955 journalism awards contest.

The Foundation brochure suggests that "good writing is the key to leadership." I agree. Good writing depends upon clear thinking. Each is increasingly indispensable to families and to nations alike in their pursuit of a free and contented life on earth, and both represent laudable goals for all of us.

Your brochure also suggests that if 5,000 words are required to cover a given subject, then 10,000 words devoted to it represent wasted time and effort. I agree again. There are some, however, who disagree. I know, because I've seen them.

Two years ago, as a new Member of the United States Senate, I sat in my seat and listened while a new footnote to current political history was being made. One of my colleagues was establishing a new record in the length of a single Senate speech.

He spoke continuously for upwards of 22 hours, commencing early 1 afternoon, proceeding throughout the night, and concluding the following day. I confess I did not hear all of it. I went home to bed around midnight, but when I returned to the Capitol the next morning, he was still going strong. He broke the existing record. Until a Texan talked for 28 hours several weeks ago in his State legislative assembly, my colleague remained the undisputed world champion, in length at least.

In my judgment, my colleague consumed at least 20 hours more than he should have on that occasion. Time is precious; none of us has too much of it. So the purpose of your contest—to write trenchantly and tersely and clearly—is praiseworthy. And what applies to the written word has equal application to the spoken word.

By the way, I recall the story of the great Winston Churchill during the war. He received a memorandum from a young naval officer that a certain war material was "in short supply." Sir Winston scribbled across the bottom of the memo "What is wrong with the good old Anglo-Saxon word 'scarce?'" I rather imagine that that awkward phrase was not utilized thereafter in official memoranda emanating from at least one member of His Majesty's Royal Navy.

Tonight, I wish to speak to you about the responsibilities of our country and of our people which the passage of time has placed upon us. Our frontiers of pioneer days have long been gone, and western America is on its way toward overtaking the rest of the Nation both in people and in production. Our population continues to grow, and our people live longer than before, and we produce more abundantly than ever. Fulfilling the needs for air to breathe, water to drink, and food to eat constitutes a different problem than our forebears faced. For example, air contamination—at least, to the extent that it poses a hazard to the health of society—is a modern byproduct of industrial progress and it is not indigenous to this community alone. The artesian wells of my grandfather's days in California are vanished; today, our millions of Southern Californians live only because of a vast importation of water into this area. We face the need of a realistic national policy on these problems. Food is a little different. We produce more than we can eat, a tragic paradox in a world which still knows starvation. Our National Government has begun to accept such modern problems in this 20th century. Air pollution has become a matter of Federal, as well as local, concern. Our national Government is undertaking the study of water supply and water conservation on a national basis, and the Congress is grappling with that subject. On the problem of food, we've made progress. Part of our food surplus goes into the schools of this country to assist the underprivileged and the undernourished. Part of it will be channeled into foreign trade, and some of it has been used to prevent starvation abroad. Our Nation's gift of surplus wheat to Pakistan averted a tragic human disaster and helped to cement an international friendship. And our new agricultural legislation is designed to protect the farmer, without bankrupting the taxpayer or putting the Government in the food business.

I need only cite the great change in our Nation's fiscal situation to demonstrate how, in this field, our responsibility is far greater than ever before. Deficit spending has been a modern curse. It never plagued past generations. In 1915 we owed a little over $1 billion, and today we owe more than $271 billion. In 1915, we spent less than three-quarters of a billion dollars, and last year over $67 billion. Forty years ago, just before our involvement in World War I, the public debt amounted to $10 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Today, the comparable figure is just under $1,650. Thus Government spending has an increasingly greater effect on our people. Our fiscal policies have a direct impact on the value of our money. They affect private credit and private business. Our Government has attempted—I think with creditable success—properly to discharge this highly sensitive responsibility. We've taken steps towards a balanced budget without attempting to turn back the clock. Federal spending is subject to additional control, and where practicable, has been reduced. Some tax reduction has been adopted to provide an additional stimulus for an expanding economy. If you will let me say so, there is a general aversion, or at any rate a considerable aversion, in Washington, against fiscal irresponsibility, and that, in itself, is real achievement.

Without question, it is in the field of foreign relations that America's summons to responsibility is of greatest concern. The summons has not been thrust suddenly upon us. As in matters of domestic concern, so too in international affairs, the passage of time has altered our country's responsibilities in the world.

We have been placed into a position of leadership among nations whether we like it or not. Prior to the World Wars in which this country has engaged, our people, through their Government, abstained from the role of a great world power. Our Federal Government was responsible for laws and administration of national problems and internal rights of our people, and very little else. We insulated ourselves in our early days with the Monroe Doctrine, and we saw our interests as a free people confined pretty much to the Western Hemisphere and the North Pacific Ocean. That was what Americans desired. That is what they received from their Government. We held ourselves understandably aloof from international quarrels abroad. Our two oceans afforded us the luxury of separation from European and Asiatic strife. And then we were drawn into a world conflict. Our Government broke off diplomatic relations with Germany by reason of her unrestricted submarine war which caused American ships to be torpedoed and American lives to be lost. American sovereignty had been assaulted and the Congress of our country, at the request of the President, took the Nation into a war and thus we were embarked on a whole new era for our people.

When victory came, the American people, quite understandably, wanted to return to their old way of living. We still enjoyed the barriers of two great oceans. Why muddle and meddle in European affairs? was the question asked in those days. No one offered a satisfactory answer. The United States refused to join the League of Nations. In the decade which followed, "isolation" and "economy" were our national watchwords.

After World War I, our Government made repeated attempts at cooperative international disarmament. But with no great success. While we began to evince some interest in European affairs, our people did not believe that our own security and prosperity depended very much on them. We followed a policy of neutrality with respect to all the world.

World War II brought with it a growing recognition that the security of the United States is affected whenever and wherever the destruction of free government or free people occurs. When that conflict was concluded, and our enemies surrendered unconditionally, we watched with growing apprehension and unbelief as the Soviet Union took advantage of a distraught European Continent, and undertook destruction of the freedom of European countries and the extension of Communism all around the globe.

Meanwhile, technological developments were destroying our traditional concepts of space. The protection afforded us by our dividing oceans was disappearing. The American people were brought face to face with the fact that their favored geographical position was no longer any guaranty to their peace and security.

Thus, in the 1940's, the United Nations was created, and our country, through overwhelming Senate ratification, joined it. We took the lead in its formation. We began to discuss with free peoples our common concern on our common problem of maintaining our respective freedoms in a world at peace. If the future were to bring more acts of brutal aggression, we were determined to agree, in advance, that together we would repel them. Mutual security treaties came

into existence. NATO was born. Our country applied the old principle of "in union there is strength." Collective defense arrangements in many areas of the world were made by our Government. And, thus, what was almost undreamed of in the years gone by became a new United States policy with a great new responsibility.

I wish now to speak with you on one facet of American foreign policy of great importance to the American people today. It concerns the Far East and Asia. I am neither a military expert nor an expert on foreign relations. I speak as an American and as a Member of the United States Senate who has been required to sit in judgment there on matters of American policy in that area. I do not speak in either a political or a partisan manner.

We are agreed, I am sure, that the most important objective of our country's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable world peace.

In the far Pacific and Asia, our summons to responsibility in accomplishing this objective represents a continuing challenge of this Nation's ability to lead. The summons and the challenge have been answered with measurable success, with enlightenment, and with a spirit of helpfulness which characterizes our people; we became a pace setter in creating independent, self-governing nations. We led the march away from colonialism. I wish to recall that on March 22, 1934, Congress granted independence to the Philippines, and on July 4, a fitting date, 12 years later, the Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed a new member of the family of nations. We have no firmer allies in our goal of freedom and of peace than the Filipino people.

Our acceptance of that responsibility in Japan is a demonstrated fact. We set an unprecedented and an inspiring example to the Japanese people almost from the moment occupation forces arrived in those islands. Instead of vengefully punishing an entire race, the United States undertook—and with heartening success, I am proud to observe—to guide, to encourage, and to advise a former foe on building a new government along democratic lines, on rehabilitating a ravaged economy, on lifting the standard of living and on recognizing the dignity of human beings.

We played an important role in establishing SEATO in the Southwest Pacific, as we did in the establishment of NATO. We have led free powers into combining together to deter Communist aggression or Communist colonialism.

Last January, by reason of the critical situation developing in the Straits of Formosa which posed a serious peril to the security of America, our Government stood united in the declaration of our policy in that area. In a message to Congress asking for such a declaration, President Eisenhower recalled that ever since June 1950, when Communism committed armed aggression against Korea, this Nation determined to defend the island of Formosa against possible Communist invasion from the mainland of China. He said: "We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its Charter for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body. * * * The danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores." He concluded by saying that this country "shall remain faithful to our obligation as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not in danger."

I quote from the resolution introduced immediately in the Congress:

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."

The resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives almost unanimously, and on January 27 debate commenced in the Senate. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, argued that it was not a question of how much power the President had under the Constitution. In his judgment, the President was right in asking the Congress to pass such a resolution "even if the only reason for so doing was to secure the moral support of the American people."

I want to recall what I said earlier this year in discussing this situation. Every thinking professional military man has unequivocally concluded that Formosa and the Pescadores must not fall into Communist hands. Those islands constitute what they call a part of the defense perimeter of the United States.

That conclusion is not a political conclusion. It was not made by party-minded people. It represented the best thinking of those best qualified from a military standpoint to render it. I assume that our people do not require assurances that the President adopted those conclusions as an American statesman dedicated to our own welfare, and not as a politician. And I am sure that our country approves the bipartisan manner in which the Congress, after debate, adopted the resolution on a basis of your and my right to freedom.

As I listened to the debate, I recalled the phrase which General MacArthur used during Korea when he referred to the area north of the Yalu River as a "privileged sanctuary." And I want to recall again his own words on the stake of our country in Formosa. "Under no circumstances," he told our country, "must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

During the debate, a number of amendments were proposed. One of them was offered by a Republican Senator who was joined by two Democratic Senators. Let me read the text of the amendment: "Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw nationalist troops and civilians from such islands."

The amendment apparently accepted the importance to our own freedom of deterring Communist aggression in that area of the world so long as we voluntarily prevented ourselves from such deterrence at an imaginary 12-mile offshore limit. If the Communist Chinese were to set off a conflagration aimed at Formosa and the Pescadores, such an amendment would shackle our President with a ridiculous restriction in attempting to deter it. Furthermore, it would present to the Communists a legislative guaranty, in advance, of what we would not do to protect our perimeter of American defense.

Suffice to say, the amendment was defeated overwhelmingly. Other amendments were offered and they, too, went down before bipartisan majorities. A grave conclusion on America's responsibility was reached not by political entities but by an American President and an American Congress who agreed upon an American policy to protect the freedom of the American people.

Our Government, through both the executive and legislative branches, agrees it is in the interest of American security that Nationalist China shall not be abandoned to Communism and that, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, the President is authorized to use our Armed Forces as he deems necessary in their behalf and that authority includes the related islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

By whom do the American people desire to have this authority discharged? Do they wish to have it discharged by our elected Chief Executive as he may determine in accordance with the terms of the bipartisan congressional resolution? That is the way our Constitution provides.

I am convinced that they want this authority exercised, in accordance with the law of the land, and by the head of our executive branch who, after all, is the only person I know possessed of all the facts from day to day, who is the elected head of our people, and who during his lifetime has known the horrors of war and has demonstrated a devotion to peace.

I will not challenge the good faith of those who disagree with me, but I venture to suggest that our bipartisan policy, upon which peace or war could well depend, be not subjected to partisan criticism from either of the two great American parties of our land. The President will make the decision if the exigencies of the days ahead require them. That is the responsibility which the Senate and the House placed upon him. We can be thankful that he has declined to spell out in advance what his decision and his strategy would be under different sets of circumstances if he deemed it necessary to take action.

Some of our citizens have suggested that the United Nations assume jurisdiction of this free-world problem. I believe that it should, and I have included in my remarks tonight the Presidential position that it would be welcomed.

In this connection, I have received an informative letter from Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our Ambassador to the United Nations, in answer to my question of America's position.

Ambassador Lodge wrote that the United States has followed a consistent policy of trying to get the U. N. to take up the question of a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. The United States worked for a meeting of the Security Council, which finally was held. When the meeting occurred, this country showed its good faith and earnestness and took an unusual step to dramatize our desire to bring about a peaceful solution. We voted formally to invite the Chinese Communists to sit in at the talks we hoped would be held about arranging a cease-fire. Ambassador Lodge recalled, and I am quoting his exact words, that "this invitation was contemptuously rejected, to the accompaniment of flagrant untruths and cynical impugning of our motives."

Results of the recent Bandung Conference are heartening. While Communist China has announced somewhat of an about face, only time can tell us whether her spokesmen are in good faith. Yet at the conference, ministers of sovereign nations spoke out against aggression. We had friends there, people of different colors, creeds, and religions, who share our goals of freedom.

Fear of retaliation is not the only deterrent to war. The opinions of peoples are important. The forthright stand at Bandung by the Philippine, the Pakistan, the Ceylon and the Iraq delegates unquestionably had a telling effect on the Communists. They—like others—gathered strength and courage for their stand, I believe, from the leadership which our country and the fraternity of free nations have provided. We are measuring up to the responsibility that destiny has given to us. We are responding to the most important summons of our national life.

The Worcester Telegram Salutes Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to include an editorial, entitled, "Honoring JOE MARTIN," which appeared in the April 28 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, because it truly summarizes the remarkable qualities that have made this great man a national institution in American political life, beloved by all.

The article follows:

HONORING JOE MARTIN

It was a distinguished gathering that honored Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. of Massachusetts, at the unveiling of an oil painting of him, Wednesday at the Capitol Hill Club in Washington. He fully deserved the tributes which he received just as he has deserved similar tributes in the past.

JOE MARTIN is an institution. His Republicanism is of the militant brand. He is a party man, a firm upholder of party loyalty. He requires such loyalty from himself as well as from others. His faithfulness to Republican Presidents, to Republican party leaders, to Republican administrations, has ever been constant.

As a Member of the House, as minority leader, as Speaker, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, as chairman of the Republican congressional (campaign) committee, and as permanent chairman of four Republican national conventions, his service to his party has been outstanding.

But far more remarkable than all of that, is the respect and affection in which he is held by Democrats. His political opponents, over the years, have recognized his patriotism, his sincerity, his ability and they have responded to his genuine friendliness. He has no use for triflers or shirkers. He does respect earnestness and honesty, regardless of party.

He likes politics, and he likes those who are in it with him—and they like him. His leadership is built on his personality, and on his character. Republicans and Democrats alike know that he is straightforward, and a man of his word.

The Job Harold Stassen Leaves Unfinished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article written by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, which appeared in the April 7, 1955, issue of the Reporter magazine.

Representative WILLIAMS again demonstrates in this article the keen insight that he possesses and his expertness in the field of foreign affairs. We are privileged that he is serving as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOB HAROLD STASSEN LEAVES UNFINISHED

(By Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

Now that Harold Stassen has been shifted to the post of Special Presidential Assistant for disarmament problems, I am more concerned than ever about what is to become of the important work now handled by the Foreign Operations Administration. Mr. Stassen has been the most consistent spokesman within the administration for aid to Asia. The FOA, of which Mr. Stassen has been the chief since its creation on August 1, 1953, is scheduled to expire on June 30.

Does Mr. Stassen's departure foretell the liquidation, or at least the fragmentation, of FOA? Do we have anything to offer the Asians except threats about tactical atomic weapons?

Along with a number of my colleagues in Congress, I have been trying for some months without success to get a clear picture of what the administration plans to do about technical assistance and economic development in Asia. One day Mr. Stassen would seem to favor a Marshall plan or possibly a Stassen plan for Asia. The next day Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, guardian of "responsibility," would deny that any such plan existed. Then Secretary Dulles would clear up the whole issue, as he did during a stopover in Laos, by hinting that all Asia needs on the economic side is a little more trade.

Recently the dust has settled somewhat. In a press conference on March 17, Mr. Stassen announced an administration decision to send up to Congress a foreign-aid program that is to include more public-investment funds for Asia than ever before. Its most striking and praiseworthy feature is to be a "regional fund" amounting to perhaps $200 million.

Although this is still a compromise bold new program—a little long on statements of the compelling need (Stassen) and a little short on substance (Humphrey)—it will probably resolve the administration's internal fight. But, as Mr. Stassen himself said, it is only a first step in meeting the requirements of our foreign policy in Asia.

CHINA VERSUS INDIA

Economic assistance to Asia is both a necessity and an opportunity for the United States. The final answer to communism is neither conventional nor unconventional weapons but the fulfillment of Asia's economic needs by democratic means. The contrast is already there—in the respective means by which China and India are trying to catch up with the industrialized nations of the world.

The nations in the non-Communist crescent of Asia must find ways to improve the economic well-being of their people. All of them are watching this competition between India and China.

In China, the Communist leaders are trying to industrialize their nation by imposing greater sacrifices on those who have least to give—the peasants. That, of course, is exactly what Stalin did in Russia. His Chinese followers are now facing the same stubborn fact he faced. No police state has ever figured out a way to force farmers to grow more food. It shouldn't take long for Mao Tse-tung, applying Stalin's theories in a country that has long suffered from large food deficits, to produce a severe food crisis in China. Already there is bitterness and despair.

It is now becoming clear, even to the overseas Chinese scattered throughout southeast Asia, that Communist land reform is strictly a phony; that the tenants who thought they were getting land of their own have wound up as sharecroppers for the Government. No wonder the Communists are beginning to complain in their own newspapers about "dangerous spontaneous tendencies toward capitalism" among the peasants.

The Indians, on the contrary, build up the agricultural sector of their economy rather than exploit it. Nehru's 5-year plan still has a year to run, but it is already possible to talk of its success. Aided by good weather, better fertilizers, more irrigation, some technical advice, and a widening participation in village community projects, India's farmers have already increased grain production by 21 percent, substantially reducing a deficit that ran close to 5 million tons before the plan got under way. According to a New Delhi dispatch in the New York Times, "It can be said now that India is self-sufficient in food." Nehru's government still has many problems to face, but it has clearly demonstrated for the rest of Asia to see that a democratic state can make a success of economic development.

INEVITABLE CONCLUSION

When we turn to Japan we find that a solution to that nation's economic distress lies in the rapid development of south and southeast Asia. Japan's problem is simple: An island crammed with industrial machinery and skilled workers, it needs markets for what it produces and has to import a wide variety of food and raw materials. The Japanese would like to increase their trade with us. But even if we had no tariffs at all, the United States would be a good market for only a small part of what Japan has to export.

The Japanese would like to increase their trade with Red China, too. But here again the potential amount of such trade has been vastly overrated. The Chinese would certainly be eager to buy what Japan has to sell, but China cannot offer much in return except coal and a few odd commodities like tung oil and hog bristles. What would provide a real answer to Japan's trade problem is the rapid economic development of the rest of Asia.

Considerations of both politics and economics thus lead us inevitably to the same conclusion: A vigorous program of economic assistance to Asia should be at the core of United States foreign policy.

THE COLOMBO PLAN

How can the program be carried out? A new and hopeful means is now available to us. The Colombo plan, which was originally a family affair within the British Commonwealth, has now been expanded to take in practically all of non-Communist Asia.

The Colombo plan has now become the center where a dozen national-development plans are synchronized. What's more, it allows Western nations to help Asians without arousing their suspicions. The Asians themselves are spending about $2 billion this year on the Colombo plan, and loans and grants from the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have amounted to $1 billion since 1950. Alongside this investment program there is a thriving program of technical assistance: Five thousand Asians are being trained, and 2,500 British and Commonwealth experts are building dams, making geological surveys, and applying the West's skills to the East's problems in a hundred fields.

This existing association of Asian nations could be expanded into a source of investment capital for the entire region with the backing of United States funds. A unilateral United States program might be called imperialism; a multilateral program under U. N. auspices might be sabotaged by Soviet participation. The Colombo plan avoids both dangers.

THE OBSTACLES

What's keeping us from doing what obviously needs to be done in Asia? It seems to me that there are three obstacles—apart from the administration's own indecision. One obstacle is our own fixed prejudices about foreign investment. Another, not so widely known but equally damaging, is Mr. Stassen's injection of party politics into the supposedly nonpartisan Foreign Operations Administration. The third obstacle has been and continues to be an absence of clear lines of authority in administering the program.

The illusion persists in the present as well as in the previous administration that private investors can meet most of the need for capital in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world. It is an attractive idea, but the simple truth is that right here at home, to say nothing of prospering Canada, the investor finds more lucrative and far safer investment opportunities than are to be found in any underdeveloped area. Foreign countries are now paying us half again as much return on past investments as American citizens are currently investing abroad. I am afraid that continued efforts by the Government to entice American investors abroad will have little effect. Private investors will go into the less developed areas only after some advance has been made on the basic problems of transportation, communication, and health. This can only be done by some form of public investment.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development does part of this job—the part that a strictly banking operation can appropriately do. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote United States trade rather than investment in other countries; so it too can meet only a limited need on a limited scale.

The proposed International Finance Corporation would be an excellent further step in the right direction. By investing in enterprises that Asians themselves start and manage and then selling off its holdings locally when the enterprises become profitable, such a corporation could promote industrial development and help to create a capital market at the same time. It would, however, leave still unsolved the problem of where the money for basic economic development is to come from.

For too many years, our Government has suffered from a lack of imagination in grappling with the whole problem of public investment in less developed areas. Only two forms of assistance have generally been thought feasible: direct grants, which are onerous to the recipients as well as to United States taxpayers, and dollar loans that have to be repaid directly in dollars.

And yet there are other forms of dollar assistance that could be used. We need to learn to use them in Asia.

Suppose we should adopt a program to help finance a regional-development bank under the Colombo plan. The United States could provide the bank with a major share of its initial capital, and loans to the participating countries could then be paid back to the regional bank in local currency. This money could then be loaned out again for further development projects. Such a scheme would have several advantages:

It would create a long-term revolving fund to meet the need for continuous investment in such fields as public health, education, agriculture, and communications.

It would avoid the difficulty of repayment in dollars.

It would avoid the onus of "charity" for the recipient and some of the equally onerous "giveaway" implications for United States taxpayers.

It would clearly indicate a permanent interest on our part in helping Asians to realize their economic aspirations.

THE PORK BARREL

The second obstacle to moving ahead on an Asian program has been the way Mr. Stassen, the man who has advocated a new and bigger program, has been running the one he already had. To put it bluntly, political and patronage considerations have had a devastating effect on the operations of FOA.

Last year, I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act specifically prohibiting the application of "political tests" to FOA appointments abroad, including technical-assistance positions. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), sponsored the amendment in the Senate, and the provision is now law. Despite this legal restriction, FOA filled more jobs by the patronage method in the last half of 1954 than did the entire Departments of Defense, State, Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare combined. As a matter of fact, nearly 29 percent of all those given Federal employment under the "jobs-for-Republicans" program found a haven in Mr. Stassen's supposedly "nonpartisan" and relatively small agency.

In a 6-month period FOA found 237 job openings to refer to the Republican National Committee. Furthermore, funds appropriated for economic development and technical assistance have been diverted to pay for "observation trips" of Republican clubwomen. "Operation Reindeer" sent four prominent Republican women and their husbands to Europe during the Christmas season of 1953—at a cost of $19,000—to observe the Christmas package program.

"Operation Crewcut" brought 16 young men into FOA last October to study local investment opportunities around the world. All 16 appointees were cleared with the party leadership. At this writing only three of the young men have been assigned. Thirteen remain on the payroll in Washington. The reason is simple: Small FOA missions abroad fight against the assignment of relatively unnecessary personnel whose salaries will cut into their meager staff allowances. The total cost of this program to date has been close to $60,000, and the only benefit from it seems to have accrued to the Republican National Committee.

Since political affiliation has become an important criterion for recruitment and promotion, many competent technical and administrative people have left the agency, and those who remain find politics constantly interfering with their work. Efforts to find a worthy Republican for a particular job frequently hold up important projects. It has never been easy to find qualified specialists who are willing to go abroad; the intrusion of partisan considerations makes it even more difficult.

Ever since the appointment in 1948 of Paul Hoffman, a prominent Republican, to head FOA's predecessor agency, the Economic Cooperation Administration, there has been a sort of gentlemen's agreement between Republicans and Democrats in Congress that overseas economic and technical-assistance activities are to be conducted on a nonpartisan basis. Mr. Hoffman's successor was another Republican, William C. Foster. This was good politics: The whole program depends upon bipartisan support in the Congress. Mr. Stassen's deviation from the nonpartisan approach has dangerously undermined congressional support.

UNDER ONE ROOF

The third obstacle to an effective program has been disagreement over how the program should be administered. There are those who believe that foreign economic programs should be administered by the State Department and other established Government agencies. Many, though by no means all, of those who want to partition all foreign economic operations into the old-line agencies hope that if the program is split up it can soon be killed altogether.

In my opinion, there are a number of reasons why it is desirable to keep the operating parts of an economic program separate from the regular duties of the State Department and the Foreign Service. The diplomatic responsibilities of Foreign Service officers require that they avoid any action that may be considered interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They cannot be expected to perform their primary duties effectively while operating a program, even one requested by the participating country, that by its very nature is involved in changing the internal affairs of that country.

But some kind of central direction is required. Although it is essential to use all the facilities and knowledge of other Government agencies, the program cannot be "farmed out" section by section to the various old-line agencies—Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and so on. Unified administration is esential. The best plan would seem to be a separate agency under an administrator who is responsible to the Secretary of State.

PROPOSALS

To this end, I propose that the Congress enact the following legislation:

Establish a permanent Technical Cooperation and Economic Development Agency under an administrator responsible only to the Secretary of State. Under this plan, economic and technical-assistance programs would be separated from military-aid activities, which would be transferred to the direct control of the Defense Establishment.

Authorize the continuation of the technical-assistance and development programs for periods of at least 4 years. Some degree of long-range planning is absolutely essential for any degree of success.

Authorize a regional fund for Asia, loans to be repaid in local currency. The funds should be used to further economic development through an agency like the Colombo plan.

Congress should furthermore make sure that all the facts about the administration of FOA are brought to light before new funds are appropriated. If it meant what it said last year about keeping politics out of economic and technical assistance, it should impress its attitude upon the new chief of whatever agency is set up to handle these matters.

Such a program will certainly not solve all our problems. It is only the beginning of a long process. But since so many of the obstacles we face are of our own making, an effective program in Asia must necessarily begin right here in Washington.